ʾēm 'mother.'"[79] These kinship terms constitute 43.5 percent of all theophoric elements in Hebrew names, while Yahwistic theophoric elements only make up 24.4 percent. Karel van der Toorn (1996, 230) highlights even more explicit examples: "The divine nature of the ancestor is made explicit in the name Ammiel: 'My Ancestor is god' (עמיאל, cf. אליעם, Eliam, 'My god, the Ancestor'). A similar significance is to be attributed to the name Ammishaddai (עמישדי), which proclaims the ancestor to be one of the Šadday gods, chthonic deities that were credited with powers of protection."

There is also significant overlap in the care and feeding of deceased kin and of YHWH.[80] Offerings to YHWH are most commonly framed within the biblical literature as signaling commitment to YHWH's commands, but there can be little doubt that requirements to provide food of various kinds on a daily basis stem not only from the perception that there is some reciprocal benefit for the one making the offering, but that the recipient is in some sense in need of it.[81] The most likely source of this perception for deities is the identical perception of the dead attested in the various offerings mentioned above. Even the structures that housed deities and the deceased, or the loci of their agency, shared features of form and function. For instance, the use of lamps in burial contexts aligns with the use of the lampstand within the temple (Exod 27:20).[82] Some kind of chair or throne is also often represented in the depictions of both (see the Katumuwa Stele discussed above). Altars are so parallel in form and function to offering tables that archaeologists often disagree about their identification.[83] Isaiah 56:4–5 mentions

[79] He notes, "Names containing these units amount to 13.1% of all theophoric names and 12.1% of all instances." Albertz (2012, 351) has proposed that these terms reflected "early designations of personal gods," rather than an ancestral cult, as van der Toorn concludes, but acknowledges that van der Toorn's position, "is now widely accepted." He notes the close overlap in the roles of family deities and divinized ancestors, suggesting, "all divinized kinship terms may be considered semantically equivalent to designations of family gods."

[80] Sonia (2020, 14) notes, "the different modes of offering and maintenance that constitute the cult of deities are strikingly similar to those constitutive of the cult of dead kin" (cf. Sanders 2015, 82–83 n. 62).

[81] "Care for the dead (e.g., provision of offerings, protection, commemoration) is strikingly similar to the care of a deity in a temple cult, and the underlying logic of such cult assumes reciprocity between the one who sacrifices and the divine recipient" (Sonia 2020, 17).

[82] Lamps are known from cultic settings in the second and first millennia BCE from around ancient Southwest Asia. See Meyers 2003. See also Hachlili 2001, 11–16: "candelabra were used for illumination in cultic settings, as indicated by their location at the time of discovery, be it in a temple, tomb, or palace."

[83] The same artifacts at Arad were identified by Elizabeth Bloch-Smith (2015, 101) as "incense altars or offering tables," by Ze'ev Herzog (2010, 174) as incense altars, and by Menahem Haran (1993, 237–47) as offering tables. See also Douglas 1999, 241: "a very