

Agriculture in Ancient Ugarit and the Old Testament

A thesis
submitted to the University Honors Program
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Baccalaureate Degree with University Honors

Northern Illinois University
Department of History

David Alan Thompson

May 13, 1989.

Agriculture in Ancient Ugarit and the Old Testament: outline

David Alan Thompson

Outline

- I. Introduction
- II. Agricultural Practice
 - A. Royal Agricultural Administration
 - B. Local Agricultural Administration
 - C. Priestly Agricultural Administration
- III. Religious Ritual
 - A. The New Year Festival
 - B. The Rite of Desacralization
 - C. The Law of the Firstfruits
 - D. Sabbatical Year and Resoration
- IV. Mythic Themes and Theological Concepts
 - A. Motifs in Religious Expression
 - B. The Role of Agriculture in the Religions of Ugarit and Israel
 - C. Conclusion

Abbreviations

Notes

Appendix: Etymological Comparison of Selected Agricultural Terms

Bibliography

The most valuable of the Ugaritic texts in terms of Old Testament studies are the body of mythological texts which tell the stories of the Ugaritic pantheon and provide a basis for the cultic expression of Canaanite cosmology. The myth of Ba'al, which is the best known of the Ugaritic myths, has provided invaluable information toward understanding the religion that proved so detestable and dangerous to the prophets of Israel and Judah.

It is generally agreed that the Baal myth is fundamentally concerned with aspects of agricultural life; particularly as a cosmological explanation for the seasonal cycle as it occurs in the Levant. As a myth it supplemented a cult which attempted to re-enact those important cosmological events in the hopes of insuring continued agricultural success.

Agriculture played a very important role Ugaritic society; an aspect which it profoundly shared with Israelite neighbors. Both were societies whose economic and social foundation lay in a wide variety of farming activities.

The purpose of this paper is to examine agriculture as it is found in the literatures of Ugarit and early Israel. Much work has been done in the field of Ugaritic and Old Testament studies which attempts to draw parallels and offer reconstructions of the relationship between the Old Testament and the Ras Shamra texts. This paper does not claim to offer new material in this direction, but rather to classify and analyze existing observations within the parameter of agriculture. This is done

in an effort to better understand an aspect that was so fundamental to the experiences of early Israelites, particularly as they tried to settle a foreign land in the wake of the conquest of Canaan.

Its method will be to examine broad categories of agricultural subjects, looking for similarities and contrasts to the way each feature of agricultural life is represented in the text. It will first deal with agricultural practice in terms of land tenure and agricultural organization within each society. Then it will turn to the area of religion, examining agriculture in the cultus as well as common mythological themes and theological concepts. Finally, it will attempt to put the broader question of the role of agriculture in religion as a whole into perspective and offer a historical suggestion as to why Canaanite religious expression is such an integral part of early Israelite religion (1).

II. Agricultural Practice

The first category under which agriculture will be examined is perhaps the most obvious: agricultural practice. It is clear from both archaeology and the literatures of the period that the Levant was an agriculturally rich region, a land indeed "flowing

with milk and honey." When a Middle Kingdom Egyptian named Sinuhe was forced to flee into Canaan, he described the land in glowing terms:

... figs were in it and grapes. It had more wine than water. Plentiful was its honey, abundant its olives. Every (kind of) fruit was on its trees. Barley was there, and emmer. (2)

Given its natural resources, it is not surprising that a wide variety of agricultural activity provided the economic and social base of both Ugarit and Israel. In this section, we will attempt to compare some of the features of agricultural practice that can be known from the texts available.

Ugaritic Society was headed by a hereditary king who held sovereign power of the land of his kingdom. Unlike the Egyptian kings, there is no evidence that he was thought of as a god in his own right, although we do see in the legendary king Danel a description of the king being suckled by the gods. (3) In any case, the sovereignty of the kingship provides a starting point for understanding the land distribution system of Ugarit.

There seems to have been in Ugarit a distinction between the royal and local rural economy. The building block of the royal agricultural economy was the *gt*, or "tower", which was usually located within the vicinity of a particular local community. Its role was clearly distinct, however, from the community in which it was located, and oriented toward maintaining the king's economic interest in the region and feeding the royal storehouses. (4) Heltzer delineates the activities associated

with the gt as:

1. a storehouse of tools and agricultural supplies.
2. housing royal fattening cattle and beasts of burden.
3. a storehouse for royal grains at harvest. (5)

Each gt was manned by a crew of royal dependents (bns gt), some of whom some were agricultural laborers, while others were tradesmen of various sorts. Thus, it seems that the gt was a center for the king's broader economic interests in each community. (6)

Another important aspect of the royal economy was the king's role in the distribution of land. The king was the owner of all real estate, and he exercised his prerogative by distributing lands to support a class of royal dependencies as well as simply to reward friends of the king and queen. (7) In this respect the land distribution policies of Ugarit were very similar to that of Iron Age Israel. A system of royal land grants is also found in the Israelite context. In I Samuel 8: 10-18, Samuel warns of the dangers of having a king; a warning no doubt stimulated by observation of Israel's neighbors:

And he will appoint for himself commanders of thousands and of fifties, and some to do his plowing and to reap his harvest and to make weapons of war and equipment for his chariots . . . and he will take the best of your fields and your vineyards and your olive groves, and give them to his servants. . . (8)

In time this type of policy indeed became part of the Israelite social fabric. Royal estates clearly existed, although the legal passages of the Pentateuch deal almost exclusively with

private and village land laws. (9) The existence of royal landholdings and land grants is inferred from the historical texts. Saul promised land to the Benjaminites who would fight with him against David. (10) David also exercised this right in giving the land which he had inherited from Saul back to Saul's son, Mephibosheth. (11) It is interesting that although Saul came from a modest family, the landholdings which David inherited from him after a reign of kingship were fairly sizable.

There is no indication of a system resembling the "gt" system in Israel, although the lack of strictly administrative sources in the Hebrew texts does not allow for a clear statement in either direction. The only extant extra-biblical administrative texts are the so-called "Samaria Ostrica," which shed light to a discussion of land tenure only to the extent that they show that "land in Mount Ephraim acquired by clans of Manasseh during the conquest and settlement remained in the hands of their descendants till, at least, the second half of the eighth century B.C.E., and probably till the fall of Samaria in 722 B.B.E." (12) Aharoni does point out two of the ostrica do not bear clan names, leading him to the speculation that they were royal vineyards. (13)

I Chronicles 27 mentions that David installed overseers (sare harekus) to administer economic affairs for the crown, among whom was "Ezri, son of Chelub," who "had charge of the agricultural workers who tilled the soil." (14) This verse implies not only that there was a system of overseers, but also a

corps of agricultural laborers who worked the king's fields. I Kings 5:13-18 attributes the first implementation of slaves to king Solomon, although the context seems to be strictly related to mining activities. The status of those who "tilled the soil" for the king remains unclear.

Regardless of these ambiguities, it is clear that there was "an administrative system in vogue among ancient Israelites through which servants of the crown were supported by the income from the estates." (15) In this respect, the royal agricultural economies of Ugarit and Israel were very similar.

Because most of the administrative texts found in the archives at Ras Shamra deal with land exchanges between relatively wealthy land-owners, information about the composition of the local rural economy is not as extensive in that the local community maintained a fairly independent existence. There was some degree of private land ownership, but the local community functioned together in the sense that they were assigned a tax burden which they were responsible to meet as a community. This load was then divided among individual members. (16) If a person was not able to meet his share of the responsibility, he was declared "hyyala" and was forced to go into royal service. (17)

The local rural economy in Israel was probably much like the one in Ugarit, except that Israel was divided into tribal units which acted on behalf of its members. Thus, when the Ephraimite farmers complained that their high, mountain land was too

marginal to succeed agriculturally, they complained to Joshua, who sent them to the Bashan in search of greener grass. (18)

The final category of rural economy is that of the priestly class. Almost all Ancient Near Eastern cultures supported a priestly class by means of a separate priestly economy. The Egyptian priestly class is renowned for the immense wealth and political power it accumulated. The temple of Amun at Thebes even went as far as to occasionally challenge the dominance of the pharaoh in times of decline.

There is no evidence that the priestly class in Ugarit ran an entirely separate economy based on granted estates, although there are some priestly storehouses mentioned. (19) It appears to have been supported on the basis of taxes generated by the crown and special fees which were paid in by pilgrims during festivals. Unlike the Egyptian priesthood, the official cult personnel of Ugarit were squarely in the hands of the royal power. (20)

The priestly class of Israel was the tribe of Levi, for whom huge tracts of land were laid aside as a means of providing a separate agricultural base. (21) This land was not owned by any individual, but was communally owned, as the term "nigrash" (or "common land") would imply. (22) In the sense that Levitical priests operated autonomous agricultural estates they differed from what we know so far of their northern neighbors. But the Levitical priesthood also resembled the Canaanite class in it

also benefited from agricultural (and non-agricultural) offerings which were brought to the cult center for sacrifice.

III. Religious Ritual

Parallels in the area of the cult and religious practice are extremely tenuous and speculative, mostly because of the nature of the available sources. The religious practices of Ugarit must be reconstructed from what can be gleaned from the tablets containing the myths of Baal and Anat. Statements about rituals, rites, and sacrifices are made using a combination of of these mythical sources with other administrative and religious texts which list, for example, offerings that were donated at a specific temple. The nature of early Israelite religion, as opposed to religion during the divided monarchy or in the exilic period, is also a widely debated issue.

Nevertheless, there are some parallels in cultic activity which can be clearly observed. It is these areas, perhaps more than in the area of agricultural practice, which are so valuable in understanding the Canaanite context of the Hebrew Bible.

A. The New Year Festival

An element which can be found in both Ugaritic and Early Israelite religion is the celebration of a New Year festival which coincides with the agricultural calendar.

The Myth of Baal provides the mythological background for the New Year festival as it was practiced in Ugarit. In it, Baal struggles to defeat the elements of chaos in the world (Yam and Mot), and establish stability and agricultural prosperity. Throughout the myth, Baal is associated with the presence of rain, lightning, and fertility, while his absence is an explanation for sterility, dryness, and death. Baal's battle with Mot (death) culminates in a confrontation in the netherworld, which causes the earth to wilt and become dry. Eventually, Baal comes back from "the dead," and the land regains its vitality. Theodor Gaster describes the myth as "a nature myth," whose primary theme is the alternation of the seasons. (23)

All of these events were mythologically set in the fog of the remote past. And yet every year they were "actualized" in the cult of the people. Theodor Gaster sees the function of ancient myth as providing the "durative element," or the cosmological explanation of the specific event which is actualized in the ritual act. (24) This is especially true of annual, or seasonal, myths in which cosmological events are re-enacted in order to assure a continuation of the benefits derived from the outcome of the myth. In the case of the New Year festival, the rituals re-enacting the cosmological defeat of chaos and death and the re-

establishment of fertility and order came in the Autumn, just as the oppressive summer of the Levant was wearing down. The ritual, accompanied by the myth, was meant to re-enact the events of the remote past which were responsible for the rains which in late August every farmer in the Levant desperately hoped would come again. Thus, the myth of Baal can be seen as the mythological background of the New Year festival.

From examining other religious and administrative texts, we can know some of the details about how the New Year festival was implemented and some of its particular features. Johannes DeMoor offers an excellent summary of the available data in his New Year with Canaanites and Israelites. The following summary is based largely on part I of that work.

The events of the New Year festival actually began in the summer, some weeks before the New Year. At the time of the summer solstice, Baal was supposed to have come to life in the netherworld, and prayers were offered to the sun, who had the responsibility of bringing Baal back to earth unharmed. (25)

The actual New Year festival celebrated Baal's return and his victory over Mot. It lasted seven days, beginning on the new moon of the month of "r is yn ("First of the Wine"). (26)

Some of the integral features of the festival were the celebration of the new wine, various offerings, and a private rite of sacred marriage held on top of the king's palace. (27)

The sacred marriage, which is a common Mesopotamian rite, involved a ceremony in which the king acts out the fertility of the chief god of the pantheon by having intercourse with two of his wives while a crowd of specially chosen guests sing erotic hymns. Booths made of branches were set up on the roof of the palace in order to shelter the gods who were also thought to be in attendance. (28)

The Israelite ritual of the New Year festival operated in a similar way to the Canaanite one. It, as in Ugarit, was celebrated on the first day of the month of the autumn equinox. It also lasted seven days. DeMoor points out that Phoenician sources refer to the autumn festival as the *zbn ymn*, which is what it was called in Israel during the period of the judges. (29) Both festivals were "harvest festivals and connected with the new wine." (30) In short, there are enough similarities to adequately say that the Canaanites and the Israelites celebrated the same sort of New Year festival.

In spite of these parallels, there were also significant differences which should be mentioned. The practice of the sacred marriage never found its way into the Israelite version. Also, the role of Baal as the provider of sustenance was replaced in the Israelite festival by Yahweh's dominance over nature. In all, it seems that while the similarities indicate a common west-semitic background, the variances indicate a historical movement in the Israelite tradition away from the religion of her neighbors.

B. The Rite of Desacrilization

John Gray has suggested another cultic parallel which is based on a passage from the Baal text which describes Anat grinding, drying, and sowing the body of Mot after Baal has won the great confrontation. (31) The passage reads as follows:

She seizes Mot the son of El;
With a blade she cleaves him;
With a shovel she winnows him;
With fire she poaches him;
With a millstone she grinds him;
In the field she sows him;
He remains, the birds eat,
The wild creatures consume his fragments,
Remains from remains are sundered. (32)

This passage describes, according to Gray, a rite of desacralisation which involved a cultic ritual which paralleled the mythic event, much the way the events of the confrontation of Baal and Mot are actualized in the New Year festival. Rites of desacralisation are common in the Ancient Near East. They usually involve a dedication of dried seed in the hopes of renewed life evolving from the "death" of the offering, with crops.

Even if Gray is right in speculating a cultic ritual to accompany UT 49, the evidence for a similar rite in the Old Testament is rather scant. He offers as a proof text Leviticus

2:14. which exhorts worshipers bringing a grain offering of "early ripened things" to bring "fresh grains roasted in the fire." But this command is listed among a whole flock of other regulations regarding grain offering in general. It is possible that this verse indicates an awareness of a desacrilization practice, but such a conclusion does not seem to be explicitly accounted for in the text.

C. The Law of the Firstfruits

The Legend of Aqhat, whose protagonist is the righteous king Danel, describes a scene in which Danel unknowingly give a bow of the gods to his son, Aqhat. Upon giving him the gift, Danel reminds him that the first thing he kills with the bow rightfully belongs to the gods.

The firstfruits of thy chase, O Son,
the firstfruits of thy chase, lo! ... [do thou]
set in his temple... (33)

The "law of firstfruits" is also common in the Old Testament. (34)

D. Sabbatical Year and Restoration

The question of the sabbatical year in Ugarit and Israel is a widely debated one, and rests largely on which interpretation of the cycle-of-Baal one subscribes to. It is clear that the Mosaic law installed a sabbatical year of rest in which crops and land were restored. (35) The question that is debated is to what extent this practice is reflected in the Ugaritic texts.

Cyrus Gordon holds the opinion that the battle between Mot and Baal is not a seasonal event with Baal dying during the summer months, but rather that it depicts a Sabbatical cycle, with Baal killing Mot for seven years, whereafter Mot comes back to face Baal again. Thus, the seventh year is a time of conflict and sterility (36)

A.S. Kappelrud and John Gray maintain that the Baal myth is indeed a seasonal cycle, and that seven year death of Mot suggests a "connection" to the sabbatical year, although the link is rather incidental. The sabbatical cycle certainly is not, in their opinion, a central theme of the Baal-cycle. (37)

In either case, both opinions are in agreement that there was some sort of observation of a sabbatical year in Ugarit, even though there is no mention of it in religious texts outside of the Baal myths.

IV. Mythic Themes and Theological Concepts

A comparison of agricultural themes in terms of mythology and theological concepts is an attempt to make comparisons of a higher nature than cult practice. It is an attempt to step back and describe the role of agriculture within the larger parameters of the religions of Ugarit and early Israel. To what extent can the same themes be seen in each, and to what extent do they differ?

Perhaps the most obvious and fundamental concept which lies at the bottom of all agricultural ritual is a concept which links the favor of the gods (or God) with agricultural stability. More than any other factor, this is obviously at work in both the Ugaritic and the Israelite worldview. Such a perspective would seem natural, given the insecurities of agricultural subsistence, especially in a part of the world where there is such a disparity between the wet and the dry seasons. And yet to say that the Israelites and the Canaanites looked to their god(s) for continued fertility is not to say a great deal: almost every ancient culture did that. The interesting thing is to see how they looked to their god(s). What language did they use?

The power of Baal and Yahweh over the forces of the sea and of chaos is a theme which runs closely parallel in Ugaritic and

Hebrew hymnody. Phrases describing the march of God and the retreat of nature are common. Consider the following examples:

When you (Ba'l) smote Lotan the primeval dragon,
Destroyed the coiled serpent,
Tyrant (Silyat) of the seven heads,

(Then) the heavens withered (and) drooped
Like the loops of your garment (38)

The heavens roll up like a scroll,
And all their hosts languish,
As the vine leaf withers,
As the fig droops. (39)

Such examples of common poetic phrasing and theological perspective are abundant. (40) It seems clear that themes such as the storm motif in describing God, his struggle with and eventual control of nature, and the sterility that results from his absence can be considered as common approaches to religious expression.

When we turn to agriculture's role in the overall religion of Ugarit and Israel, the differences in approach become apparent. I would like to suggest that agriculturalism is much more central to the religion of Ugarit than it is to the religion of Israel. The basis for making such a claim is the observation that seasonal motifs and the restoration of agricultural fertility lie at the heart of the mythological texts which provide the basis for so much of the Ugaritic cult. This does not seem to be true of the Hebrew religion, which is much more concerned with "heiligsgeschichte," or the retelling of the

covenant history as a means toward national cohesiveness. (41)
It is true that many of the same motifs are used in the religious
expression of both literatures. Yet the role that the theological
concepts which those motifs represent play within the religious
texts as a whole are dramatically different.

The observation that agriculturalism played different roles
within each religious system provides a historical clue
concerning the constant struggle with syncretism that the Hebrew
text reflects. The following reconstruction is admittedly based
purely on the free exercise of historical imagination and
inference, but it is offered with the hope that the conclusion it
yields will seem probable nonetheless.

When the Hebrew tribes began to infiltrate Canaan, they were
a nomadic people of west-semitic stock. The greatest single issue
after the conquest was the transformation from a nomadic to a
sedentary society. When couched in such academic terms, the
process sounds innocuous enough. But from the perspective of an
Iron Age I farmer in the high country of Ephraim, the issue at
hand is whether you can muster a sufficient crop to survive.
Given that kind of pressure, the fact that agriculturalism and
fertility was the central concern of Canaanite cult and mythology
becomes a powerful impetus toward synchronization.

It is interesting to note that most of the openly
"Canaanite" portions of the Old Testament occur in passages which
are dated in the early stages of Israelite religion. (The
Pentateuch, Job, Psalms) By the ninth century B.C. "the imagery

of revelation derived from the mythology of the storm god largely fell out of use." (42) Such a situation follows naturally from a reconstruction which paints Israelite synchrotism as a response to insecurities regarding agricultural pressures. As the society successfully made the transition to a sedentary way of life, the tendency would not have been toward synchrotism, but toward emphasizing distinctions from her neighbors. (43) The agricultural pull of Canaanite religion lessened.

When seen from this perspective, agricultural themes in Ugaritic and Hebrew literatures are more than an interesting (or not so interesting!) angle of comparison. They provide a means for understanding an important social feature of early Israel, and in the development of Hebrew religion.

Abbreviations

| | |
|-------|---|
| BASOR | Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research |
| IEJ | Israel Exploration Journal |
| HUCA | Hebrew Union College Annual |
| PEQ | Palestine Exploration Quarterly |
| UF | Ugarit-Forschungen |
| UT | Cyrus Gordon's <u>Ugaritic Textbook</u> |

JOURNAL OF THESIS ABSTRACTS
THESIS SUBMISSION FORM

AUTHOR: David Alan Thompson
THESIS TITLE: "Agriculture in ^{Ugarit} Ugarit and the Old Testament."
THESIS ADVISOR: Dr. Marvin Powell
ADVISOR'S DEPT: History
DATE: May 12, 1989
HONORS PROGRAM: _____
NAME OF COLLEGE: Northern Illinois University
PAGE LENGTH: 22
BIBLIOGRAPHY (YES OR NO): Yes
ILLUSTRATED (YES OR NO): No
COPIES AVAILABLE (HARD COPY, MICROFILM, DISKETTE): Hard Copy
IS YOUR THESIS OR ANY PART BEING SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION? YES ___ NO X
IF ANY PART HAS BEEN ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION, PLEASE INDICATE WHERE _____
SUBJECT HEADINGS: (CHOOSE FIVE KEY WORDS) Ugarit, Old Testament, Agriculture, Religion, Baal, Israel
ABSTRACT (100-200 words):
The discovery in 1929 of the city of Ugarit in northern Syria opened an unparalleled gateway toward understanding of the cultural background of the Hebrew Bible. Among the most important of the many tablets discovered at Ugarit are ones describing the myths of the Canaanite pantheon, which provides a basis for Ugaritic religion. Agriculture played a fundamental role in these myths, and there are striking similarities with the Old Testament in this area. The agricultural administration of Ugarit and early Israel is largely similar. Both celebrated a similar New Year Festival. Both practiced a law of firstfruits. Both cultures have a sabbatical year. The religious expression used in Ugaritic and Israelite hymnody is similar. Nevertheless, agriculture is a much more central theme in Ugaritic religion than in Israelite religion. This agricultural aspect of Canaanite cult might be an explanation for early syncretism and Canaanite features of the Israelite texts.
For Office Use:
THESIS NUMBER: _____

Notes

1. Most of the comments about Israelite history will be directed toward the earliest periods of Israel's occupation of Canaan. This is done partly because these formative years of Israelite history are so fascinating, and partly because later periods move farther and farther away from the Ugaritic sources which are being used as a comparison. Also, later periods must take into account the Phoenician variation of Canaanite religion for which there are less available sources. See Albright, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1968: pp. 208-264.
2. Pritchard, James B. The Ancient Near East vol. I. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973: p. 7.
3. Pfeiffer, James B. Ras Shamra and the Bible. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1976: p. 40.
4. See Heltzer, Michael. The Internal Organization of the Kingdom of Ugarit. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1978:
5. Ibid., pp. 47-79
6. Ibid., p. 49
7. Rainey, Anson F. "The System of Land Grants at Ugarit in its Wider Near Eastern Setting." Tel Aviv: (pamphlet from the Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies, vol. I; 1967) p. 187.
8. I Samuel 8:12, 14
9. Borowski, Oded. Agriculture in Iron Age Israel. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987. p. 28.
10. I Samuel 22:7-8
11. II Samuel 9

12. Borowski, p. 26.
13. Aharoni, Yohanan. The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography. London, Burns and Oates, 1967: p. 322
14. I Chronicles 27:27. See Borowski p. 28
15. Rainey, p. 191.
16. Heltzer, Michael. The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1976: pp. 67-69.
17. Ibid., p. 52.
18. Joshua 17:16-18
19. Heltzer, The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit, p. 132.
20. Ibid., p. 139.
21. See Joshua 21
22. Borowski, p. 30.
23. Gaster, Theodor. Thespis: Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East. New York: Henry Shuman, 1950: p. 125.
24. Ibid., p. 77.
25. DeMoor, Johannes C. New Year with Canaanites and Israelites. (Part I) Nederland: Camper Cahiers, 1972: p. 5
26. Ibid., p. 6
27. The sacred marriage was conducted at the end of the feast, just as it is in Sumerian versions of the same ritual. See DeMoor, p. 7.
28. Ibid., p. 7.
29. See I Samuel 2:19, which falls in the context of Hannah coming to Shiloh for a feast called the zbh ymm. DeMoor has convincingly reconstructed this feast as the feast of the New Year, p. 12.
30. DeMoor, p. 29.
31. Gray, John. The Legacy of Canaan. (Vetus Testamentum Supplement V) Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965: pp. 68-70.
32. UT 49, II., 30-37.
33. Aqhat II iii 37-40

34. See Exodus 23:18. Leviticus 23:10 and Deuteronomy 18:4
35. See Lev. 25:1-7. Neh. 10:31.
36. Gordon, Cyrus H. "Sabbatical Cycle or Seasonal Pattern?" Orientalia: 1953: pp. 79-81.
37. Gray, Legacy of Canaan. p. 80.
38. CTA 5.1.1-5. Taken from Cross, Frank Moore. Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973. p. 150.
39. Isaiah 34:4
40. See Cross, chapter 7. for more examples as a more full discussion of the theophany of Ba'al and Yahweh.
41. For a summary of this approach to the history of the religion of Israel and its impact on Ugaritic studies see Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. pp. 83-90.
42. See Cross, pp. 190-191.
43. The important element with regard to syncretism is the average Israelite farmer, not those who were in charge of the official cult. I assume that those in charge of cultic orthodoxy were the element that tried to centralize the cult and combat syncretism.

Appendix

The following is a comparative list of selected Ugaritic and Hebrew Agricultural terms. The Hebrew words have been transliterated to include the traditional vowelings. Words with an asterik (*) are mentioned in the notes that follow this list.

| <u>English Word</u> | <u>Ugaritic Word</u> | <u>Hebrew Word</u> |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. apple | tph | tāpuṭ * lūz |
| 2. almond tree | tgd | lūz |
| 3. barley | š ^h r | se ora |
| 4. cassia | kš | kšy ^h a |
| 5. cedar | anz | anz |
| 6. ear (of grain) | šblt | šibboleṭ |
| 7. earth | arš; kpt | arš |
| 8. feed (for horses) | hndt | No parallel |
| 9. fertile | šy(?); qsr(?) | qore. * šmenā šāoeh |
| 10. field | šd | šāoeh |
| 11. dried figs (cake of) | dblt | debelā |
| 12. flax | ptt | pištā. * pešet |
| 13. flour(wheat) | gmh | gemāh * |
| 14. forest | y ^h r | y ^h r |
| 15. fruit | pr | pr |
| 16. summer fruit | qz | qayiq |
| 17. furrow | tlm | tlm |
| 18. garden | gn | gan |
| 19. grain | dgn | dagan |

| | | |
|----------------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| 20. desiccated grain | ḥmdrt | qali * |
| 21. granary | asm | asān |
| 22. grape | lrmn (gas) | enab |
| 23. grove | krm | kerem |
| 24. harvest | ‘br | qasir |
| 25. honey | nbt | debaš |
| 26. meadow | ah | aḥu * |
| 27. myrrh | mr | mr |
| 28. oil | šmn | šemen |
| 29. olive | zt | zayit |
| 30. to plant | nt | nt |
| 31. to plow | ḥrt; tlt | plḥ |
| 32. raisin | šmq | šimnuq |
| 33. scythe | m‘sd | mā‘asād * |
| 34. season | ‘dn | vonā |
| 35. seive | htr | kebara, naqa, nišman |
| 36. sesame | ššmn | |
| 37. sickle | gm(?) ; ḥymtt | maggal * |
| 38. to sow | dr | zr |
| 39. spelt | ksm | kismet * |
| 40. staff | ḥt; mt | mt, heter |
| 41. threshing floor | grn | qoren |
| 42. tree | ‘s | ‘š |
| 43. trowel | uit | magrepa |
| 44. vine | gpn | gepen |
| 45. vineyard | krm, šdmt | kerem |
| 46. wine | hmr, yn, trt | yn, tinos |
| 47. winepress | gt | pura |

1. tph is actually a place-name in the Ugaritic Text. It is translated "apple" based on the Hebrew word. But this translation is given further weight because of the fact that the Minoan "apple" pictograph has the phonetic value of tu, which is now ~~tu~~ would be vocalized in Ugaritic. (Gordon, UH p. 499) Gordon's confidence in the Greek etymological support is indicative of his general thesis that Ugarit has provided the link between the Greek civilizations and Mesopotamia. See Gordon, The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilizations, 19 .

9. ^lky alternately identified by Vinolleaud as meaning a "fertile field" as in the phrase ^lgd^lky (1079:7, 10). He does this on the basis of a parallel with Genesis 41:47. See PRU II, p. 98. (Gordon UH p. 462)

12. The Gezer Calendar uses peshet.

13. gmh as distinct from k^lmm and s^lrm in UH text 2037. (Gordon p. 278) gmh has been known in the Ancient Near East since the Pyramid Texts.

20. See Aistleitner (Untersuchungen 42) for a comparison of Ugaritic "hmdrt" to the Accadian "hamadirutu" (drying u^l). Bezhold, on the basis of this comparison, has suggested hmdrt as meaning "scorched or desiccated grain." (Chicago Assyrian Dictionary 6 (H) 576.) (Gordon, p. 347)

26. Ahu is usually translated in Hebrew as "reeds, rushes," although Genesis 41:18 allows a context closer to "meadow": marshes. Brown, Driver, and Briggs (A Hebrew and English Lexicon, 1907) indicates an Egyptian origin of the word. (p. 28)

37. gml has been translated "sickle" by W. Herrmann (BZAW 105; (1968): 20-21) and J.T. Milik (Ugaritica VII; 1978: p. 141). In both contexts "sickle" has been used to describe some sort of curved wooden instrument held in a symbolic fashion by divinity or royalty. It is Healey's opinion (UF15; 1983: pp. 47-53) that gml should be understood in relation to the Akkadian "gamlu", which is a symbol of the moon-god Sin. Hence, it should not be thought of as an agricultural tool per se.

39. As distinct from wheat and barley. In Aqhat II 1,32 and ii, 4,21 ksm is used in a ceremonial context, leading Gordon to a speculation that spelt was possibly once associated with ceremonial meals. (UH p. 422)

Bibliography

- Aharoni, Yohanan. The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography. London: Burns and Oates, 1967.
- Albright, William Foxwell. Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan: A Historical Analysis of Two Contrasting Faiths. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1968.
- Anderson, Gary A. Sacrifices and Offerings in Ancient Israel: Studies in their Social and Political Importance. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987.
- The Holy Bible. New American Standard Version. Nashville: Holman Bible Publishers, 1985.
- Borowski, Oded. Agriculture in Iron Age Israel. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987.
- Bowman, John. "Is the Samaritan Calendar the Old Zadokite One?" Palestine Exploration Quarterly. vol. 91: 1959: pp23-37.
- Brown, F., Driver, S.R. and Briggs C. A Hebrew and English Lexicon. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1907.
- Cassuto, U. Biblical and Oriental Studies, vol. II. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1975.
- , "Baal and Mot in the Ugaritic Texts." Israel Exploration Journal 12: 1962: pp. 72-88.
- Craigie, Peter C. Ugarit and the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983.
- Cross, Frank Moore. Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in

- the History of the Religion of Israel. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Dahood, S. J. Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.
- DeMoor, Johannes C. An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit. New York: E.J. Brill, 1987.
- New Year With Canaanites and Israelites. (Parts I and II) Nederland: Camper Cahiers, 1972.
- DeVaux, Roland. Les Institutions de L'Ancien Testament. vol. II Paris: Les Editions Du Serf, 1960.
- Driver, G. R. Canaanite Myths and Legends. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976.
- Dussaud, Rene. Les Decouvertes De Ras Shamra et L'Ancien Testament. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1941.
- Les Origines Canaanennes Du Sacrifice Israelite. Paris: Editions Ernst Leroux.
- Gaster, Theodor Herzl. Thespis: Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East. New York: Henry Shuman, 1950.
- Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament. Evanston: Harper and Row, 1989.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. Ugaritic Textbook. (Analecta Orientalia 38) Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1965.
- "Sabbatical Cycle or Seasonal Pattern?" Orientalia vol. VIII; 1953: pp. 79-81.
- Gray, John. The Legacy of Canaan: The Ras Shamra Texts and their Relevance to the Old Testament. (Vetus Testamentum Supplement V) Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965.
- The Canaanites. New York: Frederick A. Praiger, 1965.
- Grabbe, Lester L. "Ugaritic TLT and Plowing: On the Proper Cultivation of Semitic Etymologies." Ugarit-Forschungen vol. 14: 1982: pp. 89-92.
- "The Seasonal Pattern and the Baal Cycle." Ugarit-Forschungen vol. 8; 1976: pp. 57-63.
- Healey, J.F. "Swords and Ploughshares: Some Ugaritic Terminology." Ugarit-Forschungen. vol. 5; 1983: pp. 47-52.
- Heltzer, Michael. The Internal Organization of the Kingdom of Ugarit. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1982.

- Goods, Prices, and the Organization of Trade in Ugarit. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1978.
- The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1976.
- Hopkins, David C. "The Subsistence Struggles of Early Israel." Biblical Archaeologist vol. 50; Sep. 1987: pp. 178-191.
- Kaufman, Yehezkel. The Religion of Israel. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Kingsbury, Edwin C. "A Seven Day Ritual in the Old Babylonian Cult at Larsa." Hebrew Union College Annual 34; 1963: pp. 1-34.
- Lowenstam, S. "The Ugaritic Fertility Myth --- The Result of a Mistranslation." Israel Exploration Journal 12; 1962: pp. 87-88.
- Mazar, Amihai. "Giloh: An Early Israelite Settlement Near Jerusalem." Israel Exploration Journal vol. 31; 1981: pp. 1-36.
- Mazar, Benjamin. "The Early Israelite Settlement in the Hill Country." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research vol. 241; 1981: pp. 75-85.
- Meek, Theophile James. Hebrew Origins. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
- Morgenstern, J. "Supplementary Studies in the Calenders of Ancient Israel." Hebrew Union College Annual vol. 3, pp. 77-107.
- Noth, Martin. The Old Testament World. (trans. V.I. Gruhn) Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Obermann, Julian. Ugaritic Mythology: A Study of Its Leading Motifs. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948.
- Paul, Shalom M. and Dever, William G. Biblical Archaeology. The New York Times Book Co., 1974.
- Pfeiffer, Charles F. Ras Shamra and the Bible. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1978.
- Pritchard, James B. The Ancient Near East Vol. I Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.
- Rainey, Anson F. "The System of Land Grants at Ugarit in its Wider Near Eastern Setting." Tel Aviv: (Pamphlet from the Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies, vol. I; 1987: pp. 187-191)
-

----- The Social Stratification of Ugarit. (PhD Dissertation,
1962) Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.

Whitaker, Richard E. A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature.
Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972.

