FOREIGNERS AND RELIGION AT UGARIT

František Válek
Charles University

During the Late Bronze Age, Syria was mostly dominated by the larger powers of the ancient Near East—Mitanni (the Hurrians), the Hittite Empire, and Egypt. The ancient city of Ugarit yielded numerous texts and artifacts that attest to the presence of foreigners and their influences on local religious traditions. Textually, the best-preserved influences are those of Hurrian origin, although these were probably promoted thanks to the Hittites, who incorporated many Hurrian deities and cults. Hurrian traditions thus influenced both Ugaritic cults and divine pantheons. Egyptian influences, in contrast, are observable mostly in art and material evidence. Art of Egyptian origin was considered prestigious and because of that was prominently seen in trade and international exchange gifts, but it also entered the religious sphere in the form of cultic statues and ex-voto gifts for deities. Egyptian art was also often imitated by local artists. The same can be said of art from the Mediterranean area. Some evidence suggests that foreigners actively related to local traditions as well. Ritual tablets from Ugarit (namely KTU³ 1.40 and its variants) illustrate that there were always frictions in a multicultural/national society. These tablets also indicate that such frictions could have been dealt with through ritual action, and thus emphasize the role religion played. The city of Ugarit is used in this paper to illuminate some processes that can be observed in the whole of ancient Syria. Nevertheless, every site has its own outcome of interactions with other cultures.

INTRODUCTION

The ancient city of Ugarit provides us with rich material on cultural contacts of the Late Bronze Age. In the present article, I will focus on several topics regarding the religious life of the city and how it was influenced by such connections.[1] The main topics are Hurrian (or, as I argue for the final phase of Ugarit, Hurrian influences promoted by the Hittite Empire) and Egyptian influences, and the ritual text KTU³ 1.40, which may likely deal with the frictions within a multicultural (or one may even say *transcultural*)[2] society. In addition, the topic of Mediterranean influences in art is briefly discussed. The topic of religious and cultural influences is critical for discussions of identities in the ancient Near East.

---

1 This paper is based on my master's thesis (Válek 2019), which focused on non-Semitic influences in the religion of ancient Syria during the LBA.

2 This word better emphasises the merging and intertwining of cultures into new cultural complexes in contrast to the coexistence of cultures side by side.

Finnish Oriental Society

The case of Ugarit is a fine illustration of the topic of *foreign influences* in the religion of Late Bronze Age Syria,[3] thanks to the great quantity of material which has survived until the modern day; few other sites compare to it in preserved finds. The multicultural character of this city was clear from the earliest phases of excavations.[4] However, the reader should keep in mind that we are attempting to describe a process which was ongoing and continuous. The presence of foreigners at Ugarit long predates the Late Bronze Age and thus many influences had their own predecessors and should not be thought of as arising from the presence of large empires. As a final caveat, this paper considers a large topic through a narrow lens, referencing a small selection of material and textual evidence in order to illustrate the topic of foreign influences and to outline their variety of forms.

The political history of Ugarit is a starting point for understanding the influence of foreigners on its religious life. Given the confines and limitations of this article, I must rely on the foundations laid by previous discussions regarding the general development of the international relations of Ugarit with other powers of the ancient Near East during the Late Bronze Age.[5] At the beginning of the Late Bronze Age, the power void in northern Syria created by the destruction of Yamḫad by the Hittites was gradually filled by Mittani. At this time, it seems that while Ugarit was not necessarily a Mittanian vassal, diplomatic contact between the two did exist. The first letter from Ugarit to Egypt (EA 45) is found during the reign of ʿAmiṯtamru II (*c.*1370 BCE).[6] In it, the Ugaritic ruler expressed his loyalty to the pharaoh, suggesting that the city had already been under the Egyptian sphere of influence.[7]

The expansion of the Hittite king Šuppiluliuma weakened the bond between Ugarit and Egypt, with one letter from Ḫatti to Ugarit (RS 17.132) even suggesting the presence of a peace treaty between the Hittites and Ugarit. When Ugarit's southern neighbor Amurru revolted against Egypt and threatened Ugarit, Ugarit's then-king Niqmaddu III (*c.*1370–1335 BCE) was forced to seal a treaty of military "protection" provided by Amurru. Later, Niqmaddu III entered the Hittite vassalage (treaty RS 17.340). Not long after this, Niqmēpaʿ VI (*c.*1332–1270 BCE) sealed an additional treaty with Muršili II, possibly after his predecessor Ar-Ḫalba (*c.*1335–1332 BCE) tried to

---

3 The terms "foreign" and "foreigner" are, even contextually, difficult to define. Nonetheless, I posit they, in the general sense, appropriately reflect the geographical origin, linguistic and cultural background, or ethnicity of the people interacting with Ugarit. Within this paper I deal with the concept of foreignness in part as "non-Semiticness," though the latter is a term that obviously misses the broader picture. In this sense, the debate on Egyptian, Hurrian, Hittite, or Mediterranean influences touches upon the "most obvious" cases of foreignness. For a discussion on foreigners and foreignness in the ancient Near East, see Beckman 2013; Válek 2019: 9–16; Pitkänen 2020: 32–38. Although this paper focuses on non–Semitic foreigners, we should not forget that many Semites (including those from other cities in northern Syria) were often considered foreign, too. The term *influence* covers interactions which result in cultural change, both intentional and unconscious. The most difficult part is that after even a short period of time, some foreign influences may cease to be perceived as foreign and are incorporated to such an extent that they are instead seen as inherently local.

4 After all, the very first discovery was a tomb at Minet el-Beida with strong Mediterranean influences (Albanèse 1929), and the first fragment of the Stele of Mami, inscribed with Egyptian hieroglyphs (as will be discussed below), was excavated during this first campaign.

5 For more details and context, see, e.g., Liverani 2014: 269–377; Van De Mieroop 2007: 149–170; Morris 2005: 27–67, 115–179, 217–309, 343–610, 691–773; Liverani 2001; Singer 1999.

6 The general chronological timeframe is based on Liverani 2014, while the sequence and numbering of Ugaritic kings are based on Arnaud 1999.

7 However, the question of vassalage is disputed. See Morris 2005: 168–169, as well as a discussion of the special position of Ugarit in the international relations of the region in Mynářová 2006. In general, it is worth considering how we consider the term vassalage; if it is as something established by a "vassal" treaty, it may be properly applied only to the relations with Ḫatti.

revolt against his Hittite overlords. Under Niqmēpaˤ VI, the Hittite rule stabilized. The Egyptian influence endured the shifting loyalties of the rulers of Ugarit. Thus, the city also worked as an intermediary between Ḫatti and Egypt. This role was deepened after the Silver Treaty[8] was sealed between Ḫattušili III and Ramses II. Hittite rule in northern Syria was mediated through Karkemiš, but Ugarit maintained an important position and several disputes were communicated directly with the ruler of Ḫatti. Ugarit's existence came to an end at the beginning of the twelfth century BCE, with the last known ruler recorded as ˤAmmurāpi II (*c.*1200–1182 BCE). The end of Ugarit was coupled with widespread changes throughout the entire region.

HURRIAN INFLUENCES

Although the question of whether Ugarit was directly a Mittanian vassal (or even whether such a term is appropriate in this context) is still unresolved, Hurrian traits remain the most notable as observed in the written evidence. About fifty texts in syllabic cuneiform (for a list of these texts, see Vita 2009: 219) were unearthed at Ugarit. KTU³ identifies twenty-one Hurrian texts written in the local alphabetical cuneiform, in addition to seven texts that may also be Hurrian but are too fragmentary for certain identification, and five texts that mix Hurrian and Ugaritic.[9] Most of the alphabetical texts were found in the so-called "House of a Hurrian Priest," including all those that mix Ugaritic and Hurrian, and in the "House of a High Priest." Two other alphabetical texts were found at the acropolis of Ugarit, while syllabic texts were scattered throughout the city, in different locations from the alphabetical texts.

Regarding this study, the most striking feature is that all of the legible alphabetical texts belonged to the cultic genre—incantations, lists of sacrifices, ritual prescriptions, or hymns. The syllabic tablets contain two letters, one bilingual wisdom text, and a large number of musical/hymnic texts,[10] and lexical lists, including lists of deities. Apart from the musical texts and one letter, these texts were not purely Hurrian but a mix of Akkadian/Hurrian[11] or Sumerian-Akkadian-Hurrian(-Ugaritic).[12] In sum, the vast majority of the Hurrian corpus at Ugarit is connected to religious life.

My previously mentioned proposal that Hurrian influences should be seen, at least partially, as Hittite imperial influences is supported by the dating of the textual material. The invention of alphabetical cuneiform is now dated to the mid-thirteenth century BCE, to the reign of ˤAmittamru III (*c.*1270–1230 BCE).[13] During this period and in contrast to the Hittite Empire, the Mittanian state was no longer of any relevant importance for Ugarit. Although Devecchi (2019) argues that the last rulers of Ugarit tested the limitations of the power of their overlords, the Hittites remained an influential force. Dating the texts in syllabic cuneiform is a more problematic endeavor. Van Soldt (2010: 85) states that all the texts from Ugarit date to the Late Bronze Age

---

8 Akkadian versions A: KBo 1.7 + 28.115 + KUB 3.121; B: KBo 1.25 + KUB 3.11 + VBoT 6 + KUB 48.73; C: KUB 3.120. Egyptian version KRI II, 225–232. See Edel 1997.

9 Hurrian texts: KTU³ 1.26, 1.30, 1.32+1.33, 1.35+1.36+1.37, 1.42, 1.44, 1.51, 1.52, 1.54, 1.59, 1.60, 1.64, 1.66, 1.68, 1.120, 1.125, 1.28, 1.131, 1.135, 1.149, 1.181. Possible Hurrian texts: KTU³ 4.673, 7.5, 7.23, 7.24, 7.40, 7.42, 7.43. Mixed Hurrian-Ugaritic texts: KTU³ 1.110, 1.111, 1.116, 1.132, 1.148.

10 Including the famous "Hymn to Nikkal" (RS 15.30 + 15.49 + 17.387 = Ug 5: text h. 6 = PRU 3: 334).

11 On the wisdom text RS 15.010 and the letter RS 23.031, see Dietrich & Mayer 1999: 61; van Soldt 1991: 346.

12 On the lexical lists, see Vita 2009: 219.

13 On this development and dating, see Pardee 2014; Hawley, Pardee & Roche-Hawley 2015: 234 with further references.

(namely to *c.*1330–1180 BCE).[14] Depending on the chronology, we may suppose that the oldest excavated texts to include Hurrian date, at best, to the end of the Mittanian hegemony, and most of them fall within the time of the Hittite Empire. On the other hand, the Mesopotamian scribal tradition was probably originally mediated to Ugarit in times of Mittanian dominion over northern Syria (Veldhuis 2012: 20–21). Thus, I would argue that although Hurrian influences were not new during the last phase of Ugarit, when it was under Hittite hegemony, they were kept alive thanks to their promotion by the Hittite overlords. In other words, the cultural and political influence of the Hittites led to the unusually strong position of Hurrian elements in Ugaritic culture. Moreover, this influence was not coincidental, but intentional on the part of the Hittite Empire.

This does not mean that Hurrians were themselves absent from Ugarit at that time; on the contrary, their presence is textually attested (for example, in KTU³ 1.40, discussed below). Nonetheless, the use of Hurrian as a living language remains disputed (Lam 2015; Vita 2009; Sanmartín 2000; Dietrich & Mayer 1999). Suggestions that the Hurrian element gradually faded at Ugarit (Minunno 2013: 120; Dietrich & Mayer 1999: 58, 74; Mayer 1996: 209–210) seem to contradict this textual evidence, but the idea that Hurrian was in wide and everyday use is also improbable. I would instead posit that while Ugarit was a Hittite vassal, Hurrian was predominantly, but not exclusively, restricted to cultic use.[15]

This is further supported by the fact that the Hittite cults of the Late Bronze Age were strongly influenced by Hurrian traditions. The spread of these joined Hittite-Hurrian (and local) cults is observed elsewhere in northern Syria, with the best case being at Emar (see Michel 2017; 2014; Cohen 2011; Démare-Lafont 2008; Faist 2008; Prechel 2008; Beckman 2002; Fleming 1996). Although the political and cultural situation of each site was certainly unique, some degree of comparison is justifiable for the purpose of further analysis. These influences are observable beyond the sphere of cultic activities. The high position of Hurrian culture during the final phase of Ugarit is also well demonstrated by the rich presence of Hurrian onomastics and by numerous Hurrian loanwords in Ugaritic.[16]

The connection between Hittite rule and the presence of Hurrian personal names is seen in the corpus of royal names from Amurru or Karkemiš, as the number of Hurrian names appears to increase as the influence from Ḫatti grows stronger. For example, Hittite Piyašili acquired the name Šarri-Kušuḫ after his enthronement on the throne of Karkemiš (van Soldt 2003: 685–686). However, the situation of the royal family of Ugarit was different. Only four members of the royal family bore a Hurrian name (van Soldt 2003: 684), and only one of them, Ar-Ḫalba, was a king. This is likely due to the Ugaritic royal family having far weaker bonds with the Hittite royal family than the royal families of Amurru or Karkemiš (Singer 2011: 253–255) and thus they did not adopt this name-giving practice. Indeed, it seems that only one ruler of Ugarit

---

14 In addition, see his discussion of the "archives" of Ugarit, van Soldt 1991: 1–231, especially 48, 141 and 228; although van Soldt focuses on the Akkadian texts from these contexts, his conclusions about the dating of the "archives" seem to be general.

15 This phenomenon has many parallels in the history of religions: consider Sumerian in Mesopotamia, Ḫattian and Hurrian in Ḫatti, or, more closely to us, Latin in the Catholic Church.

16 For the former, see the series on Ugaritic onomastics by Watson, with the most recent volume from 2016, as well as van Soldt 2003 and Hess 1999. Regarding the latter, see Noonan 2012; Watson 2007; 2010 and earlier volumes in that series.

married a Hittite princess.[17] Moreover, in line with the tradition adopted in Amurru, children of Niqmēpaˁ of Ugarit and his wife Aḫat-Milku (from Amurru) bore Hurrian names (Ḫišmi-Šarruma, ÌR-Šarruma), except for the crown prince ˁAmiṯṯamru III (Singer 2011: 254).

Hurrian culture also influenced the literary compositions of Ugarit. Possible Hurrian influences may be observed in the text known as the Epic of Kirta (KTU³ 1.14–1.16). Kirta is a known Hurrian name and a ruler of Mittani; in the epic, he is said to be a ruler of Ḫābur. The connection with the river Ḫābur located in the area of Mittanian heartland can hardly be denied (see Wyatt 2002: 176–177). Moreover, Kirta's dreamed-of lady bears the ethnonym Ḫurraya. In addition, other minor motives of possible Hurrian origin appear – for example, some scholars connect the term *ap* (KTU³ 1. 16 I, line 3) to the Hurrian cultic structure *abi/āpi* (Dietrich & Loretz 2004), though this conclusion is debatable. Seen in light of this evidence, it has also been suggested that the epic was composed long before Ilimilku recorded it at the end of the Late Bronze Age (Dietrich & Loretz 2004: 260). Whatever Ilimilku's inspiration or motive was, a Hurrian background to the text is clear. There is a further possibility that this is an epic tale set in a new context, just as the outline of Baˁal's fight with Yamm is used in the Egyptian Astarte papyrus (pBN 202 and pAmherst 9; see Collombert & Coulon 2000). However, no other version of the Kirta Epic has been unearthed so far, and it is thus also possible that the Hurrian background was the creation of Ilimilku himself and no "original" epic existed. While a definitive answer still eludes us, the composition of this epic at Ugarit is consistent with the overall trend of Hurrian cultural influences.

As a whole, then, I would conclude that Hurrian elements are attested at Ugarit primarily during the time of the Hittite vassalage – and attested not in spite of this vassalage but rather thanks to it. This does not exclude the presence of Hurrian influences at Ugarit before the Hittites increased their political pressure, but only posits that the Hittite Empire may have consciously promoted these influences. Unfortunately, our knowledge of Hurrian influences in earlier periods before the final phase of Ugarit is too limited for a meaningful comparison.

Hurrian Cults at Ugarit

The "House of a Hurrian Priest" and "House of the High Priest" yielded many tablets that attest to the presence of both the Hurrian pantheon and Hurrian rituals at Ugarit. In composition and structure, these texts often do not differ from Ugaritic ritual texts. Their grammar is not complex, as most simply enumerate deities and prescribe sacrifices for them. KTU³ 1.110 is a fine example of such a text:

1	aṯḫlm in ṯlnd	*aṯḫulumma*-sacrifice for goddess Šala
	in atnd	for God–Father
	ild . ṯṯbd	for Ilu, for Tešub
	kḏǵd iwrn prznd	for Kušuḫ, for the king of the (oracular) decisions
5	kmrwnd	for Kumarbi
	iyd . aṯṯbd	for Eyya, for Aštabi
	ˁntd . ṯmgnd	for ˁAnat, for Šimegi

---

17 Eḫli-Nikkalu was most likely a wife of Niqmaddu IV (Singer 1999: 701–704). Text RS 94.2605 = RSO XXIII no. 23 confirms this hypothesis, whereas before ˁAmmurāpi II was considered to be her husband by earlier scholarship. This text also suggests that she did not divorce her husband, as was previously thought, but rather that her husband died.

	nkld	for Nikkal
	in ardnd	for god of the city
10	nbdgd	for Nubadig
	w pamt šbꜥ	and (do this) seven times

The text also provides an example of a side-by-side mixing of Ugaritic and Hurrian languages within the space of one text, as line 11 is, in the otherwise Hurrian text, written in Ugaritic. It also places both Ugaritic/Semitic (Ilu, ꜥAnat) and Hurrian deities side by side, presenting a merging of the two cultures, and the ritual as it appears in this text reflects the veneration of deities in a transcultural society. In addition, the deity God-Father (*in atn*) is an exact equivalent to Ugaritic God-Father (*ilib*), who often appears first in such sacrificial lists. The goddess Nikkal is yet another well-known example of cultural mixing: the deity is of Sumerian origin (NIN.GAL) and entered both Syrian and Hurrian pantheons earlier in history, possibly independently. Similarly, we see the deity Eyya, who has a counterpart in Ugaritic Heyya, also named Koṯar-wa-Ḫasīs. These deities are related to the Mesopotamian god Ea.

The mixing of Ugaritic and Hurrian elements is even clearer in KTU³ 1.111, of which lines 5–7 are taken as an example:

5	kḏ̣ġd in prznd	for Kušuḫ, for the god of the (oracular) decisions
	nkld . šrpm . ꜥṣrm .	for Nikkal, two birds (as a) holocaust.
	gdm . klhn . š l yrḫ	two kids for all of them, a ram for Yarīḫ

Whereas on lines 5 and 6 'for' is written in Hurrian with the suffix *-d* to refer to Kušuḫ, to the god of the (oracular) decisions, and to Nikkal, the Ugaritic preposition *l* is used for the same construction when referencing Yarīḫ in line 7. One could suggest that scribes used Hurrian grammar for Hurrian deities and Ugaritic grammar for Semitic deities, but, as we have already seen in the case of KTU³ 1.110, this is not consistently the case. In my view, these interchanges appear rather as a case of the scribe switching between languages which were both important to them, akin to how I may myself switch between Czech and English while making notes for an English lecture.

Once again, these texts show Hurrian and Ugaritic deities appearing side by side. However, such mixing is not limited to Hurrian/Hurrian-Ugaritic texts. On occasion, otherwise entirely Ugaritic texts mention Hurrian deities (see KTU³ 1.115). Both the "House of a Hurrian Priest" and the "House of the High Priest" yielded various texts from both traditions and such blending was perhaps inevitable. Moreover, this suggests that the same priests may have had responsibilities connected to both the Ugaritic and Hurrian cults, even performing duties for both at the same time.

Not all the Hurrian/Hurrian-Ugaritic texts share this simple structure. For example, KTU³ 1.42 describes a far more complicated ritual with a full and detailed grammatical structure (Lam 2011). This text describes a ritual of anointing of Hurrian deities; only the goddess ꜥAnat (*ꜥnt amr*, possibly ꜥAnat of Amurru, line 44 in the text) transgresses into the Semitic sphere.

The Hurrian[18] pantheon of Ugarit included the following deities (del Olmo Lete 2014: 63–66): Šala (*ṯl*),[19] God-Father (*in atn*), Tešub (*ṯṯb*), Tešub of Ḫalāb (*ṯṯb ḫlbġ*), Kušuḫ (*kḏ̣ġ*,

---

18 Sometimes, their Hurrian origin might be disputed (e.g., in the case of Ḫebat, Nikkal, Išḫara, Kubaba or Adamma). We do know that some of these deities were not originally Hurrian but the form in which they appear may be a Hurrianized one (e.g., Eyya (*iy*)). As a note, the spellings mentioned in this paper may not be comprehensive in light of the wide spectrum of attested variants.

19 It is possible that this deity is rather 'Goddess–Daughter' or 'God of Daughters' as it appears as *in ṯl* and not *ṯl* alone.

kzǵ), king/god of the (oracular) decisions (*irwn/in przn*), Kumarbi (*kmrw/b*), Šauška (*ṯuṯk*), *in ḫmn*, Ninitta (*nnt*), Kulitta (*klt*), Nubadig (*nbdg*), Ḫebat (*ḫbt*), *šbdr*, Daqit (*dqt*), Ḫudena (*ḫdn*), Ḫudellura (*ḫdlr*), *ḫnnǵ*, *tgn*, Nikkal (*nkl*), Ib-Nikkal (*ibnkl*), Eyya (*iy*), Aštabi (*aṯtb*), Šimegi (*ṯmg*), god of the city (*in ardn*), *tgrḫn*, Pišašapḫi (*pḏḏpḫ*), Išḫara (*išḫr*), Alanni (*aln*), Kubaba (*kbb*), Adamma (*adm*), Dadmiš (*ddmš*), and Keldi (*kld*). To this list, del Olmo Lete further adds *in trḫn* and *in aṯtḫn* (KTU³ 1.42 l. 55). Supposing he is correct, *in trḫn* could be the appearance of Hittite storm god Tarḫun, supporting the idea that the Hurrian influence partially masks the Hittite influence. This identification is far from certain, however, and Lam suggests rendering these deities as 'the male gods' and 'the female gods' (Lam 2011: 153–154).

In addition to Hurrian deities and grammar, the cult at Ugarit was also influenced by Hurrian sacrificial vocabulary. The term *aṯḫulumma* (*aṯḫlm*) is possibly equivalent to Ugaritic *dbḥ*, a 'sacrifice' (Merlo & Xella 1999: 293; del Olmo Lete 1995: 43). The meaning of the word *tzǵ* is unknown, as it appears only in an overly general context (del Olmo Lete 1995: 43). *Ḫdrǵl* is a hapax, possibly meaning 'respect, obedience' and appears in an otherwise entirely Ugaritic text (KTU³ 1.105) (del Olmo Lete 1995: 45). Also of significance is the term *keldi*, designating a peace sacrifice (Lam 2011: 163), which corresponds with Ugaritic *šlmm* a 'peace (offering).' In Ugaritic texts, *šlmm* is often connected to *šrp*, a 'burnt (offering)' or 'holocaust.' I would suggest this connection is a possible Hittite(-Hurrian) influence from the *ambašši* and *keldi* offerings, which themselves mean a 'holocaust' and a 'peace (offering),' respectively and the pair of sacrificial acts is also observable in rituals at Emar (see Válek 2019: 51–52; Michel 2017: 207).

"Hurrian" Buildings at Ugarit

There are two buildings at Ugarit that are often designated as "Hurrian." The first is the "Hurrian Temple," which is also described as the "Sanctuary of the Hurrian Gods" (Merlo & Xella 1999: 302) or the "Temple with the Mittanian Axe" (Yon 2006: 49). The second is the "House of a Hurrian Priest," which has also been given names such as the "House of the Priest Containing Inscribed Livers and Lung Models," the "House of the Magician-Priest," or the "Annex Library of Medico-Magic and Literary Texts" (Yon 2006: 99–100).

The "Hurrian Temple" is located near the royal palace and it seems to have been in use from the Middle Bronze Age up to the end of Ugarit. It owes its Hurrian designation to the nature of the artifacts found within, though any actual connection with Hurrian cults is still debated. Some suggest the structure was instead connected to the royal cult (Yon 2006: 35), though this does not necessarily invalidate the Hurrian interpretation as the royal cult was to some extent Hurrianized. In KTU³ 1.111, for example, the king is said to carry out the *aṯḫulumma*-sacrifices. Interestingly, the final scheme of the temple is not axial, as was the case with other temples at Ugarit, but bent-axis (Yon 2006: 49). Comparisons may be found with the Ḫalābian temple of the local storm god, where multiple renovations and additional constructions during the Hittite period gradually changed its plan from axial to bent-axis and modified its overall decoration and equipment (see Kohlmeyer 2009). A similar process has also been observed in Alalaḫ (see

Fink 2010: 31–60). This may suggest involvement of the Hittite cultural policy;[20] however, it is also possible that in this instance the final structure respected the previous ground plan.

This temple may have housed a Hurrian deity, as can be deduced from the statues found there (Fig. 1), which were considered by the excavators to be of Hurrian style.[21] Stratigraphy of the temple suggests that these statues should be dated to the nineteenth–eighteenth centuries BCE (Yon 2006: 133; Schaeffer 1939: 133), which would testify to a very old tradition of Hurrian influences at the site. However, additional textual evidence is required to reach a more certain interpretation of the whole structure and its rituals during the final phase of Ugarit.

The "House of a Hurrian Priest" contained[22] about a dozen Hurrian texts and many objects and texts related to divination.[23] I have already compared some of the Hurrian influences at Ugarit to Hittite influences at Emar. At Emar an office of "diviner of the gods of the town existed"; this office participated in and supervised Hittite(-Hurrian) cults at Emar (see Rutz 2013: 319–321; Démare-Lafont 2008; Prechel 2008; Faist 2008: 200–201; Fleming 2000: 26–29, 34–35). The connection of Hurrian cultic texts and divinatory practices within one institution at Ugarit might suggest that this house accommodated a similar office to the Emariote diviner. In his colophons, scribe Ilimilku described himself as a "student of Attēnu, the diviner" (e.g., in KTU³ 1.6 VI: 55). For the title *diviner*, a Hurrian word *purulini* (*prln*) is used (see van Soldt 1990). However, connecting *purulini* from Ugarit to the Emariote diviner (^{LÚ}ḪAL *ša* DINGIR.MEŠ *ša* URU^{KI}) in their role is for now too far-reaching.

EGYPTIAN INFLUENCES

The case of Egyptian influences differs significantly from Hurrian ones. The latter were represented, as discussed, by a great deal of written evidence and only a handful of material objects. Conversely, the relations between Egypt and Ugarit are manifested in numerous material artifacts relating to religion, but the textual evidence is far scarcer. The importance of relations between Ugarit and Egypt is reflected by substantial scholarly discussion (Matoïan 2015b; Lagarce 2013; Caubet & Yon 2006; Singer 1999: 621–627; Schaeffer 1956: 164–226).

Egyptian influences at Ugarit were longstanding and well-established. During the Late Bronze Age, the city hosted an Egyptian community and political and trade relations flourished.[24] Egyptians at Ugarit were not only high-ranked persons like diplomats—some worked on palace farms and were provided with rations of food and clothing (see KTU³ 4.352; Vita

---

20 In addition, the use of windows in Ugaritic temples (e.g., KTU³ 1.109: 19, 1.41: 11, or 1.171: 6) may be seen as an example of Hittite cultural influences. After all, during the reconstruction of the Ḥalābian temple of the local storm god (under the Hittite supervision), some false windows were added to the decoration (see Kohlmeyer 2009: 192, 194–195). Baʿal's change of heart regarding the building of a window in his new palace (KTU³ 1.4 V 59–65 + VI 1–9 contra 1.4 VII 14–25) may also reflect this topic. Nonetheless, this topic remains open for further discussion, and Hittite influence is far from being the only possible explanation for the appearance of windows in cultic structures at Ugarit. For a general discussion on the use of windows in temple architecture in Hittite Anatolia and Ugarit, see, e.g., Hundley 2013, especially 94–97 and 118.

21 See Schaeffer 1939: 128–140, whose analysis compares these statues to similar statues from Ḥattuša.

22 This is apart from a larger number of cultic, medico-magical, and mythological texts in Ugaritic, two texts in Akkadian, a musical instrument of Egyptian type, a decorated mug, a libation stand (?), and some pottery.

23 This included several inscribed models of livers and one model of lungs, as well as about twenty other objects linked to divinatory practices.

24 See, e.g., letters RS 86.2230, 88.2158, RS 94.2002+2003 (RSO XXIII: text II-1) or RS 94.2176 (RSO XXIII: text II-2).

Figure 1 An example of a Hurrian statue from the "Hurrian Temple." AO 19397. Photo © RMN-Grand Palais (Musée du Louvre) / Raphaël Chipault, courtesy of Musée du Louvre.

1999: 460). Egyptian loanwords and personal names, although not as numerous as Hurrian examples, also testify to broad Egyptian cultural influences.[25]

Prestige of Egyptian Art

As has already been stated, Egyptian influences are seen mostly in artifacts. Egyptian art appears to have been highly desired, as seen in a letter (RS 88.2158) from Egypt to Ugarit, which responds to a prior correspondence wherein the king of Ugarit (probably Ibirānu; see Fisher 2010: 619) demanded a statue of Pharaoh Merenptah to place in the temple of Baʿal.[26] Merenptah's response was a negative one, as his craftsmen were busy at the time, but he promised a number of luxurious gifts instead (Singer 1999: 709–710). Unfortunately, before Egyptian craftsmen became available, Ugarit had ceased to exist.

This correspondence also casts light on the numerous Egyptian statues found at Ugarit, the presence of which corresponds with evidence from other sites. For example, the letter EA 59 mentions Egyptian statues of deities and the pharaoh in a temple in Tunip and contains a request for additional manufacturing. Similarly, Letter EA 55 states that in Qaṭna "names" of pharaohs were put before the statue of the local sun deity, and also includes a request for the manufacture of a statue. The Ugaritic letter and examples from the Amarna correspondence speak to the prestige of Egyptian art, a standing that was connected to its political and artistic value, which may in turn have been emphasized by its innately foreign qualities. They also reflect on the state of political relations after the Silver Treaty was sealed. At that time, Ugarit was a Hittite vassal, but that status did not impede diplomatic relations with Egypt, nor did those Egyptian connections necessarily cast any shadow on the loyalty of Ugarit.[27]

---

25 On this, see the series on Ugaritic onomastics; Watson 2016 and earlier volumes; Noonan 2012; the series *Non-Semitic words in the Ugaritic lexicon*; Watson 2010 and earlier volumes; Watson 2007; Hess 1999; and Muchiki 1999, though one should, however, consider the criticism by Watson 2002 and Schneider 2001.

26 For an analysis of further possible motives for this request, see Morris 2015.

27 Weighed against this claim, however, Devecchi 2019 suggests that the last rulers of Ugarit also tested the power limits of their foreign overlord.

However, the material evidence suggests that attitudes toward Egyptian art were not always positive. Several mutilated Egyptian statues dated to the Middle Kingdom (Yon 2006: 16–18; Singer 1999: 616) were excavated at Ugarit. The dating of these mutilations is still disputed; however, it is reasonable to suggest these mutilations date to before the Late Bronze Age based on the stratigraphy of the finds (Schaeffer 1962: 212). Such mutilations are not observed in New Kingdom art and the corresponding textual evidence of that period suggests rather positive attitudes toward the Egyptians. Although the precise reasons behind these mutilations is undetermined, several mutilated statues were excavated in the area of the temples at the acropolis, suggesting that regardless of who brought these statues or mutilated them, they may have been intended for the local deities (Singer 1999: 616).

Given the prevalence of divine representations among Egyptian objects, many likely relate to religious practices, including magic or popular religion (Matoïan 2015a). In addition, a considerable number seem to be objects of prestige and luxury, some of which are local products that imitate Egyptian style. Such examples support the thesis of this style being prestigious even though its cosmological connotations and ritual practice seem to have been mostly put aside. Several examples of Egyptian/Egyptianizing style are shown in Fig. 2.

Figure 2 Examples of Egyptian and Egyptianizing objects from Ugarit and adjacent areas. From left to right: AO 11598, AO 14725, AO 14726, and AO 11599. Photos © RMN-Grand Palais (Musée du Louvre) / Franck Raux and Raphaël Chipault, courtesy of Musée du Louvre.

Foreign Residency of Koṯar-wa-Ḫasīs

From the previous topics aries the question of the mythological localization of the Ugaritic craftsman deity Koṯar-wa-Ḫasīs (also named Heyya). In the Baʕal cycle, this deity is said to dwell in *ḥkpt* (Memphis) and *kptr* (Crete). A relevant passage, concerning messengers heading to the god of crafts, is best preserved in KTU[3] 1.3 VI, lines 16–31, as follows:

16	… b ym . rbt	… by the great sea,
	x [km]n . b nhrm	x[acr]e, by the river,
	[ʕ]br . gbl . ʕbr	cross Byblos, cross
	qʕl . ʕbr . iht	the summit, cross the islands
20	np . šmm . šmšr	of heavenly peaks. Ride,
	l dgy . aṯrt	O fisher of Aṯirat,

	mġ . l qdš . amrr	proceed, O Qadīš Amrar.
	idk . al . ttn	then, yes, set
	pnm . tk . ḫ{q}kpt	face towards Memphis,
25	il . klh . kptr	the god of all of it, (to) Crete,
	ksu . t̠bth . ḥkpt	the throne where he sits, (to) Memphis,
	arṣ . nḫlth	the land of his heritage,
	b alp . šd . rbt	from thousand hectares, ten thousand
	kmn . l pˁn . kt̠<r>	acre, at the feet of Kot̠a<r>
30	hbr . w ql . tštḥ	bow down and fall, prostrate
	wy . w kbd hwt	yourself and honour him.

Of course, it is immediately apparent that Crete and Memphis are neither the same location nor are they close to one another. This does not, I would suggest, arise from poor geographical knowledge of Ilimilku, the author of the Baˁal cycle. It is likely that the relative position of these two places was generally known to diplomats and merchants at Ugarit; Ilimilku belonged to the first category and would have known of both locations (Tugendhaft 2018: 27–37).

Rather, the dwellings of this deity correspond to a mental mapping of the world, using the reputation of each place to deliberate effect. Both Crete and Memphis were considered sources of valuable art products. Crete was engaged in trade relations with the whole of ancient Syria, especially the coastline. The trade was long established as Cretan products, material, and people are referenced in textual evidence already in Amorite Mari (Sørensen 2009: 27–30). One Mariote text even mentions a Cretan from Ugarit (ARM 23, 556, lines 28–31). In general, Cretans had been considered excellent artists (Sørensen 2009: 25–26), and their art, as well as other art from the Mediterranean area, was considered prestigious. Moreover, the Egyptian city of Memphis was further connected to art by being the site of the cult of the craftsman deity Ptah.

Stele of Mami

Although the Egyptians influenced Ugarit mostly through its art, some evidence of cultic connections exists as well. The Stele of Mami (Fig. 3) illustrates this topic well. This artifact, a funerary stele (Levy 2014: 293) 42 cm high (Yon 2006: 135) and dated to the nineteenth dynasty (Yon 1991: 287–288), shows us a worshipper, "the royal scribe, overseer of the royal domain, Mami the justified," giving an offering to the deity *bˁr d̠ʒpwnʒ*—'Baˁal of the Ṣapan Mountain' (upper register; see Levy 2014: 297). The god Baˁal is written with a Seth-animal determinative, connecting him in the eyes of Egyptians with this Egyptian deity, who was a god of foreign countries with a physiognomy that partially corresponded to Baˁal. This is the only known inscribed representation of Baˁal (Levy 2014: 295), likely thanks to the Egyptian custom of inscribing artwork, which is not otherwise seen in Ugaritian art. The text which describes the scene is as follows:

(1) [Royal offering for Baˁal]-Ṣapan, the great god, that He may give (2) [you life, power, health, love], ˹honour˺, joy and h[ap]piness every ˹day˺, (3) (in order that you may) reach ˹in˺ [peace] ˹the state of venerable˺. [For the *ka* of the honoured of the] Good God, the beloved of the Lord of the Two Lands (4) thanks to ˹his qualities˺, […] the efficient [who rejoices] ˹the heart˺ of his Master, (5) the royal ˹scribe˺, ˹overseer˺ […] Mami, justified, (6) son of the dignitary, great scribe of [I…].

(translation according to Levy 2014: 297, slightly modified)

Figure 3 Upper part of the Stele of Mami showing Baʿal of Ṣapan and his worshipper Mami. AO 13176.
Photo © RMN-Grand Palais (Musée du Louvre) / Mathieu Rabeau, courtesy of Musée du Louvre.

As a whole, the stele is an interesting example of cultural fusion. Generally speaking, it is perfectly Egyptian, with even its material originating in Egypt (see Yon 2006: 135; 1991: 285). But the deity to which the worshipper relates himself is Ugaritic and the stele was positioned in that same deity's local temple, even if Baʿal was in this instance appropriated into the Egyptian Sethian category.

Nonetheless, Mami remained fully aware of Egyptian cosmological conceptions. Several ideas are primarily Egyptian: that behind the cult there is always a pharaoh; that offerings are for the *k3* of the deceased; that the depiction of offering works as the offering itself; and that the deceased wants to reach the "state of venerable" (becoming an *3ḫ*). At least in this case it is clear that the foreigner connected to this stele lived (or rather died) within his native cosmological conceptions; at the same time, however, he related himself to a deity implicitly belonging to a foreign cosmology.[28] This situation corresponds to the territorial conception of deities and their polytheistic non-exclusiveness; these conditions overall allowed for a much easier and "natural" fusion of the cultures of the ancient Near East and Egypt. The discussed stele is a fine example of transcultural processes.

MEDITERRANEAN ART

Ugarit did not experience political and imperial pressure from regions in the Mediterranean as it did from Egypt or Ḫatti. However, art from this area, particularly Cyprus, was considered prestigious and Mediterranean artistic influences were strongly represented at Ugarit. We have already seen this was reflected in mythology, as with the dwelling of the craftsman deity Koṯar-wa-Ḫasīs in the Baʿal Cycle being situated at Crete (and also at Memphis). An enormous number

---

28 On the other hand, some may argue that by this time Baʿal was integrated into the Egyptian pantheon as a foreign manifestation of Seth (see, e.g., Tazawa 2009: 154–158). Nevertheless, his foreignness was always acknowledged, and several other deities of Semitic origin were worshipped in Egypt, such as ʿAnat, ʿAṯtarta, Rašap, Ḥoron, or Qadeš (see Tazawa 2009; Zivie-Coche 2011).

Figure 4 The Mistress of Animals. AO 11601. Photo © RMN-Grand Palais (Musée du Louvre) / Hervé Lewandowski, courtesy of Musée du Louvre.

of objects of Mediterranean origin were excavated at the city of Ugarit and adjacent areas, and their style was also imitated by local artists. Texts from Ugarit suggest that the city hosted a Cypriote community,[29] and several tablets containing a yet undeciphered Cypro-Minoan script were discovered in different parts of the city (e.g., RS 17.006 found in the Residential Quarter; see Yon 2006: 126–127). As a whole, relations (including trade) with the Mediterranean area, especially Cyprus (Alašiya), must have been rich.[30] Although many examples of art showcasing Mediterranean styles are attested, the same cannot be said of representations of divine figures. Nevertheless, the prestige of these influences is clear in the available evidence, as can be seen from the collection of art with Aegeanizing motifs found in a tomb from the Ugaritic harbor Minet el-Beida (Feldman 2015: 34).

The distribution of objects and their origin suggest that the appropriation of Mediterranean motifs, unlike Egyptian art and motifs, was carried out rather individually, as no systematic influences are observed. Seen in this light, it seems probable that aforementioned tomb belonged to an individual personally involved in Mediterranean trade and thus in direct contact with the Aegean area (Feldman 2015: 34). Among the objects from this tomb, one particularly famous example can be used as a case study for this style of art overall: the Mistress of Animals (Fig. 4). Pfälzner (2015: 190–191) notes that this piece of art was most likely made by a local artist, as the general composition of the scene is "perfectly Levantine" and the Aegeanizing motives, or "perfectly Mycenaean costume, hairstyle and sitting posture, and with an Aegean chair, or altar," are copied with "mistakes." The local artist had been inspired in his work by a foreign artistic tradition, but then used those motifs and images to create a more familiar scene.

---

29 For example, a model of livers (RS 24.312) mentions an acquisition of a young man from Cyprus (Pardee 2002: 128). Cyprians are also mentioned in KTU³ 1.40 (see below).

30 Some textual material also testifies to these relations: e.g., RS 16.238+16.254 (PRU 3: 107) for Crete; RS 34.153 (RSO VII: text 35), KTU³ 4.352, RS 20.163 (Ug 5: text 153) or KTU³ 2.42 for Cyprus.

Examples such as this tomb and its objects provide the most relevant evidence for the development of personal identity in Ugarit during this period.

Other objects from the Mediterranean area may have been related directly to the cult. For example, several Mycenaean and Cypriote rhytons were unearthed at Ugarit, and the cultic use of some of these was suggested in connection with *marziḫu*[31] (Yon 1996: 416). In general, however, the relation between Mediterranean art to the sphere of religion at this site as such is ill-defined, and any more certain conclusions elude us. Regardless of these unsolved issues, the presence of Aegeanizing influences on local art and the personal incorporation of those same motifs, primarily seen in burial equipment, attest to the importance of these influence.

PROTÉGÉS OF THE WALLS OF UGARIT (KTU³ 1.40)

The discussion so far has centered on the fusion of cultures and intercultural influences. However, this situation was not always seamless, and frictions existed. Peaceful coexistence within a multicultural society was not an effortless process. At Ugarit, this tension was addressed through a ritual that we find described on several alphabetical tablets, with KTU³ 1.40 being the best-preserved. These tablets were found in the "House of a High Priest" (KTU³ 1.40), the royal palace (KTU³ 1.84), and the "House of a Hurrian Priest" (the badly damaged KTU³ 1.121 and 1.122). The tablets seem to be inscribed by different scribes (Pardee 2002: 78) and are variant versions, rather than copies, of the same ritual text, implying the ritual itself was occasionally repeated, although any specifics concerning this repetition elude us. The importance of these texts is reflected by the rich scholarly discussion focused on them.[32]

KTU³ 1.40 is divided into six parts by horizontal lines, with one line being a modern reconstruction. Interestingly, these sections alternate between masculine and feminine grammar. Sacrificial animals alternate as well; sections III and IV include a ram sacrifice whereas sections V and VI include a donkey. It is possible that a third animal was sacrificed in sections I and II, but these sections are too damaged for certain identification. As the best preserved section, lines 26´–34´ are provided below as an example of the text's format:

26´	w . šqrb . ᶜr . mšr mšr. bn . ugrt . w np[y . gr . ḥmyt] ugr<t>	And let come near a donkey of exculpation: exculpation of a son of Ugarit and puri[fy the protégés of the walls of] Ugari<t>
	w npy yman . w npy . ᶜrmt . w npy . x[…]	and purify Yamanian and purify ᶜAramtian and purify x[…]
	w npy . nqmd . u šn . ypkm . u l p . q[ty . u l p . ddm]y	and purify Niqmaddu. If your dignity was defiled, whether by words of Qa[ṭiyan or by words of Didma]yan
	u l p . ḫry . u l p . ḫty . u l p . alty . u l[p . ġbr .] u l p	or by words of Hurrian or by words of Hittite or by words of Cyprian or by [words of Ġabiran] or by words of
30´	ḫbtkm . u l p . m[dl]lkm . u l p . qrzbl . u šn [.] ypkm	your pillagers or by words of your op[press]ors or by words of QRZBL. Or your dignity was defiled

---

31 This was a cultic institution likely connected with excessive drinking. The institution, and especially tablet KTU³ 1.114, which possibly describes this cultic event in the divine world, have been broadly discussed; see, e.g., del Olmo Lete 2015, with references; 2014: 334–338; Pardee 2002: 167–170; McLaughlin 2001; Cathcart 1996; Pardee 1996.

32 See del Olmo Lete 1989; 2014: 116–127; Hoyt 2010; Pardee 1991; 2002: 77–83; 2000: 92–142; Shedletsky & Levine 1999; Tarragon 1998; de Moor & Sanders 1991.

u b apkm . u b q[ṣ]rt . npškm . u b qṭṭ . tqṭṭ	whether by your anger or by your w[e]akness or by a disgracefulness with you should commit
u šn . ypkm . l d[b]ḥm . w l .ṯˤ . dbḥn . ndbḥ . hw . ṯˤ nṯˤy .	or your dignity was defiled regarding the sac[ri]fices and regarding the *ṯaˤa*-sacrifice. (These) sacrifices we sacrifice, this *ṯaˤa*-sacrifice we sacrifice.
hw . nkt . nkt . y[t]ši . l ab . bn . il . jtši . l dr	This (is) slaughtered. May the slaughter ri[se] up to the father of the sons of Ilu, may it rise up to the Circle of
bn il . <l mpḫrt . bn . il> l ṯkmn [. w] šnm . hn . ˤr	the Sons of Ilu <to the Assembly of the Sons of Ilu>, to Ṯakiman-wa-Šanim: here (is) a donkey.

This ritual is generally interpreted as intending to calm frictions within the society. The tablet aims to calm the mood regarding verbal insults among inhabitants while also absolving any offences against the cult. Vita suggests this text may show that the Hurrians had not yet been fully integrated during the reign of Niqmaddu, who is mentioned in line 28′ (Vita 1999: 457). However, considering the dating of alphabetical cuneiform to the mid-thirteenth century and the more established position of Hurrian culture at Ugarit, I would instead suggest the text demonstrates the presence of social frictions despite the integral place of foreigners in Ugaritic society and culture. It would hardly be possible to find a society where such frictions are entirely absent, but these texts from Ugarit demonstrate that these problems were both acknowledged and solutions were actively sought. Moreover, the text contributes to the overall discussion on the concept of foreignness. The geographical identities of various inhabitants of Ugarit are clearly stated, but the text talks of them as of the 'protégés of the walls of Ugarit' (*gr ḥmyt ugrt*). The city of Ugarit was in this respect inclusive, taking care of its inhabitants regardless of their origin.

CONCLUSION

As a whole, this article has considered the topic of foreign influences in the religion of ancient Ugarit, focusing on several key points of origin for these influences. Hurrian culture is the most prominent foreign element in written sources: its imprint is seen in the language used in ritual texts and hymns and its pantheon was at least partially fused with the local Semitic one. On occasion, Hurrian mixed with Ugaritic or Akkadian, a practice in part further attested in the presence of loanwords and onomastics. Apart from texts, several religious artifacts of Hurrian style were excavated at Ugarit. The extensive presence of Hurrian influences, particularly during the final phase of Ugarit, when the city as a vassal of Ḫatti, may have been a result of the Hittite promotion of those same influences, and so they were not only a reflection of the heritage of previous times.

Artistic evidence primarily reflects Egyptian and Mediterranean influences. Numerous statues, plaques, stamp seals, and other objects of Egyptian style were unearthed in the city and its vicinity, and the style was also imitated by local artists at Ugarit. The role of Egypt as connected to art and material culture was also reflected in mythological compositions, as the Ugaritic craftsman deity Koṯar-wa-Ḫasīs was said to dwell in Memphis as well as in Crete. Representations of influence in the cultic sphere may be seen in examples such as the Stele of Mami, an Egyptian funerary stele that depicts a worshipper venerating Baˤal. The pronounced presence of Egyptianizing and Aegeanizing artistic motifs attests to the prestige of such art and demonstrates personal use and relationships with these objects.

However, we see influences beyond Hurrian, Hittite, Egyptian, or Mediterranean realms. The most important influences of all were Semitic, and foremost among them was the cunei-

form culture itself. Often the dividing line between the foreign and local cannot be made and we thus remember that what we perceive externally as foreign may in fact have been integrated to such an extent that its foreignness was not reflected within the actual context of Ugarit, instead being considered an intrinsic part of the local culture. This does not mean that such transcultural society was friction-free, as is clearly demonstrated by ritual described in KTU³ 1.40 and its variant versions. In sum, I believe we must not regard foreign influences as something that "defiled" the local "pure" West Semitic culture but as a continuing process that had led to a new, but still local, tradition. Through contact with more powerful empires, the identities of Ugaritians shifted.

ABBREVIATIONS:

AO	museum siglum Louvre (Antiquités orientales)
ARM	*Archives royales de Mari,* Paris, 1941–.
EA	tablet siglum, Tell el-Amarna
KRI	Kitchen, Kenneth 1975–1990. *Ramesside Inscriptions: Historical & Biographical*. Oxford: Blackwell.
KTU³	Dietrich, Manfried, Oswald Loretz, Joaquín Sanmartín & Hans Neumann 2013. *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und anderen Orten. Dritte, erweiterte Auflage*. Münster: Ugarit.
KUB	*Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*. Berlin, 1921–.
KBo	*Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*. Leipzig, 1916–.
PRU 3	Schaeffer, Claude F.–A., Jean Nougayrol, Georges Boyer & Emmanuel Laroche 1955. *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit*, III: *Textes accadiens et hourrites des archives est, ouest et centrales*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale & Klincksieck.
RS	object siglum, Ugarit (Ras-Shamra)
RSO VII	Ordreuil, Pierre (ed.) 1991. *Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville*. (Ras Shamra-Ougarit VII) Paris: ERC.
RSO XXIII	Lackenbacher, Sylvie & Florence Malbran-Labat 2016. *Lettres en akkadien de la «Maison d'Urtenu», Fouilles de 1994*. (Ras Shamra-Ougarit XXIII) Leuven: Peeters.
Ug 5	Nougayrol, Jean, Emmanuel Laroche, Claude Schaeffer & Charles Virolleaud (eds) 1968. *Ugaritica V: Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit: commentaires des textes historiques*. Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
VBoT	Götze, Albrecht 1930. *Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte*. Marburg.

REFERENCES

Albanèse, Léon 1929. Note sur Ras Shamra. *Syria* 10(1): 16–21.

Arnaud, Daniel 1999. Prolégomènes à la rédaction d'une histoire d'Ougarit, II: Les borderaux de rois divinisés. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 41(2): 155–173.

Beckman, Gary 2002. The Pantheon of Emar. In: P. Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*: 39–54. Warsaw: Agade.

Beckman, Gary 2013. Foreigners in the Ancient Near East. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 133(2): 203–216.

Cathcart, Kevin J. 1996. Ilu, Yarihu and the One with the Two Horns and a Tail. In: N. Wyatt, W.G.E. Watson & J.B. Lloyd (eds), *Ugarit, Religion and Culture*: *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Ugarit, Religion and Culture, Edinburgh, July 1994: Essays Presented in Honour of Professor John C.L. Gibson*: 1–7. Münster: Ugarit.

Caubet, Annie F. & Marguerite Yon 2006. Ougarit et l'Égypte. In: E. Czerny, I. Hein, H. Hunger, D. Melman & A. Schwab (eds), *Timelines: Studies in Honour of Manfred Bietak*, II: 79–95. Leuven: Peeters.

Cohen, Yoram 2011. The Administration of Cult in Hittite Emar. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 38: 145–157.

Collombert, Philippe & Laurent Coulon 2000. Les dieux contre la mer. Le début du «papyrus d'Astarté» (pBN 202). *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire* 100: 193–242.

Démare-Lafont, Sophie 2008. The King and the Diviner at Emar. In: Y. Cohen, L. d'Alfonso & D. Sürenhagen (eds), *The City of Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society*: 207–217. Münster: Ugarit.

Devecchi, Elena 2019. A Reluctant Servant: Ugarit under Foreign Rule During the Late Bronze Age. In: J. Mynářová, M. Kilani & S. Alivernini (eds), *A Stranger in the House – The Crossroads III: Proceedings of an International Conference in Ancient Egyptian and Near Eastern Societies of the Bronze Age Held in Prague, September 10–13, 2018*: 121–135. Prague: Charles University, Faculty of Arts.

Dietrich, Manfred & Walter Mayer 1999. The Hurrian and Hittite Texts. In: W.G.E. Watson & N. Wyatt (eds), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*: 58–75. Leiden: Brill.

Dietrich, Manfried & Oswald Loretz 2004. Hunde im ap des königlichen ‚Mausoleums' nach dem ugaritischen Keret-Epos. In: D. Groddek & S. Rössle (eds), *Šarnikzel: hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer (19.2.1894-10.01.1986)*: 253–262. Dresden: Technische Universität Dresden.

Edel, Elmar 1997. *Der Vertrag zwischen Rameses II. von Ägypten und Hattušili III. von Hatti.* Berlin: Gebr.

Faist, Betina 2008. Scribal Traditions and Administration at Emar. In: Y. Cohen, L. d'Alfonso & D. Sürenhagen (eds), *The City of Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society*: 195–205. Münster: Ugarit.

Feldman, Marian 2015. Qatna and Artistic Internationalism during the Late Bronze Age. In: P. Pfälzner & M. Al-Maqdissi (eds), *Qaṭna and the Networks of Bronze Age Globalism: Proceedings of an International Conference in Stuttgart and Tübingen in October 2009*: 33–42. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Fink, Amir Sumakaʿi 2010. *Late Bronze Age Tell Atchana (Alalakh): Stratigraphy, Chronology, History.* Oxford: Archaeopress.

Fisher, Loren 2010. Double Attribution in a Letter from Egypt to Ugarit (RS 88.2158). *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 130(4): 619–621.

Fleming, Daniel E. 1996. The Emar Festivals: City Unity and Syrian Identity under Hittite Hegemony. In: M.W. Chavalas (ed.), *Emar: The History, Religion, and Culture of a Syrian Town in the Late Bronze* Age: 81–122. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press.

Fleming, Daniel E. 2000. *Time at Emar: The Cultic Calendar and the Rituals from the Diviner's House.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Hawley, Robert, Dennis Pardee & Carole Roche-Hawley 2015. The Scribal Culture of Ugarit. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* 2(2): 229–267.

Hess, Richard S. 1999. The Onomastics of Ugarit. In: W.G.E. Watson & N. Wyatt (eds), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*: 499–528. Leiden: Brill.

Hoyt, JoAnna M. 2010. Justification at Ugarit. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Evangelical Theological Society, November 2010, Atlanta, GA.

Hundley, Michael B. 2013. *Gods in Dwellings: Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East.* Atlanta: SBL Press.

Kohlmeyer, Kay 2009. The Temple of the Storm God in Aleppo During the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages. *Near Eastern Archeology* 72(4): 190–202.

Lagarce, Bérénice 2013. L'image du pouvoir égyptien dans les documents d'Ougarit. In: P. Bordreuil, F. Ernst-Pradal, M.G. Masetti-Rouault, H. Rouillard-Bonraisin (eds), *Les écritures mises au jour sur le site antique d'Ougarit (Syrie) et leur déchiffrement 1930–2010, Commémoration du quatre-vingtième anniversaire du déchiffrement de l'alphabet cunéiforme de Ras Shamra-Ougarit*: 269–296. Paris: AIBL.

Lam, Joseph 2011. A Reassessment of the Alphabetic Hurrian Text RS 1.004 (KTU 1.42): A Ritual Anointing of Deities? *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 11: 148–169.

Lam, Joseph 2015. Possible Ugaritic Influences on the Hurrian of Ras Shamra-Ugarit in Alphabetic Script. In: A.M. Butts (ed.), *Semitic Languages in Contact*: 267–279. Leiden: Brill.

Levy, Eythan 2014. A Fresh Look at the Baal-Zaphon Stele. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 100: 293–310.

Liverani, Mario 2001. *International Relations in the Ancient Near East, 1600–1100 BC.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Liverani, Mario 2014. *The Ancient Near East: History, Society and Economy.* Abingdon: Routledge.

McLaughlin, John L. 2001. *The Marzēaḥ in the Prophetic Literature: References and Allusions in Light of the Extra-Biblical Evidence.* Boston: Brill.

Matoïan, Valérie 2015a. Ḥoron et Shed à Ugarit: textes et images. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 46: 235–288.

Matoïan, Valérie 2015b. Ougarit et l'Égypte: essai d'interprétation de la documentation archéologique et perspectives de la recherche. In: B. Eder & R. Pruzsinszky (eds), *Policies of Exchange, Political Systems and Modes of Interaction in the Aegean and Near East in the 2nd millennium bce, Proceedings of the International Symposium at the University of Freiburg, Institute for Archaeological Studies, 30th May - 2nd June 2012*: 35–84. Vienna: VÖAW.

Mayer, Walter 1996. The Hurrian Cult at Ugarit. In: N. Wyatt, W.G.E. Watson & J.B. Lloyd (eds), *Ugarit, Religion and Culture*: *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Ugarit, Religion and Culture, Edinburgh, July 1994: Essays Presented in Honour of Professor John C.L. Gibson*: 205–212. Münster: Ugarit.

Merlo, Paolo & Paolo Xella 1999. The Rituals. In: W.G.E. Watson & N. Wyatt (eds), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*: 287–304. Leiden: Brill.

Michel, Patrick Maxime 2014. Hittite Cults in Emar. In: P. Taracha (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eight International Congress of Hittitology: Warsaw, 5–9 September 2011*: 507–515. Warsaw: Agade.

Michel, Patrick Maxime 2017. Private Religious Life in Emar and the Hittite Empire. In: R. de Boer & J.G. Dercksen (eds), *Private and State in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 58th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Leiden 16–20 July 2012*: 203–210. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Minunno, Giuseppe 2013. *Ritual Employs of Birds in Ancient Syria-Palestine.* Münster: Ugarit.

de Moor, Johannes C. & Paul Sanders 1991. An Ugaritic Expiation Ritual and its Old Testament Parallels. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 23: 283–300.

Morris, Ellen F. 2005. *The Architecture of Imperialism: Military Bases and the Evolution of Foreign Policy in Egypt's New Kingdom.* Leiden: Brill.

Morris, Ellen F. 2015. Egypt, Ugarit, the God Baʕal, and the Puzzle of a Royal Rebuff. In: J. Mynářová, P. Onderka & P. Pavúk (eds), *There and Back Again – The Crossroads II: Proceedings of an International Conference Held in Prague, September 15–18, 2014*: 315–351. Prague: Charles University in Prague.

Muchiki, Yoshiyuki 1999. *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic.* Atlanta: SBL Press.

Mynářová, Jana 2006. Ugarit: "International" or "Vassal" Correspondence?. In: P. Charvát, B. Lafont, J. Mynářová & L. Pecha (eds), *L'État, le pouvoir, les prestations et leurs formes en Mésopotamie ancienne: Actes du Colloque assyriologique franco-tchèque. Paris, 7–8 novembre 2002*: 119–128. Prague: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta.

Noonan, Benjamin J. 2012. *Foreign Loanwords and Kulturwörter in Northwest Semitic (1400–600 bce): Linguistic and Cultural Contact in Light of Terminology for Realia.* PhD Dissertation, Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati.

del Olmo Lete, Gregorio 1989. El sacrificio de expiación nacional en Ugarit (KTU 1.40 y par). In: F. García Martínez (ed.), *La Paraula al servei dels homes: XXV Jornades de biblistes catalans (1963–1985)*: 46–56. Barcelona: Associaciô Biblica de Catalunya, Editorial Claret.

del Olmo Lete, Gregorio 1995. The Sacrificial Vocabulary at Ugarit. *Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici* 12: 37–49.

del Olmo Lete, Gregorio 2014. *Canaanite Religion According to the Liturgical Texts of Ugarit.* Münster: Ugarit.

del Olmo Lete, Gregorio 2015. The Marzeaḥ and the Ugaritic Magic Ritual System: A Close Reading of KTU 1.114. *Aula Orientalis* 33(2): 221–241.

Pardee, Dennis 1991. The Structure of RS 1.002. In: A.S. Kaye (ed.), *Semitic Studies: In Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of His Eighty-fifth Birthday, November 14th, 1991*: 1181–1196. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Pardee, Dennis 1996. Marziḥu, Kispu and the Ugaritic Funerary Cult: A Minimalist View. In: N. Wyatt, W.G.E. Watson & J.B. Lloyd (eds), *Ugarit, Religion and Culture*: *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Ugarit, Religion and Culture, Edinburgh, July 1994: Essays Presented in Honour of Professor John C.L. Gibson*: 273–287. Münster: Ugarit.

Pardee, Dennis 2000. *Les textes rituels d'Ougarit.* (Ras Shamra-Ougarit XII) Paris: ERC.

Pardee, Dennis 2002. *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit.* Atlanta: SBL Press.

Pardee, Dennis 2014. L'Autorité littéraire au XIII e siècle av. J.-C.? 'Ilîmilku d'Ougarit: Scribe/Auteur? In: M. Gorea & M. Tardieu (eds), *Autorités des auteurs antiques: Entre anonymat, masque et authenticité*: 35–57. Brepols: Turnhout.

Pfälzner, Peter 2015. The Art of Qatna and the Question of the 'International Style.' In: P. Pfälzner & M. Al-Maqdissi (eds), *Qaṭna and the Networks of Bronze Age Globalism: Proceedings of an International Conference in Stuttgart and Tübingen in October 2009*: 181–218. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Pitkänen, Pekka 2020. *Migration and Colonialism in Late Second Millennium BCE Levant and its Environs: The Making of a New World*. London: Routledge.

Prechel, Doris 2008. Hethitische Rituale in Emar? In: Y. Cohen, L. d'Alfonso & D. Sürenhagen (eds), *The City of Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society*: 243–252. Münster: Ugarit.

Rutz, Matthew 2013. *Bodies of Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Diviners of Late Bronze Age Emar and Their Tablet Collection.* Leiden: Brill.

Sanmartín, Joaquín 2000. Sociedades y lenguas en el medio sirio-levantino del II milenio a.C.: Ugarit y lo hurrita. *Aula Orientalis* 17–18: 113–123.

Schaeffer, Claude F.–A. 1939. *Ugaritica: etudes relatives aux decouvertes de Ras Shamra.* Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

Schaeffer, Claude F.–A. (ed.) 1956. *Ugaritica III: Sceaux et cylindres hittites, épée gravée du cartouche de Mineptah, tablettes chypro-minoennes et autres découvertes nouvelles de Ras Shamra*. Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

Schaeffer, Claude F.–A. (ed.) 1962. *Ugaritica IV: Découvertes des XVIIIème et XIXème campagnes, 1954–1955, fondements préhistoriques d'Ugarit et nouveaux sondages, études anthropologiques, poteries grecques et monnaies islamiques de Ras Shamra et environs.* Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

Shedletsky, Lauren & Baruch A. Levine 1999. The *mšr* of the Sons and Daughters of Ugarit (KTU2 1.40). *Revue Biblique* 106(3): 321–344.

Schneider, Thomas 2001. Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic (review). *Jewish Quarterly Review* 92(1–2): 155–165.

Singer, Itamar 1999. A Political History of Ugarit. In: W.G.E. Watson & N. Wyatt (eds), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*: 603–733. Leiden: Brill.

Singer, Itamar 2011. *The Calm before the Storm: Selected Writings of Itamar Singer on the End of the Late Bronze Age in Anatolia and the Levant*. Atlanta: SBL Press.

van Soldt, Wilfred 1990. ʾAtn prln, "Attā/ēnu the Diviner". *Ugarit-Forschungen* 21: 365–368.

van Soldt, Wilfred 1991. *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit: Dating and Grammar.* Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker.

van Soldt, Wilfred 2003. The Use of Hurrian Names at Ugarit. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 35: 681–707.

van Soldt, Wilfred 2010. The Akkadian Legal Texts from Ugarit. In: S. Démare-Lafont & A. Lemaire (eds), *Trois millénaires de formulaires juridiques*: 85–124. Geneva: Librairie Droz S.A.

Sørensen, Annette Højen 2009. Approaching Levantine Shores: Aspects of Cretan Contacts with Western Asia during the MM-LM I Periods. *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens* 6: 9–55.

Tarragon, Jean-Michel de 1998. Le rituel ugaritique KTU 1.40: quelques réflexions. In: M. Dietrich, I. Kottsiepier & H. Schaudig (eds), *"Und Mose schrieb dieses Lied auf": Studien zum Alten Testament und zum alten Orient*: 727–732. Münster: Ugarit.

Tazawa, Keiko 2009. *Syro-Palestinian Deities in New Kingdom Egypt: The Hermeneutics of Their Existence.* Oxford: Archaeopress.

Tugendhaft, Aaron 2018. *Baal and the Politics of Poetry.* NY: Routledge.

Válek, František 2019. *Foreign Influences in Religion of Ancient Syria: Non-Semitic Traits in Syrian Culture in the Late Bronze Age.* Unpublished MA thesis, Charles University, Faculty of Arts, Prague.

Van de Mieroop, Marc 2007. *A History of the Ancient Near East: c.3000–323 BC.* Cornwall: Blackwell.

Veldhuis, Niek 2012. Domesticizing Babylonian Scribal Culture in Assyria: Transformation by Preservation. In: W.S. van Egmond & W. van Soldt (eds), *Theory and Practice of Knowledge Transfer: Studies in School Education in the Ancient Near East and Beyond*: 11–24. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

Vita, Juan-Pablo 1999. The Society of Ugarit. In: W.G.E. Watson & N. Wyatt (eds), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*: 455–498. Leiden: Brill.

Vita, Juan-Pablo 2009. Hurrian as a Living Language in Ugaritic Society. In: D.B. Fracaroli & G. del Olmo Lete (eds), *Reconstructing a Distant Past: Ancient Near Eastern Essays in Tribute to Jorge R. Silva Castillo*: 219–231. Barcelona: Sabadell.

Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2002. Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic (review). *Journal of Semitic Studies* 47(1): 117–119.

Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2007. *Lexical Studies in Ugaritic*. Barcelona: Editorial AUSA.

Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2010. Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon (8). *Ugarit-Forschungen* 42: 831–846.

Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2016. Ugaritic Onomastics (9). *Aula Orientalis* 34(2): 335–358.

Wyatt, Nicolas 2002. *Religious Texts from Ugarit: The Words of Ilimilku and His Colleagues*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Yon, Marguerite (ed.) 1991. *Arts et industries de la pierre*. (Ras Shamra-Ougarit VI) Paris: ERC.

Yon, Marguerite 1996. The Temple of the Rhytons at Ugarit. In: N. Wyatt, W. Watson & J. Lloyd (eds), *Ugarit, Religion and Culture: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Ugarit, Religion and Culture, Edinburgh, July 1994: Essays Presented in Honour of Professor John C.L. Gibson*: 405–422. Münster: Ugarit.

Yon, Marguerite 2006. *The City of Ugarit at Tell Ras Shamra*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Zivie-Coche, Christiane 2011. Foreign Deities in Egypt. *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology* 1(1). <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7tr1814c>.