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Recent research on the chronology of the Emar (legal) texts has greatly modified the old framework, arguing for, e.g., the presence of another local dynasty, partial changes in the succession order of the kings, and a chronological discrepancy between the Syrian- and Syro-Hittite-type texts. The present study examines these arguments critically and discusses also other basic issues. It concludes that these arguments should be rejected and instead presents a more reasonable chronological framework (for the period of ca. 1270s-1175 B.C.), with one local dynasty and no discrepancy between the two types of texts, as in the old framework.
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I. Introduction

The chronological studies on the Emar texts began with D. Arnaud’s 1975 article, even before his publication of Emar VI (1985-87). In this article, Arnaud provided preliminary remarks on the absolute and relative chronologies of the texts (giving a range of ca. 1310-1187 B.C.) and presented the first model for the reconstruction of the Emar dynasty, the basic framework for the inner relative chronology. With the texts published thereafter (Emar VI as well as, e.g., TS in 1991 and RE in 1996), other scholars slightly revised Arnaud’s model (1975, 89) and recognized the following kings of Emar as attested in the texts:

1. Yaṣi-Dagan (son of dIM-kabar) → 2. dIM-kabar (his son) → 3. Zu-Aštarti (his son) → 4. Pilsu-Dagan (his brother) → 5. Elli (his son)

*Chuo University, Lecturer

1 In reference to texts from Emar and its vicinity, the following abbreviations will be used below (usually with text no.): ASJ 12-T = Tsukimoto 1990; ASJ 13-T = Tsukimoto 1991; ASJ 14-T = Tsukimoto 1992a and b (without no.); AuOr 5-T = Arnaud 1987; BLMJE = Westenholz 2000; Ekalo = Mayer 2001; Emar VI = Arnaud 1985-87; GsK-T = Sigrist 1993; RE = Beckman 1996; Sem. 46-T = Arnaud 1996; SMEA 40-T = Arnaud 1992; SMEA 45-T = Salvini & Trémouille 2003; TS = Arnaud 1991; ZA 89-T = Streck 1999; ZA 90-T = Streck 2000.

2 This PN (probably to be read as Ba’lu-kabar) attested in the royal family is usually written as dIM-GAL (e.g., Emar VI 156: 28; RE 81: 25; also with 4U- in Emar VI 42: 20), but once as dIM-ka-bar (Emar VI 42: 8).

3 See Fales 1991; Yamada 1994a, 19-23, 34; Beckman 1996, xii; cf. also Adamthwaite 2001, 3-16. As for “Bisu-Dagan” (”BI-sú-KUR) son of dIM-kabar (Emar VI 42: 11, 20), who Arnaud suggested had usurped Pilsu-Dagan’s throne (1975: 89), other scholars are in agreement to identify him (Pissu-Dagan, reading the first sign as pi-) with Pilsu-Dagan (Durand 1989a, 184 and n. 79; Dietrich 1990, 35; Fales 1991, 83f.). This identification was well established by another variant spelling of this RN, pi-sí-dá-ga-nu, in ASJ 12-T 1: 25, where he is referred to as the father of Elli in l. 24 (Tsukimoto 1990, 180). Note also that J.-M. Durand suggests taking the first sign pi- in Emar VI 42: 20 as pi<l>- (Durand & Marti 2003, 150f.).
This is well confirmed as each of them (1) is referred to with the title LUGAL, “king,” and/or (2) appears in legal documents as the first witness (= W1) together with as the second witness (= W2), a son who is known to have succeeded him as king. A sample of such data is presented in Table 1.4

### Table 1. The Emarite Kings Attested in the Emar Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RN</th>
<th>Title LUGAL</th>
<th>W1 with his son (W2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yaṣi-Dagan</td>
<td>e.g., RE 14: 6 (cf. l. 24)</td>
<td>e.g., RE 16: 27f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿIM-kabar</td>
<td>e.g., Emar VI 256: 33f.</td>
<td>e.g., Emar VI 138: 48f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zu-Aštarti</td>
<td>e.g., ASJ 12-T 7: 28, 34 (cf. l. 41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilsu-Dagan</td>
<td>cf., e.g., Emar VI 147: 35-37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elli</td>
<td>e.g., RE 86: 21 (cf. l. 36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was assumed that the range of time for these kings covers that of the Emar texts in general. However, in 1998 A. Skaist presented an innovative study on the Emar chronology. In this article, he maintained not only that the above dynasty had more kings, but also that it was preceded by another local dynasty. According to him, the texts of the Syrian type, in which kings of both Emar dynasties are referred to, are to be dated to ca. 1400-1220 B.C., while those of the Syro-Hittite type, in which kings of Carchemish and other Hittite dignitaries appear, are ca. 1275-1210 B.C. Skaist’s chronology has been welcomed by most scholars (e.g., Fleming 2000, 21-25), who have at the same time suggested some revisions and developments (esp. Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008).

In the present study, I examine this new wave of chronological studies, mainly analyzing anew the legal documents, and discuss also other relevant issues. We will see what chronological framework of the Emar texts we end up with. Now, let us start with examining Skaist’s proposed dynasty.

## II. The Proposed Early Dynasty

Skaist is of the opinion that the family of Irʾib-ʿIM5 was a royal dynasty of Emar preceding the above one (see § I). This is based on GsK-T 6, which records that as a reward for the great achievement by Irʾib-ʿIM son of Lala for his city and his lord, the king and the city of Emar nominated his son (and his successors thereafter) to the offices of the šangū-priest and administrator of the temple of Nergal (or Rašap) of the market place and of the qabbix-official (ll. 9b-27). Skaist equates the first witnesses of this document, “Li-šarra6 and the city of Emar”(l. 36), with the above nominators, “the king and the city of Emar” (l. 20), and thus regards Li-šarra as the king (1998, 61). At first glance this interpretation appears to be supported by the opening phrase of the text: i-na qaš-ma-ti ša ÂN-LUGAL DUMU ir-ib-ʿIM, “during the days of Li-šarra

---

4 As for Elli, although he appears as W1 together with his son ʿIM-kabar as W2 (see the list), this ʿIM-kabar has not yet been attested with the title LUGAL.
5 For a fully possible reconstruction of this family tree, see Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008, 5; cf. also Skaist 1998, 60; Di Filippo 2004, 196. But for the father of Irʾib-ʿIM, see below and n. 19.
6 His full name seems to be Limi-šarra as it is usually spelled as li-MI-LUGAL (e.g., TS 17: 29), with variants: li-LUGAL (e.g., GsK-T 6: 1, 36) and li-im-šar-ra (e.g., ASJ 12-T 2: 9 [see below]).
son of Irīb-IM” (ll. 1-2a; cf. TS 87: 1f.), which could be taken as referring to his reign.  

So, according to Skaist, we have here two Irīb-IMs, one being the loyal servant of the king Li(mi)-šarra and the other being the father of the same king. Furthermore, since the so-called 4NIN.URTA seal is impressed on GsK-T 6 and other legal documents in which a member of the Irīb-IM family appears as the first witness, Skaist regards it as the official seal of this dynasty (ibid., 63).

Irīb-IM’s great achievement was bringing back four princesses of Emar, 4,000 (shekels of) silver (and) 400 (shekels of) gold from the king of the land of Ḫurri (GsK-T 6: 9b-18a). Skaist dates it to the period before the Hittite conquest of Mittani by Šuppiluliuma I in ca. 1325 B.C. and before Yaṣi-Dagan, the first attested king of the following dynasty (1998, 62). He suggests that Šuppiluliuma, when he conquered Emar, replaced Zu-Ba’la son of Išbi-Dagan, i.e., the grandson of Limi-šarra,8 with Yaṣi-Dagan (ibid., 64). Although actually King Yaṣi-Dagan seems rather to have been a contemporary of the sons of Limi-šarra9 and even of Limi-šarra himself,10 the existence of this dynasty and then the change of dynasty have not been seriously questioned.11

However, I would like to point out the following two problems with this theory. Firstly, the 4NIN.URTA seal is known as the official seal of the urban authority of Emar, i.e., the city god 4NIN.URTA and the city elders.12 Therefore, it seems to me rather consistent to think that it represents the latter element in “the king and the city of Emar” (GsK-T 6: 20), the nominators, and also in “Li-šarra and the city of Emar” (l. 36), the first witnesses. In this respect, it is worth noting that Limi-šarra uses his personal seal on TS 87 (ME 22), which is referred to as “the seal of Limi-šarra” (l. 38), and it is identified with D17 impressed on the upper edge of the tablet, just before this reference (see Beyer 2001, 181; handcopy in Arnaud 1991). According to D. Beyer (ibid.), this seal impression is found also on Emar VI 150 and TS 16 (ME 6). Particularly important is TS 16, in which 4NIN.URTA and the elders sell fields, and Limi-šarra son of Irīb-IM appears as the first witness (l. 34). It should be noted here that the 4NIN.URTA seal (E1) is impressed on this tablet, too (see Beyer 2001, 434). If Limi-šarra were a king and his dynastic seal were the 4NIN.URTA seal, why would he need to use the two seals here (D17 and E1)? The rational interpretation is that D17 and E1 are the seals of Limi-šarra and the urban authority, respectively. Thus it is difficult to regard the 4NIN.URTA seal as the dynastic seal of the Irīb-IM family.

Secondly, the position of the first witness seems to be exchanged between two sons of Irīb-IM.

---

7 For this reading of the opening phrase, see Durand & Marti 2003, 147 and n. 31, 149; Pruzsinszky 2003, 22f. n. 8, 31; cf. also Di Filippo 2004, 198 and n. 98. In TS 87, a certain Pilsu-Dagan, who built the stone temple of Nergal (Ē 4NÈ. IRI₁,GAL ša NA.), is nominated as its šangû-priest. In addition to the same opening phrase (see above), in view of the same witness list (ll. 26-35) and date (ll. 36f.), there is no doubt that this is the same Nergal temple as in GsK-T 6 and that Pilsu-Dagan’s nomination was made at the same time that Irīb-IM’s son was nominated as its šangû-priest and administrator.

8 Gained by combining the following references: Išbi-Dagan son of Limi-šarra (Emar VI 148: 19 [W1]) with three brothers of the former (ll. 20-22); and Zu-Ba’la son of Išbi-Dagan (TS 19: 23 [W1]) with two sons of Limi-šarra (ll. 24f.).


ORIENT

As RE 91: 20-22 shows, Irʿib-IM had three sons, Igmil-Dagan, Limi-šarra and Rašap-ili. Although the text of Emar VI 153: 22f. is damaged, the traces of the signs and the sizes of the broken spaces fit well with the above restorations. Now, if his family were a royal dynasty, the exchange of the first two witnesses occurred between ASJ 12-T 2: 9’ and Emar VI 153: 22 would be unthinkable.¹⁵

These points indicate that the family of Irʿib-IM was not a royal dynasty, but probably one of the leading families in Emar, which was closely associated with the urban authority.¹⁶ In this case, GS-K-T 6 will be read as stating that for the great achievement by Irʿib-IM son of Lala, an anonymous king¹⁷ and the city of Emar rewarded his son, Limi-šarra, by nominating him and his successors to high-ranking offices of the Nergal temple. The opening phrase (ll. 1-2a) means simply that it was done during the lifetime of Limi-šarra, not of his father Irʿib-IM.¹⁸ The reason why they did not immediately nominate Irʿib-IM himself to the above offices is obvious: because the temple was not existent at the time of his achievement, and it took long time to build it (cf. l. 5;

---

¹³ Reading: (22) [IGI li-im-ša]-ra IGI [g-mil-ʿa-ga]n (23) [DUMU.MEŠ ir-i]-[b-]IM (cf. Tsukimoto 1990, 183; Yamada 1994b, 61 n. 25). In view of the handcopy (Arnaud 1985-87/1, 143), note that there is no space for restoring the witness Igmil-Dagan in the broken part in l. 22a and that the PN in l. 22b cannot be read as Rašap-ili (so Skaist 1998, 63 n. 45). On the restoration of the scribal name in l. 31, see Yamada 1993, 140, 145 n. 6.

¹⁴ For this reading of the latter PN, see Arnaud 1992, 230; Yamada 1994b, 61 n. 25; Pruzsinszky 2003, 184 and n. 352.

¹⁵ The three lists could suggest that King Irʿib-IM was succeeded first by Igmil-Dagan (ASJ 12-T 2; RE 91) and then by Limi-šarra after the death of his brother (RE 22). However, this reconstruction would contradict the order of the witnesses in Emar VI 153: 22.

¹⁶ As I noted elsewhere (1995a, 107 n. 26), the fact that Rašap-ili son of Irʿib-IM never appears as witness in the documents written by the scribe Rašap-ili suggests that he was the scribe. Note also that TS 87 is a document written by (or before) the city elders (see ll. 5b-7a). Then one may surmise that the eight witnesses (ll. 26-35), including the scribe Eḫli-Kuša (W8) who actually wrote this text, were those elders. If so, Limi-šarra (W1) must have been one of the elders.

¹⁷ Probably Yaṣi-Dagan. Eḫli-Kuša, the scribe of GS-K-T 6 and the contemporary of Li(mi)-šrra, most probably refers to his son, “Riḫṣi-Dagan son of Limi-šarra,” in Emar VI 148: 20. In TS 19: 24f., this Riḫṣi-Dagan is referred to with his brother Ili-Abi, who is attested in a text dated to the reign of Yaṣi-Dagan (RE 34: 29, 31).

¹⁸ Or perhaps, in the period of Limi-šarra as the administrator of the Nergal temple. This meaning may be intended in TS 87: 11. As seen above (n. 7), GS-K-T 6 and TS 87 (ME 22) are contemporary and concerned with the same Nergal temple; and now, Limi-šarra is its administrator. It is worth noting here that his seal is impressed on TS 87 (see above) instead of the NIN.URTA seal (see Beyer 2001, 434). Although not explicitly stated in the text, this suggests that it was Limi-šarra who nominated Pilsu-Dagan as his subordinate šangû-priest.
also TS 87: 3-5a). Thus we recognize only one Ir'ib-IM (son of Lala)\(^{19}\) here.

**III. The Royal Dynasty**

Now we have only one local dynasty as attested in the Emar texts again. On this dynasty, too, Skaist presents new arguments.

Firstly, he (1998, 59f. n. 35) correctly points out that the father of King Yaši-Dagan\(^{20}\) is not dIM-kabar but dIM-malik (RE 2: 24a; 16: 27; 34: 29). It has been suggested that “Yaši-[aga]n son of dIM-malik” (TS 19: 26 [W4]), too, may be added to this list of references (Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008, 6 n. 12), since the same scribe Alal-abu wrote both TS 19 and RE 34 and he refers to Yaši-Dagan son of dIM-malik as the first witness in the latter (l. 29). If so, this is the only exception to the rule that whenever a king or prince appears whether with or without his son(s) or brother(s) in a witness list, he takes the first position.\(^{21}\) Note also that on this tablet, TS 19 (ME 89), the dNIN.URTA seal is impressed, whereas the dynastic seal is not (see Beyer 2001, 435). Although the former point is understandable as the first three witnesses (ll. 23-25) seem to be members of the Ir'ib-IM family associated with the urban authority, the reason for not sealing with the dynastic seal, which represents the royal authority,\(^{22}\) remains unexplainable. So, I leave open the problem whether the Yaši-Dagan in TS 19: 26 is regarded as the king or not.

Secondly, Skaist maintains that more kings belonged to the dynasty than the five listed above (§ I): Abbanu son of dIM-kabar (and brother of Zu-_ASTARTI and Pilsu-Dagan) and dIM-kabar son of Elli, even though they are not referred to with the title of king. According to him, the dynasty is to be reconstructed as follows (1998, 58):

(1) Yaši-Dagan (son of dIM-malik) → (2) dIM-kabar I (his son) → (3) Zu-ASTARTI (his son) → (4) Abbanu (his brother) → (5) Pilsu-Dagan (his brother) → (6) Elli (his son) → (7) dIM-kabar II (his son)

Skaist (ibid.) explains his judgment on dIM-kabar II as: (1) he appears as the first witness in many texts and (2) the dynastic seal is impressed on one of them (ASJ 14-T). However, no explanation on Abbanu is given. He is referred to as the first witness in seven texts.\(^{23}\) Although now we know that the dynastic seal is impressed on all but Emar VI 11 (partly broken) and RE 71 (see Beyer 2001, 432, 434), the sealing data were probably not available to him at that time (cf.

---

\(^{19}\) Not Ir'ib-IM son of Asda-ahi (TS 14: 33, 35 [reading -a-ahi]; also AuOr 5-T 3: 19f.; ZA 89-T 4: 1', 4'), as Y. Cohen and L. d’Alfonso thought (2008, 5 [with Asda-abu]).

\(^{20}\) On the reading of this RN in RE 34: 29, see Yamada 2010b, 123 n. 5.

\(^{21}\) At first glance, Emar VI 180 looks like such an exceptional case. However, as it is obvious when looking at the handcopy (Arnaud 1985-87/2, 555), its witness list composed of six witnesses is to be read first ll. 28-31 on the left edge of the tablet (e.g., ‘W3’ = W1: Pilsu-Dagan) and then ll. 26f. on the rest of the reverse (e.g., ‘W2’ = W6: Belu-malik, the scribe). Probably realizing there remained little space on the reverse, the scribe began to write the list on the left edge, but since he used up the space there for the first four witnesses, he wrote the remaining two on the rest of the reverse. Cf. Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008, 10.

\(^{22}\) See Yamada 1994b; Beyer 2001, 208f. (E2), 430-437. It is interesting to note that the dynastic seal is impressed on Ekalte 25 (see Werner 2004, 22f., Taf. 23 [no. 4585]). Although the text itself does not imply any connection with the royal authority of Emar, this fact suggests that the Emar dynasty was continuing from the period before the Hittite conquest of northern Syria by Šuppiluliuma I.

\(^{23}\) **Emar VI** 2: 31; 3: 36; 11: 37; 126: 22; **RE 71**: 24; TS 5: 46 (ME 52); 6: 25 (ME 9).
Skaist 2005a, 570). If so, it seems that his judgment on Abbanu as king was actually based only on the former fact. Then, one may wonder why he ignored the possibility that Yaṣi-Dagan son of Pilsu-Dagan was king. Although data of the seal impressions on RE and SMEA 30-T have not yet been published, he is referred to as the first witness in two texts, too. Therefore, according to the above Skaist’s actual criterion, Abbanu, Yaṣi-Dagan and 㹳IM-kabar are all to be regarded as candidates for additional kings (cf. Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008, 7 n. 15, 9 n. 22, 11).

So, were they kings? In this respect, it is interesting to note that Emar VI 9 (W1: Elli) is dated before Emar VI 8 (W1: Pilsu-Dagan) as Durand correctly pointed out (1989a, 172f.) and that the dynastic seal (E2) is impressed on both tablets (see Beyer 2001, 432). This indicates that Emar VI 9 was written during the reign of Pilsu-Dagan, when Elli was the crown prince. Thus, only appearance as the first witness and sealing of the dynastic seal are not enough conditions to identify a member of the royal family as king (pace Skaist 2005a, 570), although at least the former is enough in the case of a prince. When we try to identify a king, he must either be given the title of king or be first witness along with his son, who is known as a future king, as second witness (see § I). Although I would not exclude the possibility that 㹳IM-kabar son of Elli was a king, the last king, the available data do not permit us such assertion. In conclusion, the above three candidates are to be regarded as only princes.

Furthermore, Skaist and other scholars recently proposed partial changes in the succession order of the kings. However, since this issue is connected with the problem of the active periods of scribes, I will deal with it in the next section. In its stead, I take up here the enigmatic problem caused by ASJ 14-T. When we compare its witness list (ll. 27-36) with that of other documents such as RE 14 (ll. 24-32; cf. also 16: 27-36), the presence of many common witnesses (see Appendix 2) shows that they are approximately contemporary documents. However, their first witnesses indicate a chronological discrepancy, RE 14 (with 㹳IM-kabar son of Yaṣi-Dagan) being dated to the early phase of the dynasty while ASJ 14-T (with 㹳IM-kabar son of Elli), belonging to its latest phase. Was time in Emar circular?

Cohen and d’Alfonso are of the opinion that ASJ 14-T, which records a field sale, is a later copy of an old document with modification of the first witness (2008, 10 and n. 27). If so, one may wonder why 㹳IM-kabar son of Elli” is referred to as one of the neighbors of, i.e., the owners of the fields adjacent to, this field (l. 10; cf. l. 27 [W1]) and also as its owner and seller (the 㹳IM-kabar in ll. 11f.). Can one imagine that when a scribe copied an old field sale contract, he changed the PN(s) of its owner, seller and neighbor? This seems unlikely. In view of the witnesses, ASJ

24 RE 28: 50; SMEA 30-T 2: 22. But note that according to G. Beckman’s handcopy, a cylinder seal is impressed on the upper edge of RE 28. One may reasonably surmise that it is the dynastic seal.

25 Concerning the Yaṣi-Dagan, note the following text in RE 28 (W1: Yaṣi-Dagan): (43) a-nu-’um-ma “bu-bi"-u DUMU ab-bi (44) LÚ.x (45) [a-na "ia]-ši-ši KUR DUMU pil-sú-ši KUR LUGAL-ri (46) [ip-te-er]-šu ša ra-ma-ni-šu (47) [id-di]n[ ]u ra-ma-an-šu (48) [ip]-šu-ar-ki-iši UTU (49) [za]-ku-ú “Now Bubiu, son of Abbu, the […], [pai]d the [ransom] money for himself [to Yaṣi-Dagan, son of Pilsu-Dagan, the king, and [re]leased himself. He is [cl]ear like the sun” (cf. Beckman 1996, 47). This “king” probably indicates Pilsu-Dagan, not Yaṣi-Dagan. The restoration of the word ipṭi/erū (with -ṭe 4-) is based on Emar VI 256: 21, a text (W1: Zu-Aštarti) written by the same scribe Imlik-Dagan.

26 It seems to me that most of the texts, which Cohen and d’Alfonso regard as later copies (2008, 7 n. 16, 10), were actually drawn up when the first witness was a prince, i.e., during the reign of his father (or brother). Particularly the texts with 㹳IM-kabar son of Elli (as W1) must be regarded as such cases (see § IV.2). Note also that it is not impossible that Emar VI 139 (W1: Elli without the title of king) dates to the reign of Pilsu-Dagan (cf. Emar VI 137-138). On the other hand, for Emar VI 180 see n. 21 above.
14-T must be dated to the early phase of the dynasty, i.e., to the reign of ḫIM-kabar or perhaps of his father Yaṣi-Dagan, and thus the two ḫIM-kabars were the same person. This suggests that Yaṣi-Dagan had two names, Elli (birth name?) and Yaṣi-Dagan (throne name?).

IV. The Official Scribes

1. Royal vs. Urban

As argued in my previous study (2000, 120, 130 n. 14), the legal documents, mainly real-estate transactions, of the Syrian type concerning the two official (i.e., royal and urban) authorities of Emar can be divided into the following three types:

(1) R (= royal and non-urban): when a king or a member of the royal family (prince or his son) appears as the person concerned in a legal transaction and/or a king or prince is referred to as the first witness (e.g., Emar VI 14, 125, 138; RE 9).

(2) U (= urban and non-royal): when the city god ḫIN.URTA and the city elders appear as a party in a legal transaction and no king or prince is referred to as the first witness (e.g., Emar VI 150; TS 16).

(3) R&U (royal and urban): when the city god ḫIN.URTA and the city elders appear as a party in a legal transaction (i.e., as sellers of real estate) and a king or prince is referred to as the first witness (e.g., Emar VI 146; RE 71).

When checking which scribe wrote which type of texts, we can safely divide the following scribes affiliated with the official authorities into the two groups (note: * = only one known document of the scribe):

(1) Royal scribes: Abda (R*), Abi-kapi (R and R&U), Baba (R*), Belu-malik (R and R&U), Dagalli (R), Ea-damiq (R and R&U), Imlik-Dagan (R), Iš-Dagan (R and R&U), Mašru-ḫamis (R)

(2) Urban scribes: Alal-abu (U! and R&U), Dagan-belu (U and R&U), Eḫli-Kuša (U), Marduk-muballiṭ (U*), Rašap-ili (U)

27 For a different view, see Viano 2007, 246-254, esp. 252.

28 That is, in real-estate transactions, as the seller, purchaser, grantor (once in ASJ 12-T 7: 21ff.) or exchanger (once in Emar VI 10). But note that no king is attested as a purchaser.

29 In real-estate transactions, as the sellers, but once as the grantors (RE 22). On GsK-T 6 (U!), see the following footnote.

30 See Yamada 2000, 123-128 (which includes Emar VI 42, a copy of three royal inscriptions, under the scribe Ea-damiq), noting the following corrections and one addition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scribe</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abi-kapi</td>
<td>RE 16</td>
<td>R&amp;U</td>
<td>Ep?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S: ḫN&amp;E &gt; # (p. 124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alal-abu</td>
<td>RE 34</td>
<td>R&amp;U</td>
<td>[Ep?]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S: ḫN&amp;E* &gt; # (ibid.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alal-abu</td>
<td>TS 19</td>
<td>U!</td>
<td>Ep</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>S: ḫN&amp;E &gt; # (ibid.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagan-belu</td>
<td>RE 2</td>
<td>R&amp;U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S: ḫN&amp;E &gt; # (p. 126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iš-Dagan</td>
<td>ZA 90-T 6</td>
<td>R&amp;U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S: ḫN&amp;E &gt; # (p. 127)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clear classification is difficult for three of the texts. As seen above, TS 19 lists a possible king as the fourth, not the first, witness (l. 26). As for GsK-T 6 (under Eḫli-Kuša; Yamada 2000, 126) treated above, although the “king” (l. 20) appears as one of the nominators of a religious official, he is not referred to as the first witness, nor is the dynastic seal impressed. On TS 87 (under Eḫli-Kuša; ibid.), note that the city elders (l. 5) are involved in drawing up this document, which records the nomination of a religious official (cf. GsK-T 6).

Since there is no scribe who wrote both R and U texts, the difference between the two groups is clear-cut. So, if a scribe left an R or U text, we may reasonably understand with which authority he was affiliated. When R&U texts were drawn up, both groups of scribes were involved in writing.

2. The Royal Scribes

The first to be taken up is Abi-kapi, who was active in the reigns of Yaṣi-Dagan, 4IM-kabar and Pilsu-Dagan but seemingly not in the reign of Zu-Aṣtarti. Although we have dated ASJ 14-T with 4IM-kabar son of Elli (as W1) to the early phase of the dynasty, the active period of this scribe, three generations, seems still a bit too long for one man and the existence of the ‘chronological gap’ is enigmatic. In view of these points, one may ask, were there perhaps two royal scribes with the same PN Abi-kapi? To explore this issue, let us compare the witness lists of his documents (see Appendix 2). The result is remarkable: (1) they can be divided into two distinct groups, an old one (W1: Yaṣi-Dagan, 4IM-kabar) and a new one (W1: Abbanu, Pilsu-Dagan), each having many witnesses in common; (2) we find only one or two common witness(es) between them, as presented in Table 2 (note: s. = son of).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>Old (W1: 4IM-kabar)</th>
<th>New (W1: Abbanu vs. Pilsu-Dagan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irib-4IM s Ḫatani</td>
<td>Emar VI 144: 35f.(?)</td>
<td>TS 6: 33; prob. also Emar VI 2: 39(?) vs. Emar VI 4: 31; 159: 27; prob. also TS 8: 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šadi-Da s. Namarti</td>
<td>Emar VI 144: 33f.</td>
<td>Emar VI 126: 27 vs. φ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can this be regarded as evidence for the presence of two different royal scribes, Abi-kapi A (old) and B (new)?32 This is a delicate problem. Some people may say “No,” insisting that it is not impossible for a scribe to have been active from the latest phase of Yaṣi-Dagan’s reign to the middle of his grandson Pilsu-Dagan’s reign,33 and that no clear linguistic difference can be observed between the two groups of texts.34 Then, others would say “Yes,” pointing out Abi-kapi’s peculiarity in reference to years. As I noted elsewhere (1996, 300), when an Emarite scribe refers to specific years, he uses only one of the two methods, either the year name (i.e., reference according to an event) or the eponymous year (i.e., according to PN), but never both types.35 In this respect, it should be noted that it is only Abi-kapi who uses both types, once a year name (TS 9: 21f., without MU) and once an eponymous year (RE 16: 3736). This problem will be solved if

32 Suggesting the documents of Abi-kapi A = Emar VI 14, 144, 156; ASJ 14-T; RE 14, 16, 52(?); TS 3; those of Abi-kapi B = Emar VI 2(?) 4, 126, 157, 159; ASJ 12-T 7; RE 71; TS 6, 9, probably also 8.
33 Note, e.g., RE 16 (W1-2: Yaṣi-Dagan and his son 4IM-kabar) and TS 9 (W1-2: Pilsu-Dagan and his son Elli). Based on our discussions below on the reigns of the Emarite kings (§§ V-VI), the term from the final year of Yaṣi-Dagan to the mid-reign of Pilsu-Dagan will be estimated as ca. 46 (= 1 + 25 + 5 + 15) years. This would be reduced, of course, if, e.g., 4IM-kabar reigned for 20 instead of 25 years.
34 J. Ikeda, personal communication. He is of the opinion that linguistically only ASJ 14-T is distinguished from the other texts written by Abi-kapi (Ikeda 1992).
36 If Beckman’s reading is correct: MU DUMU x x x x (1996, 29).
there were different scribes, Abi-kapi B who used the former and Abi-kapi A who used the latter. In any case, however, we have to accept the exceptional case that a royal scribe (Abi-kapi or Abi-kapi A) used an eponymous year.

I do admit that it is difficult to draw a decisive conclusion on this issue. However, to make our discussions below simpler, it seems to me better to assume that Abi-kapi A and B are different scribes. Therefore, I take it as a working hypothesis here. Keeping this point in mind, let us now turn to the problem of the succession order of the kings, on which Skaist and others propose partial changes.

According to the Arnaud-lined reconstruction of the Emar dynasty, which I have mostly confirmed above, the royal scribes who left plural royal documents (R and/or R&U) were active in the periods as shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scribe</th>
<th>First Witness</th>
<th>‘Chronological Gap’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abi-kapi A</td>
<td>Yaṣi-Dagan, 4IM-kabar (s. Yaṣi-Dagan)</td>
<td>φ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abi-kapi B</td>
<td>Abbanu, Pilsu-Dagan</td>
<td>φ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belu-malik</td>
<td>Pilsu-Dagan, 4IM-kabar (s. Elli)</td>
<td>Elli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagalli</td>
<td>Pilsu-Dagan, Elli</td>
<td>φ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ea-damiq</td>
<td>Pilsu-Dagan, Elli</td>
<td>φ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imlik-Dagan</td>
<td>Zu-Aštarti, Yaṣi-Dagan (s. Pilsu-Dagan)</td>
<td>Pilsu-Dagan at least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iš-Dagan</td>
<td>Pilsu-Dagan, Elli</td>
<td>φ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his recent study, Skaist questions the position of Zu-Aštarti in the succession order of kings. He points out that there seems to be a chronological gap between Zu-Aštarti and Elli, observing the following points: (1) common witnesses, i.e., Zu-Eya and Ibni-Dagan (sons of Aḫi-malik) as well as Aḫi-abu (son of Belu-malik), are found in Zu-Aštarti- and Elli-texts but not in Abbanu- and Pilsu-Dagan-texts; (2) the scribe Imlik-Dagan wrote all the Zu-Aštarti-texts and SMEA 30-T 2 (a Yaṣi-Dagan [son of Pilsu-Dagan]-text), which is dated close to, or in the time of Elli (2005a, 571f.). Skaist notes also: (3) the scribe Abi-kapi was active in the reigns of 4IM-kabar, Abbanu and Pilsu-Dagan but not in the reign of Zu-Aštarti (ibid., 572). To avoid these chronological gaps, i.e., the reigns of Pilsu-Dagan for (1-2) and of Zu-Aštarti for (3), he proposes to put Zu-

37 Note that even if it turns out to be incorrect, this distinction for one scribe according to the phases of his career will be valid when we consider the active periods of the urban scribes below (§ IV.3).

38 But it should be noted that a name of king or prince presented there is no more than that of the first witness of a document, and so it does not immediately mean he was reigning at the time. Therefore, the possible ‘chronological gap’ in the activity of a scribe merely means that we do not have his documents in which that king or prince appears as the first witness.

39 In the following, note that when I say ‘KING/PRINCE-texts,’ it means the texts in which the KING/PRINCE appears as the first witness; and that ‘SCRIBE-texts’ means the texts written by the SCRIBE.

40 Note that Skaist does not distinguish Abi-kapi A and B. Furthermore, one may add another ‘chronological gap’ for the scribe Belu-malik (see Table 3), in view of his texts: (1) W1: Pilsu-Dagan — Emar VI 10, 125, 137, 180(!), 183; BLMJE 3; RE 3, 21; TS 35, 54; (2) W1: 4IM-kabar (son of Elli) — AuOr 5-T 15; RE 81; TS 13.
Aštarti after 4IM-kabar II (son of Elli), as the last king and son of 4IM-kabar II. Although this in turn causes a new chronological gap, the reign of 4IM-kabar II, for (1-2), he dismisses this problem by considering it to have been rather brief (ibid., 572f.).

F. Di Filippo, who, too, recognized the gap caused by (1-2), 41 proposes a slightly different solution. He puts Zu-Aštarti between Pilsu-Dagan and Elli: “After Pilsu-Dagan’s death Zu-Aštarti probably had an extremely short inter-reign, presumably because he usurped his nephew Elli” (2004, 191-193, esp. 192f.). Cohen and d’Alfonso accept this order and assume a severe inner struggle in the royal family after the death of Pilsu-Dagan (2008, 7-9; also Cohen 2009, 20).

According to these scholars, we have to accept a chronological gap, although brief, of the reign of 4IM-kabar II (Skaist) or of Zu-Aštarti (Di Filippo, Cohen and d’Alfonso). 42 As for Di Filippo’s reconstruction, if Zu-Aštarti usurped the throne and then Elli was restored (so Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008, 7-9), is it not rather surprising that the Zu-Aštarti- and Elli-texts share the same witnesses, probably in the entourage of the king? Even more serious, if we put Zu-Aštarti between Pilsu-Dagan and Elli, the ‘chronological gap’ observed on the Belu-malik-texts (see Table 3) would be enlarged: Zu-Aštarti and Elli!

In my opinion, there is no such chronological gap, since Abbanu, Yaṣi-Dagan (son of Pilsu-Dagan), and 4IM-kabar (son of Elli) are only princes, not kings. The texts in which they appear as the first witnesses must be dated to the reigns of their fathers and/or brothers. In the case of the texts of the scribe Imlik-Dagan, the Yaṣi-Dagan-texts (see n. 24 above) can be assigned to the reign(s) of Pilsu-Dagan and/or Elli; and as for the texts of the scribe Belu-malik, the 4IM-kabar-texts (see n. 40 above) must be dated to the reign of Elli. As for the texts of the scribe Abi-kapi B, the Abbanu-texts are to be dated to the reign(s) of 4IM-kabar and/or Zu-Aštarti. It is interesting to note here that all the Abbanu-texts (see n. 23 above) are real-estate sale documents of the R&U type, while among the Zu-Aštarti-texts all the real-estate sale documents (ASJ 12-T 8; RE 9, 79; TS 55) are of the R type. So, in case some of, if not all, the Abbanu-texts are dated to the reign of Zu-Aštarti, we may assume that the king and his brother (a prince) systematically divided the tasks of authorizing those sale documents as the first witness.

Finally, let us consider why the above-mentioned witnesses, Zu-Eya, Ibni-Dagan and Aḥi-abu, attested in Zu-Aštarti- and Elli-texts, are not found in Pilsu-Dagan-texts. Before answering this question, however, let us see the following witness lists:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RE 9</th>
<th>TS 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. W: Zu-Aštarti, the king,</td>
<td>25. W: Abbanu, son of 4IM-kabar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. son of 4IM-kabar, the king</td>
<td>26. W: Pilsu-Dagan, his brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. W: Abi-Rašap, his brother</td>
<td>27. W: Belu-malik, his brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. W: Abbanu, his brother (omitted)</td>
<td>(omitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. W: Imlik-Dagan, the scribe</td>
<td>34. W: Abi-kapi, the scribe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 Although he (Di Filippo 2004, 191) notes another gap for “Iš(bi)-Dagan son of Šim‘u” appearing in Zu-Aštarti-texts and a Yaṣi-Dagan (son of Elli)-text (SMEA 30-T 2), in fact this person is not found in the latter text.

42 With regard to the latter, cf. Table 3 on Dagalli (ASJ 12-T 1, 16), Ea-damiq (e.g., Emar VI 147, 253) and Iš-Dagan (e.g., Emar VI 138; RE 23).
Among these brothers of Zu-Aštarti (RE 9: 29f.; TS 6: 25-27), Abi-Rašap and Abbanu do not appear as witnesses in Pilsu-Dagan-texts.\(^{43}\) Probably they died or left the court during the reign of Zu-Aštarti. But how? Zu-Aštarti’s reign is usually assumed to have been short in view of the small number of his texts and the succession by Pilsu-Dagan, his brother. Although it is possible that they died of illness one after another, one may suspect also that they might have been executed or purged. According to Emar VI 17, during the reign of Zu-Aštarti there was a revolt against the king, in which “the people of Emār, the ḫupšu-people and the ‘brothers’ of the king” (ll. 3f.) participated.\(^{44}\) When the revolt was suppressed, one half of the rebels were executed and the other half were cast in prison (ll. 19b-21). Although the term ‘brothers’ (LÚ.MEŠ.AḪḪÁ, with the Akkadogram AH, not ŠEŠ) does not necessarily refer only to his natural brothers,\(^{45}\) it would not be strange that several princes became victims at that time. When Pilsu-Dagan succeeded, or perhaps usurped, Zu-Aštarti, what happened to the latter’s entourage? In the cases of Zu-Eya, Ibni-Dagan and Aḫi-abu, I guess as a possibility that although they escaped execution or purge, the new king did not accept them as his own staff but assigned them down to his son, Prince Elli.\(^{46}\)

3. The Urban Scribes

In Appendix 3, I present all the witness lists in the documents written by the urban scribes mentioned above: Alal-abu (= AA), Dagan-belù\(^{47}\) (= DB), Ehli-Kuša (= EK), Marduk-muballiṭ (= MM), and Rašap-ilì (= RI). The result of comparing them is obvious: all of these scribes are contemporary and date to the early phase of the royal dynasty as attested in the Emar texts (cf. Cohen 2009, 65-71). This is well confirmed by comparing them with the witness lists of the Abi-kapi-texts: common witnesses are attested for Abi-kapi A, whereas no common witness is found for Abi-kapi B. Those common witnesses are shown in Table 4.\(^{48}\)

M. R. Adamthwaite argues that the eponymous years were in use only in the early period of the Emar texts (2001, 16-21; also Fleming 2000, 202). This seems to be correct in general, since, as he observes, the above urban scribes, who used them,\(^{49}\) were active only in that period. However, he did not clarify this point for others who used eponymous years,\(^{50}\) i.e., scribes who may have been urban scribes: Ali(?)-malik (Emar VI 110: 38f.), Dagan-baštì (AuOr 5-T 17 [=

---

\(^{43}\) In “Belu-malik, his brother” (Emar VI 125: 27 [W4]), “his” can be understood as referring to Pilsu-Dagan (l. 23 [W1]), as in the case of Aḫi-malik (l. 26 [W3]; cf., e.g., RE 21: 23; TS 35: 26). However, if not (cf. RE 81: 27f.), we must add him also to the list of lost brothers of Zu-Aštarti.

\(^{44}\) The dichotomous interpretation of the rebels, (lit.) “the ḫupšu-people of Emār and the ‘brothers’ of the king” (Durand 1989a, 175; Adamthwaite 2001, 108f., 235, 237 [note 2]; Durand & Marti 2003, 142f.), is difficult to accept (Yamada in press 1). Besides the syntactical problem, I wonder how the lower- and the upper-class peoples could cooperate without the participation of the ordinary citizens in the middle.

\(^{45}\) See, e.g., RE 7: 1-3a and Beckman 1996, 12f.

\(^{46}\) If one considers Abi-kapi A and B as the same scribe, his absence in the Zu-Aštarti-texts can be explained similarly: for some reason the new king degraded this royal scribe to serve Prince Abbanu, his brother.

\(^{47}\) Distinguishing him from his namesake, the scribe of Emar VI 35 (Syro-Hittite type). See Ikeda 1999, 182f.

\(^{48}\) In the Dagan-belu-texts (see Appendix 3.2), Yaṣi-Dagan (= R1) is referred to as W1 (RE 2: 24; TS 1: 17’), whereas his son ḪM-GAL(kabar) (= R2) is attested only as W2 (TS 1: 18’). Note also the following five PNs common between these texts and the Abi-kapi A-texts (W1 in Dagan-belu-texts vs. Abi-kapi A-texts): Aḫšu-lu (R1 vs. R2), Alal-abu (R1 vs. R1-2), Aḫšu-abu (R1 vs. R1-2), Aḫšu-malik (R1 vs. R1-2), and Ḫaššu-abu (R1 vs. R1-2).


\(^{50}\) Except for Iḫi-Nabium (Adamthwaite 2001, 21).

\(^{51}\) Or Aḫšu-malik (see Cohen 2009, 86f.; also Adamthwaite 2001, 17).
Among them, the scribes Dagan-ba’ili, Iḫi-Nabium and Sin-aḫam-iddinam are safely dated to the early period, since their eponymous years are attested in the texts by the five urban scribes mentioned above.

As for the rest, except for Emar VI 13, which is preserved only fragmentarily, it is at least possible to date them to that period.

On X-IM, note “IM-GAL son of Limi-LUGAL” in Emar VI 171: 5 (see Durand 1990, 66), who can be identified with “IM-GAL son of Lim-šarra” in ASJ 13-T 33 (l. 14; reading li-

---

Table 4. The Urban Scribes and Abi-kapi A-B: Common Witnesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PN</th>
<th>Urban Scribes</th>
<th>Abi-kapi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA DB EK MM RI A B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaṣi-Dagan s. (IM-malik</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukul(ti-Dagan), his brother</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4IM-GAL s. Yaṣi-Dagan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abda s. Limi-Dagan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abi-Dagan s. Asda-aḫi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abi-Dagan s. Dagan-tari</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu(d)da s. Abi-ḪAR</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiya s. Dada</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḫi-malik s. Attaliki</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dadu s. Abi-kapi</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagan-malik s. Ḫinna-IM</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igmil-Dagan s. Irḫib-IM</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iḫi-Dagan s. Irḫam-Dagan</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikun-Da(gan) s. Ḫinnu-Dagan</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikun-Ra s. Rihṣi</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li(mi)-LUGAL/šarra s. Irḫib-IM</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMU-dai s. Abi-limu</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milki-Dagan s. Ḫinna-IM</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GİR-abu s. Abi-ka(pi)</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rašap-ili s. Irḫib-IM</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rihṣi-Dagan s. Limi-LUGAL</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zu-Brāla s. Ḫinir-damu</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

im­-), written by Rašap-ili (l. 15). If X-­4IM is the same as Ir­-ib-­4IM (Cohen 2009, 70 n. 23), the latter scribe, too, is dated to the early period. On *BLMJ*E 4 (scribal name broken), note “Ikki­di­ son of Ba­ši” in l. 21, who is referred to in *TS* 14 (ll. 3f.; reading ik-­ki-­di­), one of the ARANA-­documents (see Yamada 1993) belonging to the early period (see Appendix 3.4; cf. also 3.5). As for Ali(?)-malik, dating to the early period is possible only if the restoration of “Abda s[on of Nuniya]” in *Emar* VI 110: 18, based on 109: 12 (see Arnaud 1985-87/3, 116), is correct. In this case, note “Belanu son of Lanaša” (109: 35f.), who appears in *Emar* VI 14 (l. 31), which refers to “IM-­kabar son of Ya­ši-­Dagan” (l. 26 [W1]) and was written by Abi-­kapi A (l. 32).

Although the dating of these four scribes remains admittedly tentative, it should be emphasized at the same time that as far as I can see, there is nothing to suggest they should be dated to a later period.

Since many of, if not all, the urban scribes and possible urban scribes who used eponymous years are in temporal terms biased to the early period, i.e., the reigns of Ya­ši-­Dagan and probably his son IM-­kabar,53 we may assume a decline of the urban authority in relation to the royal authority through time. I hope to discuss this issue elsewhere.

V. Absolute Chronology

Now, let us ask how long the chronological range of the Emar texts extends. As mentioned above (§ I), whereas Arnaud dated them within the period of ca. 1310-118754 B.C. (1975, 92), Skaist, dividing the two types of Emar texts, dated the Syrian type to ca. 1400-1220 B.C. and the Syro-­Hittite type to ca. 1275-1210 B.C. (1998, 57, 64, 67). In their recent study, Cohen and d’Alfonso more drastically separate the two types of texts, dating the Syrian-­type texts to the period approximately from the first two decades of the fourteenth century B.C. to the mid thirteenth century B.C. and the Syro-­Hittite-­type texts to ca. 1275(!)-1175 B.C. (2008, 15, 24). Even if they count the length of the period for the phantom dynasty (see § II) as Skaist did, the large discrepancy between the two types of texts proposed by Cohen and d’Alfonso (see ibid., esp. 25) is quite shocking. Did the two types of texts really overlap for only about 25 years?55

As it is well known, “the second year of Meliši­HU, king of Babylon” (*Emar* VI 26: 10-­12) is one of the latest dates attested in the Emar texts. Since in the Low Chronology, which I follow with Skaist, Cohen and d’Alfonso, this king is dated to 1181-67 B.C. (Boese 1982, 23), Emar must have been still existent in 1180 B.C. As for another such reference to an Assyrian eponymous year, “lîmu Ber-­na­ṣir” (*RE* 19: 35), although we know that it belonged to the reign of King Ninurta-apil-­Ekur (to be dated to 1182-70 B.C.56), it has not been established to what

53 It is interesting to note that so far we know at least ten (and at most thirteen) eponymates (see Yamada 1995a, 110f.; 2000, 119; cf. Adamthwaite 2001, 17; Pruzsinszky 2003, 17-20) and that two years seem to have been assigned to each of them (Yamada 1995a, 96, 103). This means that the attested eponymates covered 20 (or 26) years in theory. However, the paucity of Ya­ši-­Dagan-­texts (*RE* 2, 16, 34; *TS* 1; cf. *TS* 19) suggests that they belong to the late phase of his reign. So, even if we date the earliest Emar texts with eponymous years to that period (for 10 years or less), those for the remaining 10 (or 16) years or more are to be assigned to IM-­kabar’s reign.

54 To be corrected to 1185 (the second year of Meliši­HU [see immediately below]) according to the current Middle Chronology (see, e.g., Pruzsinszky 2003, 24 and n. 14).

55 But cf. Cohen’s recent dating of the texts according to the Middle Chronology: the Syrian type (ca. 1340-1200 B.C.) and the Syro-­Hittite type (ca. 1270-1185 B.C.), overlapping ca. 70 years (2009, 23ff., esp. 26).

56 Cf. 1182-80/70 B.C. (Boese & Wilhelm 1979, 38). Note that now this king is dated to 1191-79 B.C. in the Middle Chronology (see Beckman 1996, 33f.; Grayson 1998-2001, 524).
absolute year it corresponds. Taking these points into account, the ca. 1175 B.C. of Cohen and d’Alfonso would be acceptable as a safe date for the fall of Emar.

When dating the texts of the Syro-Hittite type, the key families are the dynasty of Carchemish and the family of Zu-Ba’la, the diviner of the gods of Emar. As it is known, the earliest datable texts are of two kings of Carchemish: Emar VI 31 probably from the late(st) phase of Šaḫurunuwa’s reign, and Emar VI 201 from the earliest phase of Ini-Tešub’s reign.\(^57\) In Emar VI 201, it is first recalled that according to the order of Muršili II,\(^58\) king of Ḫatti, Šaḫurunuwa once granted the estate of dIM-malik to the diviner Zu-Ba’la\(^59\) (ll. 7-18). Now Ini-Tešub reconfirms this grant (ll. 19-22a) and also recognizes its future inheritance only by the sons of Zu-Ba’la, whom Dagan-lai, most probably his principal wife, bore him, including dIM-qarrad the eldest (ll. 49-51a; cf. ll. 22b-48).

The following points are to be made here: (1) when Zu-Ba’la was young and acquired the dIM-malik’s estate, both Muršili II and Šaḫurunuwa were still alive; (2) when Zu-Ba’la was close to the end of his life, Ini-Tešub was a novice king. Although we do not know exactly when Ini-Tešub succeeded Šaḫurunuwa, if Emar VI 31 is dated to ca. 1275 B.C. (Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008, 15), then Emar VI 201 would have been drawn up in ca. 1270 B.C.\(^60\) Around this time, as we may reasonably assume, Ini-Tešub and dIM-qarrad succeeded Šaḫurunuwa and Zu-Ba’la, respectively. In this case, the anonymous king of Ḫatti (dUTU-ši) in Emar VI 201: 6, who is most probably the incumbent king when that text was written, may be regarded as Urḫi-Tešub, not Ḫattušili III as I previously thought (2006, 229 n. 25).\(^61\) However, since no evidence of direct synchronism between Ini-Tešub and Urḫi-Tešub or Ḫattušili III is available, let us leave the problem of identification of that king of Ḫatti open. In any case, since Temple M\(_1\), to which the above diviner family belonged, was destroyed at the fall of Emar, we may estimate the range of

\(^{57}\) For the latter dating, see d’Alfonso 2001; Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008, 13; also Yamada 1998, 331 and n. 21; Di Filippo 2004, 179f. For others of the earliest texts, note also ASJ 12-T 13 with the seal impression of “Ini-Tešub, the prince” (see Tsukimoto 1990, 205; but cf. d’Alfonso 2000, 283 n. 36) and MFA 1977.114 (Owen 1995) in which Ini-Tešub appears with his mother.

\(^{58}\) Although several scholars maintain that he is Urḫi-Tešub = Muršili III (Skaist 2005b, 613f.; Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008, 13), this is unacceptable (Yamada 2007, 798f.).

\(^{59}\) In my opinion, this was actually inheritance from father to son (Yamada 1998, 324-327 and n. 15; 2006, 227-229). In SMEA 45-T 1, the ‘house’ of Zu-Ba’la is described as ŠA šišḫanittaraš ŠA Anda-mali, “of the i, of Anda-mali (< *Adda[IM]-malik)” (l. 6). Previously I took the Hittite word išḫanittara- as “kinsman, parent” (1998, 326; 2006, 228) following E. Laroche (1982, 54). However, it has been confirmed that it means “a close relative by marriage, son-in-law” (Cohen 2009, 153 with previous literature), as finally evidenced by the following equation in an unpublished Hittite text: MUNUS išḫanittar(a) = MUNUS E.GE₄,A = kallātu, “daughter-in-law” (Hoffner 2009, 368). Therefore, the above phrase would be rendered as “of (my) father-in-law, of PN,” or more likely as “of the son-in-law of PN” indicating ‘my,’ i.e., of Zu-Ba’la himself. In any case, now I think that Zu-Ba’la was adopted by dIM-malik upon his marriage with his daughter (probably Dagan-lai in Emar VI 201: 49; 202: 10, 22), entered into his family as a male kallātu (and adopted son), and succeeded to his high-ranking religious office. Then the above inheritance is to be rephrased as ‘from father-in-law to son-in-law.’ This means that legally, Zu-Ba’la’s ‘father’ was dIM-malik (cf. also Appendix 1). The intervention by Muršili II and Šaḫurunuwa when Zu-Ba’la inherited dIM-malik’s estate suggests some trouble with the latter’s natural son(s) or brother(s) at that time.

\(^{60}\) This seems to be a more or less reasonable estimation, since both Šaḫurunuwa and Ini-Tešub must have had long reigns (at least ca. 70 years together) and the former is thought to have died before the reign of Ḫattušili III (Hawkins 1976-80, 431). If we follow the Hittite chronology of T. Bryce (2005, xv), since Šaḫurunuwa is known to have succeeded to the throne in the ninth year of Muršili II (ca. 1321-1295 B.C.), the above dating of Emar VI 31 to ca. 1275 B.C. means assigning ca. 40 years to his reign (thus ca. 1313-1273 B.C.).

\(^{61}\) According to Bryce (2005, xv), the reigns of these kings are dated as follows: Urḫi-Tešub (ca.1272-67 B.C.) and Ḫattušili III (ca. 1267-37 B.C.).
the Syro-Hittite-type texts as ca. 1275-1175 B.C., following Cohen and d’Alfonso.

It is known that after Zu-Ba’ala, the succession of the office of ‘the diviner of the gods of Emar’ was as follows: → 4IM-qarrad (his son) → 4Šaggar(30)-abu (his son) → 4IM-malik (his brother).62 Then the office of 4IM-malik seems to have been passed to his son Zuzu, 63 who belonged to the final generation of the family and thus probably during whose period Emar was destroyed. In order to let these four diviners of three generations cover 95 years (ca. 1270-1175 B.C.), we have to assign, e.g., 40 years to each of 4IM-qarrad and 4IM-malik, 5 years to Šaggar-abu, and 10 years to Zuzu (cf. Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008, 15f.). Although the assignment of 40 years to one generation is rather unusual, it would be possible if 4IM-qarrad and 4IM-malik were still young when they succeeded to the office.64

As for the texts of the Syrian type, the key family is, of course, the Emar dynasty. As seen above, the period in which the urban scribes were active seems to have been as early as the reign of Yaṣi-Dagan, the first attested king. Unlike the case of the texts of the Syro-Hittite type, we have unfortunately no significant clue for consideration of the absolute chronology. So, on trial let us simply calculate back from the end of Emar, ca. 1175 B.C., assigning 25 years (the average of 30-20 years for a full reign) to all the kings65 but Zu-Aštarti, with a short reign (say, 5 years). As a result, the reign of Yaṣi-Dagan is theoretically dated to ca. 1280-55 B.C. It is interesting to note that the earliest date in the texts of the Syro-Hittite type (ca. 1275 B.C.) goes well in this chronological range. This would mean that the chronological ranges of both types of texts are more or less the same, not just a partial overlap as Cohen and d’Alfonso maintain. Although close observations on the synchronisms will lead us to assign rather 30, instead of 25, years to Pilsu-Dagan and Elli (see § VI), we may reasonably conclude that the Emar (legal) texts of both types extend for approximately 100 years (ca. 1270s-1175 B.C.).66

62 See Yamada 1998, 327-330; Fleming 2000, 31, 33f.; Adamthwaite 2001, 31f., 145; Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008, 12; Cohen 2009, 22f., 155-178. A problem is the existence of another bearer of this title, Rašap-abu(4GIR-AD) son of 4IM-qarrad, in Emar VI 604.6, who seems identical with Šaggar-abu (Yamada 1998, 328f.). It was once thought the problem could be avoided by the emendation of 4GIR to 4HAR = Šaggar (Fleming 2000, 31f. n. 61; cf. Abi-30/4HAR in GsK VI 6: 41 and 7S 87: 32). However, recently M. T. Rutz demonstrated well that the reading of 4GIR is correct (2006, 595-605, 616), but he nevertheless tried reading 4GIR-AD as Šaggar-abu, suggesting some association of Šaggar with Sakkan (4GIR) in Mesopotamia or with 1Išum (4GIR) in Ugarit (ibid., 605-610). It should be noted here that we can hardly assume that there was a diviner Rašap-abu, who used the Syro-Hittite scripts introduced by the Hittites, before the predecessor of Zu-Ba’ala; since Zu-Ba’ala was active in the late(st) phase of Muršili II’s reign, the beginning of the period of his predecessor (4IM-malik) can be dated to around the time when Šuppiluliuma I conquered northern Syria in ca. 1325 B.C. Although admitting that we have no clear evidence of an equation between 30 (or 4HAR) and 4GIR in Emar, I tentatively follow Rutz’s interpretation in view of the double DN, Šaggar-wa-Išum, in Ugarit (ibid., 609).

63 Emar VI 225-226 record transactions between two sons of 4IM-malik. In these texts, both Zuzu (225: 1) and Ipiqi-Dagan (225: 5 [see Arnaud 1985-87/1, 112]; 226: 1) are called only DUMU HAL, “son of the diviner.” However, since Zuzu bought the whole inheritance share (H.A.LA) of Ipiqi-Dagan, his brother (no. 225), and then Ipiqi-Dagan was living on Zuzu (no. 226), it seems likely that these texts are from the period after the death of their father and that Zuzu was his successor. Cf. Adamthwaite 2001, 32; Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008, 12; Cohen 2009, 178f.

64 Although the situation concerning the choice of 4IM-qarrad as the successor of Zu-Ba’ala is unclear, this seems well applicable to 4IM-malik. In his will (SME 4 30-T 7) 4IM-qarrad nominates Šaggar-abu, the eldest son, as his successor (ll. 13-15) and 4IM-malik as only an alternate successor should Šaggar-abu die (ll. 16-19). As we see in ll. 3b-4, 4IM-malik takes the third position among the five sons of 4IM-qarrad.

65 Including the last king Elli, who appears in many texts.

66 If we assume 4IM-kabar’s reign began in ca. 1265 B.C. (see n. 81 below), the earliest texts of the Syrian type, which belong to the reign of his father Yaṣi-Dagan, would be dated to ca. 1275 (cf. n. 53 above).
This then urges us to reconsider the identity of “the king of the land of Ḫurri” in GsK-T 6: 11, 13. Although Skaist regards him as a ruler of Mittani before the Hittite conquest by Ṣuppiiliuliuma I in ca. 1325 B.C. (1998, 62), this is quite doubtful. Let us recall that Ir'ib-4IM, the father of Limi-šarra, brought back the four Emarite princesses as well as silver and gold from the Ḫurrian king. This was achieved one generation before GsK-T 6 was written (see § II). Even if we date this document to as early as 1275 B.C., theoretically Ir’ib-4IM would have been active only around 1300 B.C. Therefore, it seems better to assume that the above Ḫurrian king was a king of Ḫanigalbat of the early thirteenth century B.C., probably Ṣattuara I, before he was defeated by Adad-nirari I, king of Assyria (cf. Harrak 1987, 123, 128).

VI. Synchronic Chronology

The notable synchronisms attested in the Emar texts are as follows:

1. the Emar dynasty and the Carchemish dynasty
   Ḫuṣur-Dagan (son of King 4IM-kabar) — Ini-Tešub (Emar VI 206)

2. the Zu-Ba’la (the diviner) family and the Emar dynasty
   4IM-qarrad (son of Zu-Ba’la) — Ḫuṣur-Dagan (Emar VI 206; BLMJE 8)

3. the Zu-Ba’la family and the Carchemish dynasty
   Zu-Ba’la (son of 4IM-malik) — Śaḫurunuwa, Ini-Tešub (Emar VI 201)
   4IM-qarrad — Ini-Tešub (Emar VI 201, 206, 207)

4. the Zu-Ba’la family and the Hittite dynasty
   Zu-Ba’la — Muršili II (Emar VI 201)

Furthermore, if it is correct that Emar VI 42 (ll. 9b-16) refers to the second military conflict between ‘Assyria’ and ‘Ḫatti’ in the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I (Yamada in press 2), we may assume another synchronism between the kings of Emar, Assyria and Ḫatti as follows: Pilisu-Dagan — Tukulti-Ninurta I — Tudḫaliya IV.

A synchronic chart based on these observations is given in Appendix 4. We have observed above that as far as is attested in the Emar texts, each family or dynasty of Emar, Zu-Ba’la and Carchemish covers more or less the same range of time. However, as it is apparent on the chart, whereas the generations in the Zu-Ba’la family are more or less parallel to those of the Carchemish dynasty, they are not really so to those in the Emar dynasty.

Although several scholars have proposed the following synchronisms to maintain that these dynasties and family actually overlap in only part, they are untenable. Firstly, Skaist (1998, 51-
53) asserts that “Ibni-Dagan, son of the diviner” in TS 44: 14f. indicates Ibni-Dagan son of Zu-Ba’la, the diviner,\(^72\) and notes that he was contemporary of, e.g., Bulalu of the Awiru family (TS 25: 4), who is certainly to be dated to the late phase of the Emar texts. Although TS 25 and 44 must be contemporary (cf. TAR-PI in 25: 2; 44: 2), the above identification of Ibni-Dagan as son of Zu-Ba’la is not fully convincing, since that reference lacks his patronymic. In fact, that synchronism between the diviner Ibni-Dagan (son of Zu-Ba’la) and Bulalu has been definitely disproved (see Di Filippo 2004, 187f.).

Secondly, Di Filippo (2008, 47) argues that Ini-Tešub, king of Carchemish (Emar VI 18-19), postdates Zu-Aštarti, king of Emar (Emar VI 17), regarding Kunazu (17: 10, 22, 31) as father of Kitta (e.g., 18: 2; 19: 2). This is simply wrong, however, since Kitta’s father is referred to as Itur-Dagan in Emar VI 19: 16. Precisely, it is incredible that in the same family, while the father served the king of Emar, his son served the king of Carchemish.\(^73\) Therefore, the documents from the jar Msk 7340 (Emar VI 17-19) cannot be regarded as a family archive (so Di Filippo, ibid.).

Thirdly, Cohen and d’Alfonso insist: “Iṣṣur-Dagan, a contemporary of Ba’l-qarrād, often appears as a witness beside his nephew, Elli. It is to be understood from this that Ba’l-qarrād was contemporary with Elli and not with Pilsu-Dagan” (2008, 18). However, this is obviously incorrect, since Iṣṣur-Dagan, brother of Pilsu-Dagan, is actually attested as a witness more in Pilsu-Dagan-texts (Emar VI 10: 23; 138: 50; BLMJE 5: 42; TS 35: 29; 54: 22’f.; cf. also Emar VI 137) than in Elli-texts (Emar VI 139: 44; 140: 22; RE 59: 22). Therefore, the synchronism they claim between ۴IM-qarrad (son of Zu-Ba’la) and Elli is quite doubtful, as it was gained only through this wrong assumption.\(^74\) Here it should be noted that this is the basis for their claim for the chronological discrepancy between the texts of the Syrian type and those of the Syro-Hittite type! In conclusion, the argument by Cohen and d’Alfonso is to be rejected as baseless.

However, in view of Appendix 4 (looking at the dates in italics), one may ask how Iṣṣur-Dagan and ۴IM-qarrad (ca. 1270-30 B.C.) could be contemporary, pointing out that they seem to belong to different periods if we assign 25 years per reign for Elli (ca. 1200-1175 B.C.) and Pilsu-Dagan (ca. 1225-00 B.C.) and 5 years for Zu-Aštarti (ca. 1230-25 B.C.). On this problem, let us examine Emar VI 206 (cf. also 168: 8’-12’; 89’-129’; 108’-139’ and BLMJE 8. Emar VI 206 records the purchase of a garden (GIŠ.KIRI₆.NUMUN) by the diviner ۴IM-qarrad (ll. 12f., 16). In this text, two of the four neighbors of the garden are noteworthy: Iṣṣur-Dagan, son of the king (l. 6), and Addiya (written as “ad-di-ia”) son of Dada (l. 7). This Addiya may be the same as the one referred to as a witness in the early texts.\(^75\) If this identification is correct, one may surmise that Emar VI 206 belongs to the reign of ۴IM-kabar. Although this is possible, it has not been confirmed that Iṣṣur-Dagan, who is first attested in Pilsu-Dagan-texts (see above), was active in that period.

On the other hand, BLMJE 8, another document in which the same ۴IM-qarrad (l. 10)

\(^72\) See also Adamthwaite 2001, 230. Based on this identification, he maintains that there were two attacks on Emar by the TAR-PI troops (ibid., 230f., 270-272).

\(^73\) Actually, we know that Kitta’s father, too, served the king of Carchemish (see Yamada 1995b, 308).

\(^74\) However, now Cohen regards ۴IM-qarrad as the contemporary of Pilsu-Dagan (ca. 1270-50 B.C. according to the Middle Chronology), rather than of Elli, through the synchronism with Iṣṣur-Dagan (2009, 26).

purchased a garden, lists the following among its neighbors: Iṣṣur-Dagan\textsuperscript{76} (l. 7) and Zu-Eya son of Aḥi-malik (l. 4). The latter is probably the same as the well attested witness Zu-Eya in Zu-Aštarti- and Elli-texts.\textsuperscript{77} If this identification is correct, \textit{BLMJΕ} 8 would be dated to the reign of Zu-Aštarti or of Pilsu-Dagan.\textsuperscript{78} In view of the fact that Iṣṣur-Dagan does not appear in Zu-Aštarti- or Abbanu-texts, the latter option may be preferable.

Thus \textit{BLMJΕ} 8 suggests that the generation of Zu-Aštarti and Pilsu-Dagan and that of \textsuperscript{4}IM-qarrad actually overlapped in part. To adjust to this requirement, it seems to me better to assign 30 years to the reigns of the kings, at least for Elli (ca. 1205-1175 B.C.) and Pilsu-Dagan (ca. 1235-05 B.C.).\textsuperscript{79} In this case, \textit{Emar} VI 206, too, can well be dated to the reign of Pilsu-Dagan (its earliest phase) or perhaps of Zu-Aštarti (ca. 1240-35 B.C.).\textsuperscript{80} Therefore in Appendix 4, I give for the Emarite kings two sets of dates, one based on a full reign of 30 years (in roman) and the other of 25 years (in italic) with preference to the former.\textsuperscript{81}

\section*{VII. Conclusions}

On the basis of the above discussions, the following points are to be made:

(1) In the Emar texts, only one local, royal dynasty is recognized. The Ir‘ib-\textsuperscript{4}IM family is to be regarded as a leading family associated, or even affiliated, with the urban authority.

(2) The Emar dynasty as attested in the Emar texts is reconstructed as shown in Appendix 4. Abbanu, Yaṣi-Dagan (son of Pilsu-Dagan) and \textsuperscript{4}IM-kabar (son of Elli) are not to be regarded as kings but as princes.

(3) Among the royal scribes and the urban scribes, the latter (including scribes who may

\textsuperscript{76} This man is referred to without his patronymic or title, unlike other individuals appearing in the main text (ll. 4, 8, 10): i.e., the Iṣṣur-Dagan. In the Emar texts, the only prominent man with this PN is Prince Iṣṣur-Dagan, son of \textsuperscript{4}IM-kabar (but cf. Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008, 17 n. 63). The same interpretation can be applied to “the house of Iṣṣur-Dagan,” referred to in the testament of the diviner \textsuperscript{4}IM-qarrad (\textit{SMEA} 30-T 7: 20). However, since we know of a case where the previous owner of a house is referred to without his patronymic (\textit{Emar} VI 202: 13; see Appendix 1), it is not definite that this latter reference, too, is the same Iṣṣur-Dagan.

\textsuperscript{77} For references see Skaist 2005a, 571 n. 15, with addition of TS 82 (Elli-text).

\textsuperscript{78} As seen above on \textit{Emar} VI 9 (§ III), we cannot immediately date all the Elli-texts to his reign. When Elli appears in a text without the title of king or his son \textsuperscript{4}IM-kabar as W2 (Elli himself being W1), that text can be dated either to his reign or to that of Pilsu-Dagan, his father. Note that the witness Zu-Eya is referred to in such texts: \textit{Emar} VI 97: 23; \textit{RE} 23: 32f.; TS 11: 35; 59: 28; 82: 32; cf. also TS 12: 24; 62: 32.

\textsuperscript{79} In this case, the military conflict between ‘Assyria’ and ‘Ḫatti’, which, in my opinion, occurred in the middle phase of Tukulti-Ninurta I’s reign (1233-1197 B.C.), will be dated to the second half of Pilsu-Dagan’s reign as I assumed (see Yamada in press 2, n. 67). On the other hand, most of the Pilsu-Dagan’s reign still overlaps with the period of the diviner \textsuperscript{4}IM-malik, not of his father \textsuperscript{4}IM-qarrad (ibid., V.3, according to my old chronological framework). However, note that in \textsuperscript{4}IM-malik’s period, too, we see no gap in the sequence of the Hittite dignitaries sent to Emar; if there is one, it could only have occurred in the late(st) phase of his period (see Yamada 1998, 332), corresponding to the reign of Elli. We may conclude again that during Pilsu-Dagan’s reign the Hittite control of Emar seems to have remained stable in general.

\textsuperscript{80} The seal of Ini-Tešub impressed on \textit{Emar} VI 206 is A3 (see n. 70 above) = CS3 (Bardeschi 2001, 251, 263f.), which was used later than C1 (Beyer 2001, 151) = SS1 (Bardeschi 2001, 250, 257, 260), which belongs to the earliest phase of his reign (d’Alfonso 2001). It is worth noting that the seal A3 = CS3 is impressed also on RS 17.59 (Beyer 2001, 48; Bardeschi 2001, 258f.), which was most probably written when the Hittites anticipated the imminent war with Assyria, i.e., the battle of Niḫriya (see Singer 1999, 682f., also 686-689). As I discussed elsewhere (in press 2, III.1), this battle dates to the beginning of Tukulti-Ninurta I’s reign, i.e., ca. 1233 B.C. If so, the above sealing suggests that \textit{Emar} VI 206 was drawn up around that time, when Ini-Tešub was still alive.

\textsuperscript{81} If we automatically assign 30 years also to \textsuperscript{4}IM-kabar, we have ca. 1270 B.C. as the earliest possible beginning date of his reign in theory (cf. ca. 1265 B.C. when assigning 25 years, the date which I tentatively hold). This would indicate that the reign of his father Yaṣi-Dagan can hardly be dated to the fourteenth century B.C.
have been urban) were active only in the early period of the Emar texts, i.e., the reigns of Yaṣi-Dagan and probably ʿIM-kabar.

(4) The Emar (legal) texts of both Syrian type and Syro-Hittite type are to be dated to ca. 1270s-1175 B.C. It is not necessary to assume any chronological discrepancy between them.

(5) The Zu-Baʿla family provides us with several basic synchronisms with the dynasties of Emar, Carchemish and Ḫatti as shown in Appendix 4.

Appendix 1. On Zu-Baʿla, Son of Šurši, Again

Although two scholars have maintained that the father of Zu-Baʿla, the diviner of the gods of Emar (= A), was Šurši, not ʿIM-malik (d’Alfonso 2000, 276f.; Skaist 2005b, 616-619), their arguments are unconvincing (Yamada 2007, 793-798). Recently, Cohen has insisted anew that the six men listed in ASJ 14-T 43: 18-19a, i.e., the “sons” of Zu-Baʿla son of Šurši (= B), are sons and grandsons of Zu-Baʿla A. Those six men are as follows: Kapi-Dagan, ʿIM-malik, ʿIM-belu, Zu-Aštarti, Tura-Dagan, and Qiri-Dagan. Although his argument is substantially the same as Skaist’s, 82 Cohen explicitly states that two out of the six sons of Zu-Baʿla A 83 and three out of his five grandsons 84 listed in SMEA 30-T 7, the testament of ʿIM-qarrad, are referred to in the above list of ASJ 14-T 43 (2009, 149f., 157f.).

Here, it should be noted that the name ʿIM-belu (ASJ 14-T 43: 18) is not found among the sons and grandsons of Zu-Baʿla A as listed in SMEA 30-T 7, or even among the known members of the Zu-Baʿla A family (cf. Cohen 2009, 147-183). 85 Ignoring this point, Cohen asserts, it is “the fact that Zū-Baʿla’s father was ... Šuršu” (ibid., 179; cf. also p. 149). However, in my opinion, this shows that the above six “sons” of Zu-Baʿla B are not those of Zu-Baʿla A, i.e., Zu-Baʿla A ≠ Zu-Baʿla B, and thus that the overlap of a set of popular PNss is to be regarded as a coincidence (Yamada 2007, 797f.).

To clarify this point, let us consider how ʿIM-belu’s absence in SMEA 30-T 7 could be explained, if Cohen is correct. Since ʿIM-belu is not included among the five recognized sons of ʿIM-qarrad, he cannot be regarded as his recognized son. The absence of ʿIM-qarrad and Šaggar-abu and the presence of ʿIM-malik in ASJ 14-T 43 could indicate that it belongs to the period of the diviner ʿIM-malik. However, seeing that ʿIM-belu takes the third position following the ʿIM-malik among the family members here, one should wonder why that important member (brother of ʿIM-qarrad) was excluded from the witness list in SMEA 30-T 7. This problem remains to be explained. Then, one might propose to take him as the eldest son of ʿIM-malik. In this case, however, we are obliged to conclude that he died young, since it was, in my opinion, Zuzu who

---

82 And actually the same as Adamthwaite’s (2001, 32-35).
83 Besides ʿIM-qarrad himself (l. 1), note the following five among the witnesses: Abi-Šaggar, Ibni-Dagan, Tura-Dagan, Ipḫur-Dagan and Kapi-Dagan (ll. 28f., 31).
84 I.e., sons of ʿIM-qarrad: [Šaggar]-abu, Zu-Aštarti, ʿIM-malik, Qiri-Dagan and Belu-qarrad (ll. 3b-5a), who it is prescribed will inherit his estate (ll. 7b-8).
85 Adamthwaite (2001, 33) says that this ʿIM-belu could well be the same as ʿIM/U-belu in a PN list (Emar VI 336: 81 [DUMU ḪAL]) and in colophons of two lexical texts (604.2.1: 3 [I.ZU.TUR]; 2: 3 [MÁŠ.ŠU.GÍD.GÍD]). However, since all of these references lack patronymic, this identification is uncertain. In particular, ʿIM-belu I.ZU.TUR.<TUR>., the “novice diviner” or student, in Emar VI 604.2.1 (colophon of Emar VI 541A) cannot be regarded as a member of the Zu-Baʿla A family, since he uses the Syrian scripts, not the Syro-Hittite scripts used by the members of that family (see Cohen 2009, 132f., also 147). On Emar VI 604.2.2: 3, see below and n. 90.
succeeded him (see § V). Although admittedly possible, this seems to me a bit too arbitrary, even improbable, explanation.

Following the above assertion, Cohen assigns Emar VI 604.4, the colophon of Emar VI 548H, which refers to Zu-Ba’la as dIM-malik’s son (l. 1), 86 to Zuzu, Zu-Ba’la’s great-grandson (2009, 179). Although he insists that Zu-Ba’la is a hypocoristic name for Zu-Ba’la (or Zu-dDN type of PN in general), is this pattern of hypocorism attested in Emar or elsewhere? At least, the “evidence” Cohen provided (ibid., 179 and n. 87) does not seem very convincing. Precisely, if Ipqi-Dagan was the successor of dIM-malik (Cohen & d’Alfonso 2008, 12; cf. also Cohen 2009, 178f.), how could his brother Zu-Ba’la = Zuzu bear the title of ‘the diviner of the gods of Emar’ (Emar VI 606.4: 2a-3)?

Furthermore, although Cohen says, “Tarṣipu was almost certainly the daughter of Adda-mālik” (2009, 151), this is quite doubtful. Firstly, according to him, É c-mdIM-ma-lik1,87 “the house(hold) of Adda-mālik” (Emar VI 202: 13) is a part of the dowry which her father (dIM-malik) gave her when she married Zu-Ba’la (ibid., 151f. and n. 16). However, this nominal phrase is obviously to be read as ‘É c-mdIM-ba-ri, “the house of dIM-baru.”88 This PN (not the same person) is known as dIM-MÁŠ.ŠU.GÍD.GÍD in the Emar texts (ASJ 12-T 7: 14; also Emar VI 146: 14;89 604.2.2: 390). Secondly, it is worth noting that it is stated that the three sons of Tarṣipu must leave the house of Zu-Ba’la without inheritance after taking care of him to his death (Emar VI 201: 40-48). This is a feature of the contracts of caring by a slave (e.g., RE 27; Emar 177: 20’-22’) or by an amīlītu (e.g., Emar VI 117; TS 39).91 On the other hand, in the past those sons seem to have had the right to participate in the inheritance of Zu-Ba’la’s estate and to receive their terḫatu-money (cf. Emar VI 202: 5-12, 17-24 [see Durand & Marti 2003, 179]), and Tarṣipu once received the title deed of the house of dIM-baru (ll. 13-16). Although the reason for canceling these rights is unknown, taking the above two points into account, Tarṣipu is more likely to have been Zu-Ba’la’s female slave who gave birth to his sons, i.e., a concubine.

In view of these points, Cohen’s argument for regarding Šurši as the father of Zu-Ba’la, the diviner of the gods of Emar, seems to me untenable.

* * *

Appendices 2-3 show the witness lists in the texts written by Abi-kapi (A and B) and the urban scribes (Alal-abu, Dagan-belu, Eḫli-Kuša, Marduk-muballīṭ and Rašap-ili). The readings of the PNs are partially revised on the basis of the handcopies and in comparison with other lists. Although those lists are basically arranged according to their similarities, it should be noted that

86 For the reading of Emar VI 604.4: 1, see Yamada 1998, 326; Cohen 2009, 179.
87 Cf. é iŠKUR ma-ri (Arnaud 1985-87/3, 213); é dIM-ma-<lik ma> -ri (Durand & Marti 2003, 179).
88 Cf. BA (ll. 9, 26, 27, probably also 25 [reading ū ba-]; cf. l. 4) vs. MA (ll. 3, 5, 8, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 [in -ha-ma-di]). This “IM-baru must have been the previous owner of the house, from whom Zu-Ba’la acquired it, probably by purchase.
89 Reading “IM-MÁŠ.ŠU.GÍD.GÍD (cf. Durand 1989b, 84, no. 111c; 1990, 62). His son Mašru-ḫamis (l. 13; reading “māš-ri-) may be identified with Mašruḫe son of “IM-MÁŠ.ŠU.GÍD.GÍD (ASJ 12-T 7: 14).
91 In Emar amillātu is a specific type of debtor owing silver, who himself enters into the house of the creditor as an antichretic pledge (see Yamada 2010a). For contracts of caring by slaves and amillātus, see Yamada 2012, 3-7.
their order is not necessarily chronological. Note the following abbreviations: br. = brother; d. = daughter of; s(s). = son(s) of.

The concordance of the texts treated below is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Emar VI 2</em></td>
<td>2K</td>
<td><em>ASJ 13-T 28</em> = <em>AuOr 5-T 17</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sem. 46-T 2</em></td>
<td>3.1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emar VI 4</em></td>
<td>2N</td>
<td><em>ASJ 13-T 33</em></td>
<td>3.5D</td>
<td><em>TS 1</em></td>
<td>3.2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emar VI 12</em></td>
<td>3.3A</td>
<td><em>ASJ 14-T</em></td>
<td>2C</td>
<td><em>TS 3</em></td>
<td>2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emar VI 14</em></td>
<td>2G</td>
<td><em>AuOr 5-T 3</em></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td><em>TS 6</em></td>
<td>2L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emar VI 126</em></td>
<td>2I</td>
<td><em>AuOr 5-T 4</em></td>
<td>3.2E</td>
<td><em>TS 8</em></td>
<td>2R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emar VI 144</em></td>
<td>2D</td>
<td><em>AuOr 5-T 17</em></td>
<td>3.2F</td>
<td><em>TS 9</em></td>
<td>2Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emar VI 148</em></td>
<td>3.3I</td>
<td><em>GsK-T 6</em></td>
<td>3.3G</td>
<td><em>TS 14</em></td>
<td>cf. 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emar VI 149</em></td>
<td>3.3E</td>
<td><em>RE 2</em></td>
<td>3.2A</td>
<td><em>TS 15</em></td>
<td>3.5C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emar VI 150</em></td>
<td>3.2D</td>
<td><em>RE 4</em></td>
<td>3.1C</td>
<td><em>TS 16</em></td>
<td>3.3C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emar VI 153</em></td>
<td>3.5A</td>
<td><em>RE 14</em></td>
<td>2B</td>
<td><em>TS 17</em></td>
<td>3.3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emar VI 156</em></td>
<td>2H</td>
<td><em>RE 16</em></td>
<td>2A</td>
<td><em>TS 18</em></td>
<td>3.3F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emar VI 157</em></td>
<td>2P</td>
<td><em>RE 22</em></td>
<td>3.3B</td>
<td><em>TS 19</em></td>
<td>3.1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emar VI 159</em></td>
<td>2O</td>
<td><em>RE 34</em></td>
<td>3.1B</td>
<td><em>TS 87</em></td>
<td>3.3H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ASJ 12-T 2</em></td>
<td>3.5B</td>
<td><em>RE 52</em></td>
<td>2E</td>
<td><em>ZA 89-T 4</em></td>
<td>cf. 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ASJ 12-T 7</em></td>
<td>2M</td>
<td><em>RE 71</em></td>
<td>2J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ASJ 12-T 12</em> = <em>AuOr 5-T 4</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>RE 91</em></td>
<td>3.2C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2. Witness Lists of Abi-kapi (A and B)

A: RE 16
Yaṣi-Dagan s. ⁴IM-ma[lik]
⁴IM-GAL his s.
Addiya s. Dad[a]
Ikun-Ra s. Riḫši
Ḫinunu-Dagan s. d. Tekiši
Aḫi-malik s. Attaliki
Ḫi-in-Da LÚ.ŠU.1
⁴GİR-abu s. Abi-kapi
Dagan-ma LÚ.ḫazannu
Abi-kapi DUB.SAR

B: RE 14
⁴IM-GAL s. Yaṣi-Dagan
Addiya s. Dada
Ikun-Ra s. Riḫši
Ḫinunu-Dagan s. d. Tekiši
Abudda s. Abi-⁴ḤAR
⁴GİR-abu s. Abi-kapi
Abi-ḫamis s. Abi-kapi
Abi-ka LÚ.NAGAR
Abi-kapi LÚ.DUB.SAR

C : ASJ 14-T
⁴IM-GAL s. Ellī (= Yaṣi-Dagan!)
Addiya s. Dada
Yakun-Ra s. Riši
Ḫinunu-Dagan s. Iṣur-ma
ＧİR-abu s. Abi-kapi
Šēmma s. La(l)la
Abi-ḫamis s. <Abi>-kapi
Itur-Dagan s. Igmuli
Abi-kapi LÚ.DUB.SAR

D: Emar VI 144
⁴IM-GAL s. Yaṣ[š]-Dagan
Addiya s. Dad[a]
⁴GİR-abu s. Abi-kap[i]
Šēmma s. Lal[l]a
Rašap-lai [s. Mi]lka-ma
Ili-aḫi s. Ḫi[n]-X]
Ša-di-ḫa s. Nama[rti]
Ir'i-bu[⁴IM?] s. Ḫa[tani?]?
Ab[i-kap[i] LÚ.D[UB.SAR]
ITI [Niqal]i?

E: RE 52
⁴IM-GAL s. Yaṣi-Dagan
Addiya s. Dada
⁴[G]İR-abu s. Abi-kapi
X-ti s. Iliya
Šēmma s. Lalla
[I]r'iibu s. Dagal[i]
[A]murša s. Abi-Ra
[EN]-ka s. A[
[x]-AN-[\[Abi-k][a]pi? DUB.SAR]

F: TS 3
⁴IM-GAL s. Yaṣi-Dagan
Addiya s. Dada
Amurša s. Abi-Ra[
Ir'i[bu LÚ.x[
EN-ka s. A[
Šēmma s. L[alla]
Abi-kapi DUB.SAR

G: Emar VI 14
⁴IM-GAL s. Yaṣi-Dagan
Zu-Baḥla s. Tura-aḫi
Zu-Asdi s. Zu-⁴IM
Irēšap ŠEŠ Dagan
Belanu s. Lanaša
Abi-kapi DUB.SAR

H: Emar VI 156
⁴IM-GAL s. Yaṣi-Dagan
Zu-Baḥla s. Tura-aḫi
Irešap ŠEŠ Dagan
Abi-kapi DUB.SAR
[x]te
Ukal-Dagan
[x]-Dagan s. Ḫulma
[...-]i
Abda-ḫi
[...] s. Kapi

I: Emar VI 126
Abbanu
Pilsu-Dagan
EN-malik ss. ⁴IM-GAL
Ša-di-De s. Dagan-ka
Ša-di-De s. Namarti
Ili-abi s. Abi-ḫamis
Rašap-lai s. Kirra
⁴IM-GAL s. Ikun-Da
Abda s. Bašša
Abi-kapi LÚ.DUB.SAR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J: RE 71</th>
<th>K: Emar VI 2</th>
<th>L: TS 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbanu s. <em>betemgal</em></td>
<td>Abbanu s. <em>betemgal</em></td>
<td>Abbanu s. <em>betemgal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilsu-Dagan his br.</td>
<td>Pilsu-Dagan his br.</td>
<td>Pilsu-Dagan his br.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4_betemmalik_</td>
<td>4_betemmalik_</td>
<td>4_betemmalik_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rašap-lai s. Kirra</td>
<td>Rašap-lai s. Kirra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abda s. Ḫemi</td>
<td>Abda s. Ḫemi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Šadi-Da s. Dagan-ka</td>
<td>Šadi-Da s. Dagan-ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...-D[a]gan? s. Y)yahiši-X</td>
<td>[I]riš-temgal s. Ḫani?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M: AS/12-T 7</th>
<th>N: Emar VI 4</th>
<th>O: Emar VI 159</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[P]ilsu-Dagan s. <em>betemgal</em></td>
<td>Pilsu-Dagan s. <em>betemgal</em></td>
<td>Pilsu-Dagan s. <em>betemgal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A]bdad s. Ḫemi</td>
<td>Abda s. Ḫemi</td>
<td>Iriš-temgal s. Ḫani?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B]aba s. Addiya</td>
<td>Zuzana s. Ikun-Ra</td>
<td>Yašur-Dagan s. Aldaš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ra]šap-lai s. Kirra</td>
<td>Abda s. Abudda</td>
<td>Zu-Asdi s. Milki-Ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Abi]-kapi LÚ.DUB.SAR</td>
<td>Iriš-temgal s. Ḫani?</td>
<td>Zuzana s. Ikun-Ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Ḥurrian attack (ll. 29-33)</td>
<td>Iriš-temgal s. Ḫani?</td>
<td>Ikun-Ra s. Abudda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[I]riš-temgal s. Ḫani?</td>
<td>Abkilaiš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[I]riš-temgal s. Ḫani?</td>
<td>[Abi-kapi LÚ.DUB.SAR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P: Emar VI 157</th>
<th>Q: TS 9</th>
<th>R: TS 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilsu-Dagan [s. <em>betemgal</em>]</td>
<td>Pilsu-Dagan LUGAL</td>
<td>[Pilsu-Dagan s. <em>betemgal</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiya LÚ.sukkalu</td>
<td>Illi his son</td>
<td>[...] x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuzana s. Ikun-Ra</td>
<td>Asda-aḫi his son</td>
<td>[...] his br.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iriš-temgal LÚ.hazannu</td>
<td>Abi-kapi LÚ.[D]UB.SAR</td>
<td>[...]ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdi-Išḫara</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Rašap-lai] s. Kirra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abi-kapi LÚ.DUB.SAR</td>
<td><em>in an KÚR.KÚR KALA-ti ša</em></td>
<td>[...]ba s. Ta[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ḥurri BĀD ilmima (ll. 21f.)</td>
<td>Iriš-temgal s. Ḫani?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Abi-kapi LÚ.DUB.SAR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix 3. Witness Lists of the Urban Scribes

#### 1. Alal-abu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: TS 19</th>
<th>B: RE 34</th>
<th>C: RE 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Zu-Baḥla s. Išbi-Dagan | Yaṣ-<Da>-gan! s. ʿIM-malik | [I]mlık-Dagan s. Ir-i Advisory | Zu-Baḥla DUB.SAR ITI createView
| Rihši-Dagan s. Limi-LUGAL | Tukulti-Dagan his br. | Išbi-EN s. Ikki-Da | Alal-abu DUB.SAR |
| Ili-abi his br. | Ili-abi s. Limi-LUGAL | Šei-Dagan s. Abudda | Alal-abu DUB.SAR |
| Tuppi-[IM]-ub s. Amur-ša-Dagan | Addiya s. Dada | Ugada s. Ḫaniya | |
| Iḫši-Dagan s. Yarib-Dagan | Abda s. Limm-Dagan | Alal-abu DUB.SAR | |
| Abd-a-malik s. Abdi-Iššara | [D]agan-GAL DUMU ḫazannu | Alal-abu LÜ.D[UB.SAR] | |
| Pīlsu-Dagan LÜ. ḫazannu | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D: Sem. 46-T 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaru? [s. Ell]ši?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuza[nnu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amudu [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] s. [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alal-abu DUB.SAR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Dagan-belu

A: RE 2
Yaṣi-Dagan s. 4IM-malik
Tukul his br.
Ikun-Da s. Ḫinnu-Dagan
Abda s. Limi-Dagan
Dagan-EN LÚ.DUB.SAR

B: TS 1
Yaṣi-D[agan s. 4IM-malik]
4IM-GAL [his] s.
Addiya s. [Dada]
Ikun-Ra s. Riḫ[ṣi]
Abda s. Lima-D[aga]n
4IM-ma s. Dada
Ru(b)da s. Abi-ḫAR
Aḫi-malik s. Zu-Aštarṭi
Aḫi-malik s. Attaliḫi
Rašap-TI s. Uggal
Ḫinnu-Dagan s. Yaḫṣi-Dagan
4GİR-abu s. Abi-ka<pi>
Aḫi-malik s. Attaliḫi
Dagan-EN LÚ.DUB.SAR

C: RE 91
Igmil-Dagan,
Lim-DUGAL &
Rašap-ili ss. Irīb-4IM
Abi-Dagan s. Asda-aḫi
DUMU-dai s. Abi-limu
Abi-Dagan s. Dagan-tari
Dadu s. Abi-kapi
Ḫi-Dagan s. Ir'am-Dagan
Itur-Dagan s. IrĤa-Dagan
Dagan-malik s. Ḫinnu-4IM
Milki-Dagan s. Ḫinnu-4IM
4IM-EN LÚ.ḫaza ...nunu
Dagan-EN DUB.SAR

D: Emar VI 150
Igmil-[Dagan],
[L]imi-LUGAL &
Rašap-ili ss. Irīb-4IM
Abi-Dagan s. Asda-aḫi
DUMU-dai s. Abi-limu
Dadu s. Abi-kapi
Itur-Dagan s. IrĤa-Dagan
Ḫi-Dagan s. Ir'am-Du[gl]an
Dagan-malik
s. Ḫi[nnu-4IM?]
4IM-EN LU.ḫazu[nun]u
Dagan-EN DUB.SAR

F: AuOr 5-T 17?
Igmil-Dagan s. Irīb-4IM
Dadu! s. Abi-kapi
Il-latī-Dagan s. Dagan-EN
4UTU-gamil s. ZAG-Dagan
Danuwa &
Abi-yunu ss. IrĤaḫu
Dadu s. DINGIR-lumma
Išbi-Dagan s. Itur-DINGIR
Dagan-baḫli DUB.SAR

Bubu s. Rašap-DINGIR
Šei-Dagan DUMU SANGA
Rašap-TI s. Taḳkata
Dagan-EN LÚ.DUB.SAR
Yaḫṣi?-Dagan s. IB[

[ITI] 4NIN.KUR
MU DUMU Qatebiḫu
2.KAM.MA
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3. Eḫli-Kuša

A: Emar VI 12

[Limi-LUGAL?
[Raša]p-ili?
Ḫḫi-Dagan s. Ir[am-D]agan
Milki-Dagan
s. [Ḫinnu-Dagan?]
Dagan-malik
s. Ir[zaḫ-Dagan]
Ir[zaḫ-Da]gan s. K[irr[a]
Ahī-ḫamis s. x
Eḫli-Kuša DUB.S[AR]

I[TI]
MU x

B: RE 22

Limī-LUGAL &
Rašap-li s. Ir’îb-4IM
Abba s. Yarim-EN
Ḫḫi-Dagan s. Ir[am-Dagan
Milki-Dagan s. Ḫinn-4IM
Milki-Dagan
s. Ḫinnu-Dagan
Dagan-malik
s. Ir[zaḫ-Dagan
Ipḫu-Dagan s. Ahī-malik
Ir[zaḫ-Dagan s. Kirra
Eḫli-Kuša DUB.SAR

C: TS 16

Limī-LUGAL s. Ir’îb-4IM
Rašap-li his br.
Abba s. Yarim-EN
Ḫḫi-Dagan s. Ir[am-Dagan
Milki-Dagan s. Ḫinn-4IM
Milki-Dagan
s. Ḫinnu-Dagan
Abi-Rašap LŪ. ḫazannu
Ir[zaḫ-Dagan s. Kirra
Eḫli-Kuša DUB.SAR

ITI Adam
MU Turam-Dagan s. Kunši
2.KAM.MA

D: TS 17

Limī-LUGAL s. Ir’îb-4IM
Rašap-li his br.
Abba s. Yarim-EN
Ḫḫi-Dagan s. Ir[am-Dagan
Dagan-malik
s. Ir[zaḫ-Dagan
Milki-Dagan s. Ḫinn-4IM
Milki-Dagan
s. Ḫinnu-Dagan
Ir[zaḫ-Dagan s. Kirra
<4 KUR-rapiḫ s. Rahša
Abi-Rašap LŪ. ḫazannu
Eḫli-Kuša DUB.SAR

ITI Adam
MU Turam-Dagan s. Kunši
2.KAM.MA

E: Emar VI 149

L[i-L]UGAL s. Ir’îb-4IM
[Raša]p-ili his br.]
A[bb]a s. Y[arim-EN]
Ḫḫi-Dagan s. Ir[am-Dagan
Milki-Dagan
s. Ḫin[n]a-4IM
Milki-Dagan
s. Ḫinnu-Dagan
Ir[zaḫ-Dagan s. Kirra
<4 Abi-Rašap LŪ. ḫazannu
Eḫli-Kuša [L]Ū.D[UB.SAR]

ITI Adam
MU Turam-Dagan s. Kunši
2.KAM.MA

F: TS 18

Limī-LUGAL s. Ir’îb-4IM
Ḫḫi-Dagan s. Ir[am-Dagan
Dagan-malik
s. Ir[zaḫ-Dagan
Milki-Dagan
s. Ḫinn-4IM
Milki-Dagan
s. Ḫinnu-Dagan
Ir[zaḫ-Dagan s. Kirra
<4 Abi-Rašap LŪ. ḫazannu
Eḫli-Kuša DUB.SAR

ITI Adam
MU Turam-Dagan s. Kunši
2.KAM.MA

[ITI?
[MU T]ur[a(m)-Dagan?
x.KAM.MA]

I[TI] x-ti
M[U D]UMU Kunši
2.KAM.MA
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G: GsK-T 6

Li-LUGAL & URU.Emar
Abba s. Yarim-EN
Rašap-ili s. Irıb-₄IM
Milki-Dagan
s. Ḫinnu-Dagan
Dagan-malik
s. Izraḥ-Dagan
Abi-₃₀ s. Itur-ŠÂ
Abi-Rašap LÚ.ḥazannu
Eḫli-Kuša LÚ.DUB.SAR

H: TS 87

Lim-LUGAL s. Irıb-₄IM
Rašap-ili s. Irıb-₄IM
Milki-Dagan
s. Ḫinnu-Dagan
Dagan-malik
s. Izraḥ-Dagan
Abi-₃ḤAR s. Itur-ŠÂ
Abi-Rašap LÚ.ḥazannu
Eḫli-Kuša DUB.SAR

I: Emar VI 148

Išbi-Dagan s. Lim-LUGAL
Rḫṣ-Dagan his br.
Amur-ša-Dagan his br.
Šadi-Dagan his br.
Abba s. Yarim-EN
Limi-Dagan s. Tillati-Dagan
Dagalli s. Ir'am-Dagan
Dada s. Abi-Dagan
Abi-Rašap LÚ.ḥazannu
Eḫli-Kuša DUB.SAR

ITI ₄NIN.KUR
MU Gadidu 2.KAM.MA

cf. ina ṫmāti ša Li-LUGAL
DUMU Irıb-₄IM (ll. 1f.)

4. Marduk-muballīṭ

AuOr 5-T 3

Yarib-baḫlu s. Imlik-₄IM
Irıb-₄IM
Izraḥ-Dagan ss. Asda-aḫī
Abi-Dagan s. EN-GAL
Abi-baḫlu s. Abi-kapi
Abi-limu s. Abi-baḫlu
₄UTU-gamīl s. Gitta
Ir'am-Dagan s. Irıb-₄IM-lu₄
Abirsa s. Malku-Dagan
Irıb-DINGIR s. Mašḥata
Abi-Dagan s. Dagan-tari
Zu-Baḥla s. Ḫinnu-Dagan s. Dagan-tari
Rigmi s. Aya
₄AMAR.UTU-muballīṭ
DUB.SAR

cf. TS 14?

Irıb-₄IM
Izraḥ-Dagan
Ḥinnu-Dagan ss. Asda-aḫī!
Irıb-DINGIR s. Mašḥata
dUMU-dai s. Abi-limu!? 
[Abi-D]agan s. EN-GAL 
[Abi-D]agan s. Dagan-tari 
[Zu-Baḥla s.] Ḫinnu-Dagan s. Dagan-tari 
[x] x [x] x [x] x [x] x [x]

[...] x-Baḥlu?
[...] x-Baḥlu?
[...] -m]alik
[...]

cf. ARANA (ll. 19-26)

cf. ZA 89-T 4?

[Irıb]-₄IM [M]
[Izraḥ-D]agan
[...] x-Baḥlu?
[...] -m]alik
[...]

Išbi-Dagan s. Lim-LUGAL
Rḫṣ-Dagan his br.
Amur-ša-Dagan his br.
Šadi-Dagan his br.
Abba s. Yarim-EN
Limi-Dagan s. Tillati-Dagan
Dagalli s. Ir'am-Dagan
Dada s. Abi-Dagan
Abi-Rašap LÚ.ḥazannu
Eḫli-Kuša DUB.SAR

ITI ₄NIN.KUR
MU Gadidu 2.KAM.MA

cf. Beckman 2000
5. Rašap-ili

A: Emar VI 153

[Lim-ša]rra
I[gmil-Dagan]n [ss. Ir'îb-]IM
[Abi-D]agan s. Asda-ahī
[DUMU-dai] s. Abi-limu
[Abi-Dagan]n s. Dagan-tari
[Zu-Baṭla?] s. ḫir-dad<mu>
[Dadu] s. Abi-kapi
[Dagan-malik] s. Ḫinnu-Dagan
[...] s. Igmil-Dagan
[Rašap-ili D]UB.SAR

B: ASJ 12-T 2

Igmil-Dagan
Lim-šarra ss. Ir'îb-IM
DUMU-dai s. Abi-limu
Abi-Dagan s. Dagan-tari
Zu-Baṭla his br.
[D]adu s. Ab[i]-kapi
[Dagan]-malik
's. Ḫinnu-Dagan'
[Rašap-ili DUB.SAR

C: TS 15

Igmil-Dagan s. Ir'îb-IM
DUMU-dai s. Abi-limu
Abi-Dagan s. Dagan-tari
Zu-Baṭla his br.
Dadu s. Abi-kapi
Dagan-malik
s. Ḫinnu-IM
Rašap-ili DUB.SAR

D: ASJ 13-T 33

Zu-Anna s. Abi-ili?
4IM-GAL s. Lim-šarra
Rašap-ili DUB.SAR

ITI Zarati
MU Ipḫur-Dagan 2.KAM.MA
Appendix 4. Synchronic Chart: The Zu-Ba’la Family and the Dynasties of Emar, Carchemish and Ḫatti

Note: All reigns and active periods are approximate; roman/italic = date by assigning 30/25 years per full reign; the reigns of the kings of Ḫatti follow Bryce 2005, xv.
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