

*H. F. van Rooy*

THE RELATION BETWEEN ANAT AND BAAL IN THE UGARITIC TEXTS<sup>1</sup>

1. The texts which enlighten the topic:<sup>1a</sup>

Non-religious texts: 1043, 1061 and 2008.

Ritual and liturgical texts: 1, 3, 5, 9, 173, 1004, 2004, 2158 and UG V: 7, 8, 9, 13 and 14.

Literary texts:

Krt: 127:56

128 II:27

Krt 145, 295–6

Aqht: 124:8, 9

II Aqht I:17

II Aqht VI: 25–33

Anat-Baal cycle:<sup>2</sup>

Kingship theme: Baal-Yam-motif

137:7–8, 40–42

68:28–32

1001 I:1; II:9–10

Kingship theme: House-building-motif

‘nt III:1–44

‘nt IV:45–49, 81–89

‘nt P1. vi IV:6–8

‘nt P1. vi V:9–12, 37–43

51 II:15, 21–24, 38

51 III:23–36

51 IV:18–19

51 V:82–90

The agricultural cycle

---

<sup>1</sup> As a token of my sincere gratitude for his most patient guidance in my initial staggering strides in the field of Semitic languages, culture and religion, I dedicate this paper to prof. dr. E. J. Smit of the department of Semitic languages, Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education, Transvaal, Republic of South Africa.

<sup>1a</sup> The Ugaritic texts are quoted according to the system of GORDON, C. H., *Ugaritic Textbook, Analecta Orientalia* 38, 1965, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, Roma, with the exception of the texts from *Ugaritica V* (UG V).

<sup>2</sup> The texts of this cycle are classified according to the system used by VAN ZIJL, P. J., *Baal. A study of texts in connection with Baal in the Ugaritic epics, Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 10, 1972, pp. 6–12. He deals with the classification of the different authors which is followed by his own. He distinguishes between two main themes, viz. “Kingship among the gods” and “The agricultural cycle”. He furthermore describes two divisions as regards the Kingship-theme, viz. Baal’s victory over Yam and the house-building episode. This classification is quite satisfactory.

67 V:17–22  
 67 VI:26–31  
 62:1–29  
 49 I:4–14  
 49 II:6–12, 26–31  
 49 III:1–3, 22–47  
 76 I:3, 6, 7, 9  
 76 II:1–29  
 76 III:1–4, 21–22, 33–38  
 132:1–5  
 UG V 3:Rev. 6–7

2. In the non-religious texts hardly any reference is made of Anat and not in any way is she connected with Baal. It is also significant how very rarely the name “Anat” is used as an element in personal names. Cf. *bd'nt* (1055:6; 2011:7) and *bn'nt* (1043:12; 1061:6). This may be a pointer that Anat was of minor importance removed from the cult.<sup>3</sup>

3. In the ritual and liturgical texts and the god lists Anat is very rarely connected with Baal. In texts 17, 107, 173, 1004 and 2004 the name Anat does not even appear. In texts 1, 3, 5, 134, 2158 and UG V 9 and 14 her name is noted, but not at all in connection with the name of Baal. The only cases where the names of Baal and Anat are connected, are in text UG V 13 and text 9.<sup>4</sup> In both these texts the designation *'nt špn* is to be noted. In this whole group of texts, therefore, no uniform picture is observed with regard to the relation between Anat and Baal. Many of these texts are unfortunately damaged with the result that it is hardly possible to come to a definite conclusion.

4. In UG V 7 and 8, the two snake-incantations, the same basic sequence is followed to introduce the gods called upon. *atrt* is omitted in both. The consecutive order of the two texts is as follows (as regards the initial gods):

UG V 7: *il, b'l, dgn, 'nt w'ttrt*

UG V 8: *il w'hrn, b'l wdgn, 'nt w'ttrt*

In both lists Anat and Attartu are combined. They follow, in both lists, after Baal and Dagan. This may be an indication that a certain group,

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of the names formed with *'nt* as an element, cf. GRÖNDAHL, FRAUKE, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit, Studia Pohl I*, 1967. pp. 111 and 83. Mention are made of a few names in addition to those mentioned above, but they do not appear in the Ugaritic texts from Ugarit, but rather in the Akkadian texts. They are *šu-ba-an-tu*, *šu-um-a-na-ti* and *fā-na-ti-um-mi*. The conclusion that *'nt* is rarely used as an element in personal names, concurs with that of Gröndahl (p. 83): “Anat, die in der ugaritischen Mythologie eine sehr grosse Rolle spielt ist in Personennamen verhältnismässig selten belegt.”

<sup>4</sup> According to the restoration of HERDNER, A., *Corpus des tablettes en cuneiformes alphabetiques (decouvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939) II*, 1963.

the snake charmers, used to invoke the gods in the same basic order. It also signifies a close relationship between Anat and Attartu. Nothing can, however be concluded as regards the nature of the relationship between Baal and Anat.

5. In the Krt-texts Baal and Anat are not directly associated, although the appellation *'ttrt . šm . b'l* appears.

6. In the Aqht-texts it is quite clear that the Dnil family is supported by Baal while evil is casted upon them by Anat. There is no co-operation between them, but they are on different sides.<sup>5</sup> It was for the author(s) of this text no problem to have Anat and Baal on different sides in the struggle. This is quite important for the relationship between them.

Remarkable is in this regard 2 Aqht VI:25–33:

- (25) . . . *wt'n . btl*  
 (26) *'nt . irš hym . laqht . g'zr*  
 (27) *irš hym . watnk . blmt*  
 (28) *wašlhk . ašsprk . 'm . b'l*  
 (29) *šnt . 'm bn il . tspr . yrhm*  
 (30) *kb'l . kyhwy . y'šr . hwy y'š*  
 (31) *r . wyšqynh . ybd . wyšr 'lh*  
 (32) *n'm(n wt)nynn . ap ank . aḥwy*  
 (33) *aqh(t g'z)r . . .*

*The virgin Anat then replied:*

“Ask life, oh hero Aqht,  
 Ask life, and I shall grant it to you,  
 Immortality, and I shall let you count years with Baal;  
 With the son<sup>6</sup> of Il you will count months,  
 Just as, when Baal lives, they celebrate and give him to drink,<sup>7</sup>  
 They chant<sup>8</sup> and sing beautiful things about him.”

*Thus she replied:*

“I also will keep the hero Aqht alive”.

Here Anat offers immortality to Aqht. Note here in particular the claim made by her in lines 32 and 33: *ap ank . aḥwy aqht g'zr*. The particle *ap*

<sup>5</sup> For a detailed discussion of this subject and the parts played by Baal and Anat, cf. KAPELRUD, A. S., *The violent goddess. Anat in the Ras Shamra Texts*, 1969, pp. 70–82. Cf. especially p. 82: “It is interesting to note that it is Baal who tried to repair what Anat had destroyed, an indication that in the cult which accompanied the Aqht text, both these gods had their place. That is not unusual. What is unusual here, however, is the feature that they have their roles in different parts of the drama, Anat this time in the negative part, otherwise connected with Mot, Baal in the positive one. It is the impression of Anat’s warlike and violent sides which prevails here.”

<sup>6</sup> *bn* could be the singular or plural masculine construct state: “son of” or “sons of”. The singular is to be preferred on account of the possible parallelism between *b'l* and *bn il*.

<sup>7</sup> Explaining *hwy . y'šr* between *y'šr* and *wyšqynh* as dittography.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. KAPELRUD, *Anat*, p. 72.

serves the purpose in this context of stressing the subject of the sentence. The subject is also stressed by the tautological use of the independent personal pronoun *ank*. Anat therefore emphasises it here very strongly that she could indeed grant life. In a way she competes with Baal as regards fertility. The interpretation of the entire Aqht cycle reveals many problems, but the cycle is undoubtedly connected with fertility. The relationship between Baal and Anat in the Aqht texts must caution one against a view of the relationship between them that places the relationship on the same level throughout.

7. The texts dealing with the struggle between Baal and Yam is important for the relationship between Anat and Baal chiefly on account of the lack of information as regards our subject. Text 129, one of the texts of this group,<sup>9</sup> is not even listed in the list of relevant texts, because Anat and Baal do not figure in it. It may be regarded as a prologue to the entry of Baal. In text 137 Baal and Yam are represented as adversaries. Note the malediction uttered by Yam against Baal:

(7) . . . *yṭb (r ḥrn yṭbr ḥrn)*<sup>10</sup>

(8) *rišk 'ṭrt . (šm b'l qdqk)*

"May Horon crush,

May Horon crush your head

Athtartu-name-of-Baal your skull."

Athtartu is called upon to take action against Baal. This is well worth noticing, seeing that elsewhere (e.g. in UG V 7 and 8) there is a close relationship between Anat and Athtartu.

Of due importance is text 137:40:

(*yṃnh 'n)t . tuḥd . šmalh<sup>11</sup> . tuḥd . 'ṭrt*

"Let Anat seize his right hand

Let Athtartu seize his left hand."<sup>12</sup>

An important problem in this section is the damaged first part of the line. Any translation of this section is based on a restoration of the first part. Several restorations are suggested by different authors.<sup>13</sup> The restora-

<sup>9</sup> Cf. VAN SELMS, A. Yammu's dethronement by Baal, *UF 2* (1970), 251-268.

<sup>10</sup> In the lacuna VAN SELMS, *op. cit.*, p. 258, wants to read *y aliyn b'l*: "Oh, Aliyn b'l".

<sup>11</sup> GORDON, *Ugaritic Textbook*, p. 198 has *šmalk*. HERDNER, *CTA II*, has *šmalh* in her transliteration of the text as well as in the reproduction of the cuneiform. Gordon's reading is probably a misprint—cf. his translation of the text in his *Ugaritic Literature*, p. 14.

<sup>12</sup> VAN SELMS, *op. cit.*, p. 262, translates:

"Athtartu grasped his right hand

"Athtartu grasped his left hand".

This translation is possible, but it fits better in the context to explain *tuḥd* as a jussive.

<sup>13</sup> e.g. (*yṃnh 'n)t*: GORDON, *Ugaritic Textbook*, DRIVER, G. R., *Canaanite Myths and legends*, 1956, p. 80 and HERDNER, *CTA*, p. 40. Herdner proposes *ilt* or *art* as other possibilities. (*yṃnh 'ṭrt*): VAN SELMS, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

tion (*yṃnh 'n)t* is undoubtedly preferable on account of the space available.<sup>14</sup>

If this restoration is correct, and it seems acceptable, it signifies that Anat opposed Baal. Then it is clear that she and Athtartu co-operated to keep Baal at bay. Il gave consent that Baal should be surrendered to Yam as his slave and tributary.<sup>15</sup> When Baal offers resistance, Il commands Anat and Athtartu to pacify Baal.

This interpretation of this crucial passage in text 137 has important consequences for the relationship between Anat and Baal. If this interpretation is correct, it follows that the author(s) of this text regarded it as quite possible for Anat to oppose Baal. This would be in line with the status quo in the Aqht texts. Although there was no actual clash between the two gods in these texts, Anat took action against an individual favoured by Baal. In text 137 there was a direct clash between the two, according to the interpretation accepted above.<sup>16</sup>

According to this interpretation Anat and Athtartu were allies in text 137 to exercise control over Baal. In text 68 Anat does not figure. Athtartu does appear and she again opposes Baal. In 68:28-32 she rebukes Baal for killing Yam:

(28) *bšm . tg'rm . 'ṭrt bṭ laliyn b('l)*

(29) *bṭ . lrkb . 'rpt . kšbyn . zb(l ym k?)*

(30) *šbyn . ṭpṭ . nhr . wyša b( )*

(31) *yḃṭ . nn . aliyn . b'l . w( )*

(32) *ym . lmt . b'lm yml(k )*

By name Athtartu rebuked him:

<sup>14</sup> According to the copy and reproduction of the original tablet in HERDNER, *CTA*, the damaged part at the beginning of the line is quite small. The wedges for (*yṃnh 'n)t* could just be fitted into the available space. Those for (*yṃnh 'ṭrt*) would take up much more space than that available. The same applies to the wedges for (*yṃnh art*)*t*. The wedges for (*yṃnh il*)*t* are the same number as those for the name of Anat, but the wedges for (*il*) would occupy more space than those for (*'n*). The space available is so small that the wedges for (*yṃnh 'n)t* would hardly fit. There just is not enough space for (*il*) in stead of (*'n*). This reason, as well as the known close relationship between Anat and Athtartu, makes the restoration of the name Anat very probable.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. VAN ZIJL, *Baal*, pp. 26-30.

<sup>16</sup> This proposition does not concur with that of Kapelrud in this regard. He says (*Anat*, p. 38, 39): "Anat is depicted as an opponent of Baal only in one special text, the Aqht text, but apart from that she is always at Baal's side as a helper." This statement is quite incorrect according to the restoration and interpretation of 137:40 accepted above.

If Van Selms' restoration of 137:40 is correct, or any of the other mentioned above, and Anat did not act directly against Baal, it would follow that she never figured in this group of texts. That would still invalidate the statement of Kapelrud that "she is always at Baal's side as a helper". She would then be conspicuous by her absence. Whether she is absent from Baal's side or acting against him, she still is not actively *on* his side.

"Shame, oh Aliyn Baal.  
Shame, oh rider of the clouds,  
For prince Yam was a captive,  
For judge River was a captive.  
Then Baal went out . . .  
Baal is surely ashamed . . .  
Yam is truly dead,  
Baal will reign."<sup>17</sup>

<sup>17</sup> This translation is in no way without any difficulties. It agrees with those of GORDON, C. H., *Ugaritic literature*, 1949, p. 16, DRIVER, *op. cit.*, p. 83 and VAN SELMS, *op. cit.*, p. 266, 7. It differs considerably from that of VAN ZIJL, *Baal*, p. 41.

"With the name 'Attart roars harshly: (?)"

"Hail, o Aliyan Baal,

"Hail, o Rider of the clouds,

"Behold, Zubul Yam is our captive,

"(behold), Tāpiṭ, Nahar our captive.

...  
"Aliyan Baal rejoices indeed

"( ) Yam is indeed dead,

"Baal shall indeed reign."

The difference lies in the interpretation of *tg'rm*, *bṯ* and *ybt*. *nn*. Van Zijl (p. 44) translates *tg'rm* with "roars harshly" but states (p. 25, 26) that the root in Hebrew could mean "roar" and "rebuke". Cf. UG V 1.1.11 and 14 where both could fit the context. Van Selms however claims that the word in this case has the meaning of a "moral rebuke". Both interpretations could be possible and the interpretation of *bṯ* and *ybt*. *nn* would be the deciding factor for a choice between the two interpretations. The most obvious would be to compare *bṯ* with the Hebrew root *bwš*. The noun *bšr* is definitely found in Ugaritic; cf. 51.3:19 and 21 and UT p. 378 par. 19.544. Van Zijl (p. 44, 5), however, accepts an interpretation of Dahood: "Dahood points out that a comparison of text 67:II:11-12 with 68:28-30 proves that in the word *bṯ* the intervocalic *h* has been dropped." Apparently he regards *ybtinn* as an energetic form from (*yqtlhn*) of *bht* with loss of *h*. But why should the *h* be dropped, if the root was *bht*? There is no obvious reason for the loss of the *h*.

This interpretation of Van Zijl, furthermore, implies that Athtartu has dropped her enmity (as in text 137) towards Baal and welcomes him as the victor. It is more probable that she rebukes him for killing her ally, in the light of text 137, where she opposes Baal. The two texts form part of the Baal-Yam motif in the Kingship theme and it is obvious that Athtartu would retain the same relationship to Baal throughout, unless there is direct evidence to the contrary. There is no such evidence; therefore the association of *bṯ* and *ybtinn* with the Hebrew root *bwš* must win the field.

VAN SELMS, *op. cit.*, p. 266, also states that *šbyn* is not a noun plus suffix of the first person plural, but just the noun—with the *n*—for "prisoner of war". He refers to II Kings 6:22. Athtartu therefore rebukes Baal because he has killed Yam, a prisoner of war. Van Selms says: "Athtartu reminds Baal of the time-honoured customs with regard to defeated enemies: they are not to be killed after the battle is over, but will be kept alive as captives and slaves."

AISTLEITNER, J., *Wörterbuch der Ugaritischen Sprache*, 1965<sup>2</sup>, connects *bṯ* to the Arabic *baṭṭa* (scatter). JIRKU, A., *Kanaanäische Mythen und Epen aus Ras-Schamra-Ugarit*, 1962, p. 25, does the same. This type of comparative explanation is possible, although sometimes quite far-fetched. If this interpretation is correct, it would mean that Athtartu encourages Baal to destroy Yam. Again the evidence of text 137 must be decisive. The internal comparison between text 137 and 68—both belonging to the same group of texts in the Anat-Baal cycle—points to the meaning "shame" for the root *bṯ*.

Although it is Athtartu that is opposing Baal here, the text is of importance for the matter in question. It is definitely noteworthy that Athtartu plays an important role in this series of texts—a more important one than Anat. In the remaining AB texts she does not figure at all.<sup>18</sup> In 137:40 Anat and Athtartu co-operate and in the other texts of the Baal-Yam motif only Athtartu figures. It is of importance as regards the relationship between Anat and Athtartu, but that would be a separate study.<sup>19</sup> It is clear, however, that the two goddesses oppose Baal in this part of the Anat-Baal cycle.

Another text that belongs to this part of the AB cycle, is text 1001, where it is stated that Baal killed the sea-monster and not Anat, as she claims in the text 'nt.

8. The following series of texts deals with the house-building motif. In the texts of this series, especially texts 51 and 'nt, Anat plays a part as Baal's ally, yet there are a few problematic passages that must be considered. The first problem is encountered in 'nt III:34-44, IV:45-50. Here follows a translation of lines 34-37 and 48-52:

- (34) *mn . ib yp(') lb'l . šrt*  
 (35) *lrkb 'rpt . lmḫšt mdd*  
 (36) *il ym . lklt nhr . il rbm*  
 (37) *lištbm . tnn . išbm(n)h*  
 (48) *mnm . ib . yp' . lb'l . šrt . lrkb . 'rpt*  
 (49) *(w)'n . ḡlmm . y'nyn . lib . yp'*  
 (50) *lb'l . šrt . lrkb . 'rpt*  
 (51) *thm . aliyn . b'l . hwt . ali*  
 (52) *qrdm*

"Which enemy arises against Baal,

"Adversary against the Rider of the clouds?"

"Did I not kill the beloved of Il, Yam,

"Destroyed Nahar, the great god?"

"Did I not muzzle Tanninu,

"Muzzled him?"

"Which enemy arises against Baal,

"Adversary against the Rider of the clouds?"

<sup>18</sup> Cf. WHITAKER, R. E., *A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature*, 1972, Her name does not appear in the following AB texts: 6, 49, 51, 62, 67, 76, 129, 130, 131, 132, 134, 'nt.

<sup>19</sup> My preliminary hypothesis is that Anat and Athtartu originally were two distinct goddesses who in the course of time became more identified. They were not fully identified in Ugarit, but their close association is evident in UG V 1, 7 and 8. At a later time, elsewhere, a complete identification could have taken place, with the result that Anat was superseded by Athtartu in Canaan. This is only a preliminary hypothesis which would have to be verified by further research in the primary literature.

The youths indeed answered her:

"No enemy arises against Baal

"No foe against the Rider of the clouds.

"The message of Aliyan Baal,

"The word of *aliy qrdm!*"<sup>20</sup>

Anat here again claims that she slayed the sea-monster. Yam, Nahar, Tanninu and the other names used here for the sea-monster, could be nothing else than appellations for the prince Yam and judge River of text 68. By this claim Anat places herself at Baal's side in the clash with Yam. This does not in any way agree with the picture of the clash given in the previous group of texts dealing with the Baal-Yam-motif.

Anat's relationship with Baal as regards the struggle with Yam, is pictured differently in the two parts of the kingship theme. In the texts of the Baal-Yam-motif she does not feature actively on Baal's side, at the least. It rather seems that she was helping Yam (cf. 137:40). In the text 'nt, part of the house-building-motif, Anat claims, however, that she did indeed help Baal. According to this claim she played an important role on Baal's side, but this does not concur with the data of the texts of the Baal-Yam-motif.

As regards the house-building operations, Anat's role is also not quite so clear. In the text 'nt Anat gains II's permission to build a house for Baal; cf. 'nt pl. vi: IV and V. She actually threatens II to force him to give his permission; cf. 'nt pl. vi: V10-12, 32-33 and 38-42. Here it is quite clear that Anat herself went to II to intercede with II for Baal.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. the discussion for this passage by VAN ZIJL, *Baal*, p. 62-66 and KAPELRUD, *Anat*, p. 54-63. The interpretation given above agrees with that of Van Zijl. Cf. also his translation of this passage, which is quite satisfactory, save the one qualification that the verbs in lines 35-37 should be translated in the past tense. Kapelrud interprets this section altogether differently. He does not regard the *l* prefixed to *b'l* in line 34 as *nota dativi* but as a vocative particle (p. 54). His contention is, therefore, that Baal is addressed in this passage and that the verbs *mḥšt* (line 35), *kl* (line 36), *mḥšt* (line 38, 40 and 43) and *šmt* (line 41) are the second person masculine singular inflected forms of the verbs and not first person singular. According to this interpretation Anat was Baal's ally in the victory over the sea-monster. He does not regard the first person singular *išbm* and *išbmnh* as decisive for the interpretation of the other verbs. In his translation Kapelrud only went as far as line 45. From lines 48-52 it is quite clear, however, that it was not Baal that was addressed by Anat. He does not answer the question asked by Anat. The answer that no enemy arises against Baal, emanates not from Baal himself, but from Gupanu and Ugaru, Baal's messengers. This answer they follow up with Baal's message to Anat. Although Kapelrud's translation is grammatically possible, the whole context is against it. Baal was not present when the messengers arrived at Anat. The messengers came to her at his command and therefore Anat could not be asking the question of him. She claims, therefore, that it was she who slayed the sea-monster. The fact that *išbm* and *išbmnh* are in the first person singular also makes it preferable that the other verbs mentioned are the same. The translation given above and supported by that of Van Zijl, agrees also with that of AISTLEITNER, J., *Die Mythologischen und Kultischen Texte aus Ras Shamra*, 1964<sup>2</sup>, and DRIVER, S. R., *op. cit.*, p. 87.

In text 51, however, the situation is pictured in a different way, where it is stated that not Anat but Athirat obtained permission from II for the building of the house; cf. 51:IV:20-62 and V:63-98.

Here is clearly a contradiction that must be explained in some way. Maybe the problem could be solved by positing some double-dealing on the side of II in text 'nt. In this case he deceived Anat. When her attempt failed as a result of this double-dealing, she and Baal went to Athirat to obtain II's permission through her mediation.<sup>21</sup> Text 'nt is, unfortunately, quite broken with the result that the proper state of affairs cannot be discerned with certainty. The interpretation that there was some double-dealing on II's side can therefore not be brushed aside.

When the matter is, however, approached with the difference between text 'nt and the texts of the previous group as regards the struggle with Yam in mind, the possibility is raised that text 'nt and text 51 are different editions of the same event, viz. the house-building episode. Anat plays quite an inferior part in text 51. She simply accompanies Baal to Athirat and carries the message of Athirat's mission to Baal. In text 'nt, however, she has a very important part. In both texts she is on Baal's side, but much more active in text 'nt.

9. In the last series of texts, those forming part of the agricultural cycle, Anat undoubtedly has a very important part to play. In these episodes there is no uncertainty or ambiguity in regard to her commitment towards Baal. This group of texts particularly deals with the fertility and it is in respect of fertility that Anat's most intimate relationship with Baal appears. In respect of fertility she plays an indispensable role on Baal's side.

Her important part is particularly clear after the death of Baal. In text 62 it is described how she mourns Baal, searches for him and buries him. In text 49 she demands him of Mot and fights against Mot to recover Baal from him. She definitely plays a decisive role in Baal's return to life and the subsequent return of fertility.

In this series of texts Anat is also described as Baal's mate. Cf. especially texts 76 and 132.<sup>22</sup> Text 76 includes a description of the birth of a bull, which symbolises the return of fertility with the return of Baal.

According to the agricultural cycle, therefore, there is a close relationship between Anat and Baal. As this is quite clear from the different texts of this cycle, it is not necessary to argue the case in detail.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. KAPELRUD, *Anat*, p. 112, 113, for a discussion of this episode. He also mentions double-dealing.

<sup>22</sup> For a fuller discussion, cf. KAPELRUD, *Anat*, p. 92-105. It is not necessary to add anything to his discussion of the sexual relationship between Anat and Baal in the texts of the agricultural cycle.

## 10. Final conclusions

1. The texts other than the AB-texts offer hardly any information in respect of the subject under discussion. The vast majority of them shows no knowledge of a close relationship between Anat and Baal.

2. The Aqht texts are, however, of greater importance. In the events described in these texts there is no co-operation between Baal and Anat but rather an indirect confrontation.

3. As regards the AB-texts there is clearly no uniform picture of the relationship between Baal and Anat. In the first series, the texts dealing with the struggle between Baal and Yam, Anat is, to say the least of it, not actively on Baal's side. According to the interpretation given in paragraph 7 and the reconstruction of the important passage 137:40, she is taking an active part in the struggle against Baal.

4. The texts dealing with the house-building episode furnish no uniform picture of the relationship between Anat and Baal. Anat is pictured, however, as taking an active part on Baal's side to a greater or lesser extent. Cf. paragraph 8.

5. The texts of the agricultural cycle do not allow any room for dispute. Anat clearly figures on Baal's side and plays a very important role in this episode. Cf. paragraph 9.

6. From the foregoing can be concluded that the relationship between Anat and Baal is not regarded in the same way in all the Ugaritic texts. In different texts or different groups of texts mention is made of an indirect confrontation between them (Aqht), of direct confrontation (the struggle with Yam and of different degrees of co-operation (the house-building episode and the agricultural cycle)).<sup>23</sup>

7. This is therefore the factual position as regards the relationship between Anat and Baal in the Ugaritic texts, according to the foregoing interpretation of the relevant texts. A question that must be considered at this point is whether there was a development in the relationship between them or was there a co-existence in the Ugaritic mythology of these different views of the relationship between Baal and Anat. The answer to these questions is closely related with one's view of the relationship between the three groups of the AB-texts, viz. the Baal-Yam struggle,

<sup>23</sup> This conclusion does not agree with Kapelrud's. Cf. KAPELRUD, A. S., *Baal in the Ras Shamra texts*, 1952, p. 66: "The goddess (i.e. Anat H. F. v.R.) is always found at Baal's side. She is found ready to help him in any situation and more than one time she has to do her utmost to bring him out of the trouble in which he is involved." This does not apply to Baal's struggle with Yam.

Cf. also Kapelrud, Anat, p. 41, 42, 48 and 110. He maintains the view that Anat and Baal always operate together, with the exception of the Aqht-texts. Cf. Oldenburg's description of Anat in OLDENBURG, U., *The Conflict between El and Baal in Canaanite religion*, 1969, pp. 83-92. His view is that Anat's role as goddess of fertility was gradually taken over by Baal on account of the fact that her name is seldom mentioned in the sacrificial lists of the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries B.C.

the house-building episode and the agricultural cycle, and with one's view of the place of the Aqht texts in the Ugaritic mythology. As regards the relationship between the three groups of AB-texts there are two possibilities: The texts could all form part and parcel of one continuous whole<sup>24</sup> or they could constitute two or three different myths.<sup>25</sup>

If the texts all form part of one big continuous myth, the sequence must be: Baal-Yam struggle, house-building episode and agricultural cycle. If this is the case, one must conclude that there was a development in the relationship between Baal and Anat<sup>26</sup> from confrontation in the Baal-Yam struggle to the closest co-operation in the struggle against Mot in the agricultural cycle. Text 'nt could then be a different edition than text 51 of the house-building episode. It could have been compiled to credit Anat with a more important role in the house-building episode than in text 51 and to range her on Baal's side in the struggle with Yam, something that does not agree with the data of texts 129, 137 and 68.<sup>27</sup> The Aqht texts could then signify a further development in the relationship, viz. an estrangement between them that occurred later than the situation described in the agricultural cycle.<sup>28</sup>

If, however, the three groups of AB-texts constitute three different myths, one should have to conclude that there contemporaneously existed different views of the relationship between Baal and Anat. This explanation could also clarify the indirect confrontation between Anat and Baal in the Aqht texts as being in a line with one of the different contemporary views of the relationship between the two of them.

Even if one subscribes to the view that the three groups of AB-texts constitute three different, contemporary myths, it is still possible to conclude that there could have been a development in the relationship between Anat and Baal. This is stated on account of the fact that the three myths could have evolved in different stadia in the development of the Ugaritic religion. It is therefore possible that they contain indications of such a development in the relationship between Anat and Baal in Ugaritic religion.

This argument pleads for a tentative conclusion that there was a development in this relationship, but this prudent conclusion will have to be verified on the basis of other data, especially those concerning the relation between the three groups of AB-texts.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. GORDON, *Ugaritic literature*, pp. 9-11, DRIVER, *Canaanite myths and legends*, pp. 10-21, KAPELRUD, *Baal*, pp. 135-145 and OLDENBURG, *The conflict between El and Baal*, pp. 12-145.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. VAN ZIJL, *Baal*, pp. 323, 324.

<sup>26</sup> It is in fact possible that also El's disposition towards Baal changed in course of time. Cf. POPE, M., *El in the Ugaritic texts*, 1955, pp. 92, 93.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. VAN ZIJL, *Baal*, p. 10.