
Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic

Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel

Frank Moore Cross

Harvard University Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
and London, England

Preface

The essays which follow are preliminary studies directed toward a new synthesis of the history of the religion of Israel. Each study is addressed to a special and, in my view, unsolved problem in the description of Israel's religious development. The barriers in the way of progress toward a new synthesis are many. While the burgeoning archaeological enterprise has increasingly uncovered materials which can be used to reconstruct the ancient environment of Israel, at the same time its discoveries have thrown the field into chaos. Great strides have been taken in the endeavor to interpret the new data from the centuries contemporary with ancient Israel and to view the history of Israelite religion whole in its ancient context; still, the sheer mass of new or unassimilated lore hinders synthetic treatment.

Another obstacle in the way of attempts to rewrite the history of Israelite religion has been the obstinate survival of remnants of older syntheses, especially the idealistic synthesis initiated by Wilhelm Vatke and given classic statement by Julius Wellhausen. It is true that the idealistic and romantic presuppositions which informed the early development of literary-critical and form-critical methods have largely been discarded when brought fully to consciousness. Few today would follow Gunkel in presuming that the primitive Israelite was incapable of retaining more than a line or two of poetry. Not a few, however, continue to date short poems or poetic fragments earlier than longer poems. In this fashion the results and models based on the idealistic synthesis often persist unrecognized and unexamined. Particularly difficult and troublesome, for example, is the task of disentangling and removing antinomian tendencies of idealistic or existentialist origin from the analysis of law and covenant and their role in the religion of Israel. Hegel's evaluation of Israelite law might as easily have been written by a contemporary scholar: "The liberator [Moses] of his nation was also its lawgiver; this could mean only that the man who had freed it from one yoke had laid on it another." Unhappily, such a view is also wholly in tune with an older Christian polemic against Judaism.

Yet another hindrance has been the tendency of scholars to overlook or suppress continuities between the early religion of Israel and the Canaanite (or Northwest Semitic) culture from which it emerged. There has been a preoccupation with the novelty of Israel's religious con-

sciousness. More serious, the religion of Israel has been conceived as a unique or isolated phenomenon, radically or wholly discontinuous with its environment. In extreme form these views root ultimately in dogmatic systems, metaphysical or theological, and often serve an apologetic purpose. Yehezkel Kaufmann's monumental attempt to write a history of the religion of Israel comes under this criticism. The empirical historian must describe novel configurations in Israel's religion as having their origin in an orderly set of relationships which follow the usual typological sequences of historical change. Kaufmann's insistence that Israelite religion "was absolutely different from anything the pagan world ever knew" violates fundamental postulates of scientific historical method.

Characteristic of the religion of Israel is a perennial and unrelaxed tension between the mythic and the historical. Concern with this aspect of Israel's religious expression gives some unity to the essays to follow. Israel's religion emerged from a mythopoeic past under the impact of certain historical experiences which stimulated the creation of an epic cycle and its associated covenant rites of the early time. This epic, rather than the Canaanite cosmogonic myth, was featured in the ritual drama of the old Israelite cultus. At the same time the epic events and their interpretation were shaped strongly by inherited mythic patterns and language, so that they gained a vertical dimension in addition to their horizontal, historical stance. In this tension between mythic and historical elements the meaning of Israel's history became transparent.

Perhaps the term "epic" best designates the constitutive genre of Israel's religious expression. Epic in interpreting historical events combines mythic and historical features in various ways and proportions. Usually Israel's epic forms have been labeled "historical." This is a legitimate use of the term "historical." At the same time confusion often enters at this point. The epic form, designed to recreate and give meaning to the historical experiences of a people or nation, is not merely or simply historical. In epic narrative, a people and their god or gods interact in the temporal course of events. In historical narrative only human actors have parts. Appeal to divine agency is illegitimate.

Thus the composer of epic and the historian are very different in their methods of approach to the materials of history. Yet both are moved by a common impulse in view of their concern with the human and the temporal process. By contrast myth in its purest form is concerned with "primordial events" and seeks static structures of meaning behind or beyond the historical flux.

The epic cycle of the Israelite league was taken up into the prose Epic (JE) sources in the course of the early monarchy. The Pentateuch itself may be described as a baroque elaboration of these Epic sources. The Deuteronomistic history (Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings) and the Chronicler's work (Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah) in effect extended the Epic, interpreting the later history of Israel in Epic patterns. Epic was, of course, a well-known literary genre in ancient Canaanite (Ugaritic) religious literature albeit of marginal interest as compared with the Canaanite mythic cycle which provided the libretto to primary rites of the cult. Israel's choice of the epic form to express religious reality, and the elevation of this form to centrality in their cultic drama, illustrates both the linkage of the religion of Israel to its Canaanite past and the appearance of novelty in Israel's peculiar religious concern with the "historical."

This volume is decidedly lopsided in the space it gives to problems belonging to the earlier stages of Israel's history. The ancient era is the least known, of course, and its historical description is in the greatest need of revision. In any case, the study of origins always has a special fascination, and the writer has yielded to its blandishments in apportioning space.

I wish to acknowledge indebtedness and express gratitude to many friends including colleagues and students, who have come to my aid in the preparation of this book. My chief scholarly debt is to William Foxwell Albright. "from whom I gratefully acknowledge myself to have learnt best and most." I owe much, too, to the stimulus of G. Ernest Wright, my colleague for more than twenty years, and to the encouragement and criticisms of David Noel Freedman. Father Richard Clifford has kindly read my manuscript and saved me from many errors. Miss Carolyn Cross has typed the long and wearisome manuscript, handling with miraculous accuracy Roman, Greek, and Hebrew type. To her I offer my special thanks. My thanks go, too, to my daughter, Susan Elizabeth, who has given her precious vacation days to the improvement of my manuscript.

F. M.C.
July 1, 1971

Contents

Abbreviations	xv
I The Religion of Canaan and the God of Israel	1
1 The God of the Fathers	3
2 'El and the God of the Fathers	13
'El in the Ugaritic Pantheon	13
The Epithets of 'El	15
'El in the Canaanite Myth	20
'El and Ba ^ʿ lḤamōn	24
The Abode of 'El	36
'El the Divine Patriarch	39
3 Yahweh and 'El	44
'El in the Bible	44
'El Epithets in Patriarchal Narratives	46
The Name Yahweh	60
II The Cultus of the Israelite League	77
4 Prolegomena	79
The Myth and Ritual School	8 2
The History-of-Redemption School	83
5 The Divine Warrior	91
Psalm 24 and the Warrior-King	91
The "Ritual Conquest"	99
Transformations of the "Ritual Conquest"	105
6 The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth	112
The Mythic Cycle of Ba ^ʿ l and 'Anat	112
The Song of the Sea	121
III League and Kingdom	145
7 Yahweh and Ba^ʿl	147
The Theophany of Ba ^ʿ l	147
The Storm Theophany in the Bible	156
The Revelation at Sinai	163
History of the Tradition of the Storm Theophany	169
'El's Modes of Revelation	177
Yahweh and the Council of the Gods	186

Ba'1 versus Yahweh	190
8 <i>The Priestly Houses of Early Israel</i>	195
The Classical View of Israel's Early Priesthood	195
The Function of the Stories of Conflict	198
The Priestly Genealogies	206
The Priests of David's National Shrine	207
IV Kings and Prophets	217
9 <i>The Ideologies of Kingship in the Era of the Empire: Conditional Covenant and Eternal Decree</i>	219
The Limited Monarchy of Saul and Monarchy in the Northern Kingdom	219
Davidic Kingship	229
The Imperial Rule of Solomon	237
The Judaeen Royal Theology	241
The Typology of the Royal Ideology	264
A Brief Excursus on <i>b'ērīt</i> , "Covenant"	265
10 <i>The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History</i>	274
The Contemporary Discussion of the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History	274
The Two Themes of the First Edition of the Deuteronomistic History (Dtr')	278
The Theme of the Exilic Edition of the History (Dtr ²)	285
The Two Editions of the Deuteronomistic History	287
V Exile and Apocalyptic	291
11 <i>The Priestly Work</i>	293
The So-Called P-Source of the Pentateuch	293
The P System of Covenants	295
Is P a Narrative Source?	301
Documents Used by P	321
Archaizing Language in P	322
The Date of P	323
The Composition of the Priestly Work	324
12 <i>The Early History of the Apocalyptic Community at Qumrân</i>	326
The Archaeological Context of the Qumrân	326
Qumrân and the Essenes	330

Contents

xiii

The Essenes: Priestly Apocalyptists	332
Essene Origins	334
A Note on the Study of Apocalyptic Origins	343
Index of Biblical Citations	349
Index of Ugaritic Citations	364
Index of Technical Terms	366
Index of Authors	367
General Index	371

Abbreviations

<i>AASOR</i>	<i>Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>AfO</i>	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>
<i>AJA</i>	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
<i>AJSL</i>	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
<i>ALQ²</i>	<i>The Ancient Library of Qumrân</i> , by F. M. Cross, 2nd ed. (New York, Doubleday, 1961)
<i>ANEP</i>	<i>The Ancient Near East in Pictures</i> , ed. James B. Pritchard (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1954)
<i>ANES</i>	<i>The Ancient Near East: Supplementary Texts and Pictures</i> , ed. James B. Pritchard (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1969)
<i>ANET</i>	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts</i> , ed. James B. Pritchard (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1950)
<i>AR(A)</i>	<i>Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia</i> , ed. D. D. Luckenbill (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1926)
<i>AR(E)</i>	<i>Ancient Records of Egypt</i> , ed. J. H. Breasted (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1906)
<i>ARI</i>	<i>Archaeology and the Religion of Israel</i> , by W. F. Albright (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1942)
<i>ARM</i>	<i>Archives Royales de Mari</i> , ed. A. Parrot and G. Dossin (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1940—)
<i>ASTI</i>	<i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>
<i>AThNT</i>	<i>Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments</i>
<i>B</i>	Codex Vaticanus
<i>BA</i>	<i>The Biblical Archaeologist</i>
<i>BAL</i>	<i>Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig</i>
<i>BANE</i>	<i>The Bible and the Ancient Near East</i> [Albright Volume], ed. G. Ernest Wright (New York, Doubleday, 1961)
<i>BAR</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist Reader</i> (New York, Doubleday, I, 1961; II, 1964; III, 1970)
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>BAV</i>	<i>Die Beziehungen Aegyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.</i> , by Wolfgang Helck (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1962)
<i>BK</i>	<i>Biblischer Kommentar</i>

<i>BMP</i>	<i>The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri</i> , ed. E. G. Kraeling (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1953)
<i>BWANT</i>	<i>Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament</i>
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>BZA W</i>	<i>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>CAD</i>	<i>Chicago Assyrian Dictionary</i> (Chicago, The Oriental Institute, 1956—)
<i>CAH²</i>	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i> , rev. ed. (Cambridge University Press, 1971—)
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>C-F</i>	“Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry,” by F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, photocopy (Baltimore, 1950)
<i>CIS</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum</i> (Paris, 1881—)
<i>CRAIBL</i>	<i>Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres</i> (Paris)
<i>CTA</i>	<i>Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques</i> , by A. Herdner (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1963)
<i>CTBT</i>	<i>Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets (in the British Museum)</i>
<i>DJD</i>	<i>Discoveries in the Judaean Desert</i> (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955—)
<i>EA</i>	<i>Die El-Amarna-Tafeln</i> , ed. J. A. Knudtzon (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1915)
<i>EHO</i>	<i>Early Hebrew Orthography</i> , by F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman (New Haven, American Oriental Society, 1952)
<i>EI</i>	<i>Eretz Israel</i> (Jerusalem)
<i>G</i>	The Old Greek translation (“Septuaginta”)
<i>G^B</i>	The Egyptian recension of the Old Greek
<i>G^L</i>	The Lucianic Recension of the Old Greek
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>HZA T</i>	<i>Handbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
<i>ICC</i>	<i>International Critical Commentary</i>
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JCS</i>	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
<i>JEA</i>	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>

<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JPOS</i>	<i>Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JThC</i>	<i>Journal of Theology and the Church</i>
<i>JThS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>KAI</i>	<i>Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften</i> , by H. Donner and W. Rollig (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1962-64)
<i>KS (Alt)</i>	<i>Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel</i> , by A. Alt (Munich, C. H. Beck, 1953-59)
<i>KS (Eissfeldt)</i>	<i>Kleine Schriften</i> , by Otto Eissfeldt (Tübingen, Mohr, 1962-68)
<i>L</i>	Vetus Latina
<i>M</i>	Massoretic Text
<i>MAD</i>	<i>Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary</i> (Chicago)
<i>MDOG</i>	<i>Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</i>
<i>MVAG</i>	<i>Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch (Ägyptisch)en Gesellschaft</i>
<i>NPS</i>	<i>Nomspropres sud-semitiques</i> , by G. Ryckmans (Louvain, Muséon, 1934)
<i>OA</i>	<i>Oriens antiquus</i>
<i>OLZ</i>	<i>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>OIP</i>	<i>Oriental Institute Publications</i>
<i>PRU</i>	<i>Palais royal d'Ugarit</i> , ed. C. F. A. Schaeffer (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1955—)
<i>PTU</i>	<i>Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit</i> , by F. Gröndahl (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967)
Q	Qumran
1QIsa ^a	The great Isaiah manuscript from Qumrln, Cave 1
1QpHab	The Habakkuk Peshar from Qumran, Cave 1
1QS	The Order of the Community from Qumran, Cave 1
4QpNah	The Nahum Peshar from Cave 4, Qumrln
4QPssJos	The Psalms of Joshua from Cave 4, Qumran
4QSam ^a	The great Samuel manuscript from Cave 4, Qumrhn
<i>RA</i>	<i>Revue d'Assyriologie</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RSO</i>	<i>Revista degli studi orientali</i>
<i>SBS</i>	<i>Stuttgarter Bibelstudien</i>
<i>SBT</i>	<i>Studies in Biblical Theology</i>
<i>SMir</i>	"The Song of Miriam," by F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, <i>JNES</i> , 14 (1955), 237-250

<i>SVT</i>	<i>Supplement to Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>Sy</i>	The Peshitto (Syriac) translation
<i>ThLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>ÜGS</i>	<i>Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien</i> , by M. Noth (Tübingen , 1943)
<i>UT</i>	<i>Ugaritic Textbook</i> , by C. H. Gordon (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965)
<i>V</i>	Vulgate
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>WM</i>	<i>Wörterbuch der Mythologie</i> , ed. H. W. Haussig (Stuttgart)
<i>WO</i>	<i>Die Welt des Orients</i>
<i>YGC</i>	<i>Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan</i> , by W. F. Albright (New York, Doubleday, 1968)
<i>ZA</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZDMG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZThK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

I The God of the Fathers

The modern discussion of Patriarchal religion may be said to begin with the brilliant essay of Albrecht Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, published first in 1929.¹ Alt proposed to use new means to penetrate into the prehistory of Israel's traditions of the old time. He repudiated the methods of such earlier scholars as Robertson Smith and Julius Wellhausen, who attempted to reconstruct the pre-Yahwistic stage of the tribal forebears of Israel by sifting Israel's early but fully Yahwistic sources for primitive features, primitive in terms of an a priori typology of religious ideas derived largely from nineteenth-century idealism. Such procedures, Alt recognized, yielded merely the superstitious dregs of Israelite religion at any of its stages. As early as 1929, it had become obvious to him that new historical data, much of it from archaeological sources, gave a very different picture from that painted by the older historians. At least it was clear that the religion of Israel's neighbors was on a very much more sophisticated level than that being predicated of the Israelite tribes.

Alt was no less aware than his predecessors of the formidable barriers obstructing the historian's approach to the Patriarchal Age. Even the earliest epic traditions of Israel did not reflect directly the religious milieu of the time of their origin. Rather, by oral transmission over gulfs of time, more or less uncontrolled by written sources, they were shaped even before precipitation into literary form by the events which created the union of the tribes and the Yahwistic cult which was the primary ground of their unity. Nevertheless, the tools for the analysis of the pre-literary history of the old traditions had been forged by Hermann Gunkel's programmatic work in the legends of *Genesis*,² as well as in studies of other complexes of Old Testament tradition, and by such

1. Albrecht Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, III, 12 (1929). Republished in A. Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Munich, Beck, 1953), I, 1-78 (later references are to this edition): in English in *Old Testament History and Religion*, trans. R. A. Wilson (New York, Anchor Books, 1966), pp. 1-100.

2. See especially Hermann Gunkel's introduction to his *Genesis (HzAT)* 2nd ed. (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1902), "Die Sagen der Genesis," pp. xi-xcii. This introduction has been republished in English translation under the title *The Legends of Genesis* (New York, Schocken Paperback, 1965).

analysis—especially by freeing ancient cult names and divine epithets from their secondary (Yahwistic) complex—Alt saw the possibility of progress.

One group of epithets in the Patriarchal legends is characterized by the element *'ēl*. Following Gunkel and especially Gressmann, Alt attributed the *'ēl* appellations to local *numina*, local deities tied to Palestinian shrines or localities, encountered by elements of Israel when they entered the land of Canaan.³ He gave relatively little time to an examination of the “*'ēl* religion” as he called it, and this part of his monograph now appears wholly unsatisfactory.

Alt was much more interested in isolating another group of epithets and analyzing its typology: epithets in which the god is identified by the name of a patriarch. He called these “the gods of the Fathers,” *theoi patrdoi*; they were originally distinct deities presumably, but all belonging to a special religious type, which in the development of Israel's traditions were coalesced into a single family god by the artificial genealogical linkage of the Fathers and at the same time assimilated to Yahweh. These were the “Benefactor⁴ of Abraham,” the “Fear (possibly Kinsman⁵) of Isaac,” and the “Bull of Jacob,”⁶ later the “god of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.” We note with interest that all three epithets

3. For Alt these contacts were not so much in the Patriarchal, i.e., the pre-Mosaic period, as in the era of the entry into Canaan in “Israelite” times. In our view, this is a fundamental weakness in Alt's historical stance, a position increasingly untenable in view of our present knowledge of the movements in Palestine in the second millennium B.C. See, for example, G. E. Mendenhall, “The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine,” *BA*, 25 (1962), 66-87; and Roland de Vaux, “Les Patriarches hébreux et l'histoire,” in his *Bible et orient* (Paris, Editions du Cerf, 1967), pp. 175-185, and the literature cited therein. Except in describing Alt's views, we shall mean by the designation “Patriarchs” the elements of Israel's forebears who moved about in Palestine before the Mosaic age.

4. We read here *māgān*, Ugar. *ma-ga-ni*. Phoenician *māgōn*, from the root *mgn*, “to bestow (favor).” On this form and meaning, see M. Dahood, *Psalms, I, The Anchor Bible (New York, Doubleday, 1966)*, pp. 16f. and references. Its use in the couplet in Gen. 15:1 (*mgn lk* parallel to *škrk*) appears decisive; however, cf. Dt. 33:29.

5. Cf. W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins, 1946), pp. 188f., n. 71; p. 327: Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, p. 26, n. 2. In a forthcoming article by Delbert R. Hillers, “Paḥad Yiṣḥaq,” the meaning “kinsman” is repudiated.

6. Hebrew *'ābīr* originally meant “bull,” or “stallion.” The names of male animals were used often in Old Hebrew and Ugaritic to apply to nobles, lords, or heroes. In Ugaritic, compare CTA, 15.4.6f. (KRT B) *šh.šb'(m).try (7) ṭmnym.[z̄b]yy* (see H. L. Ginsberg, *The Legend of King Keret, BASOR Suppl. Series Nos. 2-3*, [1946], p. 42; and *SMir*, p. 248, for the biblical parallels in Exod. 15:15; Isa. 14:9; Ezek. 17:13; and 2 Sam. 1:19). Other examples include Ugaritic texts CTA 5.5.8f. (*ḥnzrk*, “boars” parallel to *ḡlmk*, “heroes”); 4.4.38 (‘El designated as *īōr* “bull”); and 5.5.18f. (cf. Amos 4:1). See also B. Mazar, “The Military Elite of King David,” *VT*, 13 (1963), 312. A

contain in their initial element a frozen archaism, terms which did not survive in later Hebrew in their early, ordinary meaning.

Elohistic tradition in Exodus 3 :13–15 is crucial to Alt's analysis :

When I come to the people Israel and say to them, "the god of your fathers sent me to you," they will say to me, "What is his name?" What shall I say to them? And God said to Moses, "'*ehyê 'ăšer 'ehyê*.'" Thus you shall say to the people Israel, "'*ehyê* sent me to you." Again God said to Moses, "Thus you will say to the people Israel, **Yahweh** the god of your fathers, the god of Abraham, the god of Isaac, and the god of Jacob sent me to you; this is my name forever, and by this (name) I shall be remembered always."

In this text there is a clear claim for the continuity between the religion of the Fathers and the Yahwistic faith of later Israel. At the same time the text, precisely in its insistence that Yahweh is to be identified with the god of the Fathers, discloses to the historian that the old religion and the Mosaic religion were historically distinct or, in any case, belonged to two stages in a historical development.'

The Priestly tradition in Exodus 6:2-3 points in part in a similar direction : "God said to Moses, 'I am Yahweh. I revealed myself to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as 'El Šadday, but was not known to them by my name Yahweh'." In this stratum of tradition there is also the recognition of a cleavage between the ancient time and the Yahwistic era, though again there is the theological affirmation of the ultimate identity of the god of the Patriarchs and Yahweh. The use here of an 'El appellation is disturbing to Alt's scheme. He admits the authenticity of the title, but argues that this stream of tradition (that is, P) has merely chosen the name of a *numen* of a local shrine, broken it loose from its moorings, and substituted the name for the "god of the Fa-

systematic study of this phenomenon, the use of animal, especially male animal, names to designate nobility has been made by P. W. Miller, "Animal Names as Designations in Ugaritic and Hebrew," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 2 (1971), 177–186.

7. Ah, **Der Gott der Väter**, p. 10: "Dagegen ist die Identität Jahwes mit dem Gott der Väter nicht einfach vorausgesetzt, sondern wird sozusagen vor dem Auge des Lesers erst im Verlauf der Erzählung feierlich vollzogen, indem der erscheinende Gott auf Moses Fragen hin seinen Namen Jahwe mit eigenem Munde ausspricht (V. 14). Eben darin besteht die spezifische Funktion dieser Erzählung im Gesamtaufbau des elohistischen Werkes, dass sie dem Leser einerseits den ganzen Abstand zwischen Väterzeit und Mosezeit **sub specie Dei** zum Bewusstsein bringt und andererseits den Unterschied dann doch wieder in einer höheren Einheit ausgleicht, indem sie ein und denselben Gott als Träger der alten und der neuen Gottesbezeichnung erscheinen lässt."

thers.” More fully assimilated to later Yahwistic institutions is the tradition of the Yahwist, who simply assumes the use of the name Yahweh in pre-Mosaic times and reshapes his tradition in this light.*

Alt turns next to a detailed analysis of the Patriarchal traditions in the Epic sources.⁹ In them he finds evidence of the divine type, “the god of the Father,” and discovers clues to the essential traits of this religion. It differs radically, according to Alt, from the cults of the Canaanite *’ēlīm*, the *numina* of particular holy places. The god of the Father is not attached to a shrine, but is designated by the name of the Patriarch with whom he has a special relation, or rather, in Alt’s view, by the name of the founder of his cult. He is not a local deity, but the patron of the clan, the social group. He may be described as a “historical” god, that is, one who enters into a kinship or covenantal relationship with a clan,¹⁰ and who guides the social group in its peregrinations, its wars, in short through historical vicissitudes to its destiny. The election motif running through the Patriarchal histories was native to the religion of the Fathers, and, though heavily nuanced by later Yahwistic features, was not a theme simply read back into primitive tradition. The special traits of the cult of the Patriarchal gods in fact anticipate at a number of points characteristics of the religion of Yahweh, the lord of covenant and community. These provide continuity between the old religious forms and the new, a historically credible background for emergent Yahwism and an explanation of the development of a religious unity of apparently disparate clans which came together in the Yahwistic league. The gods of the Fathers were *paidagōgoi* to the god Yahweh who later took their place.

Alt also seeks support for his historical construction by a comparison of the Israelite “god of the Father” with analogous divine types, drawn from the Nabataean and related sources. Here there is abundant evidence of epithets of the form, “god of PN.” As in the case of the biblical epithets, Alt posits a simple evolutionary scheme for the epithets of the inscriptions. As nomadic clans entered civilized country, according to Alt, they brought anonymous gods of the type, “god of PN,” and after acculturation began identifying their patriarchal god with *Dū-Šarā*,

8. The key text in J is Gen. 4:26.

9. By “Epic” we mean JE and the epic of which J and E were, in origin, oral variants.

10. It is in this context that we are to understand the kinship elements common in the Amorite names of the second millennium B.C. and in the earliest onomastic material of Israel: *’ab* (“father”), *’ad* (“father”), *’ah* (“brother”), *’hal* (“uncle,” “kinsman”), *’amm* (“kinsman”), and *’hatn* (“relative by marriage”).

the national god, or *Ba'l šamên*, the “Landesgott,” or Zeus *Anikētos*.¹¹

We must argue, however, that the Nabataean and Palmyrene evidence, which furnished Alt's principal analogy with the religion of the Patriarchs, has become ambiguous at best in the light of further analysis and new data.

One may ask seriously if *Dū-Sarā* is not native to the Nabataean tribes; he is unknown earlier in the Transjordanian country. One must also ask if the great gods of the Arabian as well as the Aramaean peoples were unknown to the Nabataeans, or to newly settled people. Alt attributes a strange primitivism to the Nabataeans (and *mutatis mutandis* to Israel) in view of what we now know of their forebears' religion, even in North Arabia. It is quite true that an invading people identify old gods with new. Canaanite and Babylonian deities were, of course, systematically identified, as were the Canaanite and Egyptian pantheons, and so on.¹² Moreover, there can no longer be any doubt that many of the old Semitic gods, like 'Attar/'Attart or 'El, were common to the old Arabic and Canaanite pantheons.”

In the Nabataean inscriptions we have a number of overt identifications: 'lh (mr'n') rb'l with *dwšr* ('r' dy *bbšr*) [Alt, Nos. 5-1 I];¹⁴ *b'šmn* with 'lh *mtnw* [Alt, No. 12], *b'šmn* with 'lh *s'ydw* [Alt, No. 15], *Theos Aumou* with *Theos Anikētos* and *Dios Anikētou Hēliou*,¹⁵ and

11. Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, pp. 68-77.

12. See further below. The Nabataean-Arab goddess, 'al-Kutbā', presents an interesting study in syncretism. See John Strugnell, “The Nabataean Goddess 'Al-Kutbā' and Her Sanctuaries,” *BASOR*, 156 (1959), 299-37.

13. Identifications are often obscured by secondary cult titles or local epithets. W. F. Albright has recently identified *Ba'l Šamēm* of Canaan with 'Attar Šamayn, a god popular in North Arabia as early as the seventh century B.C. (and no doubt earlier) when Assyrian records mention a league (*i'lu*) of *Atarsamain (Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan)* [New York, Doubleday, 1968], pp. 226-232). There are problems, however, with this identification. The solar character of *Ba'l Šamēm* is explicitly stated by Philo Byblius, *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. evan.* 1.10 (ed. Mras), and perhaps more important, in Nabataean texts in Greek, *Ba'l Šamēm* is regularly equivalent to Zeus *Hēlios*. In *Ugaritica V* (Paris, 1968), pp. 48-50, Jean Nougayrol has proposed to read the name of a conflate deity Adad-and-šamaš in a pantheon list (No. 18). Such a deity would fit well with what we know of *Ba'l Šamēm*. However, probably the reading of *IDIMÙIDIM* should be *šamū ù eršitu* parallel to Text 9 (p. 580), 1.5 'aršwšmm (Riecke Borger, “Zu Ugaritica V. Nr. 18 und 138,” *RA*, 63 [1969], 171f.). The *Ba'l* of the “Biq'at *Ba'l*” (Baalbek; cf. Amos 1:5) evidently had solar features to judge by the Greek name of Baalbek; Heliopolis. More data is needed, we believe, before the identity of the god bearing the epithet *ba'l šamēm* can be ascertained.

14. To this series add Milik 2 in Milik, “Nouvelles Inscriptions nabattennes,” *Syria*, 35 (1958), 231. The new inscription reads *ldwšr* 'lh *rb'l*.

15. Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, Nos. 33-45.

perhaps *'lh qsyw* with *b'l šmn*.¹⁶ The first mentioned, since it is the god of Rab'el, presumably Rab'el II,¹⁷ may be called a special case. But Alt is too facile, perhaps, in describing the formula *Theos Aumou* as primitive. *Theos Aumou* indeed occurs in the earliest of the inscriptions of the series (second century of the Christian era!); later we find *Dios Anikētou Hēliou Theou Aumou* (third-fourth centuries); in the latest of the series, however, the “primitive” form *Theos Aumou* reappears. Alt speaks of this latest formula as the survival of the archaic form. We now know that the oldest of the formal Nabataean inscriptions, that of Aṣṣlah [Alt, No. 3] from ca. 95 B.C. is to be read . . . *ldwšr'lh mlktw* (written *mnktw*) . . .¹⁹ The “*Dū-Šara*, god of *Malikatō*” of this inscription then must be identified presumably with the *Theos Maleichatou* of Alt's inscription numbers 51 and 52, from A.D. 106 and 175. This is to reverse Alt's line of evolution unless we persevere in arguing that the earliest inscription is late typologically and *vice versa*.

We also must question the legitimacy of the analogy between the Nabataean Arabs and ancient Israel. The time span is, of course, formidable. Much more serious is Alt's tacit assumption that Israel, like the Nabataeans, infiltrated Palestine from the desert as simple nomads, untouched by the civilization of the settled country. One may question the validity of this conception of the Northern Arabs in the Hellenistic age. Certainly it is an untenable view of Israel. The era of the Patriarchs must be placed in the Middle and Late Bronze Age, the era of Amorite movements from North Mesopotamia, not at the end of the Late Bronze Age (ca. 1200 B.C.) in the time of the conquest of Canaan by Yahwistic clans. The Patriarchs belonged to an age of donkey-nomadism and

16. Ibid., Nos. 13,14. The latter reads *'I qsyw l'lhbm b'l [šmn]*, “the league of *qsyw* to their god *Ba'lišamēm*,” the former *l'lh qsyw*. On Nabataean *'l*, see the discussion in note 13. The root of *'I*, Akk. *l'lu*, is *e'ēlu* “to bind,” perhaps cognate with Arab. *'hl*. **CAD** translates *l'lu* as “confederation,” “amphictyony,” no doubt correctly.

17. On the date of the *'lh rb'el* series, see Milik. “Nouvelles Inscriptions nabatéennes.” pp. 233f.

18. On the chronology of the early Nabataean inscriptions, see F. M. Cross, “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. Ernest Wright (New York, Doubleday, 1961), p. 161 and notes 103–105; Jean Starcky, “Inscriptions archaïques de Palmyre.” in *Studi orientalistici in onore de Giorgio Levi della Vida* (Roma, Instituto per l'orientale, 1956), II, 520–527.

19. On the reading, see Jean Starcky, “Inscriptions archaïques de Palmyre,” p. 523. n. 3, and on the interchange *mlkw/mnkw, mlktw/mnktw*, see also Milik. “Nouvelles Inscriptions nabattennes.” pp. 228. 234: and “Nouvelles Inscriptions stmitiques et greques du pays de Moab.” *Studii Biblici Franciscani. Liber Annuus*, 9 (195859). 354f.

moved through settled lands, never far from water. It was an age, too, when a cultural continuum stretched from Ugarit in the north through Canaan, for much of the period an Egyptian dependency, into the western delta, especially the area of the Wādī Tumeilât (Goshen).²⁰

The most vulnerable points in Alt's construction of the religious type, the gods of the Father, are found in the notion that these gods were without personal names or cult places.

Julius Lewy attacked Alt's position on the basis of parallels from the Cappadocian (Old Assyrian) texts of the early second millennium.*' Here in a series of formulae, Lewy could show that the expressions *il abika*, "the god of your father," *Ilabrat il abini*, "Ilabrat, the god of our father," and *Ilabrat* (simply), were interchangeable elements. He concluded that the Amorites attached to the Assyrian merchant colonies, while adopting the high god Assur of Assyria, called as well on the ancestral god, "the god of your father," or "the god of our fathers," or without further specification, *Ilabrat*,²² the proper name of their god. To Lewy this appeared to be clear evidence that Patriarchal deities were not anonymous, at least in his archaic texts, and suggested that the Old Testament God of the Fathers was a family god as tradition had it, and that his proper name was 'ēl šadday quite as Priestly tradition claimed. For example, in the old poem in Genesis 49 : 25 there is the bicolon :

m'l 'byk wy'zrk
w'⟨l⟩²³ šdy wybrkk

From the god of your father who supports you,
'Ēl-Šadday who blesses you.²⁴

20. Cf. W. F. Albright, "Abram the Hebrew," *BASOR.* 163 (October 1961), 3654. We need not accept all the conclusions of Albright's tour *de force* to establish our case. Cf. on the other hand, R. de Vaux, "El et Baal, le dieu des Peres et Yahweh," *Ugaritica VI* (Paris, Geuthner, 1969), pp. 510-514.

21. Julius Lewy, "Les Textes paleo-assyriens et l'Ancien Testament," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 110(1934), 29-65: cf. A. Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, p. 31, n.1.

22. *Ilabrat* corresponds to Sumerian Ninšubur, messenger and grand vizier of Anu ; cf. Lewy, p. 52, n. 57. Note also *il ebbarūtum*, "the god of the collegium," and *i/i ummeāniya*, "god of my principal" ["Les Textes paléo-assyriens," p. 53. n. 59: *CAD.* VII, 97] which replace *Ilabrat*. On Ninšubur, see most recently D. O. Edzard, *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, ed. H. W. Haussig (Stuttgart, n.d.) I, 113. Thorkild Jacobsen suggests that Il(i)-abrat is most likely a shortened appellative form of il(i)abrātum, "god of the people/folk" (private communication).

23. Correcting the Massoretic text on the basis of Sam and Sy: cf. G.

24. For similar views, see M. Haran, "The Religion of the Patriarchs, an Attempt at Synthesis," *ASTI*, 4 (1965), 30-55; cf. also, S. Yeivin, "The Age of the Patriarchs." *RSO*, 38 (1963), 2777302.

Thanks to the publication of additional Cappadocian (Old Assyrian) texts, the evidence which Lewy drew upon is now expanded. In addition to Ilabrat, the god Amurru is called *î-li a-bi-a*, “the god of my father,” and in another instance, Ištar the star (*kakkubum*) is called *i-lia-ba-e-ni*, “the god of our fathers.”²⁵

In inscriptions from Zincirli there are references to “the gods of my father’s house”²⁶ on a broken orthostat of **Bir-Rākib**,²⁷ and to **Rākib-’El** as the family patron (*b’l byt*)²⁸ on inscriptions of Panamū and Kilamuwa. In the text of Kilamuwa a series of family gods are recorded: *b’l šmd’š lgb*, “Ba’l Šimd who belonged to Gabbar”; *b’l hmn’š lbnh*, “Ba’l of the Amanus²⁹ who belonged to BMH”; and *rk’l b’l bt*. “Rākib’il, patron of (my) family.”³⁰ In the texts of his successors the epithets used here are replaced by the personal names of the gods in question except in the case of **Rākib’il:Hadad** for Ba’l Šimd, “lord of the Warclub,” ‘El for **Ba’lḤamōn**.³¹ We are not certain of the identification of **Rākib’il**.³² To be sure, the objection can be made that we are dealing here, not with the old “gods of the Fathers,” but national gods, patrons of the royal house, comparable to the Nabataean god of Rab’il.

25. See P. Garelli’s review of *Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets (CCT/V)* in *JSS*, 3 (1958), 298301 (also in Garelli’s volume, *Les Assyriens en Cappadoce* [Paris, Adrien Maisonneuve, 1963]); H. Hirsch, “Gott der Väter,” *AfO*, 21(1966), 56ff. (also in Hirsch’s volume, *Untersuchungen zur altassyrischen Religion* [Beiheft 13/14 *AfO*, Graz, 1961]). Cf. also the discussions of R. de Vaux, *Ugaritica VI*, 502ff.; and J. Ouellette, “More on ‘El Šadday and BēlŠadē,” *JBL*, 88 (1969), 470f.

26. *KAI*, 217:3.

27. On the pronunciation of **Bir-Rākib**, see J. Friedrich. “Das bildhethitische Siegel des Br-Rkb von Sam’al,” *Orientalia*, 26 (1957). 3455347.

28. *KAI*, 215.22: 24.16 (Kilamuwa of Zincirli). Compare the Nabataean text Jaussen I, 59 [Alt 16] *Imr byt’ Ḥ t/ymw*, “to the patron of the family, the god of T .”

29. On *hmn* (< *hmn*) “Amanus,” see below.

30. *KAI*, 24.15. 16.

31. On the identification of ‘El with “the lord of the Amanus,” see below where the views of Landsberger and others will be taken up.

32. The epithet *rākib* often is used of Ba’l-Haddu. See now the names *bin rakub-ba’l* and *bin ili-ma-rakub* at Ugarit (cf. F. Gröndahl, *PTU*, p. 179). and the frequent epithet of Haddu, *rākib’arapāti*, “rider of the cloud-chariot.” However, **Rākib-il** at Zincirli appears to be the lunar god *Yariḥ*. We have **Bir-Rakib** speak of *Rdkib’il* as *mr’y*, “my lord”; he speaks also of Ba’l Ḥarran (Sin) as *mr’y*, suggesting their identification. The symbol of the moon, full and crescent, is apparently the symbol of both. Regularly **Rākib’il** is listed alongside *Šams* in series (Panammu I, 2-3, 11, 18; II, 22). R. Rendtorff in “El, Ba’l und Jahwe,” *ZAW*, 78 (1966), 277-292, fails to understand the special order of gods at Zincirli (according to the series of patron gods of the dynasty), and at Sefire (patron gods, high gods, old gods, the regular order of treaty witnesses.) There is no doubt possible concerning El’s place at the head of the pantheon.

No such objection can be leveled at the evidence which comes from the onomasticon of Amorite tribal folk. We alluded above to the kinship names of the Amorites. Such names have their *Sitz im Leben* in the cult of the personal or covenant god who enters into special relationship with the Patriarch and his offspring. A perusal of the names shows, however, that the Amorite gods of the Father are neither anonymous gods nor minor *genii*.³³ Most common in these names are the gods 'II, Hadad, and Dagan.

Another group of Amorite names are those compounded with *sumu*, "the name," *sumuhu*, "his name," *sumuna*, "our name," plus a divine name or epithet. The element *sum-* refers to the hypostatized name of the god of the family or clan (that is, the personal or Patriarchal god) on whom he can call or by whom he swears. Frequently we find this element compounded with 'II ('El): su-mu-la-AN /sumū(hu)-la-'il/ "El is indeed his personal god": su-mu-AN /sumū-'il/ "El is his personal God": and so on. It also appears with other high gods: Dagan, Ba'l (Haddu), and so on.³⁴ The same name formation is found in early Hebrew *šmw'l* (> *šimuhu-'Il > šimû'Ēl), and in Old South Arabic *šmh'ly* /šumhu-'Alī/.³⁵ Such a hypostatization of the name stands in the background of the Deuteronomic name theology.³⁶ A frequent onomastic pattern also is *sum-* plus a kinship epithet of deity: su-mu-a-mi/sumū-'ammi/ "The (divine) kinsman is his personal god": su-mu-na-a-bi /sumuna-'abi/ "The (divine) Father is our personal god."³⁷

Two biblical names of the god of the Father particularly resist inclusion in Alt's scheme. There is 'El Šadday which is patterned after the 'El epithets and is attached, at least by Priestly tradition, to Bet-'El (Gen. 48:3). 'El Šadday, moreover, is explicitly named "the god of your father" not merely in Priestly tradition but in the archaic Blessing of Jacob. There is also the epithet 'El 'ēlōhē yiśrā'el "El, god of (the Patriarch) Israel" (Gen. 33 : 22) attached to an etiology of the altar at

33. Contrast Sumerian religious culture where the personal gods of common folk are minor gods.

34. See H. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1965), pp. 248f.

35. We find names with the 3 m.s. suffix both with h and š. See G. Ryckmans, *Les Noms propres sud-sémitiques* (Louvain, Muséon, 1934) I, 266.

36. See the forthcoming monograph of S. Dean McBride, *The Deuteronomic Name Theology* (Ph. D. diss., Harvard, 1969), especially the section entitled "Hypostatization of the Divine Name in Northwest Semitic Religion," pp. 136–141.

37. Another interesting group of names is represented by a-ya-la-su-m-ú/'ayya-la-sumū/ "where is his personal god?"

Shechem.³⁸ We shall return to these epithets in discussing the ‘El names.

Our examination of Alt’s analysis of Patriarchal religion has raised a number of questions. I should not deny that Alt has performed an extremely significant work in distinguishing a special type of deity or divine cult which he labels “the god of the Father.” I do not believe that the Patriarchal gods were typically nameless, designated only by the eponym of the clan and/or the cult founder. In fact we should regard the formula “god of PN” as specifying the **cultus** of a clan or tribal league, and hence a special cultic epithet used in place of the usual proper name of the god. Insofar as these Patriarchal deities belong to a pastoral or migrant folk, no doubt they were imported, ancestral gods in origin rather than the gods of popular sanctuaries in the **lands** of Patriarchal sojournings. However, there seems to be no reason to doubt, in view of our evidence, that these clan or “social” gods were high gods and were quickly identified by common traits or by cognate names with gods of the local pantheon. For example, an Amorite moving from northern Mesopotamia to Canaan would have no difficulty in identifying Amorite ʾIl and Canaanite ‘El, Amorite Dagan and Canaanite Dagnu, Amorite Hadad and Canaanite Haddu. In any case, the movement of the Patriarchs of Israel was from an old culture to a new but related culture, an old pantheon to a new, not from anonymous gods to named gods, nor from a cultural blank into first contacts with civilization.

³⁸ Cf. *l]’el’elohē’abikā*, “‘El god of your father,” in Gen. 46: 3. The article is to be omitted in this epithet, since in any case the article developed after the beginning of the Iron Age.

2 'El and the God of the Fathers

'El in the Ugaritic Pantheon

The discovery of the Ugaritic texts beginning in 1929 and continuing into the present has removed any doubt that in the Canaanite pantheon 'Il was the proper name of the god par excellence, the head of the pantheon. While **'if** may be used, of course, as an appellative of deity, for example in such an expression as 'il Haddu, "the god Haddu," such usage is relatively rare. In mythic texts, in epic texts, in pantheon lists and temple records, 'Il is normally a proper name.' That 'El was the name of a particular deity should have been clear from the beginning from Sakkunyaton's "Phoenician Theology" preserved in fragments in Philo Byblius who in turn was epitomized by Eusebius in the *Praeparatio evangelica*.²

Moving to East Semitic we find again very ancient evidence that Il was the proper name of a deity. Il appears often in earliest Old Akkadian sources without the case ending,' unambiguously the divine name and not an appellative.⁴ The forms *Ilu* and *Ilum* are ambiguous as are forms written logographically with DINGIR, but many of these forms, too, are no doubt the divine name. For example, the pattern DN-I,-lum does not occur, but kinship names (*Abu-ilum Aḥu-ilum*, and so on) and like patterns (*Ilum-bānī*, "Il/God is my creator," *Ilum-qurād*, "Il/God is a warrior") are frequent and give the same picture of the god as 'patron, creator, "god of the Father," and warrior that we find in unambiguous names. One also finds names like I-I-DINGIR-lum /Ilī-ilum/ "my god

I. See the study of O. Eissfeldt, *El in ugaritischen Pantheon* (Leipzig, Akademie Verlag, 1951), and the excellent treatment by M. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts, VT Suppl. 2* (Leiden, 1955).

2. The best critical text is that of K. Mras, ed., *Eusebius Werke*, vol. 8, part 1, *Die Praeparatio evangelica* (Berlin, 1954) 1.10. 1-44 (hereafter referred to as *Praep. evang.*). Cf. C. Clemen, *Die phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos* (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1939); O. Eissfeldt, *Ras Shamra und Sanchuniaton* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1939); *Sanchuniaton von Berut und Ilumilku von Ugarit* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1952). The most thoroughgoing recent study of Sakkunyaton is the unpublished Harvard dissertation of Lynn R. Clapham, *Sanchuniathon: The First Two Cycles (1969)*.

3. Exclusive of the predicate state.

4. See the recent study of J. M. Roberts, *The Early Akkadian Pantheon* to be published shortly by the Johns Hopkins Press. Cf. also I. J. Gelb, *Glossary of Old Akkadian, MAD³* (Chicago, 1957), pp. 26-36, esp. p. 28; *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*, 2nd ed. *MAD²* (Chicago, 1961), pp. 139-142, 145-148.

is *Il(um)*.” I. J. Gelb has gone so far as to say “we may note the very common use of the element *Il* in Akkadian theophorous names, which seems to indicate that the god *Il* (later Semitic *’El*) was the chief divinity of the Mesopotamian Semites in the Pre-Sargonic period.”⁵

In the Amorite onomasticon of the eighteenth century B.C. the god *’Il* plays a large role.⁶ Occasionally the divine name is spelled *ila* which many scholars have normalized /’ilāh/.⁷ It is perhaps best to take the *-a* of *ila* as a morpheme denoting predicate state both in Amorite and Old Akkadian.⁸

Among the more interesting Amorite names are those compounded with *sumu* “the name,” *sumuhu* “his name,” plus the element *’Il* or *’ila*. Kinship terms used as theophorous elements are also frequent with the name *’Il* in the onomasticon: *’abum-’ilu*, “‘Il is the (divine) father”; *’adī-’ilu*, “‘Il is my (divine) sire”; *’aḥum-ma-’Il*, “‘Il is my (divine) brother”; *Ḥali-ma-’ilu*, *’ammu-’ilu*, and *Ḥatnī-’ilu*, all “‘Il is my (divine) kinsman.”

The divine proper name *’Il* is frequently found in Old South Arabic. As we have noted, some of the patterns of Amorite *’Il* names are found also in South Arabic.

In view of the fact that *’Il* appears as a proper name in the earliest strata of languages belonging to East Semitic, Northwest Semitic, and South Semitic, we may conclude that this denotation of *’if* belongs to Proto-Semitic as well as its use as a generic appellative. To argue that one of the two denotations takes priority is to speculate in the shadowy realm of a pre-Semitic language and is without point.

In the three pantheon lists⁹ found at Ugarit, first in order came *’il-’ib* (Akk. DINGIR.a-bi) followed by *’Il* (Akk. *ilum* [DINGIR-lum]). *Dagnu* (later *Dāgān* > Heb. *dāgān*; Phoen. *dāgōn*) and *Ba’l Ṣapān* are third and fourth respectively.¹⁰ The designation *’il-’ib*, Hurrian *en atn*, plural *enna-ka attanna[šta]* apparently applies to a generic type of deity,

5. Gelb, *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*, p. 6.

6. Cf. Huffmon, *Amorite Names* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), p. 165, and the literature cited.

7. Cf. Huffmon, *Amorite Names*, p. 165, and the literature cited.

8. Cf. I. J. Gelb, *Old Akkadian Grammar* (Chicago, 1961), pp. 146f., and “La lingua degli Amoriti.” *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei: Rendiconto della Classe de scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, ser. VIII, vol. XIII (Rome, 1958), p. 154, § 3.2.3.1.4 and p. 155, § 3.2.5.

9. *CTA 29* (Gordon 17); and J. Nougayrol et al., *Ugaritica V* (Paris, Geuthner, 1968), No. 18 and pp. 42-64; the third text, as yet unpublished, is described on pp. 63f.

10. Compare the Hurrian god lists, *Ugaritica V*, pp. 518-527.

perhaps the divine (dead) ancestor.” In any case, the major gods of the cult begin with ³Il. His place at the head of the pantheon is clear also in the mythic texts of Ugarit and in the lore of Sakkunyatun.

The Epithets of 'EL

The character of the god 'El is revealed in part in his epithets. A number of epithets portray 'El as father and creator. He is called on occasion ³abū banī 'ili,¹² “father of the gods.” One may compare:

ṭōru 'il 'abūhu
'11 malk dūyakāninuhu¹³

Bull 'El his father
King 'El who created him

Though Ba'l is called son of Dagan regularly in these texts, here 'El is called his father and progenitor. However, we are dealing here with a fixed oral formula which could be used of any of the sons of 'El, that is, any god.¹⁴ The epithet “Bull” is noteworthy. One may compare, for example, the epithet of the patriarchal god ³Ābīr Ya'qob, “the Bull of Jacob.” Like epithets are *bāniyu binwāti*,¹⁵ “Creator of (all) creatures,” and ³abū 'adami,¹⁶ “Father of man.” In Text 10 we find the 'El epithet:

ki qāniyunu 'ōlam
ki dārdā(ṭ) dīi yakāninunu¹⁷

Indeed our creator is eternal
Indeed ageless he who formed us.

Compare also *qāniyatu 'ilīma*,¹⁸ “Creatress of the gods,” a formula applied to 'El's consort Asherah-'Elat. Yet another designation used of 'El is *ḥātikuka*, “thy patriarch.”¹⁹ In later West Semitic texts we

11. See YGC, pp. 141f.

12. *CTA*, 32.1.25, 33, etc.

13. *CTA*, 3.5.43; 4.1.5; 4.4.47; etc.

14. In *Praep. evan. I*, 10.26, we find the plain statement that Ba'l *was born* to 'El.

15. *CTA*, 6.3.4 IO; 4.3.31; etc.

16. *CTA*, 14.1.36; 14.3.150; 14.6.296; etc.

17. *CTA*, 10.3.6. The reading is based on the reconstruction of H. L. Ginsberg.

18. *CTA*, 4.3.30; 4.4.32; 4.1.23; etc.

19. *CTA*, 1.2.18; 1.3.6. On *ḥātik*, see F. M. Cross, “The Canaanite Tablet from Taanach,” *BASOR*, 190(1968), p. 45, n. 24.

13. *CTA*, 3.5.43; 4.1.5; 4.4.47; etc.

find the liturgical name *'El qōnē'arš*, Hittite *Ilkunirsa*, "'El, creator of earth."²⁰

Another series of epithets describe 'El as the "ancient one" or the "eternal one" with grey beard and concomitant wisdom. One is cited above. In another Asherah speaks of a decree of 'El as follows :

taḥmuka 'ilu ḥakamu
ḥakamu (*sic!*) 'ima 'ólami
ḥayyatu ḥizzata taḥmuka²¹

Thy decree O 'El is wise,
Wise unto eternity,
A life of fortune thy decree,

In the same context Lady Asherah addresses 'El:

rabita 'ilu-mi la-ḥakamta
šēbatu daqanika la-tasiruka²²

Thou art great O 'El, verily Thou art wise
Thy hoary beard indeed instructs Thee.

In *Ugaritica V* a new text has been published which gives to 'El the familiar biblical epithet *mélek 'ólām*, "eternal king."²³ A similar liturgical name of 'El is *malku 'abū šanīma*, "king, father of years."²⁴ This in turn is reminiscent of biblical *'PI gibbōr 'abī 'ad* "El the warrior, eternal father," and of the white-haired "Ancient of Days," *'attīq yômīn* of Daniel 7.²⁵

20. *KAI*, 26A III, 18; 129, I. On the Hittite *Ilkunirsa*, consort of *Ašertu* (Asherah), see Otten, "Ein kanaanäischer Mythos aus Boğazköy," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* (1953), pp. 125-150; and the discussion of Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, pp. 52-54. To his comments we should add only that the god *kinnār*, Akk. *ki-nārum*, now appears in a pantheon list, *Ugaritica V*, No. 18,31, and pp. 59f.

21. *CTA*, 4.4.41; 3.5.38.

22. *CTA*, 4.5.66; cf. 3.5.10.

23. Text 2.1; verso 4.5 (?), 6; cf. Jer. 10:10. The writer predicted in 1962 that biblical *mlk'wlm* would prove to be an 'El epithet ("Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *HTR*, 55 [1962], 236). The title is also used of Amenophis III in *PRU*, V, 8.9.

24. *CTA*, 6.1.36; 17.6.49; etc. That *šnm* appears here should not occasion surprise. The plurals *šnm* and *šnt* were available in Old Canaanite, and the Ugaritic materials reflect more than one level of dialect. We judge it to be a frozen formula. Note that *'ab šnm* appears only with *mlk*, confirming that *mlk'lm* and *mlk 'ab šnm* are alternate formulaic epithets of the god 'El.

25. Isa. 9:5; Dan. 7:9; cf. Isa. 40:28.

The text of Daniel 7 is of particular interest. The apocalyptist utilized for his eschatological vision an old mythological theme: 'El sitting in judgment in his court. The identity of the Ancient One is transparent.²⁶ The manlike Being ("like a son of man") who comes to receive kingship is evidently young Ba'l reinterpreted and democratized by the apocalyptist as the Jewish nation. This has been clearly recognized and defended by J. A. Emerton.²⁷ It has not been pointed out, I believe, that the 'mṣ šmṣ' who come with the "one like a man" belong to the traditional entourage of Ba'l, the (deified) storm clouds (or cloud chariot) accompanying him or on which he rides.²⁸

On occasion the name 'Ōlām (*simpliciter*) may be used of 'El. An excellent example is found in a Phoenician incantation on a plaque of the seventh century B.C. from Arslan Tash. The text reads in poetic parallelism :

The Eternal One has made a covenant oath with us,
Asherah has made (a pact) with us.²⁹

The formulaic juxtaposition of 'El's consort Asherah with 'Ōlām in the bicolon argues strongly for the identification of 'Ōlām as an appellation or cult name of 'El. The two supreme gods are named and then follows :

And all the sons of El,
And the great of the council of all the Holy Ones.
With oaths of Heaven and Ancient Earth,

^{26.} See below.

^{27.} J. A. Emerton, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery," *JThS*, 9 (1958), 225-242.

^{28.} See *CTA*, 5.5.6-1 1; 2.1.35; 10.2.33 and the discussion below.

^{29.} This reading is discussed by F. M. Cross and R. J. Saley, "Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B.C. from Arslan Tash in Upper Syria," *BASOR*, 197 (February 1970), 42-46; the text is written largely in Phoenician orthography but Aramaic script:

k;r:/rt.ln.'lt/'lm
'Sr. krt/lm
wkl bn 'lm
wrb.dr kl. qdšn /sic!
b'lt.šmm.w'rš/'lm
b'lt.b'1/[']dn'rš
b'1l/lt ḥwrn.'š tm py
wšb'.srty
wšm/nh.'št.b'1 qdš

With oaths of Ba'l, lord of earth,
 With oaths of Ḥawrān whose word is true,
 And his seven concubines,
 And Ba'l Qudš' eight wives.

Other evidence of the divine name 'Ōlām appears in the place-name *bt'rm(m)*, that is, *bēt'ōlām*, "(city of the) temple of 'Ōlām." The place-name is found in the Shishak List³⁰ of towns allegedly conquered in his campaign in the late tenth century B.C. The name 'Ōlām also appears in the Phoenician theogony of Moschos reported by Damascius, in the late Phoenician form transliterated into Greek: *oulōm(os)*.³¹ Its context strongly suggests, however, that it applies not to a god of the cult such as 'El, but to one of the old gods belonging to the abstract theogonic pairs. This would equate Moschos' *oulbmos* with Philo Byblius' *Aibn* of the pair *Aiōn* and *Prōtōgonos*,³² and, of course, the *Aiōn(s)* of later Gnosticism.

We also find the epithet 'ōlām applied to the "old god" Earth in the theogonic pair: "Heaven and Eternal Earth."³³

Perhaps the most striking evidence portraying 'El as the Ancient (or Eternal) One has come from the Proto-Canaanite inscriptions of the fifteenth century B.C.³⁴ In 1947, W. F. Albright, during his campaign at Serābīṭ el-Ḥādem, recognized that the miners of Sinai in their proto-Canaanite texts used appellations of the Canaanite deities identified with the Egyptian gods, notably with Ptah, creator god of Memphis and with Ḥathor whose temple was in Serābīṭ el-Ḥādem. The late Sir

30. No. 36 in A. Jirku's edition, *Die ägyptischen Listen palästinensischer und syrischer Ortsnamen* (*Klio*, Beiheft 37, 1937). p. 48.

31. Damascius, *De primis principiis* (ed. J. Kopp), p. 125.

32. *Praep. evang.* I, 10.9.

33. See above, note 29. We should also take into account the divine epithet *špš'lm*, "the eternal sun," in the Karatepe Inscription (B III,18-IV *[margo]*). This title, in the form *šamaš dārētum* (a Canaanite feminine!) appears in the Amarna texts (*EA*. 155:6, etc.), used as an epithet of the Pharaoh. The late Arthur Darby Nock called my attention to *semesilam*, probably for *semsōlam*, the equivalent of Hebrew *šemes'ōlām*, in the magical papyri: K. Preisendanz, *Papyri graecae magicae* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1928), II 169/70; IV 591, 1805; V 351, 366, etc. These papyri are full of archaic elements, e.g., *ereschigal* (=Sumerian *Ereškigal* [II, 341]); nevertheless, it is interesting to find a Canaanite epithet known from Egyptian documents of the fourteenth century B.C. surviving in texts of the fourth century of our era.

34. These texts are treated by W. F. Albright in his important monograph, *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions and Their Decipherment* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1966); see also "The Early Alphabetic Inscriptions from Sinai and Their Decipherment," *BASOR*, 110 (1948). 6-22.

Alan Gardiner had made the first step by reading correctly *lb'lt* "(dedicated) to the Lady," the title of the goddess of Byblos who was identified both in Egypt and Canaan with Ḥathor.³⁵ Albright read also *dt b'n* "the Serpent Lady," an epithet of Qudšu-Asherah.³⁶ There was also the epithet *d'ib* "the Merciful One," much like the Ugaritic appellation of **'El: dū pa'idi**, "the Compassionate One."

In 1958 I recognized that a mine inscription, owing to a poor facsimile, had been misread and hence remained undeciphered." It reads *'lq'lm*, **'if dū 'ôlami**, "El, the Ancient One" or "El, lord of Eternity." It is evidently the epithet which stands behind the biblical **'El 'Ôlām**, "the god of eternity,"³⁸ and may be compared with Ptaḥ's epithets **nb dt** or **nb nhḥ**, both meaning "the lord (or one) of eternity."³⁹

A similar epithet in form if not in content appears in a prism from Lachish.⁴⁰ It bears on one face the name of Amenophis II (ca. 1435–1420 B.C.), on another face a representation of Ptaḥ and an inscription beside Ptaḥ in Proto-Canaanite letters identical in date with the Sinai script. Albright recognized here the epithet **dū gitti**, "lord of Gath," an appellation he already had found in Serābīt Text 353.⁴¹ I should take both to be liturgical names from an 'El cult at Gath in southwestern Palestine.⁴²

Aside from the confirmation of the dating of the Sinaitic inscriptions

35. Alan Gardiner, "The Egyptian Origin of the Semitic Alphabet," *JEA* (1916), pp. 1-16.

36. See below, notes 119 and 120.

37. The Mine M inscription (No. 358) was published by Romain F. Butin, S.M., in "The Serabit Expedition of 1930," *HTR*, 25 (1932), 184f. and Pl. XXVII. Monsignor P. W. Skehan has kindly written to me reporting that Butin's squeeze, in the collection of the Catholic University of America, conforms to my reading. W. F. Albright accepts the reading in his latest study, *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions*, p. 24.

38. Genesis 21: 33. As generally recognized, **yhwh** is secondary here. (See also below.)

39. See Papyrus Harris 1308 (Breasted, *AR* IV, 163); the Memphite theology, *passim* (see John Wilson in *ANET*, pp. 4-6, and bibliography): etc.

40. *Lachish IV: The Bronze Age*, by Olga Tufnell et al., Text 128 (Diringer), pl. 38, 295. Cf. the Amenophis II seal, Rowe S. 37 (Alan Rowe, *A Catalogue of Egyptian Scarabs* [Cairo, Imp. de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1936]), which bears a representation of Ptaḥ, and a hieroglyphic inscription *ptḥ*.

41. Albright, *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions*, p. 22, reads **d gnt**. In the photograph **I see** only **d gt** and prefer the assimilated form. At Sinai there are both assimilated and unassimilated **nuns**.

42. Albright takes the epithet to be "Lord of the Vintage (or Winepress)," the Egyptian god Shesmu, a god in the entourage of Ptaḥ who was. Albright explains, apparently taken by the Semites to be "only a form of his immediate chief Ptaḥ" (*The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions*, p. 4).

and the identification of Ptaḥ with Canaanite 'El, the little inscription adds to the evidence that in south Canaan and in the Sinai the cult of 'El was widespread⁴³ and that liturgical epithets of the type *dū'ólami*, *dū pa'idi*, *dū tābi*, and *dū Gitti* were characteristic of the period.⁴⁴ The consort of 'El, Canaanite and Egyptian *Qudšu*, whose other names included 'Atirāt *yammi*, "she who treads on Sea," and 'Élat, also is well documented in the south.⁴⁵

'El in Canaanite Myth

In a recently published text⁴⁶ we find 'El, called *Rapi'u malk'ólami*, "the Hale One, eternal king," presiding at a courtly banquet. His epithet *rapi'u*, literally "one who is hale," applied to the great gods 'El and apparently Ba'l-Haddu,⁴⁷ as well as to El's entourage. The element *rapi'* is found often in kinship names of personal gods: '*abrp'u /abi-rapi'u*'/"Rapi' is my (divine) father": '*mrp'i /'ammu-rapi'*'/"Rapi' is the Kinsman": *mt rpi'*, an epithet of Dan'il, "man of Rapi'"; and so on. Semantically, the term is close to *heilig*, "holy one." As is the case with 'élōhīm in Hebrew, *rapi'* may secondarily apply to dead gods or heroes. Note, however, that in the so-called "Rephaim" cycle,⁴⁸ *rapi'ūma* (pl.) is parallel regularly to 'ilāniyūma, "divinities," later Phoenician 'élōnīm and 'élōnūt, the generic appellative for "gods,"

43. On the temple of Ptaḥ ('El) at Ascalon in the Late Bronze Age, see J. Wilson in *The Megiddo Ivories*, by Gordon Loud (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939), pp. 11–13; and W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1962). pp. 480f.

44. In the Old Testament the usage survives, with a noun, in *zē sinay*, older **dū sīnay* in Judges 5:5, and as a relative before verbs sporadically, e.g., *zū qānitā* "whom thou didst create" (Exod. 15:16). This usage is, of course, well known in Phoenician (cf. J. Friedrich, "Zur Einleitungsformel der ältesten phönizischen Inschriften aus Byblos," in *Melanges Dussaud* [Paris, Geuthner, 1939], pp. 37–47). The use of *dū* in divine epithets is frequent in Old Canaanite and ubiquitous in South Arabic. We shall have occasion to cite several below. The grammatical formation also appears not infrequently in Amorite personal names: *zū-ḥatni*, *zū-sumim*, etc. See the discussions of I. J. Gelb, "La lingua degli Amoriti," p. 152, and W. L. Moran, "The Hebrew Language in its Northwest Semitic Background," in *BANE*, p. 61.

45. On Asherah-Bat's cultus in thirteenth century Lachish, see F. M. Cross, "The Evolution of the Proto-Canaanite Alphabet," *BASOR*, 134 (1954), 20f.; "The Origin and Early Evolution of the Alphabet," *Eretz-Israel*, 8 (1967), 16*. Much later she appears also on coins of Ascalon, presumably still in association with 'El. She holds the *aphlaston* and otherwise displays her associations with the sea.

46. *Ugaritica V*, Text 2 (RS 24.252).

47. Cf. *CTA*, 22.2.8.

48. *CTA*, 20–22.

“goddesses.”⁴⁹ The text reads:

'Ilu yaṭibu ba-ʿattarti ʿšadī
'Ilu ṭapaṭa ba-Haddi rā'iyu
dū yaširu wa-yaḏammiru ba-kinnāri⁵⁰

'El is enthroned with 'Attart (of the field);
'El sits as judge with Haddu his shepherd,
Who sings and plays on the lyre. . .

The scene is a pleasant one, the old king sitting in state with his young mistress and with the shepherd Haddu singing and playing in court as David sang to old Saul. Evidently Haddu sits at the right hand of the father-god, 'Attart on his left, The scene fits strikingly with lore to be found in Sakkunyaton: “Astartē, the greatest goddess and ... Adodos, king of the gods, ruled the country with the consent of Kronos (ʿEl).”⁵¹

The text ends in a broken but intriguing way:

[yaṭpuṭu?] rapi'malk ʿōlami ba'uzzi[hu]
[yaṭpuṭu? m]alk ʿōlami ba-ḏimrihu
bal [yamluk] ba-ḥatkihu ba-namirtiḥu
larā[mim ba]'arši ʿuzzaka
ḏimrika la [panī]nu (?) ḥatkika

namirtuka ba-tōk 'Ugariti
la-yāmāt šapši wa-yariḥi
wa-na'imatu šanāti'ili

⁴⁹ Neither in this text nor in the Rephaim cycle do I see the slightest reason to assign the scene to the lower world.

⁵⁰ I have no illusions that my vocalizations of Ugaritic here and elsewhere reflect accurately the actual pronunciation of the text. By this risky procedure, however, the morphology and syntax of the interpretation is made plain. More important, vocalization of some sort is necessary for prosodic analysis and unless the prosodic patterns are correctly *grasped*, the interpretation is often faulty. Finally, I suppose I should say that vocalization of the text is a habit acquired in drilling students in comparative grammar, a necessary pedagogical device, I think, in dealing with a language which in fact we must reconstruct by comparative techniques to read. Happily, data from cuneiform transcriptions of words and names are steadily increasing our limited knowledge.

⁵¹ *Praep. evang.*, I, 10.31. It is unfortunate that this text comes to light precisely in time to refute much of Ulf Oldenbug's thesis in *The Conflict Between El and Ba'al in Canaanite Religion* (Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1969). See also below where the Mesopotamian theogony is discussed.

Let Rapi' the eternal king [judge?] in might,
 Let [the eter]nal king [judge?] in strength,
 Verily let him [rule] his offspring in his grace:

To ex[alt(?)] thy might in the earth
 Thy strength be[fore] us (?) thy offspring,
 Thy grace in the midst of Ugarit
 As long as the years of Sun and Moon
 And the pleasance of the years of 'El

It should be pointed out that the “ancient king’s” role here stands in remarkable contrast to earlier pictures drawn by scholars portraying 'El as a *deus otiosus* and confirms those who have balanced Ugaritic lore against Sakkunyaton’s doctrine.⁵²

The chief text falling into the pattern of the *hieros gamos* tells of 'El (and not Ba'!) with his two wives and of the birth of his sons Dawn and Dusk (Šaḥar and Salim).⁵³ The text is the libretto for a cultic drama. It has been badly misunderstood by reason of its impressionistic and repetitious series of scenes. Glimpses of action-'El's hunting and feasting, the squeals of his wives being seduced, their lovemaking and the birth of the gods-follow one on another, but not in sequence, sometimes anticipating, sometimes repeating actions described earlier. We are given a description of the lovemaking and birth, for example, followed by a repetition of the description of lovemaking and birth. The repetition is a literary or mimetic device, not an account of two different episodes.

After some broken text, the drama opens with 'El preparing a meal at his abode near the sea.

...
 [yqḥ.]'il.mšt'ltm.
 mšt'ltm.lr'iš'agn

hlh.[t]špl.
 hlh.trm.

...
 'El takes two ladlesful,⁵⁴
 Two ladlesful filling a flagon.

Behold one: she bends low.
 Behold the other: she rises up.

52. In the latter category is the paper of Patrick W. Miller, “El the Warrior,” *HTR* 60 (1967), 411–431.

53. *CTA*, 23.31-53 [Gordon 52].

54. We have translated the passage in the historical present since the movement back and forth in time is more easily expressed in this fashion.

hlh.tšh 'd 'd whlh.tšh 'um, 'um	BeholdonecriesSire!Sire! Beholdonecries Mother! Mother! ⁵⁵
t'irkm.yd.'il.kym wyd.'il. kmdb 'ark.yd.'il kym w.yd.'il.kmdb	'El's power ⁵⁶ is great like Sea's, 'El's power is like that of Flood ; Long is 'El's member like Sea's, 'El's member like that of Flood.
yqh.'il.mšt'ltm mšt'ltm.lr'iš.'agn. yqh.yš<t>. bbth	'El takes two ladlesful, Two ladlesful filling a flagon, He takes (it), he drinks in his house.
'il.ḥṭh.nḥt. 'il' ymnn.mṭ.ydh. yš'u yr.šmmh	'El bends his bowstave, ⁵⁷ He drew ⁵⁸ his mighty ⁵⁹ shaft, He lifts (it), he shoots skyward.
yr.bšmm.'sr yḥrt yšt lphm	He shoots a bird in the sky, He plucks (it), he sets (it) on coals.
'il.'aṭtm.k ypt. hm.'aṭtm.tšhn ymt[.]mt. nḥtm.ḥṭk mmnm.mṭ.ydk	'El seduces his wives, Lo, the two women cry: O husband! husband! stretched is your bowstave, Drawn is your mighty shaft,
h[l.] 'sr.tḥrr.l'išṭ šḥrrt.lphmm	Behold the bird is roasted, Broiled on the coals.

55. The two wives, no doubt mentioned in the break, bob up and down in embarrassment and excitement. Metrically, the verses form a quatrain b:b:l:l [for this notation, see chapter 6, n. 14]. In traditional stress notation they would be read 2:2::3:3. *Hlh*, "Behold her," introduces each colon.

56. We have expressed the *double entendre* by translating the identical cola. differently suggesting the two levels of meaning. The use of puns or paranomasia continues throughout this section of the poem. For the idiom "long of hand" meaning "great in power." compare Hebrew *qisrê yad* or *ha-vad YHWH tiqsar* (Num. 11: 23). etc. Of course 'ark.yd.'il could also mean "El's penis is long."

57. *ḥṭ* here means bowstave; cf. 19.1.14 where *ḥṭ* is in parallelism with *qšt*, "bow," and *qš't*, "darts," "arrows." The idiom *nḥt qšt*, "to bend or stretch a bow" is found in 2 Sam. 22: 35 (= Ps. 18:35), "my arm to stretch the bronze (composite) bow."

58. The verb is denominative from *yamin*, "right hand": "to draw (with the right hand)" is precisely the meaning of *mymynym bhšym bqšt* in I Chron. 12:2.

59. *Mṭ*, Hebrew *mattê* means "shaft," "dart" in Hab. 3:9, 14. In 3:9 it is parallel to *qšt*; 3:14 reads, "thou didst pierce his head with arrows." Also in Text 3.2.15,16 *mṭm* and *qšt* are a formulaic pair.

'a[ṭ]tm. 'att. 'il.	The women are (now) 'El's wives,
'att. 'il. w'lmh.	The wives of 'El forever.
...	...

After repetitions with subtle variations we read :

yhbr.šp̄thm.yš[q]	He reclines; he kisses their lips.
hn.šp̄thm.mtqtm	Lo, their lips are sweet,
mtqtm.k lrmn [m]	Sweet indeed as pomegranates.

bm.nšq.whr.	As they kiss they conceive,
bhbq. <w>ḥmḥmt.	As they embrace, they are made pregnant,

tqt[nšn] tldn	The two travail and give birth,
šḥr.wšlm	To (the gods) Dawn and Dusk.

'El in this text lives up to the reputation found in Sakkunyatōn's lore that he was a vigorous and prodigiously lusty old man as is fitting for the primordial procreator and patriarch.

'El and Ba'l Ḥamōn

In 1948 Benno Landsberger observed, "Eine gewisse Wahrscheinlichkeit für die Gleichung *Ba'al-ḥammān*=El ergibt sich, wenn man den obigen Gedankengang gutheisst, aus dem Vergleich der Aufzählung des Hauptgötter (*Ba'al-šemed*, *Ba'al-ḥammān*, Rakkab-El) mit der Reihe Hadad, El, Rakkab-El (Hadad 18; Pan. 22). Die Variante *El-ḥammān* findet sich in späten phönizischen Inschriften."⁶⁰ There is now overwhelming evidence identifying *B'l Ḥmn* of Zinçirli and *B'l Ḥmn* of the western Punic colonies with Canaanite 'Él.⁶¹ As a matter of fact, both the epithets *B'l Ḥmn* and *Tnt* (his consort) survived only on the peripheries of the spread of Canaanite culture, a mark of archa-

60. Benno Landsberger, *Sam'al* (Ankara, Druckerei der Türkischen Historischen Gesellschaft, 1948), p. 47, n. 117. The inscriptions referred to are *KAI*, 24.16 (Kilamuwa); *KAI*, 214.2, 11, 18 (Hadad); 215.22 (Panamū). The inscriptions reading 'l ḥmn have proved to be irrelevant. The term is used of the god *mlk'šrt* at his temple at Umm el-'Amed. See M. Dunand and R. Duru, *Oumm el-'Amed* (Paris, Librairie de l'Amérique et de l'Orient, 1962).

61. For *bl ḥmwn* at Palmyra, see most recently. H. Ingholt, Henri Seyrig, and J. Starcky, *Recueil des Tessères de Palmyre* (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1955), Nos. 212-215; and R. du Mesnil du Buisson, *CRAIBL*, 1966, pp. 165-174 and references.

ism comparable to the survival of linguistic archaism at the frontiers of the spread of a family of languages.

Philo Byblius, and other classical sources, and inscriptions in Greek and Latin all establish the formula that *B' l Hmn* on the one hand, and 'El on the other, are Greek **Kronos**, Latin **Saturnus**.⁶² These equations have long been known,⁶³ and all new data confirm the ancient. Moreover, we now perceive the significance of the epithets **gerontis** used of the Kronos of Gadir (Cadiz), **senex** used of Saturnus of New Carthage, and, indeed, of the epithet **saeculo [frugifero]** used of the African Saturnus.⁶⁴ They reproduce 'El's appellation 'ólām, "the Ancient One."

W. F. Albright, S. Moscati, and R. de Vaux recently have drawn upon classical sources and new archaeological data from Africa, Sardinia, and Sicily to describe the cult of child sacrifice in the Punic world. "Tophets" in Carthage, Sousse (Hadrumetum), and Cirta (near Constantine) have been found in North Africa where archaeological or inscriptional evidence established the existence of the grim cult.⁶⁵ Italian scholars under the leadership of Sabatino Moscati, in a remarkable series of archaeological missions have found precincts ("tophets") and shrines where child sacrifice was practiced in Sicily at Motya (Mozia)⁶⁶ and in Sardinia at Monte Sirai,⁶⁷ Nora, Tharros, and Sulcis.⁶⁸

62. Most explicit of course is Philo Byblius, but the inscriptions are equally convincing.

63. For the early discussion, see Stphan Gsell's standard work, *Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du nord* (Paris, Hachette, 1920), IV, 2777301.

64. The classical references are found in Gsell, *Histoire*, IV, 290, 298. An illustration of the coin of Claudius Albinus may be found in A. Merlin, *Le Sanctuaire de Baal et de Tanit près de Siagu*, Notes et Documents IV (Paris, 1910), Pl. II, 4.

65. See YGC. pp. 234-238, and references: S. Moscati, *The World of the Phoenicians* (New York, Praeger, 1968), pp. 142ff.; 150f.; 215-218; "Il sacrificio dei fanciulli," *Rendicotti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia*, 38 (1965-66), 1-8; "New Light on Punic Art," in *The Role of the Phoenicians in the Interaction of Mediterranean Civilizations*, ed. William A. Ward (Beirut, American University of Beirut, 1968), pp. 65-75, and references; A. Berthier and R. Charlier, *Le Sanctuaire punique d'el-Hofra à Constantine* (Paris, Arts et metiers graphiques, 1955); D. Harden, *The Phoenicians* (London, Thames and Hudson, 1962), pp. 94-101; R. de Vaux, *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice* (Cardiff, University of Wales Press, 1964), pp. 75-87.

66. A. Ciasca et al., *Mozia I* (Rome, Istituto di studi del Vicino Oriente, 1964); A. Ciasca et al., *Mozia II* (Rome, 1966); I. Brancoli et al., *Mozia III* (Rome, 1967). The series was scheduled to publish *Mozia IV* in 1968 and *Mozia V* in 1969.

67. F. Barreca et al., *Monte Sirai*, I (Rome, Istituto di studi del Vicino Oriente, 1964); M. G. Amadasi et al., *Monte Sirai*, vols. II-IV (Rome, 1965-67).

68. See G. Pesce, *Sardegna punica* (Cagliari, Fossataro, 1961), and the brief review of S. Moscati, "New Light on Punic Art," pp. 67-72.

Diodorus Siculus specifically observes that the cult of human sacrifice was limited to worship of Kronos, that is, of 'El, and alludes to the myth of 'El's sacrifice of his own children. Sakkunyaton preserves the myth of 'El's sacrifice of *Yadīd*⁶⁹ and *Môt*,⁷⁰ a theme repeated thrice by the hierophant. An echo of this aspect of the 'El cult is probably heard in the biblical tradition that the first-born belonged to the deity, and in the background of the story of Isaac's sacrifice as well as in the paganizing cult of the "mulk sacrifice." As Albright has emphasized, there is no longer any basis to doubt Diodorus' accuracy both in describing the cultus itself or in his assertion that the cult was linked to Kronos, that is, to Ba'1 HMN-'El.

There has been a long discussion of the meaning of the epithet **Ba'1 H̄MN**. Two etymologies of *H̄MN* which have survived from the older discussion⁷² are (1) to understand *H̄MN* to denote Mt. Amanus (Halevy) and (2) to relate *H̄MN* to the biblical term *ḥammānīm* (Lagrange). With the establishment by H. Ingholt of the meaning "incense altar, brazier," for *ḥammān* (inscribed on an incense altar), a series of scholars took **B'1 H̄MN** to be **ba'1 ḥammān**, the "lord of the Brazier" including J. Starcky (1949),⁷³ Moscati,⁷⁴ and recently W. F. Albright.⁷⁵

There is decisive new data from Ugarit. In 1967 the writer recognized that there was sufficient data to settle this question, and that the epithet *ba'1 ḥamōn* applied to 'El meant the "Lord of the Amanus."⁷⁶ The

69. Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History*, XX. 14.4-7 (ed. Loeb).

70. *Apud* Eusebius, *Praep. evang.*, I.10.21, 34, 44.

71. See O. Eissfeldt, *Molk als Opferbegriff im Punischen und Hebräischen und das Ende des Gottes Moloch* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1935); on the meaning of *molk/mulk*, "royal sacrifice," see YGC, pp. 235-243.

72. The early discussion is summarized in a most helpful way by S. Gsell, *Histoire*, IV, 280-286.

73. J. Starcky, "Autour d'une dedicace palmyrenienne à Sadrafa et à Du'anat," *Syria*, 26 (1949), 51-54. Cf. W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942), p. 146 and notes 58f., pp. 215f.

74. *The World of the Phoenicians*, p. 138.

75. YGC, p. 233. Cf. *KAI*, II, 77f.

76. F. M. Cross, "The Origin and Early Evolution of the Alphabet," p. 12, n. 27. See O. Eissfeldt, "Die Wanderung palästinisch-syrischer Götter nach Ost und West." *JPOS*, 14 (1934), 294-300 [*Kleine Schriften* II (Tübingen, Mohr, 1963), pp. 55-60, esp. p. 58]. More recently, Y. Yadin has attempted to identify **Ba'1 Ḥamōn** as a moon god, the "lord of the Amanus." While agreeing that *Hamdn* in the epithet means the Amanus, I can accept none of Yadin's arguments in support. See Y. Yadin, "Symbols of Deities at Zinjirli, Carthage and Hazor," in *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century*, ed. J. A. Sanders (New York, Doubleday, 1970), pp. 199-231, esp. p. 216.

alphabetic writing *hmn* for a theophorus element appearing in Ugaritic personal names (cuneiform *ḥa-ma-nu*),⁷⁷ as well as the Hurrian reading in alphabetic script: in *ḥmnnd/eniḥamān-ni-da/* “to the divine (mountain) *Ḥamān*,”⁷⁸ proved that there could be no relation between the deity Ba’l *Ḥamān* and the brazier *ḥammān*. The laryngeals *ḥ* and *ḫ* are different. The *mēm* is doubled in *ḥammān*, derived from a root *ḥmm* “to be hot”: it is not doubled in any of the certain transcriptions of *Ḥamān* in cuneiform or Greek.⁷⁹

There is now every reason to equate *ḥamān* with the element *hmn* in the epithet *b’l hmn*, Punic *Ἀμουν*:⁸⁰ it is likely also that Greek *Ἀμανός*, *Ἀμανου ὄρος* and Punic *Ἀμουν* derive from the forms *ḥamān* and *ḥamōn*, Iron Age forms in the north and south respectively, after the merging of *ḥ* and *ḫ* (> *ḥ*). The usual transcriptions in cuneiform are KUR *Ha-ma-nu*. KUR *Ha-ma-ni*, and KUR *Ḥa-ma-a-nu*.⁸¹

The mountain *Ḥamānu*, Mount Amanus, is not to be confused with the mountain *’Ammana*⁸² in the same general region. The latter is Ugaritic *ḡr ’amn /guru ’amma-na/*,⁸³ cuneiform Hittite *Am-ma-na*, *Am-ma-a-na*, *A-ma-na*, *A-ma-a-na*, and probably also Akkadian *Am-ma-na-na*. In early cuneiform transcriptions we find also *Am-a-num* or *A-ma-num*, the omission of doubling perhaps owing to early orthogra-

77. The names include *’abdi-ha-ma-nu* and *’bdhmn*. See *PRU*, II, 223: *PRU*. 111, 240; *PRU*, V, 84.12. Interestingly enough, the name (of a tenth-century b.c. Tyrian) survives in the form *Ἀβδημουνος*: Menander *apud* Josephus, *Contra Apion*, I, 120. Note the Phoenician shift *ā > ō > ū*.

78. *CTA*, 172.1; cf. *in ḥmnnd* in 261.6, 16; 295.7 and below, n. 85.

79. See above, n. 77, and below.

80. From Carthage comes the transcription *βαλ Ἀμουν*. Cf. Berthier and Charlier, *Le Sanctuaire punique d’El-Hofra*, No. I-Greek, Pl. XXVIII, A.

81. See the material collected by J. Lewy. “The Old West Semitic Sun-God *Ḥammu*,” *HUCA*, 18 (1944), 454-459. Cf. Honigmann, “Amanos,” in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, ed. Erich Ebeling and Bruno Meissner (Berlin, W. de Gruyter, 1928), I, 92. Other variants occur (e.g., see R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien* [Graz, *Beihet? 9 AfO*, 1956] references on p. 131), but none reflect a different West Semitic etymology. The root evidently is *ḥwm*, the noun patterned like *qāmōn* from *qwm*.

82. See J. Lewy, *HUCA*, 18 (1944), 454-459, and references. Cf. H. Otten, “Die Berg- und Flusslisten im *Hišuwā* Festrival,” *ZA*. 59 (1969), 247-260, esp. 251; A. Goetze in *JCS*. 23 (1970), p. 26. The geographical location of Mt. Amman is not certain. The older identification with the Anti-Lebanon may be too far to the south. It is usually paired with Mt. Casius (Hazzi), and may be the Bargylus, Strabo’s Anti-Casius, or a peak in the Amanus, perhaps Jebel *Arsūz* (Strabo’s *Pieria*) at the southern most extension of the Amanus. Cf. W. F. Albright, “A Geographical Treatise on Sargon of Akkad’s Empire,” *JAOS*. 45 (1925), 197, nn. 5, 7.

83. *PRU*, II, 12.16.

phic usage. In Canticles 4:8 *ammana* is written *ḥmnh*, probably to be read **ammānā*.

Thus the equation between the mountain *Ḥamān* and the element *ḥmn/Amūn* in 'El's epithet presents no linguistic obstacles.

There is yet more evidence. In *Ugaritica V*, Laroche published a hymn to 'El⁸⁴ in which we read the following: *ḥil pbnḥwn/ḥmn... (ll. 9f.), /'Il() paban-ḥi- wi-ni ḥamān()/* "'El the One of the Mountain/*Ḥamān...'*"⁸⁵ As a matter of fact, such an expression as *in ḥmnd*, "to the god *Ḥamān*," and *in ḥmndd* "to the divine (Mountain) *Ḥamān*" (*the Ḥamān* with the article -ni-) is the precise Hurrian equivalent of such a mountain designation as *if Ṣapān*, "the divine (mountain) *Ṣapān*. *Ṣapān/Ṣapōn* also is used in both Phoenician and Ugaritic personal names as is *Ḥamān*, and both receive offerings independently of the gods Ba'l-Haddu and 'El.⁸⁶ It is interesting also that the names are patterned alike.*

We experience much more difficulty in identifying the consort of Punic 'El. She is referred to as Tannit, or more fully "Tannit, the presence of Ba'l." *panē Ba'l*, in Greek transcription *φανεβαλ*.⁸⁸ In Sakkunyaton 'El-Kronos takes three wives: his sisters Astarte, Rhea, and Dione.⁸⁹ Rhea and Dione appear to be alternate identifications (as happens often) of the goddess Asherah, Ugaritic *'atiratu*, that is, Rhea=Asherah, and Dione='Ēlat.⁹⁰ The third great goddess 'Anat is most easily identified with Greek Athena, called by Sakkunyaton

84. Pp. 510–516. The text is RS 24.278. We note that in the text Kumarbi and Ellil (Enlil) are mentioned among others, the gods equivalent to 'El in the Hurrian and Mesopotamian pantheons.

85. The syntax is not wholly clear. *Ḥamān* probably stands independently in parallelism.

86. Philo Byblius lists four such divine mountains from Sakkunyaton's lore: Casius, Lebanon, Mt. Hermon (*šryn*), and *βραθν*, i.e., the cypress (mountain), Greek *βραθν*, Hebrew *bē'rōš*, which is the Amanus. The relation between *ḥamān* "Amanus" and the god who appears as *Ḥumunni* and *Ḥammanni* in Hurrian and Hittite sources is not wholly clear. See I. J. Gelb, P. M. Purvis, and A. A. MacRae, *Nuzi Personal Names. OIP 57* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943), p. 213 and references; and E. Laroche, *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites* (Paris, G. P. Maisonneuve, 1947), p. 49.

87. Both appear to be substantives derived from Hollow roots to which are added the adjectival morpheme -8nu.

88. The transcription is found in the inscription cited in note 80; it is also found on coins of Ascalon. See G. F. Hill, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Palestine* (London, British Museum, 1914), p. 129; Pl. XIII, 18, 19.

89. *Praep. evang.* I, 10.24.

90. In *Praep. evan.* I, 10.35, Kronos is said to give Baaltis (= *Ba'lat Gebal*) the city of Byblus, explaining that Baaltis is Dione. However, *Ba'alat* appears to be equiva-

Kronos/El's daughter,⁹¹ but 'Anat does not appear in Sakkunyaton by her Semitic name.

Tannit at Carthage and in the West was identified with Greek Hera, Latin Juno.⁹² We should have expected either Aphrodite/Venus⁹³ the usual counterpart of Astarte, or Rhea with whom Asherah/Elat is identified in Sakkunyaton, or Athena for 'Anat.

In recent discussion, Tannit has been identified with each of the three Phoenician goddesses.

The evidence for the identification of Tannit with 'Astarte is in my view the weakest. One may argue, however, that Tannit replaces Astarte in Africa. Tannit in western Punic texts is rare before the fifth century. By the fall of Carthage, Tannit is almost exclusively mentioned in Carthaginian texts. At the same time, the element 'aštar persists in personal names. Several Italian scholars, including Garbini and Moscati, have argued recently for this identification on the basis of the inscriptional data found in association with the temple of Hera/Juno (the *fanum Iunonis* of Cicero) at Tas Silg. On a stone architectural element from the shrine is a votive inscription to 'Aštar.⁹⁴ At the same time there have been found inscribed l'štrt or lnt (or abbreviated lt).⁹⁵ These data have been taken to suggest that 'Aštar and Tannit should be identified, at least in this precinct and perhaps throughout the Punic world.⁹⁵

Alternate titles of Tannit—Caelestis, Juno Caelestis, and Virgo Caelestis, and even Nutrix (Saturni)—can be appropriately applied to Astarte. In a Sidonian inscription she is called 'štrt šmm 'drm. "'Aštar of the awesome heavens."⁹⁷ In Egypt she and 'Anat are described as

lent at Sinai to Hathor, and perhaps to Qudšu, an alternate designation of Asherah at Ugarit and in Egypt. One notes the transparent etymological relation between Dione and Zeus (gen. *Dios*), 'Élat and 'El.

91. 'Anat, a war goddess, is identified with Athena in *KAI*, 42: ΑΘΗΝΑ ΣΩΤΕΙΡΑ ΝΙΚΗ = 'n.

92. The classical references are collected in Gsell, *Histoire*, IV. pp. 2555277; cf. W. Röllig in *WM*, I, 311f.

93. This is explicit in Philo Byblius; cf. *Praep. evang.*, I, 10.32.

94. See G. Garbini in V. Bonello et al., *Missione archeologica italiana a Malta I* (Rome, Università di Roma, 1964). pp. 83-89; Pl. 26.

95. In M. Cagiano de Azevedo et al., *Malta II* (Rome: Università di Roma, 1966), Garbini gives statistics, p. 64.

96. See G. Garbini, *Malta I*, pp. 94ff.; and S. Moscati, *The World of the Phoenicians*, pp. 137ff., and 191-194; cf. G. Garbini, *OA*, 1(1962), 297f.

97. *KAI*, 14:16 (Ešmun'azōr).

“the great goddesses who conceive but do not bear”⁹⁸ referring, it appears, to their role as divine bride or virgin in the *hieros gamos*, while at the same time they are goddesses of fertility. In Egypt *‘Astart* is also called “Mistress of Heaven,”⁹⁹ and is pictured as a war goddess, as sometimes Tannit and Juno are portrayed.¹⁰⁰

Finally, *‘Astart*’s epithet, *šm 6’l*, “Name of Ba’l” found at Ugarit in the fourteenth century, and at Sidon in the fifth is semantically equivalent to the epithet *panē ba’l* used of Tannit.¹⁰¹ These epithets belong to a general development of hypostases of deity in Canaanite religion. Similar tendencies are found in Israel’s religion. The “name” and the “presence” of Yahweh act for him, in effect protecting his transcendence. The “Angel of the Presence,” or the angel “in whom is Yahweh’s Name” is given to Israel to guide them in the Exodus-Conquest.¹⁰²

There are equally strong arguments against the identification of *‘Astart* and Tannit. An inscription from Carthage begins: *lrbt l’šrt wltnt blbnn* “To the Ladies, *‘Astart* and Tannit in Lebanon.”¹⁰³ The text goes on to speak of their new temples (in the plural). There is not the slightest reason to doubt the identity of *tnt pn b’l* and *tnt blbnn*. Both Ba’lḤamōn and Tannit were Canaanite deities bearing archaic and rare epithets (see below). These data suggest strongly that at Tas Silg we must construe the mixture of dedications to *‘Astart* and to Tannit as evidence that the temple originally was dedicated to both, and perhaps to the triad, ‘El and his two wives.¹⁰⁴

98. Cf. W. F. Albright. *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. p. 75; W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Aegyptens zu Vorderasien*. p. 495.

99. *BA V*, p. 492.

100. For *‘Astart* as a war goddess, see *ANEP*. Pls. 468 and 479; YGC. p. 133; J. Leclant, “*Astarté* a cheval d’après les représentations égyptiennes.” *Syria*, 37 (1960), pp. 1-67; *BA V*, pp. 492-494. For Tannit=Juno as war goddess, see the Ascalon coins of *phanē Bal* which portray the goddess with sword, shield, and palm branch (see n. 88 for references), and the tradition of “the arms and chariot of Juno” residing at Carthage. Cf. Gsell, *Histoire*, IV, 256f. (citing Virgil, *Aeneid* I, 16, 17).

101. CTA, 16.6.56, and KAI. 14,18.

102. For the “angel of the presence,” see Exod. 33:14 and esp. Isa. 63:9 *ml’k pnyw*: for the angel of the name see Exod. 23:20, 21. Cf. the names *šmw’l* and *pnw’l* referring to manifestations of ‘El available to the worshipper. The development of the *šēm* theology in later Israelite religion, especially in Deuteronomic tradition, is traced in the study of S. Dean McBride, Jr., “The Deuteronomic Name Theology” (Harvard dissertation, 1969).

103. *KAI*, 81:1 (CIS, I, 3914).

104. An early text from Spain published by J. M. Solá-Solé was first read to refer to both *‘šrt* and *tnt*. However, on closer examination, the reading *tnt* disappears. See now M. G. Amadasi, *Le iscrizioni fenicie e puniche delle colonie in occidente* (Rome,

The case for the identification of *Tannit* with 'Anat has been made most persuasively by Albright.¹⁰⁵ He combines the relatively rare identification of Tannit as Virgo Caelestis, with 'Anat's usual title at Ugarit : **Batultu 'Anatu**, "the Virgin 'Anat." He notes also the epithets of 'Anat in a new Ugaritic text: **ba'latu mulki**, **ba'latu darkati**, and **ba'latu šamēmi rāmima**,¹⁰⁶ and compares the title **Caelestis** with 'Anat's epithet "Lady of the Highest Heavens," and **ba'latu darkati**, "Mistress of Dominion" with **Derketd**, the name of a goddess of Ascalon preserved by Diodorus.¹⁰⁷ The war goddess of Ascalon called **Phanē Balos** thus is linked to 'Anat, the war goddess par excellence of Canaan.

Problems persist in this identification. The goddess Derketd is described clearly as a marine goddess by Diodorus. Moreover, alongside the coins with **Phanē Balos** stamped on them are other coins depicting a marine goddess standing aboard a ship, holding in the left hand an **aphlaston** (a ship's stern ornament), in the right hand a standard topped by a triangle or so-called "sign of Tannit." The goddess is associated with an incense altar¹⁰⁸ and dove.¹⁰⁹ Another series shows the goddess, crowned with crescent or crescent and disc, standing on a **triton** holding a scepter in the left hand, a dove in the right. I find it easiest to identify as one the goddess portrayed in the three types; in any case **Derketd** should be seen in the latter two coins. Of course, **darkatu** "dominion" like **mulk** or **milkat**, "royalty," "queen," is appropriately applied to any one of the three great goddesses.

Asherah, Ugaritic **'aṭiratu yammi**, "she who treads on the sea," has the only clear marine connections of the three. She is associated with **Daggay 'Aṭirati** at Ugarit, the "fisherman of Asherah."¹¹⁰ **'Élat** of Tyre¹¹¹ is also portrayed as a goddess of the sea on Tyrian coins.¹¹²

Universita di Roma, 1967), pp. 149ff. (Spain No. 16); and F. M. Cross, "The Old Phoenician Inscription from Spain Dedicated to Hurrian Astarte." *HTR*, 64 (1971), 189-195.

105. YGC. pp. 42f., n. 86; 130, 134f.

106. *Ugaritica*V. Text 2.6f. (p. 551).

107. II, 4.2-6; cf. Herodotus I, 105.

108. The incense altar in question together with the Greek caduceus belong to the ancestry of the **Punic** caduceus.

109. In Diodorus' story of *Derketō*, doves play an important role.

110. *CTA*, 3.6 IO.

111. The epithet "'ilt šrm" appears in *CTA*, 14.4.198, 201.

112. See H. Hamburger, "A Hoard of Syrian Tetradrachms and Tyrian Bronze Coins from Gush Ḥalav," *IEJ*, 4 (1954). 224, No. 137 (Pl. 20. 137). The goddess is

On a priori grounds we should expect Punic 'El to have as his consort 'Elat. At Ugarit and in Sakkunyaton 'Elat-Asherah is the primary wife of 'El, and as such, the "Creatress of Creatures," and "Creatress of the gods," the great mother goddess. Later, especially in biblical notices, she is the consort of Ba'1.¹¹³ The latter connection can provide an explanation for the identification of Tannit in the West with Hera the consort of Zeus. On the other hand, Tannit is also identified with *Ops*,¹¹⁴ consort of Saturn, the counterpart of Rhea, and is called *Nutrix* or *Nutrix Saturni*,¹¹⁵ and 'm, "mother."¹¹⁶ She is, in short, a mother goddess and a virgin bride. Hera also is a mother goddess, and as participant in the *hieros gamos* called *parthenos*.¹¹⁷

In 1967 the writer proposed to read the Proto-Sinaitic Text 347 *tnt* [tannittu] "Tannit." This would be easily the oldest occurrence of the epithet. The text itself is on a sphinx found in the Hathor temple: a second text on a sphinx reads as reconstructed by Albright: lb[1t].¹¹⁸ "to the Lady [of Byblus]." These appear to be parallel epithets. In the past *tnt* has been taken to be an infinitive of Canaanite *ytn/ntn*: *tintu*. This is highly unlikely, since *nun* is generally assimilated in these texts.¹¹⁹

The epithet *tannittu* would mean literally, "the One of the serpent," or, possibly, "the Dragon Lady." The most straight-forward derivation of Punic *Tennit* (Greek ΘΕΝΝΕΙΘ, ΘΙΝ(N)ΙΘ) is from Canaanite **Tannit*¹²⁰ < **tannittu* < **tannintu*. These shifts all reflect normal

shown riding in a galley. The legend reads 'It šr. On the related coin showing the goddess in a building enterprise, see Albright, YGC, p. 122, n. 30. Cf. Hill, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Phoenicia* (London, British Museum, 1910), Pl. XLIV, 8, 9.

113. See the myth preserved in Hittite, H. Otten, "Ein kanaanäisches Mythus aus Boğazköy," pp. 125-150.

114. See Gsell, *Histoire*, IV, pp. 259f. and references.

115. See Gsell, *Histoire*, IV, 260 and reference. At Ugarit, both 'Aṭirat and 'Anat were wet nurses: *CTA*, 15.2.26.

116. *CIS*, I, 195, 380.

117. M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* (Munich, C. H. Beck, 1941), I, 402.

118. *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions*, p. 17.

119. Theoretically, one could posit a form **tinatu* from *ytn*. For example, Heb. *šēnā* from *yšn* is so patterned (in Phoenician *št* < *šintu* [ʿAḥiram I. I]). This apparently is Yadin's proposal, comparing Aramaic (Nabataean) *tnt*, "gift" ("Symbols of Deities at Zinjirli," p. 230, n. 96). However, such a derivation is impossible for the name of the goddess *Tannit*. The Greek transcriptions and parallel data are clear that *nūn* is doubled and that a vowel in the i-class follows (see W. Röllig, in *WM*, I. 311 and references).

120. On the shift of short a > e, cf. G. Levi della Vida. "Sulle iscrizioni 'Latino-Libiche della Tripolitania," *OA*, 2 (1963), 72; cf. Friedrich, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1970), § 75b.

and documented Canaanite/Phoenician sound changes.¹²¹ The name is the feminine of a *qattil* pattern which in Phoenician becomes regularly *qattiltu*.¹²² The form is thus a feminine derivative of **tannin**, “serpent,” and is precisely parallel to the old epithet of Asherah *labiʿt(u)*, the “One of the Lion,” or the “Lion Lady.”¹²³ Closely parallel also are the epithets *ḏt bʿn*, *ḏāt baʿni*, “Lady of the Serpent,” identified in the Proto-Sinaitic texts by Albright. and **rabbat ʿaʿiratu yammi**, “the Lady who treads on the Sea(-dragon),” both old epithets of Asherah/ʿĒlat. Both the names Baʿl Ḥamūn (=ʿĒl) and his consort Tannit (=ʿĒlat) thus go back to very early epithets of well-known patterns, lost in central Phoenicia, surviving only on the fringes of the Canaanite realm (Ugarit, **Samʿāl**, Sinai, Carthage, and the western Mediterranean).

Another epithet of Asherah found in Ugarit¹²⁴ and in Egypt¹²⁵ is *Qudšu*, “Holiness.” She is portrayed on reliefs as a nude goddess standing on a lion, holding one or more serpents. Her headdress is described by Edwards :

The goddess. . . is represented on the Berlin stela wearing on her head the wig of Ḥathor surmounted by a naos with volutes and at the top of the naos are the disk and crescent . . . Such an elaborate head-dress is, however, exceptional; as a rule, the naos is omitted and the wig is surmounted either by a simple disk and crescent or by a member which, in the Ḥathor capital, forms the abacus. In some cases this member also is surmounted by the disk and crescent.¹²⁶

121. W. F. Albright has proposed (YGC, p. 42f., n. 86; p. 135. n. 63; and pp. 266f.) a derivation from Hebrew/Phoenician *tabnīt* > **tannīt* > **tannīt* > *tennīt*, translating “glory.” We should prefer to take *tabnīt* in Hebrew to mean “pattern.” or “creature.” In any case *tbnt* appears (without the putative assimilation) in Phoenician and Hebrew. Albright discovers the middle form **tannīt* in Psalm 17:15 parallel to *pnm*, comparing Ugaritic *tmn//pnt* in Text 2.4.17f., 26. The argument is easily reversed. Hebrew *ʾēmūnah* in Ps. 17:15 would appear to be confirmed by the Ugaritic parallel. Cf. the Hebrew meanings “image, apparition.” Similarly, the suggestion that the Greek form of the royal name *Tennēs* reflects *Tennit* is perhaps possible, but to use it to argue that *Tennit* derives from *tabnīt* is to beg the question. Compare the hypocoristica of such Tyrian royal names as ʿ*Astart* (*Astartos*) and *Baʿl* (*Baal*, **Ball**, as well as the personal names *Asmunis* (?), *mlqrt*, *skn* (*Sachonis*, *Secchun*), **hdd** (Edomite)).

122. Cf. Phoenician *qatīl* > *qatiltu*; *ʿdr*/*ʿdrt*; in Latin transcription *berict*/*berect* < **barikt** (note the vowel shift, a>e): *labiʿ*/*labiʿtu* [Ugaritic *lbʿit*, Phoen. *lbʿt*/*lbt*]; Hebrew *šallit*/*šallētet*; etc.

123. See F. M. Cross, “The Origin and Early Evolution of the Alphabet,” p. 13 and notes 31-33.

124. CTA. 14.4.197; cf. 16.1, 11, 22, etc.

125. See now I. E. S. Edwards, “A Relief of Qudshu-Astarte-Anath in the Winchester College Collection,” *JNES*, 14 (1955), 49-51; YGC, p. 121, n. 27.

126. Edwards, “A Relief of Qudshu-Astarte-Anath,” pp. 49f.

Of special interest is the Winchester relief on which three names, QudSu, 'Astart, 'Anat, appear revealing the confusion of the three goddesses, but also using *Qudšu* as the equivalent of Asherah.¹²⁷ Plaques and figurines from the Canaanite realms in Syria Palestine conform to the QudSu representations in Egypt.¹²⁸

The epithets *Tannit*, "Lady of the Serpent," and *Labi't*, "the Lady of the Lion" thus fit best with Asherah's iconography.

The Egyptianizing headdress of the goddess *Qudšu* persists throughout Phoenician and Punic representations. It may take the form of the *Ḥathor* horns and disk.¹²⁹ It may be ornamented by the abacus alone, or with naos and crescent and disk.¹³⁰ An example of special interest comes from Ibiza from a *Tannit* sanctuary described by A. Garcia y Bellido as follows: "on the '*kalathos*' as on the breast there are ornaments, among them the lotos, solar disk, crescent moon, and rosettes of four or six petals."¹³¹ The most persistent motif, however, is the crescent and disk. On the QudSu representations, it resembles more the Khonsu crown than that of *Ḥathor*,¹³² and there was evidently some confusion on the part of Phoenician artisans. Relatively early Punic representations of the goddess crowned by the disk and crescent are found on the steles of Motya.¹³³ Especially in the relatively early *cippo naiskos* steles, the disk and crescent is placed above the niche on the pediment or frieze; the symbol alternates with the flying sun disk. In late steles, notably of the *cusped* type, the crescent and disk have become

127. *Ibid.*

128. Most of the materials are collected by J. B. Pritchard, *Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known Through Literature* (New Haven, American Oriental Society, 1943), pp. 33-42; see also *ANEP*. Pls. 469-477.

129. Examples are the Yahawmilk stele portraying *Ba'lat Gēbal* as *Ḥathor*: *ANEP*. Pl. 477: the bas relief on the *naos* from the *Wādī 'Ašūr*; on a stele from Dafneh (Ba'l *Ṣapōn*); *Oumm el-'Amed*, Pls. 75 and 76; and the stele from Hadrumetum, A. M. Bisi, *Le Stele puniche* (Rome, Università di Roma, 1967), Fig. 42. Cf. the bas relief picturing a winged Nutrix, with horns and disk from Ugarit, *ANEP*. Pl. 829.

130. Examples may be found in *ANEP*, Pl. 471 (abacus, naos and crescent and disc): Edwards, "A Relief of *Qudšu-Astarte-Anath*," Pl. IV (with abacus alone), and *Ugaritica II*, Fig. IO, p. 36 (with abacus alone).

131. A. Garcia y Bellido, *Fenicios y carthagineses en Occidente* (Madrid, C. Bermejo, 1942), pp. 248f.: Pl. XX, I. The form is clearly influenced by the *Ḥathor*-column tradition. Cf. the *Ḥathor* columns of the stele from Sousse on which the *Ḥathor* hair braids are topped by crescents and disks (A. M. Bisi, *Le stele puniche*. Pl. 24, 2).

132. Cf. *ANEP*, Pl. 474.

133. Isabella Brancoli et al., *Mozia*. 111, Pl. 39 (stela No. 130). Pl. 42 (stela No. 129), a dedication to Ba'l *Ḥamōn*, despite female with *Ḥathor* headdress in relief. Often there is a disk alone: Pl. 35 (stela 112). Cf. the relief from Fi. Moscati, *The World of the Phoenicians*, Fig. II (p. 57).

merely a conventional decoration placed usually at the peak of the stele. Sometimes the disk turns into a rosette or solar disk. Late coins of Ascalon and of Punic Africa also represent the goddess with disk and crescent over her head.¹³⁴

A different tradition of the *Qudšu* iconography appears in the Thinisut figurine, in which the goddess stands on a lion.¹³⁵ Two statues of goddesses from this same sanctuary (of Baʿl[Ḥamōn?]) and Tannit are lion-headed,¹³⁶ in the tradition of Egyptian Sekhmet. Confusion between Sekhmet of Egypt and the Canaanite "Lion Lady" is not surprising since Sekhmet is also consort of Ptaḥ, Canaanite 'El.

The iconography of Punic Baʿl Ḥamōn derives directly from older Canaanite representations of 'El. From Ugarit comes a relief¹³⁷ of a male god, with long beard, sitting on a throne with his right hand raised in a gesture of blessing. On his head is a high conical crown below which bovine horns protrude prominently: above is a winged sun disk. A priest is in attendance. From Hadrumetum (Sousse) comes a strikingly similar relief.¹³⁸ A long-bearded god is portrayed seated upon a cherubim (that is, winged-sphinxes) throne. His right hand is lifted in the gesture of benediction. He wears a high conical crown. His left hand holds a spear. A priest stands before him. A winged sundisk is in the frieze above. Two scarabs from Sardinia have virtually identical scenes.¹³⁹ In each the god wears the conical headdress and raises his right hand in benediction; each is bearded. One is seated on a cherubim throne and holds the *w}s-scepter*, a spear in the background. The other is seated on a plain throne with a spear in his left hand. Merlin has published a small statue of a male deity, bearded, raising the right hand in blessing, sitting upon

134. Hill, *Catalogue. Palestine, No. 192*; Pl. XIII, 21; L. Müller, *Numismatique de l'ancienne Afrique* (Copenhagen, B. Luno, 1860-1874), 111, 53, No. 63 (Hippo Regius and Tipasa); p. 177, Nos. 289, 290 (Mauretania).

135. A. Merlin, *Le Sanctuaire de Baal et de Tanir près de Siagu*, p. 9 and Pl. 6, 2. The abbreviation C on the image may be for C(aelestis).

136. *Ibid.*, Pl. III. Merlin compares the coin of Cl. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio minted in Africa which pictures a lion-headed goddess, her head crowned with the disk and crescent, which is inscribed G. T. A., which has been explained as G(enius)T(erra)e A(fricae).

137. C. F.-A. Schaeffer, "Les Fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit. Huitième campagne," *Syria*, vol. 18 (1937), pl. XVII (ANEP, pl. 493). Compare the figurine of an aging god, with right hand upraised, seated (on a missing throne), published by Schaeffer, "Nouveaux Témoignages du culte de El," *Syria*, vol. 43 (1966), pl. 2 (ANEP, pl. 826).

138. P. Cintas, "Le Sanctuaire punique de Sousse," *Revue Africaine*, 91(1947), I-80; esp. Pl. 49 and Fig. 48.

139. Bisi *Le stele puniche*, Figs. 57, 58.

a cherub throne.¹⁴⁰ He differs from earlier representations in that he is pictured from the front and wears a feathered crown.¹⁴¹ The coin of Claudius Albinus (who was born in Hadrumet) is stamped with the same motif.¹⁴² A bearded god sits on a cherubim throne. His right hand is lifted in blessing. He is crowned with a feather crown. Before him stands a worshiper. Most significant, he is named in the legend, **Saeculo Frugifero**.

The Abode of 'El

The descriptions of the abode of 'El and his council in the Ugaritic texts have been the subject of much discussion and little agreement. One of the most frequent themes, stereotyped and repetitious, is as follows:

'idaka la-tattin panima
 'im 'il mabbikt naharêmi
 qirba 'apîqê tihāmatêmi
 tagliyu ḏadī 'il wa-tibā'u
 qarašī malki 'abi Sanima
 li-pa'nê'il tahbur wa-tiqal
 tištaḥwiyu wa-takabbiduhu

Then she ('Elat) set her face,
 Toward 'El at the sources of the two rivers,
 In the midst of the fountains of the double-deep.
 She opened the domed tent (?)¹⁴³ of 'El and entered,
 The tabernacle¹⁴⁴ of King, Father of Years,
 Before 'El she bowed and fell,
 She did obeisance and honored him.¹⁴⁵

140. Cintas, "Le Sanctuaire punique," pl. II, 2.

141. Cintas presents other parallels from the same area. See especially pl. II, I, where the god wears the conical crown. One perhaps should also refer to the stele of Sulcis on which a bearded God stands in a niche, his right hand raised, his left holding the spear. On the frieze above is the crescent and disk. See G. Pesce, "Due opere di arte fenicia in Sardegna," *OA*, 2 (1963), 247-256, esp. pl. 41.

142. See note 64 above.

143. This meaning for *ḏd* is that suggested and defended by Richard Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament* shortly to be published by the Harvard University Press. See also below.

144. On the tent shrine of 'El and the biblical tabernacle. see F. M. Cross, "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," *JThC*, 5 (1968), 2f., n. 5; and R. J. Clifford, "The Tent of El and the Israelite Tent of Meeting," *CBQ*, 33 (1971), 221-227.

145. *CTA*, 4.4.20-26; cf. 2.3.4-6; 1.3.23; 17.6.46-51; 3.5.15.

The passage continues with a charming view of 'El receiving 'Asherah

halum 'il ki yipāhannaha
yapruqu lišba wa-yishaq
pa'nēhu la-hudumi yaṭpud
wa-yakarkir ušba'ātihu

As soon as 'El spied her
He unfastened his scabbard and laughed;
He put his feet on his footstool
And wiggled his toes.

He offered her food and drink and his conjugal bed before hearing her petition on Ba'l's behalf for a temple.

A second passage relates an account of the arrival of Yamm's two messengers at the council of 'El :

'idaka panima la-yattina
tók gūri 'i'li¹⁴⁶
'im puḥri mō'idi
'ap'ilūma la-lahmi yaṭibū
banī qudši la-ṭrm
ba'lu qāmu 'al 'ili

Then the two set their faces
Toward the mountain of ('É)l,
Toward the gathered council.
Indeed the gods were sitting at table,
The sons of Qudšu(-'Élat) at banquet,
Ba'l stands by (enthroned) 'Él.¹⁴⁷

The picture of 'El's abode given in these two passages places it at the cosmic mount of assembly in the north at whose base the cosmic waters well up; there the council of 'El meets in his Tabernacle of assembly (biblical *'ōhel mō'ēd*) on the shore of sea.¹⁴⁸ Recognizing that 'El's

146. CTA. 2.1.19–21.

147. This idiomatic use of 'I with a verb of "standing" is well known, applying to the courtiers (heavenly or earthly) standing by a seated monarch or judge (divine or human). Cf. 1 Kings 22:19; Zech. 4:14 (both of council of Yahweh; cf. Isa. 6:2), and Exod. 18:13, 14 (Moses sitting in judgment). See also *Ugaritica* V, Text 2 (cited above).

148. Cf. Tyre's description as "dwelling in the midst of the sea." The same expression is used of Arvad in Akkadian (URU Ar-ma-da ša qabal tām̄ti). Mt. Ḥamān is regularly

abode is in the north, we can solve a number of problems. In Isaiah 14: 13 we find “I shall be enthroned in the mount of the council (of ‘El) in the distant north.” This has been taken to be a reference to Mt. *Şapōn* south of the Orontes, the traditional abode of Ba’l *Şapōn*. There is no need to impute such confusion to Hebrew tradition. In fact the expression *yarkētē şapōn* elsewhere refers to the territory in the Amanus and farther north.¹⁴⁹ Mt. *Ĥamān*, which towers over even Mt. Cassius, also bubbles with fountains at its foot.¹⁵⁰ The description also fits with the biblical description of “Eden, the garden of God at the Mount of God.”¹⁵¹ The mythic pattern which couples the cosmic river(s) with the Mount of God, the place where the gates of heaven and the watery passage into hell are found, may be applied to any great mountain with springs at its foot or side where a sanctuary of ‘El (or Yahweh) exists. In Enoch and the Testament of Levi, Mount Hermon and the springs of Banias are so treated (on the occasion of great revelations).¹⁵² The pattern is also transferred to Zion in the Bible. This is patent in such passages as Ezekiel 47: 1-12, Joel 4: 18, Zechariah 14:8, and Isaiah 33 : 20-22. The theme in another transformation also is found in Genesis 2: 10 where the waters springing from Eden are divided and one identified as Gihon. Perhaps the most extraordinary case of identification of Zion with the cosmic mount of assembly is in Psalm 43: 8 where Zion, Yahweh’s holy mountain, is given the name *Yarkētē Şapōn*, “the Far North.”

A third form of the theme occurs only in broken contexts:¹⁵³

‘idaka la-yatinu panima
 ‘im Luṭpāni ‘il di pa’idi
 tōk ḥuršā[ni
 [tōk ḡuri ks]

described as by the sea. For example, cf. **AR**, § 641 “the great sea of the setting sun as far as Mt. *Ĥamān*.”

149. Cf. Ezekiel 38:6, IS; 39:2.

150. See **AR** §600, p. 215; *rēš* e-ni *ĪD* sa-lu-a-ra *ša šēp* Sad&-e KUR Ha-ma-ni, “at the sources of the River Saluara which is at the foot of Mt. *Ĥamān*.”

151. Ezekiel 28 : 2, 13, 14, 16. In the Assyrian annals a royal garden of trees and herbs is often compared with Mt. *Ĥamān*.

152. See J. T. Milik, “Le Testament de Levi en araméen,” **RB**. 62 (1955). 404f. and n. 2. Marvin Pope, in his attempt to locate ‘El’s abode at Afqa at the source of the Nahr *Ibrāhīm*, has simply chosen another valid example of the mythic parallelism of the cosmic mount and source with an actual sanctuary at a mountain spring. Cf. **El in the Ugaritic Texts** pp. 72-81.

153. CTA. 1.3.21-25; 1.3.11-12; 1.2.23.

yagliyu *ḏadī*’i[lwayibā’u]
[qarašī malki] ‘abi Sanima

Then he set his face
Toward Luṭpān ‘El the Compassionate,
Toward the mountain [...]
[Toward Mount Ks....]
He opened the domed tent of ‘El,
He entered the tabernacle of King Father of years.

These verses serve only to confirm the mountainous character of ‘El’s abode; it is interesting that the loanword *ḥuršān* is used parallel to Canaanite *ḡūr*. One wonders what connotations it carried beside the usual meaning “mountain.” Can it refer also to the place of the river ordeal (at the entrance to Sheol) as in Mesopotamia?

‘El the Divine Patriarch

In another recently published text we find ‘El feasting in his *marziḥu*, the *θείασις* or cultic revel.¹⁵⁴ The gods are invited to the banquet: they prepare food and drink for ‘El, and his lackeys warn the gods to care well for the patriarch, who in consequence becomes drunk as a lord and finally passes out, meanwhile having confronted a certain Ḥubbay, “he of the horns and tail,” about whom we should like to know more.

The exercise of authority by ‘El over his council suggests that his role is more that of a patriarch, or that of the judge in the council of a league of tribes, than the role of a divine king. It is extraordinary to discover two new epithets of ‘El in the Hurrian hymn to ‘El discussed above,¹⁵⁵ namely *’il brt* and *’if dn*. Laroche suggests that we read “El des sources, El du jugement.” We should expect in this period, however, that “sources” would be written *b’irt*. Rather we should read ‘El *bērīt* and ‘El *dān*, “god of the covenant.” and “‘El the Judge.” The former may be compared with the epithet of the god whose cult was at Shechem,¹⁵⁶ *’el bērīt*¹⁵⁷ or *ba’l bērīt*.¹⁵⁸

154. *Ugaritica* V, Text 1, pp. 545–551.

155. See above note 84.

156. See now G. Ernest Wright’s chapter, “The Sacred Area of Shechem in Early Biblical Tradition,” in his volume *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City* (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1965), pp. 123–138.

157. Judg. 9:46.

158. Judg. 8:33; 9:4.

If one examines the major decrees of 'El, he finds 'El a strong but not absolute ruler. In Text 2, for example, 'El appears to give in to the desires of Prince Sea, giving Ba'l over to Sea. Ba'l is the only member of the divine council who is not cowed. He stands by 'El's throne and rants at the assembly. Nevertheless, Ba'l is given to Prince Sea as his "perpetual slave," and apparently Ba'l has not enough power to contest the decision. In Text 6 Mot, "the beloved of 'El" as he is called here, and in Sakkunyaton, is doing battle with Ba'l. Šapšu warns Môt that if 'El learns of his fighting against Ba'l, "he ['El] will overthrow your royal throne/ He will break the scepter of your judgeship." Mot is sufficiently afraid of 'El to leave off combat and seek reconciliation. A final example we shall cite is in Text 4. Ba'l desires a temple of his own. 'Asherah-'Elat goes to 'El to lobby in Ba'l's behalf, and through flattery and cajolery gains 'El's reluctant agreement.

'El also appears as the divine warrior: *'El Gibbôr*.¹⁵⁹ Patrick Miller in a paper entitled "El the Warrior,"¹⁶⁰ describes 'El's role as a patron god of Kirta, "the son of 'El." He instructs Kirta in an incubation to prepare and conduct a campaign of "holy war" in order to secure a bride. In the mythic texts of Ugarit the great cosmogonic battles are waged by Ba'l and 'Anat with 'El like an aging David remaining at home seducing goddesses, but 'El plays the mighty man of war in the narrative of Sakkunyaton. His battles, however, fit not so much in the context of cosmogonic myth, as in myths of theogony, the story of the old gods, the natural pairs like Heaven and Earth, which stand behind the pantheon. In the sophisticated, or rather typologically more developed, cosmogonic myths, the theogony of the old divine pairs often function as an introduction, giving the complex myth placement in "time." This is the case in *Enūma eliš* and also in the conflate series of cosmogonies in Sakkunyaton. Theogonic series are also linked with the great gods in another function: the listing of witnesses to a treaty or covenant. An intriguing case is found in the Sefireh Treaty **Inscription**.¹⁶¹ After listing the major patron deities of each party to the treaty, the text then names the high god 'El-and-'Elyon and then goes on to list primordial pairs: Heav[en and Earth], [Ab]yss and Sources, Day and Night. Similar sequences are familiar in the Hittite treaties. It will be noted that in the list of witnesses the theogonic sequence is reversed, moving behind the

159. This title, used of Yahweh, probably goes back to an 'El epithet.

160. *HTR*, 60(1967), 411-431.

161. *KAI*, 222.I.A.8-12.

“executive” deities to more fundamental structures that bind even the gods. This special use of the old gods survives in the Old Testament in the covenant lawsuit oracle; witnesses are called, Heaven and Earth or Heaven and Mountains to hear the case of the divine suzerain against his rebellious vassal. As a matter of fact, ‘El like Enlil stands at the “transition point” between the old gods and the deities of the **cultus**. To put it another way, ‘El reflects the patriarchal structures of society in many of the myths and the organized institutions of kingship in other titles and functions. He may be a state god or a “god of the father.”

The particular wars of ‘El are to establish his **headship** in the family of the gods. His wars are against his father *Šamēm*, “Heaven,” in behalf of his wronged mother *Arš*, “Earth”; the two, Heaven and Earth are the last of the theogonic pairs. ‘El takes his sisters to wife and emasculates his father. The parallels with the Theogony of Hesiod are close: Earth by her firstborn Heaven gave birth to the great gods, among them Rhea and Kronos. It is Kronos who, in defense of his mother Earth, emasculates Heaven. Zeus the son of Rhea and Kronos went to war against his parents and defeated them, casting them into the nether **world**.¹⁶² Similarly, in the Kumarbi myth, Kumarbi emasculated his father Anu (Heaven), who in his own time had cast his father Alalu into the nether world.

The most extraordinary example of what we may call the **patricide-incest** motif is found in a newly published **theogony**.¹⁶³ Through some six generations of theogonic pairs, power is transferred by the device of patricide and incest. In the second generation the young god **Sumuqan** kills his father (whose identity is uncertain), weds his mother Earth and his sister Sea for good measure. Sea also kills her mother and rival wife Earth. In the third through the sixth generation the young god murders the patriarch (twice his mother as well), and regularly weds his sister (only in the third generation does he wed his mother also). In the seventh generation the young god holds his father captive. In the broken lines that follow we meet the great gods of the pantheon, Enlil and his twin sons **Nušku** and **Ninurta**, who apparently share rule amicably.

The existence of this “baroque” form of the patricidal and incestuous

162. Hesiod, *Theogony*, 165-180; 455-490; 650-730 (ed. Loeb).

163. W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard *CTBT*, vol. 46 (1965), Pl. 39; W. G. Lambert and Peter Walcot, “A New Babylonian Theogony and Hesiod,” *Kadmos*, 4 (1965), 64-72; W. F. Albright, YGC. pp. 81ff. The most penetrating study I have seen is that of Thorkild Jacobsen entitled “The Harab Myth,” forthcoming.

pattern of the theogonic myth should make clear once and for all that the succession of the Gods: Šamēm to 'El, and 'El to Ba'l-Haddu, and so on, does not root in the history of a sequence of cults, one following the other in the history of the Canaanite (Mesopotamian, Hurrian, and so on) religion. The pattern of violence in the generations of the old gods (one or more) comes to an end at the point of transition to the great gods of the cult, those who finally establish an uneasy, but tolerable, peace. In Greece the transition went over two generations, Zeus "the Father of the gods and man" successfully banishing his old father to Tartarus. In the Canaanite shift from the old gods to the established cosmic state, 'El like Enlil established himself father of the gods, associating his son (or nephew) in his rule over the cosmos.

The myths of 'El present static or eternal structures which constitute nature and the uneasy order of a patriarchal society. They do not seek to explain the historical course in the rising or falling popularity of a god's cult. In the cosmic family of the gods the patriarch always stands between the old (or dead) god and his lusty and ambitious son. It is this structure the myth describes, a "primordial" structure. The older theogonic pairs, at least at first, must inevitably be incestuous. Moreover, patriarchal society creates settings in which the temptation to incest on the one side and revolt against the father on the other side constantly threaten family peace. In the court history of David these forces are dramatically revealed. The rape of Absalom's sister Tamar by Amnon, another son of David, began a conflict which included fratricide and ultimately the revolt of Absalom against David. The transfer of power was signaled by Absalom's violation of his father's harem, and the episode ended only in a test of arms in which Absalom fell. The succession to David's throne by Solomon whom David appointed king in his last days also was marked by fratricidal conflict and harem intrigue. This is the pattern of life of men and gods who live in the extended families of patriarchal society.

We see 'El as the figure of the divine father. 'El cannot be described as a sky god like Anu, a storm god like Enlil or Zeus, a chthonic god like Nergal, or a grain god like Dagon. The one image of 'El that seems to tie all of his myths together is that of the patriarch. Unlike the great gods who represent the powers behind the phenomena of nature, 'El is in the first instance a social god. He is the primordial father of gods and men, sometimes stern, often compassionate, always wise in judgment.

While he has taken on royal prerogatives and epithets, he stands closer to the patriarchal judge over the council of gods. He is at once

father and ruler of the family of gods, functions brought together in the human sphere only in those societies which are organized in tribal leagues or in kingdoms where kinship survives as an organizing power in the society. He is a tent-dweller in many of his myths. His tent on the mount of assembly in the far north is the place of cosmic decisions. There are myths of monumental **carousals** where he appears to live in a palace, *hêkal*, and live like a king. Such uneven layers of tradition in oral poetry should not occasion surprise.

'El is creator, the ancient one whose extraordinary procreative powers have populated heaven and earth, and there is little evidence that his vigor has flagged. Myths of 'El perceive creation as theogony. Myths of **Ba'l** view creation as cosmogony. 'El rests now from ancient wars in which he won patriarchal authority; feats of arms "now" are fought by younger gods, Ba'l in particular, and he shares 'El's rule. 'El's chief wife, the mother of the gods, is occupied with family intrigues. 'El appears affectionate toward her, but the *hieros gamos* texts of 'El reveal that he often turns to younger wives. His three important consorts are his two sisters Asherah and Astarte, and his daughter 'Anat. Ba'l also takes 'Anat as consort, and 'El shows particular favor to Astarte the divine courtesan.

In Akkadian and Amorite religion as also in Canaanite, 'El frequently plays the role of "god of the father," the social deity who governs the tribe or league, often bound to league or king with kinship or covenant ties.

His characteristic mode of manifestation appears to be the vision or audition, often in dreams. This mode stands in strong contrast to the theophany of the storm god whose voice is the thunder and who goes out to battle riding the cloud chariot, shaking the mountains with stormy blasts of his nostrils, striking the enemy with fiery bolts. Ba'l comes near in his shining storm cloud. 'El is the transcendent one.

3 Yahweh and 'Ēl

'El in the Bible

'Ēl is rarely if ever used in the Bible as the proper name of a non-Israelite, Canaanite deity in the full consciousness of a distinction between 'El and Yahweh, god of Israel. This is a most extraordinary datum.

In Ezekiel, 28: 2, the prophet's famous oracle against Tyre, he describes 'El in excessively mythological terms, suggesting that he knew that he sang of the Canaanite deity : "Because your heart was proud you (Tyre) said, 'I am 'Ēl, in the seat of 'Elōhīm I am enthroned in the midst of the seas.'" The abode of 'El is described precisely in Canaanite language. Yet there are problems. Ezekiel uses 'Elōhīm in parallel to 'El here, and later in vv. 14 and 16 speaks of 'El's mountain as *har 'ēlōhīm*, and in v. 2 uses 'Ēl in its fairly frequent generic sense. I am inclined to believe the prophet was aware of the background of the language he used. In the phrase, "you are human and not divine/'Ēl," it appears that he plays on the double possibility in meanings of 'ēl: "a divinity"/"the divinity 'El". Similarly in using the expressions *gan 'ēlōhīm* and *har 'ēlōhīm*¹ he may have been aware that 'ēlōhīm could be used with a double meaning : the "plural of cult manifestations" of a proper name (like Bē'ālīm = Ba'l), as well as a simple plural: "gods". Still problems remain and the evidence is not wholly clear.

In Judges 9 : 46 there is a reference to the temple of 'ēl bērit. As we have noted above, this appears to be a specific epithet of Canaanite 'El. Here again, however, one must ask how the epithet was understood in later biblical tradition. In view of the parallel title *Ba'l bērit*, the god was evidently understood to be a pagan deity.

Some have suggested that the expression 'ādat 'El in Psalm 82: 1 be taken as "the council of 'El," and the poem read to mean that Yahweh (revised to 'ēlōhīm in the 'Elohistic Psalter) stood in 'El's council. I doubt that this is so and would place the passage among those in early poetry where 'El is clearly regarded as a proper name of Yahweh. However, there can be no doubt that the origin of the designation 'ādat

1. Cf. hr. 'il in Text 4.2.36.

'El is in Canaanite myth. It appears at Ugarit in the form **'adatu 'Ili-ma** (**'dt 'ilm**), "**council of 'El**."²

A similar frozen, archaic phrase having its origin in Canaanite mythic language is **kôkabê 'El**, "the stars of 'El,"³ that is, the northern or circumpolar stars. The expression has turned up in the Pyrgi Inscription in the form **hkkbm 'l**.⁴

In the same category, I think, are the expressions **'arzê 'El** (Psalm 80: 11) and **hararê 'el** (Psalm 36:7; compare Psalm 50: 10). The usual explanation, that **'el** here means "preeminent," or "grand," appears weaker, especially in view of 'El's abode in the "cedar mountains" of the Amanus. It is doubtful that the original connotations of any of these archaisms survived in Israelite usage after the era when Yahweh ceased to be an epithet of 'El (see below).

The use of the apparent plural **'lym** requires special treatment. It occurs in the Bible only four times, three times⁵ in early Hebrew poetry: Psalm 29: 1, Psalm 89:7⁶ and Exodus 15:11;⁷ and once in a late Apocalyptic context, Daniel 11: 36. In Psalms 29: 1 and 89:7, it is used in the phrase **bny 'lym**. The original referent was, of course, to the family of 'El and hence to members of the genus "god." These two occurrences, one evidently in a borrowed Ba'l hymn,* require further comment in view of Canaanite usage. In the Ugaritic texts the council of the gods is designated by the following phrases: **dr bn'il / dār banī 'ili, / mḫrt bn 'il, ḫr bn 'ilm / puḫru banī 'ili-ma/**. 'El is called

2. CTA. 15.2.7,11.

3. Isa. 14:13.

4. On the problem of the article and the m-enclitic, see M. Dahood, "Punic **hkkbm 'l** and Isa. 14, 13," *Orientalia*. 34 (1965), 170-172; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Phoenician Inscription from Pyrgi," *JAOS*, 86 (1966), 285-297; and T. O. Lambdin, "The Junctural Origin of the West Semitic Definite Article," *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell A/bright*, ed. Hans Goedicke (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971), p. 329, n. 24.

5. We need not treat here the use of **'lym** and **'ly** in such passages as **'ly ḡbwrym** in Ezekiel 32: 21 or **'lym** in Job 41: 17. There are simply orthographic variants of **'ly** and **'lym** in passages where the animal name is used as a military or noble appellation. Such usage (with various animal names) is frequent in Canaanite literature and in the Bible.

6. The material in Ps. 89:6-19 is quite archaic although now brought together with later hymnic tradition in the Psalm as a whole.

7. See below where I argue for a late twelfth or early eleventh century date for the poem.

8. See H. L. Ginsberg, *Kitvé Ugarit* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem, Bialik Foundation, 1936), pp. 129ff.; and F. M. Cross, "Notes on a Canaanite Psalm in the Old Testament," *BASOR*, 117(1950), 19ff., and the references cited there.

'ab bn 'if /'abū banī 'ili/. Epithets of a single member of the "family," divine or human, include **bn 'il** /bin 'ili/, and **bn 'ilm** /bin 'ili-ma/. These data may be taken to suggest that 'lm⁹ in Psalm 29: I and Psalm 89:7 is to be read as a singular with the enclitic. In later Phoenician **bn 'Im** appears, for example, in *kl bn 'Im* in the Arslan Tash Plaque (seventh century B.C.). As in the case of the biblical occurrences, it is in archaizing poetry. In Phoenician, **'Im** can reflect the singular **'El** plus the enclitic, a plural applied to a single god ('El or any other !), or a simple plural of the generic appellative. We know that the m-enclitic survives at least as late as the fifth century B.C. in Phoenician.¹⁰ The balance of evidence seems to be on the side of reading the proper name 'El plus the enclitic in both occurrences in the Psalter and in the incantation from Arslan Tash as well. At all events, this usage was long dead when the apocalyptists revived the use of 'ēlīm and b'ne'ēlīm in which 'ēlīm is taken to be the appellative plural. In Exodus 15 : 11 we have the sole biblical example of the living use of the plural 'ēlīm as an ordinary generic appellative before the time of the late apocalyptic (Daniel 11 : 36).

'El Epithets in Patriarchal Narratives

We are prepared now to return to the 'El epithets in the Patriarchal narratives of Genesis. These names are compounded of the element 'ēl with a following substantive or adjective, among them 'ēl 'ōlām (Genesis 21: 33),¹¹ 'pI 'elyōn (Genesis 14: 18ff.),¹² 'pI 'ēlōhé yisrā'ēl (Genesis 33 :20),¹³ 'ēl rō'i (Genesis 16: 13), 'ēl bêt-'ēl (Genesis 35:7;

9. We use here pre-Exilic orthography in which 'ēlīm and 'eli-m could not be distinguished.

10. See above note 4, where an instance from fifth-century Pyrgi is cited.

11. As is generally recognized, **yhwh** is secondary in Gen. 21:33.

12. In Gen. 14:22, omit **yhwh** with G and Sy; Sam reads here **h'lhym 'I 'lywn** which adds slightly to the evidence for omitting **yhwh**. That is, both **yhwh** and **h'lhym** are additions for explication.

13. "El, god of (the Patriarch) Israel." Cf. []'ēl 'ēlōhé 'ābikā, Genesis 46: 3, "'El, god of your father," an epithet used at Beersheba. Omit the article (with Sy) in the epithet, since in any case it developed after the loss of inflectional endings in Canaanite at the beginning of the Iron Age. The first examples of the true article fall in the tenth century, and even in inscriptions of this period it is not used systematically; it is quite late in invading poetic and/or liturgical language. For the non-use of the article in Canaanite poetry, see F. M. Cross and R. J. Saley, "Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B.C. from Arslan Tash in Upper Syria," p. 48. In Ugaritic prose, **hnd** and **hmk** are demonstrative pronouns, the element **hn-** probably unrelated to the later Canaanite article. See W. F. Albright, "Specimens of Ugaritic Prose," *BASOR*, 150 (April 1958). 37f., n. 1 I; M. Dahood, "The Linguistic Position of Ugaritic in Light of

compare 31: 13);¹⁴ and 'ēl šadday.¹⁵ Most of the epithets are tied to specific Patriarchal sanctuaries or altars, 'ēl 'ōlām to Beersheba, 'ēl 'elyōn to Jerusalem, 'ēl 'ēlōhé yisrā'ēl to Shechem,¹⁶ 'ēl rō'i to Beerlahay-roi, and 'ēl bêt-'ēl, of course, to Bethel. 'El Šadday, unlike the other epithets, is not firmly fixed in cultic aetiology, although the P source does attach the name to Bethel in Genesis 48 : 3.

Many of these epithets are capable philologically of receiving more than one interpretation. We may read 'ēl as a proper name 'El or as a generic appellative, "god." In the first instance, the second element will normally be an attributive adjective or participle, or a substantive in apposition. In the second instance, the second element may be taken as a divine proper name in apposition, or a substantive in a genitive relationship. Thus 'ēl 'ōlām, for example, may be read "the god 'Olām," or "the god of eternity" ("the ancient god"). Again, we may take the epithet 'ēl 'elyōn to mean "the God 'Elyōn," or "'El, the highest one," or conceivably "the highest god."

The choice of one of these alternate interpretations has been determined in the past by general views of the history of Canaanite and Patriarchal religion. Usually the choice in one instance has determined the choice in all or most of the others. Thus, under the influence of the theory that the gods of Canaan were local genii, one school has consistently read the element 'ēl as an appellative.¹⁷ On the other hand, scholars with much more sophisticated views of Canaanite religion have arrived at much the same conclusion as to the correct philological

Recent Discoveries," in *Sacra Pagina*, ed. J. Coppens et al. (Paris, Lecoffre, 1959), pp. 271f. and references; and especially T. O. Lambdin, "The Junctural Origin of the West Semitic Definite Article," pp. 3 15-333.

14. This epithet raises special problems in view of the hypostatization of Bethel and the eventual emergence of Bethel as a full-fledged deity. See provisionally the material collected by O. Eissfeldt, "Der Gott Bethel," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*. 28 (1930), 1-30 (reprinted in *KS* [Eissfeldt], I, 206-233); A. Vincent, *La Religion des judéo-araméens d'Éléphantine* (Paris, Geuthner, 1937), esp. pp. 562-592. In our view we should read "the god of Bethel" in the two passages of Genesis, not "the god Bethel." At some early point in history the name **Bet-'Cl** must have meant simply "the temple of 'El": but these issues cannot detain us here.

15. In the form 'ēl šadday (as opposed to šadday alone) the epithet occurs in contexts of the Priestly strata: Gen. 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 43:14; 48:3 and Exod. 6:3. The full epithet also appears once in an archaic context: Gen. 49:25 (with G Sam Sy) in parallel to 'ēl 'abika. sufficient evidence that P draws upon old tradition.

16. The epithet 'ēl bērit is also attached to Shechem; cf. above, notes 156ff.

17. The classical, critical statement of this view is that of Alt; U. Cassuto defends with modern tools a modified version of the traditional view (*La questione della Genesi* [Florence, F. Le Monnier, 1934], pp. 60-82).

analysis of the epithets. No doubt the most powerful argument for reading “the god PN” lies in the fact that such elements of epithets as ‘*ôlām*,¹⁸ ‘*elyōn*, and ‘*šadday* appear in the Bible and in extrabiblical sources independently, without the prefixed ‘*ēl*. In view of such data it was easiest to suppose that the element ‘*ēl* has been leveled through the material in the late development of tradition,¹⁹ namely, when the old divine epithets were reapplied to Yahweh, in the pattern Yahweh, ‘El ‘*Ôlām*, and so forth.

The view that these cultic or liturgical names are epithets of the god ‘El has been given a new life by the expansion of our knowledge of Canaanite and Amorite religion. As we have seen, ‘El has emerged from the texts as a central figure of the pantheon. We know that in south Canaan his cult was especially popular in the second millennium and that in the Punic Occident he dominated, not only theoretically as head of the pantheon, but actually in his several cults. We know that ‘*if* in the Canaanite texts is regularly, or rather in a majority of cases, the proper name of ‘El. Some scholars actually have argued for a tendency in Canaan toward an ‘El monotheism, or, better, pantheism.²⁰ On the contrary, it seems clear that no later than the fourteenth century B.C. in north Syria, the cult of ‘El was declining, giving place to the cult of Ba’l-Haddu in point of popularity. The cult of Ba’l, it seems, was more supportive of the institution of kingship and of an agricultural as opposed to a cattle-keeping economy. However this may be, it has become tempting to see the epithets ‘*ēl* ‘*ôlām*, and so on as titles of Canaanite ‘El, epithets drawn from liturgical names of the father of the gods as he was worshipped in the chief Palestinian sanctuaries.²¹

18. On ‘*ôlām* as a divine name in the Old Testament, see F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, “The Blessing of Moses,” *JBL*, 67 (1948), 209, n. 85. Dt. 33: 27 reads, *mē’ônô [sic!] ‘ēlohē qēdem/mittahtāw zērō’ōt ‘ôlām*, “His (Jeshurun’s) refuge is the God of old/Under him are the arms of the Ancient One.” A divine name is expected after *zērō’ōt*, to parallel ‘*ēlohē qēdem*. On the other hand, it may be argued that *zērō’* is often the hypostasis of the divine power and hence may make an adequate parallel. Cf. Isa. 40: 28 and Jer. 10: 10. M. Dahood has found the divine name ‘*ôlām* in a number of places in the Psalter: Ps. 24:7, 9; 52:11; 66:7; 73:12; 75:10; and 89:3. Had he found fewer instances his case would appear stronger; see *Psalms*, I, *The Anchor Bible* (New York, Doubleday, 1966), p. xxxvii and *ad loc.*

19. See M. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (Leiden, Brill, 1955), pp. 14f.

20. Cf. R. Dussaud, *Les Découvertes de Ras Shamra (Ugarit) et l’ancien Testament*. 2nd ed. (Paris, P. Geuthner, 1941); and especially O. Eissfeldt, *El im ugaritischen Pantheon*; and “El and Yahweh,” *JSS*, 1(1956), 25-37 (reprinted in *KS* [Eissfeldt], 111, 386-397).

21. This position has been most eloquently defended by O. Eissfeldt.

Such an epithet as *'el 'elōhē yiśrā'el*, “‘El, the god of (the Patriarch Jacob) Israel” is unambiguous. It simply must be read as identifying the god of the Father with Canaanite ‘El. The epithet²² [] *'El 'elōhē 'ābika*, “‘El, the god of your father,” also seems to be a transparent reference to ‘El. Does it not follow then that *'el 'ōlām, 'el šadday*, and so forth are each variant cult forms of ‘El?

There are grammatical problems in so construing some of the names. An epithet *'el 'ōlām* is most easily read “the god of eternity.” We cannot take the proper name ‘El to be in a construct relationship to the noun *'ōlām*.²³

Again, on methodological grounds, I do not believe that the interpretation of the several epithets can be solved by general religio-historical constructions. To be sure, we can speak no longer of the *'elīm* of Canaan as “local *numina*.” The great gods of the Canaanite pantheon were cosmic deities. There is, indeed, a double movement clearly discernible in Syro-Palestinian religion. A great god such as ‘El or ‘Asherah appears in local manifestations in the cult places and gains special titles, attributes, hypostases. In the process, one cult or title may split apart and a new god emerge to take his place beside ‘El or ‘Asherah in the pantheon. On the other hand, there is a basic syncretistic impulse in Near Eastern polytheism which tends to merge gods with similar traits and functions. A minor deity, worshipped by a small group of adherents, may become popular and merge with a great deity; major deities in a single culture’s pantheon may fuse; or deities holding similar positions in separate pantheons may be identified.²⁴

22. See above, note 13.

23. This applies, too, to *'el Bethel, 'el bērit*, and possibly *'el rō'i*. The original epithet of the Shechemite god was probably *'El ba'l bērit*, “‘El lord of Covenant.” As we have seen, the liturgical formula underlying *'El 'ōlām* was probably *'El dū 'ōlām*, “‘El lord of eternity,” as well as simple *'ōlām*. Of course, it is possible to form compound divine names, in effect hyphenated forms. Examples are *'lu'ib, 'Iu-wer* or with other gods *'ir'i* (Atargatis), *'štrkms, 'ršp mlqrt*, etc. At Ugarit occasionally we find double names of gods or rather names of gods used in fixed or formulaic pairs joined in hendiadys: *Kōtar wa-Ḥassis, Nikkal wa-'lb, Qudšu wa-'Amrur*, and *'Atirat wa-Rahmay*. But these are nevertheless unusual.

24. See A. Bertholet’s essay, *Götterspaltung und Göttervereinigung* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1933), now somewhat antiquated. An extraordinary example of cross-cultural assimilations is found in Kumarbi myths published by H. G. Güterbock, *Kumarbi* (Zurich-New York, Europa Verlag, 1946). Another old but still useful collection of bizarre instances of both hypostatization and fusion can be found in W. F. Albright, “The Evolution of the West-Semitic Divinity ‘an-‘anat-‘atta,” *AJSL*, 41 (1925), 73–101.

It must be maintained after all that, aside from one or two, the divine epithets are ambiguous. To illustrate from Ugaritic texts, we can cite the following formulae: *'if malk*, *rasp malk*, and *'if haddu*. The first appellation is used exclusively of 'El, and we may suitably translate, "'El, the king." Similarly, *rasp malk* must be translated "Rasp the king." But the third name, a title of Ba'l-Haddu as its context certifies, is "the god Haddu." It may be noted, however, that the latter construction is rare among the divine epithets which proliferated in Ugaritic myths and liturgies. At all events, if we are to identify 'el 'ôlām with the head of the Canaanite pantheon, 'El, we must do so on the basis of evidence that 'ôlām is a characteristic appellation of 'El and that 'ôlām is not better applied to another deity. The same holds true for 'el 'elyōn and 'el šadday, although the second element in each may easily be understood as a substantive in apposition. We must establish the identity of the god on the basis of evidence other than that of the biblical formula itself.

In the case of *'El 'ôlām*, "the god of eternity" or "the ancient god," the evidence, in our view, is overwhelming to identify the epithet as an epithet of 'El. This is the source of Yahweh's epithets "the ancient one" or "the ancient of days," as well as the biblical and Ugaritic epithet *malk 'ôlām*. It is found in fuller form in the Sinai epithet *'II dū 'ôlām*. At Ugarit and in the Punic world, 'El is the "old one" or "ancient one" par excellence: *'ôlām, gerōn, senex, saeculum*, he of the grey beard, he of eternal wisdom.

This is not to claim that the epithet 'ôlām is used exclusively of 'El. In the Arslan Tash incantation we found 'ôlām both as an epithet of 'El and applied to "ancient Earth," *'arš 'ôlām*; and the "old god" of a Sakkunyaton theogony is called Aeon, the *Oulōmos* of Moschus. There can be no question, however, of Patriarchal 'el 'ôlām being identified with a god in the sequence of primordial pairs. Such gods do not belong to the present or to the cult save in the highly specialized functions we have described above. 'El 'ôlām is an "executive deity," a deity of the cult, namely the *cultus* of the ('El) shrine at Beersheba.

'El as the "ancient one" brings us to the biblical epithet 'el 'elyōn *qōnē šamáyim wā-'āreš*. The title theoretically could mean "the god 'Elyōn, creator of (heaven and) earth," or "'El, Most High, creator ...," or "'El-'Elyōn, creator ..." (that is, a double divine name). Whatever the precise form of the epithet, *qōnē (šamáyim wā-)'āreš* (and the shorter form is perhaps original in view of its widespread occurrence

documented above²⁵), it is patent that 'El is the creator god of the Canaanites and that *qōnē'ars*, at any rate, applies exclusively to him. Indeed there is no alternate candidate for such an epithet. A question remains about the epithet 'Elyōn conjoined to 'ēl here. It (*ilyoun*) is used of an old god in Sakkunyaton, one of the theogonic pair in the generation before Heaven and Earth. Again we must say that the old god is not the active creator, god of the shrine of Jerusalem. Nowhere does such an old god appear in the pantheon lists or in the lists of gods given sacrifices.²⁶

The mention of 'Elyōn in the Sefire I inscription is more pertinent to our discussion. The pair 'lw'lyn, 'El and 'Elyōn²⁷ comes after the tutelary gods, immediately before the great natural pairs summarizing the old powers of the cosmos. What are we to make of the pair? Certainly 'Elyōn here is not the member of the theogonic pair listed by Sakkunyaton. One may argue that since the gods appear paired with their consorts, each a separate deity, 'El and 'Elyōn are here to be distinguished. But they obviously are not god and consort. On the other hand their association in a pair in such a series, and followed by natural pairs, suggests that they must be intimately associated. It is even possible to interpret the pair as a double name of a single god as often is the case at Ugarit, perhaps carried in stereotyped language when the pair was borrowed from the Canaanites into the Aramaean realm.²⁸ Or one may take 'elyōn as an early epithet of 'El, split apart in a separate cult and hence taken as an independent deity. I am inclined to believe that 'elyōn in Genesis 14 serves as a proper epithet of 'El and is not an intrusive ele-

25. References are given in chapter 2, note 20. To these may be added L. della Vida, "El 'Elyōn in Genesis 14: 18-20," *JBL*, 63 (1944), 1-9. We should also call attention to the Aramaic papyrus of the late seventh century published by A. Dupont-Sommer, "Un Papyrus araméen d'époque saïte découvert à Saqqarah," *Semitica* 1 (1948), pp. 43-68; cf. H. L. Ginsberg, "An Aramaic Contemporary of the Lachish Letters," *BASOR*. 111 (October 1948). 24-27; and J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Letter of King Adon to the Egyptian Pharaoh," *Biblica*, 46 (1965), 49. Here in a broken context the epithet of a god is found "[] of heaven and earth..." which may be tentatively read (with Ginsberg in part), "El creator of heaven and earth." We may compare also the Akkadian epithets *bāni Same u eršiti*, "creator of heaven and earth" (Marduk), *bēl Same u eršiti*, "lord of heaven and earth" (Anu, Enlil, Marduk, Šamaš); *bānāt šamē u eršiti*, "creatress of heaven and earth" (Maḥ); and *bēlit Same u eršiti*, "mistress of heaven and earth" (Damkina, Inanna, Ištar).

26. See the article of Rémi Lack, "Les Origines de Elyon, le Très-Haut, dans le tradition culturelle d'Israël," *CBQ*. 24 (1962), 44-64.

27. Hardly Aramaized to 'Elyān (pace Fitzmyer).

28. Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire* (Rome, The Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967), pp. 37f.

ment in the formula." Such epithets expand and contract in a variety of lengths suitable to metrical form in orally composed poetry.³⁰ In any case, the creator god of Jerusalem was 'El, and later, at least, the epithets 'elyōn and 'eli³¹ both became standard epithets of Yahweh alongside his alias 'El.

The epithet 'ēl šadday, while the most frequent of the biblical epithets under consideration, is also the most enigmatic. It is the primary designation of the Patriarchal deity in Priestly tradition, as we have seen, and at the same time is rooted in very old poetic tradition.³² The element šadday, older šadayyu³³ derives from a root ṭdw/y as shown persuasively by W. F. Albright in 1935.³⁴ The writer refurbished the argument with new evidence in 1962.³⁵ More material has accumulated since.

A chief problem has been to establish the identity of the sibilant in šadday.³⁶ The Hebrew notation, šdy ordinarily would require an etymological s₁ or s₃(ṭ or š) standing behind the form. In this case s₂ is eliminated. S₂ is preempted also by Hebrew śdy/śdh "field," unless

29. The epithet also occurs in an early context in Psalm 78:35. Compare Old South Arabic *I l'ly*, "El, Most High" (G. Ryckmans, *Les Noms propres sud-semitiques* [Louvain, Muséon, 1934], I, 23).

30. Cf. Albert Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1960), pp. 30–67, and especially Richard E. Whitaker, "A Formulaic Analysis of Ugaritic Poetry" (Ph. D. diss., Harvard 1970).

31. The element 'ly appears in the biblical hypocoristicon 'Eli and appears in an eighth-century ostrakon from Samaria in the name yhw'ly. We are not inclined to read 'ly in 2 Sam. 23: 1; 4QSam reads 'l.

32. Gen. 49: 25 is part of the Joseph blessing which occurs in two oral variants in the Blessing of Jacob and in the Blessing of Moses (Dt. 33:13–17). It must be dated in the era of the Judges, probably in the eleventh century B.C. See F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, "Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry," photocopy (Baltimore, 1950), pp. 129–183.

33. The doubling is secondary in šadday, arising apparently by analogy with forms qattal or qattāl from third-weak roots. The same secondary development may be seen in the East Semitic šaddāyu/šaddā'u.

34. W. F. Albright, "The Names Shaddai and Abram," *JBL*, 54 (1935), 180–187.

35. F. M. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *HTR*, 55 (1962), pp. 244–250; cf. M. Weippert, "Erwägungen zur Etymologie des Gottesnames 'El Šaddaj," *ZDMG*, n.s. 36 (1961), 42–62.

36. For our purposes we shall label as s₁ Proto-Canaanite ṭ as s₂ Canaanite ś (surviving in Hebrew S), and s₃, Canaanite š. Our notation implies nothing about phonetic realizations of the phonemes in question. There is some reason to believe, for example, that the binary opposition in Ugaritic is phonetically equivalent to Amorite and, similarly, that Egyptian transcription reflects the binary opposition seen in Jerusalem Canaanite, suggesting that the traditional cuneiform notations have been reversed. There are very strong reasons to believe that the phonetic realization of Ugaritic ṭ was

one proposes to label *šdy* a loanword equivalent to *šdy* "field."³⁷ The writing *ša-de₄-e* "field" in Jerusalem Amarna Letter 287, 56 should not confuse one. This is the notation for *s*₁ and *s*₂, while *s*₃ is consistently rendered *s* by the Jerusalem scribe. We should read /*šadē*/ in all likelihood since the binary opposition *s*_{1,2} vs. *s*₃ is transcribed by Egyptian *s* vs. *š* and in Proto-Sinaitic by *š* vs. *š*.

Further evidence comes from the appearance of the name *šadāy* in an element in a personal name of the late fourteenth century B.C., written in Egyptian syllabic orthography: *ša-di^c-m-i/šadē-‘ammī*.³⁸ The same name with the elements reversed *‘mysdy* and a comparable name *šdy’wr (šēdē’ūr)* appear in Priestly lists of personal names at-

/s/. These matters need not concern us here; for a full discussion, see L. Rustum-Shehadeh, "The Sibilants of the West Semitic Languages of the Second Millennium" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard 1969). What is important for our purposes is to recognize that the following equivalences hold throughout the material:

Proto-Canaanite	Egypt. Transc.	Jerusalem Cuneiform	Proto-Sinaitic	Ugar. Alph.	N. Can. Cuneiform	Amorite Cuneiform
<i>s</i> ₁	š	š	š	š(s)	š	š
<i>s</i> ₂	š	š	š	š	š	s
<i>s</i> ₃	š	s	š	š	š	s

37. The best defense of this position is made by M. Weippert, "Erwägungen zur Etymologie des Gottesnames 'El Šaddaj." It is clear that in Phoenician and North Canaanite (of the reduced "Ugaritic" alphabet) *s*, merged with *s*_{2,3}(š/s/>š) before 1200 B.C. At the same time, the phonetic shift of *samekh* (8) from an affricate, transcribed by Egyptian *š*(š), to a fricative transcribed by Egyptian *s* gave rise to a new binary opposition. These shifts took place before the development of the conventional Phoenician alphabet from the older Proto-Canaanite alphabet. In both Hebrew and Old Aramaic, notation of the sibilants is incomplete because scribes adopted, under the influence of Phoenician scribal tradition, a reduced alphabet, not devised for their phonemic system. In no case can it be held that the Proto-Canaanite alphabet developed independently in Palestine into the Hebrew alphabet and in Aram into the Aramaic. The palaeographical data will not allow such a view.

38. See M. Burchardt, *Die altkanaanäischen Fremdwörter und Eigennamen in Aegyptischen* (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1909-10), II, No. 826; cf. W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1946), p. 183 and n. 61; *The Biblical Period*, (Pittsburgh, 1950), p. 7 and note 20. The transcription follows the system devised by Albright and revised by Albright and T. O. Lambdin, "New Material for Egyptian Syllabic Orthography," *JSS*, 2 (1957), 113-127. Cf. W. Helck, *BA V*, p. 376, No. 28 who reads the name *ša-di-mi!* The reading *mi* is incorrect; Helck may have meant to write *mí*, but neither is this correct. The name, that of a petty official, is written on a figurine published by W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Kahun, Gurob, and Hawara* (London, 1890), Pl. 24. The hieroglyphs ^c, then *m*, stand separately followed by ⁱ (the writing of the l.p.s. suffix which the scribe evidently understood). There is no reason to suppose that the sequence ^c followed by *m* is an alternate writing for *mi* (forearm-over-owl), Gardiner G20.

tributed to the Mosaic Age, which, whatever their history, actually reflect characteristic formations of the onomasticon of the second millennium.³⁹ The Egyptian transcription of *šadday* with *ś* once again establishes the sibilant as *s*₁ or *s*₂ (*ṯ* or *ś*). The Egyptian transcriptions of the Canaanite sibilants beginning in the Middle Kingdom with the Execration Texts and continuing through the New Kingdom are remarkably consistent, *s*₁ and *s*₂ being transcribed with Egyptian *ś*, *s*₃ being transcribed with Egyptian *š*. Since Hebrew *šadday* requires either *s*, or *s*₃ (*ṯ* or *ś*), and the Egyptian evidence *s*₁ or *s*₂ (*ṯ* or *ś*), an etymology from *s*₁ (*ṯ*) is required.

A group of names from Ugarit gave additional confirmation of the etymology, including the names *ṯdy ṯdyn* and *ṯdṯb*.⁴⁰ Indeed, there is evidence from Ugarit that the element *ṯdy* meant “mountain,” distinguishing it from *šd*, “field.”⁴¹ Probably also we should combine West Semitic *ṯdw/ṯdy* with East Semitic *šadū* [*< *ṯadwum*], “mountain,” despite some difficulties.⁴² Whether this equivalence proves to be correct or incorrect, the Northwest Semitic evidence is determinant for the etymology of *šadday*.

39. See the lists in Num. 1:5–15; 2:3–29; etc.

40. See F. Gröndahl, *PTU*, p. 416. The last-mentioned name, *ṯdṯb*, evidently is *ṯadē-ṯāb*, comparing *ṯb^ʿm* and *ṯb^ʿl*. On the formation, see I. J. Gelb, “La lingua degli amoriti,” *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 8 Rendiconti*. Classe di scienze, morali, storiche e filologiche, vol. 13 (1958), §3.3.8.2.4, and compare the epithet of ʿEl: *dū-tābi*, “the Compassionate One” (Sinai).

41. A. F. Rainey called my attention to this evidence in a personal letter dated February 20, 1966. I quote:

“Concerning the meaning of the personal names *šdyn* (*UT* Glossary 19.2387) and *ṯdy; ṯdyn* (*ibid.*, 19.264), there is important confirmation from the *PN*’s cited by Nougayrol (*PRU* III, pp. 256–257). His entry No. 3 must be removed from the list: Nos. 1, 2 and 6 are written ^m*A.ŠĀ-ia-nu* with the ideogram for “field.” They belong with ^m*sa-de₄-ia-nu* (*PRU* III, p. 256) as demonstrated by *ša-de₄-e* as the gloss for *ugari* in EA 287: 56. These names are obviously reflexes of *šdyn*.

“On the other hand, Nougayrol’s No. 5 is *ša-du-ya(WA)* and No. 7 is *ša-du-ya(WA)*; this latter is paralleled by ^m*KUR^d[u-ya]* in line 1 I of the same text. They all probably represent *ṯdy*. Finally *ṯdyn* clearly corresponds to Nougayrol’s No. 4 ^m*ša-du-ya-na* and Nos. 9 and 10 of which the latter is ^m*KUR-ia-na*.

“The distinction between names with ‘field’ [*A.ŠĀ*] and with ‘mountain’ [*KUR*] is therefore certain.”

42. The development of the sibilants in Akkadian is still not clear. The data for the etymology of *šadū* is found in Old Akkadian. Among the recent treatments of this material are J. Aro, “Die semitischen Zischlaute (*ṯ*), *ś*, *š* und *s* und ihre Vertretung im Akkadischen,” *Orientalia*, 28 (1959), 321–335; I. J. Gelb, *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*, 2nd ed. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1961), especially pp. 35–39; A. Goetze, “The Sibilants in Old Babylonian,” *RA*, 52 (1958), 137–149; and L. Rustom-Shehadeh, “The Sibilants in the West Semitic Languages.”

The epithet *šadday* thus proves to mean “the mountain one,” The primitive meaning of *tdw/y* is obviously “breast,” Arabic *tdy*, Hebrew *šādáyim*, Ugaritic *td* and perhaps *dd*,⁴³ Aramaic *tēdayyā*, and so on. However, the secondary meaning “mountain” developed for transparent reasons,⁴⁴ and early in Semitic, in view of its occurrence in both East and West Semitic.

In Old Akkadian, *šadwum appears written SA.TU and Sa-du(im). The latter writing is expected, since etymological *l* normally is written ša, ši, šu, etc. The writing SA, normal with etymological S/S, also occurs with etymological s₁(*l*) in the normative phase of Old Akkadian and so frequently (see Gelb, *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*, p. 36) that its occurrence certainly cannot surprise.

The only real argument for identifying the sibilant in Akk. *šadū* with s₂, as a number of scholars have done, has been to equate it with West Semitic *šadē* “field, steppe” on the basis of meanings. However, their only common ground (if we may put it so) is upland steppes or lowland hills (*pace* Heide). As for their nuclear meanings, *šadē* is to *har* as *šēru* is to *šadū*, and their etymological identity can be argued only on the analogy of what the Arab lexicographers call *didd* (literally, “contrary/similar”).

43. The usual word for breast in Ugaritic is *td*. It appears in the variant form *dd* twice (CTA, 23.1.61; cf. 23.1.59), once written *zd* (CTA, 23.1.24). One is reminded of the terms for “teat,” “nipple” which arise in onomatopoeia or rather, baby talk: Heb. *dud*, Greek *tithos*, etc. It is possible that *d* represents the dental voiced spirant /d/; it does so often. It is far more likely that it represents the dental unvoiced spirant /t/ in this case, since, as we have shown elsewhere, it also represents etymological /t/. In Ugaritic it is clear from Egyptian and Hittite transcriptions that the graph *t* in the usual Ugaritic notation had a phonetic realization in the sibilant range which we note with /š/. Hence both dental spirants /t/ and /d/ were lost except in archaizing contexts and in foreign words, when they are both rendered by the old sign *d*. For a detailed discussion, see F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, “The Name of Ashdod,” *BASOR*, 175 (1964), 48-50; Cross, “Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs,” *HTR*, 55 (1962), 249f.; cf. Jonas Greenfield, in *JAOS*, 89 (1969), 175.

In some seven passages we find the mention of the *qd il*. Writing in 1962 I proposed that we read *td'il* “mountain” since it appears in a context with *gr* <'i> l, mountain of 'El, and the *huršān*, the mount of the divine assembly (1.3.23; see above). However, my student Richard Clifford has convinced me that the proper parallels to *qd'il* are (1) *qrš mlk*, “the tabernacle of King ['El], and (2) <'a> *hlm*, “tents” (19.4.213), and that the term means “tent-shrine” or the like. I am inclined to suppose that the term means “dome” with the identical etymology. Many parallels to such a meaning can be given. For example, the term in Arabic for a tent shrine is *qubbah*. The Mosaic “Tent of Meeting” was so translated in the Arabic Bible, and indeed we find the term *qubbā* in biblical Hebrew twice, in both instances, we believe, as an archaic designation for the Tabernacle (Num 25:8 *bis*). Literally, *qubbā* means “dome” or “domed tent.” Since the biblical “domed tent” is modeled after the pattern (*tabnūt*) of the cosmic tent of assembly, that is, the tabernacle of 'El, it is appropriately called *td* “dome.” The play on the meanings “mountain of 'El” and “dome of 'El” may very well have been in the poet's mind.

44. For parallels to the development of the meaning “mound,” “peak,” “mountain” from terms originally meaning “breast,” see Albright, “The Names Shaddai and Abram,” p. 184, and E. P. Dhorme, “L'Emploi mttaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien,” *RB*, 31(1922), 230f. (to which may be added the

Šadday, the “One of the Mountain” is paralleled precisely by the epithet of ‘El in the Hurrian hymn cited above, *’Il paban-ḫi-wi-ni* . . . “‘El the one of the mountain . . .” The formation of the name, a natural element plus the adjectival suffix *-ay* (<*-ayyu*)⁴⁵ cannot be separated, I believe, from the series of divine names known from Ugaritic sources, *Pidray*,⁴⁶ *Tallay*,⁴⁷ and especially *’Arşay*, all goddesses belonging to Ba‘l’s entourage.⁴⁸ The pattern, “the One of. . .” and an element of nature such as mist, dew, earth, or mountain, is wholly suitable. *’Arşay*, “the one of the earth” must be taken to mean “the one of the Underworld.”⁴⁹ Similarly, we should assume that the epithet *šadday* refers to a cosmic mount, no doubt “particularized” and “realized” in a number of earthly mountains associated with shrines of the deity.

The question may now be asked, is the appellation *’El Šadday* a liturgical epithet of Canaanite ‘El who tented on the mount of assembly in the far north? Certainly it would be an appropriate epithet. How-

American Grand Teton range). Note also in **Genesis 49:25, 26**, that after the mention of “your father’s god,” and its parallel *’El Šadday*, blessings are listed from Heaven (*šāmāyim*), Deep (*tēhōm*), Breasts (*šadāyim*) and Womb (*rāḫam*), and finally mountains (*harārē’ād/gib’ot’ōlām*). There appears to be a play on words here between *šadday* and *šadāyim*, and it is just possible that in the fertility clichés behind the present composition there is also knowledge of the epithet of ‘El’s consort *Rahmay*. We may also draw attention to the mythological identification of the breasts of *Tiamāt* with mountains (having gushing springs) in the creation account. See the lines of *Enūma eliš* published by O. R. Gurney and J. J. Finkelstein. **The Sultantepe Tablets** (London, 1957), vol. I, 12, lines 8’-9’, now combined with older material, B. Landsberger and J. V. Kinnier Wilson, “The Fifth Tablet of *Enūma eliš*,” *JNES*, 20 (1961), 154–179, esp. pp. 160 and 175.

45. In view of Ugaritic and Amorite data we are inclined to posit closely related adjectival suffixes in two series: *-i/a/u-yya* and *-ī/ā/ū-ya* which appear also in the compound suffixes *-yānu, -uyānu*, etc. Certain members of the series specialized in certain uses, gentilic, hypocoristic, etc., varying according to dialect. The Hebrew hypocoristic ending *-ay* (<*ayyu*) in such names as *yiššay, ’amāšay, hūšay* is probably ultimately identical with the adjectival suffix of such names as *Šadday, Tallay, Pidray, Daggay*, etc. Compare the Ugaritic names *dādaya* (cf. Hebrew *dōday*) *nu’maya*, etc.

46. The divine name appears vocalized DINGIR pi-id-ra-i in Text 17.116, *PRU*, IV, p. 132. Nougayrol failed to recognize the goddess, vocalizing ^hbi-it-ra-i; cf. Albright, in **BASOR**, 146 (1957), 35.

47. The divine name may appear in the feminine personal name *Ṭá-la-ia*. Cf. Gröndahl, *PTU*, p. 359; *PRU*, 111, Pl. LV, RS 16.156.17; cf. J. T. Milik, “Giobbe 38. 28 in siro-palestinese e la dea. *Pdry bt’ar*,” *Revista biblica*, 3 (1958), 252ff.

48. See the standard list repeated in the mythic texts; *CTA* 5.5.10; 3.3.3; 4.1.17; etc. A similar divine name is *Daggay*, Asherah’s fisherman.

49. This is confirmed in the pantheon list by her identification with *Allatum*. She probably is the goddess, the daughter of ‘El, equated with Persephone in Philo Byblius (*Praep. evang.* 1. IO.18 [ed. Mras]). It should be noted that while they are called Ba‘l’s “lasses.” they are in fact his wives (Ginsberg). See *CTA*. 3. 1.23.

ever, I do not believe that there is sufficient evidence to establish such a thesis. For one thing, we are embarrassed with the plenitude of deities associated with mountains in the Canaanite and Amorite pantheons, not to mention the Akkadian gods called *šadū* [KUR] or *šadū rabū* [KUR.GAL].⁵⁰

The Amorite deity called Amurru and Ilu Amurru [DINGIR.DINGIR.MAR.TU] in cuneiform sources has a particularly close relation to a mountain or mountains to judge from his epithets *bēlu šadī* or *bēl šadē*, "lord of the mountain," *dūr-hur-sag-gá sikil-a-ke*, "He who dwells on the pure mountain," *kur-za-gin ti-[la]*, "who inhabits the shining mountain."⁵¹ Amurru, one will remember, is named a "god of the father," a clan god, in the Cappadocian texts. These data have been the basis of an identification of Šadday with the Amorite Amurru proposed in a new form by Lloyd R. Bailey and Jean Ouellette.⁵² The name Ilu-Amurru is interesting, as is Amurru's liaison with Ašratu, no doubt the counterpart of Canaanite Ašertu/Aširatu, consort of 'El. The place of Amurru's abode KUR.ZA.GĪN, Akk. *šadū ellu*, is described in the same terms, the "shining mountains" or "snow-covered mountains" used in Akkadian of the Amanus.⁵³ These items suggest the identification of 'Ilu Amurru with Amorite 'El. Such an identifica-

50. K. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta* (Helsinki, Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1938), p. 221, lists Aššur, Enlil, and Adad among others.

51. See K. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta*, pp. 54 and 251; J.-R. Kupper, *L'Iconographie du dieu Amurru* (Brussels, Académie royale de Belgique, 1961), pp. 56-80; and E. Ebeling, ed., *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* (Berlin and Leipzig, De Gruyter, 1932), I, p. 102.

52. L. R. Bailey, "Israelite 'El šadday and Amorite Bēl šadē," *JBL*, 87 (1968), 434-438; and Jean Ouellette, "More on 'Él Šadday and Bēl Šadē," *JBL*, 88 (1969), 470f. I do not find the connection made by Bailey with Sin (bēl Ḥarrān) convincing in the slightest. The storm god, 'El, and Amurru are mountain dwellers, which is not the same as being a patron god of steppe and mountain people. Sin's abode is celestial (*āšib šamē ellūti*). Moreover, if we were to identify every god pictured with the sun disk above, or the crescent above, with the sun or moon we could make equations between virtually every god in the pantheon, male and female, with the sun and the moon. The appearance of the conflate Sin-Amurru is very strange (cf. Kupper, *L'Iconographie du dieu Amurru*, pp. 60f. and 77), but must be set alongside the frequent mention of Sin and Amurru as distinct, if associated, deities of the Amorites. Compare also the juxtaposition: DINGIR.Mar-tu DINGIR Geštin-an-na.

53. The mountain of Amurru is also named Di-da-num (TI-da-nu-urn), a name identical with North Arabian and biblical Dedan, though we cannot be sure that the place name is not used in more than a single locale. However, it is not impossible that Amurru's mountain country lies in the south. See Kupper, *L'Iconographie du dieu Amurru*, p. 68, and (missed by Kupper) W. F. Albright's discussion, "Dedan," *Geschichte und Altes Testament* [Festschrift A. Ah] (Tübingen, Mohr, 1953), pp. 1 ff.

tion would also explain the extreme paucity of Amorite personal names compounded with Amurru. In any case, in the West the god Amurru must have borne a different but familiar name.

Generally Amurru has been taken to be a storm god, and it must be said that most of his epithets and descriptions point in this direction. He receives the epithet *ramān* held in common with Hadad (compare biblical Hadad-rimmōn). He is called *bāriqu*, “hurler of the thunderbolt,” *Adad ša a-bu-be* “Adad of the deluge.” At the same time he is clearly distinguished from Adad in his iconography and not infrequently stands holding his throwstick alongside Adad who holds the thunderbolt.⁵⁴

Perhaps his most pristine character is that of the war god bearing mace and bow, going forth in blazing fire to destroy the wicked enemy. As divine warrior he naturally assimilated features of the storm god, the seven winds with which he was armed, the storm chariot and the blazing fire and thunderbolts which preceded him.

We are reminded of Ezekiel’s allusions to “a noise like the voice of Šadday.”⁵⁵ Šadday’s “voice” is the thunder, obviously, and has its background in the lightning and thunder which accompany the theophany of the storm god. We are not certain, however, that Ezekiel here uses traditions of the god of the Fathers which had survived intact from the old time. In early Israel the language of the storm theophany was taken over and applied to Yahweh in his role of divine warrior, marching from the south, as well as in the theophany at Sinai. In the sixth century B.C., Ezekiel, Job, and Second Isaiah resurrected the ancient symbols and mythic forms of the storm theophany in descriptions of Yahweh’s appearances and in war songs describing his universal victory in the new age. It may be that Šadday received the traits of the storm god in Ezekiel from Šadday’s assimilation to Yahweh.

The god as “divine warrior” belongs to two types, stemming from parallel but distinct *Sitze im Leben*. One finds its place in the great cosmogonic myth in which the storm god, overcoming the powers of chaos (Tiāmat, Yamm, or Môt according to the myth), usually in individual combat, establishes kingship and with it the order of heaven and earth. The other type has its setting in the patriarchal society, as “god of the father,” or especially as god of a league. Here the fundamental institution is “holy warfare,” in defense of clan or league, or in the

54. See Kupper, *L'iconographie du dieu Amurru, passim*. Amurru’s assimilation to the gods of the Ea cycle is apparently secondary.

55. Ezek. 1:25;10:5.

movement of semi-nomadic peoples who, to survive or flourish, must enter and secure new domains in wars led by their tutelary deity. To be sure, these two types do not remain in ideal form, clean and distinct, but, tend to become mixed. The war god who establishes the order of the cosmos also establishes the political-historical order thereby. Kingship in heaven and kingship on earth belong to the "orders of creation." In the same way, historical wars of a league may be given cosmic-universal significance, and the god of the league given the attributes of the storm god, at least in his attack on the enemy. We shall have to return to this **typology** in discussing the relationships between Ba'l Šapōn and Yahweh.

It seems not unlikely that *šadday* was an epithet of Amorite 'El, and that 'El as the divine warrior of important western tribes or leagues was reintroduced into Mesopotamia under the name **Amurru**. Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient evidence to prove either equation.

It appears less likely that *Šadday* was an epithet of Amorite **Hadad** or Canaanite Ba'l Šapōn, the Haddu of Mt. **Ḥazzi**. The latter is, of course, the great storm god of the Canaanites, and as storm god is inevitably and regularly associated with the mountain, in his epithets and in descriptions of his abode in Canaanite mythological lore. However, if *šadday* were the Canaanite storm god, it is difficult to explain (as Eissfeldt has argued⁵⁶) how, in Israelite tradition, **'El Šadday** or *Šadday* could be used blandly as an orthodox epithet of Yahweh. Certainly **Ba'l** epithets, when understood to be such, were shunned in Israel at least from the ninth century B.C. onwards.

The distribution of *Šadday* as a Yahweh epithet is interesting in this respect. It forms a highly irregular pattern, very much like that of 'El used as a Yahweh epithet or alias. After use in the 'ēl names of Genesis and early Exodus, both *Šadday* and **'El** are found frequently in archaic poetry.⁵⁷ There is then a gap in usage of *Šadday* until the sixth century when it is taken up again by Ezekiel and, above all, by the author of the dialogues of **Job**.⁵⁸ *Šadday* occurs more than thirty times in Job as the proper name of the god of Israel, 'El some fifty times, a dozen in parallel with *Šadday*. Equally interesting, **Yahweh** is never used in the dia-

56. "El and Yahweh," *JSS*, 1(1956), pp. 25-27 (KS [Eissfeldt], III, 386-397).

57. In the Oracles of Balaam, *Šadday* is found once, **'El** eight times. *Šadday* is found in Psalm 68 :15 ('El six times in Ps. 68), Psalm 9 1 : I (parallel to *'Elyōn*; cf. O. Eissfeldt, "Jahwes Verhältnis zu 'Elyon und Schaddaj nach Psalm 91," KS [Eissfeldt], III, 441-447). We have referred above to **'El Šadday** in the blessing in Genesis 49.

58. Only four references remain to be given: Ruth 1 : 20, 21; Isa. 13 : 6 = Joel 1 : 15.

logues of Job, only in the prologue and epilogue and in rubrics of the Yahweh speeches where it is probably secondary.⁵⁹ In other words, Yahweh appears only in the prose parts of the book. One must argue, I believe, that the poet of the Dialogues either belongs to a different tradition or is engaged in a heroic effort to archaize or both. At all events, it is clear that the Yahweh epithets, **'El**, *Šadday*, and *'Elyon* are associated in the earliest strata of biblical poetry as if interchangeable and are used again in the archaizing literature of the Exile.⁶⁰

In sum, we cannot eliminate the possibility that **'El Šadday** was (1) an Amorite or Canaanite storm god to be equated more or less with Ba'1=Haddu or (2) an epithet of Canaanite 'El parallel to other 'el epithets in Genesis. We are inclined to believe, however, that **'El Šadday** was (3) an epithet of Amorite 'El in his role as divine warrior, identified early by the Fathers with Canaanite 'El. An identification of *Šadday* with *Ilu Amurru*, possible in solution (1) and attractive in solution (3), must be left *sub judice*.

We have found that the epithets 'el 'ôlām, 'el qōnē 'arṣ, 'el 'ēlohē yiśrā'ēl, and 'el [ba'1?] bērit are epithets of 'El preserved in Patriarchal tradition ; 'el 'elyōn probably is to be added, along with 'el bêt-'el, and finally there is a good possibility that 'el šadday is an epithet of Canaanite or Amorite 'El (or both).

The Name Yahweh

The discussion of the meaning and origin of the name Yahweh constitutes a monumental witness to the industry and ingenuity of biblical scholars. Fortunately, there is no space to review it here.⁶¹ Several new

59. Job 12:9 would appear to be an exception; however, the textual evidence is divided between 'ēloh and **Yahweh**.

60. The name 'El, often used in archaic poetry as a name of Yahweh, is used sporadically in a few passages of the Elohist and Hosea in the same way, and some fifteen times in Psalms 43-83, especially in the more archaic psalms of the "Elohistic Psalter." In the late literature of Israel, only Second Isaiah other than Job makes extensive use of 'El as a proper name of the god of Israel. We judge the phenomenon to be explained by his revitalization of old liturgical forms and his general impulse to archaize (much in the same way as does the author of the Job dialogues). In late Psalms, in Daniel, and especially in postbiblical apocalyptic works, 'El returns to popularity, finally ousting the sacred name **Yahweh** in Hellenistic Jewish literature. These data tend to support the argument for a northern (or non-Judean) origin of the Book of Job, argued in the past on quite different grounds. Cf. the arguments of D. N. Freedman and W. F. Albright in "Orthographic Peculiarities in the Book of Job," *Eretz Israel*, 9 (1969), 35-44.

61. A review of recent research until 1957 can be found in R. Mayer, "Der Gottesname Jahwe im Lichte der neuesten Forschung," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, n.s. 2 (1958), 26-53. To this we should add the following selected items of recent date not to be found in

lines of evidence have emerged, however, which promise to advance the discussion.

In the first place, the form **Yahweh** has been established as primitive by its appearance in epigraphic sources. In extrabiblical materials which date before the Exile, it is the invariable independent form. This is not to say that the jussive (and combinatory) form *yahū* is not early; in fact it is surprising that *yahū* as an independent name does not appear before the fifth century B.C.. At all events, there seems to be no valid reason to doubt that **Yahweh** is a primitive divine name, the verbal (hypocoristic) element in a liturgical epithet or sentence name. The name appears as **yhw** in the seventh-early-sixth century letters from Lachish and 'Arad. It appears also on an unpublished seal of the eighth century B.C. acquired by the Harvard Semitic Museum. The seal reads, interestingly enough, *lmqnyw/'bd.yhwh*,⁶² "Belonging to Miqueiah, the slave of Yahweh." Israel's god appears also in the Mesa' Stele from ninth-century Moab written **yhw**. The earliest appearance of what appears to be the independent form of the name is found in fourteenth and thirteenth century lists of South Palestinian (Edomite) place-names, written *yhw*, in syllabic orthography probably to be read

Mayer's paper: A. Murtonen, **A Philological and Literary Treatise on the Old Testament Divine Names 'I, 'lwh, 'lhym, and yhw** (Helsinki, Societas orientalis Fennica, 1952); M. H. Segal, "El, Elohim, and YHWH in the Bible," *JQR* 46 (1955), 89-115; M. Reisel, **The Mysterious Name of Y.H. W.H.** (Assen, Van Gorcum, 1957); David Noel Freedman, "The Name of the God of Moses," *JBL*, 79 (1960), 151-156; R. Abba, "The Divine Name Yahweh," *JBL*, 80 (1961), 320-328; S. Mowinckel, "The Name of the God of Moses," *HUCA*, 32 (1961), 121-133; F. M. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *HTR*, 55 (1962), 250-259; O. Eissfeldt, "Jahwe, der Gott der Väter," *ThLZ*, 88 (1963), cols. 481-490 (KS [Eissfeldt], IV, 79-91); cf. "'ähëyäh'äsär'ähëyäh und 'El 'ôlām," KS [Eissfeldt], IV, 193-198; H. Kosmala, "The Name of God (YHWH and HU)," *ASTI*, 2 (1963), 103-120; Joh. Lindblom, "Noch einmal die Deutung des Jahwe-Namens in Ex 3: 14," *ASTI*, 3 (1964), 4-15; J. P. Hyatt, "The Origin of Mosaic Yahwism," in **The Teacher's Yoke**, ed. E. J. Vardaman et al. (Waco, Texas, Baylor University Press, 1964), pp. 85-93; Andre Finet, "Iawi-ill, roi de Talhayûm," *Syria*, 41 (1964), 117-142, esp. pp. 118-122; W. von Soden, "Jahwe, 'er ist, er erweist sich," *WO*, 3 (1944-66), pp. 177-187; J. P. Hyatt, "Was Yahweh Originally a Creator Deity?" *JBL*, 86 (1967), 369-377; W. F. Albright, YGC, pp. 168-172; R. de Vaux, "El et Baal, le Dieu des Peres et Yahweh," *Ugaritica* IV (Paris, 1969), pp. 501-517.

62. The seal, shortly to be published, along with the Museum's fairly extensive collection, is exquisitely designed and engraved, on one side in the positive, on the other side in the negative. No doubt it belonged to a temple official of Judah. The element -yaw< -*yahū* is expected in early Judah as well as in Samaria. After about 700 B.C., despite a continuing general tendency to syncopate intervocalic **h**, spellings reverted to the historic -**yhw** only to shift again to -*yw* (-*yaw*) by the fifth century. Assyrian transcriptions throughout this period reflect the pronunciation -yaw.

ya-h-wi.⁶³ **No** other suggested occurrences seem to withstand close linguistic scrutiny.

We must begin in any analysis of the name, therefore, with the form **yahweh** (as well as the form *yahū*). This should have been recognized earlier by historical linguists on the basis of parallels in related Near Eastern material. West Semitic personal names normally begin in transparent appellations or sentence names and shorten or disintegrate. Divine epithets and often divine names follow the same patterns of formation and shortening. They do not begin in numinous grunts or shouts and build up into liturgical sentences or appellations.

Again, new evidence for the morphological analysis of the verbal element **yahweh** has appeared in Amorite personal names, notably in the Maritexts.⁶⁴ There are now more than a score of names which follow the pattern : ya-wi-DINGIR /yahwī-ʾIl/, ya-wi-i-la/Yahwī-ʾIla/, ya-wi-DINGIR.IM /Yahwī-Haddu/, la-wi-DINGIR/Lahwī-ʾIl/ from *La-yahwi-11. A second group, more restricted in number, is represented by the following: ya-ah-wi-DINGIR /yahwī-ʾIl/ or /yahwi-ʾIl/; la-ah-wi-ba-lu /Laḥwī-Baʿlu/ or /Lahwi-Baʿlu/, la-aḥ-wi-DINGIR /Laḥwi-ʾIl/ or /Lahwī-Il/, la-ah-wi-ma-li-ku /Laḥwī-Maliku/ or /Lahwī-Maliku/. Finally, there are two interesting names ya-u-i-li /Yahū-ʾIlī/ and ya-hi-DINGIR /yahī-ʾIl/.

These several formations document a series of characteristic verb forms used in Amorite. Since Amorite *ḥ* is represented by *h* in these inscriptions in a very high percentage of its occurrences, and, conversely, **h** is represented in a low percentage (but **is** occasionally represented by *ḥ*), it seems certain that **Yahwi-N** is usually to be read in the first, larger group.⁶⁵ In the second, smaller group, probably *YahwīN* or **Lahwi-N** is the dominant form, but we cannot be sure of the laryngeal.

63. The name appears in a list of Amenophis III (1417–1379_{B.C.}) from Soleb and in a copy of this list from the time of Rameses II (1304–1237_{B.C.}). See R. Giveon, "Toponymes Ouest-Asiatiques à Soleb," VT, 14 (1964). 239-255: esp. p. 244. The vocalization of the toponym follows the notation of W. Helck who posits the value *wiand wu* for *w* as well as its usual value **wa**. Admittedly, the evidence is very flimsy. Cf. W. F. Albright, in *JBL*, 67 (1948), p. 380, who vocalizes *Ya-h-we(a)*.

64. It must be emphasized that the Amorite verbal form is of interest only in attempting to reconstruct the proto-Hebrew or South Canaanite verbal form used in the name *Yahweh*. We should argue vigorously against attempts to take Amorite *yahwi* and *yahū* as divine epithets. In this we agree fully with W. von Soden, "Jahwe, *er ist, er erweist sich," pp. 178f., against A. Finet "Iawi-ilā," pp. 118–122.

65. Both Huffmon and Gelb pass over the statistical evidence in the Akkadian transcription of West Semitic **h** and *ḥ*.

The final two forms are interesting as shortened or, better, apocapated jussives : *yahi-* and *yahū-*.

The forms represented here, *yahwi-* and *yaḥwī*, *yahū-* and *yaḥī-*, are most easily taken to be **causatives**, imperfect and jussive. The meaning of the names in this case would be: "the god N brings (or brought) into being (a child),"⁶⁶ or "the god N gives (or gave) life (to a child)." The jussives and **precatives** would mean, "Let (the child) endure, O god N" or "Give life, O God N."⁶⁷

Recently new arguments have been given for taking *yaḥwī* from the Simple (G) stem.⁶⁸ It is true that *yahwiin* Amorite could be analyzed as a G-form. The stative-intransitive use of *yaq̄tal/yaqtal* appears to be dying in Mari Amorite, although a number of forms *in yaq̄tal* appear.⁶⁹ The Babylonian name *Ibašši-ilu(m)*⁷⁰ is alleged to be analogous in meaning: "The god is (in evidence)."⁷¹ There are, however, grave problems in so reading the South Canaanite verbal element in the name Yahweh.

66. The verbal element *yahwi* may reflect the durative (present-future) *yaq̄til(u)* or the preterit *yaq̄til* of Northwest Semitic. It contrasts with *yahū* (<*yahwi), the jussive.

67. One may compare Akkadian names commonly formed with *ušabši* and *šabši*: *Nabū-ušabši* "Nabu has called into being," *Nabu-šabši* "call into being (a child), O Nabu," etc. Cf. K. L. Tallqvist, *Assyrian Personal Names* (Helsingfors, Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1914), p. 276 (for references); Stamm, *Die akkadische Namengebung* (Leipzig, *MVÄG* 44, 1939), pp. 145, 148f. Not infrequently the object of the verb is specified: *Nabū-zēra-ušabši* "Nabu has brought progeny into being," *Bēl-aḥa-ušabši* "Bel has called a brother into being," etc.

68. W. von Soden, "Jahwe 'Er ist, er erweist sich'," pp. 177-187. Von Soden argues for a *yaqtul/yaqattal* opposition in the prefix conjugation in Amorite. In light of the evidence, however, at most one can speak of frozen vestiges of *yaqattal*. The argument for the existence of present *yaqattal* is based only on a small handful of forms, all *ulti-mae-y*, all capable of being read as D-forms. The patterning of the Amorite verb fits easily into the durative-punctual opposition of Ugaritic and South Canaanite **prefixal** and **suffixal** conjugations, an opposition which, we believe, must be **Proto-Canaanite** (in which we include Amorite) and, indeed, **Proto-Northwest Semitic**. In addition to Huffmon's study, see W. L. Moran, "A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets," (Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins 1950); and "The Hebrew Language in its Northwest Semitic Background," in *BANE*, pp. 54-72; G. E. Mendenhall, "The Verb in Early Northwest Semitic Dialects" (Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins 1947); and C. Krahmalkov, "Studies in Amorite Grammar" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard 1965).

69. The form *yaqtal* appears for the most part with verbs, active or stative, containing a laryngeal or *rēš* in their second or third radical. Forms *iq̄tal* or *eq̄tal* need not stem from *yaq̄tal* since in some Amorite dialects there is a general shift of initial *ya* > *yi/ye* > *i/e* both in verbal and substantive forms.

70. On the meaning of the name, see J. J. Stamm, *Die akkadische Namengebung*, pp. 20f. and especially 135. The name is written I-ba-as-Si-DINGIR.

71. Von Soden, "Jahwe, 'er ist, er erweist sich'," p. 179, explains the name as meaning "er erweist sich dauernd (als kraftvoller Helfer)."

(1) Canaanite expresses the meaning “‘El exists, endures” in a well-known group of names: ha-ya-il /ḥayya-ʾil/ (alphabetic *ḥyʾil*), “‘El lives,” or “‘El endures”; Hebrew *yšy*, a hypocoristic of Canaanite **ʾitê-N*⁷² “the god N exists,” that is, manifests his existence or renewed life (in the case of dying and rising gods) in the birth of a child or in fertility; and **hwʾil** /*huwa-ʾil*/, “‘El exists.”⁷³ Albright has rightly compared such names with the Ugaritic couplet:

ki hayya ʾalʾiyānu baʾlu
ki ʾitê zubulu baʾl ʾarši

Indeed ʾAlʾiyān Baʾl lives,
Indeed Prince lord of Earth exists.⁷⁴

(2) The stative-intransitive **yiqtal** is very much alive in South Canaanite. In Canaanite, if not in Amorite, the imperfect of the Simple stem properly was **yihway**. Both in Old Hebrew and Old Aramaic roots **ultimae-y**, the G-imperfect took two forms, **yaqtil** (active) and **yiqtal** (stative), as is evidenced by contrasting orthographies.⁷⁵

72. Compare Hebrew *yšyhw* (?), Aramaic names *ʾytybl*, *ʾytyʾl*, **etc.** The names *ʾšy* *ʾšʾ*, *ʾšbʾl*, *ʾšyhw* (unpublished from ʾArad) may also be derived from the element Canaanite *ʾit(ê)*, Hebrew *yš* and *ʾš*. However, there is ambiguity in the analysis of these forms. The element *ʾš* also may reflect the root *ʾwš*, “to give,” which appears, for example, in Hebrew *yʾwš* (Lachish Letters), *yʾšyhw*, **etc.** It is not impossible that Ugaritic *ʾšbʾl*, cuneiform i-ši-DINGIR.U/ʾišê-baʾl/ is a South Canaanite form for what would normally appear in Ugaritic as **ʾitbʾl*. **So YGC**, p. 170; cf. F. M. Cross, “An Aramaic Inscription from Daskyleion,” **BASOR**, 184 (December 1966), p. 8f., n. 17.

73. Compare *hyʾdt/hiya-adattu* “the (Divine) Lady exists,” and *hyʾabn/hiya-abnu* “the Rock exists.” The Hebrew personal name *yēhū* also belongs here [**yahū-hū* > **yawhū* > *yôhū*], and by dissimilation > *yēhū*. Cf. YGC, p. 263, n. 155. The use of the pronouns **hw** and **hy** in this sense is dramatically underlined by the writing of the pronoun *ú-wa/huwa/* in the polyglot vocabulary from Ugarit parallel with Hurrian *manni*, “he is.” See **Ugaritica V**, pp. 244f., where Nougayrol unhappily repeats the error of C. Viroleaud taking the word to reflect **hwy** “to be.” In 1962 the writer pointed out that the reading reflected the pronoun (“Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs,” **HTR**, 55 [1962], 254, n. 124). The same interpretation has been given independently by A. F. Rainey, “Notes on the Syllabic Ugaritic Vocabularies,” **IEJ**, 19 (1969), 107f. The verb **hwy** unhappily does not yet appear in Ugaritic texts.

74. **CTA**, 6.3.21; cf. 6.3.3; 6.3.9.

75. In Old Aramaic the imperfect **rhwy** “may she (not) become pregnant,” and **thwy** “may it become” stand in contrast with **ybʾh** “he seeks (my head),” etc. We must read **tihray** and **tihway** over against *tibʿe* (< **tabʿt*), etc. The **mater lectionis y** always marks a final *i* or the diphthong **-ay** (which was uncontracted in Old Aramaic); **h** is used for **-ē** (< *i*), **-ō**, and **ā**. See **EHO**, p. 31, and Nos. 47 and 53 (p. 28). The form *yhw* in Sefireh

(3) As we shall see below, in the sentence-names of which South Canaanite ⁷⁶ *yahwê* is an element, the verbal form takes an object: *yahwê šēba'ôt*, "he creates the (divine) hosts." This cannot be read "Yahweh of hosts," that is, as a construct chain. A proper name cannot be put into the construct state (as a *nomen regens*) according to grammatical law."

The accumulated evidence thus strongly supports the view that the name **Yahweh** is a causative imperfect of the Canaanite-Proto-Hebrew verb *hwy*, "to be."⁷⁸

Occasionally, one hears a protest that a verb form meaning "to cause to be," "to create" is too abstract or philosophic a concept to be predicated of an ancient Proto-Israelite deity. The problem may be semantic and solved by translating "procreate," or the like. In personal names,

II A4 is to be read as *aphel* imperf. (which appears also in Syriac). In Hebrew the archaizing forms *yibkâyûn*, "they wept," *vehmâyûn*, "they roared," etc., preserve witness in the stative-intransitive *yiqtal* in verbs *tertiaie yod*. Cf. W. F. Albright, in *JBL*, 67 (1948), p. 380.

76. That *Yahwê* is South Canaanite can hardly be doubted. The name should conform to early Hebrew phonetic and morphological laws. Its occurrence in South Palestine in a place name of the fourteenth century, that is, in pre-Mosaic times, makes any other supposition precarious.

77. J. P. Hyatt blunders here in his article which for the most part is most useful and challenging: "Was Yahweh Originally a Creator Deity?" p. 377.

78. In his article "The Name of the God of Moses," S. Mowinckel asked how one explained the form *yahû* if *yahwê* was taken to be a finite, imperfect verb form. As a matter of fact, the necessity of explaining both forms on the basis of documented historical changes is one of the reasons why *yahwê* must be analyzed as an imperfect of the causative stem. In the early Canaanite dialects, the imperfect of the causative was *yaqtihu* (indicative durative), *yaqtih* (jussive-past). In *tertiaie-yod* verbs the forms appeared as *yagliyu* and *yagli*: in the verbs med. *waw* and tert. *yod*, the forms were **yahwiyu* > *yahwî* (indicative durative) and *yahû* (jussive-past). These forms are not theoretical projections, but are based on patterns in Canaanite and Amorite verb forms which actually appear in vocalized scripts (cuneiform, Egyptian syllabic orthography, and roots in 'alep in Ugaritic). Hebrew reflects the late stages of the parallel development of imperfects and past-jussive: *vihyê/yêhî*, *yihyê/yêhî*. The St-stem (causative reflexive) of *hwy* in Hebrew (and Ugaritic) also supplies an analogy: *yistahawê* (imperfect indicative) *yistahû* (jussive, 3.m.sing.).

Mowinckel also argues that Neo-Babylonian transcriptions of Jewish names ending in *-ya-a-ma* indicate a pronunciation *yahwa /sic!/'* of the divine name in these combinations. As the notion seems to survive among Hebraists in spite of all advances in our knowledge of Neo-Babylonian orthography, a comment is in order. Final short vowels were lost in Babylonian well before the Late Babylonian era, but the syllabary designed to show these vowels continued in use. *Ma* in the final position in transcriptions represents *-w* (only); *ya-a-ma* is the normal way in Late Babylonian to write *-yaw*. This *-yaw* is the same as that of the fifth-fourth century alphabetic texts *-yw* for *-yaw* < *yahû*. See the fundamental work of J. P. Hyatt, *The Treatment of Final Vowels in Early Neo-Babylonian* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1941).

the causative forms of “to be” such as Akk. *ušabšī*, Can.-Am. *yahwī* and *yakīn*, as well as other verbal forms meaning “to create” *yakānin* (*yēkōnēn*), *yaqūi*, *yabnī*, and so on specify the creation, or the calling into being of a son, a name, progeny. Such usage obviously does not involve ontological speculation nor a notion of “cosmic creation.” In the case of divine personal names and epithets taken from liturgical or hymnic sentences, the same terms are used to speak of a god’s procreation of other gods, in the case of ‘El the procreation of gods and men of whom he is father. Both in Canaan and in Mesopotamia the epithets of the gods describe them, male and female, as creators of heaven and earth, father or creatress of all creatures, gods and men, formers or progenitors of the world.⁷⁹ As a matter of fact, fertility, order, and creation are bound together in the old myths.

Our evidence also points strongly to the conclusion that *yahwē* is a shortened form of a sentence name taken from a cultic formula. An ample number of parallels may be found in which West Semitic divine names are the first element, frequently a verbal element in view of West Semitic syntax, of a sentence name from a litany or cultic cliché. These names evolve just as hypocoristic personal names develop from sentence names, often leaving only the initial verbal element, with or without a hypocoristic affix or internal patterning. From Canaanite sources we may list *‘al’iyu qarrādīma*, “I prevail over the heroes,”⁸⁰ and the

⁷⁹ One is hard put to understand the protest of J. P. Hyatt “that it is a mistake to cite Amorite names as support for the notion of cosmic creation; it is a long step from recognition that a deity forms the child in the mother’s womb and preserves its life (an idea very widespread in the ancient Near East) to the belief that the deity is creator of the universe.” The personal names with the element *yahwī* have been cited primarily for the purposes of a grammatical analysis of the name *Yahweh*. However, I should not be willing to separate so widely the role of a god in creating a child and his role as creator of gods in view of epithets such as “creator of gods and men.” In any case, the epithets of the gods describe them constantly as “cosmic creators.” We have cited such epithets of *‘El* and *‘Elat* above, and in note 25 have listed a very few of the multitude of epithets predicating “cosmic creation” of the great gods of Mesopotamia. Can Professor Hyatt be arguing that Israel was a backward people which lost or forgot the notion of creator gods held so centrally by their Canaanite and Mesopotamian forebears in Patriarchal times? Surely not, in view of the preservation of such Canaanite names as *qōnē šamāyim wā-‘āres* “creator of heaven and earth” in Israelite tradition.

⁸⁰ See “Recent Progress in North-Canaanite Research,” W. F. Albright, *BASOR*, **70** (1938), **19**; and *ARI*, p. 195, n. 11; A. Goetze, “Peace on Earth,” *BASOR*, **93** (1944), **18**, has queried the longer sentence name proposed by Albright: *‘al’iyu qurādīma qāriyēyaba-‘arši malḥamati*. In *CTA*, **4.8.34**; **5.2**. IO, **18** the short form *‘al’iyu qarrādīma* is used; in **3.3** 11; **3.4.5** 1; **7.2**. 14 the long formula occurs. The issue need not be decided for our purposes here. The short form *‘al’iyu qarradīma* is indisputably a sentence name.

typical hypocoristicon *'al'iyānu*, once *'al'iyu ba'l*.⁸¹ *Aṭirat* (*'aṭirat* > *'āsērā*) is a perfect verb, formally stative, from the fuller name *'aṭirat yammi* "She who treads upon Sea." Other examples are *Yagarriš*, "He drives out," and *'Āy-yamarri*, "Ho, he routs," magical names given to the divine clubs fashioned for Ba'l's combat, and the appellation *Rākib* or *Rakub* shortened from *rakub 'arapāti*⁸² or *rākib 'arapāti*.⁸³ Another divine name is *yd' ylh̄n, yadi' yilhan*, in which imperfect verbal elements are used: "He knows, he understands."⁸⁴

From *Mari* comes the interesting name of a patriarchal deity of the Amorites (DINGIR.)*yakrub-il*, "the god (or 'El) blesses." Fortunately, there can be no doubt that *Yakrub-'Il* is a divine name in view of its context in *Mari* texts and from the use of the DINGIR sign as determinative. The name is of special interest in view of the suggestion of David Noel Freedman, on wholly different grounds, that the curious combination *Yahwē'ēlōhīm* in the primordial stories of Genesis goes back to an earlier sentence name of the god of Israel, namely *Yahwē-'El*, in which the element *yahwē* still preserved verbal force.⁸⁵

Two other Amorite divine names are worthy of attention. One appears as *Yapuḥ* (or in the Amorite dialectal form *Epuḥ*), the other is *Yašuḥ* (*Ešuḥ*).⁸⁶ Both names have transparent etymologies and forms: *yapu'* from *wp'* "to be radiant (in theophany)" and *yatu'* from *yī'* "to be victor." Both may be analyzed as perfect statives of the G-stem,* comparable with the theophorous elements *šaduk* and *rakub*, or with the *qatil(a)* stative frozen as a divine name: *rapī'*.

81. *CTA*. 5.5.17. This need not be an error for the usual *'al'iyānu ba'l*, but the hypocoristicon without termination: "I Ba'l prevail .." Cf. Hebrew *'ehyē* in Exodus 3: 14 and *Hosea* 1:9.

82. Compare the personal names *ili-ma-rakub* and *rakub-ba'l*. The stative perfect *rakub(a)* is probably original. In Canaan *rkb* seems to have been used in the epithets of Ba'l-Haddu, e.g., *rkb 'rpt*, "the Cloud Rider." At *Zinčirli rkb'l* named alongside 'El and *Hadad* has split apart to become an independent god, perhaps originally as a *hypostasis* from Ba'l or 'El. On the other hand, *rkb'l* could be "the god is a charioteer," *rakib-* (stative) or *rakub-* 'il, a suitable epithet of the moon god.

83. Cf. Akk. *šākinurpāti* and *rākib ūmi*, epithets of *Adad*.

84. On *ylhn* see F. M. Cross, "Epigraphic Notes on the Amman Citadel Inscription," *BASOR*, 193 (1969), 18, n. 12. The god appears as a candidate for kingship in *CTA*. 6.1.48.

85. Freedman, "The Name of the God of Moses," p. 156.

86. There can be no doubt that these have become divine epithets. See Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), pp. 77 and 98f.

87. An alternate is to read them as *qatūl* forms, a well-known old hypocoristic pattern. Cf. M. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik* (Giessen, Töpelmann, 1908), II, 21f.

The names or appellatives of two South Arabic deities which also exhibit the G-imperfect formation may be cited: *yagūt*,⁸⁸ literally, “He brings aid,” and *dū yahriq*⁸⁹ “he (the star) who sets,” that is, the god *Attar* as the evening star.

Two archaic liturgical formulae require re-examination in view of the data collected above on the cult-names of ‘El and the origin of the name Yahweh. One is the famous crux of Exodus 3: 14, **‘hyh ’šr ‘hyh**, the other is the cult name **yhw h šb’t, yahwê šēba’ôt** stemming from the Shiloh *cultus* as argued persuasively by O. Eissfeldt.⁹⁰

The first formula has been vocalized by the Massoretes to read “I am he who exists,”⁹¹ or “I am he who endures.” Not only is the meaning rather odd for an ancient liturgical formula but is not idiomatically expressed. We should expect **’ānī hū’ ’āšer ’ehyê** or even better **’ānī ’ēl ’ōlām**, “I am he who exists,” “I am the god who endures.” Furthermore, the expression **‘hyh šlhny** in v. 14 is repeated in parallel form in v. 15: *yhw h . . . šlhny* so that it is clear that **‘hyh**, the first person form, and **yhw h**, the third person form, are taken as acceptable alternate forms of the name.⁹² Divine epithets as we have seen can be derived both from first and third person formulae so that the alternation in the revelation of the name is not surprising.

This brings us then to the view that the formula is probably original in the third person as pointed out first, I believe, by Paul Haupt,⁹³ and long defended by Albright. The vocalization of the formula would then be *yahwê ’āšer yahwê*.⁹⁴ Further, we know that the element **’āšer**

88. *NPS*. I, 16.

89. *NPS*. I, 28.

90. O. Eissfeldt, “Jahwe Zebaoth, “in *Miscellanea Academia Berolinensia* (Berlin, 1950). pp. 127–150 (KS, 111, 103–123).

91. This rendering has been demonstrated by Joh. Lindblom in his paper cited in n. 61.

92. Charles Krahmalkov, “Studies in Amorite Grammar,” has analyzed the name e-wi-ma-lik (Alalakh 194, 2) as /’ehwī-malik <yahwi-malik. the form **’ehwi** simply the dialect form showing the shift of initial ya>e. This would provide a rather neat explanation of the **’ehwê/yahwê** variation in Exodus 3: 14,15. However, **ewi** also can be taken as a Hurrian element, and we do not expect an Amorite dialect form in a name native to South Palestine.

93. Paul Haupt, “Der Name Jahweh,” *OLZ* (1909), cols. 211–214.

94. In the case of the formula **‘hyh ’šr ‘hyh, we** must vocalize **’ahyê’ ’āšer’ ahyê**, “I create what I create” in place of the Masoretic pointing which rests on Hellenistic Jewish tradition (to judge from the Old Greek). In the era of the Elohist it was probably understood as an *idem per idem* construction, in effect, “I am the creator” as pointed out by D. N. Freedman.

cannot be original if the formula *is* old. *Ašer* began to replace the relative particle *dū* (> *zū*) no earlier than the beginning of the Iron Age in Hebrew to judge from its scant use in early Yahwistic poetry. All this yields the reconstructed formula **yahwī dū yahwi*.

It will be noted immediately that the phrase *dū yahwi* is precisely parallel to several formulae in Ugaritic literature: *dū yakdninu* in the couplet spoken by Baʿl: *ki qāniyunū ʿôlāmu/ki dārdāʿru dū yakāninunū*, “Indeed our creator is eternal/Indeed ageless **he who formed us**”;⁹⁵ *dū yakdninu* in the couplet *lōru ʿil ʿabūhu/ʿil malk dū yakāninuhū*, “Bull ‘El his father/King **‘El who created him** (Baʿl)”;⁹⁶ and *[ʿil dū yaqniyu ...]*, “[ʿ]El **who created. . .**”⁹⁷ We may compare also the verse of Deuteronomy 32: 6 which speaks of Yahweh :

hl' hw' 'byk qnyk
hw' 'Sk wykknk

Was he not thy father, who created thee,
Who formed thee and brought thee into being?

In all of the longer forms of these formulae, the verbal element “to create” takes an object: a god, the council of the gods, the host of heaven. We expect such a concrete object in the original cultic clichés. This brings us to the second formula, *yahwē šēbāʿôt*. It finds its original setting in the liturgical name of the ark: *yhw h šbʿwt yšb(h)krbym*.⁹⁸ The epithet *yōšēb kērūbīm*,⁹⁹ “who is enthroned on the cherubim” applies, of course, to the cherub throne which belonged to the iconography of the shrine at Shiloh and its successor at Jerusalem. We have described above the characteristic iconography of **‘El** in reliefs from Ugarit and from Punic shrines in which ‘El is portrayed characteristically seated upon a throne flanked by *kērūbīm*. The epithet *yōšēb kērūbīm* is evidently an ‘El epithet applied to Yahweh. We are more interested, however, in the archaic epithet *yahwē šēbāʿôt*. There can be no doubt, in my opinion, that *yahwē šēbāʿôt* is the earliest form of the epithet and that *yahwē ʿēlohē šēbāʿôt* is secondary. The latter fits into the

95. See above, chapter 2, note 17.

96. See above, chapter 2, note 13.

97. *CTA*, 19.4.220. The context is broken and difficult.

98. I Sam. 4:4; 2 Sam. 6:2.

99. The epithet is used apart from the ark in Psalm 80:2; 99:1; cf. 2 Sam. 22:1 1 = Psalm 18:11.

category of *lectio facilior*. ⁹Elōhē is inserted to ease the supposed ungrammatical juxtaposition of **yahwe** and *šēbā'ôt* after **yahwe** came to be known only as the personal name of the deity.¹⁰⁰ *Yahwē šēbā'ôt* conforms to Hebrew grammar only when **yahwe** still carries verbal force and takes an object. *Yahwē šēbā'ôt* cannot be a construct chain, nor can *šēbā'ôt*, the ordinary word for heavenly armies (the gods) and earthly armies, be turned into an adjective or participle in agreement with Yahweh.¹⁰¹

On the basis of the mythological parallels, *šēbā'ôt* in this context probably means “the hosts of heaven,” the *banū'ilima*, “sons of ‘El” or “holy ones.” In this case Yahweh is described as *ḏū yahwī šaba'ôt*, “He who creates the (heavenly) armies,” a title of the divine warrior and creator. It is thus not greatly different from ‘El’s epithets, “Father of the gods,” “creator of creatures.” Moreover, such an epithet lent itself to use not merely as a creation formula, but as an appropriate name of the god who called together the tribes to form the militia of the League, who led Israel in her historical wars. In the holy war ideology Yahweh led the cosmic forces of heaven alongside the armies of Israel. We need only remind ourselves of this powerful motif¹⁰² in early poetry and old tradition. At the beginning of the conquest proper, Joshua was confronted by the *šar haš-šēbā' yahwē*, “the general of the (heavenly) army of Yahweh,” Joshua’s cosmic counterpart.¹⁰³ In the victory song in Judges 5 we are told that “the stars fought from heaven,”¹⁰⁴ and at Gibeon even the sun and moon support Yahweh’s host “... the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the nation had taken vengeance on their enemies.”¹⁰⁵ The same theme is found in the archaic tradition preserved in a part of the hymn in Habakkuk 3 :

... God came from the South,
The Holy One from Mount Paran...
Before him marched Dabr,

100. It is interesting to observe alternate techniques of suppressing the anomaly: in I Kings 19:15 (cf. Isa. 37:16) and I Chron. 13:6 (the parallel to 2 Sam. 6:2) *šēbā'ôt* is simply omitted.

101. Cf. W. F. Albright’s review of B. N. Wambacq, *L’Épithète divine Jahvé Š‘ba’ôt: Etude philologique, historique et exégétique* (Bruges, Belgium, 1947), in *JBL* 67 (1948), 377–381.

102. See below in the essay on “The Divine Warrior,” and the dissertation of Patrick D. Miller, “Holy War and Cosmic War in Early Israel” (Ph.D. diss. Harvard. 1963).

103. Josh. 5:14.

104. Judg. 5:20.

105. Josh. 10:12f.

Rašp went forth at his feet. ..
 The eternal mountains were split,
 The ancient hills collapsed ...
 The mountains saw thee and writhed,
 [] the Deep roared ;
 On high Sun raised his arms,
 Moon stood <on> his lordly dais.¹⁰⁶
 They march by the glare of thy darts,
 By the (lightning) flash of thy spear.¹⁰⁷

In the archaizing poetry of Second Isaiah comes an echo of the theme: "Lift your eyes to heaven, Behold who created these? Who mustered their army by number? Called each of them by name?"¹⁰⁸

We must ask finally if the phrase *ḏū yahwī šaba'ōt*, "He who creates the heavenly armies" is not in origin an epithet of 'El, and if the primitive formula is not better reconstructed in the pattern *'ēl zū yahwī (šaba'ōt)* in parallel with Ugaritic *'il malk dū yakāninu* . . . , *'il dū yaqniyu*, and more remotely *'il dū 'ōlami*, *'il dū pa'idi*, and so forth. The substitution of **Yahweh** for 'El in the first position would be natural when Yahweh became the principal cult name: *yahwē zū yahwē (šaba'ōt)*, and so on).

If the construction appears radical, we may observe that, after all, both Elohist and Priestly tradition have anticipated this proposal in recording the revelation of the name Yahweh, and, of course, identifying him with 'El the god of the Patriarchs.¹⁰⁹

If Yahweh is recognized as originally a cultic name of 'El, perhaps the epithet of 'El as patron deity of the Midianite League in the south, a number of problems in the history of the religion of Israel can be solved. We can sketch here only a few such problems and solutions, assuming that the god Yahweh split off from 'El in the radical differentiation of his cultus in the Proto-Israelite league, ultimately ousting 'El from his place in the divine council, and eventually condemning the ancient powers to death (Psalm 82).

'El, 'Elyōn, Šadday, and 'Ōlām continued throughout Israel's his-

106. We follow here the reconstruction of W. F. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (T. H. Robinson Volume), ed. H. H. Rowley (Edinburgh, Clark, 1950), p. 16, note mm.

107. Hab. 3: 3, 5f., 10ff.

108. Isa. 40: 26.

109. We can enlist also the authority of Julius Wellhausen, "Jehovah was only a special name of El ." in *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, trans. Bloch and Menzies (Edinburgh, 1885), p. 433, n. 1.

tory to be suitable names for Yahweh despite fierce animosity to Ba'l, the chief god of Syria in the first millennium B.C.; as has been eloquently stated by Eissfeldt,¹¹⁰ no reconstruction of the origins of Yahwism can be successful which has no adequate explanation of these contrasting phenomena.

The popularity of the cult of 'El in the Semitic community in Sinai, the eastern delta of Egypt, and Seir gives some plausibility to the notion that Yahweh was an 'El figure. Moreover, to reformulate one of Alt's arguments, we contend that some prior cultic unity, binding people of Patriarchal stock and the disparate elements invading Canaan from the wilderness, must be posited to explain the rapid cultic unification of the diverse peoples who were bound into the twelve-tribe league around the shrine of the Ark of Yahweh *Šēbā'ōt*.

Many of the traits and functions of 'El appear as traits and functions of Yahweh in the earliest traditions of Israel: Yahweh's role as judge in the court of 'El (Psalm 82; Psalm 89 : 6-8) and in the general picture of Yahweh at the head of the Divine council: Yahweh's kingship (Exodus 15: 18; Deuteronomy 33: 15; Numbers 24:21); Yahweh's wisdom, age, and compassion (*yahwē 'ēl raḥūm wē-ḥannūn*)¹¹¹ and above all, Yahweh as creator and father (Genesis 49 : 25 ; Deuteronomy 32 : 6).

The early cultic establishment of Yahweh and its appurtenances—the Tabernacle, its structure of *qērašīm*, its curtains embroidered with cherubim and its cherubim throne, and its proportions according to the pattern (*tabnīt*) of the cosmic shrine—all reflect Canaanite models, and specifically the Tent of 'El and his cherubim throne.¹¹² We have reason to believe that the biblical descriptions in the Priestly traditions go back to the Tent of David. Behind David's Tent stands an earlier Tent tradition expressed powerfully in Nathan's oracle denouncing David's plans to innovate by constructing a temple: "Will you build a temple for my dais? Indeed, I have never dwelt in a temple from the day' I

110. "El and Yahweh," pp. 25-37.

111. See the perceptive comments of D. N. Freedman in his discussion of this old liturgical formula, "The Name of the God of Moses," p. 154.

112. The writer described the Canaanite motifs of the Tabernacle in his 1947 paper "The Priestly Tabernacle," republished in *BAR*, I, 201-228. See also the references above, chapter 2, notes 143 and 144. Of special interest is the description of 'El's abode in a Hittite version of the Canaanite myth of 'El and Ašertu. One of the terms used is *GIŠ.ZA.LAM.GAR.* = Akk. *Kušturu*, "tent." See H. Otten, "Ein Kanaanäischer Mythos aus Boğazköy," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*, 1 (1953), 126, 1.7; and most recently, R. J. Clifford, "The Tent of El and the Israelite Tent of Meeting." *CBQ*, 33 (1971), 221-227.

brought the children of Israel up from Egypt unto this day but have moved about in a tent and in a tabernacle.”¹¹³ Although Nathan’s oracle has been written over in light of Solomon’s subsequent building of the Temple, we can perceive that Nathan’s attack was actually against the notion of a temple as an appropriate **cultic** establishment for Yahweh. David thus returned to the tradition of the league sanctuary at Shiloh in his new, national shrine in Jerusalem¹¹⁴ and appointed the scion of the old Mushite family of Shiloh as one of his two highpriests.

If 'El and Yahweh were related as we have suggested, many of the puzzling features of the cult of Jeroboam¹¹⁵ would have immediate explanation. On the one hand, the “sin of Jeroboam” was claimed to be the chief sin of Israel by Deuteronomistic sources, themselves ultimately rooted in Shilonite priestly tradition. Moreover, the traditions of Aaron’s sin in the matter of the bull stemmed from the North, was preserved in Elohist tradition, and was obviously shaped by the polemic against the Bethel cultus and its Aaronid priesthood.¹¹⁶ In spite of its polemical distortion, the slogan “Behold your god(s) who brought you up out of the land of Egypt” is a characteristic Yahwistic confession, and further scrutiny reveals that the singular “god” must have been original. In I Kings 12: 28 the expression *hnh ʾlhyk*, “Behold thy god/gods” is ambiguous, though the context, the making of the two young bulls, permits a plural interpretation.” In Exodus 32:4,

113. 2 Sam. 7:5f.

114. It has been customary for scholars to assume that the sanctuary at Shiloh was in fact a temple in light of the mention of the *hēkal yahweh* at Shiloh in the 1 Sam. 1:9 and 3:3. However, in early liturgical poetry, older than the folkloristic prose sources of Samuel, the pre-Davidic sanctuary is clearly portrayed as a tent (Psalm 132:6-7; pre-Solomonic in its original form and Psalm 78:60), and Nathan’s oracle could not be more explicit. We must rather take the prose source in Samuel as anachronistic. Cf. Virgil W. Rabe, “Israelite Opposition to the Temple,” *CBQ*, 29 (1967), 228-233.

115. On the cult of Jeroboam, see R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1961), pp. 332-336, and the literature cited on pp. 540-543.

116. On the conflict between the Mushites of Shiloh and the Aaronids of Bethel, see below, chapter 8.

117. The young bulls were no doubt conceived as pedestals for the same god in the two national shrines. However, there were, we suspect, grounds for the accusation in Exodus 32:4=1 Kings 12:28 that the bulls of Dan and Bethel were worshipped. A god and his animal “participate in each other,” and while the god may be conceived as enthroned or standing on the bull in Canaanite mythology and iconography, he also is immanent in his animal so that the two may be confused. On the interesting question of the aniconic tradition among the Phoenicians, see S. Moscati, “Iconismo e aniconismo nelle più antiche stele Puniche,” *OAS* (1969), 59-67.

8 'lh'lyk 'sr h'lwk m'rš mšrym, while originally ambiguous, is difficult not to read as plural: "These are thy gods ..." However, the effect is weird. Aaron only made one calf. "These gods" belong to Dan and Bethel. In Nehemiah 9 : 18, Aaron's words are altered to read unambiguously in the singular: zh 'lyk 'sr h'lk m'rš mšrym.

It is inconceivable that the national cult of Jeroboam was other than Yahwistic. Jeroboam and the tribes of the North seceded in the face of Solomonic innovations and remained the center of League traditions. Jeroboam, desperate to consolidate his kingdom, wrenched from the **Davidids** and desirous of wooing his own people away from the shrine of the ark in Jerusalem and its pilgrimage festivals, would not have repudiated Yahweh and chosen a new god. Nor would he have flown in the face of fact and tradition by naming *another* god as the god who brought Israel up from Egypt.

Further, it is impossible to believe that opponents of the Bethel establishment from the Northern Kingdom invented the account of Aaron and the Bull. Aaron receives strange handling in the account. "How did it come about that venerable Aaron himself was credited with the manufacture of the double of Bethel's bull and the recital of a classic Yahwistic cult formula over it? Other peculiarities appear in the story: the mention of the pilgrim feast by Aaron and his insistence on a miracle: the young bull "emerged" from the fire. There are too many loose threads in the account. Underneath the polemical tale must have been a cult legend of the old sanctuary of Bethel claiming Aaronic authority for its bull iconography. In short, it appears that Jeroboam did not invent a new *cultus*, but, choosing the famous sanctuary of 'El at Bethel, attempted to archaize even more radically than the astute David had done when he brought tent and ark and the cherubim iconography to Jerusalem, transferring the nimbus of the old league sanctuary at Shiloh to **Zion**.¹¹⁹ The sanctuary of Bethel had Patriarchal connections according to tradition, and the Bull iconography of Jeroboam's shrine merely reintroduced an iconography having Aaronic connections. The young bull apparently had dual associations; the storm god is often pictured standing on a bull, a symbol of virility, and

118. The account in Exodus 32 is basically Elohist, i.e., pre-Deuteronomistic in origin.

119. Cf. O. Eissfeldt, "Silo und Jerusalem," in *VT, Suppl.* (Leiden, 1957), IV, 138-147; M. Haran, "Shiloh and Jerusalem: The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch," *JBL*, 81 (1962), 14-24; V. W. Rabe, "The Identity of the Priestly Tabernacle," *JNES*, 25 (1966), 132ff.

the bull was the animal of *Tôr'Il 'abika*, "Bull 'El your father." There can be no question of Jeroboam introducing a Ba'l-Haddu cult; if he had, tradition should have preserved the fact, in vivid invective. As a matter of fact there seems to have been no awareness on the part of those who preserved the Elijah-Elisha traditions, or upon the part of Amos, or the tradents of I Kings 13, 14, of the radical idolatry of the Bethel shrine and its bull. None of them made any mention of the young bull when they visited Bethel.

Apparently, Jeroboam's real sin was in establishing a rival to the central sanctuary in Jerusalem, not in the introduction of a foreign god or a pagan idol. As we have argued, it is wholly implausible that an insecure usurper, in the attempt to secure his throne and to woo his subjects would flout fierce Yahwists by installing a foreign or novel god in his national shrine. Yet he made an 'El shrine his royal chapel. The only real solution for these several problems, so far as I can see, is to recognize in Yahweh an 'El figure.

Our interests have been directed toward the continuities between the god of the Fathers and Yahweh, god of Israel. We have agreed with Alt to this extent, that Patriarchal religion had special features: the tutelary deity or deities entered into an intimate relationship with a social group expressed in terms of kinship or covenant, established its justice, led its battles, guided its destiny.¹²⁰ This strain entered Yahwism. Yahweh was judge and war leader of the historical community. He revealed himself to the Patriarch Moses, led Israel in the Conquest; he was the god who brought Israel up from the land of Egypt, her savior. There is also the second strain which entered Israel's primitive religion, that of the high and eternal one, 'El the creator of heaven and earth, father of all.

120. Professor Thorkild Jacobsen, who has aided me in more than one difficulty in dealing with Mesopotamian lore, comments on the "historical" character of the Patriarchal god as follows: "I have the impression that a great deal of what is seen as true in Alt's view can be very greatly deepened by going into the Mesopotamian concept of the 'personal' god. The elements of 'power to effective decision and acting' inherent in the concept of the 'personal god,' and the development in Mesopotamia around the time of the First Dynasty of Babylon which has the 'personal god' turn away from his protege in anger at cultic and moral offences leaving him open to attack by evil, all seems to me to have relevance here."

4 Prolegomena

Recent discussion of the history of the early Israelite *cultus* is voluminous and variegated, but can be schematized for our purposes as follows.¹

(1) The central or constitutive element in the early cult was the dramatic reenactment, by recital and ritual acts, of the events of the Exodus and Conquest. This reenactment of the *magnalia Dei* may be seen as the primary or initial movement in a covenant-renewal ceremony (at either the fall or spring New Year) in which the basis of the community's common life and *institutions* is restored or *renewed*.² Or it may be placed in the setting of a festival, perhaps Passover, which, it is claimed, is to be distinguished sharply from the festival of law and covenant *held in the fall*.³

(2) The central or constitutive movement in the early *cultus* was the celebration of the enthronement of Yahweh as king and creator of

1. Chapters 4 and 5 of Section II draw heavily on the writer's paper, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," in *Biblical Motif: Origins and Transformations*, Philip W. Lown Institute for Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University, Studies and Texts, 3, ed. A. Altmann (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1966), pp. 1 I-30.

2. This view has emerged in the wake of recent studies of ancient Near Eastern covenant forms and their utilization in old Israel. The pioneer work in relating this lore to the Old *Testament* was that of George E. Mendenhall, "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law," *BA*, 17 (1954), 2646; and "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," *BA*, 17 (1954), 50-76 (reprinted in the *Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, ed. E. F. Campbell and D. N. Freedman (New York, Doubleday, 1970), III, 3-53). His programmatic essays have been followed by a number of important studies, including Klaus Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular* (Neukirchen, Neukirchener Verlag, 1960); G. Ernest Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York, Harper, 1962); J. Harvey, "Le 'Rib-Pattern', rquisitoire prophettique sur la rupture de l'alliance," *Biblica*, 43 (1962), 172-196; and Delbert Hillers, *Treaty Curses and the Old Testament Prophets* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964).

3. This view received classical statement in G. von Rad, *Das form-geschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch* (Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1938), now reprinted in his *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, Theologische Bücherei, 8 (Munich, C. Kaiser, 1958), pp. 9-86; and in English, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, tr. E. W. T. Dicken (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966), pp. 1-78; it draws heavily on the work of A. Alt, *Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts* (Leipzig, S. Hirzel, 1934), reprinted in *KS* (Alt), pp. 278-332; in English, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* tr. R. A. Wilson (New York, Doubleday, 1968), pp. 103-171; and in turn has been extended by H. J. Kraus, *Gottesdienst in Israel*, 2nd ed. (Munich, C. Kaiser, 1962); cf. Kraus, "Gilgal. Ein Beitrag zur Kultusgeschichte Israels," *VT*, 1(1951), 181-199. Sharp as well as lengthy debate in recent years has marked the discussion of the Exodus-

cosmos by virtue of his victory over his enemy or enemies in a cosmogonic struggle.⁴

The first view has arisen out of a preoccupation (on the part of such scholars as Alt, Mendenhall, Baltzer) with the form-critical analysis of early legal and covenantal formulae and (by men such as Noth and von Rad) of early historical traditions, notably the Israelite Epic sources.⁷ These investigations have led to the reconstruction of the cultic function of cycles of liturgical (apodeictic) law and of the cultic function of the recitation of the *magnalia Dei*.

The second view stemmed largely from the analysis of the Psalms and the attempt to reconstruct the cultus underlying them. This research was carried out in the new light of lore from neighboring religions, at first (by Volz, Hooke, and especially Mowinckel) primarily from Babylon, and later (by Engnell) from Canaanite sources.⁶

These two "views" are what we may call ideal types, in Weberian

Conquest events, the Sinai Covenant traditions add theophany motif, and their relationship. For a review of the discussion and citation of pertinent literature, see J. M. Schmidt, "Erwägungen zum Verhältnis von Auszugs und Sinaitradition," *ZAW*, 82 (1970), 1-31; D. J. McCarthy, *Der Gottesbund im Alten Testament, Ein Bericht über die Forschung der letzten Jahre*, SBS 13 (Stuttgart, 1966). A few items may be singled out for special mention: W. Beyerlin, *Herkunft und Geschirfte der ältesten Sinaitraditionen* (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1961); in English, *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions*, tr. S. Rudman (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1965); W. L. Moran, "Review of K. Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular*," *Biblica*, 43 (1962), 100-106; D. J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*, *Analecta Biblica*, 21 (Rome, 1963); R. Smend, *Jahwekreis und Stämmebund* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963); N. Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot. Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5-11*, *Analecta Biblica*, 20 (Rome, 1963); G. Fohrer, *Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus*, *BZAW* 91 (Berlin, 1964); H. B. Huffmon, "The Exodus, Sinai and the Credo," *CBQ*, 27 (1965), 101-113; H. Gese, "Bemerkungen zur Sinaitradition," *ZAW*, 79 (1967), 10-154; G. W. Coats, "The Tradito-historical Character of the Reed Sea Motif," *VT*, 17 (1967), 253-265; D. R. Hillers, *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea* (Baltimore, John Hopkins Press, 1969).

4. This construction had its stimulus in two fundamental works: P. Volz, *Das Neujahrsfest Jahwes* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1912); and S. Mowinckel, *Psalmstudien II. Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie* (1922; reprinted, Amsterdam, P. Schippers, 1961); for selected bibliography of more recent works, see R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions*, trans. John McHugh (London, Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1961), pp. 551f., and Kraus, *Gottesdienst*, p. 79, n. 92.

5. In addition to the literature cited in note 1, see M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1948). See also Noth's critique of the myth-and-ritual school "Gott, König, Volk im Alten Testament," *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*. Theologische Bücherei, VI (Munich, 1960).

6. See especially I. Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East* (Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksells, 1943). Cf. S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, trans. G. W. Anderson (New York, Abingdon Press, n.d. [1954]), pp. 52-95; and the literature cited by de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 526f.

language, and neither is found in pure form, perhaps, in current research. Since one deals primarily with the *cultus* of the league the other with the ideology of the cult in the era of the kings, they need not be conceived as being in direct opposition to each other, and, in fact, various accommodations of one view to the other have been attempted.

The late Professor Engnell could argue, for example, that the motifs of Exodus and Conquest and of covenant renewal of the cultic community grew out of a progressive historicizing of mythological forms. He insisted, however, that the mythic patterns were typologically primary, since obviously they existed before the foundation of Israelite cultic institutions. This gives a strange picture of the *cultus*: those constitutive "historical" elements discovered in the festival liturgies and hymns of the league are secondary to the cosmogonic and mythological elements derived from analysis of the liturgies and hymns of the monarchy.

Kraus, representing the Alt school, takes the reverse position. The old themes of Exodus and Conquest are in part suppressed in the age of the kings, owing to the inauguration of a royal *Zionfest*.⁷ This festival celebrates primarily the election of the house of David and the choice of Zion as the site of Israel's new sanctuary. The rites included a procession of the Ark to Zion's shrine, reenacting the original choice of Zion. This new festival, while preserving some continuities with the traditions of the early sanctuaries of the Ark, also drew deeply, we are told, upon the mythic sources of the old Jebusite cult of 'El 'Elyōn, above all in its incorporation of the motif of the "kingship of God." Kraus thus explains the mythological elements in the royal *cultus* as lately introduced into Israel with the rise of monarchic forms, and by this means he suggests a mode of dealing with the enthronement hymns. This solution to the problem of historical development is most awkward, also: Israel, having had an essentially "historical" *cultus* in the early time (when Canaanite influence is most expected!),⁸ later

7. H. J. Kraus, *Psalmen I*, *Biblischer Kommentar*, XI, 1 (Neukirchen, 1960), pp. 197-206; *Gottesdienst*, pp. 215-220.

8. One may compare the Sea Peoples, notably the Philistines, who (contrary to Israel) came from an alien culture into the Canaanite cultural realm and in the course of the twelfth and eleventh centuries were wholly assimilated to the Canaanite religious environment. Israel on the contrary (though the elements who sojourned in the strongly Canaanite settlements in the eastern delta and the elements who never left Palestine were for some centuries dissolved in a Canaanite milieu) remained fundamentally unaffected, such a view must maintain, until David met the priests of 'El 'Elyōn (that is, the familiar 'El of the Fathers!) in Jerusalem in the tenth century. Such a view should be described, rather, as incredible.

retrogressed, so to speak, by accepting (in attenuated form, to be sure) mythological lore from the Canaanite cult of Jerusalem. Israel's religious development thus moved from the era of the league, with its distinctive historical themes, into an era of kingship, when these themes were infused with Canaanite language and mythology—in a word, mythologized.

One can discern certain strengths and weaknesses in these alternative views, one of which we can label as belonging to the “myth-and-ritual” school, the other to the *Heilsgeschichte* school.

The Myth and Ritual School

In the position of the myth-and-ritual school, there is the tacit assumption that the development of the cult must move from the “natural” to the “historical,” a legacy of the tradition of Vatke and Wellhausen. Those of the school merely substitute for Wellhausen's essentially Hegelian concept of natural religion⁹ Canaanite myth and ritual as discerned in current research. For the main part, the approach of this school has been phenomenological rather than historical, so that it has not grappled with the problem of “earlier” historical elements, later mythological elements, in the cult. So by and large the school has been content with a simple interpretation in terms of a unilinear, diachronic development: the historicizing of myth. We are never told what was the motive power disintegrating myth into history—in a Hegelian system the movement from the natural to the historical belongs to the very logic of historical process—but while idealistic premises are discarded by myth-and-ritualists (or most), extraordinarily enough, the idealistic framework of the evolution is kept. This posture requires, in our view, a dogged suppression of much of the evidence drawn from the early prose and legal material. Or rather we should say, this school subordinates early prose and early hymnic tradition to the body of hymns from the royal period. With this subordination come dangers. The royal hymns utilize, in their prosodic style and language, a classical style which had its origin in Bronze Age Canaan. Wholesale borrowings of mythological material

9. Lothar Perlitt in his *Varke und Wellhausen, BZA W, 94* (Berlin, 1965), tries mightily to free Wellhausen from the heritage of Vatke and Hegel, but succeeds only in revealing his own inability to stand apart from that same tradition whose influence is still pervasive in German Old Testament scholarship. Had Wellhausen proceeded purely as a positivistic historian, his great synthesis would never have been written, and he would not have become the powerful figure he was and is.

were made under the tyranny of this Canaanite aesthetic tradition. In reconstructing the cultic function or *Sitz im Leben* of such hymns, one is never quite sure whether he arrives at a description of Israel's royal cult or at a picture of an old Canaanite *cultus* from which the hymnic tradition stems. Analysis of a borrowed psalm, or of a hymn or liturgy heavily dependent on Canaanite hymnody, is a dangerous and subtle, if not a subjective, process. One must detect not one, but a series of *Sitze im Kultleben*. On the one hand, it is obvious that in the reuse of such material an altered context altered meaning. On the other hand, it is equally important to observe that the transformation of such material cannot have been absolute, that there must have been some continuity between the religious cultures so engaged. There must have been a suitable matrix into which Canaanite lore could be grafted and in which it could remain alive.¹⁰ Control here must come from the corpus of archaic poetry, law, and Epic tradition.”

The History-of-Redemption School

The history-of-redemption school has pictured the development along at least two lines: a dominant line (as the name of the school suggests) bearing the theme of the Exodus-Conquest—that is, the history of redemption—and an alternate theme of revelation (of the Law) at Sinai, preserved in the covenant-renewal ceremonies in the central sanctuary of the league at **Sukkōt**.¹² I think it is not unfair to say that in this analysis the key to Israel's early cultic history is found in the traditional contrast between gospel and law, and its form-critical analogue, *kērygma* and *didachē*.¹³ Such duplicity or doubleness in Israel's cultic development must be repudiated in view of our fresh understanding of the forms of the covenant and the covenant re-

10. That old Canaanite myth remained alive, however attenuated, in royal psalms or in Prophetic oracles, is clear from early apocalyptic. Here myths stemming from old Israelite sources, especially from hymns and liturgies of the royal cult, break out anew in transformed but vigorous modes of life. Fresh borrowings of myth in apocalyptic composition are exceedingly rare, as becomes clearer with each advance of our knowledge of apocalyptic origins. See below in Section V, “A Note on Apocalyptic Origins.” On the contrary, there was direct reintroduction of Phoenician theogonic and cosmogonic lore in early Gnosticism.

11. By “Epic” sources we mean here and elsewhere the so-called JE sources and the common poetic tradition that lies behind them.

12. To the fall calendar, Kraus would add a “tent festival” underlying traditions of **Sukkōt** that preserve traditions of the desert history (*Gottesdienst*, pp. 152–159).

13. One is tempted to say, in a radical Lutheran understanding of grace and law and its Idealistic analogues.

newal.¹⁴ It is now clear that the confession of the *magnalia Dei* or recitation of the Epic theme (von Rad's *heilsgeschichtliche Credo*) belongs to the covenant formulary as its first major element or prologue, to the covenant renewal festival as its first movement. The recitation of the law and the renewal or actualization of the covenant comes as a consequent act in the ritual drama.¹⁵ In the present shape

14. See above, note 2.

15. The parade example of the covenant ritual is found in the accounts of Joshua's covenant making in Joshua 24:2-28 happily supplemented by Joshua 8:30-34 and Deuteronomy 27 (11-15-26. Verses 2-13 of Joshua 24 recite the history of Yahweh's redemption (the promises to the Fathers, the Exodus and Conquest); verses 14-28 the subsequent rites of the covenant making (the putting away of alien gods, the oath of the people, the deposit of the covenant document). A missing feature only hinted at in Joshua 24:27, namely the blessings and curses of the covenant, is described in the parallel account in Joshua 8: 30-34, and Deuteronomy 27: 15-26 preserves some of the cultic recitation of curses surviving from the old time.

Actually we must probably see in Deuteronomy disintegrated materials of the old fall festival of Shechem, as is argued by Alt, von Rad, and Baltzer. After the fall of Shechem in the late twelfth century B.C., the annual cultus presumably ceased, perhaps replaced by a seven-year cycle of pilgrimage festivals during the era when Shechem lay abandoned. Cf. Deut. 31:10.

The attempt has been made to see the Epic traditions of Exodus 19-24 (32, 33) 34 similarly as disintegrated materials of the same Shechemite covenant (von Rad, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch*, pp. 13-26). It is true that cultic materials are woven into these traditions, including the archaic poetic (liturgical) prologue in 19:3-6 (on the age and meaning of this passage, see W. L. Moran, "A Kingdom of Priests," in *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought*, ed. J. L. McKenzie [New York, Herder and Herder, 1962], pp. 7-20); the stipulations of the covenant 20:2-23:19; the covenant ceremony proper in 24:1-11; and parallel materials in 34:10-17; 27. Cf. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), pp. 152-167. However, the ordering and selection of materials here by the Priestly editor, and his inclusion of his great cycles of law, priestly prescriptions, etc., in the Sinaitic context obscures the covenant formulary in E and, indeed, suppresses even the main part of Yahwistic decalogue. The actual covenant formulary, if we seek the parallel to Deuteronomy, is to be found in the Priestly reformulation; Prologue, Exodus 6: 2-19: 6; the law 20:2-14 (revised by P); 21-23; the covenant ceremony 24; ordinances of the sanctuary, the depository of the law 25-29 (30, 31); breach of covenant and renewal 32-34; establishment of the covenant cultus and its prescriptions, 35-40, Leviticus 1-16; covenant stipulations Leviticus 17-26:2; and blessings and curses of the covenant, 26: 3-13 and 26: 14-45.

It is difficult to detect any elements of the cultic traditions of Sinai which attach themselves to *Sukkōt*, i.e., to the Fall New Year. In the old traditions the clearest ties are to the spring celebration at *Gilgal*. Thus the erection of twelve stelae (Exod. 24:4) stands parallel to the twelve stones of *Gilgal*, the latter specifically connected with Passover (Josh. 5:10; cf. 4:19f.). Priestly tradition places the covenant meal of Exodus 24 at the Feast of Weeks (Exod. 19:1); however, the first festival celebrated after the erection of the Tabernacle is the Passover, shortly before Israel departs from Sinai (Exod. 40:2, 17; Num. 9:1; 10:11). Although the Priestly editors have preserved a remnant of the "second" covenant-making in Exodus 34, one notes that no mention of a covenant feast survives from the Yahwistic tradition. There is, thus, in the final stage of the Tetra-

of Epic tradition, the ritual pattern of the covenant-renewal ceremony has been displaced. Not only have diverse traditions (including non-cultic materials) been introduced to expand the account of the events of the Exodus and Wilderness sojourn, the cultic form of traditions also has been dissolved in the interests of the historical or prose-epic form into **which** our sources recast available tradition. The primary displacement is the intrusion of covenant rites into the middle of the *Heilsgeschichte*, rather than at the end in their proper cultic position, following the historical recital of the call of the Fathers, the deliverance from Egypt, and the gift of the land in the Conquest. That is, the formation of the covenant is placed after the Exodus and before the Conquest, while in the ritual of covenant renewal, the covenant rites proper are placed in the context of the twelve-tribe league, celebrating the gift of the land in the Conquest. But the epic order of **events**—Exodus, Covenant at Sinai, Conquest—is based on older historical memory, not on the more directly cultic traditions in which the recitation of the historical acts of God and the recitation of the stipulations of the covenant are two separate acts in a single cultic drama of the League. This background explains the absence of the “revelation at Sinai” in such archaic materials as those found in Joshua 24, which reflect cultic traditions of the covenant festival at Shechem, and in Exodus 15 (the Song of the Sea), which reflects traditions of the covenant renewal rites of old **Gilgal** (see below). In this view, it was the cultic use of the covenant formulary in the era of the league which displaced the **Sinaitic** traditions. There can be little doubt, however, that the Sinai traditions ultimately stem from preleague cult, as well as historical memory, and are “correctly” located in epic tradition. In other words, the **cultus** of the twelve-tribe league (covenant renewal ceremonies in variant forms at the great sanctuaries) presented the events of Exodus and Conquest as a single continuity to be reenacted in a single act, preceding formally the covenant ceremony in which the tribes bound themselves anew in community. Indeed there is evidence in some early traditions that the march of the Divine Warrior from the South or the Wars of Yahweh tended to dominate the cultic reenactment of the *magnalia Dei*. The Yahwistic account of the covenant in

teuch no covenant *renewal* festival until the Ark of the Covenant, its tent, and the entire Priestly apparatus is established at the Spring New Year (Exod. 40:2,17), the priesthood consecrated (seven days, Lev. 8), and the *nēšfīm* present their gifts (the first day) and offerings (twelve days, Num. 7). The Passover on the fourteenth (Num. 9:1ff.) thus crowns the service of dedication in the Priestly tradition in its final form.

Exodus 34: 10-27, despite its expansion and reworking, preserves elements which place the covenant making, not in the context of the events of the Exodus, but by anticipation juxtaposed to the “terrible events” of Conquest and the gift of the land. As in the Yahwistic tradition of Genesis 15, covenant is understood more in terms of divine oath or promise of blessing, a reformulation of the covenant form in the interest of the monarchy, into the eternal decree or oaths to the house of David.¹⁶ More eloquent testimony is to be found in the archaic hymns to be discussed in the next section. Thus Exodus 15: 1-18 treats both Exodus and Conquest; Deuteronomy 33: 1-3, 26-29; Judges 5 :4-5 (=Psalms 68: 8-9); and Habakkuk 3: 3-7, all describe the Divine Warrior marching in conquest from the South-land.” In these poems one finds the language of the theophany of the Divine Warrior utilizing mythical elements from the theophany of the stormgod as warrior. The theophanic language of the prose sources of the Sinai revelation is secondary, derived from the hymns of the Wars of Yahweh, where the (Exodus-) Conquest motif is naturally and primitively linked with theophany.¹⁸

Taken in the revised form suggested above, this covenant-renewal festival becomes the cultic carrier of Israel’s historical traditions, and the early cult can be understood to have a unity comparable to that posited by the myth-and-ritual school. In one, the history of the community’s creation is rehearsed or reenacted to reconstitute its life and institutions, since the historical community is conceived as the community of salvation. In the other, the primordial events (the battle of creation, the theophany of Yahweh as king manifest) are recited and reenacted, in order to restore the orders of creation or, to say the same thing, to actualize the “eschatological” kingdom of God.

At least one major problem remains. The history-of-redemption school, while minimizing the impact of borrowings from Canaan, must

16. Cf. N. Lohfink, *Die Landverheissung als Eid. Eine Studie zu Gn 15, SBS 28* (Stuttgart, 1967).

17. Cf. Numbers 10:35f. The earliest sources use in parallelism, Sinai, Seir, and Paran (Dt. 33:2), Sinai, Seir and Edom (Judg. 5:4f.), Teman and Paran (Hab. 3:3). Qadesh in Num. 13:26 is placed in the Wilderness of Paran, in Num. 20:1; 33:36 in the Wilderness of Zin (all P); Deut. 1:1-3 associates (roughly) Paran, Mt. Seir, and Qadesh-barnea. Num. 20:14, 16 (E) places Qadesh on the Edomite border from whence messengers are dispatched to the king of Edom. These data along with the place name [Bét] Yuhwi in Edom/Seir not only point to Yahweh’s association with the southeastern mountains, but reinforce those theories of Yahweh’s origins in the Midianite amphitony. Cf. also the place name El-paran in Gen. 14:16.

18. See below, Chapter 7.

admit to a considerable invasion of mythological lore in the time of the monarchy. In view of the recrudescence of extraordinarily vivacious motifs of Canaanite origin in Jewish apocalyptic, mediated by Israel's royal ideology and the Wisdom tradition, we cannot escape such a conclusion. This sequence in the development of the cult posits a *cultus* in the early period dominated by historical categories: celebration of the history of Israel's redemption in the Exodus and Conquest, reenactment of the ancient covenant rooted in these gracious acts of Yahweh. The question of how this historical cult rose out of the mythopoeic religious culture which preceded is left unanswered, as is the problem of the receptivity of Israel's religion and cult to the increment of mythological symbols and motives in the imperial and monarchic eras.

As a matter of fact, students of the Alt school, even more than their master, appear to be incapable of dealing with the origins of a historical *cultus* or of tracing the lines of historical continuity between the myth and ritual patterns of pre-Mosaic Canaan and the earliest forms of Israelite religious and cultic practices. The movement from dominantly mythical to dominantly historical patterns is not a natural or inevitable tendency, as is evidenced by the perennial resurgence of mythic forms and language in biblical religion: in the royal theology, in apocalyptic, in Gnosticism, in Qabalah. The reason for this failure or inability lies in the refusal of many form critics or historians of tradition to raise the question of actual historical memory lying behind cultic patterning of the Exodus, Covenant at Sinai, and Conquest. The thrust of historical events, recognized as crucially or ultimately meaningful, alone had the power to displace the mythic pattern. Even then we should expect the survival of some mythic forms, and the secondary mythologizing of historical experiences to point to their cosmic or transcendent meaning. An obvious example is the description of the victory of Israel and her God over the Egyptians: the overthrow of the Egyptian host in the sea is singled out to symbolize Israel's deliverance, Yahweh's victory. Later, an equation is fully drawn between the "drying up of the sea" and the Creator's defeat of Rahab or Yamm (Isaiah 51:9-11); the historical event is thereby given cosmic or primordial meaning. As a matter of fact, the earliest sources do not equate the crossing of the sea and the killing of the Dragon by the Divine Warrior,¹⁹ but it is highly likely that the role of the sea in the Exodus story was singled out and stressed

19. See Chapter 6.

precisely because of the ubiquitous motif of the cosmogonic battle between the creator god and Sea in West Semitic mythology.

The tendency of form critics is to break up what is properly and primitively a pattern into artificial units. This tendency is not inherent in the method, although the philosophical presuppositions which informed the methodology in its early development by Gunkel and Alt led to this tendency, and it persists as a defective inheritance in the contemporary use of form-critical techniques for historical analysis. Hence, some members of the history-of-redemption school are driven to find separate cults or festivals, or separate units of Israel contributing one by one the elements in the historical pattern of Israel's early cult and epic: Exodus traditions stemming from one place, those of the covenant making at Sinai from another, Conquest traditions from a third cult or shrine or tribe. While it is true, obviously, that all elements of later twelve-tribe Israel did not engage in these epic events but came to share them as historical memories through the "actualizing" of them in the covenantal *cultus*, it also must be insisted that the *pattern*—Exodus from Egypt, Covenant at Sinai, Conquest of Canaan—is prior, cultically and historically, to the several elements in the pattern or *Gestalt*.

These remarks may be illustrated by reference to Gerhard von Rad's important monograph, *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel*.²⁰ Here von Rad describes Israel's sacral warfare as an institution of the era of the Judges, limited to the defensive wars of Israel. Von Rad takes this stand in conscious contradiction of the unanimous witness of Israelite tradition that the wars of Yahweh par excellence were the wars of the Conquest. His view rests on the dogma of the Alt school that only individual tribes entered **the land**, or infiltrated it, and that the traditions of the Conquest are a secondary complex composed of unitary traditions of individual tribes. The Conquest so understood is not a historical event (not even a reinterpreted, schematized set of incidents) nor a historical event covered over with accretions of legend and myth. It is a construct of the *Heilsgeschichte*, but not history. The upshot is that von Rad fails to deal with the origins of holy war in Israel and in turn with the mythological elements in holy war as practiced by earliest Israel, and indeed as practiced by pre-Yahwistic and non-Israelite peoples.²¹ He ignores also the earliest psalmody of Israel, where certain

20. Gerhard von Rad, *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel*, *AThNT 20* (Zurich, 1951).

21. For an extended treatment of the origins of holy war in Israel as well as for a detailed analysis of cosmic or mythological elements in sacral warfare, see the *disserta-*

mythic features still cling, and fails to perceive, therefore, the reutilization of some of these mythological elements in the royal cult, in prophecy, and above all in the apocalyptic development of the concept of the Divine Warrior.

We should argue that the development of Israel's **cultic** themes and institutions was a more complex evolution than is envisaged by either of these schools. In the pre-Yahwistic phase of the religion of the **patriarchal** folk, we can discern both historical and mythic features. On the one hand, there was the cult of the Divine Kinsman, the tutelary deity who entered into an intimate relationship with a social group, established its justice, and directed its battles. This is Alt's divine type, "the god of the Father." On the other hand, there was the cult of Canaanite 'El, the Divine Patriarch, "creator of heaven and earth," and leader of cosmic **armies**.²² How early these types of deity could merge in the cult of one god we do not know. At all events, these two had coalesced in the figure of Yahweh in the earliest stratum of Israelite tradition.

In the era of the league in Canaan, the historical impulse became powerful in the Mosaic faith and in the covenant festivals of the great sanctuaries and especially of the shrine of the Ark.²³ On the whole, the school of Alt has done great service here in analyzing old prose and legal traditions. Even in the cult of the league, however, themes of mythological origin can be detected, standing in tension with themes of historical memory or enhancing redemptive events by assimilating them to primordial events. These mythic features are to be found especially in archaic psalmody, which underwent less shaping in transmission than the prose. It is this more or less subdued mythological element

tion of my student Patrick D. Miller, Jr., "Holy War and Cosmic War in Early Israel" (Harvard University, 1963), shortly to be published under the title, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*. Compare R. Smend, *Yahwekrieg und Stämmebund*, a title which has been clumsily translated in English as *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation*. trans. M. G. Rogers (Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1970). For a discussion of a non-Israelite Holy War song, see P. D. Hanson, "The Song of Heshbon and David's Nir," *HTR*, 61 (1968), 297-320.

22. See below, Chapter 7 on Ba'1 as Divine Warrior.

23. Professor Paul Riemann has argued that Israel's central sanctuary during the era of the League was not at a fixed place, but that the central shrine was defined as that sanctuary where the portable Ark for the moment stood. Such is the force of the old portion of Nathan's oracle (2 Sam. 7: 5-7), and provides an explanation for the fact that many circles in the north continued to regard Jerusalem as the legitimate central sanctuary even after Jeroboam's creation of his national shrines. We think particularly of the Elohist polemic against Bethel (Exodus 32), and the sources of Deuteronomistic tradition which regard as legitimate the shrine (*māqōm*) where Yahweh "will place his name."

of the old time that breaks out afresh in the *cultus* and ideology of the monarchy. This movement is counterbalanced by the great prophets who, while influenced by the royal cult and its liturgical style, recall the more austere themes of the covenant forms of the league, its legal language, and its relatively minor use of mythological material. As late prophecy and remnants of the royal ideology flow together to create the early apocalyptic movement, we may say that the old mythological themes rise to a new crescendo, though even in the apocalyptic the expression of Israel's faith is still firmly controlled by a historical framework. The primordial events of creation and the eschatological events of the new creation are typologically related but are held apart by the events of human history so that, unlike the movement of myth, the primordial event and the eschatological event never merge in a cultic "Now."

In short, Israel's early *cultus* does visibly emerge from a mythopoeic past; the emergent is new, but in Patriarchal religion there was a *praeparatio* and the lines of continuity may be discerned. In the subsequent history of the cult, in the league, in the days of the kings and prophets, and in the time of the apocalyptic seers, both historical and mythologically derived elements were interwoven or blended in the cult. But here we must also say that the *Heilsgeschichte* school is correct in recognizing the historical or epic framework into which mythic materials were introduced and thereby transformed in Israel. In Israel, myth and history always stood in strong tension, myth serving primarily to give a cosmic dimension and transcendent meaning to the historical, rarely functioning to dissolve history.

5 *The Divine Warrior*

Psalm 24 and the Warrior-King

To illustrate the general comments in chapter 4, I have chosen to discuss some of the transformations of the motif of the Divine Warrior, the Day of Yahweh, and related themes. Two quotations may be juxtaposed, each representing one of the schools above, one from Gerhard von Rad and one from Sigmund Mowinckel. Von Rad writes:

the Day of Yahweh encompasses a pure event of war, the rise of Yahweh against his enemies, his battle and his victory. ..

There is no support whatsoever in these texts for the supposition that the enthronement of Yahweh, too, belongs to the concept of the Day of Yahweh ... the entire material for this imagery which surrounds the concept of the Day of Yahweh is of old-Israelite origin. It derives from the tradition of the holy wars of Yahweh in which Yahweh appeared personally to annihilate his enemies.'

Mowinckel writes:

[the] original meaning [of the Day of Yahweh] is really the day of His manifestation or epiphany, the day of His festival, and particularly that festal day which was also the day of His enthronement, his royal day, *the* festival of Yahweh, the day when as king He came and "wrought salvation for his people."^{*}

Our comments can begin with a brief exegesis of Psalm 24:7–10, a tenth-century B.C. liturgical fragment, which can serve as a testing ground.

שֵׁאוֹ שְׁעָרִים רֵאשִׁיכֶם ³
הַנִּשְׂאוֹ פֶתַח עוֹלָם ⁴ []

1. G. von Rad. "The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh," *JSS*. 4 (1959). 103f.

2. S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1954), p. 145.

3. The structure of the *strophe* is typical of early lyric poetry: mixed meter, regularly arranged. In syllabic notation (l = *longum*, b = *breve*):

l:l

b:b::b:b

In stress notation: 3:3, 2:2::2:2.

4. Omit the conjunction here and elsewhere as noted, for stylistic reasons. Cf. F. M.

יבא מלך כבוד
 מי זה מלך כבוד
 יהיה עוז וגבור
 יהיה גבור מלחמה

שאו שערים ראשיכם
 [הג] שאו פתחי עולם

יבא מלך כבוד
 מי זה מלך כבוד
 יהיה צבאות
 הוא מלך כבוד

Lift up, O Gates, your heads,
 Lift yourselves up, ancient' doors!

The king of glory shall enter.
 Who is this king of Glory?
 Yahweh mighty and valiant,
 Yahweh the warrior.

Lift up, O Gates, your heads,
 Lift yourselves up, ancient doors!

The king of glory shall enter.
 Who is this king of glory?
 Yahweh of the [Heavenly] hosts,
 He is the king of Glory.

Cross and D. N. Freedman, "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: II Samuel 22=Psalm18," *JBL*, 72 (1953), 19f.

5. The article is probably secondary. See F. M. Cross and R. J. Saley, "Phoenician Incantations," *BASOR*, 197 (1970), 48.

6. The *hw*' here is a prosaic addition, anticipating the last colon.

7. Father Mitchell Dahood recently has suggested that *'wlm* here be read as the divine epithet, "The Eternal," *Psalms*, I (New York, Doubleday, 1966), p. 153. I prefer "ancient (doors)" on stylistic grounds. The solemn announcement of the Name of the victorious warrior is anticlimactic if his name "The Ancient One" is already given away in the name of the gates. And I should reject the suggestion that two gods, the Ancient One, 'El, and the Warrior god, Yahweh, are specified in the hymn. Moreover, the Temple and its towers are "primordial" in their mythic identity with the heavenly or cosmic temple.

The psalm is an antiphonal liturgy used in the autumn festival. The portion of the psalm in verses 7-10 had its origin in the procession of the Ark to the sanctuary at its founding, celebrated annually in the cult of Solomon and perhaps even of David. On this there can be little disagreement. But how are we to understand its archaic phrases? The prosodic form is intriguing, falling into the mixed meter and repetitive parallelism characteristic of Israel's earliest poetry.

We may see reflected in this liturgy the reenactment of the victory of Yahweh in the primordial battle and his enthronement in the divine council or, better, in his newly built (cosmic) temple.

Such an interpretation assumes a Canaanite myth-and-ritual pattern standing behind the Israelite rite reflected in the psalm. This Canaanite "pattern" can be described tersely as follows: Yamm, deified Sea, claimed kingship among the gods. The council of the gods assembled and, told of Yamm's intentions to seize the kingship and take Ba'l captive, made no protest. They were cowed and despairing, sitting with heads bowed to their knees. Ba'l rises, rebukes the divine assembly, and goes forth to war. In the (cosmogonic) battle he is victorious, and he returns to take up kingship.⁸ Presumably he returned to the assembled gods and appeared in glory, and the divine assembly rejoiced. In a later text⁹ Ba'l's temple, symbolic of his new sovereignty,¹⁰ is completed, and the gods sit at banquet celebrating. Ba'l is king. Similarly, in Tablet VI of the Babylonian Creation Epic, Marduk, after battling the primordial ocean, *Tiāmat*, and creating the universe out of her carcass, receives from the gods a newly constructed temple where the gods sit at banquet celebrating his kingship. The Babylonian account of creation in *Enūma eliš* is not too remote a parallel since there is some evidence, collected by Thorkild Jacobsen,¹¹ that the battle with the dragon Ocean is West Semitic in origin.

Psalm 24:7-10 can be fitted into the Canaanite pattern, provided we assume that it was modified somewhat in the Israelite context. One

8. *CTA*. 2 and 4.

9. *CTA*. 4. In column VII of this text, there is a repetition of the narrative of Ba'l's going on the warpath (7-14), a return to his temple, theophany (29-35), and proclamation of kingship.

10. See A. S. Kapelrud, "Temple Building, a Task for Gods and Kings," *Orientalia*, 32 (1963), 56-62; and below, chapter 6.

11. Thorkild Jacobsen, "The Battle Between Marduk and Tiamat," *JAOS*, 88 (1968), 104-108.

may observe that the so-called “torah liturgy” of verses 1-5, the present introduction to the archaic liturgical fragment, begins:

The Earth is Yahweh’s and its fullness,
The world and they who live in it.

He has founded it upon Seas
And on Rivers he has created it.

Moreover, we can have no doubt as to the identity of him who comes. It is the Divine Warrior, “Yahweh mighty and valiant, Yahweh the Warrior, Yahweh *š^ebā’ōt*.” The procession of the Ark marks the going forth of the Divine Warrior to battle and his return to his royal seat. In Psalm 132, an old hymn of the royal cult, there is allusion to the processional of the Ark when Yahweh first took up his abode on Zion.¹² The second *strophe*, verses 6-9, may be read as follows.

הַנִּיחַ שְׁמֵנוּהָ בְּאֶפְרַתָּה
מִצִּיבֵינוּ בְּשָׂדֵי יַעֲרֵה
נִבְאָה לְמִשְׁכְּנֵתוֹ
נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לְהַדָּם רִגְלָיו

קוֹמָה יְהוָה לְנַחֲתָךְ¹⁴
אַתָּה וְאַרְוֵן עוֹךְ

כִּהְנִיךְ יִלְבְּשׁוּ צִדִּיק
חֲסִדֶיךָ יִרְנְנוּ

Lo, we heard of it (the Ark)¹⁵ in Ephratah,¹⁶
We found it in the fields of Ya‘r.

12. This hymn is appropriately quoted by the Chronicler on the occasion of the inauguration of Solomon’s Temple (2 Chron. 6:41).

13. The short form is preferable, *metri causa*.

14. Psalm 132:8 reads *lmnwḥtk*, 2 Chron. 6:41 *lnwḥk*. Read *lnwḥtk*; *mnwḥt* is the *lectio facillior*, introduced probably under the influence of *mnwḥty* in v. 14. The shorter reading is better metrically. Cf. the use of *nḥt* in *CTA*, 16 (KRT C). 23f.

ytḅ I-ks’i mlk

l-nḥt l-kḥt drkt

[Kirta returned to his assembly;]

He sat upon his royal throne,

On the restful seat of dominion.

We follow Albright in taking *lnḥt lkḥt* as a hendiadys (“The Phoenician Inscriptions of the Tenth Century B.C.,” *JAOS*. 67 [1947], 156, n. 26). Compare also *CTA*, 22:18.

15. אַרְוֵן is treated both as masculine and feminine in classical Hebrew.

16. Ephratah stands in parallelism with ya‘r, certainly a shortened name of Kiryat

Let us enter into his encampment,¹⁷
Let us fall down before his footstool.¹⁸

Arise,¹⁹ Yahweh, from thy rest,²⁰
Thou and the Ark of thy might.

Let thy priests dress in righteousness,²¹
Thy devout shout for joy.

The structure of this liturgical hymn is quite clear:

A. *Strophe I* 4 (1:1)

1. Rubric to Oath (vv. [1 -]2²²)
2. Oath of David (vv. 3-5)

B. *Strophe II* 5 (1:1)

Ye'ārīm. There is no escape, I think, from the conclusion that Ephrat is a clan name in the district of Kiryat Ye'ārīm. Delitzsch's evidence established this understanding firmly despite the tendency of recent scholars to overlook it. By Ephrat, Caleb sired clans who settled at Bethlehem and at Kiryat Ye'arim (F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Psalms* [New York, n.d. (1883?)] III, 310). According to 1 Chron. 2:19, Caleb begot Hur by Ephrat. From Hur stems a Bethlehemite clan (1 Chron. 4:4), and through his son Shabal the clan which settled Kiryat Ye'arim (1 Chron. 2:50). Probably we are to identify Caleb Ephratah with Kiryat Ye'arim (1 Chron. 2:24).

17. The plural *miškānōt* is used in its archaic sense, "camp," "tent." See provisionally, F. M. Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle," *BAR*, I, p. 225.

18. *Miškānōt* refers to the tent shrine, *hadōm* to the Ark in all probability. Cf. Ps. 99:5.

19. Delbert Hillers in his paper "Ritual Procession of the Ark and Ps 132," *CBQ*, 30 (1968), 48-55, discusses this line and is probably correct in translating "Arise O Yahweh from your resting-place/You and your mighty ark." He is certainly correct in seeing the background of *qūm(ā)* in the language of Holy War when the Ark sets out, comparing Num. 10:35 from the era of the League or even earlier. One may compare *qūm Bārāq* in Judg. 5:12 or of the deity in relatively early contexts: Psalms 132:12; 74:22; 82:8; and in general the use of *qūm('al)* in the sense of "attack" and *qām* in the sense of "attacker." Compare also the related use of *'ūr* in Holy War contexts. (Compare also, the excellent article of T. E. Fretheim, "Psalm 132: A Form Critical Study," *JBL*, 86 (1967), 289-300, which came into my hands after this section had been written.)

20. We have elected to read *I* "from" following Hillers, a change from our earlier position, which followed exegetical tradition in taking *lnwhtk* as a pregnant construction, but comparing the Ugaritic and early Hebrew idiom *ysb I* of enthronement (cf. CTA, 3.4.47; 16.6.24; Ps. 9:5; 29:10). However, the juxtaposition "arise"/"take thy (royal) seat" is too harsh. See now M. Dahood, *Psalms* III (New York, Doubleday, 1970), p. 245.

21. See the variants in 2 Chron. 6:41.

22. We are inclined to believe that the original first line of the hymn was *nšb' <dwd> lyhwh/ndr l'byr y'qb* parallel to *nšb' yhwh ldwd etc.*, v. II.

1. The Old Sanctuary: Search and Entrance (vv. 6-7)
 2. Summons to Yahweh to Go Forth (v. 8)
 3. Appeal for Victory in Behalf of
 - a. priests and faithful (v. 9)
 - b. the Anointed (v. 10)
- A., *Strophe III 4* (1: 1)
1. Rubric to Oath (v. 1 la)
 2. Oath of Yahweh (vv. 11b-12)
- B., *Strophe IV 5* (1: 1)
1. The New Sanctuary: Yahweh Takes up Abode (vv. 13-14)
 - [2. Promise of Blessing on Poor (v. 15)]
 3. Promise of Victory to
 - a. priests and faithful (v. 16)
 - b. the Anointed (vv. 17-18)

The only real difficulty in interpretation is found in *Strophe II*. Verse 6 speaks of the search for the (old) tent-shrine of Yahweh and its discovery. Insufficient notice has been taken of the conflict between this account and the traditions of 2 Samuel 6. Psalm 132: 6 implies that the Shrine of the Ark, and even its location, has fallen more or less from memory. David finds it, and the summons comes to enter the tent shrine and do obeisance to the Ark. Then follows the battle cry, "Arise, Yahweh, from thy resting place" (that is, the old shrine), and finally the petition for (victorious) celebration by priests and people.

The juxtaposed *Strophe IV* (after Yahweh's oath) tells of Yahweh's choice of Zion which is (now) become his eternal seat or resting place. The priests and devout are promised victory and celebration. There are verbal parallels, as well as structural, between *Strophes II* and *IV*. The placenames Ephratah and Zion stand in parallel positions; *nwhtk* (or MT *mnwhtk*) is parallel to *mnwhty* in v. 14; and vv. 9 and 16 are verbally parallel with only one significant change, that of the verb from petition to promise. In short, the strophes center upon the transition from the old sanctuary to the new.

In 1 Samuel 7 : 1 f. and 2 Samuel 6 : 1- 15 we hear of the Ark coming to Kiryat Ye'ārīm to the house of Abinadab whose son Eleazar was sanctified to care for the Ark. Here it remained, we are told, for twenty years. Nothing is said of a tent-shrine, and the story is told as if the place of the Ark were well known and the Ark in effect in storage awaiting its transfer to a genuine national sanctuary. The episode of *Obed-*

edom's care of the Ark after David's first abortive attempt to bring it to Jerusalem has no reflex in Psalm 132.

The above data point strongly to the conclusion that the traditions of Psalm 132 are wholly independent of the traditions in the Deuteronomistic history. They combine with the archaic royal theology²³ of Strophe III (vv. 11–12), as indicators that the psalm preserves very old material stemming from the time of David's cultus,²⁴ reworked only slightly in the later royal cult.²⁵

Returning to Psalm 24, we find the Divine Warrior recognized as the "glorious king"; and the procession of the Warrior-King into his temple may be said to reenact the founding of the Temple (at the fall New Year) and the choice of Zion as the shrine of the Ark.

The strongest evidence for recognizing mythological elements in Psalm 24, to my knowledge, has gone unrecognized. Certain images in Psalm 24 are very strange. The circle of gate towers is commanded to "lift their heads," to receive the returning Warrior, the glorious

23. See below, chapter 9.

24. There are several archaic, or archaizing elements in Psalm 132 overlooked by Hillers, "Ritual Procession of the Ark," in addition to I "from" in v. 8, a preposition replaced by *min* early in classical Hebrew. Similarly, the idiom *yšb* I (*ks*², etc.) of enthronement, is frequent only in early Hebrew poetry (Ps. 132 : 12, Judg. 5 : 17 ; Ps. 29 : 10) and archaizing contexts (Ps. 9 : 5, Isa. 47 : 1[?]). The normal Hebrew prose idiom is *yšb* I (*ks*², etc.). The use of *mšknwt*, plural, in a singular sense, "tent" or "tent shrine" is used of Yahweh's old sanctuary in archaic contexts (Ps. 132 : 5, 7; Ps. 78 : 28 [cf. Ps. 78 : 60], or of the temple in archaizing contexts (Ps. 43 : 3 ; cf. 46 : 5). The root *škb* and its derivatives, especially *šebet* and *mōšāb*, are used of the **earthly** shrine of Yahweh almost exclusively in archaic contexts (Exod. 15 : 17 ; Ps. 68 : 17 ; 1 Kings 8 : 12 [quoted from book of Yašar] and Ps. 132 : 13 *bis*). Otherwise, *yšb* is used of the cosmic abode of Yahweh or in **denials** of his earthly abode (2 Sam. 7 : 5 ; 1 Kings 8 : 30, etc.). *yšb* and its derivatives are replaced by the "Name Theology" in Deuteronomistic tradition, by *škn*, "to tent" in other traditions, and by the archaizing use of *škn*, actually a denominative of *mīškān* "tabernacle" in Priestly tradition. The **hapax legomenon** *nwhṭk*, known in Ugaritic and early Canaanite may be archaic. In v. 17 we are to read *nīr*, "mandate," parallel to *qēren*, a living use of *nīr*, in contrast to the frozen cliché of the Deuteronomist, parallel to *nīr* in Num. 21 : 30, as shown by Paul Hanson, "The Song of Heshbon," pp. 310–320. Hillers's suggestion that *šnt* is an archaism may be correct. I am inclined to think it a conflate reading of variants *šnh*, the usual Hebrew for "sleep," and dialectal *št* "sleep" known from tenth century Phoenician (*ʿAḥīrām*).

25. The pattern of Psalm 132 is found also in an early hymn, Psalm 89 : 2–19 : vv. 2–5, the battle of the Divine Warrior, and the processional (vv. 16–19, esp. v. 16), and in such archaizing materials as Isa. 62 : 6–12 (a passage called to my attention in this connection by Mr. James Sauer) where there is a clear echo of David's oath (vv. 6f.) followed by Yahweh's oath ("democratized," vv. 8–9), after which we find the description of the "ritual conquest," a processional way leading to Zion (vv. 10–12). We shall return to the "Second Conquest" theme below.

King. The metaphor seems odd at first look, not to say bizarre. How does a gate lift its head? Where is its head that it may be lifted? We hasten to say that gate types in the ancient world did not include the portcullis which moves up and down, only gates which swing sideways on their pivots.

The figure is actually one of full personification of the circle of gate towers which like a council of elders sat waiting the return of the army and its Great Warrior gone to battle, and which sat bowed and anxious. Then comes the shout,

שאו שערים ראשיכם

Lift up, O Gates, your heads!

In Ugaritic Text 2.1. 19–37,²⁶ we find a picture of the council of the gods assembled in the mountain of ‘El. On the approach of emissaries of Ba‘l’s archfoe, Prince Sea, the gods are cowed and fearful, “dropping their heads onto their knees, down on their princely thrones,” sitting in fear and despair. Ba‘l, the young king, shouts:

šū’ilm r’āštkm²⁷

Lift up, O Gods, your heads!

Ba‘l can deal with the foe. The verse is addressed to the divine council in this text²⁸ and the phrases in the Psalm are strikingly alike in wording²⁹ and prosodic form. While the Ugaritic verse is preserved

26. III AB B:19–37 (=Gordon 137).

27. *CTA*, 2.1.27.

28. In Ugaritic, the colon represents a classical *Gattung*: “the address to the divine assembly.” The writer has discussed this literary type in another connection in “The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah,” *JNES*, 12 (1953), 274–277. The address in plural imperatives, especially in repetitive form, is characteristic. This reinforces the conclusion that the Psalm passage is a transformation of the “address to the divine council.”

29. The Akkadian idiom *ullū* with *rēšu* can mean “to finish a building or structure to its summit.” However, this usage is unrelated to the Hebrew idiom. Much closer is the sense “to be proud” or “to show independence” (cf. Judg. 8: 28; *Zech.* 2:4; Job 10:15, and *CTA*, 16.3.12 (KRT C). The latter text has been related to Psalm 24 by Father Mitchell Dahood, “Ugaritic Studies and the Bible,” *Gregorianum*, 43 (1962). 77f., who renders the idiom “rejoice.” The passage is ambiguous: the plowmen may be “looking up” at the coming rain, or may be “taking courage” with the coming of the rain, in which case the meaning is much the same as Text 2.1.27.

only in a passage anticipating Ba'l's going to do battle with Yamm (Sea), we can claim confidently, in view of the repetitive style of the Ugaritic texts, that the shout was repeated, addressed to the council of gods, when Ba'l returned in victory to receive the kingship.

The "Ritual Conquest"

Having given the myth-and-ritual school its due, and more, we wish to approach Psalm 24 by a different path. Central to the early cultus of Israel was the reenactment of the Exodus-Conquest: what we may label shortly "the ritual Conquest." While the motif "creation-kingship" is present in Psalm 24 and was especially popular during the monarchy and in apocalyptic, it was by no means central or formative.³⁰

The language of holy war and its symbolism may be said to be the clue to an adequate interpretation of Psalm 24 and its place in the cultic history of Israel. The Glorious King is called *gibbōr milhāmā* and *yahwē šēbā'ōt*. These epithets stem from the old ideology of the league, from the "Songs of the Wars of Yahweh."³¹

30. Neither was it absent in early Israel. The kingship of the gods, including 'El, was a popular theme in Canaanite religion. The common scholarly position that the concept of Yahweh as reigning or as king is a relatively late development in Israelite thought seems untenable in the light of this, and is directly contradicted by the evidence of the earliest Israelite poems. Cf. Num. 23 : Deut. :5 ; Ps. 68 : 25 ; Exod. 15 : ; M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, "Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry" (Ph.D. diss. Johns Hopkins 1950), *passim*. One is astonished by perennial attempts to discover the source of kingship and creation motifs in the Jebusite cult of 'El 'Elyōn (see, for example, Kraus, *Psalmen, I* [Neukirchen, Neukirchener Verlag, 1961] 193-206). In fact, the cult of King 'El (*'ilu milku*) was ubiquitous in Canaan in the Late Bronze Age as we have seen, and the cult of Prince Haddu was well known. Of the many shrines of 'El, Jerusalem was merely one. To be sure, the language of kingship was not used frequently in premonarchic Israel when league forms were ascendant, but with the coming of monarchy and the Canaanite palace-temple of Jerusalem, the language of kingship became popular. But this was the resurgence of an old language, not the introduction of a novel, pagan language. The elements making up Israel derived from Canaanite and Amorite stock, spoke a South Canaanite dialect, and preserved old North Mesopotamian traditions and Canaanite traditions rooted in the second millennium B.C. They did not emerge from the desert as newcomers to Canaanite culture, nor did they speak the language of North Arabia.

31. We see no sufficient evidence to separate the institutions of the League, and the institution of "Jahwekrieg" in their origins (pace R. Smend). Legal and military functions coinhere in the office *šōpēt*, the undifferentiated executive institution of the league; the symbols of covenant-making are at the same time the means of calling up the league militia to holy war. See most recently, R. Polzin. "H WQY" and Covenantal Institutions in Early Israel," *HTR*, 62 (1969), 233-240.

Again, the procession of the Ark, with its immediate background in the Davidic and Solomonic processions to the Jerusalem sanctuary, had a long prehistory in the cult and ritual warfare of Old Israel.

In Numbers 10:35f., we find the archaic formula:

קמה יהוה ויפצו איביך
וינסו משנאיך מפניך

שבה יהוה <ב> רבת³²
<אל ב> אלפי ישראל³³

Arise, Yahweh, let thy enemies be scattered,
Let thy adversaries flee before thee.³⁴

Return, Yahweh [with] the myriads,
[‘El with] the thousands of Israel.

Evidently, these are liturgical fragments rooted in holy war ideology, used secondarily also in the reenactment of the wars of Yahweh.

The “ritual conquest” appears as a basic ingredient of certain **cultic** traditions in Old Israel. And as we examine these traditions, it becomes apparent that the normal locus of holy warfare is discovered in the Exodus-Conquest, not in the primordial battle of creation.

The oldest poetry of Israel, our earliest biblical sources which survive in unrevised form, is marked by a ubiquitous motif: the march of Yahweh from the southern mountains (or from Egypt) with heavenly armies. We may mention first Judges 5:4-5 (compare Psalm 68: 8-9):

בצעדך משדה אדם	יהוה בצאתך משעיר
הרים גולו	ארץ רעשה
זו סיני	מפני יהוה
אלהי ישראל	מפני יהוה

32. The text is corrupt, perhaps hopelessly corrupt, and any reconstruction is speculative. Our suggested reconstruction is patterned on Deut. 33:2-3 and especially Ps. 68: 18 (cf. W. F. Albright, “A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems,” *HUCA*, 23 [1950-51], 14, 24f.).

33. The haplography arose, perhaps, in early orthography: **אלב < אלף** or in any case by homoioarkton.

34. The couplet also appears in slightly variant form, in Psalm 68: 2. Apparently each couplet is the **incipit** of a longer liturgical piece.

When Thou, Yahweh, went forth from Seir,
 When Thou didst march forth from the highlands of Edom,
 Earth shook, mountains shuddered;
 Before Yahweh, Lord of Sinai,
 Before Yahweh, God of Israel.³⁵

In Deuteronomy 33 : 2-3, we read:³⁶

יהו מסני בא
 [] זרח משער לנ
 הפע מהר פרן
 את־מ רבבת קדש
 מימנ אש[ר] ³⁷ [א]לם
 אף חבב ³⁸ עמם

Yahweh from Sinai came,
 He beamed forth from Seir upon us,
 He shone from Mount Paran.

With him were myriads of holy ones
 At his right hand marched the divine ones
 Yea, the purified of the peoples.

Note that here in Deuteronomy 33 : 2, in Judges 5 : 4-5 (*zū Sīnay*), and in Psalm 68: 18, Sinai plays a role in the march of the Conquest. It is integral to Israel's earliest traditions of Exodus-Conquest.

35. The readings are based on a reconstruction of the original text underlying Judges 5:4-5 and Psalm 68:8-9. *[ʔ]p/šmym nṯpw*, "yea, the heavens shook" and *hrym nzlw*, "the mountains shuddered," are ancient oral variants. The verbs are to be derived from *ṯpp* and *zll* respectively. Cf. W. F. Albright, "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems," p. 20; and Isa. 63:19. The colon *gmʿbym nṯpw mym*, missing in Ps. 68, is secondary, attracted to *šmym nṯpw*. It is parallel only after reinterpretation of *nṯpw* as "dripped," and metrically is impossible.

36. We have reconstructed the line in tenth-century B.C. orthography (= Phoenician notation). The readings of the text are defended in F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," *JBL*, 67 (1948), 191-210. Changes in readings from that study are noted below. See also P. D. Miller, "Two Critical Notes on Psalm 68 and Deuteronomy 33," *HTR*, 57 (1964), 240-243, and references to recent studies.

37. For alternate reconstructions, see Miller, "Two Critical Notes," pp. 241ff., and M. Dahood, *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965), p. 52f.

38. *hbb* "to be pure," Akk. *ebēbu* was first suggested to me by George Mendenhall, who compared the use of *iēbibtum* at Mari. However, the meaning "military census"

Psalm 68 : 18 reads :

רכב אלהם רבתם
אלפ שנג [יהו]
ב > בא < מסני בקדש

The chariots of God are two myriads
Two thousand the bowmen³⁹ of Yahweh
When he came from Sinai with the Holy Ones.

To these may be added the old fragment in the Song of Habakkuk
3:3-6:

אלה מתימן יבא וקדש מהר פרן ⁴⁰
כסה שמים הדורה [] תהלתה מלאה [] ארץ ⁴¹
...
לפניו ילך דבר ויצא רשף לרגליו
עמד וימדד ארץ ראה ויתר גוים
[] יתפצצו הררי עד שחו גבעת עלם

God came from the Southland,
And the Holy One from Mount Paran.
His glory covered the heaven,
His praise filled the earth.

...

Before him walked Pestilence,
Plague marched at his feet.
He stood and shook Earth;
He looked and startled the nations.

is by no means undisputed. See *CAD*, IV, 6f., s.v. "ebēbu"; G. E. Mendenhall, "The Census Lists of Numbers 1 and 26," *JBL*, 77 (1958), 52-66, esp. 56. Still the meaning "to be pure," often in a ritual sense, adheres to the root and may carry such meaning here, whatever the special derived sense of *tēbibtum* at Mari. We expect a stative participle plural in the text.

39. On the reading, see W. F. Albright, "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems," pp. 24f. On *lann*, "composite bow," see Albright *apud* Cross, "The Evolution of the Proto-Canaanite Alphabet," *BASOR*, 134 (1954), 19, 24 n. 32.

40. The poem is inscribed in pre-Exilic orthography; the pronominal suffix 3.m.s. was written -h (*uh* > **θ**).

41. The ellipsis dots which follow indicate that the text of v. 4 is badly corrupt. The best reconstruction (though radical) is perhaps that of W. F. Albright in his paper, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, ed. H. H. Rowley [The T. H. Robinson Volume], (Edinburgh, Clark, 1950) pp. 11, 13f.

The ancient mountains were shattered,
The eternal hills collapsed.

In many ways the best example is the Song of the Sea, which will be studied in more detail in the next chapter.

Thou hast faithfully led
The people whom thou hast delivered.
Thou hast guided in thy might
To thy holy encampment.
The peoples heard, they shuddered,
Horror seized the dwellers of Philistia.

...

While thy people passed over, Yahweh,
While thy people passed over whom thou hast created.

Thou didst bring them, thou didst plant them
In the mount of thy heritage. . .⁴²

The relation of this motif, the march of Conquest, to the early Israelite *cultus* has been insufficiently studied. The last-mentioned hymn, in Exodus 15, is rooted in the liturgy of the spring festival ("Pass-over" or *Maṣṣōt*), and it may be argued that it stems originally from the *Gilgalcultus* as early as the twelfth century B.C.⁴³ It rehearses the story of the Exodus in a primitive form, the march of Conquest (vv. 13–18), and after "crossing over," the arrival at the sanctuary (vv. 13, 17).

It will be useful to take the *Gilgalcultus*, so far as we can reconstruct it, as exemplifying the use of the "ritual Conquest" as a movement in the *cultus*. It has been recognized that chapters 3-5 of Joshua preserve traditions derived from the *Gilgal* sanctuary and, especially, traditions of its spring ritual, utilized by the Deuteronomistic historian and probably by earlier tradents to reconstruct the history of *Israe!*'s entry into

42. For the basis of this translation, see *SMir* pp. 237-250 and the next chapter.

43. In addition to this study by David Noel Freedman and the writer (see n. 42 and "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," *JThC*, 5 [1968], 1-25). see now the study from the point of view of linguistic typology, David A. Robertson, "Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry" (Ph. D. diss., Yale, 1966). On page 231 he writes, "But what cannot be challenged without first exposing the inadequacies of [Robertson's] methodology is the use of linguistic evidence as a very strong argument for dating Ex15 early. This is the one unequivocal, firmly grounded conclusion of this study."

the Promised Land.⁴⁴ The festival may be reconstituted from the Joshua materials as follows. (1) The people are required to sanctify themselves, as for holy war, or as in the approach to a sanctuary (Joshua 3: 5). (2) The Ark of the Covenant, palladium of battle, is borne in solemn procession, which is at the same time battle array, to the sanctuary of Gilgal. (3) The Jordan, playing the role of the Red Sea, parts for the passage of the Ark and the people of Israel. The repetition of the Exodus is the transparent symbolism in the processional (Joshua 4: 21-24; compare Psalms 114: 1a, 3-5; 66:6). At the same time, "from Shittim to Gilgal" (Micah 6:5) represents the decisive movement of the Conquest, and Gilgal was the battle camp of the Conquest, "when they passed over."⁴⁵ (4) At the desert sanctuary of Gilgal, twelve stones were set up, memorial to the twelve tribes united in the covenant festival celebrated there; we must understand this festival to be the festival of the old spring New Year. It is explicitly called Passover, and the tradition of eating parched grain and unleavened bread, as well as the etiological notice of the suspension of manna, lends confirmation (Joshua 5 : 10-12).⁴⁶ The setting up of the twelve *maššēbōt* of the *gilgal* is paralleled by Moses' setting up of the "twelve *maššēbōt* for the twelve tribes of Israel" at Sinai (Exodus 24:4) (5) We must note also the circumcision etiology (Joshua 5 :2-8),⁴⁷ and finally (6) the ap-

44. The pioneer study was the essay of H. J. Kraus, "Gilgal. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte Israels," *VT*, 1(1951), 181-199; cf. *Gottesdienst in Israel*, 2nd ed. (Munich, Kaiser Verlag, 1962) pp. 179-189 (literature cited on p. 180, n. 87); M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen, 1953), pp. 32-35; Jan Dus, "Die Analyse zweier Ladeerzählungen des Josuabuches (Jos. 3-4 and 6)," *ZAW*, 72 (1960), 107-134; E. Vogt, "Die Erzählung vom Jordaniibergang: Josue 3-4," *Biblica*, 46 (1965), 125-148; and especially J. A. Soggin, "Gilgal, Passah und Landnahme.. .," *SVT*, 15(1966), 263-277. The last-mentioned study is the most balanced and sensible since Kraus's first paper. It also deals exhaustively with the intervening literature of which we have listed only special items. On the complicated literary-critical problems, see both Soggin and Vogt.

45. One perceives that Joshua 5:1 contains reminiscences of Exodus 15:13-17. When they crossed over (*d'brm*; cf. *d'y'br*), the rulers of Transjordan and Canaan (cf. Exod. 15:15) heard (cf. Exod. 15:14) and melted with fear (cf. Exod. 15:15). At the same time, there is no hint of the sea drying up or of a path through the sea in Exodus 15. These are later accretions, arising precisely from the ritual crossing of the Jordan. See chapter 6.

46. That is to say, later tradition has attributed to the spring festival the elements of variant forms of spring festivals of a later time, elements both of Passover and *Maššōt*. This should not obscure the very early elements in this account (*pace* Kutsch).

47. For parallels between Exod. 12-15 and Josh. 3-5. see Soggin, "Gilgal, Passah und Landnahme," p. 270. He includes circumcision, but strangely omits reference to the twelve stela.

pearance of the (angelic) general of the host of Yahweh (Joshua 5: 13-15: compare Ex. 3:2ff.; 14: 19).

In these fragments of **cultic** tradition we recognize the use of the ritual procession of the Ark as a means of reenactment of the “history of redemption,” of the Exodus-Conquest theme, preparatory to the covenant festival of the spring New Year.⁴⁸

Transformations of the “Ritual Conquest”

As has become evident, our thesis is that the two apparently opposed views of the history of Israel’s **cultus** prove to be complementary. The joining of the motif of Conquest and kingship in the royal cult is readily explained. The ideology of holy war makes possible the transition from the **cultus** of the league to the **cultus** of the kingdom, and ultimately to the ideology of the apocalyptic.

The ideology of holy war in early Israel and in pre-Israelite times was characterized by a number of cosmic elements. This may be seen in the imagery of the heavenly council of Yahweh, which may take on the characteristics of a judicial court or assembly, a royal court, or of a Divine Warrior leading heavenly armies. The “heavenly host” fights in the wars of Yahweh (Judges 5:20, 23; Joshua 10:12-13, and so on): these are the wars of *Yahweh Šēbā’ōt*, “Creator of the heavenly armies.” The cosmic elements give mythic “depth” to the historical events of the Exodus and Conquest. Moreover, we may be sure that the institution of holy war, a primary function of tribal federation, existed in several pre-Yahwistic or non-Yahwistic leagues in southern **Palestine**: Moab, Edom, Ammon, **Midian**, and **Qedar**.⁴⁹ Holy war terminology appears in Moab in the royal period in the **Meša^c** Inscription. In Numbers 21: 27-30, we actually have a fragment of an old song reflecting holy-war ideology in non-Yahwistic circles.⁵⁰ In the ideology

48. The major spring festival of Gilgal, later at Shiloh (and much later in Jerusalem in the time of Josiah), and the major fall festival of Shechem, later in Solomonic Jerusalem (as well as Bethel), are thus variant covenant festivals of old sanctuaries which at different periods or at different seasons played their role as sites of a pilgrim festival of the league.

49. On the Midianite and Qedarite league, see William J. Dumbrell, “The Midianites and Their Transjordanian Successors” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard, 1970). The Qedarite league is called *i’lu ša^d Atar-samayn* (LÚi[’]lu ša DINGIR a-tar-sa-ma-a-a-in) in Assurbanipal’s records, “the amphictyony of ‘Aṭtar-of-the-Heavens.’” On *i’lu*, “amphictyony,” see **CAD, I** under *a’lu/i’lu* (p. 374). See also E. F. Campbell and G. E. Wright, “Tribal League Shrines in Ammon and Shechem,” **BA**, 32 (1969), 104-116.

50. See Paul D. Hanson, “The Song of Heshbon and David’s Nir,” **HTR**, 61 (1968), 297-310.

of these non-Israelite leagues, the mythopoeic motifs of the cosmic warrior no doubt were present. At all events, the cosmic elements and survivals of myth provided a matrix for the reintroduction of the kingship theme and also, especially, of creation motifs of Canaanite or West Semitic lore.

The institution of kingship and the inauguration of a temple in the Canaanite style in Israel obviously gave an occasion for the radical mythologizing of the “historical” festivals, especially the “ritual conquest,” and the procession of the “Ark of the Covenant” of *Yahweh šēbā’ōt yōšēb kērūbīm* (“who is enthroned on the cherubim”). In turn, the cultic institutions of the league tended to decay; covenant forms and festivals languished or were suppressed in the interests of the royal festivals,⁵¹ in which the eternal decrees of God, the choosing of the house of David and Zion, were celebrated. Nevertheless, the “ritual conquest” persisted, transformed, in the royal cultus.

It is only by such a historical analysis of the cultus that we can understand the “processional way” in Second Isaiah, combining notions of cosmic warfare with the theme of the Second Conquest or Exodus, and with the motif of the processional to Zion.⁵²

In Isaiah 40: 3-6 we read :

A voice [of a herald]⁵³ cries:
 “Prepare in the desert the way of Yahweh,
 Make straight in the wilderness a highway for our God.
 Every valley shall be raised up, every hill made low. . .
 And the glory of Yahweh shall be revealed,
 And all flesh see it together.”

The theophany of the Divine Warrior marching victoriously through the desert to Zion with his redeemed appears in like form in Isaiah 35 :

The desert and the wasteland shall exult,
 And the wilderness shall burst into bloom . .

51. The covenant festival of the spring as a national pilgrim feast ceased during the era of kingship until its revival in the Josianic Reform. At least this is the plain meaning of 2 Kings 23 : 21f. See below chapter 9.

52. Were there no processional psalms, the proto-apocalyptic theme of the Second Exodus-Conquest, the way through the desert to Zion, would require the reconstruction of a processional march of the Divine Warrior in the royal cult.

53. On the proclamation of the divine (angelic) herald, in this and other contexts, see the brief paper of the writer, “The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah,” pp. 274-277.

They shall see the glory of Yahweh,
The splendor of our god.

Then follows the address to the divine council:

Strengthen ye the weak hands,
Make firm the wobbly knees,
Proclaim to the fearful of heart,
“Be strong, be not afraid.
Behold your god with vengeance,
With divine recompense he comes,
He comes and saves you.”

Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened,
The ears of the deaf unstopped,
The lame shall leap as the hart,
And the tongue of the dumb sing.

For water shall gush forth in the desert,
Streams in the wilderness. . .

There shall be there a highway and a way,
And it shall be named the “Way of Holiness.”
The unclean shall not pass over it,
And the redeemed shall not ‘stray.
The lion shall not be found there,
Nor shall a beast of prey go up on it.⁵⁴
The redeemed shall walk upon the way,
Those ransomed by Yahweh shall return,
They shall enter Zion with a shout of joy.

Eternal joy shall be on their head
Rejoicing and joy shall pursue (them)
Sorrow and sighing shall flee away.

In Isaiah 51:9–11, we read:

Awake, awake, dress in power, Arm of Yahweh . . .
The repetitive imperative, reminiscent of Canaanite style, begins
an apostrophe to the arm of the Divine Warrior.

54. We have omitted ancient variants which have been conflated in the Massoretic Text.

Awake as in ancient times, primeval generations.
 Was it not thou who smote through Rahab?
 Who pierced Tannin (the dragon)?

The allusion is to the cosmogonic myth, the battle of creation, in which the monster of chaos is slain by the God who thereby establishes kingship.

Was it not thou who dried up Sea,
 The waters of the abysmal Deep?

Suddenly the myth is penetrated by historical memory; the battle with the dragon Sea becomes the redemption from Egypt. Creation and cosmic redemption are one.

Who makes the deep places of the sea a way
 For the redeemed to pass over.
 The redeemed of Yahweh shall return,
 And come with shouts of joy to Zion.

Once again time turns fluid, and the Second Conquest, the new redemption, is described in terms of the old. And yet not precisely. As in Isaiah 35:8-10; 40:3-5, 51:9-10 quoted above, in 44:24-28 and especially in 62: 24-28 (Third Isaiah), the old Exodus-Conquest route,⁵⁵ the way through the wilderness, becomes at the same time the pilgrimage way to Zion. The march of the Conquest abruptly shifts into the festal, ritual procession to Zion. The procession to Zion and the feast on the holy mountain (compare Isaiah 25:6-8; 55: 1-5) have recast, so to speak, or redirected the route of the Exodus and Conquest to lead to Zion.

Isaiah 52:7-12 is another extremely instructive passage. It begins with a picture of the herald of victory and looks forward to the proclamation of God's kingship and to the return of Yahweh to Zion :

How beautiful on the mountains,
 Are the feet of the herald of good tidings,
 Who proclaims peace, who brings tidings of good,

^{55.} See the excellent essay of Bernhard W. Anderson, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York, Harper, 1962), pp. 177-195.

Who proclaims victory,
Who says to Zion: "Thy God reigneth."

Thy watchmen lift up (their) voice,⁵⁶
Together they shout;
For they see, eye to eye,
When Yahweh returns to Zion.

It continues (verses 10-12) with a description of the theophany of the Divine Warrior, the proclamation of release to captives, who are to purify themselves to join the procession which bears the holy vessels, substitutes for the Ark, to Zion. Yahweh marches with Israel.

Yahweh has bared his holy arm
In the eyes of all the nations.
All the ends of the earth see
The victory of our God.

Depart, depart, go out thence,
Touch no unclean thing.
Go out from her midst, cleanse yourselves!
Ye who bear the vessels of Yahweh.
For you go out not in haste,
Nor go in flight:
For Yahweh goes before you,
The God of Israel your rear guard.

In these and other passages (for example, **Hosea 2:16-17⁵⁷**), it is necessary to recognize the wedding of two themes: one derived from

56. *qwl spykns'w* and *spykns'w qwl* were ancient variants conflated to produce the MT.

57. As early as **Hosea (2:16-17)**, the motif of a second Exodus-Conquest may be detected. See H. W. Wolff, *Hosea (BK)*, pp. 49-53. Wolff has missed our discussion of the northern boundary line of Judah (F. M. Cross and J. T. Milik, "Explorations in the Judaean **Buqê'ah**," *BASOR*, 142 [1956], 5-17, esp. 15-17 and note 32). Our brief remarks can be amplified. The boundary runs (according to Joshua 15: 5-7: 18:17-19) from the mouth of the Jordan (11 km. south of ancient Jericho), to Beth Hoglah by 'En **Hajle** over against the **Hajle** ford (5 km. north of the Jordan mouth), one of the few certain identifications in the desert province of Judah. It then passes to the Stone of Bohan, modern **Hajar el-'Ešba'** (cf. R. de Vaux, "Exploration de la region de **Qumrân**," *RB*, 60 [1953], p. 541) north of Beth 'Arabah. The last-named is probably the Iron Age site at Khirbet **Qumrân** since no other sizable Iron Age remains appear south of a line drawn from Beth Hoglah to **Hajar el-'Ešba'** which towers over the cliffs on the south side of the **Wādī Dabr**. The boundary then goes up towards **Dēbir**, a place name preserved in the modern **Wādī Dabr**, from the 'Emeq 'Ākōr. After passing **Gēlīlōt** (with Numbers 18:17), over against the Ascent of Adummim, usually associated with the

the ritual conquest,⁵⁸ one from the procession of the Ark to Zion and the manifestation of Yahweh's kingship.

Tal'at ed-damm but uncertain, the boundary passed En-Shemesh (*'Ēn Ḥôd*) to En-rogel in the Kidron Valley south of Jerusalem. The listing of the towns of the desert province in Joshua 15:61f. is instructive. First named is Beth-'Arabah (Khirbet Qumrln), next Madon, Secacah, and Nibshan, the three royal settlements in the *Buqē'ah* with their elaborate irrigation works (from north to south presumably, Khirbet Abū Tabaq, Khirbet es-Samrah, and Khirbet el-Maqārī), and finally "The City of Salt, and En-gedi." En-gedi is the well-known Tel Jurn. The City of Salt has been identified with Khirbet Qumrln by Noth and, formerly, by the writer. To be preferred, however, is the Iron Age site at 'Ēn Feškah or further south, between the mouth of the Kidron (*Wādī en-Nār*) and 'En Gedi where Iron Age fortresses have been reported.

In exploring the *Buqē'ah* we found that an ancient road, connecting with the southernmost fords of the Jordan, ran up the *Wādī Dabr* through the opening into the *Buqē'ah*, traversed this "little valley" in a southwesterly direction until it branches, one track connecting a little more than a kilometer north of Mar Saba with the old road along the Kidron to Jerusalem, the other track continuing south in the direction of Hebron. On the guard stations along this road from the *Wādī Dabr* entrance to the intersections with the Kidron (*Wādī en-Nār*), see our paper listed above. For travelers coming from Moab, crossing the Jordan at the *Ḥajle* Ford, the road through the *Buqē'ah* to Jerusalem would be as direct and much easier than the *Wādī Qelt* road up from Jericho. Thus Hosea's notion that the *'Emeq 'Ākōr*, the Vale of Trouble, would become the Door of Hope in the Second Conquest appears less farfetched. Certainly the battle camp in the *'Arbōt Mō'āb* tradition lay immediately opposite the southernmost fords of the Jordan from Abel Shittim (Tell el-Ḥammām, south of the *Wādī Kefrein*) southward to Beth-jeshimoth (Numbers 33:49, Tell el'Azeimeh, on the south side of the *Wādī 'Azeimeh*). On the identifications, see N. Glueck, *Explorations in Eastern Palestine IV, AASOR 25-28* (1945-1949), pp. 366-404. On the shift of the site of the Valley of 'Ākōr to the northeast of Jericho, see J. T. Milik, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrān, DJD*. (Oxford, 1962), III, 262. *Gilgal* similarly appears to have been moved north in tradition in association with the Valley of 'Ākōr and Jericho, being connected apparently with the ruins at Khirbet Mefjir. However, the Iron Age remains found thus far at Mefjir appear to be relatively insignificant. Cf. James Muilenburg, "The Site of Ancient Gilgal," *BASOR*. 140 (1955). 11-27.

It is not impossible that Hosea's tradition stemmed from the Jerusalemite cultus (cf. Isaiah 65 : 9f.) which early viewed Jerusalem and the Temple of the Ark as the ultimate goal of the "ritual conquest" : from Shittim to *Gilgal*, and by way of the Valley of 'Ākōr, to Jerusalem! In any case, Hosea may have witnessed the transformation of the 'Ākōr from a barren wasteland into a garden by the elaborate irrigation works built probably in the eighth century B.C. by King Uzziah, who "built towers in the wilderness and hewed out many cisterns. ." (2 Chron. 26: 10). This is a revision of views expressed in F. M. Cross and G. E. Wright, "The Boundary and Province Lists of the Kingdom of Judah," *JBL*, 75 (1956), 202-266. We should now see in the list of towns in the wilderness province (Josh. 15: 61f.) an appendage, later added to the basic list in Josh. 15: 2 1-60. Such a dating conforms better with the epigraphic and ceramic evidence from the *Buqē'ah*.

On the doctrine of the Second Conquest at Qumrln, see Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*, trans. B. and C. Rabin (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), chapter 3; and F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumrān*, 2nd ed. (New York, Doubleday, 1961), p. 78 and note 36a. The typology of the second Exodus-Conquest appears in the use of Isa. 40 (1QS 8:12-14) and Ezek. 20 (1QS 6:2 *mgwryhm*: cf. Ezek. 20:38; IQM I :3 *mabr h'mym*: cf. Ezek. 20:35), etc.

58. In Isaiah 42:10-16 there is a "new song" of the march of Yahweh: "Yahweh

Late Prophetic and proto-apocalyptic eschatology was born of this wedding of kingship and Conquest themes in the cultus. The Day of Yahweh is the day of victory in holy warfare; it is also the Day of Yahweh's festival, when the ritual Conquest was reenacted in the procession of the Ark, the procession of the King of Glory to the Temple, when "God went up with the festival blast, Yahweh with the sound of the horn ... for Yahweh is king of the whole earth."⁵⁹

In apocalyptic, the battle of the sons of light and darkness-the Second Conquest-becomes a central feature of the "last days." At the same time it is the time of the manifestation of the kingdom of God, when the dark powers of chaos and evil are subdued and the new heavens and earth created. Here mythic and historical themes are combined in a radical tension.

Arise, O Warrior,
Take thy captives, O Glorious One,
And gather thy spoil, Doer of Valor.
Put forth thy hand on the neck of thy enemies.
And thy foot on the heaps of the slain.

...
O Zion, rejoice exceedingly;
Break forth with joyful song, O Jerusalem,
And exult, all ye cities of Judah.

Open thy gates forever,
That [men] may bring thee the wealth of nations,
And their kings serve thee.⁶⁰

goes forth as a warrior, as a man of war he stirs his wrath ." In Ezekiel 20:33-42 appears the motif of a second Exodus: "As I live, oracle of the Lord Yahweh, 'surely I will be king over you with a mighty hand, an outstretched arm and wrath poured out, and I will bring you forth from the peoples.'" There is a covenant in the wilderness, and a return to the land and [says Yahweh] "In my holy mountain, in the mountain of the height of Israel . there shall the whole house of Israel worship me. ." See the detailed treatment of W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* (BK13, I), pp. 454-458.

59. Psalm 47 : 6, 8.

60. *Sérek Milhāmā* (1QM)12.9f, 12f.

6 *The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth*

The Mythic Cycle of Baʿl and ʿAnat

Much study has been given in recent years to the mythic cycle of Baʿl and ʿAnat.¹ The texts are written in Canaanite cuneiform² of the mid-fourteenth century B.C. and come from Rās eš-Šāmra, ancient Ugarit. The date of the copies we possess does not answer the more important question of their date of composition, nor does the Ugaritic provenience determine the original setting in which they were first sung. There can be no doubt that this poetic cycle was orally composed. It is marked by oral formulae, by characteristic repetitions, and by fixed pairs of synonyms (a type of formula) in traditional thought rhyme (*parallelismus membrorum*) which marks Semitic oral literature as well as much of the oral literature throughout the world.³ Moreover, their repertoire of traditional formulae overlaps broadly with that of the

1. This chapter is a revised and expanded form of the writer's essay, "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," *JThC*, 5 (1968), 1-25; it rests, too, on *SMir*, pp. 237-250 [= *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, Baltimore, 1950 (microfilm-reprint, Ann Arbor, 1961, pp. 84-127)].

2. The appearance of tablets in a simple cuneiform alphabetic script from three sites in Palestine, as well as a second type of alphabetic cuneiform at Ugarit, makes clear that the system had wide usage in Syria-Palestine and cannot be viewed as a local Ugaritic script. That the cuneiform alphabet was not originally designed for the Ugaritic dialect should have already been clear from such evidence as the existence of the grapheme *d*, a sign for the voiced dental spirant which at Ugarit had already merged with the stop *d*. It may be that the secondary development of the ^ʾ*alep* sign into 'a, 'i, and 'u is a local Ugaritic phenomenon designed to facilitate transcription of Hurrian, but even this is uncertain. Very likely, the center for the radiation of the Canaanite cuneiform alphabet was central Phoenicia. However, we shall have to await systematic archaeological exploration of the great port cities before we can be sure; these cities have escaped major excavations carried out with modern techniques.

3. See the epoch-making work on the character of oral literature by A. B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1960). The methods of formula analysis developed by Milman Parry, Albert Lord, and their followers furnish new tools to attack both Ugaritic and early biblical literature. For the analysis of Ugaritic literature utilizing these methods, see Richard Whitaker's forthcoming study based on his Harvard dissertation, "A Formulaic Analysis of Ugaritic Poetry" (1970). Among other things, they sharply undercut theoretical conceptions of oral transmission presently ruling certain circles of both Old and New Testament scholars and may very well have an impact on the analysis of biblical tradition comparable to that of *Gattungsforschung* which similarly developed first in Homeric studies. See also the paper of R. Jakobson, "Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet," *Language*, 42 (1966), 399-429. (This study is wider in scope than its title suggests.)

earliest Hebrew poetry, a circumstance impossible to explain unless a common tradition of oral literature embraced both Israel in the south and Ugarit in the north. In view of this shared oral repertoire, its formulae, its themes, and its prosodic patterns, it seems highly likely that the mythic cycle stems from the main centers of Canaanite culture and dates in terms of its earliest oral forms no later than the Middle Bronze Age (1800-1500 B.C.). Such a context is confirmed both by the geographical terms preserved in the corpus and by its archaizing diction.⁴

The mythic themes in the Baʿl texts share much in common with the Phoenician traditions preserved by Sakkunyaton (Sanchuniathon), and for that matter, in the Bible. At a greater distance, we also can perceive now the influence of the Canaanite theme of the battle with the sea-dragon in the Mesopotamian creation epic, *Enuma eliš*,⁵ and in the Greek myth of *Typhoeus-Typhon*.⁶ At all events, we must insist that in the Baʿl cycle we are dealing with a version of a mythic literature common to the Canaanites and to those who shared their culture from the border of Egypt to the Amanus in the Middle and Late Bronze Age.

When first the content of this complex of myths becomes clear, we find a conflict developing between Prince Sea and mighty Baʿl-Haddu.⁷ The scene portrays Yamm, Sea, sending his divine pair of messengers to the assembly of the gods held at the tabernacle” of ‘El located at the source of the double-deep, at the cosmic mountain, that is, at the gates to heaven and the entry into the abyss. Prince Yamm, alias Judge River, demands that Baʿl be given over to him as a captive and that his, Yamm’s, lordship be acknowledged.

4. The contrast between the prose of letters from Ugaritic and the older parts of the mythic literature is very striking.

5. See above, chapter 5, n. 11.

6. Professor David Flusser has reminded me of the unmistakable ties of the Typhon myth with the East. Apollodorus, *Bibl.* I, 5, 3.7ff. describes Typhon’s birth of Gaia and Tartarus in Cilicia and Zeus’ battle with Typhon on Mount Cassios (Hittite *Hazi*, Canaanite *Ṣapōn*). Cf. Homer, *Iliad* 2, 782f.; Hesiod, *Theog.*, 820ff. Compare also the curious story of the she-dragon and Typhon in Horn., *Hymn to Apollo*, 300-375. The Hittite myth of Illuyanka has also influenced the form of the Typhon myth, but in general is further removed from the Greek theme than the Canaanite. Cf. E. von Schuler, in *WM*, I, 178.

7. Mesopotamian Adad < Hādād < Haddu. Compare Phoenician Dagōn (Hebrew dāgān) < Dāgān Dagnu, etc.

8. See above, chapter 3, note 112; and chapter 2, notes 143 and 144.

The council is cowed, and despite Ba'l's rebuke, 'El, patriarch of the gods, replies to the terrible ambassadors of Yamm :

'abduka ba'lu ya-yammu-mi
'abduka ba'lu [la-'ôla]mi
bin dagani 'asiruka-mi

Ba'l is thy slave, O Sea,
Ba'l is thy slave forever,
The son of Dagan thy prisoner.'

Ba'l in this decree of the assembly comes under the sway of Prince Sea. After a break in the text we hear **Kôtar**, craftsman of the gods, predicting a victory of Ba'l over his captors:

la-ragamti laka la-zubûli ba'li
taniti la rākibi 'urapāti
hitta 'ibaka ba'lu-mi
hitta 'ibaka timḥaṣu
hitta taṣmit(u)ṣarrataka

tiqqaḥu mulka 'ôlamika
darkata data dārdārika

Let me speak to you, O Prince Ba'l,
Let me recite (to you), O Rider of the Clouds :

Behold, thy enemy, O Ba'l,
Behold, thy enemy thou shalt smite,
Behold, thou shalt smite thy foes.

Thou shalt take thy eternal kingship,
Thy dominion forever and ever."

Kôtar fashioned two clubs for Ba'l and gave them magical names:

9. **CTA**, 2.1.36f. Note the pattern abc:abd:efg, and the chiasm of the last line. The enclitic *-mi* provides perfect overall symmetry of line (9: 9: 9) as well as rhyme.

10. **CTA**, 2.47-10. Cf. Ps. 92:10. The metrical forms in the passage are typical. Each unit is symmetrical: a bicolon I I :11 (in syllables); a tricolon 8:8: 8 (9); and a bicolon 9:9. The tricolon is in climactic parallelism (abc:abd:aef). The final bicolon is marked by strong assonance, especially with the repetition of the syllables **ka** and **da(r)**.

Simuka 'atta yagarriš
 yagarriš garriš yamma
 garriš yamma la-kussi'ihī
 nahar(a) la-kaḥṭi darkatihū

Thy name is Yagarriš ("Let him drive out ..."):
 Yagarriš, drive out Sea!
 Drive out Sea from his throne,
 River from the seat of his dominion."

Simuka 'atta 'By-yammari
 'āy-yamarri marri yamma
 marri yamma la-kussi'ihū
 nahar(a) la-kaḥṭi darkatihū

Thy name is 'Ay-yamarri ("Ho! let him rout ..."):
 'Ay-yamarri rout Sea
 Rout Sea from his throne,
 River from the seat of his dominion.¹²

With clubs, Ba'l overcomes Yamm :

yaparsih yammu/yaqul la-'arši
 tinnagisna pinnātihū/wa-yadlup tamūnihū
 yaqtu Ba'lu/wa-yaštī yamma
 yakalliyu¹³ t̄āpiṭa nahara

Sea fell,	He sank to earth,
His joints trembled,	His frame collapsed.
Ba'l destroyed,	Drank Sea!
He finished off Judge River. ¹⁴	

ii. **CTA**, 2.4.11–13. The names like personal names and divine names are verbal elements, shortened from sentence names. In this passage as in the following, the two bicola are interlocked by repetition to form what is in effect a tetracolon in a variation of climactic parallelism.

12. **CTA**, 2.4.19f. 'āy is cognate with Hebrew *hōy* or 'ōy.

13. The vocalization of prefixal verb forms in the perfect sense, or better, for historical narration, is here puzzling. Apparently **yaqtul** and **yaqtulu** can be placed in "impressionistic" parallelism, quite as *qatal* and *yaqtul* are placed in parallel. We should expect **yaqtul** not **yaqtulu/a**. For a discussion of the use of the standard Canaanite verb forms, see W. L. Moran, *A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets* (Xerox reprint, Ann Arbor, University microfilms, 1961) pp. 4352.

14. **CTA**, 2.4.25ff. In the battle, the meter shifts into staccato form. Described in terms of the Ley-Sievers system the passage scans: 2:2::2:2,2:2:3 or one could read 4:4, 4:3.

Then comes the shout:

yamma la-mitu	ba'lu-miyamlu[ku]
Sea verily is dead ;	Ba'l rules! ¹⁵

The completion of the palace on Mt. Şapōn is the occasion then of a decree by 'El, father of the gods, that a temple be built for Ba'l, king of the gods. The craftsman Kōtar constructs a palace so that Ba'l exults:

ahātiya baniti dāta kaspi
hēkalīya data-mi ħurāṣi

My temple I have built of silver,
My palace, indeed, of gold.¹⁶

The completion of the palace on Mt. Şapōn is the occasion then of a great feast of the gods, celebrating Ba'l's installation and inaugurating the temple cult.

A second conflict then developed, a struggle between Ba'l and the ruler of the underworld, Mot (Death). If Y amm represented the unruly powers of the universe who threatened chaos, until restricted and tamed by Ba'l, then Mot, 'El's dead son, represents the dark chthonic powers which bring sterility, disease, and death. The drama, however, is still a cosmogony, the victory of the god of life.

Ba'l and his entourage, Clouds, Winds, and Rain, together with the goddesses "Misty One, daughter of Bright Cloud, Dewy One, daughter of Showers"" went down into the Underworld city of dread Mot. The

The former is more accurate since there is internal parallelism. However, an accentual scheme of scanning is not as efficient in revealing the symmetry of the cola as syllable counting. In syllables the cola count is 5: 5, 8 : 7, and 5 : 5:: IO. We note the symmetry is by bicola in the first lines, but two short cola precisely balance a long colon (5:5::10) in the last lines. In general we prefer to speak of building blocks of short cola for which the *siglum* will be b (*breve*), and long cola signified by l (*longum*). The present passage thus scans: b:b, b:b, b:b::l. Mixed meter of the type l:l,l:l:l, b:b::b:b, b:b::l,l::b:b is typical of Ugaritic epic style. In pure form it is found only in the earliest Hebrew poetry, notably the Song of the Sea, the Song of Deborah (Judges 5), the Lament of David, and Psalm 29. (Provisionally see C-F. *pussim*).

15. CTA, 2.4.32.

16. CTA, 4.6.36ff. I have translated "temple" and "palace" in the singular. Actually the terms are plural: "temple complex." Cf. Hebrew *miškānōt*, "tent shrine."

17. CTA, 5.5.10f. *'immaku Pidrayyu bitta'āri' immaka tallayyabitta rabbi*. With Ba'l also are "seven squires (*ġalamika*), eight knights" (*hunzirika*, lit., "boars").

scene is a fearful one :

[Saptu la-'a]rši Saptu la-šamêmi
 [ya'arrik la]šāna la-kabkabima
 ya'rub ba'lu ba-pihu
 la-kabidihu yarid

[One lip to ea]rth, one lip to heaven,
 [He stretched out his] tongue to the stars.
 Ba'l entered his mouth,
 Descended into his maw."

He became a slave to Mot "in the midst of his city Ooze, Decay the seat of his enthronement, Slime the land of his **heritage**."¹⁹ Ultimately the message is brought to 'El :

ki mita 'al'iyānu ba'lu
 ḥaliqa zubulu ba'l'arši

Mighty Ba'l is dead indeed,
 The Prince lord of earth has **perished**.²⁰

'Anat the consort of Ba'l appears to succor her lord, giving battle to Mot:

ti'ḥad bin 'ili-mi môt(a)
 ba-ḥarbi tabaqqi'unannu
 ba-ḥaṭri tadrīyunannti
 ba-'išti tašrupunnannū
 ba-riḥēma tiḥānannū
 ba-šadī tadarri'unnū

She seized 'El's son Mot.
 With a sword she sliced him;

18. *CTA*, 5.2.2–4. The reconstruction is based in part on *CTA*, 23.61f., partly on *Isa*. 57:4. Cf. *Isa*. 5:14; *Hab*. 2:5; *Prov*. 1:12; *Ps*. 141:7; and *Jon*. 2:6. The structure is b:b::l,l:l[5:6 (= 11)::12.8:8]. The paired formulae in the final bicolon have been reversed. Such errors often occur in oral literature when it is dictated to a scribe, not sung and hence controlled by music, as A. B. Lord has shown (*The Singer of Tales*, pp. 124–138). Several errors involving reversed formulae in the Ugaritic corpus can be corrected by parallel passages.

19. The description is found in *CTA*, 5.2.15; cf. 4.8.12.

20. Cf. *CTA*, 5.6.9; 6.1.4; 6.3.1.

With a sieve she winnowed him:
 With a fire she burnt him;
 With millstones she ground him ;
 In the field she scattered him.²¹

The imitative magic of Canaanite fertility rites could not be more obvious than here. With the victory of 'Anat, the dead god is strewn to fertilize the fields.

In the next episode, the god 'El sees in a prophetic vision the outcome of 'Anat's (and hence Ba'l's) victory over Death:

wa-himma ḥayyu 'al'iyānu ba'lu
 wa-himma 'iṭē zubulu ba'l 'arši

...

šamāmi šamna tamattirūna
 naḥalūma talikū nubta-mi

Behold, Mighty Ba'l lives;
 Behold, the Prince, lord of earth exists.

...

The heavens rain oil,
 The wadis flow with mead.**

The divine warrior Ba'l, after yet another combat with the dead god, returns to take up his government, sitting as king of the gods.

In addition to these major themes we find elsewhere in our texts reference to Ba'l and 'Anat's battle with a dragon called Lôtān, biblical Leviathan :

ki timḥaṣlôtāna baṭna barīḥa
 takalliyu baṭna 'aḳalatāna
 šilyaṭa di Sab'ati ri'ašīma
 tiṭkaḥū titrapū šamāmi
 ka-ri <ka> sī'ipādika

21. *CTA*, 6.2.30-35. In the last colon, the second *n* of *tdr'nn* is taken as a dittography. The vocalization of 'iṣt assumes that the doubling of *š* in Hebrew and Aramaic is secondary.

22. *CTA*, 6.3.3f., 6f. Probably the conjunctions beginning the two cola of the first bicolon should be dropped as secondary. Cf. 6.3.9, 21. Note again the *-mi (-mu)* particle used *metricausa*.

When you (Ba‘l)²³ smote Lôtān the ancient dragon,
 Destroyed the crooked serpent,
 Šhilyaṭ with the seven heads,
 (Then) the heavens withered (and) drooped
 Like the loops of your garment.²⁴

The cosmogonic form of the passage is clear (“when ... then,” the standard structure), as are parallels in biblical literature. The beast of Revelation 12, the dragon of Canaanite myth, and *Tiāmat* of *Enūma eliš* all have seven heads. Typhon is many-headed.

Variants to the Lôtān theme are found recorded in the Ugaritic texts in apparent contradiction. ‘Anat slew both Yamm and/or the crooked serpent in two extant texts:

Did I (‘Anat) not smite the beloved of ‘El, Sea?
 Did I not destroy ‘El’s River, Rabbim?
 Did I not muzzle the dragon (*tnn*)?
 I smote the crooked serpent
 Šhilyaṭ of seven heads.²⁵

ba’arši mḥnm ṭarapa yamma
 lašanāmi tilḥakā šamēma
 taṭrupā yamma ḡanabatāmi
 tunnāna²⁶ lā-šabūma tašīt
 tirkas la-miryami laba[nāni]

In the land of Mḥnm he (the dragon) swirled the sea.
 His double tongue flicked the heavens:
 His double tail swirled the sea.
 She fixed the unmuzzled dragon ;
 She bound him to the heights of Leba[non].²⁷

23. Ba‘l must be addressed, to judge from the form *tkly.takalliyu*. If ‘Anat were addressed, the form would be *tkl* (takallī < *takalliyī) or *tkln*. However, it is ‘Anat who smites the dragon in *CTA*, 3.3.38f. Cf. *PRU*, 11.1.1 (Ba‘l smites the dragon?) and *PRU*, 11.3.3-11.

24. Text 5.1.1-5. The first tricolon is remarkably symmetrical. W. F. Albright’s article written in 1941 is still useful: “Are the Ephod and the Teraphim Mentioned in Ugaritic Literature?” *BASOR*, 83 (1941), 39f. Note the biblical parallels: Ps. 74:14; Isa. 27:1; Job 26:10; Rev. 12:9. Isa. 34:4 is thoroughly reminiscent of the final bicolon.

25. *CTA*, 3.3.35-39.

26. On this vocalization, see *Ugaritica* V, 137.8 (pp. 240f.). The form *quttāl.tunnān* is augmentative, evidently, used along side of *tannin* and *tannittu*.

27. *PRU*, 11.3.3-1 I. Cf. Job 40:25.

In the biblical parallels to these texts it is clear that there is full identification between Yamm and the dragon (Isa. 27: 1, and especially Isa. 51:9–10).

It is easiest to suppose that the tale of *Yamm-Nahar* elaborated in the cycle has a major variant in the myth of *Lôtān*, the sea dragon. One may compare the confusion in Greek mythology between Typhoeus, Typhon, and the old she-dragon of Delphi. In the extant tradition, the dragon motif appears as a torso only, but we can imagine that in Canaan as in Mesopotamia and Israel, Sea was portrayed as a seven-headed dragon, a dragon to be slain in order to establish the rule of the warrior-king of the gods. Such variation and unevenness in oral cycles of myth and epic are not surprising; indeed they are characteristic of the genre.

The interpretation of the myth of Ba'l is not an easy task, as becomes apparent in the diverse literature devoted to the subject. One scholar will claim that the old Canaanite myths do not speak of "creation," despite the attribution in biblical lore of these myths to the time of the beginning or of the end (the new creation). Another will characterize the entire complex cycle as an elaborated cosmogonic myth, and hence properly called a "creation story." One of the problems is the confusion of two types of myths, owing to the tendency to approach Canaanite and other Near Eastern myth utilizing the biblical creation story as a yardstick. Often this is an unconscious prejudice. The biblical creation accounts, however, are atypical. The "primordial" events have been radically historicized in the Israelite environment so that the beginning is "merely" a first event in a historical sequence.

We have distinguished above²⁸ two ideal forms of "creation" myth, one the theogony, the other the cultic cosmogony. The theogonic myth normally uses the language of time; its events were of old. The cultic cosmogony may or may not use time language. Yet the myth always delineates "primordial" events, that is, events which constitute cosmos and, hence, are properly timeless or cyclical or "eschatological" in character. It appears to us that the myths of combat with Yamm, Mot, and *Lôtān* are indeed cosmogonic myths, primitive in that there is no reference to the beginning, that is, no explicit time language. The Ba'l cycle relates the emergence of kingship among the gods. The tale of the establishment of a dynastic temple and its *cultus* is a typical *subtheme* of the cosmogony and its ritual and is found also in *Eniima eliš* and, as we shall see, in the Bible.

28. See above in the final section of chapter 2.

The Song of the Sea

We turn now to the archaic victory song in Exodus 15 :1 b-1 8. ²⁹ Much debate has been expended recently on the date of the song. The poem is to be dated by (1) the **typology** of its language, (2) the **typology** of its prosody, (3) orthographic analysis, (4) the **typology** of the development of Israel's religion, (5) the history of tradition, and (6) historical allusions. Most scholars have based their datings on the last three methods. The first two are more objective techniques; the third is a precarious procedure at best since usually it depends on the failure of scribes to revise spellings to later orthographic systems owing to misunderstanding or corruption of, the **text**.³⁰

We have argued **elsewhere**³¹ that the language of Exodus 15 is more consistently archaic than that of any other prose or poetic work of some length in the Bible.³² The poem conforms throughout to the prosodic patterns and canons of the Late Bronze Age. Its use of mixed metrical structure, its extreme use of climactic (repetitive) parallelism, internal rhyme and assonance, place it alongside the Song of Deborah. The latest comparable poems are Psalm 29 and the Lament of David.

29. Recent bibliography can be found in S. E. Loewenstamm, **The Tradition of the Exodus in its Development** [Hebrew] (Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1965). pp. 146-150. To the works cited there should be added now, D. N. Freedman, "Archaic Forms in Early Hebrew Poetry," **ZA W**, 72 (1960). 101-107; M. Dahood, "Nādā 'To Hurl' in Ex. 15, 16," **Biblica**, 43 (1962), 248f.; L. S. Hay, "What Really Happened at the Sea of Reeds," **JBL**, 83 (1964), 397-403; G. Fohrer, **Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus**, **BZA W**, 91 (Berlin, 1964), pp. 110-1 16; N. Lohfink, **Das Siegeslied am Schilfmeer** (Frankfurt am Main, 1965), pp. 103-128 (also "De Moysis epinicia," **Verbum Domini**, 41[1963], 277-289); G. W. Coats, "The Traditio-Historical Character of the Reed Sea Motif," **VT**, 17 (1967), 253-265; J. Muilenburg, "A Liturgy on the Triumphs of Yahweh," **Studia biblica et semitica**, Vriezen Volume (Wageningen, 1966), pp. 233-251; G. W. Coats, "The Song of the Sea," **CBQ**, 31 (1969), 1-17; and B. S. Childs, "A Traditio-Historical Study of the Reed Sea Tradition," **VT**, 20 (1970), 406,418. and references. The writer has also had the benefit of studying a forthcoming article of D. N. Freedman, "Strophe and Meter in Exodus 15." Mention must also be made of the Yale dissertation of David A. Robertson, "Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry" (1966) which eventually will bring an end to the discussion of the date of the poem, at least for those with training in the history of the Canaanite dialects.

30. The several orthographic systems represented at **Qumrân** have enriched our knowledge of scribal practices in revision, both in the direction of modernization and in certain traditions in attempts to archaize. See the writer's discussion in "The Contribution of the **Qumrân** Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text," **IEJ**, 16(1966), esp. 89f., and references.

31. **SMir**, pp. 237-250.

32. This evidence has been extended by Robertson, "Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry."

The former is a Canaanite hymn borrowed by Israel probably in the tenth century but older in its original form.³³ The Lament of David is doubtless a tenth-century work. While it uses an archaic elegiac meter,³⁴ the patterns of climactic parallelism have largely disappeared.

33. See below, chapter 7, for discussion and references.

34. The lament is written in b:b::b:b meter (in stress notation, 2:2::2:2 [not 2:2, or 4:4]), broken by refrains in 1:1:1 (twice) and 1:1 (once, in conclusion). The structure of the refrain has not been understood owing to the corruption of its first use at the beginning of the poem. It can, however, be reconstructed. Let us review the refrain structure beginning at the end and working back to the beginning:

איכה] נפלו גברים	1(8)	v. 27
] יאבדו כלי מלחמה	1(8)	
איכה] נפלו גברים	1(8)	v. 25
בתוך]מלחמה ינתן	1(8)	
עלי במתיך חלל	1(8)	
הו] צבי ישראל <שאול>	1(8)	v. 19
עלי במתיך חלל	1(8)	
איכה] נפלו גברים		

How the warriors have fallen ;
Perished the weapons of war.

How the warriors have fallen,
In the midst of battle, Jonathan
On thy heights slain.

Ho, prince (lit. gazelle) of Israel, Saul
On thy heights slain
How the warriors have fallen !

The use of the name of a male animal as a noble or military title is now well known. Precisely this usage of *šby*, “gazelle,” “noble” is found in the *KRT* Epic (*CTA*, 15.4.6f.):

šh šb'm t̄ry
tmnym zbyy
t̄r Ḥbr rbt

Summon my seventy peers (ht. “bulls”),
My eighty lords (lit. “gazelles”),
The nobles (lit. “bulls”) of Great Ḥubur.

A confusion of the familiar אלים, אילים, “chiefs” (cf. Exod. 15:15 below) and אלים “gods” probably lies behind the corrupt text of Judg. 5: 8 :

יבחרו אלים חדשים 1 (8)
אזי ל-ק-חם שערים 1 (8)

In this regard it shares prosodic form with eleventh century poems, Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33, and the tenth-century hymn 2 Samuel 22 = Psalm 18.³⁵

We have collected some orthographic data which would suggest a tenth-century date or earlier for its being put first into writing.³⁶

We shall discuss at some length below the question of the place of the Song of the Sea in Israel's early cult. In our view, the hymn is not merely one of the oldest compositions preserved by biblical sources. It is the primary source for the central event in Israel's history, the Exodus-Conquest. In its present context, and originally, I believe, it was associated with the cultus of the old spring New Year's festival.³⁷ Apparently, the song was preserved in both strands of Israel's Epic tradition, that is, both in the Yahwistic version of the Epic (Exodus 15:1b-18) and in the Elohist (Exodus 15:21), where only the *incipit* of the hymn, that is, its name, is cited. The view that the

They choose new leaders,

Yea, they took for themselves captains (lit. "bucks").

The loss of *š'wl* after *yšr'l* is a simple haplography, probably of the fourth-third century when *waw* and *rēš* were virtually identical in form. The structure of the refrains can be described as follows:

v. 19 abc (tricolon)

v. 25 cab (tricolon)

v. 27 ad (bicolon)

Hence colon "a" of v. 25, *btwk mlhnh ywntn*, should be precisely parallel to colon "a" of v. 19, *hw šby yšr'l š'wl*. Symmetry thus requires the restoration of the personal name paired with "Jonathan" elsewhere in the lament.

35. Cf. Cross and Freedman, "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving," *JBL*, 72 (1953), 15-34; W. F. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, ed. H. H. Rowley (Edinburgh, Clark, 1950), pp. 1-10, and especially his general discussion of the typology of early prosody, YGC, chapter 1 (pp. 1-52).

36. *SMir*, pp. 243-250 (notes to the text).

37. We must posit two New Year's festivals in the early cult of Israel, both covenant-renewal festivals. The autumn festival, falling on the New Year common to Canaan and Egypt, in Israel became the great feast of the era of kingship, both in Jerusalem and Beth'el. The spring New Year, with its ultimately Mesopotamian connections, appears to have been the time of the major festival at the old league sanctuaries of Gilgal and Shiloh, a covenant festival which virtually disappeared during the monarchy as a national pilgrimage feast, until the archaizing reforms of Josiah (2 Kings 23:22; cf. 2 Chron. 30:1-26). The associations of the Gilgal rites with the spring, with the covenant, with the sea crossing and the "ritual conquest," seem very clear indeed. I am not interested here in speculating on the origins and history of the feasts of Passover and *Maššôt*, and their conflation in later tradition, at least in the present discussion. The problems are, of course, very complex. B. S. Childs' comments, "a Traditio-Historical Study of the Reed Sea Tradition," p. 415, are based on a misunderstanding of my reconstruction of the Gilgalcultus.

incipit, or the first line of the Song of the Sea, is itself the archaic hymn, the body of the victory song having been appended secondarily, survives long after the theoretical structure which permitted such an analysis has vanished. The notion that old Israel in its early stages was incapable of composing or listening to long compositions, and that "early" and "short" were in effect synonymous, stems especially from the idealistic and romantic views of the last century, expressed in most painful form by Hermann Gunkel.³⁸

The poem must have been available to the Yahwist no later than the early tenth century B.C., and if we posit it as common to both Epic sources, we are pushed back into the era of the league and to the common lore of its chief shrines.

In short all the evidence points to a premonarchic date for the Song of the Sea, in the late twelfth or early eleventh century B.C..

The allusion to the Philistines in v. 14 has been a severe barrier to any dating of the Song of the Sea before the late twelfth century B.C. Customarily the date of the arrival of the Philistines in the maritime plain of Palestine has been placed in the reign of Ramses III at the beginning of the twelfth century. The reference then would be anachronistic, and sufficient time would have to pass for the precise time of the coming of the Philistines to be forgotten. New evidence concerning the fall of the Hittite empire, the conquests of Ugarit and Cyprus, and the southern sweep of the Sea Peoples requires that the date of the first Philistine settlements be placed a good deal earlier, in the reigns of Ramses II (1304-1237) and Merneptah (1237-1225).³⁹ This earlier date of the Sea Peoples' settlement eases somewhat the problem of the mention of the Philistines in a poem purporting to describe the inhabitants of the land in the era of the Israelite Conquest. Other references, to the chieftains of Edom and the nobles of Moab, reflect cor-

38. This view appeared to be supported by short couplets or verses embedded in the old sources of the Pentateuch, and also, perhaps, by the shortness of original oracle units in Prophecy. In the latter case, brevity belongs to the ecstatic origins of the oracle form. In the case of the Epic materials, however, we are inclined to reconstruct a long and rich poetic epic of the era of the league, underlying JE, and to take the prose epic variants (with their surviving poetic fragments) preserved in the P work (i.e., the Tetrateuch, JEP) as truncated and secondary derivatives. In any case, we possess long, poetic epics from old Canaan, from ancient Mesopotamia, and Homeric Greece, and to find the same phenomenon in Israel would not be surprising.

39. See W. F. Albright, *CAH²*, chapter XXXIII (pp. 24-33 in preliminary publication), and his references. Cf. YGC, pp. 157-164: G. Ernest Wright, "Fresh Evidence for the Philistine Story," *BA*, 29 (1966), 70-86.

rectly (contrary to Epic tradition [JE]) the terminology of the brief premonarchical period in these nations founded in the thirteenth century. This picture can hardly be explained as studied archaizing.⁴⁰

The allusion to the *n^ewê qodšēka* (v. 13) cannot be used as an argument for late date. It is a specific designation of a tent-shrine.⁴¹ Similarly the expression “mount of thy possession” gives no hint of the date of the poem; it is a formula in the oral literature of Canaan in the Late Bronze Age, a standard way for a poet, in Ugarit⁴² or in Israel, to specify the special seat of the deity, either his cosmic shrine or its earthly counterpart; often it stands in parallelism to *ks’u tbt* (compare *mākōn lešibtekā* in Exodus 15 :17).⁴³ The identification of the sanctuary in v. 17 will be discussed below.

A comment should be made on the use of the “tenses,” which bears both on the question of the age of the hymn and on its interpretation. Consistently *yaqtul* is used to express narrative past, precisely as in Old Canaanite of the Byblus-Amarna correspondence and in Ugaritic. Thus it stands in parallelism frequently with *qatal* forms.⁴⁴ In verses 16b and 17 we should take the *yaqtul* forms, *ya’ābōr, tēbī’ēmō,* and *tiṭṭā’ēmō,* as preterit in force. In this case the conquest is not anticipated but is described along with the event at the sea, as a past event. Only with the later misunderstanding of this archaic tense usage was the poem attributed to Miriam or to Moses, in Epic (JE) tradition. It is to be noted, moreover, that this misunderstanding is very ancient.

The hymn falls into two major sections by content and structure, Part I (vv. 1b-12) describing the victory of Yahweh over the Egyptians

40. On the “non-mention” of Ammon, see *SMir*, p. 239, and Loewenstamm, *The Tradition of the Exodus*, pp. 113f.

41. See *SMir*, p. 248, n. 42; and D. O. Edzard, “Altbabylonisch *nawūm*,” *ZA*, 19 (1959). 1688173, and most recently YGC, p. 27, n. 63. The basic meaning is “pastoral abode” or “encampment.” On the localization of the tent shrine, see below.

42. See *CTA*, 1.3.1; 3.6.16; 4.8.14; 5.2.16; 3.3.27; 3.4.64.

43. See *CTA*. 1.3.1; 3.6.15; 4.8.13; 5.2.16; cf. 1 Kings 8:13, a quotation from the Book of Yašar, and Ps. 89:15.

44. In v. 5 *yēkasyūmū* parallel to *yārēdū*; in v. 7 *tahārōs, tēšallah, yōkelēmō* parallel to (v. 8) *ne’ermū, niššēbū,* and *qāpē’ū*; v. 14 *šāmē’ū* parallel to *yirgāzūn*; v. 15 *nibhālū* parallel to *yōhāzēmō,* to *nāmōgū, tippōl,* and *yiddēmū*. While *yaqtul* forms (<*yaqtulu*) are also used of the future (v. 9 and v. 18), for the most part *yaqtul* has preterit force. Often in early poetry, for example, in Judges 5 and 2 Samuel 22. this stage of verbal usage has been obscured by the introduction of **wow-consecutive** at the beginning of cola. Fortunately, the Song of Miriam is preserved in pristine form. Cf. the discussion of this phenomenon in Cross and Freedman, “A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18,” *JBL*, 72 (1953), 17–20.

Sea, of Israel's walking through the sea, and of the walls of water is a mark of its high antiquity. The Song of the Sea alone of the traditions of the Exodus escaped this shaping by rite and preserved an older version of the event. The poet knew only of a storm at sea and the sinking into the sea of the Egyptians. To be sure, the elements of myth which created the **Gilgal** rites were present in early Israel, and the pattern of the myth makes itself felt more fully in the second portion of the hymn. One must conclude, however, that influence of the mythic pattern is extraordinarily restrained in Part I, a restraint which can be due only to the force of historical impulses in Israel's earliest Epic traditions.

Part II of the Song of the Sea preserves materials of special interest to the historian of tradition. Two passages require discussion.

While your people passed over, Yahweh
While your people passed over whom you created ...
(Exodus 15: 16b)

What does this couplet mean? The first **strophe** of this section described Yahweh's leading of Israel through the wilderness. Israel is brought to the "holy encampment" of Yahweh. Conceivably this expression might apply to a shrine in Sinai or Qadesh. Much more likely, in view of the **cultic** function of the hymn, is the battle encampment of Shittim, that is, the traditional site from which Israel launched her conquest across Jordan and where the procession of the Ark began in the early traditions of Joshua.¹⁰² The **strophe** which the above couplet concludes describes the dread which overwhelmed the enemy in the land as Israel was poised for Holy War. In effect Yahweh had already defeated the enemy in accord with the ideology of Holy War. In this context we must certainly understand the words of the couplet to refer to the crossing of the river, to the "passing over" into the land through Jordan : "from Shittim to **Gilgal**" (Micah 6 : 5).

You brought them, you planted them
In the mount of your possession,
The dais of your throne
Which you made, Yahweh,

102. It is in the same encampment in the plains of Moab that Moses, according to Deuteronomistic lore, preached the great sermons that make up the Book of Deuteronomy.

at the sea; Part II (vv. 13–18), the leading through the desert and the entry into the land. Smaller units, sequences of alternating couplets and triplets, are marked off by the change of meter.⁴⁵

Part I

1. couplet	2(b:b)	v. 1b	(2:2::2:2)
couplet	1:1	v. 2b	(3:3)
2. triplet	3(b:b)	v. 3, 4	(2:2::2:2::2:2)
couplet	1:1	v. 5	(3:3)
3. couplet	2(b:b)	v. 6	(2:2::2:2)
triplet	3(b:b)	vv. 7, 8a	(2:2::2:2::2:2)
couplet	1:1	v. 8bc	(3:3)
4. triplet	3(b:b)	v. 9	(2:2::2:2::2:2)
couplet	2(b:b)	v. 10	(2:2::2:2)
triplet	1:1:1	v. 11	(3:3:3)
5. short couplet	b:b	v. 12	(2:2)

Part II

6. couplet	2(b:b)	v. 13	(2:2::2:2)
couplet	1:1	v. 14	(3:3)
7. triplet	3(b:b)	v. 15	(2:2::2:2::2:2)
couplet	2(b:b)	v. 16a	(2:2::2:2)
couplet	1:1	v. 16b	(3:3)
8. triplet	3(b:b)	v. 17	(2:2::2:2::2:2)
9. short couplet	b:b	v. 18	(2:2)

45. This analysis stands somewhere between that of *SMir* written in 1955 and Freedman's forthcoming study, "Strophe and Meter in Exodus 15." We are indebted to the latter study at a number of points. The present analysis also differs from that of 1968 in reflecting increasing scepticism that the oral poet intended strophe divisions larger than those marked off by change of meter.

Exodus 15:1b-18⁴⁶

Part I

Sing to Yahweh, For he is highly exalted, Horse and chariotry He cast into the Sea.	(1)	שרי ⁴⁷ ליהו b כ גא גא b סס ורכב ⁴⁸ b רמ בים ⁴⁹] b
This is my god whom I exalt, The god of my father whom I admire.	(2b)	ז אל וארממנה ⁵⁰ 1 אלה אבי ⁵¹ ואנוה ⁵² 1
2.		
Yahweh is a warrior, Yahweh is his name.	(3)	יהוגבר ⁵³] b יהו שמ b
Pharoah and his army	(4)	פרע וחל ⁵⁴] b

46. The poem is transcribed in the consonantal notation used in Israel in the tenth century B.C. and earlier and used throughout Proto-Canaanite and classical Phoenician texts.

47. *Širū*, v. 21, is preferable *metri causa*. For a more detailed discussion of the variant readings *’āširā, nāširā*, and the conflate *’šrw* of the Samaritan, see *SMir*, p. 243, n. 1.

48. Reading *rēkeb* with P. Haupt. *rōkēbō* or Old Greek *rōkēb*, is awkward, to be read “chariot driver” if correct. The original text, to judge from the renderings of the versions read *rkb*. In the era of the Conquest, cavalry had not come into use in Egypt. It appears not to have been used in Israel until the ninth century B.C.

49. V. 2a is a secondary interpolation. In the poem 1:1 and 1:1:1 appears as anti-phonal elements. A quatrain 1: 1::1:1 is wholly out of place. Presumably v. 2a was a familiar bicolon; it is found also in Isa. 12:2b and Ps. 118:14. A fuller discussion of v. 2a is given in *SMir*, p. 243 and nn. a-d.

50. As the received text stands, the second colon is considerably longer than the first. The simplest solution to this metrical imbalance is to interchange the verb; this produces the desired symmetry. The transposition of terms in a formulaic pair is frequent both in texts orally composed and dictated (e.g., the Ugaritic texts), and in the written transmission of a text, especially in a case where both words begin and end with the same letter.

51. In the genitive, the suffix of the first person singular is *-iya* in early Canaanite and Phoenician, written with consonantal *yod*.

52. W. F. Albright associates *’anwēhū* (cf. Hab. 2:5 *ynwh*) with Arabic *nwy*, Eth. *nawa*, Ugaritic *nwyt*, “settlement.” *Mari nawūm*, Heb. *nāwē* “pastoral or nomadic camp,” etc. He derives these from a root meaning “to aim at,” which then developed in two directions, “to look ardently at,” and “to reach or settle.” The *h-stem* here may be translated, “I shall make him a cynosure, I shall admire him” (i.e., “I shall cause him to be the object of ardent gazing”). The versions interpret the word correctly, either from knowledge of its true meaning or from context.

53. The major versions (Sam G Sy) have the reading *gbr mlhḥm*. Evidently we have here a conflation of ancient variants: *yahwē gibbōr* and *’iṣ mlhāmā*. For metrical reasons *gibbor* seems the preferable reading. Note the climactic pattern *ab:ac* in the first bicolon.

54. We follow Albright’s suggestion that *mrkbt pr’h* and *pr’h whylw* are ancient variants. There is no basis, really, to choose between them; they are metrically identical.

He hurled into the sea.		ב יר בים
His elite troops		ב [] מבחר שלשו ⁵⁵
Drowned in the Reed Sea.		ב טבע בים-סוף

The deeps covered them;	(5)	ל חסדח יכסימ ⁵⁶
They sank in the depths like a stone.		ל ירד במצלת כמ-אבן

3.

Your right hand, Yahweh,	(6)	ב ימנכ יהו ⁵⁷
Is terrible in strength ;		ב נאדר בכח
Your right hand, Yahweh,		ב ימנכ יהו
Shattered the enemy.		ב תרעץ איב
In your great majesty	(7)	ב [] ברב גאנכ
You crushed your foes.		ב חסדח קמכ
You sent forth your fury,		ב תשלח חרנכ
It consumed them like stubble.		ב יאכלמ כקש
At the blast of your nostrils	(8)	ב [] ברח נפס
The waters were heaped up.		ב נערמ מם

The swells mounted up as a hill;		ל נצב כמ-נד ⁵⁸ נולם
The deeps foamed in the heart of the sea.		ל קפא ⁵⁹ תהמת בלב-ים

55. On the omission of the conjunction here and below, cf. *SMir*, pp. 245 n. 7, 246 nn. 15 and 24. See also Cross and Saley, "Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B.C. from Arslan Tash in Upper Syria," *BASOR*, 197 (1970), 48.

56. This form is doubly archaic, preserving the final *yod* of the root as well as the archaic suffix (-*mū* = -*mō*). Note that -*mō* is used regularly in Exod. 15 with the verb as the 3.m.pl. pronominal suffix, a sure sign of archaism.

57. Note the repetitive style in the couple of v. 6:ab:cd::ab:ef; this is the equivalent in meter with *b*-couplets or the pattern abc:abd in the climactic I-bicolon.

58. *nēd* is a rare word, and appears elsewhere in the Bible only in passages dependent on this passage: Ps. 78:13; Josh. 3:13, 16. Other putative occurrences are suspected of corruption or mispointing. There is every reason to [אע at face value the only etymological evidence we possess, the Arabic cognate *nadd* "hill," "large mound of earth or dirt."

59. The verb *qp'w* has been taken traditionally to mean "congeal" i.e., into solid walls. Most recently, B. S. Childs insists on this meaning, claiming that the Priestly notion of a wall of water is present here (*VT*, 20 [1970], 411f., and note 3). Unhappily, there are only three occurrences of the root other than in Exod. 15:8; Zech. 14:6 where the meaning is wholly obscure, Zeph. 1:12, of the dregs of wine, and Job 10:10, used of the curdling of cheese (parallel to the pouring of milk). Apparently, the action common to wine dregs and curdled milk is the precipitation or sediment of solids. In *SMir* we assumed that the original meaning was "to churn (or milk)," or "to work (or wine)," the process leading to precipitation. Whether this be right or wrong, we see no ground for a meaning "congeal," except the traditional interpretation of Exod. 15:8, drawn anachronistically from the P account of the walls of water. In Mishnaic Hebrew and

4.

The enemy said :	(9)	ב אמר איב
I shall pursue, I shall overtake;		ב ארדף אסג
I shall divide the spoil,		ב אחלק שלל
My greed will be sated,		ב תמלא-ם ⁶⁰ נפש
I shall bare my sword,		ב ארק חרב
My hand will conquer.		ב תרש-ם יד
You blew with your breath,	(10)	ב נשפת ברחכ
Sea covered them.		ב כסמ ים
They sank like a lead weight		ב צלל כעפרת
In the dreadful waters.		ב במם אדרם

Who is like you among the gods, Yahweh? (11) **m-n** 1 באלים יהו
 Who is like you, terrible among the holy ones?⁶¹ **m** כמכ נאדר בקדש |
 Awesome in praises, wonder worker. **wy** נרא תהלת פלא 1

5.

You stretched out your hand,	(12)	ב נטת ימנכ
The Underworld swallowed them.		ב תבלעמ ארץ ⁶²

the Aramaic of the Talmud, the basic meaning is "to precipitate" of solids in liquid, hence "to rise to surface," "form scum, froth or foam," "to curdle": in the D-stem and causative-stem, "to skim," "remove foam from wine," and "to make float," "to coagulate blood (by boiling)," "to foam over" and "to flood." The derivative *qippūy* means most often "froth" or "spume," and is used specifically of the froth on the surface of fermenting wine (e.g., 'Abōdāzārā 56a). In Syriac the verb means "to skim off," "to collect," "to float (of scum or froth)." Cf. *qēpāyā*, "flotsom." "scum." and *qūpāyā*, "spume," "foam," "floatage," "scum (of broth)." In the Aramaic text of 'Ahiqar. **qp**' occurs in association with the sea and has been translated "Rood," and "foam." The latter reading is preferable.

These data require that we take *qāpē'ūtēhōmōt* to mean "the deeps foamed," or "the deeps churned into foam," or the like, probably under the figure of wine. The rendering "congeal (as ice? gelatine?)" must be firmly rejected.

60. *timlā'em*, v. 9, and *tōrsēm* are verbal forms augmented by the enclitic *-m* (<*mi/ma*) particle. The pronominal suffixes are out of place (Albright). Cf. *SMir*, p. 246 and nn. 25, 26.

61. *qdš* is to be taken as a collective as suggested by J. T. Milik here and in Deut. 33: 3. In these instances the Old Greek and certain other witnesses translate in the plural. The alternate in v. 11 is to suppose a haplography of *mēm* before the following *nūn* (in Palaeo-Hebrew script).

62. For documentation of this meaning of 'ēreš in biblical Hebrew and elsewhere. see *SMir*, p. 247, n. 39; cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms*, vols. I-111. under 'ēreš in the indices to each volume.

Part II

6.

You faithfully led	(13)	נחת בחסדך	b
The people whom you redeemed ;		עם זגאלת	b
You guided in your might		נהלת בעזך	b
To your holy encampment.		אל נו קדשכ ⁶³	b

The peoples heard, they shuddered ;	(14)	שמע עמם ירגון	1
Horror seized the inhabitants of Philistia.		חל אחזי שב פלשת	1

7.

Yea, they were undone,	(15)	או נבהל	b
The chieftains of Edom.		אלפ אדם	b
The nobles of Moab		אל מאב	b
Were seized by panic.		יאחזומ רעד	b
They were melted utterly,		נמג כל ⁶⁴	b
The enthroned of Canaan.		ישב ⁶⁵ כנען	b
You brought down on them	(16)	תפל עליהם	b
Terror and dread.		אמת ופחד	b
By thy great power		בגדל זרעך	b
They were struck dumb like a stone		ידמ ⁶⁶ כאבן	b

While your people passed over, Yahweh,	עד-יעבר ⁶⁷ עמך יהו	1
While your people passed over whom you	עד-יעבר עם ז קנת	1
have created.		

63. See above n. 41.

64. This appears to be a rare instance of enjambment. On the other hand *kl* may hide an old adverb (cf. late *kullō*). Compare the remarks in *SMir*, p. 248, n. 48.

65. "Enthroned," i.e., reigning kings. This meaning, which is not infrequent, seems required by parallelism. Cf. in particular, Amos 1 : 5, 8.

66. See M. Dahood, *Psalms*, vol. I, for an alternate interpretation of this colon.

67. This verb *y'br*, and the following *tb'm* and *tl'm*, must be read as preterits, referring to past events. Compare Joshua 13:13:

[ידם שמש ירח עמד
עד יקם גוי איביו

Sun stood, Moon stayed,
While the nation took vengeance on its enemies.

This means that, contrary to the usual interpretation of v. 16b, the poet wrote *from* the point of view of Israel after the Conquest, or rather from the point of view of one re-enacting the Conquest, including both the episode of the sea and the passing over into the land to a Palestinian sanctuary. This we shall argue is in fact the *Sitz im Leben* of the hymn.

8.

You brought them, you planted them	(17)	ב תבאמ [] תטעמ	b
In the mount of your heritage,		⁶⁸ בהר נחלתכ	b
The dais of your throne		⁶⁹ מכן לשבתכ	b
Which you made, Yahweh,		⁷⁰ פעלת יהו	b
The sanctuary, Yahweh,		⁷⁰ מקדש יהו	b
Which your hands created.		כננידכ	b

9.

Let Yahweh reign	(18)	יהו ימלך	b
Forever and ever.		לעלם ועד	b

Part I of the hymn describes the combat of the Divine Warrior with his enemies: Yahweh's defeat of the Egyptians at the Reed Sea. His weapon was a storm at sea, a storm blown up by a blast of wind from his dilated nostrils. The key passages are as follows:

At the blast of your nostrils
The waters were heaped up.

The swells mounted up as a hill,
The deeps foamed in the heart of the sea. (15:8)

You blew with your breath,
Sea covered them.
They sank like a lead weight
In the dreadful waters. (15: 10)

There is no suggestion in the poem of a splitting of the sea or of an east wind blowing the waters back so that the Israelites can cross on a dry sea bottom or of the waters "returning" to overwhelm the Egyptians mired in the mud. Rather it is a storm-tossed sea that is directed against the Egyptians by the breath of the Deity. Moreover, the sea is not personified or hostile, but a passive instrument in Yahweh's control. There is no question here of a mythological combat between

68. See above, n. 42.

69. See above, n. 43.

70. *'dny* is obviously secondary. Sam. reads **yhw**, a rare instance of its preserving the older reading.

two gods. Yahweh defeats historical, human enemies. Most extraordinary, there is no mention of Israel's crossing the sea" or of a way through the deep places of the sea for the redeemed to cross over.⁷² The absence of these traditional motifs is surprising and requires explanation. So far as we can tell, the Egyptians are thrown from barks or barges into the stormy sea; they sink in the sea like a rock or a weight and drown.

The phrases are unambiguous:

Horse and chariotry
He cast into the sea. (15: 1b, 21b)

Pharaoh and his army
He hurled into the sea.
His elite troops
Drowned in the Reed Sea.
The deeps covered them,
They sank in the depths like a stone. (15:4f.)

They sank like a lead weight
In the dreadful waters. (15: 10b)

In the late prose sources in the Bible, it is perfectly clear that one picture of the episode at the Reed Sea had become regnant. It is well expressed by the Chronicler: "And you split (*bq^ti*) the sea before them and they crossed over in the midst of the sea on dry ground and their pursuers you threw into the deeps like a stone in the mighty waters." (Neh. 9:11).

While the last phrase is directly reminiscent of the Song of the Sea,

71. V. 16b refers to passing over Jordan into the land in the Conquest.

72. Loewenstamm reads these verses, esp. v. 8 and v. 10, in a traditional way, one referring to the dividing of the sea, one to its return, overwhelming the Egyptians (pp. 117f.). But this cannot be deduced from these archaic verses, except by reading in the (later) prose tradition. The five strophes in Part I are parallel, not consecutive in their themes. The first *strophe* says Yahweh cast the Egyptians into the sea, the second that he hurled them into the sea and they sank in it; the third *strophe* speaks of the shattering of the enemy, the sending forth of his fury to consume the foe, the blast of the storm wind against the Egyptians. *not* to give Israel a path in the sea; the fourth and fifth strophes reiterate the mode of the Egyptian defeat. At no point is Israel's succor mentioned until Part II. Then the account is of the leading in the wilderness, the crossing of Jordan, and the arrival at the shrine of Yahweh. The poem simply cannot be made to conform to the patterns of the prose traditions, neither to that of the older (JE) sources nor to that of the Priestly source.

the primary motif is that of the sea dividing and Israel crossing on dry ground.

The Priestly editor of the **Tetrateuch**⁷³ wrote in the sixth century as follows: “The children of Israel came into the midst of the sea on dry ground, the waters being a wall (*hōmā*) for them on their right and left ... And Yahweh said to Moses, ‘Stretch out your hand over the sea that the waters will fall back (*wēvāšūbū*) on the Egyptians, on their chariotry and on their horsemen” (Exodus 14: 22, 26).

Obviously this picture is identical with that of the Chronicler. The song in Exodus 15, however, can be dependent on neither. There is little doubt, however, that the Priestly traditionist knew the Song of the Sea. *Hōmā* in the P account appears to be a prosaized translation of the old poetic word *nēd*; if so, its meaning is distorted, unknowingly no doubt, to agree with another traditional view.⁷⁴

The Deuteronomist of the seventh century B.C.⁷⁵ places the following speech on the lips of Rahab: “I know that Yahweh gave the land to you and that your terror has fallen on us and that all the inhabitants of the land melted before you. For we have heard how Yahweh dried up the waters of the Reed Sea before you in your exodus from Egypt” (Joshua 2 : 9f.).

Joshua 2:9 is clearly reminiscent of Exodus 15: 15 and 15: 16; but the account of the drying up of the sea for Israel’s escape belongs to a different tradition, close to those of the Chronicler and the Priestly tradent.⁷⁶

The old narrative sources come from the Epic tradition of the Yahwist (tenth century B.C.) and from Joshua 24, where archaic tradition (ninth century or earlier) is only slightly reworked by the Deuteronomistic editor. In the Yahwistic source in Exodus we read: “and Yahweh made the sea go back with a strong east wind (blowing) all night, and so made the sea into dry ground ... and the sea turned back (*wayyāšob*) again in the morning to its steady flow, and the Egyptians fled against it, and Yahweh routed the Egyptians in the midst of the sea” (Exodus 14: 21, 27).

Once again it is clear that the Song of the Sea does not derive its account from Yahwistic tradition. While a wind blows in each, the

73. See below, Chapter 11.

74. Note also the anachronistic mention of cavalry here.

75. See below, Chapter 10.

76. Cf. also, Deut. 11: 4 and Josh. 4: 23, the latter to be discussed below

timing and effect are different. The Egyptians are drowned when the wind *ceases* to blow and the sea returns to its perennial state (*'ētānō*) according to the Epic tradition. In the song, the divine wind overthrows Pharaoh and his host. Contrary to the late tradition, the sea is not split so that Israel marches through the sea on dry ground while towering walls of water rose on their right and left. Rather, the divine act is described in more naturalistic language; an east wind blows, driving the waters of the shallow sea back, laying bare dry ground. The divine act is not so naturalistic as the account in the Song of the Sea in which the Egyptians sink in a wind-tossed sea.

In Joshua 24 we read: “and you came to the sea, and the Egyptians pursued your fathers ... to the Reed Sea, and they cried out to Yahweh and he put a dark cloud between you and the Egyptians, and he brought on them the sea and it covered them” (Joshua 24:6, 7).

Interestingly enough, nothing seems to be said here about Israel's crossing the sea on dry ground, only that they came to the sea and that Yahweh caused the sea to cover the Egyptians while a dark cloud hid the Israelites. The passage has clear contacts with Epic material in Exodus 14, usually attributed to the Elohist. While in some ways the tradition in Joshua 24 stands closest to that of the Song of the Sea, it must be said, finally, that the hymn can only be prior to it or independent of it.

We have traced above the history of the prose traditions of the event at the sea. Nowhere, from the time of the earliest Epic sources down to the end of the Persian Age can we find a place for the traditions preserved in the song to have come into being. Most of the prose sources have reminiscences of Exodus 15, but the song cannot be derived from any of them. The primary and most dramatic theme in the prose sources, the splitting or drying up of the sea and Israel's escape across the dry sea bottom, is wholly absent from the hymn. In short, the tradition preserved in the Song of the Sea must be much older.

The poetic sources also give an interesting picture of the development of the Exodus tradition. Psalm 78, a song dated by Eissfeldt and Albright as early as the united monarchy,” and in any case pre-Exilic, includes a reference to the event at the sea in verse 13 :

77. O. Eissfeldt, “Das Lied Moses Deuteronomium 32:1-43 und das Lehrgedicht Asaphs Psalm 78 samt einer Analyse der Umgebung des Mose-Liedes,” *BA L.* vol. 104. no. 5 (Berlin, 1958). Cf. YGC. pp. 17 n.41, 25 n.56, 212; and G. Ernest Wright, “The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32,” in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, ed. B. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York, Harper, 1962), pp. 36-41.

He split Sea and brought them across,
He made the waters to stand as a hill.

בקע ים ויעבירם
ויצב מים כמו נר

This passage fits with the prose accounts in centering on the division of the sea and Israel's crossing. The term *bq'*, "split," is used as in Nehemiah 9: 11, a word more appropriate to the smiting of the Sea-dragon than to the drying up of the sea. The second colon, however, echoes Exodus 15 : 8 and is secondary to it. Other psalms, most of them late, reflect precisely the prose tradition: Psalms 136: 15; 66:6;106:9.

We turn next to texts which refer directly to Yahweh's battle with Sea or the Sea-Dragon. They fall into two groups, one in which the language is purely mythic, with no reference to the historical event at the Reed Sea remembered in Israelite tradition, another in which the cosmogonic or creation battle with monstrous Sea is combined with the historical tradition of the Exodus.

In the first group belong the passages in Psalm 89: 10f.⁷⁸ and Psalm 93: 1-4. Both hymns are early, or at least the sections from which our passages come are early, probably of the tenth century B.C.⁷⁹ Both are psalms of the royal cult and deal with creation. Also to be placed here are Isaiah 27: 1; Job 7:12, 9:8, 26:12, and 38:7-11, all from sixth-century contexts,⁸⁰ and Nahum 1: 4 from the end of the seventh century B.C. (at the earliest). These passages need not concern us here. They do fit into the general typology of the development of Israel's religion. Mythic elements were present at the beginning of Israel's history when Yahwism emerged from its mythopoeic environment. The *cultus* of the league was strongly shaped by historical patterns; however, it is best expressed in the Epic tradition of Israel as shown by A. Alt and his students. The myths of creation and kingship became recrudescent with the introduction of kingship and its ideology, especially in the Solomonic era with the institution of the dynastic temple. The Exile was a second era of the recrudescence of myth in the rise of proto-apocalyptic. In this era, however, notably in the poetry of Second Isaiah (including Isaiah 34, 35) and the Isaianic

78. In v. 11 read '**wybk**, "thy enemy." The mythological combatant is meant, not historical enemies.

79. Note, for example, the creation of the old gods (the mountains) in Ps. 89:13 (where *hmn* or *'mn* is to be read for *wymyn*).

80. See provisionally the Harvard dissertation of William Millar, "Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic" (1970) which deals with the Isaianic apocalypse as a proto-apocalyptic rather than apocalyptic work.

“apocalypse,” the myths were transformed and combined with historical themes in order to formulate an eschatology, or a typology of “old things” and “new things” in the drama of salvation.

We are brought to a final group of passages in which the creation myth is fully combined with the Exodus-Conquest events. From the early monarchy comes a pertinent section of Psalm 77 :⁸¹

The Waters saw you, **Yahweh**,⁸²
The Waters saw you and writhed,⁸³
Yea the Deeps shuddered.

The clouds⁸⁴ streamed water,
The heavens roared,
Your bolts shot back and forth.

Your thunder was in the **tempest**,⁸⁵
Lightning lighted the world,
Earth shuddered and shook.

Your way was through the sea, **Yahweh**⁸⁶
Your path in the deep waters,
Your tracks beyond our **understanding**.⁸⁷

(Psalm 77: 17-20)

A number of passages in which creation and historical conquest are combined are found in Second Isaiah.⁸⁸ We can best refer again to the “Ode to Yahweh’s Arm”:

81. Verse 17 begins a series of four archaic bicola inserted into Psalm 77. On their tenth century date see M. Dahood, *Psalms*, II, note to Ps. 77:17 and his references. The first bicolon is climactic structure: abc:abd:efg.

82. Reading **ywhh** for *’lhym* as is necessary often in the Elohist Psalter.

83. “Writhe” makes clear the dragon-like form of “waters,” i.e. Yamm. Cf. Psalm 29:8.

84. Probably we should read *’rbl* for *’by*, *metri causa*.

85. See M. Dahood’s interesting suggestion for *glgl*. *Psalms*, II, p. 232, n. 19.

86. The first colon is not symmetrical. A divine name has dropped out most probably: *’lhym* before *bym* perhaps or *šdy* before *šbyl*. In the first instance, *’lhym* would be a substitute for *ywhh*.

87. We prefer to read *I’nd’*, “we do not know.” Orthographically *lō’ nōda’ū* would be identical with *lō’ nēda’* in the tenth century B.C. Also, it improves the symmetry of the tricolon. For the idiom, cf. Job 37:5.

88. In addition to Isa. 51:9–11, note 43:15f.; 50:2; cf. Ps. 106:9, and especially 114:1–5 (on which see below).

Was it not you who smashed Rahab, the writhing dragon?
Was it not you who dried up Sea, the waters of the great deep?
Did you not make a way in the depths of the sea for the redeemed
to cross?

The ransomed of Yahweh shall return and enter Zion with a shout.
(Isaiah 5 1: 9–11)

In this poem, the battle of creation merges with events of the crossing of the sea and the old Exodus gives way to a vision of the new Exodus-Conquest, the return to Zion, and the feast of the New Jerusalem. In these passages the main theme is the “Way” which splits through the Sea(-dragon) along which Yahweh leads his people, a theme absent from the Song of the Sea.

Our survey brings us to the conclusion that the Song of the Sea cannot be fitted into the history of the prose and poetic accounts of the Exodus-Conquest, except at the beginning of the development in the period of the Judges. Its independence is remarkable, preserved by the fixity of its poetic form, while prose traditions, especially those orally transmitted and the later poetic traditions, developed and crystallized into more or less stereotyped themes and images, replacing or reinterpreting the archaic poetic tradition. Our examination below of the second part of the composition will show further that the hymn fits well into the religious environment of the league, its cultic institutions and concepts. This conclusion conforms with the place the poem has in typologies of language and prosody.

How are we to understand the development of these traditions, from the archaic poetry in Exodus 15 in which the Egyptians founder in a storm to the late prose traditions in which Israel marches through walls of water which then collapse on the hapless Egyptians, or to Proto-apocalyptic poetry in which the way through the depths of the sea fuses mythically with the split in the defeated sea-dragon and the new creation?

First of all it should be said that it was not by chance that the episode at the sea was chosen as symbolic of Israel’s redemption and creation as a community. Theoretically, other episodes might have been selected just as well as this one, say the march from the southern mountains into the new land, a favorite theme of old Israelite poetry, or the Conquest proper in Canaan. Nor is it by coincidence that, with the recrudescence of myth late in Israel’s history, myths of creation, especially the battle with sea, came to be identified with the historical battle in which Yahweh won salvation for Israel. In choosing the event

of the sea, Israel drew upon available symbols and language which retained power and meaning even when the old mythic patterns which gave them birth had been attenuated or broken by Israel's austere historical consciousness.

More can be said about the mode in which the episode at the Reed Sea and associated traditions evolved in Israel's early cultus. In the last chapter⁸⁹ we discussed the reconstruction of the cultus at the early league shrine at Gilgal from traditions preserved in Joshua 3-5. The Ark was borne in solemn procession from the battle-camp across the Jordan at Abel-shittim to the river and from thence to the shrine at Gilgal where a covenant-renewal ceremony was consummated. The crossing of the Jordan which was "divided," that is, dammed,⁹⁰ so that Israel in battle array could pass over on dry ground, was understood as dramatic reenactment of the crossing of the sea, and as well the "crossing over" to the new land in the Conquest. Exodus and entrance, the sea-crossing from Egypt and the river-crossing of the Conquest were ritually fused in these cultic acts, followed then by the consummation of the covenant which created the community at Sinai and established them in the land at Gilgal. Yahweh dried up River as he had dried up Sea (Joshua 5: 1). The cultic identity of River and Sea, of course, lies close at hand in Canaanite myth in which Prince Sea and Judge River are formulaic pairs. The pairing of Sea and Jordan is found in Psalm 114.

When Israel went forth from Egypt,
 The house of Jacob from an outlandish nation,
 Judah became his sanctuary,
 Israel his dominion.
 The Sea saw and fled,
 The Jordan turned back.
 The mountains danced like rams,
 The hills like lambs.
 What ailed you, O Sea, that you fled?
 You, Jordan, that you turned back?
 The mountains danced like rams,
 The hills like lambs,
 Before the lord of all⁹¹ the earth,

⁸⁹ For literature, see Chapter 5, note 44.

⁹⁰ In Joshua 3:13, the expression *nēd'ehād* is evidently a gloss. It is not found in the Old Greek and is under the asterisk in the Hexaplaric tradition.

⁹¹ We read *kl* for *hl* (in later orthography *hwly*), and compare Josh. 3: 11,13.

Before the god of Jacob,
 Who turned rock into a pool of water,
 Flint into fountains of water.

(Psalm 114: 1-8)

This hymn makes very clear Israel's pairing of River and Sea;⁹² it is further documentation of the ritual procession of the Gilgal cult. The psalm has many archaic features and formulae. Verses 1a and 7 have contacts with Judges 5 : 4-5, and verses 4, 6, 7 with Psalm 29 : 6, 8. The psalm is not dependent on these early psalms; it merely uses formulae common to early Israel and Canaan. The use of tenses in the psalm is remarkable. *Yaqtul* is used for narrative past in parallelism with *qatal* forms.⁹³ The conjunction is never used at the beginning of cola. The epithet *'dn kl 'rs*⁹⁴ is a specific tie to the Gilgal cult. The cultic function of the hymn is difficult to conceive (as scholars have confessed), unless it is placed in the setting of the Gilgal processional, and the covenant festival celebrated there. In verse 2 there is specific reference to the creation of the nation. As we find parallelism between the crossing of Sea and River, so we should see parallelism between the covenant making of Sinai, whose sign in tradition is the twelve stone stelae (Exodus 24:4), and the festival in Gilgal and the traditions of the twelve stones set up there.⁹⁵ Finally note the two case-endings preserved in verse 8, which may be a mark of archaism (or of archaizing).⁹⁶

92. Cf. also Psalm 66:6: "He turned the sea into dry land/They crossed through the river by foot."

93. In verse 3, *yissōb*; verse 5 *tānūs* and *tissōb*; in verse 6 *tirqēdū*.

94. This epithet may originally have belonged to Ba'1. Cf. *zbl b'l'arš* (CTA, 5.6.10; 6.3.9; etc.)

95. There is, of course, duplication in the traditions of the twelve stones at Gilgal. As a matter of fact, there may be three variant forms of the tradition of the twelve stones and the covenant ceremony at Gilgal. Recently Otto Eissfeldt has drawn attention to confusion between Gilgal and Shechem in a series of Deuteronomic passages, notably Deut. 27:1-8 which records the instruction to set up "large stones," plastered and inscribed with the "words of the law," and to build an altar, all, according to the time notice, "on the day you cross the Jordan" (Deut. 27:2). On the complicated critical problems involved, see O. Eissfeldt, "Gilgal or Shechem?," in *Proclamation and Presence* [G. Henton Davies Volume], ed. J. I. Durham and J. R. Porter (Richmond, John Knox, 1970), pp. 90-101; and Soggin, "Gilgal, Passah und Landnahme," *SVT*, 15 (1966), 263-277.

96. [] *hōpēkī* and *lēma'yēn/i*. [The Massoretic text reads *lm'yw*.] Owing to the fact that there is a period of considerable length in which *yōd* and *waw* were not distinguished at **all** in the Jewish script, and an even longer period in which **yod** and **waw** were so similar as to be easily confused, one must be very brash to claim the poet mixed case-

The parallelism between Sea and River also is found in the old verses preserved in the Psalm of Habakkuk.⁹⁷

Was not your wrath against River, Yahweh,⁹⁸
 Your anger against River,
 Your ire against Sea,
 When you drove your horses,
 The chariot⁹⁹ of your salvation?

These verses stand much closer to the myth of Yamm/Nahar and the Cloud Rider than those in Psalm 114.¹⁰⁰ But they also reveal how easily the Reed Sea and the Jordan could merge in ritual reenactment in the cult at Gilgal.

The cultic repetition of the crossing of River-Sea in the cultus of early Israel at Gilgal had a reflex effect on the historical traditions of the Exodus. Both the old mythic pattern of Canaan and the ritual crossing of the Jordan on dry ground reshaped the later story of the episode of the sea. The way is prepared for the shift of interest from Yahweh's defeat of the Egyptians, primary in Exodus 15, to interest in the march of the redeemed, the making of a way through the sea on dry ground.

The absence in Exodus 15 of the motifs of the splitting (*bq^c*)¹⁰¹ of

endings. In support of such a mixing Dahood (*Psalms, III*, 137) cites *'dtw* (*KAI*, 6, 2); however, the waw is the 3.m.s suffix on a **plural** noun (cf. *'ādōnay*). For similar reasons we must reject Dahood's postulation of a third m.s. suffix written *y* which he compares with Phoenician, forgetting apparently that the Phoenician suffix written *-y* stands for *-iyū, ēyū*, etc., which in Hebrew orthography would be written *-yw*. The explanation of the bizarre *hw'/hy'* confusion in the Pentateuch must be similarly explained as owing to the falling together of *waw* and *yōd* in a form which looked like *waw* to a copyist a century or so later when an old (and excellent) manuscript became the basis of the Rabbinic recension (i.e., the *textus receptus*) of the Pentateuch.

97. The basic study is still that of W. F. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," pp. 1-18.

98. We read:

'm bnh-r-m ywh

'm bnh-r-m 'pk

'm bym 'brtk

'm or *h* should be leveled through. Note the first colon in the Old Greek. Albright first recognized the enclitic *-m* with *nahar*.

99. Read the singular with Greek *ἵππασία*. There is no reason to introduce a verb (vs. Albright); the bicolon counts 7/7 in syllables (1: 1) though it fits badly in a stress-metrical scansion (3:3); *rkb* can mean both "to drive horses and chariot" or "to ride a horse."

100. See also the enthronement hymn, Psalm 93:1-5, where *nēhārōt/maym rabbīm/mišbērē-yām* stand in parallel.

101. Cf. Ps. 78:13; Exod. 14:16, 21; Neh. 9:11; cf. Ps. 74:14f.

Sea, of Israel's walking through the sea, and of the walls of water is a mark of its high antiquity. The Song of the Sea alone of the traditions of the Exodus escaped this shaping by rite and preserved an older version of the event. The poet knew only of a storm at sea and the sinking into the sea of the Egyptians. To be sure, the elements of myth which created the **Gilgal** rites were present in early Israel, and the pattern of the myth makes itself felt more fully in the second portion of the hymn. One must conclude, however, that influence of the mythic pattern is extraordinarily restrained in Part I, a restraint which can be due only to the force of historical impulses in Israel's earliest Epic traditions.

Part II of the Song of the Sea preserves materials of special interest to the historian of tradition. Two passages require discussion.

While your people passed over, Yahweh
While your people passed over whom you created ...

(Exodus 15: 16b)

What does this couplet mean? The first **strophe** of this section described Yahweh's leading of Israel through the wilderness. Israel is brought to the "holy encampment" of Yahweh. Conceivably this expression might apply to a shrine in Sinai or Qadesh. Much more likely, in view of the cultic function of the hymn, is the battle **encampment** of Shittim, that is, the traditional site from which Israel launched her conquest across Jordan and where the procession of the Ark began in the early traditions of Joshua.¹⁰² The **strophe** which the above couplet concludes describes the dread which overwhelmed the enemy in the land as Israel was poised for Holy War. In effect Yahweh had already defeated the enemy in accord with the ideology of Holy War. In this context we must certainly understand the words of the couplet to refer to the crossing of the river, to the "passing over" into the land through Jordan : "from Shittim to **Gilgal**" (Micah 6: 5).

You brought them, you planted them
In the mount of your possession,
The dais of your throne
Which you made, Yahweh,

102. It is in the same encampment in the plains of Moab that Moses, according to Deuteronomistic lore, preached the great sermons that make up the Book of Deuteronomy.

The sanctuary, Yahweh,
Which your hands created.

Yahweh will reign
Forever and ever.

(Exodus 15: 17f.)

We stressed above the formulaic character of the triplet (verse 17). Yahweh led his people into the land of which he took possession¹⁰³ and to his shrine. Yahweh built his own sanctuary.¹⁰⁴ This contrasts with Ba'l's arrangements to build a temple in which to be enthroned. Ba'l had to seek the consent of the divine council chaired by 'El, and the actual building is done by the craftsman of the gods. Still Ba'l, too, could say that he had built a temple of silver and gold.¹⁰⁵ We recognize here the old mythic pattern which the following themes of the Song of the Sea preserve :

(1) the combat of the Divine Warrior and his victory at the Sea, (2) the building of a sanctuary on the "mount of possession" won in battle, and (3) the god's manifestation of "eternal" kingship.

It is appropriate to ask what sanctuary is referred to in verse 17. The "mountain of inheritance" is often a general term referring to the special land of the god; here we judge it to refer to the hill-country of Canaan as Yahweh's special possession. The actual shrine referred to in the original composition is at once the earthly sanctuary and the "cosmic" mountain of which the earthly sanctuary is the duplicate and local manifestation-built, incidentally, by the god's worshippers.¹⁰⁶ In this case, it may be proper to say the poet had in mind the sanctuary of Gilgal. One may complain that Gilgal was not on a high mountain and that its tent-shrine and twelve stelae were unprepossessing. Such matters were no problem to the ancient Canaanite or Israelite. A temple precinct in Sidon was called "the high heavens," *šamēm rōmīm!*¹⁰⁷ A temple mound or platform constituted the counter-

103. This is the old force of the term *nahālā*. Compare also Ba'l's "mount of victory," *gri'it*, and the formula cited in note 42 above.

104. Cf. Psalm 78:69: Yahweh builds his temple in the likeness of that in the height (of heaven), reading *kmrm*.

105. See above, note 16.

106. See Richard J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*, Harvard Semitic Monographs (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1972).

107. See Sakkunyaton *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. evan.*, I.10.9 (ed. K. Mras); O. Eissfeldt, "Schamemrumim 'Hoher Himmel,' ein Stadtteil von Gross-Sidon," in *KS* (Eissfeldt), II, 122-126; and Ugaritic Text RS 24.252 (a title of 'Anat: *ba'lat šamēmi rāmīma*); as well as in the inscription of Bod'ašart.

part of the cosmic mountain. It should be remembered also that Mount Zion itself was a low hillock overshadowed by the towering heights of the Mount of Olives; yet it was a mountain which "at the end of days ... shall be established as the top of the mountains/and shall be exalted above the hills."¹⁰⁸ In the Apocalypse, "Zion" has become a name of heaven. In short, the language of verse 17 could apply to any Yahwistic sanctuary. Certainly, in later times the verse was assumed to apply to the temple "mount" in Jerusalem.

Study of the mythic pattern of Bronze Age Canaan and the history of traditions of the episode at the Reed Sea in Israel's literature reveal a dialectic in the evolution of Israelite religion and religious institutions. Israel's religion in its beginning stood in a clear line of continuity with the mythopoeic patterns of West Semitic, especially Canaanite myth.¹⁰⁹ Yet its religion did emerge from the old matrix, and its institutions were transformed by the impact of formative historical events and their interpretation by elements of what we may call "Proto-Israel" which came together in the days of Moses and in the era of the Conquest. In any case, the rites and religious ethos of the days of the league were fundamentally shaped by celebration of historical events, preserved in Israelite memory, which were conceived as acts of Yahweh creating a new community. The reenactment of primordial events of cosmogonic myth gave way to festivals reenacting epic events in Israel's past, thus renewing her life as a historical community. This was the character of the covenant renewal festivals of the league. This was the context of the composition of the Song of the Sea. Israel's early religious evolution was neither simple nor unilinear. It will not do to describe the process as a progressive historicizing of myth. Even in Hegel's dialectic, the movement from the natural to the historical was complex, and the modern historian presumably permits no metaphysical principle to motivate the movement from natural to historical consciousness. The Canaanite mythic pattern is not the core of Israel's epic of Exodus and Conquest. On the other hand, it is equally unsatisfactory to posit a radical break between Israel's mythological and cultic past and the historical cultus of the league. The power of the mythic pattern was enormous. The Song of the Sea reveals this power as mythological

108. Mic. 4: 1 = Isa. 2: 2.

109. At the present stage of our knowledge of Amorite religion, we can say little of its distinctiveness from Canaanite religion. No doubt Israel did inherit elements of Amorite myth and rite.

themes shape its mode of presenting epic memories. It is proper to speak of this counterforce as the tendency to mythologize historical episodes to reveal their transcendent meaning. The history of the Exodus-Conquest theme illustrates this dialectic well.

With the institution of kingship in Israel and the temple cultus, both institutions of Canaanite origin, the old myths became resurgent. In hymns like Psalms 29, 93, and 89B (verses 6–19), the myths of creation appear, unsullied by historicizing, for example, by reference to the Epic theme of the victory at the Reed Sea. With the close of the monarchy and the end of classical (pre-Exilic) prophecy, the older theologies of history which interpreted Epic themes, the Yahwistic, Deuteronomic, and Priestly, give way to a new synthesis of mythic, royal ideological, and literary forms (now freed from their older cultic functions) and the Prophetic tradition that harked back to the league. The Song of the Arm of Yahweh in Isaiah 51 is a superb example of this new synthesis, in which the old Exodus is described in terms of the Creation myth and in turn becomes the archetype of a new Exodus. The old Songs of the Wars of Yahweh were transformed into descriptions of eschatological battle (Isaiah 34; 63). The ancient royal festival became a future “Messianic banquet” (Isaiah 55 : 1-3). At the feast on the mountain, Death (Mot) was to be “swallowed up” forever (Isaiah 25 : 6-8). In Second Isaiah, Third Isaiah, Second Zechariah, Isaiah 24-27, and the eschatological visions of Ezekiel, we detect tendencies which will produce the Apocalyptic in which historical and mythological elements are combined in a new tension and take on a new life.

7 Yahweh and Ba^ʿl

The Theophany of Ba^ʿl

The relationships and continuities between Yahweh, god of Israel, and Canaanite ʿEl and his mythology have been much elaborated in the preceding pages. Yahwism also owes a debt to the myths of Ba^ʿl. In the earliest poetic sources the language depicting Yahweh as divine warrior manifest is borrowed almost directly from Canaanite descriptions of the theophany of Ba^ʿl as storm god. As a matter of fact, any discussion of the language of theophany in early Israel must begin with an examination of the Canaanite lore.¹

(1) Ba^ʿl, who on one occasion is called “[the god] Haddu, lord of the Stormcloud” or “lord of the Nimbus,”² appears enthroned on his (newly-won) mountain in an important text :³

b^ʿl. yṭb. kṭbt. ḡr.
hd. r[ʿy] (2) k mdb.
btk. ḡrh. ʿil ṣpn.
b[m] (3) ḡr. tlʿiyt.

Ba^ʿl sits enthroned, (his) mountain like a daïs,
Haddu the shepherd, like the Flood dragon,⁴

1. Jörg Jeremias in his excellent study, *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung*, Wissenschaftlich Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testamente, 10 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1965), draws upon Mesopotamian and (less fully) Canaanite descriptions of the theophany of the storm god. Nevertheless, he does not examine the form of Ba^ʿl's theophany in the mythic cycle from Ugarit, the starting point in our view for the discussion of the early biblical theophany. He does not treat the transformation of the Canaanite *Gattung* in the early Israelite context. Jeremias therefore does not recognize (as does Westermann) the primary connections of the battle with/at the sea with the theophanic form. Cf. E. Jenni, “‘Kommen’ im theologischen Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments,” in *Wort-Gebot-Glaube* [Eichrodt Festschrift], ed. J. J. Stamm and E. Jenni (Zurich, Zwingli Verlag, 1970), pp. 251–261.

2. *CTA*, 10.2.33 [ʿil.]hd.dʿnn[.]. On the meaning of ʿanan, see the discussion below.

3. *Ugaritica* V, 3 (RS 24.245). See the recent treatments of L. R. Fisher and F. B. Knutson, “An Enthronement Ritual at Ugarit,” *JNES*, 28 (1969), 157–167; J. C. de Moor, “Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra. I,” *Ugaritica-Forschungen*, 1. (1969), 180–183.

4. Compare Psalm 29:10 *yahwē lammabbūl vāšab*, “Yahweh sits enthroned on the Flood dragon,” and Job 36: 30: “Behold ʿEli spreads his bright clouds/his throne is on

In the midst of his mount, Divine Šapōn,
On the mount of (his) victory.

The appearance of the victorious warrior is described as follows :

Sb't. brqm [yr]
ṭmnt. 'iṣr r't.
'š brq y[mn]

Seven lightning bolts he casts,
Eight magazines of thunder;
He brandishes a spear of lightning.⁵

Fisher calls attention to the identity of this description with iconographic representations of Ba'l and the Syrian wargod.⁶

The cultic background of the scene is evidently the return of the god from victory over Yamm or the flood-dragon, and his subsequent sitting in state on his throne, manifesting himself as lord of the storm. The theophany can be said to take place in his temple on Mount Šapōn, and at the same time in the ritual in his earthly temple on its platform or dais representing the Divine Šapōn. Unhappily, the tablet is too damaged to make out the next episode: Ba'l appears to be in the midst of his harem.

(2) In a closely related text, after 'El gives the decree for the building of Ba'l's temple on Šapōn, Lady Asherah praises 'El's wise decision and says:

(68) wn 'ap. 'dn. mṭrh (69) b'l.
y'dn. 'dn. ṭr⁸ bglṭ

the roots of Sea." For 'ōr, "bright cloud," cf. Job 37:11,15 and Ugar. 'ār in the epithet *pdry bt 'ar*, "Misty, daughter of Bright Cloud," Note the parallel phrase in v. 29 using *prš* with 'āb, "cloud-mass." Cf. M. Pope, *Job*, (New York, Doubleday, 1965), p. 237. "Roots of Sea" are the primordial mountains. Compare Ps. 46:3, and the "teats of Tiamat" used of mountains in *Enūma eliš* (Tablet 5). On the name *pdry*, "misty," see J. T. Milik, "Giobbe 38, 28 in siro-palestinese e la dea ugaritica Pdry bt ar," *Revista biblica*, 3 (1958), 252-254. The second colon is highly elliptical. Apparently Ba'l's mōun-tain is compared with a dais, and with the (back of the) dragon.

5. The last line is filled out with the denominative verb *ymn*, "to do with the right hand," used both in Hebrew and at Ugarit (cf. *CTA*, 23.37f.) of throwing or shooting darts. It stands with *yr* to make a formulaic pair in Ugaritic. The word *r't*, *ra'attu* < *ra'adtu* occasions no difficulty.

6. Fisher and Knutson, "An Enthronement Ritual at Ugarit," p. 159, n. IO. Compare also *ANEP. Nos.* 501, 537 as well as 490.

7. *CTA*, 4.5.68-71.

8. Gaster and Driver have read *trt*. I am inclined to read *tr* only which stands closer to the cuneiform, and which may occur in *Ugaritica* V, 3.8[*hdj*] *il tr*. "Haddu, god of moisture" (?). The root is *try*.

(70) w<y>tn. qlh. b'rpt
(7 l)Srh. l'arş. brqm

Behold now, Ba'l has appointed his rains;
He has appointed the wet and snowy season.
He has thundered in the stormclouds,
He has blazed his lightning bolts to the earth.

(3) In a parallel text, Ba'l's theophany coincides with the opening of a window by the craftsman god in Ba'l's new temple.⁷

(29) qlh. qdš[.]b[^l.y]tn
(30) yṭny. b'l. š[^lat.š]pth
(31) qlh. q[dš ypr]r¹⁰'arş

(32), [bg^lrth]¹¹ ḡrm. ṭḥšn
(33) rhq [] (34) qdm ym
bmt. 'a[rş] (35) ṭṭṭn.

Ba'l gives forth his holy voice,
Ba'l repeats the utterance of his lips,
His holy voice [shatters] the earth.

[At his roar] the mountains quake,
Afar [] before Sea,
The highplaces of the earth shake.

(4) In the mixed tradition preserved at Ugarit, both Ba'l and his consort 'Anat are credited with killing the seven-headed dragon.¹² Both also are credited with victorious battles over Yamm-Nahar. Evidently we have in each case "alloforms" of the basic cosmogonic myth. Important for present purposes is the "cosmogonic formula" found in Text 5.¹³

9. CTA. 4.7.29-35.

10. Compare Isa. 24: 19 and Ps. 74: 13 for *pr* used in similar contexts (parallel to *mtt*, used of the earth in Isa. 24:19). Of course, the reconstruction is speculative.

11. For the reconstruction, compare Ps. 18:16; Job 26: 11; and Isa. 66:15. *gr* appears at Ugarit with the meaning "roar."

12. 'Anat defeats the dragon (and Yamm among others), in CTA. 3.3.35-43. The description of Ba'l killing the dragon (*tnn*) is found in PRU, II.1.1 and in the text discussed below.

13. CTA. 5.1.1-5.

ki timḥaṣ lôtāna baṭna barīḥa	1 (11)
takalliyu ¹⁴ baṭna ʿaqalatāna	1 (11)
šilyaṭa di Sabʿati riʾašīma	1 (11)
tiḥkaḥū titrapū šamūma ¹⁵	1 (9)
ka-ri <ka> si ʾipādika	1 (8)

When¹⁶ you (Baʿl)¹⁷ smote Lôtan the primeval dragon,
 Destroyed the coiled serpent,
 Tyrant (Šilyaṭ) of the seven heads,

(Then) the heavens withered (and) drooped
 Like the loops of your garment.

The collapse of the cosmos in response to the battle of the divine warrior is well known in biblical lore. A particularly good example is found in the “Song of the War of Yahweh” in Isaiah 34. After the announcement of the ban (*&rem*) on all nations and their armies, we read:

The heavens roll up like a scroll,
 And all their hosts languish,
 As the vine leaf withers,
 As the fig droops.

An equally useful example is found in Habakkuk 3 :5- 12, cited above, describing the march of the divine warrior, before whom mountains shatter and earth shakes.

(5) Baʿl as the divine warrior and thunderer was well known also in Egypt.” Interesting is a comparison of the Pharaoh Akhenaton to Baʿl in a letter from Abimilki of Tyre written to his suzerain by an Egyptian scribe.¹⁹

14. The preservation of the *yod* assures us that the address is 2. person, masculine, that is. to Baʿl. The feminine form would be *takalli* (<**takalliyi*) or *takallina*.

15. On this vocalization, see *Ugaritica* V, p. 352.

16. The characteristic “When then” formula of cosmogonies is unmistakable.

17. See note 14 above and Miss Herdner’s comment. *CTA*, p. 32, n. I.

18. See the collection of these materials in *BA V*, pp. 482-485; and R. Stadelmann, *Syrisch-palästinensische Gottheiten in Ägypten* (Leiden, Brill, 1967).

19. *EA*, 147.13-15. On the Egyptian scribe, see W. F. Albright, “The Amarna Letters,” in *ANET*, p. 484, n. 2.

... ša iddin rigmašu ina Same
 kīma Addiu tarkub gabbi
 māti ištu rigmašu

... who utters his (battle) cry in the heavens,
 like Haddu so that the whole land
 shakes at his cry.

Several passages, while not describing directly the epiphany of the stormgod, nevertheless are useful in revealing the two-sidedness of Baʿl's role of stormgod: on the one hand, the dread warrior before whom all nature blanches and dies, on the other hand, the god whose sway brings the fructifying rain which makes the desert bloom.

(6) In the Aqhat Epic a drought is depicted as follows:

Sb'. šnt (43) yšrk b'l.
 ṭmn. rkb (44) 'rpt.
 bl. ṭl. bl rbb
 (45) bl. Sr'. thmtm.
 bl. (46) ṭbn. ql. b'l.

Seven years Baʿl failed,
 Eight the Cloud Rider ;
 No dew nor shower,
 No surging of the double-deep,
 Nor goodly sound of Baʿl's voice.²⁰

(7) This passage may be compared to the vision of 'El in which Baʿl's coming to life is revealed :

šamūma Samna tamaṭṭirūna
 naḥalūma talikū nubta-mi

The heavens are raining oil,
 The wadis run with mead.²¹

(8) Alongside these Canaanite traditions of the stormgod may be put the Canaanite hymn preserved in the Psalter, namely Psalm 29. H. L. Ginsberg in 1936 drew up conclusive evidence that Psalm 29 is

20. CTA, 19.1.42-46.

21. CTA. 6.3.6f., 12f.

an ancient Baʿl hymn,²² only slightly modified for use in the early cultus of Yahweh.²³ Further study has steadily added confirmatory detail. In its Israelite form it is no later than tenth century B.C. and probably was borrowed in Solomonic times. The hymn is introduced by a classic "Address to the Divine Council" in repetitive, imperative plurals²⁴ (verses If.); the theophany of the storm god follows (verse 9), and with it the convulsions and travail of sea and mountain, forest and creature (verses 3–9b), and finally the appearance of the god as victor and king enthroned in his temple (verses 9c f.). The text is reconstructed in Canaanite orthography in use in Israel until the end of the empire.

(v. 1)	הב ליהו בנ אלם ²⁵	b:b (5:4 < 4:4) ²⁶	a b : c d
	הב ליהו כבד ועז	b:b (5:4 < 4:4)	ab:ef
(v. 2)	הב ליהו כבד שמ ²⁷	b:b (5:4 < 4:4)	ab:eg
	השתחו ליהוה בהדרת ²⁸ קדש ²⁹	b:b (7:6 < 6:6)	

22. H. L. Ginsberg, *Kiby'wgryt* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem, The Bialik Foundation, 1936), pp. 129ff. See also Gaster's treatment, "Psalm 29," *JQR*, 37 (1946–47), 55ff.; and the writer's early treatment, "Notes on a Canaanite Psalm in the Old Testament," *BASOR*, 117 (1950), 19ff. Recently, fresh interest has been directed at the psalm: for discussion and references, see M. Dahood, *Psalms*, I, 174–178; H. Strauss, "Zur Auslegung von Ps. 29 auf dem Hintergrund seiner kanaanäischen Bezüge," *ZA W*, 72 (1960), 101–107.

23. The revisions would include the substitution of "Yahweh" for "Baʿl" (which occasionally disturbs the meter slightly), and particularly the closing verse (v. It). Language in part and orthography throughout, of course, have undergone "modernizing" revision. It is interesting to compare the thorough revision of old formulae in Psalm 96 (e.g., *mišpēhōt ʿammīm* for *bēnē ʿēlīm*).

24. On the form in question, see F. M. Cross, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *JNES*, 12 (1953), 274–277 (which deals chiefly with the revival of the form): and below.

25. D. N. Freedman is probably correct in reading here *'Eli-m*, "El" with the enclitic, as often at Ugarit. See "Archaic Forms of Early Hebrew Poetry," p. 104f.

26. The syllable counts given are based on (1) the Israelite adaptation with the divine name *Yahwē*, and (2) the putative Canaanite original with the divine name *Baʿl* or, perhaps, *Hadd*.

27. The Canaanite suffix may have been *-hū* at the time of the composition of the poem. This writing is used as late as the tenth-century Byblus inscriptions. In Israel, however, the suffix was *-ii* or *ō*, zero in the orthography of the tenth-century text from Gezer.

28. As pointed out by the writer in 1950, *hdt* here probably means "apparition," as in the KRT text, *CTA*, 14.3.155, where it is in parallelism with *hulumu*, "vision," "dream." This suggestion has been generally accepted. Recently, H. Donner, "Ugaritismen in der Psalmenforschung," *ZA W*, 79 (1967), 331ff., has raised objections against the meaning "appearance," "theophany" in the KRT text, contending that strict paral-

(v. 4)	קל יהו בכח קל יהו בהדר	b:b (5:6 < 4:5)
(v. 5)	קל יהו ³³ ישר ארום	I (9 < 8)
	ישבר יהו ארו לבנן	b:b (5:5 < 4:5)
(v. 6)	ירקדם ³⁴ כמ עגל לבנן	I (9)
	ושרין כמ בן ראמם	I (9)
(v. 7)	קל יהו חצב להבת אש	I (8 < 7)
(v. 9b)	קל יהו ³⁵ יחסף ³⁶ יערת	I (8 < 7)
(v. 8)	קל יהו יחל מדבר	I (7 < 6)
	יחל יהו מדבר קדש ³⁷	I (7 < 6)
(v. 9,,)	יהו יחלל אילת ³⁸ { }	I (8 < 7)
	בהכל ³⁹ אמר ⁴⁰ כבד ⁴¹	I (8)

33. The second colon is quite short. We suggest here the patterning *yšbr* . *yšbr* like *yhl* . *yhl* in v. 8. The conjunction before the second *yšbr* is to be deleted.

34. The verb with enclitic *mēm* as recognized by H. L. Ginsberg. Again the conjunction is probably not original.

35. As generally recognized, *wyḥšp y'rw* is a fragment in v. 9b, no doubt arising in a haplography, a very easy scribal error in repetitive material. Verse 7 also is without a parallel colon or cola; we thus have combined the two cola filling out the second with *ql yhw* to achieve metrical symmetry. However, much more of the poem may be lost and hence not recoverable. Compare here Strauss, "Zur Auslegung von Ps 29," p. 91.

36. We read *yḥsp* for *yḥšp* with Ugaritic *ḥsp* and Arabic *ḥasupa*, both meaning "to pour water," "drench" (with Strauss). The root is found also in Isa. 30:14 and Hag. 2: 6.

37. As long ago suggested, *mḏbr qdš* must be taken here as the Syrian desert, the *mḏbr qdš* of CTA, 23.65, to fit with the other northern placenames, Lebanon and Sirion (Antilebanon).

38. *qōl* is to be dropped as a so-called vertical dittography. The colon is full long with *qōl* omitted. The symmetry of seven repetitions of the expression *qōl yhwē* is preserved by the insertion in v. 9b (see n. 35).

39. The colon as it stands makes no sense; *kullō* is prosaic in any case; the colon also is metrically impossible. We should reconstruct *bēhēkālō 'āmōr kābōd*. *klw* is taken to be a dittography, 'mr is vocalized as the stative *qatula*, 'amur > 'āmōr, in the archaic meaning "to see," stative-passive, "to appear." The 'amur is familiar from the Canaanite name: *a-mur-ba'l* (PTU, p. 320 and references) /'amur-ba'l/. "Ba'l is seen," better "Ba'l appeared." On Hebrew 'mr, "to see," see M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography I," *Biblica*, 44 (1963), 295f. In Psalm 29:9 he reads 'ōmer kābōd, "vision of the Glorious One," and the colon, "while in his temple—all of it, a vision of the Glorious One." I find this rendering awkward and prosaic as well as metrically impossible.

40. See n. 39. The *qatula* form is quite common also in Amorite names. gg, Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), pp. 92ff.; I, J. Gelb, "La lingua degli Amoriti," *Atti Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, 8, *Rendiconti*. Classe di Scienze, storiche e filologiche, 12 (1958), p. 155 § 3.2.5.4.

41. The pronominal suffix or *hēkālō* may be treated as a "double-duty" suffix so that we need not read *kēbōdō*.

יהוה למבול ישב⁴³ 1 (7 < 6)
 ישב יהוה מלך לעולם I⁴⁴ 1 (8 < 7)

- v. 1 Ascribe to Yahweh, 0 sons of 'El,
 Ascribe to Yahweh glory and might;
 Ascribe to Yahweh the glory due his name.

Fall down before Yahweh who appears in holiness!

The god of the Glory thunders,
 The voice of Yahweh is on the Waters,
 Yahweh is upon the Deep Waters.

The voice of Yahweh is mighty; the voice of Yahweh is majestic,
 The voice of Yahweh splinters the cedars;
 Yahweh splinters the cedars of Lebanon.

He makes Lebanon dance like a bullcalf,
 Sirion like a young buffalo.

The voice of Yahweh strikes with flaming fire,
 < The voice of Yahweh > drenches the forests.

The voice of Yahweh makes the desert writhe;
 Yahweh makes the Holy Desert to writhe;
 Yahweh makes the hinds to writhe (that is, calve).

In his temple (his) Glory appears!
 Yahweh sits enthroned on the Flooddragon ;
 Yahweh is enthroned, king forever.

From the several texts cited, two patterns or genres can be discerned either in separate or mixed form. The first pattern (1) is the march of the Divine Warrior to battle, bearing his terrible weapons, the thunderbolt and the winds. He drives his fiery cloud-chariot against his enemy. His wrath is reflected in all nature. Mountains shatter; the heavens

42. On *mabbūl*, see W. F. Albright, "The Predeuteronomiac Primeval," *JBL*, 58 (1939), 98 and the references cited there.

43. The idiom *yšb/yḡb I-*. "to sit enthroned," is typical of Canaanite diction where normally Hebrew prefers *yšb 'I* (Albright). Compare the text *Ugaritica* V, 3 discussed above, and nn. 3, 4.

44. The final bicolon appears to be an Israelite addition.

collapse at his glance. A terrible slaughter is appointed. All nature wilts and languishes. In the foreground is the cosmogonic struggle in which chaos-Yamm or Lôtân—is defeated.⁴⁵

The second pattern (2), and the most frequent, is the coming of the Divine Warrior from battle to his new temple on his newly-won mount.⁴⁶ In the background is his victory over Sea or the flood-dragon, though it is often alluded to, especially in his being enthroned on the Flood. Primary is his manifestation as Victor and King in the storm. The roar of his voice awakens nature. The appearance of his radiant storm cloud is both awesome and fructifying. His rule is manifest in the fertility of the drenched earth, of seed and womb. The mountains dance before the lord of life and all the trees clap their hands.⁴⁷

These related genres or themes are sometimes mixed, especially in the theophany proper. The storm god, whether attacking his enemy or thundering from his temple-mountain, is terrifying. While “the rain of Baʿl is sweet to the earth,”⁴⁸ and one may speak of his “goodly voice,” nevertheless, the dancing of the mountains, the writhing of the desert, and the spears of lightning east to earth are also manifestations of numinous power. Each storm, each epiphany of Baʿl, is a recapitulation of his victory over Sea. Thus in Psalm 29, in the central theophany, the “voice” of the storm god is “on the Waters,” or makes “the highplaces of the earth shake,” as well as making “the heavens rain oil; the wadis run with mead.”

The Storm Theophany in the Bible

In hymnic descriptions of the theophany of Yahweh we find these same patterns and motifs. (Otherwise the Canaanite hymn, Psalm 29, would hardly have been accommodated to the cult.) The language

45. See especially the passages under headings (4); cf. (5).

46. The best description of “his newly-won mount” is found in *CTA*. 3.3.26ff.

batōk ġuriya ‘ili šapāna
ba-quḏši ba-ġūri nahlatiya
ba-nu’mi bagib’i tal’iyati

In the midst of my mount, Divine Šapān,
In the holy mount of which I took possession,
In the lovely height of (my) victory.

Note the use of hendiadys in the last lines and the symmetry of the tricolon: IO: IO: 10.

47. See the passages under headings (1) to (3): cf. (6) through (8).

48. *CTA*, 3.3.7.

of theophany in early Israel was primarily language drawn from the theophany of Baʿl.

Hymns which fall into our first category, the march of the Divine Warrior to battle, convulsing nature by his wrath, have been treated at length above under the headings “The Divine Warrior” (chapter 5) and the “Song of the Sea” (chapter 6). They include virtually all of Israel’s oldest hymns and in most instances are fixed geographically and historically with the march of Conquest, sometimes including the event of the Reed Sea, regularly including the march from the southern mountains and the gift of the land. The Song in Exodus 15: 1–18 has been found to be the earliest as well as the fullest example. Other examples which include the event at the Reed Sea as part of the Conquest march are the Song of Habakkuk (Habakkuk 3: 3–15), Psalm 77: 15–20, and Psalm 114.⁴⁹ The poem underlying Judges 5 :4–5 and Psalm 68: 8–9; Psalm 68: 18 ; and Deuteronomy 33 :2f, 26–29 rehearse only the march from Sinai northward, the Conquest proper. The closing verses of the Blessing of Moses, while descriptive of the Conquest, also are strong with reminiscences of the storm god in their language :

- (v. 26) There is none like the god of Jeshurun,⁵⁰
Who rides the heavens mightly,⁵¹
Who gloriously rides the clouds.
- (v. 27) His (Jeshurun’s) refuge is the God of old;
Under him are the arms of the Ancient One.⁵²
- He drove out the enemy before you ;
< Before you > he smashed <the foe > .⁵³
- (v. 28) Israel encamps in safety;
Jacob dwells securely apart

⁴⁹ Although special problems are involved, the materials in Numbers 23:22–24; 24:8–9 bear witness to the same tradition.

⁵⁰ Detailed notes on this reconstruction of the text can be found in F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, “The Blessing of Moses,” *JBL*, **67** (1948), 191–210, esp. 209f.

⁵¹ See Cross and Freedman, “A Note on Deuteronomy 33: 26,” *BASOR*, **108** (1947), 6f., where we propose to read: rkb Smym b’z rkbg’wt šhqm.

⁵² Note the juxtaposition of Baʿl epithets in v. 26 and ‘El epithets in v. 27.

⁵³ The fragmentary text is restored on the assumption that the second colon has suffered a haplography by homoioteleuton. Note the chiasmic pattern. Presumably wy’mr was secondarily added as a rubric.

ygrš ‘yb mpnyk
<wšn’mpnyk> hšmd

Upon his land are grain and wine;
Yea, his heavens drip down dew.

- (v. 29) Blessed are you, O Israel,⁵⁴
A people who gained victory in Yahweh,
Whose shield is your help,
Whose sword is your glory.
Your enemies fawn upon you,
But you tread upon their backs.

One ancient fragment⁵⁵ containing the imagery of the storm-god theophany requires special comment: 2 Samuel 22 :8-16 = Psalm 18:8-16. If it had historical ties they are no longer preserved. In verse 16 we find “the sources of the sea were exposed ... at the blast of your nostrils,” and enemies are defeated in verse 15, but there is no sufficient reason to suppose that these are references to the Exodus-Conquest. At the same time, the context in which the fragment is placed, the succor of the king by the descent of Yahweh from his cosmic palace, appears not to be original. The psalmist drew on older sources and included only the storm theophany proper of the Divine Warrior:

- (v. 8) The earth quaked and shook;⁵⁶
The foundations of the mountains shuddered;
They quaked when his wrath waxed hot.
- (v. 9) Smoke rose⁵⁷ from⁵⁸ his nostrils,
And fire from his mouth devoured;
Coals flamed forth from him.

54. We have chosen arbitrarily one of the ancient variants conflated in this verse:

(1) ʾšryk yšrʾl

(2) yšrʾl my kmwk

55. On the date of the psalm and the theophany within it, cf. Cross and Freedman, “A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18,” *JBL*, 72 (1953), 16-21.

56. For detailed discussion of the text, see Cross and Freedman, “A Royal Song of Thanksgiving,” pp. 23-26.

57. Verses 8 and 9 form two tricola, verse 13 an additional tricolon. Note also the sequence of the tenses in v. 9.: perfect, imperfect, perfect (without waw-consecutive), fitting the early use of *yaqtul*.

58. The preposition **b** is used with the archaic meaning “from” as also in vv. 14 and 16.

- (v. 10) He spread apart the heavens and descended,⁵⁹
A storm cloud under his feet.
- (v. 11) He rode a cherub and flew,
He soared on the wings of the wind.
- (v. 12) He set darkness round about him,
His pavilion is the raincloud.⁶⁰
- (v. 13) Cloud-banks were before him,⁶¹
Before him his clouds raced by,
Hail and coals of fire.
- (v. 14) From⁶² the heavens Yahweh thundered,
And 'Elyon gave forth his voice.
- (v. 15) He shot forth his arrows and scattered them,
Lightning-bolts he flashed and put them in panic.
- (v. 16) The sources of the sea were exposed ;
The foundations of the world laid bare;
At your roar,⁶³ O Yahweh,
At the windy blast of your nostrils.

59. The meaning of this passage is explained by a similar passage in Isaiah 63:19, *lū' qāra'tā šāmāyim yāradtā mippānēkā hārīm nāzōllū*. "Truly you have torn open the heavens, you have come down; before you the mountains shook." The sense of the root *ny* here must be, "to spread out. to spread apart. to spread open (as curtains)."

60. *ḥasrat māyim* is the more difficult reading, and probably correct: *ḥeškat* in Psalm 18 apparently has been substituted under the influence of *ḥōšek* earlier in the verse. The word has been connected falsely with Akk. *ašāru*, Arab. *ḥašāra*. It is etymologically related to Neo-Hebrew *ḥšrh*, "sieve," and *ḥšr* which is used occasionally of clouds sifting or distilling water (cf. the Vulgate translation, *cribans*). Ugaritic *ḥyr* also fits into the picture, with the meaning "sieve" or the like. In the present context, the phrase must refer to the clouds as sieve-like containers from which the rain-water drops. Cf. the remarks of S. I. Feigin, "The Heavenly Sieve." *JNES*, 9 (1950), 40-43.

61. We read here (in pre-Exilic orthography):

עבי שחקם נגדה	1 (7)
נגדה עבו עברו	1 (7)
ברד וגחלי אש	1 (7)

nrgdh is a corruption of *ngdh*, *nigdō*, the initial *mēm* being due to dittography of the final *mēm* of the preceding word; the final *hē* is correct for the 3rd m.s. suffix in pre-Exilic times. The text of Samuel here has suffered haplography and been influenced by v. 9: *ghlm b'rw mmnw*.

62. See n. 58.

63. The root *g'r* may mean "roar" as well as "rebuke." Cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms*, I, I IO, citing H. G. May. "Some Cosmic Connotations of *Mayim Rabbim*, 'Many Waters'." *JBL*, 74 (1955), p. 17, n. 32. Both meanings are found in Ugaritic. See above, n. 11.

After Psalm 29, Psalm 89B (verses 6-19) is most characteristic of the second pattern, the coming of the Divine Warrior from the battle of creation to manifest his kingship.

- (6) Let heaven confess your wonders, **Yahweh**,⁶⁴
Your faithful deeds in the council of holy ones.
- (7) For who in the heavens compares with Yahweh?
Who may be likened to Yahweh among the gods?
- (8) The god **terrible**⁶⁵ in the council of the holy ones,
Great and dreadful above all around him,
- (9) Yahweh, god of hosts, who is like you?
Your might and your fidelity surround **you**,⁶⁶
- (10) You rule (enthroned) on the **back**⁶⁷ of Sea.
When his waves rise you calm them.
- (11) You crushed Rahab as a corpse,
With your mighty arm you **despatched your enemy**⁶⁸
- (12) The heavens are yours, yea, and earth is yours.
The world which you **created**.⁶⁹

64. Verse six introduces a new hymn. *Waw* at the beginning of the first colon is secondary. The form here is the address to the Divine Council as in Psalm 29:1f, requiring a jussive form. We reconstruct the first bicolon as follows:

יְדוּ שָׁמַיִם פְּלִאֵיךְ יְהוָה	1 (10)
[] אֲמַנְתִּיךְ בְּקֹהֶל קִדְשֶׁם	1 (11)

We read *ywdw* for M *wywdw* with GVSy. *pl'yk*, plural, follows GVSy, and *'mntk* altered to *'mntyk* to conform, *'ap*, a particle often added to cola in the process of transmission is deleted *metri causa*.

65. Compare the epithet of *Attar* at Ugarit: *'ttr'rz*, "Attar the Terrible."

66. Probably the text should read:

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת מִי־כֹכַב	1 (12)
חֲסֹנָה וְאֲמַתְךָ סַבְבִּיתִיךְ	1 (12)

The reconstruction is in pre-Exilic orthography. *hshkh*, an old spelling now found in an inscription from Beit Lei, has given rise to the corrupt *hshyn yh*. See F. M. Cross, "The Cave Inscriptions from Khirbet Beit Lei," in *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century*, ed. J. A. Sanders (New York, Doubleday, 1970), 299-306.

67. We read gwt. *gēwat* "back," following for the most part M. Dahood, *Psalms* I, 279: cf. M. Pope in *Job*, p. 69, on Job 9:8b; Psalm 29:10 above.

68. Read *'wybk*, singular.

69. *wml'h* is secondary, introduced to fill out the usual cliché: the *m* of *ysdtm* is enclitic with the 3. f. singular suffix.

לֵךְ שָׁמַיִם אֶף־לֶךְ אֶרֶץ	1 (8)
תְּבַל אֶתְּךָ יִסְדַּתְּךָ	1 (8)

- (13) Ṣapōn and Amanus⁷⁰ whom you created,
Tabor and Hermon shout joyfully in your name.
- (14) You possess a mighty arm ;
Your hand is strong and your right hand high.
- (15) Righteousness and Justice are the dais of your throne,
Loyalty and Fidelity march before you.
- (16) Blessed are the people who know your clarion,
Who march, Yahweh, in the light of your face.
- (17) In your name they rejoice all the day,
And in thy righteousness they are exalted.
- (18) For you are our" glorious might;
In your favor our horn is exalted.
- (19) Indeed* Yahweh is our ruler⁷³
The holy one of Israel our king.

The hymn begins with the address to the divine assembly to give praise to Yahweh and to acknowledge him the incomparable and terrible warrior (verses 6-9; compare Psalm 29: If.). The deity is then pictured as king, ruling enthroned on the Flood (verse 10; compare Psalm 29: 10). Allusion is made to his recent victory over the Flood dragon Rahab and to the subsequent mighty works of creation, the forming of Heaven and Earth, the mountains, and the divine giants (verses 12f.). Each of these evokes names of the old gods. He is portrayed as victor (verse 14); he is enthroned on the dais named Righteousness and Justice, words redolent of the Canaanite gods bearing abstract names: *Ṣidqu* and *Miṣōru*.⁷⁴ In the triumphal procession Loyalty and Fidelity are his vanguard: his people march bathed in the radiance of his nimbus (verses 15f.). The tableau shifts finally to the

70. We have discussed in chapter 2 the mountains *hamōn* and *'amn* (Hebrew *'mnh*) identifying the former with Amanus, the latter with Anti-Cassius. Either reading could be original here: I am inclined to think the corruption is most easily derived from *whmwn*. It has long been recognized that the two mountains (that is the old gods of Canaanite mythology) are to be found here. See most recently Dahood, *Psalms* II, 3 14, and references.

71. Read *'znw*. In the old Hebrew script *mēm* and *nūn* are regularly confused, especially in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. The shift from third to first person between v. 17 and v. 18 no doubt accounts for the scribal error.

72. The *lamed* is "emphatic *lamed*." See M. Dahood, *Psalms*, II, 315, and references.

73. Read *magān*, Phoenician *magōn*, "ruler." "commander." Cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms*, I, 16f.; *Psalms*, II, 316.

74. Ugaritic *ṣdq* and *mšr*, Sakkunyatōn's *suduk* and *mišōr* (*Praep. evang.* 1.10.14 [ed. K. Mras]). Cf. M. Astour, "Some New Divine Names from Ugarit," *JAOS*, 86 (1966), 282f.

victory feast in which the victorious warrior is acknowledged as ruler and king.

The parallel motifs in this hymn and in Psalm 29 are quite striking. Psalm 89B differs, however, in that in imagery of the storm theophany is eschewed. Only in verse 16 is there a hint of it.

Another hymn in this category is Psalm 97 : 1-6:

Yahweh is king, let the earth rejoice,
 Let the many isles be glad.
 Bright cloud and Storm cloud surround him,
 Righteousness and Justice are the dais of his throne.
 Fire goes forth before him,
 And blazes about his back.⁷⁵
 His lightning bolts light up the world,
 The earth sees and writhes,
 The mountains are melted like wax
 Before the <Lord>Yahweh,⁷⁶
 Before the Lord of all the earth.”

The heavens declare his righteousness,
 The peoples see his Glory.

Many other examples, early and late, lie at hand: Psalms 96 and 98 recount the rejoicing of nature before the Divine Judge; Psalm 93 is allied. Compare also Psalm 46 : 7f. ; Psalm 50 : 1-6 ; Psalm 104 : 1-9, 3 1; and Job 26 : 11-13.

In the Canaanite and early Hebrew poetry thus far examined, texts have tended to fall into two categories, (1) the march of the Divine Warrior to battle, and (2) the return of the Divine Warrior to take up kingship. One sees behind these two types of texts an archaic mythic pattern :

- (a) The Divine Warrior goes forth to battle against chaos (Yamm, Leviathan, Mot).
- (b) Nature convulses (writhes) and languishes when the Warrior manifests his wrath.

75. On this translation of *šryw(šūrāw)*, see M. Dahood, *Psalms*, II, 361.

76. Often *mlpny yhw* is deleted as a dittography. The textual witnesses which omit the phrase are late and few, and are better reckoned as having suffered secondary haplography. However, parallels (Ps. 114:7; Judg. 5:5=Ps.68:9) and meter suggest that *mlpny yhw* is the torso of a colon. We have expanded with *'ādōn* which satisfies the meter, increases repetition, and provides the basis of a haplography.

77. Father Dahood has called attention to the Ugaritic epithet *'adn 'ilm rbm* (as well as the well-known *ba'l'arši*). See *Ugaritica* V.6. 1.

- (c) The warrior-god returns to take up kingship among the gods, and is enthroned on his mountain.
- (d) The Divine Warrior utters his voice from his temple, and Nature again responds. The heavens fertilize the earth, animals writhe in giving birth, and men and mountains whirl in dancing and festive glee.

In the earliest texts of Israel this mythic pattern is replaced by an epic pattern. Yahweh as Divine Warrior fought battles which are particularized in place and time. The first element of the mythic pattern is replaced by the wars of Exodus and Conquest, by the march from Egypt or Sinai in the old victory hymns. The substitution of the historical wars of Yahweh is not complete, however, and especially in the royal cultus and in sixth-century prophecy (properly proto-apocalyptic) the Exodus-Conquest motif often merges with that of the battle with Sea.

The conflation in question is a conflation in fact of the god of the Fathers, 'El the warrior at the head of his covenant-folk, who leads in "historical" battles, and Ba^ʿl, the storm god, who defeats Sea in the cosmogonic struggle. It is a conflation of 'El, creator-progenitor, kinsman, and Ba^ʿl-Haddu, dragon-killer and creator-cosmic ruler. In the victory hymns of the league the epic theme dominates; the mythic pattern, however, was never wholly suppressed or submerged.

The Revelation at Sinai

In Israel's prose epic the primary locus and normative form of the theophany of Yahweh is found in the episode at Sinai. At first glance this appears surprising. In view of the theophanies in the old victory songs of Israel, one would suppose that the appearance of the Divine Warrior in battle at the sea, and/or marching to the Conquest of the land from the southern mountains, would provide the classic pattern of the theophany of the warrior god in Israel's tradition. In this view, the first of our genres of theophany discussed above would be original, the theophany at Sinai a secondary construct. Although this view is held by a number of scholars who have studied theophanic forms, it is too simple and unitary. The theophanies of the old hymns of the wars of Yahweh were written from the point of view of the league cultus in a shrine in Canaan. This is the reason that the march of the Divine Warrior is at the same time a "coming" in some of these texts, a "bringing" in others. Necessarily this march of the god-manifest is

linked to the theophany of the god who returns to his cosmic mount and there reveals himself from his palace as the invincible king.

The revelation at Sinai falls into genre (2), and presumes a tradition in which Yahweh's cosmic mount and ancient sanctuary were in the southern mountains. In the theophanic tradition, Yahweh was *zē sīnay*, "lord of Sinai" (Judges 5:5). At Sinai he showed himself in stormy and fiery cloud as ruler and lawgiver.* Here, too, however, the complete pattern exists, much obscured by the Priestly ordering of Epic tradition. In the background is the victory over Egypt at the sea. The use of the language of the storm theophany begins, not at Sinai, but at the sea. This is true, not only of the old hymns, the Song of the Sea, Psalm 77: 15-20, Psalm 114, and the Song of Habakkuk, but also of the Epic sources, J and E. In Exodus 13:21f., Yahwistic tradition records the appearance of "the column of cloud," *'mwd 'nn*, by day and of "the column of fire," *'mwd 'š*, by night, beginning at the border of Egypt. At the sea, according to the Yahwist in Exodus 14:24, "in the morning watch, Yahweh looked down on the Egyptian camp from the column of fire and cloud (*b'mwd 'š w'nn*) and threw the camp of the Egyptians into panic." In Elohist tradition in Exodus 14:19f. "the column of cloud" intervened, stationing itself between the battlecamps at the sea, being "a dark cloud."⁷⁹

To be sure, the language of the prose sources is secondary to the mythic and poetic imagery descriptive of the storm theophany. The Yahwist's expressions, *'mwd 'nn* and *'mwd 'š*, did not refer to separate phenomena, but the one "column of fire and cloud," *'mwd 'š w'nn* (Exodus 14: 24).⁸⁰ The Elohist uses the term "column of cloud," *'mwd h'nn* or *'mwd 'nn* (Exodus 14: 19; 33: 10; and Deuteronomy 31: 15), but varies his language with the parallel expression, *'b h'nn*, "cloud bank" (Exodus 19 :9), *'nn kbd*, "storm cloud" (Exodus 19: 16), and *'rpl*, "dark and fiery cloud, storm cloud" (Exodus 20:21).⁸¹ This last

78. Apparently this is the case in the difficult introduction to the Blessing of Moses, Deuteronomy 33: 4f.

79. Both the Massoretic and Greek texts are corrupt here. Joshua 24: 7, reflecting the same tradition, says succinctly "and he put a dark cloud *ma'āpēl* between you and the Egyptians." M and G may reveal two ancient variants: *h'nn whššk/hššk whm'pl*, a hendiadys in each case for "dark cloud." *wy'r 'i hlylh* is probably a harmonistic gloss. The Greek reading is different but unacceptable. Cf. Joel 2:2; Zeph. I :15: *ywm hššk w'plh ywm 'nn w'rpl*.

80. Cf. Dt. 1: 33, *b's lylyh wb'nn ywmm*.

81. Cf. the quotation from the Book of *Yašar* quoted in 1 Kings 8:12, "Yahweh has set the sun in the heavens/but said he would tent in the dark cloud (*'rpl*)."

term a derivative of ʿ*rp*,⁸² is familiar from 2 Samuel 22: 10 (= Psalm 18: 1b) in the context of the storm theophany, “and the storm-cloud under his feet,” and is often paired with ʿ*ānān* in prose and poetry.⁸³ In Deuteronomic tradition, the theophanic cloud is described as “fire or darkness, dark cloud, and storm cloud” (*ḥšk/ʿš ʿnn wʿrpl*).⁸⁴ All of these designations point back to the theophanic cloud of the storm god. Taken out of their poetic and ultimately mythic sources, they have been objectified and “historicized” in Epic and later tradition. The language is therefore a step away from its original context. The storm cloud, at once dark and fiery, on which the god rides, or which he drives as a chariot, has become a column of cloud by day, of fire by night, which succors Israel at the sea and then leads them to Sinai. When Yahweh reveals himself, the storm cloud hides the godhead who speaks (not thunders) from it. At Sinai the heavy cloud (*ʿnn kbd*) descends on the mount to the accompaniment of “the sounds of thunder” and “lightning bolts” (Exodus 19 : 16 and 20: 18 E), the most explicit reminiscences of the poetic storm theophanies. The response of nature in convulsions of fear and/or dances of joy has been lost in the process of demythologizing.⁸⁵

The relation between the ʿ*ānān* or ʿ*ārāpel*, “the storm cloud,” and the *kēbōd yahwē*, “the Glory of Yahweh,” is not wholly clear. We have suggested above two possible origins of the technical meaning of *kābōd* in the context of theophany, in the hypostatization of the abstract “majesty” of the deity, or as a shortened form of ʿ*nn kbd*, “storm cloud.”⁸⁶ The former appears to be the more likely. The

82. Cf. Ugaritic *rkb ʿrpt* (*rākib ʿarapāti*), Hebrew *rōkēb baʿārābōt*, “Cloud Rider” (Psalm 68: 5) used of the storm god.

83. Ezek. 34:12; Psalm 97:2; Job 38:9.

84. Dt. 5:19 and 4:11.

85. J. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, emphasizes the point that the response of nature is missing, pp. 100-11.

86. See above, note 30. George E. Mendenhall in recent lectures at the Biblical Colloquium and Johns Hopkins University [to be published under the title *The Tenth Generation*; cf. YGC, p. 274, add. (bb)] has argued, if I understand him correctly, that the term ʿ*ānān* corresponds in origin to the *melammu* of the Akkadians and has been misunderstood in later Israelite tradition. The ʿ*ānān* then would be the symbol of sovereignty of the king or god, presumably an aureole. As the writer pointed out in the discussion of Mendenhall’s paper, this construction requires that ʿ*ananu* in West Semitic only secondarily came to mean storm cloud. However, in Hebrew, biblical Aramaic, and Syriac, the meaning “cloud, rain cloud” seems to be primary. In Arabic the meaning of the verb “to appear” and the nouns in the sense “apparition, phenomenon” are most easily explained as denominative, i.e., secondarily derived from the meaning

earliest prose source using the term *kābōd* of the refulgent aureole surrounding or worn by the deity is found in Exodus 33: 17-23. Moses asks Yahweh to show him his “Glory.” Moses, hidden by Yahweh in a cave or cleft of rock, is permitted to see the back of the Glory after Yahweh has passed by. As has generally been recognized, the tradition in 1 Kings 19:9–13, the incubation of Elijah in the cave of the Mount of God, although very different in language, must in some way be dependent on Exodus 33 : 17-23. The tradition of Elijah in 1 Kings 19 is undoubtedly pre-Deuteronomic, going back to northern traditions which began to take form in the ninth century B.C. Exodus 33: 17-23 is Yahwistic in its present form, and it is very likely that the tradition is older. The Priestly editor of the Tetrateuch took up the term *kēbōd Yahwē* as part of his rich vocabulary of revelation. Certainly the Priestly source carefully distinguished the *kābōd* or nimbus from the *‘ānān* or storm cloud. In Exodus 16: 10 from the Priestly hand we read, “Behold the Glory of Yahweh appeared in the cloud.” In Exodus 24: 18 we are told that Moses “entered into the midst of the cloud” covering Mount Sinai. He certainly did not enter the “Glory.”* The Priestly description of the Glory says

“cloud, cloud bank.” The relation to the term *‘nn, du./pl. ‘nmm* in Ugaritic is most problematic. *Haddudū‘anani* (see above, n. 2) can be taken to mean either “storm cloud” or “nimbus.” Otherwise the term *‘nn(m)* applies to messenger boys, frequently called *‘nn ‘ilm* “divine messenger boys.” This designation is sometimes applied to members of Ba‘l’s retinue (2.1.18, 35), Ba‘l’s messengers Gapn and Ugar (4.8.14), and other messengers (1.3.17; 3.4.76). *CTA*, 4.4.58-60 is of special interest. ‘El speaks: “Am I a slave, the (messenger?) boy of Asherah? Am I a slave, an apprentice mason?” One might argue that the divine clouds were messengers of Ba‘l in the first instance, and then *‘nn* came to mean “messenger, errand boy.” In another listing of Ba‘l’s entourage, the term *‘rpt*, “clouds,” is used (5.5.6-11). It is interesting in this connection to note that in the scene of ‘El’s council underlying Daniel 7, the man-like one (Ba‘l) comes to receive kingship from the Ancient of Days (‘El) accompanied by the *‘ānané šēmāyyā*, “the clouds (?) of heaven.” This entire discussion of the Ugaritic material is highly speculative, and must be left aside in the present discussion.

87. In Exodus 24: 15f. and 40:34 we find two curiously parallel phrases:

wyks h‘nn ‘t hhr
 wyškn kbd yhw‘l ‘I hr syny

wyks h‘nn ‘t ‘hl mw’d
 wkbd yhw‘l ml’ ‘t mškn

The parallelism is greatest in Exod. 40:34 where in prose form the parallel members have ten syllables each. If minimum changes are made to turn the lines into poetry, the symmetry remains:

only that the *kēbōd Yahwē* had the appearance of “devouring fire,” *ʿēš ʾōkélet*.⁸⁸ Fire is, of course, regularly used in descriptions of the theophany of the storm god, and is part of the stock language of war oracles.⁸⁹ It is fitting in combination with the term *ḥēmā*, “hotness, wrath,” and *rēšep* “burning, disease,”⁹⁰ as well as with the fiery storm-cloud(s) and the lightning bolt, the storm god’s characteristic weapon. The epithet *ʿēl kābōd* belongs to Baʿl-Haddu in the **Vorlage** of Psalm 29, and *mélek kābōd* used repeatedly in Psalm 24 may have been a Baʿl title as well to judge from the Canaanizing context. This is not to suggest that only Haddu and later Yahwē had the “Glory,” or that the “Glory” was exclusively the possession of the storm god. But it may be said that the appearance of the “Glory” in the storm theophany is characteristic.

A large company of scholars continues to claim that the oldest and most original strand of the Sinai theophany, notably the Yahwistic tradition (as well as later Deuteronomic and Priestly accounts of the theophany) derives its imagery from the phenomena of a volcanic eruption.⁹¹ The traditions of the Elohist cannot be so construed; there can be no doubt that one of the Epic sources used the language of the theophany of the storm god. The crucial Yahwistic text is Exodus 19 : 18 : “Mount Sinai smoked, all of it, before Yahweh who descended upon it in fire, and smoke went up as the smoke of an oven, so that all the people⁹² were terrified.”⁹³

Such a tradition surely rests, not on a description of volcanic activity, but upon hyperbolic language used in the storm theophany.

In the poetic tradition which antedates the prose sources, the Divine Warrior is described as follows:

יכסה ענן אהל מועד	1(8)
כבד יהוה מלא משכן	1(8)

There can be little doubt that the Priestly editor drew on poetic sources in composing Genesis 1, as has been recently demonstrated to me by Father John Kselman. It may be that these passages, too, reflect a poetic *source* hitherto unsuspected. We know that *ʿhl* and *mškn* constituted a formulaic pair already in Ugaritic verse. One might argue that *ʿnn* and *kbd* similarly form a poetic pair.

88. Exod. 24: 17; cf. Ezek. 1: 28.

89. In old theophanic poetry, e.g., Ps. 18:9,13=2 Sam. 22:9, 13, and Ps. 29:7; in later hymns, see, e.g., Ps. 50:3;97:2-4; and 104:4; in Prophecy and proto-apocalyptic see, e.g., Amos 1:4-2:5; Isa. 29:6; 30:27, 30; 31:9; and 66:15f.

90. *Rēšep* is part of the storm god’s bodyguard in Hab. 3:5.

91. See the discussion of Jörg Jeremias. *Theophanie*. pp. 100-111.

92. On the text here, see Jeremias. *Theophanie*, p. 102, n.1.

93. Cf. Deut. 4:11f.; 5:23f.; 9:15b.

Fire and light, smoke and shining cloud, thunder and quaking are all elements intimately bound together in the poetic descriptions of the theophany of the storm god, or of the attack of the Divine Warrior. When Sinai or Zion is described as on fire or smoking, we need not send for seismologists. Experienced mountain climbers know well the frequency, violence, and special danger of the thunder storm in high mountains. The approach of towering black clouds lighted from within by so-called sheet lightning is an awesome spectacle. It is not a rare sight, moreover, to see lightning strike high points including often isolated trees near the timber line. Those who bear witness to such sights speak of explosions of fire, smoke, and steam. Such experiences stand behind the highly imaginative poetry of the storm god's epiphany. The northern storms of Lebanon, Cassius, or the Amanus no doubt gave initial rise to the tradition of the theophany, rather than Sinai or the southern mountains. That is, Israel used traditional Canaanite language in early descriptions of Yahweh's theophany, and it is this traditional poetic language, objectified and historicized in excessively literal prose that we find in the Epic accounts of the revelation at Sinai. This follows the same pattern of development that we have observed in the history of the traditions of the event at the sea.⁹⁸

History of the Tradition of the Storm Theophany

In early Israel, as late as the tenth century B.C., the storm theophany or derivative language was a frequent means of describing Yahweh's mode of revelation. It returned to popularity in the sixth century in proto-apocalyptic and persisted into full-blown apocalyptic.

In Job, which contains archaic material, reworked most probably in the sixth century B.C., we find the language describing the creator god and his revelation in the storm in fairly pure form: Job 26:5-14 and 38:1-4:6; compare 9: 5. In the inaugural oracle of Ezekiel, the prophet describes the manifestation of Yahweh in the northern storm

98. In the past the theory that Israel in Sinai encountered a volcano was bound up with the view that Yahweh was the local *numen* of the desert mountain. The latter view has collapsed and with it most of the underpinnings of the volcano theory. Yahweh was more akin to Baʿl, not to mention 'El, than to the local volcano genius of nineteenth-century constructs. One notes in passing that the actual Vulcan of the Canaanite pantheon had as his heritage and abode Egypt and the western isles, notably Crete as is wholly fitting, and so far as we can see, had no distinctive features or epithets in common with Yahweh.

associated with a great cloud, fire and lightning, and, of course, the appearance of the Glory. In the proto-apocalyptic of Isaiah, much of it dating from the sixth century, the imagery of the storm god as divine warrior is ubiquitous: Isaiah 24: 19–23; 26:21; 34:4, 8–10; 35: 1-10; 42: 13-15; 50:2f.; 59: 16-19; 63: 19b–64:2; and 66: 15f. Related proto-apocalyptic materials include Zechariah 9: 14; 14: 5b–9; and Haggai 2:6f., 21.⁹⁹

In the majority of these contexts, we find the coming of the Divine Warrior in eschatological warfare with imagery drawn from Israel's old hymns and from the royal cultus. The transformations of the old forms and language were not inconsiderable. The language of nature's response or uproar, in the presence of the warrior-god, in particular was reutilized. The explicit language of lightning and thunder is used, but is relatively infrequent. On the other hand, the theme of divine kingship and new creation becomes dominant.

One of the passages cited above will illustrate these continuities and transformations: Isaiah 35: 1-10.

1.

- | | | |
|--------|--|--|
| (v. 1) | The desert and the steppe shall laugh,
The wilderness shall rejoice and
blossom ; | יששום ¹⁰⁰ מדבר וציה 1 (8)
ותגל ערבה ותפרח ¹⁰¹ 1 (8) |
| (v. 2) | Like the crocus it shall burst into
bloom,
And shall rejoice, yea, rejoicing and
singing. | men כחבצלת פרח 1(8)
ותגל אף גיל ורבן ¹⁰² |
| | The glory of Lebanon shall be given
to it,
The splendor of Carmel and Sharon. | כבוד ¹⁰³ לבנון נתן לה 1 (8)
הדר כרמל ושרון 1 (7) |

99. From the same date and background are the war oracles in Nahum 1 (the acrostic poem first recognized by Gunkel as late); Jeremiah 10:10,13; and 25: 30bf.; and several Psalms including Psalm 50:2–6; and 104: 32f.

100. The anomalous *mēm* has been explained as a dittography, as *sandhi*; the assimilation of *yśśwn* to *mabr* (Torrey), and as enclitic, a rather esoteric archaism for this period.

101. Omit the conjunction for stylistic reasons, and with G.

102. Note the use of repetition and *figura etymologica*, but in patterns different from the genuinely archaic: *gyl* and *tgl (bis) prh* and *tprh (bis)*.

103. The article is often omitted here and below for stylistic or metrical reasons. Here IQIs^a omits the article before *lbwnn*.

They shall see the Glory of Yahweh,	המה יראו כבוד יהוה	1 (8)
The splendor of the eternal god.	הדר אלהי > עולם ¹⁰⁴	1 (7)
2.		
(v. 3) Strengthen weak hands;	חזקו ידיים רפות ¹⁰⁵	1 (7)
Make strong feeble knees,	ברכים כשלות אמצו	1 (8)
(v. 4) Say to the fearful of heart:	אמרו לנמהרי-לב	1 (7)
Be strong, fear not.	חזקו אל תיראו	1 (7)
Behold your god with vindication,	הנה אלהיכם נקם	1 (8)
He comes with divine recompense;	יבוא גמול אלהים	1 (7)
It is he who comes and saves you.	הוא יבוא וישעכם ¹⁰⁶	1 (8)
(v. 5) Then the eyes of the blind shall see,	אז תפקחנה עיני עורים	1 (10)
And the ears of the deaf be opened.	ואזני חרשים תפתחנה ¹⁰⁷	1 (10)
(v. 6) The lame shall leap as a gazelle,	וידלג כאיל פסח ¹⁰⁸	1 (8)
And the tongue of the dumb sing.	ויתרנן לשון אלם ¹⁰⁹	1 (8)
3.		
Indeed waters shall break out in the desert,	כי נבקעו במדבר מים	1 (8)
And streams in the wilderness.	ויזנחלים בערבה ¹¹⁰	1 (8)
(v. 7) And glaring desert shall become a swamp,	והיה שרב לאגם	1 (7)
Parched earth springs of water.	צמאון למבוקי מים	1 (7)

104. In 1QIs^a, there is an omission from *wlm* (34:17) to *hzqw* (35:3). It has been filled in by a hand of the Herodian Age (roughly a century after the *floruit* of the original scribe) with the traditional text for the most part. The omission could be explained as a haplography by homoioteleuton if *wlm* completed verse 2. A reading *'lhym'wlm* could also stand behind *'lhynw* < *'lhym.m* and *nw* are often confused. At all events, the metrical form and *'lhynw* can scarcely be correct in the Massoretic reading. Notice again the use of repetition in the quatrain, and the use of chiasm in the second bicolon.

105. The series of imperative plurals introduce the address to the divine council. Note the repetition of *hzqw* (*pi'el*) and *hzqw* (*qal*) in the first and fourth cola binding together the quatrain. The first colon also exhibits chiasm.

106. The tricolon stands very close to Isa. 40:10. Note the repetition of *ybw*³ and *'lhykm/'lhym* binding the tricolon together. The meter builds.

107. The bicolon is marked by the assonance of *'z/'zny* and *tpqḥnh/tpḥnh*, and by chiasm.

108. The *'z* here is to be deleted as vertical dittography.

109. The longer form is required, *metri causa*.

110. This bicolon is a striking instance of stress meter giving an improper scansion, syllabic meter reflecting a fuller symmetry (and correct scansion) of the bicolon. Note the chiasm.

Sorrow and sighing shall flee away. 120 נסו יגון ואנחה¹²⁰ 1 (8)

The poem begins with the anticipated response of nature to the theophany of the victorious warrior. The dry and sterile desert is to bloom and rejoice; the wilderness will become as fertile and green as the well-watered fields of Sharon and the wooded hills of Carmel and Lebanon. The theophany which the transformed lands witness is expressed in the ancient language of the “glory” and “splendor” which appear associated with his manifestation as victor and king. In the companion piece in chapter 34 of Isaiah, the divine warrior goes forth to battle, and the heavens “roll up as a scroll, and all their armies languish.”

In both chapter 34 and 35, we recognize the ancient forms of the theophany of the storm god in his role as warrior and king. Much of the storm imagery has been leached out of the new forms of the sixth century. Enough survives to make its origin patent.

The second **strophe** begins with the address to the divine council (by heralds) announcing the coming of the god with “deliverance, recompense, and victory,”“* a message to hearten the feeble and fearful. The surge of renewal and new creation now is portrayed in the healing of the maimed and defective, and in the third **strophe** by hyperbolic transformation of the desert into springs and marshes. Water in the desert, like the blooming of the desert, is a theme ultimately integral to the manifestation of the god of fertility, the storm god. However, in Israel it also is reminiscent of Israel’s march through the wilderness in the Exodus-Conquest. The third **strophe** thus serves as a transition to the climactic fourth **strophe** in which the theme of the New Exodus-Conquest breaks out plainly.

The high road across the desert (in Isaiah 40 built by the council of Yahweh) as a theme recalls both the old march of the divine warrior at the head of his hosts and the armies of Israel in the conquest of the land and the battle at the sea, and the processional of the “glorious king” back from victory to his throne in what we have termed the

120. The first two cola of the *tricolon* are bound together by repetition of *śmḥt*; the last two by *chiastic order*. Note the extraordinary assonance achieved by the repetition of *m* in colon 1, the repetition of the rather rare *ś* in colon 2, and the repetition of *n* in the final colon.

121. These are, perhaps, better translations in this context of *nāqām*, *gamūl*, and *yōšīr*. G. E. Mendenhall in a forthcoming study traces the meaning “deliver” for *nqm* ‘from Amarna Canaanite to late classical Hebrew. *Nāqām* is two-sided-vengeance against enemies, deliverance or vindication to one’s friends.

“ritual conquest.” The festal context of the latter with its celebration on Zion in the royal cultus involves the transformation of the theme of the old hymns and the Epic.

The old Exodus-Conquest is conflated with the battle of creation and its mythical associations. In turn the theme undergoes a second transformation in the eschatological context of proto-apocalyptic. The new Exodus-Conquest is merged with the new creation.

In the era of the kings and prophets, after the division of the kingdom, and before the destruction of Jerusalem, the tradition of the nature theophany of the divine warrior is carried in the royal cultus in a restricted group of Canaanizing hymns: Psalm 46: 7f., 93, 96, 97: 1-6 (quoted above), 98, and 144:5f. Two of these, 46 and 93, may be archaic; at least both include ancient material. Psalm 96 echoes Psalm 29, imitates the repetitive prosodic patterns of the ancient hymns, but must be labeled archaizing, not archaic.

In classical prophetic oracles, this tradition is excessively rare, and where it exists the explicit language of the storm has been largely eschewed. In Amos 1: 2, for example, the tradition evidently lies in the background.

יהוה מציון ישאג
מירושלים יתן קולו
אבלו גוות רעים
ויבש ראש כרמל

Yahweh roars from Zion,
From Jerusalem he gives voice.
The pastures of the shepherds languished,
The peak of Carmel became sere.

The context is the declaration of war against the nations of the Davidic empire who have breached covenant. The divine warrior is to go forth. Hence nature blanches. Here no doubt is the language of the storm theophany, but not explicitly. One must know the tradition to detect it. The first bicolon appears to be in the figure of the lion roaring, rather than of the storm god roaring and thundering. One suspects that the voice of Yahweh as thunder may lie just under the surface; if so, the language is muted.

Micah 1: 3 is another, similar instance. Yahweh goes forth to war from his cosmic sanctuary :

122 הנה יהוה יצא ממקומו
 ירד ודרך על במותי-ארץ
 ונמסו הרים תחתיו
 ועמקים יתבקעו
 כדונג מפני אש
 כמים מגרים במורד

Behold Yahweh shall go forth from his place,
 He shall descend and tread the heights of earth.
 The mountain shall melt beneath him,
 And the valleys shall burst,
 Like wax before fire,
 Like water running down a slope

The second bicolon has verbal contacts with the war song of Isaiah 34: 3f.

ונמסו הרים מדמם
 ונמקו > כל עמקים < 123
 ונגלו כספר שמים
 וכל צבאם יבול
 כנבל עלה מגפן
 וכנבלת מתאנה

The mountains shall melt with their blood,
 And all the valleys rot away.
 The heavens roll up as a scroll,
 And all their host languishes,
 As the wilting of the vineleaf,
 As the withering of the fig.

In both there is a high level of assonance and paronomasia of a similar sort, as well as parallelism of ideas and form. So close are the verbal and stylistic correspondences that one is pressed to give one of two possible explanations: (1) that both paraphrase an archaic battle hymn, or (2) that Micah 1:3f. is an insertion of late material of the Isaianic

122. **ky** is omitted at the beginning of v. 3, **waw** from the beginning of the second colon of verse three (hence *yērēd* for *wē-yārad*), and the article from the first word of the second colon of v. 4, all for prosodic reasons.

123. *kl'mqym* has been lost by haplography. The corruption of the text is complex here. IQIs^a reintroduced *wh'mqym*, but is influenced by Micah 1:3. G reflects the full haplography. *kl šb' hšmym* is a doublet of *kl šb'm* immediately below.

tradition of the sixth century B.C., corresponding to the late Isaianic material incorporated in Micah 4: 1-4 (= Isaiah 2: 4-4). It is not impossible that both (1) and (2) are true.

Both passages describe the convulsions and sterility of nature before the onslaught of the divine warrior. Again, explicit phenomena of the storm are remote.

Only one other passage deserves our attention as coming possibly from the age of classical prophecy,¹²⁴ Isaiah 30:27-33, especially verse 30. It proves to be a quotation from a war song, as is made explicit in verse 27:

You shall sing the song,	השיר יהיה לכם	b (6)
As in the night when the feast is celebrated,	כליל התקדש חג	b (6)
And your heart will rejoice,	לכנ <i>nnnwi</i>	b (5)
As when one goes in procession with the pipe.	כהולך בחליל	b (6)
To enter to the mount of Yahweh,	לבוא בהר יהוה	b (6)
To the Rock of Israel.	אל צור ישראל	b (5)
“Yahweh has made heard the crash of his voice:	השמיע יהוה הד ¹²⁶ קולו	1 (7)
His arm has drawn his bow and he has shot(arrows of lightning):	נחת ¹²⁷ זרועו ¹²⁸ ירה	1 (8)
With hot wrath and consuming flame,	בועף אף ו {להב} אוכלה ¹²⁹ {אש}	1 (8)

124. Isa. 19: 1, a highly modified description of “the rider on a swift cloud,” must be considered later. The hymnic fragments in Amos 4:13:5:8-9; and 9:5-6 are secondary in the collection. The hymn may be older (as is the case with the Hymn of Habakkuk), or, perhaps, Exilic. For the recent discussion of these materials, see J. L. Crenshaw, “Amos and the Theophanic Tradition,” *ZAW*, 80 (1968), 203-215; older literature is cited by Eissfeldt. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 3rd ed. (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1964), p. 540, n. 3.

125. The hymn quoted from the cult was probably cast, originally, at least, in the narrative past. Hence, we have omitted *waws* at the beginning of cola. However, meter remains unaffected by casting in the future.

126. Ehrlich is probably correct in reading *hēd*, “crash (of thunder).” *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel* (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1912), 111.

127. Read *nihhat* (= 2 Sam. 22:35) or *nihhātā* (= Psalm 18:38). *nht* with *zērō* in Ugaritic and early Hebrew is an idiom meaning “to draw the bow,” or “to shoot a bow.” See our discussion above, chapter 2, notes 57, 59 and especially 58. Add also Psalm 38:3 to parallels cited. The noun *zērō* may be feminine or masculine.

128. *Waw* has been lost by haplography, probably, although we need not introduce it. The *’alef* was introduced in a secondary revision when the colon was misunderstood.

129. *Lāhab* and *’ēš* are conflated old variants.

With cloudburst and flood and hail.” נפץ חרם ואבן ברד 1 (7)

In all these passages from prophecy, the old language of theophany is restricted to the context of divine warfare against the nations. In fact, the ordinary language of divinemanifestation and revelation in prophetic oracles belongs to a very different tradition.

‘El’s Modes of Revelation

Baʿl’s characteristic mode of self-revelation is in the storm theophany. ‘El on the other hand makes his will known in the word or decree of the council of the gods. ‘El’s word is, in effect, the judgment or decision of the divine council, and it may be announced by the messenger of the council or more directly to mankind in dream or visitation. These two different modes of manifestation and revelation are well defined in the Canaanite, especially the Ugaritic, sources preserved, limited though these sources are.

(1) In the first tablet of the ‘Aqhat Epic¹³⁰ we find Dani’il engaged in an incubation. For a week he gives offerings, spending each night awaiting a divine revelation. On the seventh day, the scene shifts to the council of ‘El. Baʿl approached the throne of ‘El with a plea :

Wretched is Daniel, man of Rapi’;¹³¹
 Gazr, man of the Harnamite¹³² is sad,
 Who has no son like his brothers,
 Nor scion like his kindred.
 Should he not have a son like his brother?
 Or a scion like his kindred?

He has given offerings for the gods to eat;
 He has given offerings for the sons of Qudšu¹³³ to drink.
 Will you not bless him, O Bull ‘11 []¹³⁴
 Grant him grace, O Creator of Creatures?

130. *CTA*. 17 (Gordon 2 ‘Aqht).

131. *Rapi’* as we have seen above (chapter 2) means “Hale One,” a god or especially ‘El himself. ‘El appears evidently to be the patron of Daniel.

132. On the place name Harnam, modern *Hermel* near *Baʿlbeq*, see W. F. Albright, “The Traditional Home of the Syrian Daniel,” *BASOR*, 130 (1953). 26f.; and D. N. Freedman and F. I. Anderson, “Harmon in Amos 4:3,” *BASOR*, 198 (1970). 41. *Harnamay*, then, would be the “one of Harnam,” perhaps a deity.

133. Here *Qudšu* probably is the epithet of Asherah, mother of the gods.

134. The text reads l-ṭr. ‘il ʾaby.ʾaby, “my father” is probably to be omitted. Often epithets “filled out” in copying, a confusion between the short or long alternate formulae.

Let there be a son in his house,¹³⁵
 A scion in the midst of his palace.¹³⁶

A formulaic description of the duties of the heir follow. Then 'El takes the case of Daniel presented by Ba^l as advocate¹³⁷ and renders a favorable decision :

[Behold], 'El took his servant (into his care).¹³⁸
 He blessed Daniel, man of Rapi',
 He gave power to Ġazr, man of the Harnamite:

"Let Daniel be enlived with vitality,
 With spirit Ġazr, the man of the Harnamite."¹³⁹

'El continues with instructions, to be transmitted to Daniel, directing him to mount his conjugal couch and embrace his wife, with the result that she conceive a child. 'El concludes:

Let him have a son in his house,
 A scion in the midst of his palace."¹⁴⁰

In the missing portion at the end of column 1 and at the beginning of column 2, Daniel is informed by messenger or in a dream of 'El's decree and blessing, and in the first preserved lines of column 2 we find him rejoicing.

(2) A closely similar episode is found in the Keret Epic, the second

135. The text reads :

wa-yakun binuhūbabēti
 šuršu baqirbi hēkalihū

136. CTA. 17.1.17-28.

137. Ba^l plays the same intercessory role in the KRT Epic, **CTA. 15.2.1** l-end to be discussed below.

138. The line is reconstructed as follows:

[hn.y]'ihd.'il.'bdh.

Behold. 'El took his servant."

An alternate reading is barely possible:

[byd.y]'ihd.'il 'bdh

"'El took his servant by the hand."

There is very little room in the lacuna, so that the first reading is preferable.

The meaning of *'hd* in this context is figurative. Whether or not it is construed with **byd** it means "to succor." "to take care of." Cf., for example, Ps. 73: 23, and such names as *'āhazyāhū*, "Yahweh has taken (by the hand)." "Yahweh has cared for."

139. CTA, 17.1.35-38.

140. **CTA**, 17.1.43f.

column of the second tablet.¹⁴¹ A half-dozen major gods are mentioned in the first, broken lines. Keret like Daniel appears to have arranged a feast for the gods.

[The]n the council of ʿĒl¹⁴² arrived,
[And] ʿAlʿiyān Baʿl took up speech.

Come [now], O kindly One, [ʿEl the] Compassionate,
Will you not bless [Keret] the Noble?
Will you not grant grace to Nuʿman, [Lad] of ʿĒl?

[ʿEl] took a cup in (his) hand,
A goblet in (his) right hand.

Verily he blessed [his servant] ;
ʿĒl blessed Keret [the Noble];
[He granted] grace to Nuʿman, Lad of ʿEl.

“A w[ife you shall ta]ke, O Keret,
A wife you shall take in your house;
A maiden you shall bring into your court.
She shall bear seven sons to you ;
Indeed she shall give birth to eight.

She shall bear Yaṣṣib the lad,
Who shall suck the milk of Asherah,
Who shall suckle the breasts of the Maid ʿAnat.”¹⁴³

After the naming of the sons and daughters to be born, with their births, and Keret’s exaltation among his peers, the episode ends with the verses :

The gods blessed, they proceeded,
They proceeded to their tents,
The family of ʿEl to their encampments.¹⁴⁴

The place of the meeting of the divine council is not wholly clear. It may be that the ambiguity stems from the usual dualism of the feast, the feast at the god’s shrine, and its paradigm in the cosmic mount of the assembly. In the present case Keret seems to have participated in

141. CTA, 15.2.11–28 (end).

142. ʿidatu ʿili-mi. identical with biblical ʿadat ʿel, Ps. 82: 1.

143. CTA, 15.2.11–27.

144. CTA. 15.3.17–19.

the divine assembly, much as the prophet Isaiah in his inaugural oracle saw the proceedings in Yahweh's cosmic temple and took part in its actions.¹⁴⁵ One may also compare the visitation of Abraham at the terebinths of Mamre when he was promised a son (Genesis 18: 1-16).

Again Ba'l plays the role of intercessor or advocate in addressing 'El. One is immediately reminded of the role of the *mal'ak yahweh*, the advocate in the heavenly court, who, as the late Sigmund Mowinckel showed, is identical with the Heavenly Vindicator, *gō'ēl*, or Heavenly Witness, 'ēd, in Job.¹⁴⁶

Finally, as in the case of Daniel, 'El blessed Keret and gave a proclamation of what the future held, namely, the birth of progeny to Keret.

(3) In the first tablet of the Keret Epic 'El appears to Keret in a dream or vision.

In his (Keret's) dream, 'El descended,
 In his vision, the Father of Mankind,
 He drew near, questioning Keret :¹⁴⁷
 "What ails Keret that he cries?
 That Nu'mān the Lad of 'El weeps?
 Does he desire the kingship of Bull, his father?¹⁴⁸
 Or, indeed, dominion like the Father of Mankind's?

Keret replies at length, describing first what he does *nor* wish, finally coming to the point:

[Grant that] I may beget sons;
 [Grant that] I may multiply kindred.¹⁵⁰

'El then directs Keret to cleanse himself, prepare meat and drink

145. Isa. 6:1-8. Cf. the remarks of the writer, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *JNES*, 12(1953), 274-277.

146. See Sigmund Mowinckel. "Hiobs *gō'ēl* und Zeuge im Himmel," in *Vom Alten Testament (Marti Festschrift)*, ed. K. Budde (Giessen, A. Töpelmann, 1925), pp. 207-212; and "Die Vorstellungen der Spätjudentums von heiligem Geist als Fürsprecher und der johanneische Paraklet," *ZNW*, 32 (1933) 97-130. Much new data is to be found in materials from Qumrān; cf. provisionally, *ALQ*², pp. 213ff.

147. The text is to be read: wa-yiqrab ba-ši'ali kirta.

148. It is of interest that 'El asks if Keret wishes to usurp his throne. It is a surprising question. Yet it scarcely can be coincidence that both Tyre and Babylon are accused of desiring to take 'El's seat, "in the heart of the seas" (Ezek. 28:2) or on "the mount of the council" (Isaiah 14: 13).

149. *CTA*, 14.1.35-43.

150. The reconstruction is that of H. L. Ginsberg, *The Legend of King Keret, BASOR, Supplementary Series 2-3* (1946), p. 36.

offerings, and mount the top of his temple-tower (*migdal*):

Lift up your hands to heaven ;
Sacrifice to Bull, your father 'El.
Minister to Baʿl with your sacrifice,
The Son of Dagan with your provision.¹⁵¹

'El then directs Keret to prepare for war, to gather supplies and muster armies, for a campaign against Pabel, king of 'Udum. The prize of the campaign will be fair Hurriya, Pabel's first-born, the gift of 'El to Keret to provide him with progeny.¹⁵²

(4) In the last tablet of the Keret Epic there is a curious scene of 'El presiding over his assembly. Seven times he addresses the gods:

"Who among the gods will exorcise illness?
Who will drive out sickness?¹⁵³
No one among the gods answered him.
Then the Kindly One, 'El the Compassionate spoke:
"Sit, my children, on your seats,
On your princely thrones.
I myself will practice magic:
I will surely create¹⁵⁴
An exorcist¹⁵⁵ of the illness,
One who will drive out the sickness."¹⁵⁶

'El then forms a female creature named Sa'tiqat to send to Keret to heal him and instructs her:

"Let Death now be extirpated,
Let Sa'tiqat prevail."¹⁵⁷

And so Keret was healed.

151. *CTA*, 14.2.75-79.

152. *CTA*, 14.3.155 ends the dream sequence. The text 14.3.152 has been corrected by Professor Dean McBride to read:

k!t!ld. špḥ. lkrt
ki talidu šipḥa la-Kirta

153. H. L. Ginsberg has argued that *zbl* means "illness" as well as "prince" (*The Legend of King Keret*, p. 34). This meaning may be denominative from *ršp zbl*, "Rašpu the Prince" (cf. *CTA*, 15.2.6), the god of disease. Compare *dāgān*, "grain," 'aštārôt, "fertility." See also *UT*, glossary, No. 816; and M. Held, "The Root ZBL/SBL in Akkadian, Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew," *JAOS*, 88 (1968), 90-96.

154. The verb *šakānu* in old Canaanite had usages parallel to those in Akkadian. "to establish," "to make," "to create."

155. The forms *ydt* and *gršt*, which Miss Herdner insists are correct (*CTA*, p. 76, n. 4), must be vocalized as feminine participles: *vādītu* and *gārištu*, "exorcist," "ex-peller."

156. *CTA*, 17.5.20-28.

157. *CTA*, 17.6.1f.