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This study reexamines the four Emar texts of real estate sales by the urban authority which include an account concerning arana. Although the present writer’s first attempt to interpret those accounts was rejected by two scholars, their arguments were rather problematic. On the other hand, an investigation of the ‘waste plots’ attested in the texts from Emar and Ekalte shows that the real estate sold in the four texts belongs to this category. The function of the account in those texts is to explain how the urban authority acquired the real estate now being sold. The present writer argues again that it describes an extensive exchange in Emar of royal (i.e., King Arana’s) real estate for urban money that occurred in the period before the Emar texts, and that the ‘waste plots’ sold in the four texts are remnants of this exchange which the urban authority had not sold off during this long period of time.
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I. Introduction

More than twenty years ago, I wrote a paper on four Akkadian texts from Emar which include an enigmatic account concerning arana or arana LUGAL (Yamada 1993). These documents record the sale of real estate, three of KI erṣetu (ASJ 12-T 2, Emar VI 153 and TS 14) and one of another type unintelligible for me at that time (TS 15), from the city god 4NIN.URTA and the city elders, i.e., the urban authority of Emar, to individuals. They are dated to the early phase of the period covered by the Emar texts. In these documents, such as the well-preserved TS 14, the arana account (ll. 19–26) is inserted between the main text of transaction (ll. 1–18) and the stipulation on the payment of fines (ll. 27–32).

According to my reading, this account (see Yamada 1993, 140f.; cf. also § IV below) states that when (I) King Arana asked the city for a large amount of silver and gold, (II) he granted his...
real estate and, in exchange, (III) the city provided him with the silver and gold.\textsuperscript{6} This interpretation was based mainly on the following two points. Firstly, the DIŠ before \textit{arana} (\textit{TS} 14: 19)\textsuperscript{7} is to be taken as the determinative \textit{m}, since it is not used for the preposition \textit{ana} in the Emar legal texts.\textsuperscript{8} This means that the \textit{arana} (without case declensions) is the name of a king (\textit{LUGAL}) of Emar in the past, probably prior to the thirteenth century B.C. (Yamada 1993, 141–144). Secondly, it is difficult to understand part II in the accounts (e.g., \textit{TS} 14: 22–24) as meaning that the city is now selling its real estate to make money to provide the king, for the present sale of real estate (\textit{KI erṣetu} in \textit{TS} 14) cannot be regarded as a part of that grand sale (exchange), in view of the fact that the money has already been provided to the king (e.g., \textit{TS} 14: 25f.). Rather, that part is to be understood as describing how the city acquired a large amount of real estate, one item of which is now being sold by the urban authority in the main text (Yamada 1993, 143f., 146 n. 19).

Disappointingly, my argument has been rejected by two scholars, and a different interpretation currently finds wide acceptance. However, since it seems to me problematic, I would like to take up the same four texts and discuss them anew with our improved knowledge of the texts from Emar, as well as from Ekalte, both situated in the land of Aštata. Now, let us start with examining the scholars’ reactions to my interpretation.

\textbf{II. Criticisms and Proposed Interpretations}

\textbf{1. Gary Beckman}

In his short note (1996a), besides pointing out that I skipped a phrase in my translation, Beckman makes several comments. Firstly, he doubts that an account of a general disposal of royal property in the distant past is included in the above four texts, since in other real estate documents in Emar “only circumstances affecting the current transaction are mentioned.” Secondly, he says it is anachronistic to claim that the city kept large holdings of real estate for a long time (without leasing them), since “ancient Near Eastern municipalities are not known to have held ordinary houses and agricultural land corporately” and usually, when the city acquired parcels of real estate through confiscation from owners who had failed to render taxes or dues, it disposed of them soon after. Thirdly, “the variant writing \textit{a-na-ra-na} as \textit{sandhi} with a personal name is also questionable.” Fourthly, he does not think it clear whether the \textit{LUGAL} indicates the king of Emar or of Carchemish.

Thus he denies the existence of an Arana, king of Emar, and translates the accounts (\textit{TS} 14: 19–26; 15: 4+x–8’) as follows:

\begin{quote}
When Emar demanded 30,000 (shekels) of silver and 2,000/700 (shekels) of gold for the treasury(?), [parcels of real property] were sold for silver and gold, and the silver and gold were given/brought to the treasury(?) of the king.
\end{quote}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{6} Yamada 1993, 142, with the corrections in idem 2014b, 79 n. 34.\textsuperscript{7} Cf. \textit{a-na a-ra-[na lugal]} (Arnaud 1991, 42). But see his handcopy.\textsuperscript{8} \textit{ana ma-di-šu-mi} in \textit{TS} 73: 16 (Arnaud 1991, 124) is the only such possibility known to me, but I believe that here too it is to be taken as “PN, and that he is to be identified with the natural son of Dagan-kabar (cf. l. 7, putting <\textit{a-ḫa-miš}> between \textit{ti-ti} and 2 DUMU.ME). Reading the verb in l. 18 as \textit{ta-ta-r} \textit{ra}-\textit{qu-mi} (cf. \textit{ta-al-qu-mi} in ibid.), his statement of complaint (ll. 17f.) can be translated as: “(As for) my daughter, do you not take pity on her?”}
As for his first comment, I explained in my previous paper that though they are concerned with an event that occurred in the distant past:

(T)hese earlier accounts serve to legitimatize the real estate transactions recorded in the main parts of the ARANA-documents: they guarantee that the plots of real estate being sold by Ninurta and the elders are among those which the city had properly acquired from the king Arana in the past. Thus these accounts may be understood as well-integrated parts of the ARANA-documents. (Yamada 1993, 143f.)

I discuss his second and the third comments in § IV below. But concerning the second, I will note here that the corporate character of the city is currently recognized not only for Emar (and Ekalte) but also for Old Babylonian cities.\(^9\) On his fourth comment, I would note that all the arana documents are Syrian-type, not Syro-Hittite-type, texts\(^10\) and that the “palace” (no doubt of Emar) is mentioned as a recipient of the fine, along with ⁶NIN.URTA and the city, in TS 14: 31 as well as in Emar VI 153: 20 (see Yamada 1993, 143, 145 n. 15). No hint of involvement of the royal authority of Carchemish (or the Hittites) is found here.

On the other hand, when looking at Beckman’s translation, we find immediately several problems. In part I, besides the unusual syntax, if Beckman takes the DIŠ as ana, “for,” he should be able to explain why that preposition is written logographically only in TS 14: 19 (cf. a-na in ll. 14f., 23, 25, 29f.) in the Emar legal texts. On parts II–III, we may ask him, who sold this huge amount of real estate\(^11\) and gave/brought the money to the king? It must be the same as the (unspecified) indirect object of “Emar demanded.” But it cannot be the king, because he received the money. Of course, Emar (or the city), the subject of part I, is out of question, and besides, if it could sell a huge amount of real estate, this would contradict Beckman’s second comment above. So, citizens who sold to other citizens? This is impossible, since there seems no way such a huge amount of real estate could have been disposed of in a short amount of time. Then, who did do that? Finally, one may wonder what connection the account has with the sale of the real estate, the main topic in each of the four texts (cf. Beckman’s first comment).

Based on the above points, we conclude that Beckman’s interpretation of the arana accounts is quite unsatisfactory.

2. Aaron Skaist

Skaist, writing in 1998, is particularly conscious of the DIŠ in question. He states, “Yamada did not really explain why the scribe was not consistent in writing the DIŠ-sign before all the examples

\(^9\) As summarized in von Dassow 2012, 183, with previous literature. As for the lack of documents concerning the leasing of real estate by the urban authority (Beckman 1996a, n. 17), note that to the best of my knowledge, no such document, including those of leasing by individuals, is attested in Emar at all. This would not mean, however, that no one leased real estate in Emar.

\(^10\) For the two scribal traditions in Emar see Cohen 2013, 282–284 (with previous literature); also Démare-Lafont 2010.

\(^11\) According to Beckman (1997, 98–100, 108–114 figs. I–III), the average prices in silver of three kinds of real estate are: house — 0.46 shekel per cubit; ‘lot’ (KI erṣetu) — 0.3 shekel per cubit; and field — 25.6 shekels per ikû. In view of these, the amount of real estate which would sell for 30,000 shekels of silver and 2,000/700 shekels of gold must have been huge. For real estate sales in the Emar texts, see also Viano 2010; idem 2012; idem 2016; Fijałkowska 2014.
of the word *a-ra-na*” and why the word LUGAL is written only in *TS* 14. Then, taking DİŞ A in *TS* 14: 19 as a badly drawn A sign, i.e., *a’-(ra-na)*, he claims, “there is no determinative for names before the word *a-ra-na*” (1998, 170). Skaist proposes taking this word as a Ḫurrian term for “gift, tribute,” and regards the LUGAL as the king either of Carchemish or of the Hittites (1998, 171). His translation of the account in *TS* 14 is as follows:

When 30,000 (shekels) of silver and 2,000 (shekels) of gold for tribute [of the king?] they demanded of the city of Emar, [parcels of real property] were sold for silver and gold, and the silver and gold were given as tribute to the king.

Skaist’s interpretation is now widely accepted by scholars.12 Concerning his comment on LUGAL, I can simply say that the scribe of *TS* 14 is not the Rašap-ili who wrote the other three texts.13 On his first comment, I reply that it was not an unusual scribal practice in Emar, as we see, for example, É ša ṁPN1 DUMU PN2 KI PN1 DUMU PN2 … in *Emar* VI 125: 9f.; and KI erṣetu ša ṁPN1 KI PN1 DUMU PN2 … in *Emar* VI 171: 8f. (based on the handcopy in Arnaud 1985–86/1, 78), “(This was) a house/KI erṣetu of ṀPN1, (son of PN2). From PN1, son of PN2, …” In these cases, the first reference to PN1 is made with the determinative Ṁ, whereas the second one (the one after the preposition as in *TS* 14: 25) is without it. In view of these occurrences, and particularly when we see that Skaist treats the word *arana* adverbially, in the same meaning as *ana arana*, “for tribute,” in his translation, his assertion of *a*- seems to me a bit arbitrary. In addition, it should be noted that his explanation of *arana* as a Ḫurrian term (cf. *irana* and *furana*) still awaits confirmation.

As for Skaist’s translation, we have the same questions we had about Beckman’s: how could such a huge amount of real estate have been disposed of in a short time, and what is the link between the *arana* account and the real estate sale described in the main text of each of the four texts? Therefore, in view of all the above points, Skaist’s interpretation, too, is difficult to accept.

Thus, both Beckman and Skaist just ignore or avoid the two issues which I think are critical for understanding the four texts in question, and their interpretations of the texts are, in my opinion, not convincing. So, let us return to those texts and reexamine them with a fresh mind. But before doing so, let us investigate the matter of ‘waste plots’ attested in the texts from Emar and Ekalte, since I believe that this type of real estate is the key to deepening our understanding of the *arana* accounts.

III. ‘Waste Plots’ in Emar and Ekalte

1. ‘Unbuilt Plots’ in Mesopotamia

In her recent study, U. Steinert (2011) dealt with streets and open spaces in Mesopotamian cities, which lacked public squares, and reevaluated their social meanings and functions. Among the terms she covered, those grouped under the type of ‘unbuilt plots’14 seem to be relevant for our

---

12 See Cohen and d’Alfonso 2008, 5; Di Filippo 2008, 62f.; Pruzsinszky 2008, 77; Faist 2012, 115; von Dassow 2014, 17f.  
13 See Yamada 1993, 140, 145 n. 6. It has now been well confirmed that *Emar* VI 153, whose scribal name is broken, was written by Rašap-ili. When we check the seal impressions and the witnesses of his documents (ASJ 12-T 2, ASJ 13-T 33 and *TS* 15), it can be seen that the same seal *Emar* IV F13 is impressed on all these documents (for *TS* 15 [ME 59], see Beyer 2001, 260) and that the only individual (witness) common to them is the scribe Rašap-ili. This indicates that *Emar* IV F13 is his seal. Since it is impressed also on *Emar* VI 153 (ibid.), we may conclude that its scribe was Rašap-ili. I am most grateful to Prof. Akio Tsukimoto for providing me with the sealing data on ASJ 12-T 2 and ASJ 13-T 33.
discussion below. She includes the followings in this type (Steinert 2011, 341):

### Table 1: Terms for ‘Unbuilt Plots’ in Sumerian and Akkadian (Steinert)

| Sumerian                        | Akkadian                  |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| (é)-ki-gál-(lá) “existing ground” | maškanu “empty lot; threshing ground” |
| (é)-kislaḫ (KI.UD) “empty house lot; uncultivated land” | maškanu, nidûitu “empty lot; fallow-ground” |
| ê-bur-bala “building ground”    | burubalû (ditto)         |
| (é)-ki-šub-ba “fallow-ground”   | kišubbû, nidûitu “empty lot; fallow-ground” |

Of these four Sumerian terms used in OB legal documents, three include or begin with KI. Steinert notes that (é)-ki-gál-(lá) and (é)-kislaḫ are synonyms, in the meanings of “threshing floor; empty lot,” and that the “interpretation maškanu, ‘threshing floor’, or nidûtu, ‘uncultivated plot of land,’ for (é)-kislaḫ depends on the context” (2011, 341 n. 107). Keeping these terms and her remarks in mind, let us see what real estate attested in the texts from Emar and Ekalte could be considered ‘waste plots.’

### 2. KI erṣetu

The first to be taken up is KI erṣetu. There is no doubt that this is a kind of real estate belonging to the category of house or building (= ‘House’), not to that of agricultural field or land (= ‘Field’), when it is mentioned in legal texts. However, there has been a long debate on whether its reading is kiršītu or KI erṣetu with KI as a logogram and erṣetu as its gloss and whether its meaning is a building or a plot of land (see Pentiuc 2001, 98–102; Mori 2003, 48–50). In her detailed analysis of the term, L. Mori correctly observes that recent studies tend to support KI erṣetu and “plot of land,” but she prefers to understand it (kiršītu is her choice; but cf. Huehnergard 1991) as a “ruin,” not a simple, vacant plot of land. Her argument is based on the points that a house may become a kiršītu, that we find occasionally that a kiršītu has a stone foundation, and that it can be the object of the verb rašāpu, “restore” or “build” (Mori 2003, 49–53).

Although her argument makes sense for KI erṣetu as a matter of physical substance, I prefer to take it as a category, as a ‘waste house plot,’ exactly on the basis of her remark that it is a ruined building: “whose actual value is determined by the plot of building land rather than by the remains of a house” (Mori 2003, 53); this would fit well the literal meaning of KI erṣetu, “earth, land.” In this respect, her suggestion that it is analogous to (É.)KI.ŠUB.BA (kišubbû), “waste (building) plot,” in contrast to É.DŬ.A (bītu epšu), “built house,” in OB legal documents (ibid.) is significant. Likewise, in Emar (and Ekalte) KI erṣetu is to be taken in contrast with É (bītu), “(built) house.” In other words, within the category of ‘House’ (as real estate in contrast with ‘Field’), there are two

---

14 This term is taken over from Baker 2009.
15 Cf. also ki-šub-ba = kišubbû/ppû (Bauland), nidîtu (ditto); ki-gál = kik/gallû (Brachland); kankal (KI-KAL) = kankallû (eine Art Brachland), nidîtu (unbebauter Zustand, Brache), teriḫtu (or teriktû; leere Fläche); kislaḫ (KI-UD) = maškanu (Tenne), also nidîtu (unbebauter Zustand, Brache?), in Borger 2010, 412f. (no. 737).
16 Although in two ritual texts we see that KI (erṣetu) means “ground, land”: Emar VI 375: 46, 48; 446: 51 (see Fleming 2000, 264f., 272f.). Note also KI erṣetu, “earth,” in the S’ vocabulary text Emar VI 537: 694’ (see Huehnergard 1991).
17 Admitting that its rigorous definition would be “Grundstücke ohne (intaktes) Gebäude” (Wilk 1990).
sub-categories, É (bītu) and KI erṣetu. The point here is not whether a KI erṣetu is actually empty or not, but whether it has a livable structure. In this meaning, the ruins of a house would certainly be a KI erṣetu.

3. KI.LAḪ and KI.LAḪ4

In the texts from Emar and Ekalte, what waste real estate other than KI erṣetu can we identify? This is a problem, since we do not know any explicit reference to a waste field, such as kankallu or kik/gallû, in them. In my opinion, however, some of the properties referred to as KI.LAḪ19 belong to this category. This word is attested in the following texts:

Emar: ASJ 12-T 3: 7; TS 20: 1, 8, 15 (both of the Syro-Hittite type)

Ekalte: Ekalte II 17: 4, 8, 11, 15, 17; 19: 37; 57: 15, 19; 61: 1 (also KILA in ll. 5, 7, 9, 13, 17, 22, 41); 85: 2, 4, 9, 15, 19; ASJ 16-T: 4420 (all of the Syrian type)

Although the publishers of these texts uniformly take this word as meaning “threshing floor (aire, Tenne)” (see esp. Mayer 2001, 31), is this correct? As seen above, KI.LAḪ (= KISLAḪ) is a term used for “empty lot; fallow-ground” (or ‘waste plot’ in my terminology), whether inside or outside a city, and its interpretation as “threshing floor” (maškanu) depends on the context. Since it is known that threshing floors were usually located in the area just outside the city wall (see Mayer 2001, 31; cf. also Steinert 2011, 341 n. 107), if a KI.LAḪ is located in a rural (outside) or residential (inside) area, it is probably a “waste plot” other than a threshing floor.21 So, let us check the occurrences of KI.LAḪ which provide information about their location.

For Emar, we find mention of a KI.LAḪ ša É,[G]AL-ì, “K. of the [p]alace,” (l. 7) in ASJ 12-T 3, a document of the sale of a KI erṣetu which is apparently located in a residential area. Although Mori insists a rural location (2003, 59), the size of this KI erṣetu (23×19 ammatu; ll. 2f.), the boundary format (by its right-left-front-rear sides [cf. usually -rear-front]; ll. 4–7) and neighboring properties, particularly “the house of PN” (ll. 4f.), all indicate a residential location. The above KI.LAḪ is mentioned as one of its neighboring properties. Here it should be noted that although

---

18 For the date of the Ekalte texts (ca. 1400–1325 B.C. for three full generations at the most), see Werner 2004, 23f. Cf. Mayer 2001, 14–19; Torrecilla 2014, 19–38.

19 I.e., KISLAḪ = KI.UD (LAḪ is another reading of UD). Since KI.UD is written as KILLA in Ekalte II 61 (Mayer 1989, 269) and its variant writing KI.LAḪ is used in Emar (see below), I will use KI.LAḪ for this word in the Emar and Ekalte texts below.

20 For the identification of ASJ 16-T as an Ekalte text, see Yamada 2003, 187f.; Justel 2006.

21 Although we cannot insist on it, since a threshing floor might be located inside the city, too. In this respect, note ASJ 12-T 11, a document of the purchase of a house on the right side of which was located a ma-īṭu : ma-ag-ri-it-tu (l. 4), “garden(?) : grain storage place/threshing floor” (Tsukimoto 1990, 200). E. J. Pentiuc doubts the former word should be taken as mašitu, saying that it may be of the Hittite origin (2001, 119f.). Even though he is correct, ASJ 12-T 11 is a text of the Syro-Hittite type, where words of Hittite origin can occur (e.g., arawannu and its derivatives; see Yamada 1995, 301–309; Pentiuc 2001, 28), and gardens can be found inside cities in Mesopotamia (see CAD K, 415 [s.v. kirâ, mng. d-2’]; Steinert 2011, 340; also Baker 2009, 94f.). Pentiuc also denies that the latter, magrälêttu, is a variant of magrattu (2001, 114). But is it unthinkable that an (unused) garden plot could have been used as a grain storage place or threshing floor? According to M. Dietrich and O. Loretz (2001), these words in this text are to be taken as mašitu (lit. Ug. mšît), “bewässertes Feld,” and as makrittu (makritu), “bewässertes Grundstück,” respectively. However, their interpretation is difficult to accept, since the plot of land in ASJ 12-T 11 was apparently located in a residential area. On the other hand, for the existence of a threshing floor in the open country, see KAV 218A iii 42 (CAD M/1, 370a [s.v. maškanu, mng. 1a–1’]).
this is a plot of land inside the city, unlike the real estate now being sold (ll. 1, 8f., 17), it is not designated a KI ersetu. This indicates that this plot was used for a purpose other than dwelling.  

TS 20 is a document of the sale of a “tugguru-building with its KI.LAḪ [a]t the gate/door (KÁ) of PN1, [son of P]N2” (ll. 1f.). As the possessive pronominal suffix -ši, “its,” shows, this KI.LAḪ is a plot of land pertaining to the tugguru-building. Mori regards a tugguru as a rural building, as it is mentioned together with fields and orchards in six texts (and sold with them in three out of the six), as well as with wells in three texts (2003, 65–67), and proposes to understand it as a rural “shelter” (cf. tugurium in Latin) which could serve also as an enclosure for flocks (op. cit., 67 and n. 136, 70). However, the above references would not necessarily demand a rural location for that building, and at least in three texts (Emar VI 144; TS 5, 67) a tugguru-building is apparently located in a residential area (cf. Mori 2003, 68). To these, I would add the above TS 20, taking the KÁ as the “door” (of the house) of PN1, who is referred to as the owner and seller of the above-mentioned tugguru-building (l. 3f.). If the tugguru is located in a residential area, its KI.LAḪ, too, would be located there.

Among the occurrences in the Ekalte texts, the KI.LAḪ sold in Ekalte II 85 is apparently located in a rural area, according to the boundary format (by its upper-lower-first-second borders/sides; ll. 8–16). Its length is 45 ammatu but its width is not recorded. At least its upper border and second side are KI.LAḪs of other individuals (ll. 8–10, 15f.; cf. ll. 12–14).  

In the rest of the Ekalte occurrences, the location of the KI.LAḪ is not as clear. In Ekalte II 17, PN1 gives KI.LAḪs to PN2. According to W. Mayer, it reads: “in front of the KI.LAḪs: the road (to) the riv[er-flats] (KASKAL ra-[qa-ti]); [in the] rear(?): the (city) wa[l]l(?) (B[A]D?)” (ll. 8f.). If so, this would indicate an area adjacent to the city wall. Ekalte II 61, a document of the sale of a KI.LAḪ, has a hybrid boundary format, i.e., its upper and lower borders and front and rear sides (ll. 4–8). The size is 70×55 ammatu (ll. 2f.). Since a similar format is known in Emar VI 110, a document of the sale of a KI ersetu (Syrian type), as well as in TS 37, a document of the sale of a house (Syro-Hittite type), we may regard it as located in a residential area, though it may be relatively larger than most real estate there.  

---

22 But note that in Ugarit, (E.)KI.U.D seems to have been used in the meaning of KI ersetu in Emar and Ekalte. We see the pairing of É.HA KI.U.D.MES : hé-yi-ma, “houses (and) vacant plots,” in RS 15.109+16.296: 15 (PRU III, 103), and also É.KI.U.D : ta-am-GL, “… house plot,” in RS 16.145: 3 (PRU III, 169). See CAD M/1, 370b (s.v. maškanu, mng. 1b); Huennefeld 2008, 127, 185.

23 Based on a reference to a tugguru-building located i-na ḫu-ṣī-ra-ni (Emar VI 144: 1). This interpretation of ḫusurānu as a variant of ḫusāra, “enclosure for sheep,” is rejected by Pentiuc (2001, 71), who prefers to take it (as well as ḫi/usahaan) as “settlement, abode.” But since a KI.LAḪ can pertain to a tugguru-building, an “enclosure for sheep” seems to be more suitable. For tugguru, cf. also Pentiuc 2001, 46 (s.v. dū-gu-ra, etc.).

24 See the boundary formats and neighboring properties in these texts. In TS 5 (ll. 1f., 15f.) and 67 (ll. 1f.), three tugguru-buildings are located in meḫtili. Although this term is usually understood as a “diversion” of the river (Pentiuc 2001, 126; Mori, 2003, 59f., 67), Tsukimoto correctly pointed out that it is to be taken as a toponymic term for an urban setting (1998, 186). Here, note particularly that on the left side of the second tugguru-building in TS 5 is located É da-gan ša qī-na-ti, “the temple of Dagan of flocks” (ll. 28f.), which must have been located inside the city (cf. RE 70: 1). Until recently one could have thought that the EDIN, “hinterland, open country,” in (the KI ersetu) i-na me-eḫ-ši-li EDIN eḫ-ši in RE 14: 1 implied that the meḫtili is located in a rural area, but now it is clear that it should be read GIBIL, “new” (Tsukimoto 1998, 186; cf. esp. the sign for pil = GIBIL in TS 9: 39, written by the same scribe [l. 42]), glossed with ešši: “in the new meḫtili.”

25 I think this tugguru-building is located on the other side of the alley which the house of PN1 faces. Cf. Mori 2003, 67; idem 2010, 260f. Although H. Reculeau takes the KÁ here as an irrigation district (2008, 134), one may wonder why it would bear the name of a contemporary man. Would it mean a new irrigation district he developed?

26 A similar concentration of KI.LAḪs can be observed in Ekalte II 17: 14–18 and 61: 5–8, too.
This Ekalte II 61 is also worthy of note because, as mentioned above, after the first reference in l. 1, all the references are made with the variant spelling KI.LA (Mayer 2001, 31 n. 129). In Emar, another variant is known, i.e., KI.LAḪ. As Mori correctly pointed out (2003, 145f.), the real estate formerly read as KI.KÁ, “gate-place,” in BLMJE 7, JCS 40-T 2 (= ASJ 12-T 4) and TS 3 is to be read as KI.LAḪ.\textsuperscript{27} Including these three, this variant spelling is attested in the following texts:

BLMJE 7: 9, 14, 19, 25; JCS 40-T 2: 1, 8, 10, 14, 18; TS 3: 6; 63: 1, 17\textsuperscript{28} (all of the Syrian type)

Concerning these texts, in JCS 40-T 2 and TS 63, both documents of the sale of a KI.LAḪ, the location in a rural area is obvious in view of their boundary formats (JCS 40-T 2: 4–7; TS 63: 2–9\textsuperscript{29}). In TS 3, a document of the sale of a field (A.ŠÂ), since the KI.LAḪ is mentioned as being the lower border (ll. 6f.), there is no doubt that it also is located in a rural area. As for the remaining BLMJE 7, a document of the sale of various kinds of real estate including a KI.LAḪ (ll. 1, 8–10, esp. 9), the location of the KI.LAḪ is uncertain from this text, since even if there are fields associated with it (e.g., ll. 9f.), that does not necessarily indicate its location. However, this text is important for the reference, a “tugguru-building with the KI.LAḪ” (ll. 8f.), since this combination is attested in TS 20: 1 (with its KI.LAḪ) as we saw above. This supports our equating of KI.LAḪ with KI.LAḪ. Furthermore, if the KI.LAḪ in TS 20 is located in a residential area (see above), it would not be strange that this KI.LAḪ, too, is located in one.

It is interesting to note that in Emar, the normal spelling KI.LAḪ is used in the Syro-Hittite-type texts, whereas the variant spelling KI.LAḪ is consistently used in the Syrian-type texts. At first glance this might appear to reflect the difference between the two scribal traditions in the land of Aštata. However, the fact that in the Ekalte texts (all of the Syrian type) the normal spelling is consistently used (in Ekalte II 61, at least for the first reference in l. 1) argues against this. At present I have no explanation for why the Emarite scribes of the Syrian-type texts preferred the complicated sign LAḪ to the simple one LAḪ.

In any case, the results of the above investigations on KI.LAḪ and KI.LAḪ can be summarized as follows:

| Area         | Emar                                                                 | Ekalte                  |
|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Residential  | ASJ 12-T 3/a; probably TS 20/a; BLMJE 7/b?                         | Ekalte II 61/a?         |
| Rural        | JCS 40-T 2/b; TS 3/b, 63/b                                          | Ekalte II 85/a          |

Also, if Mayer’s reading is correct, the KI.LAḪ in Ekalte II 17 was located in the area surrounding

\textsuperscript{27} This point is well confirmed at least on BLMJE 7 and JCS 40-T 2, both written by the scribe Iš-Dagan. When comparing the signs, it is obvious that his KÁ (BLMJE 7: 10) is different from his LAḪ. However, in the case of TS 3, written by the scribe Abi-kapi, the difference from his KÁ signs (ASJ 12-T 7: 21; TS 6: 1; 9: 2) is not very clear.

\textsuperscript{28} Cf. ki.laḫ, “terre sèche” (Arnaud 1991, 108f.).

\textsuperscript{29} ÚS.SA.DU AN/KI.TA in ll. 7f. is probably a scribal error for SAG.KI 1/2.KAM.MA or the like.
the city wall, and thus was probably a threshing floor (maškanu).

Although this table includes two cases which cannot be determined with certainty (BLMJE 7 and Ekalte II 61), generally speaking, we may understand that both KI.LAḪ and KI.LAḪ4 can indicate a ‘waste plot’ (or empty plot) either inside or outside the city. The inside plots, as differentiated from KI erṣetu, would have been used for purposes other than dwelling, such as gardens or enclosures for flocks, while the outside plots can be regarded as fallow fields or waste fields (nidûtu). If this interpretation is correct, we have now the following two conceptual sets in terms of the categories of real estate in Emar and Ekalte.

(1) ‘House’: É (bītu), “house,” and KI erṣetu, “waste house plot.”

(2) ‘Field’: A.ŠÀ (eqlu), “field,” and KI.LAḪ/LAḪ4 (nidûtu), “waste field plot.”

IV. The Arana Accounts Again

Based on the investigations in the previous section, I present a new version of the arana accounts:

I. i-nu-ma m[a-ra-[na LUGAL], 30,000 KÛ.BABBAR 7 me-tì KÛ.GI, [i-nu-ma m[a-r]a-na 30,000 KÛ.BABBAR, [2 li-mi KÛ.GI] [i-nu-ma m[a-ra-na], [30,000] KÛ.BABBAR 2 li-mi KÛ.GI, [i-nu-ma m[a-ra-na] 30,000 KÛ.BABBAR], 2 li-mi KÛ.GI

URU.KI i-ri-šu,
[UR]U.e-mar.KI, [i-ri-šu-ma]
[UR]U.e-mar.KI i-ri-šu-ma,
URU.e-mar.KI, i-ri-šu-ma

II. KI er-še-ti ù É.ḪÁ, a-na KÛ.BABBAR ù KÛ.GI, id-di-nu-ma,
[TUŠ.ḪÁ KI’.ḪÁ, [a-na KÛ].BABBAR] K[Û.G]I id-di-nu-ma,
TUŠ.ḪÁ KI’.ḪÁ a-na KÛ.BABBAR KÛ.G[IL], [id-di]-nu-ma
KI.LAḪ.ḪÁ A.ŠÀ.Ḫ[A], a-na KÛ.BABBAR KÛ.GI, id-di-nu-ma,

III. KÛ.BABBAR ù KÛ.GI a-na a-ra-na LUGÁ[L], id-di-nu,
[KÛ.BABBAR KÛ.GI] a-na [(a-)r]a-na ub-lu’-mi,
KÛ.BABBAR KÛ.GI a-na <a>-ra-n[a], ub-lu-mi
KÛ.BABBAR KÛ.GI a-na <a>-ra-[a] ub-lu-[mi],

TS 14: When Ara[na, the king], asked the city for 30,000 (shekels) of silver (and) 700 (shekels) of gold, waste house plots and houses33 were given (to the city) for the silver and gold, and

30 Perhaps, we can add KI.GAL (Emar VI 192: 5; 193: 5') to this group of outside plots. Although both tablets are only fragments, these referents are no doubt real estate. Since KI.GAL = kigallu, “socle, pedestal,” of course, does not make sense here, D. Arnaud takes it as ki gal, “le grand cabanon” (1985–86/3, 204). Another possibility is a variant spelling of KI.KAL = kankallu (ka/igallu; see CAD K, 152b) or KI.GÁL = kik/gallû.

31 Note that the inside plots (KI.LAḪ/LAḪ4) are not included in this general scheme.

32 Except for TS 15: 6’, the texts are the same as in Yamada 1993. The order is also the same, namely: TS 14: 19–26; Emar VI 153: 13–17; ASJ 12-T 2: 11+x–r. 5’; TS 15: 4+x–8’. On the text of ASJ 12-T 2, cf. Arnaud 1992, 229f.
(then) the silver and gold were given to Arana, the king.

TS 15: [When Arana] asked the city of Emar for [30,000 (shekels) of silver] (and) 2,000 (shekels) of gold, waste field plots (and) fields were given (to the city) for the silver (and) gold, and (then) the silver (and) gold were brought to Arana.

Let us first look at the references to real estate in part II. Here we recognize two categories, ‘House’ in the first three documents and ‘Field’ in the fourth (Yamada 1993, 142). This corresponds to the type of real estate being sold in the main text of these documents. For the former, TS 14 has KI erṣetu and É (bītu), while Emar VI 153 and ASJ 12-T 2 have TUŠ (šubtu) and KI, i.e., KI erṣetu. There is no doubt that the TUŠ is used for É here, as an alternate word for “house,” or perhaps a word a bit wider in meaning as suggested in RE 30: É-tu₄ GAL É-tu₄ TUR.MEŠ TUŠ differences between É-tu₄ GI/BIL “the main house, the small houses (for) dwelling, and the n[ew] house” (ll. 15f.). This means that in these three texts, all sales of a KI erṣetu, the both sub-categories of ‘House’ are referred to.

On the other hand, TS 15 is a document of the sale of real estate doubtless belonging to the category ‘Field’ (see the boundary format in ll. 2f.). By comparison with the other three, we would expect both sub-categories of ‘Field’ to be mentioned in l. 6’. Since A.ŠĀ (eqlu) is one of those sub-categories, the other referent in the same line must be KI.LAḪ₄ (nidûtu), and accordingly the real estate mentioned in ll. 1 and 9’ is to be read KI.LAḪ₄ as well (cf. n. 2 above). Unfortunately, in the handcopy, the second signs of the logograms in those three cases do not look like LAḪ₄ (= DU+DU vertically), as the sign shapes are different from the other attested ones (for refs. see § III.3 above). However, it may be noteworthy that these signs can be recognized as DU+DIŠ: a composition of three horizontal wedges (though two in l. 6’), one oblique wedge, and two vertical wedges. I presume that the scribe Rašap-ili, instead of inscribing the complicated LAḪ₄, used this simplified sign, made by adding only one vertical wedge to DU.³⁵

As for part I, I still hold that the DIŠ is used as the determinative †, since no other possibility is likely, and thus that arana is the name of a king. He is the subject of the verb erēšu. Furthermore, although part II is written in the impersonal form (3.m.pl.), the logical subject of the verb nadānu can be no one other than this king, since, as noted above, no one, not even the city/Emar, could sell off such a huge amount of real estate in a short time (to acquire the silver and gold for payment to the king). Here, the problem is not on the supply side but on the demand side. If so, although part III is also written in the impersonal form, the logical subject of the verb nadānu/abālu can only be the city/Emar. This exchange between real estate and money had already been completed at the

---

³³ Cf. “dwellings and waste house plots” (Emar VI 153: 15; ASJ 12-T 2: r. 3’).
³⁴ Cf. tukul, “subject to corvée duty” (Beckman 1996b, 50). Here, TUŠ may have been added to insure that these buildings, smaller than a normal house, would be recognized as houses. A similar case can be found in É 3tu-ub-tu in Emar VI 296: 13. Note also sub-ta KI.MEŠ E.MEŠ-ni, “den Grundbesitz, (nämlich) die Felder (und) unsere Häuser,” (l. 24) in the MA letter published in Faist 2001, 251–254, Taf. 3–6 (esp. p. 252). The addressee is Hamis-Dagal, probably a West Semite by his PN (Faist 2001, 253). Although it is admittedly uncertain that the provenance of this tablet is Emar or its vicinity, it is quite tempting for me to take the above phrase as meaning: “our dwelling(s), waste house plots, (and) houses.”
³⁵ His use of another simplified sign can be observed for DA (e.g., ASJ 12-T 2: 2, r. 9’, 11’, 16’; ASJ 13-T 33: 17; Emar VI 153: 9, 29; TS 15: 13’).
time each of the Arana (RN!) documents, documents of the sale of real estate, was drawn up. This means that Arana was a king (of Emar) previous to that time, most probably prior to the thirteenth century B.C.\(^{36}\)

The last point should not cause an automatic rejection of my interpretation anymore, since now we know that the Emarite dynastic seal (*Emar* IV E2) is impressed on *Ekalte* II 25.\(^{37}\) This fact suggests that the same dynasty had continued in Emar at least from the fourteenth century B.C., before the Hittite conquest of the land of Aštata.

As for Beckman’s comment that cities did not hold property for long, it seems to me rather natural that it would take a long time to dispose of all the huge amount of real estate the city had acquired from the king. In this respect, let us note the real estate being sold in these documents: KI *erṣetu* and, if my interpretation is correct, KI.LAḪ₄ (*nidûtu*); both are ‘waste plots.’ These probably were very late in being sold, and probably were unleased, because of their physical state among other reasons. Here, we cannot overlook the fact that they are not (livable) houses or (cultivated) fields, which must have been easier to sell.

On Beckman’s comment concerning the *sandhi* occurring in *a-na-ra-na* for *ana* Arana in Rašap-ili’s documents, I would note the direct speech marker *-mi* at the end of the cited texts. This indicates that the Arana account is a citation of what was actually spoken at the conclusion of the contract. I assume a special oral ceremony took place when the urban authority sold the real estate originating from King Arana.\(^{38}\) In any case, even though the *sandhi* involved the PN here, it could occur in direct speech. The citation texts only reflect the phonetic reality, i.e., /anārana/, the pronunciation heard by the scribe Rašap-ili, for *ana* m*Arana*.

**V. Closing Remarks**

On the basis of the above, we conclude again that the Arana account describes an extensive exchange between royal real estate and urban money which occurred in the period before the Emar texts. The account integrates well with the Arana documents as a whole, which are documents of the sale of the city’s real estate with a special origin (see § II above).

It is worth noting here that the transfer of this huge amount of real estate from the king of Emar to the city at that time must be one of the reasons why the urban authority of Emar sold but never bought real estate in the later Emar texts (Yamada 1993, 144). However, this cannot be necessarily regarded as the principal reason, since now we know that it is true also of the city god Ba‘laka and the city elders, i.e., the urban authority of Ekalte (see Yamada 2014b, 107 [List 3: types H&U and U]).

\(^{36}\) The earliest attested king of Emar is Yaṣi-Dagan. His father is 4IM-malik, and his son is 4IM-kabar. If 4IM-kabar began to rule in ca. 1265 B.C. (Yamada 2013, 142 n. 81), and if we arbitrarily assign twenty-five years per reign, Yasi-Dagan’s reign is dated to ca. 1290–1265 B.C., and 4IM-malik’s to ca. 1315–1290 B.C. In this case, the latest possible dates for the reign of Arana would be ca. 1340–1315 B.C.

\(^{37}\) For this seal impression (*Ekalte* III 4585), see Werner 2004, 22f., 26, 34, Taf. 23. A revised version and interpretation of the text of *Ekalte* II 25 is provided in Yamada 2014a; also idem 2015, 283–285.

\(^{38}\) Cf. “the ḫukku-bread is broken; the table is anointed with oil” (e.g., *Emar* VI 20: 18f.). This passage, occasionally found in documents of the sale of real estate, usually a house (Ē) or waste house plot (KI *erṣetu*), in Emar and Ekalte, probably reflects a ceremonial feast held at the time of conclusion of the contract. On this passage, see Zaccagnini 1992, 37, 39–41; van der Toorn 1995, 42, 46f.; Beckman 1996b, 35f.; Pentiuc 2001, 74f.; Démare-Lafont 2010, 47f.; also Yamada in preparation.
Finally, unfortunately it is unclear what the existence of two versions concerning the amount of money, “30,000 (shekels) of silver (and) 700 (shekels) of gold” by an unknown scribe and “30,000 (shekels) of silver (and) 2,000 (shekels) of gold” by Rašap-ili, indicates. Perhaps an extensive exchange occurred twice, or perhaps the memory of one of the scribes about the same event was incorrect, since that exchange occurred long time ago. Nor is it clear why King Arana needed that large amount of money. Perhaps for payment of a special tribute to his overlord\(^\text{39}\) or of reparation to an enemy king as a result of defeat, or for another purpose. All these issues remain to be clarified.
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