The zukru Festival in Emar:
On Royal Cooperation with the City
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The Akkadian legal documents from Late Bronze Emar in Syria reveal that under Hittite control, there were two official authorities in its society, i.e., the royal palace and the urban community. That the latter had its own authority is shown by the fact that it used its own seal (i.e., the ḫNIN.URTA seal) and its own eponymous years, as well as by a judicial decision of the king of Carchemish, the effective overlord of Emar, in which he treated the two authorities as equally important. However, unfortunately we have little information on how they interrelated. In this respect, a description of the zukru festival (Emar VI 373), celebrated only every seventh year by the people of Emar, is noteworthy. The king of Emar did not actually play any ritual part in it, but backed it as its main sponsor, providing offerings for the gods, as well as food and drink for the feast of the citizens. We can see here an endeavor of the king to strengthen a cooperative relationship with the city.
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I. The Local Authorities of Emar: Royal and Urban

The Emar texts of the thirteenth to the early twelfth century B.C. reveal that Emar on the middle Euphrates River was a vassal kingdom of the Hittite empire, while maintaining its own governing dynasty. However, it has been realized from the beginning of Emar studies that the city community, which was represented by the city god ḫNIN.URTA and the city elders, appears as a distinct entity (authority) from the royal authority in the Emar texts. For example, real-estate contracts show us that there were two groups which owned large landed property, the royal family on the one hand, and ḫNIN.URTA (and the elders) on the other. Furthermore, when contracts stipulate the payment of a fine by anyone making a claim against the contract, when a king or a prince sells (or buys) real estate, the recipient of the fine money is usually the palace (e.g., RE 9), only rarely ḫNIN.URTA and the city (e.g., RE 14), whereas when ḫNIN.URTA and the elders sell real estate, the recipient is usually ḫNIN.URTA and the city (e.g.,
Since Emar was a kingdom, the urban authority may ultimately have been under the royal authority. Nevertheless, the former was probably not just a simple component fully integrated into the latter’s administrative organization, but possessed its own authority. How can we prove this?

Firstly, it is known that there were two official seals in Emar, the so-called ‘dynastic seal’ of the royal authority, and the ‘dNIN.URTA seal’ of the urban authority. In legal documents, particularly real-estate contracts, in principle, the dynastic seal is impressed on ‘royal’ documents, that is, those in which a king or a prince sells or buys real estate and/or when he appears as the first witness of the contract (e.g., ASJ 12-T 8; ASJ 14-T), while the dNIN.URTA seal is impressed on ‘urban’ documents, that is, those in which dNIN.URTA and the elders sell real estate (e.g., ASJ 12-T 2). In the case of ‘royal & urban’ documents, that is, when dNIN.URTA and the elders sell real estate and a king or prince appears as the first witness, both seals are impressed (e.g., Emar VI 126).

Secondly, the occasionally attested year dates of the eponymous type, such as MU tu-ra-am-dá-ga-gen DUMU ku-un-shi 2.KAM.MA, “the second year of Turam-Dagan son of Kunši” (TS 16: 47f.), who is not a king, are found in documents issued by the urban authority, not by the royal authority. It is interesting to note that such year dates are never used in ‘royal’ documents but only in ‘urban’ documents as well as probably in the ‘royal & urban’ document RE 34. Since these must have been official year dates used institutionally, this suggests that the urban authority was in some way independent of the royal authority.

Thirdly, the text Emar VI 194 shows that Ini-Tešub, the king of Carchemish, the effective overlord of Emar, considered these two local entities to have equal authority. If my interpretation of the text is correct, when the king judged a dispute concerning the ownership of a piece of land between a party whose purchase document had the impression of the dynastic seal and another whose document had the impression of the dNIN.URTA seal, his decision was that the land should be divided in half. This giving equal weight to both local authorities probably reflected the real situation within Emar.

These points show that the urban authority was distinguished from the royal authority, and was almost a counterbalance. If this is accepted, one may ask next how they related to each other. Although, as mentioned above, there do exist ‘royal & urban’ documents, at present information concerning their relationship is quite poor in legal texts. In this respect, the zukru festival text
The *zukru* Festival in Emar

(Emar VI 373), which prescribes the procedures for the *zukru* festival and its preparatory rituals, is instructive.

II. The *zukru* Festival

Among the many Emar rituals (Emar VI 369-535), the most important in the religious life of the citizens must have been those designated as “festivals,” labeled with the Sumerogram EZEN. The followings are principal texts of rituals of this category:

- The NIN.DINGIR Installation (Emar VI 369);
- The maʾartu Installation (Emar VI 370);
- The *zukru* Festival (Emar VI 373);
- The kissu Festivals (Emar VI 385-88).

As already noted by Fleming (1992a, 99f.; 1992b, 60-63, 66-68), the rituals as described in these texts are remarkable in that, unlike other Syrian cities such as Ugarit, the king of Emar does not play a central ritual role in the local festivals. For example, in the NIN.DINGIR installation, it is not the king, but “the sons (i.e., citizens) of Emar” (Emar VI 369: 2) who choose and appoint the high priestess of Baʾlu (dIM).

Similarly, the *zukru* festival was performed by “the sons of the land of Emar” (Emar VI 373: 169). Although the *zukru* ritual (Emar VI 375) was performed annually by the city of “Emar” (l. 1), the *zukru* festival was celebrated only every seventh year. Both the annual ritual and the festival were dedicated to the regional god Dagan (Emar VI 375: 2), or more accurately, to Dagan *bel bukari*, “Lord of the Offspring” (Emar VI 373: 170). They were held for seven days, starting with the 15th day of the first month, that is the first full-moon day of the new year. It is interesting to note that this month is designated by the Sumerogram SAG.MU, “head of the year,” in the festival text (e.g., Emar VI 373: 38), while in the annual-ritual text it is called Zarati (Emar VI 375: 3), a word most probably related to “seed” and “sowing” (*dr*). This suggests that the *zukru* ritual and festival took place in autumn, the season of sowing.

Fleming (2000, 50-55) correctly pointed out that *Emar* VI 373 consists of two parallel parts. According to him, although both deal with the rites of the procession of Dagan and others out of and back to the city, Part I (ll. 1ff.) mainly concerns the offerings made to the gods, whereas Part II (ll. 169ff.) focuses on the procession rites. Both parts begin with the preparatory rituals carried out the preceding year in the months of SAG.MU and Niqali. As noted above, the *zukru* festival proper begins on the 15th of SAG.MU in the seventh year.
Fig. 1. Synopsis of the zukru Festival Text (Emar VI 373)

Part I (br.+ll. 1-168)

A. 15th(? day, month of SAG.MU(?), year 6 (br.+ll. 1-4)
   Uncertain contents
B. 25th day, month of SAG.MU, year 6 (ll. 5-9)
   Uncertain contents
C. Month of Niqali, year 6 (ll. 10-37)
   1. 24th day (ll. 10-16): preparatory to the ritual
      Distribution of offerings to all the gods; preparation of sheep
   2. 25th day (ll. 17-37)
      a. Procession of all the gods, šaššabittu-spirits and Dagan (bēl lībitti) (to
         the gate of the sikkānu-stones); offering and feasting! (ll. 17-33)
      b. Anointing the (sikkānu-)stones; kubadu-rite at the city gate of battle;
         return to the city with breads, beverages and meat (ll. 34-37)
D. Month of SAG.MU, year 7 (ll. 38-168): zukru festival proper
   1. 14th day (ll. 38-43): preparatory to the festival
      Preparation of 70 lambs and offerings for all the gods (ll. 38-41a); the
      same for the later day (ll. 41b-43)
   2. 15th day (ll. 44-64): first day of the festival
      a. Procession of Dagan (bēl bukari), all the gods and šaššabittu-spirits
         to the gate of the sikkānu-stones; offering and feasting! (ll. 44-59)
      b. Anointing the sikkānu-stones; lesser kubadu-rite at the city gate of
         battle; return to the city with breads, beverages and meat (ll. 60-64)
   3. Intervening Five(?)-day period in the festival (br.+ll. 65-74)
      a. Second(?) day of the festival: uncertain contents (br.+ll. 65-67)
      b. Intervening five(?) days in the festival: uncertain contents (ll. 68-72)
      c. Sixth(?) day of the festival: uncertain contents (ll. 73f.)
   4. Seventh day of the festival (ll. 75-168): last day of the festival
      a. Grand offering to all the gods of Emar (ll. 75-162+br.)
         * Heading (l. 75)
         * Offering to the three tiers of gods (ll. 76-95; 96-112; 113-162+br.)
      b. (broken); Dagan’s passage between the sikkānu-stones; dNIN.URTA’s
         joining Dagan; lesser kubadu-rite at the city gate of battle; anointing the
         stones(?); (broken) (br.+ll. 163-168)
Part II (ll. 169-206)

Heading (ll. 169-170a)
A. 15th day, month of SAG.MU, year 6 (ll. 170b-179)
    Procession of Dagan (bêl bukari) (and all the gods to the gate of the sikkânû-stones); lesser kubadu-rite at the gate of the sikkânû-stones; offering and feasting; Dagan’s passage between the sikkânû-stones; dNIN.URTA’s joining Dagan; procession of Šaggar; return to the city with breads and meat

B. 25th(? day, month of Niqali, year 6 (ll. 180-185)
    Procession of Dagan (bêl bukari) and all the gods to the gate of the sikkânû-stones; Dagan’s passage between the sikkânû-stones; dNIN.URTA(’s joining) Dagan; return to the city with breads and meat

C. Month of SAG.MU, year 7 (ll. 186-204): zukru festival proper
1a. 14th day (ll. 186-187a): preparatory to the first day
    Distribution of the prepared lambs to the gods

1b. 15th day (ll. 187b-194): first day of the festival
    Procession of Dagan (bêl bukari), all the gods and šaššabîttu-spirits to the gate of the sikkânû-stones; offering (and feasting); Dagan’s passage between the sikkânû-stones; the same rite (cf. I.C.2.b) at the city gate of battle; return to the city with breads and meat

2. Sixth day of the festival (ll. 195ff.): preparatory to the last day
    Distribution of the prepared lambs to the gods

3. Seventh day of the festival (ll. 197-204): last day of the festival

    Procession of Dagan, all the gods and šaššabîttu-spirits (to the gate of the sikkânû-stones); the same rite (cf. I.D.4.b) and feasting!; burning up all the meat and breads; Dagan’s passage between the sikkânû-stones; dNIN.URTA’s joining Dagan; the same rite (cf. I.D.4.b); (return to the city without breads and meat)

Appendix (ll. 205+br.+206)
    Heading (l. 205); (broken); “total: 700 lambs (and) 50 calves” (l. 206)
synopsis of *Emar* VI 373, the zukru festival text (Fig. 1; note: br. = broken lines), is a modification of Fleming’s outline (ibid., 55 Fig. 7). The following points are to be noted:

1. The relationship between Parts I and II is to be understood as complementary, since Part II was written in dependence on Part I. In this respect, we can see that Part II omits (\(\varnothing\)), adds (e.g., ll. 184b-185) to, substantially duplicates (e.g., ll. 184b-185) or summarizes (e.g., ll. 187b-188) the Part I text (ll. 34, \(\varnothing\), 37b, 44-47, respectively). Although it is true that Part I has detailed accounts of offerings, its accounts of procession rites can thus be regarded as indispensable, too. This indicates that Part I can be regarded as a composite version of the festival text, combining the processions and offerings together. On the other hand, the lack of the accounts of offerings in Part II is possibly due to deliberate omission. However, note that l. 206 at the end of Part II (Appendix) after a breakage refers to the “total” (\(\text{ŠU.NÍGIN}\)) number of lambs and calves (to be expended during the festival), presuming the existence of a precedent list of animals at least (cf. ll. 18b-33). This suggests the possibility that Part II is a separate version, which deals with the offerings in the broken part (bottom of Col. IV).

2. The poorly preserved text, br.+ll. 65-74, is problematic. According to the ruled lines, this part is to be divided into three sections (X-Z): X = br.+ll. 65-67; Y = ll. 68-72; Z = ll. 73f. The first fact to be noticed is that the text of section Y (l. 69), “(for?) seven(?) days” (Fleming 2000, 242f.), is actually written \(5\{n\}\ u_{4}\{mi\}, “(for) five(+) days.”\ Since section X does not seem to belong to I.D.2.b of my synopsis in Fig. 1, which describes the first day of the festival (cf. II.C.1b which has almost the same ending), but is possible to connect to section Y, we may reasonably assume that it refers to the second day. This then suggests that Y deals with the non-special five days (reading \(5\ u_{4}\{mi\}), in between the first and the last days of the festival. As for section Z, which can hardly be a part of the following I.D.4, a description of the last day (see (3) below), when we compare it with II.C.2, which describes preparations for the last day, it seems likely that it should be assigned to the sixth day. However, we prefer to present this section as I.D.3.c rather than independently as *I.D.4, since the preparation on the sixth day has been prescribed in ll. 41b-43, and the preserved text of Z may perhaps be regarded as an offering rite.

3. Although Fleming renders \(U_{4}.7.\text{KÁM ša Ezan.zu-uk-ri}\) (l. 75; without *ina, “on”) as “for the seven days of the zukru festival” (2000, 243), in my opinion this is to be taken as “(on) the seventh day of ...”\ We see that in *Emar* VI 373 whenever \(U_{4}.n.\text{KÁM}\) (usually with *ina) occurs, it refers to an ordinal day
of a month (ll. 5, 10, 17, 39, 44, 171, 186, 187) or of the festival (ll. 195, 197),
and the way to write “for n days” is different as we saw in (2) above.
Furthermore, if one takes his rendering literally, it suggests that the people of
Emar offered, for example, nineteen calves to the gods of the first tier (ll. 76-95;
see Table 1 below) every day for the seven days. In this case, the total would
be 133 calves. However, Emar was not so rich; this greatly exceeds its budget of
“700 lambs (and) fifty calves” in total as stated in l. 206, although this is not
particularly modest for a festival (see Fleming 2000, 48 n. 1).21

According to Fleming’s analysis by “the ritual logic of the texts” (2000, 54,
56-76), the present form of the zukru festival was a result of three stages of
expansion from a core event, a single visit to the shrine of sikkānu-stones, i.e.,
(two rows of) upright stones, outside the city and the rites performed there.
The first expansion developed this event into the seven-day celebration seen in
the annual zukru, with two visits, one on the first day and one on the last day of
the ritual. In the second expansion, it was enlarged into a seven-year cycle,
climaxed by the festival. Finally, in the third expansion, the preparatory days in
the sixth year were added.

III. The Royal Involvement in the Festival
Fleming’s reconstruction of the ritual expansions is probably correct in general.
However, what is important for our concern is the present form of the festival. If
one considers only the structure of the zukru festival proper, one might regard
the two processions to the gate of the sikkānu-stones on the first and the last
days as just the opening and closing ceremonies of the festival, while the main
event occurs between them, i.e., the grand offerings made to all the gods of
Emar on the last day (Emar VI 373: 75ff.) before the final procession. It is
interesting to note that a strong royal involvement in the festival is most clearly
visible in this part: the royal authority (referred to as “king” or “palace”) provides all that the people offer.

The gods are divided into three tiers according to the amount of offerings
they receive. As shown in Table 1 (cf. also Fleming 2000, 59 Fig. 8), each of the
nineteen (groups of) gods of the first tier, such as Dagan beł bukari (l. 77) and
(the pair) d30 and dUTU24 (l. 81), receives “one calf and ten pure lambs, one sātu
(and) one qū (i.e., eleven qūs) of pappāsu-bread, one qū of barley bread, one
[HA(?)-vessel], and one kurkurru-vessel, from the palace” (ll. 76-95). The
fifteen (groups of) gods of the second tier receive similar but somewhat less
offerings (ll. 96-112), and the more than forty-nine of the third tier receive less
still (ll. 113-162+br.).
Likewise, on the occasions of other offerings, the role of the king is dominant. Since the texts on the offering for the first day of the festival (the 15th of SAG.MU) and the last day are not well preserved (ll. 48-59; broken [bottom of Col. III]), let us look at the similar description of the preparatory ritual held on

**Table 1. Grand Offerings on the Last Day of the Festival**

Abbreviations: K = king; P = palace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>calf</th>
<th>lamb</th>
<th>pappasu bread</th>
<th>barley bread</th>
<th>HA(?) vessel</th>
<th>hubbar vessel</th>
<th>kurkurru vessel</th>
<th>provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First tier (19 groups)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second tier (15 groups)a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[1?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K [or P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third tier (49+ groups)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K [or P]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The king provides all the gods of this tier with ḫardu-vessels as well (l. 112).

**Table 2. Offerings and Provisions on the 25th of Niqali (ll. 17-33)**

Abbreviations: C = city; K = king; P = palace; prv. = provider; T = temple (Ē DINGIR-li)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>calf</th>
<th>sheep</th>
<th>pappasu bread</th>
<th>barley bread</th>
<th>HA vessel</th>
<th>hubbar vessel</th>
<th>kurkurru vessel</th>
<th>prv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dagan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4NIN.URTA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šaššabittu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 DNs of P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. See n. 24.
As is indirectly shown in Table 2, the city, whose citizens celebrate the festival, plays little role as provider. Although the bulk of offerings and provisions are shared by the royal authority (the king and the palace) and the temple (lit. “house of the god”), most probably Temple M1 where the zukru texts were uncovered, it is the king who plays a dominant role, as we see particularly in the fact that he, rather than the temple, provides the animal offerings.

In view of the above data, it is obvious that the main sponsor of the zukru festival is the royal authority (Fleming 2000, 56-59). The next question is whether this is also true of the annual zukru ritual. The text of Emar VI 375 is in bad state of preservation, but as far as the legible part is concerned, no royal involvement can be discerned for either the 15th of Zarati (ll. 3-27) or the seventh and last day of the ritual (ll. 28-44; cf. ll. 45f.). Based on this, Fleming (op.cit., 57, 106) observed that for the annual zukru it seems only the city and the temple are financial sponsors and the scale of provision is moderate. If so, the difference between the festival and the annual ritual with respect to the royal sponsorship is striking.

In this regard, it is interesting to note that Emar VI 373: 169-179 and also ll. 1-4 deal with the preparatory ritual to the zukru festival performed on the 15th of SAG.MU in the sixth year (Fleming 2000, 55 Fig. 7), in other words, on the first day of the annual zukru of that year (cf. ibid., 64). Let us examine these valuable texts.

The relevant text in Part II (ll. 169-179) prescribes only the procedure of the rites (cf. section II above) and does not provide any information concerning royal involvement. However, the first three lines of the preserved Part I text read as follows:

(1) [ ... NINDA.papa-su] 2 BÁN [ ... papa]-pāsu-[bread], two šatru of (2) [ ... ] x ša LUGAL a-na 4KUR [ ... ] of the king to Dagan (3) [ ... a-na pa]-ni 4KUR [ ... before Dagan

Although the text is fragmentary, there is no doubt that something of the king’s is offered to Dagan (restoring SISKUR(-u) or the like at the beginning of l. 3). This indicates that the king was involved in this ritual as a provider. Then the question arises as to whether this is a feature of the annual zukru or one specific to the sixth year, which is taken as the initial preparatory ritual for the festival.
At present this question remains open, but we may say at least that the royal sponsorship of the *zukru* was not restricted to the festival proper.

**IV. Conclusion**

The *zukru* festival must have been one of the most important festivals celebrated by the citizens of Emar. Although the king of Emar did not play a central ritual role, he backed it as its main sponsor. This may be regarded as royal desire to intervene in the urban activities (Fleming 2000, 74). Although I do not disregard this aspect, the involvement was limited to providing provisions for the offerings and feasting, and did not involve performing the core element of the festival. This suggests that the royal authority took care not to interfere with the initiative of the urban authority regarding the procedures of the traditional festival. In this sense, we may see here another aspect, i.e., the positive endeavor of the king to reinforce a cooperative relationship with the city, using the opportunity of the *zukru* festival.

**Appendix 1: Forgotten Texts?**

Curiously enough, two fragmentary portions of a text preserved on Msk 74292a (handcopy: Arnaud 1985, 613) are excluded from both Arnaud’s and Fleming’s editions, if I am not mistaken.

Firstly, one finds on the right edge (cf. Arnaud 1985, 617 for its width), after a broken part, what is apparently a textual continuation of *Emar VI* 373: 99f.: (1’) [x x a-na ǂ]KUR SISKUR-[(u)] and (2’) [x x x] x ša É DINGIR-[li].

In view of the fact that l. 99 is a short line, both seem to be continuation of l. 100. Since l. 2’ corresponds to this line and SISKUR seems to be a verb (*naqû*) at the end of a sentence or clause, we take first l. 2’ and then l. 1’ as its continuation. If this is correct, adding <KI.MIN> (“ditto”) at the end of l. 99, we get the following as a possible reading of l. 100:

\[
\text{a-na} ǂ\text{KUR EN kar-še ki-i ša} \left(\text{4KUR-\text{ma} EN x [x x x] x ša É DINGIR-[li]} \right) / \left(\text{[a-na} ǂ\text{KUR SISKUR-[(u)]}\right)
\]

To Dagan *bēl karšē*, (lit.) just as Dagan *bēl* ... offers ... of the temple [to] Dagan.

Secondly, again on the right edge, we have a text written in the vertical direction which reads:
The zukru Festival in Emar

1’ i-na U₄.1.KÁM [ On the first day [
2’ NINDA.MEŠ KAŠ.MEŠ x [ breads (and) beverages [
3’ i-na U₄.2[(+n)].KÁM On the second(?) day [

Appendix 2: dKUR.GAL in Emar VI 378

As mentioned above, Dagan proper is referred to as Dagan (dKUR) in the ‘pantheon’ list (Emar VI 373: 79). Now, it is noteworthy that there is a DN list (Emar VI 378) which is particularly similar to the list of the gods of the first tier in the zukru festival.²⁹ For comparison, let us look at the beginning parts of both texts (showing only the DNs listed in Emar VI 373; cf. Fleming 1992a, 243f.):

Emar VI 373

77 dKUR EN b-[u-ka-ri]
78 ³IM
79 dKUR
80 Ṗê-a
81 ³30 u ³UTU
82 ³NIN.URTA
— omitted —
86 ³NIN.KUR [³ša-ag-ga-ar u ³hal-ma]

Emar VI 378

1 [³KUR]₃⁰ EN b[u-ka-ri]
2 ṢeNIN.LÌL *DAM³¹ dKUR EN b-u-[k[a-ri]
3 dKUR.GAL
4 dIM u Ṣhê-ka-ar
5 dê-a u Ṣdam-ki-an-na
6 Ṣ50 u ṢUTU
7 ³NIN.URTA u DİNGIR.MES ša É-ti
8 Ṣša-as-ša-bit-ti
— omitted —
12 ³NIN.KUR Ṣša-ag-ga-ar u Ṣhal-ma

There is no doubt that dKUR.GAL in Emar VI 378: 3 corresponds to Dagan proper (³KUR) in Emar VI 373: 79, although it is problematic that the one list has him and the other list has ³IM in the position of the actual pantheon head in Emar. Otherwise these lists are parallel, with additions of three female spouses (³NIN.LÌL, Ḥebat and Damkianna) in Emar VI 378.

Fleming (1994; 2000, 89 n. 174) sees Enlil’s epithet in Mesopotamia, i.e., “the great mountain,” behind dKUR.GAL. He says the link between them is another of Dagan’s epithets attested in the above Mari text (A.1258+: 9; see n. 12): “Dagan, the great mountain (KUR.GAL // ša-du-ú ra-bu-ú).” Dagan’s taking of Enlil’s epithet is explained as “by virtue of shared status as pantheon heads.”

I do agree with him that in the middle Euphrates region Enlil was regarded
as Dagan as the pantheon head (cf. Yamada 1996, 302f.) but think that *Emar VI* 378 sheds light on the details of this equation. All we can say from ll. 1f. is that dNIN.LÍL, Enlil’s spouse, is regarded as the wife of Dagan bêl bukari. This means that the god equated here with Enlil is Dagan bêl bukari, not Dagan proper (l. 3), in a strict sense. But then, why is Dagan proper named with the epithet of his another form of lesser status? Or rather more simply, why did not the scribe spell his name properly as dKUR (or as da-gan) here?

I would suggest taking dKUR.GAL as “Dagan the Great(est),” although admittedly a DN with an adjective is unusual. It is possible that the GAL is an indicator put by the scribe to distinguish Dagan proper from his other forms such as Dagan zikri (l. 16b) and Dagan bêl mišla (l. 24b), particularly Dagan bêl bukari (l. 1), as in the case of “the Father” (see n. 12).

Then, one may ask why dIM (l. 4), Ea (l. 5), d30, dUTU (l. 6), dNIN.URTA (l. 7) and dNIN.KUR (l. 12), who have other forms in this list, are mentioned without GAL. In this respect, note that their identification as DNs proper is shown by their association with others: dIM and Ea are listed with their spouses, d30 (moon-god) and dUTU (sun-god) occur as a pair, dNIN.KUR probably constitutes a triad with the other two gods, and dNIN.URTA is listed with the šaššabittu-spirit (of his temple) in l. 8 (cf. *Emar VI* 373: 25, 45). Only Dagan proper has no such means to identify himself but GAL.

In view of the above, dKUR.GAL is likely to be regarded, not as the deified Great Mountain, but as the genuine and supreme Dagan among Dagans.

Notes
1 In reference to texts from Emar and its vicinity, the following abbreviations (usually with text no.) are used below: *ASJ 12-T* = Tsukimoto 1990; *ASJ 13-T* = Tsukimoto 1991; *ASJ 14-T* = Tsukimoto 1992a; 1992b (without text no.); *Ekalte* = Mayer 2001; *Emar VI* = Arnaud 1986; *Iraq 54-T* = Dalley and Teissier 1992; *RE* = Beckman 1996; *TS* = Arnaud 1991.

2 For their seal impressions, see Beyer 2001, 206-209 (E2a-d and E1a-b, respectively). It is interesting to note that, as Seidl observes (2006, 305), the dynastic seal of Emar is impressed on an Ekalte text, *Ekalte* 25 (for photograph, see Mayer 2001, Taf. 57). Werner 2004 (Nr. 4585) was not available to me.

3 See Yamada 1994, 60f.; Beyer 2001, 430-437. To my knowledge, the following texts can be recognized as exceptional cases to the above principles: (1) ‘royal’ documents: *Emar VI* 8*, 156, 159* (*: exchange of real estate); cf. also no. 17; (2) ‘urban’ documents: *Emar VI* 148; (3) ‘royal & urban’ documents: *Iraq 54-T* 4.

4 For the lists of data, see Yamada 1995, 110f. (cf. 1996, 299f.) with 2000, 119; Fleming 2000, 205; Adamthwaite 2001, 17; Pruzsinszky 2003, 17-19. The following occurrences are ignored in the latter three studies:


(2) the first/second year of Tura(m)-Dagan (*Emar VI* 149: 38): [MU tžu-[aš-]am]-da-gan [...]
The zukru Festival in Emar

cf. [MU]-tu KA[LA.GA] (Arnaud 1986, 165). Note that the scribe Ehli-Kuša elsewhere always uses the eponymous type when he writes year dates (e.g., Emar VI 148: 31f.; TS 16: 47f. above).

On the other hand, I hesitated to include the alleged eponymous year, MU DUMU7 x x x x, in RE 16: 37 (Beckman’s reading; scribe: Abi-kapi), in my above list, suspecting it rather to be a year name MU x x x x (Yamada 2000, 119, 129 n. 5), since Abi-kapi once refers to "(the year of) hostility (and) distress ..." of year-name type in TS 9: 21f., and no scribe has been known to use both types when he refers to specific years.

See Yamada 1996, 300-302. Note that the ‘royal & urban’ documents could be written by scribes belonging to either the royal authority (Abi-kapi, Belu-malik, Ea-damiq and Ia-Dagan) or the urban authority (Alal-abu! [see immediately below] and Dagan-belu). See Yamada 2000, 120.

As for the above ‘royal & urban’ document RE 34, we may reasonably assume the occurrence of an eponymous year in l. 37 (ITI ḫal-ma M[U ... ]), since its scribe Alal-abu uses an eponymous year in TS 19: 33. That RE 34, in which 4IN.URTA and the elders sell a house, is not an ‘urban’ document (so Yamada 2000, 124; cf. also 120), but a ‘royal & urban’ document, was demonstrated by Skaist (1998, 59f. n. 35): the first witness, “Iaši-Dagan son of Ba’lu-malik” (l. 29), is to be identified with Iaši-Dagan, father of Ba’lu-kabar, who appears to be the first local king attested in the Emar texts (RE 2: 24-24a; 16: 27f.; TS I: 17 f.). But the RN in RE 34: 29 is to be read as in ša?-ša-du>-gan’i or the like, not Ya-ši-[i]-Daḫtu-gan’i (so Skaist), since there is no space for restoring the DA-sign in view of Beckman’s handcopy.

Concerning eponymous years, Adamthwaite (2001, 20f.) argues, in my opinion correctly, that they are restricted to early texts in Emar. However, he somehow ignores the serious chronological problem caused by the witness list of Asj 14-T (with “Ba’lu-kabar son of Elli” as the first witness), apparently one of the latest texts, in comparison with those lists in the early texts RE 16 and TS I (with Iaši-Dagan, father of Ba’lu-kabar) as well as RE 14 (with “Ba’lu-kabar son of Iaši-Dagan”). For this problem, see Yamada 2000, 122f., 131 n. 27.

For details see Yamada 1993b; cf. also Yamada 2007, 794f. and nn. 15, 17.

For the Emar festivals in general with remarks on their importance, see Fleming 1992a, 199-263; Fleming 1996, 88 n. 22.


Emar VI 385: 27-38 (kissu for Ereskilgal) and 386: 1-11’ (kissu for Ea) have been reedited by Tsukimoto as Asj 14-T 49 (HCCT-E 1 + Msk 74298c).

Reedited in Fleming 2000, 258-265. I follow his lineation when referring to this text below.

Reading and translation following Fleming 2000, 88-90, but buqaru, “flock, herd, bovines” (most recently Pentiu 2001, 36f.) is also possible.

This festival god is consistently referred to as just Dagan in Emar VI 375 (ll. 2, 3, 10, 19, 27, 29, 43) except for once as Dagan ūši zukru, “Head of the zukru” (l. 17). In Emar VI 373, he is called Dagan bēl bukari (once Dagan EN ŠIP.GI/bēl libitti, “Lord of the Brickwork,” in l. 18) at the first reference to him in each section of the procession rites (e.g., ll. 18, 45, 171, 187) and thereafter is called just Dagan (e.g., ll. 19, 20, 22, 48, 50, 174, 189, 192). Cf. also Fleming 2000, 88 and n. 171.

On the other hand, Dagan proper is written Dagan (‘KUR) without any epithet in l. 79 (‘pantheon’ list) and possibly also in l. 197. But when the scribe wanted to refer precisely to him, distinguishing him from “Dagan” (bēl bukari) in ll. 189, 192, he called him Dagan abuma, “Dagan the Father” (l. 190; cf. also l. 177). Fleming regards this as an example of Dagan’s epithet “the father of the (great) gods,” attested in the Aleppo citadel stone and the Mari bilingual text A.1258+: 9 (most recently 2000, 90f. and n. 178). This is certainly possible.
However, in view of the fact that the expression is just “the father,” not “father of the gods,” in this context the reference seems to be to Dagan proper as the father of his other forms, i.e., the gods mostly named according to the pattern of Dagan bel X, “Dagan Lord of X,” mentioned in ll. 77ff. (for their list see ibid., 88 n. 167), particularly as the father of Dagan bel bukari. Cf. also Appendix 2 below.

13 For these general features, see Fleming 1996, 91-93; 2000, 48f. For comparison with annual festivals in biblical Israel, see Fleming 1999a; 1999b.


15 I.e., the second month. See Fleming 2000, 63 and n. 49, 200, 213; cf. also Cohen 1993, 18, 266, 343; Adamthwaite 2000, 170, 176, 178f.

16 This is clear from the fact that sometimes Part II (ll. 189b-190a, 193, 198b-199a, 204b; cf. ll. 195f.) refers back to something already written in Part I, as observed by Fleming (2000, 52f.). For example, “they give the offerings to the gods as written on the tablet” (ll. 189b-190a) referring to ll. 48-58. He notes that “just as for the consecration day (ûmi qaqqatu)” (l. 193) refers to the 25th of Nıqalı (ibid., 53 and n. 16, 65 and n. 59, 257).

17 According to Fleming’s handcopy (2000, 294); cf. Arnaud 1985, 630 (Msk 74297c).

18 On Emar VI 369, the NIN.DINGIR installation, Fleming (1992a, 68; see also 54 n. 17) remarked that the phrase U₄.7.KĂM, “for seven days” (ll. 51, 54, 57) must be distinguished from phrases with ina, such as i-na U₄.3.KĂM (text B) // i-na 3 U₄-mi (text A), “on the third day” (l. 48; cf. also i-na U₄.7.KĂM in l. 76). Although we admit he is correct, in l. 59 we see ū u₄-mi EGIŔ-ki (text B), “on the last day” // [i-na x u₄]-mî (text A), “[on the (last?) day]” (see ibid., 23, 42, 56). This suggests that a phrase without ina can occasionally denote an ordinal day.

19 Note that ina U₄.[7.KĂM(?)], “from the [seven] days,” in l. 199 (Fleming 2000, 250f.) is a little problematic, since the visible sign has three oblique wedges and one vertical wedge, unlike UD (= U₄), according to his collation note (ibid., 300; cf. Arnaud 1985, 616). But if his reading is correct (with U₄), it must mean “from (lit. of) the [seventh] day,” corresponding to the topic of ll. 197-204 as indicated in l. 197 (i-na U₄.7.KĂM).

20 As Emar VI 369: 49 prescribes: U₄.7.KĂM 2 UDU i-na u₄-mi-na a-na DINGIR.MEŠ ... SISKUR-u, “for seven days, two sheep on each day they will offer to the gods ...” (Fleming 1992a, 54f. and n. 17; cf. also ll. 50b-51a). On Emar VI 373: 75ff., Fleming himself (2000, 68-70, 72) assumes a seven-day period of offerings to all the gods and of feasting of all the citizens, keeping in mind that this intervening period between the opening and closing rites is commonly observed in the Emar festivals: the NIN.DINGIR and the mašt’artu installations (seven days); also the kissu for Dagan in Emar VI 385: 1-26 (three days). According to him, all the offerings of Emar VI 373: 76-162-br. are in some way made and consumed throughout these seven days, although the account of details (of how to divide them by seven days?) was lost by the damage to the tablet (top of Col. II). This is unlikely, however. If he were correct, the sum of these offerings for the seven days and those in the procession rites on the first and the last days would equal the total number of offerings expended during the festival. But more were expended, as can be clearly observed in the case of calves (see the following note). For our interpretation of this part (br.-Il. 65-74), see (2) above.

21 When and for what were these animals offered?

(1) For the procession rites on the first day and then again on the last day (cf. ll. 41b-43); twelve calves in l. 59 (following Fleming 2000, 240, 253) and at least eighty-four lambs, i.e., seventy from the king set aside for all the seventy gods of Emar on the 14th of SAG.MU in l. 39 plus fourteen from the city provided in ll. 48 (ten), 52 (two), 54 (two). Note that the “seventy” lambs (l. 39) must be the minimum provided by the king: cf., e.g., his(?) one sheep set aside for dNIN.URTA in l. 13 vs. his two sheep actually provided for him in l. 23.

(2) For the grand offering on the last day (ll. 76ff.): nineteen calves and 10 × 19 + 5 × 15 + 2 × (49+n) = 363+2n lambs (see Table 1 below).

Thus on the first and the last days a total of forty-three (= 12 × 2 + 19) calves and at least 531 (=
84 × 2 + 363 + 2n) lambs were offered. This leaves seven calves and at most 169 lambs to be expended between the second and the sixth days of the festival. Anyway, it is remarkable that more than half of the 700 lambs and fifty calves, particularly the more than 363 lambs of the grand offering, are consumed on the last day alone.

22 For sikkānu see most recently Fleming 2000, 82-87; Pentiu 2001, 156-159 (with previous literature).

23 This is of course superficial. Reading carefully the text of Emar VI 373, one realizes that among the rituals described there, only in the zukru festival does Dagan pass between the sikkānu-stones with his uncovered, i.e., unveiled, face and he does it both on the first and the last day. “By this preference, Dagan’s passage between the stones was made the ritual center of the zukru” (Fleming 2000, 92f.).

24 There is no doubt that these two gods receive offerings jointly here, as three palace gods (i.e., Bēlet-ekallī, and 3TU and 4TU of the palace; cf. ll. 87, 89f.) receive one calf on the 25th of Niqali in the sixth year: on that day in total “four calves” (l. 33) are provided, two (l. 18) for Dagan (i.e., Dagan bēl bukari/šibitti; see nn. 12, 32), one (l. 26) for the šašṭabītu-spirit of the dNIN.URTA temple and one (l. 30) for those three palace gods. For šašṭabītī see Pentiu 2001, 167f.; also Fleming 2000, 78-82.

Concerning the ritual in Niqali, it is interesting to note also that in total “forty sheep” (l. 33) are provided. Eight(?) i.e., six from the king and [two?] from the city (ll. 18f.; restoration above, and dNIN.URTA (l. 13). These sheep are most likely set aside for the offering to the gods on the 25th day. If so, for example, the above three sheep provided for dNIN.URTA on the 25th (l. 23) must include the one of the 24th day, but that means this sheep is counted double in the above total of forty sheep. This is the same also in the case of Dagan (bēl bukari). Compare the “one calf (and one) pur[e] lamb” sacrificed for him (l. 22), which must come from the two calves and six sheep provided by the king (ll. 18f.; see Fleming, ibid., n. a), to “one calf (and one lamb)” set aside for him on the 14th of SAG.MU in the seventh year (l. 41). Furthermore, if Fleming’s restoration of Bēlet-ekallī in l. 15 (ibid., 236) is correct, since one sheep is set aside for him there, one of the sheep provided for the above palace gods (l. 30) too is doubly treated. Instead of having three overlapping sheep, I suggest restoring “five” in place of “two” in l. 19 for the number of sheep the city provided for Dagan (bēl bukari). In this case, the city would provide for him, dNIN.URTA and the šašṭabītu-spirit, five, one (l. 23) and one (l. 26) sheep, respectively; note that the city provides these three gods with just double those numbers on the first day of the zukru festival, i.e., ten, two and two, in ll. 48, 52, 54 (see n. 21).

25 The similarity in offered items and the providers is not in doubt, although as far as the numbers of calves and sheep/lambs are concerned, the size of the offering in this ritual, four calves and forty sheep (l. 33), is smaller than that of the first day of the festival: twelve calves and at least eighty-four lambs (see n. 21 above). The uncertainty concerning the providers for the people (l. 20) and the three palace gods (l. 31) can be clarified on the basis of the parallel text for the first day of the festival: they are the temple (l. 51; see the following note) and the king (ll. 57f.), respectively.

26 Fleming renders E DINGIR-li as the “House of the Gods” (2000, 36-38 with n. 80). However, this is orthographically difficult, since in Emar VI 373 “gods” (pl.) is always written DINGIR.MEŠ (ll. 11, 17, 36, 37, 40, 42, 46, 59, 61, 63, 75, 112, 165, 167, 168, 180, 184, 187, 188, 190, 194, 196, 197, 198), whereas, e.g., ekullu (sg.), “palace,” is always spelled E.GAL-li in genitive forms (ll. 29 [twice], 32, 40, 46 [twice], 58 [twice], 77, 87, 108, 141). Furthermore,
it seems to me natural that a scribe belonging to Temple M₁ would call it simply “the temple” in this text. On its association with the city, see Fleming, op.cit., 39-42.

Note also that the other offerings made to all the gods at the city gate of battle on the same day are provided only by the king (ll. 35-37a; cf. also Arnaud 1985, 615). However, Fleming’s reading is undoubted, since “the day of Saggara” on the same line can be no other than the 15th day (see ibid., 256; also 70ff.). As for the fragmentary text (ll. 1-4), the parallelism between Parts I and II seen above (cf. Fig. 1) certainly supports his interpretation that it corresponds to ll. 169-179.

In fact, besides the Dagan bel bukari mentioned at the head of the list in Emar VI 378, the reference to “the gods of ‘the seven sowers’ (of the palace)” in l. 42’ (cf. Emar VI 373: 40) confirms its connection with the zukru festival (see Fleming 2000, 58f. and n. 31). As for the fragmentary text (ll. 1-4), the parallelism between Parts I and II seen above (cf. Fig. 1) certainly supports his interpretation that it corresponds to ll. 169-179.

Unfortunately the number “15” (l. 171) is heavily damaged (handcopy: Fleming 2000, 299; cf. also Arnaud 1985, 664). However, Fleming’s reading is undoubted, since “the day of aggar” on the same line can be no other than the 15th day (see ibid., 256; also 70ff.). As for the fragmentary text (ll. 1-4), the parallelism between Parts I and II seen above (cf. Fig. 1) certainly supports his interpretation that it corresponds to ll. 169-179.

Following Fleming’s reading (1992a, 222, 243). In view of the handcopy (Arnaud 1985, 582), there is enough space for this restoration in the lacuna. Cf. [\textfootnote{d}En bu-q[ä]-r] (Arnaud 1980, 372).


On the other hand, since Dagan bel bukari is equated with Enlil, it is not surprising that he was regarded as Dagan proper in a general sense. This would explain why he is called just Dagan in the zukru texts (Emar VI 373, 375; see n. 12 above). I doubt that every form of his, such as Dagan bel ippat, “Lord of the Quiver,” who belongs to the third tier of the gods (Emar VI 373: 154), could be treated like him. Although Dagan bel libitti (l. 18 in Part I) is also called simply Dagan (e.g., ll. 19, 20, 22), he must be in some way equated with Dagan bel bukari as the parallel Part II text shows (l. 180; cf. also l. 12). Dagan bel libitti is mentioned also in Emar VI 380: 3.

Another reference to $\textdagger{KUR.GAL}$ in a list of sacrifices(?) for sixteen DNs (Emar VI 382) can be similarly explained. Among them only $\textdagger{NIN.KUR}$ (l. 1) and $\textdagger{KUR.GAL}$ (l. 10) receive two portions, whereas the other gods, including $\textdagger{IM}$ (l. 2), receive only one. No reference to Dagan (without epithet) is found, but three other forms of his are mentioned after $\textdagger{KUR.GAL}$ in ll. 11, 13, 16. It seems likely that here also $\textdagger{KUR.GAL}$ is Dagan proper, with GAL used to distinguish him from those three forms.

I.e., $\textdagger{IM}$’s in l. 25b; $\textdagger{EA}$’s in ll. 36’, 38’; $\textdagger{30}$’s in l. 14 (restored); $\textdagger{UTU}$’s in l. 15 (restored); $\textdagger{NIN.URTA}$’s in ll. 47’, 48’; and $\textdagger{NIN.KUR}$’s in ll. 14b, 16b, 46’.
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