JOURNAL OF NORTHWEST SEMITIC LANGUAGES

House rules
Articles submitted for publication must be according to the house rules on the homepage
JNSL homepage (house rules, contents, subscription)
http://academic.sun.ac.za/jnsl/

CONTENTS

Paul Sanders (PThU Amsterdam)[1]

TEXTUAL RECONSTRUCTIONS OF *KTU*² RETRACTED IN *KTU*³

ABSTRACT

This article discusses some of the few reconstructions of Ugaritic texts in KTU² *that were not repeated in* KTU³. *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*² and *KTU*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*² gives the text as follows:

> [ḥšk . ʿṣk . ʿbṣk . ʿ]my pʿnk
> [tlsmn . ʿmy . twt]ḥ išdk

*KTU*³ reads:

> [ḥšk . ʿṣk . ʿbṣk . ʿ]my pʿnk
> [tlsmn . ʿmy . twt]ḥ išdk

In this case, the reconstruction between square brackets in *KTU*² was taken over completely in *KTU*³. The extensive reconstruction occurs also in other editions of this text (*CTA*, *KTU*¹, *CARTU*) and seems to be undisputed. It is based on a different passage from Ilimilku's Baʿlu Cycle, *KTU* 1.3:III.18-20, as the footnotes in *KTU*² and *KTU*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*² and the text of *KTU*³:

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 *KTU*[2] and *KTU*[3] can be taken for granted.

In this article, I propose to discuss the small number of reconstructions in *KTU*[2] that were not repeated in *KTU*[3]. 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*

KTU[2] 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 . tḥmy . b r]išk
        [rgmy .]b*n 'nk*m
        [w 'br] . *alp*
5   [šd .] b y*m . rbt*
        [km]n . *b nhrm*
        ['lb*r . 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 *KTU*[1/2/3] 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 klt 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 *tḥm* 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 *KTU*³ are lines 12-18 of *KTU* 1.3:VI:

12   *m'ṣrm . ḥ*[xx t]b
       *glṯ .is*r[. b r]i*šk*
       m . *br*q[m .] b*n 'nk*m
15   *ymt*n [. xx] . *alp*
       *š*i[r .]b y*m . rbt*
       x[km]n . *b nhrm*
       ['*]*b*r . *gbl . 'br*

Several details of the reconstruction in *KTU*³ remain debatable,[6] but it is clear that the reconstruction in *KTU*² has become obsolete. Despite the positive assessment by the editors of *KTU*², the older restoration appears to have been too hypothetical. Even the justifiable reconstruction [šd] (*KTU*², 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

*KTU*² 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 *KTU*¹. Virtually all the reconstructions recur in *KTU*³, but *KTU*³ has replaced *KTU*²'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 *KTU*³.

In *KTU*², line 15 reads:

k[d']mm . t*ẓp*n . *l pit* .

The reconstruction has been taken over from Johannes de Moor, who read: [kd']m *t*ẓp*n . l pit* "[like beads of swea]t *that drip from a brow*" (De

---

6   In line 12, De Moor (2012:132) reads *ḥ*[r]*b*. In line 13, Pardee (2009:383; 2012a:64) reads [.] ri*šk*, while De Moor has [lr]i*šk*. In line 15, both Pardee and De Moor read *ymt*m instead of *ymt*n.

Moor 1980:306, 308). Dietrich's new collation led him to a new reconstruction of the first word, which was adopted in *KTU*[3]:

k q[d]šm . tẓp*n* . *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 *KTU*[2] was also taken over from De Moor, who read the first three words as *n'm* . [ksp .] ṣ*lm*.[7] Dietrich's collation resulted in a different reading, which was accepted in *KTU*[3]:

n'm . mḥ[m]d . ṣ*lm* .

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:

[. l b'lm .][9]	(1.13:1)	k[bdk]	(1.13:17)
ġ[ll]	(1.13:33)	*g*l[gl . abn .]	(1.13:35)

Despite Dietrich's doubts, all these suggestions appear in *KTU*[3].

4.   *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 *KTU*[2] displays a commonly accepted restoration:[10]

[dnil . mt . rp]i . *aph*<n> . ġzr
[mt hrnmy .]*uzr* . i*lm* . *ylḥm*

The reconstruction is based on the bicolon *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 . kbkbm | n'm* . [ksp .] ṣ*lm* (17-18) as "*the* [silver of the] *image is more pleasant than stars*".

8   Dietrich (2013:59-60, 79, 101-102, 106).

9   Cf. De Moor (1980:305-306): [. lb'l .].

10   The same reconstruction of the missing sections is found in *CTA*, *KTU*[1] and *CARTU*.

legend (1.17:II.27-29; V.4-5, 13-15, 33-35; 1.19:I.19-21). However, *KTU*[3] favours a different reconstruction:

> [dnil . mt . rp]i . *apn*k . [u]zr
> [ilm dnil .]*uzr* . i*lm . ylḫm*

This reconstruction is based on a tricolon that occurs three times in the following lines of *KTU* 1.17:I (6-13; cf. 21-22): *uzr ilm dnil - uzr ilm ylḫm - 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 *ġzr* at the end of line 1. *KTU*[3] supposes that there are no traces of the first letter and that the lost letter may have been a *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 *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 *ġ*.[11] Their reading is quite similar to the reading in *KTU*[2]:

> [dnil . mt . rp]i . *apn*[12] . *ġ*zr
> [mt hrnmy .]*uzr . ilm . ylḫm*

5.   NEW COLLATIONS

KTU[3] withdraws several reconstructions that had been set between square brackets in *KTU*[2] because of new readings outside the square brackets. This applies not only in *KTU* 1.13 and *KTU* 1.17:I, but also in several other sections of the tablets *KTU* 1.1 – 1.24.[13] The readings outside the square brackets are uncertain as the letters are partially damaged, but

---

11   Bordreuil & Pardee (2009:101 [plate], 172 [transcription]).

12   The reading *apn* is in agreement with *CTA*.

13   In the following cases, however, the reconstruction of *KTU*[2] is replaced by a – in most cases only slightly – different reconstruction, with the text outside the square brackets remaining unaltered: *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 *KTU* 1.10:III.8, *KTU*[3] corrects a reconstruction of *KTU*[2] – *u*ṣ[b'h] – and replaces it by the correct form *u*ṣ[b'th] (cf. 1.2:IV.14, 21, 24, and *passim*). The reconstruction in *KTU*[2] is omitted but not replaced by a new reconstruction in *KTU*[3] 1.18:I.24 (a[ḫtk]) and 1.19:II.31 (*rišḫ*[m]). Cf. also 1.4:VI.52, where *KTU*[3] omits [. yn].

KTU^3 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 *KTU*^{2} has been replaced by a different reading in *KTU*^{3}:

> 1.9:1/20
> *KTU*^{2} (cf. *CTA*, *KTU*^{1})   ['b]di*l*   (line 20)
> *KTU*^{3} [d ṯ]bi*l*   (line 1)

It is clear that the new reading [d ṯ]bi*l* 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 *KTU*^{3} (Pardee 2012b). The same colophon, referring to the scribe Ṯab'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 *KTU*^{2} impossible. Therefore, *KTU*^{3} omits the reconstruction or replaces it by a different reconstruction:

> 1.3:I.25-26
> *KTU*^{2} (cf. *CARTU*)   *yd'* | [yd]'*t* . *i*m . kl*t*
> *KTU*^{3} i*d'* | [x x x]ḫ*t* . *i*m . kl*t*
>
> 1.4:V.54
> *KTU*^{2} (cf. *CTA*, *KTU*^{1}, *CARTU*)   ḫš . trmmn . *h*k[lm]
> *KTU*^{3} ḫš . trmmn . *h*t[   ]
>
> 1.20:II.2, 6
> *KTU*^{2} (cf. *KTU*^{1}, *CARTU*)   2   *il*n[ym . mrkbt]
>   6   i[lnym . l]
> *KTU*^{3} 2   *il*m[. mrkbt]
>   6   i[lm . l]

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 *ṭ*, a *ḥ*, or a *q*. The letter is not followed by a word divider, but by the undamaged letter combination *-bt*. *KTU*^{2} does not choose any of the three options and reads the line as follows:

> 1.107:27
> *KTU*^{2} [xxxx]x*bt* . *np*š[   ]n

Several scholars prefer to interpret the first letter as a *ṭ*, not for epigraphic reasons but because the reading *ṭbt* is assumed to make more sense.[14] However, *KTU*[3] interprets the first letter as a *ḫ*, thereby rendering the reading *ṭbt* impossible:

> 1.107:27
> *KTU*[3]   [xxxx]ḫ*bt . np*š[xxx xxx xxx]n

Although the reading [ ]ḫ*bt* is certainly possible,[15] it is not clear why *KTU*[3] prefers it over [   ]ṭ*bt* or [ ]q*bt*.[16] Is this preference based on epigraphic evidence, or on other considerations? And are the readings ṭ*bt* and q*bt* 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.

---

14   Although Pardee (1988:236) is convinced that the first, damaged letter can be a *ḫ*, non-epigraphic reasons induce him to prefer a *ṭ*: "Le contexte fera peut-être préférer {ṭ} (*ṭbt npš* 'bonté d'"âme"' ou 'l'"âme" est bonne')." The reading is also preferred by Korpel and De Moor (2014:251), who restore as follows: [aṯṯ.]ṭ*bt*.n*p*š "a good-natured w[oman]". They regard the reading as "practically certain" (Korpel & De Moor 251 n. 33).

15   A plausible reconstruction is [. r]ḫ*bt . np*š[.   ] "wide (*fem.*) of throat," i.e. "greedy"; see Hebrew *rḥb npš* in Prov 28:25 (cf. Isa 5:15; Hab 2:5).

16   This reading is found with Del Olmo Lete (2013:197): [- - -][*q*[?]]*bt*[.[?]][*n*]*p*[If the reading is correct, we may be dealing with a form of the verb *nqb* or the verb *ʿqb*, or the plural of the noun *ʿqb*.

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 *KTU*³ with [xxx] at the beginning of *KTU* 1.17:VI.42. The proposed reconstruction [ḫnp] 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.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bordreuil, P & Pardee, D 2009. *A Manual of Ugaritic* (LSAWS 3). Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

CARTU = De Moor, J C & Spronk, K 1987. *A Cuneiform Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit*. Leiden: Brill.

CTA = Herdner, A 1963. *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939* (MRS X). 2 Vols. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.

Del Olmo Lete, G 2013. KTU 1.107: A Miscellany of Incantations against Snakebite, in: Loretz, O *et al.* (eds). *Ritual, Religion and Reason: Studies in the Ancient World in Honour of Paolo Xella* (AOAT 404). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 193-204.

De Moor, J C 1980. An Incantation against Infertility (KTU 1.13). *UF* 12, 305-310.

De Moor, J C 2012. The Order of the Tablets of the Baʿlu Myth, in: Del Olmo Lete, G, Vidal, J & Wyatt N (eds). *The Perfumes of Seven Tamarisks: Studies in Honour of Wilfred G. E. Watson* (AOAT 394). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 131-141.

---

17   "Tropper, UG, p. 692: [ḫnp]." The reconstruction had already been proposed in *CARTU*.

Dietrich, M 2013. Beschwörung gegen Unfruchtbarkeit mit Anweisung zur Therapie: Der mesopotamische Hintergrund von KTU 1.13. *UF* 44, 47-120.

Korpel, M C A 1998. Exegesis in the Work of Ilimilku of Ugarit, in: De Moor, J C (ed.). *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel* (OTS 40). Leiden: Brill, 86-111.

Korpel, M C A & De Moor, J C 2014. *Adam, Eve, and the Devil: A New Beginning* (HBM 65). Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

KTU[1] = Dietrich, M, Loretz, O & Sanmartín, J 1976. *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, einschließlich der keilalphabetischen Texte außerhalb Ugarits.* Teil 1: Transkription (AOAT 24/1). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

KTU[2] = Dietrich, M, Loretz, O & Sanmartín, J 1995. *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places* (Second, enlarged edition; ALASP 8). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

KTU[3] = Dietrich, M, Loretz, O & Sanmartín, J 2013. *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und anderen Orten – The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places* (Third, enlarged edition; AOAT 360/1). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Pardee, D 1988. *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24e campagne (1961)* (RSOu 4). Paris: ERC.

Pardee, D 2009. A New Join of Fragments of the Baal Cycle, in: Schloen, J D (ed.). *Exploring the* Longue durée*: Essays in Honor of Lawrence E. Stager.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 377-390.

Pardee, D 2012a. *The Ugaritic Texts and the Origins of West-Semitic Literary Composition: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 2007.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pardee, D 2012b. RS 5.229: restitution d'une nouvelle signature du scribe Ṯabʾilu, in: Roche-Hawley, C & Hawley, R (eds). *Scribes et érudits dans l'orbite de Babylone: Travaux réalisés dans le cadre du projet ANR Mespériph 2007-2011* (Orient & Méditerranée 9). Paris: De Boccard, 31-49.

Roche-Hawley, C & Hawley, R. 2013. An Essay on Scribal Families, Tradition, and Innovation in Thirteenth-Century Ugarit, in: Collins, B J & Michalowski, P (eds). *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman.* Atlanta: Lockwood Press, 241-264.

Tropper, J 2012. *Ugaritische Grammatik: Zweite, stark überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage* (AOAT 273). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Wyatt, N 2007. Making Sense of the Senseless: Correcting Scribal Errors in Ugaritic. *UF* 39, 757-772.