

A Phoenician Inscription in Ugaritic Script?

EDWARD L. GREENSTEIN
Columbia University

In 1972 excavators of the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania unearthed part of the handle of an amphora at Sarepta (the ancient Phoenician city) bearing an inscription in alphabetic cuneiform.¹ The script is by and large identical to that known as the "reduced" Ugaritic alphabet.² The characteristics in the Sarepta inscription that serve to identify it with that script are the circular š-sign³ and the signs for *b* and *d*, whose lower wedges are formed vertically and upside down rather than horizontally.⁴ Although in an editorial note J. B. Pritchard designates the inscription as Ugaritic,⁵ the actual editors, J. Teixidor and D. I. Owen, appear to be more cautious in applying the designation Ugaritic only to the script and not to the language.⁶ We are to commend them for this caution, as it is not a foregone conclusion that an inscription written in Ugaritic characters is to be ascribed linguistically to the dialect of Ugarit. In fact, while a conclusive determination of the inscription's linguistic position is impossible, we shall indicate below some features of the text that point to its classification as Phoenician rather than Ugaritic.

Since the provenience of the Sarepta inscription is Phoenician, there is a strong possibility that the language is Phoenician. But purely linguistic considerations must lead to that determi-

1 J. Teixidor in J. B. Pritchard, ed., *Sarepta: A Preliminary Report on the Iron Age* (Philadelphia, 1975), 102-4, with discussion by D. I. Owen; figs. 30:4 (hand copy), 55:2 (photographs).

2 See *ibid.*, 102-3, for references to earlier published texts in that script; and for a recent analysis of the reduced alphabet, see M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, *UF* 6 (1974), 15-18.

3 Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín, *ibid.*, discuss the nomenclature for the reduced signs. In the reduced alphabet the Ugaritic sign for *ḥ* serves for both **ḥ* and **ḫ*, a simplified version of the *ḫ*-sign serves for both **ḫ* and **ḥ*, and (but for one inscription) the *z*-sign serves for both **z* and **ḥ*. They reason that since in each case a phonemic merger yielded in favor of *ḥ*, *ḥ*, and *ḥ* in Phoenician and Hebrew, the reduced signs ought to be called *ḥ*₂, *ḥ*₂, and *ḥ*₂ respectively. The use of the sub-2 signs is unnecessary and somewhat misleading, however, since in only the text from Mt. Tabor is there a possibility that the older *ḥ*-sign rather than the *z*-sign is used to designate the phoneme *ḥ*; see F. M. Cross, *BASOR* 190 (1968), 42, n. 6. In no inscription is more than one sign used for the same phoneme. Thus, from the synchronic point of view, the reduced alphabet has only one sign for *ḥ*, *ḥ*, and *ḥ*, though their forms may differ from place to place.

4 Cf. Owen *apud* Teixidor, *Sarepta*, 102-3.

5 *Sarepta*, 97.

6 *Ibid.*, 102.

nation.⁷ Before proceeding to a discussion of these linguistic considerations, however, it will be necessary to offer our interpretation of the inscription.

We agree in nearly every detail with the reading of the inscription suggested by D. I. Owen, but we must differ considerably in our philological understanding of it. Owen reads and translates the inscription as follows:⁸

(1) [ʿ]ag(?)n / pʿl yd[y] (2) ʿʿbl / lhḏt bʿʿl
 This ewer, the work of my hands,
 ʿōbāl, made for (the festival [ʔ] of) the new-moon.

This interpretation is difficult for several reasons. First, the analysis of *pʿl yd[y]* as “the work of my hands” is formulaically peculiar (contrast the standard formula, below). The inscription is broken off on the right-hand side so that the restored *[y]* is occasioned only by recourse to this interpretation. Further, it is equated⁹ with the expression *poʿal yḥdayim* in biblical Hebrew (Deut. 33:11; Isa. 45:11). This equation is misleading, however. For while this expression might theoretically refer to something like ‘handicraft’, in its actual attestations it does not refer to a concrete object, much less a handicraft such as a jar. Rather, it refers to more abstract concepts such as ‘endeavor, enterprise’¹⁰ (Deut. 33:11) and ‘creation’ (Isa. 45:11) and appears only in poetic contexts.

Secondly, as Owen admits,¹¹ the root *pʿl* ‘make, do’ is alleged to appear in this text in two variant shapes *pʿl* and *bʿl*. The former root is the only one attested in Phoenician and biblical Hebrew, and the latter is the only one attested in Ugaritic. In Ugaritic the verb *bʿl* is found in two prose texts¹² and in one epic.¹³ At Ugarit the root *pʿl* may be represented in the personal name *ypʿl*,¹⁴ but if this analysis of the name be correct, the name may well be Phoenician.¹⁵

7 Our approach contrasts with that taken by F. M. Cross, *BASOR* 190 (1968), 42–43. There Cross takes to task D. R. Hillers (*BASOR* 173 [1964], 45–50) for reading the last word of the Taanach inscription *dk* from an original root **dkk*. Cross argues that since the text was found at Taanach in southern Canaan, one would expect **dk* to be written *zk*. Though Cross may be right in criticizing Hillers’ reading (and I am not convinced that he is), Cross’ reasoning is unsound. The provenience of the text is not by itself a sufficient basis for determining its dialect, and one cannot claim that **d* would be written *z* in this dialect until it is proved independently that the dialect is southern Canaanite rather than, say, Ugaritic.

8 *Sarepta*, 102, 104.

9 *Ibid.*, 103.

10 Cf. such a meaning in similar contexts for Heb. *maʿāse yḥdayim*; e.g., Deut. 2:7; Job 1:10; cf. *BDB*, 795b.

11 *Sarepta*, 104.

12 *UT* 1024: rev. 6, 8; 1106:53, 56. Though some scholars read *pʿlk* in *UT* 6 (= *CTA* 13):21, that reading is most uncertain; cf. Herdner, *CTA* I, 57, n. 29.

13 II D, 6:24, where we must read and render: *ybl qšt lʿnt* (! see Herdner, *CTA* I, 83; M. Dahood, *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology* [Rome, 1965], 53; and cf. now A. Caquot, M. Szyner, and A. Herdner, *Textes Ougaritiques* [Paris, 1974], 1:431) *qšʿt lybmt limm* “He will make a bow for Anat, an arc (ʔ) for the YBMT of the nations.”

14 *UT* 2027:4; cf. F. Gröndahl, *Die Personnamen der Texte aus Ugarit* (Rome, 1967), 171.

15 Cf. Gordon, *UT* § 19.2075, who asserts that if the name contains the root *pʿl*, “the n(ame) is borrowed from Phoen(ician) because *bʿl* (q.v.) is the Ug(aritic) form of that verb.”

Within Phoenician the root *pʿl* is unequivocally standard. For biblical Hebrew M. Dahood and others have claimed an allomorphic *bʿl* beside the well attested *pʿl*.¹⁶ But each adduced example is objectionable for one reason or another.¹⁷

Despite the attested distribution of either *pʿl* or *bʿl* in any single dialect, some may seek to justify the theoretical possibility of having interchangeable forms with *b* or *p* in the same dialect by appealing to an alleged free variance of *b* and *p* in some Northwest Semitic dialects, particularly Ugaritic.¹⁸ Such free variation, however, does not exist. While we cannot enter here into a full discussion of all the alleged examples, it will suffice to examine a few and state that interchanges of *b* and *p* in the same root do not represent free variants but positional variants that are conditioned by different phonological environments.¹⁹ Thus, an original **b* may appear as *p* only when it directly precedes a voiceless consonant, in which case it assimilates in voicing to that consonant. For example, in Ugaritic, **nbk* 'source, spring'²⁰ becomes *npk* (= *napku*),²¹ where **b* is followed directly by voiceless *k*; but in the *maqtil*-form of the same root, *mbk* (= **mabbiku* < ***manbiku*), the *b* does not assimilate in voicing since it is geminated and is followed by a vowel.²² Similarly the root *lbš* 'dress, wear' remains *lbš* in all verbal and some nominal forms, in which *b* is followed by a vowel, but becomes *lpš* (= **lupšu* or **lipšu*)²³

16 Cf. e.g., Dahood, *Gregorianum* 43 (1962), 75; idem, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (Rome, 1963), 10–11; M. H. Pope, *Job*, AB 15 (Garden City, N.Y., 1965), 202; Gordon, *UT* § 19.494; M. Dijkstra, *VT* 25 (1975), 671–74; and the list in Dahood, *UHP*, 53.

17 An examination of the passages listed in Dahood, *UHP*, 53, leads to the following objections: The attestation in Isa. 1:31 does not exist. In Isa. 54:5 the parallel to *bōʿalayix* 'your husband' is not *ōšayix* 'your creator' but *gōʾālēx* 'your redeemer', and the appellative 'husband' is most apposite in the larger context; cf. Pope, *Job*, 202; Dijkstra, *VT* 25 (1975), 672. In Job 31:39 the point is that Job had not aggrieved the owner of the land for consuming of the land's produce without compensation; see N. H. Tur-Sinai, *Job* (Jerusalem, 1967), 449. There is no reason why a rendering 'earner' is preferable to 'owner, possessor' in Prov. 1:19. In Prov. 3:27 the word *ṭōw* acquires the meaning 'wages' only after Dahood has rendered *bʿl* as 'work' rather than '(rightful) possessor'. Finally, in Qoh. 8:8 rendering *bʿl* as 'work, earn' does not help clarify the text. In fact, considering Qoheleth's disparagement of wealth and cynicism about death, it is best to follow H. L. Ginsberg, *Koheleth* (Jerusalem, 1961), 107 [in Hebrew] and read *wāʾlō-yā-mallet* 'ošEr (!) ʿṚ-bāʾlōw "and (at the time of death) wealth cannot save its possessor."

The proposal by Dijkstra, *VT* 25 (1975), 671–74, to interpret *bʿl* in 1 Chr. 4:22 as equivalent to *pʿl* 'to work (for)' is attractive in its context, but is nevertheless speculative. A meaning of *bʿl* as 'to gain control over' or 'to (inter)marry' cannot be ruled out either philologically or contextually. For the latter, cf. e.g. the Chronicler's concern with intermarriages in 1 Chr. 2:17, 34–35; 4:18 (as per *BH*³, ad loc.); and perhaps 8:8.

18 See e.g., Dahood, *UHP*, 8–9, on "The non-phonemic interchange between voiced *b* and mute *p* . . ."; cf. idem, *Biblica* 50 (1969), 74–75; F. I. Andersen, *JBL* 88 (1969), 345; Y. Avishur, *Semitics* 2 (1971/72), 73, n. 235; and the somewhat more moderate descriptions of B. Cutler and J. Macdonald, *UF* 5 (1973), 67–70.

19 See already P. Fronzaroli, *La fonetica ugaritica* (Rome, 1955), 50–53; cf. J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1968), 100–1.

20 The difficult word(s) *nbk* in *UT* 173:35, *PRU* 2, 99:19, and *Ugaritica* V, no. 12B:10, are probably not related.

21 *Ug. V*, pp. 246–47:8.

22 Here we diverge from the somewhat convoluted derivation of Fronzaroli, *La fonetica ugaritica*, 52.

23 Cf. Gordon, *UT* § 19.1353. For the *qutl* form cf. Akkadian *lubšu* 'garment' (*CAD* L, 232b) beside the more common forms such as *lubštu* (ibid., 232f.); and for the *qitl* form cf. Akk. *libšu* (ibid., 181a).

in a nominal formation in which **b* directly precedes voiceless *š*. Thus, the form *šbh* 'offspring' in IK:290 beside normal *špḥ* is most plausibly explained as an archaic survival, in a literary text, of the root *šbh* before assimilation of **b* to voiceless *ḥ* had taken place.²⁴ The form of our verb *b'l* 'make' in Ugaritic beside *p'l* in other NW Semitic dialects results from a partial assimilation (voicing) of **p* in the YQTL form of the verb to a following voiced ' (**yip'alu*).²⁵ This form then became generalized and spread to other forms of the verb, with the result that only *b'l* is attested in Ugaritic. Moreover, were there free variation of *b* and *p* in Ugaritic, one would expect beside the numerous attestations of *b'l* 'Baal' also *p'l*, and beside *npš* 'lifebreath' also *nbš*, etc. Hence, it is highly improbable that in the Sarepta inscription two forms of the verb 'to make, do', *p'l* and *b'l*, would be attested.

Thirdly, it is syntactically irregular that the alleged verb *b'l* come at the end of the inscription, following not only its grammatical subject but also the indirect object, allegedly *lḥdṯ* 'for the new-moon'. This becomes clear when one examines other dedicatory inscriptions in Ugaritic, Phoenician, or other NW Semitic languages. These inscriptions follow a typological pattern in which grammatical elements remain in fixed positions.

In fact, a typological study of dedicatory inscriptions in NW Semitic reveals a well known pattern, which, we shall later argue, is followed by the Sarepta inscription as well. In 1935 R. Dussaud published two votive inscriptions in Ugaritic which were inscribed on stelae.²⁶ They read as follows:

UT 69: (1) *skn. dš'lyt* (2) *'t'lyl. ldgn. pgr* (3) [*š?*] *walp[.?] lakl*
Stela that PN erected for Dagān - a mortuary sacrifice:²⁷ [a sheep] and ox with (?) flour.²⁸

UT 70: (1) *pgr. dš'ly* (2) *'zn. ld'g'n. b'lb* (3) [*š wal*] *p. bmḥrt/m?*
Mortuary sacrifice that PN offered to Dagān, his lord: [a sheep and an ox] x. . .

In both cases the inscription begins with the formula: object-relative pronoun-verb-subject

24 Cf. Fronzaroli, *La fonetica ugaritica*, 50–51.

25 Fronzaroli's explanation, *ibid.*, 53, is more difficult than ours in suggesting a partial assimilation of **p* to the liquid *l* in third radical position.

26 Syria 16 (1935), 177–80 = UT 69, 70. They are reproduced below according to my reading.

27 Already Dussaud, *Syria* 16 (1935), 179 with n. 4, had realized that *pgr* designated a sacrifice and not a stela. The meaning 'mortuary sacrifice' for Ugaritic *pgr* is now established on the basis of the term *pagrum/pagnā'um* with the apparent meaning 'mortuary sacrifice' at Mari; cf. *ARM* 2, 90:18–22; *RA* 42 (1948), 130:50–52, as translated by W. L. Moran, *ANET*³, 623b; *ARM* 10, 63:15, for which see W. H. P. Römer, *AOAT* 12 (1971), 16; and cf. A. Finet, *ARM* 15 (Paris, 1954), 238; W. von Soden, *Ahw.*, 809a; and Moran, *ANET*³, 624, n. 23. For recent discussions of *pgr* in Ugaritic see especially J. H. Ebach, *UF* 3 (1971), 365–68; and cf. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, *UF* 5 (1973), 289–91. It is also interesting to note that graves were apparently constructed at Ugarit in order to accommodate services for the dead; see E. L. Sukenik, *Kedem* 2 (1945), 42–47 [in Hebrew].

28 Cf. I K:80–82, 172–73 *akl // ḥīt* 'flour // wheat'; and see Hillers, *BASOR* 173 (1964), 49.

PN-preposition-PN/DN. Other, non-votive, texts in Ugaritic follow the same formula. For example:

*l̄l̄ dyša bd šmmn lrgmn lnskm*²⁹
Copper which was conveyed by Šamumānu, as tribute, to the metal-workers.³⁰

A similar formula is the following:

*mzḥḥ dḡny šmmn bbtw*³¹
The *mazḥḥ* which Šamūmānu established in his house.³²

As J. Obermann had observed,³³ in early Phoenician inscriptions the identical pattern is followed; for example:

*'rn zp l ['] tb l bn 'ḥrm mlk gbl l'ḥrm abb*³⁴
Sarcophagus that [I]ttobaal, son of Ahirom, king of Byblos, made for Ahirom, his father;

*mš zp l 'lb l mlk gbl byḥ [mlk mlk gbl] [lb] 'lt gbl 'dtrw*³⁵
Pedestal that Elibaal, king of Byblos, son of Yehi[milk, king of Byblos] made [for the L]ady of Byblos, his mistress.

This pattern is observed in Phoenician without alteration in the order of syntactic elements until late into the first millennium B. C. E.,³⁶ when in some Phoenician³⁷ and most Punic³⁸ and Neo-Punic³⁹ inscriptions, the sequence is inverted, usually pre-posing the dedicatee of the inscription. In a few cases in Punic the verb is pre-posed,⁴⁰ and in at least one Neo-Punic text the subject is pre-posed.⁴¹ In no case is the main verb found in clause final position, as has been suggested for the Sarepta inscription.

29 UT 90:1-4.

30 Trans. D. Pardee, *UF* 6 (1974), 282, based on a thorough study of the text on pp. 275-82.

31 RS 1957.702: obv. 1-4, published by P. D. Miller in L. R. Fisher, ed., *The Claremont Ras Shamra Tablets* (Rome, 1971), 37-49, including plates IX and X.

32 Trans. Miller in *ibid.*, 37; cf. Dahood, *ibid.*, 51.

33 *JAOS* 61 (1941), 34f.

34 *KAI* # 1:1.

35 *KAI* # 6:1-2; cf. 5:1-2.

36 Cf. *KAI* # 4:1; 7:1-4; 29:1-2; 34:1-4; 38:1-2; 41:1-4; 53:1-2; 58:1f.; et al.

37 E.g., *KAI* # 47:1-3.

38 For the traditional sequence in early Punic, cf. *KAI* # 61A:1-5; cf. B:1-5; and in later Punic, cf. *KAI* # 101:1f. For inverted sequence, cf. *KAI* # 63:1-2; 64:1-3; 66:1-2; 72A:1-3; 77:1-3; 78:2-11; 79:1-3f.; 85:1-6; etc.

39 Cf. *KAI* # 118:1-3; 119:1-2f.; 137:1f.; 159:1f.; etc.

40 Cf. e.g., *KAI* # 72B:1-3; 80:1-2.

41 *KAI* # 123:1-5.

This syntactic formula in its standard patterning is also attested in early Aramaic inscriptions.⁴² Of particular interest to us is an inscription on a jug from Tell Halaf from the eighth century B. C. E. in which it is related that PN₁ made a jug for PN₂:

[kd] 'zy 'bdt pr'tn 'lstrl'tmšrn ngs⁴³

The [jug] that PN₁ (daughter of) PN₂ made for PN₃ (son of) PN₄.

We propose that the Sarepta inscription is exactly of this standard type and nearly identical in content to the Tell Halaf inscription. We shall now offer our own reading and translation of the inscription, followed by philological justifications for our renderings.

(1) 'a'gn / p'l yd(2)' 'bl / lḥdš b' 'l' ([b])

Amphora (that) Yada'-Baal made for ḤDŠ'-Baal/for ḤDŠ', [his] lord.

The word *agn* was correctly understood by Owen to be the equivalent of Hebrew 'aggōn 'basin',⁴⁴ Aramaic 'agann-,⁴⁵ Akkadian *agannu*,⁴⁶ and supposedly Ugaritic *agn*. The Ugaritic word is attested in a completely broken context in *UT* 46:5 and in the *SS* text, lines 14–15, 31, 35–36. Owen is misleading when he cites⁴⁷ Ugaritic *agn* 'ewer' in Gordon's glossary.⁴⁸ In fact, Gordon, along with many scholars,⁴⁹ takes *agn* in *SS*, where it appears to be parallel to *išt* 'fire', to mean 'fire, flame', though some have understood *agn* even in *SS* to mean 'basin'.⁵⁰ The occurrence of *agn* at Sarepta should now, however, give pause to those who render *agn* in *SS* 'fire, flame'.

At this point we should observe that the *g* of 'a'gn is written not in Ugaritic script but in a left-to-right form of the linear Phoenician character for *g*, as suggested by Owen.⁵¹ This serves as one indication that our scribe was used to writing in a linear script, such as Phoenician, rather than the alphabetic cuneiform employed at Ugarit.

42 E.g., *KAI* # 25:1–4 (in Samalian; cf. most recently Ginsberg, *JANES* 5 [1973], 146–47); 201:1–4 (for an improved reading, see now J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, Vol. 2 [Oxford, 1975], 3); 202:1; 215:1. In *KAI* # 214:1, Panammu pre-poses the subject (= himself).

43 Gibson, *Textbook* II, # 11:1–2.

44 Cf. *BDB*, 8b.

45 Cf. Jean-Hoftijzer, *DISO*, 3.

46 Cf. *CAD* A¹, 142–43.

47 *Sarepta*, 103.

48 *UT* § 19.65.

49 For bibliographic references, see now D. T. Tsumura, *The Ugaritic Drama of the Good Gods—A Philological Study* (Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis, 1973; available from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Mich.), 43 with footnotes.

50 Cf. e.g., Driver, *CML*, 134; J. C. de Moor, *New Year with Canaanites and Israelites*, Part 2 (Kampen, 1972), 19f.; *Textes Ougaritiques* 1:371f.

51 *Sarepta*, 103.

Following the first word and the word-divider, our analysis calls for a relative pronoun, but the text has none. If our analysis is nonetheless correct, there are two alternative explanations. One is that the clause is asyndetic, omitting the relative pronoun. The other is that the relative marker was omitted through scribal error. Considering the fact that in the numerous attestations of this formula in NW Semitic the relative marker is never omitted, the second is by far more likely. Now if the text were Ugaritic, the relative pronoun would have been *d*,⁵² and its omission would be inexplicable other than by a gross error. On the other hand, were the text in a dialect of Phoenician akin to that which we know from Byblos, the relative pronoun would have been *z*, and its omission could be explained more plausibly as a natural scribal error. For in our inscription the word-diver is written as a long vertical line, which closely resembles the form of an Ugaritic *z* (𐤆). An omission of *z* would then be merely haplographic. Note that there are attested in Ugaritic texts (copyist?) errors of *g* (𐤂) and *y* (𐤃) for an expected word-divider (𐤄).⁵³ Although the assumption of a scribal error is always hazardous, it is by far preferable to analyzing this text as the only exception to the widespread dedicatory formula.

For the verb *p'l*, which must be Phoenician and not Ugaritic, see above (pages 50 f.) and compare *KAI* # 1:1 'm zp'l ['] tb'l. . . "Sarcophagus that [1] tto-Baal made. . .," etc.

The next word Owen read *yd[y]*, although there is no trace on the photograph or hand-copy of a sign at the break. According to the formula we expect the name of the person who made the amphora, and we propose to read that name without any restoration as *yd'bl* = **yd'b'l* 'Baal has shown favor, has been favorably disposed'.⁵⁴ The omission of the ' in the DN Baal is not especially difficult as the phenomenon occurs in the divine element *b'l* both in Ugaritic⁵⁵ and Punic⁵⁶ personal names. And despite the fact that our interpretation claims that the word *b'l* is written in this inscription once with ' and once without ', this phenomenon also appears to be

52 Cf. now S. B. Parker, *Studies in the Grammar of Ugaritic Prose Texts* (Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins, 1967; University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Mich.), 28–29. Note that relative *d* is also attested in the Claremont tablets, RS 1957.701: obv. 6 and RS 1957.702: obv. 2, rev. 6.

53 See S. Segert, *BZAW* 77 (1961), 207; cf. idem, *ZAW* 71 (1959), 30 (*g* for *ḡ*) and 31 (. for *g*). Cf. W. J. Horwitz, *UF* 6 (1974), 75–83, who concludes that scribal practices indicate that "the mythological texts discovered. . . are scribal copies of a written *Vorlage* which was dictated. Many errors in our present texts can be explained in this way"; *ibid.*, 77, n. 6.

54 For this connotation of *yd'*, basically 'to know', see for Hebrew R. David Qimḥi's comment on Ps. 1:6 (ed. A. Darom; Jerusalem, 1967, p. 11) with several examples; and cf. M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen* (Stuttgart, 1928; reprint: Hildesheim, 1966), 181; J. Barr, *Comparative Philology*, 22, 328 (with references to the studies by Winton Thomas). This connotation of *yd'* in Ugaritic is probably intended in *Ug.V*, no. 1:6–8 *il dyd'nn y'db lḥm lb* (gloss: *dmšd wdyd'nn ylmn ḥṭm* (gloss: *bqr*) *tḥt ilḥn* "As for the god whom he favors, he prepares him food (gloss: of game), but as for the god whom he disfavors, he strikes him with a staff (gloss: with a stick) beneath the table"; cf. S. E. Loewenstamm, *UF* 1 (1969), 74, and B. Margulis, *UF* 2 (1970), 134, who recognized here this connotation of Ugaritic *yd'* and cite biblical examples as well.

55 Cf. *bn bl* (for *bn b'l*), *bly* (for *b'ly*), *blḏn* (*UT* 1061:11) = *b'ldn* (*UT* 1032:13); see Gröndahl, *Personennamen*, 20. For *bly* = **b'ly* see now *PRU* 6, 83:iii:15 *Ba-[a?]-li-ya*; and for *blḏn* = *b'ldn* see now *ibid.*, 91:5 *Ba'-a-la-da-a(?)-n[i]* and 139:5 *[B]a(?)'-a-la-dá-ni*.

56 Cf. *zrbl* = *zrb'l*, *bl'zr* = *b'l'zr*, *blšt* = *b'lšt*; see F. L. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions* (Rome, 1972), 203, 89.

attested (in Ugaritic) for the same word.⁵⁷ Now although this name is not yet attested in Ugaritic or Phoenician, nearly identical PNN are attested throughout NW Semitic. Compare “Amorite” *Ya-di-AN*, *Ya-daḅ-AN*;⁵⁸ Ugaritic *yd'* (hypocoristic),⁵⁹ *b'ld'* (= **b'lyd'*),⁶⁰ Hebrew *'lyd'*, *b'lyd'*, *ybwyd'*;⁶¹ Phoenician and Punic *yd'mlk*;⁶² Palmyrene *ydy'bl*,⁶³ which is probably identical to the name we propose to read here. Numerous Akkadian PNN also combine the verb **yd'* + DN; for example, Old Akkadian *Īda-ilum*, *Ilum-īda*, and *Īda-bēli*.⁶⁴ There is, therefore, no reason to doubt that Ugaritic or Phoenician might have had a PN such as **yd'b'l*.

Finally, following the formulaic prepositional *l* we have *ḫdš b'l'l*. It is certainly possible that Owen's interpretation of *ḫdš* 'new moon'⁶⁵ is correct. But then we would, according to our analysis, have a special festival, namely the “New Moon of Baal,” which would be otherwise unknown. A more important objection is that ‘new moon’ in Ugaritic at least is written *ym ḫdt* ‘day of the new moon’.⁶⁶

On the other hand, the standard formula leads us to expect a PN. Owen himself raised the possibility that *ḫdš* alone might represent a PN, citing Ugaritic *Ḥudaši*.⁶⁷ We, however, are beset with the difficulty that while there are attested the Ugaritic PNN *Ḥudaši*, *Ḥudšānu* = *Ḥdt̄n*, and *Bn Ḥdt̄*,⁶⁸ and the Phoenician PNN *Bn Ḥdš(t)* and *Mḫdš*,⁶⁹ none of these names includes a second element consisting of a divine name.

Two plausible solutions to this problem are at hand. One is that we do have here a PN of the form *ḫdš* + Baal ‘Baal is renewed’, analogous to such Akkadian PNN as *Ediš-Sîn*,⁷⁰ *Ediš-Zababa*, *Ediš-Saggil* (‘Esagila [the temple] is renewed’).⁷¹ The other is that, as we have just mentioned above, we have a PN *ḫdš*, a name attested at Ugarit, followed by the word *b'l'l* [*h*] ‘his lord’, in

57 Note *UT* 2089:13 *bn bly* (for *b'ly*; see n. 55 above) beside what is most probably *b'l* in line 3 of that text; see Gordon, *UT*, ad loc.

58 See H. B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore, 1965), 209.

59 Cf. Gordon, *UT* § 19.1080: Gröndahl, *Personnamen*, 142.

60 See Gröndahl, *Personnamen*, 39, 142.

61 See Noth, *Israelitischen Personnamen*, 120, n. 3.

62 See M. Lidzbarski, *Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik* (Weimar, 1898), 1:285; Benz, *Personal Names*, 127.

63 See Lidzbarski, *Handbuch*, 1:285; cf. idem, *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik* 3 (1909–15), 135.

64 For these and other examples, see J. J. Stamm, *Die akkadische Namengebung*, *MVAG* 44 (Leipzig, 1939), 198; see further, Goetze, *JCS* 1 (1947), 346.

65 *Šarepta*, 103.

66 See Gordon, *UT* § 19.843; cf. now *Ug. V*, no. 12:A1.

67 *Sarepta*, 103–4, n. 38.

68 Gröndahl, *Personnamen*, 134; cf. *ibid.*, 30 for the phenomenon of calendrical PNN.

69 See Benz, *Personal Names*, 308. On Phoen. *bn ḫdš* ‘born of new moon’ see G. A. Cooke, *Textbook of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1903), 17n. The (fem.!) Heb. PN *Ḥodēš* in 1 Chr. 8:9 is located in a textually suspect passage; Noth, *Israelitischen Personnamen*, 242; cf. the variant readings in *BH*³ ad loc.

70 Already attested in Old Babylonian; e.g., *PBS* 8/2, 203:12; a few examples in *BE* 6, 1; cf. *ARN*, 724:8 (Nippur).

71 See Stamm, *Akkadische Namengebung*, 62.

apposition. Such appositions are very common in NW Semitic instances of our pattern.⁷² In this case, *ḥdš* would be the person to whom *yd'bl* was subject and for whom he made the amphora. Whichever of these solutions is preferred, the Sarepta inscription can thereby be shown to follow the formulaic pattern: object-(relative)-verb-PN₁-preposition-PN₂/PN₂ + apposition.

In conclusion, we should observe that linguistically there are no features in the Sarepta inscription that need be characterized as distinctly Ugaritic. On the other hand, there are perhaps three indications that the language is Phoenician: (1) the *g*-sign is Phoenician; (2) if a relative pronoun were omitted, it would most likely have been dialectal Phoenician *z* (against Ugaritic *d*); and (3) the verb *p'l* can be said with assurance to be Phoenician but not Ugaritic.

⁷² E.g., *UT* 70:2 *b'lb* 'his lord'; *KAI* # 1:1 *'bb* 'his father'; 5:2 *'dtw* 'his mistress'; 34:1 *'by* 'his father'; 41:3 *'dny* 'his lord'; etc.