

## Ad Hoc Administration and Archiving at Emar: Free Format and Free Composition in the Diviner's Text Collection

*Daniel E. Fleming* – New York

New York University

*Sophie Démare-Lafont* – Paris

Université Panthéon-Assas, EPHE-PSL

[The one collection of administrative texts found at Late Bronze Age Emar belonged to the diviners of the building M-1, where by far the largest number of excavated texts was found. These are most striking for their lack of duplicated form, even when they treat similar transactions, so that they display a free administrative form that is in conceptual continuity with what we call the Free Format of the legal tradition that and its accompanying script.]

**Keywords:** Emar, administrative texts, scribal practice, diviners.

The Late Bronze Age cuneiform finds from Emar in northwestern Syria are modest, and the city itself was both relatively small and far from the centers of power in the late second millennium BCE. Situated at the western elbow of the Euphrates River, south of Carchemish and east of Aleppo, Emar had a longstanding role in trade and travel across the ancient Near East, though its contribution to study of history will never derive from its political heft. Rather, the archaeology and the archives of Emar offer an equally important vision of the past from a different social point of view, in contrast to the vantage of ambitious monarchy and centralizing power. In this merchant town, political authority was in constant negotiation between various inside and outside players, finally including the great Anatolian kingdom of Hatti and its subsidiary center at Carchemish.

With this article, we propose that Late Bronze Emar never developed an administrative or bureaucratic culture, and even without excavation of a palace and its cuneiform texts, this can be seen in the character of the written evidence. Emar's local kings served in concert with traditional collective institutions defined by the town as a whole, with scribes committed to customary standard forms. When new scribal practices arrived during the 13<sup>th</sup> century, contemporary with Hittite domination but not deriving directly from its influence, the texts display a vigorous spirit of innovation, without reference to a fixed framework of authority. In legal documents, this new writing follows a "Free Format," and we propose here that the same innovative spirit characterizes the one significant body of administrative texts from Emar.<sup>1</sup> The diviner of the building M-1

---

1. In Démare-Lafont and Fleming (2015), we reevaluate the entire historical framework for writing at Emar, with particular attention to the two scribal streams represented in the archives, which we distinguish between an old-fashioned

supervised the public religious life of the town, a role that made him a bridge between local institutions and outside power with complex responsibilities in an extensive network of interests. Texts from the diviner's archive include many records that could be read as bureaucratic, yet this administrative writing was ad hoc, with every new tablet conceived to meet the need of a moment, never intended to form part of a consecutive or conceptual set, even as the ingredients of form naturally depended on prior experience and occasion. The "free" spirit thus permeates the new handling of both law and record keeping, and it probably applies to the collection of ritual texts as well. Emar administration from the diviner's archive confirms the trend of writing visible in Free Format law, and together, these point to the larger character of scribal response to the political circumstances of life under foreign domination.<sup>2</sup> The arrival of new powers generated alternative lines of authority and opened up different possibilities for decision-making, without the constraints of any bureaucratic structure, either indigenous or foreign.

This study has the single site of Emar as its focus, both for interest in progress toward understanding Emar on its own terms and with intent to exploit the unusual character of its written finds for their larger historical import. We do not attempt to locate the administrative texts from Emar in a systematic overview of Mesopotamian record-keeping, even as we suggest that they represent a non-bureaucratic pole of administrative practice. For the other end of such a spectrum, one comparison is the royal archives from early second-millennium Mari, where at least a significant component of the administrative collection is dated, including both individual transaction dockets and summary texts.<sup>3</sup> Despite their high degree of standardization, these tablets also exhibit interesting differences.<sup>4</sup> It would be worth exploring the varieties of settings that produce more and less standard documentation in different political and historical circumstances. Roughly contemporary with the mass of Mari archives, a recent study of texts from the collection of Šamaš-ḥazir, a royal registrar (*šassukkum*) at Larsa, presents a blend of documents for royal and personal business that recalls the archive we will examine here.<sup>5</sup> In fact, though these Old Babylonian

---

Conventional Format and an innovative Free Format. For previous discussion of chronology and scribal streams, see especially Skaist (1998); Di Filippo (2004); and Cohen and D'Alfonso (2008).

2. One indication of his range and the extent of this administrative style is evidence of his hand in administrative texts from the storm god temple in Area E (E43, E56, E57, E61; see Cohen 2009: 163, 170). Texts from Area E with the diviner's seal appear only in the last generation, however, and it may be that we should understand Ba'lu-qarrad to have produced documents only for use within the building M-1.

3. The quantity of dated documents formed the foundation of the tabulation in Sasson (1980). One specific example is the disbursement of oil, as in the set of 107 tablets published in Duponchel (1997). Duponchel observes (p.201), "Ils suivent un schéma standard," matching other sets of oil disbursements published previously.

4. Chambon (2016) has noticed variations regarding the shapes of the signs, the use of Akkadian and Sumerian forms, and the description of the same operation in parallel documents.

5. Fiette (2014) assembles and examines 193 letters and 120 legal and administrative documents from outside controlled excavation at Tell Senkereh in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The archive combines administrative texts for managing royal fields with the management of Šamaš-ḥazir's own finances. What Fiette identifies as "private" appears rather to be at the registrar's disposal by way of compensation. The two groups of texts do not have radically different form, and this may reflect a reality that they all have to do with the registrar's function, so none is truly "private." Note the following types within each group. For the royal estate: registry of fields shared by cultivators; lists of land surveyors; receipts for the transfer of fields to cultivators; lists of fields; reports by cultivators; registry of harvests; memoranda. For Šamaš-ḥazir: contracts for the cultivation of fields, palm groves, and for grazing; grain inventory; grain rations for delivery; loan contracts for grain; receipt of grain to exchange for bran; accounts for dates; registry of harvests; annual summary of lost cattle; inventory of wooden objects. We list each set as one point of reference for the complex combination of types in the

archives derive from royal or official contexts, they cannot be labelled as “public.” Rather, they involve the practices of the household of the king or of a local dignitary. In some respects, the Emar administrative documentation shares the same features: it originates in the activity of an individual vested with official functions. The peculiarities of the Emar sources that we are going to discuss should be understood against this general background. We offer our own case and interpretation in hope of stimulating new questions as specialists consider others.

### *1. Old and new scribal practices: conventional and free formats*

Out of frustration with the incoherence of the standard classification of Emar scripts, we proposed elsewhere (Fleming and Démare-Lafont 2009) a more meaningful pair of designations. Based on a contrast visible first of all in the legal documents, Daniel Arnaud (1975) identified texts witnessed by the local king as “Syrian” and those witnessed by leaders from the Hittite ruling sphere as “Syro-Hittite,” applying the two labels to all legal texts of each physical layout and script. It became clear with further investigation that the contrasting layouts for these two groups of legal tablets corresponded to other features not dependent on tablet shape, including script and spelling, so that the Syrian/Syro-Hittite dichotomy has been generalized to all Emar textual finds.<sup>6</sup> We endorse emphatically this pursuit of two main streams in the scribal practice at Late Bronze Age Emar. Our frustration grows out of the inadequacy of the Syrian/Syro-Hittite duality to describe either the writing trends themselves or their relationship to the social and political realities of Emar and its region. Beyond the inaccuracies embedded in the terminology, their entire conception constrains interpretation of the site and its written finds. We propose to work from the coexistence of the two contrasting cuneiform practices toward a better understanding of the evolving situation at Emar before and during Hittite domination.

Starting with the legal documentation alone, as the clearest point of departure for comparing parallel writing practices applied to the same needs, we have identified the texts witnessed by the local king as Conventional Format (CF) and the other group as Free Format (FF). As observed by others, the Conventional Format texts adopt a layout with precedent going back centuries, inscribed across the short dimension, and leaving margins across the top and left sides of the obverse for seals.<sup>7</sup> The sign forms likewise display more direct affinity with Old Babylonian palaeography.<sup>8</sup> In their treatment of legal transactions, the CF documents truly present a standard procedure and display a consistent compositional style. Texts with nearly identical traits have been found at Ekalte (Tell Munbaqa) and Azu (Tell Hadidi), in the Euphrates River valley upstream.<sup>9</sup> Not all of

---

Emar archive, where it can be difficult or impossible to determine with certainty which documents concern the office and which concern the record-keeper.

6. A crucial first step was the detailed study of palaeography by Claus Wilcke (1992), who showed that certain signs were rendered differently in each group. The list he provided has become a point of departure for other analyses that treated the larger Emar corpus. See especially Stefano Seminara’s grammar (1998), Yoram Cohen’s study of scribes (2009), and Matthew Rutz’s reevaluation of all published tablets and fragments from the diviner’s archive of the building M-1 (2013). There is a need for systematic extension of the traits discovered by Wilcke, which have been exploited without attempt to find other examples.

7. Beyer (2001: 421) compares especially the earlier second-millennium collection from Terqa; cf. Balza (2009: 43-4).

8. See Wilcke (1992); Seminara (1998: 12).

9. The excavated tablets from Tell Munbaqa (Ekalte) are published in Mayer (2001); for Tell Hadidi (Azu), see Robert Whiting, “Catalog of Tell Hadidi Tablets,” <http://www.helsinki.fi/~whiting/hadidcat.html>.

these documents have royal witness, but they are all remarkably consistent and might even be dubbed “old-fashioned.” They are “conventional” in form and method and take their authority from their participation in conventional practice. So far as this practice was longstanding in this particular region, it was indeed “Syrian,” though nothing demonstrates it to have served Syria more broadly or to constitute an indigenous Syrian version of cuneiform. It is simply old-fashioned, with older links to Babylonian cuneiform than the other scribal practice, which likewise reflects Babylonian writing.

The larger problem with the Syrian/Syro-Hittite terminology arises with the designation of the remaining group of locally produced tablets as a corresponding type, understood to have similar consistency, only within some other scribal circle. If the Conventional documents are a standard type, executed according to a fixed style, most often marked by the same framework of authority, then the others should be the same, only with a different style and authority – now framed by Hittite rule. Yet such a characterization squeezes the diversity of this group into a definitional straightjacket entirely at odds with its contents. In her study of legal formulae from Emar, Démare-Lafont (2010) concluded that these texts are marked by a non-style, the antithesis of obligatory or automatic formulation that constitutes “style.” Searching for a way to articulate the radically different logic behind this legal and scribal stream, we have named the texts Free Format, reflecting their tendency toward innovation and variation to suit individual need.

With the current undertaking, we explore the application of such writing in Free Format outside the legal setting, among what are commonly called administrative texts.<sup>10</sup> We combine an extension of investigation into scribal patterns with study of a neglected body of texts that tell us much about the activity of the institution that generated by far the largest number of tablets found at Emar. Our results connect these dimensions deeply: the record-keeping of the diviners in Emar’s building M-1 adopted a scribal method as “free” as what we encounter in the legal documents, and their writing tradition displays trends in spelling, script, and layout familiar to the legal texts. The administrative texts and approach therefore deserve the label “Free Format” as much as the legal documents that inspired our proposal for a change in terminology.

## 2. *The diviner’s administrative work*

Elsewhere in the ancient Near East, the production of administrative records can occur wherever writing is found, though accumulated archives are associated especially with royal palaces.<sup>11</sup> Excavations at Emar (Meskeneh) have not uncovered the royal palace that must have existed, and so we have no way to evaluate the king’s administrative apparatus.<sup>12</sup> The later kings Pilsu-Dagan and his son Elli were served by more than one scribe each, as shown by the legal documents with royal witness.<sup>13</sup> It is not clear, however, whether these scribes worked full-time for

10. Rutz (2013: 129) groups these as “administrative records”; Faist (2008) as “administration.”

11. Details for a range of tablet collections from the mid-second through first millennia are gathered in Pedersén (1998). Larger assemblages of administrative texts are often associated with palaces (e.g. Hattuša 5, p.50; Babylon, pp.183-4), but such texts occur in many contexts, including large temple organizations. The scale and consistency of their production varies according to political and institutional situation, as explored here for Emar.

12. For the hypothesis that Emar’s royal palace was in the lower part of the city, which was never excavated, see Fleming (2012).

13. See the listing of scribes beginning with king Pilsu-Dagan in Cohen (2009: 78-84).

the king and whether they had administrative responsibilities in addition. We cannot assume so. Emar does nevertheless preserve one assemblage of administrative writing, as part of the diviner's archive from the building M-1, which generated the overwhelming majority of tablets from the site. Arnaud designated a portion of the M-1 texts "administrative," though these are in some ways a catch-all for texts that fit no other category.<sup>14</sup> The occupants of the building M-1 gathered a remarkable variety of tablets that offer an empirical basis for considering the interests of those who took the title "diviner" (the main idea in Rutz 2013). The first division separates texts concerned with local Emar affairs from those composed elsewhere without particular interest in the town, especially as part of the school for training scribes in divinatory lore.<sup>15</sup> Among the rest, there are two main categories of local interest: private legal documents both for the diviners themselves and for a mysterious range of others from their circle; and texts that spell out ritual procedure for many different Emar deities and sacred events. Most of the tablets beyond these two groups have been classed as administrative, an adjective that does suit their tracking of exchanges that go beyond household interest and that reflect in various ways the diviner's involvement in ritual affairs for a cross-section of Emar's sacred sites.<sup>16</sup> This concern for the religious life of the larger community is shared by the texts identified by Arnaud and in common parlance as "ritual," and in fact, the ritual and administrative tablets properly represent a single set. One basis for distinguishing a body of texts as "ritual" would be the use of durative verbs that embed the recorded procedure in an enduring temporal horizon that links it with past and future practice. The texts we call "administrative" record one-time transactions that are generally complete.<sup>17</sup>

As a group, the administrative texts from the building M-1 are gathered in numbers 274-368.<sup>18</sup> While this group together reflects the diviner's activity in the daily affairs of Emar's sanctuaries and their rites, and we join in treating them as administrative, it is difficult to determine in what sense they are institutional. The diviner clearly helped keep track of materials related to Emar's sacred sites, following goods that moved into or out of these domains. Yet it is never clear that such goods were held in the name of an institution headed by the diviner or at a location identified with him. Likewise, it is not certain that the body of texts as a whole reflected the diviner's accountability to a superior institution. We see in certain letters the interest of outside officials in particular transactions, but it remains to prove that the diviner had to report to any higher authority in a systematic

---

14. This overarching category is visible in Arnaud's designation of E274-E281 as "textes administratifs de la sacristie" and of E361 and E362 as "divers administratif." Arnaud divides the other texts of E274 – E368 according to function: "inventaires" (E282 – E304); "bordereaux" (E305 – E335); lists of proper names (E336 – E360); and "livraisons cultuelles" (E363 – E368).

15. Both Cohen (2009), "The Scholarly Compositions of the Syro-Hittite Tradition," and Rutz (2013) in his long section on texts by genre, explore these at length. The large categories are lexical, divinatory, and literary.

16. The one other clearly distinct tablet type consists of letters (E259 – E273, E536). Outside the texts from excavations, see also TSBR 94-96; RE 83, 97; BLM 32 (Hittite). The one other clearly distinct tablet type consists of letters (E259 – E273, E536). Outside the texts from excavations, see also TSBR 94-96; RE 83, 97; BLM 32 (Hittite).

17. There are potential exceptions. In particular, E320 lists persons who have not given barley, perhaps in the sense of "not yet," anticipating future gifts, whether pledged or somehow required.

18. We considered including the group identified by Arnaud as "listes sacrificielles," because they may record numbers of sheep or birds for offering. Yet in the end we conclude that the texts' purposes are more ambiguous and perhaps varied. The list of deities in E378 indicates no transfer. The sheep and birds counted in E380 and E382 could record items listed without identifying them as "administrative." Note that although Rutz frames his project by the contents of the M-1 archives as such, he includes in his genre lists some texts from other locations. It is clear that the M-1 diviners were directly involved with drawing up documents at other sites, as observed in n.2, above.

way, or that the administrative texts found in his workplace were composed for the purpose of reporting to such an authority.<sup>19</sup> Further, we cannot tell that the diviner's involvement in record-keeping at sacred sites was comprehensive, that his presence was required for every transaction. And finally, it must not be assumed that every record in the archive was executed by the diviner. The collection of legal texts in the building M-1 displays diverse origins, yielding a document depot, and the site could have served the same function for administrative writing.

In spite of their tenuous connection to any definable institution, the administrative texts from the diviner's archive are numerous enough to indicate repeated practice, and they provide our sole opportunity to examine administrative custom at Emar. In his will, Ba'lu-qarrad passed down the title "diviner of the gods," a function elaborated in scribal colophons by his son Ba'lu-malik as "diviner of the gods of Emar."<sup>20</sup> Many of the administrative records deal with the affairs of various gods, like the ritual texts, and together they indicate involvement with a broad range of sacred sites. The seventh-year *zuku* festival for the turn of the year and the installation festival for the storm god's priestess are initiated by "the sons of Emar," thus the city as a body.<sup>21</sup> In some sense that remains difficult to pin down, the diviner served the city of Emar as such, through its public or common religious life. This service for the collective town is intriguing in scribal terms. Among the legal documents, the collective activity of Emar is prominent especially in the Conventional Format texts, where real estate is repeatedly sold by the town in the name of its elders and a god rendered <sup>d</sup>NIN.URTA, perhaps for Il Imari, God of Imar.<sup>22</sup> Yet the texts produced in the building M-1 under the leadership of Ba'lu-qarrad and his sons are consistently in the Free Format, and there is no sign of a special relationship between the diviner and the institution of land held in the name of the city god <sup>d</sup>NIN.URTA.<sup>23</sup> Somehow the diviner's responsibility for Emar's communal religious life stood completely apart from the institution of <sup>d</sup>NIN.URTA's temple and its identification with city leadership by plural elders, who were led in turn by the local king. His record-keeping likewise would have been carried out without reference to the cluster of collective authority represented by <sup>d</sup>NIN.URTA, the elders, and the king. Perhaps someday the Late Bronze Age palace at Emar will be brought to light and its administrative practices will become

19. The letters show the occasional involvement of external personages with Emar religious affairs: the movement of oils (E261) and other materials (E264) for sacred purposes; the appointment of a priest (*sanga*) for the goddess <sup>d</sup>Nin.kur (E268).

20. Ba'lu-qarrad's will was published outside the excavated texts and yet must have come from the building M-1 (SMEA 30 no.7). For systematic discussion of the diviner's family by generations, see Cohen (2009: 147-83). The full title first appears in the colophons of Šaggar-abu, eldest son of Ba'lu-qarrad and older brother of Ba'lu-malik (pp.165-7).

21. See Fleming (1992: 86); E369:1-2A, *e-nu-ma dumu<sup>meš</sup> uruE-mar ereš.dingir a-na <sup>d</sup>Iškur i-na-aš-šu-ú*, "When the sons of Emar elevate the high priestess to the storm god"; and E373:169-170 (174-175), *[e-nu-m]a dumu<sup>meš</sup> kurE-mar i-na mu.7.kám<sup>meš</sup> ezenzu-uk-ra [a/i-na] <sup>d</sup>Kur en bu-ka-ri i-na-an-di-nu*, "When the sons of Emar give the *zuku* to Dagan Lord of the Offspring." See a similar expression for celebration of the *kissu* festival for Dagan at Šatappi (E385:2).

22. For <sup>d</sup>NIN.URTA as the God of I/Emar, see Westenholz 1999 and Fleming 2000: 94-5. Discussions of the god in connection with real estate are ubiquitous in treatment of the Conventional Format; for one early version, see Fleming 2000: 40-2.

23. All the tablets demonstrably written under the aegis of Ba'lu-qarrad and sons, as shown by names in scribal colophons or the diviners' seals, use the Free Format script. Nevertheless, the diviner kept in the building M-1 at least two archaic ritual texts in the CF script (E375 and E446, see Fleming 2000: 109-13) and a larger number of "scholarly" texts (Cohen 2009: 121-46).

accessible,<sup>24</sup> but for now, our one entry into the administrative habits and mindsets of Emar scribes comes from the diviner and his workplace in the building M-1.<sup>25</sup>

Our interpretation of the diviner's administrative work in the building M-1 is founded on two principal observations, which we will elaborate in the following sections. First, all of the administrative texts from the diviner's workplace were composed in the Free Format scribal school, and the only fragments that cannot be identified definitively as such merely lack the detail necessary to confirm this origin.<sup>26</sup> Second, every individual record from the diviner's archive represents an ad hoc account of one transaction, without intent to create any series or system. The confirmation of this interpretation lies in the texts' individuality of form.

Our discussion of specific texts will be preoccupied with their individuality and not with the script, which is evaluated text by text in the appendix. Various writing habits are associated with the two distinct scribal streams, though the division of traits may not be absolute. Wilcke (1992) launched the recognition of separate scribal schools or streams by identifying a divergence in the forms of certain signs, which he documented with extensive drawings of specific examples.<sup>27</sup> There are certainly signs not included in his list that may display a similar divergence of form. We found that the Free Format DUMU sign, which is ubiquitous in records naming persons, includes a vertical wedge that is lacking from the sign in Conventional Format script.<sup>28</sup> Other such contrasts must exist and call for systematic search.

Free and Conventional Format writing can also be distinguished by aspects of layout and orthography. Arnaud's initial categorization of legal documents included the obvious difference of orientation between the two, with the CF inscribed across the shorter dimension like a typical modern page. The FF legal texts vary considerably in shape, and the script cannot be identified entirely with tablets inscribed across the long axis. One feature of the FF legal texts, however, is

---

24. On this point, we attempt a uniform caution. It is plausible that the palace may have generated written records, but we cannot assume that these would have been composed in Conventional Format script or by the scribes involved in the legal documents witnessed by the king. No such records of royal accounting survive in excavated settings outside the palace. We remain ignorant regarding the extent and character of any palace accounting.

25. There has been an ongoing discussion regarding the architectural form of the building M-1 and its implications for the contents of the archives there. Originally, the excavator identified it as a temple, based on the long main room on the ground floor with entrance along one short wall (Margueron 1975: 65-6). This conclusion was challenged by Werner (1994: 70-1), who identified the building as a house in a systematic study of such structures in the larger region. McClellan (1997) observed that it displayed features of both, with its long room and temple-style entrance combined with three side rooms that would be typical of domestic forms. Recently, Rutz has sided vigorously with Werner, alleging that the earliest publications leave uncertain whether there was an entrance to the long room (2013: 98-104; 303-7). This interpretation remains difficult to assert without definitive publication from the team that has published findings that affirm the existence of such a doorway. In any case, the building M-1 was a structure of modest size, probably serving as both home and workplace for the resident scribes, however its service to "the gods of Emar" as a body may have been expressed in physical terms.

26. This is a more definitive conclusion than that of Rutz (2013), though he does not propose that any administrative text is in CF script.

27. Wilcke considers there to have been a "Syrian" and a "Syro-Hittite" scribal school (Schreiberschule).

28. According to Lorenzo D'Alfonso (personal communication), this added vertical wedge is not typical of the common script from the Hittite capital but is rather identified with the kingdom of Mittani. When this form of DUMU appears in texts from Carchemish, it does not follow the line of political dependence on the royal court at Hattuša. For the delineation of three palaeographical streams in late second-millennium upper Mesopotamia and Anatolia, see Schwemer (1998: 8-39), including a detailed sign list for Assyro-Mittanian, Mittanian, and Middle Assyrian scripts – all of which show the vertical wedge in TUR (=DUMU, p.24). Schwemer (p.16) identifies Emar script with the Middle Assyrian type, though this would appear to apply only to the Free Format, as seen vividly with the LI-sign (p.19).

found in many other text types: the common use of separation lines drawn across the full breadth of the text as a way of blocking off sections. Many of the administrative texts make use of this technique. Further, the more up-to-date script of the FF sometimes prefers sumerograms where the CF uses syllabic writing. This contrast is particularly visible in personal names, where Dagan is rendered <sup>d</sup>Kur in the FF, instead of <sup>d</sup>Da-gan, and versions of the verb *târu* (“to return”) are written as gur (Itūr-, Tūra-). As with sign forms, there are clearly more patterns than we have observed, and an exhaustive search would generate a better base. It is likewise evident that certain personal names appear only in one scribal stream or the other – not as individuals but as names. The common divine element written as <sup>d</sup>30 for Šaggar is limited to FF texts, especially when it is the first part of the name.<sup>29</sup> Further, these diverse features can be invoked to confirm the FF writing of the administrative texts from the building M-1, even as they warrant further investigation in themselves.

### 3. *Individuality of administrative form: grouping the records by function*

Our essential argument regarding the form of the diviner’s administrative records is that every tablet was different. No two of them were drawn up as replicas, iterations of a single accounting operation. This is the case even though there were not so many different types of exchange. Rather than imitate another text, the scribe composed each new document independently, constructing it from familiar elements. Demonstration of such systematic contrast requires a point of reference in larger patterns of likeness. Multiple texts treat the transfer of sheep or grain, list objects of value in divine holdings, or combine groups of gods receiving coordinated offerings. What is striking in the M-1 assemblage is the fact that similar transactions are recorded in different forms every time, reflecting the ad hoc nature of the administrative effort, to suit the need of the moment.

With the demonstration of difference in view, we have provided an appendix with brief descriptions of every administrative text, both to indicate some basic contrasts and to identify features that are characteristic of Free Format script. In order to sharpen our assertion of contrast, we have undertaken to group the texts in coherent sets, a task that is hindered by their laconic nature, often taking for granted a context that now eludes us. For example, we need not conclude that every unadorned list of personal names served the same type of transaction, and we cannot know whether such transactions were potential or actual. Nevertheless, administrative records are most effectively ordered by the administrative acts reflected in their writing, and we have insisted on attempting such a categorization.<sup>30</sup> Given the nature of the material, our effort can be no more

29. Note also that the writing <sup>d</sup>Har for Šaggar is associated particularly with personal names in CF texts and is found in the CF script of the ritual text E446 (line 45). It seems that Pruzsinszky did not pursue trends in the occurrence of personal names in FF and CF texts, though her files mark the distinction and she must have observed certain patterns. For consideration of the populations served by the two scripts and their scribes, the contrasting range of names suggests that we are not dealing with a homogeneous group. For us, this contrast would be harder to explain by a simple chronological shift from earlier to later scribal practices by exactly the same population, as envisioned by Cohen and D’Alfonso (2008). We now offer a systematic alternative in Démare-Lafont and Fleming (2015).

30. The inscrutability of many texts has led to inconsistent grouping in scholarly discussion. As observed in n.13, Arnaud presents a small set of rough divisions by written type, as inventory, (delivery) notice, or general list. Only Rutz (2013: 129-38) attempts a fresh categorization, varying his grouping according to the evidence, with a pragmatic approach that yields no coherent framework for defining the purpose of the writing. His types include (the alphabetical order is his):



than partially successful, but it is important to examine each text with an eye to its function and not merely to its contents.

In general, administrative texts record materials, animals, or persons of interest, either because they are items of exchange or they are parties to the exchange. By “exchange” or “transfer,” we mean the movement of materials, animals, or persons from one domain to another, though some documents may count the holdings of a given party, an act of “inventory” that may also be linked to fresh arrivals or departures. By far the larger record-keeping category involves transfer, and although function has priority over named objects in defining exchange, we are compelled to avoid the certainty implied by disbursement or receipt, when the direction and purpose of transfer often remains unclear. With this caution in view, our grouping of transfers instead follows lines of probable or potential association. Given the diviner’s evident involvement in public religion at Emar, it is no surprise that many transactions display connection with sacred affairs, and this is reflected in our first divisions:

- the diviner’s household;
- temples, shrines, and ritual;
- without evident sacred association.

The larger corpus with sacred concern then suggests at least the following:

- temples and shrines;
- ritual association;
- general link to sacred stores.

When we define a category by lack of sacred association, this cannot constitute a secure set. By it we recognize other possible contexts for record-keeping. For example, two documents (E277 and E278) suggest debts or expenses with no evident cultic context, and two related texts list deliveries of barley for what mysteriously appears to be the support of individuals absent from Emar as “captives” or hostages (E279//E319). In the end, any grouping by object of exchange sets aside the purpose of transfer, and any grouping by nature of transfer is bound to combine and confuse exchanges of different types. Our definitions are self-consciously loose in recognition of the limits to our knowledge and the evident range of concerns displayed in the collection. No matter the precise assignments of particular texts, the ad hoc nature of every record remains clear.

### *Inventory*

Two texts record “jewels” (*šukuttu*; E282, E284; cf. E43 from Area E), objects belonging to gods, and other records list vessels or metal items with divine names. References to weight may assume the same count of sacred holdings. The occasions for taking inventory are obscure and in light of the larger administrative pattern appear to be ad hoc.

### *Transfer: the diviner’s household*

---

Animals; Cult; Grains; Inventory; Manufacture; Memoranda; Metals; Persons; Properties; Tags; Textiles; Various Items; Vessels; Weapons; and Weights.

Not all records involving the diviner may be understood automatically to indicate sacred concern. One text even states explicitly that part of the flour listed is “for me” (E367:8).

*Transfer: temples and shrines*

In a few cases, objects are listed in connection with named gods (E284, E287, E289).

Although E284 may anticipate the enumeration undertaken for inventory, the text represents transfer of silver into the charge of <sup>d</sup>Nin.kur.ra. This text includes reference to the weight of objects, and where broken texts mention this it is difficult to distinguish between transfer into sacred holding and inventory (cf. E293, E295, etc.).

*Transfer: ritual association*

Certain records name personnel known from ritual texts, vessels specially linked to ritual, or other ritual details not defined by particular gods. As with the preceding group, the diviner’s administrative role in Emar’s religious life is on display here.

*Transfer: sacred stores*

This group is less secure, representing a choice between potential involvement in the diviner’s oversight of sacred affairs and the possibility of other explanations. In general, we have taken sheep as probable objects of offering, whether donated by or designated for the care of named individuals (e.g. E325). Likewise the silver of E280, the gold and silver of E310, among other contents, appear with hints of sacred association. With these texts, however, it is important to consider alternatives outside divine concern, when neither gods nor ritual appear directly.

*Transfer: without evident sacred association*

With this category we recognize the possibility that some records in the diviner’s archive have to do with neither his family affairs nor the sacred domain that he oversees. If we do not assume association with the cult, certain texts offer no hint of such, and other interpretations must be considered. In E277, with a mix of shekel transfers “pertaining to” (*ša*) and “for” (*ana*) different named people, the first one with *ana* is for the land (kur) of Qadesh (Kinza, line 5), and the second identifies a man who is in a certain town (<sup>ur</sup>ZA-A[L?-x], line 6). Most simply, these exchanges appear to reflect debts or expenses from private affairs; the references to two external sites could suggest either the domain of merchants or financial dealings with the external authorities. The transfer of large amounts of barley to dozens of individuals in E279 and E319 displays no interest in public religion and is somehow to be explained by the phrase *i-na hu-ub-te-ti* in E319:1, discussed below. E361 presents a special case, with an elaborate list of nine companions and various supporting goods to accompany a “woman of the king” “who left the land of Qizzu (Qadesh) (and) whom they lodged (*ú-še-ši-bu-šu*[sic]) in the town of Šatappi.” Šatappi only appears on the horizon of Emar affairs in the last generation of building M-1 diviners, Ba’lu-malik, and the “king” in question is probably the ruler at Carchemish. Location of Qadesh south of Qatna, with Carchemish north of Emar, upstream on the Euphrates River, suggests that this woman was on her way to

eventual installation in the royal court. Definition of transfer documents as “without evident sacred association” remains an interpretive judgment, but we find it highly probable that the diviner’s archive reflected such a range of transactions. It is not necessary to assume that all records were drawn up by the diviner himself or at his scribal center, if this served as a document depot.

#### *Lists of Personal Names*

We set simple lists of named individuals in a group apart. The length of the lists varies widely, and their occasion and purpose may have done likewise. By the choice of a list unadorned by information about any purpose, the scribe considered the names alone to provide all necessary detail. Perhaps the simple list allowed a check for participation in an immediate context, without expectation to revisit it in the more distant future. Such name lists appear of little use for long-term archiving and seem to have survived because there was equally no effort to remove or destroy them. At least some of the occasions likely involved the sacred sphere, since name lists were found in all three temples.<sup>31</sup> The companion to the storm god temple in Area E yielded mainly name lists. None of these lists bears a scribal seal, which adds to the impression that they served a more informal function with a short temporal horizon. Far from representing a single administrative type, the name lists present the most rudimentary form of written notation, one more expression of the ad hoc nature of all administrative writing in the diviner’s archive.

#### *4. Individuality of form: examples*

For the larger purpose of this argument, the assignment of individual texts to particular functions is secondary to the conclusion that all administrative texts take a distinct form. Comparison is facilitated by examining the texts that have most in common. We have included a brief description of every administrative record in an appendix so that our assertion of individuality can be checked against the evidence. Some discussion of examples will illustrate the phenomenon.

##### *4.1. Divine holdings*

Two different terms are associated with lists of objects held in the name of gods: *šukuttu* (“jewels”)<sup>32</sup> and *unūtu* (“paraphernalia”).<sup>33</sup> The word *šukuttu* appears in two M-1 lists (E282 and E288), along with a text found in the storm god temple but produced in connection with the diviners Kapi-Dagan and Ba’lu-malik (E43). In each case, the word *šukuttu* introduces a line, followed by a divine name, and then reference to objects of gold, silver, and stone. All of these texts share a single notion of the term and what it represents, and they likewise share an interest in

---

31. In the storm god temple of Area E, see E53 and the fragments E54 and E55; in the other Area E temple, see E66 and E67, along with E64 and E65, where the names are preceded by unexplained numbers. E73 from the temple M-2 appears to be a list of names, with particular interest in men and their wives, though the text is fragmentary.

32. The particular objects associated with this term in the Emar texts are made of gold, silver, and stone, all relatively small. Translation as English “jewelry” (*CAD* s.v. *šukuttu* A) suggests a narrower range of objects and use than “jewels,” as in the “crown jewels” of the British monarchy. For example, it is not certain how a silver *lamassu* figurine would have been worn or displayed (E282:2, 7).

33. This translation defines a catch-all that appears to be intended in its application to a broader range of objects than the *šukuttu*; the *CAD* renders *unūtu* by a wide range of catch-all terms, best related to this context in definition 3, “utensils, furnishings, vessels, belongings.”

listing objects under this label. As texts, however, the three tablets are constructed and conceived in very different ways.

E288 is a tiny docket, inscribed only on the obverse, naming only “the jewels of Ḫebat,” with at least two gold items included. The list of the *šukuttu* begins with the phrase, “in its midst” (*ina šà-šú*), without the obscure silver *maršu* that somehow holds each batch of divine jewels (cf. E43:1, 4, 6, 10, 17; E282:1, 7).<sup>34</sup> The two longer *šukuttu* texts are structured very differently. Above all, the text found in the storm god temple names four men who seal the record (E43:18- 21), where E282 lacks any reference to personal names. The latter text combines three different *šukuttus*, each with different gods, in contrast to the jewels of Aštartu of the Town in E43, and it concludes with a list of 14 different precious stones, after a double separation line, and without clear connection to the three *šukuttu* lists.

Inventory of divine holdings may also be designated by the term *unūtu*, adding yet another administrative variant. E284 identifies the paraphernalia of <sup>d</sup>Nin.kur.ra, which includes various silver objects, each of which is registered as being in the possession of (*ana* “to” or *ana muḫḫi* “onto”) a different named person.<sup>35</sup> Unlike the *šukuttu* “jewels,” which applies only to divine possessions, the term *unūtu* appears twice with other reference, each very different from the other. E283 lists a variety of bronze objects, “pertaining to” a group of personnel with uncertain title, not attested in the ritual texts and so without secure link to the diviner’s sacred oversight.<sup>36</sup> A third list (E285) is rendered as “new” paraphernalia “entrusted” (verb *paqādu*) to the diviner Ba’lu-malik. At face value, these may be taken as goods belonging to the diviner’s own family, not concerned with any temple or ritual. Two of the three texts (E283 and E284) are concerned with the weight of each object (*ki.lá.bi*, “its weight”) but not the third, which combines bronze with other materials (E285). What is most important for our larger argument is the fact that each list of paraphernalia has different structure and is defined by different human or divine accountability. Together, the *šukuttu* texts and the *unūtu* texts provide one cluster of documents that account for similar lists of objects, capable of application to divine holdings, yet with entirely individual forms in every case.

#### 4.2. Grain and bread

One of the most difficult sets of texts in the administrative group involves grain, flour, or bread that somehow moves from one party to another. Among these, the longest text (E279) immediately suggests the distribution of grain, with 50 lines of personal names attached to *parīsu* of barley in varying quantities, between 30 and 2 units.<sup>37</sup> We know that the larger quantities are comparable to annual allotments to the storm god’s priestess, 15 or 30 *parīsu* for bad or good years (E369:85), so the scale of listed amounts is considerable. Why would such large quantities of barley be distributed to private persons at Emar, and from what institution? The text does not say, and we have no settled evidence for this kind of redistribution at the site.

34. In the *CAD* s.v. *maršu* A, the term is treated as a leather thong, but the largest number of examples gathered as “other occs.” do not identify its nature, whether for OA or for MB examples. Arnaud translates “plateau.”

35. The names are preserved in lines 3-7, with *ana muḫḫi* in lines 3-5 and *ana* in lines 6 and 7. The opening two lines are broken before the section that would include a name.

36. Arnaud read *šu-ga<sub>5</sub>-gu<sub>5</sub>*, imagining the Mari term for “leaders” (*sugāgum*) otherwise unknown at Emar and not expected with reference to cult administration in any case. Durand (1990) proposes *šu.sil.du<sub>8</sub>* (“singers”), but the signs offer no clear solution.

37. See Fleming 1992: 148; 2000: 37; Rutz 2013: 131.

Once again, it is most useful to begin by recognition of diversity. Even the direction of transfer need not be the same in every case. In one text (E320), a list of personal names is summarized as “men who have not (yet) given the barley” (lú<sup>meš</sup> ša še<sup>meš</sup> la-a id-di-nu), who have either pledged grain and not yet delivered or who are otherwise considered obligated and did not produce. Here, the administrative interest lies in the names of people who must be checked, not the amounts in question. Where we find quantities of grain listed with the names, the nature of the transfer may be different. The 30 *parīsu* of barley for the storm god’s priestess are an annual allotment, and the *parīsu* amounts in E279 and E319 suggest transfer to the named persons rather than from them, as well as the possibility of transfer for a full year’s term. The shorter text E319 shares names and numbers with one section of the E279 list and thus a contemporary set of obligations.<sup>38</sup>

E319 adds the description of the barley as “given” in special terms (*ša i-na hu-ub-te-ti na-ad-na*, line 1), which would appear to apply to both lists, based on the partial overlap of contents. Nothing in these two texts indicates ritual concern, nor is there any hint of distribution from vast temple stores. Although Arnaud treated *hu-ub-te-ti* as a form of *hubuttatu* (“loan”), the variant is unattested and the list does not resemble debt records, and it would be strange to separate what was owed by three different children of Kamma (319:5, 6, 9). The answer may lie in a reading suggested by Durand in his review, from the noun *hubtu*, as that which is taken by force, either as “booty” or “captives.”<sup>39</sup> The peculiar form in *-ēti* could represent a dissimilation of vowels from an otherwise unattested abstract, *\*hubtūtū*, so “status as captive,” or hostage. If certain Emar inhabitants were removed from the city as what might be taken as hostages, it would not have been by the Hittite sovereigns but by another power such as Assyria.

Such a reading, which remains a hypothesis, could offer an enticing explanation for Zu-Aštarti, second son of the diviner Ba’lu-qarrad. In Ba’lu-qarrad’s will, it is stipulated that “if (the eldest son) Šaggar-abu dies, it is (the third son) Ba’lu-malik who will be Diviner of the Gods” (SMEA 30 no.7:18-19). Is it a coincidence that the son who is skipped over is the very one who leads the list of persons to receive barley in E319? We wonder whether Zu-Aštarti was unavailable for the role because he was not at Emar, though still alive.<sup>40</sup> The amounts of barley in transfer are enormous, and it is possible that the sovereign power of Hatti and Carchemish are somehow involved. It is not clear why the shorter list was recorded, with the same names and amounts, framed by two members of the diviner’s family. Either the personal connection framed a special interest in a group associated with the diviner’s own household or perhaps the texts reflect successive annual payments.

38. The list of names in E319:2-16 begins with Zu-Aštarti son of Ba’lu-qarrad and runs to Ibni-Dagan son of Ribī-Dagan, matching “Zu-Aštarti the diviner’s son” (E279:5) and “Ibni-Dagan the diviner’s son” (E279:16), with specific names and quantities matching for sections of each text in different order: E319:2-3//E279:5-6; E319:4-9//E279:21-26; E319:10//E279:11 (starting a new section); E319:11-15//E279:27-30 (except E319:15, not in E279); E319:16//E279:16. Note that Aḫi-ḫami receives 5 *parīsu* in E319:4, and only 4 in E279:21 (clerical error?); otherwise the numbers match, where visible in both texts.

39. Durand (1990: 83) observed the difficulty finding a workable form related to “debt” and proposed an alternative from the verb *ḫabātu*, “pillar,” so a transfer “à l’occasion des ḫ.” The *CAD* s.v. *hubtu* lists late second-millennium usage for sites associated with Mittani and Assyria: 1 “robbery,” Nuzi; 2 “booty, loot,” Ḫattuša, Nuzi; 3b “captive, prisoner of war,” as collective, EA 17 from Tušratta of Mittani, Middle Assyria, and Ḫattuša.

40. Note that ASJ 14 no.43 lists all the living descendants of Zu-Ba’la, father of Ba’lu-qarrad, without Šaggar-abu but including the second and third sons, Zu-Aštarti and Ba’lu-malik (see Cohen 2009: 165).

Whatever their specific purpose, all of the records involving grain, flour, or bread take different form. Even the two related texts are distinguished by the special heading for the shorter list *i-na ħu-ub-te-ti* (E319:1). The negative list of people who did not deliver is concluded by a “total” (*šu.nigin*) counted by 34 “houses” (E320:13). One other text lists personal names with some quantity of “flour” (*zi.da*), in this case identical for seven people, five of whom are women, all recorded on the obverse of a small docket (E312). Another short text notes 14 *parīsu* of barley and a smaller amount of another grain product (<sup>nig</sup>*har.ra*, “milled”), “into the hand of Ipqi-Dagan” (E316), a mode of accounting that matches the 98 sheep and goats “into the hand of Ĥimaši-Dagan” in E323, most easily understood as his responsibility until needed for ritual use, rather than as a gift to him. E317 begins with a *parīsu* of barley in the form of *pappasu*-meal (or “porridge”), then inexplicably introduces a separate transaction by *inanna* “now,” followed by a person who must give 6 donkeys for one shekel of silver. These two texts are in turn totally unlike E318, which lists quantities of different bread types, without reference to personal names or gods, whether as donors or recipients.

#### 4.3. *Distributions to listed gods*

There is one group of texts from the diviner’s archive that we have declined to label “administrative” that nevertheless offers a useful test for the individuality of form visible throughout the collection. In his publication of the texts from the building M-1, Arnaud separated out seven tablets as “listes sacrificielles” (E378 – E384), which he placed after some of the more prominent ritual texts, including the two installations for priestesses of the storm god and Aštartu (E369 and E370) and the *zukru* festival (E373). In fact, these lists have much in common with the administrative texts except that they list gods rather than humans. We do not treat the lists as administrative because it is not clear that they record any exchange. They do, however, belong to the diviner’s larger project of writing texts that assist in the conduct of daily business, and the structural similarity of listed gods allows one more comparison of individual documents with a broad type.<sup>41</sup>

For all that Arnaud’s seven “sacrificial lists” share the compilation of divine names they are once again quite individual in form. Just two of them list divine names alone, one at considerable length and with two columns on the lower obverse (E378) and the other perhaps divided into two columns by a vertical line, leaving only the right column partially legible (E383). We cannot know what occasion or need lies behind these texts, and indeed they may not reflect any transaction at all. The writing alone suggests some sort of reminder, as with the lists of personal names. The other four texts that are preserved to any degree present four distinct forms, each with slightly different administrative logic.<sup>42</sup> One of them (E381) enumerates sheep assigned to listed gods, generally one per deity.<sup>43</sup> Another (E380) also has in mind listed assignments, this time for birds (*mušen*), but it omits any numbers. A third (E382) includes the numbers, again mostly for a single

41. One of the texts identified by Arnaud as an “inventaire de mobilier cultuel” (E274) likewise lists only gods, though the form is so different that it seems to belong to another class. That text records numbers of *ħizzibu* and *ħubu* vessels associated with various gods, perhaps as offerings linked to some sacred occasion. No detail is preserved regarding the occasion, and the later part of the document is lost. Multiple deities are listed in each line, unlike the texts gathered by Arnaud in E378 – E384, but all of these records may relate to offerings.

42. E384 survives only as a small fragment and resists categorization.

43. The broken line 7 indicates two for a god that might be read [<sup>d</sup>Īš]kur.

unit, but omits reference to the animal or object in question.<sup>44</sup> These may reflect sacrifice for some event, or the assignment of sheep and birds could envision divinatory needs. In the latter case, the texts could even represent projected distributions rather than particular transfer. What is crucial about this set of three texts is the fact that they record almost identical transactions and yet do so with small but significant variations of form. Each document appears to have been drawn up independently of the others. The last of the distribution lists (E379) makes no reference to animals and adds mention of cult personnel and the phrase “gods of the upstream towns” (line 15).<sup>45</sup>

#### 4.4. *The diviner as administrator*

The diviner who oversaw the scribal center in Emar’s building M-1 kept records for transactions involving a wide variety of sacred sites, personnel, and materials. Some of these were kept in his own place of work, though seals from members of the diviner’s family suggest that such records could be produced for other institutions and stored at those sites, at least in the generation after Ba’lu-qarrad<sup>46</sup>. We cannot conceive of the diviner’s administrative output as a body of writing to be found in a single “archive.” The fact that we encounter his work in two different buildings reminds us that only a fraction of the texts survive, but it indicates equally that his responsibilities and output had considerable breadth and had implications for a significant cross-section of Emar institutions, especially in the sacred domain. Area E, at the southwestern high point of the site, was far removed from Area M, near the center of the city, linked by the religious stature of the temple and the religious responsibility of the diviner. The diviner’s administration is thus defined not by a single building or archive but rather by the sweep of his involvement in the financial lives of diverse Emar sacred sites.

Just as the location of administrative finds attributable to the diviner and his family was not limited to the building M-1, the records from the building M-1 do not represent a systematic effort to manage any regular series of transactions in regular terms from a central site and centralizing authority. The surviving texts show no sign of daily activity: no reference to the calendar except within texts for calendrically defined rites; no repeated exemplars of the same exchange in a format duplicated from an existing text. Likewise, nothing indicates an attempt to track *all* income or outflow of materials from any location. We cannot assume that the diviner supervised a staff adequate to follow such movement of goods on a systematic basis, or that anyone in the town considered it necessary to do so.

Instead, the diviner’s record-keeping seems occasional, whether for ritual events or otherwise. The large barley transfers recorded in E279 and E319 could be associated with harvest. Given the range of institutions involved, the lack of system, and the absence of evidence that the building M-1 either housed or administered a single clearinghouse for the exchange of livestock, grain, or other materials, we conclude that the diviner may rather have done his work on an as-needed basis, moving from place to place. In the small cache of letters, there are two references to outside

44. Only <sup>d</sup>Nin.kur (line 1) and <sup>d</sup>Kur gal (line 10) receive two offerings each.

45. The personnel are the obscure <sup>lu</sup>mu.šen, the *zammāru* (“singer”), and the *nupuhannu* (herdsmen or providers of sheep?), lines 13-14.

46. These texts can be tracked down through Cohen’s presentation of the diviner’s family (2009: 147-83). Several administrative texts evidently drawn up in the diviner’s circle were found in the temple of the storm god in Area A: E43, the *šukuttu* of Aštartu of the Town (seals of Kapi-Dagan and Ba’lu-malik); silver given for work (seal of Ba’lu-malik); E57, same, as belonging to the storm god (seal of Ba’lu-qarrad son of Kapi-Dagan); E61, label for basket of precious stones (seal of Ba’lu-malik). All of these were produced after the generation of Ba’lu-qarrad the diviner.

interest in the diviner's ritual responsibilities, but these are likewise circumstantial, and the diviner's primary client appears to be the town itself, as indicated by his title, "diviner of the gods of Emar."<sup>47</sup> The administrative transactions found in the building M-1 texts have no business at all with Hittite officials, authority, or finances. Where we encounter exchanges that could reflect external dealings, as with transfer involving geographical distance (e.g. E277 and E278) or as possible hostage support (E279 and E319), these indicate no large-scale and systematic oversight. As far as we can tell, then, the administrative work of the building M-1 was primarily local in its interest and ad hoc in its method. The diviner drew up documents on occasions when materials were somehow in play for ritual use and various commitments or transactions might need to be remembered.

#### 4.5. *The innovation of ba'lu-qarrad*

The study of the M-1 archives by Matthew Rutz (2013) undertakes to grasp the range and interest of a diviner by examining the full contents of an archive with secure archaeological provenance. In the case of the building M-1, this means accounting for the combination of legal documents, ritual and administrative texts, and a mass of texts from the curriculum of larger Mesopotamian scribal learning. Focus on the administrative texts suggests a refinement of this effort to place the M-1 archives in historical context. Cohen observes that the first figure to be associated with what he calls the "scribal school" is Šaggar-abu son of Ba'lu-qarrad, the older brother of Ba'lu-malik (2009: 166), and he is also the first with attested claim to the full title, "diviner of the gods of Emar," retained by Ba'lu-malik after him. All the scribal products of the diviner's school, therefore, must be attributed to the generation of Ba'lu-malik: the lexical and divinatory texts, along with the literature.

In contrast, both texts and seals prove that the administrative activity of the diviner began with Ba'lu-qarrad, the father of Šaggar-abu and Ba'lu-malik. E275 records some responsibility or benefit according to seven "houses" with Ba'lu-qarrad as "supervisor" (ugula, line 13), and his identity as son of Zu-Ba'la the diviner is confirmed by his position as master of the last household (line 11).<sup>48</sup> Three more short records with ritual associations are sealed by Ba'lu-qarrad: two

47. In E264, the diviner Ba'lu-malik complains to an unknown outsider named Pirati about his uncle Kapi-Dagan's lack of cooperation with respect to cultic affairs and materials. Cohen (2009: 171-3) understands Kapi-Dagan to attempt a usurpation of Ba'lu-malik's role, based in part on reading line 26 as *ba-ru-ut-ti* (for *bārûtu*, office of diviner). It is unclear what authority Pirati represents and how any outsiders involved themselves in the diviner's concerns, if at all. The only reference to specific and direct intrusion by the outside power into Emar cult affairs occurs during the life of Zu-Ba'la, the first diviner to hold this office under Hittite imprimatur. A foreigner named Akal-<sup>d</sup>Utu pushes the diviner to finalize the appointment of a specific man to the priesthood of <sup>d</sup>Nin.kur.

48. Each name in this text is preceded by a number from 1 to 4, followed by the ZA/ŠA-sign, with unknown reference. Four of the ZA-units are attributed to each household (except three for the last), divided between one and four persons. The first five houses are linked to a sacred office that is placed at the end of the section, not to be read as a title for the final personal name: the *zābiḫu* ("slaughterer") of the storm god, the *zābiḫu* of Dagan, the *zābiḫu* of <sup>d</sup>NIN.URTA, the priestess (ereš.dingir) of the storm god, and the *wābil ilā'i* ("bearer of gods"). Proof of this interpretation lies in the fact that the masculine name Iba is not himself the priestess in line 6. Given the ad hoc nature of the records as a group, it is likely that the text treats a one-time transaction or event. Based on the similar count of numbers followed by ZA in E276, this text probably deals with households as well. Its association with Ba'lu-qarrad would be confirmed by the appearance of Ellati son of Ikmu-Dagan in service of the *zābiḫu* of Dagan in both E275:2 and E276:11-12. Consider also Alal-abu son of Dagalli in the service of the storm god's priestess (E275:5) and Alal-abu son of <sup>d</sup>Kur-li (E276:2), both first in their sections, though the association of the man in E276:2 is lost. For all their similarity, texts E275 and E276 illustrate once again the individuality of composition in the administrative collection. Although both texts share the same interest, with



deliveries of wine to “the gods” (E363 and E364) and a list of bronze associated with seven men called “men of the *kubadu*” (E366).<sup>49</sup> Whatever the basic logic of the administrative role visible in the M-1 archive, it preceded the creation of the school that generated the mass of lexical and divinatory texts. Before the diviners founded a school, they became involved in the documentation of transactions related to Emar ritual life across a range of sacred sites, evidently tied to the town. Delineation of certain major rites as “festivals” (*ezen*) and their description in lengthy individual tablets can likewise be identified with Ba‘lu-qarrad.<sup>50</sup> The notion that the festivals were celebrated by “the sons of Emar” as a body therefore comes from the writing of Ba‘lu-qarrad as well. In his will, Ba‘lu-qarrad names a successor to his responsibility as “diviner of the gods,” anticipating his son’s title without specifying Emar in its definition (*SMEA* 30 no.7:19).

Our study of the diviner’s administrative production and method offers a point of reference for characterization of the modernizing scribal style as “Free Format,” in that the diviner’s administration was as free-form as the legal method and terminology of the Free Format documents. In light of the in-depth studies by Cohen and Rutz, it is possible to locate this “free” spirit in a scribal environment before establishment of the building M-1 school, in that both the first administrative texts and the earlier Free Format legal texts predate the generation of Ba‘lu-malik.<sup>51</sup> According to Rutz’s principle of establishing scribal interest by the actual contents of a provenanced collection, the earlier diviner’s activities call for evaluation without the overlay of the school texts as a whole. It is possible that the school component of the diviner’s workplace had roots in the collection of divinatory texts. As noted previously, a few tablets with old-style Conventional Format script survive among the overwhelming majority of Free Format script school texts (Cohen 2009: 121-46). All the other contents of the archive appear to originate by the generation of Ba‘lu-qarrad: legal documents, letters, administrative texts, and rituals (see above). The free-form, ad hoc, logic of the administrative corpus is almost certainly shared by the ritual texts as well, and these are equally individual in their form.

If measured by a notion of downstream Mesopotamian centrality, the individuality and creativity of writing at Emar could be taken as an effect of its “peripheral” location, far from the engines of cuneiform distribution and education. We find it more plausible to look for other explanations, rooted in the social and political traditions of this Syrian region and the particular expression of Hittite interaction with a subordinated yet distant region. The cuneiform skills of the Emar diviners were substantial, especially in their last generation, and yet they persisted in resisting any impulse to work within rigid formats or to build textual frameworks for centralized authority. The diviners had a hand in the ritual life of Emar writ large, with responsibility to facilitate its continued practice, but they do not appear to have attempted any firm control over this life. The family of Zu-Ba‘la joined its exercise of the prior ritual role to a new responsibility to

---

overlapping personnel and even titles, E276 adds a concern for the ritual “weapons” (*gištukul*, lines 6, 8, 14) that is absent from E275.

49. Durand and Joannès (1990) proposed that these should somehow be copper-workers, but this was before the ritual texts had received extended attention, and the prominence of the *kubadu* as a local rite and together with the centrality of ritual to the diviner’s responsibility make this a more natural connection.

50. Fleming (2015) proposes that the two principal copies of the installation festival for the storm god’s priestess are a generation apart. The older text (B/C) could thus belong to the generation of Ba‘lu-qarrad and the later one (A) to that of his son.

51. For the chronology of the Free Format (Syro-Hittite) texts, see Di Filippo (2004).

represent and track Hittite financial interests. Nothing in the archive indicates a systematic control by record-keeping, and the diviners kept no bureaucratic staff. Destruction of the building M-1, with collapse of an upper level, left the tablet finds in disarray, but the character of many administrative texts suggests only short-term use, without expectation of inclusion in a collection for consultation. The numerous lists of personal names would soon have become as impenetrable to them as to us, lacking any reference to occasion or purpose. A few texts were sealed, with a very different long-term concern, yet producing a ragtag assemblage of varying interest and authority.<sup>52</sup> It seems that the horizon of anticipated relevance varied as individually as the form and content.

By this examination of the diviners' administrative production at Emar, we undertake first of all to put this in the company of Free Format legal composition and the entire use of Free Format script. We do not imagine a more institutionalized administrative practice in Conventional Format, perhaps emanating from the palace. Traditional legal custom had indeed generated a much more stable documentary "style," but this derived from the rigidity of habit rather than exercise of centralizing power. We emphasize the "free" nature of the entire new writing culture in order to illuminate the way in which external Hittite authority found expression in this Syrian city. Every aspect of the diviner's record-keeping initiative pushes us away from any conception of structural state oversight introduced by new overlords. As we find with Hittite political presence at Emar, the diviner represents one more avenue for management of local affairs by relationship to strategic individuals rather than imposed institutions. When the king at Carchemish or another high authority came to Emar, checking Hittite financial interest in Emar religious affairs, this check would very likely have led to the diviner, whose memory would have been bolstered by these texts.<sup>53</sup>

### 5. Abbreviations for Emar texts

ASJ 14, A. Tsukimoto (1992): Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection, III, ASJ 14, 289-310

BLM (=CM 13), J. Goodnick Westenholz (2000): Cuneiform Inscriptions in the Collection of the Bible Lands Museum, Jerusalem. The Emar Tablets. Groningen

E274, etc., D. Arnaud (1986): Recherches au pays d'Aštata, Emar VI.3. Textes sumériens et accadiens. Paris

52. These can be identified most easily in Rutz's Appendix B.1, for "Administrative Records": E275, seven households with sacred interest under diviner's supervision; E279 (but not E319), grain; E285, "new" objects pertaining to (ša) the diviner; E287, checked items pertaining to a priest; E290, items not recorded on wooden tablet; E305, vessels "not given"; E309, uncertain objects; E363, E364, and E366 (ritual provision). The individual seals vary widely: the diviner Ba'lu-qarrad (A62, for E363, E364, E366); the diviner Ba'lu-malik (A69, for E285, E287, E305); a certain Punu (B47, also for E285); Kili-šarruma scribe (B64, also for E287; see Cohen 2009: 114, as high Hittite official); stamp seal of an unknown (Carchemish/Hittite?) scribe Kutumilia (C3, for E275); unattested Mittanian seal (E71, for E279); unnamed (B49, for E290). Extending the count of "administrative" texts to all records associated with the Emar finds, Faist (2008: 198 and n.16) counts 25 sealed tablets out of 175 total, with the same ten counted here for documents found in the building M-1. Faist (cf. also Balza 2009: 115) observes that we only find two persons sealing a document when it pertains to "commodities and the recount of persons," a check or modification of a previous arrangement, whereas a single person seals texts for simple transfer of materials.

53. We develop further our interpretation of how Hittite authority was manifest at Emar in a forthcoming article that gathers and evaluates the texts related to regional rule through the center at Carchemish.

RE, G. M. Beckman (1996): Texts from the Vicinity of Emar in the Collection of Jonathan Rosen. Padua

SMEA 30, D. Arnaud (1992): Tablettes de genres divers du Moyen-Euphrate, *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 30, 195-245

TSBR, D. Arnaud (1991): Textes syriens de l'Âge du Bronze Récent. Barcelona

## 6. Bibliography

Arnaud, D. (1975): Catalogue des textes cunéiforms trouvés au cours des trois premières campagnes à Meskéné-Qadimé Ouest, *Annales Archéologiques Arabes Syriennes* 25, 87-93

Balza, M. E. (2009): Sigilli e modalità di sigillatura a Emar nel Tardo Bronzo (XIV-XIII sec. a.C.). Lugano

Beyer, D. (2001): Emar IV. Les sceaux. Göttingen

Chambon, G. (2016): Écrire, compter, mesurer. Comptabilité du grain dans le palais de Mari sur le Moyen Euphrate (XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C.). *Comptabilités [en ligne]* 8, URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/comptabilites/1907>

Cohen, Y. (2009): The Scribes and Scholars of the City of Emar in the Late Bronze Age. Winona Lake

Cohen, Y./L. D'Alfonso (2008): The Duration of the Emar Archives and the Relative and Absolute Chronology of the City, in L. D'Alfonso, Y. Cohen, and D. Sürenhagen (eds.), *Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires. Chronology, Environment, Society*. Münster, 3-25

Démare-Lafont, S. (2010): Éléments pour une diplomatie juridique des textes d'Emar, in S. Démare-Lafont and A. Lemaire (eds.), *Trois millénaires de formulaires juridiques*. Geneva, 43-84

Démare-Lafont, S./D. Fleming (2015): Emar Chronology and Scribal Streams. *Cosmopolitanism and Legal Diversity*, RA 109, 45-77

Di Filippo, F. (2004): Notes on the Chronology of Emar Legal Texts, *SMEA* 46, 175-214

Duponchel, D. (1997): Les comptes d'huile du palais de Mari datés de l'année de Kahat, *FM* 3, 201-62

Durand, J.-M. (1989, 1990): Review of Arnaud, *Recherches au pays d'Aštata*. Emar VI.3, RA 83, 163-91; 84, 49-85

Durand, J.-M./F. Joannès (1990): *Kubbudā'u* à Mari et à Emar, *N.A.B.U.* 1990/70, 53-4

Faist, B. (2008): Scribal Traditions and Administration at Emar, in *Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires*, 195-205

Fiette, B. (2014): Les archives de Šamaš-hazir. Exercice du pouvoir et administration de la terre dans la province de Larsa sous Hammurabi de Babylone (1792-1750 av. J.-C.). Doctoral dissertation, École Pratique des Hautes Études

Fleming, D. E. (1992): The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar. A Window on Ancient Syrian Religion. Atlanta

----- (2000): Time at Emar. The Cultic Calendar and the Rituals from the Diviner's Archive. Winona Lake

----- (2012): Textual Evidence for a Palace at Late Bronze Emar, in G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East*. CRRAI 54. Winona Lake, 101-9

- (2015): Emar's *entu* Installation. Revising Ritual and Text Together, in P. Delnero and J. Lauinger (eds.), *Texts and Contexts. The Circulation and Transmission of Cuneiform Texts in Social Space*. Berlin, 29-47
- Fleming, D./S. Démare-Lafont (2009): Tablet Terminology at Emar. 'Conventional' and 'Free Format', *AuOr* 27, 19-26
- Margueron, J.-C. (1975): Quatre campagnes de fouilles à Emar (1972-1974). Un bilan provisoire, *Syria* 52, 53-85
- McClellan, T. L. (1997): Houses and Households in North Syria during the Late Bronze Age, in C. Castel [e. a.] (eds.), *Les maisons dans la Syrie antique du III<sup>e</sup> millénaire aux débuts de l'Islam*. Beirut, 29-60
- Pedersén, O. (1998): *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East, 1500-300 B.C.* Bethesda
- Rutz, M. (2013): *Bodies of Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia. The Diviners of Late Bronze Age Emar and their Tablet Collection*. Leiden
- Sasson, J. M. (1980): *Dated Texts from Mari. A Tabulation*. Malibu
- Schwemer, D. (1998): *Akkadische Rituale aus Hattuša. Die Sammeltafel KBo XXXVI 29 und verwandte Fragmente*. Heidelberg
- Seminara, S. (1998): *L'accadico di Emar*. Rome
- Skaist, A. (1998): The Chronology of the Legal Texts from Emar, *ZA*, 45-71
- Werner, P. (1994): *Die Entwicklung der Sakralarchitektur in Nordsyrien und Südostkleinasien vom Neolithikum bis in das 1.Jt.v.Chr.* Munich
- Westenholz, J. (1999): Emar – The City and Its God, in K. van Lerberghe and B. Voet (eds.), *Languages and Cultures in Contact: At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro- Mesopotamian Realm*. CRRAI 42. Leuven, 145-67
- Whiting, R. *Catalog of Tell Hadidi Tablets*. <http://www.helsinki.fi/~whiting/hadidcat.html>
- Wilcke, C. (1992): AH, die Brüder von Emar. Untersuchungen zur Schreibertradition am Euphratknie. *AuOr* 10, 115-50

## Appendix

### Administrative Texts and Other Notes

[Although the ad hoc and free form character of the various lists and notes found in Emar's building M-1 represents a serious obstacle to classification, this individuality is difficult to see without at least rough grouping. It is often difficult to determine the purpose of listed names or items and where some transaction is likely, its direction and context. In principle, the function of the text in relation to the nature of a transaction or situation is more essential to identification than the items named, and it is of little use to fall back on the items as a basis for categorization. With these constraints in view, we begin with the broadest distinctions of function and then sketch further division by domains of interest, elaborated below. Where the domain of interest stands close to the diviner's family itself, characterization of the texts as "administrative" may be problematic, but since the diviner kept records in ad hoc and informal terms, this only adds to the portrait we paint here. Our organization of the administrative texts is heuristic, so that if individual attributions are changed, the larger argument for complete variety remains.]

**Keywords:** xxxxxx

#### 1. *Inventory*

One functional division can be made from the start, though it leaves one group much larger than the other. A few texts elaborate items held in one place, which we call "inventory," in contrast to many texts that suggest the movement of material from one domain to another, which we call "transfer." It is not always clear which is which, but both clearly exist. By inventory, we do not require that this refers to temples, though this offers one clear setting.

##### 1. *As šukuttu "jewels"*

282, for Išhara and <sup>d</sup>NIN.KALAM 288, for Ḫebat

##### 2. *Other religious interest*

274, vessels identified with different deities

283, list of bronze objects as *unūtu* "paraphernalia," with special concern for "its weight" (ki-lá-bi)

##### 3. *Possible*

291, 293, 295, 299, concern for weight (but see 286)

294, 297, 298, very broken, with numbers or objects

301, 302, objects include textiles

303, objects include gold, furniture, sandals, textiles

## 2. *Transfer*

The far larger number of texts may most probably be understood to reflect some kind of exchange, though the direction of transfer and its purpose are often unclear. We place some of Arnaud's "inventories" in this group because the naming of individuals suggests the movement of material into each person's charge, but the context remains unclear. Within this mass, we draw certain crucial distinctions. First, some texts may reflect the business of the diviner's household as such, with no connection to his oversight of public religious life at Emar. These may in some cases involve materials received in connection with his function as "diviner of the gods," whether the financial support was local or ultimately Hittite. Then, among the exchanges, there are degrees of clarity regarding their connection to the cult. We distinguish between explicit references to sacred sites, ritual association without designated sanctuary, and hints of sacred ties. Another group of texts lacks intelligible reference to cult affairs, and a few of these suggest particular alternatives, including commercial concern. We do not assume that these texts cannot have any connection to the cult, but this group allows us to leave open other possibilities.

### 4. *The diviner's household*

- 285, list of metal and worked objects as *unūtu*, deposited under the diviner
- 312, seven people, including five women, have flour – personal accounting?
- 313, similar to 312?
- 367, flour, partly for the diviner's household ("for me," line 8)

### 5. *Temples and shrines*

- 284, silver objects "to" named persons, as *unūtu* for <sup>d</sup>Nin.kur.ra
- 286, gold, silver and precious stone for two gods, sacred personnel including ereš.dingir and *maš'artu*
- 287, distinct items listed for two different gods, "weighed out" in connection with a priest
- 289, at least partly for Irra, "received"

### 6. *Ritual association*

- 275, seven "houses," five named by ritual personnel: *zābiḫu* slaughterers of the storm god, Dagan, and <sup>d</sup>NIN.URTA, the priestess (ereš.dingir) of the storm god, and the *wābil ilā'i* "god-bearer"
- 276, same concept, distinct structure
- 281, something "given" to the gods? (broken)
- 300, vessels and baked goods; links to the month of Abû (452)
- 305, vessels "not given"; *hubu* and *ḫizzibu* in 369 etc.; god-bearer
- 306, *qu'û* vessels for "men of battle," "men of the goddesses"
- 307, also *hubu* and *ḫizzibu*
- 314, god with <sup>d</sup>N[IN-...]?]
- 332, sheep with references to ritual personnel (*ḫussu*, *nuppuḫannu*)
- 363, vessels familiar to ritual
- 364, vessels associated with months Sag.mu and Niqalu, of *zuku* festival (373)
- 365, sheep to named gods?
- 366, bronze associated with *kubadu*-men, a festival rite
- 368, copper related to the *kubadu* (rite)

7. *General link to sacred stores*

- 290, *riksu* (bundles?); bronze vessels, arrowheads, and bows not “placed” on a wood tablet;  
cf. bows in E52, from the storm god’s temple
- 296, large objects with some ritual association, including cart, bed, footstool, and chairs
- 309, *kirītu* and *ašhallu* with named persons?
- 310, gold, silver, garments, to persons/gods, as *unūtu*
- 325, single sheep and named persons (also cf. 322, 323, 324, 326, 327, 328, 331, 333?):  
unclear context; could be related to offering or divination
- 329, 330, 334, 335, very broken animal transfer

8. *Without evident sacred association*

- a) Non-sacred accounting?
  - 277, silver in shekels, accounted to named persons
  - 278, same (broken)
  - 280, silver in shekels “to” (broken)?
- b) Barley as hostage support (*i-na hu-ub-te-ti*)?
  - 279 and 319, barley given to named persons
- c) Barley for various leaders
  - 315
  - 316?
- d) Provision for the move of a queen (“woman of the king,” *munus lugal*) from Kinza (Qadesh) to Šatappi – part of Carchemish/Hittite leadership?
  - 361
- e) Unknown association
  - 311, special case, where involvement of “temple of NINURTA” could be for the city
  - 313, unknown item, no sign of context
  - 317, donkeys, barley
  - 318, breads/flours
  - 320, behind on barley payments – to the Hittite power?
  - 321, animals, garments, etc. “received” by various persons or groups
  - 362, named persons “received” unidentified object

3. *Lists of personal names 336-360**List of administrative texts by number:*

It is a commonplace that the administrative texts are dominated almost entirely by Free Format writing (e.g. Faist 2008; Balza 2009: 114; cf. Table 9 in Rutz 2013: 138, as Free Format or unknown). We simply assert that the trend is universal and important in itself.

The article of reference for definition of palaeographic contrast between the scribal hands in the Conventional and Free Format (“Syrian” and “Syro-Hittite”) legal documents is Wilcke 1992, where the author assembles a range of examples for the signs AH/A’, LI, IG, GI, AG, UG, AZ, IL, and AL. In terms of palaeographic form, we observe also that the DUMU sign is rendered in Free Format with a vertical wedge in the lower section, in contrast to the Conventional Format DUMU, which consists only of horizontals. The Free Format is marked by preference for horizontal separation lines, and we encounter particular writings for divine names, including <sup>d</sup>Kur instead of

<sup>d</sup>*Da-gan* and <sup>d</sup>30 instead of <sup>d</sup>Har for Šaggar. Further search for palaeographic and orthographic patterns would likely yield other contrasts.

274, inventory

*Layout* (L): number, vessels, DN; several gods per line; no separation lines, no verb, heading, conclusion

*Idiosyncrasies* (I): some ritual details (*hiyari*; *hudašu* of Dagan)<sup>1</sup>

*Free Format writing* (FFw): <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan; <sup>d</sup>30 for Šaggar

275, diviner's oversight of ritual personnel – sealed (C3)

L: numbers of ZA/ŠA, PNs, with total of 4, in 7 sets, with separation lines; first five sets with title at end for assignment; conclusion with “7 houses”, the overseer Ba‘lu-qarrad, “pure men”

I: five houses for *zābiḥus* (slaughterers) of the storm god, Dagan, and <sup>d</sup>NIN.URTA, the priestess (ereš.dingir) of the storm god, and the *wābil ilā'i* (god-bearer)

FFw: sign forms A'/I' (1, 5), LI (5), IK (6), IL (8); diviner written <sup>lu</sup>hal instead of <sup>lu</sup>máš.šu.gíd.gíd; multiple separation lines

276, similar to 275

L: numbers of ZA/ŠA, PNs, 7 sets preserved (broken at bottom), with separation lines; title at end for assignment?; ritual weapons for sets 3, 4, and 7; conclusion lost

I: titles for sets 1, 5, and 6, the priest (<sup>lu</sup>sanga) of X, the *wābil ilā'i* (god-bearer), the *zābiḥu* (slaughterer) of Dagan Bēl Tabniya; weapons in sets 3 and 4 for the priestess (ereš.dingir) of X and the priestess (ereš.dingir) of Aštartu

FFw: sign forms A'/I' (1, 5), LI (2, 5), AK (7), IK (11); <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan; multiple separation lines

277, uncertain list of (non-cultic?) debts or expenses

L: number, gín *ša* or *ana* PN (once <sup>kur</sup>*Ki-in-za*, line 5); separation lines for groups

I: Kapi-Dagan without patronym in lines 2, 7, 9, with “the garments of Kapi-Dagan” in 7; land of Kinza (Qadesh) suggests exchange with Hittite/Carchemish figures? Note a “woman of the king” (queen?) moving from Kinza to Šatappi in 361, perhaps part of Hittite presence.

FFw: <sup>m</sup>gal-<sup>d</sup>30 as PN (see Šaggar-kabar, <sup>d</sup>30-gal, in Pruzsinszky 2003); read as Kabar-Šaggar, rather than the Hurrian Talmi-Kuša as Pruzsinszky?; <sup>md</sup>30-*a-bu* for Šaggar-abu<sup>2</sup>

278, similar to 277

L: number, bronze, *ana* PN; separation lines between each recipient (the rest broken)

I: “debts” in line 3

FFw: <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan; multiple separation lines

279, barley given (see 319), possibly to support people removed from the city – sealed (E71)

L: number, <sup>gi</sup>pa (*parīsu*) barley, PN(s), repeated with “ditto” (min), names grouped in sections with separation lines (50 lines total)

I: Partial correspondence with shorter text 319; Zu-Aštarti and Ibni-Dagan as diviner's sons (lines 5, 16); only in the final section of the list (lines 21-50), priests (sanga) of Dagan

1. This reading perhaps supports the interpretation of Dagan's *hudašu* as the New Moon in 446: 100 (Fleming 2000, 192-3), since the Hebrew *hōdeš* would reflect the earlier *\*hudš*.

2. In general the overwhelming majority of personal names with Šaggar are Free Format, so that we find very few references to names with <sup>d</sup>Har (see the list in Pruzsinszky 2003).



- (21) and Šaggar (48), and several women (lines 22, 23, 27, 31, 32, 33, 37)  
 FFw: sign forms (not exhaustive) LI (8, 24, 27, 32, 34, 37, 49), I' (10, 33, 44), AL (23), IL (31), *dumu passim*; <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (1 and *passim*); diviner as <sup>lu</sup>hal; multiple separation lines; *lu.ú.lu-tu* for *amēlūtu* (4)
- 280, commercial accounting?  
 L: number, *gín*, *kù.babbar* first line repeated without, recipients lost to break; two separation lines  
 I: line 9, *i-na egir* (“behind”)  
 FFw: separation lines?
- 281, transfer with ritual association? (not clearly for a temple)  
 L: very broken, only ends of lines, with PNs, except line 2' verb “to give” (*sum*); separation lines between every entry  
 I: verb “to give”  
 FFw: sign form LI (3'), *dumu* 1', 3', 4'; multiple separation lines; verb *nadānu* written with *sum*, as in ritual texts (e.g. 369:5, 10)
- 282, inventory  
 L: 15 lines with broken opening line, *šukuttu* (“jewels”) + DN in line 6, expect to apply to lines 7-15; two groups of precious objects each introduced by *mar-ŠUM*(*šu*<sub>14</sub>) “of silver” (lines 1, 7) and “in its midst” or “inside it” (line 7) – an object elsewhere associated with both leather and precious metal; listed objects in gold, silver, precious stones; second *šukuttu* separated by horizontal lines (16-18); final section of named stones, perhaps added by different hand  
 I: *Išhara* and <sup>d</sup>NIN.KALAM in line 6 (for <sup>d</sup>NIN.URTA?); uncertain divine name in line 16, with an uncertain object given “to the priest” (<sup>lu</sup>sanga); see 288:1-2, where *ina libbīšu* (“in its midst”) refers to the “treasure” as a whole  
 FFw: sign form IG (/eq/) (13); *-šú* for 3ms suffix (5, 7, and *passim*)
- 283, list of bronze objects, possibly with ritual interest  
 L: number, object, *zabar* (“bronze”), *ki.lá.bi* (“its weight”) (no “bronze” in lines 12, 15; weight only through line 11); separation line followed by “3 items (*unūtu*) pertaining to (*ša*)” some group of personnel<sup>3</sup>  
 I: line 21, five bronze cups “for offering” (*ša siskur*), confirms sacred use; the size of the vessels can be substantial, and it may be that the weights are only attached to the larger pots, which range from a 1000-shekel *tūdu* (kettle) to pots of 300 or 200 shekels; no PNs or DNs  
 FFw: sign forms LI (1, 17), AL (8, 9, 15)
- 284, transfer of silver objects for sacred interest  
 L: number, object, silver, *ki.lá.bi* (“its weight”), *ana* (*muhhi*) PN; without separation lines, concluded by “these items (*unūtu*) pertaining to (*ša*) <sup>d</sup>NIN.KUR.RA”

3. Durand (1990: 81) reads *lu.meššu.sil.dug*<sup>1</sup> (“cupbearers”), but the copy appears to read *lu.meššu.gi-bi*, where the final sign could be taken as a phonetic complement. We consider these key lines to be obscure, in that the objects include a wide range of vessels for cooking or presentation, and it is completely unclear whom we may imagine to have an interest in them. There is no institutional structure at Emar that would sustain the service of a crew of plural “cupbearers,” but equally we find no proper precedent for items associated with “elders” (not with such a spelling), who appear frequently in legal settings but not in ritual.

- I: individual PNs receive the items in question *from* the goddess  
 FFw: *dumu* (4, 7); PNs with sumerograms, *Abi-kapi* as <sup>m</sup>ad-*diri* (4); *Abdi-ili* as <sup>m</sup>ir-*dingir*-[*i*] (5); compare *ki.lá.bi* for weight in 283
- 285, deposit of metal objects under the diviner (related to his household?) – sealed (A69, B47)  
 L: number, object, material (bronze, silver, cloth type); after metal objects, two *riksu* (bundle?) references (10, 11), the second “sealed with the seal of Kapi-Dagan the diviner” (11-12); separation line, then concluding “these new items (*unūtu annūtu eššūtu*) that Ba‘lu-malik the diviner checked,” and broken PNs, reference to a (wood?) tablet  
 I: individual PNs only twice (9, 12) in the main list; the oversight of Ba‘lu-malik takes precedence over or follows upon the seal of Kapi-Dagan, the younger diviner over the older?; the detail of “checking” (verb *paqādu*) defines the transaction, along with “new” items – not clear new to what  
 FFw: sign form IK (10, 11), *dumu* (17); PNs Kapi-Dagan with <sup>d</sup>Kur (12), Ili-abi with *dingir* (19); Kapi-Dagan as “diviner” spelled <sup>lú</sup>hal
- 286, transfer of precious objects for sacred interest  
 L: badly broken, especially at start of lines; number?, object (possibly more than one per line), material (gold, silver, bronze, precious stones), frequent reference to “weight”; sometimes reference to titles (diviner 11, *ereš.dingir* priestess and *maš’artu* priestess 19’; cf. “slaughterer” <sup>lú</sup>za-bi-[*hi*(?)] 10)  
 I: Dagan in 14 could be DN or theophoric PN, after break; no clear reference to PNs, but only titles without names  
 FFw: diviner spelled <sup>lú</sup>hal (11); priestess the same as in installation rituals (E369 and E370)
- 287, transfer of precious objects for sacred interest – sealed (A69, B64)  
 L: number, object, material (gold, silver, bronze), last line “pertaining to (*ša*) DN”; grouped for two gods, with two separation lines between them; final line of text *lá* “pertaining to (*ša*) Itur-Dagan the priest (<sup>lú</sup>sanga)”  
 I: the responsibility of Itur-Dagan is defined by *lá*, “to weigh,” so perhaps “weighed items” (alternatively, “minus” that which pertains to PN?); the two gods are <sup>d</sup>NIN.KUR of Uri (a town) and *Ḫalma*\*  
 FFw: -*šú* for pronominal suffix (2); PN Itur-Dagan with sumerograms as <sup>m</sup>gur-<sup>d</sup>kur; note *ki.lá.bi* (line 1) as in 283
- 288, inventory (broken)  
 L: *šukuttu* DN as opening, “in its midst” (*ina libbīšu*), number, object, material (gold) – broken  
 I: *šukuttu* as opening may contrast with placement at close of listed batches in 282; the deity appears to be *Ḫebat*, but copy shows break across the top  
 FFw: -*šú* for pronominal suffix, same writing as 282
- 289, transfer of precious objects for sacred interest  
 L: (opening of lines missing at top), number?, object, material (gold); just 3 lines, final ends 50 *ki.lá.[bi]*, “its weight is 50 (shekels)”; PN the overseer (<sup>lú</sup>ugula) received (verb *leqû*); pertaining to (*ša*) DN  
 I: “receiving” of gold items by a human in position of responsibility, then identified with a deity (Erra Lord of X?)  
 FFw: sign form IL (5)
- 290, transfer linked to sacred stores – sealed (B49)

- L: *riksu* as the opening word, *ša* + *x*, where the sign at the break is neither the PN marker DIŠ nor the DN marker DINGIR; next lines with number, object, material (bronze vessels; bows and arrows); separation line before statement that “these items (*ú-du-ú*)” were not recorded on a wood tablet
- I: no PN or DN to show specific association; final word of list section is *butuqqû* or *butuqtu* (“deficiency” – not clear of what)
- FFw: sign forms IK (1), LI (10); writing of verb *šakānu* with *gar* (cf. ritual texts, e.g. E369:28B, 37A, 59D, 67A and D, etc.; contrast the Conventional-style script of the ritual text E446, which does not use sumerograms to render verbs, esp. line 40 for *šakānu*)
- 291, inventory?
- L: small fragment
- I: first line, reference to “in its midst” – found in 282 and 288 with *šukuttu*; second line concern for weighing
- FFw: writing the preposition *ina* with AŠ; the associations of the above two terminologies 292, inventory?
- L: small fragment
- I: two lines appear to mention “stone”
- FFw: sign form IG (2’)
- 293, inventory?
- L: fragment with left side broken; some objects (vessels?), numbers for weight, “its weight” at end of lines (2’, 5’, 6’, 7’, 8’); possible connection with 295
- I: no PNs, DNs; possible reference to “the presence of” (*i/ana pānī*) in final visible line
- FFw: only the similarity to others with weight, though written here with LÁL instead of LÁ (doubled form of sign)
- 294, inventory?
- L: left edge preserved, with numbers
- 295, inventory?
- L: like 293, left side broken, objects and “its weight” at end of lines 1’ and 2’
- I: writing one weight with 100 as just *me* (for *me-at*) in line 1’ is like 293:2’; also no PNs, DNs
- FFw: very like 293, except that “its weight” is written with LÁ (so, not the same tablet)
- 296, transfer linked to sacred stores?
- L: opening line “tablet(?) of the gate”<sup>4</sup>; then numbers, objects, sometimes material; separation lines to break up sections; final section with *u anumma* (“also this”)
- I: no PNs or DNs except reference to Dagan (<sup>d</sup>Kur) after break at end of line 8; furniture in lines 6-8 recalls priestess installations E369 and E370 (bed, stools, chairs); final line “of the gate of the house (of) residence (*šu-ub-ti*)” and the verb “to give” (*nadānu/sum*)
- FFw: multiple separation lines; writing *nadānu* with the sumerogram; Dagan as <sup>d</sup>Kur
- 297, inventory?
- L: fragment divided by separation line, with only one line above, referring to silver shekels; followed by list: number, object [break] – vessels?

4. The reading of the opening line is uncertain; Durand (1990: 83) reads *kišib* for Arnaud’s dub, but the document is not sealed, and in FF texts the writing is consistently <sup>na</sup>*4kišib*; the following signs are clear, though their meaning is not: DUB *ša* *ká* *hu-ZA-ri*, followed by *é* *ha-x* and a break.

- I: no PNs, DN; the object in 3' is *namsītu* (CAD s.v. *nemsētu* "washbowl")  
 FFw: only the separation line
- 298, inventory?  
 L: small fragment; fragments of two PNs; Arnaud considers that 298 belongs to the same tablet as 297  
 FFw: elements of divine names written <sup>d</sup>30 (Šaggar, line 1'), <sup>d</sup>U (storm god, line 3'); *dumu* with trace of vertical? (3')
- 299, inventory??  
 L: small fragment, preserves bit of right edge; reference to "its weight" (line 2'), a number (line 3')  
 FFw: only the similarity to others with weight
- 300, transfer associated with rites for the month of Abû (related to ritual text 452)  
 L: Read opening, <sup>iti</sup>A'-[*bi-i*] "month of Abû"; next 4 lines number, vessel (dug, 2; qa, 5); then breaks, but ends of lines give further numbers and vessels; line 6 begins *ana* ("for"); then the remaining lines again with number, vessel  
 I: two DNs visible, Aštartu of the Mountain (<sup>d</sup>*Iš<sub>8</sub>-tár ša hur.s[ag]*, line 3),<sup>5</sup> Aštar-šarba (read in line 4, [<sup>d</sup>*Aš*]-*tar-ša-ar-ba*<sup>6</sup>; recipients are designated by *ana* ("for") in lines 6, 8, 9, and 11, the last with *a-bi-i*, to match the *abû* shrines that receive offerings in the rite for the month of Abû (452:32, 33, 39, 40, 46, 50, 52); the measures and materials are familiar from the same text: <sup>dug</sup>*pihù* (line 11, cf. 452:1, 29, etc.); <sup>dug</sup>*H[A(?)]* line 7 (cf. 452:3, 9, etc.); <sup>zi</sup>*ba-ba-za* (lines 6, 11, cf. 452:3, 6, etc.); the five signs at the end of line 7 may be read é(?) *hur-ur-ri-ti*, "the Hurrian house" (?), not part of the preserved ritual text  
 FFw: the strongest evidence is the continuity with E452, which has FF style script
- 301, inventory?  
 L: fragment, broken at top; number, object (mix of textiles, 5', 10'; and vessels, 8') I: no PNs, DNs  
 FFw: sign form IG (9')
- 302, inventory?  
 L: small fragment, right edge; names of objects preserved, including a bed (1) and textiles (2, 3, 4)  
 I: no PNs, DNs  
 FFw: too little for evaluation
- 303, inventory?

5. The text that gathers rites for the month of Abû devotes particular attention to Aštartu during an event on days 14, 16, and 17, with Aštar-šarba appearing on day 16. There is no "Aštartu of the Mountain," but the text frames this occasion with concern for two mountains (*hur-sag*), Mount Šinapši on days 3, 8, and 20; and Mount Šuparatu on day 19. On day 3, the mountain shares attention with Aštartu *ša abi* (lines 3-6). These sites appear to be the points of reference for the DN in 300:3. Unfortunately the text is broken after reference to the "mountain," which could have been followed by a name.

6. Arnaud reads the four visible signs at the end of line 4 as [<sup>d</sup>*Iš*]-*tar Za-ar-ma*, though this would entail treating the second sign of the divine name as an alternative to the usual TÁR sign. For this reading and the goddess in Syria more generally, see Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 182-83; the deity was first identified in the Emar texts by J. A. Belmonte, "Zur Lesung und Deutung von *ina sila.lim ar-ba* in Emar-Texten," *N.A.B.U.* 1997/87, 82-3.

- L: fragment; first two lines have left edge preserved: number, *gín* (“shekels”) gold, with further description of objects in line 2; break, then broken left side, names of objects, including chair, table, sandals, and textiles  
 I: no PNs, DNs  
 FFw: writings for furniture resemble ritual texts  
 (304, record of transfer – a letter? if so, not an “administrative” text)  
 L: fragment, only part of a left edge preserved; some category of “men” (*lú.meš*, 1’), “now” (*i-na-an-[na]*, 5’), verb “bring”? (*bi-la* [...], 6’), something other than a number or noun (*i-*, 8’), all could suggest a message as opposed to an administrative record; list of vessels in lines 2’-4’, one shekel of something in line 7’  
 I: no PNs, DNs  
 FFw: too little for evaluation  
 305, transfer with ritual association? – sealed (A70)  
 L: five lines with number, vessel (*hizzibu* or *hubu*), PN (broken at end of lines); lines 6-7, “this [material?] PN will deliver”; line 8 set apart by separation lines above and below; final section, “this silver,” reference to a wooden writing board, “and it has not been given” (11, *la-a na-din*)  
 I: The last man in the opening list appears to be a “god-bearer” (*wa-b[il i-la-i]*, 5); the vessels are familiar from ritual, though no DN is mentioned  
 FFw: sign form LI (1, 10), *dumu passim*; writings of PNs with <sup>d</sup>30 for Šaggar (3, 4), <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (4, 5); *gal* for -kabar (4, 5); all Šaggar names at Emar are in FF texts  
 306, transfer with ritual association (the *maš’artu* installation festival, E370)  
 L: two main sections, each followed by separation line; final line with *lú.meš ša i-la-ti* written on upper edge (Arnaud: “hommes de l’armée”); first section, opens *lú.meš ta-ḥa-zi*, key ritual participants in the installation for the *maš’artu* priestess (370:32’, 62’, 65’, 68’, 90’, 91’), then 9 lines with number, *qu’û*-vessel, PN, closed by “total: 22 *qu’û*-vessels,” line 11 on lower edge; second section in same format without total – material received for participation?  
 I: six women out of nine in the opening section; three women out of five in the second; provision *by* these named people, not necessarily identifying them *as* the “men of battle”; or if they are, these may not be soldiers?  
 FFw: sign form ’U in lines 2, 11, 17, cf. 13, *dumu passim*; writing PNs with sumerograms, <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (2, 9, 18), dingir for Ilu (6, 14), <sup>d</sup>30 for Šaggar (10, 14); continuity of “men of battle” with term from ritual text E370, which has FF script  
 307, transfer with ritual association  
 L: two parts, each with separation line afterward; text only inscribed on obverse; number, vessel, PN  
 I: vessels are all *hizzibu* and *hubu*, the principal vessels for the storm god priestess installation (369)  
 FFw: separation lines, vessels from ritual text with FF script; PN <sup>m</sup>gur-<sup>d</sup>Kur for Tura-Dagan, only FF  
 (308, lexical, with reference to *narkabtu* “chariot”; so Arnaud’s note and Rutz, p. 386)  
 309, transfer linked to sacred stores? – sealed (E79)  
 L: very small tablet with three lines in two parts, followed by separation lines; each is a *kirītu* (Arnaud remarks the choice of definitions for some object), followed by PN

- I: the first *kirītu* is accompanied by a *ká aš-ḫa-li* (followed by a break), unclear  
 FFw: sign form LI (1), *dumu* (2, 3); separation lines
- 310, transfer linked to sacred stores?  
 L: two main sections preserved, each followed by a separation line, then one more mostly lost; first section number, *gín guškin* (shekels of gold), *ana* (“for”), recipients lost but two of three start with DINGIR (lines 2, 3), so for gods, final line “total”; second section number, (*gín*) *kù.babbar* (shekels of silver), *ana* (“for”), recipients lost but two are clearly PNs with masculine determinative (7, 8), final line “total”; last line of text in third section “these items” (*unūtu annūtu*)  
 I: gold for gods, silver for humans; first line of transfer to humans is *ina* (“in?”), not *ana*, not followed by masculine determinative (then broken); second transfer to humans is for “one garment” (line 6); last of transfers to humans is a foot-bracelet, measuring its weight  
 FFw: separation lines; similarity of elements with “total,” “weight” (line 9), “these items”
- 311, unusual transaction (crews of men), without clear ritual concern  
 L: lines 1-5 with number, *erim*<sup>mes</sup>, PN; end of line 5, “to the hand of Ba‘lu-malik”; final line (6), “house of <sup>d</sup>IB(=URTA?)” for <sup>d</sup><NIN>.URTA?  
 I: Ba‘lu-malik must be the diviner; the temple of <sup>d</sup>NIN.URTA would be the financial center that holds property in the name of the town; *erim/šābu* refers to counts of men in groups; though the diviner is the last one and the monarchy may fall early in his term, the activity of <sup>d</sup>NIN.URTA suggests that the Conventional Format may still be in use, along with local kings (Démare-Lafont and Fleming 2015)  
 FFw: writing the storm god as <sup>d</sup>U in PNs, only FF
- 312, transfer of barley for the diviner’s household?  
 L: first line some broken number(?) of *parīsu* measures of flour, repeated in six more lines as “ditto” (min), each line with one PN  
 I: five of seven names are women; no sign of temple interest  
 FFw: sign forms IG (4), I’ (6), LI (7), *dumu passim*
- 313, transfer of unknown item, no evident context  
 L: top missing, then number, “ditto” (min), PN (format like 312)  
 I: one of four PNs is a woman; two lines have *ša* “pertaining to” before the PN  
 FFw: similarity to 312
- 314, transfer with ritual association?  
 L: top missing, then number, “ditto” (min), PN (like 312, 313) through line 4’; then three lines with *ana* “for,” one for DN (marked with divine determinative)  
 I: the god may begin with <sup>d</sup>N[IN], to suit <sup>d</sup>NIN.URTA or <sup>d</sup>NIN.KUR (line 5’)  
 FFw: PN with NIR for Matkali-X (3’), only FF
- 315, assignment of barley to leaders  
 L: top missing, then barley, *ana* (“for”), human recipients by title; each line followed by separation line  
 I: no PNs; none of the titles are for sacred domains, two leaders (*lú gal*, 1’, 2’), an overseer (*ugula lú x*, 3’),<sup>7</sup> and a smith (<sup>lu</sup>*simug*, 4’)

7. Arnaud reads *ugula* <sup>lu</sup>*du*[*b.sar* <sup>mes</sup>], and though the first sign is possible, there is no precedent to our knowledge for an “overseer” of scribes. Cohen (2009: 57) tentatively accepts Arnaud’s reading as appropriate to the traces and plausible, with one example of the title in Hittite ritual.

- FFw: repeated separation lines
- 316, transfer of barley, no clear sacred context  
 L: two lines with number, material (barley and another grain preparation), “to the hand of PN” (text complete)  
 I: the person responsible is Ipqi-Dagan; no occasion or purpose given; the material does not appear to be for Ipqi-Dagan’s personal use, but rather he has overseen its arrival  
 FFw: Dagan written <sup>d</sup>Kur
- 317, transfer of barley linked to delivery of donkeys  
 L: a *parīsu* measure of barley of (i.e. “for”) *pappāsu*-flour; “now” (*inanna*) PN will give six donkeys for one shekel of silver  
 I: the man who delivers the donkeys is Tiḥa’e son of Ribī-x  
 FFw: sign form for partial ’E (2), *dumu* (2); writing verb with CVC sign *i-na-din*; likeness to rituals, texts with the barley measured as “*pa*” for *parīsu* and flour
- 318, transfer of breads (products made with grain), no clear sacred context  
 L: number, type of bread, each line followed by separation line (bottom broken)  
 I: varieties include *sariu*, *sīpu*, *magurru*, *ḥalḥallu* (regular and with *pappāsu* flour), *kakkaru* (regular and large)  
 FFw: multiple separation lines
- 319, barley given (see 279), possibly to support people removed from the city  
 L: first line barley, “which was given in hostage status(?)” (*ša ina ḥubtēti nadnā*), followed by lines with number, *parīsu* of barley (then “ditto” [min]), PN  
 I: the “giving” in this case does not appear to represent incoming materials (vs. 305:10; 317:4; 320:12; 363:3; 364:4; 367:7); see article discussion for relationship to 279  
 FFw: sign forms AL (6), IL (11), LI (11), UG (12), *dumu passim*; PNs written <sup>d</sup>kur for Dagan (4, 10, 16), <sup>d</sup>U for storm god (2, 5, 13), etc.
- 320, barley not yet paid  
 L: list of PNs, followed by “men who have not (yet) given barley” (11-12, *lú<sup>meš</sup> ša še<sup>meš</sup> la-a id-di-nu*); separation line, then “total: 34 houses”  
 I: one man is “the priest (sanga) of Šaggar”; ten lines list nine PNs, yet the total is 34 “houses” (or households); Kitta son of Kunazi (line 4) appears also in E5 as the father of one of the men who seals a will found in the public building of Area A – so this document is a generation earlier?  
 FFw: sign forms LI (3), A’ (10), *dumu* (especially lines 8, 10 in copy)
- 321, assignment of onagers, gazelles, garments, and oil to human recipients  
 L: five sections, each followed by separation line (double, after the second, line 7); number, animal first, then either *ana* (“for”) plus PN or *é* (“house”), or simply PN; two sections conclude with “these things” (*annūtu*, 4, 13); two references to “they have received” (*ilqû*, 7, 12)  
 I: sections 1, 2, 4, and 5 involve “onagers” (*anše.edin.na*), and section 3 involves gazelles (*maš.dà*); other items are occasionally added (garments, 2, 5, juglets of oil 3, 6, 20); the 3mp verb indicates that the list counts livestock and materials received “for” certain designated parties, and simple reference to names without *ana* seems likewise to identify recipients; at the end of section 1, “these things of the palace” (4) appears to name the palace as donor, with “the cooks of the house of the servant-women” and (the woman) Adaya as recipients

- FFw: sign forms IL (7, 12), IK (9), dumu (6, 9, 10); repeated separation lines; <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (6, 9, 10, 20)
- 322, transfer in sacred context?: white sheep associated with named persons  
 L: short sections with separation lines; number, “white ewe,” with further information, including another number for “male” and at least one PN per section  
 I: the first section gives two PNs, the second with male sheep, lambs, and a goat  
 FFw: sign form A’ (5), multiple separation lines
- 323, transfer in sacred context?: white sheep “into the hand of” PN  
 L: six lines with number and animal; “total” (line 7), 98 “sheep” (udu<sup>hi-a</sup>), “*ana qāt Himaši-Dagan*”  
 I: the udu category includes both sheep and goats; there are 99 animals counted  
 FFw: <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (7)
- 324, transfer in sacred context?: lambs and PNs  
 L: broken on all sides, individual lines followed by separation line, (number), lamb, PN  
 I: number preserved only line 3’, “lamb” only lines 1’, 3’, 4’  
 FFw: sign forms LI (5’) and I’ (5’), dumu (6’, 7’); <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (2’, 5’)
- 325, transfer in sacred context?: single sheep with PNs  
 L: number, sheep, PN; broken top and bottom, with 15 lines followed by separation line, then 13 more lines preserved  
 I: always 1 sheep per person except 2 in line 17’; no titles  
 FFw: sign forms A’ (11’), LI (16’, 20’, 25’), dumu *passim*; <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (4’, 19’), Šaggar-abu only FF (17’)
- 326, transfer in sacred context?: sheep  
 L: fragment, preserving top left corner of obverse, bottom left corner of reverse; number, sheep, *ana* (“for”); DN = <sup>d</sup>Iškur in line 3, without number and udu; reverse includes *pár-šu*, “rites”  
 I: not a lengthy list like 381; the reverse is too broken to understand, but reference to “rites” indicates a ritual occasion  
 FFw: two separation lines on the reverse; very few signs to evaluate
- 327, transfer in sacred context?: mostly sheep  
 L: 4 sections, each followed by a separation line; number, sheep, PN, with occasional added detail; section 3 ends “of/from Šaggar-abu”; and section 4 ends “on the preceding day”  
 I: section 1 follows the sheep with a reference to “donkeys: Tutte”; line 9 adds to the reference to one sheep that it is “from among the flock” (*ša ina ba-qa-ra*); the phrase *i-na u4-mi ma-ḫi-ri-i* (“on the preceding day”) is used to define offering during the ritual text for Anatolian gods 471:28, spelled exactly the same way (cf. Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 228)  
 FFw: sign forms dumu (1, 7, 12, 14); *ina* with AŠ; Šaggar-abu only FF, <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (1, 10, 11 (note *da-gan* at the end of line 3 in broken context); separation lines
- 328, transfer in sacred context?: sheep  
 L: fragment of left edge, top and bottom broken; number 1, sheep, association (varies); separation line after every line  
 I: first two visible entries begin with divine determinative DINGIR (1’, 2’); the second is <sup>d</sup>Šu- [...]; then a cult occasion, *i-na u4-mi a-x*-[...]; the final entry is a ewe for some PN  
 FFw: separation lines
- 329, sheep for unknown purpose



- L: fragment of left edge, top and bottom broken; number, female sheep, large, white, number, male sheep (broken); separation line after each line  
 I: always 4 ewes, either 4 or 5 male sheep; no PNs or DNs preserved  
 FFw: separation lines
- 330, sheep for unknown purpose  
 L: small fragment broken on all sides; similar to 329 with numbers of female and male sheep, “large white”; separation line after line 1’ (of three)  
 I: only numbers are 4 females (1’), 2 males (2’)  
 FFw: separation line
- 331, transfer in sacred context?: sheep  
 L: six lines, separation line, a 7<sup>th</sup> line; number, sheep (udu<sup>hi.a</sup>), PN (including the last line)  
 I: numbers are fairly large: 7, 7, 9, 9, 9, 24, 29; Tura-Dagan son of Itur-Da appears twice, with 7 in line 2, 29 in line 7  
 FFw: sign forms A’ (1), AG (5), LI (6), dumu *passim*; <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (2, 3, 7); writing gur for the verb *târu* in Itur-Da (2, 7)
- 332, transfer with ritual association: distribution of sheep?  
 L: sections with lists of “one sheep” with unknown association; each section followed by separation line; each section includes one reference to sheep followed by *ina* (at/on), in one case with *u*[4...], such references suggest temporal definition, perhaps for ritual; final preserved section (separated from the rest) includes references to the *nuppuḥannū*-men and the *ḥussu*  
 I: both ritual terms are known from the rites for the month of Abû (452), where the first day of the month is “the day of declaration” (*ūmi ḥussu*, 452:1) and sheep for sacrifice are sometimes provided by the *nuppuḥannū*-men (452:4, 17, 29, 32, 36, 54)  
 FFw: separation lines; ritual terms in common with 452, a text with FF-like script
- 333, transfer in sacred context?  
 L: small fragment, number, plural sheep, *ana* (“for”), recipient  
 I: the first recipient is the palace, and the second “the gate of x” (broken)  
 FFw: nothing to compare
- 334, sheep for unknown purpose  
 L: small fragment; number, sheep, PN; followed by separation line  
 I: only one visible line; one sheep  
 FFw: sign form dumu (1); separation line
- 335, cow for unknown purpose  
 L: small tablet complete (3 lines); number, cow, PN (in two lines)  
 I: one cow; person is a woman  
 FFw: sign form A’ (2), dumu (3)
- 336, list of PNs  
 L: 110 lines of PNs  
 I: various “brothers” (5, 6, 8, 33, 37, 62); titles include “slaughterer” (*zābiḥu*, 34, 100?, 108 of Dagan), “diviner’s son” (dumu ḥal, 48, 81), “singer” (*nuaru*, 83); “the Babylonian” (lú<sup>kur</sup> *kar-du-ni-ia-aš*, 94)  
 FFw: sign forms FF throughout, dumu *passim*; -šú for 3ms suffix; <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (1, 3, etc.), gur for verb *târu* (4, 13, etc.) – and more
- 337, list of PNs

- L: top and right edge, 21 lines preserved  
 I: “singer” (*zammāru*, 5), “brothers” (7, 10), “as far (*adi*) as the daughter of PN” (8), “weaver” (21)  
 FFw: sign forms I’ (2), LI (2, 14), *dumu passim*; -šú 3ms suffix; <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (3, 4, etc.)
- 338, list of PNs  
 L: top and bottom broken, 23 lines at least partially preserved  
 I: no preserved titles, relationships – except *lú* in line 9; line 10 begins with the number 10 (counting); line 23 begins *lú<sup>meš</sup> ša x*, “the men of x”  
 FFw: sign forms *dumu passim*; <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (9, 11)
- 339 – 360, lists of PNs  
 Consistent FF script where available to check: *dumu passim*; <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (339:4’, 7’, 9’; etc.); LI (344:5’); -šú suffix (345:5’; 348:3’); diviner as <sup>lu</sup>hal (345:6’); separation lines (e.g. 347, 352); IG (349:7’); PN Šaggar-abu (351:3’); <sup>d</sup>U for storm god (354:3’; 355:3’); *gur* for *tāru* (355:4’)  
 Based on this list of features, every one of these fragments can be identified as having the FF style script, except 360, which has only one or sometimes two signs visible at the start of each line, at the left edge.
- 361, provision for the move of a queen  
 L: two sections, each followed by a separation line; the first is a single line for humans: three women, three (servant-)girls, three (servant-)boys; the second begins with a list of items, each with a number and the item (animals, clothing, and grain); “these things” (*annūtu*) are pertaining to (*ša*) PN the <sup>lu</sup>ur.ra (Sumerian *lu’urak*, spice miller; OB lexical as *marrāqu* in lists of professions) of the queen (munus *lugal*); “who left the land of Qizzu (Qadesh) (and) whom they lodged (*ú-še-ši-bu-šu*[sic]) in the town of Šatappi”  
 I: it is not the queen who moves but the <sup>lu</sup>ur.ra of the queen, as shown by the 3ms suffix on the final verb  
 FFw: separation lines after each section
- 362, transaction with no evident sacred context  
 L: fragment; two sections, separation line between, only right edge preserved; PNs at end of three lines; verb *ilteqe* (“he has received”) at end of line 4’, first in second section; material “for” (*ana*) PNs in 5’, 6’, silver in line 6’  
 I: nothing shows a cultic context; PNs in 5’ and 6’ are given without patronym  
 FFw: sign form IL (4’); separation line
- 363, transfer with ritual association – sealed (A62)  
 L: numbers of two types of vessels, wine, *i-na wa-ar-da*(=?), “given to the gods”  
 I: no specific DNs; vessels are familiar to ritual (*hizzibu* and *hubu*)  
 FFw: separation line after single section (line 3)
- 364, transfer with ritual association (the *zukru* festival, 373) – sealed (A62)  
 L: three sections, each followed by separation line; number(s), vessels, wine, during month name; final section “total,” number, vessels, wine “given to the gods”  
 I: the two months are Sagmu and Niqali, which define the entire calendrical interest of the *zukru* festival (373; see *Time at Emar*, Chapter 3); the vessels include 4 *hubu* and 3+8 *hizzibu*, for a total of 10 *hubu*, which could lead to the conclusion that 11 *hizzibu* fit in 6 *hubu*, which could be a ratio of two to one

- FFw: sign form LI (2); month names from the festival version of the *zukru*, which is in FF script; separation lines; possibly the use of a sumerogram (sum) for *nadānu*
- 365, transfer with ritual association
- L: fragment with parts of left edge preserved; two sections with separation line between; lines may begin number, sheep; “for” (*ana*) DN and DN (2’, 3’); second section almost lost, similar layout(?), with last visible line “pertaining to” (*ša*) PN
- I: No DNs or PNs preserved, though three divine determinatives mark recipients, with one masculine determinative for the PN in line 10’; number 70 opens second section?
- FFw: separation line
- 366, transfer with ritual association – sealed (A62)
- L: number, bronze (then “ditto”), PN; separation line after 7 entries, then “men of the *kubadu*”
- I: the *kubadu* is a frequently attested ritual at Emar (see Fleming, *Installation*, 162-69; *Time at Emar*, 95-6); PNs all with patronyms, no titles; quantities are 50 (5x), 20, and 70 (shekels); are these smiths, to make items for ritual use?
- FFw: sign form A’ (1); <sup>d</sup>U for Teššub (2); <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (2, 3); separation line
- 367, transfer in part with ritual association, in part for the diviner’s household
- L: two sections, each followed by separation line; first section with number, item; two PNs in lines 4, 5; verb at end, “released” (*šūšir*, 5); second section, “this flour” and “the offering” (*siskur*) “are given” (sum); broken ending
- I: the items all appear to be breadstuffs, until two *hubar* vessels in line 5; no patronyms or titles with PNs; at end, *a-na a-ia-ši* as “for myself”??
- FFw: sign form IK (4); separation lines; verb *nadānu* with sumerogram (sum)
- 368, transfer with ritual association
- L: first line, “copper pertaining to (*ša*) the *kubadu*”; then six lines with PN and patronym; “the *kubadu* in the town of Zattibani” (8), six more lines with PN and patronym, three with number, first two with “copper” (9, 10, 13)
- I: title as “smith” (4) – appropriate to copper?; “of the town of Arzawani” (5); quantities in second group are 25, 25, and 100
- FFw: sign forms I’ (2), *dumu passim*; <sup>d</sup>Kur for Dagan (2, 3, 9, 13, 14); separation line at end