

Néanmoins, il y en a aussi une action assez vive et développée, dont j'ai parlé sur les pages 88 - 89 du travail cité. C'est ce que je veux dire maintenant, c'est que nous y avons à faire avec un élément épique comparable - de nouveau: toute proportion gardée - à celui de la "Divine Comédie", ainsi qu'aux autres oeuvres européennes qui ont les mêmes traits. Rapellons ici cette parallèle que j'ai fait autrefois entre Ali - chevalier musulman et Roland - preux de Charlemagne.²

C'est bien juste de chercher des ressemblances entre les hymnes religieux /ilāhī/ de Yunus, écrite plutôt sous la forme des ġazels, et les oeuvres des trouveurs /Minnesaenger, trubadori/ européens, mais il ne faut pas oublier que c'est le même esprit d'amour, qui poussa Dante à créer sa "Comédie", a poussé aussi Yunus Emre à créer son "Traité de Bons Conseils".

Seulement A. Dante avec son "Lasciate ogni speranza" est beaucoup plus pessimiste que Y. Emre ne l'est pas avec son ardeur frottant la malveté, avec son espoir et de la joie même. Il "seviyor ve seviliyor" /c.-à-d. il aime et reste aimé/, lui... On voudrait même dire: "seviniyor" /c.-à-d. il est joyeux/...

Il y a encore une chose à laquelle je voudrais attirer votre aimable attention en faisant cette parallèle bien discutable entre deux poètes. De même A. Dante et Y. Emre, tous les deux, ont contribué de beaucoup et d'une manière vraiment fondamentale à la formation des langues nationales, elles mêmes, l'une - italienne, l'autre - turque.

Or, si quelqu'un me demande, est-ce qu'il y a entre les poètes turcs, pourtant si nombreux, un poète qu'on pourrait comparer à Dante, ma réponse serait, sans doute, Yunus Emre! Et je passerais sans hésiter des grands comme Bākī avec ses ġazels, comme Fuḫūlī avec sa "Leylī ve Mecnūn" et beaucoup d'autres... Et c'est à cause qu'Ali-ghieri et Yunus vivaient en même temps, ils subissaient les mêmes passions, ils créaient leurs langues nationales et parce qu'ils étaient, tous les deux, les premiers parmi les premiers.

Notes

¹ Cf. J. C i o p i ń s k i, *Le Traité de Bons Conseils de Yunus Emre*, "Folia Orientalia", t. 17 /1976/, t. 18 /1977/, t. 20 /1979/ surtout pp. 87 - 88 de t. 20.

² Cf. J. C i o p i ń s k i, "Késik bás kitābý" variante de Kazan, III. Commentaire, "Folia Orientalia", t. 13 /1971/, pp. 11 - 12.

BRUNO W.W. DOMBROWSKI

TOWARDS A REVISION OF THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT ISRAEL — A RESPONSE TO OSWALD LORETZ'S *UGARIT UND DIE BIBEL*

In his recent monograph on the dependence of biblical materials on the society and religion attested for the ancient kingdom of Ugarit and its Canaanite environment¹, Oswald Loretz has noted "Die Vergleiche biblischer Schriften mit den Texten von Ugarit, die in den letzten sechs Jahren vorgenommen worden sind, reihen sich nahtlos an die früheren Versuche an, die Aussagen des Alten Testaments im Rahmen seiner altorientalischen Umwelt zu deuten. Dennoch haben die ugaritischen Texte zu einer tiefgreifenden Revolutionierung der bisherigen Anschauungen über das Alte Testament geführt."²

Nevertheless, Loretz observed that "Unterschiedliche Terminologie und weit auseinandergehende historisch-theologische Gesamtkonzeptionen über die Entwicklung der biblischen Religion beherrschen in verwirrender Weise das Feld. Deshalb ist" in his opinion "die Frage nach dem Wert eines Vergleiches ugaritischer und alttestamentlicher Texte von einem klar bestimmten historischen und theologischen Standpunkt aus neu zu stellen."³ This he attempts.

He feels that "Von einem Vergleich Ugarit-Texte—Altes Testament her ergibt sich somit, dass die Bedeutung der bisher", as he claims, "unreflektiert verwerteten biblischen und bibelwissenschaftlichen Gesichtspunkte über das Verhältnis Kanaan—Israel unsicher wird und die Bibelwissenschaft aufgefordert ist, ihren Standpunkt und Begriffsapparat zu wechseln."⁴ For Loretz this means with the assistance of *die Texte von Ugarit* — as multifarious they may be — "eine Sicht der Entwicklung der biblischen Texte zu setzen, in der vor allem auf den Prozess der Umbildung und Umdeutung von Symbolen und Sprache der Kanaanäer in Israel grösseres Gewicht gelegt wird."⁵ Surely, Loretz shuns away from "construing an origin" of "the biblical writings" in the "Ugarit-texts". He prefers to let his eyes wander from the Ugaritic literature to the biblical texts, yet for him "zeigen die Ugarit-Texte jetzt doch unmissverständlich,⁶ dass die jüdische Rekonstruktion der Geschichte Israels mehr und mehr als *monotheistische Deutung*⁷ kanaänischen Gedankengutes⁶ zu verstehen ist."⁸

Using, as elsewhere in his book,^{8a} a detour, this time *via* "the Canaanites" and their traditions, Loretz makes the civilisation and, especially, the

assertions on religious life in the kingdom of Ugarit the forerunners of the biblical god and religious life. While he is well aware of the complications involved in his and others' approximate identification of the people of Ugarit with "the Canaanites" or merely some of the Canaanites,⁹ he claims that "<es> steht andererseits wiederum fest, dass wir durch ihre <sc. the people of Ugarit> Literatur und Religion eine Tradition kennenlernen, die in ganz Kanaan verbreitet war und die wir in einem gewissen Sinne [whatever this may mean: see further below] zugleich auch als Vorläuferin der biblischen Literatur anzusehen haben. Sowohl Ugariter als auch Israeliten bezeugen ein gemeinsames literarisches Erbe trotz verschiedener Sprachen und unterschiedlicher Herkunft."¹⁰

Throughout his learned book, Loretz tries to convey his view as a kind of message to the wider public the *Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft* at Darmstadt is concerned with, especially, the student generation of the present. This necessitates to selectively point to facts at variance with his presentation. I have mainly chosen significant assertions concerning religion as the most relevant section of cultural life with regard to any dependence of preexilic and/or postexilic Israel/Judah.

1. Loretz writes on p. 56 "Nachdem die Literatur der Kanaanäer untergegangen war, tritt sie mit den Ugarit-Texten zum erstenmal wieder ans Tageslicht." "Diese Texte aus der altsyrischen Hafenstadt ermöglichten uns einen unmittelbaren Einblick in die Welt der Kanaanäer." This is an oversimplification, to say the least. Even though texts from Ugarit have materials in common with such known of the considerable number of Canaanite religions — this being similar to other cultural aspects —, all of them offer numerous assertions and forms thereof which had originated or were transformed in other areas prior or subsequent to their establishment at the places whence we have relations.¹¹ Besides the linguistic and cultural influences on Ugarit and their varying backgrounds recognised by Loretz, i.e., Sumerian, Akkadian, Hurritic and Aegean, one has to acknowledge elements in the civilisation of Ugarit otherwise known as Egyptian, Hittite, and Luvian. Still others of Semitic, not yet precisely defined character were involved also.¹²
2. Thus, Loretz's claim "Von ihr [die Literatur der Kanaanäer] or what he considers its alias, i.e., 'die Ugarit-Texte' her ermesen wir, in welchem Masse die biblischen Schriftsteller die Kanaanäer von ihrer monotheistischen Position aus beschrieben haben"¹³ does not convince at all.
3. Since he suggests that "Dieses biblische Bild der Kanaanäer, das zweifellos erhebliche Verzeichnungen aufweist, lässt sich nun von den ugaritischen Texten her korrigieren",¹³ Loretz makes "die Ugarit-Texte" the yard-stick or comes dangerously close to determine what was Canaanite and what not, as far as Biblical allusions thereto are concerned, and what the nature of materials has been which texts of the Old Testament (henceforth = OT) and other traditions may mirror or, as he claims, inherited.

4. Highly questionable is already his generalisation "Die Geschichtsdarstellung der Bibel entspricht somit¹⁴ den Vorstellungen des nachexilischen Judentums, und das Verhältnis zu den Kanaanäern wird von diesem späteren Gesichtspunkt her entworfen ... sie [sc. the Canaanites] nehmen religiös und ethisch eine niedrige Position ein."¹⁵ Loretz's emphasis on the "Prozess der Umbildung und Umdeutung von Symbolen und Sprache der Kanaanäer in Israel"¹⁶ and, especially, his somewhat exclusive stress on the Jewish and already Israelite enmity towards the Canaanites does no justice to either the prophetic literature with its many references to others such as Egypt and Assur or the multitude of relations to assumed and historical events, data and persons in the narrative and poetic literature of the OT and other sources reflecting such.
5. Surely, there are genuine¹⁷ similarities and allusions in OT literature and texts from Ugarit regarding deities, heroic figures, and their behaviour and cultural expressions (e.g., poetic structure) and environments. In brief, socio-religious conditions as reflected through various writings in the OT may be compared, indeed, to the situation recognisable from the literature of the Ugaritic kingdom. However, this is exactly not what Loretz and others before him tried to point out.
6. The complexity of the situation envisaged is demonstrated, for example, by Loretz's claim that "<es> feststeht, dass Aspekte Baals auf Jahwe übertragen worden sind, wie der Titel rkb 'rpt, seine Erscheinung im Gewitter und sein Kampf gegen Leviathan zeigen."¹⁸
 - a) While Loretz did not realise the cause for the equation of Ugaritic 'rpt and Hebrew 'rbwt,¹⁹ he claimed "Wenngleich es dort den durch die Steppe kommenden Jahwe bezeichnet, so dürfte doch feststehen, dass hier das kanaanäische^[sic] rkb 'rpt den Ausgangspunkt bildet".²⁰ However, the frequency of employments of Eblaitic [i.e. an Akkadian dialect of as early as the 3rd millennium B.C. within the Syrian environment²¹], Amorite, Aramaic and Phoenician *rakab(um)* "to ride" in the 3rd masc. sing. of the present, as participle and occasionally in other forms in theophoric names referring to several deities and in the names of the deified patron of Sam¹ al and the latter's protégé, king *brkkb*,²² as well as archaeological evidence for divine riders strongly contradict the argument that the idea of any deity as a "rider", especially of Ba'al "in the clouds" as attested for Ugarit and of 'elohim^[1] in Ps 68:5²³ is specifically Ugaritic and then just Canaanite and bears witness to a dependence of the biblical assertion on Ugaritic and/or Canaanite traditions.
 - b) Even more commonly attested is the image of deities as "Gewittergott" or better as *weather-god* throughout the Near East²⁴ and beyond²⁵. To consider assertions of Yahweh's revelation and apparition through natural phenomena, such as thunderstorms,²⁶ as having been passed on as a kind of bequest of aspects of Ba'al to Yahweh may safely be assumed to be erroneous. This is the more true as Yahweh like Ba'al has not only played a great role in pre-Israelitic times ["Israel" by the hitherto

traditional understanding²⁷], but was also worshipped in places and forms besides those of the traditionally Israelitic form of this god.²⁸

c) On pp. 92 f. Loretz has presented the passages relevant for Yahweh's encounter with the dragon and other monsters of the sea and he admits with emphasis that here the "im Alten Orient und in der Mythologie der Völker weitverbreitete Topos vom Kampf gegen die vielköpfige Schlange" is tangible. Nevertheless, also in this regard he infers a direct dependence of Yahweh's image on the Ugaritic Ba'al and his mythology and cult concluding that it was necessary "alle sogenannten Chaotkampfsszenen"²⁹ — to these belong for him the sea and its monsters which, according to the author of Ps 74, must be vanquished "jedes Jahr zur Sicherung der Fruchtbarkeit"³⁰ — "auf Jahwe zu übertragen und ihn auch als Sieger und Herr über das Meer darzustellen."²⁹

7. Being on his track, as he is, Loretz gets more and more entangled in the snares he has laid through his pan-ugaritic approach to his presentation of the background and environment of the God variously referred to as that of Israel and Judah in the writings of the OT. Surely, this God, as his designations and many other references show, has been the result of fusion, and he was definitely not a mere prolongation — *mutatis mutandis* — of the Ugaritic Ba'al šapān or the latter's integrated equivalents³¹ as Loretz suggests. Even though we have in Yahweh's incorporation of other deities an interesting analogy to Ba'al's combination with other gods, there was not much more: Yahweh's resp. 'Elōhīm's, 'Ēl's and 'Adōnāy's activities were decidedly different from those of Ba'al, in particular of his apparition in the Ugaritic environment, and of such who had become his aliases.³²

a) Loretz claims, further, "Schöpfung als Sicherung des Lebens durch Sieg über die Kräfte des Bösen bestimmt in breitem Ausmasse auch die biblischen Texte. Wenn Jahwe so von Baal die Kraft des Regens übernimmt, schafft er nach seiner Thronbesteigung durch den Regen ein neues Leben. Der Sieg über das bedrohliche Meer bereitet die Grundlage für das positive Wirken Gottes."³³ Prior to this amazing statement, Loretz had conceded "Wenn man somit Schöpfung als einmaligen Akt am Anfang der Welt versteht, der nur einmal erfolgen konnte, besteht keine Möglichkeit, die Kämpfe Baals als Teil des Schöpfungsgeschehens zu interpretieren."³⁴ However, Loretz feels he should have a basis for the line he draws from Ba'al to Yahweh. So he presents first "wohl mit genügender Sicherheit" 'il = "El" as "alter Schöpfergott" — "doch noch nicht im biblischen Sinne 'Schöpfer von Himmel und Erde'".³⁵ and he sees then "die Möglichkeit, das Wirken Baals als ein wahres, sekundäres Schöpfungsgeschehen zu verstehen."³⁴

This "Wirken" Ba'al's is, in his view, "der Kampf Baals gegen Môt und Jammu"³⁴ it is characterised by its "vorläufiger und stets zu wiederholender Charakter. Diese unendbare Auseinandersetzung gehört zum Bestand der Welt. Sie macht ihr Wesen aus und muss deshalb periodisch beim Neujahrsfest kultisch durch das Ritual wieder vergegenwärtigt werden."³⁶

b) As is obvious from foregoing claims of Loretz, he needs for his

construction several presuppositions. The most important are: (1) that the "El" of Ugarit had been a creator, (2) the alleged celebration of an annual "tronstiningsfest"³⁷/Thronbesteigungsfest³⁸/Enthronement of Yahweh³⁹ in Israel,⁴⁰ (3) the acceptance as fact of a constitutive character of such festival for the worship of the Ugaritic Ba'al,⁴¹ (4) the significance of such to mean the reanactment of "creation", (5) a partial coincidence or even an equation of *providentia dei* connected with the god's *gubernatio* resp. his *providentia generalis/universalis et singularis/particularis*⁴² with the *creatio dei*,⁴³ and (6) the assumption of pristine age of the thought of the Israelitic god (with his various names on account of fusion of several deities) as creator of the universe.

c) It is impossible and unnecessary to discuss all these premises at this place. Since obviously there was no transfer of the Ugaritic Il's alleged function as "Schöpfergott" to Ba'al, it will suffice to refute no. (1) together with no. (6):

α) On p. 66 Loretz adduces as epithet of 'il in KTU 1.17 I 24 (= Eissfeldt-Aistleitner [henceforth E-A] II D = Gordon 2 Aqht I 25) the word-connection *bny bnwt* and translates it with Aistleitner and others by "Schöpfer der Geschöpfe".⁴⁴ One may do this, provided one is aware that *bny* means here "begetter" and *bnwt* relates to the begotten children.⁴⁵ This is clear from the context of these words and in line with their meanings as Semitic morphemes based on the root *BN* I.⁴⁶ Without immediate reference to the bestowment of progeny, but merely as a standard address supposed to be somewhat flattering an alternate to 'il's name⁴⁷ this epithet is used in passages not adduced by Loretz but, if KTU 1.17 I 24 would not be known, more readily suitable for Loretz's argumentation, i.e., in KTU 1.6 (= E-A I AB = Gordon 49) III 5 and 11 as well as merely by reference in KTU 1.4 (= E-A II AB = Gordon 51) II 11 and *ibid.* in III 32 in antithesis to Il's wife.⁴⁸ However, for anyone familiar with ancient Near Eastern name-giving the thought of children as a gift of deities is nothing new. Especially, a multitude of Eblaitic names attests — more than anywhere else — to the thought and belief that deities had been the physical fathers or mothers of the bearers of such names. This had nothing to do with the notion of creation.

To this strict limitation regarding the interpretation of Il's relationship to other deities and human beings suit also other epithets of his: 'ab bn 'il "father of Il's sons" (in KTU 1.40 33 and 41 [= E-A and Gordon 2 25 and 33])⁴⁹ and 'ab 'adm "father of mankind"⁵⁰ (in KTU 1.14 I 37.43, III 32.47, VI 13⁵¹. 32 [= E-A I K = Gordon Krt 37.43.136.151.278⁵¹ and 297]). Again, the cause for the employment of this latter epithet of Il is obvious: It is Il who can and will grant king and high priest Kerāt⁵² the desired heir. Completely contrary to its sense within its context and entirely out of place is Loretz's connection of *kqny*^[sic] in KTU 1.10 III 5 (= E-A IV AB = Gordon 76 III 6), i.e., within the context of a reference to the copulation of 'aliyn [*b'l*] with 'nt, with the claimed function of the Il of Ugarit as a "Schöpfergott".⁵³

β) Foregoing corrections regarding the misinterpreted epithets of Il are corroborated by the presentation of his wife *'atrt* as mother. Since Loretz has recognised this function,⁵⁴ there remains mainly to take general exception to several details in his description of this goddess and her identification with others, i.e., numina called by the same name (or the latter's form *'ašērā*) as well as with the Ugaritic and other apparitions of *'ttrt/ 'štrt*.⁵⁵ Only his translation of *qnyt 'ilm* by "Schöpferin, Gebälerin der Götter"⁵⁶ (in *KTU* 1.4 [= *E-A II AB* and *Gordon* 51] III 26 and more often) should be refused acceptance explicitly. While Ugaritic *qny* like its cognates in other Semitic languages can mean "to bring forth, produce, plan"⁵⁷ its basic meaning behind all of them is "to (gain) control, be in command of, the lord of".⁵⁸ At any rate, there is no implication of "creation" in the proper sense of *qnyt 'ilm* as there is none in this root and its morphemes elsewhere.

γ) Loretz has correctly observed⁵⁹ that there is considerable dissension regarding Il's residence or abode and that this as well as the position of Il in lists is irrelevant for the question whether he was a "Schöpfergott" or not. Nor is here the place to discuss those matters and/or to take a position thereon. Yet, noted should be the lack of any justification whatsoever to apply, as Loretz does, in a kind of transfer the Qunirša⁶⁰ myth to Il or to the biblical El and thereby implicitly to Elohīm/Yahweh merely on the grounds that the Qunirša myth is "allgemein als kanaaniäischer Mythos angesehen" and because there are in Loretz's view "Bezeichnungen Els als Schöpfer⁶¹ von Göttern und Menschen".⁶² Further, Loretz suggests: "Zusammen mit seiner Gattin Atiratu erinnert El deshalb⁶¹ an das mesopotamische Götter- und Schöpferpaar Anu und Ninhursag." Apparently, he considers this himself still insufficient as basis for Il's — he says "El's" — claimed function as creator, and so he adds "Die Bezeichnung Els als des Schöpfers der Erde könnte⁶¹ auch auf die Tradition zurückgehen, der zufolge die Erde den Urgrund des Lebens bildet." Then he continues in the next paragraph: "Deshalb dürfte⁶¹ in Gen 14,19 die alte Tradition über El als Schöpfer der Götter und Menschen sowie der Erde nach dem Motiv der Schöpfung durch Trennung von Himmel und Erde und Teilung der Wasser in obere, himmlische, und untere (Gen 1,1—6) aufgefüllt worden sein."⁶²

Here we have come upon several aspects of Loretz's method and the results thereof. Besides the criticism that has already been voiced against Loretz's misinterpretation of Il's epithets, strongest exception is to be taken, of course, to Loretz's identification *a priori* of the Ugaritic Il and the biblical El which, as the trend of his chapters 2.6.1.1 and 2.6.1.2 is supposed to go, is still to be proven, provided the identification of El with Elohīm and Yahweh in the Old Testament is accepted as fact — and this is beyond dispute for Loretz also, of course. However, in order to demonstrate that Elohīm as the creator by biblical traditions (Gen 1 et al.) *alias* Yahweh became the heir of Il's alleged function as "Schöpfergott" via Ba'al, Il is made a "Schöpfergott" not only through said unfounded interpretation of some of his epithets but also by Loretz's borrowing of supposedly relevant

traditions manifested in (a) the "elqunirša myth", (b) a "Canaanite myth" commonly identified, as he says, with the Qunirša myth, (c) Il's — he writes "El's" — togetherness and common activities allegedly as creators with his wife 'Atirat allegedly similar to those of the "Mesopotamian" couple Anu and Ninhursag, (d) the chance that Il alias El as "creator of the earth" could have been so named — as he was not! — on account of a tradition insinuating that "the earth is the primeval foundation of life".⁶³

Certainly, also Loretz knows that all this is far-fetched and there is no shred of any valuable evidence therein, especially, as he is aware that the "späte Schöpfungsbegriff der nachexilischen Priesterschrift ist den ugaritischen Texten mit Sicherheit noch fremd."⁶⁴ Instead of referring to the Iranian influence on the early Jewish community's ideology,⁶⁵ he takes the words *qōnēh šāmayim wā'āres* in Gen 14:19 — with it goes, of course, their repetition in Gen 14:22 — into his service.⁶⁶ However, these are attached as epithet in the first instance to 'ēl 'elyōn and in the second to yahweh 'ēl 'elyōn, i.e., names betraying the composite character of the designation of this deity. As 'elyōn was understood, beyond doubt, as adornment of the biblical God so *qōnēh šāmayim wā'āres*.⁶⁷

δ) Like some others Loretz mistakes the epithet *qōnēh šāmayim wā'āres* in Gen 14:19 and 22 to characterise Israel's god as creator of the universe.⁶⁸ However, while *k/qunirša*, and the variant forms of this name resp. designation express the idea of *ewerne hawurniya*, the Hurrian rendition of Sumerian and apparently others' [see the Eblaite texts] Enki⁶⁹ and their further translations or representations, such as *b'l 'rs* and (l) *qn 'rs*,⁷⁰ the predicate *qnh šmym w'rs* in Gen 14:19 and 22 expresses the thought contained in the glorifying formula "Lord/Matron (or King/Queen) of Heaven(s) and Earth" having apparently originated in Sumerian Mesopotamia and having become rather common among several Near Eastern peoples.⁷¹

ε) Following Sigmund Mowinkel and Hermann Gunkel in their identification of the festivals annually celebrated at the beginning of a new year with an alleged annually observed festive (re-)enthronisation of Yahweh as king⁷² Loretz concludes "Von den Ugarit-Texten her wird somit klar, dass die Israeliten die Vorstellung von der jährlichen Thronbesteigung des Regengottes Baal nicht von den Babyloniern übernommen haben, sondern von den Kanaanäern. Wann und mit welchen Einschränkungen sie es (sc. the "Thronbesteigungsfest") auf Jahwe übertragen haben, lässt sich nicht mehr mit Sicherheit feststellen. Aus den biblischen Texten ist jedoch zu ermitteln, dass im vorexilischen Israel dieses Fest kultisch gefeiert worden ist."⁷⁴

While the claim of an annual "Enthronement of Yahweh" was shown to be irrelevant for the question whether El/Elohīm inherited his capacity of creator from Il and/or Ba'al Šapān of Ugarit or the like, since there was no such bequest nor an "heir"⁷⁵ and while the annual festival of re-enthronisation of Yahweh at the beginning of the new year "is not actually attested but only surmised",⁷⁶ Loretz's argument against the overwhelming current of reasons and conclusions deserves attention.

Not only, that he opts with Mowinckel *vs* Gunkel⁷⁷ for the pre-exilic period as the time of origin and early cultic use of the psalms allegedly alluding to and sung at the occasion of the (re-)enthronement of Yahwe, he feels that the existence of these songs, whose purpose to serve for cultic festivals is "zu ermitteln aus den biblischen Texten"⁷⁸ can be explained only by this very purpose. "Eine Übernahme dieser kanaanäischen Kultlieder durch die Israeliten zum Gebrauch in einem unkultischen Rahmen könnte in keiner Weise erklärt oder gerechtfertigt werden."⁷⁸ In plain words this means: in order to sustain Loretz's hypothesis of Yahwe's and the general biblical inheritance of Ba'al's and Ugarit's bequest, the "*Thronbesteigungsfest*" must have been reality.⁷⁹

Merely on the grounds that the "grundlegende mythische Vorstellung von der Rückkehr des Regen- und Gewittergottes Baal zu Beginn der Regenzeit und die damit verbundene Kultfeier mit der jährlichen Inthronisierung der Gottheit mit dem nachexilischen jüdischen Monotheismus nicht mehr vereinbar war <,> ... wurden diese Texte <sc. the psalms considered to be "*Thronbesteigungslieder*"> kommentiert, erweitert, umgedeutet und dem neuen Gedanken von der ewigen und allgemeinen Herrschaft Gottes in der Endzeit dienstbar gemacht. Erst auf dem Hintergrund der ugaritischen Texte ist es möglich geworden, diesen erstaunlichen Entwicklungsgang⁸⁰ nachzuzeichnen. Die Umwandlung der Thronbesteigungslieder in Psalmen auf eine Königsherrschaft Gottes, die die ganze Welt und alle Völker umspannt, zeigt einerseits besonders anschaulich, dass das vorexilische Israel die Kraft besass, Kanaanäisches zu übernehmen, und andererseits, dass das nachexilische Judentum gleichermaßen befähigt war, das Erbe neuen Bedingungen anzupassen und weiterzuentwickeln."⁸¹ While the question, whether the Ugaritic and Hurritic⁸² mythological assertions and tales as attested for the kingdom of Ugarit and its environment have really been correctly understood to relate mainly to cultic events, may remain open at this time and must possibly do so forever, Loretz's grandiose picture of religious history he paints here drawing on the cultic situation as conceived by him leaves out of regard that the idea of kingship of gods in its various ways of expression and its recognition by worshippers in manifold expressions of sentiments has been common among various peoples of the ancient Near East. However, contrary to Loretz's view, in Hebrew religion there was no bond between a deity as divine force — like Ba'al — and nature to renew the seasons. Man gratefully exploited and enjoyed and/or was afraid of nature acknowledging Yahweh's control thereof, yet he must forego the excitement of celebrating the natural forces and seasons of earth and sky as emanating expressions of his god. While the Ugaritic Ba'al had to prove, so to say, his being alive through natural phenomena in the course of the seasons, Yahweh was beyond question, "God was not in sun and stars, rain and wind; they were his creatures and served him."⁸³ As direct pantheism is essentially alien to the OT, so the indirect pantheism through revelation of the deity, sc. of the Ugaritic Ba'al, him- or herself in the natural phenomena.

Moreover, contrary to Loretz's assumption of the cultic absorption of any vitalistic — Loretz says "Canaanite" — heritage through pre-exilic Israel and post-exilic Jewry, an *increase* of such vitalistic traits has been observed during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, i.e., when the rule of the Torah is supposed to have almost eclipsed many other sources of religious *règlement*. This was apparently due to environmental influences alien to Israelite and Jewish traditions.

9. Loretz lays the ground to his overall picture of the religious history of Israel and Jewry as a continuation and partial confrontation with its alleged Ugaritic heritage and even enmity to — as he generalises — the Canaanitic heritage⁸⁴ [by the way, emphasising this hostility too much at the expense of other concerns] through his modification of Julius Wellhausen's main thesis (:the law after the prophets). His "neue These lautet: Nachdem das Königtum in Israel untergegangen war, entstand während des babylonischen Exils und nachher das Thorajudentum. Vor dem Exil stand der König im Zentrum des Geschehens und des Kultes. Der König war die wichtigste Person, erst nach dem Exil setzt die Herrschaft der Priester und die Geltung der Thora, des Gesetzes ein. Die Geschichtsdarstellung der Bibel entspricht somit den Vorstellungen des nachexilischen Judentums, und das Verhältnis zu den⁸⁵ Kanaanäern wird von diesem Gesichtspunkt her entworfen."⁸⁶ This mistaken presentation of the Israelitic and Jewish history is blending fact and fiction, as can be seen already by Loretz's appreciation of Israelite kingship, especially of the position of kings with respect to the relations of Israel to its god in "Geschehen und Kult". It is useful to recall what Henri Frankfort wrote on Israelitic kingship and that he noted in this respect: "The relation between the Hebrew monarch and his people was as nearly secular as is possible in a society wherein religion is a living force."⁸⁷

Further: to spin his thread from Ugarit to the Bible, from Il to El, from Ba'al to Yahweh, and in many other respects which could and need not be discussed here, Loretz has simply shelved a good deal of traditions related in the OT aside as irrelevant or even fancy. Surely we all know of the difficulty to separate genuinely historical data from aetiological or even fictional prose or poetry, how to blow the chaff from the wheat, but Loretz's selective approach to historiography is slanted. Moreover, apart from his rejection of the Panbabylonism⁸⁸ and formally also of the Panugaritism⁸⁹ which, thereafter, he practises, nevertheless, to the degree of near exclusiveness, Loretz has missed the fact, as it seems, completely that in the OT more similarities and allusions relate to other Near Eastern peoples and tribes and their cultural habitat than to Ugarit and its civilisation. It may suffice, to point in this context, for instance, to environmental materials, such as unearthed at Ebla relatively recently whose revolutionising character becomes just now apparent, especially with regard to the story of Israel's origin(s),⁹⁰ of its affiliation with El and Yahweh,⁹¹ and writings in the OT reflecting early conditions of Israelites.

However, while Loretz in his learned book is drawing extensively and

intensely on the results of his own research and that of others, he needs his, as he assumes, "klar bestimmten historischen und theologischen Standpunkt"⁹² for his presentation and explanation that he had to bring to an end the era of understanding of Ugaritic and biblical texts as, so to say, "parallel" phenomena (wherever this may have been the case). His book rests on the premise that "während in der ersten Phase der Forschung die ugaritischen Texte vornehmlich der Bestätigung traditioneller bibelwissenschaftlicher Anschauungen dienten, setzte sich nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg eine philologische und historische Betrachtungsweise durch, die den jeweiligen Besonderheiten der ugaritischen und biblischen Texte besser gerecht wird. Die Ugarit-Texte erweisen sich so als die kanaanäischen, heidnischen Vorläufer der biblischen Texte."⁹³ In view of the assertions of both the texts from Ugarit and the OT as well as evidence from sources other than these, this premise while methodically correct has obviously *not* been followed by Loretz (like others). At any rate, the alleged results are wrong and misleading: The texts from Ugarit are not "die kanaanäischen Vorläufer der biblischen Texte". The latter have many traits in common with others, *inter alia* such from the kingdom of Ugarit, but they have their own peculiar and independent character. They are not the "heir" of an Ugaritic bequest.

A revision of the historiography of the religion of ancient Israel, especially its beginnings and early period, is urgently needed, in particular, as hypotheses, such as Martin Noth's on the origin of this people and nation, its name and its relationship to El resp. Yahweh have been mistaken.⁹⁴ Once more, "unterschiedliche Terminologie und weit auseinandergehende historisch-theologische Gesamtkonzeptionen über die Entwicklung der biblischen Religion beherrschen in verwirrender Weise das Feld."⁹⁵ Yet, such revision will certainly not allow scholars to have *a priori* a "klar bestimmten historischen und theologischen Standpunkt", but require from them not to have such and/or to avoid, by all means, to be guided by such.

NOTES

¹ *Ugarit und die Bibel: kanaanäische Götter und Religion im Alten Testament* (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1990) X and 272 pp., 1 map. (ISBN 3-534-08778-X) [henceforth = Loretz].

² Loretz p. 230

³ O.c. p. 243.

⁴ O.c. p. 245.

⁵ O.c. p. 28. The emphasis is mine.

⁶ My emphasis.

⁷ Loretz's emphasis.

⁸ Loretz p. 28. ^{8a} See below item 7 a).

⁹ O.c. p. 15

¹⁰ O.c. pp. 15 f.

¹¹ See, e.g., O. Eissfeldt, "Kanaanäisch-ugaritische Religion" = *Religionsgeschichte des Alten Orients* = B. Spuler et al. (eds.), *Handbuch der Orientalistik* I, viii, 1.1 (Leiden-Cologne 1964) [henceforth: *Eissfeldt Rel*] pp. 76—91, esp. pp. 80 and 87 f.,

H. Gese, *Die Religionen Altsyriens* = H. Gese et al., *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer* = C. M. Schröder (ed.) *Die Religionen der Menschheit* 10,2 (Stuttgart etc. 1970) pp. 1—232 [= Gese], B. W.W. Dombrowski, *The Background of the Formula 'DWN KL HRS: Near Eastern Deities and their Epithets* = *Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 31 (Budapest 1985—88; published in 1991/92) pp. 179—250 [= *Background*].

¹² See *Background* passim, esp., appendices 3, 4, 15, and pp. 199—201. Notwithstanding W. von Soden's mistaken, yet repeated connection of Eblaitic, erroneously classified by him as "nordsemitisch" [see, e.g., *IdE* pp. 355—61] and the Semitic strain of the languages of the people of Ugarit, which in his opinion likewise "ursprünglich wohl eine nordsemitische Sprache war" [*Einführung in die Altorientalistik* (2nd ed. Darmstadt 1992) pp. 20 and 18 f.], the cultures of Ebla and Ugarit obviously have as many features in common as that of Ebla and biblical Israel. The evaluation of most details must be left to other studies, see, however, below note 22.

¹³ Loretz p. 56. My emphasis.

¹⁴ See below item 9.

¹⁵ Loretz p. 56.

¹⁶ See above through n. 5.

¹⁷ However, a considerable number of similarities have been artificially created through emendations in the Hebrew text by Loretz and others, further, on account of misinterpretations of Ugaritic and/or biblical materials or erroneous and fallacious conclusions.

¹⁸ Loretz pp. 76 f.

¹⁹ See B. W.W. Dombrowski, *Der Name Europa auf seinem griechischen und altsyrischen Hintergrund: Ein Beitrag zur ostmediterranen Kultur- und Religionsgeschichte in frühgriechischer Zeit* (Amsterdam 1984) [= *Europa*] here pp. 119—22.

²⁰ Loretz p. 75.

²¹ For particulars see B. W.W. Dombrowski's, "Eblaitic" = The Earliest Known Dialect of Akkadian" in *ZDMG* 138 (1988) pp. 211—235 (esp. p. 214), "The Creation of Verbal Forms in Eblaitic and its Significance for the History of the Semitic and Hamitic Language Families" [in:] H. G. Mukarovsky (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress* vol. 2 = *Veröffentl. der Institute für Afrikanistik und Ägyptologie der Universität Wien* 57 (Vienna 1991), pp. 185—208 (esp. pp. 195 f.), and "Das System der Eblaitischen Zahlen im Vergleich zu anderen, vornehmlich in den semitischen und hamitischen Sprachbereichen" (forthcoming).

²² For the Eblaitic present-preterit in the masculine gender *irkab* see theophoric names which appear to refer to a group of deities specifically concerned with life and death, i.e., *ir-kab-da-mu* "Damu rides" (through *MEE* 1 p. 271, *ARET* IV # 19 r. IX 12), *ir-kab-ar* "Ar rides" (through *MEE* 2 p. 346, *ARET* II # 25 VI 1, *ARET* III p. 286, *ARET* IV p. 252 <for *ar* see *Eblaitica* I n. 219>); *ir-kab-gu-sirš* "Gusir [= sister of Damu, one of the goddesses of fate] rides" (*MEE* 1 # 5091), *ir-ir-kab-tù-lum* "Tullum rides" (in *MEE* 1 # # 797, 809, *MEE* 2 # 41 r. XI 5, *ARET* III # # 240 III 5', 341 r. II 2', 5' [tullum "violent, brute" here = DN in statu absoluto of verb.-adj. D <cf. AHw p. 1394a>].

The 3rd sing. fem. is attested in *tár-kab-da-mu* of *ARET* III # 410 v. III 5', *ARET* IV # 1 r. VIII 7.

As Amorite forms *Gelb* pp. 345 f., 30a adduces the present of the basic stem (= B ≈ Qal) and of the causative stem, here — as frequently — with the meaning of B (cf. the Hebrew Hiph'il), as well as the participle in the feminine gender (so *Gelb*) or possibly in the masculine form thereof: *ir-kab-ib* ["ib = Ugar. (il)'ib = Hurritic 'umbu; see *Background* pp. 188, 222 (esp. n. 14 and 15)], *ir-kab-DU* [re. ^aDU see *Deimel Panth.* 2 p. 48 # 410, *Panth.* p. 102 # 728], *ia-ar-ka-ab-IM* and *ia-ar-ki-ba-IM* [weathergod ^aIM ≈ Ba'al!], and either *ru-ka-ba-tum* or *ru-ka-ba-ib* (= ^aib).

For the attestations in Phoenician (latter part of 9th cent. B.C.) and Aramaic (middle and 2nd half of 8th cent.) see through *KAI* III p. 58b. Which deity stands behind *brkb* is uncertain. One may be inclined to assume this name to refer to the deified ancestor of the dynasty of Sam'al and translate it as "son/descendant of *rkbl'*".

²³ For evidence of the alleged "Übertragung" of Ba'al's aspect as *rkb* 'rpt "Wolkenreiter" [- others have in line with the text of Ps 68:5 "der auf den Wolken daherkommt, der die Wolken besteigt": see HAL p. 1147b f.] to Yahweh (based on Loretz's unnecessary emendation of 'elōhīm) Loretz adduces also Ps 104:3, Deut 33:26, Isa 19:1. Of these the Isaiah passage may come closest to the idea of the "Wolkenreiter", according to its image in Ps 104 the deity is definitely not riding but driving a cart or, preferably, a chariot, and Deuteronomy 33:26 leaves it open, whether the 'el yešūrūn is driving or riding. At any rate, while — in line with apparently very common Near Eastern [and other, e.g., Germanic] imagery — all of them attest to a deity driving or riding, none suggests or merely supports that an "aspect" of Ba'al as "rider in/on the clouds" was applied in form of a kind of *terminus technicus* as bequest to Yahweh or 'Elōhīm.

²⁴ While the images of the various local and regional forms of the weather-god have influenced each other, the necessity to strictly differentiate between the Hittite, Hittite, Luvian, Egyptian, Sumerian, Akkadian, Hurritic, Ugaritic, various Canaanite and other apparitions cannot be overemphasised, so the originality of Ba'al and Yahweh. For the former see *Background*, esp. pp. 181—3. The conclusion offered there has been amply confirmed by Eblaite attestations. Regarding the latter see B. W.W. Dombrowski, *From 'Ia to Yahweh — The Growth of a National God* [based on a paper submitted to the International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature (Vienna 1990)] (forthcoming) [henceforth = *Ia to Yahweh*].

²⁵ Again, reference is made, e.g., to Germanic gods whose similarity to Near Eastern deities, as striking as it is, does not cause to infer any interrelationship or even subordination.

²⁶ The definition of Yahweh as "Gewittergott", i.e., to separate his involvement with thunderstorms from his authority and control over other natural events is one-sided and cannot be accepted without qualification. Passages like Ps 104:8—30 show that the *Gewittergott* aspect must be seen as just one of several in Yahweh-Yahweh 'Elōhīm — 'El. While Loretz has recognised the beneficent side of both Ba'al and Yahweh (pp. 162—66), however, he damages the parallelism between Ba'al and Yahweh in their dual function as potentially destructive and nourishing gods, by his artificial construction that it is "anzunehmen, dass die Verbindung Jahwes mit dem die Fruchtbarkeit schenkenden Regen im nachhinein geschehen ist. Jahwe übernahm Baals Funktionen und wurde so für Israel zum Regengeber." (p. 165; my emphasis; cf. also o.c. p. 77). For the bilateral, in fact, many-faced image of 'Ia = Yāh/Yahweh in Eblaite, Amorite and other names see *Ia to Yahweh*, esp. sect. II (h) α) 7 and 9.

²⁷ For the pre-biblical history of Yisrā'el from Ebla into the 2nd millennium B.C. see B. W.W. Dombrowski, *The Name ISRAEL: Its Formation, Background and Environment* [based on a paper read at the International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature (Copenhagen 1989)] (forthcoming).

²⁸ Loretz has recognised this (o.c., pp. 54 f., 71), but "buried" this issue, since he is obviously more interested in other matters, such as the identification of El with Yahweh, and Il's — allegedly identical with the El of the OT — and the latter's spousals. (pp. 66—73; cf. below item 7 c) β) ang γ).

²⁹ Loretz p. 159.

³⁰ O.c. pp. 93, 106.

³¹ Re. b'l 'ugrt, b'l hlb/ttb hlbğ 'adad bel il huršān hazi, 'al'iyān b'l, (akab) ewerne hawurniya/ (zbl) b'l 'ars and others see *Background* pp. 181 ff.; the latter were apparently not recognised as such by Loretz (see o.c. pp. 74, 164, 81).

³² E.g., the ('ēl) 'elyōn, ('ēl) šadday, 'ēl bēl'ēl.

³³ O.c. p. 159.

³⁴ O.c. p. 158.

³⁵ O.c. pp. 155 f.

³⁶ O.c. p. 158. See, further below item 8.

³⁷ Publicised first, as it seems, by S. Mowinckel through his "Tronstigningssalmerne og Jahves tronstigningsfest" in *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 1917 (Reformation issue) pp. 13 ff.

³⁸ See on the alleged "Thronbesteigungsfest" of Yahweh in particular H.-J. Kraus' studies listed in *Loretz* pp. 101 and 103. These works contain considerably more and convincing materials, however, than are referred to by Loretz.

³⁹ English rendition of "tronstigningsfest" (see S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* 2 vols. (Oxford 1962) and others).

⁴⁰ See below item 8.

⁴¹ See below p. 9.

⁴² For the strict differentiation of the deity's (for Christians 'Elōhīm's/Yahweh's = God's) *providentia* [with the slightly varying concepts of *conservatio*, *concursus* and *gubernatio*] from its *creatio* in both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant enunciations of official *faith* [for one significant exception see next note], i.e., in the doctrines of theology as well as in religious philosophy, see already such elementary works as H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum* (30th ed. by C. Rahner (Freiburg i. Br. 1955)) [= *Denzinger*] through *Index systematicus VI* vs *VII* and — not withstanding a certain impact of Friedrich Schleiermacher — Alexander Schweizer, *Die Glaubenslehre der Evangelisch-reformierten Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt* vol. 1 (Zürich 1844) pp. 312 ff. vs pp. 296 ff., and C. E. Luthardt — R. Jelke, *Kompodium der Dogmatik* (sc. Lutheran) (14th ed. [= 2nd ed. of Jelke's revised form] Leipzig 1937) pp. 185 ff. vs pp. 181—5.

⁴³ Loretz's confusion of these two activities of 'Elōhīm/Yahweh, unambiguous since the introduction of the thought of God's creation of the universe into OT ideology, conflicts also with the teachings of major Jewish interpreters of tradition and thinkers. Even Maimonides, with his acceptance of a natural steady process of emanation, held that the creation of the world was an act of free divine resolve not withstanding the natural teleology of the immanent world order which is subject, however, to God's unfettered determination. Yet, Maimonides also allowed for *providence* in a liberal way so as not to limit human responsibility. Actually, his thought is somewhat in line, in this respect, with Thomas Aquinas and Calvin's idea of human *cooperatio* being used as means for the *providentia dei*. [For references see K. Barth, *Die Theologie Calvins 1922 = KB II* p. 510.] Obviously, Loretz has changed the biblical and ecclesiastical traditions and Jewish teachings to tie Ugarit to the Bible and the Bible to what he (and others) considered Ugaritic mythology, religion and cult. Though Professor for Old Testament Studies in the Faculty of Roman Catholic Theology at the University of Münster in Westphalia, Oswald Loretz has taken a stance to a certain extent comparable to Martin Luther's attitude in his *Grosser Katechismus/ Catechismus maior* who allowed in its first article his anthropocentric view to modify the doctrine of creation as follows, specifically, in its second section: ".... Was ist nu gesagt oder was meinest Du mit dem Wort: 'Ich gläube an Gott, Vater allmächtigen, Schöpfer' etc.? Antwort: Das meine und gläube ich, dass ich Gottes Geschöpfe bin, das ist, dass er mir gegeben hat und ohn Unterlass erhält Leib, Seele und Leben, Gliedmasse klein und gross, alle Sinne, Vernunft und Verstand und so fortan, Essen und Trinken, Kleider, Nahrung, Weib und Kind, Gesind, Haus und Hof etc., dazu alle Kreatur zu Nutz und Notdurft des Lebens dienen lässt, Sonne, Mond und Sternen am Himmel, Tag und Nacht, Luft, Feuer, Wasser, Erden und was sie trägt und vermag, Vogel, Fisch, Tier, Getreide und allerlei Gewächs, item, was mehr leibliche und zeitliche Güter sind, gut Regiment, Friede, Sicherheit. Also wie klein und gering es ist es alles gefasst ist in das Wort 'Schöpfer'." While Luther continues with his subsumption of *providentia* and *gubernatio* in this vein — he obviously knew of their traditional differentiation from *creatio* and pushed his theological concept *par force* —, the Latin version of section 2 closes even more precisely: "Haec enim omnia nomine creatoris comprehensa sunt." (quoted from *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (2nd ed. Goettingen 1952) p. 648. As Luther replaced the OT concept of creation *ex bonitate sua ... liberrimo consilio* (Conc. Vatic. with reference to Conc. Later. IV: see *Denzinger* 1782/1783 —> 428) by the interests of his *Mensch* so Loretz made way for the Ugaritic Ba'al as alleged forerunner of Yahweh.

⁴⁴ Following (o.c. p. 66) J. Aistleitner, *Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus*

Ras Schamra = Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 8 (2nd ed. Budapest 1964) [= MKTRS] p. 68, Gordon p. 373 # 483 and others.

⁴⁵ Properly the noun *bnwt* has to be translated by "product". For its classification see F. A. Dombrowski, "Erwägungen und Vorschläge zu einem Vergleichenden Wurzelwörterbuch der semitischen Sprachen", ZDMG 134 (1984) pp. 24–60, here p. 55.

⁴⁶ The pervasion of the meaning "build, produce" is striking; see the arrangement in F. A. Dombrowski *o.c.*, pp. 45–60.

⁴⁷ Cf. the epithets of Il adduced by Loretz *o.c.* p. 66 and those listed in *Background* p. 187 n. 50.

⁴⁸ See below in this section under β).

⁴⁹ Due to the obvious plural in *ilm* as offered in *atrt's* epithet *qnyt ilm* "producer/mother of the gods" (see again subsection β)) I consider (with MKTRS p. 107) *il* to relate to the deity Il. Or to correspond to Hebrew *el* "power, strength". Il would then be "the father of strong sons". This corresponds also to reasoning: How could Il be the father of "sons of gods"? Why did Loretz omit this very important epithet? One is probably to infer that it did impede his hypothesis of "El-Schöpfer der Welt und Vater der Menschen" (*o.c.* p. 66).

⁵⁰ With Aistleitner-Eissfeldt # 83 and Gordon p. 352 # 83.

⁵¹ Partly, yet safely restored.

⁵² To form and meaning of this name see *Background* pp. 240–46.

⁵³ Loretz p. 66. — However, while K. Aartun, *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen* = AOAT 21 2 parts (København — Neukirchen-Vluyn 1974/1978) I p. 9, II pp. 28, 47, could not make any sense of the damaged passage in III 6, since he considered *lm* as being composite of the preposition *l* and the enclitic *-m* this compound being then used as interrogative pronoun (i.e., analogous to Arabic *limā*, Hebrew *lā(m)mā* and Aramaic *l'mā/ā* "why?", for what reason?" [also with other meanings caused by their employment in varying contexts]) and while Aistleitner translated it (in MKTRS p. 54) tentatively by "Wohne bei, wie unsere Eltern ...", I consider *l* to be the affirmative particle and likewise the *k* preceding the 1st pl. perf. *qny*. Lines 5–7 would then be rendered by "Then His Highness Ba'al said: 'Now then, we have planned [or "we plan", since by its employment as *verbum sentiendi* *qny* could also have the force of a present form] for sure ... as the one who sustains us [sc. our father] wished". *drd* = "wished" [or by analogy as *verbum dicendi*: "wishes"] as Aistleitner proposed in MKTRS p. 54; for *qny* "to plan" see through n. 57.

⁵⁴ Loretz p. 83. However, the goddess on the ivory bedstead, Loretz refers to *o.c.* p. 84, was probably 'Anāt. On 'Anāt's equation with Hathor see *Europa* pp. 59–61, 73–77, 81, 113.

⁵⁵ Loretz pp. 83–88.

⁵⁶ Different from Aistleitner-Eissfeldt # 2426 and others, Loretz (*o.c.* pp. 66 and 83) goes with Gordon p. 479 # 2249.

⁵⁷ Aistleitner-Eissfeldt # 2426.

⁵⁸ See already *Background* pp. 201 f.

⁵⁹ *O.c.* pp. 154 f.

⁶⁰ Sic! See through *Background* pp. 201 f. notes 142 and 147a.

⁶¹ My emphasis.

⁶² *O.c.* p. 155. See also the following note 63.

⁶³ So one would have to render Loretz's German (*l.c.*) in his desire to produce grounds — here with reference to Marvin H. Pope — for his claim of Il's resp. the pre-exilic biblical El's function as *creator*. [However, on cosmogonies of Phoenicians, i.e. a substantial group of the Canaanites so often referred to by Loretz, especially in comparison to Greek traditions and Biblical thought, see already W. Staudacher, *Die Trennung von Himmel und Erde. Ein vorgriechischer Schöpfungsmythos bei Hesiod und den Orphikern* (Tübingen 1942) pp. 16–18, and O. Eissfeldt's, "Das Chaos in der biblischen und in der phönizischen Kosmogonie" = *Forschungen und Fortschritte* (Berlin 1940) pp. 1–3 (= *Kl. Schriften* II pp. 258–62) and his "Phönizische und Griechische Kosmogonie" = *Éléments Orientaux dans la Religion Grecque Ancienne, Colloque de Strasbourg 22–24 mai 1958* (Paris 1960) pp. 1–16 (= *Kl. Schriften* III pp. 501–12).] That Loretz is not misunderstood, is obvious from the last paragraph of his section 2.6.1.1 on p. 156

where he translates KTU 1.3 V 35–36 (< 1.4 47–48) [= E-A V AB E 43–44 (< II AB IV–V 47–48) = Gordon 'nt V 43–44 (< 51 IV 47–48)] and Deut 32:6b and replaces (in the Ugaritic text like some scholars, e.g., Gordon p. 418 # 1213, vs others, e.g., Aistleitner in MKTRS pp. 31, 40 and together with Eissfeldt in Aistleitner-Eissfeldt # 1335, and in the Hebrew passage with, e.g., the Codices Alexandrinus and Ambrosianus of LXX) the proper meanings of *yknn* "produce, beget, establish, sustain" by "create". Moreover, he also chooses to translate *gnk* in Deut 32:6bx — like the RSV, and the Zürcher Bibel, yet vs LXX (in all major codices, at least), the Vulgate, and the Lutherbibel — by "your creator" instead of rendering it by "your owner" or still better "your lord". Thus, two passages — one in Ugaritic and one in Biblical Hebrew, the former pointing to Il as "father" and "king" who had produced *'aliyn b'l* [who, not withstanding this origin, had been left without an appropriate palace] and the latter relating to Yahweh, the god of the "foolish and imprudent people", reminding them of their divine origin and guidance through all perils of life (see the lines following this text) — being outwardly similar, but in no way otherwise interconnected, are used by Loretz to tell his readers that, since allegedly "kanaanäische Redeweise auch in der Bibel unverfälscht auf Jahweh übertragen wird (<) ... trifft es kaum zu, dass die Israeliten Vorstellungen über El als Schöpfer, von einigen Ausnahmen wie Gen 14,19 abgesehen, abgelehnt haben." One cannot be wrong to conclude that since Loretz wants to connect Il with El to build a bridge for his derivation of Yahweh's (as alternate to 'Elohim) function as *creator* from Ba'al, Il as well as El had to be presented as "Schöpfergott".

⁶⁴ *O.c.* pp. 155 f.

⁶⁵ Loretz rather claims that "die Entwicklung zum Monotheismus in Israel brachte es mit sich, dass auch in dieser Frage" — he apparently means the thoughts and belief, as he and others suggest, already of pre-exilic Israelites, at any rate, however, of post-exilic Jewry in the creation of the universe by their god — "ein Prozess der Klärung einsetzte, der erst in Gen 1,1 zum Abschluss gekommen ist." (*O.c.* p. 159). Unfortunately, nothing is really known of such process. Nor does it help that he continues by setting a wrong accent to the creation story of Gen 1:1 ff. when he claims "Schöpfung wird dort von dem Bemühen her definiert, Jahwe als einzigen wahren Gott zu verkünden." (*O.c.* p. 159). However, it remains *communis opinio* that the narrator of P intends to explain in Gen 1:1 that and how the universe was created by God whence history proceeded. See, for example, the neatly arraigned outline in R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (2nd impr. New York and Evanston 1948) pp. 188 ff.

⁶⁶ Loretz writes *o.c.* p. 155: "Deshalb dürfte in Gen 14,19 die alte Tradition über El [- obviously, Loretz means the Ugaritic Il and, in accordance with his equation, "the Canaanite" Il/El! -] als Schöpfer der Götter und Menschen sowie der Erde nach dem Motiv der Schöpfung durch Trennung von Himmel und Erde und Teilung der Wasser in obere, himmlische, und untere (Gen 1,1–6) aufgefüllt worden sein." The difference between his El, i.e. the Ugaritic Il, and the biblical El (Elohim) was then, according to Loretz (*l.c.*), that — merely — the "Schema" of "creation by the separation of heaven and earth" was not yet applied to Il. See also *o.c.* pp. 153 f. and 68.

⁶⁷ For the originally separate use of the epithets *qn'rs* and *qn smym w'rs* and their differences see *Background* esp. pp. 201 f. and 206. Although H. Nier, *Der höchste Gott: Alttestamentlicher JHWH-Glaube im Kontext syrisch-kanaanäischer Religion des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.* = BZAW 190 (Berlin 1990) pp. 120–23, still holds to the meaning "create" for *qny/h*, he has correctly pointed to such attachment to *b'l smm* as analogue and, not withstanding his presentation of the Ugaritic "El" = Il as "Schöpfergott" and of Ba'al as the provider, he clearly differentiated between the *loci of creatio* and *providentia*.

⁶⁸ *O.c.* pp. 153–55. However, see *Background* p. 206.

⁶⁹ For the complicated transition see *Background*, esp. pp. 180 f. and 205.

⁷⁰ See through *Background* pp. 179–206 passim.

⁷¹ *Background* pp. 206 and 226.

⁷² Loretz pp. 96 ff.

⁷³ My emphasis.

⁷⁴ *O.c.* pp. 108 f.

⁷⁵ The word "Erbe" is used by Loretz *o.c.* p. 109 regarding the alleged annual

festival of the enthronement of Yahweh. It certainly befits also Loretz's claim of Yahweh's "Übernahme" and continuation *mutatis mutandis* of Ba'al's function as creator.

⁷⁶ See the short and fair survey in O. Eissfeldt [P. R. Ackroyd (transl.)], *The Old Testament. An Introduction* ... (Oxford 1965) [= transl. 3rd ed. of *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* Tübingen 1964] pp. 109—11 and 737 f. [≈ pp. 147 f. of the *Einl.*]

⁷⁷ Loretz p. 100.

⁷⁸ O.c. p. 109.

⁷⁹ Similarly, but much more cautiously, especially in his assumption of biblical evidence for cultic use of the Ba'al epopee, argues Gese pp. 78—80.

⁸⁰ My emphasis.

⁸¹ Lc.

⁸² While Loretz has completely neglected the Hurritic share in the civilisation and, specifically, the textual materials — I have found a reference to the existence of such on p. 7 only —, their paramount importance has been recognised for the last three decades by a considerable number of scholars. Thus, still before the publication of the sizable materials in the *Ugaritica* series and other easily accessible works it was already noted in Eissfeldt *Rel* (p. 87 f.) that "Insbesondere haben offenbar die Hurriter, die jedenfalls eine erhebliche Minderheit, wenn nicht gar die Mehrheit der Bevölkerung Ugarits bildeten, auf ihre kanaänischen Mitbürger auch in dieser Hinsicht (<sc. "Religion und Kultus">) einen starken Einfluss ausgeübt." Apart from everything else here characterised, this omission of Loretz is not amusing.

⁸³ So aptly, with reference to Deut 4:19 and Psalm 19, H. Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods. A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society & Nature* (Chicago, Ill. 1948, 2nd impr. 1955) [= Frankfort] p. 343.

⁸⁴ See Loretz, e.g., pp. 28, 76, 230 ff.

⁸⁵ My emphasis.

⁸⁶ Loretz p. 55.

⁸⁷ Frankfort p. 341.

⁸⁸ Loretz pp. 20 ff.

⁸⁹ O.c. p. 26.

⁹⁰ See above n. 27.

⁹¹ See *Ia to Yahweh*.

⁹² See above through notes 3 and 4.

⁹³ So it reads in the advertisements on the cover of Loretz's book and p. 322 of the *Jahreskatalog 1993* of the *Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft* (Darmstadt).

⁹⁴ See through the monograph mentioned in n. 27

⁹⁵ See above through n. 3.

Bibliographic sigla not yet explained:

- AHW W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* 3 vols. (Wiesbaden 1965—81)
- Aistleitner-Eissfeldt J. Aistleitner — O. Eissfeldt (ed.), *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache = Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Kl. 106,3* (3rd ed. Berlin 1967, repr. as 4th ed. 1974)
- AOAT *Alter Orient und Altes Testament. Veröffentlichungen zur Kultur und Geschichte des Alten Orients und des Alten Testaments* (Neukirchen-Vluyn and Kevelaer 1969 ff.)
- ARET Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza", *Archivi Reali di Ebla: Testi* (Rome 1981 ff.)
- ARET III A. Archi — M. G. Biga, *Testi amministrativi di vario contenuto* (*Archivio L. 2769: TM. 75. G. 3000—4101*) (1982)

ARET IV

BZAW

Deimel *Panth.*²

E-A

Eissfeldt-Aistleitner

Gelb

Gordon

HAL

KAI

KB

Kl. Schriften

KTU

LdE

MEE

MEE 1

MEE 2

Panth.

ZDMG

M. G. Biga — L. Milano, *Testi amministrativi: Assegnazioni di Tessuti* (*Archivio L. 2769*) (1984) *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

A. Deimel, *Pantheon Babylonicum oder Keilschriftkatalog der Babyl. GN* (Rome 1950 = Deimel, *Sumerisches Lexicon* part iv, 1)

= Eissfeldt-Aistleitner

System of enumeration of Texts from Ugarit developed by Otto Eissfeldt and followed in Joseph Aistleitner's works

I. J. Gelb, *Computer-aided Analysis of Amorite* = *Assyriological Studies* 21 (Chicago, Ill. 1980)

C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* = *Analecta Orientalia* 38 (Rome 1965, repr. 1967)

L. Koehler — W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (4 parts so far, Leiden 1967—90)

H. Donner — W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften* 3 vols. (Wiesbaden 1962—64, 3rd ed. 1971—76)

H. Stoevesandt et al. (eds.), *Karl Barth — Gesamtausgabe. II. Akademische Werke* (Zurich 1993)

R. Sellheim — F. Maass (eds.), O. Eissfeldt, *Kleine Schriften* 6 vols. (Tübingen 1962—79)

M. Dietrich et al., *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit* ... (part 1) = *AOAT* 24,1 (1976)

L. Cagni (ed.), *La Lingua di Ebla*. Atti del convegno internazionale (Napoli, 21—23 aprile 1980) = Istituto Universitario Orientale Seminario di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor XIV (Naples 1981).

Materiali Epigrafici di Ebla = Istituto Universitario Orientale (di Napoli) Series Maior (Naples 1979 ff.)

G. Pettinato — A. Alberti, *Catalogo dei testi cuneiformi di Tell Mardikh — Ebla* (1979)

G. Pettinato — F. Pomponio, *Testi amministrativi della biblioteca L. 2769* part 1 (1980)

A. Deimel et al., *Pantheon Babylonicum* (Rome 1914) *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Leipzig, Wiesbaden, and Stuttgart)