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RETRIEVAL OF THE EASTERN LOWER TOWN PALACE and its archives was initiated in 1985 with Peter Akkermans and Glenn Schwartz as site supervisors of two 100-square-meter excavation units. In 1987, the operation was expanded with Peter Akkermans, Annelou van Gijn, Julia Frane, Dominique Parayre, Holly Pittman, and Mohammed Muslim supervising and recording the excavation within 100-square-meter units. The meticulous labors of Tell Leilan village workmen sustained the May–June excavation season in 1985 and the September–October field season in 1987. Tony Ronning and Rik van der Velde carefully prepared the field plans of the palace architecture. The complex daily registration of artifacts from the palace during the 1987 excavation, including the seal impressions and cuneiform tablets, was expertly controlled by Barbara Porter, who also prepared the summary registration and provenience lists that were a constant guide through the 1988 and 1989 conservation, photography, and study periods in the National Museum, Deir ez-Zor. Dr. Adnan Bounni, Director of Excavations, Directorate-General of Antiquities, Damascus, graciously provided the administrative support for Tell Leilan excavations and study periods.

Funding for the 1985 and 1987 excavations was provided by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, supplemented by generous gifts from Barbara Clay Debevoise and the support of Yale University. The National Endowment for the Humanities also provided a post-exca- vation grant for Harvey Weiss and Ulla Kasten to purchase, transport, and install a professional kiln for firing the 1985 and 1987 cuneiform tablets in the National Museum, Deir ez-Zor, and for travel to curate and photograph the 1987 excavation tablets and seal impressions in 1988 and 1989. In addition, Ulla Kasten helped shepherd this volume to press through frustrating and almost countless delays. Mark Besonen, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, systematically processed and digitized the data presented in Figure 20.
**INTRODUCTION**

_Lauren Ristvet and Harvey Weiss_

*Micro- and Macro-Contexts of the Tell Leilan Eastern Lower Town Palace Archives*

Between 1811 and 1796 B.C., Šamši-Adad, paramount leader of the Amorite tribes of northern Mesopotamia and the Middle Euphrates, famously transformed this region into the “The Kingdom of Upper Mesopotamia” and selected the most fertile district of the Habur Plains of northeastern Syria for his political base. For his capital city, Šamši-Adad chose the ninety hectare ruins of Šehnā, a city abandoned three hundred years earlier, rebuilt its collapsed city walls, and thereby created a fortress “like a mountain in the heart of the land” (ARM 14, 101: 5–6; LAPO 1 362). Upon the city’s imposing acropolis his architects built a striking mudbrick temple with a spiral column façade facing the Taurus Mountains to the north and an entryway façade of mud-sculpted palm trunks facing the city’s acropolis to the south. The city was renamed Šubat-Enlil, “The Dwelling of (the god) Enlil,” and was the setting for the prominent political, military, and economic ventures that directed Mesopotamian affairs for decades (Weiss 1985a, b).

Upon the death of Šamši-Adad, however, the “Kingdom of Upper Mesopotamia” collapsed (Anbar 1989; Charpin and Ziegler 2003). His son Yasmah-Addu lost control of Mari on the Euphrates almost immediately, another son, Ishme-Dagan, controlled Ekallatum near the Tigris for a little longer, while petty kings from across Mesopotamia strove to capture Šubat-Enlil, and loot Šamši-Adad’s rich palace (Eidem 1994; Heimpel 2003). Here enters Turum-natki, king of the land of Apum (“Reeds”), upon the archaeological and historical stages. Turum-natki repeatedly tried, and finally succeeded, to take and control the city; the sealings of his servant, recovered in 1982 from the Leilan Acropolis Temple floors, were the first Leilan excavation data linking the site to previously retrieved, but yet unpublished, Mari documentation for him, for Šehnā, and for Šubat-Enlil (Weiss 1985a, b; Charpin 1987). Turum-natki’s successors were the rulers of the Eastern Lower Town Palace, and their servants’ sealings also lay upon the floors of the Acropolis temple (Weiss 1985b). It is Turum-natki’s successors who provide the archival records that uniquely document north Mesopotamian history during the tumultuous thirty-four years before Samsu-iluna of Babylon, Hammurabi’s son, marched north to destroy the city in 1728 B.C. (Eidem 1991; Heimpel 2003).

The Leilan Eastern Lower Town Palace archive, here treated by Jesper Eidem, comprises approximately 600 tablets recovered in the palace excavations of 1985 and 1987. The letters and treaties join the archive’s dated administrative texts studied by Vincente (1992) and Ismail (1991), the Leilan recension of the Sumerian King List (Vincente 1995), and one of the Leilan treaties (Eidem 1991). An analysis of their excavation, the micro-archaeological context of these archival tablets, establishes their relative chronology, archival integrity, and unique historiographic value. The archives’ macro-archaeological context resides within the well-documented and dramatic restructurings of regional and inter-regional Mesopotamian settlement, agro-production and political-territorial wealth accumulation at this period, and the volatile natural conditions that unleashed and exaggerated these social forces.
Here we analyze first the range of these tablets’ spatial and temporal contexts. We consider the tablets’ spatial situation within the palace, the city of Šubat-Enlil (Fig. 1), and the Habur Plains (Fig. 2), the tablets’ temporal distribution within Leilan Period I, the first half of the eighteenth century B.C., and the resettlement of Tell Leilan and the Habur Plains following three centuries of major population abandonment. The palace’s letters and treaties describe vividly the regional turbulence between warring Amorite states across northern and southern Mesopotamia. Explanations for these events are not provided by the texts’ narratives, of course, and so it is to the macro-archaeological context that we turn for understanding changing regional settlement patterns and productive forces, and the dynamic environments within which these forces developed and were ultimately released.

Fig. 1. Tell Leilan topographic plan, with second- and third-millennium excavations.
The Eastern Lower Town Palace

The 1985 and 1987 Operation 3 excavations at Tell Leilan exposed 1000 m² of the Eastern Lower Town Palace. The topography of the Lower Town indicates that the excavation has, so far, retrieved only part of the palace’s northeastern quadrant. Defined by the 100-m contour line (Fig. 1), the palace area extends approximately 75 m to the west and 60 m to the south across at least 1.25 ha. Our excavations, therefore, have likely sampled less than 10% of this building (Weiss 1990; Akkermans and Weiss 1991b).

This Operation 3 sample comprises 25 rooms situated between two courtyards (Figs. 3–4). These rooms are divided between kitchens (room 8 and the suite consisting of 12, 13/14, 17, and 21), storage rooms (rooms 5, 22, 23, 24), and a possible reception suite (rooms 1, 2/3, 6, 16, 20). Four building levels were recovered: the earliest is the initial construction and use of the palace, while the most recent building level, building level 1, represents the scant architectural remains of a “squatter occupation” following the abandonment of this building and the final destruction of Šehnā. Inscribed sealings provide us with *termini ante quem* for the construction of building levels 2,
Fig. 3. Eastern Lower Town Palace, building level 2.
Fig. 4. Eastern Lower Town Palace, building level 2, isometric plan.

Tell Leilan 1985-1987
Eastern Lower Town Palace

Fig. 4. Eastern Lower Town Palace, building level 2, isometric plan.
3, and 4. Most of the tablets, including all of the ones analyzed in this volume, were retrieved from building level 2, the latest occupation of the palace. This building apparently served as the main palace for the kings of Šubat-Enlil/Šeḫnā/Apum for nearly a century, from its revival as the administrative capital of Upper Mesopotamia to its final destruction at the hands of Samsu-iluna of Babylon. We present the construction history of the palace, correlate this history with the epigraphic artifacts within the building, and finally compare this palace to other contemporary palaces.

**Building Level 4**

Three rooms—9, 10, and 11—exposed in the northeastern corner of Operation 3 represent the oldest excavated building level in our sample. Each room was approximately 2.75 m wide with walls of regularly laid mudbrick oriented slightly off the main compass directions, ca. 3 degrees NW/SE. A clay oven, retrieved in room 11, was the only distinguishing feature in these rooms. The west wall of room 9 formed the eastern limits of a large courtyard, room 4. North of the excavated area, within the probable confines of room 4, a small baked brick pavement was recovered. During a later phase in the history of these rooms (building level 4b), new floors were laid and the wall between 9 and 10 was not rebuilt. This new room, approximately 6.25 m wide, could be entered via two 1.25-m-wide doorways in its eastern and southern walls. A sealing (L87-1281) belonging to Kaniwe, a servant of Išme-Dagan, was located in room 9. The doorway of room 10 had been sealed with a cylinder seal that originally belonged to Liter-šarrūsu, servant of Šamši-Adad and perhaps later to Bunuma-ili (L87-1480 and L87-1485). The same seal had also been impressed on a tablet found in the Acropolis Temple (L85-115), providing a synchronism between building level 4 of this palace and building level 10 of the temple. Liter-šarrūsu was a well-known functionary who is also attested at both Mari and Açemhöyük. The sealings from Tell Leilan indicate the close relationship between the bureaucracies of Mari and Šubat-Enlil and date building level 4 to Šamši-Adad’s reign (Parayre 1991:132).

**Building Level 3**

During building level 3 this palace was expanded horizontally into the previously open space to the south and the west to create the large palace that was uncovered during the 1985 and 1987 excavations. The rooms recovered in this level were situated between a northern and southern courtyard. Excavation focused on the area east of these courtyards, south of the building level 4 rooms. The walls of this level were oriented at the same angle as those of building level 4, NW/SE. They were carefully constructed with regularly laid gray or red square and rectangular mudbricks, $34 \times 34 \times 10$ cm and $34 \times 16 \times 10$ cm respectively, with 5-cm wide bands of mortar parallel to the direction of the walls and 3-cm wide bands perpendicular to them. The faces of these walls were usually well plastered, with multiple plasterings up to 2 cm thick. They were sunk into shallow foundation trenches dug into the abandoned late third-millennium architecture underlying this area. Most of the doorways in this building level were a standard 1.25 m wide.

In the central quadrant, courtyards 4 and 20, and the large rooms 1, 2/3, 5, and 6 that are situated between them, form an axis that communicates with both the western and eastern wings of the palace. Their general cleanliness, symmetry, careful construction, and placement suggest that this suite of spacious rooms was a reception area.

The northern and eastern walls of room 4 remained in use during this phase. They were connected with a ca. 24.5-m-long wall to the south, which formed the southern limit to both room 4 and room 8. Room 4 was a large open area, at least $12 \times 18.25$ m. A doorway with a bitumen-
coated mudbrick sill, in the center of the southern wall of room 4, opened into room 1, $3.75 \times 9.5$ m, which was the largest interior space recovered. A doorway in the western part of the southern wall of room 1 gave access to the long narrow room 2/3, $1.75 \times 12.5$ m. The building level 3 floor of this room was destroyed during the construction of building level 2 (Fig. 5). Room 5, a small storage room, was located east of room 1 and north of room 2/3, although no doorways were found in the course of excavation. Only one floor from this room was recovered; it was probably used during both building levels 2 and 3. Standard doorways in the western walls of rooms 1 and 3 provided access to the large room 6, at least $6 \times 3.75$ m, which probably had a function similar to rooms 1 and 2/3. A doorway in the eastern part of the south wall of 2/3 opened onto the baked-brick paved southern courtyard, room 20.

![Fig. 5. Court 20, rooms 2 and 3, building levels 2/3.](image)

The room 20 courtyard was 14 m long and at least 12.5 m wide (Figs. 6 and 7). Both its northern and eastern walls were 4.5 bricks wide with brick dimensions $34 \times 34 \times 10$ cm. Its western wall was not recovered, but a test excavation suggested that it was immediately west of the excavated area. The square baked bricks forming the courtyard pavement measured $42 \times 42$ cm square and were between 6 and 7 cm thick. Four possible doorways leading into the courtyard were recovered. To the north and northeast, regular doorways led into rooms 2 and 16. A test excavation to the northwest suggests that another regular doorway was located in the northern part of the western wall, opposite the entrance to room 16. The final doorway was 2 m wide and located in the center of the southern wall (Fig. 8). It was the largest entrance found in this structure. Almost directly opposite the southern doorway, the bricks of the southern face of the northern wall of this courtyard were cut to form a symmetric curve extending 1.35 m along this face. At each end of this curve, a deep posthole could be articulated along the mud plaster wall face. The placement of this feature opposite the main entry of the courtyard doubtless provided symbolic and emblematic significance for palace functions. The courtyard’s dimensions, the placement of the doorways, and the presence of the decorated alcove all emphasized the architectural symmetry of this room.
Fig. 6. Court 20, view to south toward doorway.

Fig. 7. Court 20, view to north toward possible throne locus.
West of the reception area lay room 8. The sloping floor, baked brick platform, and drain found here suggest that this 3.75 × 3.75-m-room was a kitchen or bath. Room 8 could be entered only from room 7, to the west, which was probably another unroofed area.

Northeast of the reception area lay another suite of rooms—12, 13/14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19—which probably comprised a food preparation area. The courtyard’s northeastern doorway opened into room 16 (2.75 × 2.75 m), which was paved with the same type of baked bricks used in the courtyard. A hematite cylinder seal (L87-9), which depicts a king offering a kid to a scimitar-wielding Šamaš, was found beside a bronze awl (L87-10) on the pavement next to the southern wall of room 16. The doorway in the east wall of room 16 opened into room 17 (4.5 × 3 m), while a narrow, 1-m-wide, doorway in room 17’s west wall connected it to room 12 (Fig. 9). A regular doorway in the east wall of room 12 opened into
room 13/14. The large amount of ash, quantities of animal bones and pottery, as well as the distinctive doorways (containing respectively a drain and a mudbrick sill) found between rooms 12, 13/14, and 17 suggest that these areas were used as kitchens. Fragments of bitumen were found on the floors in rooms 12 and 13/14. Room 13/14, 2.5 × 6 m, also contained a fragmented oven in the center of the room and a baked brick platform in its southwest corner.

A regular doorway in the southeast corner of room 13/14 provided access to room 18 (4.5 × 1.75 m). Another doorway located in the northeast corner of room 18 led to room 19 (4.5 × 2.25 m). The building level 3 phase of this room was not retrieved, but the plan likely did not change from building level 2. In that level, another doorway in room 19, in the southeast corner, led to the unexcavated part of the building. The walls separating these rooms were usually three bricks wide, while the floors were made of thin, poorly preserved layers of plaster.

To the north of room 19, although not connected with it, was room 15, with one doorway that led into the unexcavated part of the building (Fig. 10). A small niche cut into the east wall of room 15 contained a sealing from a servant of Šamši-Adad (L87-1279), whose name is illegible.

North of this suite lay rooms 9, 10, and 11, which remained in use during this building level. The construction of rooms 13, 14, and 15 blocked their southern entrances; they could be entered only from the unexcavated areas to the north, east, and west.

South of the areas described lay a final set of kitchens and storage rooms: 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 (Fig. 11). These rooms were not connected to room 17, 18, or 19; instead a doorway in the south wall of room 22 led into room 25. The partially excavated room 21 lay adjacent to court 20; it is unclear if an entryway connected it to this courtyard. An oven, surrounded by burnt bones and

Fig. 10. Rooms 9/10, 11, 13/14, 15, building level 2/3.
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Fig. 11. Rooms, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, building level 2/3.

sherds, was built on the level 3 plaster floor. A doorway in the east wall of room 21 led into room 25, only a small corner of which was retrieved in the excavation. The building level 3 floor was burned and covered with charcoal and a layer of ash. One could enter the remaining three storage rooms—22, 23, and 24—through a doorway in the north wall of room 25 (Fig. 12). Each of these rooms measured ca. 2 × 2.75 m. The building level 3 phases of rooms 23 and 24 were not recovered. In room 22, two storage jars were sunk into the red plaster floor.

BUILDING LEVEL 2

During building level 2 many of the walls of this structure were rebuilt and the floors were relaid, although the changes in the overall floor plan were minor. The alignment of some of the walls changed slightly, so that they were now aligned parallel to compass directions. Some of the rooms fell out of use, and new rooms were created by inserting dividing walls into the large rooms 2/3.

Fig. 12. Rooms 16, 17, 22, 25, building level 2/3.
and 13/14. In general, however, the function of most rooms likely remained the same. Building level 2 represents the final building level of this palace; afterwards the building was abandoned and left to collapse.

The building level 3 walls were deliberately leveled one to three courses above their occupation surfaces to allow for the construction of the building level 2 walls. The building level 2 walls were usually ca. 40 cm thicker than their building level 3 counterparts, reducing the size of the rooms. These walls were built of friable, soft, crumbly, light gray bricks measuring $33 \times 33$ cm, $18 \times 33$ cm, and $12 \times 33$ cm, in contrast to the denser red bricks of level 3. They were irregularly laid, with relatively thin mortar lines. The width of the walls of building level 2 was not consistent; the top courses were often set in a few centimeters from those closer to the floor. Wall faces were occasionally plastered, but due to the many animal burrows, and the soft, crumbly nature of the mudbrick, little plaster survived.

In most areas, sets of floors belonging to both building levels 2 and 3 were retrieved. Generally, the building level 2 floors were 20–30 cm higher than their building level 3 counterparts. There were, however, several exceptions. The baked brick pavements in court 20 and room 16 continued to be used. In room 13, extensive pitting and animal burrows destroyed the building level 2 floor, except in one corner. In rooms 2 and 3, the building level 3 floors were removed as part of the general modifications in this area during building level 2. Similarly, in rooms 3 and 12, only one floor survived; it was probably used during both building levels.

The circulation patterns in the reception suite were modified during this period, although this area probably served the same purpose. Room 20, the southern courtyard, remained in use. The building level 3 doorway in the east part of the north wall of court 20 was blocked, and a narrow entrance, 70 cm wide, leading into room 2 was constructed. In room 2/3 a dividing wall was built separating this space into two rooms: room 2, $1.75 \times 3.5$ m, and room 3, $1.75 \times 7.75$ m. From the ashy layers covering the burnt floor of the eastern side of room 2, ca. 60 tablets and ca. 40 sealings were found (Table 1). Most of the tablets recovered in this room in both 1985 and 1987 came from the archives of Yakûn-Ašar’s royal wine steward (Ismail 1991). The labels and door sealings belonged to servants of Himdiya, Mutiya, Till-Abnû, and Yakûn-Ašar. The placement of the wine archive conforms with the use of court 20 as a reception area (where wine was received, served, and distributed to visiting dignitaries) and the close proximity of food preparation facilities to the east.

During this occupational phase, room 5 fell out of use. The building level 3 surfaces were used initially but the doorway leading from room 2 was blocked subsequently and no new entryways were created for this room. Nineteen tablets and ca. 100 sealings were found in an ashy layer that lay directly upon the floor (Table 2). The tablet assemblage comprises administrative texts from the reigns of Šamši-Adad to Himdiya. The majority of sealings belonged to servants of Mutiya (L87-896, 898, etc.), but sealings of servants of Šamši-Adad (L85-442), Himdiya (L87-1274-5, etc.), and Till-Abnû (L87-894, L87-901) are also present. These inscribed materials suggest that this room fell out of use during or after Till-Abnû’s reign.

Few changes were made in the function or alignment of the rooms of the northeastern suite. In rooms 13, 14, 17, and 18 building level 2 surfaces were laid upon 20–60 cm of brick fragments, bricky wash and trash on top of building level 3 floors. A three-brick-wide wall was built in room 13/14, creating two rooms: room 13, to the west, $2.5 \times 3.25$ m, and room 14, $2.5 \times 1.75$ m. Since this building sloped to the south, the building level 2 walls and surfaces found in these northern rooms were badly eroded. To the east of room 14, although not connected to it, lay room 15. Only the building level 3 floor was well preserved in this room, although traces of a building level 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Phase Rooms</th>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Sealings</th>
<th>Treaties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šamli-Adad</td>
<td>3, 15, 4</td>
<td>L85-129</td>
<td></td>
<td>L87-1279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2, 2, 5, 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>L87-35, 371, 377, 683, 674</td>
<td>L85-442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Íme-Dagan</td>
<td>4, 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>L87-1281, 1480, 1485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2, 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L87-1486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiya-abum</td>
<td>4, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L87-1474-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2, 17, 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ET 1: 253, 259-30, 260, 303, 507b, 620, 711, 734, 1348a, 1348b-3, 1444-9b, 1447, 1450, 1456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimri-Lim</td>
<td>2, 22, 23</td>
<td>L87-158a, 459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindya</td>
<td>2, 5, 18, 22</td>
<td>L87-887</td>
<td></td>
<td>L85-128; L87-787, 812a-c, 865, 892-3, 915, 918Pc, 1274-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1. Distribution of Eastern Lower Town Tablets by Reign**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REIGN</th>
<th>PHASE ROOMS</th>
<th>LETTERS</th>
<th>SEALINGS</th>
<th>TREATIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Till-Abnû</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5-17, 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Yakin-Ašur  | 2  | 5-17  |  |  |  |

**TABLE 1** (cont’d.). Distribution of Eastern Lower Town Tablets by Reign
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rm</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Reign Letters</th>
<th>Administrative Treaties</th>
<th>SKL Uned. Frag.</th>
<th>Env.</th>
<th>Sealings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2  | 2  | Šamī-Adad,  
|    |    | Hûmidîa,  
|    |    | Mutiya,  
|    |    | Yakûn-Asâr |
|    |    | L85-80–94,  
|    |    | 114,  
|    |    | 123,  
|    |    | 139,  
|    |    | 430–1,  
|    |    | 1449,  
|    |    | 551.  
|    |    | L87-167,  
|    |    | 217–8,  
|    |    | 261–3,  
|    |    | 266,  
|    |    | 268–70,  
|    |    | 272–5,  
|    |    | 277,  
|    |    | 279–80,  
|    |    | 285–7,  
|    |    | 289–95,  
|    |    | 298–9,  
|    |    | 304–5,  
|    |    | 307,  
|    |    | 311–2,  
|    |    | 314–5,  
|    |    | 321–4,  
|    |    | 326–7,  
|    |    | 331,  
|    |    | 333,  
|    |    | 335,  
|    |    | 335–9,  
|    |    | 344–5,  
|    |    | 347–5,  
|    |    | 351–2,  
|    |    | 354,  
|    |    | 356–9,  
|    |    | 362–3,  
|    |    | 371.  
|    |    | L87-265,  
|    |    | 288,  
|    |    | 297,  
|    |    | 329,  
|    |    | 332,  
|    |    | 343,  
|    |    | 350,  
|    |    | 360,  
|    |    | 395–6,  
|    |    | 377,  
|    |    | 857,  
|    |    | 860–1,  
|    |    | 868,  
|    |    | 1335.  
|    |    | L87-860–1,  
|    |    | 865,  
|    |    | 923.  
|    | 2  | Šamīya  
|    |    | L85-129  
|    |    | L87-30,  
|    |    | 159,  
|    |    | 1169.  
|    |    | Floor  
|    |    | Foundation.  
| 5  | 2  | Šamī-Adad,  
|    |    | Hûmidîa,  
|    |    | Mutiya,  
|    |    | Till-Abnû  
|    |    | L87-887  
|    |    | L85-470,  
|    |    | 446;  
|    |    | L85-522,  
|    |    | L87-175–7,  
|    |    | 180,  
|    |    | L87-182,  
|    |    | 878,  
|    |    | 888–91,  
|    |    | 895,  
|    |    | 1277,  
|    |    | 909–10,  
|    |    | 919.  
|    |    | LT3: 180  
|    |    | L87-881  
|    |    | L87-882,  
|    |    | 917a,  
|    |    | 918,  
|    |    | 921,  
|    |    | 1277.  
|    |    | L85-117–119,  
|    |    | 122 (L85-122  
|    |    | includes 30 sealings with same  
|    |    | design),  
|    |    | 134,  
|    |    | 442–3,  
|    |    | 454,  
|    |    | 482–4,  
|    |    | 495,  
|    |    | 499;  
|    |    | 529–30.  
|    |    | L87-857,  
|    |    | 104,  
|    |    | 151–3,  
|    |    | 160–1,  
|    |    | 166,  
|    |    | 169,  
|    |    | 171–4,  
|    |    | 176,  
|    |    | 181,  
|    |    | 814–5,  
|    |    | 876,  
|    |    | 879–80,  
|    |    | 883–6,  
|    |    | 892–  
|    |    | 4896–908,  
|    |    | (L87-898 includes  
|    |    | 31 sealings),  
|    |    | 911–18c,  
|    |    | 920–2,  
|    |    | 1274–5.  
| 9  | 4  | Ilme-Dagan  
|    |    | LT3: L87- 
|    |    | 180  
|    |    | L87-1281  
| 10 | 4  | Ilme-Dagan,  
|    |    | Šamī-Adad  
|    |    | L87-1480,  
|    |    | 1485  
| 12 | 2  | Mutiya  
|    |    | L87-163,  
|    |    | 170  
|    |    | L87-168  
|    |    | L87-57,  
|    |    | L87-171  

**Table 2.** Distribution of Eastern Lower Town Tablets by Room
| RM Ph Reign Letters Administrative Treaties SKL Uned. Frag. Env. Sealings |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 13/14 3 Hāya-abum |                |                |                |                | L87-7-8, 21101 |                |                |
| 15     3 Šamš-Adad |                |                |                |                | L87-1279-80   | Niche          |                |
| 16     3                |                |                |                |                | L87-36         |                |                |
| 17     2 Hāya-abum, Mutiya, Till-Abnû | L87-1446b | L87-198b, 200, 201a, 202, 205, 212, 243, 246, 248, 250-1, 253-4, 255a, 256-7, 259, 1453, 1455, 1460-3, 1491 | LT 1: L87-203, 260, 1440-3, 14444-b, 14469, 1447, 1450, 1456 | LT 2: L87-208-9, 213 | L87-204, 207, 210-1, 214-5, 219, 222, 244, 245, 247, 249, 252, 258, 810, 980-2, 1445, 1448-9, 1457-9, 1488, 1490 | L87-162, 206, 221 | Room fill       |
| 18     2 Himdiya, Mutiya, Till-Abnû | L87-807 | LT 2: L87-811a |                | L87-813 | L87-813-c | Room fill       |                |
| 19     2                |                |                |                |                | L87-220, 1489 | Room fill       |                |
| 20     2 Mutiya | L87-183-4 | LT 2: L87-150 |                |                | L87-154        | Door            |                |

**TABLE 2 (cont’d.). Distribution of Eastern Lower Town Tablets by Room**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>Administrative Treaties</th>
<th>SKL</th>
<th>UNED. Frag.</th>
<th>Env.</th>
<th>Sealing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sanšir-Adad, Išme-Dagan, Haia-bum, Muditia, Till-Abnû, Yakun-Asar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L87-295, 302b, 320, 364, 381, 769, 770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2 (cont’d.)**. Distribution of Eastern Lower Town Tablets by Room
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RM PH</th>
<th>REIGN LETTERS</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE TREATIES</th>
<th>SKL</th>
<th>UNED. FRAG.</th>
<th>ENV.</th>
<th>SEALINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 (co)</td>
<td>Samṣi-Adad, Bêne-Dagan, Hammurapi, Humidiya, Mutiya, Till-Abnû, Yakûn-Ašar</td>
<td>1306, 1309, 1311, 1313–7, 1318, 1332a–b, 1333a, 1339, 1340b, d, e, g, h, 1341, 1346, 1352–3, 1355, 1358, 1365–7, 1370, 1373, 1377, 1381–4, 1389, 1394, 1396–8, 1400, 1419, 1421, 1423a–b, 1426, 1430, 1434, 1436b</td>
<td>1319–21, 1334, 1336b, 1340b, 1341–2, 1344, 1347–8, 1351, 1360–1, 1368–9, 1371–2, 1374–5, 1378–9, 1385, 1399, 1401, 1402, 1409–14, 1417, 1422, 1424–5, 1427, 1431–3, 1435, 1437–9, 1487</td>
<td>794b, 1403a</td>
<td>L17:532, 562, 615, 687b, 788b, 793c, 1423c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Till-Abnû, Yakûn-Ašar</td>
<td>L87–158a, 817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L87–816–23 (L87–818 includes at least 50 fragments), 983–99, 1250–73, 1283, 1404–9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2 (cont’d.). Distribution of Eastern Lower Town Tablets by Room
surface were found ca. 60 cm above the building level 3 surface in the northwest corner of this room, along with a hearth.

In the southeastern suite, where the main archive was discovered, several architectural modifications restricted access to these magazines. During this occupational phase, a large storage jar was placed in a packing of mudbricks in the southern doorway of room 25, blocking the south entrance to rooms 22, 23, and 24. These rooms could be reached only from the unexcavated area to the southeast. In the southeast corner of room 23, near the doorway, ca. 50 inscribed sealings were found (Table 2). These sealings belonged to servants of Mutiya, Till-Abnû and Yakûn-Âšar, and possibly Himdiya. The most popular of these sealings belonged to Sin-Iddin, “the baker,” servant of Yakuya or Yakûn-Âšar (L87-818, etc.)—which provides further evidence that this area of the palace was associated with food preparation. The doorway between rooms 22 and 23 was reduced to just 50 cm, narrower than any other entrance in this structure.

The constriction of this entrance probably controlled entry into room 22, which housed the majority of the tablets discovered in this structure (Fig. 13). Approximately 600 complete tablets and several hundred tablet fragments dating from the reigns of Háya-abum, Himdiya, Mutiya, and Till-Abnû come from this area. In the area to the north, room 17, approximately 40 tablets were found. As Jesper Eidem indicates, it is obvious on epigraphic grounds that the tablets found in both areas belong to the same archive. The letters and treaties published here were found together with administrative texts dating to the reigns of Mutiya (Vincente 1992) and Till-Abnû (Ismail 1991), and a recension of the Sumerian King List (L87-769-70, etc.; Vincente 1995). These tablets were
generally recovered from the room fill, i.e. the brick collapse above the floors (Fig. 14), although a few were found lying on the floors of these rooms (Fig. 15). Tablets were discovered from high elevations in room 22, in some cases higher than the tops of the surviving walls that delineated this area. This suggests that these tablets were stored either on the roof, in a second storey, or possibly on shelves against the north wall of room 22. The collapse of the superstructure of the palace scattered the tablets throughout the two rooms, where they were found mixed with brick collapse (Fig. 16). Post-depositional processes were responsible for the discovery of some of the tablets belonging to this archive in other areas. An animal burrow between the building level 2 and building level 3 floors in room 22 contained three tablets (L87-551-3); two treaty fragments that joined to fragments from room 22 were found to the west of this area, in court 20 (L87-150) and room 5 (L87-180), and two letters from Mutiya were found on the surface of the building level 2 floor in room 12.

BUILDING LEVEL 1

Very scanty occupational remains belong to this level. In the southwest part of the excavation, above the west wall of room 6, part of a mudbrick wall or platform was unearthed. This wall seemed to be built of regular bricks 34 × 34 cm with 5 cm mortar lines between them. It was 6 bricks wide, or ca. 2.3 m thick, and appeared to continue south of the excavated area. Unfortunately, the presence of many animal burrows meant that the wall face was difficult to establish and bricks were difficult to articulate. The only other architecture belonging to this level was an oven, uncovered above and to the west of the remains of the building level 2 oven in room 21.

Several deep and shallow pits, located close to the modern surface of the mound, were also traced and excavated. A brick-lined pit, with a diameter of 1.85 m, was constructed above the remains of room 1, and contained three broken clay equid figures and a basalt stone grinder. To the
south, another pit contained a Habur ware jar with a bird motif (L87-173), and a lead ring (L87-47).
Pits were especially numerous in the western and central areas of the palace, above rooms 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

**AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE EASTERN LOWER TOWN PALACE ARCHIVES**

Integrating the epigraphic and excavation data from the Eastern Lower Town Palace allows us to correlate the construction phases of this palace with the reigns of the Leilan kings, as well as general historical events (Tables 1, 2). As is to be expected, the majority of the tablets and seal impressions recovered relate to the last phase of this palace, building level 2. These include the tablets found in room 5, room 2, room 12, and rooms 17, 22, and 23. Very few sealings and just one tablet were found in building level 3 or building level 4 contexts. Important information was no doubt removed before the rebuilding, while unnecessary documents would have been discarded elsewhere. Nevertheless, enough remains for us to set forth a few hypotheses.

Building levels 3 and 4 were both used during the reign of Šamši-Adad; in fact the majority of the inscribed material found in both construction phases relates to this king. A seal impression (L87-1281) found in building level 4 contexts in rooms 9 and 10 shows that servants of Sme-Dagan were active during the time of this building’s use. It seems likely that Šamši-Adad was responsible for the initial construction of this building as well as its level 3 rebuilding. Further excavation is needed, however, to define the relationship between building level 4 and building level 3. A letter (L85-129) from Samiya, the official of Šamši-Adad who controlled Šubat-Enlil after his death, was found in the building level 3 foundation trench of the southern wall of room 4. The placement of this letter suggests that building level 3 was undertaken during or shortly after the reign of Šamši-Adad. The discovery of a sealing of one of Šamši-Adad’s servants (L87-1279) in the room 15 niche also suggests that building level 3 was in use during his reign. Finally, the obvious architectural planning and careful construction of this palace indicates that it was built during a relatively stable period in the history of Šubat-Enlil. This was presumably while Šamši-Adad was still alive, as the Mari letters underline the confusion that the city experienced following his death (Eidem 1994). Evidence for the most recent king of Šubat-Enlil/Šehnā who used building level 3 comes from two sealings.

---

**Fig. 16. Administrative tablets in situ, east baulk 57Go6, rooms 17 and 22, building level 2/3.**
found in the fill above the building level 3 floors in room 13/14 belonging to Bêli-emûqi, a servant of Háya-abum, several of whose sealings were found at the Leilan Acropolis (L87-1474-5) (Weiss 1985a: 283).

The construction of building level 2 probably took place during or immediately after the reign of Himdiya of Andarig, Háya-abum’s successor, according to the evidence of a sealing from one of his servants that was found within a building level 2 wall in room 2 (L85-128). The ashy deposits and burnt floors recovered in nearly every building level 3 context in this palace suggest that this occupation phase was destroyed violently. The assignment of the reconstruction of the palace to Himdiya suggests that the Eastern Lower Town Palace was destroyed by Atamrum of Andarig. Atamrum seized control of Šubat-Enlil from Simti-hullurusi, an agent of the sukkalmah of Elam, who was left in charge of the city after the initial Elamite conquerors pulled back in the year Zimri-Lim 9’ (Weiss 1985a: 274; Charpin 1986; Akkermans and Weiss 1991b; Pulhan 2000). The original (building level 3) palace served as a powerbase for Šamši-Adad, Samiya, Turum-natki, Zuzu, Háya-abum, and possibly Himdiya. The reconstructed (building level 2) palace probably played a similar role for Himdiya, Atamrum’s son, who ruled Šehna for two years. It remained the primary palace for his successors—Mutiya, Till-Abnû, and Yakin-Asar—the three kings whose activities feature heavily in the majority of the documents recovered from this level.

If the epigraphic data allow us to date the construction history of the palace, and often support our basic functional interpretation of these chambers, then the precise archaeological data of the findspots of these tablets help us to define true archives. Assyriologists usually generate prosopographic reconstructions to define ancient archives. These epigraphically reconstructed archives and the social and economic conclusions drawn from them may have little bearing on ancient practices (Postgate 1986: 182). Unfortunately, few archives have been excavated using modern archaeological techniques. At Mari, for example, reconstructing the findspots of the majority of the tablets excavated prior to World War II within the palace has proved impossible for both later archaeologists and epigraphers, due to different recording systems and the mixing of material from separate beaten earth floors during excavation (Margueron 1986). Such problems have led historians to conclude, perhaps falsely, that the archaeological evidence suggests the “lack of a noticeable system in organizing the archives” at Mari and other second-millennium palaces excavated before World War II (Sasson 1972: 55).

The discrete excavation and the distinctive contents of the tablets retrieved at the Eastern Lower Town Palace allow us to discriminate three separate archives:

1. In room 2, anterior to the inner courtyard, the wine archive from the reign of Yakin-Asar was deposited (L87-217, 261-2, etc.; Ismail 1988). This was probably a living archive at the time of the palace’s destruction.

2. The diplomatic archive made up of letters, treaties, a copy of the Sumerian King List and administrative texts from the reigns of Mutiya and Till-Abnû was situated in rooms 17/22/23 (Akkermans and Weiss 1991b). Jesper Eidem characterizes this main archive as “inactive.” Although they were not used during the final days of the palace, these documents may have served as scribal reference materials prior to the destruction.

3. In contrast, the final set of epigraphic material found in the sealed room 5 is less distinctive. It includes two silver texts (L85-446, 490), one of which is dated to the end of Šamši-Adad’s reign (L85-490), a letter to Himdiya (L87-887), as well as several envelope fragments that cannot be dated (L87-882, 921, etc.; Eidem, this volume: appendix 2). Door sealings mixed with the tablets belonged to servants of Šamši-Adad, Himdiya,
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Mutiya, and Till-Abnû. The material in this room was neither a living nor an inactive archive, but a dead archive discarded here after this room went out of use.

Northern Mesopotamian Palaces during the Mari Age

The discrete excavation of the Eastern Lower Town Palace can refine our understanding of room functions and archival practices in Mesopotamian palaces. At the same time, comparing the limited exposure of this palace to other Mesopotamian palaces of the same date provides physical evidence for the administration of second-millennium polities. The Old Babylonian palaces from Mari, Tell Rimah (Qattara/Karana), Tell B‘ia (Tuttul), and Tell Asmar (Ešnunna), as well as the Northern Lower Town Palace at Leilan provide architectural parallels to this building (Margueron 1982; Heinrich 1984; Strommenger 1993; Strommenger 1994; Kohlmeyer and Strommenger 1995). Although all Mesopotamian palaces had similar functions—as administrative centers and royal residences—their design varied greatly (Oates 1972: 82). This architectural variety emphasizes the fluidity and flexibility of administrative practices and the fluctuating importance of various centers at this time.

We can identify some common elements in Old Babylonian palaces. All of these palaces were built around an inner and an outer courtyard, usually connected by a reception suite similar to rooms 4, 1, 2/3, and 20 in the Eastern Lower Town Palace. The size and layout of these suites varied enormously—the palace of the rulers at Ešnunna, for example, had a very small “reception room” and outer chamber, while the palace at Rimah had extremely spacious chambers (Heinrich 1984: 68). At Rimah the outer courtyard is also situated north of the inner courtyard; while as at Leilan, the palace expansion took place to the south (Oates 1972: 78; Oates 1976: xi).

In general, the tablets found in situ adjacent to these courtyards in Northern Mesopotamian palaces have been concerned with beer or wine. At Rimah, most of the texts relating to beer were found in room XXIV, just off the outer courtyard (Oates 1976: xiii). This mirrors the archaeological context of the beer archive found in the Northern Lower Town Palace at Leilan, where 643 administrative texts relating to the manufacture and disbursement of beer, sealed by servants of Qarni-Lim of Andarig, were deposited in a room directly east of the courtyard (Pulhan 2000: 12). The placement of Yakûn-Ašar’s wine archive in room 2 of the Eastern Lower Town Palace provides yet another instance of this pattern.

A few other elements of the basic design of the Eastern Lower Town Palace are echoed in contemporary palaces. At Mari, the northeastern corner of the palace, which parallels the excavated area at Leilan, provided access both to the large court in the south, and to the central kitchen directly east of the main entrance (Margueron 1982). According to the Mari texts, these kitchen and work rooms comprised the bit têritim, an office that mediated between the palace and the outside world (Durand 1987: 39–49). At Leilan, the kitchens and store-rooms excavated east of the reception suite may also have formed part of the bit têritim. The hundreds of sealings found in room 23 belonged to the servants of nearly every Leilan king, indicating the highly restricted nature of this precinct.

Finally, the findspots of some tablets at Rimah parallel the context of the major archive of the Eastern Lower Town Palace and provide some insight into Mesopotamian archival practices. At Rimah, 36 tablets dating to the reign of Ḥatnû-rabi, a predecessor of Aqba-ḥammu, the last Old Babylonian king of this city, were found in room II—a storage room filled with fragmentary storage jars, directly south of the reception suite (Dalley, Walker, et al. 1976: 1–30). This small collection of tablets from a primary context is probably another example of an inactive archive. Its location in a
magazine near the inner courtyard mirrors that of the main archive at the Eastern Lower Town Palace. Otherwise, the discovery of the dead archive in room 5 parallels the discovery of a similar quantity of discarded tablets in room 110 of the Mari palace (Margueron 1986: 151).

**THE TWO PALACES OF TELL LEILAN**

The recovery in 1991 of 300 m² belonging to another palace in the northern lower town at Tell Leilan (Akkermans and Weiss 1991a) provides a unique opportunity to compare the simultaneous operation of two palaces in the same city. These two palaces were located about a kilometer apart. The Eastern Lower Town Palace was built in the center of the lower town, equidistant from the city wall and the acropolis, which, judging from the remains of the Acropolis Temple (Weiss 1985b; Weiss 1990), was probably a religious precinct. In contrast, the Northern Lower Town Palace was built near the city wall and the northern gate. While the Eastern Lower Town Palace has a complex history of rebuilding, the Northern Lower Town Palace contained only one occupational phase. The archive found in this palace dates this phase to the reign of Qarni-Lim of Andarig. This indicates that the Northern Lower Town Palace was occupied during the latter part of the building level 3 occupation of the Eastern Lower Town Palace.

The Northern Lower Town Palace is less elaborate than the eastern palace. The main courtyard, for example, measured only 10 × 10.4 m and had a simple stamped earth floor. Both palaces were built of square bricks, although the walls of the Northern Lower Town Palace were less well preserved. In several places, locating and following wall faces was difficult due to the crumbly brick as well as the large number of animal burrows and pits in this area, near the modern surface. The rooms located south of the courtyard in the Northern Lower Town Palace were food preparation facilities, characterized by the presence of ovens, baked brick platforms, and drains. They resemble rooms 12, 13, and 17 in the Eastern Lower Town Palace.

The location and nature of the archives recovered in both palaces also differed. In the Northern Lower Town Palace, 651 tablets were recovered from two rooms, the courtyard and room 12, directly to the east. Both of these areas were large and contained multiple entrances, in contrast to the restricted access to the international archive in room 22 of the Eastern Lower Town Palace. One complete tablet and seven tablet fragments were recovered from the courtyard; they recorded issues of barley and peas (Van De Mieroop 1995: 307). In room 12, 643 administrative documents dealing with the manufacture and distribution of beer were found in the remains of three ceramic jars broken in antiquity (Van De Mieroop 1995; Pulhan 2000: 60–64). These tablets represent a living archive, which was still active at the time of this building’s abandonment. Most of the beer tablets were impressed with a seal belonging to a servant of Qarni-Lim. An analysis of these tablets suggests that the palace was built and used by Qarni-Lim during his visits to Subat-Enlil while he exercised his influence over the kings Zuzu and Häya-abum. Leilan Treaty 1, which Qarni-Lim and Häya-abum concluded together with an unidentified king, illustrates his power at Subat-Enlil (Eidem, this volume).

The Northern Lower Town Palace was less grand than the palace of the Leilan kings. Its smaller size and placement near the northern gate suited its purpose admirably; it probably served as an embassy for Qarni-Lim, and possibly for his successor Atamrum as well (Van De Mieroop 1995).

**PALACES AND ROYAL HOUSEHOLDS**

The presence of two, simultaneously occupied palaces at Tell Leilan during the early second millennium implies that the administration of Upper Mesopotamian towns and their countryside was
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more varied than generally understood. Different kings controlled different villages and city quar-
ters, sometimes in far-flung regions. The Mari evidence shows that Yasmah-Addu possessed houses in Šubat-Enlil and Ekalatum as well as at Mari and Dûr Yasmah-Addu (Villard 2001: 100–11). Each of these establishments controlled agricultural estates and herds in the countryside, the sources of pre-industrial wealth (Durand 1997: 39, ARM XII 139). Similarly, Zimri-Lim kept a house in Aleppo with a skeleton staff, where he stayed upon political occasions in Yamhûd (Durand 1997: 151, XXVI/3, A.2933). Kings (and queens) could also have multiple palaces in the same city. Zimri-Lim seems to have lived at the main Mari palace only near the beginning and end of his reign, probably during periods of danger; otherwise he preferred to live in a palace that was probably located outside the main city (Charpin and Ziegler 2004). Texts relating to the king’s meal dating to the earliest years of Zimri-Lim’s reign have also been found in a small eastern palace (Durand 1987: 41). Both Mari queens and queen-mothers also possessed estates in other city districts (Villard 2001).

This multiplication of administrative buildings and sources of authority encourages us to recon-
sider the role of the palace in Northern Mesopotamia in the second millennium B.C. The texts may seem to distinguish between the king’s household and the palace administration, using the phrases bit šarrīm and bit Mari, for example, when referring to Yasmah-Addu’s personal estates and the Mari palace. Yet these distinctions are rarely clear (Villard 1995: 878; Villard 2001: 117), as shown by the use of the same terminology for officials in both domains (abu bitim) and the physical location and appearance of these two administrations, which could be housed in the same building.

The melding of public and private activities pervades the administrative texts and the archaeo-
logical data from North Mesopotamian palaces. The epigraphic evidence indicates that kings could possess more than one bit tērtim, the palace’s central administrative office. These bit tērtim could also be located in neighboring capitals. Babylon possessed one in Mari, suggesting that the term can also mean “embassy.” The Northern Lower Town Palace no doubt contained such a bit tērtim, which managed Qarni-Lim’s state affairs when he was in Šubat-Enlil, his de facto second capital. Yet the texts of the beer archives suggest the palace also housed his personal estate, where barley either grown in his fields or received as tribute was made into beer for Qarni-Lim’s table (Van De Mieroop 1995). The Old Babylonian Chagar Bazar texts list rations for a “House of Šubat-Enlil” (Bit Šubat-Enlil) indicating that this town also possessed multiple palaces (Talon 1997: texts 73, 78–79, 91, 93, 106, 108). These texts imply that the House of Šubat-Enlil was both a state organization and a personal estate. The term “House of Šubat-Enlil” parallels “House of Mari,” which indicates its formal administrative nature. Ration lists detailing payments made to individuals connected to the estate, however, stress its private aspect. Rations are given to various women, a man named “Šamši-Addu is my god,” brewers, singers, and an assortment of animals (Talon 1997: 32).

The evidence of these multiple palaces complicates our understanding of early second-millen-
nium palace society. It suggests an urban and rural landscape divided between multiple authorities, both private and public, with constantly shifting allegiances. This patchwork world where foreign kings carved up cities and their hinterlands mirrors, on a smaller scale, the ever-changing alliances of the diplomatic evidence of this period (including the letters and treaties treated in this volume).

We have long seen Northern Mesopotamia during the third and second millennia as a palace-
dominated economy. There are no epigraphic or archaeological data for a market economy in Northern Mesopotamia for this period. At the same time, however, the presence of multiple palaces, and multiple sources of authority, cautions us from over-simplifying this system and depict-
ing the economy of Northern Mesopotamia as centered on one monolithic palace that controlled all land and labor in its immediate hinterland. Similarly, seeing the economy as a patrimonial pyra-
mid where the palace economy replicates the patriarchal organization of simple households (Schloen 2001; Fleming 2002) misses the distinction, however blurred, which the cuneiform documentation maintains between the king’s private domain and the state.

Šeḫnā and the Land of Apum

The archaeological context of these archives extends beyond their findspots in the Eastern Lower Town Palace. To understand their world we must consider both the urban organization of Leilan (Šeḫnā/Subat-Enlil) and the regional organization of the Land of Apum. The data from other Leilan excavations indicate that this was an administrative city during the early second millennium B.C., with little domestic habitation (Ristvet and Weiss 2005). Like Rimah, Leilan was a “hollow” capital, an artificial city designed for religious and political administration with few residents unconnected to these spheres (Oates 1982; Weiss 1983a; Ristvet and Weiss 2005).

All the Period I buildings were apparently constructed after Šamši-Adad’s conquest of this site, with the possible exception of a few domestic structures along the eastern city wall. The Acropolis temple, the Old Babylonian Town Wall, and the Eastern Lower Town Palace were each built of red or gray bricks of a uniform size (34 × 34 × 10 cm or 34 × 16 × 10 cm), probably commissioned by Šamši-Adad. It seems likely that Šamši-Adad chose to build his capital at the long-abandoned, but still imposingly walled, Šeḫnā for the same reasons that Šeḫnā was the region’s agricultural capital: centrality and high cereal yield. Šamši-Adad’s arrival in this region was coincident with or followed upon the amelioration of climate conditions at the termination of the 4.2-kaBP event’s 300-year period of reduced precipitation (Weiss et al. 1993; Weiss 2000; Staubwasser and Weiss 2006). The re-establishment of dry-farming cereal agriculture encouraged massive Amorite immigration into this region.

The Leilan Period I regional survey data underscore this point. Period I village and town settlement was densely packed around Tell Leilan, with fifteen villages located less than 5 km away, while Mohammed Diyab (Azamhul?), the second main administrative center in the Land of Apum, was only 6 km distant (Fig. 17). The scant space left for cereal agriculture around Leilan suggests that the capital was not self-sustaining but relied on its hinterland. This picture neatly reverses the pattern of densely populated cities and sparsely populated countryside of the mid- to late third millennium in northern Mesopotamia. The number of sites and population density within a 15-km radius of Tell Leilan is relatively high during this period: assuming an average population of 100 people per hectare of occupied settlement, density would have been 57.3 people/km², whereas today Haseke Mohafazat has a population density of 45 people/km². However, such calculations assume that sites were occupied simultaneously, for the duration of the period, while the majority of sites were both founded and abandoned within a two-hundred-year period (Ristvet and Weiss 2005).

The Tell Leilan Regional Survey, the 30-km-wide transect from the Turkish to the Iraqi borders, provides additional settlement data for this period. The transition from Period IIc (2200–1900) to Period I (1900–1700) is the most dramatic in the region’s archaeological sequences (Figs. 18–19): Period IIc was the period of least occupation, while Period I has the most with 158 settlements and total number of occupied hectares, 767.2, more than 10 times that of the previous period. Most Period I settlement occurred in villages that formed over half of the occupied hectareage: 121 settlements are smaller than 5 ha, while the average size of sites, excluding Leilan (90 ha, site 1) and Farfara (100 ha, site 186), is only 2.25 ha.
The number of urban (>10 ha) sites is also greater than expected. During this period, Tell Farfara (186), located only 21 km from Leilan, expanded to 90 ha. Tell Aid (90), located exactly 15 km north of Farfara and 15 km west of Leilan, also expanded to 20 ha, while Mohammed Diyab (55) was at least 35 ha in size (Lyonnet 1990). The wadi Radd, the southern part of the survey area, was even able to support two large sites: Hansa (201) and Dumdum (241) at 25 and 27.5 ha respectively. Most of the urban sites of this region were thus probably semi-independent, conforming with Mari evidence from Zimri-Lim’s reign (Ristvet 2005).

In contrast to the over-representation of large and small sites, medium-sized sites, those between 5 and 10 ha, are under-represented during this period. This suggests that early second-millennium polities were not well integrated. Authority was probably exercised directly by the dominant city, rather than mediated through smaller, secondary centers.

These data from recent surveys and excavations contextualize the epigraphic evidence. In the treaties presented in this volume, Šeňnā and the Land of Apum are amorphous concepts whose boundaries constantly change. The contracting parties are not territorial states, but a collection of people, both sedentary and pastoral. This political situation is mirrored in the Leilan survey, where
the many villages (probably occupied only for short periods) and large sites imply flexible boundaries and the constant combination and dissolution of separate settlement systems (Ristvet 2005; Ristvet and Weiss 2005).

Similarly, the Leilan letters underline the importance of protecting grain and fields and guarding access to pastureland, highlighting the dual nature of these second-millennium kingdoms (Eidem, Letters 22, 138, etc.). This duality is reminiscent of the sharp division between the land to the west, which was predominantly pastoral (Lyonnet 1996; Lyonnet 1997; Wilkinson 2000; Wilkinson 2002) and the territory near Sehna, which was mostly agricultural. Even within the densely settled agricultural districts of the land of Apum, however, some pastoral encampments may have been located below the 300-mm rainfall isohyet and in the basaltic uplands to the north.
The epigraphic evidence suggests that kingdoms were often geographically non-contiguous—especially when it came to pasture, which could be distant. A letter (55) from Ḥalu-rabi, probably the king of Ṭabāṭum on the lower Habur, reminds Till-Abnū not to neglect the nawūm, suggesting that these two rulers shared common pasturage—despite their distance.

**Amorite Sedentarization and Inter-regional Conflict**

These regional reconnaissance-retrieved Leilan settlement patterns and the excavation-retrieved Leilan and Mari epigraphic data encourage another evaluation of pastoralist-agriculturalist relationships during the late third and early second millennia in Mesopotamia, and across West Asia. During the post–World War II period when epigraphic data alone were available, two major histo-
Kupper's (1957) analysis of pastoral nomadism described in the Mari archives concluded broadly that Amorite nomadic pastoralists persistently endangered agricultural-based urban polities during this period. Rowton (1974, 1980), following Barth (1961), concluded that the dynamic pastoral economy forced sedentarization of tribal pastoralist strata within urban society, and thereby generated the interdigitation and interdependence of pastoral and agricultural societies, polities, and economies. Both essentially functionalist, neither Kupper's nor Rowton's perspective explained the historical appearance of these Amorite tribal pastoralists at the third-millennium interstices of steppe and plain, nor the rapid sedentarization process now evident from the surface-retrieved archaeological data (Weiss et al. 2002; Ristvet and Weiss 2005).

The global abrupt climate change at 4.2 kaBP encouraged the rapid social adaptations of political-economic collapse, regional abandonment, and habitat-tracking. Soreq Cave speleothem geochemistry and Dead Sea levels suggest that precipitation dropped twenty to thirty percent during the peak of the 4.2-kaBP event (Bar-Matthews and Ayalon 1997; Enzel and Bookman 2003) while across West Asia and Africa, the recently retrieved paleoclimate proxies for the 4.2-kaBP event provide robust data for this event's abruptness, magnitude, and duration (Fig. 20). The decreased precipitation reduced available areas for cultivation, dry-farming cereal yields, and forced sedentary Habur Plains cereal cultivators to abandon agriculture, abandon the region, and/or adopt seasonal pastoralism. Where the archaeological record is highly resolved, similar regional land use alterations coincide with the 4.2-kaBP event, as in the Aegean, Egypt, Palestine, Anatolia, Mesopotamia, Iran, the Caucasus, and central Asia (Weiss 2000).

The Leilan Period IIc settlement pattern documents a 73% abandonment of sedentary settlement at the Akkadian collapse. Such data also suggest habitat-tracking to still viable irrigation agriculture along the western and southern Euphrates with remnant Habur Plains agricultural settlements in areas that still received enough precipitation to allow for dry-farming like Tell Mozan (ancient Urkiš), along wadis, or in areas with abundant ground water (Weiss et al. 1993; Ristvet 2005). Finally, ephemeral camps, probably pastoral, developed on abandoned occupations. Phase 5 at Taya, which consisted of “a single streaked layer, thickest in the hollow centre of the mound and dying out at its perimeter . . . consisting respectively of carbonized sheep-dung and friable gypsous flooring” along with debris similar to that of modern pastoral encampments, provides evidence of such a site (Reade 1968: 256).

At the termination of the 4.2-kaBP abrupt climate change, at ca. 1900 B.C., cereal agriculture precipitation levels increased across West Asia, as documented in the proxy record at the Dead Sea (Migowski et al. 2006), the Red Sea (Arz et al. 2006), Anatolia (Weiss 2001; Eastbrook et al. 2006), and the Persian Gulf (Cullen et al. 2000; Parker et al. 2006). Coincidentally, sedentary re-population abruptly reached unprecedented levels on the Habur Plains. This is the environmental and social background for Šamši-Adad’s leadership of the Amorite resettlement in Leilan period I. However, the details of the pull and push for Amorite pastoralists’ sedentarization in this and adjacent regions are explained by neither Barth’s (1961) model nor historical analogues (Khazanov 1991). Similarly unexplained are the intense attempts of Elam, Babylon, and Aleppo to capture the new dry farming wealth of north Mesopotamia (Villard 2001; Heimpel 2003).

The Amorite settlers quickly established a diversified farming economy, with a continued reliance on pastoralism. The Mari, Shemshara, and Rimah letters reveal a society less segregated into “nomadic” and “sedentary” elements than seasonal “dimorphism” (Rowton 1974, 1980; Liverani 1997) and recognizable in tribal allegiances extending from the “Hana” navûm (field station) to the
Fig. 20. Paleoclimate proxy records for 4.2-kaBP and 5.2-kaBP abrupt climate change events in West Asia (data: Bar-Matthews et al. 1997; Lemcke and Sturm 1997; Cullen et al. 2000; Thompson et al. 2003; Arz et al. 2006; Drysdale et al. 2006; Migowski et al. 2006; Eastwood et al. 2007). Gray vertical bars indicate probable duration of 4.2-kaBP and 5.2-kaBP abrupt climate change events.

The dynamism of this Amorite world was the unique product of historical, environmental, and paleoclimate contingencies. The political instability accompanying the resettlement and the political reconsolidation of the Habur Plains frames the dramatic political machinations recorded in the Eastern Lower Town Palace letters and treaties. The different historical experiences documented in this region during the late third and early second millennia, regulated and bounded by the three-century duration of the 4.2-kaBP event and the disruption and dislocation of Akkadian imperial rule, caution attempts to apply second-millennium historical and social models to earlier periods, or models from earlier periods to the second millennium. Both textual and archaeological records document a unique experience, the sudden resettlement of a vast cereal agriculture landscape and the foundation of a flexible administrative system to govern it.
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THIS VOLUME is the editio princeps of the Old Babylonian letters and treaties found in 1987 in the “Eastern Lower Town Palace” (Operation 3) at Tell Leilan in northeastern Syria. These tablets, with a few possible exceptions, formed parts of archives belonging to the kings Mutiya and Till-Abnû, who reigned at Leilan ca. 1755–1745 B.C. (middle chronology). Most of the letters and treaties were found together with hundreds of administrative records in the same two small rooms of the palace.\(^1\) Both archaeological and archival evidence indicates that this “archive” is a composite group of texts, formed in antiquity through a process of selection and deselection of older and partly redundant documents. This, of course, has little impact on our modern interest in the evidence, evolving from its importance as the first major group of historical sources found on the Habur Plains, and indeed as the only historical sources from northern Mesopotamia in this period.

In recent years the Habur Plains in northeastern Syria have become a major focus for archaeological and historical research. Neglected for decades after the pioneering efforts of Max Mallowan, the resumption of excavations at Tell Brak, and the inception of the Yale University excavations at Tell Leilan in the 1970s, have inaugurated a new and intense phase of exploration. Many important projects of survey, excavation, and textual studies are in progress, and it seems realistic to expect the future appearance of comprehensive historical vistas of the region in all its syn- and diachronic configurations.\(^2\) In this perspective the present volume enters the virtual maelstrom of a rapidly increasing scholarly literature, incorporating some recent research results, but is itself primarily a new component in the data base from which more mature historical analyses should eventually emerge. Apart from the likely prospect of new tablets from unexplored rooms of the Eastern Lower Town Palace, or from elsewhere at Tell Leilan, or indeed other important tells in the northern Jezira, it must be noted that the present volume presents only part of the corpus of epigraphic evidence from the Eastern Lower Town Palace 1987 excavations.\(^3\)

The efforts in this volume have concentrated on the empirical presentation of the tablets themselves. The actual texts, the letters and the treaties, are edited in separate sections to allow easy reference and ready access for what analytical reappraisal may become necessary or desirable in the future. The introductory chapters contain background material, summaries, and analyses based on my comprehension, which at times is quite tentative. I believe, however, that the problems attached to historical analysis of these sources are no excuse for avoiding such analysis, and therefore try to present the most advanced reconstructions possible.

\(^1\) The tablets also included fragments from a version of the Sumerian King List. See Vincente 1990 and 1995.
\(^2\) For a history of archaeological research in the region see the contribution by D. Warburton in the first volume of the Tall al-Hamidiya publications. Both that volume (Eichler et al. 1985) and the second in the series (Eichler et al. 1990) contain numerous articles on Habur archaeology and history. For full bibliographies see Anastasio 1995, specifically for Tell Leilan p. 214. Collections of recent studies on the region may be found in Lebeau (ed.) 1998 and Rouault and Wäfler (eds.) 2000.
\(^3\) See Vincente 1991; Ismail 1991. To avoid unnecessary confusion the administrative texts are referred to here with their L.87 field numbers.
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