

We know that Ugarit is mentioned together with Byblos and Tyre, and archaeological evidence shows, that the culture of Ugarit was that of Phoenicia. The same applies to the religion and the epics of Ugarit. In Ugarit we have not simply a provincial culture but the culture of Canaan.

The arguments of the Bauer-Goetze school consist mainly in three points:

1. The use of the article ha in Hebrew and Phoenician, not in Ugaritic.
2. The š-causative in Ugaritic, not found in Hebrew.
3. The differentiation between h and h in Ugaritic, while in Hebrew only one sound Heth is found.

There is no definite article in Ugaritic while the article ha is found in Hebrew and Phoenician. But the farther back we go in Phoenician the more infrequent becomes the article until in the Biblical inscriptions (1100-900 B.C.) it hardly appears at all. And in Hebrew poetry, especially old Hebrew poetry the article is very rare. Therefore the absence of the article in Ugaritic does not prove that it is derived from a non-Canaanite parent-language.⁴

It is true that the causative in Ugaritic is mostly formed by š, while Hebrew and Phoenician generally use h or ʔ for that purpose. But the problem is not as simple as it first appears because there are causative forms in Ugaritic formed with ʔ and we find š-causatives in Hebrew. In his article on Expression of the Causative in Ugaritic⁵ Zellig Harris lists two definite cases of ʔ-causatives in Ugaritic: ʔakn in Krt 15, and ʔabn in Krt 117.⁶ Besides these two definite occurrences Harris lists a number of probable cases. Gordon mentions the following ʔ-causatives: wyʔi in Krt 100 (the parallel in Krt 189 reads wybl!), ʔamlkn in 49:I:18, nmlk in 49:I:20,26.⁷