congregation was still in camp before the division of the country, they were hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation, but after the country was divided and the Israelites lived in their towns and on their own land, they remained hewers of wood and drawers of water for the House of God.” Kimhi expands the final expression to include Gilgal, Shiloh, Nob, Gibeon and Jerusalem. This agrees with the traditional assumption that the Gibeonites are the later metinim and “the place which he should choose” means the House of God in Jerusalem. However, if the Gibeonites became hewers of wood etc. after the division of the country, the “House of the Lord” meant by the Biblical text is certainly that of Shiloh. When the nation united in war was about to break up into separate tribes, each going to his own territory, it was natural to transfer the obligations of the Gibeonites from the congregation to the central sanctuary of the whole people.

This view seems to be nearly correct. Immediately after they had rested from the wars of conquest and had possessed themselves of the land, they established the Tabernacle at Shiloh (Cf. Jerem. 7:12).

In the Talmud (Mishna Zebahim XIV, 8; ibid. Tosefta XIII, 20; Gemara Babli 119 a-b) there is difference of opinion about the meaning of the sentence in Deut. 12:9—"For ye have not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance." According to one interpretation, "the rest" alludes to Shiloh. In contrast to this, R. Simeon maintains that "both of them refer to Jerusalem," whereas R. Ishmael, "the interpreter of the plain meaning of the text," holds that "both of them (both "the rest" and "the inheritance") refer to Shiloh." The earliest history of Canaanite shipping is very nebulous. Mainland objects were found in chalcolithic levels of Cyprus. Yet, because no proper documentation occurs on Syrian soil, we have no way of discussing the actual means by which the coastal region traded with other lands; that is whether ships or floats were used, whether they belonged to Cypriots, Syrians or Egyptians.
Purely conjectural is Schaeffer's supposition that a port such as Ugarit was used by Sargon and his grandson Naram-Sin in their conquests of lands 'beyond the Upper Sea'.2 Snefru's inscription on the Palermo Stone which mentions the "bringing of forty ships of 's wood"3 and Sahure's depiction of Kbn ships may indicate Syrian involvement with sea trade.4 It is only when we come down to the second millennium, and to the Late Bronze Age in particular, that positive evidence of Canaanite supremacy on water is made available.

From Byblos two models of ships were unearthed by Dunand in a Middle Bronze context.5 They were studied by Février. The first is a boat with a flat bottom where a cabin, rectangular in shape, was placed midship. Assuming that the cabin was large enough to permit one to stand within it, this boat would have been eight to ten meters long and four to six meters wide. Février notes that this was certainly not a fluvial vessel in view of the fact that the cabin would have been placed on the deck, in the manner of Egyptian Nile barges, to permit one to contemplate the scenery. He concludes: "Cette grande largeur, la


2 Urk. I:236.

4 Concerning the 'Kbn' ships, a large literature has accumulated. See among others: Torgny Saee-Soederbergh's The Navy of the Eighteenth Dynasty, Upsala (1946) p. 48ff.; Raymond O. Faulkner, "Egyptian Seagoing Ships," JEA 26 (1940) pp. 3-9; Percy E. Newberry, "Notes on Seagoing Ships," JEA 28 (1942) pp. 64-66. I share the view of R. W. Hutchinson, Prehistoric Crete, Penguin Books (1962) p. 93: "... if we consider the lack of timber suitable for ships in Egypt and its abundance on the Lebanon coast and the later shipbuilding traditions of the Phoenicians, we may perhaps go so far as to suggest that 'Byblos ship' meant the type of ship built at Byblos, without of course excluding the possibilities of Egyptians also building such ships either at Byblos or in Egypt." I would confine, however, construction in Egypt to Memphis, in particular at Prwj (see below).

It is also just possible that Sahure's vessels may not have been Egyptian at all. Montet, in "Le Roi Sahure et la princesse lointaine," Mélanges Dussaud (1939) p. 195 suggests that these ships brought to Egypt a Syrian embassy whose role was to deliver a Semitic princess to Pharaoh.

6 Maurice Dunand, Fossiles de Byblos, 1937-54, Plates CXL, No. 6851 and p. 434; No. 3306 and p. 244.

hauteur de son franc-bord, l'absence de toute superstructure semblent indiquer [sic] que c'était un petit, mais robuste bateau de mer.7 The second model is that of a ship which was also known to Cyprus, for there a similar one was found.7 Février concludes that this type seems to have been the model of a sailing ship, large of hull and very strongly built.8 Indeed, ships such as the ones described above might very easily have been used by Syrians who travelled to Kaptaru, Crete, in search of the various objects destined for Zimri-Lim's court at Mari.9 Even more important, the same type of vessels were probably used to transport a good portion of a population from one continent to another, early in the second millennium before Christ.

The Torque-Bearers were members of a race, probably non-Semitic, of adroit metal workers. In various places in the Near East, they left traces which in effect became their calling cards: large togglepins, spiral wires, heavy bronze or silver waist (neck?) bands, triangular daggers with crescent-shaped hilts, spears with sockets and flat axes with blades pierced by large windows.10 Apparently, in the early second millennium, some of them decided to pack up and leave, perhaps desiring to emigrate to regions where natural bronze, a metal which had become their specialty, was more plentiful than in their Near Eastern habitat.

"Les deux grandes régions où l'on a trouvé les sépultures et les dépôts des porteurs de torques, Hongrie, Bohême et Syrie (Byblos et Ras Shamra), sont séparées d'une part par la Méditerranée orientale, où leur traversée n'a pu laisser de trace, de l'autre par le pont de terre formé par l'Asie Mineure occidentale et les Balkans. Or, à en juger selon l'état des recherches, nos porteurs de torques ne semblent pas avoir emprunté la route de terre, car, à l'exception de quelques épingles à cols


8 Février, loc. cit., pp. 135-138; fig. 2, 3.


10 Such implements have been found in Syria, Egypt, Palestine, Asia Minor and Mesopotamia in appreciable quantities (Ugaritica II, pp. 106ff.). Strangely enough, they are quite rare in Cyprus (Ugaritica IV, pp. 226-7, 237).
percés, trouvées à Troie, rien ne signale leur présence dans ces vastes pays; l’absence du torque caractéristique, y est particulièrement significative. Force est donc d’admettre que les porteurs de torques de Syrie, prospecteurs et artisans du metal, on pris la mer.”

It is when we come to the Late Bronze Age that, unmistakably, we meet with definite proofs of a Canaanite ‘thalassocracy.’ By then written documents become numerous. But first a quick look at the Egyptian depictions of Semitic ships.3

Some have argued that Syrian ships were not seaworthy; but the fact that they were represented on Egyptian soil belies such a contention. We have yet to see Cretan and Egyptian vessels represented on foreign territories, yet those who champion their cause do not hesitate to proclaim their great maritime abilities.4 Février, Nougayrol and now


3 Egyptian tombs on the walls of which Syrians were painted are not too plentiful: 1) The tomb of Seni (No. 17), a badly preserved representation of which is to be found in MVAG (1904); 2) Photographs of the tomb of Х-м-б3т are in Wressinski’s Atlas I p. 199, and 3) the scenes in Ken-Amon’s tomb at Dra‘-aboul-Neggah are well reconstructed in JEA 33 (1947) p. 40ff.

4 Without going extensively into the matter, it would be very difficult to disprove the widely held contention that Egyptian, Minoan and, later, Mycenaean sea-power were dominant in the Late Bronze Age. On Egyptian shipping, let it be pointed out that, with the debatable exception of the Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage, the usually loquacious Pharaonic sources nerver mention a Mediterranean journey to foreign sea ports. The recent exciting discovery made by K. A. Kitchen of Aegean place names (Knossos, Amnisos, Lykto to which one should also add Cythera) on a late Egyptian topographical list, does not alter the value of this statement. See “Theban Topographical Lists, Old and New,” Orientalia N.S. 34 (1965) pp. 1ff. During the New Kingdom, Thutmoses III and his successors seem to have appropriated the Canaanite fleet for their own use. It is also pertinent to point out that Pre-nfr, a Memphite district where boat-building was undertaken, was undoubtedly a Semitic enclave. There, Semitic gods were worshiped. Černý, using material gathered by Grdseloff, emphasizes that the Semitic, mostly Phoenician, elements saturated the area. Cf. Caminos, Late Egyptian Miscellanies, Oxford (1954) p. 337. See also W. Helek’s Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr., Wiesbaden (1962) pp. 544–545. [See now also Kitchin, “Aegean Place Names in the List of Amenophis III,” BASOR 181 (Feb. 1966) pp. 23–24.]
his conclusions, on the whole, are quite in agree-
ment with this author's point of view. He remarks
that the Canaanite ship was smaller in length and
more stocky than the one of Hatshepsut, giving
one the impression that it was more massive, more
stable and more powerfully built. The ship had
high stem and stern-posts, thus preventing waves
from spilling into the boat. This protection was
increased by the use of a mobile fence made of
vertical planks. The mast, massively sitting in the
center of the keel, does not seem to have
been strengthened by cables, a feature which was
regularly found on Cretan and Egyptian ships.
Because of their absence, Février speculated that “les
marins phéniciens ne se contentaient pas de navi-
guer avec le vent arrière, et qu’ils étaient capable
d’utiliser dans une certaine mesure le vent de
côté.” This rather bold conclusion, if ever it is
proven to be true, would explain why Canaanite

 ships were never depicted with oars or rowers. The
sails used on such ships were enormous. In pro-
portion to the length of the boat they were twice
as large as those found on Egyptian vessels and
were probably relied on very heavily. The absence
of a thick cord which, on Egyptian vessels, was
used to attach the prow to the stern, thus prevent-
ing the break-up of a ship when it hit the crest of
a wave, testifies to the solidity of Syrian merchant-
men. From the crude depiction of such ships on
Egyptian tombs we also get the impression that
they possessed a deck on which sailors circulated.
Février concludes: “Voilà donc un vrai navire de
haute mer.”

A possible Syrian sea-going vessel has been lying
at the bottom of the Mediterranean ever since it
sank sometime in the thirteenth century B.C.
Smaller in size (eight to nine meters long) and less
heavy in tonnage (one ton capacity) than the us-
ual Canaanite ship, its cargo consisted of copper
ingots in the familiar ox-hide shape. An oil lamp,
the captain’s seal, scarabs, as well as the wood used
for boards were of Syrian origin. Apparently the
ship was on its way to the Aegean from the island
of Cyprus to deliver its cargo of precious copper
when storm and treacherous currents led to its
sinking.

Criticism of Février’s reconstruction is to be
found in Sæve-Soederbergh’s Navy... a crit-
icism to which Faulkner subscribes. They both
regard the Canaanite ships essentially as copies
of Egyptian models. According to Faulkner, the
great and obvious difference in the art of ship-
designing stems from “artistic license . . . , igno-
rance or carelessness of the artist . . . , inaccurate
draughtsmanship . . . , drawing [that is] demon-
strably inaccurate . . . , distorted . . . proportions
[etc.].” It would have been much simpler to

—-
realize that, apart from the fact the Egyptian and Syrian ships shared a basic shape, everything about their construction and rigging was markedly dissimilar. Indeed, one has only to take a look at representations of Hatshepsut's ships and those of Canaan painted on the walls of Ken-Amon's tomb to realize that completely different traditions were fostered in ship-building. They arose, no doubt, because one civilization was river-oriented while the other one was sea-directed.

At the time of writing his Navy... Soederbergh had very few documents from Syria proper that would have given him the correct perspective with which to evaluate Canaanite sea trade. In addition to the two published administrative texts from Ugarit, he relied mainly on the Amarna letters. His interpretation of the latter texts depended on the assumption that a good portion of the trade and defense of the sea was borne by the Egyptian navy, an assumption that is surely correct if one accepts the fact that the navy of the Two-Lands was composed of either requisitioned or captured Syrian ships. While serving the kings of the XVIIIth dynasty, Canaanite sailors took advantage of their position within the Egyptian fleet to harass and to plunder other cities which were still loyal to Pharaoh. On one such instance Rib-Addi of Byblos complains: "Further, whose are the ships that stand against me? [Do they] not [belong] to the people of Arwad? And they are even now with thee? Seize the ships of the people of Arwad which are in Egypt" (EA:101:11-18). During war times, this mercenary fleet was used to supply cities that were either under siege and in need of victuals or to transport troops to areas badly in need of reinforcements. As we shall see later, the Ugaritic fleet was used for much the same purpose.

The mound of Ras-Shamra has been yielding, year after year, precious texts which have revolutionized our knowledge of Canaan and its inhabitants. Recently, a good number of alphabetical texts have been published in a volume, the con-

---

20 Concerning Soederbergh's statement: "I would, however, rather stress the fact that the sea hardly plays any role in the religious texts from Ugarit," op. cit., p. 59, see now Otto Kaiser's Die Mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Aegypten, Ugarit und Israel, Berlin (1962), Chap. II.

21 On the seizure and use of Canaanite ships by Thutmoses III, two passages are of special importance. During the fifth campaign in Asia which occurred in his twenty-ninth year, the great Pharaoh marched to Wrt.t and destroyed it. He then proceeded to sack this city, capture a number of its ships which he filled with the spoils of victory, and then sail southward to Egypt (BAR:II §456-460). We consider Soederbergh's objections to be postulatory and his interpretation of the passage to be doubtful, perhaps even forced (op. cit., pp. 34-6). It is only after the capture of this fleet that Thutmoses was able to break the power of ports such as Arwada and Ullaza.

Another text refers to the inspection of Syrian harbors during Thutmoses' thirteenth campaign (year 38). There, mention is made of Kftlw, Kbn, and skt ships in connection with 'ś wood. Because they seemed to have been built with Syrian trees, Breasted interpreted this document to mean that the ships formed part of the Canaanite tribute (BAR:II §492). Soederbergh translates differently and understands that these ships were laden with, and not made of, such timber (op. cit., pp. 43-45). The point is moot; different renderings can be tolerated by this inscription, but this does not mean that the latter scholar is necessarily right. Indeed, to find vessels of foreign derivations, filled with Syrian objects, in a Syrian port at a time when Egypt ruled the East, makes it quite suggestive that the Two-Lands depended on Canaan for its naval needs. See also the criticism of P. Montet in his "Notes et documents...," Kemi, 13 (1954) 64-70. To keep the number of its boats constant, Egypt imposed upon the Syrian states a tribute which required the delivery of ships. Amarna letters No. 160 and 161 reveal that Aziru of Amurru found it prudent to furnish his overlord with his quota. It is not surprising, then, to note that as soon as Canaan broke away from Egypt, we hear next to nothing of Pharaonic sea-power. The ships used by Raamses III in his sea battle with the 'Peoples of the Sea' were designed in a manner suspiciously similar to those employed by his opponents. Thus it may not be impossible to conjecture that, as they descended from the North, these hordes of invaders captured the fleets of destroyed Canaanite cities only to be opposed by an Egyptian force composed of Syrian mercenaries (see R. LeB. Bowen, Jr., Mariner's Mirror 48 [1962] pp. 52-57). It is possible now to reconstruct that the 'Peoples of the Sea' succeeded in capturing Cypriot ships with which they attacked Ugarit (see below).

22 With the reservations of the last remarks in the preceding note, Soederbergh's treatment of the Amarna age naval power of Egypt is still very sound. But Thomas O. Lambdin's paper on "The MISHI-People of the Byblian Amarna Letters" in JCS 7 (1953) pp. 75-77 should also be consulted.
tent of which teaches us much about the sea trade of one coastal city. Together with earlier publications, P(alais) R(oyal) d’U(garit) V, enables us now to speculate on what one may call the ‘Canaanite Thalassocracy.’

While in the Akkadian language a large variety of boat appellations are known, most of which derive ultimately from Sumerian, the Ugaritic dialect of West Semitic has so far yielded only a few terms which can be identified with ships.23 Ugarit knew of three terms, br, tkt, and any.24 The first two, br and tkt, are also known from Egyptian sources as J = “I - and pb For the term br, Alt suggests a Creto-Aegean derivation, for he does not think it to be Semitic.25 Helck compares it with Akkadian bd ‘iru, ‘fisherman’, hence ba’artu, some sort of fishing vessel later known from Herodotus’ book on Egypt as 1apis (II:96).26 In the Mediterranean world, however, the br seems to have been differently employed. Such a ship was used to supply Tyre with water (Pap. Anastasi I:21, 2), to import provision and to guard against the Peoples of the Sea.27 To ship wood from Lebanon, Wen-Amon hired Syrian vessels from the prince of Byblos (Wen-Amon 1:55, 2:72, also 2:7, 15, 18).28 From Ugarit we learn that a br was employed as a warship (UT:319). In UT:2057, the term was given a Semitic plural in m, and was differentiated from any. UT:319 mentions 4 tkt which, together with 12 br, completed the list of anyt mihdt, ‘ships that were seized.’

The problem of the term tkt is complicated.

23 One of the finds from Ras-Shamra was a Sumero-Akkadian vocabulary of ships, most of which were designations of river boats (F. Thureau-Dangin, Syria 12 [1931] vocabulary No. 5). A good scholar, the Ugaritic scribe would have copied and studied such texts which probably were of little practical value in their application to Canaanite daily life.


26 Helck, op. cit., p. 557, No. 56.

27 These br may have been the same type of ships that were depicted at Medinet-Habu; earlier, in note 21, we speculated upon their Semitic derivation.

28 While at Byblos, a flotilla of 11 br belonging to the Skr came after the unfortunate ambassador; he barely escaped being captured (Wen-Amon 2,63).

Saeve-Soedbergh has collected most of the material connected with this type of ship.29 He associates the word with Eg. skti, ‘to destroy’; thus tkt, Eg. skt, would have been a ‘trooper.’ Akkadian lexical texts, however, allow us to suggest a possible etymology. IJAR:ra:hubullu IV:347 (MSL V) lists GIS.MA.SIG.GA as equal to eleppu si-tq/k-tum. In his Die Wasserfahrzeuge in Babyloniens (1939, p.45), Armas Salonen proposes that the term designates a small, light ship. This agrees well with its West-Semitic counterpart. A Neo-Assyrian ritual text (BBR:75–8) notes that the mountains of Syria abounded with a tree known as ši-qit/kit-ti, the wood of which may have been used to construct such ships. XVIIIth Dynasty mention of skt vessels occurs only in the two passages discussed above (see note 21). From a later time, we learn that such ships were built at Prwnfr of imported ši and native šiti wood (Anast. IV:7–9, Wb. Bel. IV:315. P. Harris I:12b,11). Thus, there is a good chance that their names were Semitic in origin. At Ugarit, tkt seems to have designated a boat of small dimensions. UT:2085 contains a long list of Ugaritians who either possessed such boats or were hired to manage them.

Also of possible Canaanite origin is the type of ship known to the Egyptians as mnšt. The hieroglyphic determinative for such a vessel is strikingly similar to the design of Syrian ships depicted in Ken-Amon’s tomb.30 The rich epigraphical records from Western Asia have not yet provided us with a Semitic equivalent,31 but consideration of the ship’s history makes its Syrian derivation very plausible. The Berlin Wb. (II:89,7-10) knows of several mentions of this type of vessel. Only once is Nile travel meant, while eleven times mnšt is recorded as floating on the ‘Great Green.’ Langing 4, 10 and Anast. IV:3, 10 deal with mnšt ships.

30 One can suggest a term such as *munāššu, a D-stem participial formation from the root naššu, ‘to raise, be high,’ which may have referred to the firmly held mast in the center of the ship. Note, for example, the scaraboid seal from Ugarit on which is depicted a stylized figure of a ship with an obviously firm center-structure, Ugaritica IV, p. 134, fig. 114, and p. 147.
trading with Dijahy, North and Central Syria, and Khor, Palestine. One such a boat was captained by a certain P3 b3r, 'The Palestinian' (Pap. Turin B Vs.1, 7), another had a person by the name of 'I3y at its helm (JNES X, 1951, 94). A flotilla of twenty mnš is known to have belonged to Zakar-Ba'al, prince of Byblos, one which was in commercial relations with Smendes of Egypt. Another one of fifty br traded with Sidon (Wen-Amon:1, 58). Used in shipping corn (D. el. Medinah ostr., 1044), mnš is equated, in a duplicate papyrus (Lansing 8, 9), with kr, a type of ship whose Semitic provenance has been strongly suggested.

By far the most common word used in Ugaritic to denote a seagoing vessel is the term any. The alphabetical texts differentiate among a variety of such ships. One which carried soldiers on board (sбу any, 'soldiers, or team, of a ship') was possibly a warship (UT:83). Any kn, a 'stable ship', seems to be the designation of a cargo vessel (UT: 2059). Such merchantmen were quite large, even as early as the XIIth century B.C. РŠ 20:212 is a letter from the Hittite king to that of Ugarit, requesting him to furnish one ship in order to supply a Cilician city, Ura, with grain. This was to have been exported from the fertile regions of Mukis in Northern Syria. The letter insists that the 2,000 kors of grain can be shipped in one trip; at most two shuttles would be required. Nougayrol, the publisher of the text, estimates that this amount of grain would have formed a total cargo of about 450 metric tons. He concludes: “The author of the letter thus admitted that the king of Ugarit disposed, or could dispose of ships capable of carrying about 500 tons, or perhaps even more, if one takes into account the containers. This very high figure is not improbable according to the information which we have of the Egyptian fleet of that time, or on the later Phoenician and Greco-Roman fleets.”

Reminding us that Columbus’ largest ship, the Santa Maria, was only 233 tons— even half as big—certainly could even cross the Atlantic, not only the short sea-distances on the route: Ugarit - Cyprus - Southwest Asia Minor - Crete. It should be remembered, however, that to the ancient sailors, heavy cargo capacities did not mean equal sailing possibilities. Much depended on the design and construction of the sea vessel. Whereas Hatshepsut’s huge, obelisk-carrying ships would have split asunder in the Mediterranean, the well built Canaanite merchantmen, as is amply documented, criss-crossed these same waters.

As was the practice of ancient peoples, ships that traded with foreign lands were often named after either the place of destination or that of origin. Thus we have the Egyptian kbn and kftiw, ‘Byblos and Crete,’ ships; the Sumero-Akkadian Dilmun, Magan and Meluḫḫa ships; and at Ugarit, it is possible to restore an any al[tu], a ‘Cyprus’ ship (UT:2056:1). Cyprus, a country whose population was possibly composed of North Syrian elements, is known to have possessed a fleet as early as the Amarna age (EA:36:12).

The trade of Ugarit, far-flung and most prosperous, was for the greater part handled by the king. Among the various workers of the palace we meet a special group called hrš anyt, ‘builders of ships’ (UT:170:1). To them fell the task of constructing and equipping a huge naval fleet, each individual ship of which was capable of conveying livestock from one corner of the Mediterranean to the other: “Fine horses from Hatti, cows from Alasia, horse teams from Sangar” (Anast. IV:17, 8-9). That they were shipped to Egypt on Canaanite vessels is deduced from a fine tomb painting which depicts cows being led out from such boats by bearded Semites. Often, however, a coastal city such as Ugarit would increase the size of her fleet by purchasing ships from a neighbor. UT:

32 Helck, op. cit., p. 571.
34 Astour, Hellenosemitica, p. 348.
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2106,

10. ḫmā. mat.arb’m
   kbd.ksp.anyt
   d.’rb.b.anyt
15. lqh.mlk.gbl
   lbā.s. anyth
   b’rm.ksp
   mḥr.hn

540 heavy (shekels) of silver for the ships which came out of (lit. entered from) the fleet of the king of Byblos and 50 [shekels] of silver, (in addition) the king of Byblos took (for) the cargo (sails? lit. clothing) of his ships (brought) from ‘Arm. The silver is their price.

As was amply recorded in the Amarna tablets, the Canaanite fleet was used to supply the coastal cities with food, water, and troops (see above, note 21). The Ugaritic documents reveal similar endeavors, but often on a larger scale. In time of war, especially in the late thirteenth and early twelfth centuries, full use of the fleet was called upon in a vain but valiant effort to stem the tide of the invading Peoples of the Sea. In RS 20.238, a tablet which will be published in Nougayrol’s forthcoming Ugaritica V, we read of ‘Ammurapi’s answer to the king of Alasia, the ‘Shield of Ugarit’:

“Mon père ne sait-il pas que toutes mes troupes ... se trouvent en pays hittite, et tous mes bateaux sont aux pays lycaïen?” While Ugarit was thus unprotected, seven enemy ships managed to inflict damage on the city. These warships may well have come from Alagia. Although a vassal of the Hittites and especially close to Ugarit — the king of Alasia calls ‘Ammurapi ‘my son’ to which the latter responds with ‘my father’ — the island of Cyprus seems to have been infested with supporters of the enemy. Ešuwara, a high functionary at Alasia, confirms the suspicions of the Ugaritic monarch by revealing to him that some traitors handed over a flotilla to the enemy (RS 20.18). Indeed, such a renegade fleet fought three times against the Hittite king, Suppiluliumas (Suppiluliumas II). Probably forming the bulk of his navy, the Canaanite fleet was victorious each time.87

This fleet, of which that of Ugarit was only a segment, must have attained large proportions. One alphabetic tablet, found in an oven where it had been baking, contains a request from a certain Ydn, a vassal of the king of Ugarit. “ṭšknn ḫmṣm.lm[ī]t.any”, “equip a hundred and fifty ships,” he proposes to the king (UT:2062:4–5). If, as it seems likely, this armada was only to reinforce the already existing navy, then the Ugaritic sea power must have reached dimensions that were unequalled until some seven hundred years later.40

With such a mighty instrument of communication, Ugarit was called upon on various occasions to supply with grain the lands that were struck by famine. Earlier, we had a chance to mention the role of the city in shipping grain from Mukiš to Ura. “It is a matter of life or death,” the Hittite king had added (RS 20.212). At about the same time, Egyptian records reveal that a similar request for grain was sent to Merneptah.41 It is quite conceivable that the supply was loaded on Canaanite vessels. UT: 2060 discloses another instance in which Hatti was grateful to its vassal. The ‘Sun’ to ‘Ammurapi:

17. w.lḥt. akl.ky
   likt.’m.Špš
   b’lk.ky. akl
   b’hwtk.inn
   śpān

And the shipment of food, when you sent it to the Sun, your lord, although there was no food in your realm (UT: §19.850), Our Sun[ 37 From the point of view of syntax, this tablet is most difficult. Virolleaud translates lines 10–13 thus: “Cinq cents quarante (sicles) lourd(s) d’argent, (prix du ?) navire qu’on a donné en gage pour le navire (appartenant) au roi de Gebal [Byblos]” PRU, (V p. 129). The formula d.’rb.b has the meaning ‘donner en gage’ in UT:2046, 2079, but makes little sense in this tablet. The city of ‘Arm is well known at Ugarit - UT: §19:1921. 38 For a preliminary survey of the events that transpired just before the final holocaust which claimed at least a dozen cities, see M. C. Astour, “New Evidence on the Last Days of Ugarit,” AJA 69 (1965) pp. 253–8. See also Nougayrol, Iraq 25 (1963) pp. 110–123. 39 Heinrich Otten, ‘Neue Quellen zum Ausklang des Hethitischen Reiches,” MDOG 94 (1963) pp. 1–23. 40 Astour, AJA 69, p. 236 points out that the kingdom of Mycenae could furnish no more than a hundred ships to the Achean coalition (Iliad II:576). Samos of the sixth century boasted of 150 ships, a navy which was so powerful that the tyrant Polycrates was able to roam and plunder at will (Herod. III:39). 41 BAR III: §580. 42 The word lḥt, properly a ‘tablet’ is here translated ‘shipment’ because of context: when received in Alasia, it was enough to cause abundance and plenty (UT:2061). Astour, loc. cit., p. 255, points to a usage at Mari where ša l bilat kaspim tup-pa-am is explained as an order to

...
Similar requests came from Alasia. Pgn, who can be identified as the king of that island by the manner in which he addresses 'his son,' the king of Ugarit, writes (UT:2061):

> ky.lik.bny Since my son sent
> lht.lik.‘my a shipment of food, with me
> midy w gbny there is plenty and abundance.43
> w. bny.hnkt And my son, in the same manner,
> yškn anyt let him equip sea
> ym.yšr vessels and dispatch?? (them?);
> 10. 15. w.ak[. . . and food . .

In addition to grain, other commodities were requested. RŠ 20.168, an Akkadian tablet to be published in Ug. V, informs us that oil was shipped to the king of Alasia by Niqmad, probably Niqmad III, king of Ugarit.

The activity of the fleet in time of peace was no less important than in time of war. With the exception of UT:2084 which suggests that small-sized ḫkt boats were possibly privately owned, our evidence strongly supports the contention that, at Ugarit, the greatest portion of maritime trading enterprises lay in the hands of the king. This economic situation can be contrasted with that found in the Roman Empire, where state and imperial enterprises were sharply distinguished. A small fragment of a tablet (UT:2057) speaks of “anyt. mlk . . . w.[][ll] brm”, “the ships of the king . . . and three br”. Another one contains a fragmentary message; what can be made out seems to imply royal involvement with merchants and ships. UT: 2008:

Rev. k[. . .
‘šrm[. . .
'yst.tb[. . .
qrt.mlk[. . .
5. w.‘l.ap.s[. . .
bhm.w.rgm.hw.al[. . .
> atn.ksp.lhm.’d I will give silver to them until
> ilak.’m.mlk I will send to the king.”

With four ports to handle the sea trade,45 the royal undertakings were very profitable and very widespread. This last remark is well illustrated by an unpublished tablet where the route to the west contained the following ‘escales’: Alasia, Ura, Lycia and Kaphtor.46 To conduct such operations, the king had a large number of prominent businessmen — tamkār‘u ša mandattị ša šar Ugarit, ‘tributary merchants to the king of Ugarit’ (RŠ 17.146) — working under his aegis. These traders were so well integrated in the royal machinery that various documents such as UT:1028–1031 group them with ‘maryannu,’ guards of the palace, butlers, and other functionaries, mostly military, of the kingdom. In addition to being his personal ambassadors at foreign courts, the merchants were responsible for purchasing, selling and shipping commodities to and from Ugarit. With special treaties contracted among the various powers protecting their lives and rights,47 Canaanite traders were widely dispersed throughout the Mediterranean world. Wherever possible, but usually within the kingdom such as at Tell-Soukas, a gar-

41 Astour, loc. cit., p. 254 note 3. Atallig, Gib‘ala and the island of Ḥimulli (Pigeon Island), in addition to Ugarit, are known to have handled the sea trade of the area.

42 Nougayrol, loc. cit., p. 163.

43 RŠ:17.46; 17.230 and 18.115 are treaties between Ugarit and Carchemish. RŠ:17.130 was contracted with Ugarit by the Hittite king in behalf of the merchants of Ura.
The house of Ewr-kl was established at Beirut. From the local population, this Ugaritian was able to purchase an entire family with which he staffed his office. The house of Ewr-kl was established at Beirut. From the local population, this Ugaritian was able to purchase an entire family with which he staffed his office.

Beirut was then a city renowned for its metal working (UT:2101). From Alasia large quantities of copper were brought into the port of Atallig (UT:2056:1–4), then directed to the foundries of Beirut. In one instance a small quantity of brr, ‘iron,’ was sent along.

Lists of personnel stationed in Arwad, Tyre, Askalon, Acca and Uşnatu were reported by Schaeffer. At gattusas, deep in the heart of Anatolia, a bit-tuppasi was established by Ugarit; it functioned in the same manner as today’s banks (RS 17.59). It is not impossible that the kings of Ugarit had representatives in Mycenae, Pylas, Thebes, and the larger cities of Crete. Linear A and B documents record names that greatly resemble those that were current in Northern Syria of the same epoch. As it is, we now know of one Ugaritian who apparently had sole rights to trade with the Aegean. Sinaranu, the son of Siginnu, was in many ways an exceptional merchant. Highly favored by both Niqmepa and ‘Ammistamru, he was able to amass great fortunes. To these were added various privileges such as the right not to quarter the Ḥapiru and the Ubru mercenaries and to be exempted from the taxing ambassadorial duties (RŠ 15.109). He was also given a franchise to trade with KUR.

DUGUD-ri, read by Nougayrol as māt-Kapturi, the land of Crete. On his return, his ship was to bypass the inspectors, for it was acknowledged that Sinaranu “on behalf of the king ... will toil” (ana mūḥi šarri ... ētannaḥ RŠ 16.238:15–16).

There is no doubt that in the capital cities of other lands, Egypt, Alasia, Babylonia and Assyria, Canaanite merchants were stationed. In turn these lands were well represented at Ugarit. These gr ḥmyt ugrt, ‘aliens within the walls of Ugarit’ (UT:2:27–28), were well cared and even prayed for. Egyptians were given wine and oil (UT:1084, 1089, 2095). One of them, for the high price of 150 shekels of gold, was able to purchase a fief (RŠ 16.260). Cypriots were also highly regarded and well treated; wine and oil were handed to them (UT:1090, 2095). The island’s chief representative at Ugarit, Abrm, is known to have had a ship at his disposal (UT:2095, 2123). The Hittite agents were abundantly provided with food (UT:1090, 1091). A highly placed Hittite official, the number of seal cylinders of both Babylonian and Syrian designs. That they were found at Thebes where Greek legends persisted in recognizing the Phoenicians as founders, strongly suggests that this city was a commercial depot for the Canaanites. At the least, one has to recognize that the Theban kings were strongly interested in Eastern culture. Judging from the state of some unfinished seals, the local artist, perhaps an ambulating Semite, was hard at work imitating them. See, among others, the London Times, July 17, 1904, p. 13; E. Vanderpool, AJA 68 (1964) p. 293; E. Porada, AJA 69 (1965) p. 173; M. Astour, Hellenosemitica, p. 387.

A treasury room at the royal palace of Cadmos’ Thebes, dating to the XIVth century, produced a rich collection of tablets, some of which are inscribed in Linear B.
Huburtanuri of Carchemish, did not hesitate to do a little 'moonlighting,' possibly to keep up with the high cost of living; R Ś 16.108 records that he sold a horse to the king of Ugarit. Smaller cities and kingdoms were also well represented. The kingdom of Tarbudashšu sent its merchant, Ar-Simiga, to Ugarit (RŚ 17.158). Under the auspices of the Hittite monarch, the city of Ura became recognized as a commercial power (RŚ 17.316, 130, 18.03).65

Was shipping, a very profitable enterprise, undertaken by private individuals? The reputation of the later Phoenicians as fierce merchants leads one to believe that a certain amount of trade was held in capitalistic hands. Although we possess enough evidence on the role of the Canaanite commoner in manufacturing and in overland trade (RŚ 17.59, 383), the Ugaritic tablets do not reveal anything substantial concerning their maritime trading ventures.66 Further discoveries in the residential area may prove our thesis to have been wholly one-sided, even quite wrong. As of now only two tablets from the whole archive offer us the possibility that private endeavors existed. UT:2006:

b.ym.hdt On the day of the New Moon,
b.yrb.pgrm in the month of Pgrm,67 lqrwprzp Iwrpzn, argdd Argdd, 5. [ ]kn [ ]kn, [w]brk [and] Brk bought ntb t a ntb m b.mitm for two hundred 'arm and twenty 10. kbd.hrß heavy [shekels] of gold


65 Aballa and Talimmu, both foreign merchants operating at Ugarit, speak of ‘their merchants’ (RŚ: 17.145, 17.229). It is impossible, however, to determine whether they had any sea connections with the rest of the Mediterranean world or whether they were limited to trade on the mainland only.

66 A speculatory note on the month of Pgrm (the syllabic form Pagri, occurring in Alalah, is now assured by RŚ 25.455b where there is mention of arāḫ Pagrima, CRAI [1964] 133) may be in order here. As was suggested by Virolleaud (UT: §19:2006), the term pgrm brings to mind Hebrew pgr, ‘corpse.’ Thus Pgrm possibly denoted a month in which funerary sacrifices took place. It is also possible to think of it as designating one in which the gods, either for cultic or for practical reasons—they may have been in a deteriorated state—were buried. Compare Gen 35:5 where Jacob buried the idols of Laban See also the newly found Punic inscription from Pyrgi (G. Garbini, “Considerazioni sull’inscrizione Punica de Pyrgi,” Or. Ant. IV [1965] 35-52). There, an Etruscan king speaks of byrh krr bym qbr ‘lm, “In the month of Krr, in the day of the gods’ entombment.”

66 ntb t must be here taken as a place name. The į at the end of this good Semitic word, if it is not a scribal error, cannot be a Hurrian ending. Dr. Astour, with whom I discussed this problem, connects this particle with the Akkadian adverbial ending -iš. Two things should be noted however: 1) This suffix -iš had a dative meaning in Old Akkadian (I. Gelb, Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar, Chicago [1961] p. 142). Thus nibt t may have been a word which evolved into a place name through constant repetition of ‘to the concession, to the trading post.’ Compare the derivation of the name Istanbul. 2) The Hurrian suffix -ši/i, expressing the idea of belonging, pertaining was always represented by ǧ in the alphabetic script of Ugarit; hence our cate-
Another transaction, worded in a manner similar to UT:2006-2007, confirms our interpretation. UT:1156 records that on the New Moon of the month of Pyrm, B'lmdr and Bnblp purchased a mihd for 400 shekels of gold. In UT:115, the same partners are joined by a third merchant to buy another mihd for the same amount of money. To have cost so much, a mihd must have been a substantial piece of real estate. In Akkadian, the word ihza, phonetically equivalent to Ugaritic Ihd, connotes the mounting of gold upon an object of lesser value (CAD I:47). One can conjecture that a mihd was a place, in this case a concession, where the precious metal was worked for private profit. In a manner similar to that of ntbt, mihd became known as a place-name under the forms of Mihd and Mahd (UT: 1059, 1090, 1134, 2016, 2017; note also syllabic Ma-a-ha-di PRU III, p.266. It is likely that we are here dealing with more than one locality bearing the same name).

The second millennium before Christ seems to have been a period when a veritable epidemic of run-away wives plagued the various civilizations. Powerful, sea-oriented kingdoms relied on their navies to retrieve the errant spouses. RS 18.06 relates how 'Ammistamru II, king of Ugarit, prepared ships and troops in order to capture and punish his sinful wife.

Shipping, of course, was a business which involved many risks. While the waters of the Mediterranean must have swallowed many a merchantman, such shipwrecks were not too often recorded by the ancient scribe. But now Ugarit furnishes us with a tablet which relates the following incident. The king of Tyre to that of Ugarit in UT:

10. any kn.dt  
   likt.merm  
   hndt.b.sr  
   mtt.by  
   gšm.adr
15. nškh.w.  
   rb.tmtt  
   lqšt.kl.dr'  
   bd.nš[m]w.ank
20. [ ... ]pš[?]  
   w[ ]hlm.bd  
   rb.tmtt.lqht  
   w.ttb.ank.lhm  
   w.anyk.tt
25. by.'ky.'ryt  
   w.ahy.mhk  
   b.lbh.al.yšt

The merchant vessel which you have sent toward Egypt that one, near (lit. in) Tyre was grounded (lit. died), in torrential rain having found itself. And the rb tmtt took all the cargo from the hand of the men (merchants?). And I, all their cargo and all of them, from the hands of the rb tmtt I took, and caused to return to them. Your ship is (now) stationed in Acco, unloaded (lit. naked). Let my brother not place care in his heart.

The rb tmtt was probably a high functionary at the Tyrian court, perhaps in charge of coast guard and salvage operations. The apparent ease with which the king was able to take possession of the confiscated goods makes it doubtful that a pirate, as Virolleaud suggests or, a "'Lord of Death': epithet of some god such as Rsp or Mt", as Gordon supposes (UT §19:2568, 2297), was involved. It is interesting to note that, in an age when land caravans were often robbed and when respectable rulers did not hesitate to plunder travelling mer-

gorical statement above. But the recently found Hurrian texts which are written alphabetically—they will be published by Laroche in the forthcoming Ugaritica V—have made the problem more involved. The Hurrian phoneme represented at Ugarit by d was occasionally written with š and sometimes with t. Thus the word atš (285:11) was spelled atšš (278:16) and at another time atšš (168:8, 169:13); Bush, op. cit., §3.512.

It is also possible the the regions Hur.Sag. KASKAL-MES ša "Pi-it-ša-na, localities that once belonged to Mukššē, earned their name 'Mountains of Pithana's Emporia' (RS 17.62, 17.339) from being trading depots of an Anatolian merchant. Ugaritic merchants controlled at least 10 such places in one bit-tuppāššē, one 'bank,' at Httuššē (RS 17.59, PRU IV p. 22 and also above note 52).

Finally, the word ntbt also occurs in a badly broken mythological passage, UT:1001:Rev. 7, where a god speaks of sitting in someone's ntbt.
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STUDIEN ZU ALTBABYLONISCHEN HYMNISCH-EPISCHEN TEXTEN (2).1
EIN LIED ÜBER DIE JUGENDJAHRE DER GÖTTER SIN UND IŠUM
(CT 15, 5-6)

W. H. Ph. Römer
BAARN, NETHERLANDS

[...]
Rest nicht erhalten.

III i-ik-bi-il-ma e-[i-ja'..............]...
sha-ar-pi-is ma-ah-[i-ja' d'ni-lil(7)] u[m']-
mi?'-šu' ib'-ki'?

is-ku-ul-ma iz-zi-iz [a'?'-na'? še?'-ri'?'-i?...-
ša'? ?

mu-ul-ti-is um-ti-šu [a'-'wa'-'la'-am' iq'-bi'
iz'-'za'-'ak'-'kā'-ar']

5 a-ša-al-ki-i ma-ši-a? [-am? ..............]
ū-la tu-šu-še-ri-i [...]

Rest nicht erhalten.

IV; 6V Nicht erhalten.

1 (1) Erscheint demnächst an anderer Stelle, (3) in