

This book attempts to outline the role of the goddess Anat as depicted in the Ugaritic texts. Since the author deals with the original Ugaritic of the texts, it cannot be intended for popular use, but as a serious scholarly study. As such, this book is to be severely censured, for it is this type of work which does a great disservice to Ugaritic studies. Regardless of whether one agrees with the author's view that these texts are cultic, one cannot attempt to evaluate many of his interpretations, since they are often based on a faulty understanding of the texts. In addition, apart from the many incorrect translations and dubious interpretations, the book is full of errors, misquotations and contradictions. Examples of these are the following:

Errors (in addition to the fifteen cited by Tadeusz Penar in his review of this book<sup>1</sup>): Read nny for nyy (p. 27); cnh for anh (p. 27); ncmt for ncmnt (pp. 37 and 38); š[p]š for špš (p. 49); dmr for dmr (p. 50); VAB for XAB (p. 54); špn for spn (p. 59); [s]brt for [s]brt (p. 66); [i]k for ik (p. 66); waš|lhk for waš|hk (p. 71); lb[k ti]hd for lb[ti]hd (p. 76); hlmn for klmn (p. 77); qtr for qtr (p. 77); imḥsh for imḥsh (p. 79); mhrh for mnh (p. 80); udmct for ndmct (p. 85); hmrn for hmrn (p. 86); ymšh for ymšh (p. 95); ntcn for ntcn (p. 95); pblt for pblt (p. 96). An entire line, lirth mšr ldd aliyn, is missing at the bottom of page 102.

<sup>1</sup> Biblica 50 (1969), pp. 555-59.

Misquotations: Ginsberg makes no such statement as the one attributed to him in note 3, p. 48. The quotation from Albright on p. 55 should end: "However, in Canaanite mythology as we have it, the goddess of war, Anath, slays most of the monsters" without the "always" which Kapelrud inserts. On p. 85 the reference to Aistleitner's translation should be pp. 16-17, not pp. 167. Gordon's translation on p. 100 should read "a libation in the midst of the fields." Kapelrud even misquotes himself. For example, on pp. 51-52 in discussing VAB B:4-5, wṭqr̄y ḡlmm bšt ḡr, which he translates "The lads happened to meet the Lady of the Mountain," Kapelrud comments, "She was a goddess in power, residing at a mountain; and there can hardly be any doubt that this mountain was Sapon, as Anat was called Cnt ṣpn (see above, p. 31)." But upon turning to p. 31, the reader finds that it is Baal who is identified with Sapon, not Anat.

Contradictions: On p. 52 Kapelrud makes a specific point of translating b<sup>c</sup>mq "in the valley" and not "with violence," oblivious to the fact that he had translated the very same word in the same context on p. 33 as "violently." On p. 31 y<sup>m</sup>mt limm is declared to be a variant of y<sup>b</sup>mt limm, but on p. 103 it is held to be "probably a scribal error."

On the philological side, Kapelrud is exceptionally weak. A detailed refutation would require another book. The following represent some observations on selected points in addition to those discussed by J. C. deMoor in his review in Ugarit-Forschungen.<sup>2</sup>

(1) Kapelrud devotes much space (pp. 54-62) to the question of who actually destroyed the monsters in VAB D:33-45. The problem arises because three of the verbs in the passage can be read as 1st or 2nd person singulars. However, since Anat is speaking and since there are two unquestionable first person singular forms in the text, most scholars attribute the conquest of the monsters to Anat. Kapelrud, in accordance with his theory that Baal and Anat worked together as a team, translates the ambiguous forms in the second person--the reference being to Baal whom, Kapelrud alleges, Anat is addressing here. Proof for the latter is to be found in the preceding lines 34-35 mn ib yp<sup>c</sup> lb<sup>c</sup>l ḡrt lrkb Crpt normally translated "What enemy has arisen against Baal, what foe against the Rider of the Clouds?" Kapelrud asserts that the lamed's used here are vocative lamed's and the passage should read "What enemy has arisen, O Baal? Or foe, You Driver on Clouds?"

<sup>2</sup> Vol. 1 (1969), pp. 223-27.

But his translation disregards the elementary rule of Ugaritic grammar which states that the vocative lamed can only be used with two or more words, never with one.<sup>3</sup> Thus Kapelrud's rendering "O Baal" is erroneous as is his statement that "the vocative l, and especially the testimony of the texts, weigh more than the two first person singular forms ištbm and the difficult ištmnh (sic!)" (p. 61).

(2) Throughout the book Kapelrud persists in translating the epithet btlt Cnt as the "Virgin Anat" and regards it as some kind of terminus technicus to indicate everlasting youth and beauty (p. 29). In support of this view Kapelrud points to the fact that Ishtar is called "the virgin Ishtar." But this is not so; nowhere in Mesopotamian literature does Ishtar have this epithet. Kapelrud is also wrong in stating that Hebrew נחולה is technically a virgin (p. 29). The Hebrew word, like its Akkadian cognate batultu, means simply "an adolescent, nubile girl." A virgo intacta in Hebrew is clearly denoted by the qualifying phrase אשר לא ידעה איש "who has not had intercourse with a man" (Judges 21:12, cf., ša zikaram lā idû in CH 130:56) or something similar (cf., Genesis 24:16, Leviticus 21:3, etc.).

(3) Kapelrud is far too sweeping in his repeated statement that "there is no doubt that št designates Anat" (pp. 33 and 34). In the two cases mentioned there is indeed doubt. In the first case, št in VAB B:4-5 wgrqy qlmm bšt gr, which Kapelrud translates "and the lads happened to meet the Lady of the Mountain," is most probably a locality.<sup>4</sup> In the second case, št in Yatpan's epithet mhr št translated "Soldier of the Lady" may have other interpretations as Driver, Gaster, Ginsberg, etc., have observed in their respective translations. Kapelrud should have at least indicated that there is not universal agreement on this point.

(4) Kapelrud is not aware that the preposition b can mean "from" as, for example, when he translates VAB B:34-35 trḥṣ ydh bdm dmr ušbCth bmmC mhrm "she washed her hands in the blood of soldiers, her fingers in the gore of troops" (pp. 50-51). Anat has now finished her carnage and proceeds to wash her hands of (=from) the blood.

(5) Incorrect stich divisions abound. For example, in VAB B: 27-28 Kapelrud reads tšyt kbrkm tqll bdm dmr hlqm bmmC mhrm and translates "she puts her knees in the blood of soldiers,

<sup>3</sup> See A. D. Singer, "The Vocative in Ugaritic," JCS 2 (1948), p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Cf., Cassuto, Anath, p. 64; Driver, CML, p. 85; Ginsberg in ANET, p. 136; Gaster, Thespis, p. 236, etc.

her seat in the gore of troops" (p. 50). The first stich is completely wrong, because tšyt belongs to the previous clause, while tóll is left untranslated.

(6) Some miscellaneous incorrect translations: ittu does not mean "a stream of tears, dirge" (p. 28); arḥ and alp are not interchangeable in meaning (p. 43); kdrt does not mean "vulture," which in Ugaritic is nšr (pp. 49 and 52); Kapelrud's rendering of VAB B:15-16 mṯm tgrš šbm bksl qšth mdnt as "with a stick she drove out old men (?), at the back she drew her bow" (p. 66) has been refuted by Held in the Landsberger Festschrift<sup>5</sup>; kyhwy does not mean "as he lives" but "when he gives life" (p. 72); eršetu in the context of p. 90 means "underworld" not "earth."

(7) In some of his translations Kapelrud has allowed his imagination to run wild. This is especially the case in IVAB where, following Aistleitner, he renders qrn dbatk btlt Cnt in II:21 as "Come here, so that I may have intercourse with you, Virgin Anat!" and bCl ysqd mli[ ] il hd mla u<g>[ ] blt pbtlt Cn[t] wp nCmt aht [bCl] in III:8-11 as "Baal erects and fills...The god Hadad fills [his] 'fin[ger]'. . .he breaks through the 'mouth' of the Virgin Anat, yea, the mouth of the fairest of Baal's sisters" (pp. 95-96). This pursuit of erotica is not limited to the Ugaritic texts, for on p. 21 Kapelrud finds the testes in line 161 of Gilgamesh VI, isluḥ imitti alîma ana panî Ištar, which he interprets as "when Enkidu threw the 'thigh' of the bull, obviously its testicles"!!

One dreads to think how this book will be utilized by those who have not had training in Ugaritic.<sup>6</sup> The Violent Goddess is to be seriously discommended.

<sup>5</sup> P. 403. Held offers the following translation: "she drives off captors with the staff, with the string of her bow (she drives off) opponents" (ibid., n. 121).

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, Arthur L. Merrill's review in JBL 89 (1970), pp. 89-92.