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Although the Hittite state of the Late Bronze Age always had its roots in central 
Anatolia, it continually sought to expand its hegemony toward the southeast into Syria, 
where military campaigns would bring it booty in precious metals and other goods available 
at home only in limited quantities, and where domination would assure the constant flow of 
such wealth in the form of tribute and imposts on the active trade of this crossroads between 
Mesopotamia, Egypt, and the Aegean.

Already in the seventeenth century, the Hittite kings Ḫattušili I and his adopted son 
and successor Muršili I conquered much of this area, breaking the power of the “Great 
Kingdom” of Ḥalab and even reaching distant Babylon, where the dynasty of Ḥammurapi 
was brought to an end by Hittite attack. However, the Hittites were unable to consolidate 
their dominion over northern Syria and were soon forced back to the north by Hurrian 
princes, who were active even in eastern Anatolia. Practically nothing can be said 
concerning Hittite administration of Syria in this period, known to Hittitologists as the Old 
Kingdom. During the following Middle Kingdom (late sixteenth-early fourteenth centuries), 
Hittite power was largely confined to Anatolia, while northern Syria came under the sway

1 During the past quarter century research in Hittite studies has proceeded at such a pace that there currently 
exists no adequate monographic account of Anatolian history and culture of the second millennium. The most recent 
editions of the standard English-language histories, however, have been somewhat revised to take account of 
advances in knowledge. See O.R. Gurney, The Hittites (Harmondsworth, 1952; 2nd ed. 1954; repr. with revisions 
For a shorter, but more up-to-date, presentation, see H. Klengel, ed., Kulturgeschichte des alten Vorderasien 
(Berlin, 1989) 234-267. Numerous essays by experts on various aspects of the history and civilization of ancient 
Anatolia will appear in J.M. Sasson, ed., Civilizations of the Ancient Near East (New York: Scribners, 1993), and 
a useful and well-illustrated introduction to the field is to be found in a special issue of BA 52/2-3 (1989), edited 
by R.L. Gorney: Reflections of a Late Bronze Age Empire: The Hittites, which contains contributions by several 
cholars.

2 S. de Martino, “I Hurriti nei testi dell’Antico Regno,” Seminari [dello Istituto per gli studi micenei ed egeo-
of the Hurrian state of Mitanni. One of the Hittite rulers of this period, however, a certain Tudhalia, does seem to have reasserted Hittite claims over Ḫalab. But his success was ephemeral.

Not so that of Šuppiluliuma I, founder of the Hittite Empire (or New Kingdom) in the first half of the fourteenth century. This greatest of Hittite monarchs destroyed the realm of Mitanni and absorbed the greater portion of its territories, extending Hittite dominion in Syria from the western reaches of the Khabur basin in the northeast to the upper end of the Beqqa valley in the south. While his son and second successor Muršili II had to suppress a major uprising in this region, and the later rulers Muwatalli II and Tudhalia IV confronted serious challenges from Egypt in the south and Assyria in the east, respectively, most of northern Syria remained securely in Hittite hands until the general collapse of the Late Bronze Age state system in the early twelfth century.

Our primary sources for the history of the Hittite Empire in Syria are cuneiform tablets, chiefly from three sites: 1) the Hittite capital of Ḫattuša (Boghazköy) in central Turkey, where the central administrative archives of the Hittite imperial bureaucracy were uncovered; 2) the Syrian coastal emporium of Ugarit (Ras Shamra), where the archives of the local rulers include correspondence with the Hittite Great King and his representatives in Syria, as well as various edicts and day-to-day records involving the imperial administration; and 3) the outlying commercial town of Emar on the middle course of the Euphrates (present-day Meskeneh) and various settlements in its environs, from which many records of private individuals, as well as the technical library of a local priest, have been recovered.

While most of the relevant material from Ḫattuša and Ugarit has been published, and the epigrapher of the more recently-discovered Emar texts has made the Akkadian

3 G. Wilhelm, Grundzüge der Geschichte und Kultur der Hurrier (Darmstadt, 1982) 23-58. This volume has been translated as The Hurrians (London, 1989).

4 KBo 1.6 obv. 15-18 (CTH 75), edited by E.F. Weidner, PDK 82-83. See also O. Carruba, “Beiträge zur mittelhethitischen Geschichte I. Die Tūdhalijas und die Arnuwandas,” SMEA 18 (1977) 137-174.

5 The most important textual source for the military and diplomatic activities of Šuppiluliuma I is the account of his reign composed by his son (CTH 40). See the edition by H.G. Güterbock, “The Deeds of Šuppiluliuma as Told by His Son, Mursili II,” JCS 10 (1956) 41-68, 75-98, 107-130. An historical interpretation of the conqueror’s Syrian campaign is presented by K.A. Kitchen, Šuppiluliuma and the Amarna Pharaohs (Liverpool, 1962).


7 The confrontation with Egypt culminating in the famous battle of Kadesh is best known to us from Egyptian sources. For a thorough discussion see W.J. Murnane, The Road to Kadesh (Chicago, 1985; SAOC 42; 2nd ed. 1990).


documents from the official excavations of that site available in timely fashion.\textsuperscript{10} hundreds of tablets from this area are in private collections\textsuperscript{11} or remain on the art market. As these texts gradually become known to scholarship,\textsuperscript{12} our picture of life and society in Hittite Syria correspondingly becomes clearer.\textsuperscript{13}

Four major deficits in our documentation must also be acknowledged: We do not have pertinent archives from the cities of Carchemish, Ḫalab, Šumur, or Waššukkanni. The first city, one of the most important in second millennium Syria, was long ago identified as Jerablus on the Euphrates, and was indeed partially excavated in the early years of this century, but no tablets from the second millennium were found, and its location on the sensitive Turkish-Syrian border has precluded further investigation.\textsuperscript{14} Ancient Ḫalab lies inaccessible beneath the modern city of Aleppo.\textsuperscript{15} Šumur, likely capital of Amurru, is probably Tell Kazel on the southern Syrian coast. Preliminary excavations there have turned up only a few suggestive indications of the presence of Hittite imperial government.\textsuperscript{16} Finally, the location of Waššukkanni, chief city of Mitanni, is still one of the most hotly-debated questions in Ancient Near Eastern archaeology.\textsuperscript{17}

Although other polities, such as Ḫalab, Mukiš, Niya-Nuḫašše,\textsuperscript{18} Tunip\textsuperscript{19} and Kinza, played a role in Hittite Syria, the most important dependencies were Carchemish, Ugarit, Mitanni, Aššata, and Amurru. Carchemish was the seat of a cadet line of the Hittite royal house, founded when Šuppiluliuma installed his son Piyaššili, who also bore the Hurrian name Šarri-Kušu, as king of this city. Throughout the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries the king of Carchemish served as Hittite “vicerey” in Syria. In time of peace he was the


\textsuperscript{11} I am currently preparing an edition of more than 90 tablets from Emar and its environs in the collection of Jonathan Rosen of New York City (cited here as \textit{RE}).


\textsuperscript{13} For the history of Hittite Syria in this period consult the relevant chapters of H. Klengel, \textit{Geschichte Syriens im 2. Jahrtausend v. u. Z. I-III} (Berlin, 1965-70), and his supplemental “Neue Quellen zur Geschichte Nordsyriens im 2. Jahrtausend v. u. Z,” \textit{AoF} 2 (1975) 47-64. Although these works were written before the publication of the Emar tablets, Klengel has briefly discussed these latter sources in “Die Keilschrifttexte von Meskene und die Geschichte von Aššata/Emar,” \textit{OLZ} 83 (1988) 645-653. See also in general S.D. Waterhouse, “Syria in the Amarna Age: A Borderland between Conflicting Empires,” (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1965).


\textsuperscript{17} See the literature listed by G.F. del Monte and J. Tischler, \textit{Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte} (Wiesbaden, 1978; \textit{RGTC} 6) 480; and also A. Dobel et al., “Neutron Activation Analysis and the Location of Waššukkanni,” \textit{Or} 46 (1977) 375-382.


\textsuperscript{19} M.C. Astour, “Tunip-Hamath and Its Region: A Contribution to the Historical Geography of Central Syria,” \textit{Or} 46 (1977) 51-64.
chief political authority to the south of the Taurus mountains, and in time of war the highest military commander in the area. Remarkably, our sources reveal no friction between any of the kings of Carchemish and their cousins, the Hittite Great Kings.20

Ugarit was the major port and trading center of northern Syria, enjoying commercial connections with Mesopotamia and regions farther to the east, as well as with Egypt, the Aegean, Hittite-controlled Cilicia, and of course the Syro-Palestinian coast to the south. Her high tribute in gold, textiles, and fine wool was certainly of great importance to the Hittite economy, and her fleet of sea-going vessels was at the disposal of the imperial authorities for both military purposes and for the transshipment of foodstuffs in time of famine. In addition, of course, the incorporation of Ugarit into the Hittite system of states afforded Anatolian merchants better access to the international trade networks of the age.21

Mitanni, much of whose former territory was ceded by Suppiluliuma to Carchemish, was allowed a continued existence as a buffer against newly-resurgent Assyria to the east. However, the Assyrians also had their own puppet Hurrian state, Ḫanigalbat, and it seems that the latter gradually expanded to the detriment of the Hittite vassal, until in the later thirteenth century Ḫatti and Assyria confronted one another directly not far to the east of Carchemish.22

The land of Aššata, of which Emar was one of the most important cities, constituted the frontier district against Babylonia to the southeast, from which direction no trouble is attested, as well as against the Assyrian realm to the northeast. From this quarter unpleasantness indeed emanated, as indicated by two Emar records which mention in passing the siege of the town by “the Hurrians,”23 certainly a reference to the Assyrian pawn Ḫanigalbat. Several smaller archaeological sites around Meskeneh, such as Tell Faq'ous,24 seem to have been military stations and frontier posts. The international character of life in this district is demonstrated by the presence in the archives of individual cuneiform tablets inscribed in a Babylonian25 or an Assyrian hand,26 as well as a number of texts composed in the Hittite and Hurrian languages.27

20 See n. 14 above.
22 See n. 3 above and A. Harrak, Assyaia and Hanigalbat (Hildesheim, 1987; TSO 4).
23 Hirayama 7, 29-30: ināma erēn.meš Hurri bād u-emar ilmi, “when the Hurrian troops besieged the fortifications of Emar.” Tsukimoto, “Hirayama I” (1990) 191-192, compares an excerpt from a copy of a dedicatory inscription, Emar VI, 42, 8-10: "Pilsu(!)-kur dumu ʾlškur-šakar lugal u-emar lugal erēn.meš kur Hurri u-emar ʾilammin, “Pilsu-Dagan, son of Ba’al-kabar (was) king of Emar. The king of the Hurrian troops and the city of Emar were(!) on bad terms.” For the reading and interpretation of these lines, see J.-M. Durand’s review of Emar VI, RA 83 (1989) 183-184. Both of these texts were composed under King Pilsu-Dagan, who as a contemporary of Ini-Tessup of Carchemish and Tudhalia IV of Ḫatti, ruled in the mid-thirteenth century.
26 RE 19.
The frontier of Hittite Syria over against Egyptian possessions in Syro-Palestine was guarded by Amurru, and by the smaller state of Kinza, of which relatively little is known. After the conclusion of the great peace treaty between the Ḫatti of Ḫattušili III and the Egypt of Ramses II in the mid-thirteenth century, Amurru served as the hub of diplomatic and trade contacts between the two great powers, and the local ruler was responsible for furthering the traffic in diplomats, sumptuous gifts, and brides.

Given the slowness of communication in this age and the fact that all movement into or out of the core Hittite area was severely restricted during the winter months, the Hittite state throughout its history tended to grow by the association of vassal units rather than through their full political and economic integration into the central structure. In fact, the Hittites usually preferred to rule distant areas through the agency of members of the dynasties whom they had defeated.

These kings assumed certain obligations toward Ḫatti and were bound by treaty to the person of the Hittite Great King. The primary duties imposed upon vassals in these treaties were the payment of tribute, the providing of military assistance when required, the renouncing of all independent foreign contacts, the extradition of fugitives from Ḫatti (of ordinary peasants and artisans as well as of disgruntled members of the ruling class), and the guarantee of the succession to the Hittite throne of the Great King’s designated heir.

This system was indeed employed in Hittite Syria, for most of whose states treaties are attested. Should respect for the oaths upholding these agreements be insufficient to secure loyalty and obedience, the Hittites might resort to military action and the replacement of the recalcitrant vassal, should he indeed survive the war. There might also be a punitive redrawing of borders upon the successful outcome of the campaign. Thus, during the initial establishment of Hittite rule, much of Mukiš was presented by Šuppiluliuma to Ugarit, which had had the good sense to pledge its allegiance to the conqueror earlier. Conversely, when Ugarit herself later joined the Syrian rebellion against Muršili II, her southern dependencies of Siyannu and Ušнатu were removed from her jurisdiction and made directly subordinate to the king of Carchemish. There can also be little doubt that the

---

30 See the thoughts of I. Singer, “A Hittite Hieroglyphic Seal Impression from Tel Aphek,” TA 4 (1977) 178-190. As the southernmost major Hittite vassal, Amurru was certainly instrumental on the Hittite side of this exchange.
31 On Hittite diplomatic practice in general see G. Kestemont, Diplomatique et droit international en Asie orientale (1600-1200 av. J.C.) (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1974; PIOL 6).
32 V. Korošec, Hethitische Staatsverträge (Leipzig, 1931).
33 Actual treaty documents have been preserved in regard to Amurru (CTH 49, 62, 92, 105), Ḫalab (CTH 75), Carchemish (CTH 50, 122), Mitanni (CTH 51, 52), Nuḫaše (CTH 53), and Ugarit (CTH 46, 66). For other polities, such as Kinza and Aštata, a treaty relation is mentioned in other types of text.
35 See n. 18 above.
function of the Hittite garrisons sometimes assigned to vassal kingdoms was as much to keep
an eye on the activities of the local ruler as to protect his life.

But the Hittites preferred less coercive measures. The most important of these was
the marriage alliance. 37 Such ties are known in respect to Mitanni, whose first vassal ruler
Sattiwaza was married to a daughter of Suppiluliuma I, as well as for Ugarit, whose final
king Ammurapi married—and later divorced—Ehli-Nikkalu, probably the daughter of
Suppiluliuma II. 38 But the most intricate marriage ties were with Amurru: its king
Bentešina and his son Saušgamuwa each married a daughter of the Hittite Great King
Ḫattušili III, while the latter’s son Nerikkaili was betrothed to a daughter of Bentešina,
apparently the bridegroom’s own niece. Political and familial relationships became yet more
complicated in the next generation, when the daughter of Bentešina, and granddaughter of
Ḫattušili III, became the wife of Ammimamru II of Ugarit. When as the result of some
unexplained offence, the woman was divorced and her irate husband sought to punish her
even more severely, the matter became an international incident, ultimately adjudicated by
her brother Saušgamuwa of Amurru, her cousin Tudaliya IV of Ḫatti, and her more distant
cousin Ini-Teššup of Carchemish. 39

But what of day-to-day administration? As mentioned earlier, although the Great
King of Ḫattuša might on occasion intervene in Syrian affairs and could be appealed to in
the final instance, the highest political and military authority in Hittite Syria was ordinarily
the king of Carchemish. 40 His participation in judicial and economic affairs is manifest in
documents from Ugarit and Emar. For example, the king of Carchemish whose activities
are best known to us, Ini-Teššup, adjudicated disputes between Ugarit and Amurru on the
one hand, 41 and between Ugarit and Siyannu-Ušnatu on the other. 42 He also concluded
an agreement with Ammimamru II of Ugarit concerning compensation in the case of the
murder of a merchant, 43 and arranged for the resurveying of the borders of Ugarit. 44 In
at least two instances he received complaints concerning false imprisonment by high
administrators of the port town. 45 Various documents from Ugarit and from Emar relating
to private affairs—disputes at law, sales of real property, and testaments—are said to have
been composed “in the presence of Ini-Teššup.” 46 It is not clear whether this situation

37 The Hittites also established such bonds with their equals, Egypt and Babylonia. See F. Pintore, Il
matrimonio interdinastrico nel Vicino Oriente durante i secoli xvi-xvii (Roma, 1978) 33-78.
40 Consider the actions taken by Muršili II in CTH 63: H. Klengel, “Der Schiedsspruch des Muršili II.
hinsichtlich Barga und seine Übereinkunft mit Duppi-Tešup von Amurru (KBo III 3),” OR 32 (1963) 32-55. It
should be noted that the measures taken here are not to become final until the king of Carchemish has been
consulted.
41 PRU IV, 134ff.
42 PRU IV, 161ff.
43 PRU IV, 152ff.
44 PRU IV, 188; cf. also PRU III, 6-7.
45 PRU VI, 35-38.
46 Ugarit: PRU IV, 165-169, 292-293. The first group of texts is made up of legal cases in which the King
involved the travel of the parties in these transactions to Carchemish, or whether the king rather made a periodic circuit of the area under his jurisdiction.  

Active throughout Hittite Syria were officials designated by the Sumerographic term dumu.lugal, literally “Son of the King”—the Hittite reading is uncertain. Although this turn of phrase may indicate that the higher echelons of the Hittite administration were generally occupied by persons of royal descent, it is quite clear that not all holders of this title were offspring of the reigning Great King. Texts from Ḫattuša, Ugarit, and Emar demonstrate that the “Sons of the King” were very high ranking officials, often dispatched by the Hittite King to perform particular political or administrative tasks. They do not seem to have been permanently posted to any single locality. Guy Bunnens has aptly compared them to the Carolingian missi dominici.

At Ugarit we encounter “Sons of the King” redrawing the borders of the state, arbitrating between the queen and a tax official, and even ordering King ʿIbiraḫu to make the required appearance before his sovereign, the Great King. In the Emar documents the dumu.lugal are most often found as witnesses to various transactions in real estate and slaves. Their preeminence is signaled by their invariable position at the head of the list of witnesses.

In moving down the administrative hierarchy to more local officials, our sources are extensive enough to allow relatively detailed discussion only of the governments of Ugarit and of the region of Emar, that is, the Land of Aššuwa. Since the administration of Ugarit has already been extensively studied by others, I will confine myself here to a few remarks concerning the governance of Aššuwa. This area was the province of an official designated

---

of Ugarit is one of the litigants, while the final, fragmentary, tablet deals with a dispute between two high officials. Emar: Emar VI, 18, 177, 202; RE 54, 55.

47 In favor of the first alternative is Text B treated by A. Tsukimoto, “Sieben spätbronzezeitliche Urkunden aus Syrien,” ASJ 10 (1988) 157-160, in which three persons agree to settle their affairs “upon our arrival in Carchemish” (rev. 6'-7': nēnu ina ʿKarkamīš ina kaššādīni), but this may be atypical since those involved are all Hittite bureaucrats. In another text, however, persons who are certainly native Syrians include in a contract the following clause concerning a possible litigant: “let him (go) to the city of the king and swear” (Hirayama 5 [ASJ 12 (1990) 185-186], left edge 12-13: ana uru šarri šummani). This is more likely a reference to Carchemish than to either Emarsu or Ḫattuša.

48 F. Imparati, “‘Signori’ e ‘figli del re’,” Or 44 (1975) 80-95.

49 F. Pecchioli Daddi, Mestieri, professioni e dignita nell’Anatolia ittita (Roma, 1982) 503-512.

50 AbN 27 (1989) 27.

51 PRU III, 6f.

52 PRU IV, 189.

53 PRU IV, 191.

54 For example Emar VI, 182 and Hirayama 3.


56 M. Heltzer, The Internal Organization of the Kingdom of Ugarit (Wiesbaden, 1982). See also his The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit (Wiesbaden, 1976).
as the “Overseer of the Land,” written sumerographically ugunta.kalam.ma,57 or on occasion simply uguLa.58 He was apparently responsible for the entire southeastern region of Hittite Syria and traveled about from town to town in the performance of his duties, to judge from correspondence recovered at Emar.59 His attested activities include military intelligence,60 administrative oversight,61 and the witnessing of various legal transactions,62 as well as (probably passive) participation in the local cult.63 In witness lists he follows any “Son of the King” who might be present.

Native authority at Emar was held by the local king,64 as well as by the collegium of city elders,65 acting in most cases in conjunction with (the temple of?) the god whose name is written with the Sumerogram dNIN.URTA.66 These elders seized and resold the property of delinquent citizens67 and guaranteed various other legal transactions.68

Lawsuits are attested before the local king,69 before a group called “the great ones” (lú.meš gal),70 who may be identical to the elders, and before a “Son of the King.”71 Most

---

59 H.A. Hoffner has pointed out to me the great similarity between the duties of this official and those of the BEL MADGALTI, “margrave, district governor,” in Hittite Anatolia. On this latter official see the instructions text (CTH 261) edited by E. von Schuler, Hethitische Dienstanweisungen (Graz, 1957; AFO Beihfpte 10) 36-59.
60 Emar VI, 263.
61 Emar VI, 262.
63 Emar VI, 460.
66 The identity of the West Semitic deity hidden behind this Sumerian writing is uncertain. It is remarkable that this ideogram is not employed as a theophoric element in any personal name from Emar and its environs known to me. Presumably one of the phonetically-written divine names is its equivalent, yet with the exceptions of Dagan and Bašal, who are not in question here, no single deity is so frequently attested in personal names as to correspond to the prominence displayed by dNIN.URTA in the contracts and thus in the life of the city of Emar.
67 In many instances (e.g., Emar VI, 143-155), parcels of real property are sold by the “elders of the city of Emar” (šašu šibātu umu Emar)26 and the deity dNIN.URTA. Since there are far too many transactions of this type for them to represent a selling-off of temple property, and since no sales to dNIN.URTA are known, these actions must entail the disposal of some sort of delinquent property. On judicial matters at Emar in general see D. Arnaud, “Traditions urbaines et influences semi-nomades à Emar, à l’âge du bronze récent,” in J.-Cl. Margueron, ed., Le Moyen Euphrate (Leiden, 1980) 245-264.
68 The seal which D. Beyer, “Quelques vestiges de l’imagerie émarioite du Bronze Moyen,” MARI 6 (1990) 94, n. 7, has identified as that of dNIN.URTA (p. 95, No. 4; p. 96, No. 1) appears on the upper edge of many tablets from Emar, while the anepigraphic design which he recognizes as that of the dynastic seal (in four exemplars thus far known) is found even more frequently on the left edges of the tablets.
69 Emar VI, 212, RE 21. Note that the local king also often heads the list of witnesses to sales of real property.
70 Emar VI, 28, 252.
frequent by far, however, are cases brought to the attention of the king of Carchemish.\(^72\) It is not possible to determine how a certain official came to be responsible for a given matter, or to follow any particular case through appeal from instance to instance. It is also puzzling why a particular type of transaction is sometimes carried out before the local king and his court, sometimes before a Hittite official, and sometimes before what is to all appearances a group of ordinary citizens.\(^73\)

Finally, the Emar documents mention a fair number of other bureaucrats who, judging by their personal names, seem to be Syrian natives rather than Anatolian imperial officials. Among these are scribes\(^74\) (including the “chief scribe”\(^75\) and the “great scribe”\(^76\)), the “mayor” (\(hazammu\))\(^77\), and the “lord of the storehouse.”\(^78\) Little can be gleaned from our sources concerning their duties and responsibilities.

In summary, the Hittites did not impose a uniform system of government upon all of their Syrian realm. Rather, they installed a thin layer of imperial bureaucracy over the societal structures which they found upon their conquest, structures which could differ greatly from one another. (The activities of the Emariote elders, for instance, do not seem to be paralleled at Ugarit.) This picture, by the way, is in harmony with what we know about Hittite rule in outlying regions of Anatolia as well.

In normal times, the Syrian locals directed their own economic and internal political affairs, while rendering unto the Hittite Great King his due in tribute and services. It seems that Hittite authorities were active as judges or witnesses under three sets of circumstances: First, when the rulers of local Syrian polities were themselves parties to a dispute, this would of course necessitate imperial adjudication, since their treaties with Ḫatti denied vassals recourse to military force among themselves. Secondly, if a native of sufficient wealth and prestige was unable to obtain satisfaction from the local authorities in some matter, he might turn to a “Son of the King,” the king of Carchemish, or even the King of Ḫatti. Finally, a member of the local community might find it advantageous to put the prestige of the imperial service behind a legal settlement by arranging for the presence of a Hittite official at the head of his witnesses.

Further study of the ever-increasing number of published texts from the middle Euphrates region of this period, as well as their careful comparison with materials from Ugarit, will doubtlessly allow the refinement of the picture sketched here.


\(^{72}\) \textit{Emar} VI, 18, 19, 31, 177, 194, 201, 202, \textit{RE} 54, 55, 85.

\(^{73}\) For example, \textit{Emar} VI, 130, 144, 148 (but note the presence of the \(hazammu\) in this document).

\(^{74}\) Typical is the inclusion of “Baṣal-malik, son of Imlik-Dagan, scribe,” among the witnesses of \textit{Emar} VI, 90. More than seventy-five occurrences of this title are to be found in the published Emar texts. It is, however, interesting to note that in the majority of recorded transactions, scribes do not sign their work, or at least do not append their professional designation to their names should they appear among the witnesses.

\(^{75}\) \textit{Emar} VI, 212. Note also the “overseer of scribes” in \textit{Emar} VI, 315 (fragmentary).

\(^{76}\) \textit{Emar} VI, 201.

\(^{77}\) \textit{Emar} VI, 148, 149, 150, 157, 253, 254, \textit{RE} 16, 24, 34, 39, etc.

\(^{78}\) \textit{Emar} VI, 186, 212.