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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY.

The Ras Shamra Tablets constitute a discovery of first rate importance for our knowledge of Semitic, and more particularly, Canaanite religion, mythology and ritual. The significance of the documents for Canaanite studies is most readily apparent when we consider the sources on which we were dependent for our knowledge of these subjects before the discovery of the texts.

These sources were three in number. There was first of all, the information provided by archaeology. The excavations at Gezer, Samaria, Beth-Shan, Jericho, to mention only a few sites, familiarised us, to a certain extent, with the material aspects of Canaanite religious culture. The many temples laid bare, and the numerous cult objects discovered shed much light on the religion of those who produced them. Information was also derived from the Phoenician inscriptions. These however were few in number. Most of them, moreover, came from cities outside Phoenicia, and few belonged to a period earlier than the sixth century. Not more than a dozen deities were actually mentioned in them by name. Important however as is the archaeological evidence it does not give us any insight into the inner meaning of Canaanite religion, and gives us little or no
information about the beliefs that found expression in these material objects.

The second source is to be found in the Old Testament. The early documents of that collection afford valuable information about Canaanite religious beliefs in the days of the patriarchs and at the time of the settlement in Canaan. But the facts thus provided must be used with great caution. It has to be remembered that the notices of Canaanite religion in the Old Testament came from writers whose object was to discredit that religion. They are biased against it, and therefore tend to show it in a distorted light and in its worst aspects. Their great aim is to guard their readers from the abominations of Canaanite religion and recall them to the more spiritual religion of Jahwism. Hence much of our information about Canaanite religion is derived from ritual prohibitions, for a prohibition clearly pre-supposes the existence of the practice prohibited. In recent years valuable information has also been derived from a study of the liturgical portions of the Psalter, and from the ritual portions of the Mishnah.

A third source for our knowledge of Canaanite religion is supplied by allusions in the works of various classical writers - Lucian, Diodorus, Damasius to name the most important. It is evident that the value of these writers is limited by their late date. Indeed their value lies chiefly
in the information they provide about late Phoenician religion. Of the writers mentioned the two of greatest interest are Eusebius and Lucian. In the De Dea Syria Lucian gives an account of the Adonis myth and of the rites connected with the great Syrian mother goddess, Astaunte, as they were preserved at Hierapolis in the north of Syria. The conjecture that a similar cult flourished in Canaan is now confirmed by the Ras Shamra texts. Eusebius is important because he preserves fragments of the writings of Philo of Byblus. Philo (circa 100 A.D.) professed to give an account of Phoenician mythology derived from Sanchuniathon who probably flourished in the sixth century B.C. Philo's description was regarded with suspicion by most scholars as being more or less fictitious, but his authenticity has now been vindicated by the Ugaritian texts. The pantheon and mythology of Philo bear a very close resemblance to those of the Ugaritian texts, and we are therefore justified in accepting his narrative as a genuine account of what was known in his day regarding Phoenician religion.

To these scanty sources have been added the Ras Shamra texts. These are important not least of all for their early date. They belong to about the middle of the fourteenth century, for on one of them reference is made to the famous Hittite king, Shuppiluliuma. The ideas and practices recorded in them, however, undoubtedly belong to a much earlier date.
In support of this contention W. F. Albright has pointed out (Archaeology and the Religion of Israel p. 185) that the horse and chariot scarcely appear in the texts, and that the gods actually worshipped at Ugarit, as revealed by the ritual texts do not entirely correspond with the gods who figure in the mythological texts. But the real importance of the texts lies in the fact that they give meaning and coherence to what was formerly a collection of more or less unrelated facts. They fill in with a wealth of detail what was formerly only an outline. Before the discovery of the texts, the pantheon, mythology, ritual and religious beliefs of the Canaanites were known only from isolated references. There was no unifying pattern into which these scanty references might be fitted. Now however we have a very complete picture of the Canaanite gods and their relations to each other, of the ritual practices of the Canaanites, their myths and beliefs. We have a very full background against which to set the information derived from our three original sources. This pattern is seen to be that which was current throughout the Ancient East from Egypt to Mesopotamia, the central feature of which was the ritual killing of the divine king.

The purpose of the present enquiry is to give an account of the sacrificial system revealed in these texts. The institution of sacrifice is only one of the many aspects of
Semitic religion on which the texts shed much light. A cursory examination of the texts makes it clear that both in the mythological and ritual texts sacrifice occupies a prominent position. It is obviously a complex and highly developed institution with a large specialised vocabulary. Our purpose is to attempt a description of the institution of sacrifice as it is portrayed in the texts - its rites, its significance, and the relation in which it stands to the other Semitic systems of sacrifice, particularly that of the Israelites. Previously little was known positively about the sacrificial system of the Canaanites. It was deduced that it must have borne a general resemblance to that of the other Semitic peoples. Now we have abundant first-hand evidence about the Canaanite sacrificial system. Much of the evidence is still obscure, but a great deal admits of no doubt, and its value for comparative Semitic religion can hardly be over-emphasised.
Chapter II

The Altar and Cult Utensils.

The solemnity of the rite of sacrifice required that it be performed at an appointed place. Indeed among many primitive peoples, as among the Hebrews, to slaughter a sacrificial animal at any but the appointed place was murder. (cf. Lev. 17: 3-5). The place of sacrifice was one that for some reason appealed to the worshipper. It might, for example, be a place marked by a natural phenomenon of curious form which suggested the presence of deity, or as is frequently recorded in the Old Testament, the offering might be made at the site of a theophany.

Inseparable, at later times at least, from the sacred place was the altar. The necessity of the altar is accounted for on the simple ground that there should be a distinctive object on which the act of sacrifice might be performed. The need was also felt of preventing the sacred offering, which had been consecrated to the deity, from coming in contact with the un-consecrated environment. The altar may originally have been the sacred pillar laid lengthwise, and as the latter was thought to be the home of the god, a similar property may have been ascribed to the altar. An example of a primitive altar is probably to be seen in the cubical stone facing the fifth and sixth masses both excavated in the sanctuary at Gezer. (See Lods - Israel, English translation, p. 88 Plate V.) No such primitive
Several altars have been unearthed in Canaanite temples of which we may briefly notice those found in the temples at Beth-shan and Tell-ed-Duweir.

A temple dedicated to the god Mekal has been excavated at Beth-shan in a stratum contemporary with the reign of Thotmes III. The temple remains are extensive and bear witness to a highly organised cult. (P.E.F.Q.S. 1931 pp.12 ff: Rowe - The Topography and History of Beth-shan pp.10 ff.). Five altars have been identified. In the inner sanctuary were two altars, one of brick, the other of stone, used respectively for bloody and bloodless offerings. A room to the south of this inner sanctuary contained a large altar approached by steps on which animals were slain. The blood of the sacrificial victim was drained off by means of a channel. South of this room again was a smaller room in which a similar altar was found. In a third room was discovered a pillar or [m & s s e b a h] beside which was a bowl. This was probably a libation altar.

In a temple of the late Bronze Age excavated at Tell-ed-Duweir a large altar was discovered approached by three steps similar to the large altars in the temple of Mekal at Beth-shan. (J.L.Starkey - P.E.F.Q.S. 1934 pp.164 ff.) Beside it was a stand probably intended for receiving offerings.

On none of the Canaanite altars so far discovered does
it appear that fire sacrifices were offered. There does appear however to be definite evidence that such sacrifices were offered by the Canaanites, though not perhaps on altars. A pit was discovered near the massebah in the temple at Beth-shan containing ashes and calcined bones. (Rowe op. cit. p.13). A pit with similar contents has been discovered at Megiddo. (Lods op. cit. p.96) At the temple at Gezer the remains of the burned bodies of two children were discovered under the threshold. (Macalister - The Excavation of Gezer Vol.II p.402). All these are probably to be interpreted as fire sacrifices.

In Ugaritian, as in the other Semitic dialects, the altar is termed mābḥ, from the root ḍāḇāḥ. The word occurs only once in the texts - 1929, 3: 41: mābḥ b'1 - "altar of Baal". The meaning of the root ḏāḇāḥ is "to slaughter", and the altar is therefore the place of slaughter par excellence. Animal sacrifice among the Semites was thus originally confined to ritual slaughter, the devoted animal never being burned. The altars excavated at Ugarit bear no indication that fire was applied to them, nor do the texts make it clear that fire was put on the altar, though fire sacrifices are mentioned in the texts.

At Ugarit the cult centred round the temples of Baal and Dagon. These were constructed after the same pattern, and consisted of a naos, a pro-naos and a court-yard.
In the latter stood a great altar. In the temple of Baal the altar measured 2m20 x 2m, and was approached by two steps. In its present state it resembles a square basin with two steps at the south end. (Schaeffer - The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra - Ugarit p.67). In a view of Ugarit taken from the air the altar is clearly visible. (Syria XV Plate XIII).

In two of the tombs excavated (No.V and VI) several flagstones were discovered furnished with gutters and cups. (Syria XIV p.116) These have been interpreted as altars.

Among a depot of jars situated near the Mycenaean tombs one jar was found to have been placed above a small pit, and near it was a small horned altar. (Schaeffer op.cit.p.53; Syria XIII Plate III). These were obviously employed in connection with funerary rites, the significance of which will be discussed later.

An altar is depicted as part of the ornamentation of a gold vase discovered in 1933 (Syria XIV p.124).

We have noticed that one of the altars discovered at Ugarit was surmounted with horns. No Canaanite altar belonging to a pre-Israelite period has yet been discovered with horns, though horned altars of an early period have been found in Syrian cities. (Lods op.cit.p.434).

A common article of temple furniture and one readily adapted to the purpose of sacrifice must have been the table.
In Israel, though not completely identified, altar and table were closely associated. (B. Gray - Sacrifice in the Old Testament p. 101). The shewbread was placed on a table - "\( \gamma \delta \zeta \alpha \) (Lev. 24: 6). A stone table for offerings has been discovered in a Canaanite temple excavated at Debir. (Albright - B.A.S.O.R. No. 39, 1930 pp. 5 ff).

In Babylonian the food of the gods (\( \text{a} \text{k} \text{a} \text{l} \text{t} \text{a} \text{k} \text{n} \text{u} \)) was placed on a table. (Jeremias s.v. Ritual in R.B.). In Ugaritian the sacred table is mentioned as one of the furnishings constructed by Hiyon for the temple of Baal - "\( \text{s} \text{l} \text{h} \text{n} \text{e} \text{l} \text{d} \text{m} \text{l} \text{a} \text{m} \text{n} \text{m} \text{m} \) - "the table of El which was full of gifts". (I I A B 1: 39). This was undoubtedly an altar.

Bread upon a table is mentioned at II A B 4: 36 - '\( \text{b} \text{s} \text{l} \text{h} \text{n} \text{t} \text{l} \text{h} \text{m} \).

A frequent accompaniment of the altar was a pit in which the blood of the sacrificial animal was received. Thus among the ancient Arabs the slain animal was allowed to lie on the ground till the blood had drained into a pit called the (R. Smith - The Religion of the Semites, 3rd ed. p. 228). The blood was regarded as the portion of the god whose abode was thought of as being in the earth.

At the temple of Beth-shan near the mass e b a h altar, a pit has been discovered though apparently used for a different purpose. It was full of calcined bones and probably served the purpose of a hearth in which the sacrif-
ficial animal was burned.

In the Ugaritian poem describing the building of Baal's temple there occurs the phrase dpr s a b br n'î (II A B l. 36). This has been rendered (Gaster - J. R. A. S. 1935 p. 13) "Lift up the plank on the closed pit". At Mecca the pit was called nî. For n'î of. Heb. s h; "to bar, to bolt". The removal of the plank denoted the inauguration of the sacrificial cult.

In connection with the cult of the dead, various contrivances were devised, similar in purpose to the altar, for the presentation of mortuary offerings. These have been fully described by M. Schaeffer in his Schweich Lectures, and without at this point entering into the purpose of these rites, the various utensils employed in connection with them may be briefly noticed. "Immediately by the side of each tomb was a pit, the mouth of which, some fifty centimetres below the ancient ground level was covered by a pierced stone slab. A stone gutter led to this hole, and at its further end a pipe of baked clay was buried upright, its opening flush with the ground level. Liquids poured from above into the pipe were carried along the gutter, through the opening in the slab and into the underground pit. Sometimes the upright pipe took the place of an overflow for a stone or cemented basin into which libations were poured. Another of these devices had two stone gutters one above the
other, which carried the libation into the pierced base of a pot from which it flowed away into the depths." (Schaeffer op.cit.p.50). These rhytons or libation funnels were of various forms, ranging from plain tubular pipes to grotesque representations of animals. (See Schaeffer op.cit. Plate XXVIII).

We shall see (c.IV) that incense was offered in sacrifice at Ugarit, but so far, no objects have been discovered that might be regarded as incense altars. Canaanite incense altars have been discovered at Megiddo, Gezer, Schechem and Kirjath Sepher. These are small horned altars made of one piece. The incense altar may have been of native Canaanite origin, and at Ugarit incense may have been offered on the ordinary altar, or on censers. In Israel the incense altar was not introduced till the end of the fifth century. Previously incense was burnt in censers (₪/₪), and even after the introduction of the special altar for incense, the burning of incense was not confined to it, but might be offered on the altar of burnt offering. (B.Gray op.cit.ppl42 ff)

In addition to the altar, some other utensils of the sacrificial cult at Ugarit have survived. We have already mentioned the rhytons and bowls preserved in the tombs. In some of the tombs there were also discovered deposits of large vessels with the base knocked out. (Schaeffer op.cit.p.53) These have been connected with the fertility cult practised at the tombs, in which sacrifices of flesh and liquids were
offered. In one of the tombs a bronze dagger was found. This was probably the knife used to kill the sacrificial animals. Under the floor of the high priest's dwelling, along with a collection of bronze weapons there was found a tripod stand which was probably intended to support a ritual vessel. (Schaeffer op. cit. p. 35 Plate XXIII fig. 2).

Besides these few objects that have actually survived, various cult utensils are mentioned in the texts as follows: -

The ritual basin. Heb. יָנָה.

_you_m._ occurs at line 11 of a short text published by Virolleaud in Syria XVI p. 181 (RS 62/5). The text is clearly a ritual in connection with the Sun god. It may be the Heb. יָנָה. The fact that at Ugarit the _you_m._ is mentioned in connection with a ritual of the Sun points to its being derived from the root of יָנָה (יָנָה) "to be light", and strengthens the conjecture of Josephus (Ant. III, 8.9) that decisions were taken from the יָנָה according to the manner in which it shone.

 hå_nr. II A B 1: 36. Interpreted by T. H. Gaster (J. R. A. S. 1935 p. 13) as the plank which covered the sacrificial pit and which had to be removed at the commencement of the sacrifice.

 hå brs. II A B 2: 9. Compared by Gaster (ibid) to the Hittite hå_pr uš - an article of attire. It may
have been an article of clothing burnt as part of the sacrificial rite.


SS 31, 35, 36. Obviously cult utensils which formed a pair. They were placed in the ritual basin (line 31) and then placed in the temple (line 36)

'd: SS 12, 65, 67. Line 12 - s b'd y r h m  'd
b t k m a b r. "Raise the 'd in the midst of the wilderness." Line 65 - s u 'd

'd - Place the disc on the 'd. Line 65 - s u 'd

'n o e e." Line 67 - n a n t 'd - "Women dancing round the 'd." The 'd was probably a ritual stone, on which perhaps sacrifices were offered, and round which in some rites, sacred women danced. It has been identified (Gaster - P.E.F.G.S. 1934, p.141) with the qaif, the circuit stone of South Arabian ritual. The word is used of an altar at Josh 22: 34. cf. Gen. 31: 48.

1929, 5: 11. Perhaps a sun-shaped ritual object. cf. Heb. o'2v (Is. 3: 18) and Arab. " a collar".

x

At I AB 1: 4 occur the words ' t t r p and e p d k. They have been identified by Virolleaud (Syria XV p.309) with the ephod and teraphim of Hebrew religion. W.F.Albright
has shown however (B.A.S.O.R. No. 83 p. 39) that the
identification cannot be sustained. The is a verbal
form from the root ' to say', and is simply "garment", Accad. eppatu.

In several ritual contexts various vessels, mentioned
as being employed in the cult, are indicated by terms which
probably denote utensils used also in every day secular use.
These are as follows:-

K 72  Heb. "S"
K 1929, 3: 44  Heb. 717
KAB 6: 54  Accad. dakiru
K 1929, 3: 23  Heb. 70
K D 147  Accad. kankanna
K VAB A:10  Heb. 70
K D 6: 36  Heb. 70
CHAPTER II

NOTES.

1. See below c.V under ṢRP

2. For the origin and significance of the horned altar see Obbink, J.B.L. 56, 1937 pp. 43 ff.

3. cf. Malachi 1: 7

4. See Graham and May - Culture and Conscience p. 289, for full bibliography. An incense altar has also been found at Serabit - Petrie, Researches in Sinai pp. 133 ff., quoted by Wiener - The Altars of the Old Testament in O.L.J. 1927.
CHAPTER III

CULT OFFICIALS.

The origins of cult officials are to be sought among the beginnings of religion. There was undoubtedly a period prior to their emergence when the functions of religion were discharged by the individual personally, but early it was felt that certain persons were especially in rapport with the spirit world. Thus arose a class represented by the shaman and medicine men—men who were regarded as possessing spiritual power to an extraordinary degree. As religious belief and practice grew more complicated, and the body of religious knowledge increased, there gradually came into existence a class of sacred men whose professional acquirements were attained after a long period of initiatory training. These were the cultic priests proper. They formed the depositary of the accumulated religious lore of the community, and upon their exclusive manipulation of the cult depended the general welfare. This final stage in the development of the cult official is represented in the Ugaritian texts.

The study of the myth and ritual of ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia has revealed the important part played in the life of these centres by the divine king. In each of these areas the whole communal life was focussed on the person of the monarch who was originally regarded as being at one and the same time god, king and priest. Eventually these three
functions became separated, but up to the end the ideas of
divinity and kingship in Babylon and Egypt were closely
associated.

The uniformity in the culture pattern of the Ancient
East which recent study has disclosed leads us to expect that
traces of the conception of the divine king will be found in
Syria and Palestine. Of the evidence for the prevalence of
the idea among the Canaanites we may notice the correspondence
preserved in the Amarna Tablets between the Canaanite kings
and their Egyptian overlords, in which the Pharaoh is
addressed as "my god", and his vassals prostrate themselves
before him, referring to themselves as his footstool and as
the dust beneath his feet (Lods op.cit.p.118)

In the Old Testament there are various indications that
the Israelites regarded their kings as enjoying a status
comparable to that of the kings "of all the nations" (1 Sam.
8: 5, 20). There is the familiar phrase "anointed of
Jahwoh". $\text{נְבֵּי דַּוִּיד}$. While this phrase does not
signify that the person so designated was thought of as being
actually a god, the reverential awe which it inspired would
seem to imply that its subject was in some undefined manner
regarded as the locus of divinity. That the welfare of the
community was bound up with that of the king is shown by
2 Sam. 21: 15-17 where after narrowly escaping death at the
hands of the Philistines, David is forbidden by his followers
to expose himself to danger "that thou quench not the lamp of Israel". As regards the priesthood of the Israelite kings we may notice that the sons and grandsons of David were priests (2 Sam. 8:18; 1 Kings 4:5).

that on the occasion of the removal of the ark to Jerusalem, David wore an ephod and performed certain priestly rites, (2 Sam. 6) and that the kings of Israel offered sacrifice. (1 Kings 9:25; 2 Kings 16:12).

The evidence for the position of the king at Ugarit is scanty. Nevertheless it is clear that as might be expected, the king occupied a definite place in the cult. Mention is made of the cultic function of the king in four of the ritual texts.

(I) 1929, 3:50. ḏ b h m l k l p r g l
 "The sacrifice of the king to P r g l."

1929, 3:53. y r d m l k s b u
 "The king sacrifices a gazelle."

(II) 1929, 5 This tablet which contains many words of uncertain meaning is composed of three paragraphs. The first and third, which are relevant to our purpose, give an account of a ritual in which the king takes part. The second paragraph would appear to describe an exchange of gold and silver. The first paragraph may be translated thus: "When Astarte will introduce Horus into the palace of the king, ten and ten of the temple of the gods ........
he has clothed ..... has placed Horus at three ..... thy temple. A lamb an ox and three sheep as peace offerings. 

Sevent times before the gods, seven times before ...........

The third paragraph is fragmentary. The last four lines may be translated thus: "The king has gone to the .... of the gods ..... the king has gone seven times before them all."

(III) 1929, 9: 10 This text contains a list of sacrificial offerings. At line 10 occur the words mlk brr - "the king purifies".

(IV) Syria p. 231. A ritual text. At line 4 we have sr mlk s'im - "the ox of the king, the lamb of the people". The offering of the king is here distinguished from that of the people. cf. 2 Kings 16: 15, Ezek. 45: 22.

These passages make it clear that the king at Ugarit exercised distinctively priestly functions. As regards the larger poems, particularly the Aleyan Baal cycle, it is being increasingly realised that these preserve the ritual of the New Year festival, and that consequently they bear witness to the existence at Ugarit of the divine king. It is extremely probable also, that in this as in other respects Ugarit conformed to the pattern of religious belief prevalent among her neighbours.

Next to the king, the chief cult official at Ugarit
seems to have been the \( k r n \). B. Gray shows (op. cit. p. 181 f) that this root, as denoting an official attached to a developed cult, is peculiar to Hebrew and Phoenician. This is obviously its significance in the Ugaritic texts. In Arabic of course, the root means sooth-sayer. (\( k 2\)). The Ugaritic usage throws no light on the original meaning of the root.

The order of \( k r n m \) was presided over by an official called the \( r b k r n m \) - chief of the priests. (1929, 18:1; I A B 6: 54). With this term we may compare the Phoen.

and Hebrew \( s 1 f n j \). The text gives no indication as to the status of the \( r b k r n m \) either among the officials of the cult or in the community. Neither the fact that differences of rank existed among the priests in pre-exilic Israel, nor the existence of a chief priest at Ugarit, entitle us to infer the antiquity of the \( s 1 f n j \) as described in the post-exilic literature.

The library in which the texts were found seems also to have been the residence of the \( r b k r n m \) (Schaeffer op. cit. p. 34). This building was situated between the temples of Baal and Dagon. Beneath the floor was discovered a collection of unused bronze weapons with the inscription \( b r s n r b k r n m \) - "axe of the chief priest". They may have been votive offerings. (Schaeffer Ugaritica Plate XXIV).
The name of one of the chief priests has come down to us—Atn P r l n (IA B 6:54). He is described also as being r b n q d m and ṣ' y. For these terms see below.

Two monumental representations of priests have been preserved. (Syria XVII Plates XIV and XVI). The former depicts a sacrificial group in which the priests are portrayed dressed in animal masks and horns. The horns were undoubtedly connected with some aspect of the mother goddess cult. Horned figurines of the mother goddess have been found at Gezer and Beth-shan, (Macalister op. cit. p.419; Rowe op. cit. Plate 48), and the same goddess is no doubt referred to in the Old Testament at Gen.14:5. Another witness to the same cult is probably to be found in the story of the prophet Zedekiah who signified the prosperity that was to befall his royal master Ahab by donning a mask composed of two horns (II Kings 22).3

The k h n was probably the highest order of official. The large dwelling of the r b k h n m shows that he must have occupied a position of consequence in the community. The k h n is not included among the various officials mentioned in the ritual texts, and from this we may conclude that he played little part in the general routine of the cult. He was probably a state priest, a political personage, who was concerned chiefly with the great seasonal
rituals enacted to secure the welfare of the community.

The feminine form of \( k-h-n \) does not occur at Ugarit, and in this Ugaritian agrees with Hebrew as against Phoenician. That women occupied a definite place among the cult officials at Ugarit is however certain. ID 172 refers to a class of women known as \( b\text{-}k\text{-}y\text{-}t \) and \( m\text{-}s\text{-}s\text{-}p\text{-}d\text{-}t \) "the women who weep", and "the women who mourn". The Shafel form of the latter term points to the probability that these were professional mourners (the Shafel is frequently employed in a cultic significance). Another female attached to the cult was the \( b\text{-}l\text{-}t \ b\text{-}h\text{-}m \) "mistress of the temple" (1929, 1: 21; 3: 37; 9: 10; 19: 4). Occurring in ritual texts, this term almost certainly denotes a cult official. We may hazard the conjecture that the \( b\text{-}l\text{-}t \ b\text{-}h\text{-}m \) was the female sacred prostitute (Heb. \( n\text{-}s\text{-}t\text{-}p \)). In tablet RS 8252 (Syria XVIII p.163) which contains a list of cult officials occurs the word \( e\text{-}h\text{-}s\text{-}t \) - women. These may also be female sacred prostitutes.

In respect then of the position of women officials in the cult, the Ugaritian usage agrees with the Hebrew. In both women were excluded from performing the specifically priestly duties, such as sacrifice, but other sacred functions were permitted them. Among the Phoenicians on the contrary, the existence of the \( n\text{-}s\text{-}t\text{-}p \) and the \( n\text{-}s\text{-}t\text{-}p \) is well attested, and this would seem to imply that women in Phoenicia
were admitted to all the offices of the regular priesthood.

The institution of sacred prostitution seems to have been inseparable from the cult of the mother goddess, and was prevalent throughout the whole Fertile Crescent. Male sacred prostitutes occur under two names at Ugarit — qāḏāšm and kəlḇ. The former term corresponds to Heb. ׃ Бес and has not been found in any other Canaanite dialect. At Ugarit it occurs twice. In a text of four lines published in Syria XV (p. 243) the qāḏāšm are mentioned along with the kəḥnəm. This would seem to indicate that they occupied a position of some importance.

\[
\begin{array}{c c c c c c}
\text{kəḥnəm} & \text{tətʃ} \\
\text{bənəm} & \text{wəhmr} \\
\text{qāḏāšm} & \text{tətʃ} \\
\text{bənəm} & \text{wəhmr}
\end{array}
\]

"Priests, place (this tablet) on the men and the ass:
holy men, place (this tablet) on the men and the ass."

The qāḏāšm are also referred to in text R S 8252 and text R S 8208 (Syria XVIII p. 150).

The kəlḇ is referred to at 1929 3: 52 and 1 D 10.

Ritual prostitutes are so designated both in Hebrew and Phoenician.

The duties of the sacred prostitute were two-fold — to provide hospitality for wayfarers (cf. Joshua 2) and to take part in the ritual of the sacred marriage. The practice was
probably a sympathetic rite, intended to sustain and increase the procreative powers of the mother goddess.

The texts afford little direct information as to the functions of the priests, but an outline of these can readily be supplied.

A major part of their duties must have been concerned with the offering of sacrifice. Sacrifice occupied an important place in the cult at Ugarit, and even if the offering of sacrifice was not restricted to the priesthood (a point on which there is no evidence) this must have been a prominent priestly function.

Of equal importance among the ancients was the practice of divination. References to this practice in the Old Testament are numerous. (see e.g. Gen. 44:15; Judges 9:37; Deut. 18:9-14). Among the Phoenicians the sacrifice of divination may have been denoted by the term $N^\text{N}$ (NS 1 42: 11).

At Ugarit diviners may have been referred to by the term $u^\text{t}m$ (L X A B 1:5; III D 1:3) with which we may compare Heb. $\tilde{N}$ $\tilde{N}$. The texts give evidence of at least five methods of divination.

(1) By means of vases. I D 4-5 $t^\text{s}br\quad q^\text{s}t\quad y^\text{s}br\quad s\quad m\quad h$ - "Thou shalt break the vases, he shall break eight."

I 14 $\text{emhs h k d}'\quad q^\text{s}t\quad \text{emhs h}'\quad l$

$q^\text{s}'\quad t\quad h\quad w\quad t\quad l\quad a\quad h\quad w$ - "I shall break it, the jar
against the vase. I shall break it against his vase that I may bring to life the word."

It is not told in what manner the breaking of the jars foretold the future, but the object of the rite was clearly divinatory.

(II) By watching the flight of birds. I D 28-37. Paget and Danel inspect eagles (nšrm) on the threshing floor. The birds are allowed to fly away and their flight augurs ill. Paget weeps at the unfavourable omen and as a sign of mourning breaks vases. III D 1: 19-34. Danel is ordered by Anat to cause the eagles to fly over Aqhat that she may be allowed to presage the future from their flight. Apparently as part of the ceremony of divination Anat offers a sacrifice for the benefit of Aqhat. The results appear to be unfavourable.

(III) Hepatoscopy. I D 105-150. Baal kills (šbr) eagles, birds of the word (dey hmt - cf. Heb. יִזְכֹּל ) and breaks the liver. The omen is taken from the state of the šm† and ōgÄ. These words are uncertain in meaning. At line 117 Baal rejoices because he does not find the šm† and ōgÄ, but at line 145 he rejoices because he finds them. Hepatoscopy was widely practised by the ancients.

(IV) Astrology. I D 200-201. yd’t h 1 k k b k b m - "thou who knowest the courses of the stars". 1929,6:17 k b k b t n’m - "the star of good fortune". In both
instances the context is uncertain.

(V) By means of wine. ID 224

\[ \text{s.n.m.t.s.q.y.m.s.k.h.w.t} \]
\[ \text{t.s.q.y.m.s.k.h.w.t} \]

"Twice thou shalt drink the wine of the word, thou wilt
drink the wine of the word" i.e. the wine that inspires
the prophetic word.

Divination may be referred to also at the following
passages. In each instance the context is uncertain.
1929, 1:8 - \text{w.b.u.r.m.} - "and those who make plain"
i.e. divine. cf. Heb. \( \gamma \chi \).
1929, 6:6 - \text{h.b.s.s.} - cf. Accad. \text{g.b.e.s.u} "to divine
by lot".

Another function almost certainly exercised by the
priests at Ugarit was that of teaching. As guardians of the
cult one of their duties must have been to impart a knowledge
of its mysteries to the younger officials. That such a
school of sacred learning existed is proved by the colophon
appendend to poem I A B which preserves the name of one of
the pupils of the chief priest - \text{E.l.m.k.l.m.d.A.t.n}
\text{p.r.l.n.r.b.k.h.n.m.} - Elmlk pupil of Atprln chief
of the priests."

Another official was the scribe - \text{s.p.r}. That the
scribes were an organised body is proved by a fragment of a
text (R3 6174) published by Virolleaud in Syria XVI (p.184),
where reference is made to rb spr Hbb - "Hbb the chief scribe". Their task probably was to compile the liturgical texts, and to their labours are no doubt due the existing tablets. Text 1929: 16 is perhaps a writing exercise performed by one of the spr m.

An important priestly activity in ancient times depended on the belief physical illness might be cured by appropriate spells and incantations. The large part played in the Babylonian cult by the asipu priest is well known. There can be no doubt that the priests at Ugarit exercised similar functions, and one of their ritual prescriptions may be preserved in the text published in Syria XIV pp. 75 ff. (Fragment d'un traité phénicien de thérapeutique hippologique).

The Ugaritian priesthood, like all priesthoods, undoubtedly subsisted on the offerings of the worshippers, but the texts contain no certain information as to the manner in which their maintenance was provided. It is true we hear of "two birds for the man of god" (1929 1: 20) " a large beast for the lady of the temple" (1929 1: 20) but these were not necessarily presents for the support of the cult officials. They may have formed the material for the official's own offering.

The conception of religious uncleanness and rites deriving from it, presumably formed part of the religion of the Ugaritians, and in this connection many duties would devolve on the priests. We have already noticed that one of
the functions of the king may have been to offer purificatory sacrifices. K 62-79 describes the ritual enacted by Keret before entering on battle. One purpose of this ritual was undoubtedly to effect the purification of the warrior.

In addition to the officials we have mentioned, the following have also been noted.

**ensenel** 1929, 1:22; 3:27; 9:8, "man of the gods", cf. Heb. דִּינַּשַׁנ בֵּית נַהֲשׁ (Deut. 33:1 etc.) and Phoen. דִּינַּשַׁנ נ (J. S. Harris - A Grammar of the Phoenician Language p. 79) Virolleaud suggests (Syria XII p. 73) that he was not a priest, but merely a layman attached to a particular temple or god. When a sacrifice was offered birds had to be given him, either for his maintenance, or to provide him with the means of sacrifice.

**bndbhm** Syria XVI p. 184 "Son of the sacrificers". A class of officials termed אָנָּה is referred to in an inscription from Kitium circ. IV cent. B.C. (N S I 2 O A; 8)

**bnslnhm** V A B, B: 30. Servants of the temple who had charge of the tables or perhaps the altars.

**gr** 1929, 2: 27. gr בֵּית נַהֲשׁ ת. "gr of the sacred enclosure of Ugarit." cf. Phoen. בֵּית נַהֲשׁ temple dweller (N S I 2 O A; 15) and Arab. בֵּית נ "client of the god."

**brsbhtm** R S 8183 & 8201 (Syria XVIII p. 164). "Artisan of the sanctuary". This official is mentioned along
with the \textit{khnm} and \textit{qdm} and must therefore have been a regular member of the temple staff. Officials termed \textit{\(\text{do\,\,n}\)} are mentioned in NS 120 A: 13. They were probably stone masons.

\textit{kmr}. ID 7, 10, 12. B. Gray shows (op. cit. p. 183) that \textit{\(\text{nh}\)} was the original term in Aramaic for a priest. His conclusion that \textit{\(\text{nh}\)} might also be native to Canaanite would seem to be justified by the appearance of the root in Ugaritian. In Hebrew the term is limited to priests other than those of Jahweh. No information is given as to its usage in Ugaritan.

\textit{mkrm}. RS 8252 (Syria XVIII p. 165), may be referred to the root \textit{\(\text{nk}\)} cf. Heb. \textit{\(\text{nh}\)} in the Hiph. "to observe". May be translated perhaps "overseers".

\textit{mm}. RS 8252 (Syria XVIII p. 165). cf. Heb. \textit{\(\text{nh}\)} "task workers."

\textit{msg u qtr}. UD 1: 28 "He who sends out the incense."

\textit{nsk s1s}. RS 8183 & 8201 (Syria XVIII p. 165). "Libation pouser of the third class"? (Virrolleaud). T.H. Gaster suggests (Syria XIX p. 98) after referring to Isaiah 40: 19; 44: 10 where the words \textit{\(\text{nh}\)} and \textit{\(\text{nh}\)} occur together, that it should be translated "metal smelter". For \textit{\(\text{nh}\)} in this sense he points to G 16 1 67: 4; 327: 4, 5. The Ugaritian tablets in which \textit{\(\text{hnsk}\)} and \textit{\(\text{hr}\)}
occur obviously form a group. The terms are also found together at N.S.1.52:6,7. At V AB c 13 however, the root n=q=k definitely means "to pour a libation". In Ugaritan as in Hebrew, the root may contain both meanings.

n q d m  I AB 6: 55 r b n q d m "chief of the shepherd" cf. Heb. "applied to Mesha, King of Moab (2 Kings 3:4) and to Amos (Amos 1:1). At Ugarit the n q d was obviously a cult official. At n p r l n was chief both of the k h n m and the n q d m. The n q d m may have ranked in importance next to the k h n m.

"Servant of El". occurs in Phoen. as denoting a cult official (Harris op. cit. p. 128 s.v.)

r b b t II AB 1: 44 "Master of the temple". Possibly the chief sacristan.

r ' y Syria XIX p. 341 (Fragments alphabetiques Divers de Ras Shamra No. V). 1 res r ' y y s l m "To the chief shepherd greetings". Obviously a cult official.

In the Accadian literature the term "shepherd" ( r e ' u) is a common royal and divine epithet.

s e y III D 1: 23, 35. Parallel to s h t and must therefore mean "sacrificer", cf. Arab. "to roast", Syriac 1 2 "holocaust". May have been the official who offered the holocaust.
"Sacrificer" cf. Heb. סְמָר frequently used in a sacrificial context.
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| סְמָר עַל | II D 1: 29; 2: 17. "Keeper of the sanctuary"? A Sacristan. cf RS 8183 & 8201
| סְמָר רְאֵל | (Syria XVIII p.158) b n סְמָר רְאֵל "Son of the sacristans".
| סְמָר רְאֵל RS 8183 & 8201 (Syria XVIII p.158) "Singers"? (Heb. דְּפָרְשִׁים) or "princes"? (Heb. דְּפָרְשִׁים).

In the priestly literature of the Old Testament the סְמָר was a sacerdotal office.

| סְמָר | I A B 6: 56; II A B 8: 48. Obviously a cult official. The root occurs at 1929, 2: 15 where it means "to sacrifice." The סְמָר was therefore an official who offered sacrifices. It is compared by Montgomery and Harris to a South Arabic root. (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society IV 1935 p.129).
CHAPTER III

NOTES.

1. cf. 2 Kings 11: 18; 12: 10; Jer. 19: 1
2. cf. Heb. ʃba ʃba Accad. h a s s i n u
5. cf. Deut. 23: 19; C 1 5 I 8 6 8 : 1 0
7. The oldest examples of hepatoscopy are thirty two clay models of livers with Accadian inscriptions dating about 2000 BC or earlier found in the palace of Mari. (See B.A.S.O.R. No.77 p.21). The practice is attested among the Canaanites by a red clay model of a liver found at Gezer. (See Cook - Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology Plate XXIII fig.2). For the theory of hepatoscopy among the Babylonians and Assyrians see Jastrow - Religious Belief in Babylonia and Assyria pp.143 ff. Briefly the theory was that for the occasion of sacrifice the victim and the god were identified, and that by an inspection of the soul of the animal, which was thought to reside in the liver, the soul of the god might be studied, and his attitude to mortals thereby deduced.
8. cf. N.S.1. 20 A: 14 - 27.
Sacrificial offerings are commonly divided into two classes (1) animal offerings (2) vegetable offerings. To these a third class may be added, consisting of inanimate objects usually presented as votive offerings. To the various types and occasions of sacrifice custom no doubt assigned appropriate offerings, though that a large choice was allowed to the worshippers may be deduced from the fact that at Ugarit the "š1m" might consist of animals (1929,1:4; 5:7) or of a liquid (Fal.6:13).

It is probable that the Ugaritians, like most ancient peoples, regarded certain animals as sacred, and therefore not to be offered in sacrifice, or at least to be offered only on occasions of special importance. On this point however the texts afford no evidence. The only animal of which we can say that it appears to have been holy is the swine (šunzîr). It seems to have been associated with the worship of Aleyan Baal (A B 5:9) and is not mentioned as being offered in any sacrifice.

A fragmentary text found in 1934 (Syria XVI p.181) contains the word šptîr, probably to be compared with Heb. šīrō - "first born". The tablet appears to contain a list of offerings presented to the sun goddess, and we may
conclude that among the Ugaritians, as among the Israelites, the first born was regarded as furnishing a sacrifice of peculiar potency.

The animals sacrificed at the dedication of the temple of Aleyan Baal (II A B 6: 40-55) include no females. From this it may be deduced that for purposes of sacrifice the male was more highly esteemed than the female. The sacrifice of males would seem to be referred to also at 1929,5:19.

Among the Israelites the peace offering and the sin offering might be a male or a female, but the burnt offering, the sacrifice of greatest efficacy, might only be a male. (Lev.1:3,4)

With the Canaanites also the male was held to be of superior worth. (Dussaud. Les Origines Cananeennes du Sacrifice Israelite p. 137).

At the opening of the temple of Aleyan Baal it would appear that animals of a year old were offered (II A B 6: 43). In the Old Testament yearlings are frequently mentioned in P but were probably common offerings in pre-exilic times, though the only pre-exilic passage in which they are referred to is Micah 6:6.

The offering without blemish - m t n t m (Heb. n b n) is referred to at 1929,1:2. At Babylon it was necessary that the offering should be of first quality. (Furlani - Il Sacrificio Nella Religione Dei Semiti Di Babilonia e Assiria p. 339)

Like the Arabs (R. Smith op.cit.p.218) and the Babylonians
(Furlani op.cit.p.338) but unlike the Hebrews, the Ugaritians sacrificed wild animals as well as domestic animals. Keret is ordered (K 79) to sacrifice to Bn  D n the produce of the chase (m s d k - Heb. 77). The gazelle (g b u) is mentioned as forming part of the material of sacrifice (1929, 3: 47,53). Like other kinds of game the gazelle was eaten by the Israelites though not used in sacrifice. Among the Arabs the gazelle was treated as a poor offering. (R. Smith op.cit.p.219). The gazelle was sacrificed by the Babylonians (Furlani op.cit.p.338). Other wild animals mentioned as being sacrificed are:—

r u m m — wild oxen (Accad r i m u) I A B 1:19, II A B 1:44; II D 6:21.

y' l m — wild goats (Heb. s v' ) I A B 1:26; II D 6:22.

a y l m — stags (Heb. s ? X) I A B 1:24. Stags are mentioned in the Marseilles sacrificial tariff (N S I 42:5).

a y l t — Does (Heb n s? ) 1 A B 1:7.

Domestic animals offered in sacrifice may be classified as follows:—

(a) Animals of the bovine kind.

a l p — 1929, 1:2,5; 3:14; 5:6; 9:2,8: 12:2; I A B 1:20; II A B 6:40; V A B D 85; II D 2:29. The ox. Heb. s a never occurs in a sacrificial context. The n s a was offered at Marseilles (N S I 42:3) and Babylon (Furlani op. cit.p.338).
אַרְבָּה ( plur. אַרְבָּהִים) II A B 6:50. The cow. 
Accad. אַרְבָּהּ.

גֵּל - II A B 6:42. The calf. The שֶׁבֶשֶׁת was a common sacrifice among the Israelites and was offered at Marseilles (N S I 42:3).


(b) Animals of the equinine kind.

בֺּגֵל - II D 6:23. The mule. Arab בּוֹשׁ. The mule was not sacrificed by the Hebrews or Phoenicians.

חַמֵר - I A B, 1:28. The ass. Heb. חֲזֶב. There is ample evidence that the ass was regarded as a sacred animal throughout the Ancient East (R.Smith op.cit.p.408).

The ass was eaten sacrificially by the Arabs (ibid) and the excavations at Gaza reveal that it was offered in sacrifice by the Canaanites. (W.M.F.Petrie. Illustrated London News, May 14, 1932 pp.814 ff. quoted by Graham and May op.cit.p.78).

The ass was not sacrificed by the Hebrews.

יַר I D 59. The young ass. There is no evidence that the כְּרֵי was sacrificed by the Hebrews.

פֹּבֵל - I D 60. The stallion. Arab. פְּבָל. The horse was sacred to the sun god and was especially the sacred animal of the Hyksos. (R.Smith op.cit.p.293). Remains of a sacrifice of horses have been discovered at Gaza. (Petrie, ibid)
(c) Sheep.

_čmr_ - II A B 6:43; VI A B 4:32; II D 5:17, 22; K 66, 67, 170. The lamb. Accad. ₁mṛu. The word occurs with the same meaning in the Carthaginian tariff (NS I 43:5). Among the Hebrews the lamb (ךסן) formed a very common sacrifice.

_š_ - 1929, 1: 2.5.6.10.11; 3:13, 15, 16, 25, 35, 44, 52; 5:6; 9:2, 36, 10; Syria 1934 p.231 line 4. The sheep. In Heb. ךח comprehends both the sheep and the goat. The sheep was perhaps the most common sacrifice among the Hebrews. Sheep of all kinds were offered by the Babylonians (Furlani op. cit. p.338). In the Phoenician tariffs beside the lamb (ךחך) the only animal of the sheep kind referred to is the ram (ךץ) (NS I 43:4). ץ occurs in the Kilamuwa inscription (lines 8 and 11).

_phd_. II D 5:17, 23. cf. Accad. pūḫedu - "the lamb at the moment of its maturity". Offered in sacrifice at Babylon (Furlani op. cit. p.338).

_šen_ 1929, 5:7; 12:2; 48:5; I A B 1:22; II A B 6:41; VI A B 4:30. In Heb. ךמש is a collective term including goats and sheep. It is impossible to determine its precise significance at Ugarit but we may note that (1) it was distinct from the š - 1929, 5:7 (2) at VI A B 4:30-31 šen appears to be in apposition to ḫlpm and mrne to srm, and as the lines seem
to be parallel we may conclude that םֶנ might denote a small beast of any kind.

(d) Goats.

םָד II 6:21. The kid. cf. Heb. נֶג. Phoen. גֶנ (N 3 I 42:9; 43:5). At Ugarit the kid was sacrificed in milk (SS14). cf. Ex. 23:19; 34:36. The Ugaritian practice was probably a fertility rite, and this explains the Jahwist prohibition.


(e) General terms.

dָגְג (plur. _דָגְג_ II 9:4, 7. The kid regularly occurs as the counterpart of the גָּדְג and almost certainly denotes a small animal. Dussaud's suggestion, (Syria XII p.99) that it is to be connected with Aram. גָּדְג and to be translated "ritual" is highly improbably. cf. N H גָּדְג and Arab. גָּדְג used of sheep. It is probably a generic term.

םָד II 1929, 1:3, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 21; 3:12, 17, 26, 30, 33, 34, 46; 9:4, 5, 7, 9. Clearly means "large animal".

The following term undoubtedly refers to a sacrificial animal, but has not been identified - annb (§ 14).

Among the Ancient Semites - including the Arabs and Babylonians - sacrifices commonly consisted of birds. Among the Israelites birds were offered in patriarchal times (cf. Gen. 15:9) and were allowed by the Levitical law (Lev. 1:14), the latter specifying the pigeon and the turtle dove. They were only allowed for the burnt offering and the sin offering. (R. Smith op. cit. p. 219).

Birds were offered at Ugarit. The common term in Ugaritian for a bird offered in sacrifice is šar (cf. Accad. issuru) and is of frequent occurrence. (1929 1:21; 3: 27, 40; 6:8; 9:8; 12:5; 19: 1, 3, 17; 48: 7, 8; SS 36, 41; K 70). Of interest is the phrase šar dēb - "the bird of sacrifice". K 71.

At 1929, 1:20 mention is made of šrm lenš e 1m "two birds for the man of god" and at 3: 27 and 9: 8 we have šrm lenš "two birds for the man". The suggestion has been made (Dussaud Syria XII p. 72) that these passages refer to substitution offerings, but for this there is no evidence. The reference is either to the salary of the official or to the offering provided for him.

Birds in a sacrificial context are denoted also by the term p - w p ṣr k - "and a bird we shall offer" (1929, 6:8). The Heb. ṣvr is used in a sacrificial context
at Gen. 8:20. At II A B 6:43 occurs the word q.m.q.
This has been connected by T. H. Gaster (J R A S. 1935, p. 34)
of with a Samaritan root which renders יבע in the Targum of
Gen. 1:20.

Three species of birds are referred to as being offered
in sacrifice. יונת — "the dove" (1929, 1:1) כ gameState —
"the eagle" (III D 1: 32-35) דאף "the vulture"
(1 B 105).

Birds are not included in the list of sacrifices offered
at the opening of the temple of Aleyan Baal, and from this it
may be deduced that the sacrifice of birds played a subsidiary
part in the cult at Ugarit, perhaps being confined to private
sacrifices, and then being regarded as a poor offering.

Among the Phoenicians birds formed part of the material
of sacrifice. In the Carthaginian tariff two classes of
fowls are mentioned — יי נ y drk probably the domestic
fowl and י נ perhaps the wild bird. Birds were offered at
Babylon. (Furlani op. cit. p. 338).

As regards offerings of the produce of the soil (ybl
אילא גא 2:5) the texts reveal that these were very
comprehensive, and we may conclude that offerings might be made
of everything that the earth produced. In this respect the
usage of the Ugaritians resembled that of the Babylonians
whose sacrificial offerings were taken from the whole vegetable
kingdom. (Jeremias op. cit.). Among the Hebrews on the other
hand, the range of sacred gifts was subject to certain restrictions. Thus for example nothing containing leaven might be burnt on the altar nor might the altar receive a gift which had undergone fermentation. Israelite offerings again were composed only of the products of agriculture, and did not embrace wild fruits. There is no trace of any such restrictions at Ugarit.

The first fruits of the various crops were undoubtedly presented to the gods at Ugarit as they were by most ancient peoples, though no technical term denoting first fruits has been identified. In one of the narrative poems however (I A B 2: 30-36) occurs the well known scene commonly called "The Winnowing of Mot", generally regarded as describing the ritual connected with the offering of the first sheaf. (See below c.VI)

As regards cereal offerings, the following substances have been noted as forming part of the sacrificial offering. 

\[\text{\textdollar\textsuperscript{1929}, 1:9 cf. Heb. } \text{\textdollar\textsuperscript{1929}1:9} \text{ cf. Heb. } \] "grass". Not offered sacrificially in the Old Testament.

\[\text{\textdollar\textsuperscript{1929}, 48:16 cf. Arab } \text{\textdollar\textsuperscript{1929}1:9} \text{ cf. Heb. } \] "sheaf of corn".

\[\text{\textdollar\textsuperscript{1929}, 1:9} \text{ cf. Heb. } \] "spelt"

\[\text{\textdollar\textsuperscript{1929}, 12:1} \text{ cf. Heb. } \] "barley".

There is no evidence of the offering of parched grain so common among the Hebrews. Meal or flour is referred to as \[\text{\textdollar\textsuperscript{1929}, 1:9} \text{ cf. Heb. } \] (Syria XV p.75 line 2) though not in a sacrificial
context. (Heb. פֶּלֶּפֶּר). Fruit was offered by the Babylonians, (Furlani op.cit. p.338) by the Carthagians, (N S L 44: 2) and by the Hebrews (Lev.19: 24; 23:40). It was also offered by the Ugaritians and as in Hebrew, the generic term is פֶּלֶּפֶּר (Syria XV p.75 B, line 15; P A B 2:5). Specific fruits mentioned as being offered sacrificially are:

**דְּבֵל 1929, 12:17** cf. Heb. דֶּבֶל 1929, 12:17 "lump of pressed figs".

**גְּמָם 1929, 12:5** cf. Heb. גְּמָם "bunch of raisins".

Two plants grown as condiments were offered at Ugarit, namely:

- **סְמָם "sesame" (Arab סָמָם) 1929, 12:4.**
- **קְמָם "cumin" (Heb. קָמָם) 1929, 12:9.**

The only root plants found in the texts in a sacrificial context are:

- **גָּדָל "the onion" (Accad. ɡ i d l u Arab גְּדָל) 1929, 12:1.**
- **םְדּוֹמ "mandrakes" V A B 12, D 53, 68, 73.**

Mandrakes are offered as part of a fertility rite on account of the fertilising power attributed to them.

A common sacrifice among the Semites was furnished by incense. Incense might be added to other sacrificial material in order to make the odour of the sacrifice more agreeable to the god, and therefore to increase the potency of the sacrifice; or it might be offered separately. Incense was also burned to effect purification.
It has been contended (B.Gray op.cit.p.144, Dussaud - Les Origines Cananeennes du Sacrifice Israelite p.131) that although the incense altar is of late origin in Palestine, incense was nevertheless offered by the pre-exilic Israelites. The ugaritian evidence increases the probability of this suggestion.

Incense as forming the material of sacrifice is mentioned under the following terms:

- **bḥr:** I A 6:17; I A 5:5, I D 112,126,141. cf. Arab ḫуr. Accad. bāḥur. In every instance this word is associated with the gods of the underworld - elm arq.

- **lbn:** II A 6:35. cf. Heb. ḫur. Dussaud (Syria XII p.67) and Dhomme (R.B. 1931 translate as "cross". Perhaps it may more probably be referred to Heb. ṣū ṣū an ingredient in the incense.

Apart from the fact that incense was associated with the cult of the dead, there is no evidence of its significance in the Ugaritian sacrificial ritual.

The same reason which prompted the use of incense also led to the inclusion among the material of sacrifice of aromatic plants. These are mentioned in Ugaritian by the generic
term \(\text{sm}\) (VAB A:13) cf. Heb.  ז"פ . In a sacrificial context we also find \(\text{rq}\) (1929, 3:21). Under this term aromatics are referred to in Accadian sacrificial texts. (Farlani op.cit.p.339)

In primitive ritual a prominent part is played by oil - vegetable and animal. The use of oil among the Israelites was twofold. Oil was mingled with the cereal offering on the analogy that what was pleasing to man must be pleasing to God. (cf. Lev. 2:1,2; Ex. 29:2). Or it might be presented by itself as an independent offering. (cf. Lev. 14:10; Misc 6:7).

Among the Phoenicians there is evidence that the former method of presentation was practised. In the tariff from Marseilleles (K S I 42:14) the term \(\text{z-s-z}\) is to be referred to the Heb. \(\text{z-s-z}\), a term employed by P to denote the process of mixing oil with the sacrificial offering.

Oils of many various kinds were offered by the Babylonians (Farlani op.cit.p.339).

The references to oil in the Ugaritic literature are as follows:-

1929, 3:21,44. This is a text containing a list of sacrifices for the days of a month. The oil \(\text{sm}\) is contained in a pot \(\text{dd}\).

1922, 12:2 \(\text{kd sm mr}\). "A pitcher of oil of myrrh". The text is a list of sacrificial offerings.

V A B B 31 \(\text{sm slm}\) - "Oil of the peace offering".
In a non sacrificial context oil is mentioned at V.A.S 3l, 39: D 87.

Among some Semitic peoples milk occupied a prominent place in the material of sacrifice. Among the Arabs it formed a frequent libation (R. Smith op. cit. pp. 220, 229). It was also offered at Carthage (B.S. 42: 14). Cream and butter were among the principal Babylonian offerings. (Furlani op. cit. p. 339). Milk was not offered by the Israelites, probably coming under the law which with certain exceptions forbade fermented substances to be placed on the altar.

Milk seems to have formed part of the sacrifices of the Ugaritians. 33.14 reads ṭ b h  g  ṭ b h l b a n n h b b m a t "Sacrifice a kid in milk a .......... in cream".

Some confusion has existed as to the place of honey in Semitic sacrifice. B. Grey shows (op. cit. p. 402) that no discrepancy exists in this connection between Hebrew and Babylonian practice. In both cases honey was included in the sacred offerings. While Hebrew Law forbade honey to be placed on the altar (Ex. 23:18) it included honey among certain classes of sacred gifts eg. the נִשַׁיּוֹת (Lev. 2:12). It is certain that honey was offered at Babylon (Furlani op. cit. p. 339) but there appears to be no evidence that the Babylonians offered honey on their altars.

Honey was definitely offered in sacrifice at Ugarit. 1929 12:2 refers among a list of sacrificial gifts to
A jar of honey. K 72 ff. is a description of a sacrificial scene in which Keret sacrifices a lamb, a goat, bread, a bird, wine and honey. The implication of this scene would appear to be that honey was placed on the altar at Ugarit.

The use of wine in sacrifice is probably co-extensive with the use of the grape. In Israel wine formed a regular offering. (Num. 28:7; Ex. 29: 40 etc.). It might be offered along with other sacrificial material (Num. 15: 24; Lev. 23: 13) or it might be offered independently. Wine is not mentioned in the sacrificial tariffs from Marseilles and Carthage, but the omission is probably accidental. At Babylon many kinds of wine and beer were offered. (Furlani op. cit. p. 339).

At Ugarit wine used in sacrifice is mentioned under two names. (1) y n 1929, 3: 23; 12: 4; II A B 6: 47; K 72: 164. (2) b m r - V A B A 16; S S 6. In each reference instanced from a narrative text wine is associated with food in the sacrifice. From the ritual texts it is impossible to deduce how the wine was offered.

A common offering among all peoples must have been that of bread. In Israel we are familiar with the shew-bread - bread of the face (1 Sam. 21: 6 etc.) bread of God (Lev. 3: 1 etc.), holy bread (1 Sam. 21: 4). In all likelihood the sacrificial bread may have been both leavened and unleavened, for there were probably two traditions, one reaching back to the desert, forbidding the use of leaven, and one having its roots in agricultural life, to which the use of leaven would be normal.
(See B.Gray op.cit.p.399). The shew bread was set in a row on a table before Jahweh (Lev.24:5-6) and was renewed every week. In the Canaanite cities daily offerings of bread were placed before the god. These might be replaced by cakes made of clay. (See Lods op.cit.p.100). Bread is mentioned in the Carthaginian tariff (N S I 44:4). At Babylon bread of all shapes and kinds was included among the daily offerings—bread of wheat, of barley, of corn; long bread, short bread, bread with oil etc. (Purleani op.cit.p.338).

Bread figures among the sacrificial offerings of Ugarit. (K 69, 162; S 86). In each instance it is found in conjunction with other offerings. There is no trace of the prohibition of leaven at Ugarit (see below 3.VI) nor any evidence of the daily presentation of bread in the temple. Bread on a table is mentioned at II A B 4:35.

Whether water libations ever formed part of Semitic religion has been disputed. R.Smith would bring all such rites under the heading of sympathetic magic (op.cit.p.231), but this is a matter simply of nomenclature. There can be no doubt that among the Semites libations of water were offered to the gods for various purposes eg. to nourish the gods (See Lods op.cit.p.100), to slake the thirst of the dead (See Oesterley - Sacrifices in Ancient Israel p.183), to induce rainfall (R.Smith op.cit.p.231). Libations of water had no place in the Levitical Law, but the practice is attested by 1 Sam.7:6
and perhaps by 2 Sam. 23:16.

In the Ugaritian texts the offering of water is described at V A B 38 where Anat pours out water in order to secure increase of the fertilising dew. Libations of water were also probably offered in connection with the funerary cult at Ugarit. (See Schaeffer, The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra, Ugarit p. 50).

A parallel to the libation ritual of the feast of Tabernacles described in the Mishnah (Succoth IV 9 - VI 1) has been detected by some writers at V A 16-30, (See Hooke - The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual p. 35) but the meaning of the text at this point is highly doubtful.

The use of blood in sacrificial ritual is universal. Without at this point entering into its significance (See below c. VI) we may notice the references in the Ras Shamra texts to the blood offering.

1929, 9:1 This text contains a list of sacrificial offerings, and reveals that the Ugaritians regarded the blood as a significant part of the sacrificial victim.

III D 1:24 A sacrificial scene. It would seem to show that the blood was manipulated in some way by the sacrificer.

V A B 5-15 A sacrificial scene in which Anat immerses herself in the blood bath.

It would appear also that libations of blood were offered
as part of the funerary cult at Ugarit. (See Schaeffer op. cit. p. 54).

From these references it is clear that at Ugarit, as in Israel, a definite blood ritual existed, though its details have not been presented.

Human sacrifices by Semitic peoples are well authenticated. In Palestine we have the well known infant sacrifices (See e.g. P.E.F.Q.S. 1903 p. 32 f; Petrie - Tell-el Hesy p. 32, Sellin - Tell Ta'annach p. 51) and the familiar foundation sacrifices (See P.E.F.Q.S. 1904 p. 16; 1906 p. 64; Vincent R.B. 1909 p. 257). To human sacrifice in the Old Testament there are undoubtedly references e.g. Judges 11:30, 40 - the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter; 2 Kings 3:27 - the sacrifice of the eldest son of the King of Moab; 1 Sam. 15: 32 - the slaying of Agag before Jahweh. Whether the first born child of every family was at any time sacrificed to Jahweh is disputed. There are also the frequent references to passing children through the fire to Moloch, which, however we interpret the word Moloch (See e.g. Eissfeldt-Molk als Opferbegriff, passim) undoubtedly refer to the widespread practice of sacrificing children.

The archaeological evidence for human sacrifice at Ugarit is slight. In a corner of the necropolis was found a large cistern containing fragments of pottery and skeletons of newborn infants. These are probably the remains of human sacrifice (Schaeffer Syria XIII p. 4).
The literary evidence for the prevalence of human sacrifice is also meagre. There are two possible references both of them uncertain. K 13-16 a k n 1 h m 1 s t 1 v k s r m. This is rendered by Albright (B.A.S.O.R. No. 71 p. 38) "Sacrifice for her three skilled craftsmen" or "Sacrifice for her three musicians". For a sacrificial sense attaching to the root k w n cf. Isaiah 14:21, Zeph 1:7. k s r m is to be connected with Heb. 1 sw "skill, success". We may compare also the Canaanite deity K a u s a r - the wise craftsman and patron of music.

Virollesand's translation "Je lui attribuais le triple des Koserites" gives an almost impossible meaning to k w n, and is more difficult to fit into the context.

Human sacrifice may possible be referred to at V A B B 13-14 - b r k n t 1 l l b d m s m r "She plunges both her knees into the blood of the s m r". Lines 6-12 describe Anat's bloody battle with the people of the sea-shore. s m r may denote an official.

The last type of sacrificial gift to be considered is that composed of inanimate objects. These are mostly votive offerings, and are of little importance for the understanding of sacrifice. To this class belong non-human foundation offerings. At Ugarit objects that probably constituted a foundation offering were discovered under the Library. These consisted notably of a bronze axe covered with silver and a gold cup (See Schaeffer Syria XII p. 7). Other objects noted
as forming quasi sacrificial gifts are:

* nę - 1929, 12:5 - "feathers"? Heb. ?
* knp - 1929, 9:6 - "a wing".
* srt - 1929, 19:9 - "a fleece".
* ksp - 1929, 48:11 ksp y'dab - "he offered silver". Also at K 126.
* qrlnt - II De 6:22 - ard qrlnt - "I shall offer horns."
CHAPTER V.

TECHNICAL TERMS.

The Ugaritian texts make mention of many technical terms of sacrificial ritual, some of them already known from their occurrence in other Semitic languages, others peculiar to the Ugaritian dialect. We give a list of such terms in alphabetical order with an account of what appears to be their significance and their relation to their congeners where these exist.

ak₂. This root occurs in a non-technical sense in a verbal (eg. k₂₁) and nominal (eg. I D 9) form, meaning simply "to eat, food." In the two stelae discovered in 1934 (Syria XVI pp. 155 ff.) it is probably used in a technical sense meaning "sacrifice." Dussaud regards the offering as a sacrificial meal, perhaps a communion feast (Syria XVI p. 177). From this it may be deduced that at Ugarit part of the sacrificial material was retained by the worshippers to provide a meal. For a discussion of the stelae see below under p 174.

In the Code of Hammurabi is found the word ḫ₃₃₃₃₃₃ meaning "sacrifice." (Yurlani op. cit. p. 335).


These passages are parallel and read:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sk</th>
<th>slm</th>
<th>lkb</th>
<th>ar₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ar₂</td>
<td>dd</td>
<td>lkb</td>
<td>sdm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Pour the peace offering into the heart of the earth
Pour the jar into the heart of the fields."

ar ba is clearly parallel to sk and is to be compared to Heb. יָסַּמ a latticed opening through which the rain pours. Duessaed refers to Prov. 12:16 - יָסַּמ which he believes should be translated "Pour the blood". (Syria XVII p.101.) The rite described is obviously a fertility rite. For sk and 31m see below.

1929. 7:9; 34:11. This root corresponds philologically to Heb. יָסַּמ and is probably a sacrificial term. 1929:27 is extremely fragmentary but it contains the words k.d "jar" and dr "fruit" which may point to the nature of the 31m. 27 b 9 - 31m nr - "an 31m to nr" (i.e. Shapash). 27 b 9 - 31m trtbd - "the 31m is spread out". (cf. Heb. יָסַּמ. 1929:34 is also fragmentary but it would appear to be a list of ceremonies performed in honour of the goddess 31m. At line 11 read lsd 31m, not lsd 31m as given by J.W. Jack (The Ras Shamra Texts p.30).

It is clearly impossible to form any conclusion as to the nature of the 31m at Ugarit, nor do we gain any light on the Biblical יָסַּמ. In the old literature of the Old Testament יָסַּמ means (a) guilt (Gen.26:10) (b) compensation (1 Sam. 6: 3 ff). (c) money given for the support of priests. (2 Kings 12:16). As denoting a sacrifice it is first found in Ezekiel and P. It is difficult to distinguish in Hebrew
ritual between the אֲרֹן and the מִשְׁכָּב. Dussaud attempts with indifferent success to treat the מִשְׁכָּב as a sacrifice "pro pecatto" and the אֲרֹן as a sacrifice "pro delicto". (Les Origines etc. pp 117 ff.). A more probable account of the relation between the two terms is given by G.A. Barton (J.B.L. Vol. 40 1927 pp. 79 ff). The אֲרֹן belongs to the period when the idea of sin signified a violation of tabu (cf. Lev. 3). When more ethical ideas of sin came to the front the term מִשְׁכָּב was introduced. The transition from one to the other may be seen in chapters 4 and 5 of Leviticus, where the terms are used as synonyms.

We cannot infer from the existence of the term at Ugarit that there was a sacrifice called אֲרֹן among the ancient Hebrews. The ritual of the אֲרֹן may have been borrowed by the priestly writers from Canaanite or Babylonian sources.

The term does not occur in Phoenician, the expiatory sacrifice among the Phoenicians being the סַסָה.

א_ז_ר. II D 1:3, 8, 10, 12, 13, 22. The word is interpreted by Virolleaud as being an epithet of Danel and is compared to Hebrew 'ר_ץ "a waist cloth" and Arab. $\text{ء_ل_ج}$. It can hardly however be an epithet of Danel as it occurs in the plural in line 22 - א_ז_ר_מ. De Vaux suggests (R.B 1937 o.442) Phoen. రి_కమ "votive sacrifices". We shall see below that א_ז_ר may be the Ugaritian technical term for the thank offering.
b'd  SS 12, 14, 15. This is obviously a cultic term meaning "to place".

SS.12  ab'd  y rh m  'l  'd  "Place the moon-shaped discs upon the stone". For y rh m and 'd see above c.II.

SS.14  'l  est  ab'd  x z n  "Upon a fine place?" Virolleaud suggests Arab. applied to a flock producing much milk.

SS.15  w'1  agn  sb'd  "And on a vessel place".

The Shafel is often used with cultic terms though not exclusively so. (cf. eg. V A B D 84).

b's t  II A B 3: 17, 21.

s n  db hm  s n a  b' l
s l s  r k b  'r p t
b h b  b s t  w d b h  (w d b h )  d t
w d b h  t d m m  s m h t
k b h  b s t  l t b t
w b h  t d m m  s m h t

s n a. Usually compared with Heb. "to hate", but this does not fit the context. Col III opens with an account of the feasts of Aleyan among the gods, and we should expect rather to read of sacrifices offered to Baal. Compare therefore with Arab. "to be high". Here a Shafel imperative meaning "to raise on high, to offer". of the similar use of
and 

The root appears in Heb. at Ex. 15:2. (Taken from T. H. Gaster J.R.A.S. 1935 p. 22, who however in a postscript to the article reverts to the meaning "to hate").

For 

For the omission of the preposition with verbs meaning "to offer sacrifice" see N S I 61: 16 (Aramaic inscription of Banamnu) and C. I. S. IV 74: 11 f. (Sabean).

Almost certainly to be compared to Heb. שים "shame". No indication of the nature of the sacrifice is given. We may conjecture that it may be the sacrifice offered to expiate a shameful deed i.e. the sin offering, equivalent of the Heb. יבשנ.

Of Heb. יתנ "judgment". The דבב ה ינ may have been the sacrifice made to obtain judgment, the verdict being ascertained by some condition of the offering. We may compare the curious ceremony described in Num. 5:11-31, of which a sacrifice formed part, enacted to decide the guilt or innocence of a wife suspected by the husband of infidelity.

From the root דממ as in Accad. דאמאמ and Heb. דב7 "to wail". The reference is undoubtedly to the wailing of the maidens in the Tammuz cult. דבב here may be explained in two ways (a) it may be used metaphorically. The wailing of the maidens may be their sacrifice. This would be in keeping with the development of the root in other
dialects. In Heb. and Phoen. the root means not only a bloody offering, but any kind of sacrificial gift. In Egyptian the cognate root came to mean "pray, offer". (Gaster op. cit. p.40). (b) It may refer to the sacrifice offered as an accompaniment of the wailing. We know that the Tammuz wailing at Hierapolis was accompanied by a sacrifice. (Lucian De Dea Syria, 49.). R. Smith (op. cit. p.411) and more recently C.A. Barton (Semitic and Hamitic origins, p.156) find the origin of the Tammuz wailing in wailing performed for a sacrificial victim.

**ltbt** cf. Heb. לְבֵית. Translate:

"Two sacrifices offer to Baal,

a third to the rider of the clouds.

The sacrifice for sin, and the sacrifice for judgment,

And the sacrifice of the mourning of the maids,

For in it thou shalt see sinfulness

And in it the maids do mourn."

*br.* Fragments Alphabetiques de R.S. Syria XX p.123. Virolleaud suggests Heb. יִּבֵּר, "piece of an animal offered in sacrifice."

*dbb.* The idea of sacrifice is expressed in Ugaritian by the root *dbb* as in Aramaic. (בְּבִרֹז) In Hebrew and Phoenician the form is נבש and in Arabic يَرَبُ. The Accadian equivalent *zi̱l-a* occurs rarely and is of late
date. (Furlani op. cit. p. 328). The common word for sacrifice in Accadian is \textit{n i k u} (Furlani pp. 324 f.). Originally this meant "to pour a libation", but as the libation played a large part in Babylonian sacrifice the word came to mean "sacrifice" in general. The meaning of the root \textit{d b h} is "to slaughter". Among the primitive Semites all slaughter was sacrifice, and thus the connotation "slaughter for sacrifice" came to be attached exclusively to the root. In Ugaritian the forms of the root are as follows:-

(1) Verbal (a) Imp. 1929, 2:15, 24, 33; K 200; IV D 1: 1,10
(b) Imperf. K 76; I D 191; VI A B 4: 28 (c) Part. K 168
(2) Nominal (a) Sing. 1929, 19:13; S S 2 6; II A B 3: 18,19, 20; K 66, 71, 73; I D 185 (b) Sing. suff. K 78 (2nd sing. suff.) K 170 (3rd sing. suff.) 1929, 2:15, 24, 32 (1st plur. suff.). (c) Plur. 1929, 1:17; II A B 3:17.
(3) \textit{m a b h} "altar" 1929, 3: 41.
(4) \textit{m a b h t} - nominal form equivalent to \textit{d b h} (2) - 1929, 1: 20; 3: 24, 38; 6: 16.

\textit{d g s}. This word occurs only in the Danel poem - I D 185, 186, 192, 193.

\textit{ys'ly d g st} - "He causes the \textit{d g st} to ascend" i.e. he offers the \textit{d g st}.
\textit{s'ly d g ls'mym d g h r n m y d k b k b m l t br kn} - "Offer the \textit{d g s} to the skies.\textit{d g s} which is the \textit{h r n m y} of the stars that you
may bless me". The context would seem to indicate that it was a nocturnal sacrifice. Virolleaud connects the root with Arab. "darkness". In line 189 Virolleaud reads ms l t m and m r d m as "cymbals" and "dancers" (Heb. D N S m, 7 (7) from which it may be concluded that the sacrifice was accompanied by dancing and music. The sacrifice seems to have been offered by Danel to procure a blessing in P g t. From line 185 it is clear that it was a burnt offering which went up to the sky.

\[\text{d r q. II A B 2:15; V A B D 83; II D 5:11.}\]

Corresponds to Heb. in its cultic meaning "to bespatter" i.e. to bespatter the altar with the blood of the victim.

\[\text{II A B 2:15 ' n t t d r q y b m t. "Anat the Protectress scatters the blood of the sacrifice."}\]

\[\text{V A B D 84-85 t d r q y b m t a h a h s t a l p d m t. "Thou wilt scatter the blood y b m t of his father: offer an ox before him." For s t see below.}\]

\[\text{II D 5:11 t d r q h s s h l k "Thou shalt scatter the blood at thy going O h s s."}\]

\[\text{h r g. 1929, 6:5 h r g ..... s l m m "Slaughter ... peace offerings." Heb. } A \text{ is not used of ritual slaughtering.}\]

\[\text{h t. 1929, 2:14,15. w b t e n l d b b m. It is possible that this may be the same root as Heb. } A \text{ Translate perhaps "I shall cause them to make a sin offering for}
the sacrificers'. Apart from the fact that the text is a ritual one and deals with sacrifices, the context sheds no light on the connotation of the word, and the meaning put forward is entirely conjectural.

**t b b.** I A B 1: 18-28; II A B 6: 40; VI A B 4: 30; S S 14; II D 2: 29. Corresponds to Heb. יָדוּ to slaughter", Arab. " to cook". In Heb. the root is never used in a ritual sense. The root occurs in a sacrificial sense in Accad. (Purlani, op. cit. p. 334).

**y r d.** 1929 1: 20 יָרֵד מַדְּבֵּחַ "Thou hast offered the sacrifice". 1929, 3: 53 יָרֵד בַּקּוּ "the king sacrificed a gazelle". Heb. יָד is not used in a sacrificial sense.

**y s q.** This root is almost identical in usage with Heb. יָסַק. It means (1) "to pour" in a general sense, eg. I A B 6: 14 cf. 1 Kings 18: 34. (2) "to cast, to fuse" of metals eg. II A B 1: 26 cf. 1 Kings 7: 23. (3) "to pour" of liquids offered in sacrifice V A B 8: 31 יָסַק "he poured out the oil of the peace offering".

**y n.** "Take 0 המֵרֵר the bird of sacrifice and pour wine into the cup of silver". For התש cf. Hittite בתוא - silver.

**k b d.** In the ritual texts published in 1929 this root occurs four times in a cultic sense.
1929, 1:2  mtn tm nkbdd - "a perfect gift is offered."

1929, 3:39  kbd wdb'h - "an offering and a sacrifice".

1929, 5:3  Context uncertain but definitely a ritual text.

1929, 9:13  Uncertain, but clearly a sacrificial text.

In Ugaritian therefore the root kbd means to offer sacrificially. In the Sabean inscriptions we find kbd't which means "a sacrificial gift" the precise equivalent of the Ugaritian kbd. (Gaster, P.E.F.Q.S. 1934 p.141). The existence of this term shows that at Ugarit sacrifices were sometimes regarded as gifts. In the narrative texts the root means "to honour".

kw'h. Heb. 13 Arab.  (1) It occurs in Ugaritian with three meanings. (1) to establish - II D 1:26, 43; II A B 7:44. (2) to beget II A B 4:48; V A B E 44. cf. Job 31:15. (3) to sacrifice. K.15 askn lh ms1st K'sr'm "Sacrifice for her three skilled craftsmen." Afel imperative. In a ritual text published in Syria XIV (No.1, line 7) the word kn't occurs. This may be a nominal form.

bsr'p el bkn't el - "by the fire offering of El, by the sacrifice of El." For 13 in a cultic sense cf. Zeph.1:7. In Accad. the root also occurs in a sacrificial sense, in a verbal form. (Furlani op.cit.p.334).

Heb.  nūṣ. Used in Ugaritian in the sense of taking the offering preparatory to sacriﬁcing it. For a similar use in Heb. cf. Gen. 15:10; Lev. 12:8.

mārm. See under pgr below.

mān. II AB 1:40.  qāhm ēlâ màlā mām.
"the table of El which was full of gifts." cf. Heb. nāḥ, nâḥ
"portion" especially a portion of a sacriﬁce eg. Ex. 29:26;
Lev. 7:33 etc. cf. also Arab ḫā ḫū "to offer". The root occurs in South Arabic with a similar meaning. This word also points to the existence of a gift theory of sacriﬁce at Ugarit.

mtn. 1929, 1:2; VI AB 5:12, 14, 25. This term corresponds to Heb. nāḥ and nāḥ which besides meaning "gift" in general are used particularly of sacriﬁcial gifts. cf. also Phoen. nāḥ and nāḥ both used of sacriﬁcial gifts. At 1929, 1:2 read mtn tm nk bd "a gift without blemish is offered". tm is clearly Heb. nāḥ "whole, sound" applied to unblemished sacriﬁcial victims.

nṭr. II D 6: 20, 21, 22, 23.

adr  -- qdm dlbnn
adr  gdm brumm
adr  qnt by'lm mtb'lm
b'qbt šr
adr bgl el qnm
"I shall offer ..... I shall offer the kids with the wild ox. I shall offer the horns of the goats which follow on the heels of the ox. I shall offer the mule .......

The root is the same root as Heb. "to vow", cf. also Phoen. The root is further evidence of the extent to which sacrifices at Ugarit were regarded as gifts.

The ugaritian term is parallel to Heb. a technical term occurring in n to denote those offerings part of which were retained by the priest as his share. The retention of a portion by the priest was symbolised by waving the offering towards the altar, and back in token of its presentation to God and return by Him to the priest. In Babylonia also some offerings were waved by the priest before the god. (G.A.Barton J.B.L. Vol. 46, 1927 p.87.).

This is the same root as Heb. "to strike" and has a similar meaning. It occurs with this general sense at II D 6: 17,18, but in two instances seems to have a ritual significance. 1929, 3:12 "and he strikes a large beast" i.e. he sacrifices it. II A B 5: 108 and V A B D 8 (parallel passages) "Sacrifice an ox before him, a fatling, and smite its head." It has been suggested however
(Gaster J.R.A.S. 1935 p. 31) that the reference in the second passage is to Aleyan Baal, and that we have here a parallel rite to that of the striking of the king on the forehead in the New Year Babylonian festival.

\[\text{nkt. 1929, 2:16, 25, 33. hwnkt nkt.}\]

Parallel to \[\text{dbnh ndbh, and s' n's'y}\] and must therefore mean "sacrifice".

\[\text{nsk.}\]

This root means to pour, and is used in a general sense at V AB 40, 41; ID 87, 88; II D 6:36. At V AB C 13, D 53, 68, 73, (parallel passages) it is used in a ritual sense meaning "to pour a libation".

\[\text{sk slm lkb d arg. "Pour a libation into the heart of the earth".}\]

For the cultic use of \[\text{q}\] cf. Gen. 35:14; Num. 28:7 etc. The root has no ritual significance in Phoen. In Arab. \[\text{jw}\] means "to pour a libation" originally of blood, then of wine etc.

\[\text{n'sa.}\]

S S 54. The root occurs frequently in the texts with the general meaning "to raise". At S S 54 it has obviously a ritual significance, the object being \[\text{ab}\] "sacrifice". (see below). The same cultic meaning attaches to Heb. \[\text{wv} j\] cf. 1 Chron. 16:29; Ps. 96:8. In Phoen. the root occurs in a ritual sense as a noun \[\text{wv j}\] meaning "offering, tribute."

\[\text{nqtm. 1929, 1:18.}\]

This term is probably to be referred to Accad. \[\text{niq u}\] the common term for sacrifice.
(Purlani op.cit. p.324). The root has not retained this significance in Heb., Phoen., Arab. or Aram., but cf. Syriac ḫāš "to make a libation."

ṣk̇n  II D 1:27; 2:16. Stelae to Dagon A: 1 (Syria XVI p.155). Referred by Dussaud (Syria XVI p.177) to Arab. ḫāš "food" and regarded as denoting a species of sacrifice. Obermann (J.A.O.S. Vol. 61 1941 p.31) refers to the root ṣkk (cf. Heb. ẖnn, ḥnn) and regards the ṧ as representing the suffix an. He regards it as meaning some kind of veil or curtain. Both interpretations are unsatisfactory. To be referred rather to Accad. ṣk̇ṅnu - Stela.

II D 1:27; 2:16 (Parallel passages)

nšb ṣk̇ṅ e[l̇e]bh lq̄ds - "Setting up the stela of his ancestors in the sanctuary. For e[l̇e]bh cf. Heb. 21/1x "one who has power over ancestral spirits."

(See Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel p.106). For an account of the inscriptions on the stelae see below under pgr.

šḏb. This root occurs frequently in Ugaritian and means "to prepare, to set." cf. Heb. š yū. In its verbal form it does not appear to have a cultic significance except once at 1929, 48:11 wksn šḏb - "and silver he offers". The noun šḏb is however clearly a cultic term. Its occurrences are S S 54; K 234; III D 1:22. The meaning is probably "sacrifice" - that which has been prepared.
This verb occurs several times in Ugaritian meaning "to go up". At I D 185, 192 it clearly has a cultic significance. 

"he causes the to ascend to the skies" i.e. he offers the sacrifice of the . In Heb. the Hiph 'il of is frequently used in a similar sense. In the Ugaritian passage quoted the verb is used with respect of that which goes up to the sky in smoke not that which goes up on to the altar. This may have been the original meaning of the Heb. when applied to a sacrifice. The Ugaritian usage would seem to indicate that the Heb. is derived from the root "to go up" and not from the root appearing in Arab. as " to boil".

This verb occurs in Ugaritian only in a cultic sense. It is used absolutely with the significance "to make a sacrifice". In Heb. is used (1) absolutely eg. Ex. 10:25. (2) with an object denoting the type of sacrifice eg. Judges 13:16; Lev.16:24.

1929, 1: 7, 12, 17; 3:16 Stelae to Dagan A: 2, B: 1 (Syria XVI p.155). The inscriptions on the stelae are.
A. skn ds'lyt
   tryl lgtn pgr
   s wlp lsl

B. pgr ds'ly
   'zn lgtn b'l h
   s wlp bmr

For skn see above. It means stela. For ds'lyt see 'ly above. For pgr various meanings have been proposed. (1) Dhorme (R.B.1931 p.36) proposes "corpses" (Heb. יַעֲגוֹר) (2) Bauer (Z.A.W. 1933 pp.52 nd 94) regards it as the name of a deity. (3) Dussaud suggests Arab. "to be generous" (Syria XVI p.177) (4) Albright (op.cit. p.106) translates "mortuary offering" and connects with Heb. יַעֲגוֹר and Accad. pâgrûu "a corpse". None of these interpretations is satisfactory. The word is parallel to skn and must therefore have a similar meaning. It is a cult object and probably denotes an altar. This meaning fits the other occurrences of the word - 1929, 1:7 dr el wpgr b'l "the temple of El and the altar of Baal". 1929, 1:17 dbhm sns pgr "offerings of a sun-shaped object on the altar". The word is probably from the same root as יַעֲגוֹר which may have originally denoted any lifeless mass. (See Obermann op.cit.).

The stelae were set up by the persons whose name they
bear in order to preserve their memories. About 140 stelae serving a similar purpose have been discovered at Assur with dates ranging from 1400 B.C. to 600 B.C. An example of the practice among the Hebrews is recorded at 2 Sam. 18:18.

The two stelae record the only votive inscriptions so far discovered at Ugarit. They belong to the class of personal monumental inscriptions so frequent among the Phoenicians.

The final letter of the last word of the second inscription is uncertain. Dussaud (op. cit.) reads b m h r t "on the second May". Albright (op. cit.) reads m b r m and compares Accad. m a h r a "to meet, to receive", and Sabaean m b r "token of favour, gift." We may more readily refer to Heb. m y m "to devote" and translate as "devoted object" i.e. a sacrifice. The word is parallel to a k l which clearly means "a sacrifice". Translate thus:-

A. The stela which T r y l has set up to Dagan.
   An altar for the sacrifice of a sheep and an ox.

B. The altar which t z n has set up for Dagan his lord (an altar) for a sacrifice of a sheep and an ox.

It may be inferred that at Ugarit different types of altars existed for different types of sacrifice.

p w q. II A B 6:47, 54, 56. The passage describes the conclusion of the feast with which the temple of Aleyan Baal is dedicated. On the several days of the feast the
gods and goddesses are given various animals and cult objects, and the verb used is $\textit{sg}$, $\textit{spg}$. This is probably a cultic Shafel, and we may compare the Heb. $\textit{q} \textit{y}$, meaning "to produce, to furnish". The same root, with uncertain meaning, seems to occur at $K\text{12, VI A B 5:27}$ in a non ritual sense.

$\textit{s}$ $\textit{A B 1:42}$. May be the Phoen. $\textit{s}$ $\textit{y}$ a species of sacrifice mentioned in the sacrificial tariff of Marseilles. It also appears in a third inscription from Larnax Tes Lapetho in c. 345-315 B.C. published in 1938. (A. M. Honeyman, Larnax Tes Lapetho - a third Phoenician inscription, Le Museon II pp. 285 ff.). It was in all probability a common meal sacrifice corresponding to the $\textit{r} \textit{m} \textit{n}$ (See Dussaud-Les Origines etc. p. 147).

$q \textit{rb.}$ 1929 2:18. $\textit{ws} \textit{rb} \textit{sr}$ - "and he sacrificed an ox". This corresponds to the Heb. use of the Hiph'il of $\textit{m}$, meaning "to present, to offer" of a sacrificial offering. It occurs chiefly in Ezekiel and P.

$q \textit{ry.}$ V A B C II $\textit{qry} \textit{bar} \textit{mlhmt}$ "offer me plates of food on the earth." $\textit{qry}$ is parallel to $\textit{st}, \textit{sk},$ and $\textit{arb}$ and is obviously a cultic term. It is the same root as Arab. $\textit{s}$ $\textit{t}$ "to set food before a guest". For $\textit{mlhmt}$ cf. Arab. $\textit{mlhmt}$ "vessels for milk."

$r \textit{mm}$ I A B 6:43 $\textit{lhm trmnt ltst yn}$ "Bread thou shalt offer, wine thou shalt drink". cf. Heb. $\textit{y}$ $\textit{y}$.
used in the Hiph'il to signify the offering of sacrificial gifts, and נַהַלָּן a ritual term denoting the waving of certain gifts before the altar. The distinction between the נַהַלָּן and the נַהַלָּן is not clearly brought out in the Old Testament, but according to the Mishnah (Menachoth V b) the waving of the נַהַלָּן was horizontal, while that of the נַהַלָּן was perpendicular. Both terms occur only in exilic and post exilic literature, and we cannot infer from the existence of the terms in Ugaritian that the ritual existed in ancient Israel. They may have been a late borrowing.

сеֵי III D 1:23 Parallel to שָׁבַת and must therefore mean "sacrificer". For etymology see above c.III.

שָׁבַת I D 151; III D 1:24, 35. In each of these instances the meaning of the root is clearly "to sacrifice" of. Heb. כֹּהו "to slaughter" used frequently to denote the killing of the sacrificial animal. eg. 1 Sam. 1:25; Ex.29:11; Ex. 40: 3.

שלמה. This is the common Semitic root שלמה meaning fundamentally "to be at peace". The occurrences of the root at Ugarit may be classified as follows:-

(1) Meaning simply "peace" S S 7, 26, V A B B, 32.
(3) As a ritual term denoting a type of sacrifice 1929, 1:4; 3:52; 5:7; 9:7,15; 51:8; V A B C 13, D 53, 68, 74; VI A B 2: 20; K 130, 131, 274, 275. With this significance
the noun occurs both in the singular and plural and corresponds etymologically to Heb. סוע and Phoen. סוע. The term probably appears in Accad. as "small animals for the and the" (for see below).

1929 1:4 s r p w s l m m d q t m "small animals for the s r p and the s l m m" (for s r p see below).

1929 3:52 fragmentary.

1929 5:7 s e n s l m m "a sheep for the s l m m".

1929 9:7 d q t s r p w s l m m "a small beast for the s r p and the s l m m".

1929 9:15 fragmentary.

1929 51:8 s l m e l "the s l m of El".

V A B C 13; D 53, 68, 74; VI A B 2:20
sk s l m m lk bd ar s
"Pour the s l m m into the heart of the earth".

K 130, 131, 274, 275
q b K r t s l m m
"Take O Keret, the s l m m."

The following points may be noted in connection with the use of the term at Ugarit.

(1) It was sometimes a liquid sacrifice - cf. V A B C 13.

(2) It was sometimes an animal sacrifice - cf. 1929 1:4; 5:7; 9:7.

(3) It was sometimes an inanimate offering. cf. K 130-141 in which the s l m m offered to Keret consist of gold, silver, a slave and horses.
(4) The $\underline{\underline{s.l.m.}}$ described at V A B C 13 was part of a fertility rite. Aleyan Baal informs Anat that as a result of the sacrifice

\[ h s k \quad s k \quad b s k \quad m y \]

"Your orchard (Arab $\underaccent{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{\check{
at the consecration of kings (1 Sam. 11:15) on the establishment of peace (2 Sam. 6:17) on the cessation of a plague (2 Sam. 24:25) on the dedication of the temple (1 Kings 6:63). The sacrificial material might consist of oxen, rams or goats (Lev. 9:18) or of unleavened cakes mingled with oil (Lev. 7:12). The fat of the victim was burned (Lev. 7:22) but the flesh was eaten, and had to be consumed at the latest by the second day (Lev. 7:15). Any part of the flesh remaining to the third day had to be burned (Lev. 7:16,17).

The original significance of the has long been matter of dispute. In the LXX it is rendered by σωτηρία, θυσία τος σωτηρίου. The Vulgate renders "victim a pacifica" "pacificum" (sc. sacrificium). In these versions it is obviously connected with the simple stem of οςω "to be whole, sound" and with the noun οιςω "peace". Josephus renders θυσία Χριστηρία (Ant III 9,2) and evidently has in mind the intensive meaning of the stem "to repay, to requite". The Ugaritian evidence adds little to the discussion. It may however be suggested that that evidence, such as it is, would associate the sacrificial term with the fundamental meaning of the root. In the two narrative instances we have seen that the
was offered to induce Aleyan Baal to grant fertility and to ward off the vengeance of an enemy. The idea of peace may underlie both of these sacrifices. Fertility will be granted by Aleyan when a state of peace exists between him and his worshippers. To render him peacefully and favourably inclined, a sacrifice is offered. To avert the vengeance of an enemy a peaceful relationship must be established between the opponents. May we go a step further and say that to obtain peace between the worshipper and the deity, the deity must be propitiated; that as the slm was offered to Keret to propitiate him, so the slm was offered to Aleyan as a means of propitiation. The idea that the spirit of vegetation must be propitiated before fertility is granted is common among primitive peoples. 2 Sam. 21: 1-14 records that in the time of David, there was a certain drought which was regarded as due to the beneficent influence of unsaved spirits, who had to be propitiated by vengeance taken on their murderers before rain might fall. In the Ugaritian narrative texts therefore each example of the slm can be subsumed under the idea of propitiation. (The ritual texts give no clue as to the nature of the sacrifice). The conclusion would appear to be that at Ugarit the slm was the sacrifice of propitiation.

\[ \text{s q l} \quad \text{I I A B 6:40; VI A B 4:30. Both passages read} \]

\[ \text{t h h a l m s e n s q l s r m w m r e. "sacrifice} \]
oxen and sheep, sacrifice bulls and a fatling." The etymology of the word is doubtful but it may be a shafel from the root found in Heb. "to burn". The meaning would then be "sacrifice by burning". Virolleaud (Syria XII p.198) finds the word at I AB 1:37, but there the root is Accad. k a l u "to speak".

"Sacrifice to the bull, thy father El,
Make an offering to Baal in thy sacrifice."

The etymology of the root is uncertain. Virolleaud connects it with Heb. rendered by LXX T O L a i (Ex. 31:10). The root is the same as Accad. s a r i k u "to offer". The verb is Heb. s r p 1929, 1:4; 9:7; Syria XIV p. 231 line 16.

In the first two instances cited s r p is parallel to s l m m and must therefore be a form of sacrifice. The root is undoubtedly that of Heb. and the sacrifice denoted is probably the holocaust. This meaning attaches to the Accad. s u r p u (Furlani op.cit.p.335). In Accad. the verb is frequently used in connection with infant sacrifice.
In Ugaritian the verb occurs at I A B 2:33. The root occurs in a ritual sense in Heb. in several instances of which we may note Deut. 13:17 where the object of נא is שׁלמה: Num. 19:5 where נא is used of burning the red heifer: 2 Chron. 16:4 a funeral ritual. All that can be ascertained of the Ugaritian שׁלפ is (1) it seems to have been accompanied by a שׁלמ. We may note how often the Hebrew נא was accompanied by an נליא. (2) דקט מ were sometimes offered.

Fire sacrifices were common among the Canaanites. (Lods op. cit. p. 96).

This verb corresponds to Heb. נא and occurs frequently with the general meaning "to place". e.g. I D 53. In the following passages it seems to be used in a ritual sense (1) I D 112, 126, 140; I A B 1:17 - תסננב הרט של מ "She offers the incense of the gods of the earth". (2) V A B 0.12; VI A B 2:19 - של בריית דדל מ "Place mandrakes in the ground". (3) I D 59 תסננ לל ותیر "She places the ass on the high place" i.e. sacrifices it. (4) I I A B 5: 107 של אלפ שד מ "Sacrifice an ox before him".

The root does not appear in a ritual sense in Heb. or Phoen.

ס"י 1929, 1:1; 2:16, 24, 32, 33; I A B 6:56; II A B 8:46.
1929 2:16 ḏḇḥn ṃḏḇḥ hw ʾs ʾnšʾy
"Our sacrifices we sacrifice, behold our offering we offer."
Parallel to ḏḇḥ and ṃḏḇḥ and therefore clearly a sacrificial term. I A B 6: 53 - 57. These lines are the colophon of the scribe and ʾnšʾy occurs as a term parallel to ʾsʾr, ʾlmd and ṛb ʾkhʾnm. ʾsʾr is clearly "scribe", ʾlmd is probably "pupil", and ṛb ʾkhʾnm is "chief of the priests". ʾnšʾy must therefore denote a cult official. For the etymology see c. III above.

The following words were prematurely identified as technical terms of sacrifice.

This was thought to be Heb. ṣḥʾn "an offering made by fire", but in every instance it means simply "fire".

ʾkʾle I A B 2:23. Regarded as equivalent to Heb. ᵃˢʾš ʾḏ  "whole burnt offering". It is rather the preposition ʾk plus a root which appears in Accad. as ʾlʾlʾu "a kid".

ʾnbʾlt. II A B 6:23. Dussaud (R.H.R. CV p. 287) suggests that it is a niphal participle from a root corresponding to Heb. ᵃʾš ʾḥ and would therefore be equivalent to Heb. ᵃʾšʾʾš ʾḥ "the installation offering". It is simply Accad. ʾnʾbʾlu "Flame".

ʾṣʾr. 1929 3:43; 5:2 Taken as meaning "tithe". It means "ten".
q.d.m.t. Wrongly restored at 1929, 3:25. Thought to be Phoen. Ḡb7 ("first fruits"). T.H. Gaster suggests (P.E.F.Q.S. 1937 p.206) that first fruits are referred to at ID 214 under the name ḫ1m (Heb ḡ157) but the context is quite uncertain.
CHAPTER V

NOTES.

1. For a recent discussion of the /l 31 3 0 and the /n 1 1 0 see A. Vincent in Dussaud Melanges Syriens pp. 266 ff.

2. For a note on /n 1 5 in which the sacrifice is unsatisfactorily equated with the Hebrew /n 2 n see H. L. Ginsberg A. J. S. L. 1930 p. 52.

3. As the name of a god / s l m appears at 1929, 1:8; 17:12. This is the god that appears in the name "Jerusalem" and this is its earliest occurrence. See Bauer Die Gottheiten von Ras Schamra, Z. A. W. 1933 p. 99.

We may note that in the Minaean inscriptions the altar is sometimes referred to as / m a s l a m - the place of the / s l m (Lagrange - Etudes sur Les Religions Semitiques p. 262).
CHAPTER VI

THE RITUAL OF SACRIFICE.

It is being increasingly understood in recent years that the ritual of Canaanite religion is ultimately to be derived from that of Mesopotamia and Egypt. Every addition to our knowledge of the mythology, ritual and religion of the Fertile Crescent and the Nile valley makes it more and more plain that the cult pattern of the Ancient East formed a well defined unity.

This conclusion is reinforced by the texts discovered at Ras Shamra. The myth of the dying and rising god which has so many affinities with the Tammuz myth of Babylon, the numerous points of resemblance between the Babylonian New Year Festival and Poem II A B, (The Building of a Temple for Aleyan) to take but two examples, point unmistakeably to a Mesopotamian origin. Egyptian influence though not perhaps so prominent is nevertheless clearly discernible. The text 1929: 5 for instance contains a ritual in connection with the god Horus in which a part is played by the divine king. This indicates indisputably an Egyptian source.

The larger texts from Ras Shamra are probably liturgical texts recited and enacted by the priests as a principal part of the observance of the great recurring festivals of the cult. As might be expected from the extensive material
remains of Ugarit civilisation that have survived, the texts reveal the existence of a highly developed ritual in which a complicated sacrificial system stands out prominently. Indeed what the texts reveal is probably the complex ritual of Egypt and Babylon adapted to the needs of an agricultural community. These texts are as yet only imperfectly understood, but it does not fall within the limits of our present purpose to attempt a complete account of the ritual action they describe. We are concerned merely with the ritual of sacrifice. In order to gain a complete picture of the ceremonial that accompanied the act of sacrifice a two-fold enquiry is necessary. We must give an account of those cultic rites of which sacrifice formed part. And secondly we have to consider sacrifice as an institution in itself and ascertain the rites with which it was performed. The former enquiry demands a brief sketch of the various ritual texts.

The chief ritual texts form a cycle of poems in which the central figures are Aleyan Baal, god of the heavens and Mot, god of the earth. The order in which these poems follow each other is not perfectly clear. Poems I A B and I A B probably form a unity. II A B probably describes a separate ritual which may be a New Year Ritual. The poem entitled the Birth of the Beautiful and Gracious Gods (Virolleaud's S 3) is extremely important from the point of
view of ritual. Poem V A B (La Deesse Anat) is probably not a unity, but describes six different rituals. Poems III A B, IV A B (Anat et la genisse) and B H (Les Chasses de Baal) contain no reference to sacrifice.

Poem I A B opens with instructions probably given by Baal to G p n - W - U g r to slay L t n the crooked serpent and the dragon with the seven heads, as a result of which Baal's enemies will be overcome and Mot will yield to him. G p n - W - U g r seeks out Mot in the nether world but apparently fails in his mission, for the next scene describes the drying up of vegetation, a sign of the decreasing vitality of Baal. At last someone reports that Aleyan has submitted to Mot and the latter rejoices. Then follow two columns in a very fragmentary condition. When the narrative again becomes clear Aleyan is ordered to bring the clouds, the winds, and the rain, and eight holy swine to the underworld. The following scene appears to describe a sacred marriage, though its connection with what has preceded is obscure. Aleyan Baal loves a heifer and there is born a child called M ė. The last column announces the death of Aleyan and describes the mourning of L t p n ě l D p ė for the dead Aleyan. The poem concludes with the search for Baal throughout the earth, probably carried out by Anat.

Text I A B would seem to be a continuation of the
previous poem. It opens with the funeral rites for Aleyan Baal performed by Anat. These consist of large sacrifices—seventy wild oxen, seventy bulls, seventy sheep, seventy stags, seventy wild goats and seventy asses. In place of Baal Ishtar is made king and enthroned in the recesses of the north in the seat of Baal. In the second column the mourning of Anat for Aleyan is described. It is likened to the grieving of an animal for its young. Anat appeals to Mot to restore Aleyan, but he refuses. Then follows the much discussed scene generally entitled the "Winnowing of Mot". Anat seizes the ritual sickle, cleaves Mot, grinds him, sows him in the field and scatters him for the birds to eat. Reviving vegetation is now depicted in the form of abundance of oil and honey, a sign that Aleyan is alive. Anat and Shapash then go in search of the resurrected Aleyan who once more regains his throne. After an obscure dialogue between Mot and Aleyan the poem ends with a fierce battle between the two, until it is put to an end by Shapash who announces that El has heard the cry of Aleyan and will break the power of Mot. Mot then disappears and Aleyan reigns once more.

Poem II A B is the longest of the ritual poems and is perhaps the most obscure. As it would seem to recount episodes described in other poems it probably contains an independent ritual.
Column I mentions various temples of various gods and describes the casting of several objects of gold and silver for the temple of El together with an account of its furnishings. Columns II and III are very obscure. The former undoubtedly contains a description of a ritual act in which cultic objects are burned in fire. In column IV we have the incident which gives the poem its name.

Asherat comes as a suppliant to El who receives her kindly and bids her eat food and drink wine. Asherat then prays that a temple may be built for Aleyan, who unlike the other gods, has no temple. š77p7n el D pd agrees to build a temple. The temple is then described—built of cedar and bricks and adorned with silver and gold. The news is carried to Aleyan who rejoices. A feast is then prepared for š77r -w -H ss who erects the temple for Aleyan in the recesses of the north. The next incident is a dispute between Aleyan Baal and š77r -w -H ss as to whether the temple shall be furnished with a window or not. Then follows a description of the temple with its cedars, sacred fire, silver and gold, along with a list of the great sacrifices offered at its dedication, and with perhaps a description of a sacred marriage. Column VII is obscure but we learn from it that Aleyan finally consents to the window proposed by š77r -w -H ss. This appears to end with a dialogue, of which the import is vague, between Aleyan and his enemy Mot.
In these texts we undoubtedly have the liturgies for the major festivals of the cult. They provide the setting in which the cultic sacrifices were offered. Three main sacrificial rites are referred to.

Anat mourning for Aleyan raises him on her shoulder, carries him to the recesses of the north, and offers large sacrifices - incense, seventy wild oxen, seventy bulls, seventy sheep, seventy stags, seventy wild goats, seventy asses. We know that funerary sacrifices were offered at the tombs of Ugarit (see c. VII) and in the ritual of which the liturgy is preserved in poem I A B funerary sacrifices were probably offered as described. The dead god may have been represented by a statue.

I A B 2:30-37. The well known scene of the Winnowing of Mot.
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"She seizes Mot the son of the gods
With the sickle she cleaves him
With a flail she winnows him
With the fire she burns him
With the mill she grinds him
In the field she scatters him
That the birds may eat his flesh
To complete his fate."

The only difficulty in the translation of this passage is in the last line. Dussaud (R.H.R. CIV 1931 p.388) takes kārāh to be the equivalent of Heb. kārā "leaven," and connects garm with Heb. garm "to restrain" and translates "his leaven to eat and the prohibition of his portion to end," i.e. by the sacrifice of Mot Anat removes the prohibition against the eating of leaven. The translation adopted here, which is substantially that of Virolleaud (Syria XII p.206) Albright (J.P.O.S. XII p.200) and Montgomery (X.A.O.S. 1933 p.106) seems to be more natural.

In this ritual sacrifice we have clearly a reproduction of the operations of harvest. Since the texts were first deciphered it has been recognised that we have here a reference to two festivals well known to anthropologists - the festivals of the last sheaf and of first fruits. The passage is important as it is the completest description preserved of the rites connected with the festival of the last sheaf.
The rite of the last sheaf is performed at the end of the harvest. The spirit of vegetation takes refuge in the last sheaf to be cut or in an animal found in the field when the harvesters approach the last sheaf. The sheaf is burned, sometimes with the animal bound up in it and the ashes are scattered over the field. As a result of this ritual the god of vegetation who is in danger of death when the harvest is being cut, is restored to life again.

The appropriateness of the ritual described in our text to this festival is obvious. Six ritual acts are described. Anat seizes a sheaf, cuts off the ears, threshes them, roasts the grain, grinds them and scatters them in the field. In consequence we are told that Aleyan, god of vegetation, comes to life again. (whm by aleyan b'l whm es z b'l b'l arg "Behold Aleyan Baal lives, behold Zebul exists, lord of the earth.")

The Winnowing of Mot is also regarded as a prototype of the festival of first-fruits. In Israel the first fruits were offered at the commencement of the feast of JWD. On the first day a sheaf of corn was brought to the priest who presented it as a wave offering (Lev. 23: 10-11). We learn from Lev. 2:14 that the first fruit had to consist of "corn in the ear parched with fire, bruised corn of the fresh ear". Further details of the ceremony are preserved in Josephus (Ant. III 10, 5 251) and in the Mishnah (Menachoth X 3-4). The first sheaf of the harvest was solemnly cut
and threshed. The grain was winnowed in the court of the temple, boiled and ground in a mill of brass. A portion was then burnt on the altar and the remainder was given to the priests. (See de Vaux, R.B. 1937 pp. 549 ff.) The resemblance of the ritual here described to that of the Ugaritian text is obvious.

A similar rite would seem to be referred to in the poem Danel (I D 66-67) where at the conclusion of the harvest Aqhat is put to death by an associate of Anat. Aqhat is described as the son of Yâdâ, a frequent epithet of Mot.

The ritual killing of Mot and Aqhat is described as being performed in connection with the grain harvest. In a passage in poem II A B (II A B 4: 4-15) Dussaud believes he finds trace of a ritual of the same nature for the vine harvest. (R.H.R. 1931 pp. 355 ff.).
Busauud claims that Qadesh Amurru is another name for Anat and this increases the probability that we have here a fertility rite intended to revivify the withered vine.

The third outstanding sacrificial rite in the Aleyan Baal cycle is the great sacrifice offered at the dedication of the temple of Baal. (II A B 6:49-53). When the building and adorning of the temple were completed, and the sacred fire had been introduced into the sanctuary, great sacrifices were offered and the seventy sons of Asherat are summoned to a banquet.
"He sacrificed oxen and sheep
He sacrificed bulls and fatlings
Calves of a year old, lambs, fowls and kids.
He cries aloud on his brethren in his house
His companions in the midst of his temple.
He summons the seventy sons of Asherat
He gives the gods lambs and wine
He gives the goddesses ewe lambs
He gives the gods oxen and wine
He gives the goddesses heifers
He gives the gods sedes and wine
He gives the goddesses sedes
He gives the gods a concubine and wine
He gives the goddesses a male."

It is worth noting that only male animals were offered to the gods and only female animals to the goddesses, and that the sacrificial banquet seems to have culminated in a hieros gamos.

The dedication ritual is known in Mesopotamia. We have for example the building and dedication of a temple to Marduk by the other gods, as the reward of his triumph over Tiamat. Sacrifices were also offered at the dedication of earthly temples. Thus a sacrificial ritual was enacted at the dedication by Ashurnasirpal of the temple built by him to his god in Calah. (Jastrow, The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, p. 215).
The ceremonial at the dedication of Baal's temple at once suggests the ritual at the opening of Solomon's temple (1 Kings 8-9). In both instances large sacrifices were offered (1 Kings 8: 52). The temple of Solomon was dedicated in the seventh month (1 Kings 2:2). This was the month of rains, and therefore the season when Aleyan Baal was in the ascendant. These parallels would seem to suggest a Canaanite source for the Hebrew ritual.

One rite in the consecration of the temple of Baal has been thought to be parallel to a rite in the Jewish festival of Hanukkah. (See S.H. Hooke op. cit. p. 42). When Aleyan's temple is completed and immediately before the dedicatory sacrifices are offered the sacred flame is lighted. (test b>bbhtm nblat b kk lm II AB 6: 22-23). This may be the prototype of the lighting of the lamps in the Hanukkah - the festival of the dedication of the altar in the temple at Jerusalem after its destruction by Antiochus Epiphanes. (See O.S. Rankin, The Origin of the Festival of Hanukkah o.3). The celebration of this historical event was professedly the purpose of the festival, though it may probably have had a much more ancient origin.

The poem V A B (Anat) which Virolleaud would place at the head of the Aleyan Baal cycle, though much of it is obscure, contains descriptions of several sacrificial rites.
"Then he takes a thousand jars
He mixes ten thousand jars of wine
While mixing he raises himself and sings
To the accompaniment of cymbals he sings a pleasant song."

The subject is Mot. He mixes the wine for Aleyan who is about to ascend to the heights of the north. We have here probably a piece of ritual enacted by the priests as they recited the poem.

V AB B 15-16. An account of the bloody battle in which Anat exterminates the people of the sea shore (h p y m), and the West (g a t g p e). On its conclusion Anat plunges her knees into the blood of her victims. In all likelihood the celebrants of the ritual ceremonially smeared themselves with blood. The significance of the blood bath is discussed in the following chapter.

V AB. B 38-40
"She draws her water and scatters it, (on the soil)
The dew of heaven which is the fat of the earth
Do thou increase O rider of the clouds."

Water is scattered on the ground to obtain increase of
dew which is regarded as the agent that promotes the growth
of plants, undoubtedly a fertility rite.

V AB, C, 11-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>qry</th>
<th>spr</th>
<th>mlhmt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>st</td>
<td>b'prt</td>
<td>adym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sk</td>
<td>slm</td>
<td>lkbda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arb</td>
<td>dd</td>
<td>lkbdsam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hsk</td>
<td>sk</td>
<td>bsk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Offer me plates of food on the earth
Place mandrakes on the ground
Pour the peace offering into the heart of the earth
Pour the vessel into the heart of the fields
Then thy orchard, thy wood, thy husbandry will be
my care."

Manifestly a fertility rite. If the prescribed rites
were carried out Aleyan Baal would ensure the fruitfulness
of the soil. At Ugarit the fertility cult was probably close-
ly bound up with the cult of the dead as it was in many other
ancient societies. The excavations at Ras Shamra have un-
earthed ritual deposits exactly corresponding to those mention-
ed in the text (Schaeffer - The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra-
Ugarit Plate XXVIII). The aphrodisiacal qualities of the mandrake are well known, and their employment in a fertility rite can be easily understood.

From the archaeological remains excavated at Ras Shamra it is clear that funerary rites occupied a prominent place in the cult. The utensils used in these rites have already been described (c.11). Apart from the passage just considered the texts do not preserve any funerary ritual that might be regarded as corresponding to the archaeological remains. There are of course scenes in which sacrifices were offered in connection with the dead (e.g. I AB 1:19-28 in which Anat offers sacrifice after she has buried Aleyan). These scenes make it clear that a funerary cult existed, but they give no information as to any distinctive ritual.

Of equal importance from a ritual point of view is the text named "The Birth of the Beautiful and Gracious Gods". It is uncertain whether this text preserves a list of liturgies for recitation at various festivals or whether it represents the ritual for a single festival, but the apparent repetition of various scenes perhaps renders the former view more probable. Much of the text is obscure but the following rites may be identified with certainty.

55 5-11. A ritual pruning of the vines in which mention is made of Mot and his sceptre of barrenness. This may point to a ritual celebrating the end of Mot's rule.
3.3 14-15. The ritual of seething a kid in milk.
If this rite formed part of a Canaanite fertility ceremony
the prohibition in the book of the Covenant can readily be
understood.

3.3 37-43. El plucks a bird, roasts it on a brazier
and throws it to the skies. S. H. Hooke compares this "with
the slaying of the bird which is the symbol of a god in the
seals from Tell Asmar" (op. cit. p. 35).

3.3 50-60. The next act is a ritual marriage between
El and two goddesses and the announcement that as a result
of this union there is born the beautiful and gracious gods.

The concluding lines of the poem appear to describe
the ritual sojourn in the wilderness of a goddess and
hierodules together with ritual ceremonies which include
sacrifice.

S. H. Hooke (op. cit. p. 35) interprets lines 16-30 as a
water ritual in which the priests carry water in basins from
the sea to the temple to induce El to send down the early
rain. The text however at this point is very difficult and
cannot be translated with certainty.

Text 1929:5 consists of three parts of which the first
(lines 1-8) preserves a ritual celebrated in honour of the
god Horus. Astarte introduces Horus into the palace of the
king. Garments are then placed on a god named S t r m t,
Horus is placed three fields from the house and sacrifices
(g l m m) of a lamb, an ox, and three sheep are offered. A ritual of some kind is then performed seven times before the gods. This text shows that Egyptian elements were present in the Canaanite pantheon as early as the middle of the second millennium B.C.

The sacrificial rites we have discussed were probably enacted as part of the celebration of the great festivals of the agricultural year. The institution of sacrifice at Ugarit however was highly developed and there were probably many other sacrificial rites connected with minor festivals which have not survived. The smaller texts published in Syra X (R.3, 1929) point in this direction.

Text 1929:3 would appear to prescribe the ritual and the offerings for each day of a month. At line 48 we have the words b y m b d e s a n a m l's t r t "on the day of the new moon two lambs for Astarte". This would indicate the existence at Ugarit of a new moon festival. There are signs that Danel was connected with the cult of the moon. (Danel p. 201). Lunar festivals had an important place in the cult of the Babylonians and ancient Arabs (Nielsen - Die Altarabische Mondreligion pp. 49 ff.), and the many references to moon worship in the Old Testament are well known.

We have discussed the cult rituals of which sacrifice was a constituent part. We have now to consider sacrifice in
itself, and ascertain the rites with which the offering of
it was accompanied.

Undoubtedly at Ugarit, as among all peoples, acts of
reverence were performed on the approach to the sanctuary
and the altar. The necessity was felt of purifying oneself
before coming in contact with the spiritual influence with
which the sacred place was surrounded, lest the sanctuary
might be defiled by the impurity of the secular world. It
was also necessary to take precautions against any injury
that might result from improper contact with the "mana" of
the sacred place. Thus among the Phoenicians special attire
was worn on ritual occasions (R. Smith op. cit. p. 453). In
pagan Mecca the Bedouin encircled the Ka’bah without any
clothing (ibid p. 451). Among the Israelites the performance
of sacred rites was always preceded and followed by the wash­
ing of the worshipper’s garments. (Lev. 6:27; 16:26, 28).
The same idea is behind the words of Ex. 3:5 "Put off thy shoes
from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is
holy ground".

That the Ugaritians were probably familiar with the idea
of ritual tabu we have already seen, (c. III), though no
purification ritual appears to have been preserved. A ritual
of similar intention however seems to be referred to at
K 75-76.
"Raise thy hand to the heavens,

Then sacrifice to thy father the bull El"

The raising of the hand is the natural attitude of prayer, but the action would appear to have additional significance from the fact that several Babylonian sculptures depict the worshipper entering the sanctuary with raised hand. (Weber. Altorientalische Siegelbilder plate 442 a - quoted by Oesterly op.cit.p.57). We are reminded of the words in Psalm 63:4 "So will I bless thee while I live. I will lift up my hands in thy name." On the stela of the god mšl of Beth-Shan the king and his son stand before the god with hand upraised (Lods op.cit.Plate X). Above the inscription of Jehaw-milk of Byblus the king is depicted with the left hand raised, while with the right he offers a bowl to the goddess (N 3 I p.19).

Well known is the ritual act of stroking or kissing the altar or pillar in which the god was thought to reside. The practice was common among the Arabs, though women were not allowed to kiss the stones (Wellhausen op.cit.pp.56,69). The excavations at Gezer revealed the much discussed row of seven large pillars with an eighth smaller one standing a little apart. The top of this smaller stone has been worn away and presents a smooth polished surface. It has been
suggested that this is due to ritual rubbing or anointing on the part of the worshippers. (Macalister P.B.F.Q.S. 1903 p.28). A similar custom among the Israelites is witnessed to by Gen 28:2 where it is recorded that "Jacob rose up early in the morning and took the stone that he had put under his head and set it up for a pillar and poured oil upon the top of it". The same practice would seem to be referred to at 1 Kings 19:18 "Yet will I leave me seven thousand in Israel, all the knee of which have not bowed down to Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him."

In the temple of Baal at Ugarit a stela has been discovered showing the god Baal brandishing a club in one hand and a thunderbolt in the other. (Schaeffer op.cit. Plate XXXII). The top of the stela has been worn away, and this may be due to libations having been poured over it or to its having been rubbed away by the worshippers.

Everywhere associated with cult ritual and with sacrifice is the ritual procession. In Arabic and Hebrew the general word for a festival is ḫāq, which means a procession or a ritual dance. Among the Arabs an important act in the cult consisted in encircling the sacred stone. (R.Smith op.cit. p340). The sacred procession figured prominently in Babylonian ritual, especially in the New Year festival, when the procession of Marduk from E-sagil to the festival house and back again took place (see C.G.Gadd in Myth and Ritual p.57). In Israel
the existence of the sacred procession as part of the cult is generally admitted. In the historical books it is mentioned at 2 Sam.6, and almost certainly referred to in Psalms 24: 7-10; 42:4; 68:25, and others.

As might be expected the sacred procession is found also at Ugarit. It is probably referred to at II A B 4:15-26, where Asherat, Qadesh and Amurru come in procession to El to beg a house for Baal. We have already noted that the sacred dance is probably referred to at S S 65-67, where women are described as encircling the sacred stone (m.q.p.t 'd). Dancing as an accompaniment of sacrifice is referred to at I D 189, where the sacrifice of d g s t is offered in the presence of m r q d m i.e. dancers. (Heb. 7('r)).

Sacrifice in the Ancient East was predominantly eucharistic in character, and was therefore naturally offered to the accompaniment of music. That sacrifices in Israel were regularly accompanied by music is evident from Ex.32:6, 17-19 and Amos 5:21-23. The custom is attested at Ugarit by V A B A 15-19 and I D 188. In both instances the musical instrument referred to is m s l t m — cymbals (Heb. 07nS5^n).

Among the Israelites as among other primitive peoples significance was attached to ritual fasting. The purpose of fasting was probably to influence god as for example in the fast described at 1 Sam.14:24, where the Israelites, being worsted in battle by the Philistines, a fast was imposed in
the hope that it might induce Jahweh to grant victory.

Fasting is thus naturally associated with sacrifice as a means of increasing the potency of sacrifice. In the Ugaritian texts fasting and sacrifice are mentioned together at ID 152.

Sacrificial ritual may be deduced from the technical terms employed to describe the act of sacrifice.

The common term šbḥ means "to slaughter". The term no doubt connoted the conventional manner in which the sacrificial victim was killed, but this meaning has not survived. We know that in Israel the victim was first of all killed, then flayed and cut in pieces (Lev. 1:6), but no corresponding information has been preserved in the Ugaritian texts. Other terms used to denote the slaughtering of the victim are ṭbḥ, hrq, šḥḥ. It is possible that these may have denoted different methods of killing.

Liquid offerings were poured out on the ground or over the altar. This is denoted in Ugaritian by the verbs ṣgq, nsk, arb. Sometimes the liquid was sprinkled over the altar as in certain sacrifices among the Israelites (Ex. 24:6; Lev. 17:6). In Hebrew and Ugaritian this was denoted by the root drq.

A third method of devoting the sacrificial victim to the god was by means of fire. The holocaust is denoted in Ugaritian by the noun srp and the act of burning the sacrifice by the verb ṣgql.

In certain sacrifices the presentation of the offering
to the priest or on the altar conformed to a definite ritual. Two terms denoting such a ritual have survived ṃ₇₃ and ṃ₇₃₄ (see c.V). Both undoubtedly denote a wave ritual though the distinction, if any, between the two has not been preserved.

A fundamental part of many types of sacrifice among all ancient peoples was the sacred meal. Part of the offering was laid on the altar and the remainder furnished a meal for the worshippers. Many references to the meal sacrifice are to be found in the Ugaritian texts as for example at I A B 6:42-43; II A B 6:40-53. The existence of the sacrificial meal is shown also by the technical use of the root ḫ₄ with this meaning. (see c.V).
CHAPTER VI

NOTES.

1. For Egyptian elements at Ras Shamra see Gaster - Ras Shamra and Egypt. Ancient Egypt 1934 pp. 33 ff.

2. In addition to the points already noted, the following traces of Babylonian influence at Ugarit may be noted:-
   I AB 1:25-28. The search of Anat for Aleyen. This recalls the search of Zarpanit for Marduk.
   I AB 2:31-37. The Winnowing of Mot. Recalls the cleaving of Tiamat by Marduk. II AB 1:32. At the inauguration of Baal’s temple honey is offered.
   Honey was the symbol of inauguration and was employed at the dedication of temples and images. II AB 6:40-54. The banquet at the conclusion of the dedicatory festival may be compared to the banquet in the akitu festival where the victor of Tiamat is entertained along with the other gods.

3. Lucian’s description of the sacred dance at the spring festival of Hierapolis is well known. Live birds, sheep, goats and other animals were hung on trees and encircled by the procession. For dancing round the sacrifice in general see Oesterly, The Sacred Dance pp. 94 ff.
4. Communion meals are frequent themes of North Syrian seals, many of which depict worshippers eating and drinking in the presence of a bull or goddess. For bibliography see Cook Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology p. 39.
CHAPTER VII

THE THEORY OF SACRIFICE.

The general conception of sacrifice afforded by the preceding pages is that of a very complex institution. The ritual and terminology are highly developed, the material of which sacrifices are composed is so varied, and the presiding officials are so thoroughly organised, that there can be no doubt that sacrifice at Ugarit was a very elaborate institution. In these circumstances we shall not expect to find that the texts bear witness merely to one theory of the nature and significance of sacrifice. In so complicated a rite we shall be prepared to discover that sacrifices were offered for many purposes, and that the potency of sacrifice was accounted for on more than one theory. The question arises however, whether one or more of these theories can be regarded as supplying a motive for which sacrifices were originally offered, by those whose ideas found expression in the texts. In the present chapter therefore we shall give an account of the theories under which the various sacrifices can be subsumed, and shall then go on to enquire what information the texts furnish concerning sacrificial origins.

It has often been observed that the chief purpose of cultic rites throughout the world is to secure the supply of food and children. As Sir James Fraher says "To live and to
cause to live, to eat food and to beget children, these are the primary wants of man in the past, and they will be the primary wants of man in the future so long as the world lasts. Other things may be added to enrich and to beautify human life, but unless these wants are satisfied, humanity itself must cease to exist. These two things therefore, food and children, were what man chiefly sought to procure by the performance of magical rites for the regulation of the seasons". (Golden Bough pt.IV Adonis p.5).

This is abundantly illustrated by the Ugaritian texts. The most prominent ritual in these texts is that of the Aleyan Baal cycle of poems, which is undoubtedly the Canaanite form of the great New Year ritual familiar in its Egyptian and Babylonian forms. It is well known that the ultimate purpose of this great feast was the maintenance of natural fertility. The whole series of rites centred round the person of the divine king who was regarded as the representative of the god, and the belief was that everything done to promote the prosperity of the king resulted in the welfare of the community. Consequently a similar purpose must have been attached to all sacrifices offered in connection with this great festival. We have therefore at the outset one fundamental purpose for which sacrifices were offered - the maintenance and increase of life. In illustration we must refer to several of the sacrifices already described in the preceding chapter.
The central sacrifice in this connection is of course the Winnowing of Mot (I AB 2:31-36). We have here undoubtedly the early Canaanite form of the Tammuz-Adonis myth. We have already noticed that this ceremony reflects more of agricultural civilisation than its Babylonian counterpart, and preserves the ritual of first fruits and the last sheaf. These rites are to be found among nearly all peoples and are coeval with the dawn of agriculture. (Frazer op. cit. pt. VII. Spirits of the Corn and the Wild). Two ideas underlie these vegetation rites wherever they are enacted — a negative and a positive idea. The purpose of the rites is not only to continue the fertility of the soil, but also to expel famine and death. Among many peoples an image of the corn spirit was made from the newly cut sheaves and after being the subject of various rituals was regarded as possessing the power of restoring fertility to the soil from which the harvest had been taken, and also of banishing death and want. But to maintain the vital powers, positive action was not enough. It was felt that life could be maintained only by driving out the powers of death. In this way we are to interpret the slaying of Mot by Anat, and the combat between Mot and Aleyan. By the conquest of Mot, the god of death, Aleyan the god of fruitification is brought to life, "the heavens rain down oil and the streams cause honey to flow" (I AB 2:4 f.) and want is driven out.
If the liberation and strengthening of life was the aim of these vegetation rites, then it follows that the sacrifices offered in connection with them must have been made with a similar end in view.

In the fertility rites of the poem "The Birth of the Beautiful and Gracious Gods" are included sacrifices which must have been offered for the same purpose. These we have already discussed (c.VI). Two sacrifices are described. Lines 14-15 contain the ritual for sacrificing a kid in milk, and lines 37-48 give an account of how El roasts a bird in the fire. Being part of a larger vegetation ritual we must conclude that these sacrifices were offered in the belief that they would strengthen the life giving powers of nature.

Two sacrificial rites from the poem V AB (Anat) must be mentioned next. V AB B 38-40 is a fertility sacrifice.

"She draws her water and scatters it in the soil.
The dew of heaven, which is the fat of the earth
Do thou increase, O rider of the clouds."

Here it is expressly stated that the purpose of the libation is to assist the growth of vegetation.

Of similar significance is the sacrifice described at V AB, C, 11-15.

"Offer me plates of food on the earth,
Place mandrakes on the ground,
Pour the peace offering into the heart of the earth,
Pour the vessel into the heart of the fields,
Then thy orchard, thy wood, thy husbandry will be
my care."

Nothing could be more explicit than that the object of
these sacrifices was to promote those beneficent powers of
nature on which the welfare of the community depended.

Here then we have a group of sacrifices all based on
the theory that the purpose for which they were offered was
to augment and strengthen the vital powers of nature. The
fertility rites of which they formed part are among the most
widespread of all religious and cultural rites, and there is
ground for believing that they belong to the most primitive
of such institutions. Hence we must conclude that the life-
giving purpose is a primitive and fundamental idea in the
history of sacrifice.

The same idea would seem to underlie those sacrifices
that formed part of funerary rites. It was not only the
forces of nature that required to be strengthened by the out-
pouring of life. It was believed by many primitive peoples
that the soul, in the state into which it entered after death,
retained those wants that had characterised its previous
existence. This need was met by providing at the grave of
the departed offerings of food and drink, and sometimes also
offerings were made of those artifacts the deceased had used
during life, and which presumably he would require in his
new abode. It would appear from the care with which they
disposed of their dead that the religious longings of the
men of the Stone Age in Palestine found expression in a cult
of the dead. (Graham and May op. cit. pp. 24 ff.). Similar
beliefs were entertained by the Canaanites. Thus in the
graves at Gezer there have been found knives, cups, dishes
and weapons. Some of the dishes contained the remains of
food and the remains of calcined animals have also been dis­
covered. (Lods op. cit. p. 115). These remains bear witness
to a cult in which sacrifices were offered to sustain the
life of spirits. The Old Testament provides many instances
of the practice of this cult by the Israelites. The
Deuteronomist forbids the offering of hair and blood to the
dead. (Deut. 14:1). Hair and blood are well known to have
been regarded by primitive peoples as mana-possessed, and
there can be no doubt that the purpose of these offerings
forbidden to the Israelites was to communicate life to the
dead. (See also Jer. 16:6; Ezek. 27:31). Sacrifices to the
dead are also mentioned in the Old Testament. They might
take the form of a meal, part of which was consumed by the
worshipper and part bestowed on the dead. (Deut. 26:12-14;
Ps. 106:28). Epigraphic evidence of the custom of offering
sacrifice to the god is afforded by the inscription of
Panammu (N.S.I. 61). This inscription does not indeed record
a mortuary offering, but it makes clear that Panammu hoped
to live in the presence of his god after death and partake of
the sacrifices offered to him.

We have already described (c.II) the devices employed in the cult of the dead at Ugarit which archaeological excavation has uncovered, the purpose of which was undoubtedly to convey nourishment to the dead. The cult of the dead is also referred to in the texts. ID 170-189 describes how Danel, mourning for the death of his son, and in despair at the refusal of Anat to punish the murderer, returns to his palace and offers up sacrifice on behalf of the departed, with the intention no doubt of increasing within him the vital force. IV D, a fragment of the Danel poem contains the words *rpm tlhmn rpm tstyn*

"Ye will eat O shades, ye will drink O shades." These lines make clear beyond doubt that the purpose of the mortuary sacrifice was to maintain the life of the dead. We have also the large sacrifice recorded at IAB 17-29. Anat has buried Aleyan Baal in the heights of the north and completes her mourning by offering to the gods of the underworld (e1m a r g) large sacrifices. These sacrifices we are told were offered *k g m n a l e y n B 1 l* which we may venture to translate "that Aleyan Baal may benefit."

(For *g m n* cf. Heb. *§a§a*). Whether we adopt this rendering or not it is quite clear that the sacrifices were offered to ensure the welfare of Aleyan in the underworld.

We must now ask in what sense sacrifices were regarded
as renewing the life of gods and spirits. The question is readily answered when we remember that primitive peoples entertained extremely anthropomorphic ideas of their gods. The gods were regarded as having exactly the same physical wants as man, and as satisfying these wants in the same way. In a very real sense, therefore, sacrificial offerings were regarded as the food of the gods. Like men, the gods required to be nourished by food, and food was conveyed to them by means of sacrifices. Thus among the Hebrews, the shew bread (דָּבָכָה) was thought of as being placed in the temple for the sustenance of Jahweh. Sacrifices were regularly called "food of the gods" (הָנָּשָׁךְ הָנָּשָׁךְ) by the priestly writer (e.g. Lev. 26:1). That the idea lingered long among the Hebrews is made plain by the fervid denial of the author of Psalm 50 that Jahweh ate "the flesh of bulls or drank the blood of goats".

The Ras Shamra texts contain many scenes in which the gods are depicted as physically eating and drinking. It will be sufficient to refer to two such scenes. At II A B 4: 20-38 Anat comes before El as a suppliant to beg a temple for Aleyan. El receives her kindly and sets food and drink (וְּהָנָּשָׁךְ, יָנָךְ) before her. At II D 2: 29-38 it is expressly stated that the purpose of offering a sacrifice is to cause the gods to eat and drink.

By physically consuming the sacrificial meal then, the
gods at Ugarit, like the gods of other peoples, were regarded as strengthening their vital powers. Another theory by which the life strengthening properties of sacrifice were explained has still to be referred to.

G. Elliot Smith in his "The Evolution of the Dragon" has shown how the origins of magic and religion are intimately bound up with substances that may be termed "life givers". These substances - such as blood, shells, gold - were regarded, for various reasons, as being associated with life-force. For our present purpose we are concerned chiefly with the use of blood as a life giver. Abundant evidence has been adduced to show how widespread was the idea that the life of an organism resided in the blood. The evidence ranges from the well known magical drawings of Palaeolithic times, found in the caves of France and Spain, to the Intichiuma rites of Central Australia. Regarded as the soul substance by which the organism was animated, life giving properties came very naturally to be attached to blood. This blood was given to strengthen the living, as for example in the case of mothers of the Orinoco who "prick their tongues to nourish a delicate child". (E.O. James, Origins of Sacrifice p.27). From this it is an easy step to the belief that the dead can be revivified or strengthened by blood. "In the classical mythology of Greece and Rome it is this belief which finds expression in the story of the visit of Odysseus to the underworld by
way of the land of the Kimmerians. Here he dug a trench and poured into it the blood of black victims, and soon the shades gathered round clamouring for the blood. When their requests were granted, their memories of the upper world and the power of speech returned to them". (James op. cit. p. 28).

Sometimes a surrogate was used as is found in the Paleolithic internments at Grimaldi in the Italian Riviera. "Thus the body of a man of Cro-Magnon type in La Grotte du Cavillon was covered with red ochreous powder which had stained the bones". (James op. cit. p. 29). The same idea would seem to underlie the institution of Totemism and those rites widely prevalent among primitive peoples, which are based on the belief that particular and peculiar relationships exist between individuals or tribes and certain animal species. Primitive man recognised no distinction himself and the animals. Both shared in the same life, and in the ritual eating of the sacred animal, the life of the animal species and of man is strengthened by the outpoured blood, and a mystic bond established between the two. "From time immemorial" there, "blood has been regarded as the restorer of life to the dead, the bestower of health and strength to the living, and the sacred bond uniting those who possessed a common soul substance". (James op. cit. p. 48).

Many passages in the Old Testament make it abundantly clear that the Israelites regarded the blood of animals in
special veneration as being the seat of life. There are first of all the many prohibitions forbidding the drinking of blood. (e.g. Deut.12:16; 15:23; 1 Sam.14:34). There would be no point in these prohibitions unless they were made for a special reason, and the reason is not lacking. "And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among them, that eateth any manner of blood, I will set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood" (Lev.17:10,11. See also Gen.9:4, Deut.12:23). The blood was so sacred as containing the life that in sacrifices it was poured out at the base of the altar and formed Jehovah's share in the sacrifice. (Ex.29:12; Lev.4:18) Sometimes the blood was scattered or sprinkled upon the altar (Ex.29:20). But though the Law forbade the drinking of blood, men continued to drink it, on account of the vital power that was supposed to inhere in it and in the hope of increasing their own vitality. This practice would seem to be referred to at Ezek.33:25; Zeoh.9:7. An interesting incident is that recorded at 1 Kings 22:38 which describes the death of Ahab and recounts that the harlots washed themselves in his blood. Their motive for bathing in the blood of the king was undoubtedly that they might receive increase of life-power.

The evidence that the Ugaritians regarded blood as
possessed of life giving qualities is not voluminous, but is
decisive. We may consider first of all a passage in the
poem Keret (lines 62-64) which describes a rite performed by
Keret at the command of El before entering on his great combat.

\[ \text{wtrhg wtadm} \]
\[ \text{rgh ydk smt} \]
\[ \text{msg b'tk'dekm} \]

"Thou shalt bathe and be red,
Wash thy hands up to the elbows,
Even thy fingers up to the shoulder."

The ablutions are followed by sacrifices. The purpose of
Keret's making himself red by means of blood or a surrogate
cannot be doubted. He covers himself with blood in order to
avail himself of the strengthening power that resides in
blood, thereby preparing himself for the fight in which he is
soon to be engaged. Various rites, many of them of a self-
denying character were performed by combatants and their
women folk in primitive times (R. Smith op. cit. p640) and
nothing could be more natural than that the warrior should
seek to appropriate to himself an increase of vitality from
the life giving blood.

A somewhat similar scene is described at V A B B 5-15.
After a bloody combat in which she slaughters the inhabitants of
the Levant, Anat thrusts her knees into the blood of the
\[ \text{s'mr} \] (bkrm t11 bdm s'mr). In all
probability we have here more than the description of a particularly bloody battle. We have a reference to the blood bath. Anat is exhausted after her fight and reanimates herself with lustrations of blood. She is thus strengthened to take part in the various combats against the enemies of Aleyan Baal described in the sequel. If, as it would appear, the blood in which Anat bathes herself is human blood, we have here evidence of the peculiar potency of human sacrifice.

If our interpretation of V A B C 17 is correct the blood libation would appear to have been offered at Ugarit in order to secure the fertility of the soil. The passage is obscure but it seems to be a continuation of lines 11-15 which we have already noticed (o.VI) certainly describe a fertility rite.

Further evidence that the sacrificial blood was endowed by the Ugaritians with life-giving properties is furnished by two lines in the Danel epic - III D 1:24

```
8 p k k m  a e y d m
k m  s h t  l b r k h
```

"Pour the blood like the sacrificer
Pour it like the sacrificer to bless him."

Beneficent powers are regarded as inhering in the blood.

Mention may be made also of the phrase *d m ś g m*, "blood of trees" (II A B 4:38), with which may be compared the Heb. "blood of grapes". The life giving
forces of nature are compared to blood, the type of all vital power.

It is clear then that at Ugarit blood was treated as the symbol and vehicle of life. It follows therefore that a fundamental purpose of sacrifice was the desire to liberate life. The death of the victim set free life-force which then became available for the purpose desired by the worshipper. The sacrificial blood was regarded as being potent in two main directions. It might increase the life force of the worshippers or the gods. This is directly stated as being one purpose of sacrifice at II D 5:16-17 'āḇ e m r b p ḫ d l n p s K ʾ r - w - ḫ s s - "Sacrifice a lamb with a mature lamb for the life K ʾ r ʾ w - ḫ s s." The n p s/ was regarded by the Canaanites as the seat of physical life. And secondly the blood might ensure fertility to the soil.

A second principle underlying the offering of sacrifice is to be detected in a form of sacrifice which is found among all peoples - the common meal sacrifice. As is well known R. Smith regarded this as the original and fundamental type of sacrifice. As to its significance he believed that the purpose of sacrifice "was to provide the material for an act of sacrificial communion with the god ...... animal sacrifices are essentially acts of communion between the god and his worshipper" (op. cit. pp. 245 ff.). This theory was closely
connected with Totemism. The sacrificial meal was originally a totem feast. The same blood circulated in the veins of the worshippers and their god, and by eating its flesh, an act of communion was established between them. Whether or not we agree with R. Smith's theory of the origin of the idea of communion, there can be no doubt that the notion of sacramental union with the god played a large part in the history of sacrifice.

Another idea underlying the communion sacrifice has been suggested. "Among many primitive peoples there was the custom of holding a funeral feast shortly prior to the burial: at this feast the mourners ate, as they believed, in company with the spirit of the departed. It was a widespread belief that for a certain time after death, but before burial, the spirit of the departed remained in closer proximity to the body than later. Therefore to remain in touch with the departed this meal was partaken of. Further according to another widely prevalent view there were certain days in the year in which the spirits of the departed were specially approachable: it was therefore the custom at such times for the relatives of the deceased to assemble at the grave side or near the tomb and to eat and drink, and to pour out water for the benefit of the departed. Thus in the sacred spot a feast took place at which the spirit of the departed was believed to be present. In this way a bond of union with the
departed was kept up" (Oesterly op. cit. p. 155).

From these two sources the idea of sacramental communion may have arisen, and it can be easily understood how the idea thus originating would be transferred to other sacrifices.

In Israel the communion meal was the 泂อง or as it is more frequently designated the 泂องeten. In this sacrifice the fat and blood of the victim were the only parts that came on the altar, the rest forming a sacred meal for the worshippers. That the common meal sacrifice was regarded by the Israelites as cementing a union between them and Jahweh may be seen from a variety of considerations. The blood of the sacrificial victim might not be eaten by the Israelites, but was scattered on the altar. One reason for this prohibition was that the blood was Jahweh's share in the feast. When therefore the Israelites came to the sanctuary where Jahweh had his abode, to eat before him (Deut. 12:16; 15:20 etc.) Jahweh, by receiving the blood, was conceived as joining in the sacred meal. In this way, by the mere act of eating together, a bond of communion would be effected, which would be strengthened when it was remembered that the flesh which the worshippers consumed had formerly been animated by the blood given over to Jahweh. Thus both god and devotee were brought into communion and strengthened by partaking of the same vital force.
The presence of the common meal sacrifice at Ugarit is well attested. It is sufficient to refer to the many ritual banquets described as accompanying sacrifice (e.g., II A B 6:49-58; II D 2:29:38). The technical terms for this type of sacrifice may have been $\text{akl}$ and $\text{q}^1$ (See c. V above).

When thinking of the common meal sacrifice we must be careful not to attach to the idea of communion a meaning too abstract or spiritualised. Some writers have developed an idea of communion through sacrifice which is much too metaphysical to correspond to the ideas of primitive peoples. It is sufficient to posit that as men felt themselves closely united to each other as a result of partaking in a common meal, so they believed that in a similar manner the sacrificial meal established an analogous bond between them and their god.

Here then is another purpose for which sacrifices were offered at Ugarit - to effect communion between the worshipper and the god. It is true it is nowhere stated in the texts that sacrifices were offered with this end in view, but we must conclude that the same theory of the common meal sacrifice held good among the Ugaritians as among other Semitic peoples.

From its nature the sacrificial meal was regarded as the appropriate concomitant of rites which had for their purpose the forming of a union between individuals and groups, e.g., initiatory ceremonies, making of covenants etc. In the
Old Testament, for instance, there are many references to the sacrificial meal eaten when a covenant was made. Thus to take only one example, Gen. 26: 26-30 records how the covenant made between Isaac and Abimelech was sealed by a feast. "Let there now be an oath betwixt us, even betwixt us and thee, and let us make a covenant with thee . . . . and he made them a feast and they did eat and drink."

Among the pre-Islamic Arabs a covenant was frequently sealed by the contracting parties dipping their hands in blood, and by sprinkling it on the altar or by pouring it out at its base. (R. Smith op. cit. p. 314).

It has been thought that a text recording the making of a covenant between the Ugaritians and several tribes (u l p) has been preserved in 1929: 2. The alliance would seem to be directed against certain tribes who are to be expelled. (n y). The sacrifices offered by the contracting parties are mentioned at lines 15, 16, 18, 24, 25, 29, 30. At lines 26 and 35 occur the words h n 'r "here is the ass". T. H. Gaster points out (Syria XX p. 91) that in the texts from Mari there occur the words h a v a r i q a t a l u, and shows that political treaties were ratified by the sacrifice of an ass. The words in the Ugaritian text therefore probably mean that an ass was slain as part of the sacrificial meal by which the treaty was sealed.

Whatever may have been the original idea underlying the
offering of sacrifice it can be readily understood that sacrifices would soon come to be regarded as gifts to the god. E.B. Tylor has shown the extent to which sacrifices among primitive peoples can be so regarded (Primitive Culture II pp. 375 ff), and Buchanan Gray has demonstrated that among the Hebrews the gift theory predominated. (op. cit. passim).

Primitive man, feeling his dependence on unseen powers, was instinctively prompted to offer them gifts. At first, undoubtedly, these gifts were merely tributes of homage, spontaneous tokens of reverence before the unknown. In course of time the purposes for which they were offered came to be differentiated. The gods of primitive men were anthropomorphic. They were conceived as having the same wants, the same passions, the same likes and dislikes as men. And as mortals delighted to receive presents, so did the gods. If the gods were angry and withheld their boons they must be propitiated by means of gifts. If their bounty was more than usually generous, gratitude demanded that it find expression in a thank offering. And so on. In this way the idea of gift came to be closely associated with the institution of sacrifice.

We have noticed, that among the Hebrews, the predominant, though by no means the only theory of sacrifice, was the gift theory. It is certain that among the Ancient Arabs also sacrifices were regarded as gifts to the deity. It is
sufficient to mention the well known story of Theodolus son of S. Milus. (R. Smith op. cit. p. 362; Nielsen Die Altarabische Kultur p. 203). Theodolus, a prisoner of war, was destined to be sacrificed to the morning star, but escaped because his captors did not awake till after the morning star had disappeared. This is clearly an instance of a sacrificial gift offered to the god in thanksgiving for the successful issue of the combat. Among the Babylonians, the gift theory was undoubtedly prominent, though other theories also prevailed. (Furlani op. cit. p. 353 f.; Jeremiae in E B s.v. Ritual). We have only to think of the large sacrifices of homage offered daily in all the Babylonian temples from every product of the edil. That the idea of the gift sacrifice was familiar to the Canaanites is made clear by the Phoenician inscriptions. See for example the inscription of Jehaw Milk (N. S. I. p. 18) and the sacrificial tariffs from Marseilles and Carthage (ibid pp. 112 ff).

We have abundant evidence that sacrifices were regarded as gifts at Ugarit. Some of the 1929 texts are probably lists of gifts for various days or occasions. (e.g. No. 1, 3, 9). There is also the evidence from the terminology of sacrifice. The terms u z r, k b d, m n, m t n, n d r point decisively to the existence of a gift theory. The extent to which the gift theory was current at Ugarit will be apparent when we classify the various purposes for which gift sacrifices were offered.
One of the commonest types of gift sacrifice must have been the thank-offering, in which one of the most natural religious instincts finds expression. By the Israelites the thank-offering (תַּן בֵּיתוֹן) was regarded as a separate class of the thank-offering and must therefore have taken the form of a common meal sacrifice. A description of a thank-offering appears to be preserved at II D 1: 22-25. As a thank-offering for the birth of a son to Daniel a sacrificial banquet is held.

 uzr am alm ylm
 uzr m ysav bn qds
 ltrknn lsr el aby
 "The sacrifices of the gods he eats,
The sacrifices he drinks, the Holy Son,
That you may render thanks to El my father."

 uzr probably corresponds to Phoen. "votive offering". It is possible that uzr may be the technical term at Ugarit for a thank-offering.

Closely connected with the thank-offering is the votive offering, that is the gift offered as the fulfilment of a vow. In Hebrew the votive offering, (נַחֲלָה) like the thank-offering, was a sub-division of the thank-offering. In Ugaritian the votive offering is denoted by the same term.

Everywhere associated with sacrifice is the idea of
propitiation. The gods were conceived by primitive men as liable to the same passions as themselves. Especially was it believed that they were capricious and that their anger might break out at any time, and cause disaster among men. As the wrath of men was turned away by gifts, so it was felt that on the occasions when the god showed his displeasure, he might be appeased by the offering of choice gifts. It was also thought necessary to propitiate the gods at the commencement of any undertaking. His good will must be secured before entering on any project, if the venture was to succeed, and this could be secured only by the offering of propitiatory sacrifice.

We have noticed (c.IV above) that at Ugarit the technical term for this type of sacrifice may have been the š̄lm, and have noticed the existence of a verb ḫp which may mean "to propitiate". In Hebrew there is no special term reserved exclusively to denote a propitiatory sacrifice. The propitiatory sacrifice among Hebrews was commonly the burnt offering — yš (eg. 2 Sam. 8: 20, 21: 2 Sam. 24: 22).

Propitiatory sacrifices would be offered on many occasions, private and public. We have already referred to the š̄lm apparently offered with a propitiatory intention at K 130-134. Pabel Melek offers his sacrifice in the hope that it will avert the wrath of Keret, and cause him to relinquish his hostile purpose of invading the land of Uām.
A special class of propitiatory sacrifice is the foundation sacrifice. Its presence is well attested among the Canaanites, who in this connection sometimes offered human victims, and sometimes inanimate objects. In the Old Testament we have an instance of a foundation sacrifice at 1 Kings 16:34.

Foundation sacrifices may be accounted for on more than one theory. They may be classed among initiatory rites, on the assumption that the commencement of a building, like any other beginning, is a time of crisis. Or they may have been intended, as is more likely, to propitiate the genius Loci, on whose territory the building would encroach.

Under the flagstones of the library at Ugarit deposits of various objects have been found. It has been suggested that these were probably foundation sacrifices. (Schaeffer, Syria XII p.7).

Under the category of propitiation may be placed certain aspects of the funerary cult. The spirits of the dead were regarded as powerful beings able to vent their displeasure on the living, and hence it was necessary to offer them gifts in order to gain their good will. In this way for example, we are to interpret the ritual ordered to be enacted in Israel when a man was found slain by an unknown murderer (Deut.21:1-9). If the spirit of the dead were not appeased it might cause trouble to the living. Other rites eg. purificatory
ceremonies ordained by the Jewish Law for those who came into contact with the dead are to be accounted for on similar grounds. The dead were regarded as tabu, and ritual had to be prescribed for the protection of those who came under this tabu.2

It is extremely probable that such ideas underlay the funerary rites which we have observed at Ugarit. These ideas are not expressly stated in the texts of course, but we are entitled to regard the ritual of Ugarit as admitting of the same general interpretation as that of the other Semitic peoples.

Closely allied to sacrifices of propitiation were those sacrifices offered to influence the god in favour of the worshipper. As gifts had the effect of making men graciously inclined, so it was thought, the bestowal of gifts must have the same effect on the gods. When therefore the worshipper desired a benefit, he offered a gift sacrifice on the principle "do ut dedi". Such a sacrifice is referred to at K 62 where Keret offers a large sacrifice before the commencement of the battle in the hope of persuading the god to grant victory.

A purpose for which sacrifices were offered, and that a fundamental one, has yet to be mentioned - the purpose of expiation. When the god was offended by some untoward action the offence was expiated by sacrifice. The primitive idea of
sin was of course quite unethical. Offences against the god centred round the idea of tabu. Certain persons, objects, places or situations were regarded as permeated with supernatural influence. To come in contact with this influence was dangerous, was an offence, and the recognised remedy had to be resorted to. A good example of the institution of tabu is to be found at Joshua 7. Achan had sinned in treating as profane what had been declared to be tabu, and the offence was expiated only by his death.

As the religion of Israel became spiritualised and became more ethical, the sense of sin became more acute. Thus sprang into prominence the sin offerings (\( \sigma \varphi \chi \), \( \varphi \chi \vartheta \nu \eta \)) which had for their purpose the expiation of sin and reconciliation with Jahweh. Especially after the turbulent times of the sixth century do piacular sacrifices become common. The extreme holiness of these is shown by the fact that only the priests were allowed to eat the flesh of the victim. Later indeed they were burnt completely outside the camp. (Lev. 16:27). After the Exile the Day of Atonement became the culminating sacrifice of the year. In all Hebrew atoning sacrifices emphasis was laid on the blood. This is explained at Lev.17:11 "For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life."
It was not only by the Hebrews that the idea of atonement was developed. In Babylon a fundamental purpose of the New Year ritual was the removal, by the slaying of the king, of all the ritual guilt and defilement accumulated during the year, thus freeing the community from its dread consequences. (Hooke op. cit. p. 13). The Babylonians also regarded every instance of sickness and misfortune as the result of sin committed against the demons by whom they believed they were surrounded. To counteract the effects of those sins, and to ward off the influences of the demons by means of expiatory sacrifices, was the work of the ašīpu priests. (Furlani op. cit. pp. 344 ff).

Traces of expiatory ritual at Ugarit are not many, but they point unmistakably to the existence of those ideas which form the background of such ritual. Text 1929:9 which at line 10 contains the words m l k b r r "the king purifies" appears to contain a purification ritual in which the king took part.

The same conclusion is indicated by the scene describing the sanctification of Keret before entering battle (K 62 ff).

It is well known that primitive warriors formed a sacred class and were surrounded by various tabus. (R. Smith op. cit. p. 640). In Israel warriors were called "the sacred ones" (Isaiah 13:3) and it was incumbent on them to observe certain rules of abstinence. (1 Sam. 21:5; 2 Sam. 11:11).
Though the words \textit{asm} and \textit{h.t} occur in the texts it is not certain that they refer to sacrifices which were the counterpart of the Hebrew \textit{h.v.n} and \textit{h.n.c} though in all probability they do.

At I D 151 a sacrifice is described which appears to have an expiatory character. Danel offers a sacrifice to expiate the offence committed by his son Aqhat against the goddess Anat.

There is no evidence that blood was regarded by the Ugaritians as possessing atoning efficacy, unless the existence of the word \textit{dr.v} (see c.V above) in a sacrificial context may be regarded as pointing to a ritual manipulation of blood for purposes which may have included that of expiation.

On these grounds, each of which is in itself slight, but whose cumulative effect is compelling, we may conclude that the Ugaritians, like the other Semitic peoples, were familiar with piacular sacrifices.

These are the ideas underlying Ugaritian sacrifice, and for these purposes it was offered. It is impossible to learn from a study of the texts themselves which of these ideas was the earliest principle behind the rite at Ugarit, or in what conception the origin of sacrifice is to be sought. To ascertain the origins of sacrifice would entail a comparative enquiry of no small magnitude. It may not however be out of place to sketch a tentative theory of the origin of sacrifice
based on facts already indicated.

We have already noticed the powerful attributes with which blood was invested by Palaeolithic man. As the seat of life in animal organisms, life-giving properties were thought to inhere in it. When smeared on the aged it was thought to revive their decaying vital power, and when applied to the dead it was able to benefit them in their new existence. But powers more definitely magical were assigned to it. Thus in the Aurignacian cave drawings the wounded animal must have served a magical purpose - namely to prosper the chase. A similar magical significance must be ascribed to the intichiuma rites, which were enacted in order to secure the food supply.

Similar magical potency to increase natural fertility is to be attached to the many female figurines belonging to the Palaeolithic period. "In addition to these figures, objects resembling female attributes have a similar significance, just as ochre is the equivalent of blood. Thus certain shells, such as the Red Sea cowrie, shaped in the form of the portal by which a child enters the world seem to have been connected with the female principle and to have been employed as fertility charms." (E.O. James, op. cit. p.51). Since primitive man was unable to distinguish between an object and its representation, objects resembling female characteristics were naturally invested with life-giving powers.

These are the earliest religious ideas which archaeology
has revealed. (Elliot Smith op.cit.pp.145 ff). It can readily be understood that in his hard struggle against the forces of nature, primitive man's chief concern was to secure his food supply, and hence it was to this end that all his religious beliefs and practices were directed. It was against a background of such fertility practices and ideas that sacrifice emerged. How then did this important rite arise?

The view is being increasingly emphasised in recent years that all cultures that have appeared in the world are intimately connected, that they are linked together by an element of continuity. Thus the great cultures of India, China, Egypt and Mesopotamia did not arise independently, but can all be traced back to a common centre. "The line of division runs not between primitive peoples and advanced peoples, but between one area and another." (A.M. Hocart, Kingship p.143). Similarities in cultures are to be explained, not as the result of a uniform development of the human mind, but as a result of cultural contact and diffusion.

It is generally agreed that the origins of civilisation are to be sought either in the Nile Valley or in Mesopotamia. The claims of the former are perhaps the most compelling, but for our present purpose the point is of no importance. The myth, ritual and religious beliefs of Egypt and Babylon so clearly form a unity that it is not necessary to ask here
which are the original. If the diffusionist theory of the origin and spread of culture is correct one must be derived from the other. So closely however is the fundamental pattern of the belief and ritual of Egypt and Babylon integrated (Blackman, in Myth and Ritual, pp.15 ff) that for the present enquiry they may be treated as one.

The central concept of the culture pattern of the Ancient East is that of the divine king on whose well being the prosperity of the state depends. (Perry, The Children of the Sun pp.129 ff). The central ritual of the pattern is the annual representation of the death and resurrection of this divine king. Originally king, god and priest were one, and originally the king was actually killed. In course of time these functions became separated, and in course of time also, for the king a victim was substituted, which may have been human or animal. The idea underlying the killing of the king was of course the conception that the powers of nature might be controlled by appropriate ritual.

In the light of these facts we may trace the origin and development of sacrifice. The ideas out of which it developed were those ideas familiar to Palaeolithic man, of the potency of blood and the potency of objects resembling female characteristics. The ritual act which is to be regarded as the prototype of the sacrificial act, is the ritual killing of the king. The process of development would be something
like this. From Palaeolithic times it was felt that natural fertility was within the power of man to encompass by means of religio-magical rites, based on ideas centring round the potency of blood and the female principle. By a process which is not completely understood the central ritual in this connection in Egypt and Mesopotamia came to be the killing of the divine king, who was regarded as the embodiment of the community, and whose death was necessary for the annual renewal of life. At first the king himself was killed, then a substitute was provided. The substitute would be as effective as the king, for the primitive man maintained no clear distinction between himself and other members of the tribe, or between tribesmen and animals and inanimate objects. Thus the way was open for an animal substitute for the king. The last step was taken when it came to be realised that the killing of a victim need not be confined to the killing of the substitute for the king at the New Year festival. A victim might be killed at any time for purposes similar to those for which the king was slain at the beginning of every year. In this way arose animal sacrifice. To put it in a sentence. The sacrificial slaughter of animal victims arose out of the ritual killing of the divine king, as a manifestation of those ideas centring round the potency of blood and the female principle, which are first found in Aurignacian levels of culture. In other words, animal sacrifice is an
extension of the ritual killing of the king.

In course of time new ideas arose and new types of sacrifice evolved. From the prominence of the propitiatory element in the Babylonian New Year rites, we may conclude that the idea of propitiation early became attached to sacrifice. The blood which was originally regarded as the increaser of life came to be thought of as being potent for other purposes e.g. the expiation of offences against the god. The common meal sacrifice probably arose from the desire of the worshippers to possess themselves of the principle of life, not from any desire to attain identity or achieve communion with the god by drinking his blood. Hence while Robertson Smith may be correct in finding in the common meal sacrifice of the Ancient Arabs the desire on their part to unite themselves to the god by sharing in the blood, this cannot have been the earliest purpose of the sacrificial meal. It can readily be understood that bloody sacrifices might come to be regarded as gifts to the god, and in this way would arise the cereal gift offering, though the latter may have had a later and independent origin in the tabus that surrounded the harvesting and eating of the crops.
CHAPTER VII

NOTES.

2. See Lods op.cit. p.223 f.
3. See, for example, W.J.Perry, The Growth of Civilisation, passim: The Children of The Sun, c.XXV.
CHAPTER VIII

RELATIONS OF UGARITIAN SACRIFICE.

If the hypothesis as to the origin of sacrifice outlined in the previous chapter is correct, then we should expect to find that the sacrificial system of Ugarit will resemble in at least a general manner that of the other Semitic peoples. Deriving from a common ancestor the various sacrificial cults will reveal the original principles and ideas, modified of course by centuries of development and by such factors as linguistic differences and local conditions.

Before we attempt a comparison of the Ugaritian sacrificial system with those of the other Semitic peoples, it may be appropriate to notice briefly the sacrificial rites of the two best known peoples (apart from the Egyptians) whose remains have been discovered at Ugarit and traces of whose influence therefore may be expected to be discernible in the Ugaritian literature — the Hittites and the Aegeans.

Hittite remains at Ugarit are very scanty (Schaeffer. The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra Ugarit p. 24), and the town probably was never actually occupied by the Hittites, but there can hardly be any doubt that relations between the Ugaritians and the Hittites must have been fairly close. The inhabitants of such a great trading centre as Ugarit was, must have had many contacts with the Hittites through the medium of commerce.
The Amarna tablets show that the Ugaritians and the Hittites participated in the diplomatic activity revealed by these texts. (Schaeffer op. cit. p. 23). Along with other peoples the Hittites are mentioned in an Ugaritian text which appears to be a treaty of some description. (1929, 2:12). Hittite elements have been found in the Ugaritian dialect. (eg. II A B 2:9 hbrs of Hittite huprns "clothing". K 71 hts cf. Hittite hattus "silver"

The Hittite texts contain much information about sacrifice. The following brief account is taken from Furlani, La Religione Degli Hittiti. (Bologna, 1936).

Sacrifice was one of the basic Hittite religious institutions. Its ritual was most complicated, provision being made for the smallest details from the robing of the priests to the cooking of the sacred food. Sacrifice formed part of the stated religious ceremonies and also of private devotions. Indeed almost every prayer was accompanied by sacrifice. The person who offered sacrifice was called by a name corresponding to the Accad. b e l n i k i and the Phoen. n 2 9 5 y 2 .

The root commonly used in Hittite to denote sacrifice (šípan) originally meant "to pour a libation", but in course of time it came to mean "sacrifice" in general. We may compare the similar history of the Accad. n a š u .
As in Babylonia, Hittite sacred offerings were taken from every kind of vegetable produce, and from animals both domestic and wild. The chief sacrificial animals were the young ox and the lamb. The sheep, the goat, the pig and the dog were also offered. Of wild animals the stag and the hare were sacrificed. All animals offered had to be without blemish of any kind. The hide was given to the priests. A common offering was composed of birds. In the material of sacrifice was also included incense. In every sacrifice bread was offered and was of many kinds. Libations were offered of wines of all sorts. Blood was very seldom offered in sacrifice.

As regards the theory of sacrifice many similarities may be detected between the Hittite system and those of the Semitic peoples. By the Hittites sacrifices were regarded as the food of the gods. Sacrifices were offered to the dead to nourish them. The tabus surrounding the beginning of an undertaking, found among so many peoples, were known to the Hittites. Thus the Hittites offered sacrifice when consecrating a field, on the same principle that led the Semites to offer foundation sacrifices. Sacrifices were also offered to expiate sin. Certain classes of sacrifices, as might be expected, were regarded as gifts to the god. A communion sacrifice of a kind was practised by the Hittites in which any part of the offering that was not of first
quality was eaten by the sacrificer and the priest.

One development of Hittite sacrifice is not found among the Ugaritians. A sacrifice might be substituted for many of the penalties inflicted under the legal code.

It is apparent that in its main outlines the Hittite sacrificial system resembled that of Ugarit, and as we shall see, those of the other Semitic peoples. That similarity is no doubt due, to a certain extent, to the various contacts formed between the Hittites and the Semitic peoples, but it is also, in the first place, to be ascribed to the theory noticed in the preceding chapter, that sacrifice, like the other elements of civilisation, had one beginning.

Many monumental representations of Hittite sacrifice have survived. One of the most interesting is that contained on the six sculptured blocks discovered at Malatia. One of these represents a god standing on the back of a bull. Facing him are two cult officials, one carrying a goat destined for a sacrificial offering. (Garstang, The Hittite Empire, Plate XXXVIII a). The second represents a priestess approaching a sky god and carrying in her right hand a jug from which she pours a libation into a vase placed on the ground before the god. (ibid Plate XXXVIII b).

Minoan influence at Ugarit is first apparent at the beginning of the second millenium. Cretan merchants had set up their office at Ugarit, so important a trading centre had
the port become. The period is contemporary with Middle Minoan and certain fragments of pottery recovered from this level were pronounced by Sir Arthur Evans to be from the workshop of the palace at Knossos. (Schaeffer op. cit., p. 12).

During the troubled period when the Hyksos were in Egypt, the remains attest the continued existence of an Aegean settlement.

One of the most prosperous periods of Ugaritian history was that of the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries. The houses were close together and well built, the rooms were large and a perfect drainage system existed. Attached to each house was a funeral vault, closely resembling certain Cretan tombs, with an elaborate method of securing water for the dead. From this period the finer pottery remains are, without exception, of late Mycenaean type derived from Crete or Rhodes. The most striking artistic treasure is an ivory relief of the goddess of fertility which formed the lid of a box. The goddess is represented sitting on an altar, her feet on a foot-stool, with two goats on each side. (Schaeffer, op. cit., Plate XVI).

About the time of the battle of Kadesh it is found that the Phoenician civilisation had declined, and the Mycenaean-Aegean colony, so prominent from the fifteenth century, had now become dominant. This is due to the fact that during the Hittite wars the Phoenicians had lost the support of the
Egyptian and Mitannian kings, and the maritime peoples had seized the opportunity of installing themselves. Indeed so prominent was the Aegean-Mycenean culture that Ugarit has been described at this period as "an Aegean, or more correctly, an Achaean trading station". (Nilsson, Homer and Mycenae p.101)

The end of Ugarit came about the beginning of the twelfth century, when the Northern and Sea Peoples swept over the country leaving behind them ruin. The fall of Ugarit coincided also with the end of the Bronze Age and may therefore have been due partly to economic causes.

The religious texts from Ugarit, dating from the fifteenth century, were produced at a period when Mycenean influence was considerable. Traces of this influence may therefore be expected to be found in the Ugaritian religious customs.

Sacrifice was the essential ritual in the religion of the Aegean civilisation. As was natural in a religion in which the chief divinity was the mother goddess, the officials who presided over sacrifice and the other rites of the cult were priestesses. The addition of male priests was a later development. The latter always retained a secondary position, and in the performance of their sacred duties robed themselves in female attire. (Glotz - La Civilisation Égéenne p.307).

The offering of sacrifice was preceded by purificatory rites, chief of which were lustrations. Private as well as public sacrifices were offered. (Hogarth E.R.E. I p.146 s.v. Aegean Religion).
As is well known the Aegean cult utensil par excellence was the double axe. A bronze double axe was always used in sacrifice. The significance of the double axe has been accounted for on many theories. The most natural is perhaps that of Nilsson who regards the double axe as having been originally the sacrificial axe. (Nilsson, The Minoan-Mycenean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion p.192).

As regards the material of sacrifice, the ox, the goat, the sheep and the pig were offered, but the most common offering was the bull. Frequently small pottery effigies were substituted in place of the living animal. Models of sacrificial animals were placed in tombs to represent a perpetual offering to the dead. (Glotz op.cit.p.311).

The bloodless offering of grain and fruit was the commonest type of sacrifice. Libations were frequently offered, taken from all kinds of wine. For this purpose rhytoms were employed. These might be simple funnels, or they might be elaborate representations of deities or sacred objects. (Glotz op.cit.p.313).

Incense was offered in sacrifice, to increase the value of the sacrifice. This purpose was also achieved by presenting the sacrifice to the accompaniment of music. (Glotz op. cit. p.315).

Many representations of sacrifice have survived on seals
and gems, but the most comprehensive representation is that depicted on the well known sarcophagus of Hagia Triada (Glotz op. cit. Figures 50 a, 50 b, p. 317).

One of the panels represents a bloody sacrifice and a bloodless sacrifice. A bull is portrayed on a table with his neck above a pail into which the blood flows. Two goats lie crouched under the table ready to be sacrificed. A procession of priestesses advances towards the victims. On the right is depicted a double axe with a long shaft, surmounted by a bird. A tray of offerings and a water jug stand on an altar. Suspended in the air is a basket of fruit. A priestess faces the altar. The other panel has also two divisions. On the left, between two tree trunks, surmounted with double axes and birds, stands an urn into which a priestess pours a libation. Behind are two priestesses, one bringing forward two urns suspended to a yoke, one producing music from a harp. On the right side are depicted funeral rites. The deceased is represented as standing upright in front of an altar, while two worshippers bring each an offering of a calf, and a third presents a votive object.

It is clear that the sacrificial systems of the Aegeans and the Ugaritians resemble each other in general outline. The range of sacred gifts was probably more or less identical, and in both, music and the sacred procession were accompanying elements. In the absence of texts however it is impossible
to penetrate to the inner meaning of Aegean sacrifice, though we may conjecture that it was probably offered for the same purposes as at Ugarit and as an expression of the same underlying principles. Mycenaean influence is clearly discernible at Ugarit in the funerary cult. The Aegeans believed that in the life of the tomb the deceased had the same needs as he had while living. Tombs therefore were furnished with lamps, braziers, cups, knives, plates and utensils of all kinds, and the dead were nourished by sacrifices and libations. (Glotz op. cit. p. 329). The devices contrived for conveying libations to the dead in the Mycenaean tombs at Ugarit have already been described. (c. 11). They are identical in form and purpose with devices found in connection with tombs in Crete and in the Greek mainland. (Schaeffer op. cit. p. 51).

Mesopotamian influence at Ras Shamra is apparent for the first time at the third archaeological level. The pottery remains from this stratum are identical with the upper levels at Arpachiyah and Al- 'Ubaid, dating from the fourth millenium. (Schaeffer op. cit. p. 5). It is possible that Sargon and Naram-Sin may have passed through Ugarit. The unrest caused by the ethnic movements of the third millenium are reflected in the poor quality of pottery unearthed. By the beginning of the second millenium the dynasties of Hammurabi and the Pharaohs of the Middle Kingdom
had restored order in Syria, and Ugarit became a large trading centre. To this period belong the temples of Baal and Dagon. The fall of the dynasty of Hammurabi and the contemporary migrations had the effect of shutting off Ugarit from Mesopotamia and turning her attention to Egypt, with which country the kings of Ugarit entered into alliance. From this time on Egyptian and Mycenean influences are predominant.

With the Babylonian sacrificial system which is undoubtedly the oldest of all Semitic systems, the Ugaritian system displays many affinities.

Many technical terms are common to both. The ordinary Accadian term for sacrifice ṣ a ḫ a is attested at Ugarit in the form ṣ a Ḫ a (1929,1:18). The common Ugaritian term ṣ a ḫ b occurs in Accadian as ṣ i ḫ a, though infrequently. Other terms occurring in both literatures are ṣ a ḫ b "slaughter for sacrifice", ṣ a ḫ b "to offer a sacred gift", ṣ a ḫ b "sacrificial food", ṣ a ḫ b "to burn sacrificially", ṣ a ḫ b "to offer", ṣ a ḫ b "to offer".

A close correspondence exists between the two systems with regard to the material from which sacrificial offerings might be made. At Babylon offerings were given of all that the soil produced. In this respect the Ugaritian and Babylonian systems agree, both differing from the Hebrew cult, which did not allow offerings to be made from the wild products
of nature. As regards animal sacrifice a similar difference is to be observed. Game was excluded from Hebrew sacrificial offerings but was included at Ugarit and Babylon. The same domestic animals were probably offered by both peoples, a common offering in both cults being the sheep. It would appear also that in Babylon and Ugarit special qualities in the animals were valued. Thus the texts of both literatures would seem to indicate that an animal of a year old was sometimes preferred, and that a male victim was sometimes more highly esteemed than a female. Both cults also possessed the Hebrew regulation that required an animal victim to be in faultless condition. (Furlani, Sacrificio Di Babilonia e Assiria p. 339; c IV above).

In Babylonia as at Ugarit sacrifice was administered by the priests and in both communities a priestly character and functions were ascribed to the king. In both places the priesthood was supported to a certain extent by receiving a portion of the sacrificial offerings.

As regards the purposes for which sacrifices were offered many correspondences are to be noted. At Babylon sacrifices were chiefly regarded as gifts to the god. We have seen that the gift idea was prominent at Ugarit. Of equal importance at Babylon was the idea of propitiation and purification. Sacrifices were offered to avert evil by propitiating the god, and to remove ritual defilement. The ideas of purification
and cleansing were especially prominent in the great New Year festival, when sacrifices were offered to cleanse the guilt of the past year and to entreat the divine favour for the coming year. (Hooke op. cit. p. 03). We have noticed that similar ideas in regard to the purpose of sacrifice were current at Ugarit though it is probably to be inferred that at Ugarit such ideas occupied a subordinate place.

Comparison of the Ugaritian sacrificial system with that revealed by the tariffs from Carthage and Marseilles is equally instructive. Dussaud classifies Phoenician sacrifices into three groups according as the material of sacrifice is disposed of. (Les Origines Canaanéennes etc. c II). In the the whole of the animal is consumed on the altar and the sacrifice therefore corresponds to the Hebrew . At Ugarit the term does not occur, and the is not a holocaust. The communion meal sacrifice among the later Phoenicians according to the Marseilles tariff would appear to have been denoted by the term . This would correspond to the Hebrew in which part of the sacrificial flesh was retained by the worshipper. At Ugarit the root occurs once in a sacrificial context (II A B 1:42) and presumably has the same significance. The comparison of the root with the Heb. "cry of lamentation" cannot be sustained.

The equivalent of the and the in the
Marseilles tariff according to Dussaud's interpretation is the \textit{Ššô} which was consequently the sacrifice of expiation. Dussaud has pointed out (co. cit. p. 142) that in at least two Old Testament passages the \textit{Ššô} denotes an expiatory sacrifice. (Ps. 51: 21; Deut. 33:10). At Ugarit, as we have seen, expiatory sacrifices were undoubtedly offered, and though we cannot be certain it is probable that at Ugarit, as in Israel the expiatory sacrifice was the \textit{qôô}. Two other sacrifices mentioned in the Marseilles tariff which have not so far been identified are the \textit{šûû} and the \textit{yôô} (N.S.I. 42:11). The former may perhaps be connected with the Hebrew root \textit{pôô} "to see" and may have been a sacrifice offered for obtaining an omen. \textit{yôô} may be connected with Hebrew \textit{qôô} (nominal form sometimes \textit{yôô}), Arab. \textit{Âôô} "to wash out". It may have been a purification offering.

Two other types of sacrifice are referred to in the Phoenician inscriptions. In N.S.I. 20 B: 4 mention is made of the \textit{ôôôôô} but no information is given as to its nature or significance or of its relation to the \textit{Ššô} \textit{ôôôôô}. We have noticed that at Ugarit the \textit{sôôôôô} may have been the sacrifice of propitiation. It is possible that the \textit{ôôôôô} may have had a similar significance among the Phoenicians. The \textit{šôôôôô} (Heb. \textit{šôôôôôô}) is referred to in various texts (N.S.I. 7:1; 29:13; 42:14). In early times the Hebrew \textit{šôôôôôô}
denoted any kind of offering, cereal or animal, (cf. Gen. 4: 3-5; 1 Sam. 2:29) but in the post exilic period it signified the cereal offering of flour and oil. In Phoenician usage the term נtır might denote either a cereal or a bloody offering. (N.S.I. 29:13; 42:14).

With regard to the material of sacrifice and its disposal, several points may be noticed. Like the Ugaritians the Phoenicians sacrificed both wild and domestic animals, while the Israelites sacrificed only the latter. Birds were included among the sacred offerings by both peoples, mention being made in the Ugaritian texts of doves. We know from Lucian (De Dea Syria 54) that by the Phoenicians the dove was regarded as a sacred bird and was not therefore included among sacrificial offerings. Oil, milk, cream and honey were offered by the Ugaritians, the Phoenicians and Babylonians, but of these only oil was included among the Hebrew sacred gifts. Incense and aromatics were offered by all four peoples. Like the Ugaritians and Babylonians, as against the Israelites, the Phoenicians offered wild fruits. Offerings of first fruits are referred to at Marseilles under the term נרה (N.S.I. 42:12). This corresponds to the Hebrew נרה, נרה. No term denoting first fruits has been discovered with certainty at Ugarit, but it cannot be doubted that the offering of these formed part of the cult. The presentation of first fruits was probably one ceremony included in the series of rites
which centred round the ritual slaying of Mot. As in Israel and at Ugarit, so in the Phoenician usage, part of the various offerings was retained by the priest as his share, though the portion assigned to the priest differs in each centre.

The general resemblances between the Israelite, Phoenician and Ugaritian sacrificial systems are striking, but there are several differences that must be noted. There is no uniform use of terms. Thus for example the term \( \text{šalm} \) has quite a different shade of meaning in each system and connotes a different type of sacrifice. Some terms also are peculiar to one or the other systems. Thus with a sacrificial meaning the root of \( \text{ṣ} \text{p} \) occurs only in Phoenician, and the root \( \text{ḥdb} \) only in Ugaritan. There is no uniformity in the range of sacred gifts. While in each system part of the sacred material in some sacrifices is reserved to the priest, there is no agreement as to his perquisites.

In considering the relation of Ugaritian sacrifice to the sacrificial system of Israel and Phoenicia it will be necessary to take into account the differences as well as the similarities.

The points of resemblance and difference between the Levitical system of sacrifice and that of Ugarit have been noticed in our consideration of the various topics, but may here be briefly summarised.

We have listed over forty technical terms employed in
connection with sacrifice at Ugarit. Of these, about a third are unknown in Hebrew. Some of this number are found in other Semitic dialects, and others are peculiar to Ugarit.

The range of sacred gifts was particularly wide and varied at Ugarit, and included many objects which the Levitical Law did not allow to be offered in sacrifice.

From the point of view of the ritual of sacrifice the resemblance between the two systems is especially marked. Common to both systems are the numerous methods of dedicating the sacred gift at the altar - such differing methods as are implied in the libation, the burnt offering, the sacrificial meal, the wave offering, the ritual manipulation of the blood. Both peoples also observed great seasonal festivals of which sacrifice was an integral part. Such were for example at Ugarit the annual festival at which the central rite was the slaying of Mot, and the New Year ritual probably preserved in poem II A B. In Israel we have the feasts of Passover, Unleavened Bread, Tabernacles and of Weeks.

As regards the theory of sacrifice while many similarities in the two systems are to be observed, there are also some differences. The idea of sacrifice as a gift to the god is prominent in both. Equally prominent in each system is the common meal sacrifice, and it is to be presumed that in each it was connected with the idea of communion. Propitiation is an element that is more or less co-extensive with
sacrifice and figures at Israel and Ugarit. The distinguishing feature of the Levitical system of sacrifice is however the idea of expiation. As the religion of Israel became increasingly spiritualised the sense of sin became more and more emphasised and recourse was had to sacrifice as a means of blotting out the effects of sin. This of course led to new developments in the theory and practice of sacrifice. While the idea of expiation is not absent from the Ugaritian texts, it does not assume in these documents the importance it received in Israel.

It is clear that the sacrificial systems of Israel, Phoenicia, Ugarit and Babylon are closely connected. The question we must now propose is how to explain this connection, and more especially how to account for the obviously close relations that exist between the systems of Israel and Ugarit.

The nomad Israelites, before their entry into Canaan, were, like the pagan Arabs, undoubtedly familiar with the institution of sacrifice. The sacrificial rites of the desert tribes cannot have been so highly developed or so complex as those practised in cities like Ugarit and Babylon, but they were not so simple as has sometimes been supposed. Lords has shown (Israel pp.277 ff) that sacrifice was offered by the pre-Islamic Arabs for many purposes - to appease the god, to feed him, to enter into communion with him, to obtain
an oracle, to preserve a house by means of the blood. It would appear also that the Arabs were familiar with the idea of the atoning sacrifice in which no part of the victim was eaten by the worshipper. A well known type of pagan Arab sacrifice was that in which the victim was cut up, its blood scattered on the ground, and the remains left to be devoured by wild animals. (E. Smith op. cit. p. 225).

From these facts it would follow that the pre-Mosaic Hebrews were familiar with the fundamental rites of sacrifice. They were acquainted in a rudimentary form with the gift sacrifice, the holocaust, the communion meal and the sin offering.

The date of the Ugaritian texts is circ. 1450 B.C. and the rites and ideas they depict have probably been handed down from a much earlier time. The date of the entry of the Hebrews into Palestine cannot be definitely ascertained, but it certainly cannot have been earlier than the middle of the second millennium, i.e. cannot have been earlier than the date of the Ras Shamra writings. There is no evidence, and it is so extremely improbable that it can be denied with certainty, that the nomad Semites possessed an elaborate sacrificial cultus comparable to that of Ugarit or Babylon. We must therefore conclude that the developed Israelite system of sacrifice was borrowed, if not from an Ugaritian, at least from a Canaanite original, closely corresponding to the
Ugaritian sacrificial system. When due regard is paid to
the facts of history, this is the only hypothesis that will
account for the close similarity between the two systems.
The fundamental rites and principles of sacrifice were known
to the nomad Hebrews, as to the other desert tribes, and the
complex ritual and the numerous technical terms that character-
ised the Levitical institution of sacrifice must have been
borrowed from the more highly civilised Canaanites. This
theory of borrowing was put forward by Dussaud in his Les
Origines Cananéennes du Sacrifice Israelite to explain the
similarities between the Levitical system and that of the
Phoenicians as found in the tariffs of Marseilles and
Carthage. Both the Phoenician and the Israelite systems,
he maintained, were borrowed from the Canaanites. (op.cit.
p.154). The period of borrowing, he believed, was long
anterior to the Exile and must be identified with the period
of settlement in Canaan when the nomads took over the
Canaanite agricultural civilisation (op.cit.p.155). In Les
Découvertes de Ras Shamra et L'Ancien Testament, however,
in comparing the Ugaritian and Israelite systems of sacrifice,
he has withdrawn from this position, and maintains that both
systems are derived from a common ancestor which must have been
the sacrificial system of the nomads. To this theory there
are serious objections. It cannot be reconciled with what
we know of the sacrificial rites of the nomads, which were
extremely simple. It is extremely improbable that two peoples should develop systems which correspond so closely to each other at every point. Nor can the hypothesis be reconciled with the theory, adopted in the previous chapter, that cultural similarities are due to diffusion from one area to another and not to independent growth.

The intimate connection therefore between the sacrificial systems of Ugarit and Israel is to be ascribed to a process of borrowing on the part of the latter. This of course does not preclude the possibility of independent development, in certain minor respects, by the Israelites. An example of this is perhaps to be found in the 𐤀𐤁𐤀 and the 𐤀𐤁𐤌 which may perhaps be of Israelite origin. Even at the various Israelite shrines differences would arise as to the way of offering the sacrifice, as is implied at 1 Sam. 2:14, and it is only to be expected that differences would develop between the Canaanites and the Israelites, both as to theory and practice. In this way, for example, we are to explain the different meanings that became attached to the same terms at Ugarit and in Israel. Thus at Ugarit the 𐤀𐤁𐤁 denoted a propitiatory sacrifice, while in Israel it came to denote the communion meal sacrifice.

The origin of the Phoenician sacrificial system is to be accounted for on the same grounds. It too represents a borrowing from the Canaanite, and the points in which it differs
from Ugarit and Israel constitute local developments.

It may be asked if borrowing by the Israelites from Canaanite sources took place at any definite period in their history. Canaanite parallels in Hebrew literature are to be found in a few of the early writings such as the Song of Deborah and the Lament of David over Saul. They then cease, and are next found in exilic and post-exilic literature - in the books of Job, Proverbs, in the exilic and post-exilic Psalms and in the exilic parts of Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah. It may be imagined that borrowings in the sphere of sacrifice would be most frequent at these periods, though a process of borrowing was probably more or less continuous from the date of the entry into Palestine. The presence of Canaanite elements in the Hebrew literature of the latter period has been attributed by Albright to the expansion of Phoenician trade, which as revealed by archaeology, took place between the years 800-500 B.C. This commercial expansion probably gave rise to a literary renaissance, by which Jewish writers could not fail to be influenced. (B.A.S.O.R. 70, p.23).

As to the origin of the Ugaritian system of sacrifice there can be no doubt. Its close correspondence to the Babylonian system, the fact that the latter system greatly ante-dates the Ugaritian, and the diffusionist theory of the spread of culture adopted in these pages, all point to a Mesopotamian origin. From Mesopotamia therefore are
ultimately derived the systems of Israel and Phoenicia. From the point of view of the history of the origin and development of Semitic ritual and mythology, the importance of the Ugaritian literature lies in the fact, that if not itself the medium, it represents the medium by which Mesopotamian ideas were propagated in Syria and Palestine.

This theory of the origin and development of Semitic sacrifice is not vitiated by an admission of the antiquity of the sacrificial forms of the pagan Arabs. The ritual practices of pre-Islamic Arabia may in some instances be more primitive than any that have survived in Babylon, but it does not follow that on that account we are to seek the origin of sacrifice among the Arabs. The Arabs no less than the other Semitic peoples derived the theory and practice of sacrifice from Mesopotamia, and any rites they may have preserved represent a form that once obtained in Mesopotamia, but which disappeared thence as a result of subsequent developments. The sacrificial rites of ancient Arabia are primitive but not of local origin.
CHAPTER VIII

NOTES.

1. For an account of Hittite monumental representations of sacrifice see Furlani, Saggi Sulla Civiltà Degli Hittiti pp 286 ff.

2. For a discussion of the parts of the sacred offering allowed to the priest see R.H.R. Vol.76 p.230.