

and de Moor 1975; Driver 1956; Durand 1993; Freilich 1992; Gachet 1992; Gibson 1978; Ginsberg 1941; 1950; Gordon 1947; Greenstein 1977; Healey 1983b; Held 1973; Herdner 1963; Korpel 1990; Lambert 1985; Margalit 1983; Meier 1986; de Moor 1968; 1971; 1987; Niehr 1994; Nougayrol 1968; 1970; del Olmo Lete 1981; Pardee 1980; 1984; 1987; 1988a; 1988b; 1988c; 1989-90; 1991; forthcoming; Pope 1955; 1977b; Ribichini and Xella 1984; Rummel 1978; Sanmartín 1978; Schaeffer 1949; 1954; Smith 1986; 1994; Van Soldt 1989; 1991; Vaughn 1993; Virolleaud 1931; 1932; 1934a; 1934b; 1935; 1938; 1944-45; Walls 1992; Watson 1980; 1989b; Williams-Forte 1983; Yon 1989; 1990; 1991.

DAWN AND DUSK (1.87)
(The Birth of the Gracious and Beautiful Gods)

Dennis Pardee

The text recounting the birth of the double deity Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu, "Dawn and Dusk," constitutes one of the most important of the texts discovered during the early years of excavations at Ras Shamra and which stand outside the principal cycles of texts (Ba^clu, Kirta, and ²Aqhatu). The text is inscribed on a single tablet, discovered during the second campaign in the building located between the two principal temples and which is known as the "High Priest's Library" (*editio princeps* by Virolleaud 1933). The tablet is relatively well preserved and the text on it appears to have been complete, for not only are both the upper and lower edges extant, with neither archival notation on the former nor colophon on the latter, but there is space for at least one more line of writing at the bottom of the *verso* which the scribe has left blank.

The text has two peculiar features: (1) it deals with the origin and characteristics of what must be judged, on the basis of other Ugaritic texts, to be a pair of relatively minor deities; (2) the text itself contains rubric indications which have been interpreted as reflecting a cultic usage of the text.

As regards the first point, there are two indications as to why the birth of Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu may be thought to have occupied a particular position in Ugaritic thought. The first is visible in the mythological narrative of this text, viz., that the mothers of these deities are not described with terms characteristic of divinity, indeed are termed simply ²atim, "two women." We seem to be dealing, therefore, with the motif of divine engenderment well known in classical literature, in this case the impregnation by the god ²Ilu of two human females, who each give birth to one of the deities who make up the pair Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu.¹ Though a text identifiable as a theogony has not appeared yet among the Ugaritic literature, the fact that the goddess ²Aṭiratu bears the title of *qnyt* ²ilm, "progenitress of the gods," has led most scholars to see her as the divine mother of ²Ilu's central family, known in the ritual texts as *bn* ²il, *dr bn* ²il, and *mphrt bn* ²il, "the sons of ²Ilu," "the circle of the sons of ²Ilu," and "the assembly of the sons of ²Ilu." In one of these texts ²Ilu bears the title of *ab bn* ²il, "the father of the sons of ²Ilu," and in the mythological texts he bears the name of *bny bnwt*, "the producer (lit. builder) of progeny (lit. that which is built)." Into this picture may be introduced the facts that the deity Šalimu is the last deity named in the two "pantheon" texts known at Ugarit up to the present (on RS 1.017 and RS 24.643, see Pardee forthcoming) and that he is the last deity named in a sacrificial sequence repeated in three texts (RS 1.001:8, RS 1.003:17, RS 18.056:18 — see Pardee forthcoming on RS 1.001:8). The identification of this deity with one member of the binomial Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu appears plausible, though not certain, and his place in the pantheon may be interpreted as indicating that he was seen as the deity who most appropriately brought up the rear of the procession of the gods. In the light of the present myth, the rank of the deity is perhaps best interpreted as reflecting his birth, not by ²Aṭiratu and perhaps, to the extent that time was a factor in divine genealogy, after ²Ilu's children by ²Aṭiratu. The double deity Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu also appears in a rather enigmatic ritual text of which the central part is a list of divine names (RS 24.271:11, see Virolleaud 1968:583-586). On these matters see the bibliographical data and discussions in Pardee 1989-90:456-458 and forthcoming.

These details concerning Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu may be of use in identifying the "gracious gods" (*ilm n^cmm*), mentioned in lines 1, 23, and 67 (in line 60 the text has *ilm n^cmm*), who are sometimes identified with Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu, sometimes not. The sequence of the presentation requires either that they be seen as born after Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu or that they be identified with Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu whose birth would have been twice reported. The former solution appears narratologically the more plausible, but it requires that the description of the "gracious gods" as having "(one) lip to the earth, (the other) lip to the heavens" (lines 61-62) be applied to an unknown group of divinities, whereas that description and the following lines seem quite graphically to describe the gods of dawn and dusk. If Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu are indeed somehow identifiable with the single deity Šalimu, it is in any case unlikely that the "gracious gods" are to be identified with the rest of the Ugaritic deities or even with the majority of ²Ilu's offspring, as many

¹ This motif appears again in Ugaritic but in a text even more difficult than this one, CTA 12 (Herdner 1963, text 12).

scholars have thought, for there is simply no reason to believe that the circumstances described by this poem correspond to the circumstances of the birth of the children of ʔAṭiratu. It appears preferable, therefore, to see the double birth narrative simply as a narrative device expressing the birth by two women of two deities. This position is defended below in the note to lines 55-64. According to that interpretation, the text has as its central focus from beginning to end the deities Dawn and Dusk, who are, in this text, ascribed significant powers of blessing.

The second peculiarity, in comparison with the other mythological texts, is the organization of this text. The first twenty-nine lines are divided by horizontal lines across the tablet into nine sections, some of which seem to contain snippets of mythological texts, bearing motifs both familiar and unfamiliar, while others contain indications of liturgical activity, though the identity of the participants is not clear. Then the rest of the text, lines 30-76, relates, without a break by horizontal lines, the story of the birth of Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu, the “gracious gods” (lines 30-64), their characteristics and banishment to the desert (lines 64-67), and a final section dealing with the discovery by the “gracious gods” of agricultural products (lines 67-76). Beyond the basic problems of interpretation of the first nine sections, the matter of their relationship to the principal myth has exercised the minds of students of this text, with some seeing the short mythological texts as mere incipits, unrelated to the longer story, while others have attempted to discern an overarching story line. The intermingling of liturgical rubrics and mythological elements seems to favor the latter interpretation, for although one could without difficulty picture a tablet inscribed with a series of incipits, it is more difficult to posit the existence of an aleatory liturgical text from the ancient Near East. The motifs of agricultural plenty of the first sections may provide the pattern for the myth, according to which Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu are born voracious devourers of birds and fish who must be put in a situation where they will desire to live, like the other gods, from the produce of the fields (cf. Caquot, Szyner and Herdner 1974:363-64). To the extent that this myth is reflected in the ritual prescriptions written in prose, one may assume the domestication of Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu to have succeeded, for, as mentioned above, Šalimu appears in those texts, and his diet is no different from that of any of the other deities. These facts regarding the divine diet may be interpreted as reflecting general Ugaritic sacrificial practice, where the deities normally receive the products of agricultural activity rather than of fishing and fowling;² this sacrificial practice would in turn reflect alimentary patterns in the ancient Levant (cf. Houston 1993). One could posit a view of the universe in which the alimentary world reflected by the sacrificial system is viewed as an improvement, because of the organized distribution of agricultural products that it implies, over a more primitive system, more dependent on nature’s whims, presented here as one in which the voracity of certain spoiled children of ʔIlu could provoke shortages and famine.

Is it possible to identify the ceremony at which this liturgical series would have been played out? There is one specific feature and one of a more general nature that may serve to fix this ceremony in the cultic cycle. The specific feature is the mention of “dwellings of the gods, eight ...” in line 19 (*mibt ʔilm ʔmn*), for that phrase finds its closest parallel in a ritual text (RS 1.003:50-51, see text 1.95 below) where “dwellings (of the gods)” are distributed four by four on a roof, probably that of the temple of ʔIlu, on the first day of an unnamed month that follows the month named Raʔšu Yēni, “the beginning of the wine.” Though most scholars have seen the text as referring to only one month and have assumed Raʔšu Yēni to have been the first month of the year, the structure of RS 1.003 and a host of other arguments indicate that Raʔšu Yēni was in all likelihood the last month of the year, the lunar month preceding the fall equinox, during which the grape harvest and vinification would have begun, and that the ceremony indicated in RS 1.003:50-55 is that of the first month of the new year³. As in the Hebrew system, where the feast of “booths” (*sukkot*) began on the fifteenth day of the first month of the year (according to the calendar beginning in fall), the Ugaritic harvest festival would have taken place after the August-September harvest, though RS 1.003 indicates that at Ugarit it began on the first day of the new month/year, rather than the fifteenth. The more general feature of this text to which reference was made above is the mention of “wine” in lines 6 and 75 and the several allusions to viticultural activities, particularly appropriate for a harvest festival.

Because of the liturgical aspects of this text and the conception of Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu recounted in it, this text has been interpreted as reflecting the sacred marriage rite, the *hieros gamos*, at Ugarit (e.g., de Moor 1987:117-118). Though this interpretation appears plausible, to the extent that the first sections are interpreted liturgically and linked to the following myth, it must be stressed that this text provides no details whatever regarding the liturgical aspects of the *hieros gamos* itself, i.e., to what extent the various rôles were acted out and the specifics of the rite. On the *hieros gamos* in Mesopotamia, for which a greater number of details are known, see Cooper (1993).

² On birds as offerings in the Ug. ritual texts, see note 18 to RS 24.266 (text 1.88); fish appear extremely rarely in those texts (see Pardee forthcoming on RS 19.015:12 and RS 24.250+:22). In this text the products of the hunt occupy an intermediary position (the goddess Raḥmay hunts [line 16] and the “gracious gods” hunt during their stay in the steppe-land [line 68]). Game occupies an important place in the feast depicted in one of the “para-mythological” texts (Pardee 1988a:23-35 [text 1.97]), is mentioned in the Kirta text as a sacrificial item (CTA 14 ii 79 [text 1.102]), but appears rarely, if at all, in the prose ritual texts (Pardee forthcoming “Conclusions”).

³ See Pardee (forthcoming) for this interpretation of RS 1.003; for the interpretation of the present text as reflecting the New Year’s festival, see de Moor 1987:117-118.

<p><i>Invitation</i> (lines 1-7)</p> <p>I would call on⁴ <i>a</i> the gr[acious]⁵ gods [...] and beautiful, sons of⁶ [...], Who have provided a city on high,⁷ [...] in the steppe-land, on the barren hilltops⁸ <i>b</i> [...] [...] on their⁹ heads, and [...].</p>	<p><i>a</i> Deut 32:3</p> <p><i>b</i> Jer 4:11; 12:12</p> <p><i>c</i> Prov 4:17; 9:5; 23:6</p> <p><i>d</i> Ps 75:9; Prov 9:5</p> <p><i>e</i> Job 8:6</p>	<p>Eat the food, yes do,^c Drink the foaming wine,^d yes do.¹⁰ Give well-being^e to the king,¹¹ give well-being to the queen, to those who enter and to those who stand guard.¹²</p> <p><i>Mutu-wa-Šarru Joins the Feast</i> (lines 8-11) <i>Mutu-wa-Šarru takes a seat,</i>¹³</p>
--	--	--

⁴ The use of *qr*² here indicates an invitation, as in RS 34.126 (text 1.105; cf. Saracino 1982:196), rather than a purely lyrical invocation (cf. *ʔašr*, "I would sing," first word in CTA 24). The entirety of lines 1-7 thus constitute an invitation to the "gracious gods," who are first described (lines 1-5), then explicitly invited (line 6), then urged to bless the main officials of the city (line 7). The "gracious gods" are invited again in line 23, their birth is mentioned in the main mythological section after that of Šahru-wa-Šalimu (either as identical to Šahru-wa-Šalimu or as separate entities — see the introduction), and they are then the principal protagonists until the end of the text.

⁵ In English, this has become somewhat of a conventional translation of the phrase *ʔilm n^cmm*, though in Ug. it means simply "good gods," *n^cm* being the primary adjective for expressing goodness, *ʔb* the secondary one, that is, the distribution is just the opposite of the one in biblical Heb.

⁶ There is simply no way of knowing whether {bn š^[-][...]} is to be restored as *bn šrm* (cf. *šrm* in line 22), as *bn špm* (cf. *špm* in line 4), or with an entirely different word in second position (cf. Foley 1987 and Hetteima 1989-90:82, n. 10).

⁷ Given the state of the tablet, it appears improper to see as the subject of *ynm* at the beginning of line 3 anyone but the *ʔilm n^cmm*, though the mythological reference is unknown. The last words of this line as preserved, {l^cly[...]}, may be interpreted either as a compound adverbial phrase, complete ("at the high place"), or as an indirect object phrase, of which the last letters have been lost, e.g., l^cly[*nm*], "for the exalted ones." Because there is no further reference in this text to a city and because the next line mentions the "steppe-land" (*mābr*), itself an important feature in the *dénouement* of the drama, one may perhaps see here an opposition between the steppe-land, treated rather negatively in this text (see lines 64-76), and civilization, referred to in agricultural terms at the very end of the text. In such an interpretation, the "city" mentioned here would be a paragon of cultured civilization, hence, perhaps, Ugarit itself, and "on high" would refer to the imposing height of an earthly city on its mound, rather than to a heavenly city (the latter concept is, in any case, absent from Ug. literature).

⁸ *mābr špm* is plausibly a construct phrase, "in the steppe-land (consisting) of barren hill-tops." The translation "dunes" for *špm*, which one encounters too frequently, is entirely inappropriate, for *mābr* does not denote a Sahara-like desert, generally absent in Syria-Palestine, but the scrub that lies beyond the arable land, which is usually suitable as pasture for the mixed herds of sheep and goats so typical of the area (Heb. *šd²n*, Ug. *š²in*), and which may vary considerably in the amount of moisture received and hence in vegetation. *špm* will denote, therefore, the hilltops in the scrub land, which can themselves be either bare or covered with lower scrub than the valleys. On the other hand, because the damaged state of the tablet means that our division of the text into poetic lines is uncertain, *špm* could be a term further describing the "gracious gods," like *ynm* a participle, though of what verb would be uncertain (cf. Gibson 1978:123). The "steppe-land" (*mābr*), in any case, reappears below, both as the area to which the women and their offspring are temporarily banished (lines 64-67) and as marking the outer fringe of the arable land (*šdl/p²at mābr*, "field // edges of the steppe-land," line 68).

⁹ The antecedent of the pronoun is probably the "gracious gods," still being referred to in the third person (cf. note 4).

¹⁰ By etymology the word *hmr* may include a notion of bubbling and foaming, which de Moor (1987:119, n. 11) has interpreted as denoting wine still close to the process of fermentation. If the semantics of the word had not already moved beyond this sense (cf. Aram., where *hmr* is the standard word for "wine"), de Moor's appeal to it as proof that this text reflects a New Year's ceremony would be a valid one, for at the time of the autumn equinox in the third week of September the new wine would still be bubbling.

¹¹ In the phrases *šlm mlk*, etc., *šlm* may be parsed as imperative (D-stem), addressed to the "gracious gods," and thus parallel to *lhm*, "eat," and *šty*, "drink," in the preceding verse. From the standard epistolary formula *ʔilm tgrk tšlmk*, "may the gods guard you and keep you well," it is clear that the effecting of *šlm* was considered to be a standard function of the deities. The syntax here is different from that of RS 34.126:31-34 (*šlm m^cmp²i* ...), where *šlm* is a noun in construct with the following word (see Bordreuil and Pardee 1982:123, 128; Bordreuil and Pardee 1991:154-55, 162; Pardee 1993:209-210; Pardee forthcoming), though the active agents in both cases would be the deities invited to the ceremony (see the introduction and note 4). The usual translation of *šlm* here as a simple wish ("peace be with...") or greeting ("hail to ..."), besides the syntactic problem posed by the absence of a preposition in this context, leaves partially unmotivated the invitation tendered to the "gracious gods" in line 1. In this interpretation, the gods are not invited simply to feast but subsequently to bless the rulers of the city (the situation is thus very similar, though it is expressed differently, to that of RS 34.126).

¹² The "enterers" (*ʔrbm*) appear three times here below (lines 12, 18, 26) but not in other texts. The verb *ʔrb* is the standard verb denoting "to enter" in Ug. and is used in a variety of situations. The only common cultic use of the verb is with a deity as subject, entering the palace (*bt mlk*). Because there is no indication here that the *ʔrbm* are anything but human, there seems to be no basis on which to equate the two usages. Because the second category in this line is clearly military (on *ʔnm(m)*, see note 18 to the Ug. birth omen texts [1.90] and note 22 to the Kirta text [1.102]), one may surmise that this line refers to two principal categories of personnel, those qualified to enter the sanctuary (or palace), comparable to the Akk. *ērib bīti*, "the one entering the house (of the deity)" (CAD E 290-92; cf. Caquot, Sznycer and Herdner 1974:370, n. e), and the guards, whose work would have ended at the gates. Because of our general ignorance regarding the details of societal structure at Ugarit, it must be left open whether the function of both categories concerns the sanctuaries or the palace or both (i.e., the privilege of entering the deity's presence or the king's presence and the exclusion therefrom).

¹³ Because this is the only mention of *mt w šr* in Ug. (or any other literature), a good many explanations have been given of the name, of the nature of the double-deity, and of what he represents (see Pardee 1989-90:461-462; Wyatt 1992b). The presence here of the verb *yṯb*, "to sit," seems best explained as reflecting the context of the feast to which the gods have been invited, and *mt w šr*, as is to be expected from the double name, is to be seen as divine, rather than human, either, therefore, one of the "gracious gods" or a divine intruder in the feast (cf. *haššān* in the prologue to the Book of Job). The name has received two basic types of interpretation, reflecting whether the first element is interpreted as the word for "death" (*mātu*) or the word meaning "man, warrior" (*muu*); a similar problem arises in the interpretation of the Ug. lung model inscription: see note 25 to texts 1.92). The second element has been generally seen as the Semitic word *šarr-šarr*, "king, prince, ruler," either with the positive connotation it has in the older languages or in the Arabic sense of "evil." Because this deity is presented formally as a single

in his hand the staff¹⁴ of bereavement,¹⁵
 in his hand the staff of widowhood.^f
 The pruners of the vine prune it,^{16 g}

f Isa 47:8-9;
 Jer 15:7-8
 g Lev 25:3, 4;
 Isa 5:6; Cant
 2:12 (√zmr)

the binders of the vine bind it,
 they cause (it) to fall to the-field-of-a-man^{17 h} like
 a vine.

h Deut 32:32; 2 Kgs 23:4; Isa 16:8; 37:27; Jer 31:40 (Qere); Hab 3:17

deity with a double name, as is indicated by the singular suffix on the noun “hand(s)” in the following lines, it appears legitimate to interpret the two names as denoting two aspects of a single character. Thus the deity may be “Death-and-Ruler” (= “Death the Ruler”), “Death-and-Evil” (= “Evil Death”), “Warrior-and-Ruler” (= “The Ruler who is a Warrior,” “The Warrior-Prince”), or “Warrior-and-Evil” (= “The Evil Warrior”). Because he holds in his hands the staffs of bereavement and widowhood, most interpreters have chosen to see the deity as malevolent. In this view “Death-and-Ruler” or “Death-and-Evil” (de Moor 1987:120, n. 15) would be the ultimate kill-joy at the feast, who is eliminated by means appropriate for a harvest festival, by being cut into pieces like a vine. Wyatt has recently proposed (1992b), as a new form of the interpretation of the deity as a positive entity, that the pruning image be taken as representing circumcision, necessary for reproduction, though he did not explain the motifs of bereavement and widowhood in that interpretation. This is indeed a problem, for those two motifs are normally associated with the slaying of children and husbands, not with male infertility. If Wyatt is correct, one might think that the two motifs are meant simply to express the absence of male fertility, the result of which is women without children and husbands. One might also doubt that *šdm*, “shoots” in Wyatt’s interpretation, i.e., a plural (1992a), would have been used to describe the singular foreskin (on this word, see note 17). I believe, moreover, even if Wyatt’s interpretation be accepted, that he is going too far in formally identifying *mt w šr* with ʔIlu; rather the double deity would be one of the “gracious gods” who exemplifies in this text the young male ready to enter the reproductive stage of his life. He would by his presence at the feast constitute, rather than a picture of ʔIlu himself, a picture of what ʔIlu would have been in his youth. Note, if this interpretation be correct, that circumcision is depicted here as taking place at maturity (*mutu wa šarru!*) rather than in infancy, a social situation that must have also existed in pre-Biblical Israel, judging from the words *hōren* and *hātān*, “father-in-law,” “son-in-law,” derived from a root meaning “to cut,” i.e., “to circumcise.”

Faced with the difficulties and ambiguities of any interpretation, I resort to a common-sense approach: (1) the two elements of double divine names are usually synonymous and such should be the *prima facie* interpretation of this one; (2) the common Northwest-Semitic meaning of *šr* is “king, prince, ruler,” with a positive connotation, not “evil”; (3) because it prefigures ʔIlu, who below is called *mt* by the two women, the first element is *mutu* rather than *mōtu*; ergo (4) the name is best interpreted as Mutu-wa-Šarru, “Warrior-Prince”; ergo (5) the “staff of bereavement/widowhood” is so named because warriors slay sons and husbands in battle (cf. RS 24.277, Side 3, Inscription VIII [text 1.92]); (6) the pruning of the deity’s staff represents, in imagery appropriate to a harvest festival, the pacification of the warrior and, very plausibly, his preparation for marriage by circumcision. The identification of this double deity remains, in any case, a problem: if the name is a title for another deity, single or double, which is it? If not, why does this deity enter and take a seat? On the narrative level, one can say that the appearance of Mutu-wa-Šarru here is comparable to that of the goddess Raḥmay in line 16 (cf. ʔAtiratu and Raḥm <ay> in line 13) and one can add that the identification of Mutu-wa-Šarru with a known god is just as difficult as is that of Raḥmay with a known goddess. It appears best at the moment to see in this deity a new figure who attends the feast and plays his role, perhaps depicting agricultural fertility through viticultural imagery. His rôle as a “man” prefigures that of ʔIlu in the principal myth and the name/figure may represent a previously unknown hypostasis of ʔIlu, elsewhere the picture of bearded old age, as a youth.

¹⁴ There is certainly a literary connection between this staff (*šr*) and ʔIlu’s staff, designated by the same word in lines 43-44, though the literary function of the word need not be the same in each case. (The literary link in the “para-mythological” texts may be provided either by a pun [e.g., *dmr* in RS 24.252] or by a peculiar usage of a word [e.g., Yariḥu the dog, *klb*, in RS 24.258 (text 1.97)]; these literary devices are described briefly in Pardee 1988a:265). In Wyatt’s interpretation of this text (1992b:426-427), the staff is the “penis,” as in the Ug. incantation against male sexual dysfunction (RIH 78/20 [text 1.96]; Pardee 1993:211-213). As intimated in the previous note, however, an explanation of why the uncircumcised penis would have been described as the staff/penis of “bereavement/widowhood” would be in order, for though it may have been considered inept for procreation, it would not have itself directly slain children and husbands.

¹⁵ The Ug. word is *ikt*. Given the viticultural imagery that follows, one must wonder if there is not here a play on words, with *ikt* (perhaps vocalized *īklu*) recalling ʔu \dot{k} l, “bunch of grapes” (probably vocalized ʔu \dot{k} alu or ʔu \dot{k} ālu). If a similar explanation were available for the parallel word, ʔulmn, “widowhood,” one would be tempted to revamp the interpretation of this verse entirely, replacing the negative images with positive ones of vine-keeping.

¹⁶ The antecedent of the pronominal suffix in the sentence *yžbrn zbrm gpn* could theoretically be the deity or his staff, or even, proleptically, the vine (*gpn*). If the deity is a negative entity, the pruning might be effected on him, as most scholars have thought. Whatever interpretation is given to the deity and his staff, however, surely the staff, of vegetal origin, is more appropriate for pruning than is the deity himself. The motif of the living wood in a staff or weapon handle is known, for example, from “Aaron’s rod that budded” (Num 17) and from the “Baal au foudre” stela from Ugarit (Yon 1991:294-299). In addition to the difficulty presented by the rarity of the syntactic construction, the third analysis of the pronominal suffix mentioned above seems ruled out by the form of the third line of the verse, where *gpn*, preceded by the preposition of comparison, cannot be the direct object of the verb *yšql*, “they cause to fall.” The “pruners” and “binders” are unidentified here and the terms are taken as designations of the workers who would normally carry out these tasks in the vineyards, i.e., cutting the vines and binding them into bunches for easier removal. The third act, literally “causing to fall (to the ground),” is not depicted so specifically as typical of vineyard activity, i.e., by means of the participle of the verb denoting the activity (*yžbrn zbrm, yšmdn šmdm*, but only *yšql*). Note finally that the “pruning” in question could be either the winter pruning, which promotes spring growth, or the summer pruning, which opens up the vine for better aeration and more direct access to the solar rays. The latter interpretation might be preferred here, because it would take place closer in time to the fall harvest festival and because the green leaves felled to the ground would provide a form of ground cover, not so necessarily removed as the dry cuttings of winter. On the other hand, the summer green pruning would not so plausibly be linked with circumcision (cf. Wyatt’s interpretation cited in notes 13, 14).

¹⁷ The word *šdm* has usually been compared with biblical Heb. *šēmōr*, though interpretations of both terms have varied, in recent years crystalizing around two principal views, one in which *šdm* is explained as parallel to *gpn* in a very narrow sense, denoting a form of growth (see, for discussion and bibliography, Wyatt 1992a), and one according to which the parallelism is broader, i.e., the “terrace(s)” on which the vine may grow, i.e., the agricultural terraces necessary for making hilly country productive (Stager 1982). A third principal interpretation is to see the word in both Heb. and Ug. as a compound noun, made up of the elements “field” and “death” (though the word is spelled with {š} in Heb., while the word for “field” is spelled with {š}). In the interpretation of the present passage according to the first understanding of the word, the suffixed -h is explained as pronominal (e.g., “his/its shoots”), in the second (and third) as adverbial (“to the terraces/to the field of Mōtu/death”). Whatever the implications may be for Heb., literary considerations surely indicate that the third interpretation must be given serious consideration

Recitation Rubric (line 12)

Seven times¹ they are to pronounce (these verses)¹⁸ next to the "D-room"¹⁹ and those who enter respond.²⁰ /

i Gen 33:3;
Lev 4:6, etc.
j Deut 27:14
k Judg 5:30
l Exod 3:8,
etc.

The Field of the Gods and its Produce (lines 13-15)

The field is the field of the gods,²¹
the field of ²Aṭiratu and Raḥm < ay >.²² k
Over the fire,²³ seven times the sweet-voiced
youths (chant):²⁴
Coriander²⁵ in milk,²⁶ l

in the present context, for a word *mt* appears at the beginning of this section (in the divine name) and in the principal myth (lines 40, 46), while the word *šd*, "field," appears at the beginning of the next mythological section (The Field of the Gods, lines 13-15) and again in the last section dealing explicitly with the "gracious gods" (line 68). The reference to a field in line 13 is an entirely new motif if it is not carrying forward a notion introduced in the word *šdm*. As regards the matters of etymology and meaning, three remarks are necessary: (1) the word is certainly a single word in Ug., whether it be from a single root or a compound, for it is written without a word divider and the suffix *-h* comes at the end ("to the field of Mōtu/death/a warrior," as separate words, would be written *šdh mt*; the translation of *šd mth* as "the field of his death/warrior" does not fit the context). (2) No plausible etymology has been proposed for the interpretation as a simple noun denoting "terraces," i.e., there is no root *šdm* susceptible of furnishing such an etymology. (3) If the Ug. and Heb. words are identical, as the similarity of the contexts in which they are used appears to indicate, and if the Ug. word contains the word for "field," then the Heb. word must be a loanword, not an inner-Heb. development, because of the writing with {š}. One anomaly indicates a foreign origin, i.e., the construct form *šadmōt*, in place of the expected *šdmōt* if the proto-Heb. form were *šadimāt*. The Heb. form favors neither of the two possible etymologies of the element *-mt*, for both /mawt/ and /mut/ could become /mōt/ in Heb., though the invariable ending *-mōt* favors the second derivation because the element /mawt/ when accented should become /māwet/, as in the Heb. common noun meaning "death." (This vocalization may be taken, of course, if one favors the first derivation, simply as another feature indicating the foreign origin of the word). Finally, it must be noted that the absence of an accusative suffix on the verb *yšql* in this line cannot be considered a serious argument against taking *šdmth* as a locative formula, as Wyatt avers (1992a:150), for the accusative suffix is often omitted in Ug., as in Heb., if apparent from context. Its absence here may indeed be explained as reflecting the ambiguity of the antecedent, the staff itself, singular, and the multiple cuttings removed from it.

¹⁸ As no object of the verb *yrgm* is expressed, and as this recitation rubric is set off by horizontal lines, it appears plausible to see the required recitations as being either of the preceding section or of the following section, as set off on the tablet, i.e., either the Mutu-wa-Šarru section or the Field of the Gods section. Because of the apparent lexical link between the two mythological sections (see preceding note), it appears preferable to see the reference in the recitation rubric to be to the preceding section.

¹⁹ From its appearances in both ritual texts and mythological texts, the word *šd* appears to denote a sort of inner sanctum, the king's throne room, which would correspond to the principal seat of the divine effigy in a sanctuary (see note 96 to the Kirta text [1.102] and note 10 to RS 24.266 [text 1.88]). Here the recitation is to take place "i *šd*," "next to" or even, if the architecture permitted it, "above" the "D-room."

²⁰ The content of the response is no more indicated than was that of the recitation and may be thought to consist of the antiphonal recitation of the same verses.

²¹ The word ²*ilm* may be analyzed either as dual/plural, as I have done, or as the singular with enclitic *-m*, in which case the field would either be ascribed to Mutu-wa-Šarru, the only deity mentioned in the previous section, or to ²Ilu. Because the "gracious gods" visit a field in the last part of this text (lines 67-68) it appears plausible to see here a reference to that field, which would belong to "the gods" in general (the "gracious gods" come to the field from outside). The literary function of the field(s) mentioned in this section is open to dispute. If the text as a whole is interpreted as related to questions of agricultural and sexual fertility, the reference in this section to field(s) of male and female deities may connote sexual fertility. If such is the case, Wyatt's interpretation of the pruning episode in lines 8-11 as related to circumcision (see above, notes 13, 14) gains in plausibility. If the "field" here is somehow related to the *šdm* in line 10, as well as to the field which the "gracious gods" visit (lines 67-76), it appears that the term denotes a field used for growing both grapes and grain, for lines 71-74 refer both to *lhm*, "bread," and to wine. The description of a vineyard as part of a field is explicit in one of the Akk. documents describing *marzihu* property (RS 18.001 [PRU iv 230] A.ŠA.MEŠ GIŠ.GEŠTIN), while the sowing of a grain crop between vines was (and still is to a certain extent) common practice.

²² The writing {rhm} has caused no end of trouble: does it designate (1) a masculine deity named "Mercy" (the corresponding Heb. form is the pseudo-plural *rah'mim*), (2) a feminine deity named "Womb" (expressed in Heb. by *rehem/rahām*), or (3) the same feminine deity as is named *rhm* in line 16? The presence of the phrase *šd ²atrt w rhm* in line 28 indicates the likelihood of a simple graphic error here. If the reading {rhm} be accepted, the masculine deity would plausibly be ²Ilu, first because of the association with ²Aṭiratu, second because of the semantic similarity to ²Ilu's title of *lpn ²il d p²id*, "the Gracious One, the god of kindness." The second and third options are usually taken as reflecting a title of one of the well-known goddesses of the Ug. pantheon, though there has been no consensus on the identity of that deity. The simple fact that ²Anatu is once ascribed *rhm* (CTA 6 ii 27; reconstructed in line 5) does not necessarily mean that she bore the same title. A brief bibliography on the various interpretations may be found in Pardee (1989-90:473) and in the various commentaries on this text. For a trenchant criticism of all identifications with known deities, see Day 1986:390. These two goddesses are sometimes identified with the two "women," the mothers of Šahrū-wa-Šalimu in the major mythological section of this text. Without denying the possibility, one must ask why the two goddesses are so completely camouflaged as "women" in the myth.

²³ The nature of the preposition *šl*, translatable as either "above, over" or "beside," according to context, is well illustrated in this verse, where the singers are probably not literally over the fire (smoke would get in their eyes), while the milk and butter would be.

²⁴ The motif of the young singer with a nice voice is also attested in CTA 3 i 20-21 *g²r t²b ql*, "the youth (who is) sweet of voice." The present text employs the other Ug. word for "voice" (*g*) in another syntax (the adjective modifies the word "voice" rather than the youths: *g²rm g t²b*, "youth(s) (with) a sweet voice"). No verb of speech is present here but the reference to the "sweet voice" and the comparison with the text just cited from the Ba²lu cycle, where the sweet-voiced youth is said to sing (*yšr*), are taken as indicators of a speech act of some kind, as most commentators have thought since the reading of the text including *g*, "voice," was first proposed in Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín 1976:67. Because the word for "youth" appears in the singular in line 17, the word here has been interpreted also as the singular, with enclitic *-m* (cf. Watson 1994:5, 7). The state of the text in the next paragraph precludes any decision as to the identity of the *g²r(m)* in each passage. Here, one may surmise, after comparison with the text from the Ba²lu cycle cited above, that the singing youth(s) would correspond in the divine context to the musicians at an earthly feast.

²⁵ The Ug. word is *gd*, long interpreted as "kid" (see following note) which, however, is attested in Ug. with the spelling *gdy*. As long ago as 1971 Caquot proposed translating here "coriander" or "safran" (cf. Heb. *gad*).

²⁶ The rereading of this line by Herdner (1963:98), with further improvement by Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1976:67), has eliminated the interpretation of this passage, long a cornerstone of Ug.-Biblical parallels, by comparison with the biblical prohibition against cooking a kid in

mint²⁷ in butter.^m
 And over the jar²⁸ seven times again (they chant):
 The dg[t-sacrifices have been sacrificed.²⁹

The Hunt (lines 16-18)
 Off goes Raḥmay and hunts,
 [...] she/they gird,³⁰
 The goodly youth [...]
 And those who enter pro[nounce] the name [...].³¹

Huts for the Gods (lines 19-20)
 Dwellingsⁿ of the gods: eight [...]³²
 Seven times [...].³³

Holy Array (lines 21-22)
 Purple, carnelian(-colored) [...]

m 2 Sam 17:29;
 Isa 7:15, 22;
 Job 20:17

 n Lev 23:34ff
 o Exod 25:4ff

 p 2 Sam 19:36;
 1 Kgs 10:12

 q Cf 1 Kgs 3:25;
 Ps 136:13

scarlet;^o singers^p [...].³⁴
Second Invitation (lines 23-27)
 I would call on the gracious gods,
 [who delimit^q the day, sons of] a (single) day,³⁵
 who suck the nipples of the breasts of ²Atiratu.³⁶
 [...] Šapšu, who cares for their feebleness³⁷
 [(with) X] and (with) grapes.³⁸
 Give well-being to those who enter and to those
 who stand guard,
 to those who form a procession with sacrifices of
 prosperity.³⁹
The Field of the Gods Repeated (lines 28-29)
 The field of the gods,
 the field of ²Atiratu and Raḥm <ay > ,

its mother's milk (Exod 23:19; 34:26; Deut 14:21). The comparison was always difficult because the verb would here have been *ṭbh*, "to slaughter," while in Heb. the verb is *bšl*, "boil, cook in a liquid" (cf. Pardee 1976:234; Ratner and Zuckerman 1986). The word for "milk" here is *ḥlb*, which could in theory be cognate either with Heb. *ḥalab*, "milk," or with *ḥleḇ*, "fat" (covering certain internal organs); the first meaning seems clear here from the parallelism with *ḥm²at*, for in Heb. *ḥem²dh*, "curdled milk, curds, butter, ghee," appears in association with *ḥalab*.

²⁷ The word ²*annḥ* seems certainly to be related to words appearing in various Semitic languages, with and without prosthetic ²*aleph* (e.g., Akk. *ananiḥu*, *naniḥu*, *nanaḥu*), identified as a form of mint or of ammi. Though the precise identification is uncertain, the existence of the cognates designating a plant for this word in parallel with *gd* provide an additional piece of evidence against translating the latter word as "kid."

²⁸ The archaeological and epigraphic data seem to indicate that the ²*agn*-vessel was of the crater type, i.e., a large, rather squat vessel with a large mouth (Amadasi Guzzo 1990:21-23). Others have seen here a word cognate to the Indo-European word for "fire" or a word for "coals" related to the Arabic root *gwn* that can denote the color "red." The word provides, in any case, one of the many literary links between the opening sections and the principal myth, for it plays an important part in the scene below in which ²Ilu meets the two women who become his wives (lines 31-36).

²⁹ The reading here of *dg[t]*, a type of offering more clearly attested in the ²Aqhatu text (see note 124 to text 1.103), was proposed with the {t} entirely restored by Caquot, Szyner and Herdner (1974:371, note s), then as an actual reading but with a question mark on the {t}, by Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1976:67).

³⁰ Many restore the divine name ²Atiratu after the verb "to hunt" in line 16, in imitation of line 13, where one finds {²a_{irt} w ṛḥm} (see above, note 22).

³¹ The damaged state of the text here makes any interpretation dubious. Because the word *šm*, "name," does not reappear in this text as preserved, it appears impossible to identify with any certainty the name to which this line refers.

³² In the ritual text RS 1.003 there is mention of dwellings made of cut branches, set up on the roof (apparently of the temple of ²Ilu), and arranged in two groups of four: *b gg ²a_r[t]b^c ²arb^c mḫb^c ²azmr bh*, "... (the king shall sacrifice) on the roof, four (and) four dwellings of cut (branches) on it" (lines 51-52). In an even more damaged and enigmatic passage in a ritual text (RS 24.248:21-23) there may again be a reference to dwellings set up for deities in groups of eight. The significance of the number eight is uncertain. However that may be, it appears legitimate to posit a connection between the *mḫb^c ²azmr* in RS 1.003 and the *sukkt^c* erected for the Israelite "feast of booths" (see above, introduction).

³³ Whereas above the formula for a sevenfold repetition of a speech act was the multiplicative form *šb^cd(m)*, here a separate word for "times" is used (*p²amⁱ šb^c*), a formula common in the prose ritual texts. The term *p²amⁱ* can, in theory, be used with any number (up to thirty repetitions are attested), expressing the repetition of various cultic acts, primarily sacrifices and processions.

³⁴ The word ²*iqn²u* denotes the color blue and is attested in two primary usages in Ug., viz., lapis lazuli stone, and blue-dyed textile (royal purple of the blue shade, as opposed to *pḥm*, which designates the redder shade). The word *šmⁱ* is usually explained as denoting the stone "carnelian," but may designate a third shade of "purple" (Sanmartín 1992:102-103). Finally, the word *ṛn* could either be the number "two" or another noun denoting a color, corresponding to Heb. *šānīf*, and designating a dye made from an insect as opposed to the "royal" purple dye, made from various sea mollusks. Because the damaged state of the text has left us without a context here, it is not possible to know for sure whether we are dealing with two types of stones and "two singers" or with three colors of textiles, hence, probably, of garments.

³⁵ The restoration {[²agzrym.bn] ym} is generally accepted, based on the same expression in a similar context in line 61. As is usual in this text, interpretations have varied widely, depending on whether *ym* is taken as meaning "day" or "sea," on whether the fifth and sixth letters constitute this word or are suffixal to {²agzr}, and on the meaning of *gzr*. If one accepts that the "gracious gods" are Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu, then an interpretation reflecting their character appears most plausible, i.e., *gzr*, "to cut," denotes the separation of night from day (Gray 1965:98), i.e., cutting the day into two parts, while *bn ym*, literally "sons of a day," indicates that the two gods exercise their function within a single day.

³⁶ As in the case of Yašsubu, son of Kirta (CTA 15 ii 26-28 [text 1.102]), the suckling of an infant by a goddess here indicates divine adoption rather than biological motherhood. So the Ug. king is represented on the ivory panels from his bed as a youth suckled by the goddess (Schaeffer 1954: pl. 8).

³⁷ On this interpretation, see del Olmo Lete 1981:442, 615; Hettrema 1989-90:83. One might appeal to Arabic *dfr*, "help," for this interpretation of *mṣprt*. Because of the break at the end of line 24, it is uncertain precisely what Šapšu's role is here, though one would expect it somehow to be in relation with the fact that the dawn and dusk are directly related to the rising and setting of the celestial orb. According to the narrative of the birth of Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu (line 54), gifts are made to Šapšu and to the astral deities immediately after the birth of the "boys."

³⁸ Here the word is *ḡnbm*, cognate with Heb. *ʿenābī^cnābīm*, the word used for grapes as a fruit or as berries, rather than the bunch of grapes, which is ²*eškōl* (Ug. ²*utkl*).

³⁹ "Those who form a procession" are literally the "goers" (*ḥlkm*). The verb is used in RS 1.005 for a ritual procession in which the king participates (see Pardee forthcoming). "Sacrifices of prosperity" translates *dbḥ n^cm*. Note particularly that the second word is from the same root, *n^cm*, as that by which the "gracious gods" are described (see above, note 5): the sacrifices are literally those of "goodness" or of "good things." Though the sacrifices would certainly consist of "good things," the phrase would appear to function primarily as an "objective genitive," i.e., the sacrifices, by placating the "goodly gods" will result in "goodness" for the offerer.

<p>[...] s[i]ts/do[es ag]ain.⁴⁰</p> <p><i>The Myth</i> (lines 30-31)</p> <p>[²Ilu goes]⁴¹ to the seashore, strides along the shores of the Great Deep.⁴²</p> <p>²Ilu <i>Handpicks Two Women</i> (lines 31-36)</p> <p>²Ilu [spies]⁴³ two females presenting (him with) an offering,⁴⁴ presenting (him with) an offering from the jar.⁴⁵</p> <p>One gets down low,⁷ the other up high.⁴⁶</p> <p>One cries out: "Father, father," the other cries out: "Mother, mother."⁴⁷</p> <p>"May ²Ilu's hand^r stretch out as long as the sea,⁴⁸</p>	<p>r Cf. Ezek 17:6, 24</p> <p>s Num 11:23; Deut 4:34; Isa 9:11, 16, 20; 10:4; cf. Isa 57:8</p> <p>t Gen 12:15; 20:2; cf. 26:10</p> <p>u Cf. Exod 19:13ff</p>	<p>(may) ²Ilu's hand (stretch out as long) as the flowing waters,⁴⁹</p> <p>Stretch out, (O) hand of ²Ilu, as long as the sea, (stretch out, O) hand of ²Ilu, (as long) as the flowing waters."⁵⁰</p> <p>²Ilu takes the two females presenting an offering, presenting an offering from the jar; he takes (them), estab <lish> es⁵⁰ (them) in his house.¹</p> <p>²Ilu <i>Tries His Hand at Shooting Birds</i> (lines 37-39)</p> <p>²Ilu (first) lowers his staff, (then) ²Ilu grasps his rod in his right hand.⁵¹</p> <p>He raises (it), casts (it)^u into the sky,</p>
---	--	--

⁴⁰ The verb *ygb*, second sign uncertain, could be either from *ygb*, "to sit," or from *tb*, "to return" or "to do again" when used with another verb. Because of the broken context we cannot know if the reference is to the sitting of gods or officials (as might be surmised from the form of the preceding formulae, i.e., not explicitly equational as the corresponding formulae were in line 13) or to the repetition of an act or of speech.

⁴¹ Any restoration here is entirely hypothetical, though it appears quite likely, as several scholars have seen, that the principal protagonist, ²Ilu, would have been introduced here along with a verb parallel to *sgd*, "to stride, walk," in the parallel line (cf. Wyatt 1987:381).

⁴² There are three principal water words in this section, *ym/thm* in this verse and *ym/mdb* in lines 33-35. *ym* denotes primarily the salt sea, *thm* the fresh-water sea thought to lie under the earth. Though *mdb* is much more rarely attested, it appears to function as the rough equivalent of *thm* (see Pardee 1988a:132-134). These water words reflect the concerns of this story and do their part to present ²Ilu as away from home when the encounter occurs, for though ²Ilu's dwelling place is presented in watery terms, only one of the terms overlaps and that one is in a different form (²Ilu dwells at "the headwaters of the two rivers [*nhrm*], at the fountains/confluence of the deeps [*thmtm*]" — see on CTA 2 iii 4 [text 1.86, notes 145, 182], RS 24.244:2-7 [text 1.94, notes 2, 4]; cf. CTA 17 vi 48 [text 1.103]). In this story he is not, therefore, in a mountainous area where rivers begin, but at the seashore where rivers end.

⁴³ Most scholars reconstruct the verb *lqh* here on the basis of line 35, but one might rather expect here a verb describing ²Ilu meeting the women (Henema 1989-90:83).

⁴⁴ "Two females presenting ... an offering" is an attempt at reflecting each element of the form *mšr^cl^m*, i.e., Št-participle, feminine, dual (perhaps /mušta^clitāma). After years in which various interpretations of this word were proffered (often based on the interpretation of ²agn as meaning "fire" rather than "jar"), a certain consensus seems to have formed in recent years that we are dealing with a form of the verb ^cly, "to ascend, go up, mount." Even within that analysis, however, different interpretations exist. Seeking an interpretation based on Ug. usage, one sees that the simple Š-stem has three primary values: (1) the "literal" meaning, "cause to go up"; (2) a sexual meaning, "to be mounted," said of a cow mating with a bull (Ba^clu); and (3) "to present (as a gift/offering)," said of stela^e and a vase in ritual texts. The infixed-*t* form may be thought to reflect one of these usages (Tropper 1990:51-53, 77-78), but which usage, and whether the function of the -*t*- is that of the reflexive or is closer to a middle (i.e., for one's own benefit) is uncertain. Because the form is participial, and ²Ilu does not "mount" these females until later in the story, it appears that the sexual sense is not at the surface level here, though it is plausibly an underlying one. Because these entities are below described as "two women" (²at^m) and because ^cly is used in the ritual texts for presenting a gift to a deity (not a burnt offering!), it appears plausible to interpret *mšr^cl^m* here as designating two women (i.e., human beings) either offering themselves as a gift to the divinity or as offering something else to the divinity for their own benefit. Because the phrase *l r²is^c 2agn* is very difficult to interpret with the simple reflexive meaning of the participle (see next note), it does not appear that they are offering themselves to the divinity, and the interpretation as a middle becomes the more likely.

⁴⁵ The "jar" can only be the jar already introduced in line 15. There we saw youths chanting about spiced milk being prepared "over a fire," "over a jar" (^cl²agn), apparently as a *dgt*-offering. Here the "two women presenting a gift" are, literally, "at the head of the jar" (*l r²is^c 2agn*). It is uncertain what this phrase means, for "jars" do not have heads and elsewhere *l r²is^c* does not seem to function as a complex preposition (Pardee 1976:309). Because the attested usages of ^cly in Ug. show it not to be the simple equivalent of Heb. *he^clā^b*, "to offer up (esp. as a burnt offering)," one doubts that the reference here is to a burnt offering of any kind, but rather to something presented to the divinity, presumably the spiced dairy products mentioned in line 14. In this interpretation, the phrase *l r²is^c* would denote the fact that the offering would have to be ladled out of the jar.

⁴⁶ The verbs *tšpl* and *trm* apparently describe the women themselves, for the second form can only be intransitive. It is uncertain what the acts imply, perhaps nothing less banal than antics to get the god's attention (see next note).

⁴⁷ I remain dubious that ²Ilu is here being addressed directly and wittingly as a mother (e.g., de Moor 1987:123, n. 37). Indeed below, lines 42-49, the possibility of the two women even addressing ²Ilu as "father" is considered and dropped. Because the encounter ends up with the women being taken to ²Ilu's house in view of marriage (the verb *trh* is actually used in line 64), we may surmise that the women were engaging in the activity with the express purpose of catching a male, indeed a divine one (the preparations seem to be described in line 15 as a type of offering to a deity, a *dgt*). If such be the case, the cries in lines 32-33 are addressed to their own parents, as in "Daddy, mommy, what do we do now?"

⁴⁸ There is a general consensus that *yd*, "hand," here is a euphemism for "penis." There is not agreement, however, on whether (1) both verses are descriptive of ²Ilu's excitement at the sight of the women, (2) the first verse is a volitive formulation, the second descriptive, or (3) both verses are formulated volitively (*t^rirkm* = jussive, ²ark = imperative). I choose the last solution for morphological and literary reasons. The form ²ark in line 34 cannot be a perfect verb, for *yd* is a feminine noun and ²ark is not marked for feminine gender. The verb could, of course, always be parsed as an infinitive, used absolutely, as occurs rather frequently in Ug. poetry. But because the rhetoric of this poem seems usually to be allusive rather than direct in sexual matters, one may surmise that the sexual meaning here is at the level of paronomasia, and that the women are requesting, superficially, only that ²Ilu extend his hand to "take" them, as indeed he does in the following verse.

⁴⁹ On *mdb*, see above, note 42.

⁵⁰ There is general agreement to emend {yš} to {yš<t>}, i.e., the hollow verb *št*, "to put, place, establish."

⁵¹ Lit., "he grasps in his right hand the rod of his hand." *Ymn* is taken, in agreement with many scholars, as the L-stem (the verbal stem

casts (it at) a bird in the sky.
 He plucks (the bird), puts (it) on the coals,
 (then) ʔIlu sets about enticing⁵² the women.
 ʔIlu Comes Up With a Handy Test of the Women's
 Maturity (lines 39-49)⁵³
 "If," (says he,) "the two women cry out:
 'O man, man,
 you who prepare your staff,
 who grasp your rod in your right hand,
 you roast a bird⁵⁴ on the fire,
 roast (it) on the coals,'
 (then) the two women (will become) the wives of
 ʔIlu,⁵⁵
 ʔIlu's wives forever.
 But if the two women cry out:
 'O father, father,
 you who prepare your staff,
 who grasp your rod in your right hand,
 you roast a bird on the fire,
 roast (it) on the coals,'
 (then) the two daughters (will become)⁵⁶ the
 daughters of ʔIlu,
 ʔIlu's daughters forever."

vExod 22:15;
 Judg 14:15;
 16:5;
 Hos 2:16

wProv 16:21;
 cf. Cant
 4:11; 7:10

x Ps 8:4

The two women do (in fact) cry out:
 "O man, man,
 you who prepare your staff,
 who grasp your rod in your right hand,
 you roast a bird on the fire,
 roast (it) on the coals."
 (Then) the two women (become) the wives [of
 ʔIlu],
 ʔIlu's wives forever.
 The Birth of Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu (lines 49-54)
 He bends down, kisses their lips,
 their lips are sweet,⁵⁷
 sweet as pomegranates.
 When he kisses, there is conception,
 when he embraces, there is pregnancy.⁵⁷
 The two (women) squat and give birth
 to Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu.
 Word is brought to ʔIlu:
 "The two wives of ʔIlu have given birth."
 "What have they born?"
 "The two boys Šaḥru-wa-Šalimu."⁵⁸
 "Take up, prepare (a gift) for great Šapšu
 and for the immut[able] stars."^x

characterized by a reduplicated final radical and having a factitive connotation similar to the D-stem) of a verb that is denominative from *ymu*, "right hand" (*yāmanana* [pf.] or *yēmānin-* [impf.] here, */mēmāninuma/* [participle plus enclitic *-m*] in lines 40 and 44). Because of the absence in this passage of a term for "bow" or "arrow" it may be doubted that the verbs denote the stringing of the bow (i.e., setting one end on the ground, bending it, and attaching the string with the right hand). Rather the image is that of killing a bird with a thrown stick (the verb *yry* in the following verse, though it can mean "shoot an arrow," means basically only "throw, cast") and the mention of preparing the staff (*ḥt*) and taking the rod (*mṭ*) in the right hand either refers to putting down the walking stick and picking up a throwing stick or, according to common usage in parallelistic poetry, simply to transferring a single stick from the left hand to the right. Though attempts have been made to see the sexual imagery carried forward consistently here (see especially Pope 1979), they appear strained. In particular, the attempt to see in the lowering of the staff (*nḥt* "descend") an image of impotency is closely linked with the preconception of ʔIlu as a *deus otiosus*, and the "story line" here does not allow us to consider that aspect of the imagery a major one: the bird to which reference is made in the next line (the flesh of which is plausibly taken as a restorative, especially of male potency; cf. Caquot, Szyner and Herdner 1974:374, note d) is shot down with the rod that has already been raised up. On the other hand, the conjunction of words elsewhere used as euphemisms for the male member with verbs of raising, lowering and shooting, and with the resultant use of bird flesh, roasted on hot coals, seems to indicate the presence of sexual allusions in keeping with the following explicitly indicated sexual activity. If the images were meant to express a consistent line of development, one is constrained to see in the bird flesh as much an aphrodisiac as a restorative, and meant as much to entice the women as to keep ʔIlu's shooting apparatus in working order.

⁵² The use of *pr(y)* here, if correctly analyzed as cognate with Heb. *prh*, denotes the act of a male convincing a woman to engage in sexual activity, whether lawful ("attract, entice") or unlawful ("seduce"), or, more broadly, of enticing anyone into a path of action. The verb not being necessarily polarized negatively, and ʔIlu's relationship being described below as that of marriage (line 64), this passage should be taken as introducing the following passage.

⁵³ The function of this test seems to be to determine whether the women are mature enough to discern the sexual function of the roasting birds (see note 51) or whether they will simply see in ʔIlu a father figure providing them with food.

⁵⁴ On the place of the bird in the sequence of images here, see notes 51 and 53. It is important to point out the presence here, as in several cases already discussed, of a literary link between earlier and later parts of the text, in this case between this bird (*ṣḥr*), instrumental in ʔIlu's procurement of the two women as wives, and the recurrence of the word below (line 62) in the description of the voracious behavior of the offspring of this union.

⁵⁵ The Ug. phrase is *ʔattm ʔatt ʔil*, lit., "the two women (will become) ʔIlu's two women." The parallel passage indicates that the equational formulation is intended as a social classification: "the two girls (lit., daughters) (will become) ʔIlu's two daughters" (*btm bt ʔil*, line 45).

⁵⁶ The formulation *btm bt ʔil* is strictly parallel to *ʔattm ʔatt ʔil* in line 42, though the indication of change of status is less clear here: are the two "girls" to become his daughters (i.e., they will be adopted), or are they classified as belonging among his daughters (i.e., their status is recognized, rather than changed)? In either case, the term used to describe the two women who would have shown themselves by their address to be girls rather than women to be married is *btm*, "girls, daughters."

⁵⁷ Judging from the parallel in the ʔAqhatu story (CTA 17 i 41-42 [text 1.103]), this is the standard poetic idiom for intercourse and conception, with no variation in this formulation reflecting the divine status of the male partner. If there is a variation reflecting divine participation, it is expressed with regard to the women not the deity, i.e., in the description in the preceding verse of the women's lips being sweet, for the kissing motif is absent in the ʔAqhatu version, where both partners are human. Compare Gen 6:2 where the "sons of the gods" are depicted as seeking after human wives because they were "good" (*tōbōt*).

⁵⁸ There is general agreement that the two elements making up this double deity mean "Dawn" and "Dusk" (see bibliographical elements in the various studies of this text and in Pardee 1989-90:456-457). There is no apparent reason, however, for the subsequent identification with the morning and evening star, assumed by various scholars. The name Šaḥru, at least, is clearly linked with the concept of "dawn," not with a celestial body, and there is every reason to believe that the morning and evening manifestations of Venus were linked in Ug. thought with the deities ʔAṭtaru and ʔAṭtatu (bibliography in Pardee 1989-90:466-470; discussion in Pardee forthcoming on RS 1.009:4 and RS 1.017:18, 25).

<p><i>The Second Birth Narrative</i> (lines 55-64)⁵⁹ He bends down, kisses their lips, their lips are sweet. When he kisses, there is conception, [when] he embraces, there is pregnancy. He sits down, he counts, to five for the [bulge to appear], [to] ten, the completed double.⁶⁰ The two (women) squat and give birth, they give birth to the gracious [gods], who delimit the day, sons of a (single) day, who suck the nipples of the breasts. Word is brought to ʾIlu: “The two wives of ʾIlu have given birth.” “What have they born?” “The gracious gods, who delimit the day, sons of a (single) day, who suck the nipples of the breasts of the lady.⁶¹ (One) lip to the earth, (the other) lip to the heavens,</p>	<p>y Zeph 1:3 z Isa 9:19 aa Ps 29:8 bb Gen 29:18</p>	<p>Into their mouths enter the birds of the heavens and the fish in the sea.^y When they stand, delimitation to <deli>mita- tion,⁶² they prepare (food for themselves) on right and left, into their mouth (it goes) but never are they satisfied.”^{63 2} ʾIlu Temporarily Banishes Mothers and Sons (lines 64-67) “O women whom I have wedded, O sons whom I have begot,⁶⁴ Take up (your belongings), prepare (yourselves a place) in the holy steppe-land;^{65 aa} There you must dwell as aliens⁶⁶ among the stones and trees, For seven full years,^{bb} eight revolutions of time.”</p>
---	---	---

⁵⁹ This second narrative can be interpreted either as recounting the birth of additional children to ʾIlu by the two women (so, e.g., Caquot, Szyzycer and Herdner 1974:358-360) or as a second account of the birth of Šahru-wa-Šalimu. Two considerations lead me to adopt the latter hypothesis. (1) On the level of macrostructure and overall meaning of the text, one asks oneself why the “gracious gods” would appear early and late but Šahru-wa-Šalimu would occupy a mere five and a half lines, and those at the very center of the myth. Why speak at all of the birth of this double deity if the real concern of the text is with younger brothers? At the very least, one must assume a very close structural relationship between Šahru-wa-Šalimu and the “gracious gods” (e.g., the former “Dawn-and-Dusk,” the latter the morning and evening star — rôles we have every reason to believe were already filled at Ugarit, see preceding note). (2) On the metaphorical level, the images of the “gracious gods” delimiting the day and standing with one lip in the heavens and the other on the earth, devouring birds and fish (see below), are perfectly appropriate for dawn and dusk, much less so for the morning and evening star. A possible indication that the two narratives refer to the birth of a single double deity may be found in the terms chosen to describe the offspring, i.e., *ylāy*, “two boys,” in line 53 (the explanation of the terminal -y is uncertain), as opposed to [ʾilm] *nʿmm*, “two good gods,” in line 58. Given the assured divine status of Šahru-wa-Šalimu, it is striking that in their particular birth narrative they are described merely as “boys,” while a following narrative describes the birth of two gods by the very same mothers. Was the second narrative understood as signifying a replacement of the “boys” by “gracious gods” or as a strong image for a process of maturation?

⁶⁰ Ginsberg (1945:4, n. 7; cf. Tsumura (1978; Hettema 1989-90:85, n. 29) was almost certainly right in seeing here a reference to the counting of the months of gestation. Compare the case of Dānīʾilu, who also “sits down,” explicitly to count the months of his wife’s pregnancy (CTA 17 ii 43 [text 1.103]). Unfortunately the tablet is damaged here and the precise formulation is unclear. One can doubt, in any case, that *kiʾat* in line 57 denotes “fullness” or that it is cognate to Akk. *kullatu*, as Tsumura proposed. The root *kiʾ* in Ug. regularly denotes doubleness, used for two hands and double gates. One would, therefore, expect it here to denote either the conception of two children or the simple fact that ten is five doubled. The presence of *p̄hr* before *kiʾat* seems to favor the latter interpretation, for the literal translation of the phrase, “the assembly of two (entities),” in which *p̄hr* explicitly denotes the concept of bringing entities together, seems more fitting for expressing the notion of bringing two fives together than that of twins, who would always have been together. If Tsumura’s reading {s¹b¹[p̄i]} is correct at the beginning of the lacuna, the verb would be *šbʾ*, which elsewhere in Ug. expresses various notions of “going forth,” here the protrusion of the pregnant belly. Such an interpretation appears legitimate, for *šbʾ* is not a simple semantic equivalent to *yšʾ*, “exit,” i.e., “pass from an enclosed space to the outside,” which one would expect to be used to express the birth itself.

⁶¹ *šr*, a general honorific term, apparently designates ʾAtiranu here, for this goddess was actually named in this formula above, line 24. On the use of the word in the ʾAqhatu text, part of a title of the goddess ʾAnatu’s henchman *yprn*, see note 64 to text 1.103. Unfortunately, the word *šr* here is at the juncture between the two verses and the word may represent the verb *šr*, “to put,” of which the “lips” in the following verse would be the direct object (rather than standing as subjects in two nominal sentences as I have translated).

⁶² The text reads {n̄dd ḡzr l z̄r}, usually emended to {n̄dd ḡzr l <g>z̄r}. With or without the emendation, there is certainly a reference here to the tide of the “gracious gods” as ʾagzr *ym*. The use of *n̄dd*, “stand (up)” (N-stem of the hollow root *dd*), with the preposition *l* preceding the second word following the verb, seems to favor the interpretation of *ḡzr* as denoting the delimitation, rather than the “cut up pieces” upon which they would be feeding (“when they stand up piece to piece” is a rather odd formulation for “standing up to produce pieces” or “standing up to feed on pieces”). The image is that of “Dawn” and “Dusk,” when they stand, filling the horizon, one in the east, the other in the west.

⁶³ The imagery in lines 61-64 seems particularly appropriate for dawn and dusk, which, on the horizontal axis, fill the horizon and, on the vertical axis, open and close like a mouth. The “fish in the sea” can in the Levantine context refer only to sunset; whether the “birds of the heaven” refers symmetrically to the realm of sunrise is less certain. Though the noisy activity of birds at sunrise would not be concentrated in the east to the same extent that the fish are concentrated in the west, perhaps the link of birdsong with sunrise was sufficient to engender the image.

⁶⁴ Unless the two women and the two sons have for reasons unknown become single, the forms ʾatf and *bn* are in construct with the following finite verbal forms.

⁶⁵ The interpretation of the phrase *m̄dbr q̄dš* is no easier here than in Ps 29:8, where the second element is vocalized as the geographical name Qadesh. Is this a generic statement about the divine characteristics of the *m̄dbr* or a reference to a specific *m̄dbr* in the vicinity of one of the several towns of which the names are derived from the root *q̄dš*? See also below, p. 304, n. 18.

⁶⁶ Though the motivation for the apparent reduplicated form (*tgrgr*) is not clear (should the signs be divided as *tgr gr*, in the familiar “infinitive absolute” construction?), the idea of banishment appears clear, and *gr* seems to have the notion of displacement from one’s own ethnic group