

The *ilku*-service and Administrative Procedures in Ugarit

Juan-Pablo Vita – (ILC, CSIC - Madrid)

[El presente artículo analiza una quincena de textos administrativos de Ugarit, tanto en escritura alfabética como silábica, cuya interrelación nos permite intentar una reconstrucción, siquiera parcial, de los procesos administrativos que los produjeron. Este grupo documental reflejaría parte del aspecto administrativo del denominado servicio-*ilku*, cuyos aspectos jurídicos han recibido especial atención.]

Palabras-clave: Ugarit, textos administrativos, procedimientos administrativos, servicio-*ilku*.

[This article analyses about fifteen administrative texts from Ugarit, written in either the alphabetic or the syllabic script. Their interrelationship allows us to reconstruct, even if partially, the administrative procedures that produced them. To some extent, this set of documents seems to reflect the administrative aspect of what is known as *ilku*-service, the legal aspects of which have received particular attention.]

Keywords: Ugarit, administrative texts, administrative procedures, *ilku*-service.

With almost 1200 texts and fragments, the administrative genre is the category of text best represented in the corpus of Ugarit.¹ The number of administrative texts in the alphabetic script found so far in Ras Shamra and in Ras Ibn Hani has risen to about 1000, with some 200 in the syllabic script.² These texts allow us to investigate the administration, the economy and the social organisation of an important Syrian kingdom of the Late Bronze Age. Therefore, during recent decades, they have been the basis for various social and economic studies.³ On the other hand, there

1. This article is a product of the research project “Bureaucracy and Administrative Procedures in the Syrian Kingdom of Ugarit (14th to 12th centuries B.C.)” (FFI2015–67357–P) (MINECO/FEDER, UE), funded by the Spanish Ministry for Economic Affairs and Competitiveness within the National Plan for Scientific Research, Development and Technological Innovation (I+D+I). I wish to express my thanks to Wilfred G. E. Watson for reading through the manuscript critically and translating it into English.

2. See the numbers provided for each genre by Hawley, Pardee and Roche 2015, 232. The ensemble of administrative texts in Ugaritic language was recently compiled in the edition of Manfred Dietrich, Oswald Loretz and Joaquín Sanmartín (2013), chapter 4 (“Economic Texts”), which gathers a total of 872 texts and fragments. Many of these texts were translated into English by McGeough 2011.

3. As reflected by the study of Zamora 1997, the influence of the Marxist view of history was felt with some force in social and economic studies on Syria in general and Ugarit in particular, especially between the 70’s and 80’s of the previous century. Interest in the social and economic aspects of the kingdom of Ugarit were given strong impetus by the work of Michael Heltzer (1976; 1978; 1982; 1999). On the same theoretical basis, but using the Marxist historiographical models more critically and with more methodological rigour, in a series of articles Mario Liverani has provided a very fine description of the society and economy of Ugarit. The best summary of his work is provided in 1979. The general approach of his models and conclusions have left a deep impression on recent research. Even so, fresh analysis of the

have been comparative few studies that focus on the administrative texts from Ugarit as a subject for investigation in its own right and have attempted to understand how the administration of the kingdom functioned, both in specific areas and as a whole.⁴ The present article is an attempt to make a contribution along these lines.

Our starting-point is the administrative text 4.810 (RS 94.2411),⁵ with the objective of attempting to understand the exact administrative meaning of the term *bt*, “house”. This analysis leads to the study of other administrative texts, especially the following:

-Alphabetic: 4.16 (RS 1.015), 4.80 (RS 11.778), 4.95 (RS 11.836+), 4.100 (RS 11.850), 4.295 (RS 17.312), 4.417 (RS 18.258), 4.610 (RS 19.017), 4.727 (RS 24.289), 4.750 (RS 29.094), 4.795 (RS 86.2237), 4.810 (RS 94.2411), 4.812.

-Syllabic: RS 11.830 (PRU 3, 190), RS 19.32 (PRU 6, n° 77), RS 19.74 (PRU 6, n° 95).

The analysis of these texts leads to a progressive identification of their interrelationships, which, in turn, allow us to attempt a reconstruction, even if partial, of the administrative processes that produced them. On the other hand, as the closing sections 10 and 11 show in more detail, we conclude that this collection of texts reflects part of the administrative aspect of what is called the *ilku*-service, which in Ugarit denoted obligations of various kinds (related to professional work or property/real estate) to the central administration, the legal mechanics of which have received special attention.⁶

1. Bordreuil and Pardee (2012, 11-17) edited the administrative text 4.810 (RS 94.2411), which they presented as follows: “Bordereau de 27 villes avec le nombre de maisonnées dans chacune, alphabétique et syllabique”. The first three lines give some idea of the general structure of the text:⁷

arb‘m . bt . b ilštm‘	40 houses in (the village of) ’Ilištam‘u
ḥmš . ‘šrh ¹ . bt šbn ⁿ	15 houses (in the village of) Šubbanu
tlštm . l mīt . uškn	130 (houses in the village of) ’Uškanu

written documentation in Ugaritic shows that there are problems in Liverani’s models, which should not be considered as conclusive but as a valuable starting-point for further research. Other scholars have also studied in detail various aspects of social and economic life in Ugarit (Vita 1995; Zamora 2000; Vidal 2005), the toponymy and the administrative organization of the kingdom (Belmonte 2001; van Soldt 2005) or the relationships between cult and administration (del Olmo and Sanmartín 1998; Clemens 2001). A synopsis of Ugaritian society can be found in Vita 1999, which should be extended and completed by more recent studies, especially those by Schloen 2001 and McGeough 2007 (on these see Dietrich 2010), who analyse the available information from new theoretical and methodological premises.

4. There have been a relatively high number of lexicographical studies focusing on the administrative texts, the main results of which have been collected in DUL. As part of the programme of re-editing the administrative texts undertaken by the Mission de Ras Shamra (cf. Bordreuil and Pardee 1995), Dennis Pardee has republished and studied texts or groups of specific texts; see for example Pardee 2005; 2007a; 2007b; 2008; 2010. There are also several relevant studies in the collective volume edited by van Soldt, 2010. However, there are very few studies that attempt a global understanding of the administrative genre in particular and of Ugaritian administration in general, along the lines of valuable studies such as, for example, Liverani 1989 or Sanmartín 1995. McGeough 2011 should be used with caution (see Vita 2012). See also Tropper and Vita 1998a; Matoian and Vita 2014; Rougemont and Vita 2010; in press; Vita and Matoian, in press; Vita 2007; 2008; 2013; in press a; in press b.

5. Texts which have numbers beginning with “4.” are classified as “Economic Texts” in the edition in KTU³.

6. For detailed studies on the *ilku*-service in Ugarit see Márquez Rowe 1999; 2006, 234-238, 268-269; Schloen 2001, 229-230, 246-247, 251; McGeough 2007, 127-128.

7. The text 4.810 is digraphic, that is, it also has lines in the syllabic script. On this, besides the *editio princeps*, see also Roche 2008, 163-164; Vita, in press b.

In other words, the lines present a structure that, in its most extended form, comprises “number + ‘houses’ + TN”. As the editors note, the toponyms that form the first two sections (lines 1-15) and those in the upper margin (lines 27-29) record villages located in the southern part of the kingdom, whereas those in lines 16-26 are located in its northern and central areas (Bordreuil and Pardee 2012, 14).

The text has neither a heading nor a colophon that would indicate its purpose. It seems to be static, like a fixed image of several villages in the kingdom. However, this is only an impression (cf. §7).

2. Bordreuil and Pardee (2012, 14) put forward the hypothesis that 4.810 is a census of households in the villages recorded. In support of this proposal, they make the following important comment: there is a general correlation between the number of houses that 4.810 records per village and the amount of money that, according to text 4.610 (RS 19.017),⁸ those same villages supply as tribute for the Hittites. The two scholars (*ibid.*) summarise the data in the following table:⁹

Village	Houses in 4.810	Shekels in 4.610
Raqdu	43	126
’Ilišam’u	40	152
’Arutu	33	88
Ma’qabu	27	107
Šubbanu	15	36
Yaparu	10	32
’Uhnappu	9	25
’Agimu + Hupatāyu	7	18 + 6
’Enumakâ	6	8
Šurašu	5	23
Hurišubū’i	5	9

The editors add the following comment on the table:

“Si ces comparaisons n’établissent pas l’hypothèse de recensement à l’exclusion de toute autre, elles démontrent au moins que, en gros, les mêmes facteurs qui ont déterminé le montant exigible pour chaque ville devant contribuer au tribut pour le roi hittite [i.e. 4.610] sont reflétés dans le nombre de ‘maisons’ que ce texte [i.e. 4.810] enregistre pour chacune des villes nommées”.

3. Even so, 4.810 poses a series of questions: 1) What is the real nature of the “houses” that it records? 2) How was the information that it presents collected? And, therefore, 3) for what actual

8. Reedited by Pardee 2001, 250-282.

9. See also Pardee 2001, 276. Other administrative texts that may be connected with tribute to the Hittites are 4.235 (RS 16.369), 4.261 (RS 17.023), 4.267 (RS 17.103) and 4.369 (RS 18.078).

purpose was it composed? Some administrative texts enable us to try to answer the first two questions (on the third see §7). First of all, note text 4.16 (RS 1.015):¹⁰

1	bt šbn	Houses in (the village of) Šubbanu:
	iy[[x]]tlm ¹¹ . w b'lh	Iytlm and his labourer
	ddy	Ddy
	'my	'Ammaya
5	iwrnr	Ewrinīru
	alnr	Alnr
	maḥdt	Maḥdt ¹²
	ġly	Ġly
	[...]-	[...]
10	-t't	-t't
<hr/>		<hr/>
	ydn	Ydn
	mnn . w bnh	Mu/ininu and his son
	ṭkn	Ṭukanana

The heading of this text makes it clear that it is a list of “houses” in the village of Šubbanu. However, the other entries do not mention the word “house” but instead present a list of twelve personal names. Therefore, one can deduce that each of these persons represents or was either the head or the owner of a “house” in Šubbanu. This agrees quite closely – but not exactly – with the information provided by 4.810, where fifteen ‘houses’ are said to be in Šubbanu (§1). There may be various reasons for the discrepancies between these two texts, for example a possible chronological gap between them both. It is also possible that a series of texts of the same type as 4.16 was used as the basis for compiling the data presented in 4.810. In this case, 4.810 would be a sort of compilation or “Sammeltafel”.¹³

4. Therefore, the “houses” in 4.16 do not represent physical structures (a “house” as a building) but the persons in a house (a “house” as a “family” or a “home”), i.e. a household. The administrative text 4.812 has several entries of this kind:¹⁴

10. Cf. also DUL 247 sub 5).

11. Following the reading in KTU³, 253. Herdner 1963, 197 (with note 1) reads {iy'dm}.

12. Both KTU³ and DUL 507 read {maḥbt}. However, the {d} is very clear both in the copy and the photograph of the tablet, cf. Herdner 1963, 197 (n° 107, transcription), fig. 169 (copy) and pl. LXII (photo). See already Tropper and Vita 1998b, 697.

13. Text ALT 185, belonging to the archive of Alalah IV, has much the same structure as 4.810, namely, “number + ‘houses’ + TN” and with no heading or conclusion at all (transcription in Dietrich and Loretz 1970, 106-107; from line 5 the structure is simplified: “number + TN”, on this see *id. ibid.* 117). As we suggested for 4.810, ALT 185 would be a “Sammeltafel” (cf. Dietrich and Loretz 1970, 114) but, unlike 4.810, the “houses” of ALT 185 would be dependent on the palace, although the exact nature of this relationship cannot be determined (cf. Dietrich and Loretz 1970, 123). On ALT 185 see also von Dassow 2005, 59; 2008, 1831-85.

14. See the edition by Lemaire 1998.

1	tn . bnšm . b . mlk	Two persons in (the village of) Mulukku.
	tn . b . gb'ly	Two (persons) in Giba'lā.
	hrš . b . gt . grgš	One craftsman in Gt grgš.
	bt . iladn . b . uškn	The house of Iladn in 'Uškanu.
5	tn . btm . b . bir	Two houses in Bi'ru.
	bt . aḥd . b . m'r	One house in Mu'aru.
	bnš . b . šḥq	One person in Šaḥaqu.
	bnš . b .	One person in
	'nqpat	'Ēnu-qap'at.

This text, unlike 4.16 (§3), has no heading, but its function seems to be to record the presence of certain persons in a series of villages in the kingdom. In the middle section of the text, lines 4-6 record various “houses”. In line 4, the house in question is identified as belonging to a specific person (Iladn), corresponding, therefore, to the contents of 4.16 and also of the administrative text 4.727 (RS 24.289), which has lost its heading and its entries have the structure “*bt* ‘house’ + PN” (which, like 4.810, could be a “Sammeltafel”, cf. §3). Lines 5 and 6, instead, present the information just like 4.810 (§2), that is to say, with the formula “number + ‘houses’ + TN”, but they are also very like lines 5-18 of text 4.750 (RS 29.094, also a possible “Sammeltafel”).¹⁵

5	bt . yḥd . b . arm	One house in (the village of) 'Arm ¹⁶
	bt . yḥd . b . uškn	One house in 'Uškanu
	bt . yḥd . b . rqd	One house in Raqdu
	bt . b . ugrt . aḥd	One house in Ugarit
	bt . aḥd . b . ilštm'	One house in 'Ilišam'u
10	bt . aḥd . b . pd ¹⁷	One house in Pidu
	bt . aḥd . b . gb'l	One house in Giba'lā
	tlṭ . bhtn . b . šlmy	Three houses in Šalmiya
	tn . btm . b . gt . mlk	Two houses in Gittu-Mulukki
	bt . b . [m]'qb	One house in [Ma]'qabu
15	bt . b . ypr ¹⁸	One house in Yaparu(?)
	tn . btm . b . bšr	Two houses in Baširu
	tn . btm . b . š'rt	Two houses in Ša'artu
	tn . btm . b . arny	Two houses in 'Araniya

There is a series of unusual features in 4.750. On the one hand, as has been noted, the expression that we translate as “One house in TN” has three variant formulations (*bt yḥd b* TN, *bt b*

15. In this context see also text 4.813 (RIH 83/17+; KTU³, 574: “list (families (*bt*))”), although it is incomplete and only partially published.

16. Reading of the toponym according to van Soldt 2005, 36, even though he notes (*ibid.* n. 302) that “*arm* could be either a mistake for *ar* or it is an otherwise unknown toponym in the south”.

17. Reading {pd} according to KTU², see also DUL 651 and van Soldt 2005, 37. However, KTU³ reads {zb}.

18. Reading of {y} doubtful.

TN *aḥd*, *bt aḥd b* TN) which, even so, in all probability, state the same thing.¹⁹ On the other hand, the first two lines provide different information:²⁰

bn . mlk . mrily Bin-Malku, from (the village of) Mara'il:
arb' . bhtm . b . 'rgz four houses in 'Aragizu.

Based on these first two lines, the precise meaning of which eludes us, the text has been considered as a list of persons who own houses in various villages of the kingdom.²¹ However, as we have seen, the structure of lines 5-18 is completely different and, in all likelihood, must be understood in the same way as texts 4.810 and 4.812.

The relationships noted can be summarised as follows:

4.812	line 4	=	4.16	=	4.727
	lines 5-6	=	4.810	=	4.750:5-18

It is also evident that both 4.812 and 4.750 mention villages which also occur in 4.810. However, the information of the three texts is completely different in respect of the number of "houses" in each village:

	4.810	4.750	4.812
Houses in 'Uškanu	130	1	1
Houses in Bi'ru	8		2
Houses in Raqdu	43	1	
Houses in 'Ilištam'u	40	1	
Houses in Pidu	37	1	
Houses in Šalmiya	3-6	3	
Houses in Ma'qabu	27	1	
Houses in Yaparu	10	1	

As a result, and based on the combined information provided by texts 4.16, 4.727, 4.750 and 4.812, we think it is plausible to conclude that, in fact, the "houses" mentioned in these texts refer to a(n unspecified) group of persons (in the case of 4.812, more than two persons), as Lemaire

19. On this see Tropper 2012, 344: *bt yḥd* "ein einzelnes / das einzige Haus in ON", *bt aḥd b* ON "ein Haus in ON ... *bt yḥd*, *bt aḥd* und *bt* (allein) dürften im vorliegenden Text aber sachlich das gleiche meinen". However, as W. G. E. Watson reminded me, the expression *bt yḥd* could mean "household of a single man", see KTU 1.14 ii 43, *bt yḥd sgr* "the solitary man/bachelor closes his house" (cf. also DUL 743 and 946).

20. There are problems in understanding lines 3-4 because of the (doubtful) reading {yḥw} in line 4: *annmn . ugṛty / w . ṭn . yḥw . bn . 'bdb'l* "Ananmeni, from Ugarit, and two yḥw Bn 'bdb'l"; see also McGeough 2011, 507.

21. Van Soldt 2005, 82: "list of persons who own houses in various towns"; McGeough 2011, 508: "list of the number and location of houses owned by specific individuals"; KTU³, 544: "persons owning houses in several towns".

proposed (1998, 463) for 4.812.²² This would also apply to the “houses” recorded in 4.810 (§2), in line with the translation “maisonnées”, “feux”, by the editors.²³

5. The term “house”, therefore, seems to be used in texts 4.16, 4.727, 4.750, 4.810 and 4.812 as a sort of measure which allows one to calculate, certainly only approximately, a group of persons. When the scribe of 4.810 noted, for example, “40 houses in (the village of) ’Ilišm’u”, very probably he knew, even if (only) as an estimate, the total number of persons in those forty “houses”. If this hypothesis is correct, how then could the size of a “house” be known, even if only approximately? Sometimes, this datum can be deduced indirectly, as in the following fragment of 4.795 (RS 86.2237), a text dealing with the distribution of amounts of flour (*qmḥ*):

10 l byy . ddm	For Byy [PN]: two <i>dd</i> -measures (of flour).
1 bt . qwy . ḥmš ddm	For the house of Qwy: five <i>dd</i> -measures.

Line 10 could give the impression that an adult (Byy) received two *dd*-measures of flour as a personal ration. However, if one considers that in Ugarit a *dd* /dūdu/ was, most probably, the monthly ration of grain for one person,²⁴ then Byy would be receiving a double ration (possibly for himself and for another person dependent on him) and therefore the “house(hold) of Qwy” would comprise at least five persons. Some texts, however, allow a more direct approach to the matter. Of interest in this respect, are the administrative texts 4.295 (RS 17.312) and 4.417 (RS 18.258), usually described as “censuses of families”²⁵, which share a significant series of characteristics.²⁶ Here is the text of 4.295, the better preserved of the two:

22. Lemaire 1998, 463: “La ‘maison’ pourrait recouvrir ici [i.e. 4.812] la notion de maisonnée, de famille ... cette liste apparaît comme regroupant probablement des gens qui sont au service du palais royal, soit en tant qu’individus, soit en tant que familles, soit encore en tant qu’artisans”.

23. Cf. DUL 247 sub 5) “Immediate social circle, family, court, dynasty” (*bt* II); Vita 2015. Cf. Akkadian *bītu* “household, family” (CAD B, 293a sub 6). W. G. E. Watson also suggested the following parallels in Aramaic: ‘*nšy byt*’, “members of a household” (DJPA, 67a; DJBA, 120b); Aram. *bētā*’, “house, estate, room, household etc.” (DJBA, 208a; note the text: “the people of the household (*d-by*) of PN, the *r*.-official, put wine in the house of their tenant-farmers”).

24. Liverani 1982, 252; 1989, 132, 147; Milano 1981, 115; Schloen 2001, 234.

25. Gordon 1965, 272 (4.295 = n° 1080: “census of men in various towns, each registered together with his wife, children and livestock”), 282 (4.417 = n° 2044: “men from different towns listed, each with his household (including wives, children & cattle”), Sanmartín 1995, 149 (“Volkzählungen nach Haushalten”), van Soldt 2005, 78 (n° 75 = 4.295: “families from various towns”), 80 (n° 94 = RS 8.258: “list of people from different towns”), KTU³, 375 and 430 (“census by household”). Perhaps the syllabic administrative text RS 20.01 (Ug 5 n° 95, p. 187) could also be added to these two texts.

26. The form and contents of both texts are clearly related to each other, as already noted by Heltzer 1976, 84-88. On these two texts see the collation and restorations by Vita 1997 and the readings in KTU³. The elements shared by 4.295 and 4.417 can be summarised as follows: a) neither clearly states its actual purpose, b) they present personal names followed, in the most complete form, by a gentilic, mention of his wife, his sons and his flocks, c) they share some personal names: Aḫaltenu, Pln, Prd, Suwana; in two cases match exactly, that is, the same personal name is recorded followed by the same place name (Prd from Ma‘qabu in 4.295:11 and 4.417:10; Suwana from Qaratu in RS 4.295:12 and 4.417:6, mentioned probably also in 4.80 (RS 11.778), see below, in this section), a circumstance that reduces the possibility of mere coincidence, d) they also share five gentilics (*apsny*, *ypry*, *m‘qby*, *qrty*, *ṯmry*) relating to villages located in the areas that van Soldt (2005) calls “Group 1: The Northeast” (‘Apsunā, Qaratu, Ṭamrā) and “Group 4: The East II” (Yaparu, Ma‘qabu). Even so, the data (as well as other data) concerning Suwana from Qaratu show that the two texts were written at two different times.

ġdmu ²⁷ . apsny . b[x]x w . bnh . w . aṭṭh . w . alp . w . ṭmn . ṣin	Ġdmu, from (the village of) 'Apsunā b[...] and his son and his wife and one ox and eight sheep.
tdln . qmnzy . w . a[ṭṭh] w . ṭn . bnh	Tdln from Qamanuzu and [his] w[ife] and his two sons.
5 ṭmgdl . ykn'my . w . [a]ṭṭh w . bnh . w . alp . aḥ'd'	Ṭmgdl from Yakuna'mu and his [w]ife and his son and one ox.
aḡltn . [ypr]y . w[. aṭṭh] 'w' . bnh . w . alp . w . x[...]	Aḡaltenu of Yaparū and [his wife] and his son and one ox and [...].
10 'p'ln . 'ṭ'[mry ...] . w[...] [...] w . ṭn . bn'h' . [...]	Pln of Ṭa[mrā] and [...] and his two sons [...]
'p'r'd . m'qby . 'w'[. aṭṭ]h	Prd of Ma'qabu and his [wife].
swn . qrty . 'w'[. aṭṭ]h [w] . bnh . w . ṭn . alpm [w] . ṭlṭm . ṣin	Suwana of Qaratu and his [wife] [and] his son and two oxen [and] thirty sheep.
15 anndr . ykn'my w . aṭṭh . w . bnh w . alp . w . 'š'r'[.]š'i'n	Ananidarru of Yakuna'mu and his wife and his son and one ox and ten sheep.

4.295 and 4.417 provide details of what seem to be households or nuclear families, i.e. “houses”:²⁸ mention of the *pater familias*, his origin (or geographical location), his wife, his sons and (possibly) his heads of oxen and sheep, all of it as the possession of the *pater familias*. The low proportion of sons mentioned is striking, as there are never more than two, with an average of about 3·2 members per family unit (Vidal 2005, 45-46). These and other documents²⁹, as 4.795 also seems to suggest (see above), appear to show a very low birth rate, in fact. On this, Liverani (1979, 1321), for example, concluded that “on a l'impression d'un taux démographique qui peut à peine assurer la reproduction de la communauté”.³⁰ However, it is also possible, as already noted by Heltzer (1976, 88), that the texts only record persons able to work in some way (including productive animals), and exclude, for example, old people and small children,³¹ so that, in fact, these numbers should be corrected upwards (cf. 4.795: “house” of five persons, mentioned

27. According to the reading in KTU³, 375.

28. As noted by Vidal 2005, 45, these two texts “apuntan a la familia nuclear como la familia tipo de las aldeas ugaríticas”.

29. See also the syllabic administrative text RS 17.037 (PRU 6, n° 115): 1 *me-at* 13 *udu.meš* / *ugu* *ḥa-an-na-na* *ù ugu* *ḥa-na-te-na* / *ù ugu* *dam-[š]u* *ù ugu* *dumu-ri-šu* “113 sheep on the account of PN₁, and PN₂, and of his wife and of his son”.

30. On this see the critique by Schloen 2001, 323, and Vidal 2005, 40-44.

31. See also Vita 1999, 478; Schloen 2001, 325; Vidal 2005, 46.

above).³² This circumstance seems confirmed by the administrative text 4.80 (RS 11.778; very fragmentary), where the nuclear family is supplemented by daughters-in-law (*klt*), sons-in-law (*hṭn*) and siblings/brothers. The latter applies to a certain Suwana from Qaratu (lines 9-10: *swn . qrt'y*[...] *uḥh . w . š'r*[...]), who could very probably be the same person mentioned in 4.295:12 and 4.417:6.³³

6. Based on what has been set out so far, and only as a suggestion, we may suppose that from the administrative point of view (that is, only taking account of persons productive for labour), a Ugaritian “house” comprised between five and ten persons. If, in an arbitrary way and merely as an hypothesis, we take the average figure of eight persons per “house”, text 4.810 (§1) would refer to 4,048 persons distributed among 506 “houses” or families; if we take an average of five persons per “house” (cf. 4.795 in §5), the total would be about 2,530 persons.³⁴

7. For what purpose was the text 4.810 composed? Above (§1) we noted that it seems to be static in nature, but only apparently. In fact, independently of the general structure of the document, almost like a note in the margin, the text also includes the following two lines: 4) *ṭbqym . l m'g'y* “(The people from the village of) Ṭībaqu did not arrive”³⁵ 5) *dt . tšlḥmn . šbnh*. The second line, a relative clause referring to these people from Ṭībaqu, is more difficult to understand, although the translation “who deliver food to Šubbanu” may be proposed.³⁶ In our opinion, the editors pose the appropriate question concerning the scope of the verbal form *m'gy*, “to come” and also provide the correct reply: the negative formulation (“did not arrive”) indicates that the opposite circumstance (“did arrive”) concerns the whole text, not only the people from Ṭībaqu in line 4; that is, in the remaining lines of the text, one should understand that some persons certainly “did arrive”.³⁷ The following line, with the place name Šubbanu followed by the terminative case (*šbn-h* “towards

32. Vidal 2005, 46: “Sobre la fiabilidad de estas cifras, sin embargo, es necesario tener en cuenta que en esos documentos no se estaba haciendo referencia a estructuras familiares típicas de las aldeas, sino que probablemente se trataba de familias disgregadas que habían sufrido un proceso de desplazamiento de sus lugares de origen”.

33. According to van Soldt 1991, 102, this person could be the same as *šwn qrt'y* mentioned in the administrative text RS 19.136 (4.648). On the other hand, as noted by Vidal 2005, 45, “a tenor de estos datos, resulta más apropiado referirse a la familia típica de las aldeas ugaríticas como una ‘familia nuclear modificada’”. He also notes that “Tal y como la definió B. Yorburt (Yorburt 1975: 6ss.), la familia nuclear modificada se caracteriza por el mantenimiento de su independencia económica y la autonomía del grupo familiar, aunque, a cambio, establece relaciones frecuentes con sus parientes, que residen en áreas vecinas, con un intercambio diario de bienes y servicios y con formas de asistencia mutua en casos de emergencia” (Vidal 2005, 45). See also the comments of Schloen 2001, 328, concerning the “household lifecycle”. On 4.80 (RS 11.778) see also Schloen 2001, 327. Similarly, see also the administrative texts 4.339 (RS 18.026), 4.360 (RS 18.050; Schloen 2001, 326-327) and 4.644 (RS 19.106, labelled in KTU² 440, as “census [aliens by household]”, but in KTU³ 241 as a legal text sub 3.25).

34. It would be an interesting exercise to relate these figures to the overall population of the kingdom of Ugarit, but the archaeological and textual evidence available at present counsels the greatest prudence in calculations of this kind (Yon 1992; Callot 1994, 199; Vita 1999, 455).

35. Cf. Bordreuil and Pardee 2012, 12: “les gens de Ṭībaqu ne sont pas venus”; DUL 528; Tropper 2012, 872.

36. Following DUL 492 (“who deliver food to TN”) and Tropper 2012, 235, 591 (“die Essen/Nahrung nach(?) Šubbanu liefern(?)”), *contra* Bordreuil and Pardee 2012, 12 (“ceux qui étaient nourris à Šubbanu”).

37. Bordreuil and Pardee 2012, 16: “Le verbe MGY est-il propre à ce qu’enregistre ce texte (toutes les maisons ont MGY) ou reflète-t-il le statut particulier des Ṭībaquéens ? Puisque le verbe est au négatif, le formule semble établir un contraste avec les autres villes nommées et laisser entendre que les autres sont en effet ‘venues’”.

Šubbanu”), reinforces the idea of movement.³⁸ Though apparently static, text 4.810 seems to record, in fact, the final result of a considerable movement of persons. Line 1, for example, “40 houses in (the village of) ’Ilišam’u” (*arb’ m bt b ilštm’*), must then be understood as the register of a group of persons (40 “houses”) who arrived in ’Ilišam’u from another village (or other villages) of the kingdom.

On the other hand, the second line of the comment (line 5) includes a place name (*šbn*) already recorded in line 2: *hms’ šrh bt šbnn*³⁹ “15 houses in Šubbanu”. Two observations can be derived from this detail: 1) the people from Ṭibaqu who had not arrived had to set off for the village of Šubbanu, 2) in spite of the absence of the people from Ṭibaqu (cf. RS 19.32 in §10), a good number of persons (15 “houses”), who in all probability came from other places in the kingdom, had already arrived in Šubbanu. In other words, persons from various villages of the kingdom (and which probably would have also included persons from Ṭibaqu) had assembled together in Šubbanu.

Based on what has been set out above, 4.810 1) registers those who “have not come” and, in contrast, persons who certainly did reach their destination, 2) in each of the villages recorded (as seems to be the case of Šubbanu) there were (or could have been) persons from various villages of the kingdom, and 3) these movements of persons were also related to quantities of food (probably rations: cf. *tšlhm*n in line 5).⁴⁰

8. Some characteristics of 4.810 noted in the previous section display significant connections in form and substance with 4.95 (RS 11.836+). This is a list of persons who had to do (unspecified) work in a village of the kingdom.⁴¹

38. Cf. Tropper 2012, 325.

39. Bordreuil and Pardee 2012, 13: “Un second {n} est inscrit au-dessus de la pointe du {n} de {šbn}”.

40. Points 1) and 2) allow a reply to the question posed by Bordreuil and Pardee 2012, 16: “Si c’est la bonne interprétation, s’agit-il d’un recensement dans un lieu quelconque ou d’un réel déplacement de ces maisonnées, de familles en mouvement?”

41. Herdner 1963, 156: “Liste de villes qui doivent fournir un certain nombre de journées de travail”; van Soldt, 2005, 77: “list of towns which have to render services in Tallurbā during a certain time”; KTU³, 293: “towns rendering a service, with duration of service obligation”. Two other texts, 4.72 (RS 11.722) and 4.100 (RS 11.850), may belong to the same type as 4.95. In the first case, a very broken text, Herdner 1963, 214, read in line 5 {[...]u₄.meš} “[...] days”. In the second, a list of place names followed by a number, Herdner 1963, 156, read line 10 as {š_u.nigín u₄.meš 16} “Total: 16 days”. However, KTU³, 283, reads the end of 4.72 as {[... š_u.nigín kù.b]abbar.meš 12]} “Total of silver: 12”, and the last line of 4.100 as {š_u.nigín erín.meš 16} “Total (number) of persons: 16” (KTU³, 295; on this text see below, in §9). On the readings of these two inscriptions see also Roche 2008, 166. This may also apply to administrative text RS 11.830 (PRU 3, 190), list of toponyms followed by a number, the first line of which the editor, J. Nougayrol, read as {^{uru}gán-na-a u₄.me} “(Village of) Gan’ā: 4 days; cf. van Soldt 2005, 73: “list of towns with quantities (days?, workers!?)”. This last term, however, should probably be read {erín.me} “persons”, cf. Huehnergard 1989, 391 n. 69 and van Soldt 2005, 73 n. 5. On RS 11.830 see below in §9.

1	qrht . d . tššlmn tłrbh	Towns that have to supply work ⁴² (for / in) Tāllurbā. ⁴³
	art . tn . yrhm tłrby . yrh . w . hm[š . ym]m	'Arutu: two months. Tāllurbā: one month and fiv[e day]s.
5	tłhny . yrh . w . hm[š . ymm] zrn . yrh . w . hmš . y[m]m mrat . hmš . 'šr . ymm qmnz . yrh [.] w . hmš . ymm 'nmk . yrh .	Tulhanā: one month and fiv[e days]. Zarinu: one month and five d[a]ys. Mari'atu: fifteen days. Qamanuzu: one month and five days. 'Ēnu-makā: one month.
10	ypr . yrh . w . hmš . ymm	Yaparu: one month and five days.

The connections between 4.95 and 4.810 are the following:

1) For the heading of 4.95 (lines 1-2) there is a clause with much the same syntax as in 4.810:4-5: in both cases, relative clauses are used which include factitive verbal forms and toponyms in the terminative case:⁴⁴

4.810:4-5	tłqym	l mgy	dt	tšlhm	šbn-h
4.95:1.2	qrht		d	tššlmn	tłrb-h

2) The two texts indicate where the persons they record or imply come from and their destinations. 4.95 indicates that persons from various Ugaritian villages (recorded explicitly) must assemble in the village of Tāllurbā. This would be yet another circumstance that makes 4.95 similar to 4.810 if, as has been noted above (§7), our hypothesis proves to be true that persons from various places in the kingdom had gathered in Šubbanu (4.810). 4.95 could be an example of how, in 4.810, these different origins could actually be arranged (in 4.95 Tāllurbā received persons from

42. Following the proposal by Sanmartín (1988, 269 n. 17), for whom *tššlmn* would mean “pagar, no en metálico, sino mediante la realización de ciertos trabajos o prestaciones supletorias durante cierto tiempo”, such that *qrht d tššlmn tlrhb* could be translated as “ciudades que pagan mediante prestaciones en NL”. Tropper (1990, 61; 2008, 119; 2012, 325) accepts the proposal, specifying that the loan in question would be a form of work, translating “(Liste von) Städte(n), die Frondienste leisten müssen bei/für (dem/n Ort) Tāllurbā” (on the exact nature of this loan see below in §§10 and 11). This interpretation make a great deal of sense in the general context of the text and obviates the emendation *tš{š}lmn* suggested in KTU³ 293 and accepted in DUL 807 (on this see also note 44), where the term is analysed as the intensive form (D) with the general meaning “to pay”, so that the two lines are translated “cities that pay TN”, “cities which make loans”, “cities that compensate TN (?) by means of loans” (see also DUL 253, 327, 702, followed by McGeough 2011, 447: “Cities that pay at *tłrby*”). The proposal in DUL, however, entails two problems, at least. On the one hand, this heading would not fit the rest of the text, where villages of the kingdom are listed, followed by a certain number of days and/or months. On the other, the presence of *šlm* in an administrative text does not necessarily imply that it concerns money. Certainly, in some cases the verb *šlm* is used in the administrative texts in direct connection with money (e.g. 4.398:7, 4.755:1; cf. DUL 807), but it is also used in connection with flour, see 4.328:1 ... *prš qmḥ . d . nšlm* “x of *parīsu*-(measure/amount) of flour that has been preserved”, cf. Tropper 2012, 535: “(soundsoviel) *parīsu*-Maß Mehl, das (vollständig) erhalten/bewahrt blieb”, adding that “*šlm* N ‘erhalten bleiben’ steht in direkter Opposition zu *kly* N ‘aufgebraucht werden’” (Tropper 2008, 119: “N > (vollständig) erhalten bleiben”). DUL 640, instead, considers *nšlm* as a noun: “guarantee, deposit, pledge”, translating “p. of flour as guarantee”, and on p. 252 “flour” of (: as) guarantee”.

43. Tāllurbā itself is mentioned again, later in line 4.

44. This circumstance would be another argument in favour of retaining the reading {tššlmn} (see also note 42).

seven villages). Even so, the question of origin would be a partial connection between both texts: the remaining entries in 4.810 omit this datum.

We may ask ourselves, then, whether the connections mentioned allow any kind of direct relationship to be established between 4.95 and 4.810. When 4.95, for example, was written down, the number of persons required for the work had certainly already been calculated, and it is likely that this information had been recorded in an earlier document. Therefore, we may suppose that this calculation was made on the basis of a document such as 4.810, which, in fact, in lines 16-26, mentions all the toponyms present in 4.95 (with the exception of Mari'atu), as the following table shows:

Villages in 4.95	Days of work	Houses in 4.810
'Arutu	2 months	33
Yaparu	1 month + 5 days	10
Tallurbā	1 month + 5 days	6
Tulhanā	1 month + 5 days	4
Zarinu	1 month + 5 days	6
Qamanuzu	1 month + 5 days	3
'Ēnu-makā	1 month	6
Mari'atu	15 days	?

Following the reasoning set out above in §6, we may conclude that the village of 'Arutu had to supply an approximate total of 264 persons for the two months assigned to it, the village of Yaparu some 80 persons for one month and five days of work, etc. In fact, the first two lines of the tablet are quite consistent: 'Arutu, the village to which most days of work were assigned, is also the one with the most houses (and which, in 4.610, has to contribute the largest amount of money, cf. §2), and Yaparu is similar. However, the remaining equivalences exhibit a series of discrepancies: another four villages which also had been assigned one month and five days of work, had only between 3 and 6 houses available, whereas the village of 'Ēnu-makā, with 6 houses, had to provide only one month of work.

The two texts also differ on the following points:

1) The verbal forms *tšlḥmn* (4.810:5) and *tššlmn* (4.95:2) indicate different facts (but see below).

2) 4.95 specifies for how long each village had to be involved in the expected task;⁴⁵ 4.810 omits this datum.

3) 4.810 registers a number of persons, an aspect not specified in 4.95.

Therefore, it does not seem possible to establish a direct relationship between 4.95 and 4.810 in the sense of one depending on the other (e.g. one was used as the basis for drawing up the other). However, it is certainly possible that they were on the same administrative level. In 4.95, the allocation of periods of time for villages, and the fact that these amounts are specific (varying) for

45. In this respect see the comment by Schloen 2001, 237: "If the numbers in RS 11.836+842 (*KTU* 4.95) are typical, 1 (lunar) month plus 5 days (i.e., 33 days) was the normal term of service for corvée labor in the kingdom of Ugarit; that is, slightly more than a solar month", and he adds, *ibid.* note 46: "Apparently, all the workers from a given village served for the same length of time. In general, terms of service and numbers of workers are recorded by village, not individually, suggesting that villagers came together in groups to perform their service".

each village, implies a parallel calculation of the persons required for the work during the estimated (or stipulated) period as required. Conversely, the list in 4.810 of persons who left home implies a previous knowledge of the time estimated (or stipulated) as required to carry out the purpose of the displacement. In fact, 4.95 and 4.810 seem to reflect the same event: to record how many people had to move out of one village of the kingdom to another to complete a task during a specified period, but each text (for reasons unknown to us) did so recording only partial aspects of this process. The mention of sending food to Šubbanu (*dt tšlḥmn šbnh*) in 4.810:5 (§7) is surely related to the calculation of food rations required to maintain the displaced workers.

9. How did they calculate the number of persons who had to travel in situations such as those reflected by 4.95 and 4.810, but also by 4.750 and 4.812? The administrative text RS 19.74 (PRU 6, n° 95), considered as a list of “towns that provide workers”, can provide a good example.⁴⁶ The first five lines show the general structure of the text:⁴⁷

1	^{uru} <i>qa-ra-tu</i>	20 + [...]	(Village of) Qaratu: 20 +
	^{uru} <i>ša-ri-nu</i>	13 erín.meš	Žarinu 13: “persons”. ⁴⁸
	^{uru} <i>a-ru-tu</i>	13	’Arutu: 13
	^{uru} <i>šal-lur_x-ba-a</i>	10	Ṭallurbā: 10
5	^{uru} <i>šam-ra-a</i>	6	Ṭamrā: 6
	(text continues)		

Texts RS 11.830 (PRU 3, 190)⁴⁹ and 4.100 (RS 11.850)⁵⁰ seem to be very similar. Here is the text of the second tablet:

ubr’y	5	(Village of) ’Ubur’ā	5
arny	1	’Araniya	1
m’r	1	Mu’aru	1
š’rt	2	Ša’artu	2
5 ḥlb rpš	1	Ḥalbu-rapši	1

46. Van Soldt 2005, 74. The editor, J. Nougayrol (PRU 6, n° 95), had already considered the text as a “Contribution(?), en travailleurs ou soldats, de diverses villes”. Four villages listed in RS 19.74 (’Arutu, Žarinu, Ṭallurbā and Ṭulḥanā) are also found in 4.95.

47. The text seems to have ended with a total (lines 11-13), now lost. For the reading of the toponyms see van Soldt 2005.

48. Text 4.841 (RS 94.2064) shows that erín.meš is equivalent to a group of lú.meš “men”, so that its Ugaritic equivalent would be the term *bnšm* “men”; on this see the comments of Bordreuil and Pardee 2012, 62. Within the administration of Ugarit, the term *bnš* “man” was a technical term denoting persons assigned to various administrative sectors of the kingdom, especially the royal sector; for further details see Rougemont and Vita, in press.

49. See above note 41.

50. Van Soldt 2005, 77: “list of towns that provide(?) workers”.

bq't	1	Baq'atu	1
šhq	1	Šaḥaqu	1
y'by	1	Y'by	1
mḥr	3	Mḥr	3
10 šu.nigín erín.meš		16 Total of persons:	16

It can be proposed, therefore, that texts similar to RS 19.74, RS 11.830 and 4.100 would have been used as the basis for drawing up texts such as 4.95, 4.750, 4.810 and 4.812, and were even the basis for texts such as 4.16 (§3).

10. What kind of administrative or legal tasks are alluded to in 4.95, 4.750, 4.810 and 4.812?⁵¹ The answer may come from the syllabic administrative text RS 19.32 (PRU 6 n° 77). It is a list of six persons identified by their names, with an indication, in some cases, of the villages in which they were (Magdalā, Ḥarganā, Bītu-ḥulī, Ṭamrā). The purpose of the text is to specify that these persons are not travelling in order to fulfil the *ilku*-service in the village of Apsunā.⁵² By reading its contents in reverse, RS 19.32 shows that persons located in various Ugaritian villages had to go to Apsunā to complete works belonging to the *ilku*-service.⁵³ As we have seen, texts 4.95, 4.750, 4.810 and 4.812 reflect, very probably, a similar situation, such that they may exhibit some aspects of the machinery entailed by the organisation and execution of tasks in the category of *ilku*-service.⁵⁴

11. The Ugaritian administration had to meet, among other objectives, obligations from outside the kingdom (e.g. paying tribute to the Hittites, cf. 4.610 in §2) as well as needs from within. The latter includes the periodic requirement to carry out works of some importance in various parts of the kingdom and which came under the category of the *ilku*-service (§10).⁵⁵ When

51. Cf. McGeough 2011, 448, on 4.95: "The exact nature of the service is obscure".

52. Lines 6-8: šu.nigín 6 erín.meš *la-li-ku ša il-ki* ^{uru}*ap-su-ni-yu/i-ma*, "Total: 6 persons who did not complete the *ilku* of the Apsunians" (on the reading of the gentilic see van Soldt 2005, 10). See already Rainey 1973, 40: "records men who did not furnish the feudal service (*ilku*) required from the city of Apsūniya"; van Soldt 2005, 74: "list of persons in various towns who have evaded their *ilku*-obligation". As we have seen, a similar situation (persons who did not arrive to carry out work) occurs in 4.810 (cf. §7). On RS 19.32 see in general the comments by Rainey 1973, 40-41, and Schloen 2001, 249.

53. On this see the introduction to this article.

54. It is likely that other alphabetic administrative texts mention the *ilku*-service using the term *unt*, although the condition of the tablets in question does not allow definite conclusions; on this, see DUL 82; McGeough 2007, 128. Both *ilku* and *unt*, as well as *pilku*, are terms that in Ugarit refer to the same thing; on this see Márquez Rowe 2006, 234 n. 79, 268.

55. On *ilku*-service in Mesopotamia in general and in Assyria in particular see the following comments by Postgate 1982, 304: "In accordance with the etymology of the word, the fundamental obligation it imposed was to 'go', or serve the state, i.e. to place one's person at the disposal of the state for a period of time; even by itself the verb *alāku* retained this specific connotation, at least in Middle Assyrian times. What this personal service entailed varied: it was for the state to determine whether, having taken over a person, he should be employed on military or civilian duties, and the decision must have depended on economic and social conditions at the time, as well as on political events". The situation in Babylonia at the time of Hammurapi is similar, as described by Simonetti 2008, 60: "il contenuto dell'*ilkum* ... potrebbe essere stato, quindi non pre-definito, e consistere soltanto in un generico lavoro fisico da prestare in vari campi, a secondo

the nature of one of these works exceeded the capacity of the inhabitants of the district, the weight of carrying them out fell on a group of villages and, therefore, on a large number of Ugaritians according to proportions which the central administration established and which could reach considerable numbers. These works required the administration to evaluate previously the importance of the work in question, calculate the time and persons needed to carry it out, identify in each village the persons suitable and available for this work, organise their transport from villages of the country towards a designated assembly point, and then direct them in the tasks as well as provisioning them during the period when the work was carried out.

The procedure sketched out above necessarily entailed the preparation of a large number of documents related to each other at various administrative levels. Very probably, the texts studied above also constitute evidence of part of the written documentation produced during the course of the organisation of works pertaining to the *ilku*-service.

Abbreviations

CAD B: *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago 1965.

DJBA: Sokoloff, M. 2002, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods*, Ramat-Gan.

DJPA: Sokoloff, M. 1990, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*, Ramat-Gan.

DUL: del Olmo Lete, G., and Sanmartín, J. 2015, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*, Leiden.

KTU²: Dietrich, M., Loretz, O. and Sanmartín, J. 1995, *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places (KTU : second, enlarged edition)*, Münster.

KTU³: Dietrich, M., Loretz, O. and Sanmartín, J. 2013, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und Other Places*, Münster.

PRU 3: J. Nougayrol, *Le palais royal d'Ugarit*, vol. 3, Paris 1955.

PRU 6: J. Nougayrol, *Le palais royal d'Ugarit*, vol. 6, Paris 1970.

Ug 5: J. Nougayrol, E. Laroche, Ch. Virolleaud, and C. F. A. Schaeffer, *Ugaritica V*, Paris 1968.

Bibliography

Belmonte, J. A. 2001, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der Texte aus Syrien im 2. Jt. V. Chr.*, Wiesbaden.

Bordreuil, P. and Pardee, D. 1995, "L'épigraphie ougaritique: 1973-1993", in M. Yon, M. Sznycer and P. Bordreuil (eds.), *Le pays d'Ougarit autor de 1200 av. J.-C.*, Paris, 27-32.

Bordreuil, P. and Pardee, D. 2012, "I. Bordereaux et listes (n^{os} 1-55)", in Bordreuil, P., Pardee, D., Hawley, R., *Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville. Textes 1994-2002 en cunéiforme alphabétique de la maison d'Ourtenu (RSO XVIII)*, Lyon, 11-133.

delle necessità: per esempio riparare un muro, oppure scavare un nuovo canale, o altro ancora". W. G. E. Watson kindly drew my attention to these two references.

- Callot, O. 1994, *La tranchée 'ville sud'. Etudes d'architecture domestique*, Paris.
- Clemens, D. M. 2001, *Sources for Ugaritic Ritual and Sacrifice*, vol. I, Münster.
- del Olmo, G. and Sanmartín, J. 1998, "Kultisches in den keilalphabetischen Verwaltungs- und Wirtschaftstexten aus Ugarit", in M. Dietrich and I. Kottsieper (eds.), „Und Mose schrieb dieses Lied auf“. *Studien zum Alten Testament und zum Alten Orient* [Fs O. Loretz], Münster, 175-197.
- Dietrich, M. 2010, "Ugarit – Ein vorderorientalisches Wirtschafts- und Handelszentrum im levantinisch-ostmediterranen Kulturkreis", *OLZ* 105, 263-281.
- Dietrich, M. and Loretz, O. 1970, "Die soziale Struktur von Alalah und Ugarit (IV). Die É = bītu-Listen aus Alalah als Quelle für die Erforschung der gesellschaftlichen Schichtung von Alalah im 15. Jh. v. Chr.", *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 60, 88-123.
- Gordon, C. H. 1965, *Ugaritic Textbook. Texts in Translation. Cuneiform Selections*, Rome.
- Hawley, R., Pardee, D., and Roche, C. 2015, "The Scribal Culture of Ugarit", *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* 2, 229-267.
- Heltzer, M. 1976, *The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit*, Wiesbaden.
- Heltzer, M. 1978, *Goods, Prices and the Organization of Trade in Ugarit*, Wiesbaden.
- Heltzer, M. 1982, *The Internal Organization of the Kingdom of Ugarit*, Wiesbaden.
- Heltzer, M. 1999, "The Economy of Ugarit", in W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt (eds), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Leiden, 423-454.
- Herdner, A. 1963, *Corpus des tablettes en cuneiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939*, Paris.
- Huehnergard, J. 1989, *The Akkadian of Ugarit*, Atlanta.
- Lemaire, A. 1998, "La tablette Ougaritique alphabétique UF 29, 826 remplacée dans son contexte", *Ugarit-Forschungen* 30, 461-466.
- Liverani, M. 1979, "Histoire", in *Supplément au dictionnaire de la Bible* 9, 1295-1348.
- Liverani, M. 1982, "Ville et campagne dans le royaume d'Ugarit. Essai d'analyse économique", in M. A. Dandamayev et al. (eds.), *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East*, Warminster, 250-258.
- Liverani, M. 1989, "Economy of Ugaritic Royal Farms", in C. Zaccagnini (eds.), *Production and Consumption in the Ancient Near East*, Budapest, 127-168.
- Márquez Rowe, I. 1999, "Royal Land Grants and ilku-Service in Ugarit. The Legal Mechanism", in H. Klengel and J. Renger (eds.), *Landwirtschaft im Alten Orient*, Berlin, 171-178.
- Márquez Rowe, I. 2006, *The Royal Deeds of Ugarit. A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Diplomats*, Münster.
- McGeough, K. M. 2007, *Exchange Relationships at Ugarit*, Leuven.
- McGeough, K. M. 2011, *Ugaritic Economic Tablets. Text, Translation and Notes*, Leuven.
- Milano, L. 1981, "Alimentazione e regimi alimentari nella Siria preclassica", *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 3, 85-121.
- Pardee, D. 2001, "Épigraphie et structure dans les textes administratifs en langue ougaritique: les exemples de RS 6.216 et RS 19.017", *Or* 70, 235-282.
- Pardee, D. 2005, "Défense de la grammaire ougaritique: le cas de RS 15.053", *Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici* 22, 13-18.
- Pardee, D. 2007a, "RS 15.039 remis sur pied", *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 7, 67-85.
- Pardee, D. 2007b, "RS 18.028 et le palais royal d'Ougarit comme acheteur de biens", *Syria* 84, 57-68.

- Pardee, D. 2008, "Structure et interprétation du texte ougaritique RS 18.086", in V. Matoïan (ed.), *Le mobilier du Palais Royal d'Ougarit*, Lyon 2008, 345-374.
- Pardee, D. 2010, "Les documents relatifs aux terrains agricoles à Ougarit", *Orientalia* 79, 342-374.
- Postgate J. N. 1982, "Ilku and land tenure in the Middle Assyrian Kingdom: A second attempt", in M.A. Dandameyev, I. Gershevitch, H. Klengel, G. Komoroczy and M.T. Larsen (eds.), *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff*, Warminster, 304-313.
- Rainey, A. F. 1973, "Gleanings from Ugarit", *IOS* 3, 34-62.
- Roche, C. 2008, "Classification de l'utilisation du cunéiforme mésopotamien dans les textes ougaritiques", in R. D. Biggs, J. Myers and M. T. Roth (eds), *Proceedings of the 51st Reencontre Assyriologique Internationale Held at The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. July 18-22, 2005*, Chicago, 155-170.
- Rougemont, F., Vita, J.-P. 2010, "Les enregistrements de chars à Ougarit et dans le monde mycénien: approche comparative sur l'administration au Bronze récent", in W. H. van Soldt (ed.), *Society and Administration in Ancient Ugarit*, Leiden, 123-150.
- Rougemont, F., Vita, J.-P. in press, "Les 'gens du roi' à Ougarit et dans le monde mycénien", in H. Landenius Enegren and M.-L. Nosch (eds), *Aegean Scripts. Proceedings of the 14th International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies, held in Copenhagen, 2-5 September 2015*. Incunabula Graeca.
- Sanmartín, J. 1988, "Notas de lexicografía ugarítica", *Ugarit-Forschungen* 20, 265-276.
- Sanmartín, J. 1995, "Wirtschaft und Handel in Ugarit: Kulturgrammatische Aspekte", in M. Dietrich and O. Loretz (eds), *Ugarit. Ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum im Alten Orient. Ergebnisse und Perspektiven der Forschung. Band I. Ugarit und seine altorientalische Umwelt*, Münster, 131-158.
- Schloen, J. D. 2001, *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol. Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East*, Winona Lake.
- Simonetti, C. 2008, "La tassazione delle terre in età paleo-babilonese. L'*ilku* nelle lettere di Hammurapi", in M. Perna and F. Pomponio (eds), *The Management of Agricultural Land and the Production of Textiles in the Mycenaean and Near Eastern Economies* (Studi egei e vicinorientali 4) Naples, 53-62.
- van Soldt, W. H. 1991, *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit. Dating and Grammar*, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- van Soldt, W. H. 2005, *The Topography of the City-State of Ugarit*, Münster.
- van Soldt, W. H. 2010, *Society and Administration in Ancient Ugarit*, Leiden.
- Tropper, J. 1990, *Der ugaritische Kausativstamm und die Kausativbildungen des Semitischen*, Münster.
- Tropper, J. 2008, *Kleines Wörterbuch des Ugaritischen*, Wiesbaden.
- Tropper, J. 2012, *Ugaritische Grammatik*, Münster (2nd ed.).
- Tropper, J., Vita, J.-P. 1998a, "Untersuchungen zu ugaritischen Wirtschaftstexten", *Ugarit-Forschungen* 30, 679-696.
- Tropper, J. and Vita, J.-P. 1998b, "Corrigenda zu KTU2: Wirtschaftstexte", *Ugarit-Forschungen* 30, 697-702.
- Vidal, J. 2005, *Las aldeas de Ugarit según los archivos del Bronce Reciente (siglos XIV-XII a.n.e.)*, Sabadell.

- Vita, J.-P. 1995, *El ejército de Ugarit*, Madrid.
- Vita, J.-P. 1997, “Remarques épigraphiques à propos de quatre textes ougaritiques”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 29, 705-707.
- Vita, J.-P. 1999, “The Society of Ugarit”, in W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt (eds), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Leiden, 455-498.
- Vita, J.-P. 2007, “Les documents des archives est du Palais royal sur les textiles: une contribution à la connaissance de la procédure administrative à Ougarit”, in J.-M. Michaud (ed.), *Le royaume d'Ougarit de la Crète à l'Éuphrate. Nouveaux axes de recherche*, Sherbrooke, 243-265.
- Vita, J.-P. 2008, “Les textes administratifs en langue ougaritique des “Archives Est” du Palais Royal”, in Y. Calvet and M. Yon (eds.), *Ougarit au Bronze moyen et au Bronze récent*, Lyon, 227-234.
- Vita, J.-P. 2012, review of McGeough 2011 in *Syria* 89, 403-405.
- Vita, J.-P. 2013, “Interactions à Ougarit entre textes administratifs et textes d'un autre genre (lettres, textes juridiques, rituels, étiquettes)”, in V. Matoïan and M. Al-Maqdissi (eds), *Études ougaritiques III*, Leuven, 403-416.
- Vita, J.-P. 2015, “‘Magasin’ à Ougarit”, in B. Geyer, V. Matoïan and M. Al-Maqdissi (eds), *De l'île d'Aphrodite au paradis perdu, itinéraire d'un gentilhomme lyonnais. En Hommage à Yves Calvet*, RSO XXII, Leuven, 77-80.
- Vita, J.-P. in press a, “Oil in Ugarit: its price, its use as a means of payment and administrative procedures. Addendum: Oil for wool”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 48 (2017).
- Vita, J.-P. in press b, “Administrative texts in Ugarit between tradition and innovation: analysis of two instances”, in I. Kottsieper and H. Neumann (eds), *Literaturkontakte Ugarits – Wurzeln und Entfaltungen*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Münster.
- Vita, J.-P. and Matoïan, V. in press, “Textiles in Ritual and Cultic Practices in Ugarit, (Second Millennium BC, Late Bronze Age)”, in S. Gaspa and S. Vigo (eds.), *Textiles in Ritual and Cultic Practices in the Ancient Near East from the Third to the First Millennium BC.*, Copenhagen. In press.
- von Dassow, E. 2005, “Archives of Alalah IV in Archaeological Context”, *BASOR* 338, 1-69.
- von Dassow, E. 2008, *State and Society in the Late Bronze Age. Alalah under the Mittani Empire*, Bethesda.
- Yon, M. 1992, “Ugarit. The urban habitat. The present state of the archaeological picture”, *BASOR* 286, 19-34.
- Zamora, J.-Á. 1997, *Sobre “el modo de producción asiático” en Ugarit*, Madrid.
- Zamora, J.-Á. 2000, *La vid y el vino en Ugarit*, Madrid.