

Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons: Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour on His 80th Birthday, ed. G. D. Young, M. W. Chavalas, and R. E. Averbeck (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1997), pp. 95-120.

Real Property Sales at Emar^{*1}

Gary Beckman
University of Michigan

Cuneiform records recovered from the ruins of Meskene/Emar² on the middle course of the Euphrates have afforded a view of a type of society in Late Bronze Age Syria significantly different from that whose buildings and documents have been recovered at Ras Shamra/Ugarit³ and Tell Aḩana/Alalakh⁴ in the coastal region.⁵ In contrast to the royal archives of the latter two sites, Emar has yielded prima-

* Special abbreviations employed in this essay for texts are: AS 14: Tsukimoto 1992b; AOV: Arnaud 1987b; E6: Arnaud 1986; 1987b; GsK: Sigrist 1993; Hi: Tsukimoto 1990; 1991; 1992a; *Iraq* 54: Dalley and Tessier 1992; RE: Beckman 1996c; SMEA: Arnaud 1992; TBR: Arnaud 1991.

¹ I am pleased to have been invited to contribute to a volume in honor of Professor Michael Astour, from whose writings on ancient Syria I have learned so much.

² Chavalas (1996) will serve as a general introduction to the archaeology and texts of this site. See especially pp. 165-72 for a select bibliography of Emar studies published through 1995.

³ Above all, the works of Heltzer (1976), (1978), (1979), (1982a), (1982b) should be consulted on the society and economy of Ugarit. See also Liverani (1982). Sanmartín (1995) has recently discussed the economic texts inscribed in Ugaritic alphabetic cuneiform.

⁴ No synthesis of the socio-economic data from Alalakh has yet been produced. See Klengel (1974), (1979); and Gaál (1988) for preliminary studies.

⁵ Although it lies some 45 km from the sea as the crow flies, Tell Aḩana affords easy access to the coast down the valley of the Orontes (Woolley [1968] 165-81). Klengel (1979) 435 supposes that the economic situation evidenced by the Alalakh tablets

rily texts generated by private households in the course of their economic and social lives. So extensive is this private documentation that, for instance, far more testaments and adoptions are known from Emar than have been published from all other Syrian and Mesopotamian sites of this period combined.⁶ So too, transfers of real property among private citizens are better attested at Emar⁷ than at any roughly contemporary settlement except trans-Tigridian Nuzi.

I have collected 210 real estate transactions from Emar, inscribed on a total of 167 tablets.⁸ Multiple conveyances may be documented in a single record only if all of the property involved is acquired by the same individual. In most such instances the parcels are also sold or exchanged by but one person.⁹ The prices of the land sales and the sizes of the plots in question are listed by property type in ascending price order in Figures I-V. An asterisk indicates that the tablet lists only an aggregate price for two or more properties. For purposes of comparison, I have converted all prices to shekels (gín).

ought to be typical for all of interior northern Syria. But the Emar archives—which were, of course, not available to Klengel—paint a different picture for the Middle Euphrates region.

⁶ See Beckman (1996b).

⁷ For a list of real estate transactions other than those published in E6, see Beckman (1996a) 10-11.

⁸ For preliminary studies of the real estate market at Emar and its records, see Lipiński (1990), (1992); and Leemans (1988) 213-25.

⁹ Multiple purchases from the god “Ninurta” are recorded on E6 2, 3, 9, 139, 147, 149, 163; RE 29; TBR 5, 9, 11, 16, and 17. More than one parcel is sold by a single human to a single buyer in E6 8, 85, 115, 225 and TBR 31. In E6 137, 138, 207; Hi 7; RE 86, and 90, one person buys two or more properties from different vendors.

The only apparent exceptions to this pattern are posed by E6 80, 114 and Hi 11, in which the details of an earlier transaction involving the property are restated, and by the exchanges RE 4 and Hi 6, where both sides of the deal are recorded. RE 77 is unclear, but seems to deal with the division of communal property.

When multiple transactions are treated in a single document, I have differentiated them here as A, B, *etc.*



This study is based primarily on sales records, for they are by far the most numerous type of real estate document found at Emar. In addition, a few exchanges¹⁰ and gifts¹¹ of property are attested, as well as two confirmations of ownership issued by the king of Carchemish.¹² Most striking is the virtual absence of rental¹³ or share-cropping agreements from the archives. Since such arrangements undoubtedly existed at Emar, customarily they must have been concluded without written contracts. Less likely, texts of this sort might have been kept in the homes of the individuals involved, rather than deposited in the central record office from which the weight of our documentation has been drawn.

Measures of length used at Emar include the “dike” (Akk. *ikû*), which was made up of a number of “sides” (Akk. *šiddu*),¹⁴ in turn subdivided into “cubits” (Akk. *ammātu*).¹⁵ Other fractions of the *ikû* are the “reed” (Sum. *gi*) and the “foot” (Sum. *gir*). Unfortunately, we do not know the precise relationships of these measurements to one another, and cannot convert any of them to meters.¹⁶

¹⁰ AOV 10; Hi 6; RE 4, all of houses.

¹¹ Hi 47; TBR 29, 47 (houses); RE 22; TBR 31 (lots); RE 1 (vineyard).

¹² RE 54, 55, edited in Beckman (1996c) 71-73.

¹³ I know only of RE 90, the rental of a vineyard, edited in Beckman (1996c) 113-14.

¹⁴ CAD Š/2 407.

¹⁵ Occasionally expressed as N *ina ammati*. Note also *ammāti libir-ú-ti*, “old cubits,” RE 33:2. In the Emar texts this measure is always spelled *am-ma-ti*, regardless of whether it is preceded by a preposition. It is not possible to determine whether this writing is singular or plural, since the Emar scribes were not always careful in usage of case, and a writing such as 2 *aš-lu* (TBR 62:2) shows that the singular of a measure might be employed with a plural numeral.

¹⁶ According to the standard Sumerian-Babylonian system, 6 *ammātu* = 1 *gi*, 20 *gi* = 1 *ašlu* (“rope”), and 6 *ašlātu* = 1 *šiddu* (Sum. *uš*) (Powell [1990] 459, Table II). In the south the *ikû* was employed only as a surface measure, but in Assyria and elsewhere in the north it could serve as a unit of length seemingly synonymous with *ašlu* (Powell [1990] 477). If this is also the case at Emar, the Babylonian relationship of the *ašlu/ikû* and *šiddu* has been inverted. The standard Old Babylonian cubit has been estimated at approximately 50 cm (Powell [1990] 462).

As may be seen from the list of 62 house sales in Figure I, amounts paid for such structures and their land range from 12 to 4200 shekels. Leaving aside this final price, which is so aberrant that it must be confirmed by collation,¹⁷ both dimensions and individual prices are available for 18 of these transactions (whose references appear in bold type), allowing the computation of price per square cubit. This varies from 0.002 shekel (E6 122) to 1.38 shekels per cubit (E6 141), with an average price of 0.46 shekel per cubit. To facilitate comparison of larger agricultural properties, price can be recalculated as price per square *ikû*, assuming an *ikû* equals 120 cubits, as in Middle Assyrian texts.¹⁸ Prices range from 0.24 to 165.6 shekels per *ikû*, the average being 55.68. Some, but by no means all, of the lower prices are recorded in instances where a lender accepts a house in lieu of an outstanding debt,¹⁹ or when a property is sold to a third party so that the owner might satisfy his creditors.²⁰

Also well documented at Emar is the sale of undeveloped city plots, referred to by the Sumerogram KI accompanied by the Semitic gloss *eršetü*.²¹ Thirty-seven transactions of this sort are known (see Figure II), with selling prices ranging from 4 to 240 shekels. Of these sales, 20 (again indicated in bold) allow the calculation of price per cubit (stretching from 0.01 shekel in RE 11 to 2.6 shekels in RE 33).²² These figures yield an average of 0.3

Poorly-attested linear measures in the Emar texts are *sarma'u* (Hi 4:2), *matāhu* (RE 64:3—or is this a gloss for *gir*? Cf. TBR 58:3: 4 *gir.ḫi.a ma-ta-ḫu ruṣṣu*), and *ašlu ša N ikû* (TBR 62:2-3). Note also the surface measure *zizi* (RE 90:1).

¹⁷ See note 22 below.

¹⁸ Powell (1990) 477.

¹⁹ E6 123.

²⁰ E6 85A, 109; TBR 33, 65, 82.

²¹ For a review of discussions of this term, see Beckman (1996c) 6.

²² The extraordinarily high price of 2400 *gín* (wr. 40 *ma.na*) in RE 38 (collated) is perhaps to be emended to 40 *gín*¹.*na*. I have not taken this price into account here. The price per cubit in RE 33 (2.6 shekels) is almost five times higher than that of the next most expensive lot, RE 14 (0.54 shekel per cubit). Since RE 33:2 specifies “old” cubits, perhaps this document employs a different and larger measure.

shekel, which converts to 36.6 shekels per *ikû*. The average price of an empty lot is thus 66% of that fetched by houses.

Our sources also include a dozen records describing the sale of other city structures. Since we have no idea what *tugguru*-,²³ *hiṭru*-,²⁴ or *hablu*-buildings²⁵ were, let alone what a “place of the gate” (KI.KĀ)²⁶ might be, these transactions are not included in this study.

The tremendous variation in the value of urban real estate is surely to be explained by what a modern real estate broker would call “location, location, location!” But our ignorance of the details of the ancient topography of Emar²⁷ prevents us from situating these houses, even in those few instances when a note like “(situated) on the alley of the Temple of Dagan of the Reeds”²⁸ is included in the sale record.

On a few occasions alienation of real estate within the city is accompanied by a peculiar ceremony²⁹ involving a meal and the payment of a symbolic sum to the extended family, known as “the brothers,”³⁰ e.g., “The *hukku*-bread has been broken and the table anointed with oil. The ‘brothers’ have received 1 shekel (of silver) (each³) as the *kaburu*-payment for the house.”³¹ This custom, found elsewhere on the Late Bronze Age Middle

²³ E6 82, 115A, 138C, 144; TBR 5A, 5B, 20, 67.

²⁴ E6 139B.

²⁵ E6 85B.

²⁶ Hi 4; TBR 63.

²⁷ Pending the appearance of the final report on the archaeology of the site, see Margueron (1982) on the urban layout of Emar. Since those tablets whose provenience is known do not come from individual houses, we cannot associate structures mentioned in them with particular building remains, as Stone (1987) has done for Old Babylonian Nippur. But once the documents have been better ordered chronologically it may be possible to determine the relative placement of at least some dwellings. Cf. Porten (1968) for a study of the Jewish colony at Elephantine, especially p. 112, figure 5.

²⁸ RE 70:1.

²⁹ Scurlock (1993).

³⁰ Bellotto (1995).

³¹ RE 20:19-21.

Euphrates,³² is apparently a relic from an earlier era in which land had been held communally.³³

Among our texts are contracts for the purchase of agricultural holdings of the citizens of Emar. In Figure III I have gathered 56 instances in which fields change hands. Field prices range from 0.83 shekel to as much as 215 shekels.³⁴ (Unfortunately, two tablets³⁵ mention only a vague price of *kù.babbar īši u mādim*, “the full amount of silver.”)³⁶ On the basis of 18 of these documents (once more indicated in bold) whose values per *ikû* vary from 1 (e.g., TBR 38) to 100 shekels (e.g., E6 146), I have calculated an average price of 25.6 shekels per *ikû*, or 46% of the value of developed land within the walls of Emar. A striking comparison may be drawn between this figure and the average price per *ikû* of a field in thirteenth-century Ugarit: 56.5 shekels,³⁷ which is more than twice as high. Because this latter figure is based on a very small text sample, too much weight should not be placed on it,³⁸ but it is surely significant that agricultural land on the coast was approximately equal in value to houses on the Middle Euphrates.

In addition to fields, Emariote productive land included vineyards, for which 11 sales³⁹ are known (see Figure IV), and vegetable gardens, sales of which number three (see Figure V). Metrological uncertainties prevent us from calculating average silver values for these holdings. It is interesting to

³² MBQ-T 65:30-31 from Tall Munbāqa/Ekalte some 20 km north of Emar on the east bank of the Euphrates. The text has been published in Mayer (1992).

³³ Cf. Beckman (1996b) 59.

³⁴ D. Arnaud reads TBR 68:2: 1 *me* a.šà.meš, which at a total price of 10 shekels would yield a price of 0.1 shekel per *ikû*. Since this is far out of line with the other attested values of fields, and “100” is usually written *me-at* (rarely *me-ti*) at Emar, I suggest a reading 2¹ <*ikû*> a.šà.meš. This would give a more normal value of 5 shekels per *ikû*, but because of the uncertainty, TBR 68 has been left out of my calculations.

³⁵ TBR 16:27, 17:22.

³⁶ CAD I 221-22.

³⁷ Haase (1967) 205.

³⁸ It is also uncertain whether the Ugaritic *ikû* was the same size as that in use at Emar.

³⁹ Plus a rental (RE 90A), a seizure (RE 90B), and a gift (RE 1).

observe that most of the vineyards in question are located not in the immediate vicinity of Emar itself, but in satellite towns such as Rabban,⁴⁰ Rabi,⁴¹ and Uri.⁴²

The great majority of real estate sale contracts in both city and country are styled after a single basic pattern,⁴³ of which the following text will serve as an illustration:

A house, to its full extent, 27 cubits in length, 23 cubits in breadth. On the right it is bordered by (the property of) Abdu, son of Daḥuru. On the left it is bordered by the livestock shed¹ of Luluḫi. In the rear it is bordered by (the property of) Ribiya, son of Ḫuraṣu. In front it is bordered by the Broad Street of the Threshers². The house belongs to King Zū-Aštarti, son of Ba'al-kabar.

Yaḥṣiya, son of Mattiya, has purchased the house from King Zū-Aštarti, owner of the house, for 100 shekels of refined silver, the full price. He has received the silver and is¹ satisfied. Whoever in the future should make a claim on the house shall pay 2000 (shekels) of silver to the palace. If another tablet should turn up, the old one will be broken.⁴⁴

To summarize: First, the type of property is mentioned, followed optionally by its general location and other qualifications. Then neighboring landholders and topographical features are listed, usually for all four sides. These are designated as “right, left, front, and back” (*zag / gùb / egir / pānu*) for urban property, and as “upper, lower (short) side, first, and second (long) side” (*ús.sa.du an.ta / ús.sa.du ki.ta / sag.ki.1.kam / sag.ki.2.kam*) for rural holdings. Purchaser, seller, and price follow, in hybrid Akkadian and Sumerian formulation. The seller is thereupon declared to be

⁴⁰ E6 1², 3A, 89², 138B; Hi 16; RE 16; TBR 51. On this town, see Fleming (1992) 64.

⁴¹ E6 11. Durand (1989) 168 suggests that this is simply a variant writing of Rabban.

⁴² E6 90. On this town in the Tall Munbāqa texts, see Mayer (1988) 49.

⁴³ Note, however, that there are a small number of sales which do not display this structure: E6 81, 113, 122; TBR 20, 33, 37, 53, 56. Is it accidental that all of these are inscribed on tablets of Syro-Hittite type? On the typology of the Emar tablets, see Arnaud (1991) 9-10.

⁴⁴ RE 9:1-26, edited in Beckman (1996c) 15-16.

satisfied,⁴⁵ and, on occasion, provision is made for the possible redemption of the property. Here too it might be noted that the sale occurred under duress, perhaps “in a year of hostilities.”⁴⁶ The text then concludes with a sanction against renegeing on the agreement, and often includes an affirmation of the priority of the present record over all previous sale documents. A list of witnesses concludes the record.

This documentary form differs significantly from that in use in contemporary Ugarit,⁴⁷ Alalakh,⁴⁸ Assyria,⁴⁹ and Nuzi⁵⁰ (see Figure VI).⁵¹ It also shows many divergences from the familiar Old Babylonian property sale, from which it must certainly have evolved.⁵² The clearest analogues are earlier real estate transactions from the kingdoms of Mari⁵³ and Hana,⁵⁴ and roughly contemporary⁵⁵ records from nearby Tall Munbāqa/Ekaltē.⁵⁶ That is, we are dealing with an administrative and scribal tradition at home on the Middle Euphrates.

⁴⁵ See Westbrook (1991) for the expression “his/her/their heart is pleased” in legal contexts.

⁴⁶ See the list of occurrences of this phrase at Emar in Tsukimoto (1988) 162.

⁴⁷ Haase (1967); *cf.* also Boyer (1955).

⁴⁸ No property transactions are known from the fourteenth-century Level IV at Alalakh, but a few were recovered from Old Babylonian Level VII (Kienast 1979).

⁴⁹ Koschaker (1928) 27-52.

⁵⁰ Steele (1943) and Koschaker (1928) 52ff.

⁵¹ I have simply listed the most common features characterizing the documentation from each site. For details, see the works listed in notes 47-50, 53, and 55. “Late OB” indicates records from the time of Samsuiluna and later.

⁵² San Nicolò (1922).

⁵³ Boyer (1958) 183.

⁵⁴ Podany (1988) 254-77.

⁵⁵ Mayer (1990) 64-66 dates his material to the fifteenth century, but Wilcke (1992) 124-25 has shown that these texts are almost certainly to be placed two centuries later.

⁵⁶ Around 30 real estate transactions from this site have been identified (Mayer [1986] 126-27; [1988] 48; [1990] 45-47; [1993] 103), but only a few have been published: Mayer (1990) 54-62; (1992); von Soden (1982).

A characteristic of the Syrian tradition of real property boilerplate in general is the threat of severe punishment upon any party who might back out of the agreement. In the Emar texts, this sanction is almost always a fine of 2000 shekels of silver,⁵⁷ payable to the palace alone (in 30 texts) or, more frequently, to be divided⁵⁸ between the city authorities⁵⁹ and the deity indicated by the Sumerogram ^dNIN.URTA (in 61 texts).⁶⁰ Since this sum is so out of proportion to the selling price of land in most transactions, I doubt whether it was ever actually collected. That is, no rational Emariote would have incurred a loss of 2000 shekels to recover a parcel of much lesser value. In this regard we might compare the clause found in sales from Hana, according to which hot asphalt was to be poured upon the head of whoever repudiated an agreement,⁶¹ or that in Alalakh texts calling for the drinking of boiling lead!⁶²

In contrast to the situation at Nuzi⁶³—the only other Late Bronze Age site to yield large numbers of comparable transactions⁶⁴—no real estate

Dorneman (1979) 146 lists six property sales among the 14 documents excavated at Tell Hadidi/Azû, but none of these are yet available.

⁵⁷ Rarely attested are fines of 200 (RE 33, 64; TBR 58, 63), 400 (E6 109; Hi 12; RE 64; TBR 58), 500 (E6 150), 1000 (AOV 4; E6 3, 14, 125, 140, 141, 156, 159; RE 59, 77B; TBR 12), 3000 (TBR 14), and 4000 shekels (SMEA 30 2). A nearly complete list of penalties in sale documents is appended to Figures I-IV. Not included there, however, are the sanctions from the sales of miscellaneous types of real property cited in notes 23-26.

⁵⁸ The close association between this deity and the urban administration is discussed by Yamada (1994). Cf. Beckman (1995) 30.

⁵⁹ Expressed as “the city” (uru^{ki}) or “Emar” (only E6 1). Occasionally the “brothers” are involved—on their own or with “Ninurta” or the city—and once the seller (E6 156).

⁶⁰ On the deity standing behind this writing, see Fleming (1993) 94-98. I cannot accept his suggestion that ^dNIN.KALAM in E6 282:6 is to be understood as *bēl māti*. Read simply ^dNIN.URTA!

⁶¹ Podany (1988) 257-59.

⁶² AT 8:31-32; 61:15-19². Note also AT 57:38-40, which threatens the contract breaker with the amputation of his right hand.

⁶³ See Maidman (1976).

⁶⁴ I know of no certain land sales from Kassite Babylonia. Oelsner (1982) 407, n. 33 claims

magnate is in evidence at Emar. In fact, no single individual is attested as making more than a dozen acquisitions,⁶⁵ and no one alienates more than four parcels of land.⁶⁶ Most of the 27 buyers who purchase more than one property buy only two or three properties. To a certain extent, this situation is a function of the nature of the groups of tablets uncovered at Emar. For the most part,⁶⁷ these do not constitute family archives, such as are frequently attested for the Old Assyrian period or at Nuzi.⁶⁸ Rather, the bulk of the economic material was found in a temple (M₁) which served as a sort of central records office, where transactions were filed under divine oversight.⁶⁹ Therefore we should not expect to find a concentration of records from a single person or family, but a cross section of the community's business documents. Nonetheless, had there been a real estate tycoon in Emar, he certainly would have left his mark in this collection of material.

The kings of Emar do not have a particularly high profile in the real estate market. Although they could assign property to favored subordinates,⁷⁰ impose a special assessment on landowners,⁷¹ and compel others to exchange parcels with the palace,⁷² they also appear as buyers and sellers just

that no such documents are attested, but Gurney (1983) 4, n. 8 reports that a possible field sale was excavated at Isin. In the preliminary report on the tablets, Walker and Wilcke (1981) 100 describe the record in question, IB 1018b, only as "fragment of a sale contract, date lost."

⁶⁵ Išsur-Dagan, son of Ba'al-kabar (E6 137A-E, 138A-C, 139A-D).

⁶⁶ Agalli, son of Hinnu-Dagan (E6 8A-D).

⁶⁷ E6 199-226, however, seem to be the personal records of the "diviner" of Temple M₁ and his close relatives. See Fleming forthcoming.

⁶⁸ Veenhof (1986b) 9-10.

⁶⁹ See Beckman (1996a) 9.

⁷⁰ E6 361. It is actually the queen who makes the grant here.

⁷¹ See Yamada (1993), who gathers attestations of the (forced²) sale of property necessitated by the demand for 30,000 shekels of silver for the royal treasury. Perhaps this sum was required to meet a tribute payment due the Hittite overlords—*cf.* Beckman (1995) 27, n. 51. I will demonstrate elsewhere that Yamada's postulation of an Emariote king "Arana" cannot be correct.

⁷² E6 8A-D.

like ordinary citizens. But such attestations are not numerous: Zū-Aštarte sells one property,⁷³ while his brother and successor Pilsu-Dagan is involved in six transactions.⁷⁴ Elli of the following generation participates in but one uncertain field sale.⁷⁵

In 45 of the 167 tablets, the local ruler is attested in the list of witnesses, always as the first witness. The fact that almost three-quarters of the records forego royal participation demonstrates that the king's assent was not necessary to validate a transaction. Rather, it seems to have been Emariote practice to secure the most prominent available persons to witness an agreement, and to record their presence in roughly hierarchical order. Thus a number of texts feature a member of the Hittite imperial bureaucracy as the initial witness.⁷⁶

In contrast to the modest presence of the monarch, the role of the city god "Ninurta" is extremely prominent in the Emar real estate market. As I have already mentioned, he is—along with the city itself—the notional recipient of threatened fines, and the temple in which most of the sales records were stored was probably his home. "Ninurta" is also occasionally called upon to curse those who might break an agreement.⁷⁷

More significantly, "Ninurta" and the city elders⁷⁸ are the sellers in 69 (=33%) of the documented transactions.⁷⁹ On the other hand, neither the god nor the elders are ever attested as purchasers. How did they acquire this real estate? An indication is given by a remark concerning the prior status

⁷³ RE 9.

⁷⁴ E6 8A-D, 10, 137B; Hi 7B.

⁷⁵ RE 86B.

⁷⁶ Beckman (1992) 49.

⁷⁷ So in AS 14. In E6 125 "Ninurta" is invoked along with Dagan and Išhara, and in TBR 9 with Dagan alone. Note also TBR 67, where the curse is the responsibility of "the (anonymous) gods (dingir.meš)."

⁷⁸ Usually *lú.meš;šibūt uruEmar^{ki}*, but simply *uruEmar^{ki}* in TBR 14 and *lú.meš.gal.gal uruEmar^{ki}* in RE 34.

⁷⁹ AOV 1, 2; E6 1, 2A-B, 3A-B, 4, 9A-C, 11, 12, 126, 139A-D, 144, 146, 147A-C, 148, 149A-B, 150, 152-53; GsK 7; Hi 2, 7A; *Iraq* 54 4; RE 2, 5, 16, 24, 29A-B, 34, 38, 49, 52, 81, 91; SMEA 30 3, 4; TBR 1-4, 5A-B, 6-8, 9A-B, 10, 11A-B, 13, 14, 16A-C, 17A-B, 18.

of one property disposed of by the deity. The property's previous owner "had committed an offense against his city and his lord. In accordance with the offense which he committed, 'Ninurta' has taken his house,"⁸⁰ which he is hereby selling. Several other like passages are known.⁸¹ The nature of the crime in question is uncertain, as is the identity of the "lord" who is sometimes mentioned. But in any case, it was surely as the representative of the city as a corporation that "Ninurta" took possession of the parcels which he subsequently sold. That is, we are not dealing with the alienation of temple land in these transactions, but with the disposal of delinquent property by the municipal authorities.

The economic preeminence of city officials over the Crown, just demonstrated, is in harmony with observations concerning the "limited" nature of kingship in Emar.⁸² On this stretch of the Euphrates, urban institutions of long standing were more important than the local monarchy, which, seemingly, had been installed by the Hittite overlords only recently.⁸³

I wish to emphasize the contrast between the Emar real estate transactions and what is known of land sales and royal grants of real property on the Syrian coast in the Late Bronze Age. First, as we have seen, unit prices for land were significantly lower in the valley of the great river. Second, Emariote transactions always involved single houses, fields, lots, vineyards, or gardens. We find no transfers of entire communities along with their inhabitants,⁸⁴ such as are known from Ugarit⁸⁵ or from the texts of Level

⁸⁰ RE 34:10-13, edited by Beckman (1996c) 54-56.

⁸¹ E6 1, 11, 144; Hi 7; TBR 13, 65.

⁸² Fleming (1992).

⁸³ Beckman (1995) 29.

⁸⁴ Agricultural settlements in the Ancient Near East, including their fields, pasturage, vineyards, and gardens, had value not for their land itself, but only as centers of production for vegetable foodstuffs, livestock and associated raw materials (leather, wool, etc.), and small crafts. A member of the elite who "owned" such a settlement in actuality possessed the right to collect tax payments and service obligations from the inhabitants, and not their persons, houses, and fields. See Heltzer (1976) 49, and *cf.* Riemschneider (1958) for land grants in Hatti.

⁸⁵ Heltzer (1976) 48-51.

VII at Alalakh.⁸⁶ Third, there does not seem to have been an extensive system of land grants in return for service within the palace economy comparable to the Ugaritic *pilku/ubdy* regime.⁸⁷ Finally, the king of Emar and members of the royal family participated only minimally in transfers of property, while in Ugarit the monarch seems to have been heavily involved in such matters.⁸⁸

These differences between Ugarit and Emar are in keeping with what we otherwise know of the character of the respective local societies: the coastal kingdom was a classic Ancient Near Eastern palace economy, in which a small elite was supported by a broad base of semi-free peasants,⁸⁹ but the Middle Euphrates was the home of a relatively egalitarian society of traders and small producers. In Emar, the farmer might purchase his own land. In Ugarit, the agriculturalist was likely to be traded himself, along with his home town and his neighbors.

⁸⁶ AT 52-58.

⁸⁷ See Heltzer (1982b) for Ugarit. Just what obligations were generally incumbent upon Emariote property holders remains unclear. The term *ilku* is not mentioned in any of the records studied here, for Durand (1989) 168 has shown that its ostensible presence in E6 1:1 and 10 is based on a misreading. On the other hand, seven texts of other types do deal with the assignment of ^{gis}tukul-service: AOV 13:12 (testament); E6 18:19 (decree of the king of Carchemish), 33:26 (legal case), 112:16 (testament), 276:6, 8, 14 (list of persons); Hi 46:11 (decree by a Hittite prince), Hi 47:4 (= Tsukimoto [1984], gift of house by a Hittite prince); *Iraq* 54 1:8 (adoption). In the records of Ḫatti, whence the use of this Sumerogram as a technical term for a duty of service was certainly borrowed, ^{gis}tukul indicates an obligation to the Crown (Beal [1988]). Since Hittite imperial officials are involved in several of the documents just listed, perhaps the ^{gis}tukul-service was owed not to the local ruler of Emar, but to the authorities of the Hittite empire. This impression is strengthened by a letter from Emar written in Hittite (Hagenbuchner [1989] 40-41, Nr. 23) in which the Great King of Ḫatti personally frees a high priestly official of Emar from *šahhan-* and *luzzi-* obligations—cf. Beckman (1995) 31.

⁸⁸ See the transactions such as RS 16.248 (PRU 4, 48f.) in which the king confiscates (*našû*) real property from one or more persons and reallocates (*nadānu*) them to a third party. On the formulary employed here, see Greenfield (1977). Many purchases, including RS 16.261++ (PRU 3, 159f.), were executed in the presence of the ruler and bear his seal. Skaist (1988) convincingly argues that all conveyances involving the king concerned royal land whose usufruct alone changed hands.

⁸⁹ Liverani (1988) 546-52.

FIGURE I – HOUSES

<i>Text Reference</i>	<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Price</i>	<i>Penalty</i>
AOV 4	not given	12 gín	1000 (gín); recipient not given
Hi 12	12x12x7 <i>ammati</i>	15 gín (= ¼ ma.na)	200 (gín) each to city and brothers
E6 80B	20x10 <i>ammati</i>	18 gín	none
E6 113	not given	20 gín	none ²
E6 122	23x22 <i>ammati</i>	20 gín	none
TBR 53	not given	20 gín	none
Hi 9	15x8 <i>ammati</i>	26 gín	none
E6 123	not given	30 gín	none
RE 20	25x8x6 <i>ammati</i>	30 gín (= ½ ma.na)	1000 (gín) each to brothers and city
TBR 82	25x15 <i>ammati</i>	30 gín	2000 (gín) to palace
RE 80	not given	30⅓ gín	none
TBR 33	25x23 <i>ammati</i>	31 gín	none
TBR 37	not given	33 gín	none
E6 80A	20x10 <i>ammati</i>	36 ² gín	none
TBR 66	not given	40 gín	none
Hi 11C	27x15 <i>ammati</i>	41 gín	none
AOV 9	15x15 <i>ammati</i>	44 gín	none
TBR 65	not given	45 gín	none
Hi 8	23x9½ <i>ammati</i>	50 gín	2000 (gín) to palace
Hi 11B	27x15 <i>ammati</i>	50 gín	none
RE 12	20+x20+ <i>ammati</i>	55 gín	none
RE 59	24x20x10 <i>ikú</i>	60 gín (= 1 ma.na)	1000 (gín) to palace
SMEA 30, 2	27½x10x9 <i>ammati</i>	70 gín	2000 (gín) to palace
E6 81	not given	71 ² (gín)	none
E6 125	19x18x13 <i>ammati</i>	100 (gín)	1000 (gín) to palace
E6 225A	not given	100 gín	none
RE 9	27x23 <i>ammati</i>	100 gín	2000 (gín) to palace
RE 79	22x15 <i>ammati</i>	100 (gín)	2000 (gín) to palace
RE 29A	not given	100 (gín)*	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
RE 29B	not given	100 (gín)*	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
SMEA 30, 4	not given	100 (gín)*	1000 (gín) each to []
TBR 10	2+x5 <i>ammati</i>	100 (gín)	lost
TBR 8	31x10x9 <i>ammati</i>	100+ ² gín	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta [and city]
E6 225B	not given	115+ gín*	none

TBR 4	[NxN] <i>ammati</i>	120 gín (= 100 (gín) $\frac{1}{3}$ ma.na)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 56	not given	160 (gín)	2000 (gín) to palace
E6 20	not given	170 gín	1000 (gín) each to city and brothers
E6 9A	[NxNxN] <i>ammati</i>	200 (gín)*	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 9B	21x9 <i>ammati</i>	200 (gín)*	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 9C	17x13 <i>ammati</i>	200 (gín)*	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 57	not given	200 (gín)	1000 (gín) each to city and brothers
RE 70	20x6 <i>ammati</i>	250 gín (= 200 (gín) $\frac{1}{2}$ ma.na)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 111	20x20 <i>ammati</i>	300 (gín)	1000 (gín) each to city and brothers
E6 141	38x29x15 <i>ammati</i>	300 (gín)	1000 (gín) to palace
RE 34	NxN <i>ammati</i>	300 (gín)	1000 (gín) each to city and Ninurta
E6 85A	20x10+ <i>ammati</i>	310 gín*	none
E6 156	not given	600 (gín)	1000 (gín) each to city and buyer
Hi 7A	[NxN] <i>ammati</i>	600 (gín)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 139A	23x24 <i>ikû</i>	800 (gín)*	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 139C	[NxN] <i>ammati</i>	800 (gín)*	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 139D	[NxN] <i>ammati</i>	800 (gín)*	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 126	not given	1000 (gín)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 158	21x13 <i>ammati</i>	4200 gín (= 70 ma.na)	2000 (gín) to palace
Hi 10	22x12 <i>ammati</i>	[N] gín	2000 (gín) to palace
TBR 60	lost [?]	[N] gín	[2000 [?]] (gín) to palace
E6 97	21x16 <i>ammati</i>	lost	2000 (gín) to palace
E6 157	14x10 $\frac{1}{2}$ <i>ammati</i>	lost	lost
E6 161	22x14 <i>ammati</i>	lost	1000 (gín) each to I[ú] and []
TBR 54	16x9 <i>ammati</i>	lost	1000 (gín) to palace
TBR 59	20x[N] <i>ammati</i>	lost	2000 (gín) to palace
TBR 61	26x18 <i>ammati</i>	lost	lost
Hi 11A	27x15 <i>ammati</i>	not given	none

FIGURE II – LOTS

<i>Text Reference</i>	<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Price</i>	<i>Penalty</i>
GsK 4	12x13x10 <i>ammati</i>	4 gín	none
RE 11	18x18 <i>ammati</i>	4½ gín	none
RE 68	25x16 <i>ammati</i>	6 gín	none
E6 114B	not given	8 gín	none
RE 3	10x10x6 <i>ammati</i>	10 gín	1000 (gín) each to palace and city
E6 150	20x9 <i>ammati</i>	14 gín	500 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
Hi 2	20x14 <i>ammati</i>	15 gín (= ¼ ma.na)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 81	not given	15 gín	none
E6 114A	not given	20 gín	none
E6 137D	18x17x13 <i>ammati</i>	20 gín	[2000 ² (gín)] to palace
Hi 1	20x9 <i>ammati</i>	20 gín	1000 (gín) each to city and brothers
Hi 6	23x19 <i>ammati</i>	20 gín	none
RE 91	not given	20 ² gín (= ⅓ ² ma.na)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 171	17x5 <i>ammati</i>	25 gín (= ⅓ ma.na 5 gín)	lost
E6 76	24x18 <i>ammati</i>	30 gín	none
RE 31	17x2+ <i>ammati</i>	30 ² gín (= ½ ma.na ²)	none
TBR 14	not given	30 ² gín (= ½ ² ma.na)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city; 1000 (gín) to palace
TBR 24	20x8 <i>ammati</i>	33 gín	none
TBR 64	not given	35 gín	none
E6 137E	30x20 <i>ammati</i>	40 gín	[2000 ² (gín)] to palace
E6 153	[NxN] <i>ammati</i>	40 gín (= ⅔ ma.na)	[1000 ²] (gín) each to Ninurta and [city]
E6 110	25<x N> <i>ammati</i>	50 gín (= ⅙ ma.na)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and brothers
TBR 13	20x17 <i>ammati</i>	51 gín	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 207A	22x18x15 <i>ammati</i>	60 gín (= 1 ma.na)	none
E6 207B	18x12 <i>ammati</i>	60 gín (= 1 ma.na)	none
E6 94	30x10 <i>ammati</i>	100 (gín)	2000 (gín) to palace
TBR 1	not given	100+ gín	lost

E6 148	[N ina] <i>ammati</i> <i>rupšú</i>	110 gín	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
RE 33	10x9x25 <i>ammati</i> <i>šibuti</i>	120 gín (= 2 ma.na)	100 (gín) each to Ninurta and brothers
E6 109	22x18 <i>ammati</i>	130 gín (=100 (gín) ½ ma.na)	200 (gín) each to Ninurta and brothers
RE 14	20x13 <i>ammati</i>	140 gín (= 100 (gín) ⅔ ma.na)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
RE 81	27½x10x9 <i>ammati</i>	2400 gín (= 40 ma.na)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
RE 38	10 ² xNxN <i>ammati</i>	N gín	lost
RE 86A	22x12 <i>ammati</i>	[N] gín	2000 (gín) to palace
E6 152	18x20 <i>ammati</i>	lost	lost
RE 43	10+x30+x20 [<i>ammati</i>]	lost	lost?
E6 130	18 ina <i>ammati</i> gíd.da	not given	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and brothers

FIGURE III – FIELDS

<i>Text Reference</i>	<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Price</i>	<i>Penalty</i>
AS 14	2 <i>ikû</i> x 1 <i>ikû</i> 4 <i>gi</i> <i>ša</i> <i>iki</i>		5/6 <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta and city
RE 2	1½ <i>ikû</i> x 5 <i>šiddu</i>		1½ <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta and city
RE 64	2 <i>ikû</i> x 3 <i>matāhu</i> <i>ša</i> <i>iki</i>		3 <i>gín</i>	200 (<i>gín</i>) to brothers
TBR 58	2 <i>ikû</i> x 4 <i>gir</i> .h.i.a <i>matāhu</i>		7 <i>gín</i>	200 (<i>gín</i>) to brothers
Hi 14	½ x ½ <i>ikû</i>		10 <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to city and brothers
TBR 38		10 <i>ikû</i>	10 <i>gín</i>	none
TBR 68		2 ² (<i>ikû</i> ²)	10 <i>gín</i>	none
Hi 13	1 x 1 <i>ikû</i>		10 <i>gín</i> u 1 ^{gi} <i>šipšetu</i>	none
AOV 2	not given		11 <i>gín</i>	lost ²
TBR 18	2 <i>ikû</i> x 3 <i>šiddu</i> x 2 <i>šiddu</i> 4 <i>gir</i>		11 <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta and city
E6 115B	not given		20 <i>gín</i> *	none
E6 138A		10 <i>ikû</i>	20 <i>gín</i>	2000 (<i>gín</i>) to palace
GsK 7	1 x 1 <i>ikû</i>		20 <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta and city
RE 5	N x N <i>ikû</i>		20 (<i>gín</i>)	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta and city
RE 49	2 x 1 <i>ikû</i>		20 <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta? (= 1/3 ma.na) and city?
TBR 7	1 x 1 <i>ikû</i>		20 <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 62	2 <i>ašlu</i> <i>ša</i> 7 <i>iki</i> x 1 <i>ašlu</i> <i>ša</i> 6 <i>iki</i> x 4 ² <i>ikû</i>	20 <i>ikû</i>	20 <i>gín</i>	2000 (<i>gín</i>) to palace
E6 137C	10 x 3 <i>ikû</i>		30 <i>gín</i>	[2000 ² (<i>gín</i>)] to palace
E6 147A	6 <i>ikû</i> 2 <i>šiddu</i> <i>ša</i> <i>iki</i> x 1+ <i>ikû</i> 2 <i>šiddu</i> <i>ša</i> <i>iki</i> 8 <i>gi</i>		30 <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta (= 1/2 ma.na)* and city
E6 147B	6 <i>ikû</i> x ½ <i>ikû</i> 2 <i>gi</i>		30 <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta (= 1/2 ma.na)* and city
E6 147C		8 <i>ikû</i> 2 <i>šiddu</i> <i>ša</i> <i>iki</i>	30 <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta (= 1/2 ma.na)* and city
RE 24		30 <i>ikû</i>	30 <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta (= 1/2 ma.na) and city
RE 35	not given		30 <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to city and (= 1/2 ma.na) brothers
RE 77A		4 <i>ikû</i>	30 <i>gín</i>	none (= 1/2 ma.na)

RE 77B	not given	30 gín (= ½ ma.na) ¹	1000 (gín); recipient not given
TBR 12	1½ x 1 <i>ikû</i>	30 gín	1000 (gín) to palace
TBR 19	6 <i>ikû</i> x 1 <i>ikû</i>	60 gín (= 1 ma.na)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 55	10 x 1 <i>ikû</i>	60 gín	2000 (gín) to palace
AOV 1	11 <i>ikû</i> x 1 <i>ikû</i>	100 (gín)	lost ²
E6 142	2 ² x 1 ² [<i>ikû</i>]	100 (gín)	2000 (gín) to palace
E6 146	1 x 1 <i>ikû</i>	100 (gín)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and [city]
E6 163A	1 <i>ikû</i> x 1 <i>ikû</i>	100 (gín)*	lost
E6 163B	1 <i>ikû</i> u [] x 1 <i>ikû</i> 3 gír	100 (gín)*	lost
SMEA 30, 3	1 x 1 <i>ikû</i>	100 (gín)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 2	[1 x 1] <i>ikû</i>	100 (gín)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 3	4 x 2 <i>ikû</i>	100 (gín)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 11A	2 x 1 <i>ikû</i>	100 (gín)*	1000 (gín) each to []
TBR 11B	1 x 1 <i>ikû</i>	100 (gín)*	1000 (gín) each to []
RE 52	[N x N] <i>ikû</i>	100+ ² gín	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 2A	1½ <i>ikû</i> x 1½ <i>ikû</i>	150 gín (=100 (gín) ⅓ ma.na)*	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 2B	1 <i>ikû</i> x [N] <i>šiddu</i>	150 gín (=100 (gín) ⅓ ma.na)*	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 3B	1 x 1 <i>ikû</i>	150 gín (=100 (gín) ⅓ ma.na)*	1000 (gín); recipient not given
E6 4	not given	200 (gín)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 6	1½ x 1 <i>ikû</i>	150 gín (=100 (gín) ⅓ ma.na)*	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 9A	not given	200 gín*	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 9B	not given	200 gín*	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
Hi 15	[N x N] <i>ikû</i>	215 gín (=200 <i>meat</i> (gín) ¼ ma.na)	1000 (gín) each to []
TBR 16A	1 <i>ikû</i> x 30 <i>ammati</i> x 20 <i>ammati</i>	kù.babbar ⅓ ma.na)	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city

TBR 16B	1½ <i>ikû</i> x 70 <i>ammati</i> x 40 <i>ammati</i>	kù.babbar <i>īši u mādim</i>	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 16C	2 <i>ikû</i> x 2 <i>šiddu</i> x 38 <i>ammati</i>	kù.babbar <i>īši u mādim</i>	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 17A	1 <i>ikû</i> x 30 <i>ammati</i> x 20 <i>ammati</i>	kù.babbar <i>īši u mādim</i>	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
TBR 17B	1 <i>ikû</i> 3 <i>šiddu</i> x 70 [<i>ammati</i>] x 113 <i>ammati</i> x 80 <i>ammati</i>	kù.babbar <i>īši u mādim</i>	1000 (gín) each to Ninurta and city
E6 12	N <i>ikû</i> 1+ <i>šiddu</i> x N <i>ikû</i> 2+ <i>šiddu</i>	lost	lost
E6 149A	½ <i>ikû</i> x 2 <i>šiddu</i> 6 gîr	lost	1000 (gín) each to [Ninurta] and city
E6 149B	4½ <i>ikû</i> x 3 <i>šiddu</i> 5 gîr	lost	1000 (gín) each to [Ninurta] and city
<i>Iraq</i> 54, 4	6 <i>ikû</i>	lost	1000 (gín) each to []

FIGURE IV – VINEYARDS

<i>Text Reference</i>	<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Price</i>	<i>Penalty</i>
RE 16	1 <i>ikû</i> x 3 <i>šiddu</i> 5 <i>gir.meš</i> ²	2 <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta and city
E6 89	1 ² x 1 ² <i>šiddu</i>	15½ (<i>gín</i>) 20 ^g <i>pa</i> []	lost
TBR 51	not given	43 <i>gín</i> (= ⅔ <i>ma.na</i> 3 <i>gín</i>)	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to city and brothers
E6 138B	1½ <i>ikû</i> x 1 <i>ikû</i> 5 <i>gir</i>	50 <i>gín</i>	2000 (<i>gín</i>) to palace
E6 90	3 <i>šiddu ša iki</i> x 2 <i>šiddu ša iki</i>	60 <i>gín</i>	none
E6 140	3 <i>šiddu</i> 3 <i>gi</i> x 3 <i>šiddu</i> 3 <i>gi</i> x [N] <i>šiddu</i> 8 <i>gi</i> x 3 <i>šiddu</i> 5 <i>gi</i>	100 (<i>gín</i>)	1000 (<i>gín</i>) to palace
E6 11	1½ <i>ikû</i> x 2 <i>šiddu</i>	100+ ² <i>gín</i>	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to city and palace
E6 3A	1 <i>ikû</i> u <1 ² > <i>šiddu</i> x 1 <i>ikû</i>	150 <i>gín</i> (= 100 (<i>gín</i>) ⅔ <i>ma.na</i>)	1000 (<i>gín</i>); recipient not given
Hi 16	2 <i>ikû</i> x 2 <i>šiddu</i>	200 (<i>gín</i>)	1000 (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta and city
AOV 3	lost	<i>kù.babbar</i> <i>iši u mādim</i>	1000 <i>gín</i> each to Ninurta and city
E6 1	1 <i>ikû</i> 1 <i>šiddu</i> x 1 <i>šiddu</i>	not given ²	[N] <i>līm</i> (<i>gín</i>) each to Ninurta and Emar

FIGURE V – GARDENS

<i>Text Reference</i>	<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Price</i>	<i>Penalty</i>
E6 137A	[N] <i>šiddu</i> 2 <i>gi ša iki</i> x [N] <i>šiddu</i> 3 <i>gi ša iki</i>	100+ ² <i>gín</i>	[2000 ² (<i>gín</i>)] to palace
E6 137B	1 <i>ikû</i> x [N] <i>šiddu</i> x 1 <i>šiddu ša iki</i>	20 <i>gín</i>	[2000 ² (<i>gín</i>)] to palace
E6 206	3 <i>šiddu ša iki</i> x 2 <i>šiddu</i> 7 <i>gi.meš ša iki</i> x 1 <i>šiddu ša iki</i>	100 (<i>gín</i>) for ½ share	none

FIGURE VI – FEATURES OF REAL PROPERTY SALE DOCUMENTS

<i>Feature</i>	<i>Emar</i>	<i>Ekalte</i>	<i>Ugarit</i>	<i>Alalakh VII</i>	<i>Middle Assyria</i>	<i>Nuzi</i>	<i>Hana</i>	<i>Mari</i>	<i>Late Old Babylonian</i>
Complete delineation of boundaries	yes	yes	no	no	no	optional	yes	optional	optional
Urban Property									
first side	zag	zag	—	ite	—	—	ús.sa.du an.ta	da	da
third side	egir	egir	—	—	—	—	sag.ki an.ta	—	sag.bi (.l.kam)
surface measures	—	—	—	—	—	—	sar	sar	sar
length measures	<i>ammatu</i>	<i>ammatu</i>	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Agricultural property									
first side	ús.sa.du an.ta	ús.sa.du an.ta	—	—	—	<i>ina lēt,</i> <i>ina elēn</i>	ús.sa.du an.ta	da	da
third side	sag.ki .l.kam	egir	—	—	—	<i>ina itān</i>	sag.ki an.ta	sag.l (.l.kam)	sag.bi
surface measures	<i>ikú, zizi</i>	<i>ikú</i>	<i>imēru,</i> <i>ikú,</i> <i>kumānu,</i> <i>purīdu</i>	<i>imēru,</i> <i>ikú,</i> <i>kumānu,</i> <i>purīdu</i>	<i>imēru,</i> <i>ikú,</i> <i>kumānu,</i> <i>purīdu</i>	<i>imēru,</i> <i>awīharu,</i> <i>kumānu,</i> <i>ḫararnu</i>	<i>ikú, sar</i>	<i>ikú, sar</i>	<i>ikú, sar</i>
length measures	<i>ikú,</i> <i>šiddu,</i> <i>gi, gir</i>	<i>mētequ</i>	<i>purīdu</i>	—	—	<i>ammatu,</i> <i>tayāru,</i> <i>mindatu</i>	—	—	—

Feature	Emar	Ekalte	Ugarit	Alalakh VII	Middle Assyria	Nuzi	Hana	Mari	Late Old Babylonian
Verb used of seller	—	—	<i>pašaru</i> + <i>šamātu</i> , <i>nadānu</i>	—	<i>nadānu</i> + <i>šubbū</i>	<i>kima ḫa.la</i> <i>nadānu</i>	—	<i>naḫālu</i>	—
Verb used of buyer	<i>šamu</i>	<i>šamu</i>	<i>šamu</i> , <i>leqū</i> + <i>šamātu</i>	<i>šamu</i>	—	<i>kima</i> <i>nig.ba</i> <i>nadānu</i>	<i>in.ši.in.</i> , <i>šam</i> , <i>šamu</i>	<i>in.ši.šam</i>	<i>in.ši(.in).</i> <i>šam</i>
Payment in	silver	silver	silver	misc. goods	tin	misc. goods	silver	silver	silver
Verb used of payment	<i>maḫāru</i>	<i>maḫāru</i>	—	<i>nadū</i>	<i>maḫāru</i>	—	<i>in.na.lá</i>	<i>in.na.an.lá</i> , <i>šaḡālu</i>	<i>in.na(.an).</i> <i>lá</i>
Closing gesture or statement	<i>libbašu</i> <i>ṭáb</i>	<i>libbašu</i> <i>ṭáb</i>	—	—	<i>ṭuppa</i> <i>dannata</i> <i>šaṭāru</i>	—	<i>giš.gan.na</i>	—	<i>giš.gan.na</i>
Verb in irrevocability clause	<i>baḡāru</i> , <i>raḡāmu</i>	<i>baḡāru</i>	<i>tāru</i>	<i>nabalkutu</i>	<i>tāru</i> , <i>dabābu</i>	<i>nabalkutu</i>	<i>baḡāru</i>	<i>baḡāru</i>	<i>raḡāmu</i> , <i>tāru</i>
Oath	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	yes
Sanction for renegeing	large fine	large fine	large fine, forfeiture, hot lead	paymt. of entire sum, forfeiture	—	large fine	large fine hot asphalt	large fine	—
Witnesses	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Date	optional	optional	no	optional	yes	no	optional	yes	yes

Bibliography

- Aerts, E., and H. Klengel**, eds. (1990) *The Town as Regional Economic Centre in the Ancient Near East*. Leuven. **Arnaud, D.** (1986) *Recherches au pays d'Aštata. Emar VI.1-3*. Paris. (1987a) *Recherches au pays d'Aštata. Emar VI.4*. Paris. (1987b) La Syrie du moyen-Euphrate sous la protectorat hittite: contrats de droit privé. *Aula Orientalis* 5: 211-41. (1991) *Textes syriens de l'Âge du Bronze Récent*. Aula Orientalis-Supplementa 1. Barcelona. (1992) Tablettes de genres divers du Moyen-Euphrate. *Studi Micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 30: 195-245. **Beal, R.** (1988) The ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-institution in Second Millennium Ḫatti. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 15: 269-305. **Beckman, G.** (1992) Hittite Administration in Syria in the Light of the Texts from Ḫattuša, Ugarit, and Emar. In Chavalas and Hayes 1992: 41-49. (1995) Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria: The View from Mašat and Emar. In Carruba, et al. 1995:19-37. (1996a) Emar and Its Archives. In Chavalas 1996:1-12. (1996b) Family Values on the Middle Euphrates in the Thirteenth Century B.C.E. In Chavalas 1966: 57-79. (1996c) *Texts from the Vicinity of Emar in the Collection of Jonathan Rosen*. Padua. **Bellotto, N.** (1993) Il LÜ.MEŠ.aḫ-ḫi-a a Emar. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 22: 210-28. **Beyer, D.**, ed. (1982) *Meskéné – Emar. Dix ans de travaux 1972-1982*. Paris. **Boyer, G.** (1955) La place des textes d'Ugarit dans l'histoire de l'ancien droit oriental. In Nougayrol 1955: 283-308. (1958) *Textes juridiques*. Archives royales de Mari Transcrites et Traduites 8. Paris. **Carruba, O., M. Giorgieri, and C. Mora**, eds., (1995) *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*. Studia Mediterranea 9. Pavia. **Chavalas, M. W.**, ed. (1996) *Emar: The History, Religion, and Culture of a Syrian Town in the Late Bronze Age*. Bethesda, Md. **Chavalas, M. W., and J. L. Hayes**, eds. (1992) *New Horizons in the Study of Ancient Syria*. Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 25. Malibu, Calif. **Dalley, S., and B. Tessier** (1992) Tablets from the Vicinity of Emar and Elsewhere. *Iraq* 54: 83-111. **Dandamayev, M., et al.**, eds. (1982) *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East. Studies in Honour of I. M. Diakonoff*. Warminster. **Dietrich, M., and O. Loretz**, eds. (1995) *Ugarit. Ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum im Alten Orient*. Band I. *Ugarit und seine altorientalisches Umwelt*. Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas 7. Münster. **Dornemann, R.** (1979) Tell Hadidi: A Millennium of City Occupation. In Freedman 1979: 113-51. **Durand, J.-M.** (1989) Review of Arnaud (1986). *Revue d'Assyriologie* 83: 163-91. **Ellis, M. DeJ.**, ed. (1977) *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein*. Memoires of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 19. Hamden, Conn. **Fleming, D.** (1992) A Limited Kingship: Late Bronze Emar in Ancient Syria. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 24: 59-71. (1993) Baal and Dagan in Ancient Syria. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 83: 88-98. (Forth.) *Time at Emar*. Mesopotamian Civilizations. Winona Lake, Ind. **Freedman, D. N.**, ed. (1979) *Archaeological Reports from the Tabqa Dam Project*. Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research 44. Cambridge, Mass. **Gaal, E.** (1988) The Social Structure of Alalah. In Heltzer and Lipiński 1988: 99-110. **Garelli, P.**, ed. (1974) *Le palais et la royauté*. Paris. Greenfield, J. (1977) *našū-nadānu* and Its Congeners. In Ellis 1977: 87-91. **Gurney, O. R.** (1983) *The Middle Babylonian Legal and Economic Texts from Ur*. London. **Haase, R.** (1967) Anmerkungen

zum ugaritischen Immobilienkauf. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 58: 196-210. **Hagenbuchner, A.** (1989) *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter*, 2. Teil. Texte der Hethiter 16. Heidelberg.

Heltzer, M. (1976) *The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit*. Wiesbaden. (1978) *Goods, Prices and the Organization of Trade in Ugarit*. Wiesbaden. (1979) Royal Economy in Ancient Ugarit. In Lipiński 1979: 459-96. (1982a) *The Internal Organization of the Kingdom of Ugarit*. Wiesbaden. (1982b) Zum Steuersystem in Ugarit (*pilku-ubdy* und Ähnliches). In Hirsch 1982: 112-17. **Heltzer, M., and E. Lipiński**, eds. (1988) *Society and Economy in the Eastern Mediterranean (c. 1500-1000 B.C.)*. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 23. Leuven.

Hirsch, H., ed. (1982) *Vorträge gehalten auf der 28. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale in Wien 6.-10. 1981*. *Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft* 19. Vienna. **Hrouda, B., et al.**, eds. (1981) *Isin-İsan Bahriyāt II*. *Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 87. Munich. **Kienast, B.** (1979) Die altbabylonischen Kaufurkunden aus Alalah. *Welt des Orients* 11: 35-63. **Klengel, H.** (1974) Königtum und Palast nach den Alalah-Texten. In Garelli 1974: 273-82. (1979) Die Palastwirtschaft in Alalah. In Lipiński 1979: 435-57.

Koschaker, P. (1928) *Neue keilschriftliche Rechtsurkunden aus der el-Amarna-Zeit*. *Abhandlungen der Philologisch-historischen Klasse der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 39/V. Leipzig. **Leemans, W. F.** (1988) Aperçu sur les textes juridiques d'Emar. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 31: 207-42. **Lipiński, E.** (1979) Ed. *State and Temple Economy in the Ancient Near East*. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 6. Leuven. (1990) Le marché immobilier à Ugarit et à Emar au XIII^e siècle av. n. è. In Aerts and Klengel 1990: 25-58. (1992) Arcanes et conjonctures du marché immobilier à Ugarit et à Emar au XIII^e siècle av. n. è. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 19: 40-43. **Lipiński, E.**, ed. (1979) *State and Temple Economy in the Ancient Near East*. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 6. Leuven. **Liverani, M.** (1982) Ville et campagne dans le royaume d'Ugarit. Essai d'analyse économique. In Dandamayev 1982: 250-58. (1988) *Antico Oriente: Storia, società, economia*. Rome. **Maidman, M.** (1976) *A Socio-Economic Analysis of a Nuzi Family Archive*. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania. **Margueron, J.** (1982) Architecture et urbanisme. In Beyer (1982) 23-39. **Mayer, W.** (1986) Die Tontafelfunde von Tall Munbāqa 1984. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 118: 126-31. (1988) Die Tontafelfunde von Tall Munbāqa 1986. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 120: 48-50. (1990) Der antike Name von Tall Munbāqa, die Schreiber und die chronologische Einordnung der Tafelfunde: Die Tontafelfunde von Tall Munbāqa 1988. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 122: 45-66. (1992) Eine Urkunde über Grundstückskäufe aus Ekalte/Tall Munbāqa. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 24: 263-74. (1993) Die Tontafelfunde von Tall Munbāqa/Ekalte 1989 und 1990. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 125: 103-7. **Nougayrol, J.** (1955) *Le palais royal d'Ugarit*, 3: *Textes Accadiens des Archives Sud*. Mission de Ras Shamra 6. Paris. **Oelsner, J.** (1982) Zur Organisation des gesellschaftlichen Lebens im kassitischen und nachkassitischen Babylonien: Verwaltungsstruktur und Gemeinschaften. In Hirsch 1982: 403-10. **Podany, A.** (1988) *The Chronology and History of the Hana Period*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles. **Porten, B.** (1968) *Archives from Elephantine. The Life of an Ancient Jewish*

Military Colony. Berkeley. **Powell, M.** (1990) Masse und Gewichte. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 7: 457-517. **Rainey, A. F., et al.**, eds. (1993) *Kinattūtu ša dārāti*. *Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume*. Tel Aviv Occasional Publications. Tel Aviv. **Riemschneider, K.** (1958) Die hethitischen Landschenkungsurkunden. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientalforschung* 6: 321-81. **Sanmartín, J.** (1995) Wirtschaft und Handel in Ugarit: Kulturgrammatische Aspekte. In Dietrich and Loretz 1995: 131-58. **San Nicolò, M.** (1922) *Die Schlußklauseln der altbabylonischen Kauf- und Tauschverträge*. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 4. Munich. **Scurlock, J.** (1993) Once more *ku-bu-ru*. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brève et Utilitaires*. 1993/21. **Sigrist, R. M.** (1993) Seven Emar Tablets. In Rainey 1993: 165-84. **Skaist, A.** (1988) A Unique Closing Formula in the Contracts from Ugarit. In Heltzer and Lipiński 1988: 151-59. **von Soden, W.** (1982) Eine altbabylonische Urkunde (79 MQB 15) aus Tall Munbāqa. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 114: 71-78. **Steele, F.** (1943) *Nuzi Real Estate Transactions*. American Oriental Series 25. New Haven. **Stone, E.** (1987) *Nippur Neighborhoods*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 44. Chicago. **Tsukimoto, A.** (1984) Eine neue Urkunde des Tili-šarruma, Sohn des Königs von Karkamiš. *Acta Sumerologica* 6: 65-74. (1988) Sieben spätbronzezeitliche Urkunden aus Syrien. *Acta Sumerologica* 10:153-89. (1990) Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (I). *Acta Sumerologica* 12: 177-227. (1991) Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (II). *Acta Sumerologica* 13: 275-333. (1992a) Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (III). *Acta Sumerologica* 14: 289-310. (1992b) An Akkadian Field Sale Document Privately Held in Tokyo. *Acta Sumerologica* 14: 311-14. **Veenhof, K. R.** (1986a) Ed. *Cuneiform Archives and Libraries*. Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 57. Leiden. (1986b) Cuneiform Archives. An Introduction. In Veenhof 1986a: 1-36. **Walker, C. B. F., and Cl. Wilcke** (1981) Preliminary Report on the Inscriptions. In Hrouda 1981: 91-102. **Westbrook, R.** (1991) The Phrase "His Heart is Satisfied" in Ancient Near Eastern Legal Sources. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 111: 219-24. **Wilcke, Cl.** (1992) AH, die 'Brüder' von Emar. Untersuchungen zur Schreibertradition am Euphratknie. *Aula Orientalis* 10: 115-50. **Wooley, C. L.** (1968) *A Forgotten Kingdom*. New York. **Yamada, M.** (1993) "Arana-Documents" from Emar. *Oriens* 29: 130-46. (1994) The Dynastic Seal and Ninurta's Seal: Preliminary Remarks on Sealing by the Local Authorities of Emar. *Iraq* 56: 59-62.