

Altorientalische Forschungen	27	2000	2	269–295
------------------------------	----	------	---	---------

LORENZO D'ALFONSO

Syro-Hittite Administration at Emar: New Considerations on the Basis of a Prosopographic Study*

1. Emar, capital of the Land of Aštata, was subjugated by the Hittites during the reign of Šuppiluliuma I, and remained under Hittite control until the end of the empire. The complex political picture of this city in this period has emerged after the studies written from the second half of the 1970s until today:

* Abbreviation in this article follows those of Or NS, Keilschriftbibiographie. Other abbreviations for reference to the texts are (in chronological order of publication):

- Laroche = E. Laroche, Documents hittites et hourrites, in: D. Beyer (ed.), *Meskéné-Emar: dix ans de travaux: 1972–1982*, Paris 1982, 53–60;
- AuOr 2 = D. Arnaud, La Syrie du Moyen Euphrate sous le protectorat hittite: l'administration d'après trois lettres inédites, *AuOr* 2 [1984] 179–188;
- EmarVI = D. Arnaud, *Recherches au pays d'Aštata. Emar VI.3*, Paris 1986;
- BT = H. Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boghazköy*, Wiesbaden 1988;
- ASJ 10 = A. Tsukimoto, Sieben Spätbronzezeitliche Urkunden aus Syrien, *ASJ* 10 [1988] 153–189;
- Fales = F. M. Fales, *Prima dell'alfabeto*, Venezia 1989;
- Hir. = A. Tsukimoto, Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection, devised in three parts: *ASJ* 12 [1990] 178–259, *ASJ* 13 [1991] 275–333, *ASJ* 14 [1992] pp. 289–315;
- TSB = D. Arnaud, *Textes syriens de l'âge du Bronze Récent*, Barcelona 1991;
- SMEA = D. Arnaud, "Tablettes de gendre divers du Moyen Euphrate", *SMEA* XXX (1992), pp. 196–245;
- MFA 1977 = D. I. Owen, Pasuri-Dagan and Initeššup's Mother, in: Zevit-Gitin-Sokoloff (eds.), *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots*, Winona Lake 1995, 573–584.
- RE = G. Beckman, *Texts from the Vicinity of Emar in the Collection of Jonathan Rosen*, Padova, 1996;
- RAI 1997 = I. Singer, A New Hittite Letter from Emar, in *Atti della XLIV RAI* (in stampa), 59–66. I thank Professor I. Singer for sending me this manuscript, which was very useful to the results of this paper.

I am grateful to Professor C. Mora for helping initiate this study, to Professors H. Klenkel and C. Zaccagnini for reading a draft of this paper and giving me many helpful suggestions, and to Dr A. Green for assistance with the English text. All responsibility for the contents rests of course with myself.

alongside the administration related to the local powers (the temple of NIN.URTA, the Elders, the King of Emar) was a second, parallel administration, which was organised by the Hittites and usually managed by the kings and high officials from the court of Karkemiš¹. Its structures and its features have already been outlined²; however, an investigation about its role in the city of Emar and in the Land of Aštata has still to be undertaken. The present work detects in a significant group of texts produced by the Syro-Hittite administration those elements which allow for the creation of a relative chronology of time of composition; the final intent is to go further into the picture recently drawn by A. Skaist³ by considering the evidence of how this administration changed over time.

¹ For the history of Emar in general, see among others: H. Klengel, *Die Keilschrifttexte von Meskene und die Geschichte von Aštata/Emar*, OLZ 83 [1988]. 645–653; idem, *Syria 3000–300 B.C.*, Berlin 1992, passim; J. C. Margueron, *Meskene B. Archaeologisch*, RIA 8, Berlin 1993, 84–92; G. Beckman, *Emar and its Archives*, in M. W. Chavalas (ed.) *Emar*, Bethesda 1996, 1–12.

For Late Bronze Age Emar, see also: D. Arnaud, *Les textes d'Emar et la chronologie de la fin du Bronze Récent*, Syria 52 [1975] 87–92; E. Laroche, *Emar, étape entre Babylonie et Hatti*, in: J. C. Margueron (ed.), *Le Moyen Euphrate*, Leiden 1980, 235–245; J. C. Margueron, *Emar: un exemple d'implantation hittite en terre syrienne*, in J. C. Margueron (ed.), *Le Moyen Euphrate*, Leiden 1980, 285–312. For a different interpretation of the final period at Emar see: M. R. Adamthwaite, *Ethnic Movements in the Thirteenth Century B.C. as Discernible from the Emar Texts*, in G. Bunnens (ed.), *Cultural Interaction in the Ancient Near East*, Louvain 1996, 91–112.

² The subject is covered by many contributions. See among the others: D. Arnaud, *Traditions urbaines et influences semi-nomades à Emar, à l'âge du Bronze récent*, in J. C. Margueron (ed.), *Le Moyen Euphrate*, Leiden 1980, 245–264; idem, *Humbles et superbes à Emar (Syrie) à la fin de l'âge du Bronze récent*, AOAT 212 (1981), 1–14; idem, *La Syrie du Moyen Euphrate. . .*, AuOr 2 [1984] 179–188; idem, *Les hittites sur le Moyen-Euphrate: protecteurs et indigènes*, Hethitica VIII [1987] 9–27; G. Beckman, *Hittite Administration in Syria in Light of the Texts from Hattuša, Ugarit and Emar*, in M. W. Chavalas – J. L. Hayes (eds.), *New Horizons in the Studies of Ancient Syria*, Malibu 1992, 41–49; idem, *Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria: the View from Mašat and Emar*, in O. Carruba – M. Giorgieri – C. Mora (eds.), *Atti del II congresso internazionale di Hittitologia*, Pavia 1995, 19–37; D. Flaming, *A Limited Kingship: Late Bronze Age Emar in Ancient Syria*, UF 24 [1992] 59–71; F. Imparati, *La politique extérieure des hittites: tendances et problèmes*, Hethitica VIII [1987] 187–207; W. F. Leemans, *Aperçu sur les textes juridiques d'Emar*, JESHO 31 [1988] 207–242; M. Yamada, *Division of a Field and Ninurta's Seal: an Aspect of Hittite Administration in Emar*, UF 25 [1993] 453–460; idem, *The Dynastic Seal and Ninurta's Seal: Preliminary Remarks on Sealing by the Local Authorities of Emar*, Iraq 56 [1994] 59–62; idem, *The Eponymous Years and Ninurta's Seal. Thoughts about the Urban Authority of Emar*, in T. Mikasa (ed.), *Essays on Ancient Anatolia and Syria in the Second and Third Millennium B.C.*, Wiesbaden 1996, 297–308.

³ A. Skaist, *The Chronology of the Legal Texts from Emar*, ZA 88 [1998] 45–71.

2. Although recent studies have brought to light some paleographic, phonetic and phonologic parameters for distinguishing in Emar documents those drafted by the Syro-Hittite administration and those drafted by the local administration⁴, the attribution of many texts to the former or to the latter is still doubtful. The corpus of documents considered in this article does not include all the texts drafted by the Syro-Hittite administration, but is a homogeneous sub-group of them, whose main characteristic is the mention of the Hittite kings, the kings of Karkemiš, and the highest officials of this administration: the Son of the King (DUMU.LUGAL) and the Overseer of the land (LÚ.UGULA.KALAM.MA or LÚ.UGULA). The sample is not exhaustive, but allows for the arrangement in chronological sequence of the activities of the most important personalities; from the presence of witness lists on the majority of these acts, the relative chronology of their dates of composition can be a useful starting point to date other documents in which the Syro-Hittite administration's highest officials do not appear.

The texts under examination are more than forty, which can be divided in the following types of texts:

- 10 testaments⁵;
- 10 verdicts⁶;
- 13 sale contracts⁷;
- 10 letters⁸;
- 2 real estate assignments⁹;
- 2 fragmentary texts¹⁰.

2.1. As other scholars have already pointed out, prosopographic data constitute a unique element for dating the documents drafted by the Syro-Hittite administration: unlike the situation in the contemporary Middle-Assyrian and Middle-Babylonian reigns, but as parallel by the Hittite administrative system, no dating elements such as reference to an eponym or to a king's year of reign are present in juridical and administrative texts. Sometimes it is possible to find

⁴ See in particular: K. Wilke, *AH, die Bruder von Emar. Untersuchungen zur Schreibtradition am Euphratknie* *AuOr* 10 [1992] 161–190; J. Ikeda, *The Akkadian Language of Karkemiš: Evidence from Emar and its Vicinities*, *ASJ* 20 [1998] 23–62, and especially S. Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, Roma 1998, cap. I, cap. II passim, esp. 123–132.

⁵ *EmarVI* 31, 177, 181, 182, 201, 202; *Fales* 66; *Hir.* 29, *RE* 56, 85.

⁶ *EmarVI* 18, 201, 252; *Hir.* 44, 46; *ASJ* 10, B; *TSB* 30.36; *RE* 54, 55. The text *EmarVI* 201 is put in both the group „verdicts“ and the group „testaments“, because its contents concern two different affairs.

⁷ *EmarVI* 90, 194, 207, 211; *Hir.* 3, 13, 36, 45; *SMEA* 5, *TSB* 33, 56, 84, *RE* 12.

⁸ *EmarVI* 259, 261, 262, 263, 267; *AuOr* 2 1, 2, 3; *Laroche* 73.1097, *RAI* 1997.

⁹ *SMEA* 6 e *MFA* 1977.

¹⁰ *EmarVI* 19, 289.

a dating in relation to a particularly important event¹¹, but also in those cases it is difficult to fix exactly the event in a relative chronology.

In 1975 D. Arnaud presented the first essential prosopographic informations about Emar families, and he brought to light the succession of three generations over the 120 years covered by the Emar archives (1320–1187 BC)¹². A few years later F.M. Fales wrote an article on the Emar royal family, showing that five generations of this family were attested in the Emar texts, not only three¹³. The hypothesis of the existence of more than three generations has been recently confirmed by the prosopographic studies of R. Zadok and M. Yamada¹⁴, so that the reconstruction presented here, with the relation to five generations, constitutes a further confirmation rather than a new element derived from our data¹⁵.

2.2. Our corpus contains no tablets, in which members of the first generation were mentioned with an active role; those appear only as fathers of persons who belong to the second generation¹⁶. This fact could mean that the Syro-Hittite administration – but in this case also the local one – was not yet functioning during the first two decades after the conquest; therefore quarrels and contracts dating back to the first generation were not unregistered. It seems necessary at this point, as A. Skaist has already proposed¹⁷, to lower the initial date of composition of the Syro-Hittite texts to the first decades of the 13th century BC, rather than to the last decades of the 14th, and to reduce consequently the operating period of the Syro-Hittite administration by about one century.

¹¹ On this subject see the article by C. Zaccagnini on the tablets with the dating „in the year of the famine. . .“: C. Zaccagnini, *War and Famine at Emar*, *Or NS* 64 [1995] 92–109; see also M. Yamada, *The Eponymous Years. . .*, in T. Mikasa (ed.), *Essays. . .*, Wiesbaden 1996, 297–308.

¹² D. Arnaud, *Les textes d'Emar. . .*, *Syria* 52 [1975] 87–92. A thorough analysis of the absolute chronology of Emar dates is contained in A. Skaist, *The Chronology. . .*, *ZA* 88 [1998] 45–71, esp. 45–47.

¹³ F. M. Fales, *Notes on the Royal Family of Emar*, in: D. Charpin – F. Joannes (eds.), *Marchands, diplomates et empereurs*, Paris 1981, 81–90.

¹⁴ Respectively R. Zadok, *Notes on the Emar Documentation*, *OLP* 22 [1991] 27–55. and M. Yamada, *The Family of Zu-ba'la the Diviner and the Hittites*, *Israel Oriental Studies* 18 [1998] 323–334 (but on this article see below the considerations related to the text EmarVI 194).

¹⁵ See differently M. Adamthwaite, *Ethnic Movements. . .*, in G. Bunnens, *Cultural Interaction. . .*, Louvain 1996, 91–112.

¹⁶ Such is the case of Iaši-dagan, father of the Emar king Adda-kabar (see note 13 above), and the case of Hurasu, Abi-kapi's father (EmarVI 194, *Hir.* 43 etc.).

¹⁷ A. Skaist, in *The Chronology. . .*, *ZA* 88 [1998]. 67, suggests dating the composition of the Syro-Hittite texts between 1275 and 1210 B.C.; after the two letters sent by Muršili II (Laroche 73.1097 and RAI 1997) it seems that the Syro-Hittite administration began to operate in Emar in the first decade of the 13th century. For the texts dating to the beginning of the century see below.

3. Adopting the accepted criteria for the prosopographic analysis¹⁸, and using them to locate the time of composition of the analysed texts, the two following tables can be made: the first put in evidence which documents belong to which one of the five generations mentioned in the Syro-Hittite tablets at Emar; the second relates the texts of our corpus and their time of composition to the reigns of the kings of Karkemiš.

Table 1

<u>I generation</u> ¹⁹ 1320–1295ca	(Iaši-dagan LUGAL, Šuršu DUMU.ĦAL, Ħurasu abu ša Abi-kapi) EmarVI 31?
<u>II generation</u> 1295–1270ca	(Adda-kabar ²⁰ LUGAL, Zu-ba'la LÚ.ĦAL, Abi-kapi DUMU Ħurasi) EmarVI 181, 182; Hir. 3; Fales 66; TSB 30, 56; Laroche 73.1097; RAI 1997.
II or III:	Hir. 29; AuOr 2 2.
<u>III generation</u> 1270–1245ca	(Išsur-dagan DUMU Adda-kabar, Adda-qarrad LÚ.ĦAL) EmarVI 18, 19, 194, 201, 202, 207, 259, 261; MFA 1977; ASJ 10/B.
Between III & IV:	EmarVI 211, 252; Hir. 44, TSB 36, RE 56.
III or IV:	EmarVI 177; SMEA 5, RE 54, 55, 85.
<u>IV generation</u> 1245–1220ca	(Elli LUGAL, Adda-malik LÚ.ĦAL) EmarVI 90, 263; SMEA 6
<u>V generation</u> 1220–1995ca	(... DUMU Elli, ... DUMU Adda-malik LÚ.ĦAL) EmarVI 267, 289; Hir. 36, 45, 46; TSB 33, RE 12.

¹⁸ See M. Maidman, *The Tehip-tilla Family of Nuzi: A Genealogical Reconstruction*, JCS 28 [1976] 131–132. A. Skaist (ZA 88, p. 49) follows the same principles.

¹⁹ The period indicated for each generation reers to the central part of the life of an individual, between 15 and 49 years.

²⁰ The reading „Adda“ for ^dIŠKUR in personal names wa laready suggested by F. M. Fales, *Notes...*, in: D. Charpin – F. Joannès (eds.), *Marchands...*, Paris 1981, 82, n. 8; however, the reading „Ba'al“ had bee largely preferred. Recently I. Singer (A New Hittite... XLIV RAI, 62) proposed that the antroponym „Andamali“ (nasalisation for Adda-malik) attested in the Hittite lette 73.1097, corresponds to ^dIŠKUR-malik attested in EmarVI 201, 13, 21. Following this reading for ^dIŠKUR, it has been used for all the anthroponyms in which this ideogram appears.

Table 2²¹

<u>Šaḫurunuwā</u>									
	EmarVI n. 31?		EmarVI n. 181	TSB n. 56	Laroche 73.1097	RAI 1997			
	TSB n. 30	Hir. n. 3	Fales n. 66	AuOr 2 n. 2					
EmarVI n. 182?	Hir. n. 29?				EmarVI n. 194				
<u>Ini-tešub</u>		MFA 1977		ASJ 10, B	EmarVI n. 201		EmarVI n. 202		
RE n. 85?	EmarVI n. 18		EmarVI n. 19						
RE n. 55?			SMEA n. 5?		EmarVI n. 261	EmarVI n. 259	EmarVI n. 207		
RE n. 54?		EmarVI n. 177 ?							
SMEA n. 6									
			EmarVI n. 252	RE n. 56	TSB n. 84	TSB n. 36	EmarVI n. 211		
			EmarVI n. 90				EmarVI n. 263		
<u>Talmi-tešub & Kuzi-tešub</u>									
	Hir. n. 46	EmarVI n. 267	Hir. n. 45	Hir. n. 36	EmarVI n. 289	TSB n. 33	RE n. 12		

3.1. In the following pages prosopographic data useful for dating are listed text by text. The sequence in which the documents are listed here follows neither publication numbers nor a chronological order, but they are given in small groups each characterised by the mention of a single individual²². Zu-ba'la, diviner of the temple M₁, and the members of his family are mentioned in the texts of the first group; the correlation of this people with the kings of Karkemiš and

²¹ In this table:

- the question mark indicates a text to be dated to the reign of one of the Karkemiš kings, without presenting prosopographic evidence to correlate it with other texts, or to determine precisely in which part of a reign it was composed.
- unbroken horizontal lines indicate the presence of prosopographic data to determine the contemporaneity between documents.
- broken horizontal lines indicate the probability of documents being contemporaneous from their prosopographic data.
- vertical and oblique lines indicate anteriority/posteriority between documents.

²² To make easier the consultation of this section, an appendix at the end of the article indicates the pages on which each text has been discussed.

one king of Ḫatti, Muršili II, was already an important starting point for Emar prosopographic studies²³.

EmarVI 201²⁴

I) Since the first twenty lines Zu-ba'la is contemporary with both Šaḫurunuwa and Ini-tešub, kings of Karkemiš.

II) The tablet was drafted during Ini-tešub's reign. When it was written, Zu-ba'la had already several sons by his wife Dagan-la'i (l. 49); he couldn't be less than thirty years old. Since Zu-ba'la worked as diviner in Ḫattuša during the last years of Muršili's reign²⁵, he should have been even more than thirty years old when EmarVI 201 was composed; in fact Zu-ba'la must have been already adult when he operated for Muršili, and at least twenty years had passed from the last part of Muršili's reign to the beginning of Ini-tešub's²⁶. For these reasons Zu-ba'la must have been at least sixty years old at the time of composition of this document.

III) After the previous point it seems that EmarVI 201 was composed at the very beginning of Ini-tešub's reign; otherwise Zu-ba'la should have been even older, which is less likely. In fact, it has to be emphasised that the first lines of this act contain a confirmation of a donation to Zu-ba'la by Ini-tešub's predecessor and father, Šaḫurunuwa; it is very likely that a confirmation of the preceding king's decision was made in the first years of the following king, immediately after his installation on the throne²⁷.

IV) This tablet contains also a synchronism between Ini-tešub and Adda-qarrad, Zu-ba'la's older son and successor to the position of diviner. Since Adda-qarrad was older than all the other sons of Zu-ba'la, and his father named him in this document as his successor, he must have already been adult at the time of composition of EmarVI 201. The act dates to the time of the third generation of Emar, that of Adda-qarrad.

V) The synchronism between Ini-tešub, Zu-ba'la and the two scribes, Marianni and Puḫi-šenni is important to understand in which generation these two Syro-Hittite officials worked at Emar. Since both of them had to be adult to be composing legal acts and holding high positions, they probably lived between the second and the third generation.

²³ See, e.g., the first prosopographic article, D. Arnaud, *Les textes...*, Syria 52 [1975] 91, and the latest, A. Skaist, *The Chronology...*, ZA 88 [1998] 47–57.

²⁴ See the suggestions on this text in A. Skaist, *The Chronology...*, ZA 88 [1998] 51 and 56.

²⁵ See E. Laroche, *Emar...*, in J. C. Margueron, *Le Moyen Euphrate*, Leiden 1980, 235–245.

²⁶ For the synchronism between the karkemisite and the Hittite kings, see L. d'Alfonso, *Tarḫuntašša in einem Text aus Emar*, AoF 26/2 [1999] 314–321.

²⁷ The same considerations for the confirmation of treaties were used in M. Astour, *Who was the King...*, in M. W. Chavalas (ed.), *Emar*, 1996, 25–56.

EmarVI 202

I) Since Zu-ba'la and Ini-tešub appear together in this tablet, points I, II and III of EmarVI 201 are valid here.

II) It is difficult to establish whether EmarVI 201 is earlier or later than EmarVI 202. The quarrel with the sons of Taršipu appears in both documents, so that it seems in any case that little time passed between the composition of these two acts, and it is also likely that they were written on the same occasion before Ini-tešub.

Laroche 73.1097

I) A Great King of Ḫatti wrote this letter to Alziyamuwa, a Hittite official at Emar. Since the topic is the same as in EmarVI 201, 5–18, E. Laroche argued that the sender was probably Muršili II²⁸.

II) Since lines 5–18 of EmarVI 201 constitute the preceding history, from point I above this letter must have been written before EmarVI 201 and dated to the second generation.

RAI 1997

I) This is a letter that a king of Karkemiš²⁹ wrote to Alziyamuwa. Since addressee and subject are the same as in Laroche 73.1097, these letters have to be considered contemporary. Thus for the dating of this text it is valid Laroche 73.1097, II. From EmarVI 201, 5–18, the Karkemiš king in RAI 1997 must be Šaḫurunuwā.

EmarVI 194

I) This document registers a quarrel about real estate between the sons of Zu-ba'la and Abi-kapi. In line 23 is written: "...will not claim against Zu-ba'la, son of Šuršu", so Šuršu is the name of Zu-ba'la's father. Recently M. Yamada suggested that this Zu-ba'la is not the diviner of the temple M₁; on the basis of Laroche 73.1097, EmarVI 201, RAI 1997 and from a new reading of EmarVI 548H the Japanese scholar thinks that the father of Zu-ba'la, the diviner, is the Adda-malik mentioned in those texts³⁰. Our hypothesis to consider this Zu-ba'la son of Šuršu as the temple M₁ diviner derives from the following considerations:

²⁸ E. Laroche, *Emar. . .*, in J. C. Margueron, *Le Moyen. . .*, Leiden 1980, 235–245.

²⁹ On the letterhead sent by the kings of Karkemiš, see M. Yamada, *Reconsidering the Letter from the 'King' in the Ugaritic Texts: Royal Correspondence of Karkemiš?*, UF 24 [1992] 431–446.

³⁰ On the basis of the EmarVI 548H colophon, where a [Zu]-ba'la son of Adda-malik is attested, and on the basis of Laroche 73.1097, where Zu-ba'la defines Adda-malik as LU *iš-ba-ni-it-ta-ra-aš* "consanguineous", M. Yamada (*The Family of Zu-ba'la the Diviner and the Hittites*, IOS 18 [1998] 323–334) and I. Singer (*A New Hittite. . .*, in *Atti della XLVII RAI* [in print]) suggest that Adda-malik is the father of Zu-ba'la, and consequently that the diviner Zu-ba'la son of Šuršu mentioned in EmarVI 194 and Hir. 43 is another person (on these two texts see M. Yamada, *Division of a Field. . .*, UF 25 [1993] 453–460).

- the text was found in Temple M₁;
- all legal acts of Emar in which a Zu-ba'la LÚ.HAL is attested, refer to the temple M₁ diviner. Zu-ba'la bears in EmarVI 194 the title of DUMU.HAL, although it is not clear whether the title referred to him or to his father. In any case he bears the title of LÚ.HAL in Hir.43, a text parallel to EmarVI 194 referring to the same event;
- references to the Karkemiš king in EmarVI 194 fit well with the temple M₁ diviner Zu-ba'la: Šaḫurunuwa assigned to him Adda-malik's plots of land (EmarVI 201, 15–18); Ini-tešub guaranteed four legal acts for him (EmarVI 201, 202, 206, 207). Only this Zu-ba'la in the archives from Emar and its vicinities had direct relations with the court of Karkemiš;
- the use of the expression LÚ *iš-ba-ni-it-ta-ra-aš* in Laroche 731097 for “father”, instead of the Akkadogram *A-BU-IA* or the Hittite *addaš* more often adopted, seems very unusual. Since this document Adda-malik should have been more likely a relative of the diviner Zu-ba'la rather than his father;
- the son of Adda-malik attested in EmarVI 548H should be a son of Zu-ba'la's nephew, named Adda-malik himself; he would have borne his famous great-grandfather name and would belong to the 5th emarite generation.

If our hypothesis to identify Zu-ba'la, son of Šuršu, with the temple M₁ diviner is valid, this act becomes important evidency for dating several documents to Šaḫurunuwa's reign.

II) From line 23 it is clear that Zu-ba'la was still alive when the text was composed, and he intervened to defend his sons interests. The sons must have been adult themselves to possess a plot of land and to have had a legal quarrel about it. Thus EmarVI 194 was contemporary or a little earlier than EmarVI 201 (3rd generation).

III) The legal opponents of Zu-ba'la's sons in EmarVI 194 are the sons of Abi-kapi, son of Ḫurasu. It seems likely that Ḫurasu belonged to the same generation as Šuršu, and Abi-kapi to the same as Zu-ba'la. Since his sons had, like Zu-ba'la's, to be adult, Abi-kapi had to be mature, at least thirty-five years old, probably more, when the text was written. From lines 12 and 25 we see also that he was alive at the document drafting time.

EmarVI 207

D) In this real estate purchase contract the purchaser is Adda-qarrad, son of Zu-ba'la, representative of the 3rd Emar generation; the tablet is sealed by Ini-tešub, and constitutes another synchronism between the king and this temple M₁ diviner.

EmarVI 211

D) In this purchase contract Adda-qarrad, son of Zu-ba'la, acquired some slaves from Dagan-taliḫ, son of Zuzu. The composition of the contract is clearly later than EmarVI 194, 201, 202, because Zu-ba'la was dead when the docu-

ment was written; this can be concluded from the fact that Adda-qarrad bears the title LÚ.HAL, which means that he had succeeded his father in this position.

II) Adda-qarrad was more than thirty, from point I above, and EmarVI 201, IV. III) Many witnesses to EmarVI 211 are also attested in EmarVI 212, but in that text it is written that Adda-qarrad was dead (EmarVI 212, 4–5); thus EmarVI 211 is surely earlier than EmarVI 212, although the time between the composition of the first and the second document must have been quite short. The text probably dates back to the end of Adda-qarrad's life, and should be assigned to the 4th generation, rather than the 3rd; from the role played by Adda-malik, son of Adda-qarrad, the temple M₁ diviner, EmarVI 212 surely dates to the 4th generation.

EmarVI 259

I) This letter was written by Šin-abu to his lord Adda. In the text a messenger of Adda-qarrad, son of Zu-ba'la, is mentioned. Since the only Adda-qarrad son of Zu-ba'la in the Emar documents is the temple M₁ diviner, from EmarVI 201 III and IV, and EmarVI 211 III, it is clear that the text dates back to the first twenty years of Ini-tešub's reign.

3.2. The following group of texts has in common the mention of ̕ešmi-tešub, DUMU.LUGAL, brother of Ini-tešub.

TSB 30

I) In the witness list at the end of the document appears Abi-kapi, son of ̕urasu. Since he was a contemporary of the diviner Zu-ba'la, who belonged to the 2nd generation, from EmarVI 201 II and EmarVI 194 II and III the tablet can be dated to the 2nd generation, the generation of people who lived the central part of their life during the reign of Šaḫurunuwa at Karkemiš.

II) The document consists of a verdict of ̕ešmi-tešub. From point I, this son of Šaḫurunuwa worked as judge at Emar already before that his brother Ini-tešub became king of Karkemiš. Since Ini-tešub's reign was very long, and in MFA 1977 his mother played an active role, this king of Karkemiš ascended to the throne probably when he was still very young, no more than a child³¹. Since Šaḫurunuwa's reign was also quite long, about forty years, ̕ešmi-tešub was more likely Ini-tešub elder rather than younger brother. His important position at Emar, and the hard reprimand of him by Ini-tešub in EmarVI 18 (see §4.2) give to this new picture a clearer meaning.

³¹ See L. d'Alfonso, *Tarḫuntašša*. . ., *AoF* 26/2 [1999] 314–321.

Hir.3

I) This real estate purchase contract is sealed by Hešmi-tešub, who operated at Emar already during Šaḫurunuwā's reign (TSB 30 I and II).

II) In the witness list appear two persons who are attested also in TSB 30: Madi-dagan, the scribe, and Dagan-abu, son of Haia. The latter is mentioned only in these two tablets. Since three persons – Hešmi-tešub, Dagan-abu e Madi-dagan – appear together in these two documents, they have to be contemporary.

III) Hir. 3 could have a fourth person in common with TSB 30: Matkali-dagan. In Hir. 3, line 24, it is written:

24. IGI ^m*ma-at-ka-li*-^dKUR DUMU *iš-bi*-^dKUR

TSB 30, line 18, contains exactly the same name, lacking only the last sign. From point II, the following reconstruction is suggested:

18. IGI ^m*ma-at-ka-li*-^dKUR DUMU *iš-bi*-^d[KUR]

Fales 66

I) This will was composed before Hešmi-tešub. The witness list in the last lines includes Abi-kapi, son of Hurasu, and Udḫabu, son of Iya. Both of them were mentioned also in TSB 30, although the latter was written with a different sign series³². Since Fales 66 and TSB 30 have three persons in common, they must be considered as contemporary; for the dating of this text TSB 30 I is valid here.

II) From Hir. 3 II, Fales 66 must be contemporary also with Hir. 3.

III) In the witness list F.M. Fales reads also the name of Matkali-dagan, son of Ṭubi-dagan. On the basis of the homonymy with the witness of Hir. 3 and TSB 30, since a reading *iš* for the ninth sign at Vs, line 3 seems possible, we suggest reading also here:

Vs 3. [IGI] ^m*ma-at-ka-li*-^dKUR DUMU *iš-bi*-^dKUR

IV) In the witness list the first person is Puḫi-šenni, the Overseer of the land. The same name appears in EmarVI 201, line 52, as DUB.ŠAR.MAḫ, together with Marianni. If they are the same person, as D. Arnaud suggests³³, the text

³² In Fales 66 Udḫabu's father's name is written *i-ia*, in TSB 30 *bé-ia*. On the different ways to write *alef* at Emar, see the example of *nabrabu/na'rabu/narabu* in EmarVI 194 and Hir0.43. A treatment of the problem is contained in D. Arnaud, Contribution de l'onomastique du Moyen-Euphrate à la connaissance de l'émariote, SEL 8 [1991] 23–46; see also S. Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, Roma 1998, 155–158.

³³ D. Arnaud, La Syrie du . . ., AuOr 2 [1984] note 9.

is probably earlier than EmarVI 201, because Abi-kapi, son of Hurasu, mentioned in the Fales 66 witness list, lived mostly during Šaḫurunuwa's reign. Thus it seems likely that Puḫi-šenni held previously the position of Overseer of the land in the Syro-Hittite administration at Emar, and then was recalled to Karkemiš to fulfil the important role of Supreme Scribe (see also EmarVI 181 II below).

EmarVI 18

I) The tablet contains a verdict of Ini-tešub on a quarrel between Hešmi-tešub, prince of Karkemiš, and a citizen of Emar named Kitta. Since from TSB 30 I and II we know that Hešmi-tešub worked at Emar during the last period of his father Šaḫurunuwa's reign, this text belongs to a later period of the activity of this DUMU.LUGAL in the city. The document is thus later than TSB 30, Hir. 3 and Fales 66.

II) In this tablet there is a reference to a *māmītu* with the city of Emar. The dating of EmarVI 18 constitutes a *terminus ante quem* for the agreement.

EmarVI 19

I) Since the mention of Hešmi-tešub and Ini-tešub are the only elements to date the document, as for EmarVI 18, the dating from EmarVI 18 I is valid here.

II) The topic of this tablet is the same as in EmarVI 18; the drafting of these two acts happened probably in the same period, but no elements are present to determine which was written first.

Hir. 29

I) The mention of Hešmi-tešub in line 10' is the only element to date this text. The tablet must be attributed to some time during the activity of Hešmi-tešub at Emar, that is to the period of the 2nd and the 3rd generations.

3.3. The following group collects the remaining texts in which other members of the Karkemiš royal family are attested.

EmarVI 31

I) This will was drafted before Šaḫurunuwa, king of Karkemiš: no other prosopographical elements are useful to date this text. It has to be dated to the 1st or 2nd generation attested in the Syro-Hittite documents from Emar and its neighbourhood.

SMEA 5

I) In this contract Ini-tešub sold some of his real estates in Emar: no other element than the mention of the king of Karkemiš helps to date the document. From EmarVI 201 IV, EmarVI 207 I, TSB 30 II, it dates back to the 3rd or to the 4th generation.

EmarVI 177

I) This will was drafted before Ini-tešub. The name of the testator is lost in the lacuna, only the initial *a*-[...] is conserved. The testator's wife's name Ḫudi is attested as wife of an Abiu in the will EmarVI 213; however in that text Abiu assigns all his goods to his daughter Battu. Since a daughter with this name does not appear in EmarVI 177, it is unlikely that the same person could be the testator of both the wills. Thus for the dating of this text SMEA 5 I is also valid here.

RE 54

I) In this document Ini-tešub certifies the possession of a plot of land by an Adad-belu son of Muḫra'ḫi. The attestation of Ini-tešub is the only element to date the text, thus the dating from SMEA 5 I is also valid here.

RE 55

I) In this act Ini-tešub certifies the possession of a plot of land by a Muḫra'ḫi. The attestation of Ini-tešub is the only element to date the text, thus the dating from SMEA 5 I is also valid here.

II) Since the act concerns the same case as RE 54, but it clearly involves an earlier phase, it must be dated to a time before RE 54.

RE 85

I) This will was drafted before Ini-tešub. Since the attestation of the Karkemiš king is the only prosopographical element to date the text, the dating from SMEA 5 I is also valid here.

MFA 1977

I) The role played by Ini-tešub's mother in this text tends to suggest a short period of co-regency during the first years of Ini-tešub's reign. The tablet is in fact sealed by Ini-tešub, and has to be considered contemporary to EmarVI 201.

Hir. 46

I) The best dating element for this tablet is the mention of prince Kunti-tešub, son of the Karkemiš king Talmi-tešub. Thus the text dates directly to the last generation (5th).

EmarVI 267

I) The only dating element for this letter is the name of the addressee, Kunti-tešub; the sender's name is lost in lacuna. For the dating Hir. 46 I is valid here.

3.4. The dating of the following tablets depends on the mention of officials, whose period of activity has been shown above in relation to the Karkemiš royal family.

AuOr 2/2

I) The addressee of this letter is an official named Madi-dagan. One can suggest that he is the scribe whom Hir. 3 II refers to; the important administrative role attested by the letter fits well with the title of Chief of the Scribes (LÚ.GAL.DUB.ŠAR.MEŠ) borne in TSB 64.

II) The reference to “the king” as last juridical authority, at the end of the tablet refers more likely to the king of Karkemiš than to the king of Emar, since the latter only rarely fulfilled this function. Also, if the addressee is the Chief of the Scribes, it is not enough to establish who was the Karkemiš king to whom the letter refers; Madi-dagan lived surely during Šaḫurunuwa's reign, but it cannot be excluded that he survived that king, as other officials such as Marianni and Puḫi-šenni.

SMEA 6

I) Tili-šarruma, prince of Karkemiš, certified and sealed this act of donation; his presence is the only prosopographical element which helps to date the text: in fact Abi-rašap and Abi-kapi, sons of Kumru/i, and Awiru, son of Abi-kapi are attested only here. Since Tili-šarruma was probably son of Ini-tešub³⁴, this document should date to the 4th generation attested in the Syro-Hittite texts.

Emar VI, 182

I) The persons attested in this document do not appear elsewhere in the Emar texts. The witness list is, moreover, very incomplete; the only help comes from a reference to a DUMU.LUGAL sealing (line 12). In fact the only sealing on the tablet belongs to Hešmi-tešub and the act thus dates to his time of activity at Emar (EmarVI 18 I).

II) In the witness list only the names of the fathers of two witnesses remain: Belu-malik and Ikun-dagan; also surviving is a title of a witness, the title of “scribe”. The TSB 30 witness list presents these three elements:

17. IGI ^m*zi-im-ri*-^dKUR DUMU *i-ku*-^dKUR.

19. IGI ^m*ma-di*-^dKUR LÚ.DUB.ŠAR

23 IGI ^m*ik-ki*-^dKUR DU[MU EN-*m*]*a-lik*

“I-ku-^dKUR”, and “I-ku-un-^dKUR”, writing adopted in Emar VI 182, are different ways to write the same name³⁵. Since Hešmi-tešub sealed both tablets, and

³⁴ See also L. d'Alfonso, *Tarḫuntašša...*, *AoF* 26/2 [1999] 314–321.

³⁵ See, e.g., Ikun-dagan father of Appau: I-ku-^dKUR in S. Dalley – B. Teissier, *Tablets from the Vicinity of Emar and Elsewhere*, *Iraq* 54 [1992] 98, I-ku-un-^dKUR in Emar-VI 146, r. 26; 147, r. 40 etc.

nowhere else do these three elements appear together, the following reconstruction is proposed:

14. [IGI ^m*ik-ki*-^dKUR DUM]U EN-*ma-lik*.

15. [IG ^m*zi-im-ri*-^dKUR DUM]U *i-ku-un*-^dKUR.

16. [IGI ^m*ma-di*-^dKUR LÚ.D]UB.ŠAR

From TSB 30 I, the text dates back to the 2nd generation.

EmarVI 181

I) In the witness list is present the name Puḫi-šenni with the title of Overseer of the land. Puḫi-šenni bore the same title in Fales 66, a will drafted before Hešmi-tešub. Since in both documents Puḫi-šenni bears the same position, they must date to the same period; as with Fales 66, the dating from TSB 30 I (2nd generation) is thus valid here.

II) In EmarVI 201 Puḫi-šenni bore the title DUB.ŠAR.MAḪ. Since that legal act dates to the 3rd generation (EmarVI 201 IV), while EmarVI 181 and Fales 66 date back to the 2nd (EmarVI 181 I, Fales 66 I), Puḫi-šenni's *cursus honorum* began with the position of Overseer of the land at Emar, and continued with the position of Supreme Scribe at Karkemiš.

III) In the witness list of this document is attested an Alal-abu, son of Ibniya (line 21). The same person appears at the first place in the witness list of another act, TSB 38. This act is sealed by a Marianni, son of Tešub-manaddu/ Adda-manaddu; his seal legend contains the title INFANS.REX, Son of the King³⁶. It is likely that we should recognise in this high ranking Syro-Hittite official the Marianni who appears as scribe in EmarVI 201. As with Puḫi-šenni, he ought to have worked before at Emar and then at Karkemiš, and should belong to the 2nd generation.

³⁶ See H. Gonnet *Les légendes des empreintes hiéroglyphiques anatoliennes*, in D. Arnaud, *Textes syriens*. . . , *AuOr Supplementa I*, Barcelona 1991, 198–216; nn. 37, 38. The same Marianni is attested in a document, Hir. 13, whose sealing, according to A. Tsukimoto, belongs to the prince Ini-tešub (see also M. Yamada, *The Family*. . . , IOS 18 [1998], 331). This text should date Marianni's life half way between the 2nd and the 3rd generations at Emar; it should also mean that Ini-tešub had already an official position before becoming king; this, however, would be very strange, because it requires him to have lived something like ninety years. A. Tsukimoto published a photo of the tablet; it is very difficult to read the hieroglyphs in the sealing, but Professor C. Mora and I were in any case unable to read Ini-tešub name there, while the sign INFANS. REX is quite clear. The sealing requires further study to understand its significance for the prosopography of both Emar and Karkemiš.

TSB 56

I) In the witness list of this act the first position is occupied by Puḫi-šenni, who bears here the title of Overseer of the land. The document will thus be contemporary with EmarVI 181 and Fales 66. For the dating to the 2nd generation EmarVI 181 I is valid here.

II) Ikki-dagan, son of Belu-malik, is named as witness in this act (line 19), and also in TSB 30 (23). This is confirmation of the contemporaneity of EmarVI 181, Fales 66, TSB 30 and TSB 56.

ASJ 10/B

I) The only element to date the document in the Emarite context is the mention of Puḫi-šenni, who acts as legal authority together with Ḫišmi-šarruma and ^mUR.MAḪ (Vs. '10-'12). From EmarVI 181 II, Puḫi-šenni was first Overseer of the land in Aštata and then, from the beginning of Ini-tešub reign, high official at Karkemiš. Since the document seems to have been drafted at Karkemiš, it is dated to the first part of Ini-tešub reign.

II) The anthroponym Ḫišmi-šarruma is attested twice at Emar³⁷, but only in this text had the person who bore this name an important role in the Syro-Hittite administration. A Hittite high official named Ḫišmi-šarruma is well known in the Hattusa archives; my suggestion is to identify Ḫišmi-šarruma attested in ASJ 10/B with this Hittite high official attested as DUMU.LUGAL in BT IV, 3³⁸. In the same section of BT, a list of high officials who presided over the treaty drafting, a (IV, 40) ^mUR.MAḪ-LÚ GAL DUB.SAR.MEŠ appears. The writing ^mUR.MAḪ in ASJ 10/B, is a hypochoristic or a scribal mistake already attested at Hattusa in the writing of the same name, whose reading should be Walwa-ziti³⁹. The presence of both these anthroponyms with high official roles in both documents makes the identity very likely.

Walwa-ziti's period of activity covers a long time, from the reign of Hattušili III to the reign of Tuthaliya IV; the mention in ASJ 10/B together with Puḫi-šenni, makes it necessary to date this text to the 3rd Emarite generation, corresponding to the first half of Ini-tešub's reign, and to the first part of Hattušili III's reign. A higher dating, possible for Puḫi-šenni, is unacceptable for the other two Hittite officials.

³⁷ See A. Tsukimoto, *Sieben...*, ASJ 10 [1988], 160 note for line ,11.

³⁸ Many scholars have written on Ḫišmi-šarruma. See the recent prosopographic study by T. van den Hout, *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag*, StBoT 38, Wiesbaden 1995, 127–132, for references to texts and bibliography regarding this person.

³⁹ For references to texts and studies concerning ^mUR.MAḪ-LÚ see T. van den Hout, *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag*, StBoT 38, Wiesbaden 1995, 172–178; note in particular the attestation 1b equal to the one of ASJ 10/B, and clearly referred to the same official, as is clear from the presence of the title GAL D[UB.SAR.M]EŠ.

Ḫišmi-šarruma is attested once as a son of the king of Ḫatti⁴⁰, but the identity of this king is not specified. The identity suggested above between this DUMU.LUGAL and the official attested in ASJ 10/B confirms T. van den Hout's hypothesis based on Bo XVI 83 + ⁴¹: Ḫišmi-šarruma was probably a son of Ḫattušili.

EmarVI 261

I) Kapi-dagan and Sin-abu sent together this letter to their master Adda. The message of Kapi-dagan contain a reference to a DUMU.LUGAL named Tuppi-tešub. Unfortunately this is the only attestation for this DUMU.LUGAL, and so it is not useful to date the document.

II) Since EmarVI 259 and EmarVI 261 have in common one sender (Sin-abu) and the addressee (Adda), they must date to the same generation (from EmarVI 259 I, the 3rd).

3.5. The next group contains documents which are dated on the basis of the presence of Mutri-tešub, an important Syro-Hittite official.

TSB 36

I) Two of the seal impressions on this act appertain to Mutri-tešub and Buraqu. The latter must be Madukka's son, who together with Mutri-tešub also sealed EmarVI 211. These two texts should be thus contemporary, and date back to the end of the 3rd generation or directly to the 4th generation (EmarVI 211, III).

Hir. 44

I) The principal element for dating this act is the sealing of Mutri-tešub.

II) The central part of Ini-tešub reign was the period in which Mutri-tešub worked at Emar, as is clear from the contemporaneity with the 3rd generation diviner Adda-qarrad (EmarVI 211), and his 4th generation son Adda-malik (EmarVI 212). EmarVI 211 was drafted when Adda-qarrad was already an old man and his father was dead (EmarVI 212, points II and III); since that is the most ancient attestation of Mutri-tešub, it seems likely that he was not active in the first decades of Ini-tešub reign, when Adda-qarrad was younger and his father was still alive (EmarVI 201 and 202). Hir. 44 offers a confirmation of Mutri-tešub's period of activity. A cuneiform legend on the tablet for a sealing gives the following name: Matkali-dagan, son of Dagan-ta. The same name appears again as a sealing legend in another document, EmarVI 33, together with another name: Dagan-tari', son of Matkali-dagan. This latter name⁴² is

⁴⁰ See T. van den Hout above, Ḫišmi-šarruma 1d; see also 1c, if T. van den Hout's reconstruction of the first half of the anthroponym (p. 131) is accepted.

⁴¹ See T. van den Hout, *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag*, StBoT 38, Wiesbaden 1995, 131.

⁴² On the different writing of final *alef* in the two texts see note 31.

present in TSB 36, the previous act of this group. Through EmarVI 33 it is possible to date Hir. 44 to the same period as TSB 36 and EmarVI 211 (TSB 36, point I).

RE 56

I) The principal element to date this act is the sealing of Mutri-tešub.

II) From the presence of Dagan-tari', son of Matkali-dagan, in the witness list, on the basis of Hir. 44 point II, the text must be contemporary with Hir. 44, TSB 36, and EmarVI 211.

EmarVI 252

I) The only element to date this text is the presence of Mutri-tešub as judge. The document must thus date to the 3rd or to the 4th emarite generation (Hir. 44, point II).

TSB 84

I) The only element to date this text is the presence of as judge. The document must thus date to the 3rd or to the 4th emarite generation (Hir. 44, point II).

EmarVI 90

I) In the witness list of this act the first position is occupied by Laḫeia, the Overseer of the land. Laḫeia is also the name of a Mutri-tešub's son attested in EmarVI 217 and in TSB 72. Since Mutri-tešub was an important Syro-Hittite official and probably bore also the position of Overseer of the land, it seems likely his son occupied the same position: in this case the tablet should date back to the 4th or 5th emarite generation attested in Syro-Hittite documents (see Hir. 44, point II).

II) One of the witnesses to this act is Belu-malik, son of Imlik-dagan, scribe. This Imlik-dagan worked as scribe for the Emar royal family when Zu-aštarte was king⁴³. Zu-aštarte belonged to the 3rd generation of the royal family which ruled the city after the Hittite conquest; Elli, Zu-aštarte's nephew, who belonged to the 4th generation, must be thus contemporary with Belu-malik, son of Imlik-dagan. Laḫeia, the Overseer of the land, attested in this document together with Belu-malik, son of the scribe Imlik-dagan, belonged to the last period of the Emar archives (4th/5th generation); Laḫeia, son of Mutri-tešub, belonged to the same period, since he is attested in EmarVI 217 together with the 4th generation diviner of the temple M₁, Adda-malik. These considerations combine to suggest that Laḫeia, the Overseer of the land, and Laḫeia, son of Mutri-tešub, were the same person.

⁴³ See D. Arnaud, *Les textes d'Emar. . .*, *Syria* 52 [1975] 90.

EmarVI 263

I) The anthroponym Kili-šarruma is the only element to date this letter sent to a Overseer of the land. The only Kili-šarruma attested in Emar texts is a son of Mutri-tešub; in TSB 20 and 61 he appears together with temple M₁ diviner Adda-malik. So it is possible to date the document to the 4th generation⁴⁴.

3.6. The final group is characterised by the presence of the Overseer of the land Aḫi-malik.

TSB 33

I) The presence of Belu-malik son of Çalmu and Amzaḫi son of Eḫlia in the witness list is the element on which the dating of this document is based. These two persons appear as witnesses in EmarVI 221; in the same act temple M₁ diviner Adda-malik is attested. From EmarVI 221, TSB 33 dates to the last period of the Emar history.

II) The Overseer of the land Aḫi-malik sealed this tablet; on the basis of the previous point he was contemporary with the diviner Adda-malik, and worked in the last period of Emar history.

III) Since Aḫi-malik adopted a seal previously belonging to Laḫeia⁴⁵, the former must have been Overseer of the land after the latter.

IV) If the suggestion exposed in EmarVI 90 II (Laḫeia LÚ.UGULA = Laḫeia DUMU Mutri-tešub) is correct, the dating of this text is necessarily later than EmarVI 212: in EmarVI 212 in fact Adda-malik is attested together with Mutri-tešub, Laḫeia father and probably predecessor in the position of Overseer of the land. Adda-malik must have thus been very old when Emar VI 221 was drafted, and his sons already adult⁴⁶. Emar VI 221 dates back to the 5th generation and consequently on the basis of point I also TSB 33 belongs to that time.

RE 12

I) The most important element to date this document is the presence of the Overseer of the land Aḫi-malik, who worked in the Syro-Hittite administration during the time of the 5th generation (TSB 33 I-IV). The presence of Amzaḫi son of Eḫliya in the witness list is a further confirmation for the contemporaneity of this act with TSB 33.

⁴⁴ On the dating of this text see also M. Adamthwaite, *Ethnic Movements*. . . , in G. Bunens, , *Cultural Interaction*. . . , Louvain 1996, 91–112.

⁴⁵ See I. Singer *Borrowing Seals at Emar*, in J. Goodnick Westenholz (ed.), *Seals and Sealing in the Ancient Near East*, Jerusalem 1995, 57–64.

⁴⁶ That Adda-malik had adult sons is shown by EmarVI 225 and 226, where they probably exchange part of their inheritance. It is also likely that their father was already dead when these two documents were written. On this topic see M. Yamada, *The Family*. . . , IOS 18 [1998] 327–330, with references to texts and bibliography.

Hir. 36

I) The most important element to date this document is the presence of the Overseer of the land Aḫi-malik, who worked in the Syro-Hittite administration during the time of the 5th generation (TSB 33 I-IV).

Hir. 45

I) The most important element to date this document is the presence of the Overseer of the land Aḫi-malik, who worked in the Syro-Hittite administration during the time of the 5th generation (TSB 33 I-IV).

II) Since Zu-aštarte, son of Aḫi-malik, son of Kutbe appears both here and in Hir. 36, the two documents must be closely contemporary.

EmarVI 289

I) The most important element to date this document is the presence of the Overseer of the land Aḫi-malik, who worked in the Syro-Hittite administration during the time of the 5th generation (TSB 33 I-IV).

There are no prosopographic elements good enough to date the three letters EmarVI 262 AuOr 2 1 and 3.

4. The chronological setting of these texts leads us to formulate some new hypotheses on the Syro-Hittite administration at Emar. On the basis of the prosopographical data uncovered above the first point visible also in the two Tables, is a rebalancing between the number of documents dating to the reigns of Šaḫurunuwa Ini-tešub. Previously, based on the attestations in which the king played an active role, eleven tablets were dated to Ini-tešub⁴⁷ and only a pair to Šaḫurunuwa⁴⁸. I. Singer recently added a third document, RAI 1997, to the group dating to Šaḫurunuwa period⁴⁹. Table 2 now shows clearly that the Syro-Hittite administration worked actively at Emar already during the second half of Ini-tešub's father's reign. Since it seems likely that some of the documents characterised by the presence of officials such as Ḫešmi-tešub, Ini-tešub's older brother, and Puḫi-šenni, the Overseer of the land⁵⁰ should also be dated to that period, at least six other tablets were drafted late during Šaḫurunuwa's rule⁵¹. In any case, Emarite texts show a larger number of acts drafted before Ini-tešub than before his father; it is true that the Emarite texts cover all the reign of the former and only part of the latter's, but the major occurrences of Ini-tešub are better interpreted as a will to involve himself more directly in the active administration at Emar. This deeper incidence of Ini-tešub at Emar in

⁴⁷ EmarVI 18, 19, 177, 201, 202, 207; SMEA 5; MFA 1977; RE 54, 55, 85.

⁴⁸ EmarVI 31, Laroche 73.1097.

⁴⁹ See I. Singer, A New Hittite Letter from Emar, in *Atti della XLIV RAI* [in press] 59–66.

⁵⁰ See above TSB 30 I and II for Ḫešmi-tešub, EmarVI 181 II for Puḫi-šenni.

⁵¹ EmarVI 181, 182; Hir. 3; Fales 66; TSB 30, 56.

comparison to his predecessor is exactly parallel for the region as a whole; this can be demonstrated by documents coming from Ugarit and Ḫattuša⁵², whose archives cover a longer period than those of Emar.

The small number of texts dating back to the last kings of Karkemiš, Talmi-tešub and Kuzi-tešub, is probably proportional to the brief duration of the period in which they held control of the city.

4.1. Only in three texts⁵³ can the Hittite court of Ḫattuša be seen taking part directly in Emarite internal questions; in these documents references to the Hittite intervention all date to Šaḫurunuwa's reign, and for the subsequent time no Hittite direct actions in the land of Aštata are known. It thus seems likely that after an initial period of active presence in managing the Land of Aštata, the court of Ḫattuša entrusted the administration of that region entirely to Karkemiš; this change happened during the reign of Šaḫurunuwa. However the Hittite court intended to keep a check on the actions of the new administration directed by the Karkemiš kings: in the witness lists of the acts dating to the successive period to Šaḫurunuwa's reign, persons coming from the land of Ḫatti (LÚ^{KUR} *ḫa-ti* / *ḫat-ti* / *ḫa-at-ti*) are attested⁵⁴; they were high officials of the Hittite court, who moved through the various regions of the empire with the task of helping and checking the local administrations work⁵⁵.

4.2. Among the texts dating to Ini-tešub's reign it is useful to consider further EmarVI 1⁵⁶. This verdict of Ini-tešub states that prince of Karkemiš Ḫešmi-tešub, brother of the king, becomes deprived of Kitta's⁵⁷ family members servitude and properties.

In the first part of the act this Son of the king expounds before his brother Ini-tešub his reasons, remarking that he had asked the latter to allot to him not only the debtor Kitta, but also his sons and property; the king agreed to the request and sealed a document dealing with the matter⁵⁸, while he was far-away in the land of Ḫatti and in the Land of Tarḫuntašša⁵⁹.

⁵² For Ugarit see M. Liverani, *Karkemiš nei testi di Ugarit*, RSO 35 [1960] 135–147; for Ḫattuša see T. van den Hout prosopographic study in, *Der Ulmi-tešub Vertrag*, SBoT 38, Wiesbaden 1995.

⁵³ Laroche 73.1097, RAI 1997 and EmarVI 201.

⁵⁴ See for example EmarVI 112, 115, 211, 221.

⁵⁵ See F. Imparati, *La politique extérieure des Hittites: tendance et problèmes*, *Hethitica VIII* [1987] 187–207, in particular on the Piḫa-tarḫunta figure.

⁵⁶ See L. d'Alfonso, *Tarḫuntašša. . .*, *AoF* 26/2 [1999] 314–321, with references to previous studies on the text.

⁵⁷ From EmarVI 19, 2, it seems likely that Kitta was in debt with Ḫešmi-tešub.

⁵⁸ EmarVI 18, 2–6.

⁵⁹ It seems to me now that the words “*ina māt Ḫatti ina māt Tarḫuntašša*” (line 6) relate to the king and not to Kitta's service, as D. Arnaud (edition of the text) and I (see

Further the text reports Kitta's claims to Ini-tešub on the grounds of his family situation⁶⁰; the man met the king when he came back to his land.

The following words of the king are very unusual in this context. Usually in the verdicts of Karkemiš after the two opposers speeches or/and eventually a reconstruction of the facts, the judge decision follows; in this text, before the decision, a comment of Ini-tešub concerning the event is reported, where the king, who clearly was unaware of Kitta's family's present situation, harshly reprimands his brother: Hešmi-tešub position does not respect the Emar town agreement, whose existence Hešmi-tešub critically seems to ignore⁶¹.

Then it follows Ini-tešub's decision, which requires Kitta to remain Hešmi-tešub's servant, but says that Kitta's sons and inheritance should not belong to the Son of the king.

If one considers that the Palace originally assigned to Hešmi-tešub Kitta, his family and his goods, the comment before the decision seems to be the necessary explanation for the Palace's change of decision in Kitta's case. The king was far away, probably involved in other and much more important questions, and surely in the dark about Kitta's position, when he sealed the first act. After his return and the meeting with Kitta, it became evident that Hešmi-tešub's demands on Kitta's family and goods were contrary to the clauses of the Emar city agreement. Ini-tešub thus changed his mind and took a new decision, but first – a *unicum* in this kind of texts – he strongly reprimands his brother for his "ignorance" of the agreement.

EmarVI 18 ends with the following words:

25. LÚ EN *ma-mi-ia-ti ša URU e-mar šu-ut*⁶²
He is guarantor⁶³ of the Emar town agreement.

This line runs on the tablet just above the king cylinder seal impression, and I suggest Ini-tešub to be the person this expression refers to: in fact his sentence in this verdict is given in defence of an agreement clause.

note 56 above) previously believed. J.M Durand has proposed a different translation of this line (RA 83 [1989] 176), but in a note he suggests that "La *traductio faciliior* serait «alors qu'Ini-Teššub était loin de Carkemish, dans le pays hittite». This kind of interpretation seems now to me better if it is connected with the following line, where it is written "And when the king returned to his own country...".

⁶⁰ EmarVI 18, 9–10.

⁶¹ EmarVI 18, 10–12.

⁶² In text edition D. Arnaud expunged the *ia* in *ma-mi-ia-ti*; later, on the basis of his linguistic study on the Emarite dialect, he argued it was not necessary to expunge that sign: see D. Arnaud, *L'onomastique...*, SEL 8 [1991] 27–28, note 17.

⁶³ The translation "guarantor of the agreement" for EN *māmīti*, literally "lord of the oath", seems to me juridically more correct. The expression often refers in treaties and oaths to divinities, whose role is to let the parts respect the contents of the oath (see CAD, *māmītu* 1.e); an example for this period is RS 17.146 r. 53 (PRU IV, p. 157),

The hypothesis that the Emar city agreement was drafted under the aegis of Ini-tešub seems likely from lines 25 and 10–12 (the king's reprimand to his brother), which closely connect this agreement to the Karkemiš king. The agreement should date to the beginning of Ini-tešub's reign; in fact EmarVI 18 constitutes a *terminus ante quem* for this agreement. From the foregoing prosopographic analysis⁶⁴, we know that Hešmi-tešub already worked at Emar during his father Šaḫurunuwa's reign, and there is no synchronism attested with 4th generation individuals; thus the dating of the act cannot be lowered beyond the middle of Ini-tešub's reign, and between the drafting of the agreement and EmarVI 18 Ini-tešub's stay in the land of Ḫatti and in the land of Tarḫuntašša must be placed. The fragment KUB LVII 18 found at Ḫattuša, which probably belongs to a treaty between a Great King of Ḫatti and the people of Aštata (LÚ.MEŠ^{URU} *aš-ta[-ta]*, line 2), does not correspond to the agreement mentioned in EmarVI 18, and should date to an earlier period⁶⁵.

The drafting of an agreement with the city of Emar under the aegis of Ini-tešub appears consistent with the already known legislative work of the Karkemiš court during his reign; in the archives of Ugarit royal palace four agreements contracted between the people of Ugarit and the people of Karkemiš under the aegis of Ini-tešub were found.⁶⁶

If the hypothesis is accepted, to this king and his court must be attributed a legislative work not fortuitous but well planned; it is difficult from the few texts

not casually one of the agreements between Karkemiš and Ugarit sealed by Ini-tešub. *Māmītu*, literally "oath", was already translated by D. Arnaud with treaty (*traité*), and also J.M. Durand (RA 83 [1989] 177) thought that the term means here something more than simply "oath" (convention *jure*). The use of the term "agreement follows J. Nougayrol's translation ("accord" PRU IV, VF1, 152ff); to indicate a group of texts found at Ugarit in which some bilateral terms between the population of Ugarit and the population of Karkemiš are fixed under the aegis of Ini-tešub. The use of this translation instead of "treaty" allows us to point out the distinction between this group of texts and the treaties drafted in the Hittite territory in the same period, first of all the presence of a high personality *super partes*, who makes the agreement to be drafted and guarantees it (for example RS 17.146, 1–5).

⁶⁴ See above § 3.2, where texts mentioning Hešmi-tešub are analysed.

⁶⁵ W. F. Leemans (Aperçu sur le textes . . ., JESHO 31 [1988] 208) has already related the *māmītu* mentioned in EmarVI 18 with Karkemiš instead of Ḫatti, while H. Klen-gel has already suggested as the fragment bears palaeographic marks dating it back to the Hittite Old Kingdom (Die Keilschrifttexte..., OLZ 83 [1988] col. 649).

⁶⁶ See J. Nougayrol, PRU IV, V F 1, 152–160: three agreements come from the area of court V (RS 17.230 from room 68, RS 18.19 from room 69, RS 18.115 from the court itself), while RS 17.146 was found to the East, in room 90. The plumb label which probably signed this group of texts in the ancient archive (PRU IV, RS 19.75, 292). was found not far away in the Southern Palace, room 204 (all informations come from P. Bordreuil – D. Pardee, *Le trouvaille épigraphique de l'Ougarit. 1 Concordance*, Paris 1989).

available to us to define and comprehend the grounds and the aims of this work; however, one can legitimately suggest that it was the necessary premise to the important role of judge for all the Syrian disputes, a role which the court of Karkemiš began to bear starting with the reign of Ini-tešub⁶⁷. Further in this work, one can guess that there were attempts to correct some of the effects of the deep structural difficulties in the palatial system present at that time⁶⁸, as brigandage and enslavement for debts⁶⁹.

4.4. If the Emar town agreement constituted a strong change in Syro-Hittite administrative action, it is nevertheless clear that an element of continuity between Šahurunuwa's and Ini-tešub's reigns was given by the modalities of authentication of the legal acts. In the group of legal documents analysed above, some present one seal impression, some one seal impression plus a witness list, some many seal impressions and, sometimes, a witness list; if this differentiation in the modality of authentication is put in relation with the person before whom the act was drafted, the result is the following tendency⁷⁰:

act in which the king of Karkemiš is the higher rank official attested	⇒ the tablet bears only the royal seal impression
acts in which the DUMU.LUGAL is the higher rank official attested	⇒ the tablet bears the DUMU.LUGAL seal impression and the witness list
acts in which the Overseer of the land is the higher rank official attested	⇒ the tablet bears many seal impressions including that of the Overseer of the land, and sometimes the witness list

⁶⁷ See M. Liverani, Karkemiš. . ., RSO 35 [1960] 135–147; J. D. Hawkins, "Karkemiš", *RIA* 5 [1980] 426–446.

⁶⁸ In M. Liverani, *La Siria nel Tardo Bronzo*, Roma 1969, see in particular: M. Liverani, *Introduzione*, 1–14; H. Klengel, *Probleme einer politischen Geschichte der Spätbronzezeitlichen Syrien*, 15–30; M. Heltzer, *Problems of the Social History of Syria in the Late Bronze Age*, 31–46. See also M. Liverani, *Il fuoriuscitismo in Siria nella tarda età del Bronzo*, RSI 77 [1965] 315–335.

⁶⁹ The agreements between Karkemiš and Ugarit (RS 17.146, 17.230, 18.19, 18.115) form a package of law regarding issues ultimately connected with brigandage, such as merchant killing, killing of citizens or stealing. The clause of the agreement to which EmarVI 18 refers, can be interpreted as an attempt to oppose the excessive use of enslavement for debts (otherwise D. Arnaud, *Les Hittites. . .*, *Hethitica* VIII [1987] 9–27).

⁷⁰ 28 out of 32 legal acts follow this tendency; exceptions are EmarVI 181, 202, 211 e SMEA 6. However, EmarVI 181 e 211 can be interpreted as a sub-group of the acts in which the Son of the king is the higher rank official attested. Both legal cases were solved before a Son of the king, but both tablets do not present the DUMU.LUGAL

This relation between officials and modality of authentication lays open and confirms in legal contest the official hierarchy already brought to light by scholars⁷¹; this hierarchy, I would say, reveals itself in legal contest through the elements of authentication (seal impressions and witness lists).

For the documents in which the king of Karkemiš gives the authentication, his sealing suffices, since he is at Emar the Syro-Hittite administration's highest authority: his decision is unquestionable, except by himself.

Acts in which the DUMU.LUGAL is the highest ranked official attested, show beside the seal impression of the Son of the king a witness list. Of these two elements the former is clearly the most important; it implies an individual direct action (the seal impression), while the drafting of the witness list is made by the scribe, and it does not need the witnesses to be directly involved in it: its validity is finally guaranteed again by the DUMU.LUGAL's sealing. Witnesses do not represent any limit to the DUMU.LUGAL's decision; however, their constant presence evidences a limit to this official's power in authenticating legal texts, and expresses the community's need for witnesses to be present when he acts.

The Overseer of the land sometimes authenticates legal documents, sometimes appears as witness in documents sealed by the Son of the king⁷²; in the first case an act sealed only by him is not valid, and other seal impressions are required. This office had probably a short duration and this could have itself constituted a serious limit in respect of the authentication⁷³: for the same rea-

seal impression. One can suggest that the Son of the king was not present when the scribe in effect drafted the document, so the act needed many seal impressions of witnesses to be valid, as in the case of the lower rank officials, above all the Overseer of the land. EmarVI 202 bears no sealing, whereas an Ini-tešub seal impression would be expected; without it is hard to affirm that the document had a legal value; it was possibly a copy of an original. It is otherwise impossible to me to explain why SMEA 6, sealed by the Son of the king Tili-šarruma does not contain a witness list.

⁷¹ See in particular D. Arnaud, *La Syrie du Moyen...*, *AuOr* 2 [1984] 179–188; idem, *Les Hittites sur...*, *Hathitica* VIII [1987] 9–27; G. Beckman, *Hittite Provincial Administration...*, in O. Carruba-M. Giorgieri-C. Mora, *Atti del II congresso internazionale di Hittitologia*, Pavia 1995, 19–37.

⁷² In this case he usually holds the first position in the list: see, e.g., Puḫi-šenni in Fales 66.

⁷³ This hypothesis on the short duration of this office is based on the following elements:

- none of the persons bearing the title of Overseer of the land in the cuneiform text has the title written on his seal: unlike the DUMU.LUGAL;
- none bore the office of Overseer of the land for a period longer than one generation;
- one Overseer of the land passed afterwards to another office, that of Supreme Scribe (Puḫi-šenni);
- a seal with the personal name of a former Overseer was reused by the individual who afterwards bore the office (see the suggestions of I. Singer, *Borrowing Seals at Emar*, in: Goodwick – Westenholz (eds.), *Seals and Sealing in the Ancient Near East*, Jerusalem 1995, 57–63).

son perhaps the Overseer of the land seal never contains an indication of the title, but only the personal name⁷⁴.

Finally the scribes, including the highest ranked ones, only on rare occasions seal the tablets they drafted, and in those cases another Syro-Hittite high official is also involved in the act⁷⁵; habitually they are attested in the witness list, often their name occupying the last position. In any case their presence was not enough for a legal document to be valid.

The Syro-Hittite administration at Emar adopted this peculiar relation between the office and the elements of authentication in legal acts during all the period in which it was active; it must be noted however, that this way to organise and define hierarchies and functions dates back to the time of Šahurunuwa's reign, and appears the biggest effort made by the Karkemiš court during his reign.

5. Conclusions. Through a relative chronology on the drafting of the Syro-Hittite documents, it becomes clear that only during the period immediately following the building of the new city of Emar, did officials from the Hittite court administer together with Karkemiš officials the land of Aštata; this period corresponds to the time in which the 2nd of the five Emarite generations attested in those documents lived. In the following period the court of Hattuša deferred entirely to Karkemiš the task of administrating that region and its capital. During the reign of Šahurunuwa the internal list of this administrative system was defined; each office of the list had a specific way to apply its actions, and at least the characteristics of authenticating documents emerge through differences in the drafting of the legal acts: the presence of only one sealing, or one sealing plus a witness list, or more sealing and – sometimes – a witness list. The administration maintained such characteristics for the whole of the period in which it worked, i. e. from the time of the 2nd generation to the time of the last, the V generation. A strong innovation in Syro-Hittite administrative action happened during the first decades of Ini-tešub's reign; , to this time must be dated the Emar town agreement, whose the karkemisite king was probably the guarantor. Only the sense of one clause of this agreement is

⁷⁴ Emar seal impressions are only partly published. Seal impressions from official excavations were studied by D. Beyer, *Recherches sur les empreintes de sceau d'Emar (Meskene et Tell Faq'ous)*, Thèse de doctorat, Université de Strasbourg 1989, containing references to all previous studies on these impressions; TSB seal impressions with Hittite hieroglyphs were studied by H. Gonnet, *Les légendes des empreintes hiéroglyphiques anatoliennes*, in D. Arnaud, *Textes syriens. . .*, *Barcelona 1991*, 198–216. *RE and Hir. seal impressions have still to be published.*

⁷⁵ See for example TSB 36, 56, 76, 77, which contain beyond the scribe sealing respectively Mutri-tešub seal impression, Puḫi-šenni as Overseer of the land in witness list first position, Mutri-tešub seal impression and the LÚ *kartappu* Aya'u seal impression and witness list first position.

known; it establishes that a creditor cannot take into slavery the sons of an insolvent debtor and their goods. Although only the sense of this clause is known, from the legal case of EmarVI 18 it is clear that the agreement deeply altered the customs and laws previously adopted. The activity of Ini-tešub as legislator has parallels at Ugarit; from the existence of agreements in various towns this activity cannot be considered fortuitous, but a well planned effort in part to satisfy demands arising out of the structural crisis in the palatial system, in part to create a corpus of laws on which the court of Karkemiš then based its important juridical action until the fall of the Hittite empire.

APPENDIX

List of texts studied in the present work together with page numbers on which the evidence of their dating is explained:

Laroche 731097	p. 276		
AuOrII 2	p. 281	Hir. 3	p. 278
		Hir. 29	p. 280
EmarVI 18	p. 280	Hir. 36	p. 287
EmarVI 19	p. 280	Hir. 44	p. 285
EmarVI 31	p. 280	Hir. 45	p. 287
EmarVI 90	p. 286	Hir. 46	p. 281
EmarVI 177	p. 280		
EmarVI 181	p. 282	TSB 30	p. 278
EmarVI 182	p. 282	TSB 33	p. 286
EmarVI 194	p. 276	TSB 36	p. 285
EmarVI 201	p. 275	TSB 56	p. 283
EmarVI 202	p. 275	TSB 84	p. 285
EmarVI 207	p. 277		
EmarVI 211	p. 277	SMEA 5	p. 280
EmarVI 252	p. 285	SMEA 6	p. 282
EmarVI 259	p. 278		
EmarVI 261	p. 284	MFA 1977	p. 281
EmarVI 263	p. 286		
EmarVI 267	p. 281	RE 12	p. 287
EmarVI 289	p. 287	RE 54	p. 281
		RE 55	p. 281
Fales 66	p. 279	RE 85	p. 281
ASJ 10/B	p. 283	RAI 1997	p. 276