

The Ancient World: Comparative Histories

Series Editor: Kurt Raaflaub

Published

War and Peace in the Ancient World
Edited by Kurt Raaflaub

Household and Family Religion in Antiquity
Edited by John Bodel and Saul Olyan

Epic and History
Edited by David Konstan and Kurt A. Raaflaub

Geography and Ethnography: Perceptions of the World in Pre-Modern Societies
Edited by Kurt A. Raaflaub and Richard J. A. Talbert

The Roman Empire in Context: Historical and Comparative Perspectives
Edited by Johann P. Arnason and Kurt A. Raaflaub

Highways, Byways, and Road Systems in the Pre-Modern World
Edited by Susan E. Alcock, John Bodel, and Richard J. A. Talbert

In preparation

*Flewing
- Syria*

**Household and Family
Religion in Antiquity**

Edited by
John Bodel and Saul M. Olyan

 **WILEY-BLACKWELL**
A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication

- 54 See Elena Cassin, "Tablettes inédites de Nuzi," *Revue d'Assyriologie* 56 (1962): 57–80, esp. 59–61, text 2, lines 4–5 *a-na dingir-meš, ki-ip-sà-ti*. For *kippu* as a by-form of *kispu*, see also Albert T. Clay, *Legal and Commercial Transactions Dated in the Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian and Persian Periods Chiefly from Nippur*, The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A: Cuneiform Texts VIII/1 (Philadelphia: Department of Archaeology University of Pennsylvania, 1908), no. 4, line 5 *ina sag**, du *ki-tim gidim-sá-lá-sa-ma-² ki-ip-su*.

- 55 See Kalla, "Wohnhaus," p. 251 n. 10 for the interpretation of *ekallu* as domestic chapel. See also *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. E, s.v. *ekallu*, esp. p. 60b.

- 56 See Walther Sallaberger, "Zu einer Urkunde," pp. 495–9.

- 57 Such is essentially also the view developed by Krafeld-Daugherty, *Wohnen im Alten Orient*, pp. 185–218.

- 58 Note especially the first millennium text KAR 300, Rev. 8 [*šumma amelu in*]a *kinunšu istu ittanapab: kur-bi ili ina bitišu sadra*]: "If a man keeps kindling the fire in his fireplace: the blessing of the god(s) is constantly on his house." For the reading, see Wolfram von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 1965), 1: 510a under *kurbu* and *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. K 557a under *kurbu*. The *Šurpu* series mentions the oath "by the torch and the brazier" (*mamiš ²izi gar u ki-ne*, III 145). For the link between the brazier and Nusku, see the interpretation of "hand of the brazier" (*šu ki-ne*) as "hand of Nusku," see *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. K, 395b.

- 59 Arno Poebel, *Babylonian Legal and Business Documents From the Time of the First Dynasty of Babylon Chiefly from Nippur*, The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania 6/2 (Philadelphia: University Museum, 1909), no. 111: 1–33, studied in detail by Claus Wilcke, "Nachlese zu A. Poebels Babylonian Legal and Business Documents From the Time of the First Dynasty of Babylon Chiefly from Nippur (BE 6/2), Teil 1," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 73 (1983): 48–66, esp. 49–54.

- 60 See Khaled Nashif, "Zur Frage des Schutzgottes der Frau," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 67 (1975): 29–30; Van der Toorn, *Family Religion*, pp. 75–6. See Van der Toorn, "The Domestic Cult at Emar," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 47 (1995): 35–49, esp. 40 and note 47.

- 62 See, e.g., Daniel Arnaud, "La Syrie du moyen-Euphrate sous le protectorat Hittite: contrats de droit privé," *Anla Orientalis* 5 (1987): 211–42, esp. no. 13, lines 4–8. For the reading, see Jean-Marie Durand, "Tombe familiales et culte des ancêtres à Emar," *Notes assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires* (1989): 112. For studies of the phenomenon, see Katarzyna Grosz, "Daughters Adopted as Sons at Nuzi and Emar," in *La femme dans le Proche-Orient antique*, ed. Jean-Marie Durand (Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1987), pp. 81–6; Zafira Ben-Barak, "The Legal Status of the Daughter as Heir in Nuzi and Emar," in *Society and Economy in the Eastern Mediterranean*, ed. M. Heltzer and Edward Lipinski (Leuven: Peeters, 1988), pp. 87–97.

The Integration of Household and Community Religion in Ancient Syria

DANIEL E. FLEMING

In archaeology and ancient history, the enormous and the magnificent always get the best press: palaces and pyramids, empires and their capitals.¹ Religion is most easily measured by its temples and by its state celebrations, kings at the head. Mesopotamia's great creation myth, the Enuma elish, celebrates the god of the Babylonian kingdom as unquestioned ruler of his divine peers. Real life plays out on a smaller scale, and recent research has produced a countercurrent of attention to the small and unspectacular. In the physical terms of excavation, this is best represented by the house and those who inhabit it. Textual evidence can also illuminate the lives of households and their families, even though the archives of palaces and temples have received first consideration. For the religion of the ancient Near East, few have contributed more to investigation of religion at home than Karel van der Toorn, and it is a pleasure to take part in a discussion that he has done so much to frame.²

Rather than respond directly to van der Toorn's portrait, one expression of which is included in this volume, I will focus on the body of evidence for ancient Syrian religion that I know best, the finds from Late Bronze Age Emar. From a variety of mainly textual evidence, I propose one general conclusion. The religion of household and family appears to have been integrated profoundly into the religious life of the larger community. With the discovery of the micro-social perspective, it has become too easy to divide ancient society according to dualities: public versus private spheres, official versus popular ideas and practices. Household or family religion may be treated as a separate system, related only superficially to the values and activities sponsored by the ruling powers. Emar, a merchant town on the elbow of the Euphrates River in western Syria, offers an unusual opportunity to evaluate household and community practices together, and the results show considerable integration of religion in these spheres. The modest cuneiform archives from

temples, a small public building, and several houses, all from the fourteenth to twelfth centuries, offer varied evidence for religion in the home as well as in town-wide practice. As always, the information is incomplete, but what we do have suggests provocative connections between public and private affairs. When compared to more modern settings, these connections are perhaps not surprising, but it is nevertheless fruitful to consider their relationships explicitly.

It is tempting to propose that in our evidence from Emar, the religion of the household and the religion of the community are integrated at every level. There are too many gaps in our knowledge to allow certainty but what we have does suggest a pervasive connection. One possible exception may be found in the household domain of women. At least, the specific lines of evidence to be explored here tend to involve the head of household, who is usually a man. I will address the following phenomena:

- Care for the gods and the dead. This is part of the principal heir's inheritance and is mentioned in legal testaments. Sometimes a woman may be specified as heir, but the role is conceptually male in Emar terms. The woman must be declared legally "male and female" in order to take on this responsibility.
- Dagan in public religion and personal names. It may not be possible to assign the task of naming uniquely to father or mother. At least, we cannot restrict naming to the woman's domain.³
- Households and public shrines. So far as we can reconstruct the overlapping roles of private residences and public sacred sites, leadership is once again male. The head of household also bears the sacred responsibility.

As we consider the role of households in ancient society and religion, we must beware the false separation suggested by the familiar polarities: public and private, official and popular, associated with palaces and temples on one side and with houses on the other. These are made into distinct social domains, each capable of definition without reference to the other. It strikes me, however, that the household is not in itself a "private" social space. Rather, the household seems to integrate private and public activity in its regular life. The household participates with the larger community both in affairs that are explicitly political and in affairs that are defined by the concerns of each family. There may be some religious acts that pertain to the household without any reference to the larger community. Certainly, the nature of the relationship varied tremendously. Emar's evidence suggests nonetheless that we benefit from asking in every case of household practice how it may be integrated into life outside the individual house and the family that inhabits it.

Stepping back to consider the larger theoretical terrain, we must seek a framework that explains, or even notices, relationships between the rites and religious life of the house and of the community as a whole. It is my impression that few theorists focus on this interaction, natural as the combination may be. Maurice Bloch comes close in his exploration of the ritual of the royal bath among the Merina people of

Madagascar, although he does not address the phenomenon as such. The Merina of his study are Christian, but they retain practices and ideas from before the arrival of Christianity and these belong to deeply embedded social assumptions. Bloch observes in particular "the cult of the blessing," by which an elder invokes the ancestors at the request of an individual; the funerary ritual that attends two stages of temporary interment and then reburial in a communal tomb; and the ritual of the royal bath.⁴ In the royal rite, the king sprays his subjects with water, much as heads of household spray their children as part of the ancestor blessing.⁵

Bloch emphasizes both the continuity and the contrasts between royal and everyday household ritual. The impact of the royal act derives in part from what it shares with the people's household life, even as it sets the king apart as preeminent. Merina royal rituals "gain specific meaning through their adoption and adaptation of symbolic forms which organized non-royal life in the Merina culture."⁶ I find no specific similarities between modern Madagascar practices and those of ancient Syria. At Emar, the integration of household and community religion takes place more in the realm of collective political life, in the identity of the town as a unit, than at the behest of the king, so far as our evidence permits us a glimpse of some details. Nevertheless, Bloch's search for lines of symbolic connection between public and household religious acts resonates with what I see in this ancient Syrian town.

Emar in the Late Bronze Age

The modest merchant town of Emar occupied the margin of Mesopotamia, bridging the Euphrates drainage and regions further west, toward the Mediterranean sea. In the late third millennium, the city of Ebla dominated this western horizon, supplanted in the early second millennium by Aleppo. By the late second millennium, northwestern power was centered in the Anatolian kingdom of Hatti, replacing the eastern influence of a northern Mesopotamian state called Mittani. Across more than a thousand years, Emar somehow avoided wholesale incorporation into any of these larger polities. Even when the Hittites finally seized Emar outright in the late fourteenth century, the town stood at the fringe of the empire and many features of its political and social life continued without profound change.

One of the most important characteristics of Bronze Age Emar was a persistent commitment to collective governance. The power of individual rulers ebbed and flowed but never properly replaced the tradition of town decision-making by a group of leading peers.⁷ At the time of our Late Bronze archives, Emar accepted a newly ambitious family of local kings. Even so, collective political traditions remain prominent, especially through the role of elders in various legal and ritual activities. The visibility of Emar leadership outside the local palace is enhanced by the fact that no palace or palace archive has yet been discovered. By far the largest trove of tablets came from the building M1, a structure that combines the architecture of a large house with that of a classic Syrian temple.⁸ This building was occupied by a learned

leader who called himself "the diviner of the gods of Emar," and his archives include ritual and administrative texts, scribal and divination lore, and legal documents kept in safe storage for diverse clients. Most of the remaining cuneiform tablets found at Emar are personal legal documents, the majority from houses.⁹ Altogether, the written evidence from Emar shows us much about household affairs, especially through legal texts. At the same time, these can be related to public affairs through both internal references and a larger context provided by the ritual and administrative materials.

When we examine the religious life of households represented in legal documents, details suggest deep connections between this sphere and the public sphere of the larger community. The main body of this article will be devoted to exploring the most significant among these details.

Care for the Gods and the Dead

A number of Emar inheritance documents make provision for who will have responsibility to invoke and care for the "gods" and the "dead" of the testator. These "gods" are always nameless and plural, as appear to be the dead, and they accompany the primary house of a well-off family as actual property, physical furnishings. Together, the gods and the dead delimit a family ritual practice that passes from household head to primary heir. If any one element of Emar religion is defined by individual families and their households, this is it.

As a starting point for discussing the religion of family and household at Emar, we must first consider how to interpret this thought-provoking evidence. Immediately, the practice of "invoking" "the dead," placing them in the same category as "the gods," demands a defining role. It is no surprise that families would worship "gods," although it is worth noticing that these seem to be approached in the home, with no reference to any public shrine or temple. Whatever the act involves, it is most often defined as speech, specifically "naming." In family religion, some plural "dead" must receive exactly the same attention, in no way distinguished from "the gods." The dead are also "named," with whatever rites or gifts may accompany the speech. Household religion clearly places front and center the necessity of good relations with the extended family, as represented by the departed. Is any other constituency in view?

Karel van der Toorn has done more than anyone to elucidate the nature of this household religious practice.¹⁰ He has long maintained that the "gods" in this combination also refer to ancestors. Most recently, in his paper for this volume, van der Toorn proposes that "the dead" refer to the physical remains of burial, while "the gods" are images of the dead for use in the cult of the ancestors. Similar documents from Nuzi, slightly earlier and far to the east, combine "the gods" and "the *etemmu*" of the testator. The *etemmu* is usually rendered "ghost" or "spirit" of the dead, but van der Toorn suggests now that these are literally the "bones" of the deceased.

In spite of some obstacles to the details of this interpretation, van der Toorn's essential perspective strikes me as insightful and persuasive. "The gods" seem to refer to concrete images that are used for the required invocation, while invocation of "the dead" takes a burial site as its point of reference. It remains uncertain whether "the gods" also indicate ancestors. There is no intrinsic barrier to such a conclusion in the terminology itself. In any case, every document that specifies who inherits this responsibility unites them under one action, usually "to invoke" (*nubbu*).¹¹ Somehow, then, the two nouns must delineate objects that call for separate classification. It does not seem possible, however, that "the dead" represent physical remains or bones. Van der Toorn draws appropriate attention to a parallel between "gods" and "dead" in the Emar testaments and "gods" and *etemmu* in similar documents from Nuzi. In order to conclude that "the dead" indicate bones, he must read the *etemmu* as essentially the same. To this end, he suggests that *etemmu* may be etymologically related to Biblical Hebrew *'esem*, which may occur in the plural as "bones."

This specific explanation of the inheritance arrangements faces at least two difficulties. First, the *etemmu* really does seem to be a spirit, not the bones as physical remains. Human *etemmu*s properly belong in the underworld, as when Enkidu finds them there in Gilgamesh tablet XII (lines 20–1, 39). Kuta, the great underworld city, is called "the assembly of the *etemmu*."¹² A *kudurru* inscription distinguishes the "corpse" that is buried in the "earth" (*eršetu* = underworld, also) from the *etemmu*, which without proper burial of the body is thereby prevented from joining the *etemmu* of his ancestral family.¹³ The second problem with linking the *etemmu* to the Hebrew *'esem* is that Akkadian already has a more obvious cognate in the word *esemtu*, "bone(s)." The singular *esemtu* can represent the collective remains of one person,¹⁴ and the plural seems to be reserved for groups of dead people, considered together.¹⁵

It seems that the *etemmu*, and probably Emar's "dead" as well, are ancestors to whom the living family has access through burial and the rites that take place there. If an *etemmu* has no burial as a point of contact with the living, it receives no *kispu* (ancestor care), no libations, no mention by name. Neither the *etemmu* nor the "dead" are themselves bones or corpses. An *etemmu* will roam if not cared for through a burial site, and *etemmu*s belong in the underworld, into which they enter through the burial of the body in the earth.¹⁶ Van der Toorn's larger interpretation therefore proves persuasive, insofar as both *etemmu* and "dead" in the testaments from Nuzi and Emar are defined ritually by approach at the grave site.

This leaves "the gods" to be the other major part of the heir's family religious responsibilities, not defined by the burial place. Van der Toorn observes that "the gods of the house" (DINGIR^{mes} ša É-*ti*) follow the family when a house is sold to an outsider in a document from nearby Ekalte. They are mobile, as opposed to a burial. In this connection, Ugarit's *'il'ib*, "god of the father" (*'ilu 'ib*), or "god-father" (*'ilu 'ibu*) may offer indirect support for van der Toorn's approach. The term is not rare and appears frequently in lists of offerings to deities. By far the

most illuminating usage, however, is found in a repeated description of what a man hopes for in a son, in the tale of Dan'el and Aqhat. As father, Dan'el longs for an heir "to set up the sacred stone of his father's god; in the sanctuary, the votive emblem of his kinsmen."¹⁷ It is important to recognize that these ritual responsibilities do not involve care for the father himself after death. The son must honor the father's *z'ib* and kin (*'m*) as did the father. The father will go down to dishonor unless his *z'ib* and his *'m* pass to the care of a son.¹⁸ Care for the *z'ib* and the *'m* takes place at a "sanctuary" (*qadē*), not identified with any burial language, and a term commonly connected with the worship of major gods in public rites. The Ugaritic tale thus seems to assume the integration of the family religious responsibilities of an heir into public sacred space. The male heir is the same figure designated in legal testaments.

It does therefore seem possible that the essential distinction between "gods" and "dead" or *etemmu* spirits in the testaments from Emar and Nuzi has to do with the setting for ritual attention. Only the "dead" or "spirits" are approached by way of burial sites, while all other religious responsibilities to be transferred with an inheritance are understood to warrant definition in terms of "gods." Van der Toorn's idea that these may be associated with physical images makes good sense. The precise bounds of the "god" category for the religious duties of a household head are not certain. There is no reason to exclude ancestral figures from such "gods," but I also see no clear basis for limiting the "gods" of household duty to ancestors alone. The evidence does not allow a secure conclusion.

For all the more eastern Mesopotamian evidence for named individual gods with family interest, there is no sign of these at Emar. Van der Toorn cites letters and seals for the Babylonian situation, but the letters and seals from this Syrian site pass up the opportunity. Greetings in letters usually make no reference to deities, and the only two that I have found both invoke "the gods" protection generically.¹⁹ Equally generic are the shrines that may be for the "fathers" in certain texts for public ritual.²⁰

As the one family religious activity that demands disposition in wills, the invocation of gods and dead seems the quintessence of household religion at Emar. This role must be evaluated with caution. The legal significance does give the activity special weight, even as it perhaps says more about the head of the household than about the family as a whole, especially the women. Invocation of the family deities and dead may belong explicitly to the house but this does not necessarily isolate the family from the larger community. Of course, the very genealogical bonds maintained by remembrance of ancestors reach across individual households to a wider circle of kin. So far as "the dead" may be addressed at a burial site, this grave does not appear to be located inside the house. House sales at Emar are common, and the families of sellers seem to be in no danger of losing contact with their dearly departed. Jean-Claude Margueron, director of the first excavations at Emar, observes that over thirty houses were uncovered at least in part, and he mentions no evidence for burials within them.²¹ No communal cemetery has yet been discovered, but the absence of in-house burials suggests the possibility of one

or more such sites. One text for public ritual describes a major sacrifice "at the cemetery gate" during a three-day festival for Dagan that has other overtones of underworld interest.²²

Attention to the dead at Emar must not be considered the solitary interest of separate households, even as the dead provided one essential focus of religious commitment for every family. It is not then surprising that one stock clause in the formula of inheritance documents combines the statements, "They shall divide my possessions according to the town (custom)," and the qualifier, "The gods belong to the main house."²³ Focus on the location of the gods and focus on who must perform rites for them appear to be mutually exclusive. Only one of the two clauses occurs in any given document. Attribution of the family gods to the primary house and principal heir is somehow the interest of the "town" as a whole, which supports the practice as standard.

Dagan: God of First Resort

In discussion of ancient Near Eastern religion, the stock in trade usually consists of pantheons. Near Eastern religion was constructed from a community of gods, and scholars by habit speak of "the pantheon" worshipped by any given people. One may say that Marduk was the chief god or head of "the pantheon" at Babylon and that Assur led "the pantheon" of the Assyrians. I myself have called Dagan "the head of the pantheon" at Emar, where he dominates more than one domain of religious practice. In retrospect, I find this homogenizing of a religious system to be misleading, and in this evaluation of household life I would like to consider the situation at Emar with more precision.

Realistically, "the pantheon" of Babylon or Assyria is a public construction with political and practical administrative dimensions. At Emar, this public pantheon finds expression in a text that records outlay and procedure for by far the most lavish festival among the several known from the site. According to this long version, in the last year of a seven-year cycle, the people of Emar gather to "give the *zukurru* to Dagan," a rite evidently focused on some speech act. During the central week of festivities, all the gods join all the people of Emar outside the fortification walls and donations are made to every temple and shrine, down to the poorest. The list, which has lost some material to breaks, includes 83 sacred sites, divided into three tiers of gods whose status is measured by the size of their allotments. "Dagan Lord of the Offspring" stands at the head of the list, first among 19 major recipients. This is the particular name under which Dagan was worshipped for the *zukurru* festival, and the list presents a confusing picture of pantheon priorities. After the Lord of the Offspring comes the storm god (*ṯISKUR*) and then simple "Dagan," evidently the principal temple of this god. In the hierarchy of *zukurru* prestige, the storm god is allowed to step ahead of Dagan, even for a rite that is wholly devoted to Dagan and that offers no active role to the storm god.²⁴

Whose pantheon is this? The text was drawn up at the workplace of "the diviner of the gods of Emar," a man charged to oversee ritual defined by the town as such. Politically, it is not completely clear whom the pantheon represents. The diviner seems to serve the collective town under the oversight of the Hittite imperial power, without direct involvement of the local Emar king. Most of the *zukurru*'s expenses, however, are borne by the king of Emar. Whatever institution dominates the administrative perspective of the text, the high position of the storm god seems to reflect the influence of one or both public domains. Excavations have shown that the temple of the storm god (Addu or Ba'lu) occupied the western promontory of the town, its highest point.²⁵ This temple and a parallel neighbor were oriented toward the rising sun, with a pride of place that indicates a public role that we now know goes back to the middle of the second millennium.²⁶ Since that time, the storm god had looked out over Emar in some dominant public role that is reflected in the *zukurru* list.

What then of Dagan? Is he not then the chief god at Emar? This is where it seems that a paradigm of simple unities will fail us. If we set aside the political metaphor of divine kingship, it is not clear how Dagan's position in the middle Euphrates valley should be characterized.²⁷ Dagan had major temples downstream at Tuttul and Terqa that went back to the third millennium.²⁸ These do not necessarily make him "head" of a public pantheon there, however.²⁹ It may be that the model of centralized political authority cannot explain Dagan's importance at Terqa, Tuttul, and Emar. He may still have enjoyed a crucial public status, not ultimately defined or mediated by local kingdoms. Dagan could represent the people as a whole without being tied to individual leadership. Kings could lay claim to Dagan's stature, as at early second-millennium Mari, but this appears to depend on the honor he already enjoyed.³⁰ This kind of character may account for the continuity between his appearance at Emar in both household affairs and major town-wide ritual. On one side, household recognition of Dagan finds expression in personal names. On the other, the essential *zukurru* event belongs entirely to Dagan, and this rite celebrates the unity of the town as such. As a seventh-year bash, it becomes the most important event in Emar's sacred calendar, elevating Dagan to the highest respect – without being king or ruler. In the *zukurru* festival text, Dagan is called "father" as well as "Lord of the Offspring," so that he is identified in more familial than political terms.³¹ The one other major calendar-based rite that gives Dagan a central role takes place at the end of the fifth and start of the sixth month, overlapping the decline and reappearance of the moon.³² In general, this is a time of sensitivity to death and the underworld. In the Emar rites, the underworld interest has two direct expressions. The fifth month closes with three days of offerings at *abu* shrines in various public places: temples or structures devoted to named gods, the palace, and a sacred warehouse called the *bit tukli* ("House of Assistance"). These days are enclosed in a ritual envelope defined by the locking and then opening of unnamed doors. Something is shut away for this dangerous interval. Because the first day incorporates a ceremony "at the cemetery gate," it seems that the doors are somehow shut against the realm of the dead.

What, then, are these *abu* shrines? We cannot be sure from this text alone. Beginning in the early second millennium, Mesopotamian calendars attest a month called Abu, traditionally associated with rites for the dead. This name also has no definite interpretation, although it may somehow relate to a point of access to the underworld.³³ Emar had a shrine for the goddess Ashtartu-of-the-*abu*, and the oldest reference to her renders the name, [^dA]š-tar-ti ša *ab-bi*, where the doubled *-bi* marks the plural for "fathers." Even if the larger Mesopotamian *abu* ritual originated in a pit or other entry to the underworld, Emar scribes seem to have interpreted the name from the similar word for "father" or "ancestor," and the Dagan rite thus pertains somehow to care for ancestors.³⁴ So far as this is so, it is surprising to see such attention to ancestors through this variety of public sites. By their very identification with such institutions, these ancestor shrines must serve the larger community, beyond the bounds of any single household. In this rite, the people of Emar attend to their dead collectively, whatever the individual rites and relationships in play.

Why then is Dagan the lead god of this ritual cluster? He is not an underworld god, never mind its chief, even as he has persistent connections with rites for the dead.³⁵ It is not enough, however, to say he is involved with the dead because he is "father of the gods" or "the supreme creator god."³⁶ As "the very father" in the *zukurru* festival, Dagan is in some sense "the supreme ancestor," to play on Emar usage of the term. We do not know why "giving the *zukurru*" to Dagan became the most important regular ritual at Emar, but perhaps his functions in the *zukurru* and in the rites of the *abu* shrines are not entirely separate. Dagan is god of the people themselves, it seems, where the people in turn identify themselves by their people, their ancestors. The living and the dead together define the community, with Dagan the divine point of reference. So far as this hypothesis succeeds, then Dagan was essential to the integration of household and public religion at Emar. Dagan bound the people as an organic whole consisting of household cells, these joined by the idea of a shared community of the living and the dead.

The logic of a community united through its shared ancestry is ultimately tribal. In the evidence from Late Bronze writing, Emar is defined as a town, with no separate tribal identity. It has a powerful political tradition of collective governance, but no population named in a way that reaches beyond those bounds. Nevertheless, it may be that the collective tradition at Emar is rooted in a sense of social organization that assumes a bond of kinship for those who share the same space. No matter the actual origins of Emar residents, they are not finally accepted as citizens based only on their decision to live in this town. In some cases, this may be true in practice, but it is possible that town identity depended on conventions that were profoundly tribal in structure. Dagan was then the "father" of Emar, and worship of him would bridge directly the practices of home and community. When we see Dagan's prominence in the household religious concerns of naming and protecting legal commitments, this prominence must be related somehow to the god's particular role in binding the people into a whole.

Personal Names

Names are a slippery source for historical information because they depend so much on convention. Mesopotamian personal names still carried recognizable meaning, being what Michael O'Connor calls "linguistically transparent."³⁷ Broad patterns in their popularity offer one view of a religious landscape that centered on the family with each birth. Although Emar personal names have received considerable attention, including now a full monograph, their religious implications remain an open question. As with most ancient Near Eastern onomastica, a large fraction of Emar's personal names invoke some deity. The specific gods mentioned and the range of sentiments expressed can offer some insight into religious traditions attached to naming which gives an enduring identity to the emerging generation.

With any reading of Emar texts that include personal names, one fact immediately stands out. By far the most popular deity is Dagan. I have just argued that Dagan cannot be called "the" head of Emar's pantheon, but along with the storm god (Addu/Ba'lu), he has the highest standing in public ritual. The storm god is the deity invoked second most often in Emar personal names, far behind the frequency found for Dagan. In some way, the pattern suggests that in naming, the sensibilities of public and household religion held much in common.

Comparison of these two gods' appearance in names is nevertheless illuminating. Their use is not obviously predictable from what we know of public ritual at Emar, even with the importance of both gods in both settings. No matter how the names are counted, Dagan comes out far ahead of all others. This issue deserves systematic examination, and I have only undertaken a quick survey.

Technical note: Even with meticulous counting and analysis, no census of personal names in ancient documents can be more precise than any modern population census, and an Emar census will naturally face further obstacles. First, the sample is even less complete and not properly random. In legal texts it is skewed toward people of means, and in Emar's administrative lists toward people who were dependent on public institutions, especially temples. Within the body of attested names, readings are not always certain. Many names have no visible patronym (father's name) or show only the patronym and not the named son. Even where names and patronyms are the same, we cannot always be sure the same person is involved, although this is usually true. In my counts of names borne by individual people, I have culled the clear repeats from the lists, but my final numbers often involve a degree of error, especially with the more common names. Any analysis of the religious implications of personal names is now made tremendously easier by the exhaustive, text-by-text list of every attested name in the CD that accompanies the monograph by Regine Pruzsinszky.³⁸

There are two main ways to count: by separate names and by the numbers of individuals bearing a given name. The first is easier, though still not simple. Pruzsinszky's "Akkadian" and "West Semitic" categories are not reliably distinct and are most securely merged as Semitic, by far the largest group at Emar.³⁹ Out of 425 "theophoric" personal names that are probably Semitic, 175 invoke Dagan and 88 invoke some form of the storm god. No other deity comes close to these numbers.

Technical note: Here, we encounter more barriers to precision. The Dagan names are mostly certain, written in three ways: ^d*Dagan*, ^d*KUR*, and abbreviated as *Dn*. Occasional equivalences prove the identifications. The storm god is more difficult, written most often as ^d*ISKUR* or ^d*U*, and sometimes syllabically as Ba'lu, in various forms. Many names use EN or ^dEN, for Ba'lu (West Semitic) and Belu (Akkadian), as "Lord." In names, this title is generally indistinguishable from a major deity. At Ugarit and in much Emar evidence, the title of Haddu/Addu becomes an alternate name for the storm god: Ba'lu (Baal). The problem is that this title also has a deep association with Dagan in the Emar onomasticon and cannot automatically be attached to Addu. A number of names with divine elements occur only with Dagan or "Lord" as the god, and never the storm god. These include: Dagan/EN-tali', Īmāši-Dagan/BE, Ia'nu-Dagan/BE, Iaḡum-Da/EN, Iarib-Dagan/Da/Ba'lu, Iaši-Dagan/EN, Iatur-Dagan/EN, Ibni-Dagan/Da/BE, Iddi'-Dagan/Da/EN, Išbi-Dagan/EN, Itri-Dagan/Da/EN, Itur-Dagan/Da/Ba'lu/EN, Kapi-Dagan/EN, Lami-Dagan/Ba'la, Li'mi-Dagan/Da/Šarru, Ribī-Dagan/EN, Zimri-Dagan/Da/EN.⁴⁰ There are other possible examples, but these occur with no other divine representatives. Given this pattern, the storm god numbers may be inflated. I have tended to maximize his figures so as not to overplay Dagan's dominance. Dagan's fraction is impressive enough as it is.

Many of these names appear only once or twice. What happens if we try the trickier task of counting heads, the individuals who bear Dagan and storm god names? Counted this way, Dagan's popularity is even more overwhelming. Fearing false precision, I do not attempt exhaustive totals for Dagan and storm god names. Instead, I offer a sense of scale through the more common examples.

Among names with 10 or more individual bearers, 38 invoke Dagan and only 9 the storm god.⁴¹ With 20 or more bearers, there are 23 for Dagan and only 5 for the storm god. Interestingly, a handful of storm god names are extremely common. Three of five occur with 40 or more individuals, versus 9 for Dagan. The two far most frequent theophoric names invoke the storm god: Zu-Ba'la (c. 124) and Ba'ī-malik (c. 100).⁴²

Finally, we may count names in individual lists. In this case as well, Dagan leads the storm god by a large margin, even with men who receive bows from the storm god's temple.⁴³ It is mystifying to find that in all these lists, no matter the provenance, theophoric names are several times more common with the given men in question than with their patronyms. Surely the use of theophoric names was no late fad at Emar. Nothing in the witness lists for the generations of legal documents suggests this. Several possible explanations come to mind, and somehow we must conclude that the full names of fathers are not being provided. We may have clan names in some cases. The patronyms may be abbreviations or nicknames.⁴⁴

If Dagan is the overwhelming favorite in names that invoke the gods, why are the names Zu-Ba'la and Ba'la-malik so popular, far beyond the use of any one Dagan name? One possible explanation is that this reflects indirectly the institutional power of the storm god and his temple. At least one of the two parallel temples at the high-point of the town belonged to the storm god, and there is no evidence that Dagan's temple occupied any such prominent location. Among the 26 tablets and fragments found in the parallel temples (Emar VI.3 42-67), one building preserved three records of the storm god's affairs, along with one for "Ashtartu of the town."⁴⁵ One tablet (no. 42) describes king Pilsu-Dagan's dedication of a gold vessel to the storm god in appreciation for his deliverance from a Hurrian enemy.⁴⁶ This need not have been the only god who received thanks after this episode, but the specific royal reliance on the storm god in time of crisis is nevertheless noteworthy. The enormous numbers of men named Zu-Ba'la and Ba'la-malik seem to reflect the public stature of the god that is expressed in the physical priority given to his temple. It is not certain what ritual or military activity leads the men listed in text no. 52 to take bows from this establishment, and we cannot assume that full-time service is involved. Even so, there are a striking number of storm-god names in the list, almost all applied to the men given bows, not the patronyms: out of 73 recipients, six named Zu-Ba'la, perhaps two named Ba'la-malik, and one named Ba'la-ma.⁴⁷ If there is some military role for worship of the storm god, it is worth noting that the associated goddess Ashtartu takes the title "of Battle" (*ša tabnazi*) for the installation of a major priestess for her temple, the *mas'artu*. The military interest is by nature public, pertaining to the community as a whole, under threat.

Dagan, meanwhile, enjoys a leading public position as well, as seen in the *zukurru* festival alone. Two major Dagan events are included in the consecutive months of rites for "the town" (Emar VI.3 446). Beyond the rites that celebrate Dagan directly, we encounter some sense that he takes first place among the gods of Emar. The feast days of the *mas'artu* festival, which gives no active role to Dagan, allots individual days of a seven-day feast to major gods. These suggest some sort of ranking, and it is surprising to see the storm god follow Dagan in a rite for Ashtartu. The order includes: Dagan, the storm god, the town god ('NIN.URTA), "the gods," Ea, and a name lost to a break.⁴⁸ Dagan also takes a prominent place in the curses offered to guarantee the permanence of a few legal arrangements. Even

where the texts record decisions about family affairs, the curses themselves suggest association with the palace. When Dagan is the first god invoked in the curse of a legal document, the king typically leads the witnesses.⁴⁹ One document not witnessed by the king offers a similar curse, but with Išhara and the storm god as "Lord of GUR-x-[x]."⁵⁰ It seems that Dagan and the town god 'NIN.URTA, the gods of the *zukurru*, perhaps envisioned as father and son like Nippur's Enlil and Ninurta, carry legal force in the royal court.

In spite of these indications of Dagan's formal importance in thirteenth-century Emar, there are hints that this represents a sort of negotiated settlement between the interests of Dagan and the storm god. When we consider the deeper structures of Emar ritual life, Dagan is absent at curious points. He takes no part in the installation of the storm god's priestess (no. 369), a major public rite for the main deity of the western height. In the ritual collection as a whole, Emar supports only two sacred personnel who clearly reside inside a temple and serve there full time: the priestesses of the storm god and of Ashtartu, both women serving at the temple pair of the town's high point. Dagan's priest, like others in town, has no marvelous status, as shown by his modest grain allotment in a long list.⁵¹ Could it be that the western temples were the only Emar temples constructed to house live-in personnel?⁵² Otherwise, the building (M1) that yielded the motherload of Emar tablets combines elements of house and temple under the auspices of the man who takes the title, "the diviner of the gods of Emar." This "diviner" actually oversaw much of Emar's ritual life and played a significant administrative role in the affairs of many separate shrines and temples. He inhabited his own sacred center, possibly called "the House of the Gods," again distinct from Dagan.⁵³

Can we conclude from this diverse evidence that Dagan was "the head" of Emar's pantheon? Must we imagine a competition for the first place between Dagan and the storm god? It may be that the people of Emar felt no need to settle such questions of hierarchy until their government leaned toward its own hierarchy under Hittite rule. I am inclined to attribute the status of each major god to different social forces and political traditions that coexisted at Emar. Somewhat, the storm god laid claim to the best real estate, facing west, toward centers like Aleppo that gave him special honor. Meanwhile, Dagan dominated the popular base, as seen in the proportion of children who carry his name in theirs. So far as the *zukurru* celebrates the devotion of the people as a collective town, this may also hint at a different foundation for his special role. Both here and in the curses, Dagan and the god of particular town affairs, written as 'NIN.URTA, combine to represent Emar in terms separate from the storm god. The curses attend the king in his role as traditional town leader, and so the gods of the collective people are invoked. The king thus cloaks his legal authority in a religious power that is not ultimately founded on his own centrality.⁵⁴ Against this political backdrop, it should not be surprising that Dagan is the major god who most binds the religious lives of community and household, where the town is conceived as the organic sum of all its household parts.

Households and Public Shrines

By far the largest number of tablets found at Emar come from the building M1, occupied by "the diviner of the gods of Emar." Although this structure has a main room and entrance that fit perfectly the norm for Emar and Syrian temples, three rooms were added along one side. The result is more like a house in total composition.⁵⁵ If we begin our analysis of this phenomenon with the assumption that public and private spheres are essentially separate, we may conclude either that the large cella is not truly public or that as a residence the building is not properly private. Both approaches strike me as artificial. The abundant tablet finds from the building M1 show that the diviner who worked there was involved in multiple overlapping activities. He operated a substantial school for apprentices who would earn the title of "diviner," inspired by the technical omen literature that formed one part of their studies. At the same time, the lead diviner himself oversaw much of Emar's "public" ritual life, so far as that adjective may apply. He was responsible for much of what Emar celebrated as a town, with deep involvement in the administration of the individual sacred sites that participated in town-wide ritual. This role took on an inevitable political aspect, as he coordinated the execution of traditional town festivals with the interests of both the local king and the more distant power of the Hittite imperial administration. Through all these activities runs the thread of the diviner's personal interest, reflected especially in private documents that reveal a growing wealth. The diviner's school itself was a family affair, training a new generation to take over from its elders.

The building M1 itself seems to have served a public ritual role, if "the diviner of the gods" himself ran the ubiquitous "House of the Gods." This site is mentioned frequently in ritual texts as a source for supply of offerings, and the installation of Ashtartu's priestess seems to place a sanctuary for "the gods" together in the same category as temples for Dagan, the storm god, and others, where livestock are sacrificed and a feast is held day by day at each location. There is no reason to conclude that the diviner lived anywhere besides his place of work with all its sacred activity.

In this specific case, it is still possible to separate public and household religious practices if we isolate the gods and rites that pertain only to the family. When "the gods" are served or represented through the shrine in the diviner's building M1, they clearly have to do with the religion of Emar as a whole community. This is an important distinction, and the individual family must indeed be considered religiously significant, a unit in its own right. At the same time, however, the building M1 offers one example of how difficult it is at Emar to separate public and private sacred space. We do not know whether the diviner's family had its own family gods of the sort mentioned occasionally in inheritance documents. The testament of the diviner Ba'la-qarrad does not address this question.⁵⁶ It appears that in purely physical terms, there was nothing about the diviner's residence that made it profane, inappropriate to the incorporation of a public sanctuary.

In ritual terms, the installation of the storm god's priestess offers a thought-provoking comparison. She goes through a complex rite of passage that accompanies the physical transition from her father's house to a room of her own in the storm god's temple.⁵⁷ It now strikes me that this special passage into full identification with the storm god and his abode may not be standard to priests at Emar. Most priests may not have lived in temples that were completely separate from profane structures and supported by institutions capable of paying for full-time staff. The priestesses of the storm god and Ashtartu appear to have been housed in the two prominent western temples, with unique status. Their special preparations to take up residence there suggest that these temples also enjoyed special status as both sacred and physically separate in a way that cannot be assumed for every Emar sanctuary. Certainly each shrine was consecrated, but the sense of separate space requiring special passage need not have been universal.

In concrete terms, it is not obvious that the diviner would have required the same kind of passage rite to prepare him to serve the shrine of the gods that formed part of his own home. Unlike the priestess who had to move from her family's house to the storm god's temple, the diviner may even have been born in the same building where he would eventually serve. Many of the questions related to consecration of persons and space are unanswerable without more evidence. It is possible, however, that we cannot generalize from the portrayal of the storm god's temple and resident priestess.

One more phenomenon adds nuance to the interplay of community and family in supposed public and private domains. A legal document witnessed by an early Emar king guarantees the permanent right of one family to the priesthood of a temple to Nergal.⁵⁸ This in itself is no surprise, although the male inheritance of sacred status contrasts with the arrangement for Emar's two priestesses who cannot pass down their offices to daughters. What is intriguing is the fact that the construction of a shrine for public worship of Nergal is not launched in the name of any public authority or institution. A townsman named Pilsu-Dagan (unrelated to the later king) builds the shrine at his own initiative and cost, and he expects to serve as its priest and to benefit from whatever income it generates. The town backs the undertaking, as seen by the presence of both "the elders of Emar" and the king in the document available to us.

Where is the sharp line between public and private religion in this case? The shrine serves the public sphere but it seems to have been created by private entrepreneurship in the financial interest of one family. There is no way to discern the shrine's form and location, although it seems to be separate from Pilsu-Dagan's house. The document envisions the possibility that future interference from outsiders could require the rebuilding of the shrine just as Pilsu-Dagan had made it. Nothing about the transaction suggests that Pilsu-Dagan expected to live in this shrine, and it is simplest to imagine that the family continued its existence as it had been: the same house, the same income from other sources. The religion is public but the institutional framework for it merges public and private, community

and family, so that we benefit from an interpretation based on integration of these domains rather than on their isolation.

Religion and Society

I have approached the problem of household and family religion in Mesopotamia through one site, according to the pattern of my larger work. The coherence of a single body of primary evidence can allow a more precise dialogue between actual practice and more general questions. What follows turns back to the problem of how religion relates to social frameworks.

However we conceive of religion's essence, ancient Near Eastern religion was grounded in a "poly" world. Religion linked the human community to what people understood as a much larger society of active wills. Divine activity could take many forms, but the most important expression was willed, the product of minds recognizable like ours. In his piece for this volume, Van der Toorn focuses on the sociopsychological role of identity. This is itself embedded in the idea of relationship between beings who impinge on each other's worlds, with needs that mesh and the possibility of mutual commitment. Just as people whose worlds intersect will want or need something from each other, if only to keep the peace, beings classed as "divine" simply enlarged this society of actors to make it more complete.

Identity was then crucial not just for security or comfort but to define a place in this mixed human-divine society. The dimensions of the divine society always overlapped massively with the human: by place, by social level and power, by gender. "The gods" as a whole were not a ruling class — this was only true for the class of ruling gods. As a whole, divine power was unavoidable and untamable, so thus an explanation for the fragility of human life.

Where was the family in all this? Family bonds were the molecular-level glue of every social structure in ancient Syria-Mesopotamia. If tribes and cities represent the two grand social constructions of this world, both go back to villages and camps, built around family ties. Family ties remained the building blocks even of palaces, temples and the specialized professions, though these created the basis for other relations. In social terms, the family and the household were not small-scale alternatives to a separate public domain. Rather, the oldest public social constructions were created of household constituents. In religious terms, we should expect similar organic connections, especially where our evidence is not dominated by the most extreme institutional developments away from these roots. Emar was no major political power or urban center, and the old continuities between households and larger community life remained highly visible.

In the sphere of family religion, I am particularly stumped by the role of the dead. Why are the ancestors so important? Ancestors did not in fact form single strands, straight-line genealogical threads traced back from son to father to grandfather like the name-lists in the book of Genesis. If the care for ancestors was passed down only from firstborn to firstborn, what happened in the households inevitably formed

around non-firstborn men? Must we imagine numerous households without family gods or ancestor shrines? All the subordinate households were supposedly placed under a father or a brother, but what of their children? As the population expanded, and the initial circle of paterfamilias roles did not, how could the supply of family, ancestral, and household gods expand to serve all?

This line of thought raises for me another powerful dimension of the ancestors. Ancestors, real or imagined, bind people both into single households and into larger groups made up of multiple households. Tribal identity is founded especially on imagined kinship, and common ancestors are the actual basis for these bonds. Somehow, veneration of ancestors should also contribute to the foundation for whole communities, not just for individual households. Patricia McNaney presents a complex portrait of this phenomenon of attention to ancestors as an expression of current kinship ties in her study of the early Maya. Households must be "contextualized within the larger realm of macrofamily political and economic groupings," which she calls "lineages." She finds that two forces finally shape ancient Maya politics: the centripetal force of divine kingship, which lays claim to central authority, and the centrifugal force of kinship, which produces a panoply of unequal local political actors. "Ancestor veneration" stands at the center of the kinship political force.⁵⁹ There is some evidence for such communal rites both from Mesopotamian texts and from other archaeological finds. It is not clear to me how the bridging function of ancestry actually worked at the household level. Somehow, family religion should carry within it not just a straight-line concern for a single strand through time but also an ability to weave the net of shared relationship by which the public sphere took form.

In my extended study of Emar's *zukurru* festival, I concluded that the elaborate calendar of the seventh-year rite was ultimately constructed from an event that could occupy a single day. Dagan is brought outside of the town and its fortifications to a shrine of upright stones. The central procession marches him between these stones and back into town, both celebrating his entry into it and acknowledging his connection to the larger land in which it is built. The town "gives the *zukurru*" to Dagan, evidently by an act of speech. The verbal root means "to speak, invoke, recall."

At a meeting where I first proposed this idea, Stephen Kaufman wondered in a question whether I would be better off thinking in terms of address to the dead. The ritual text offers no direct clues to support such an interpretation, and I considered the clear town-wide context to count against it. Now I am less certain. Dagan is often associated with rites for the dead, and it now strikes me that an interest in ancestors could be perfectly appropriate for a rite that assembles the whole population of a town to reaffirm its identification as one people, bound under commitment to Dagan. The evidence does not allow a definite answer but the interpretive framework for Emar religion that I endorse here requires that I view the challenge differently. Where the religion of community and household are profoundly integrated, the relationships that define family and town will be intertwined, in part by a shared cast of ancestors. In every expression of household or public religion

at Emar and in all ancient Syria, I will be looking for how the one domain assumes the activity of the other.

Notes

- 1 The ideas in this paper have benefited from conversations with my colleague Anne Porter.
- 2 See especially his *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel: Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life* (Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- 3 In Hittite myth, fathers are the ones who name children. See Harry Hoffner, "Name, Namengebung. C. Bei den Hethitern," *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, ed. Erich Ebeling and Bruno Meissner (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998), 9: 120. Many biblical stories describe the giving of names, and both women (e.g., Rachel and Leah in Genesis 29–30) and men (e.g., the prophet in Hosea 1) are said to have done so.
- 4 *From Blessing to Violence: History and Ideology in the Circumcision Ritual of the Merina of Madagascar* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 39–46.
- 5 Bloch, "The Ritual of the Royal Bath in Madagascar: The Dissolution of Death, Birth, and Fertility into Authority," in *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, ed. David Cannadine and Simon Price (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 286.
- 6 *Ibid.*, pp. 272–4.
- 7 I have undertaken an extended study of this phenomenon, with the archives of early second millennium Mari as a point of reference (*Democracy's Ancient Ancestors: Mari and Early Collective Governance* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004]). This documentation suggests that Emar (then "Imar") did not even have a king in the Mari period (pp. 212–14).
- 8 I prefer the analysis of Thomas L. McClellan, "Houses and Households in North Syria during the Late Bronze Age," in *Les maisons dans la Syrie antique du III^e millénaire aux débuts de l'Islam*, ed. Corinne Castel, Michel al-Maqdissi, and François Villeneuve (Beirut: Institut Français d'Archéologie du Proche-Orient, 1997), p. 30. For a general discussion of the tablet finds from this building, see my *Time at Emar: The Cultic Calendar and the Rituals from the Diviner's Archive* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000), ch. 2.
- 9 Texts mentioned in this article come from both the excavations and from unauthorized looting and sales published from private collections. I use the following abbreviations: Emar VI.3: Daniel Arnaud, *Recherches au pays d'Aštata, Tome 3. Textes sumériens et accadiens* (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1986); AuOrS 1: idem, *Textes syriens de l'âge du Bronze Récent* (Barcelona: Editorial AUSA, 1991); RE: Gary M. Beckman, *Texts from the Vicinity of Emar in the Collection of Jonathan Rosen* (Padua: Sargon srl, 1996).
- 10 See first of all his "Gods and Ancestors at Emar and Nuzi," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 84 (1994): 38–59; and "The Domestic Cult at Emar," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 47 (1995): 35–49.
- 11 Van der Toorn, "Gods and Ancestors," pp. 45–8; "The Domestic Cult," pp. 38–9.
- 12 LKA 81.3, an incantation.
- 13 MDP 6 pl. 10 vi 22, *kimtu*. These examples are drawn from the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* s.v. *etemmu* 1, spirit of the dead.

- 14 *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* s.v. *etemtu* 1b, "referring to the remains of the dead."
- 15 The phonological changes necessary to relate Hebrew *'šem* to Akkadian *etemmu* are feasible but not straightforward. Based on Ugaritic, the Hebrew word for "bone" comes from the older consonantal root *'sm*, and Ugaritic attests the possibility of graphic confusion or alteration of *-f* and *-s*; Josef Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 2000), p. 113. The biblical Hebrew segholate *'šem* would derive from earlier *'šm*, which has a different noun formation than *etemmu*, with its doubled *-mm-* and internal vowel. The feminine *šemtu* is constructed from the absolute form **šēm-*, from the **emmu* base, with *a-e* under the influence of the lost initial *ayin*.
- 16 JoAnn Scurlock defines both the *zāqīqu* ("dream soul") and the *etemmu* (a body spirit) as "semi-divine, wind-like or shadow-like entities which exist in living beings, survive death, and subsequently receive offerings from the deceased's ancestors at his tomb" ("Soul Emplacements in Ancient Mesopotamian Funerary Rituals," in *Magic and Divination in the Ancient World*, ed. Leda Ciruolo and Jonathan Seidel [Leiden: Brill, 2002], p. 1).
- 17 The relevant lines (KTU 1.17 i 26–7, etc.) read: (26) *nib-dn il'ibh hqāsi* (27) *ztr' mb*. I follow here certain preferences of Dennis Pardee, in *The Context of Scripture*, ed. William W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 1: 344. The "father's god" is not taken as a deified ancestor, but the possibility is not excluded. "His kinsmen" are plural, like Hebrew *'sm* ("people"), although the singular "kinsman" is also feasible. Finally, the "votive emblem" (*ztr*) is based on comparison with Hittite *sitar-* (Matiyahu Tsevat, "Traces of Hittite at the Beginning of the Ugaritic Epic of AQHT," *Ugarit Forschungen* 3 [1971]: 351–2). For another translation in the same spirit, with the transliterated text, see Simon Parker (ed.), *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), pp. 52–3.
- 18 Because the care for ancestors is addressed in inheritance texts, it is natural to assume that the responsibilities described in the Aqhat tale pertain to the time after the father's death. The last actions of the devoted son, however, apply explicitly to the father's lifetime: fending off assault, supporting him when tipsy, feasting with him (or on his behalf) in the public temples of Baal and El, and keeping his home presentable (see KTU 1.17 i 28–33). This list begins with the *'il'ib* and the *'m* and then goes on, "to make his smoke go out from the earth; from the dust, the guardian of his place" ([27] *l'ars: mās'u qtrh* [28] *l'pr-dmr' a'trh*). I have translated as literally as possible, but choices are inevitable. Pardee (*Context of Scripture*, 1: 344) treats the smoke and "the song of his place" as offerings, an interpretation that requires the verb "to go out" to be rendered as "to send up" and the "earth" to be the land of the living. Earth and dust suggest the realm of the dead, however, and the question is why offering smoke (incense) should leave the earth. I have followed the syntax proposed by Tropper (*Ugaritische Grammatik*, p. 479), even as the real meaning remains obscure. This does sound like some sort of cult of the dead, rather than protection for the living, but I do not understand what is involved. The verb *yē'* may mean "to escape," as in "get out," an action that assumes a starting point in the place to be escaped.
- 19 Emar VI.3 268; AuOrS 1 96.
- 20 On the *abw* shrines of Emar VI.3 452: 31–52, see my *Time at Emar*, pp. 184–9. These will be discussed further below.
- 21 See, for example, his "Architecture et urbanisme," in *Mekéné-Emar: Dix ans de travaux, 1972–1982*, ed. Dominique Beyer (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1982), pp. 35–6.

- 22 Emar VI.3 452: 34–5; see the discussion of this event in my *Time at Emar*, pp. 184–9.
- 23 See, e.g., RE 8: 37–39; 28: 32–4; AuOrS 1 46: 9–10; Emar VI.3 184: 11'–12'; 201: 50–1; 203: 3'–4'.
- 24 I present a new edition of the *zukurru* festival text (Emar VI.3 373) in my *Time at Emar*, along with a detailed study of the whole *zukurru* tradition (Chapter 3).
- 25 On the reading of ^dISKUR at Emar, see Daniel Schwemer, *Die Wettergöttergestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001), p. 552, etc., for the most thorough and careful analysis.
- 26 The original excavations led by Margueron produced the texts that identified the southern of the two temples with the storm god during the Late Bronze Age (fourteenth–twelfth centuries). New joint Syrian–German excavations have now identified an earlier and smaller version of this southern temple, without the northern complement, that dates to an older phase of the Late Bronze Age (Uwe Finkbeiner, Hala Attoura, Betina Faist, Uta König, Ferhan Sakal and Frank Starke, “Emar 1999 – Bericht über die 3. Kampagne der syrisch-deutschen Ausgrabungen,” *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 32 [2001]: 46). It appears, then, that a solitary storm god temple first gave the site its public prominence, before it was enlarged and joined by the northern temple, perhaps for Ashratu. During the Early Bronze Age (third millennium), the site was occupied by structures not yet identified by the excavators, but not obviously sacred (Finkbeiner and Ferhan Sakal, “Emar 2002 – Bericht über die 5. Kampagne der syrisch-deutschen Ausgrabungen,” *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 34 [2003]: 65–70). So far as the early Late Bronze storm god temple directly overlies Early Bronze use, this western promontory seems not to have seen active use for the several centuries of the Middle Bronze, the time of the Mari textual evidence.
- 27 According to early second millennium copies of royal inscriptions from Sargon and Naram-Sin, rulers of Agade in the late third millennium, these kings only won victories in the west, up the Euphrates and beyond, because Dagan made them possible. See the discussion and references in Luis Feliu, *The God Dagan in Bronze Age Syria*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 43–4. Dagan's relationship to these Akkadian kings, however, is read through the lens of eastern politics, perhaps even revised to follow the later assumptions of the copyists. For the ground-breaking notion that ancient religious metaphors followed the development of society, including the rise of kingship, see Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976).
- 28 The evidence for divine lords of Tuttul and Terqa go back to Ebla and Mari of the mid-third millennium, before Agade (Feliu, *The God Dagan*, p. 41). The name Dagan is not written out in either case, but the titles in these old texts match those from the better documented early second millennium.
- 29 Feliu approaches the question of how to characterize Dagan's role in the Middle Euphrates with appropriate caution. After treatment of the Old Babylonian period (early second millennium), however, he does attribute to him the rank of “principal god” and then “leader within the pantheon of the Middle Euphrates region” and “sovereign” (p. 212). This language may best reflect the perspective of the Mari royal circle, however, and cannot be attributed with confidence to the old traditions of Tuttul and Terqa.
- 30 Zimri-Lim of Mari gave Dagan's validation first priority in his royal seals (Feliu, *The God Dagan*, pp. 162–3).

- 31 Dagan receives offerings during the *zukurru* festival as “Lord of the Offspring” (*bel bukurru*). A separate section of the text elaborates special procedures for sacred processions during the various days of celebration. On the most important day, the full moon of the first month in the seventh year, the god takes part under the name “Dagan the very father” (^dKUR *a-bu-ma* [Emar VI.3 373: 190]). For discussion of these titles, see my *Time at Emar*, pp. 88–91.
- 32 See Emar VI.3 452: 31–52 for the end of the fifth month, there called Abu. The connected rite for the new moon in the following month is presented in Emar VI.3 446: 96–102 (called *Ḫalma*) and 463: 1–12. For discussion, see *Time at Emar*, pp. 184–95.
- 33 For further treatment of the problem and its possibilities, beyond my own, see Mark E. Cohen, *The Cultic Calendars of the Ancient Near East* (Bethesda: CDL, 1993), pp. 259–61; Harry A. Hoffner, “Second Millennium Antecedents to the Hebrew *‘ol*,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86 (1976): 385.
- 34 After careful consideration of Emar VI.3 452, Wayne Pitard concludes that the text is ambiguous, and that the “fathers” may be high officials who are living leaders (“Care of the Dead at Emar,” in *Emar: The History, Religion, and Culture of a Syrian Town in the Late Bronze Age*, ed. Mark W. Chavalas [Bethesda: CDL, 1996], p. 136).
- 35 In this respect I agree with Feliu (*The God Dagan*, pp. 305–6). During the early second millennium, Dagan is associated with both the *kisum* and the *pagra’um* rites in evidence from Mari (*ibid.*, pp. 65–73).
- 36 *Ibid.*, p. 306.
- 37 “The Onomastic Evidence for Bronze-Age West Semitic,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 124 (2004): 446.
- 38 *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Emar* (Bethesda: CDL, 2003).
- 39 See my review in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 124 (2004): 595–9.
- 40 For EN (or ^dEN) as Ba’lu and Belu, see Pruzsinszky, *Die Personennamen*, pp. 49, 53; for BE with the same meaning, see pp. 142–3. This latter writing goes back in Syria to Ebla in the mid-third millennium.
- 41 Here I count only the following: Ba’la-kimi (the goddess “Lady?”), Ba’l-beli, Ba’l-malik, Ba’lu-kabar (cf. Belu/EN-kabar, uncertain association), Belu-qarrad (also uncertain), GN (^dISKUR/^dU)-gamil, Ḫinna-Ba’l (^dEN/^dISKUR), Ir’ib-GN (^dISKUR/^dU), and Zu-Ba’la. Only seven of these have a fairly secure attachment to the storm god. I cite these names in the forms given by Pruzsinszky, even where these are sometimes problematic.
- 42 Here above all, the numbers are imprecise. The most frequent Dagan name in my count is Tura-Dagan, with c. 66 bearers. Zu-Ba’la is usually written syllabically and could be understood to pertain to Dagan, but various hints suggest the storm god. The name is noticeably more common in the two temples associated with the storm god on the western promontory, along with Zu-Aštari. Only the storm god and Aštartu have priestesses that are installed as residents in the given temple, with long ritual texts to reflect this.
- 43 Emar VI.3 52, with 73 entries, five partly broken for the given name, and fourteen missing the patronym. All are men, none identified by title in place of patronym. Among these, 23 men have Dagan names, nine have storm god names, and four are ambiguous “lord” names written with EN/*belu*. The patronyms include five with Dagan and two with the storm god. Two more lists from the diviner’s archive in building M1 display the same pattern: no. 279 (barley rations), includes 14 for Dagan, three for the storm god,

and four with ambiguous EN; in patronyms, four for Dagan, one for the storm god, one with EN; no. 336 (names only), includes 32 for Dagan, seven for the storm god, and 4 with EN; in patronyms, four for Dagan, none for the storm god, and one with EN.

- 44 The relative absence of theophoric personal names as patronyms calls for systematic investigation. In Emar VI.3 336, five of the names that appear as father of father are found elsewhere as simple patronyms: Kutbe (lines 35 and 46), Alal-abi (68 and 80), Ḥalaqi (71 and 29), Qabbari (91 and 15), and Ṭuba (92 and 31). Among these, Kutbe, Ḥalaqi, Qabbari, and Ṭuba occur at Emar only as patronyms (see Pruzinszky's list, *Ku-ut-tā* son of Šeḫrapī may then indicate a separate name, the only one with that spelling). Alal-abi, the only theophoric name, has wider use. Note also the father's father Daqqa (no. 52: 33) and Tuḡnani (336: 69), both of which occur only as patronyms. Names with this pattern suggest the possibility of a larger clan. In Emar VI.3 336, a number of patronymic names could be read as abbreviations of theophoric names, especially with the god Dagan. Consider Ḥimaši (lines 18, 67, 70, cf. Ḥimaši-Dagan), Pazura (47, cf. Pazuri-Dagan), Išbiya (90, cf. Išbi-Dagan), Milka (95, cf. Milki-Dagan), Zikriya (96, cf. Zikri-Dagan). These short forms show a higher than usual proportion of use as patronyms: Ḥimaši (6 vs. 2 not), Pazura (5 vs. 0), Išbiya (5 vs. 1), Milka (1 vs. 1), and Zikriya (5 vs. 1).

- 45 Texts 42 (royal dedication to storm god as thanksgiving), 43 (Ashtarū's treasure in precious metals), 45 ("the weapons of the storm god," assigned to named men), 52 (named men who receive bows from the temple of the storm god). None of the tablets from the second building indicates any divine affiliation.

- 46 This text is one of the few from Emar that describes a political event involving the town as a whole, and it has received considerable attention. For a careful re-edition with notes, see Schwemer, *Wettergottgestalten*, p. 554. The most detailed treatment of Emar VI.3 42, along with other references to a war with the Hurrians, is found in Murray R. Adamthwaite, *Late Hittite Emar: The Chronology, Synchronisms, and Socio-Political Aspects of a Late Bronze Age Fortress Town* (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), pp. 261–70. Pruzinszky also discusses the event in question (pp. 26–9).

- 47 Emar VI.3 52: 5, 17, 19, 20, 55, and 70 for Zu-Ba'la; *ŠISKUR-ma-lik* in line 39 and EN-*ma-lik* in line 38. It is not certain that the writings must distinguish separate names, though this is possible (Adda-malik and Ba'la-malik?). The question is then whether EN-*ma-lik* assumes identification with the storm god rather than Dagan. *ŠISKUR-ma* appears in line 52.

- 48 Emar VI.3 370: 45–54, 60–8. See *Time at Emar*, pp. 36–7. Goddesses are not included in the preserved list. "The gods" may indicate the diviner's building M1.

- 49 These occur in the reigns of Ba'la-kabar I (AuOrS 1 86: 38, Dagan and Shamash), Zu-Aštarti (Emar VI.3 17: 34–6, Dagan, *ŠNIN.URTA* and three others), Pilsu-Dagan (Emar VI.3 125: 37–8, Dagan, *ŠNIN.URTA* and Iššara; AuOrS 1 9: 45, Dagan and *ŠNIN.URTA*), and Elli (RE 15: 32, Dagan and *ŠNIN.URTA*). For Emar 17, see the revised readings of Jean-Marie Durand and Lionel Mari, "Chroniques du Moyen-Euphrate. 2. Relecture de documents d'Ekalte, Émar, et Turtul," *Revue d'Assyriologie* 97 (2003): 142–3.

- 50 Schwemer (*Die Wettergottgestalten*, p. 561) suggests a plausible reading from a known epithet of the Hurrian storm god Teššub (Tesshub) of Kahat, as *bel kurrinni* (here, as *kūr-ri-i-ni*). It is not clear what the Hurrian term describes; Schwemer expects some sort of symbol of deity or sanctuary (461).

- 51 He is first in the long final section of Emar VI.3 279 (line 21), with only 4 *parissu* (per year), well below the amounts of the recipients in the five more exclusive sections ahead of him (up to 30).

- 52 The storm god's temple was enlarged significantly during the Late Bronze Age. The basic layout of the core structure does not change, but it is possible that one goal was to accommodate a residence that was not already included. No extra rooms are appended to the *in antis* axial form of the main temple, so the lodging would have to be above the main cella, if in the same building, as the installation rite suggests. For the priestess's room, see Emar VI.3 369: 66–75 and my book *The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar: A Window on Ancient Syrian Religion* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), pp. 186–92. New excavations have elaborated the changing form of the western temples: Uwe Finkbeiner, Hala Attoura, Wendy Eixler, and Ferhan Sakal (eds.), "Emar 2001 – Bericht über die 4. Kampagne der syrisch-deutschen Ausgrabungen," *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 33 (2002): 109–46 and charts, esp. 110–15, Plan 2. Two new rooms have now been discovered for the Late Bronze temple, at the front entrance, showing a new complexity compared to its later form (Finkbeiner and Sakal, "Emar 2002,"), pp. 10–100, esp. pp. 12–13.

- 53 *Time at Emar*, chapter 2, esp. pp. 35–42.

- 54 All of the curses come from the thirteenth century, under the royal house of Yasi-Dagan, but the tradition that the king leads a list of witnesses goes back to the site's earliest texts which probably reach across much of the fourteenth century. In this earlier period, the leadership of the king is more strongly balanced by the authority of the collective town. See my "Schloen's Patrimonial Pyramid: Explaining Bronze Age Society," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 328 (2002): 73–80.

- 55 See especially McClellan, "Houses and Households," p. 30, and my discussion in *Time at Emar*, pp. 4–6.

- 56 Text no. 7, in Arnaud, "Tablettes de genres divers du Moyen-Euphrate," *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 30 (1992): 195–245.

- 57 On the passage from her father's house to the storm god's temple, see my *Installation*, pp. 173–92.

- 58 AuOrS 1 87.

- 59 Patricia A. McNaney, *Living with the Ancestors: Kinship and Kingship in Ancient Maya Society* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995), esp. pp. 159, 163–4.