

A Small Town in Late Bronze Age Syria*

by Gary Beckman – Ann Arbor

Salvage archaeological excavations carried out on Late Bronze Age sites in the Middle Euphrates region of Syria during the 1970s and 1980s brought to light three significant deposits of cuneiform documents, albeit of vastly different sizes: From Emar (modern Meskene) have come over 700 practical documents and a significant collection of scholarly and literary material; Ekalte (modern Tall Munbāqa) yielded around 100 economic texts and a single lexical fragment¹; finally, 15 records of daily life were found at Azû (modern Tell Hadidi).

The Emar material from the French excavations² was published with exemplary dispatch by the expedition's epigrapher Daniel Arnaud,³ while tablets which had made their way onto the art market have been treated by various scholars over the past two decades.⁴ The Azû texts remain unpublished, although a catalogue, a few copies, and transliterations are accessible on the website of Robert Whiting.⁵ The edition of the tablets from Ekalte has recently appeared, prepared by Walter Mayer. It presents the *editio princeps* of 89 tablets, plus transliterations and translations of a further seven published elsewhere by other scho-

* This is a review article of MAYER, WALTER: Tall Munbāqa-Ekalte II: Die Texte. Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 102. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag, 2001. xiii + 195 S., 86 Taf. ISBN 3-930843-67-6. Price: € 67.00.

¹ The texts in Mayer's volume were found during German excavations from 1974 to 1990. Another German team renewed work at the site in 1999, but no further epigraphic material has turned up; see F. Blocher/D. Machule/P. Werner, MDOG 132 (2000) 123–31; 137 (2005) 99–107.

² When the waters of Lake Assad failed to submerge the tell as quickly as expected, a new German excavation began work at Emar in 1996. For its most recent report, see U. Finkbeiner/F. Sakal [et al.], BaM 34 (2004) 9–100. No additional significant finds of tablets have been announced.

³ D. Arnaud, *Recherches au Pays d'Aštata. Emar VI.1–3* (Paris 1985); *Recherches au Pays d'Aštata. Emar VI.4* (Paris 1987).

⁴ For a fairly complete list, see G. Beckman, *Emar and its Archives*, in: M. W. Chavalas (ed.), *Emar: The History, Religion, and Culture of a Syrian Town in the Late Bronze Age* (Bethesda, MD 1996) 10–12.

⁵ <http://www.helsinki.fi/~whiting/hadid01.html>, etc. (accessed July 29, 2007).

lars.⁶ The not entirely adequate hand copies are thankfully accompanied by excellent photographs, including 15 in color. The sealings from the texts have been published by Peter Werner in a separate volume.⁷

It is impossible to date the Ekalte texts with any precision. Only a handful of the tablets bear a chronological notation, and these follow a local eponym⁸ system that we cannot order even internally, let alone connect to an absolute chronology. Mayer here (p. 15 with n. 55) defends his earlier⁹ claim that one tablet (TM 80) bears a year date referring to a campaign of the Hittite king Tudḫaliya I in the region, but this is extremely unlikely.¹⁰ Prosopography allows the reconstruction of several family lines at Ekalte (pp. 70–72), each of three or four active generations, indicating that the archives cover a span of 60 to 80 years.

There is no sign of Hittite influence in the Ekalte archives (p. 17): no Anatolian personal names, no Hittite stamp or cylinder seal impressions, and no tablets in the so-called “Syro-Hittite” – that is horizontal or “land-

⁶ Probably to be added to the Munbāqa tablets is the stray document published by A. Tsukimoto, *Acta Sumerologica* 16 (1994) 231–38 (“Hirayama 51”). The first witness to this testament is one Mugla, son of Baʿal-bēlu (line 40). This same combination of personal name and patronymic appears in two Ekalte texts (TM 1: 21'; 65: 30, 33), and since Mugla is a very unusual name, it is likely that we are dealing with a single individual in both instances. Tsukimoto's text bears the impression of the seal of Zimri-Dagān (label, left edge), son of Kāpi-Dagān, who is almost certainly identical to Zimri-Dagān, son of Kāpi, discussed in n. 24 below. It is unfortunate that the study of the sealing by K. Ishida promised by Tsukimoto (p. 236) seems never to have appeared.

⁷ Tall Munbāqa-Ekalte III: Die Glyptik. Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 108 (Saarbrücken 2004). See the review by U. Seidl, *ZA* 96 (2006) 304–09.

⁸ Arnubar DUMU Šuliya, TM 28: 16; Bēlu-malik ^{L6}[*ḫazannu*], TM 48: 37; *Ba²-da²*, TM 80: 32; cf. n. 10 below.

⁹ MDOG 120 (1988) 49–50.

¹⁰ See C. Wilcke, *Aula Orientalis* 10 (1992) 124–25, for the interpretation of TM 80: 32 as MU *Ba/Ma-du/da* 1-KAM.MA rather than MU BA.DU ^m*Tu*; now also W. Sallaberger, *ZA* 93 (2003) 277. Mayer's objection that this personal name is not found at Ekalte may be answered by the presence of *Ba-da* at Emar (RE 88: 22; AuOrS1 26: 10, 18). And although the abbreviation *Tu* for Tudḫaliya is occasionally found in both cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luvian sources at Boğazköy, it is doubtful that a scribe in a foreign land would refer to a conqueror in this unclear manner, or indeed attribute a campaign to the king himself rather than to “the Hittites” (LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*Ḫatti*). Note also that there are no other native year dates to be found among the Late Bronze Age Middle Euphrates documents. The mentions of “(year of) siege and famine” collected by C. Zaccagnini, *Or.* 64 (1995) 96–98, are not part of a system of chronological notation, but rather simply remarks explaining the straitened circumstances under which the relevant transactions took place. On this, see D. Fleming, *Time at Emar* (Winona Lake 2000) 204.

scape” – format so common at Emar.¹¹ These texts were certainly inscribed before the establishment of Hittite hegemony over the region. But how long before?

Two or three kings, almost certainly with their seat in Emar (pp. 13–14), are mentioned in the Ekalte documents. At first glance, we might be tempted to identify one of these, Baʿal-kabar (TM 1: 9; 24: 18), with the second monarch in the Second Dynasty¹² of Late Bronze Age Emar (Yaḥṣi-Dagān, son of Baʿal-kabar). But Yaḥṣi-Dagān (TM 9: 27; 70: 1) and his son Zū-Baʿla (TM 9: 35; 49: 1)¹³ find no correspondence among the known rulers of the larger town. Since the sequence of kings in the First Late Bronze Age Dynasty of Emar is attested over three or four generations prior to the Hittite incursion that seemingly brought about its demise,¹⁴ Yaḥṣi-Dagān, Zū-Baʿla, and Baʿal-kabar¹⁵ must have ruled in a period that ended at least half a century before the Syrian conquests of Šuppiluliuma I.

If we follow currently prevailing opinion and date the accession of Muršili II to the Hittite throne to 1321,¹⁶ and consequently place the beginning of the reign of Šuppiluliuma I at around 1344, the annexation of northern Syria by Ḫatti will have taken place in the 1330s. Therefore the period covered by the Ekalte tablets cannot date any later than around 1460 or 1440 through 1380. Obviously, the endpoint of this span must be raised by the length of whatever chronological gap separated Yaḥṣi-Dagān, Zū-Baʿla, and Baʿal-kabar from Yarib-Baʿal, the earliest known ruler of the First Dynasty. If it approached 60–70 years, then Mayer’s attribution of the destruction of the tablet-yielding Schicht 4 at Munbāqa to the eighth campaign of Tuthmosis III in 1446 (p. 18) could still be correct.¹⁷

In terms of sign-forms and syllabary, as well as of phonology and Akkadian grammar (e.g., a productive dual, p. 37), the Ekalte tablets indeed

¹¹ For this distinction and orthographic and grammatical features that further characterize each group, see C. Wilcke, *Aula Orientalis* 10 (1992) 115–50.

¹² For this ruling family, see A. Skaist, *ZA* 88 (1998) 58, Fig. 2.

¹³ It is uncertain whether this individual was a ruler; see p. 14.

¹⁴ See A. Skaist, *ZA* 88 (1998) 60, Fig. 3. On p. 64 Skaist suggests that the transition between dynasties at Emar was a consequence of Hittite intervention.

¹⁵ There is no question but that all of the Ekalte texts date to the same general period; therefore identification with Baʿal-kabar of the Second Dynasty must be ruled out. We have no basis on which to determine the relative chronological sequence of Yaḥṣi-Dagān – Zū-Baʿla and Baʿal-kabar.

¹⁶ See G. Beckman, *Hittite Chronology*, *Akkadica* 119–120 (2000) 22.

¹⁷ [Man beachte aber, daß eine Tafel, T 25, mit dem emarotischen Dynastensiegel gesiegelt ist. – U. Seidl]

seem archaic in comparison to those from Emar. Mayer (p. 17) feels that the Ekalte texts stand closer to those from Alalakh OB level VII than to those of MB level IV at the same site, and refers to their linguistic characteristics as “spätaltbabylonisch.” Further study will be required to sort out the relative pace of development of the orthography, phonology, and grammar of the various Akkadian “scribal dialects” of inland and coastal Syria, but there can be little doubt that the Ekalte material is significantly earlier than that from Emar.¹⁸ Therefore, a comparison of the contents of the Ekalte texts with those of the later archives of Emar will allow us to investigate the changes in government, economy, and population that took place as a result of the Hittite conquest of inland northern Syria in the mid-fourteenth century B.C.E.

In many respects, the transactions documented by the Ekalte tablets are quite similar to those with which we have become familiar from Emar. In fact, several tablets from illicit digs published as coming from Emar¹⁹ are now known to have been written at Ekalte. Let us compare one of the most common types of document at the two sites, the sale of real estate²⁰. At both Ekalte and Emar, the sanction for renegeing on a transaction is the same prohibitive payment of (usually) 1000 units of silver to the local urban authorities and/or the city god, Ba'al-ka(bar) at Ekalte and ^dNIN.URTA at Emar.²¹ It is also only in these two groups of documents that we encounter the ceremonial anointing of a table and breaking of bread to consummate the transfer of a property (pp. 19–20). Furthermore, fields or houses are often sold by the deity and town elders of both Ekalte and Emar, but are never purchased by them. This probably indicates a common practice of confiscation and resale of the real estate holdings of delinquent citizens.

Both archives date documents – if sporadically – only by the name of a prominent local official, now known to have been the *ḫazannu*, or “mayor,” at least at Ekalte (pp. 23–25). (While the Emar dates occasion-

¹⁸ The appearance of several scribes (Pazuri-Dagān, Kunuriš, and Iṭtura) at both Ekalte and Azū leaves little doubt that the tablets from these two sites were roughly contemporary (p. 12). This mingling of the affairs of the towns is not surprising since it seems that their territories abutted one another (see TM 74: 4) and that the inhabitants of one house at Ekalte had a particular connection to Azū (pp. 6–7).

¹⁹ Here re-edited – without copies – as nos. 90 ff.

²⁰ Cf. G. Beckman, Real Property Sales at Emar, in: G. D. Young [et al.] (eds.), *Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons. Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour* (Bethesda 1998) 95–114.

²¹ At Azū the deity Dagān plays this role, e.g. TH 4: 25.

ally include a month, this is never the case at Ekalte,²² so we cannot compare the local calendars.) The layout of text and seal impressions on an Ekalte tablet is almost identical to that found on the traditional, so-called “Syrian”-format tablets at Emar. Clearly the two sites partake of the same scribal and cultural traditions.²³

I now take a closer look at some of the similarities and differences between the two groups of documents. First, the onomasticon: At Ekalte, the personal names are overwhelmingly Canaanite (p. 3) – note especially the frequent alternation of verbal prefixes *I-* and *Ya-* in sentence names.²⁴ We encounter only a few Hurrian personal designations (e.g., Niruwe DUMU Šigge, TM 28: 6) and one or two of Indic origin (e.g., Parata DUMU Puribta, TM 70: 26–27). As mentioned earlier, there is a total absence here of Hittite and Luwian names, and few if any Babylonian or Assyrian, unless some of the ideographic writings are to be interpreted as such. In contrast, among the mass of West Semitic names at Emar there are to be found a fair number of personal names – mostly those of individuals in high positions – indicating ethnic affiliation with one of the great powers of the day – Babylon, Assyria, or Ḫatti – as well as titles denoting membership in the Hittite imperial bureaucracy.²⁵

Theophoric personal names from Ekalte as well as Emar feature most prominently the Storm-god (written ^dŠKUR, EN, or *Ba-²-la*) and the regional deity Dagān. Interestingly, at Ekalte there are only a handful of attestations of the ideogram ^dKUR so frequently employed to indicate this god in the Emar material, but this writing is well attested in the contemporary texts from Azû.

The geographic horizon of the Ekalte archives is considerably less expansive than that of the Emar texts. As already indicated, Ekalte seems to have been politically dependent on Emar, and the texts occasionally speak of the larger city or her kings. The most distant locations appearing in the older archives are Ebla to the northwest and Tuttul to the south-

²² See only comment to TM 29: 8, below, but this is not a date.

²³ There are several peculiarities displayed by those who wrote the Ekalte texts: 1) the rather frequent use of undeclined Akkadograms (e.g., *KI.er-še-tum ibaḳ[qarū]*, TM 10: 23; cf. pp. 37–38); 2) abbreviation of both ideograms (e.g., *KI.LA* for *KI.LAḪ* = *KISLAḪ*, TM 51: 5) and common formulae (e.g., *a-ḫa la ta* for *aḫa lā taraggum*, TM 13: 27); and 3) unusual distribution of the words of stereotyped sentences (e.g., ... *ša urram | šeram A.ŠA | ibaqqarū*, TM 48: 21–23) or even the signs of a single word (e.g. *URU.KI|E-kal-te-e^{KI}*, TM 11: 1–2; *KI.er-|še-tam*, TM 11: 31–32) across lines.

²⁴ For example, *Ikūn-Dagān* ~ *Yakūn-Dagān*; for attestations see pp. 51–52.

²⁵ For the data, see R. Pruzsinszky, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Emar* (Bethesda 2003).

east.²⁶ Significantly, both Babylonia and Mittanni are absent. The later Emar scribes write of Assur, Babylonia, Ḫatti, Arzawa, Alašiya, Kinza, Qatna, and Tadmor/Palmyra – the entire known world save for Egypt and Elam.

As revealed by the archives, the economy on the Late Bronze Age Middle Euphrates was based upon cereal and grape cultivation and stock breeding. Sales of productive real estate at both Ekalte and Emar concern fields, vineyards, and vegetable gardens. In addition, trade played a significant role at the later site, as documented by Middle Assyrian²⁷ and Ugaritic²⁸ records, as well as by those from Emar itself. Commodities purveyed by Emariote merchants included copper, timber, oil, and bovines. Obviously, the local businessmen were engaged in transit trade in the case of the first two items.

On the other hand, the Ekalte texts treat but little of commerce, although we do find a single mention of a merchant (^{LU}*makkurū*) in a letter (TM 72: 8). A non-mercantile ethos is perhaps reflected in the local practice of lending money at no interest (e.g., TM 68). Pastoralism, however, seems to have been proportionally more important to the inhabitants of the earlier town. An impost to their overlord was assessed in sheep and goats, although converted to a payment in copper (TM 1). A woman was sold for the price of 1000 head of small cattle (TM 23). Among the other Ekalte records are a list of 16 shepherds (TM 59) and a letter concerning the acquisition of 140 asses from the neighboring Sutean tribesmen (TM 72).

Institutions of local government at Ekalte and Emar were comparable. Both communities were led and represented by a *ḫazannu* (pp. 23–25), and significant economic power was exercised in each case by a body of citizens²⁹ referred to alternately as “the elders” (*šībūtu*),

²⁶ For references see the collection at the conclusion of this article.

²⁷ See B. Faist, *Der Fernhandel des assyrischen Reiches zwischen dem 14. und 11. Jh. v. Chr.* (Münster 2001) 128–29.

²⁸ For business dealings with the coast, see G. Beckman, *Ugarit and Inner Syria during the Late Bronze Age*, in: J.-M. Michaud (ed.), *Le Royaume d'Ougarit de la Crète à l'Euphrate* (Sherbrooke 2007) 163–74.

²⁹ It seems that Zimri-Dagān ḫūū Kāpi-(Dagān) was a particularly important member of this group. Not only does he appear, primarily as a witness, in 13 documents (TM 1, 16, 20, 29, 30, 35, 39, 41, 50, 51, 65, 83 [participant], Hirayama 51), but impressions of his seals (P. Werner, *Tall Munbāqa-Ekalte III*, no. 4612: TM 8, 30, 39, 65; no. 4581: TM 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 16, 20, 29, 47, 50, 51, T13a) are found on nine more. (TM 22, 41, 44, 57, 58, 59, 64, 71, 72, 86, and 89 are either unsealed or have lost their sealings; the seal impressions on TM 90ff. are not available for study.) Thus he is involved in 27.7%

“the brothers” (LÚ.MEŠ *ahhū*), “the fathers” (LÚ.MEŠ *abbū*), or simply “the city” (URU^{KI}) (pp. 25–26).³⁰

The relative size of the settlements determined their place within wider political contexts. The larger regional center of Emar supported its own monarchy, although in the period documented by the archives, the powers of the Emariote ruler were tightly circumscribed by those of the Hittite imperial authorities operating from the viceregal seat of Carchemish.³¹ The small town of Ekalte owed allegiance to a king resident elsewhere in the vicinity and was probably ultimately part of the great kingdom of Mittanni. No direct evidence proves this latter point, however.

In summary, the epigraphic discoveries at Ekalte and Emar are witnesses to a single local variety of Syro-Mesopotamian Late Bronze Age culture, but they also reveal significant contrasts between the two settlements. Ekalte was a small community largely populated by a homogeneous group of West Semitic background, whose inhabitants engaged primarily in agriculture and animal husbandry. Politically, she was subordinate to a larger neighbor. Late Bronze Age Emar was a significant component of a larger territorial state, and played host to persons of various ethnicity for varying periods of time. Although most Emariotes were farmers or vintners, interregional trade was also an important element in the local economy.

To what extent are these differences due to economic developments or to the course of political events that brought the replacement of Mittanian domination by that of the Hittites? How much can be attributed to the simple difference in size between the communities in question? These problems require further reflection. Furthermore, I am aware that all of my conclusions may also have been skewed by the nature of the textual samples. We are, after all, comparing primarily family documents from Ekalte³² to Emar’s record depot. Could there have been a mer-

of all documents that can be checked for his presence. Sometimes his sealing is labeled “the seal of the brothers” (NA⁴KIŠIB LÚ.MEŠ *ahhē*, TM 20, 50, 51).

³⁰ See D. Fleming, *Democracy’s Ancient Ancestors: Mari and Early Collective Governance* (Cambridge 2004) chapter 4, for the tradition of communal government in this region.

³¹ See G. Beckman, *Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria: the View from Maşat and Emar*, in: O. Carruba [et al.] (eds.), *II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia* (Pavia 1995) 27–28.

³² TM 1–34 were found in Haus P, which according to Mayer (p. 4) may have been the headquarters of the local administration. If so, this archive would be comparable in part to that of the “House of the Diviner” at Emar, for which see D. Fleming, *Time at Emar*, 13–47.

chant's archive of any size at Ekalte? Probably not, but the nature of the evidence is more problematic for some questions than for others. For example, my assessment of the ethnic makeup of the respective populations is hardly in doubt, since it is based on more than 900 personal names from Ekalte and several thousand from Emar.

* * *

I conclude with comments on individual texts:

- TM 1: Legal case(?) concerning payment of copper in lieu of a livestock impost due to king of Emar. Line 15': *A-wi*(so photo)-*ra*.
- TM 2: Legal case concerning a building. Line 40: IGI *Šil-[lu^dDa-gan]* *hazannu*; cf. TM 3: 29; 4: 26, etc.
- TM 6, line 32: IGI *Baba DUMU A-li^dDa-gan* (so photo).
- TM 7, line 37: *Šil-lu-[^dDa-gan]* DUMU *Ab-di^dIš-ḥa-ra*, an individual also found in Hiramama 32: 4 and RE 69: 38.
- TM 8, line 26: IGI *Zi-[ik-]r[a-DN ...]*; line 32: IGI *Da^d-da* DUMU *Ba-ya-n[u]*.
- TM 11, line 36: The appearance of the buyer at the head of the witness list is surprising.
- TM 12, line 1: *É-Šūli-tuppi* as in TM 17: 12 and 61: 28; cf. also *É-DINGIR.AD-ma* in TM 48: 2 and *É-IGI.DU-qulla* in TM 73: 4. These seem to be clan eponyms and also perhaps small settlements (so p. 11). Line 22: The naming of the seller as one of the beneficiaries of the *Vertragsanfechtungsklausel* is unusual, but cf. TM 15: 14–15. In TM 16: 26–27 it is the purchaser who is given this symbolic function; cf. comment to TM 62 below.
- TM 13, line 39: IGI *Huzazu* DUMU *Nu-ri-[...]* (so photo).
- TM 19, line 26: *ana LÚ-li sarrari*.
- TM 21: See W. Sallaberger, UF 33 (2001) 495–99.
- TM 23, lines 5–6: *Abi-Rašap¹ DUMU¹ Muḥra-aḥi*; TUR does not appear elsewhere in this corpus with the meaning “servant.”
- TM 28, lines 14–15: *kīma a-kūl-li ḥalqāti*, “anstelle der verzehrten Verköstigung.”
- TM 29, line 8: *ina¹ [Hī²-ya²-]ri*; for this month name see D. Fleming, Time at Emar, fig. 19.
- TM 30, line 16: [IGI *A-ḥi-m*]*a-lik* DUMU *Ilī-aḥi*; cf. TM 19: 45. Line 17: No abbreviation similar to *Da-ka-bar* for *Dagān-kabar* is attested at Emar; there the divine portion of a theonym may be shortened only in second position, e.g., *Itūr-Da*, RE 94: 1, 12, 25, 28.
- TM 36, line 38: Read KAR.^dISKUR as *Eḥli-Teššup* or *Šūzub-Adad*.
- TM 60, line 2: ^mDUMU.^dDUMU *An-na-ga*; cf. line 11.
- TM 61: The photos of the obverse and the reverse have been reversed on Tf. 73; line 23: ^d*Ba-a²-la-(ka)*.
- TM 62, line 15: *É¹.GAL* in the penalty clause cannot be an abbreviation for Ekalte, for we would expect *URU...KI*. This is either a reference to the royal establishment in Emar or is a result of habit from a scribe Mayer recognizes as originating from outside Ekalte (p. 129). In the latter case, no substantial harm will have been done to the legal procedure, since sanctions such as these are purely symbolic. That is, we cannot imagine that any party to a contract involving one-half shekel of silver would renege on a contract if the result were a fine of 2000 shekels!

- TM 68, line 4: Translate *ul id-da-ra-a[r]* as “(the borrower) cannot be released (by royal decree)””; see CAD D, 109.
- TM 74, line 2: To *šikri-ši*, “Gärbottiche” (p. 32), cf. *šikrinnu*, “Bierfaß,” Emar 6, 301: 9’; 393: 21–22; Goodnick Westenholz et al., CM 13, No. 23: 10(?), which would similarly combine a Semitic stem with a Hurrian suffix: *šikri-ni/u*.
- TM 75, line 33: The implication of *anumma*^{DUG} *kuripu* GIŠ.ì *lā išu* is probably that “no one may marry,” an act that often involved the anointing of the bride. The *k*-vessel is otherwise attested only at Mari; see CAD K, 407.
- TH 76, line 22: *hē*(so photo)-*me-ta*; sense unclear; line 26: IGI^{dEN-ka} DUMU *A-bi-k*[*a* ...]; cf. Emar 109: 44.
- TM 80, line 32: See Wilcke, *Aula Orientalis* 10 (1992) 124–25; Sallaberger, *ZA* 93 (2003) 277.
- TM 82, line 7: ^m*Ba-aš*-[*šu* ...].
- TM 87, line 9’: IGI *Hu-r*[*a-ru* DUMU *Ba`al-bēlu*]; cf. TM 7: 12; 12: 11, 13, [19]; line 11’: IGI *Ya-mu*-[*ut*^d ...]; I know of no other possibilities for restoration in the onomasticon of the Middle Euphrates.
- TM 91, line 33: IGI^{dIŠKUR.EN} DUMU^{dIŠKUR.G}[AL].
- TH 96: See now C. Roche, *Semitica* 51 (2001) 133–38, for a photo and new study of this text, based upon an examination of the original tablet. (Only a cast was available to E. Frahm, *UF* 31 [2002] 175–85, whose edition is utilized here by Mayer.)

* * *

Since Mayer decided not to provide a list of place names,³³ for the convenience of users of this volume I include one here:

^{URU}*A-la-ma-aḥ-da*, 73: 5

Azu

^{URU}*A-zu*^{KI}, [3: 37]; [15: 5]; [26: 11]; 74: 37; [76: 3]; 76: 31

^{URU}*A-[zu-]ú*, 43: 10

^{URU}*A-zu(-)DU-KA*, 74: 4

^{URU}*Bi-ri-ti*, 56: 26

Bit-abuma

É-DINGIR.AD-*ma*, 48: 2

Bit-Rašap-quilla

É-*it*^dIGI.DU-*qú-la*, 73: 4

Bit-Šūli-tuppī

É-Šu-li-DUB.BA, 12: 1(!); 17: 12; 61: 28

Ebla

LÚ.MEŠ *E-eb-la-na*, 34: 14

^l*I-ib-la-te*, 27: 6

Ekalte

^{URU}*E-kal-te*^{KI}, 5: 11; 8: 11; 11: 7, [22]; 29: 2; 30: 2; 61: 10; 68: 2; 73: 13; 79: [7’]

³³ See p. 3. Many of these toponyms have been included in J. A. Belmonte Marín, *Répertoire Géographique* 12/2 (2001), but a perusal of that work revealed a number of errors. Citations given here in brackets have been largely or totally restored; therefore the precise spelling on the tablet might have differed slightly.

URU.KI *E-kal-te-e*, 11: 1-2
 URU *E-kál-te*^{KI}, 25: 6
 URU *E-kal-ti*^{KI}, 62: 6, 7; 80: 5
E-kal-ti^{KI}, 80: 7
I-kal-te^{KI}, 28: 2
 URU *I-kál-te*^{KI}, 74: 33
 URU.KI *I-kál-te*, 77: 6

Emar

URU *E-mar*^{KI}, 28: 18; 64: 26
 DUMU *I-ma-ri-ú*, 34: 18
 URU *I-ri-ba*^{KI}, 36: 29
 URU *Ka-s*[*a-*], 32: 15
 URU *Ku-ú-ti*^{KI}, 11: 12; 73: 2; 96: 2
 URU *Ma-du-du*, 36: 26

Purattu

^dID.DINGIR-*la*, 34: 10
ⁱD.NUN.NA, 79: 4; 96: 21
 URU *Qa-ta-*[, 32: 9

Suteans

Su-ti-i^{KI}, 72: 5
 LÚ.MEŠ *Su-ti-e*, 34: 7

Šahû

^mDUMU-*Ša-a-ḥé-e*^{KI}, 41: 28
^mDUMU-*Ša-ḥé*, 60: 4
 URU *Šu-um-na*^{KI}, 31: 19

Tuttul

DUMU-*Tu-ú-tu-la*, 41: 26
 u[RU ...]^{KI}, 43: 4
 [... -w]^e^{KI}, 26: 4