



Ugarit, Canaanite and Hebrew languages and Cultures

Ugarit



PHIL SMITH

Ugarit, Canaanite and Hebrew language and Culture

Two particular studies that I want to point out includes that of Deuteronomy and Ugaritic. These were written mostly by P. C. Craigie. Craigie says that the Ugaritic texts proved to be of great importance for Old Testament Studies. Ugarit was at one time a powerful city state situated on the Mediterranean coast situated in what is called Syria today directly across from the island of Cyprus. It reached it peak around 160000 BC but disappeared around 1200 BC. It was a cosmopolitan Canaanite city-state. It's position on the north-south caravan routes gave it a unique position for economic and cultural benefits. Human settlements dates back to 8000 BC. It is thought that the infamous invaders known as the sea people destroyed the city.

They had an advanced society with a well-established clay library made up of various languages of which mostly consisted of cuneiform. Toward 1500 BC, they actually which their language to something similar to Hebrew. Their seemed to have been a major earthquake around 1400 BC which destroyed a lot of the city and harbour. Craigie also says that the Ugaritic texts value for the study of the Old Testament is beyond question, and at many points they have shed new light on Hebrew text and on the background to the world of the Hebrews. But this information doesn't include all of the parallels covered in this text. The use of Ugaritic in is not without difficulties in regards to a practical nature. Yet it has been developed enough to actually teach the language. Like Babylonian, Aramean and Hebrew, it is a Semitic language tying it closely to the other languages. Now according to Craigie, many points in the text of Deuteronomy reveal Ugaritic resources which is invaluable in regards to our knowledge of the text.

In 1928, in the fields of Ras Shamra and ancient tomb was discovered. Williams says that was followed by archaeological explorations and digs which in turn led to the discovery of the fired brick like clay tablets that were written in an unknown cuneiform script. There were texts of King Kirta, Ba'al and Anat along with legends of Aqhat. From the related discoveries include a description of 'EL' father of all gods and head of the Ugaritic pantheon. The tablets revealed that Ba'al, Anat, and Mot were among El's children with Asherah being their mother. It goes into great length describing EL and his history and characteristics. Either El was a barrow word from Hebrew or the other way around. But we see that Ba'al permeated the Old Testament, especially in regards to Kings.

References to some of the heathenistic rituals of Ugarit are shown in Dt 14:21b a phrase is mentioned in regards to the 'cooking a kid' in context of prohibition and says that the significance of this is unclear. This somehow connects to the Ugaritic practice of idolatry perhaps in some way performing in a festival of a heathen service. We have a complete description of Ba'al from the Ugarit texts as described by Williams. Ba'al itself means 'lord' and a major actor among the Ugaritic gods. He defeats the sea god, Yam and the Dragon, Lotan. Lotan is referenced as the devil later in the Scriptures. Ba'al had power over meteorological phenomena. Remember the story of Elijah and the prophets of Ba'al to produce rain. From 1st Kgs 17:1, 7, 14, etc. Ba'al was also associated with Hadad, the West Semitic weather god and leading deity of the Canaanite pantheon. Ba'al was supposed to have dwelt on Mount Zaphan as mentioned in Ps 48:1-2. There is a reference in the Exodus narrative in Exod 14:2, 9 regarding the sanctuaries of Ba'al. Ba'al appears in regards to the temple of Ba'al in 1st Kgs 16:32. We have the altar of Ba'al in Judg 6:25 and 1st Kgs 16:32 and the pillar of Ba'al in 2nd Kgs 3:2 and then the prophets of Ba'al 1st Kgs 18:19, 22 etc. There are the priests of Ba'al in 2nd Kgs 11:18 with Ba'al having other names such as Ga'al Meon and Ba'al Gad in Numbers 32:38 and Josh 11:17 and then Ba'al Perazim in 1 Chronicles 8:34.

Some of these words in Deuteronomy seem similar to words in a Ugaritic text but the author discredits this Ugaritic term as meaning 'slaughter' instead of 'to cook'. Now Williams refers to Jacob referring to EL in Gen 33:20 where he sets up an altar that he names el elohe yisra el, El, the God of Israel. This was from Genesis 33:20!

The parallel also makes reference to 'milk' and not 'mother's milk' as the Hebrew entertains it to be. In Dt 23:17-18, the Craigie says there are two laws legislated here: Hebrew men and women were prohibited in taking part in cult prostitutes and payment of vows with money acquired through prostitution, either cultic or common prostitution. These are an abomination. These are assumed to be directed toward non Israelites countries surrounding Israel. But it isn't sure whether or not the Ugaritic translation of 'qdsim' means the same 'cult prostitutes' as in the Hebrew text. Other example of Deuteronomy and Ugaritic word similarities is in the area of parallel word pairs especially in poetry. Several examples are given: Ugaritic: hw / he and Hebrew hw / he. This word is in common used in Arabic today, 'Huwa' as in 'huwa wa hiya', he and she. Having worked in Egypt for five years, a lot of these words are familiar to me. Another example in 'hr' for mountain but this is more doubtful. But the conclusion for this parallelism is said to be common in poetry of all

languages and not of any special significance between Deuteronomy and Ugaritic texts. In the next paragraph the author does a comparison study of Ugarit and Israelite Poetry.

Craigie continues to say that these studies are actually more focused on the Hebrew dependence on or its relationship to Canaanite literature as represented by the Ugaritic texts. This provides a few principles of comparative studies, one being from criticism or how it's presented. The closeness of the two dialects makes it more difficult to understand their dependence on each other; this might indicate interdependence or it might indicate similar development within each dialect. If Ugaritic and Hebrew are dialects of Canaanite, then this creates its own problems. There is also a concern with the chronology of both texts. Chronology concerns redaction or compilation, transmission and written form. As already mentioned we see that the Ugaritic text has a pre history dating to the second millennium BC, but a common chronology can't be established. However, a similarity between the lyric and epic poetry of Ugarit and Israel may be coincidental and the literary form most likely had an independent origin for both. So these principles relates to linguistic relationships, chronology and origin of literary genres. In reading through the words gathered up by Williams, they amazing relate to that of Hebrew and the other language of the then time; meaning not just Hebrew but the other major Semitic language of the time. The geographical provenance must be taken into consideration also. The Ugarit text is in the far North of Syria while of course the Israeli text is from the area of Palestine. But you must remember, even Babylonian, further away than the Land of Israel had a very similar grammar and text being Semitic as it was.

The three texts to be examined are Song of Song 5:10-16 and RS 24.24525, Psalm 29 and its Canaanite Antecedents and the Song of the Sea in Exodus 15:1-18 and Canaanite Literature.

Song of Songs 5:10-16 reads:

My lover is radiant and ruddy, outstanding among ten thousand.
His head is purest gold; his hair is wavy and black as a raven.
His eyes are like doves by the water streams, washed in milk, mounted like jewels.
His cheeks are like beds of spice yielding perfume.
His lips are like lilies dripping with myrrh.
His arms are roads of gold set with chrysolite.
His body is like polished ivory decorated with sapphires.
His legs are pillars of marble set on bases of pure gold.

His appearance is like Lebanon, choice as its cedars.

The Ugaritic text in the first comparison is classed as descriptive ritual text the Biblical passage is suggested to have had a cultic setting. Craigie dates the Ugaritic text around 14th century and the Hebrew passage around 5th century BC. But we have to be careful here. Why he dates it around 5th century BC may be problematic. Remember we have a complete set of the Old Testament dated at 200 BC. Because of this, I believe we should date the original text at the time it was written. Both passages are poetic but the Hebrew passage is a secular lyric poetry with the classification of the Ugaritic text being mythological. The Hebrew text is neither descriptive ritual nor mythological. The second comparison of Psalm 29 and its Canaanite Antecedents and according to H.L. Ginsberg in 1935, T.H. Gaster and F.M. Cross, Psalm 29 was borrowed from a Canaanite Baal myth. I think that Psalm 29 cannot be dated with any certainty except possibly to three or more centuries because of oldest Old Testament text being 200 BC.

These two boxes represent some of the comparison between Exodus and the Ugarit Text.

Then Moses and the children of Israel sang this song to the Lord, and spoke, saying:

2 The Lord is my strength and song,
And He has become my salvation;
He is my God, and I will praise Him;
My father's God, and I will exalt Him.
11 "Who is like You, O Lord, among the gods?
Who is like You, glorious in holiness,
Fearful in praises, doing wonders?
15 Then the chiefs of Edom will be dismayed;
The mighty men of Moab,
Trembling will take hold of them;
All the inhabitants of Canaan will melt away.
16 Fear and dread will fall on them;
By the greatness of Your arm
They will be as still as a stone,
Till Your people pass over, O Lord,
Till the people pass over
Whom You have purchased.
17 You will bring them in and plant them
In the mountain of Your inheritance,
In the place, O Lord, which You have made
For Your own dwelling,
The sanctuary, O Lord, which Your hands have established.
18 "The Lord shall reign forever and ever."
The Holy Bible, New King James Version, (Nashville,
Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, Inc.) 1982.

Then Moses and the children of Israel sang this song to the Lord, and spoke, saying:

12 You stretched out Your right hand;
The earth swallowed them.
13 You in Your mercy have led forth
The people whom You have redeemed;
You have guided them in Your strength
To Your holy habitation.
14 "The people will hear and be afraid;
Sorrow will take hold of the inhabitants of Philistia.
15 Then the chiefs of Edom will be dismayed;
The mighty men of Moab,
Trembling will take hold of them;
All the inhabitants of Canaan will melt away.
16 Fear and dread will fall on them;
By the greatness of Your arm
They will be as still as a stone,
Till Your people pass over, O Lord,
Till the people pass over
Whom You have purchased.
17 You will bring them in and plant them
In the mountain of Your inheritance,
In the place, O Lord, which You have made
For Your own dwelling,
The sanctuary, O Lord, which Your hands have established.
18 "The Lord shall reign forever and ever."
The Holy Bible, New King James Version, (Nashville,
Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, Inc.) 1982.

(a) verse 2 - 'My strength and protector is Yah' יְהוָה וְיִמְּכָרְתִּי. The use of יְהוָה וְיִמְּכָרְתִּי can be compared directly with an example from one of the newer texts discovered at Ugarit: RS. 24.252, lines 9-10 (reverse); see also lines 6-7. 'Send your protection, your guard' (de Moor) 'zk.dmrk.l'ak
(b) verse 11 'Who is like you among the gods, Yahweh?' מִי כָמוֹךָ בָּאֱלֹהִים יְהוָה. Note the similarity of מִי כָמוֹךָ בָּאֱלֹהִים with the following line taken from the Keret legend. CTA 16.V.10-11. 'Who among the gods will drive out the disease?' מִי בְּיָמִים יִדְּמֵם [ydy.mr.s]
(c) verse 15 'The chiefs of Edom, the leaders of Moab' מִזְעֵב אֱדוֹם וְאֶלְפֵי מוֹאָב. In this instance, there is not a direct Ugaritic parallel. It seems, however, that the Hebrew singer is using the correct Canaanite terms for the Canaanite chiefs⁶⁰ and a parallel in principle may be seen in the following lines, also from the Keret legend. CTA 15.IV.17-18 'She shall bring in to him his dukes' (lit. 'bulls') לְה.טר.טִשְׁר.ב 'She shall bring in to him his barons' (lit. 'Gazelles') לְה.טִשְׁב.ז.ב.ז.ב.ז.ב.
(d) verse 17 Note the following phrases: 'The mountain of your inheritance' בְּהַר נַחֲלָתִי 'the dais of your throne' (Cross and Freedman) מִכּוֹן לְשִׁבְתִּי 'the sanctuary, Yahweh . . . ' מִקְדָּשׁ אֱלֹהֵינוּ. Very similar phraseology is employed in the context of enthronement in the Ugaritic texts: CTA 3.C.III.27 ' . . . in the sanctuary, in the mountain of my inheritance' בְּקִדְשִׁי בְּהַר נַחֲלָתִי. RS. 24.245, obverse 1. 'Baal was seated like the seat of a mountain' (de Moor) בְּל.י.ט.ב.ק.ט.ג.ר.ע
(e) verse 18 'Yahweh shall reign. . . ' יְהוָה יִמְלֹךְ. Although the phrase may be too short for significant comparisons, the following lines may be noted in the Ugaritic texts: CTA 2.IV.32 'Baal shall reign' בְּל.י.מ.י.מ.ל.ק CTA 6.I.55 'Let Athtar the terrible reign' י.מ.ל.ק.י.ט.ר.ז.

(a) Conflict, order (vv. 1-10, 12) the initial conflict is between Yahweh, the Warrior, and Pharaoh with his armies. 'Sea' is prominent in these verses (ים and various synonyms), but it is never personified and made the protagonist of Yahweh, as was Yamm ('Sea') in the Ugaritic texts.

(b) Kingship (v. 11) Kingship is not directly expressed here, but as a result of Yahweh's victory, his incomparability is expressed in the form of a rhetorical question: 'Who is like of Yahweh's supremacy, parallel perhaps to Baal's victory over Yamm.

(c) Conflict (vv. 14-16) Conflict is anticipated with the various inhabitants of the land of Canaan. The motif may be parallel at this point with Baal's conflict with Mot.

(d) Temple (v. 17) The reference to Yahweh's sanctuary and the mountain of his inheritance indicates the permanent establishment of his sanctuary and authority.

(e) Kingship (v. 18) Finally, Yahweh's kingship is openly expressed, parallel to Baal's kingship after a number of conflicts.

There is another comparison that comes from the Exodus 15:1-18 and Canaanite Literature. The author says that this is an example of early Hebrew Poetry. The author says the thesis is that the writer or singer made use of the Ugaritic texts. The author corrects himself and suggests that the singer adapted his song by using the Canaanite formulae. I've included the comparison for interest in this text.

Some of these similarities may be disputed. To illustrate the motifs, there is a conflict of Ba'al and Yamm who represent the power of chaos. As already mentioned, Ba'al is victorious and his kingship is acclaimed. Baal's authority seems to be assured. The creation of order represented by Baal's victory and continued rule as represented by Baal's victory over Mot relates this to the creation of the people of Israel and looks forward to the establishment of Israel in the Promised Land. So the author states, the Song of the Sea contains evidence of Canaanite resources which have been adapted to the New Hebrew context.

So we have seen some points to indicate literary relationship and its religious significance: direct borrowing which is rarely used by the Israelites, adaptation of foreign materials which fits Israel influence from foreign influences and the third suggests that the writer was more creative than adaptive in his use of resources. The purpose of these paragraphs is to explore the relationship between the Old Testament and one part of its ancient environment, namely Syria-Palestine and especially the Eastern Mediterranean seaboard. There is a relationship; that much is obvious, but it isn't necessarily favourable. Yes, we have El but EL of the Hebrew is much different the EL of the Ugarit. Yes, Ba'al is mentioned over and over again in the Old Testament but as a false god that people believe in. He is nothing like that of Yahweh.

We have again talked about Ugarit being both a city and a kingdom or a small nation state whereas Canaan refers to an area after the Ugarit nation was destroyed. Israel is a nation state. There are divergences of chronology, geography and context which this information tries to deal with. Many scholars working with the Ugarit text consider Canaan a bridge between Israel and Ugarit text. But this bridge doesn't mean that Canaan and Ugarit are the same nor is Ugaritic literature and religion the same as Canaan. The author explores the relationships between Ugarit, Canaan and Israel in order to somehow close the gap between the three so as to better relate Ugarit textual influence on the Hebrew Bible. The most obvious interrelationship is the trade between Canaan and Ugarit. There are some

architecture similarities in regard to temples in Ras Shamra. The cult of Baal appears to have functioned in Syria, Canaan and even in Egypt and there are similarities between the languages sharing a lot of common lexical stock. Ugaritic script has been discovered at a variety of sites in Syria and Palestine beyond Ras Shamra plus the kingdom of Ugarit were also widely dispersed throughout Syro Palestinian region but it must be said that the cuneiform alphabet commonly employed in Ugarit is not representative of that employed in Palestine. The author also mentions the Hurrians as a possible factor in the equation of interrelationships between Israel, Canaan and Ugarit. In addition to Hurrians in Ugarit, there were cities in Canaan with Hurrian populations such as Megiddo, Taanach and Sehchem. Israel never fought against the Hurrians. There were even references to them as the Horites or Hivites. But, still, one author 'Baruch Margalit' says that is a seemingly unbridgeable gaps, both in time and in space between Jerusalem and Ugarit. The author disagrees with H. L. Ginsberg who was mentioned earlier who says the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible should be regarded as one literature. But the author restates that even though there are many differences and difficulties in linking the Israelites and the Ugaritic data, the similarities should not be ignored.

In this passage, David Toshio Tsumura looks at several authors who pose connections between Ugaritic Poetry and Habakkuk chapter 3. Tsumura starts by saying a major methodological problem confront anyone wishing to relate the Ancient Near eastern texts to the Old Testament. There's evidence that scholars have tended to 'biblicise ancient Near Eastern documents before they are compared with OT materials. Any comparison is basically between different genres of literature. P.C. Craigie who has provided the previous three articles thus summarized says that Ugaritic has not provided any prophetic poetry. It has no unambiguous example of psalmody nor does it have any extensive examples of literary narrative prose. Thus, this means that any Hebrew - Ugaritic comparative studies are of different literary forms but still some scholar's customary hold that Habakkuk 3 was influenced by Ugaritic poetry! J. Day suggests that Habakkuk 3 contains a number of mythological allusions which come from a background in Baal mythology. He gives an example in Habakkuk 3:9 to Yahweh's seven arrows and thus Yahweh's sever thunders and lightning's matches that of Baal's seven lightening. So other scholars say that Habakkuk 3:8-10, 15 reflects one version of the Baal myth, the 'Baal-Yam myth', while Habakkuk 3:5 reflects 'the Baal-Tnn myth' and a third version a 'Baal-Mot myth'. But, according to the author, this is only an ad hoc comparison of several fragments of Ugaritic myths and a part of

the Old Testament prophetic literature. G.E. Wright says that the vocabulary of the nature myths of Canaan was used extensively and that the old Canaanite myth of creation has been transferred to Yahweh But the author says that there is no evidence that the entire myth of ancient Canaan was transferred to the Bible by means of historicization.

3 A prayer of the prophet Habakkuk according to Shigionoth.

2 O Lord, I have heard of your renown,
and I stand in awe, O Lord, of your work.
In our own time revive it;
in our own time make it known;
in wrath may you remember mercy.

3 God came from Teman,
the Holy One from Mount Paran. Selah
His glory covered the heavens,
and the earth was full of his praise.

4 The brightness was like the sun;
rays came forth from his hand,
where his power lay hidden.

5 Before him went pestilence,
and plague followed close behind.

6 He stopped and shook the earth;
he looked and made the nations tremble.

The eternal mountains were shattered;
along his ancient pathways
the everlasting hills sank low.

7 I saw the tents of Cushan under affliction;
the tent-curtains of the land of Midian trembled.

8 Was your wrath against the rivers, O Lord?
Or your anger against the rivers,
or your rage against the sea,
when you drove your horses,

your chariots to victory?

9 You brandished your naked bow,
Sated were the arrows at your command. Selah
You split the earth with rivers.

10 The mountains saw you, and writhed;
a torrent of water swept by;
The deep gave forth its voice.

The sun raised high its hands;
11 the moon stood still in its exalted place,
at the light of your arrows speeding by,
at the gleam of your flashing spear.

12 In fury you trod the earth,
in anger you trampled nations.

13 You came forth to save your people,
to save your anointed.

You crushed the head of the wicked house,
Laying it bare from foundation to roof. Selah

14 You pierced with their own arrows the head of his
warriors,

who came like a whirlwind to scatter us,
Gloating as if ready to devour the poor who were in hiding.

15 You trampled the sea with your horses,
Churning the mighty waters.

In Habakkuk 3:8, Yahweh versus the Sea has been suggested that it reflects the Hebrew counterpart of the Canaanite Chaos, 'kampf' motif in the Ugaritic Baal. Know that in ancient history around 2000 BC; the sea has always represented that of Chaos, especially by ancient non-Biblical religions. This is always compared back to Psalm 46 but the author says that in Habakkuk 3, it is Yahweh who gets angry, not the waters, and Habakkuk 3:8-10 seems to represent the actual and once for all subjection in His power and will to subdue. The reference to winged horses in Hab 3:8, 15 symbolizes the winds but there is no proof so far that Baal's hypothesized horses had wings, let alone that Yahweh's had. Yahweh is simply described metaphorically as a 'rider of horses and chariots'. The number parallelism of 'seven' as already mentioned is common practice both in Ugaritic and Hebrew and appears often in literary idioms so it is not necessarily a reflection of the Baal myth. It should be noted that 'Mace' and 'bow' appears also in Akkadian texts as a word pair. In Habakkuk 3:13, Yahweh is described as having crushed the evil one. In Ugaritic texts, this verb is also

employed to describe the slaying of Baal's enemies. But this doesn't prove that the biblical text has a literary connection with Ugaritic conflict myths. In Habakkuk 3:13, Eaton thinks that the dragon is a personification of the rebellious waters and representing the sum of chaos and death but there's no mention of dragon explicitly and neither are the rivers and the sea described as dragons. Day says that 3:5 constrains a mythological allusion in 'plague and pestilence' which is alluding to Resheph's participation in the conflict with chaos which has its background in Ugaritic text. But Day assumes that that background of the entire section of Habakkuk 3:3-15 is a Canaanite myth of Baal's conflict with the sea or dragon'. According to the author, his argument just isn't convincing as the passage shows no actual description of Resheph's participating as an archer in the described conflict. So any suggested connection between Habakkuk 3 and Ugaritic mythology is not well-founded.

In this article, we see that the discovery of the Ugaritic texts proved to be of great importance for Old Testament Studies. We also see the any comparison between Ugarit and Hebrew is simply the comparisons within the Semitic texts and language. Of there are words that carry on. For example, in Babylonian, the word for food from around 3000 BC is used today in both Arabic and Hebrew. Nearly 5000 years have separated the lineage of the word. Oh, there is a bit of a 'sameness' with what was shown but one would expect that coming from another Semitic culture. At one point the author says that the study is approaching or focuses on the Hebrew dependence of the Canaanite literature and next he says that Hebrew is the fixed point which makes the problem centre on the Ugaritic to Hebrew; but this seems to me is a contradiction. At the beginning, the author makes it very clear that the topic of the paper is a comparative study of Ugaritic and Hebrew literature. Yet, the author has again gone to some measure in pointing out the many negative aspects of the comparisons to such an extend that the topic is no longer studying and examining the comparison of the three examples but providing a convincing argument that the three examples or cases don't relate at all. Obviously the author is taking it very slow to make any dangerous comments.

In 1935 H. L. Ginsberg first put forward the hypothesis that Psalm 29 was a Phoenician hymn which had found its way into the Hebrew Psalter 40. He noticed the presence of 'pagan notions' in the psalm, the main one being the emphasis throughout on the glorification of Yahweh's voice; the evidence indicated, in Ginsberg's view, that the whole psalm originally contemplated the storm god Baal or Hadad. Eleven years later T.H. Gaster took the theory further and suggested that it was a hymn of laudation which has been detached from its mythic context and Yahwized and F.M Cross further said that it was a

Canaanite Baal hymn. I think this is interesting; If this is true, the writer is taking something that is evil and bad and using it for God's glory. However, we will see that this isn't the case. But much later the author says specifically that there are no detailed line for line comparison with the Hebrew passage and the text came from two different genres so the point is that Ginsberg, T.H. Gaster and F.M Cross are suggesting something here that has no validity whatsoever only that there seems to be some similarities. Consequently, the chronological gap between Psalm 29 and the Ugaritic parallels is of three or more centuries, and though this may be reduced by similar procedures to those employed in the first test case, the result, as before, will be to increase the hypothetical nature of the comparison. This is about the second time the author has referred to three or more centuries separating certain texts being used as un-important. To me, the author seems to be a flippant in doing this. If you consider the incredible number of changes that has happened in the past three or more centuries which has immediately preceded our lifetimes; the differences and changes are so great, which would be the same in those days. The third example and comparison is Exodus 15:1-18 and to be exact, it involves verses 2, 11, 15, 16, 17, and 18. The question that immediately arises with me is the timeline here. If this is with Moses who was before they settled in Canaan then the whole comparison is from a reverse standpoint. It's what the Ugaritic text later copied from the Hebrew text. If this is the case, then it all makes sense to me. But the references and authors are approaching it from the standpoint of what the Hebrews borrowed from the Ugaritic text. However the Ugarit city state time line places it between 1450 BC until 1200 BC in northern Syria and the Israeli time line places them in Canaan at the very earliest 1200 BC. Perhaps the Israeli timeline should be earlier than this. But the writing of this is said to either be around 1400 by Moses or much later by someone else in 535 BC.

Any comparison is filled with assumptions. But there's a problem here. First, if the Israelites did not arrive into Canaan until 1200 BC or 1250 BC, the very 'Sea Peoples' that destroyed Ugarit and attacked Egypt and settled into the Gaza strip would not have not have any relation with the Ugaritic text and any influence of the Ugarit culture and language in Palestine would have been extremely small because of the new culture of the Philistines. But, of course the Canaanites were conquered by the Israelites to a great extent and there would have been a great influence from that but still the Canaanite nature and the Ugarit nation were not one and the same! Any relationship between the two nations would have to be traced back to the earlier years of the Hittite or Hurrian influence. What it seems to me, just like the Dead Seas strolls, people are trying to make a square peg fit a round hole!

In this report, then, I wanted to see the relationship between the Ugarit, Canaan, and Israel . Well, honestly, the comparison has been more between Ugarit and Israel. I assume the knowledge surround Ugarit is almost the same as Canaanite as Ugarit was a Canaanite city. One of the authors keep talking about the impact that Ugarit has had on the study of Hebrew. Well, I'm not so sure about this. This has been referred time and again but nothing has been shown as of yet to show what kind of impact it has had. However, Craigie does question whether many of the proposed parallels have only existence in the heads of their inventors because this is also evidence. I believe this to be so.

References:

- Albright, W. F. 1950. The origin of the Alphabet and the Ugaritic ABC Again. Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.
- Cooper, Alan, and Marvin H. Pope 'Divine Names and Epithets in the Ugarit Texts 1981
Edited by Stan Rummel, Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Craigie, P. C. 1976. The Book of Deuteronomy 2nd Edition - Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, Grand Rapids, Michigan
- David Toshio Tsumura, 2006. The Books of Samuel, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, Grand Rapids, Michigan
- Gaster, T.H. and Cross, F.M. – 1946. Yahweh and the gods and goddesses of Canaan. Psalm 29 Notes on a Canaanite
- Ginsberg, H. L. 1981. Ugarit in Retrospect. Psalm 29 to be a Phoenician hymn. Winona Lake, Indian Eisenbrauns.
- Huehnergard, John. 1987. Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription. Harvard Semitic Studies 32. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Michael Williams. 2012. Basics of Ancient Ugaritic – A Concise Grammar, Workbook and Lexicon. Printed by Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- Pardee, Dennis. 1989. Ugaritic Proper Nouns – Bibliographic information pertaining to a large number of proper nouns. Volume 34 Archiv Fur Orientforschung.
- Wright, G. E. , 1960. An Introduction to Biblical Archaeology – Studies in Theology