

THE HITTITES IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE TEXTS OF UGARIT

Juan-Pablo Vita

1. Introductory

As is well known, the archives of Ugarit are roughly framed by the last century and a half of the kingdom's life,¹ a period when it was part of the regional Hittite empire in Syria.² Treaties, edicts, legal texts in general and letters document with sufficient clarity the extent and nature of Ugarit's political relations with Hatti and Karkemiš.³ Outside of politics and the scope of these textual genres, however, the impact of Hittite politics and culture on Ugarit appears to be slight, at the level of both material culture and the textual record.⁴ Consequently, the nature of Hittite control over Ugarit may seem

1. Juan-Pablo Vita: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (ILC, CSIC). This article is a product of the research project "Bureaucracy and Palace Administration in the Ancient Eastern Mediterranean: Ugarit and Idalion" (PID2019-106923GB-I00), funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation within the National Plan for Scientific Research, Development and Technological Innovation (I+D+I). I also wish to thank Wilfred G.E. Watson for his critical revision of both the content and the English of the manuscript, Valérie Matoïan her critical review of the manuscript and the provision of bibliographical references, as well as the anonymous reviewers who enriched the final result with their criticisms and comments.
2. On the concept of "regional empires" in the ancient Near East, see Barjamovic 2021, 76-78.
3. In addition to the general works on the history of Hatti, see the following works focusing specifically on the relations between Ugarit and Hatti: Astour 1981; Neu 1995; Prechel 1999; Lebrun 1995; Lackenbacher 2002; Malbran-Labat 2004; Lackenbacher – Malbran-Labat 2005; van Soldt 2010; Halayqa 2010; Lebrun 2014. The epistolary corpus of Hatti and Karkemiš has been greatly enriched by RSO 23.
4. Neu 1995, 126-128; Singer 1999, 650; McGeough 2007, 327; Genz 2011; Simon 2013, 303; Niehr 2021, 40. For Hittite loanwords in texts from Ugarit see Watson 2007, 118-124. For two ritual fragments in Hittite see Salvini 2001, 339; copies in André-Salvini 2004, 153 (RS 92.2011) and 154 (RS 92.6278). See also Gilibert 2021 (together with the comments made at the end of the article by D.E. Fleming, V.R. Herrmann, V. Matoïan and M. Pucci) on the possible impact that the tense relations between Ugarit and Hatti may have had on the urbanism of Ras Shamra/Ugarit.

eminently political and military.⁵ However, as Florence Malbran-Labat points out, texts originating in the so-called “House of Urtenu” illustrate to what extent Hittites also exercised tight control over the economy and administration of Ugarit,⁶ which most likely also extended to aspects of local worship.⁷ This control was wielded not only from Karkemiš, whose scope of action in Hittite Syria was very wide (relations with neighbouring populations, delimitation and preservation of borders, organization of military levies, matters concerning the tribute of vassal kingdoms, settlement of disputes related to international trade), but directly from Ḫatti through the dispatch to Ugarit of a large number of representatives of the Hittite central power, including numerous personnel of the highest rank.⁸ In this way, princes and high Hittite dignitaries were directly involved in trade management and in the economy of Ugarit, including matters regarding the collection of taxes and other levies, so that “the control by Karkemiš was completed, even rectified, by numerous punctual missions carried out by envoys of the central power”.⁹ Hence, Malbran-Labat wonders whether the Hittites may even have played an internal role in the economic life of the kingdom,¹⁰ bearing also in mind that some of these high dignitaries (and their entourage) seem to have lived (at least occasionally) in the city of Ugarit itself.¹¹

In the context described above, the aim of this article is to analyse the Hittite presence in and impact on the administrative texts of Ugarit, as well as briefly assessing the contribution of this documentation to the history of Ugarit as a vassal kingdom of Hatti. The main texts studied or mentioned in the body of this article are the following:

– Administrative texts:

Ugaritic: RS 5.262 (KTU 6.11; label), RS 9.453 (KTU 4.44), RS 10.052 (KTU 4.63), RS 11.715+ (KTU 4.69), RS 11.716 (KTU 4.68), RS 11.721 (KTU 4.71), RS 18.099 (KTU 4.380), RS 19.017 (KTU 4.610), RS 92.2001+ (KTU 4.800), RS 94.2392+ (KTU 4.808), RS 94.2409+ (KTU 4.866), RS [Varia 13] (KTU 4.709), RIH 78/02 (KTU 4.771)

Akkadian: RS 11.732 [B], RS 34.147

5. Cf. McGeough 2007, 327. This seems to have been the case in the Hatti-controlled territories in Anatolia, cf. Schloen 2001, 313: “As a rule, the widely scattered Hittite cities in Anatolia must have remained locally self-sufficient in most commodities, which implies that the integration of the Hittite domain was political and military, not economic”.
6. Malbran-Labat 2006, 63.
7. See Cohen – Torrecilla 2020 on the extent, in Syria in general and Ugarit in particular, of Hittite imperial worship and possible Hittite control of local cults.
8. Malbran-Labat 2004, 87-89.
9. Malbran-Labat 2004, 89: “le contrôle par Carkémiš était complété, voire rectifié, par de nombreuses missions ponctuelles effectuées par des envoyés du pouvoir central”. See also Lebrun 2014, 288-290.
10. Malbran-Labat 2004, 90; Malbran-Labat 2013, 5-7.
11. See, for example, the specific cases of Arma-ziti (Malbran-Labat 2004, 78-79; Lebrun 2014, 48-76, 289), Mišra-muwa (Malbran-Labat 2004, 79; Lebrun 2014, 102-112, 289), Tili-Sarruma (Malbran-Labat 2004, 82; Lebrun 2014, 161-167, 288-289) or Taprammi (Malbran-Labat 2004, 84); on this subject see the commentary by Lebrun 2014, 290. On Hittite traders settled in Ugarit see Vargyas 1985; Malbran-Labat 1991a; Monroe 2009, 63, 194-196. In this regard, it may be worth mentioning the discovery at Ras Shamra of a gold ring belonging to a woman and bearing an inscription in Hittite hieroglyphs (for the reading of the inscription see Lebrun 2004); it was found in the so-called “House of Patilu-wa”, “Apparently the house of a fairly wealthy family” (Yon 2006, 99; see also *ibid.* 166 and 167). A biconvex stone seal (to be worn around the neck) and a bronze ring, both inscribed with Hittite hieroglyphs, have been found at Tell Tweini, the ancient Ugaritic town of Giba‘lā (Lebrun – Tavernier 2012).

– Letters:

Ugaritic: RS 94.5015 (KTU 2.98)

Akkadian: RS 94.2363, RS 94.2578, RS 94.2579+

2. Hittite presence in Ugarit

The explicit presence of Hittites in the approximately 1,200 administrative texts (and fragments) from Ugarit is certainly significant, but also occasional.¹² At least two administrative documents relate to the tribute that Ugarit was to pay to Hatti. The alphabetic text RS 19.017 (KTU 4.610; South-West Archive of the royal palace)¹³, which can be dated to around the end of the 13th century BCE,¹⁴ makes explicit in its heading that it is a “[document of] the tribute to the Sun” ([*ṣr .] aʿrḡmn ṣpš*), i.e. to the king of Hatti.¹⁵ The text consists of two parts; the first (columns I and II) records a series of villages in Ugarit followed by a numeral, the second (columns III and IV) a (badly damaged) list of occupational categories also followed by a numeral. The last lines of column IV make explicit, in the logo-syllabic script, that the figures recorded throughout the text refer to money.¹⁶

Also connected with tribute to Hatti is the text RS 11.732 [B] (West Archive of the royal palace)¹⁷, with a heading similar to that of RS 19.017 (KTU 4.610): [*tup-pu an-nu-u*] *ša ma-an-da[-at d]UTU-šī* “[this tablet (is)] of the tribu[te] to the Sun”.¹⁸ This document records cups (of gold and silver) and quantities of linen cloths and dyed wool intended for the king and queen of Hatti, as well as for various high dignitaries of the Hittite court (DUMU.LUGAL, *tuppanuru*, *ḫuburtanuru*, EN É *abūši*, GAL ^{lu.mes} *kartappi*, SUKKAL).¹⁹

12. About 1,000 administrative texts and fragments use the alphabetic cuneiform script and ca. 200 the Mesopotamian logo-syllabic script. See the numbers provided by Hawley – Pardee – Roche-Hawley 2015, 232.
13. Bordreuil – Pardee 1989, 197.
14. Cf. Pardee 2001, 278.
15. See the re-edition by Pardee 2001, 250-282.
16. Cf. Pardee 2001, 256.
17. Bordreuil – Pardee 1989, 57.
18. Text classified by Nougayrol as economic in his first edition of the text (PRU 3, 181-182); re-edited in PRU 4, 47-48. See also Beckman 1996, n. 28B; Lackenbacher 2002, 75-76. On the excavation number RS 11.732 [B] see Bordreuil – Pardee 1989, 57.
19. On this text and these functions see also Giorgieri – Mora 2012, 650-653. On the roles of these Hittite dignitaries and their relationship with Ugarit see also Malbran-Labat 2004. Lebrun 2014 has made a specific study of the DUMU.LUGAL. On the other hand, and according to its editors, the Ugaritic letter RS 94.2580 (RSO 18, no. 62 = KTU 2.99), from a queen of Ugarit to Urtenu, could also be related to tribute to Hatti: “Les grandes quantités d’or (env. deux kg.), de ‘pourpre rouge’ [*ḫm*] et de ‘pourpre-bleu’ [*qm*] (env. 10 kg de chaque produit, si l’unité était le sicla) font penser aux édits des rois hittites où il est question de quantités importantes de ‘(laine teinte à la) pourpre (royale de couleur tirant sur le) rouge’ et de ‘(laine teinte à la) pourpre (royale de couleur tirant sur le) bleu’...L’état de ce texte empêche de déterminer si ces produits iront en fin de compte au roi hittite, mais l’hypothèse est vraisemblable” (RSO 18, 169).

Text RS 9.453 (KTU 4.44; Northwest side of the tell)²⁰ is along the same lines. The obverse records the donation of an object of disputed meaning (*šurt*)²¹ to various persons, the reverse the delivery of bowls (*špm*)²² to another series of persons. Line 23' on the reverse records "thirty bowls for the man/men of the *tuppanuru*" (*tililm šp l bnš tṣnr*), lines 27'-28', of more uncertain interpretation in detail, record the handing over of fifteen bowls to a man (or men) of the *tuppanuru*.²³

Hatti and the Hittites are also mentioned, with varying degrees of certainty, in around ten other alphabetical administrative texts. Two of these record jugs of wine for a Hittite,²⁴ another records grain rations for Hittites.²⁵ Two others mention oxen and donkeys in connection with Hatti, a fifth is likely to mention a *ḥpn*-garment²⁶ of Hattuša (*ḥpn ḥtt*).²⁷ A final text possibly mentions the Hittite prince Ḫili-Šarruma.²⁸ Karkemiš is mentioned in two texts in connection with ships.²⁹ All these texts lack chronological elements that would allow them to be dated more precisely.³⁰

20. Bordreuil – Pardee 1989, 197. Re-edited by Prosser 2010, 240-253, 612, for whom "The high quantities of items, their potential value, and the various foreign personages mentioned among the recipients leads us to conclude that this text records some type of royal payment, whether tribute, gift exchange, or something else" (Prosser 2010, 248); DUL, 754, 757: "list of presents to a Hittite legation".
21. DUL 786 "a weapon, dagger or poniard (?)", but see the discussion also in Watson 2007, 123 and 133, Prosser 2010, 245-246, Richter 2012, 538.
22. DUL 753; Prosser 2010, 246-247: "The precise identification of *šp* is uncertain, whether it is a type of bowl or jug"; Tropper 2008, 110: "(halbkugelförmige) Schale"; Watson 2012, 93: "bowl".
23. *ḥmš 'šr šp / l bnš tṣnr de yaḥd l ḡy'nm* (reading by Prosser 2010, 242). Prosser 2010, 244, translates "fifteen *šp*-vessels for the man of the *Tuppanuru* which he will take into his own possession for 'G'Y'NM'" (discussion of the verbal form on p. 247). The same author (*ibid.* p. 248) considers that "If the phrase *bnš tṣnr* refers to the client, agent, or representative of a personage with the title *Tuppanuru*, then RS 9.453 (KTU 4.44) may record the delivery of thirty *šp*-vessels to this client, agent, or representative, perhaps on behalf of his patron. It would also indicate that the Ugaritian scribe perceived the agents of their Hittite overlords as local clients to their absent masters". Tropper 2012, 536, analyses and translates "15 *šp*-Gefäße für das Personal des *Tṣnr*, das gehalten(?) wird von(?) den *Gyn*-Leuten (d.h. das sich im Besitz der *Gyn*-Leute befindet)". DUL 862 also understands *bnš tṣnr* as plural: "personnel of the *t*." See also Malbran-Labat 2004, 72 and 91.
24. RS 15.039 (KTU 4.149; we follow the re-edition by Pardee 2007) records the delivery of jars of wine for temples and various personnel, including a Cypriot; lines 13-14 record "A jar (of wine) for the Hittite towards (the port of) Ma'ḥadu" (*ḳd l ḥty . maḥdh*, where *-h* is the terminative ending, cf. Tropper 2012, 322, 325; Pardee 2007, 73, translates "à Ma'ḥadu", DUL 409, "of TN"). RS 16.165 (KTU 4.216) records jars of wine for different categories of personnel, including (l. 9) "two jars (of wine) for the Hittite..." (*ḳdm . l . ḥty . [...]*).
25. RS 17.106 (KTU 4.269; see McGeough 2011, 143, for a summary of the interpretations the text has received) records rations (*ḥpr*) of grain and wine for various personnel; line 3 reads *ḥmš . ḳdm . l . ḥtyt* "five *ḳd*-measures (of grain) for the Hittite(s)" (cf. DUL 409: "five 'cauldronsful' for the Hittite (people ?)").
26. DUL 395.
27. RS 94.2276 (RSO 18 no. 47 = KTU 4.863;) records (l. 1'-5') oxen and a donkey on their way to Hatti: "... *ḳd*-measure(s) of ... / for the fattened oxen / that Anantābu brings to Hatti[...]. / One *prš*-measure of fodder for the donkey of / Siliṭimiga that he brings to Hatti" (ʿ- . '[] ' ' *ḳd* . [...] / l . *alp* . *mr*im / d . *ybl* . *anntb* . b . *ḥ'p* [...] / *prš* . *akl* . l . *ḥmr* / *slṭmg* . dt . *ybl* . b . *ḥt*); cf. comment in RSO 18, 111. The first four lines (the ends of which are broken) of RIH 79/01 (Bordreuil – Pardee – Roche-Hawley 2019, 88-89) present the structure *alp ḥt dt* [...], "Oxen of Hatti that...". On the interpretation of *ḥt* as "Hattuša" in RS 94.2946 (RSO 18 no. 74) see RSO 18, 199.
28. RS 86.2220 (RSO 14 no. 23), cf. Malbran-Labat 2004, 91; it is a list of names followed by a number, the nature of the document being unclear. Line 9 reads *ḥi-li-LUGAL-ma DUMU LUGAL* 10. Malbran-Labat 2004, 104, comments: "A moins qu'il ne faille considérer qu'il s'agit d'un « fils du roi » d'Ougarit".

3. Less noticeable presence of Hittites

Hittite presence in the administrative texts of Ugarit is, however, not always so explicit. Detecting this presence therefore requires a closer look at other types of data and details, as the following examples show:

- In the above-mentioned text RS 34.147 (a list of Karkemiš ships probably intended to be scrapped; House of Urtenu), the tablet bears the seal of a person (Kumma-walwi) probably close to Hittite power, as he seems to have been responsible for the ships of Karkemiš in Ugarit.³¹
- A further indication may be found in the alphabetic administrative text RS 94.2409+ (KTU 4.866; House of Urtenu), dealing with copper transactions. The reverse of the text presents two syllabic lines providing the Luwian name (^m*mu-wa-DINGIR-hu-un-di-ka*), filiation (DUMU *ia-ra-LÚ*) and origin (LÚ URU.DINGIR-DA-AŠ) of a person who does not appear in the alphabetic part of the text. Consequently, the editors think that these transactions may have taken place in the presence and under the supervision of that person, a circumstance which, in their opinion, could be highly plausible in the context of economic relations between Ugarit and Hatti.³²
- The label RS 5.262 (KTU 6.11; Acropolis)³³ reads as follows: “A jar of wine for Prt̃” (*ked [.] yn / prt̃*),³⁴ but it also has a seal impression with Hittite hieroglyphs.³⁵

29. RIH 83/22 (KTU 4.779; re-edition by Bordreuil – Pardee – Roche-Hawley 2019, 156-159) records in line 13 *d anyt . grynšh* (DUL, 82-83, 304, 327, 373, 374, 475-476: “bill of the ship (bound) for TN”; Bordreuil – Pardee – Roche-Hawley 2019, 156: “(le prix) de bateaux (qui s’en iront) à Carkemish”; McGeough 2011, 596: “(silver debited upon the country for the account of the ship (going) to GN”; Tropper 2012, 848: “(Betrag an Silber...) zur (Begleichung der) Rechnung der/des Schiffe(s), (die/das) nach Karkemiš (fahren/fährt)”). RS 34.147 (Malbran-Labat 1991b, 23-25) is a list of ships of the king of Karkemiš (l. 1 ^gMÁ.MEŠ *ša* LUGAL KUR *kar-ga-mis*) which are very old and no longer seaworthy (l. 2-3 *ša* la.bi.ir *dan-niš la-a i-la-’e-e a-na a-la-ki a-ia-kám-ma*); on this text see also fn. 31.
30. In PRU 3, 181, Nougayrol considers RS 11.732 [B] to be from the time of Niqmadu II (c. 1350-1315, cf. Singer 1999, table between pages 732-733), a date that no longer appears in the reprint of PRU 4, 47-48. For the archaeological context and possible chronology of this text see van Soldt 1991, 57.
31. Malbran-Labat 2004, 86. Malbran-Labat, *id. ibid.*, considers that “Il se peut que le scribe de cet acte [RS 34.147] ait été de formation hittite car il crée un akkadogramme (LA.BI.IR), ce qui impliquerait la présence à Ougarit de scribes appartenant à l’administration hittite”. In this regard, one of the reviewers of our article commented as follows: “*la-bi-ir* is not a logogram. It is a stative (without the subject marker, not unusual). The verb *i-le-e* is also singular. The ships are taken as a collective, hence the singular forms”.
32. RSO 18 no. 51. See already Vita 2021, 195.
33. Bordreuil – Pardee 1989, 38.
34. van Soldt 1989, 376. van Soldt, *ibid.*, also studied the possible/probable relationship of some labels found at Ugarit to Hittite treaties and edicts, with a summary on p. 386 (his catalogue needs to be updated).
35. Cf. Bordreuil – Pardee 1989, 38; KTU, 618. For the topographical point where this label was discovered, see Vita – Matoian 2020 (in press). The seal impression of the tablet will be published by Mirjo Salvini. Note also that the legal text RS 17.074 (KTU 4.266; Vita 2018a, 131) also features a seal with Hittite hieroglyphs; on this see Masson 1975, 228-229 and 236.

4. Layout and internal structure of documents

In line with §3 above, the internal structure of a document is another element that can reveal that an administrative text from Ugarit is related to Hittite-Ugaritian relations. See for example RS 11.716 (KTU 4.68; West Archives of the royal palace).³⁶ It is an alphabetic text consisting of two parts separated by a continuous line. The first part (lines 1-59) is a list of place names followed (in the preserved lines) by the numerals 1 or 2; the second part (lines 60-75) is a list of occupational categories followed by the numeral 1. The text has no heading, but there is a logo-syllabic annotation in the left margin indicating that the text deals with archers (*tuppu* ERÍN.MEŠ *ša* GIŠ.BA[N].MEŠ). It will be noted that this text shares two significant elements with RS 19.017 (KTU 4.610), the tribute to Hatti document presented above (§2): 1) both texts have the same bipartite structure, in which the first part records a list of villages followed by figures and the second a list of professional categories also followed by figures, and 2) both are alphabetical texts, but present key information about their content (including figures) using the logo-syllabic script. In our opinion, it is reasonable to assume that this text reflects some movement of troops as part of Ugarit's military obligations towards Hatti,³⁷ an obligation clearly stipulated in bilateral treaties and recurrent in correspondence between Ugarit and the Hittite authorities.³⁸

In line with RS 11.716 (KTU 4.68), the alphabetic text RS 10.052 (KTU 4.63; Northwest Area)³⁹ may also have been written in response to a demand for soldiers by the Hittite authorities. Written in two columns per side, it records a list of 140 names grouped by locality and followed by an indication of a number of shields and bows (about 100 and 160 respectively).⁴⁰ After each group, a line in the logo-syllabic script gives the total number of weapons for each village.⁴¹

The heading of the alphabetic text RS 92.2001+ (KTU 4.800; House of Urtenu) is lost. It is a long list of villages in Ugarit followed by a logo-syllabic figure and also set out in two columns. The editors of the text noted that line II:35 (*ʾ. gtt 1 me-at 32* “on the account of the farmsteads: 132”)⁴² provides one of the keys to understanding the text: the amounts indicate contributions of some kind given to the administration, without the nature of the contributions being clear.⁴³ Heltzer later showed that this text has close similarities with RS 19.017 (KTU 4.610; §2), both in layout and in the name and number of the localities recorded, as well as similarity in the amounts assigned to each, so that the figures in RS 92.2001+ (KTU 4.800) most probably refer to shekels and the document can

36. Bordreuil – Pardee 1989, 56.

37. A possibility evoked by van Soldt 2005, 83: “in KTU 4.68...the towns and guilds have to supply archers, probably for the army of Ugarit (or perhaps to serve in the army of the Hittite king)”. See McGeough 2011, 35, for the research history of the text.

38. On this subject see now also Cohen – Torrecilla 2022.

39. Bordreuil – Pardee 1989, 53.

40. DUL 690 understands that these are archers and shield-bearers.

41. For example line I:24: 6 KUŠ_{ga-ba-bu} 21 GIŠ.BAN.MEŠ.

42. Cf. DUL 152.

43. RSO 14, 351-352: “La présence de la préposition [*ʾ* in II:35] donne la clé de l'interprétation de ce texte dont le titre a disparu, car elle indique qu'il s'agit d'une liste de contributions livrées à l'administration par les agglomérations en question. Nous n'avons pourtant pas trouvé d'indice de la nature de la contribution”.

fairly be considered as directly related to the tribute to Hatti, although referring to a different year than RS 19.017 (KTU 4.610).⁴⁴ This may well also be the reason for texts such as RS 11.715+ (KTU 4.69; West Archive of the royal palace)⁴⁵ and RS 11.721 (KTU 4.71; West Archive of the royal palace),⁴⁶ both alphabetic lists of personal names grouped by professions and followed by a logo-syllabic figure whose nature – money – is made explicit by totals expressed in the logo-syllabic script.⁴⁷

All these texts (among others not yet identified) most probably illustrate the following observation by Wilfred H. van Soldt: “Apart from the regular written contact with the vassals and the decrees that needed to be put in writing the Hittite overlord imposed a large tribute on his vassal and the administration made sure that every town and professional group were paying their dues”.⁴⁸

5. Letters and administrative documents

In other cases, it is the correspondence that may indicate that a certain administrative document can (or should) be understood in the context of the relations between Ugarit and Hatti. This is the case with RS 18.099 (KTU 4.380; South-West archive of the royal palace).⁴⁹ It is a list of villages followed (in general) by the indication of a certain number of donkeys (*ḥmrm*) and men (*bnšm*); see for example line 21, one of the best preserved: *ilštm' . arb' . ḥmrm . ḥmš . bnš' m*, “(village of) Ilištam'u: four donkeys, five men”.⁵⁰ In the present state of the tablet, the document records about 30 donkeys and 30 men, but the number of both was certainly higher (the poor condition of a good number of lines makes it impossible to know the total numbers on the document). The text does not contain any additional information about its purpose.

For what purpose, then, was RS 18.099 (KTU 4.380) written? On the sole basis of its content one can only speculate. However, a look at letter RS 94.2363 (House of Urtenu),⁵¹ sent by the Hittite emperor (dUTU-š) to king Niqmaddu III of Ugarit (ca. 1225/20-1215 BCE),⁵² may advance our understanding of RS 18.099 (KTU 4.380). Here is the relevant passage:

44. Heltzer 2003. Heltzer, *ibid.* 240, considers this document to be “a draft of a tribute-list”, while for McGeough 2011, 339, “It seems more likely that RS 92.2001+92.2002 is actually a draft copy of KTU 4.610”. On the other hand, according to Heltzer, *ibid.*, RS 19.017 (KTU 4.610) and RS 92.2001+ (KTU 4.800) register 82 villages each, but in reality RS 19.017 (KTU 4.610) registers 74 villages and RS 92.2001+ (KTU 4.800) registers 82.

45. Bordreuil – Pardee 1989, 56.

46. Bordreuil – Pardee 1989, 56.

47. The right margin of RS 11.715+ (KTU 4.69) presents the most elaborate expression: 4 *me-at* 87 ŠU.NIGÍN KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ ša [Š]U LÚ.MEŠ *mar-ia-ne*.

48. van Soldt 2010, 205.

49. Bordreuil – Pardee 1989, 162. For this text we follow the re-edition by Prosser 2010, 444-456, 634-635.

50. Lines 1, 2, 22, 25 and 32 only note the toponym; lines 27-31 and 33-34 note a toponym and a number, without further specification.

51. RSO 23 no. 5, 21-22.

52. Singer 1999, table between pages 732-733.

⁶⁻¹⁴ *a-nu-um-ma* ^m*at-ta-i-še-in-ni* / *a-na* UGU-*ka al-tap-ra-ak-ku* / 40 ANŠE ù ŠU.ŠI
ERÍN.MEŠ / *in-na-áš-šum-ma* / ù *ar-biš* / *té-ma šu-ku-un-su-ma* / *lil-li-ka* / 4UTU-*ši a-na*
KASKAL-*ni* / *a-šap-pár-šu*

¹⁵⁻¹⁸ ù *na-pu-ul-tu₄* / *nap-ša-a-tu₄* *ar-biš* / *té-ma šu-ku-un-su-ma* / *lil-li-ka*

Herewith I send you Attaišenni; hand over⁵³ to him forty donkeys and sixty men and give him immediate orders to depart. (1.) My Sun, I will send him on an expedition.

And it is absolutely vital!⁵⁴ Give him immediate orders to depart.

The king of Hatti asks Niqmaddu to send, urgently, men (60) and donkeys (40) for an “expedition” (*ḥarrānu*), without the context allowing us to understand whether or not it is military in nature. In favour of a military expedition, it is of interest to note that the Ugaritic letter RS 94.5015 (KTU 2.98),⁵⁵ plausibly from a king of Ugarit to the Hittite emperor,⁵⁶ deals (in a context that is difficult to understand) with *ḥrd*-militia and donkeys: “I will give donkeys, I will give *ḥrd*-militia (which will be) with him”,⁵⁷ probably in the context of Ugarit’s military obligations towards Hatti.⁵⁸ RS 94.2363 and RS 94.5015 (KTU 2.98) also share the personal name Attaišenni (RS 94.2363:6 ^m*at-ta-i-še-in-ni*; RS 94.5015:32’ *atdn*), attested in the alphabetic script only in RS 94.5015 (KTU 2.98).⁵⁹ As has been seen, in RS 94.2363 an Attaišenni is the person appointed by the Hittite king to take charge of the men and donkeys required; for his part, RS 94.5015 (KTU 2.98) mentions “... *ḥrd*-militia for *Atdn*” (l. 32’: [---] . *ḥrd* . l . *atdn*). In any case, a request such as the one made in RS 94.2363 could well have resulted in the production of a document such as RS 18.099 (KTU 4.380), in the framework of a mechanism, well known in Ugarit, whereby an administrative text reflects a request made by letter.⁶⁰ Note also that, as in RS 11.716 (KTU 4.68; §4) and RS 19.017 (KTU 4.610; §§2 and 4), the basis of the structure of RS 18.099 (KTU 4.380) is a list of Ugaritian villages, probably because all of them had to respond to the effort required of men and animals, in the same way as in RS 19.017 (KTU 4.610; §2) localities (together with a number of professions) did for money and in RS 11.716 (KTU 4.68; §4, also together with professions) for archers.

53. Lackenbacher – Malbran-Labat 2016, 22, on *in-na-áš-šum-ma*: “évolution rare de l’impératif de *nadānu*, dn>nn (idna>inna)”.

54. On the term *na-pu-ul-tu₄* / *nap-ša-a-tu₄* see the comment by Lackenbacher – Malbran-Labat 2016, 22.

55. RSO 18 no. 58, 147-152.

56. Cf. lines 8.13.22.33’-34’: *špš mlk rb*, “the Sun, the great king”. See the comment by Bordreuil – Hawley – Pardee in RSO 18, 150.

57. Lines 6-7: *atn . ḥmrm* / *atn . ḥrd* . *mnḥ*; cf. also l. 20’: *ḥrd* . *w* . *ḥmṛ*’[*m*...] “the *ḥrd*-militia and donke[ys...]”.

58. So already Vidal 2016, 127: “part of the *ḥrd*-militia was acting as auxiliary troops in Hittite territory, specifically in Anza(hu), fulfilling Ugaritian military obligations to the Hittite empire”. On RS 94.5015 see also previously Vidal 2013.

59. Cf. DUL, 118. The presence of this name in both letters has been pointed out by Florence Malbran-Labat in RSO 18, 152, and by Lackenbacher – Malbran-Labat 2016, 22.

60. Watson 2010; Vita 2013, 406-408.

6. The *mānaḥ(ā)tu* / *mnḥt* system and levies

Along the lines of RS 94.2363 (§5), the correspondence between the Hittite and Ugaritian authorities shows that the former often required the latter to send various resources: men,⁶¹ weaponry (war chariots,⁶² armour for horses and men,⁶³ arrows⁶⁴), products and services related to textiles (wool,⁶⁵ dyeing of wool and cloth,⁶⁶ alum⁶⁷), donkeys,⁶⁸ ships,⁶⁹ agricultural products (grain,⁷⁰ straw⁷¹), timber (cedar,⁷² juniper⁷³), various types of stones (lapis lazuli,⁷⁴ *algamišu*, *kabdum*⁷⁵), jars,⁷⁶ all at different levels and in varying quantities.⁷⁷ As seen above in both RS 94.2363 and RS 18.099 (KTU 4.380; §5), the comparison of this documentation from the Hittite administration with the information provided in some administrative texts from Ugarit can be of interest, as the following two cases also show.

Three Ugaritic administrative texts mention the term *mnḥt*: RS [Varia 13] (KTU 4.709), RIH 78/02 (KTU 4.771) and RS 94.2392+ (KTU 4.808),⁷⁸ found at both Ras Shamra and Ras Ibn Hani.⁷⁹ The term refers to a variety of products: linen clothes (*ktu*), madder (*puṭ*), oil (*šmn*),⁸⁰ ebony (*bbn*)⁸¹ and wool.⁸² Its precise meaning is uncertain, as shown, for example, by DUL's contradiction in

61. RS 94.2558 (RSO 23, 32); RS 94.2578 (RSO 23, 61); RS 94.2509 (RSO 23, 64); RS 94.2579+ (RSO 23, 67); RS 94.2288+ (RSO 23, 71); RS 20.237 (Ugaritica 5, 102); RS 17.289 (PRU 4, 192). But there may be more; see for example RS 94.2524 (RSO 23, 150).
62. RS 94.2373 (RSO 23, 55); RS 94.2578 (RSO 23, 61); RS 94.2288+ (RSO 23, 71); RS 20.237 (Ugaritica 5, 102); RS 17.289 (PRU 4, 192).
63. RS 94.2373 (RSO 23, 55).
64. RS 15.014 (PRU 3, 5).
65. RS 20.216 (Ugaritica 5, 108); RS 17.383 (PRU 4, 221).
66. RS 94.5013 (RSO 23, 24); RS 94.2562 (RSO 23, 76).
67. RS 94.2001 (RSO 23, 16).
68. RS 94.2408 (RSO 23, 57).
69. RS 94.5013 (RSO 23, 24); RS 20.212 (Ugaritica 5, 105); RS 20.255 A (Ugaritica 5, 100).
70. RS 94.2185 (RSO 23, 49), RS 94.2571 (RSO 23, 47), RS 94.2585 (RSO 23, 59); RS 17.423 (PRU 4, 193); cf. also RS 94.2524 (RSO 23, 150) and other texts quoted in RSO 23, 48.
71. RS 17.423 (PRU 4, 193).
72. RS 94.2497 (RSO 23, 31).
73. RS 17.385 (PRU 4, 194).
74. RS 94.2530 (RSO 23, 25); RS 94.2523 (RSO 23, 29); RS 17.383 (PRU 4, 221); RS 17.422 (PRU 4, 223). On RS 94.2530 and RS 94.2523 see also Lyons 2019.
75. RS 20.255 A (Ugaritica 5, 100); *algamišu*: CAD A/1 "steatite(?)", AHw 35 "Korund(?)", cf. also DUL sub *algbt*; *kabdum*: cf. Ugaritica 5, 101 n. 1.
76. RS 94.2408 (RSO 23, 57).
77. In RS 92.2007 (RSO 14, 260) the *tuppātnuru* orders the exemption of some traders from fees; cf. also RS 94.2466 (RSO 23, 75). In RS 94.2562 (RSO 23, 76) the repatriation of a Hittite is required.
78. DUL 556 mentions two texts in connection with *mnḥt*, RS [Varia 13] (KTU 4.709) and RS 94.2392+ (KTU 4.808), to which RIH 78/02 (KTU 4.771) is to be added: the reading *mnḥ* [.] of line 9 in KTU, 555, is wrong, the correct one being *mnḥ'p*, see Pardee 2000, 57; Bordreuil – Pardee – Roche-Hawley 2019, 84.
79. RS 94.2392+ (KTU 4.808): House of Urtenu; RIH 78/02 (KTU 4.771): Palais Nord de Ras Ibn Hani; RS [Varia 13] (KTU 4.709): exact place of discovery unknown (cf. Bordreuil – Pardee 1989, 380).
80. Clothes of linen, madder and oil: all three items in RIH 78/02 (KTU 4.771).
81. RS 94.2392+ (KTU 4.808; RSO 18 no. 40).
82. RS [Varia 13] (KTU 4.709).

translating *mnḫt* in RS [Varia 13] (KTU 4.709) as “tribute”, but also as “has been delivered”.⁸³ In the context of the syntactic structure *d mnḫt* (see below), the term has been translated as “has been delivered”,⁸⁴ but also as “of the tribute”.⁸⁵ Dennis Pardee summarises the problem as follows:

Le mystère dans tout cela est le sens précis de MNH. Il n'existe aucun doute qu'il désigne [in RIH 78/02] le transfert d'au moins l'huile *birt* à l'« acheteur ». Mais, puisqu'il semble s'agir d'un échange — parce qu'il est question d'un « compte » et que la valeur des objets est indiquée —, quelle est la raison de l'emploi de ce verbe dont les connotations principales sont celles de « tribut » ou de « don » ? Sommes-nous ici dans le domaine des échanges à but commercial qui prenaient la forme de cadeaux ?⁸⁶

The term *mnḫt* appears to be the alphabetic version of the noun *mānaḫ(ā)tu*,⁸⁷ found in half a dozen Akkadian letters found in the House of Urtenu, several of them from Hittite dignitaries.⁸⁸ The editors of these letters conclude that

dans ce corpus, *mānaḫ(ā)tu* désigne des denrées alimentaires en se référant non pas à leur nature (grain, culture vivrières) mais au système dont elles relèvent. Le fait que ce soit le pouvoir impérial qui impose leur livraison au roi d'Ugarit – et pourrait seul l'exempter – et que les personnages qui demandent d'en bénéficier soient des princes hittites incite à penser à une contribution en nature, occasionnelle ou non, destinée à constituer des réserves stockées sur place et envoyées là où le besoin s'en faisait sentir dans l'empire.⁸⁹

The term *mānaḫ(ā)tu* would therefore refer to a certain system of management of goods and not to the actual nature of those goods. It could also be a contribution in kind. RS [Varia 13] (KTU 4.709), RIH 78/02 (KTU 4.771) and RS 94.2392+ (KTU 4.808) allow the list of goods managed by means of this system (agricultural in the case of the above-mentioned letters) to be extended, which would

83. DUL 556: “tribute”; DUL 555: “to deliver”, but Tropper 2008: “(einzelne) Gabe, Geschenk, Tribut”.

84. Pardee 2000, 57: “qu'a présentées”; Bordreuil – Pardee – Roche-Hawley 2019, 84: “qu'a présentées”.

85. RSO 18, 92, with comment in *ibid.* p. 93: “appartenant à, provenant de tribut, d'offrandes, de cadeaux”.

86. Pardee 2000, 58. On the Semitic root *mnḫ* see also DUL 555, “to deliver”, from which *mnḫ*, “delivery, contribution, tribute” (DUL 555) could be derived; Hoch 1994, 128; Takács 2013, 306-307.

87. For the connection between *mānaḫ(ā)tu* and *mnḫt* see DUL 556; Lackenbacher – Malbran-Labat 2016, 49 fn. 38.

88. References and commentary in Lackenbacher – Malbran-Labat 2016, 48. See now also the detailed study of this documentation by Cohen and Torrecilla (in press); I am very grateful to both authors for having provided me with a draft of their article prior to publication.

89. Lackenbacher – Malbran-Labat 2016, 49, where they add: “Une telle mesure cadrerait bien avec la politique économique de l'empire hittite à cette époque, le développement des greniers et silos, les échanges et la gestion des produits de l'agriculture dans une zone où elle était fragile, pour faire face aux crises climatiques et à la famine endémique”. Previously Malbran-Labat 2013, 6, noted: “‘aides alimentaires’ (si c'est bien ainsi qu'il faut comprendre le terme *mānaḫtu*). À travers les allusions qui y sont faites, il semble s'agir de grain dont on peut demander l'attribution dans des situations de crise. Peut-être faut-il relier cette pratique à la constitution de greniers de réserve sur le territoire soumis aux Hittites en cette fin de l'âge du Bronze où les disettes se multipliaient au Hatti”.

also include (at least) textiles, wood and oil. Significant in this respect is the distinction made by RS 94.2392+ (KTU 4.808) (also from the House of Urtenu) between “a talent of ebony ‘of trade’” (*ḫkr . ḫbm . d . mkr*, line 1) and “a second talent of ebony ‘of *mnḫt*’” (*ḫkr . ḫbmm . ṭn / d mnḫt*, lines 5-6),⁹⁰ i.e. a quantity of ebony which was not intended for trade and which *mnḫt* explicitly places in another economic sphere. For its part RS [Varia 13] (KTU 4.709) registers, on the one hand, a quantity of wool weighed according to the talent of Ashdod (lines 1-2) and, on the other hand, a quantity of wool weighed according to the talent of Ugarit and which, like the ebony in RS 94.2392+ (KTU 4.808), is also “of *mnḫt*” (lines 3-6).⁹¹ This set of letters and administrative texts points, therefore, to the existence in the economy of Ugarit of a hitherto unidentified mechanism for the management of goods, a type of management which, in addition, was integrated within the economic sphere of the Hittite empire.

The nature of this system has now been studied in detail by Cohen and Torrecilla,⁹² who conclude that it was a “tribute of ‘grain staples’... occasional or stipulated, which was destined either to be stocked in granaries or to be sent wherever it was needed, specifically for the needs of the [Hittite] empire... Once Ugarit had delivered the *mānaḫātu*, the Hittites directed the grain staples wherever they were needed... In the international sphere, the term *mānaḫātu* could also apply to a grain purchase or delivery, and not necessarily taxation”. In Ugarit there was also an internal tax with the same name, “one supplied by the citizens of Ugarit to its king... It can be suggested that it is this type of the inner taxation of *mānaḫātu* which finds it equivalent, on some occasions, in the alphabetic *mnḫ(t)*, although the taxation in question, as far as can be understood, was not grain but goods”. The *mānaḫtu* system was certainly also employed within the kingdom of Ugarit, but the body of evidence suggests a system that gravitated primarily around Hittite needs.

Another series of Hittite letters from the House of Urtenu is intended to require the king of Ugarit to send considerable groups of people for rebuilding the city of Alathā.⁹³ In RS 94.2578,⁹⁴ the *uriyanni* asks Niqmaddu III to send 500 men, of whom 300 (together with 30 chariots) are to go to Aleppo (for an unspecified mission) and another 200 to Alathā, to do work there.⁹⁵ From RS 94.2579+⁹⁶ it is (probably) the king of Karkemiš who demands from Niqmaddu the dispatch of 200 men for working in Alathā. Responding to these demands entailed the setting up of a complex

90. Following the translation by DUL 328: “a second / another talent of ebony”; the editors (RSO 18, 92) translate “Un talent d’ébène, (en) deux (pièces)”.

91. *ṣb’ . ḫkr . ṣ’rt / b . ḫkr . addd / w b ḫkr . ugrt / ḫmš . ḫkrmm / alp . ṭmn . mat ḫbd / d . mnḫt*, “Seven talents of wool according to the talent of Ašdod. And according to the talent of Ugarit: five talents (and) one thousand eight hundred (shekels of wool) that is *mnḫt*” (cf. Tropper 2012, 407). In addition to the classic study by Liverani 1972, for this text see more recently Bordreuil 2007, 389-397; Monroe 2009, 55. One Ugaritic talent was equivalent to about 28,200 kilos, cf. Bordreuil 2012, 284. It should be noted that “the Hittites did not impose their weight system on Syrian commerce” (Monroe 2009, 51).

92. Cohen – Torrecilla (in press).

93. For the historical context of these letters see Malbran-Labat 2013, 5-6; RSO 23, 61; von Dassow 2020, 215-216.

94. RSO 23, 61-64.

95. Lines 42-43: *ša KIN.MEŠ ip-pa-šu i-na URU a-la-at-ḫa*. In the same vein see also the letters of the *uriyanni* RS 94.2509 (RSO 23, 64-66) and RS 94.2511 (RSO 23, 66-67).

96. RSO 23, 67.

organisational and administrative mechanism in Ugarit, reflected in the administrative texts, whose functioning has been described elsewhere.⁹⁷

7. Conclusions

This article has tried to show that the obligations of Ugarit towards Hatti, specified in successive treaties, and the continuous Hittite demands for soldiers, labourers, money and various goods, as well as Hittite commercial activity in Ugarit, had a greater impact on the kingdom than might appear at first glance.⁹⁸ The evidence for this is found in the administrative documents. These texts, therefore, help us to make a better assessment of the extent to which Hittite demands weighed on the human and economic resources of the kingdom during its final years, according to the administrative texts available,⁹⁹ but perhaps also from the very beginning of Hittite domination.¹⁰⁰ In this context, these texts also allow us to look inside the Ugaritian administration itself, to get a glimpse of how the local authorities organised the response in terms of logistics and administration. This is a line of research that will need to be pursued further in the future and whose results should be incorporated into a history of the relations between Ugarit and Hatti, as well as, more generally, into a history of the nature of Hittite rule in Syria.

One may also wonder about the reason for the inclusion of logo-syllabic totals in texts written using the local cuneiform alphabet, as seen above in RS 19.017 (KTU 4.610; §2), RS 11.716 (KTU 4.68; §4), RS 10.052 (KTU 4.63; §4), RS 11.715+ (KTU 4.69; §4) and RS 11.721 (KTU 4.71; §4). At this point it is worth recalling the question raised by Sylvie Lackenbacher as to whether the use in Ugarit of the Akkadian language in legal texts referring to real estate could be related to a possible control of those properties by the Hittite authority.¹⁰¹ In the same vein, and recalling also what was said above about texts RS 34.147 and RS 94.2409+ (KTU 4.866; cf. §3), it may be suggested that the logo-

97. See in detail Vita 2018b. These were tasks generally performed within the framework of the *ilku*-service; in the same vein see also the letter RS 94.2288+ (RSO 23, 71-73), where the *urîyanni* claims troops from Ugarit (ERÍN.MEŠ KI.KAL.BAD, cf. Lackenbacher – Malbran-Labat 2016, 63) in connection with the *ilku*-service.

98. It is likely that the still unpublished administrative texts of the House of Urtenu abound in the same direction; see catalogue in Malbran-Labat 2008, especially pp. 21-24 and 46.

99. As seen above under §2, RS 19.017 (KTU 4.610) can be dated to around the end of the 13th century BCE. For a late dating of most of the administrative texts from Ugarit see Vita 2019.

100. According to van Soldt 2010, 204 and 205, and van Soldt 2012, 111, Hittite domination could even explain the very existence of the Ugaritian palace archives.

101. Lackenbacher 2002, 213-214: “Il est peu vraisemblable que la suzeraineté hittite ait amorcé une redistribution des terres; mais l’emploi systématique de l’akkadien, la langue internationale de l’époque, pour établir une sorte d’état des propriétés foncières liées à des individus et le besoin même de cet état seraient-ils liés *au fait que le pouvoir hittite devait avoir la possibilité d’exercer un certain contrôle?*” (italics ours). Cited also by Malbran 2004, 103, when she states (*ibid.* 90) that “Si la terre dépend de la royauté ougaritaine qui en ‘donne’, ‘transmet’, ‘retire’ la possession, *il n’est pas impossible que le Grand-roi ait eu un droit de regard* sur cette source de richesse” (italics ours).

syllabic totals inserted into the above-mentioned administrative texts could result from the need (or obligation) for Hittite officials to supervise the key elements in those documents.¹⁰²

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- André-Salvini B. 2004, “Textes lexicographiques de Ras Shamra-Ugarit (campagnes 1986-1992), *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 46, 147-154.
- Astour M.C. 1981, “Ugarit and the Great Powers”, in G.D. Young (ed.), *Ugarit in Retrospect: 50 years of Ugarit and Ugaritic*, Winona Lake, 3-29.
- Barjamovic G. 2021, “The Empires of Western Asia and the Assyrian World Empire”, in P. Fibiger Bang – C.A. Bayly – W. Scheidel (eds.), *The Oxford World History of Empire. Volume Two: The History of Empires*, Oxford, 73-110.
- Beckman G. 1996, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, Atlanta.
- Bordreuil É. 2007, “Numération et unités pondérales dans les textes administratifs et économiques en ougaritique et dans les tablettes métrologiques en cunéiforme suméro-akkadien”, in J.-M. Michaud (éd.), *Le royaume d'Ougarit de la Crète à l'Euphrate. Nouveaux axes de recherche*, Sherbrooke, 381-421.
- 2012, “Poids et mesures dans les textes administratifs en ougaritique: unités pondérales et quantification du cuivre”, in V. Matoian – M. Al-Maqdissi – Y. Calvet (édd.), *Études ougaritiques II*, Leuven, 283-296.
- Bordreuil P. – Pardee D. 1989, *La trouvaille épigraphique de l'Ougarit. 1. Concordance*, Paris.
- Bordreuil P. – Pardee D. – Roche-Hawley C. 2019, *Ras Ibn Hani II. Les textes en écritures cunéiformes de l'âge du Bronze récent (fouilles 1977 à 2002)*, Beyrouth.
- Cohen Y. – Torrecilla E. 2020, “Hittite Cult in Syria: Religious Imperialism or Religious Pluralism?”, *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 66, 221-230.

102. Along the same lines see already Vita 2021, 195-196. One of the reviewers of the article has commented that “If the Hittites required control, then surely the whole text would have been written in Akkadian”. The Ugaritic texts discussed in this article are not the only ones that present a logo-syllabic total; see the list in Roche 2008, 164-168. According to the author, *ibid.* 158, what characterises this type of text is that, in one way or another, the logo-syllabic totals are isolated from the rest of the text, so that they are easily identifiable. The use of logo-syllabic writing in the context of an alphabetic text may respond to various needs, but was certainly not for arbitrary reasons (cf. Vita 2020; Vita 2021, 194). Nor is it likely that all the cases respond to one and the same motivation. The totals of the Ugaritic texts discussed in this article could well have been written like the rest of the text, i.e. using the alphabetic script, but the scribes chose to mark the totals by means of the logo-syllabic script. This circumstance may have been for reasons unknown to us (for example, for the scribe's own convenience in identifying the totals), but in the context of political relations between Ugarit and Hatti, where Hittite control (political, economic, etc.) over Ugarit was becoming increasingly tight, the checking of certain documents (such as those discussed here) by Hittite officials does not seem to us to be a far-fetched possibility. In that case, the Hittites would not necessarily have been interested in the details of the document, written in Ugaritic (names of persons and/or localities, specific amounts assigned to each person or locality, etc.), but in the totals, so that it would not be essential for the whole text to be in Akkadian. This is, however, a mere hypothesis.

- 2022, “The Campaign against the Suteans and the Project in The Land of Mukiš: A Consideration of Letters RSO 23 28–36, and 39 from the House of Urtenu in Ugarit”, *Israel Oriental Studies* 21, 29-49.
- in press, “The *mānahtu* and the End of Ugarit”. To appear in *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*.
- DUL = del Olmo Lete G. – Sanmartín J. 2015³, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition* (*Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section 1 The Near and Middle East* 112), Leiden.
- Genz H. 2011, “Foreign Contacts of the Hittites”, in H. Genz – D.K. Miele (eds.), *Insights into Hittite History and Archaeology*, Leuven - Paris - Walpole, 301-331.
- Gilibert A. 2021, “Urban Squares in Late Bronze Age Ugarit: A Street View on Ancient Near Eastern Governance”, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 80, 377-414.
- Giorgieri M. – Mora C. 2012, “Luxusgüter als Symbole der Macht: Zur Verwaltung der Luxusgüter im Hethiter-Reich”, in G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Würzburg, 20-25 July 2008*, Winona Lake, 647-664.
- Halayqa I.K.H. 2010, “The Demise of Ugarit in the Light of its Connections with Ḫatti”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 42, 297-332.
- Hawley R. – Pardee D. – Roche-Hawley C. 2015, “The Scribal Culture of Ugarit”, *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* 2, 229-267.
- Heltzer M. 2003, “New Evidence about Tribute from Ugarit to the Hittite King (KTU 4.610 and RS 92.2001 + 92.2002)”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 35, 239-242.
- Hoch J.E. 1994, *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*, Princeton.
- KTU = Dietrich M. – Loretz O. – Sanmartín J. 2013³, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und anderen Orten*, Münster.
- Lackenbacher S. 2002, *Textes akkadiens d'Ugarit. Textes provenant des vingt-cinq premières campagnes*, Paris.
- Lackenbacher S. – Malbran-Labat F. 2005, “Ugarit et les Hittites dans les archives de la ‘Maison d’Urtenu’”, *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 47, 227-240.
- 2016, *Lettres en akkadien de la « Maison d’Urtēnu ». Fouilles de 1994*, Leuven.
- Lebrun Ch. 2014, *Présence et pouvoir hittites à Ougarit. Le cas des DUMU.LUGAL*, Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Lebrun R. 1995, “Ougarit et le Hatti à la fin du XIII^e siècle av. J.-C.”, in M. Yon – M. Sznycer – P. Bordreuil (éd.), *Le pays d'Ougarit autour de 1200 av. J.-C.*, Paris, 85-88.
- 2004, “Bague inscrite en hiéroglyphes hittito-louvites”, in G. Galliano – Y. Calvet (éd.), *Aux origines de l'alphabet. Le royaume d'Ougarit*, Paris - Lyon, 106.
- Lebrun R. – Tavernier J. 2012, “Deux objets inscrits de Tell Tweini”, in T. Boiy – J. Bretschneider – A. Goddeeris – H. Hameeuw – G. Jans – J. Tavernier (eds.), *The Ancient Near East, A Life! Festschrift Karel Van Lerberghe*, Leuven, 319-333.
- Liverani M. 1972, “Il talento di Ashdod”, *Oriens Antiquus* 11, 193-199.
- Lyons M.C. 2019, “Requests for Food-provisions in RS 94.2523 and RS 94.2530. Reconsidering PAD.MEŠ as Metal Ingots”, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 46, 15-21.
- Malbran-Labat F. 1991a, “Traité”, in P. Bordreuil (éd.), *Une Bibliothèque au sud de la ville. Les textes de la 34^e campagne (1973) (Ras Shamra-Ougarit 7)*, Paris, 15-16.
- 1991b, “Listes”, in P. Bordreuil (éd.), *Une Bibliothèque au sud de la ville. Les textes de la 34^e campagne (1973) (Ras Shamra-Ougarit 7)*, Paris, 17-25.
- 2004, “Les Hittites et Ougarit”, in M. Mazoyer – O. Casabonne (eds.), *Studia Anatolica et Varia. Mélanges offerts au Professeur René Lebrun*. Vol. II, Paris, 69-104.
- 2006, “Où est le ‘Palais?’”, in P. Butterlin – M. Lebeau – J.-Y. Monchamber – J.L. Montero Fenollós – B. Muller (eds.), *Les espaces syro-mésopotamiens. Dimensions de l'expérience humaine au Proche-Orient ancien. Volume d'hommage offert à Jean-Claude Margueron (Subartu 17)*, Turnhout, 61-66.

- 2008, “Catalogue raisonné des textes akkadiens de la ‘Maison d’Urtēnu’”, in C. Roche (éd.), *D’Ougarit à Jérusalem. Recueil d’études épigraphiques et archéologiques offert à Pierre Bordreuil*, Paris, 21-38.
- 2013, “Déchiffrer l’histoire d’Ougarit. Nouveaux apports des textes akkadiens de la ‘Maison d’Urtēnu’”, in P. Bordreuil – F. Ernst-Pradal – M.G. Masetti-Rouault – H. Rouillard-Bonraisin – M. Zink (édd.), *Les écritures mises au jour sur le site antique d’Ougarit (Syrie) et leur déchiffrement*, Paris, 1-9.
- Masson E. 1975, “Quelques sceaux hittites hiéroglyphiques”, *Syria* 52, 213-239.
- McGeough K.M. 2007, *Exchange Relationships at Ugarit*, Leuven.
- 2011, *Ugaritic Economic Tablets. Texts, Translation and Notes*, Leuven.
- Monroe C.M. 2009, *Scales of Fate. Trade, Tradition, and Transformation in the Eastern Mediterranean ca. 1350-1175 BCE*, Münster.
- Neu E. 1995, “Hethiter und Hethitisch in Ugarit”, in M. Dietrich – O. Loretz (Hgg.), *Ugarit. Ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum im Alten Orient. Ergebnisse und Perspektiven der Forschung. Band I. Ugarit und seine altorientalische Umwelt*, Münster, 115-129.
- Niehr H. 2021, “Observations on the Language Situation in Late Bronze Age Ugarit”, in L.C. Jonker – A. Berlejung – I. Cornelius (eds.), *Multilingualism Perspectives from Ancient Near Eastern and Early Christian Contexts*, Stellenbosch 27-55.
- Pardee D. 2000, “Trois comptes ougaritiques: RS 15.062, RS 18.024, RIH 78/02”, *Syria* 77, 23-67.
- 2001, “Épigraphie et structure dans les textes administratifs en langue ougaritique: les exemples de RS 6.216 et RS 19.017”, *Orientalia* 70, 235-282.
- 2007, “RS 15.039 remis sur pied”, *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 7, 67-85.
- Prechel D. 1999, “Ugarit als Spiegel der syrisch-hethitischen Beziehungen im 13. Jahrhundert”, in M. Kropp – A. Wagner (Hgg.), *‘Schnittpunkt’ Ugarit*, Frankfurt am Main, 245-253.
- Prosser M.C. 2010, *Bunušu in Ugaritian Society*, PhD Dissertation, University of Chicago.
- PRU 3 = Nougayrol J. 1955, *Le palais royal d’Ugarit (Mission de Ras Shamra 6)*, Vol. 3, Paris.
- PRU 4 = Nougayrol J. 1956, *Le palais royal d’Ugarit (Mission de Ras Shamra 9)*, Vol. 4, Paris.
- Richter T. 2012, *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen*, Wiesbaden.
- Roche C. 2008, “Classification de l’utilisation du cunéiforme mésopotamien dans les textes ougaritiques”, in R.D. Biggs – J. Myers – M.T. Roth (eds.), *Proceedings of the 51st Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale Held at The Oriental Institute of The University of Chicago, July 18-22, 2005*, Chicago, 155-170.
- RSO 14 = Yon M. – Arnaud D. (édd.) 2001, *Études ougaritiques I. Travaux 1985-1995*, Paris.
- RSO 18 = Bordreuil P. – Pardee D. – Hawley R. 2012, *Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville. Textes 1994-2002 en cunéiforme alphabétique de la maison d’Ourtenou (Ras Shamra-Ougarit 18)*, Lyon.
- RSO 23 = Lackenbacher S. – Malbran-Labat F. 2016, *Lettres en akkadien de la ‘Maison d’Urtēnu’. Fouilles de 1994 (Ras Shamra-Ougarit 23)*, Leuven. 2016.
- Salvini M. 2001, “Textes hittites”, in M. Yon – D. Arnaud (édd.), *Études ougaritiques. I. Travaux 1985-1995*, Paris, 339.
- Schloen J.D. 2001, *The House of the Father as a Fact and Symbol. Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East*, Winona Lake.
- Singer I. 1999, “A Political History of Ugarit”, in W.G.E. Watson – N. Wyatt (eds.), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Leiden, 603-733.
- Simon Z. 2013, “Die hethitische Präsenz in der Levante während der Spätbronzezeit: Archäologische vs. schriftliche Quellen”, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 40, 295-313.
- Takács G. 2013, *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian*, Vol. 3, Leiden - Chicago.
- Tropper J. 2008, *Kleines Wörterbuch des Ugaritischen*, Wiesbaden.
- 2012, *Ugaritische Grammatik. Zweite, stark überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage*, Münster.
- Ugaritica 5 = Nougayrol J. – Laroche E. – Virolleaud Ch. – Schaeffer C.F.A. 1968, *Ugaritica V (Mission de Ras Shamra 16)*, Paris.
- van Soldt W.H. 1989, “Labels from Ugarit”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 21, 375-388.

- 1991, *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit. Dating and Grammar*, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- 2005, *The Topography of the City-State of Ugarit*, Münster.
- 2010, “Ugarit as Hittite Vassal State”, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 37, 198-207.
- 2012, “Why did They Write? On Empires and Vassals in Syria and Palestine in the Late Bronze Age”, in W.S. van Egmond – W.H. van Soldt (eds.), *Theory and Practice of Knowledge Transfer Studies in School Education in the Ancient Near East and Beyond Papers Read at a Symposium in Leiden, 17-19 December 2008*, Leiden, 103-113.
- Vargyas P. 1985, “Marchands hittites à Ugarit”, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 16, 71-79.
- Vidal J. 2013, “Ugarit at War (5). The *brd*-militia in Aru and Mulukku² (RS 94.5015, KTU³ 2.98)”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 44, 355-359.
- 2016, “Military Conscription in Ugarit”, *Revue internationale d'Histoire Militaire Ancienne* 3, 123-133.
- Vita J.-P. 2013, “Interactions à Ougarit entre textes administratifs et textes d'un autre genre (lettres, textes juridiques, rituels, étiquettes)”, in V. Matoïan – M. Al-Maqdissi (eds.), *Études ougaritiques III (Ras Shamra-Ougarit 21)*, Leuven, 403-416.
- 2018a, “Defining the Corpus of Legal Documents in Ugaritic”, *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 24, 125-135.
- 2018b, “The *ilku*-service and Administrative Procedures in Ugarit”, *Anla Orientalis* 36, 167-184.
- 2019, “Remarks on the Chronology and the Overall Total of Administrative Texts from Ugarit”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 50, 397-418.
- 2020, “Le texte bigraphe d'Ougarit RS 94.2276: fonction de l'écriture logo-syllabique”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 51, 317-326.
- 2021, “Administrative Texts in Ugarit between Tradition and Innovation: Analysis of Two Instances”, in I. Kottsieper – H. Neumann (Hgg.), *Literaturkontakte Ugarits. Wurzeln und Entfaltungen (Kasion 5)*, Münster, 189-198.
- Vita J.-P. – Matoïan V. 2020, “RS 6.174 (KTU 1.75): A Possible Cryptic Colophon and His Archaeological Context”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 51, 299-316.
- von Dassow E. 2020, “Alalah Between Mittani and Hatti”, *Asia Anteriore Antica. Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Cultures* 2, 193-226.
- Watson W.G.E. 2007, *Lexical Studies in Ugaritic*, Sabadell - Barcelona.
- 2010, “From List to Letter: Notes on Letter-Writing Techniques on Ancient Ugarit”, in W. H. van Soldt (ed.), *Society and Administration in Ancient Ugarit*, Leiden, 164-178.
- 2012, “Ugaritic Terms for Containers in the Light of Comparative Semitics”, in F. Corriente – G. del Olmo Lete – Á. Vicente – J.-P. Vita (eds.), *Dialectology of the Semitic Languages. Proceedings of the IV Meeting on Comparative Semitics, Zaragoza 11/6-9/2010*, Sabadell, 81-111.
- Yon M. 2006, *The City of Ugarit at Tell Ras Shamra*, Winona Lake.