



UNIVERSITÀ CA' FOSCARI VENEZIA

KASKAL

Rivista di storia, ambienti e culture del Vicino Oriente Antico

Volume 15

2018



LoGisma editore
Firenze 2018



UNIVERSITÀ CA' FOSCARI VENEZIA

KASKAL

Rivista di storia, ambienti e culture del Vicino Oriente Antico
Volume 15 – 2018

Direttore Responsabile – Editor

Ines Thomas

Direzione – Editorial Board

Stefano de Martino, Frederick Mario Fales, Giovanni Battista Lanfranchi, Lucio Milano,
Simonetta Ponchia

Consiglio scientifico – Scientific Board

Yoram Cohen, Stefano de Martino, Frederick Mario Fales, Francis Joannès, Michael Jursa,
Giovanni Battista Lanfranchi, Cécile Michel, Lucio Milano, Simonetta Ponchia, Michael Roaf,
Jack M. Sasson

Segreteria Scientifica – Scientific Secretary

Paola Corò

Progetto grafico – Graphic project

Daniele Levi

Composizione – Typesetting

Stefania Ermidoro

Editore – Publisher

LoGisma editore – Via Zufolana, 4 – I-50039 Vicchio (Firenze) www.logisma.it

Stampa – Print

Press Service Srl – Via Curzio Malaparte, 23 – I-50145 Firenze

Distribuzione – Distribution

Orders can be either addressed to the publisher, or to:

Casalini Libri s.p.a. – Via B. da Maiano 3 – I-50014 Fiesole (Firenze) <http://www.casalini.it>

All articles submitted to KASKAL have undergone a peer-review process.

ISBN 978-88-94926-16-3

ISSN 1971-8608

Stampato nel marzo 2020

CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN THE *HAZANNU* OFFICE AT EMARMaurizio Viano¹

The chronology of Emar texts has been long debated and still causes disagreement among scholars. Suffice it to mention the recent contributions by Yamada (2013) and Démare-Lafont and Fleming (2009, 2015), which attempted to revise the relative chronology established by Cohen and D'Alfonso (2008). It is well known that ephemeral as well as scholarly texts from Emar can be attributed to two different scribal traditions termed by scholars “Syrian” and “Syro-Hittite”. A group of sources mentioning the *hazannu* may offer new insights into the relation between the two sets of data and in the institutional changes brought about by the Hittites at Emar.

The title *hazannu* is traditionally translated as “mayor” or “Bürgermeister”, although other translations such as “headman” or “inspector” have been proposed.² In sources predating the texts from Emar, the term is found across the ancient Near East. The earliest attestations date to the Ur III period when the *hazannu* mainly functioned as a witness representing towns, village communities, or smaller groups. The *hazannu* also had legal functions and perhaps, although this remains unclear, a military duty. During the Old Babylonian period in Babylonia the *hazannu* seems to disappear and his functions are assumed by the *rabiānu*.³ However, the *hazannu* is well attested at Mari in the role of the local representative of the king. In the Late Bronze Age *hazannus* are known from all over the Middle Euphrates at Emar, Ekalte, Azu, and in important cities such as Ḫattuša, Alalakh, and Ugarit. The role of the *hazannu* at Mari and in the Middle Euphrates was treated by Marti (2010) who, following Durand,⁴ pointed out that the traditional translation “mayor” is inadequate and does not correspond to the function of this official. In the kingdom of Mari the

1. This research is part of the PRIN Project (2015) “L’Anatolia antica: politiche imperiali e culture locali tra XV e VII secolo a.C. Problemi di etnicità, assetti urbani e territoriali, tradizione e innovazione”.
2. van de Mieroop 1999, 151-152; an extensive bibliography on the *hazannu* is provided in Solans 2014, 62-63, fn. 257.
3. van de Mieroop 1999, 152-155.
4. Durand 1997, 517.

ḫazannu was not a representative of the community, but was appointed by the king and was subject to his authority, serving as a royal envoy in towns or villages that were not under direct control.

Before discussing the Emar evidence, a brief overview of the presence of the *ḫazannu* in the region is in order. At Ekalte⁵ *ḫazannus* appear in witness lists – usually in first position – mainly in contracts for real properties sold by the Elders and the temple authority Ba’la-ka, although they are also mentioned in a few private sales. The *ḫazannu* also served as an eponym in dating formulas.⁶ According to Mayer, there was no local monarchy at Ekalte, which was a town under the control of Emar, and it was ruled by a *ḫazannu*.⁷ However, definitive evidence that the kings mentioned in the Ekalte texts belonged to one of the Emar royal dynasties is still lacking.⁸ Not much information is given about the *ḫazannus* at Ekalte except for Muḫra-ahī, who was a wealthy individual appearing in a number of transactions, often as an owner or buyer of real properties.⁹ The *ḫazannu* is also attested at Azu in two witness lists.¹⁰ At Ugarit the *ḫazannu* appears in legal texts concerning real estate. The *ḫazannus* were appointed by the king in villages and subsidiary towns and operated under the authority of the *sākinu*.¹¹ they supervised court cases and were responsible for collecting taxes, conscripting corvée workers, and delivering goods to the palace, although it is unclear whether they were alien to the local community¹² or were chosen from among the local headmen.¹³ Perhaps they also headed the local council of elders. At Alalāḫ the *ḫazannu* office was primarily but not exclusively held by the *maryannu* class,¹⁴ and it seems that each town had its own *ḫazannu*¹⁵ but we do not know whether this official was appointed by the palace. The international treaties between Alalāḫ and the neighboring states of Kizzuwatna and Tunip inform us that the *ḫazannu*, together with a group of five elders or notables, was liable for the extradition of the fugitives caught in his villages.¹⁶ An Instruction Text from the time of Arnuwanda I¹⁷ is our principal source on the duties and activities of the *ḫazannu* in the Hittite capital. According to this text, the *ḫazannu* of Hattuša was responsible for the security of the city: the locking and unlocking of the city-gates, the monitoring of subordinate officers, the supervision of building activities, and perhaps the organization of corvée duties.¹⁸ The term *ḫazannu* also appears in the Amarna letters, but with a completely different meaning; it designates the local rulers subordinated to the Pharaoh but it is also employed for Egyptian military officials.¹⁹ As underlined by Zaccagnini,²⁰ in the Egyptian perspective there was no difference between vassal kings and officials of the Egyptian administration because they were both bound to the supreme authority by the same concept of loyalty.

5. For the *ḫazannu* at Ekalte see Torrecilla 2014, 57-61.

6. Torrecilla 2014, 57-61.

7. Mayer 2001, 14, 23; see also Torrecilla 2014, 21-25.

8. Werner 2004, 22; Yamada 2015, 280-283.

9. Torrecilla 2014, 59-60.

10. Torrecilla in press, I thank Eduardo Torrecilla for providing me with a copy of his article.

11. van Soldt 2010, 255-256.

12. Heltzer 1976, 80-81; Liverani 1974, 346; Liverani 1975, 153-154; Liverani 1983, 176-177.

13. Schloen 2001, 238, 252.

14. von Dassow 2008, 257-258, 286-287; Solans 2014, 72.

15. von Dassow 2008, 243.

16. Solans 2014, 226-231.

17. CTH 275, Miller 2013, 182-193..

18. Singer 1999.

19. Zaccagnini 1994, 353-355; van de Microop 1999, 158; Solans 2014, 62, 78-87.

20. Zaccagnini 1994, 355.

Emar sources provide very little information on the role of the *ḥazannu*, who only appears in witness lists. Seventeen documents of the Syrian tradition mention a *ḥazannu* as witness; nine date to the First Dynasty and eight to the Second down to the reign of Elli, likely the last king of Emar.²¹ A total of nine *ḥazannus* are mentioned in the Syrian tablets, but only three are attested in documents dating to the First Dynasty of Emar. During the First Dynasty a single *ḥazannu* is attested for each ruler, while more than one *ḥazannu* can be found associated with the kings of the Second Dynasty. Abī-Rašap, who held the office during the First Dynasty, is attested in six documents (more than any other *ḥazannu*) and probably had quite a long career because he is mentioned in documents dating to different generations, from Igmil-Dagan and Limi-šarri, the sons of Irib-Ba'al, to Išbi-Dagan son of Limi-šarri.

Regularly the *ḥazannu* appears at the end of the witness list just before the scribe's name. However, in three documents, E 157, TBR 16, and RE 24, another witness is listed between the *ḥazannu* and the scribe, and in TBR 3 the *ḥazannu* appears in the middle of the witness list. Uniquely, in E 253, the *ḥazannu* is the second witness after the king. A feature shared by all sources is that each set of documents in which the same *ḥazannu* appears was written by a single scribe, although the reason for this exclusive association remains unclear.

Document	Type	<i>Hazannu</i>	Dynasty	Date	Scribe	Ninurta Sale	Property
E 150	Sale contract	Ba'al-bēlu	I	Igmil-Dagan, Limi-šarri, Rašap-ilī	Dagan-bēlu	YES	^{ki} <i>eršetu</i>
RE 91	Sale contract	Ba'al-bēlu	I	Igmil-Dagan, Limi-šarri, Rašap-ilī	Dagan-bēlu	YES	^{ki} <i>eršetu</i>
E 149	Sale contract	Abī-Rašap	I	Limi-šarri	Eḥli-Kuša	YES	Fields
TBR 16	Sale contract	Abī-Rašap	I	Limi-šarri	Eḥli-Kuša	YES	Fields
TBR 17	Sale contract	Abī-Rašap	I	Limi-šarri	Eḥli-Kuša	YES	Fields
TBR 87	Prebend	Abī-Rašap	I	Limi-šarri	Eḥli-Kuša	-	
GsK 6	Prebend	Abī-Rašap	I	Limi-šarri	Eḥli-Kuša	-	
E 148	Sale contract	Abī-Rašap	I	Išbi-Dagan	Eḥli-Kuša	YES	^{ki} <i>eršetu</i>
TBR 19	Sale contract	Pilsu-Dagan	I	Zū-Ba'la	Alal-abu	YES	Field
RE 34	Sale contract	Dagan-kabar ²²	II	Iaši-Dagan	Alal-abu	YES	House
RE 16	Sale contract	Dagan-ma	II	Iaši-Dagan	Abī-kāpī	YES	Vineyard
TBR 3	Sale contract	Ir'ibu (?)	II	Ba'al-kabar	Abī-kāpī	YES	Field
E 157	Sale contract	Ir'ibu	II	Pilsu-Dagan	Abī-kāpī	? (Broken)	House
E 253	Confirmation of properties	Aḥi-malik	II	Pilsu-Dagan	Ea-damiq	-	
SMEA30 4	Sale contract	Kanu	II	Elli	Ea-damiq	YES	House Vineyard
RE 24	Sale contract	Mūdu	II	Elli	Ea-damiq	YES	Field
E 147	Sale contract	Mūdu	II	Elli	Ea-damiq	YES	Fields

21. It is unclear whether Elli's son, Ba'al-kabar, was ever king; see Yamada 2013, 129-131; Cohen 2013, 287.

22. The sign GAL in Beckman's reading of RE 34: 35, I[GI ^dD]a-gan-'GAL' DUMU ḥa-za'-an-nu, is to be emended in LÚ because has the same shape of the sign LÚ in the following line: [IGI] ^dA-la-al-a-bu ^{lu}D[UB.SAR]. Photos of the Rosen Emar tablets have been kindly provided me by J.-M. Durand with courtesy of David I. Owen and Laura Johnson-Kelly, photographer, at the Jonathan and Jeannette Rosen Ancient Near Eastern Studies Seminar at Cornell University.

As in Ekalte, the *ḥazannu* mostly appears at Emar in real estate sale contracts. Apart from three documents, all of the sources are sales of Ninurta²³ which, like sales of Ba‘la-ka from Ekalte, record properties sold by the Elders of the city of Emar and the Ninurta temple authority to private citizens. Although the ownership of the sold properties remains unclear,²⁴ in all Ninurta sales the king appears as the first witness, often followed by other members of the royal family. Ninurta sales are sealed by the so-called seal of Ninurta and, starting from the Second Dynasty, with the dynastic seal.²⁵ The other documents deal in one way or another with real properties. GsK 6 records the granting of a field and the appointment of an individual to the position of priest and temple administrator of the temple of Nergal.²⁶ Moreover, as in the sale contracts, the tablet is sealed by the seal of Ninurta and the king Limi-šarra leads the witness list. TBR 87 is another confirmation of a prebend, recording the appointment of a certain Pilsu-Dagan (not to be confused with the king) as the *sangû*-priest of the temple of Nergal. Although the document does not specifically record the consignment of real properties, the prebend was granted because Pilsu-Dagan built the temple of Nergal.²⁷ Finally, in E 253 the king Pilsu-Dagan confirms shares of inheritance that included real properties.

Although the sources provide no specific reference to the *ḥazannu*'s duties, it is clear that one of his tasks was supervising transactions and transfers of real properties when the city institutions were involved. The position of the *ḥazannu* in the witness lists of Ninurta sales in Emar must be connected to his subordinate role to the king, who is always listed first. Whether the kings mentioned in the Ekalte texts were local monarchs or the kings of Emar, the role and power of the *ḥazannu* at Emar was more restricted, especially if the *ḥazannu* at Ekalte was appointed by the Emar king as local governor. At Ekalte the king is never mentioned as witness in Ba‘la-ka sales²⁸ and, as said above, the *ḥazannu* often leads the witness list. Another important difference concerns the role of the *ḥazannu* as eponym, which is only attested at Ekalte.

Unlike Ekalte, sources from Emar have left no traces of the private life of the *ḥazannus*, and Adamthwaite's suggestion that some *ḥazannus* were members of the royal family seems not very likely.²⁹ Although this is not excluded for Aḥī-malik (E 253), who was the namesake of one of Pilsu-Dagan's brothers, the *ḥazannu* Abī-Rašap can hardly be identified with another brother of Pilsu-Dagan because he was in office during the First Dynasty. With one exception restored on the basis of parallel witness lists (see below), no *ḥazannu* is identified by a patronymic. As noted above, the *ḥazannu* is occasionally present in private documents (i.e., private sales) at Ekalte, but it remains unclear whether the absence of the *ḥazannu* from documents other than Ninurta sales in the Syrian texts from Emar is only accidental or reflects different duties.

23. E 157 does not preserve the seller, but most likely this was Ninurta and the Elders because the king Pilsu-Dagan appears a first witness.

24. See Fijałkowska 2014, 185-195.

25. For these seals see Balza 2009, 45-48.

26. For this document see Cohen – Viano 2016.

27. See Cohen – Viano 2016, 65.

28. Only in Ek 7 and Ek 9 does the king have an active role in Ba‘la-ka's sales, see Torrecilla 2014, 41-45.

29. See Adamthwaite 2001, 27-30.

The office of *ḫazannu* at Emar did not vanish with the decline of the Syrian tradition and the demise of the local monarchy. The *ḫazannu* appears in his typical role of witness also in three Syro-Hittite tablets:

Document	Type	<i>ḫazannu</i>
E 127	Lawsuit	Ikki-Dagan
E 254	Lawsuit(?)	Maše
RE 39	Will	Zū-Ba'la

E 254 is a tiny fragment reporting a witness list that, according to Arnaud, once belonged to a lawsuit.³⁰ Apart a single exception, the individuals mentioned in this text, including the *ḫazannu* Maše, are not elsewhere attested even as personal names.³¹ Thus the tablet cannot be chronologically anchored to other sources. The presence of uncommon personal names could be related to the foreign origin of the persons involved in the document. Foreigners are also involved in the lawsuit E 127, which mentions an Emarite and an Assyrian merchant. It is therefore not excluded that the management of international relations was part of the *ḫazannu*'s sphere of competence. In E 127 the *ḫazannu* Ikki-Dagan (elsewhere unknown) appears as the first witness and he also seals the tablet. This document provides evidence for dating the Syro-Hittite texts mentioning a *ḫazannu* to the early stage of the scribal tradition. The lawsuit took place before the “son of the king” Tuwata-ziti, whose career is dated at the very beginning of the Syro-Hittite documentation, namely from the time of Muršili II down to Muwatalli II and perhaps Muršili III/Urḫi-Teššup.³² The last Syro-Hittite tablet here concerned, RE 39, is a fragmentary testament where the *ḫazannu* Zū-Ba'la appears as a sealer.³³ Unfortunately this tablet cannot be dated.

The small number of Syro-Hittite sources mentioning the *ḫazannu* suggests that, at a certain point, this office was phased out by the Hittites. Accordingly, the three Syro-Hittite documents should be placed within a relatively short time-span immediately following the period represented by the Syrian sources, although positive evidence for dating the Syro-Hittite tablets derives only from E 127. At the early stage of Hittite domination, the *ḫazannu* cooperated with the Hittite authorities, as shown by E 127 where he exercises a judicial function; perhaps his cooperation was especially useful in international affairs. This would not be surprising, as maintaining relations between local authorities and the royal administration had been one of the main tasks of the *ḫazannus* since the Mari age.³⁴ The judicial function was obviously not a new responsibility introduced by the Hittites but was surely one of the *ḫazannu*'s duties already under the local monarchy. It follows that the Syrian tablets offer only a partial view of the *ḫazannu*'s role, because most of them concern real estate and were preserved as titles to properties.

30. The tablet can be attributed to the Syro-Hittite school because Dagan is written ^dKUR; see also Rutz 2013, 143, 393.

31. Lū-Dagan son of Abu-tāb from the canal Ibla; Nadnu; Rīmi-Sin son of Mariannu; Laḫir-aḫī; Kirna son of Miḫišai. Only the personal name Rīmi-Sin is known from another text.

32. For this Hittite official mentioned in sources from the Hittite capital, see D'Alfonso 2005, 70-71.

33. Zū-Ba'la is also the father of the first two witnesses, RE 39: 10, IGI ^{me}l / ^{im}ma-rum, 20 [ū ^m]r P^l-il-^la, 21 DUMU-MEŠ ^mZu-ba]-la LÚ [ḫa-^za]-an-nu, see Durand 2013, 32.

34. See Marti 2010, 169.

A key question regarding the office of *ḥazannu* is whether it was held by more than one person at the same time. During the First Dynasty, only one *ḥazannu* is mentioned under each ruler. Starting with the Second Dynasty, more than one *ḥazannu* can be found during a single reign, but it can be demonstrated that they did not hold the office at the same time.

Under Iaši-Dagan the *ḥazannus* Dagan-kabar and Dagan-ma are attested, but the witness lists of RE 34 and RE 16 suggest that they were not contemporary. In RE 34 the king is followed by his brother and by Ili-abī son of Limi-šarri, who was likely the son of the former ruler of the First Dynasty. In RE 16 Iaši-Dagan is followed by his son Ba'al-kabar, who was already the crown prince. Therefore, we can safely state that RE 16 was later than RE 34, and Dagan-kabar held the office of *ḥazannu* before Dagan-ma.

Two *ḥazannus* are also mentioned under Pilsu-Dagan, but one of them, Ir'ibu, was surely in office before the other one, Aḫi-malik, because he had already served as *ḥazannu* under Pilsu-Dagan's father (TBR 3).

The relative chronology of the two *ḥazannus* mentioned under the king Elli is more complicated to ascertain because the documents were written by the same scribe and report very similar witness lists, in which the king Elli is followed by his son Ba'al-kabar and his brother Asda-aḫī.

SMEA30 4	E 147	RE 24
IGI <i>Él-li</i> DUMU <i>Pil-su-^dDa-gan</i>	IGI <i>Il-li</i> DUMU <i>Pil-su-^dDa-gan</i>	IGI <i>Él-li</i> DUMU <i>Pil-sú-^dDa-gan</i>
IGI ^d IM-GAL DUMU- <i>šú</i>	IGI ^d IM-GAL DUMU- <i>šú</i>	IGI ^d IM-GAL DUMU- <i>šú</i>
IGI <i>As-da-a-ḫi</i> ŠEŠ- <i>šú</i>	IGI <i>As-da-a-ḫi</i> ŠEŠ- <i>šú</i>	IGI <i>As-da-a-ḫi</i> ŠEŠ- <i>šú</i>
IGI <i>Tu-ra-^dDa-gan</i> DUMU [<i>I-li-ia</i>]	IGI <i>Tu-ra-^dDa-gan</i> DU[MU] <i>I-li-a</i>	IGI <i>Tu-ra-^dDa-gan</i> DUMU <i>I-li-a</i>
IGI <i>A-ḫi-mi</i> DUMU <i>It-ti-e</i>	IGI <i>Ap-pa-ú</i> DUMU <i>I-ke[u-ú]n-^dDa-gan</i>	IGI <i>Ap-pa-ú</i> DUMU <i>I-ku-un-^dDa-gan</i>
IGI <i>A-bi-ka-pi</i> DUMU <i>Be-[li]</i>	IGI <i>A-ḫi-mi</i> DUMU <i>Id-[d]i-e</i>	IGI <i>A-ḫi-mi</i> DUMU <i>Id-di-e</i>
IGI <i>Mu-ú-du</i> DUMU <i>I-li-a</i>	IGI <i>A-bi-ka-pi</i> [DUMU <i>Be-li</i>]	[IGI] <i>A-bi-ka-[p]i</i> DUMU <i>Be-li</i>
IGI <i>Ib-ni-ia</i> DUMU <i>A-bi-ka</i>	IGI <i>Mu-ú-du</i> ^{li} [<i>ḫa-za-an-nu</i>]	[IGI M] <i>u-ú-du</i> ^u [<i>ḫa-za-an-nu</i>]
IGI <i>Ap-pa-ú</i> DUMU <i>I-ku-un-^dDa-gan</i>	IGI ^d E-a-SIG ₅ [LÚ.DUB.SA]R	[IGI <i>Ib-ni-ia</i> DUMU <i>A-bi-ka</i>
IGI <i>Ka-a-nu</i> ^{li} [<i>ḫa-za-an-nu</i>]		IGI ^d E-a-SIG ₅ LÚ.DUB.SAR
IGI ^d E-a-SIG ₅ DUB.S[AR]		

SMEA30 4 is witnessed by the *ḥazannu* Kanu but it also mentions a certain Mudu son of Ilia, who is preceded in the witness list by Abī-kāpī son of Bēlī and followed by Ibnia son of Abī-ka. The same sequence of witnesses – Abī-kāpī and Mudu – is attested in E 147 and RE 24 and in RE 24 Mudu is again followed by Ibnia, but on both of these tablets Mudu is identified as a *ḥazannu* and Kanu is not named at all. This makes it possible to identify Mudu son of Ilia in SMEA30 4 with the *ḥazannu* in E 147 and RE 24. Accordingly, when SMEA30 4 was written, Mudu had not yet assumed the office of *ḥazannu*, which was previously held by Kanu. Perhaps Tūra-Dagan son of Ilia,³⁵ who is mentioned in other documents as a witness, was Mudu's brother.

All Syrian sources indicate that at Emar the office of *ḥazannu* was held by one person at a time, and we have no reason to believe that the situation was different in the Syro-Hittite sources. This consideration has an important implication for the relative chronology of Emar texts. As stated

35. AuOr5 15, E 160, Iraq54 4, RE 5, RE 81; in RE 81 Tūra-Dagan appears together with Mudu. For these documents see Cohen – Torrecilla forthcoming.

above, E 127 is dated to the beginning of the Syro-Hittite documentation, and through the overseer of the land Puḫi-šenni, who appears along with Tuwata-ziti in E 181, E 127 can be synchronized with the generation of Zū-Ba'la, the patriarch of the diviner family from Building M₁.³⁶ Indeed, E 127 is one of the oldest Syro-Hittite texts, predating the testament of Zū-Ba'la (E 201).³⁷

Now, if one attempts to integrate the finding that the office of *ḥazannu* at Emar was held by one person at a time with the general assumption that Syrian and Syro-Hittite documents overlapped for a certain period, there is only a very short window of time in which to place the series of *ḥazannus* mentioned in the Syro-Hittite sources under the kings of the Second Dynasty. If Ba'al-qarrād son of Zū-Ba'la can be synchronized with the third and possibly the fourth generation of the Second Dynasty, i.e., Pilsu-Dagan and Elli,³⁸ the *ḥazannu* Ikki-Dagan attested in E 127 must be placed under Pilsu-Dagan if not an earlier king. Attempts to date the other two *ḥazannus* from the Syro-Hittite sources would result in even more complicated scenarios. By way of speculation, considering that no more than two *ḥazannus* are attested under each king, Maše and Zū-Ba'la have to be placed in the reigns of Ba'al-kabar I and Zū-Aštarti,³⁹ although they were likely quite short. Thus, Ikki-Dagan could be placed under Ba'al-kabar I, and Maše and Zū-Ba'la under Zū-Aštarti. However, such chronological placement appears to me very unlikely and artificial. In my opinion, the fact that the office of *ḥazannu* was held by one person at a time could serve as the basis for a radical reconsideration of the relative chronology of Syrian and Syro-Hittite texts that treats the two sets of data as completely separate.⁴⁰ In this scenario, the three *ḥazannus* attested in the Syro-Hittite documents held their office after the *ḥazannus* from the Syrian texts.

Another crucial question about the *ḥazannu* is his relationship with the royal authority. Unlike at Ugarit and Old Babylonian Mari, it is unclear whether the *ḥazannu* in the Middle Euphrates was appointed by the king. It has been suggested that the Emar kings appointed the *ḥazannu* at Ekalte,⁴¹ but it seems that he operated independently of royal authority, which is rarely mentioned in textual sources from that city.⁴² At any rate, the *ḥazannus* came from the local population as shown by the case of Muḫra-aḫī, whose family was installed at Ekalte for at least two generations.⁴³ The *ḥazannu* could have been one of the Elders, perhaps their leading member, because Ek 7, where the witness list is headed by the *ḥazannu*, ends with the statement that “the Elders of the city are the witnesses” (ú.meš šī-bu-ut IRI^{ki} šī-bu-tu-mā).

The relationship of the *ḥazannu* to the local collective powers is also visible at Emar, where he acts as witness in contracts where the Elders are the sellers. At Emar the *ḥazannu* always appears in conjunction with the king in the Syrian documents, but it is to be remembered that the royal status

36. See Cohen 2009, 22.

37. Cohen – D'Alfonso 2008, 14 fn. 43; D'Alfonso 2005, 201, 209.

38. Cohen – D'Alfonso 2008, 16-19; Cohen 2013, 289-290.

39. No documents dating to Zū-Aštarti mentions a *ḥazannu*; Zū-Aštarti reigned after Pilsu-Dagan, Cohen – D'Alfonso 2008, 7-9.

40. Y. Cohen is now convinced that Syrian and Syro-Hittite traditions were chronologically separated (personal communication).

41. Torrecilla 2014, 25-26, goes further, suggesting that the *ḥazannu* Ba'al-malik was the son of the Emar king Ba'al-kabar I.

42. Torrecilla 2014, 41.

43. Marti 2010, 165-166.

of the First Dynasty of Emar is questionable.⁴⁴ If we accept that the Syro-Hittite documents mentioning the *ḫazannu* date to a later period than the Syrian tablets, it follows that this institution survived the end of the local monarchy. The long duration of Abī-Rašap's office (from Igmil-Dagan to Išbi-Dagan, hence two generations) implies that royal succession did not inevitably lead to the resignation of the former king's *ḫazannu*, but it is not excluded that this office required royal confirmation.⁴⁵ It seems, therefore, that in the Middle Euphrates the office of *ḫazannu* was subject to the king, but the *ḫazannu*'s authority was not directly dependent on the monarchy. The *ḫazannu* likely served as the intermediary between the king and the city councils. There is no evidence that the *ḫazannu* was appointed by the Hurrian king at the time of the Mitannian domination of Emar and later by the Hittite emperor or the viceroy of Karkemiš, as suggested by Marti.⁴⁶ The scarcity of Syro-Hittite texts mentioning a *ḫazannu* suggest the opposite, namely that the Hittite authority replaced this officer with its own officials.

In Late Bronze Age Syria, the office of *ḫazannu* is attested at various sites; while some continuity in the office across the sites is observed, these officials could serve different functions from place to place. At Emar the *ḫazannu* was predominantly attested in the Syrian sources and was a dying institution when the Syro-Hittite tradition was introduced; the office was later eliminated by the Hittites. In my opinion, the scarce attestations of the *ḫazannu* in Syro-Hittite sources reflects the institutional and political changes caused by the Hittites that led to the replacement of the Syrian tradition. Once the local monarchy ceased to exist at Emar, the Hittites were no longer in need of an intermediary between the king and the local collective powers. The functions once attributed to the *ḫazannu* were probably taken over by the overseer of the land, who was a local representative of the Hittite overlord responsible for several duties including juridical and witness functions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamthwaite M.R. 2001, *Late Hittite Emar. The Chronology, Synchronisms, and Socio-Political Aspects of a Late Bronze Age Fortress Town*, (*Ancient Near Eastern Studies. Supplement* 8), Louvain - Paris - Sterling.
- Balza M.E. 2009, *Sigilli e modalità di sigillatura a Emar nel Tardo Bronzo (XIV–XIII sec. a. C.)*, (*Studia Mediterranea* 21), Pavia.
- Cohen Y. 2009, *The Scribes and Scholars of the City of Emar in the Late Bronze Age* (*Harvard Semitic Studies* 59), Winona Lake.
- 2013, “Problems in the History and Chronology of Emar”, *KASKAL. Rivista di storia, ambienti e culture del Vicino Oriente Antico* 10, 281-294.
- Cohen Y. – D’Alfonso L. 2008, “The Duration of The Emar Archives and the Relative and Absolute Chronology of the City”, in L. D’Alfonso – Y. Cohen – D. Sürenhagen (eds.), *The City of Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires. History, Landscape, and Society. Proceedings of the*

44. Cohen 2013, 285-286; Yamada 2013, 126-129.

45. See Marti 2010, 164.

46. Marti 2010, 165.

- Konstanż Emar Conference, 25.–26.04. 2006 (*Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 349), Münster, 3-25.
- Cohen Y. – Torrecilla E. forthcoming, “On the Emar ‘Problem Documents’ and the Practice of (Re)producing Deeds”, *Aula Orientalis*.
- Cohen Y. – Viano M. 2016, “A Land-grant Document from Emar. A (re)-Edition and Discussion of LN-104 (AKA GsKutscher 6)”, *KASKAL. Rivista di storia, ambienti e culture del Vicino Oriente antico* 13, 57-71.
- D’Alfonso L. 2005, *Le procedure giudiziarie ittite in Siria (XIII sec. a.C.)* (*Studia Mediterranea* 17), Pavia.
- Démare-Lafont S. – Fleming D. E. 2009, “Tablet Terminology at Emar: ‘Conventional’ and ‘Free Format’”, *Aula Orientalis* 27, 19-26.
- 2015, “Emar Chronology and Scribal Streams: Cosmopolitanism and Legal Diversity”, *Revue d’Assyriologie et d’Archéologie Orientale* 109, 45-77.
- Durand J. M. 1997, *Les Documents épistolaires du palais de Mari. Tome I (Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient* 16), Paris.
- 2013, “Quelques textes sur le statut de la femme à Émar d’après des collations nouvelles”, *Semitica* 55, 25-60.
- Fijalkowska L. 2014, *Le droit de la vente à Emar*, (*Philippika* 64), Wiesbaden.
- Heltzer M. 1976, *The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit*, Wiesbaden.
- Liverani M. 1974, “La royauté syrienne de l’âge du bronze récent”, in P. Garelli (éd.), *Le Palais et la Royauté (Archéologie et Civilisation). XIX Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Paris, 29 juin – 2 juillet 1971*, Paris, 329-356.
- 1975, “Communautés de village et palais royal dans la Syrie du II^{ème} Millénaire”, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 18, 146-164.
- 1983, “Communautés rurales dans la Syrie du II^e millénaire A.C.”, *Les communautés rurales. Vol. 2. Antiquité (Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin pour l’Histoire Comparative des Institutions* 41), Paris.
- Marti L. 2010, “Le *ḫaṣannu* à Mari et sur le Moyen-Euphrate”, in L. Kogan – N. Koslova – S. Loesov – S. Tishchenko (eds.), *City Administration in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 53e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Vol. 2*, Winona Lake, 153-170.
- Mayer W. 2001, *Tall Mubāqa – Ekalte II. Die Texte (Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 102), Saarbrücker.
- Miller J.L. 2013, *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts, (Writings from the Ancient World* 31), Atlanta.
- Rutz M.T. 2013, *Bodies of Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia. The Diviners of Late Bronze Age Emar and Their Tablet Collection, (Ancient Magic and Divination* 9), Leiden - Boston.
- Schloen J.D. 2001, *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol. Patrimonialism in Ugarit and The Ancient Near East*, Winona Lake.
- Singer I. 1999, “The Mayor of Ḫattuša and his Duties”, in J.G. Westenholz (ed.), *Capital Cities: Urban Planning and Spiritual Dimensions. Proceedings of the Symposium held on May 27–29, 1996, Jerusalem, Israel*, Jerusalem, 169-176.
- Solans B.E. 2014, *Poderes colectivos en la Siria del Bronce Final (Barcino Monographica Orientalia* 2), Barcelona.
- Torrecilla E. 2014, *Late Bronze Age Ekalte. Chronology, Society, and Religion of a Middle Euphrates Town*, Saarbrücken.
- *in press*, “The Dwellers of Azu: A Study on the Tell Hadidi Society and Chronology”, *Altorientalische Forschungen*.
- van de Mieroop M. 1999, “The Government of an Ancient Mesopotamian City: What We Know and Why We Know so Little”, in K. Watanabe (ed.), *Priests and Officials in the Ancient Near*

- East. Papers of the Second Colloquium on the Ancient Near East – The City and its Life held at Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan (Mitaka, Tokyo), March 22–24, 1996*, Heidelberg, 139-161.
- van Soldt W.H. 2010, “The City-Administration of Ugarit”, in L. Kogan – N. Koslova – S. Loesov – S. Tishchenko (eds.), *City Administration in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 53e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Vol. 2*, Winona Lake, 247-261.
- von Dassow E. 2008, *State and Society in the Late Bronze Age Alalah under the Mittani Empire*, (*Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians* 17), Bethesda.
- Werner P. 2004, *Tall Mumbāqa – Ekalte III. Die Glyptik*, (*Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 108), Saarbrücker.
- Yamada M. 2013, “The Chronology of the Emar Texts Reassessed”, *Orient* 48, 125-156.
- 2015, “The Land of Aštata in the 14th Century B.C. before the Hittite Conquest”, *Orientalia* 84, 276-291.
- Zaccagnini C. 1994, “Breath of Life and Water to Drink”, in L. Milano (ed.), *Drinking in Ancient Societies. History and Culture of Drinks in the Ancient Near East. Papers of a Symposium Held in Rome, May 17-19 1990*, (*History of the Ancient Near East. Studies* 6), Padova, 347-360.