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Abstract

This article discusses some of the few reconstructions of Ugaritic texts in KTU\textsuperscript{2} that were not repeated in KTU\textsuperscript{3}. Some illuminating examples of the withdrawal of older reconstructions and the introduction of new ones are described, with the aim of showing when the inclusion of textual reconstruction in a text edition can be justifiable and when not. It is demonstrated that a text edition should not include hypothetical reconstructions in the main text. Footnotes are a better means to show which reconstructions have been proposed. They can also be used to specify which interpretations of damaged letters are possible.

1. Introduction

Both in KTU\textsuperscript{2} and KTU\textsuperscript{3}, many sections of the cuneiform alphabetic texts from Ugarit that were missing when they were excavated have been reconstructed. Restorations of lost letters are given between square brackets. The first examples occur in KTU 1.1:II.1-2. KTU\textsuperscript{2} gives the text as follows:

\[ [\text{ḥšk . ʿšk . ʿbšk . ʿ}]\text{my pʾnk} \]
\[ [\text{tlsmn . ʿmy . twt}]\text{ḥ išdk} \]

KTU\textsuperscript{3} reads:

\[ [\text{ḥšk . ʿšk . ʿbšk . ʿ}]\text{my pʾnk} \]
\[ [\text{tlsmn . ʿmy . twt}]\text{ḥ išdk} \]

In this case, the reconstruction between square brackets in KTU\textsuperscript{2} was taken over completely in KTU\textsuperscript{3}. The extensive reconstruction occurs also in other editions of this text (CTA, KTU\textsuperscript{3}, CARTU) and seems to be undisputed. It is based on a different passage from Illimilku’s Baʾlu Cycle, KTU 1.3:III.18-20, as the footnotes in KTU\textsuperscript{2} and KTU\textsuperscript{3} indicate. The reconstructions in KTU 1.1:II.1-2 are substantiated by traces of the same phrases in other damaged sections of the tablet (1.1:II.21-23; 1.1:III.10-11; cf. also 1.3:IV.11-12). In the preserved part of KTU 1.1:II.1, there are some minute differences between the text of KTU\textsuperscript{2} and the text of KTU\textsuperscript{3}:

\[ \text{Thanks are due to Wilfred Watson for his valuable suggestions.} \]
In *KTU*² the letters *m*, *y* and *p* are in italics, which indicates that they are complete. In *KTU*³, however, only the letter *y* is in italics. Apparently, the editors of *KTU*³ noticed that the letters *m* and *p* are not complete, but only partially preserved. Therefore, *KTU*³ sets them in roman type.

Most of the other textual reconstructions in *KTU*³ also correspond completely with the reconstructions in *KTU*², even if the proposed additions to the surviving text are extensive. Many of them are already found in *CTA* and *KTU*¹, sometimes with minute variants. Good examples of such widely accepted reconstructions can be found especially in the work of Ilimilku, for instance in *KTU* 1.1:II.16-23; 1.1:III.1-5, 10-27; 1.2:I.13-20; 1.14:VI.1-18; 1.17:I.3-17; 1.19:I.20-25. All these reconstructions are based on parallel passages elsewhere in Ilimilku’s work. In some cases, notes in *KTU*² and *KTU*³ refer to these parallel passages as the source of the textual reconstruction. The reconstruction may differ slightly from the text of the parallel passage, for instance as far as the personal names or the verbal forms are concerned, to make it suit the context better.

Although so many reconstructions of *KTU*² and *KTU*³ correspond completely, it is clear that they were not taken over indiscriminately. Several reconstructions have been withdrawn while new reconstructions have been introduced. Also the preserved sections, outside square brackets, have not been taken over uncritically. As they make clear in the Preface, the editors of *KTU*³ have checked the transliterations once again and used better photographs, including those of *InscriptiFact* (see http://www.inscriptifact.com/). Their careful re-examinations have led to new readings. Also, the new collations showed that traces of several reconstructed letters (printed between square brackets in *KTU*²) are still visible. When these traces are supposed to be in line with the reconstruction, *KTU*³ positions the letters concerned outside the square brackets, in roman type (e.g. *KTU* 1.3:IV.13-16, 18-20, 23-24, 27-29, 31, 51; 1.16:V.18).

Of course, even in undisputed cases the correctness of the reconstruction cannot be proven. Elements of the parallel passage may have been left out or repositioned in the lost passage, as was convincingly shown by Marjo Korpel:

As is well known, Ilimilku’s works abound with repetition and the first impression may be that this is always verbal repetition. However, far from repeating literary devices over and over again, Ilimilku varies such passages quite often, leaving out cola
or adding new ones, expanding strophes with extra verses and sometimes changing the order of verses. 2

Despite such variations within the work of a single author, many reconstructions in KTU² and KTU³ can be taken for granted.

In this article, I propose to discuss the small number of reconstructions in KTU³ that were not repeated in KTU². I will describe some illuminating examples of the withdrawal of older reconstructions and the introduction of new ones, with the aim of showing when the inclusion of textual reconstruction in a text edition can be justifiable and when not. I have limited my analysis to the first 24 tablets – KTU 1.1 to KTU 1.24 – most of which were written by the high priest Ilimilku. 3

2. THE JOIN OF KTU 1.3:VI AND KTU 1.8

KTU² shows several restored lines at the top of KTU 1.3:VI, which have no direct parallels elsewhere in the Ugaritic texts:

1  [xxxxxxxxx t]b  
   [l . ṭḥmy . b r]išk  
   [rgmy . ]bn 'nkm  
   [w 'br] . alp

5  [šd . ] b ym . rbt  
   [km]n . b nhrm  
   [']br . gbl . 'br

The reconstruction seems to have been taken over from CARTU. 4 Although a justification is lacking, it is clear that part of the reconstruction was based on solid arguments. The expressions alp šd “a thousand acres” and rbt kmn “ten thousand hectares” occur together in other passages of Ilimilku’s works. 5 The verbal form ‘br, which is reconstructed in lines 4 and 7, recurs in line 8. The justification for the reconstruction of lines 1-3 is more difficult, but reference can be made to the expression rgm lil ybl

2  Korpel (1998:93). Cf. Wyatt (2007). Of course, the editors of CTA and KTU¹²³ were well aware of the changes of sequence, for instance when they restored KTU 1.3:V.39-43a on the basis of 1.4:I.11-18 and 1.4:IV.51-57 but recognized that in 1.3:V the element mṯb klīt knyt occurs only at the end; cf. 1.3:IV.48-53.

3  See now Roche-Hawley & Hawley (2013:256-257 n. 71).

4  A minute deviation occurs in line 5, where CARTU (p. 8) reads [šdm . b].

5  KTU 1.3:IV.38; 1.3:VI.28-29; 1.4:V.24, 56-57; 1.4:VIII.24-26; 1.17:V.9-10.
“word was brought to Ilu” (KTU 1.23:52, 59) and to the use of the word thm in 1.3:VI.24.

In 2006, however, Dennis Pardee discovered that there is a good physical join between the small fragment known as KTU 1.8 and the top of KTU 1.3:VI (Pardee 2009). This enabled a better reconstruction of these lines, which in KTU³ are lines 12-18 of KTU 1.3:VI:

12  m šrm . ḫ[xx ṭ]b
    glt . isr [. b r]išk
    m . brq[m . ] bn ‘nkm
15  ymnt [. xx] . alp
    š[r . ]b ym . rbt
    x[km]n . b nhrm
    [.br . gbl . ‘br

Several details of the reconstruction in KTU³ remain debatable, but it is clear that the reconstruction in KTU² has become obsolete. Despite the positive assessment by the editors of KTU², the older restoration appears to have been too hypothetical. Even the justifiable reconstruction [šd] (KTU², line 5) must be rejected. Also, the interpretation of the passage as a whole has been revised. The common assumption was that in KTU 1.3:VI Athiratu is speaking to her attendant Qidshu-and-Amruru, but the join with KTU 1.8 shows that Ba’lu is speaking to his attendant Gupanu-and-Ugaru (KTU 1.3:VI.6-7).

3. KTU 1.13

KTU² shows some minor textual reconstructions in KTU 1.13:4-5, 7-8, 11-13, 15, 18, 28-29, several of which were already found in CTA and KTU³. Virtually all the reconstructions recur in KTU³, but KTU³ has replaced KTU²’s reconstruction of lines 15 and 18, which is due to new collations by Manfried Dietrich. His reconstruction of the text (Dietrich 2013) has been accepted completely in KTU³.

In KTU², line 15 reads:

k[d‘]mm . ẓpn . l pit .

The reconstruction has been taken over from Johannes de Moor, who read: [kd‘]m ẓpn . l pit “[like beads of sweat] that drip from a brow” (De

6 In line 12, De Moor (2012:132) reads ḫ[r]b. In line 13, Pardee (2009:383; 2012a:64) reads [.] rīšk, while De Moor has [Ir]išk. In line 15, both Pardee and De Moor read ymtm instead of ymntm.
Moor 1980:306, 308). Dietrich’s new collation led him to a new reconstruction of the first word, which was adopted in KTU³:

\[\text{k q[d]šm . t|zpn . l pit .}\]

Dietrich proposes the translation “Fürwahr, die H[eili]gen halten (vergeblich) Ausschau nach Grenzen!” Although he admits that this reconstruction is uncertain, he regards it as much more plausible than the previous interpretation (Dietrich 2013:53, 57, 75-76).

The reconstruction of line 18 in KTU² was also taken over from De Moor, who read the first three words as \(\text{n ‘m . [ksp .]} \text{šlm.}\)⁷ Dietrich’s collation resulted in a different reading, which was accepted in KTU³:

\[\text{n ‘m . mh[m]d . šlm .}\]

Dietrich regards the reconstruction as plausible and translates the phrase as “Lieblich ist die An[mu]t d(ein)er Statue” (Dietrich 2013:53, 57, 79).

In some other lines, Dietrich proposes reconstructions of missing parts that he himself regards as hypothetical.⁸ Among these uncertain reconstructions are:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{[. l b‘lm .]} & \quad \text{(1.13:1)} & \text{k[bdk]} & \quad \text{(1.13:17)} \\
\text{g[ll]} & \quad \text{(1.13:33)} & \text{gl[gl. abn .]} & \quad \text{(1.13:35)}
\end{align*}\]

Despite Dietrich’s doubts, all these suggestions appear in KTU³.

4. \(\text{KTU 1.17:I.1-2}\)

About ten lines are missing completely from the top of KTU 1.17:I. For the first two lines that have been partially preserved KTU² displays a commonly accepted restoration:\¹⁰

\[\begin{align*}
\text{[dnił . mt . rp]i . apn<\n> . ġzr} \\
\text{[mt hrnmy . ]uzr . ilm . ylhm}
\end{align*}\]

The reconstruction is based on the bicolon \(\text{apnk dnil mt rpi - aphn ġzr mt hrnmy}\) “Thereupon, Dani’ilu, the man of the Healer – thereafter, the hero, the Harnamite man ...”. This bicolon occurs several times in the Aqhat

---

⁷ De Moor (1980:306, 308), who translates the clause ‘l . kbkhm | n‘m . [ksp .] šlm (17-18) as “the [silver of the] image is more pleasant than stars”.


¹⁰ The same reconstruction of the missing sections is found in CTA, KTU¹ and CARTU.
legend (1.17:II.27-29; V.4-5, 13-15, 33-35; 1.19:I.19-21). However, \textit{KTU}^{3} favours a different reconstruction:

$$[\text{dnil} \cdot \text{mt} \cdot \text{rp}]i \cdot \text{apnk} \cdot [u]zr$$
$$[\text{ilm dnil} \cdot ]uzr \cdot \text{ilm} \cdot \text{ylhm}$$

This reconstruction is based on a tricolon that occurs three times in the following lines of \textit{KTU} 1.17:I (6-13; cf. 21-22): \textit{uzr ilm dnil} - \textit{uzr ilm ylhm} - \textit{uzr yšqy bn qdš}, “A sacred oblation Dani’ilu (gave) the gods, a sacred oblation he gave the gods to eat, a sacred oblation he gave the children of Qdš (?) to drink”. The new reconstruction became possible since doubt was cast on the reading \textit{ġzr} at the end of line 1. \textit{KTU}^{3} supposes that there are no traces of the first letter and that the lost letter may have been a \textit{u}. It is possible that the decision of the editors is based on a new collation of photos of the tablet. Unfortunately, a clear justification is missing. The new reading of \textit{KTU}^{3} contradicts the analyses by Pierre Bordreuil and Dennis Pardee, who claim that traces of a letter are still visible and that they are remnants of a \textit{ġ}.\footnote{Bordreuil & Pardee (2009:101 [plate], 172 [transcription]).}

Their reading is quite similar to the reading in \textit{KTU}^{2}:

$$[\text{dnil} \cdot \text{mt} \cdot \text{rp}]i \cdot \text{apn}^{12} \cdot \text{ġzr}$$
$$[\text{mt hrmny} \cdot ]uzr \cdot \text{ilm} \cdot \text{ylhm}$$

5. \textit{NEW COLLATIONS}

\textit{KTU}^{3} withdraws several reconstructions that had been set between square brackets in \textit{KTU}^{2} because of new readings outside the square brackets. This applies not only in \textit{KTU} 1.13 and \textit{KTU} 1.17:I, but also in several other sections of the tablets \textit{KTU} 1.1 – 1.24.\footnote{In the following cases, however, the reconstruction of \textit{KTU}^{2} is replaced by a – in most cases only slightly – different reconstruction, with the text outside the square brackets remaining unaltered: \textit{KTU} 1.5:II.21; 1.17:V.35; 1.17:VI.32; 1.18:IV.37; 1.19:II.39; 1.23:58; 1.24:26. In \textit{KTU} 1.10:III.8, \textit{KTU}^{3} corrects a reconstruction of \textit{KTU}^{2} – \textit{us}[b’h] – and replaces it by the correct form \textit{us}[b’t’h] (cf. 1.2:IV.14, 21, 24, and \textit{passim}). The reconstruction in \textit{KTU}^{2} is omitted but not replaced by a new reconstruction in \textit{KTU}^{3} 1.18:1.24 (a[ḥtk]) and 1.19:II.31 (\textit{riš}h[m]). Cf. also 1.4:VI.52, where \textit{KTU}^{3} omits [. \text{yn}].} The readings outside the square brackets are uncertain as the letters are partially damaged, but
KTU³ interprets the traces differently, which has consequences for reconstruction.

KTU 1.9 displays a short colophon on the upper edge of the tablet, but there are only traces of letters at the end. The older reading of KTU² has been replaced by a different reading in KTU³:

1.9:1/20
KTU² (cf. CTA, KTU³) ['b]di\l (line 20)
KTU³ [d \t]bil (line 1)

It is clear that the new reading [d \t]bil is based on Dennis Pardee’s recent collation and analysis of the text, published in an article that is mentioned in the bibliography for KTU 1.9 in KTU³ (Pardee 2012b). The same colophon, referring to the scribe Ṭab’ilu, also occurs at the beginning of KTU 1.92.

In three other cases, the new readings of uncertain letters seem to go back to a new collation, but no explanation is provided. The new readings render the reconstruction in KTU² impossible. Therefore, KTU³ omits the reconstruction or replaces it by a different reconstruction:

1.3:1.25-26
KTU² (cf. CARTU) yd' | [yd]' i . im . klt
KTU³ id' | [ x x x]ht . im . klt

1.4:V.54
KTU² (cf. CTA, KTU³, CARTU) hš . trmmn . hk[lm]
KTU³ hš . trmmn . ht[ ]

1.20:II.2, 6
KTU² (cf. KTU³, CARTU) 2 iln[ym . mrkbt]
KTU³ 2 iln[ym . mrkbt]

An illuminating example can also be found in KTU 1.107:27, where the first visible letter is damaged. Only the right side of the letter is visible, as a vertical wedge. It may be the remnant of a t, a h, or a q. The letter is not followed by a word divider, but by the undamaged letter combination -bt. KTU² does not choose any of the three options and reads the line as follows:

1.107:27
KTU² [xxxx] xbt . npš[ ]n
Several scholars prefer to interpret the first letter as a $t$, not for epigraphic reasons but because the reading $tbt$ is assumed to make more sense.\textsuperscript{14} However, $KTU^3$ interprets the first letter as a $h$, thereby rendering the reading $tbt$ impossible:

1.107:27

$KTU^3 \quad [\textit{xxxx}]hbt . np\check{s} [ \textit{xxx xxx xxx}]n$

Although the reading $[\textit{hbt}$ is certainly possible,\textsuperscript{15} it is not clear why $KTU^3$ prefers it over $[\textit{tbt}$ or $[\textit{qbt}$.\textsuperscript{16} Is this preference based on epigraphic evidence, or on other considerations? And are the readings $tbt$ and $qbt$ still considered possible? These questions remain unanswered in $KTU^3$.

6. THE NEED FOR RESTRAINT AND FOR EXPLANATION

In several cases, the reason why $KTU^3$ withdraws reconstructions of $KTU^2$ is that better collations make them impossible. In one case, instead, a restoration is made possible by a new physical join. Of course, this shows that reconstructions that are not based on parallel passages are quite hypothetical and may become obsolete, even if solid arguments are adduced and if several specialists find them convincing.

In $KTU^3$, the reconstruction of the beginning of $KTU$ 1.3:VI given in $KTU^2$ is rejected, which is certainly correct. The replacement of the reconstruction of other lines, such as lines 15 and 18 of $KTU$ 1.13, is also plausible. On the other hand, $KTU^3$ introduces new reconstructions that even the scholar who proposed them regarded as dubious ($KTU$ 1.13:1, 17, 33, 35). There is a risk that users may take such debatable reconstructions for granted, as they occur in the main text.

\textsuperscript{14} Although Pardee (1988:236) is convinced that the first, damaged letter can be a $h$, non-epigraphic reasons induce him to prefer a $t$: “Le contexte fera peut-être préférer {t} ($tbt$ np\check{s} ‘bonté d’‘âme’’ ou ‘l’‘âme’ est bonne’).” The reading is also preferred by Korpel and De Moor (2014:251), who restore as follows: $[\textit{att.}]hbt np\check{s}$ “a good-natured w[oman]”. They regard the reading as “practically certain” (Korpel & De Moor 251 n. 33).

\textsuperscript{15} A plausible reconstruction is $[\textit{r}hbt . np\check{s} [\textit{. }$ “wide (fem.) of throat,” i.e. “greedy”; see Hebrew $r\check{h}b np\check{s}$ in Prov 28:25 (cf. Isa 5:15; Hab 2:5).

\textsuperscript{16} This reading is found with Del Olmo Lete (2013:197): $[\textit{- - -}][q^\prime]b[. ^\prime]n\check{p}$. If the reading is correct, we may be dealing with a form of the verb $nqb$ or the verb ‘$q$,$b$, or the plural of the noun ‘$q$,$b$.}
In my view, a text edition should not include hypothetical reconstructions between square brackets in the main text. Of course, it is important to propose new reconstructions and to seek alternatives for existing restorations, but the analysis above shows that in the case of a text edition it is best to mention them in footnotes, or to discuss them in separate publications.

A clear example of a good procedure is the footnote of KTU² 3 with [xxx] at the beginning of KTU 1.17:VI.42. The proposed reconstruction [ hôpa] does not occur in the main text, but a note refers to this interesting but uncertain reading.¹⁷ In the case of damaged passages without clear parallels in the Ugaritic texts, footnotes are an excellent means to show which reconstructions scholars have proposed (as in CTA).

In addition to referring to uncertain reconstructions, footnotes can be used to account for new readings of uncertain letters and to specify whether alternative readings are possible. Explanation along these lines would be welcome for the examples in KTU 1.3:I.25-26, 1.4:V.54, 1.20:II.2, and 1.107:27.
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¹⁷ “Tropper, UG, p. 692: [ hôpa].” The reconstruction had already been proposed in CARTU.


