

Migration and Mobility

in the Ancient
Near East and Egypt
– the Crossroads IV

Proceedings of an International
Conference Held in Prague,
September 19–22, 2022

edited by
Jana Mynářová
Ludovica Bertolini
Federico Zangani



Migration and Mobility

in the Ancient Near East and Egypt –
the Crossroads IV

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to Lockwood Press, PO Box 1080, Columbus, GA 31902, USA.

Copyright © 2024 by Lockwood Press

ISBN 978-1-957454-10-8 (hardcover)

Cover design by Susanne Wilhelm

Cover image: Stele of Adad-ēṭir, BBSt 34. British Museum. © Marie-Lan Nguyen / Wikimedia Commons, CC-BY 2.5

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Mynářová, Jana, editor, author. | Bertolini, Ludovica, editor, author. | Zangani, Federico, editor.

Title: Migration and mobility in the ancient Near East and Egypt : the Crossroads IV : proceedings of an international conference held in Prague, September 19-22, 2022 / Jana Mynářová, Ludovica Bertolini, Federico Zangani (eds.) ; contributors, Ludovica Bertolini [and 19 others].

Description: Columbus : Lockwood Press, 2024. | Includes bibliographical references and index. | Summary: "Movement and mobility represent intertwined concepts that have persisted throughout human history. The act of moving from one place to another is, however, intricately tied to the challenges that hinder it. These obstacles can either be natural in origin or the product of human design aimed at constraining the movement of individuals or groups. Furthermore, movement and mobility can also manifest themselves within society, encompassing the fluid shifts of people within the social hierarchy and the transitions between various social groups. The transfer of words, technologies, and religious ideologies often accompanies these human movements. The region of ancient Western Asia and northeast Africa serves as a rich repository of evidence for these forms of movement and mobility, extensively documented through written sources and material culture. The essays collected in this volume variously examine the political dimensions of movement and mobility; how ideas, concepts, and languages move across boundaries; and the material evidence for cultural interactions"—Provided by publisher.

Identifiers: LCCN 2024021026 (print) | LCCN 2024021027 (ebook) | ISBN 9781957454108 (hardcover) | ISBN 9781957454115 (pdf)

Subjects: LCSH: Bronze age—Middle East—Congresses. | Human beings—Migrations—Congresses. | Bronze age—Egypt—History—Congresses. | Middle East—History—To 622—Congresses. | Egypt—History—To 332 B.C.—Congresses. | Middle East—Antiquities—Congresses. | Egypt—Antiquities—Congresses.

Classification: LCC GN778.32.N4 M54 2024 (print) | LCC GN778.32.N4 (ebook) | DDC 939.4/02—dc23/eng/20240514

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2024021026>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2024021027>

Migration and Mobility in the Ancient Near East and Egypt – the Crossroads IV

Proceedings of an International Conference Held in Prague,
September 19–22, 2022

Edited by

Jana Mynářová
Ludovica Bertolini
Federico Zangani



LOCKWOOD PRESS

Columbus, GA • 2024

CONTENTS

Preface	xiii
About the Contributors	xv
Abbreviations	xxi

Part 1. Politics

Aaron A. Burke

Creating Crisis: Empire and Refugees at the End of the Bronze Age in the Eastern Mediterranean 3

Abstract: The history of territorial conquests by the Hittite and Egyptian Empires during the Late Bronze Age and their impact are well documented and have been thoroughly studied, albeit almost exclusively from the perspective of imperial sources. Although extensive consideration has been given to the major factors in the decline and eventual disappearance of these political constructions—usually within a system collapse framework—understudied is the evidence for the net social, economic, and cultural effects of warfare during this period upon so-called peripheral zones. This study revisits this context during the Late Bronze Age (ca. 1550–1100 BCE) across the Levant, Anatolia, and northern Mesopotamia with the aim of highlighting the implicit textual evidence for the impact of imperial warfare upon and state claims over the region’s communities. Refugee policies, as articulated among treaties, edicts, and international correspondence, are examined to highlight the persistence of forced migration and resettlement, its scale and frequency during this period. Particular attention is focused on the Levant where both the Hittite and Egyptian Empires maintained a presence throughout this period, adopting analogous policies toward the repatriation of refugees, just as also evidently occurred between vassals within the Levant. With the decline of these empires, it is suggested that there followed a decline in the curation of refugee movements, which is of central importance to understanding the emerging social and political landscape of the early Iron Age.

Keywords: Late Bronze Age – Early Iron Age – Levant – Anatolia – refugees – forced migration – empire – treaties – warfare

Andrew Burlingame

“To the King, My Master”: Epistolary Evidence for Ugaritian Agents Abroad 21

Abstract: This study is designed to contribute to two related lines of research interest, located at the intersection of administrative mobility and epistolary and scribal practice in the kingdom of Ugarit during Late Bronze Age. The study gathers examples of letters sent to the king of Ugarit by individuals who describe themselves as his “servants,” evaluating each to determine whether the Ugaritian status of the sender as well as a position outside the kingdom at the time of dispatch can be determined. Examples that satisfy these conditions provide previously understudied evidence for the activities of Ugaritian agents abroad. At the same time, this dataset allows us to consider related questions of epistolary and scribal protocol. The study presents an evaluation of the criterial value of such protocol in historical reconstruction as well as the evidence provided by letters sent from Ugaritians abroad for matters of script and language selection. Finally, a specific test case concerning Ugaritian agents in Amurru is revisited in light of more recent textual, onomastic, and prosopographic data.

Keywords: Ugarit – Amurru – merchants – diplomacy – trade – epistolography – epistolary protocol – mobility

Yoram Cohen and Eduardo Torrecilla

Shepherds, Armies, and Prisoners of War in Late Bronze Age
Hittite Syria

69

Abstract: After Šuppiluliuma's conquest of Syria, having full control over important trade centers along the Euphrates, such as Emar, the Hittites directly faced the Sutean tribes. A remarkable turn of events led to an all-out campaign of the Hittite king (probably Tudhaliya "IV") and his allies against these groups at the city of Tuttul in the middle Euphrates. The discussion is based on the letters from House of Urtenu at Ugarit and additional sources.

Keywords: nomadism – Suteans – Tuttul – Hatti – border policy – Ugarit – Urtenu – Karkemish

Susan Cohen

Mobility of Boundaries in the Middle Bronze Age Southern Levant

79

Abstract: Conventional visual spatial representation of the southern Levant most frequently presents its borders following modern geopolitical divisions. While useful in a broad sense, these static lines do not convey accurately the boundaries, either actual or implied, that existed in the ancient world itself. In addition to basic territorial limits demarcating political power and control, other boundaries of interaction, communication, and influence may also be identified when considered through different lenses, such as extent of linguistics and literacy, or the use and production of material cultural traditions, as well as other evidence for social and economic interactions. Accordingly, depending on which subject is examined, the Middle Bronze Age in the southern Levant (ca. 2000/1950–1600/1550 BCE) can be understood as a landscape composed of multiple intersecting boundaries. Through analysis of different categories of evidence, this study examines the different and flexible boundaries of Middle Bronze Age society and culture and discusses the ways in which these mobile spheres of interaction further illustrate its development and interconnections with the cultures and regions around it.

Keywords: borders – boundaries – southern Levant – Middle Bronze Age – mobilities

Steven Garfinkle

Mobile Patronage: Amorite Spatial and Social Mobility under the Third
Dynasty of Ur

101

Abstract: The kingdom of the Third Dynasty of Ur (2112–2004 BCE) was a remarkably well documented early experiment in complex state formation. Both ancient texts and modern commentators have often portrayed the Amorites as one of the existential threats to that state. In this contribution, I argue that many Amorites became critical allies in the development of the patrimonial Ur III state, and that this was partly the result of their perceived role as outsiders. Some Amorites groups continued to be seen as a threat while others emerged as agents of the royal dynasty and as a key constituency of growing state power. These Amorites acquired status and social mobility that was rare in early Mesopotamia because of their ability to operate across traditional boundaries and to provide critical pastoral resources to the new kingdom and its court.

Keywords: Ur III – Amorite – state formation – pastoralism

Jacob Lauinger

Movements of Persons and Populations at Middle and Late Bronze Age
Alalakh

113

Abstract: It is impossible to talk about movement and mobility at the site of ancient Alalakh (modern Tell Atchana) without considering the influential 1965 article by Mario Liverani, "Il

fuoruscitismo in Siria nella tarda età del bronzo.” This article, which is a key part of a larger historical narrative advanced by Liverani and other scholars about the social-political dynamics of the Late Bronze Age and its end, relies heavily on the textual evidence from Alalakh. The first part of this article reviews Liverani’s arguments, with a particular focus on the role played by the Alalakh texts. The second part revisits these texts in light of recent scholarship and introduces some others either not included by Liverani or only published after “Il fuoruscitismo” appeared in order to offer a somewhat different narrative that emphasizes continuity over change.

Keywords: Alalakh – *habiru* – Idrimi – Late Bronze Age – Liverani – Middle Bronze Age

Ellen Morris

How to Tell “Moving” Tales of Female Captivity in the Ancient World 125

Abstract: Historians and anthropologists agree that women and children are routinely and preferentially targeted for capture, especially (but not exclusively) in nonstate or modest-state societies. Archaeologists, however, have been slow to recognize their presence in past contexts given that women and children who survived typically adopted the cultural signatures of their captors. Female captives are difficult to distinguish from wives, as the latter were often drawn from different communities, were occasionally abused, and frequently performed hard labor. Additionally, the destiny of many captives was to *become* wives. This contribution argues that plausible identifications of captive women must rely on multiple lines of evidence. Drawing from anthropological and ethnohistoric records—as well as from the first-hand meditations on captivity narrated by Euripides’s Trojan women and by Euro-American women in early America—it is here argued that archaeologists interested in discerning the presence of female captives should view their evidence through four lenses: an archaeology of honor, an archaeology of the tyranny of force, an archaeology of labor, and an archaeology of identity.

Keywords: gender archaeology – captivity – female slavery – bioarchaeology – abuse – retainer sacrifice

Jana Mynářová

Crossing Borders, Reaching Limits: Boundaries in the Late Bronze Age Levant 153

Abstract: The process of state formation and the concept of a territorial state are closely intertwined elements that significantly influence our discussion of political institutions and their functioning in the ancient Near East. By the middle of the second millennium BCE, a system of political structures was already fully developed in the region under discussion, and the various political entities interacted with each other either through trade and diplomatic relations or military conflicts (or both). However, this system was far from rudimentary, static, or uniformly stratified, displaying fluidity across temporal and geographical contexts. This study aims to identify and explore the principles of the political system as it was practiced in the Levant during the Late Bronze Age (ca. sixteenth–twelfth centuries BCE), a time when the city-states of the region were experiencing intense political, economic, and cultural expansion from neighboring “empires.” Central to our investigation is the question of political borders and their permeability, as they played a crucial role in shaping the character of individual political centers. To achieve this, I will analyze written sources to glean insights into the very notion of borders, limits, and boundaries prevailing in the region. By gaining an enhanced understanding of these aspects, we can unlock a deeper understanding of the intricate interplay between political, economic, and cultural forces in shaping the developmental trajectory of the ancient Near East during the Late Bronze Age.

Keywords: Levant – Late Bronze Age – written sources – Amarna – borders – boundaries – state formation

Seth Richardson

First Causes, Individual Focus: Displacement and Inequality, Babylon,
Seventeenth Century BCE 165

Abstract: This study of people displaced from residential and home communities in the Late Old Babylonian period (ca. 1730–1595 BCE) looks at both foreign and native individuals in the same framework for two purposes. First, it is argued that all displacements, from foreign slaves brought from hundreds of miles away to debtors sent to work in local households, belong within a single continuum of displacement for their common attribute of socioeconomic inequality. Second, attention to individuals allows us to consider the specific circumstances leading toward displacements that are often not visible in studies of group migration and settlement. Specific populations of displaced persons of the period are then profiled; contexts both ancient and modern are considered to make sense of the findings.

Keywords: displacement – inequality – individual focus – Mesopotamia – alterity

Part 2. Ideas, Concepts, and Languages

Ludovica Bertolini

Crossing Life Stages: Dressing, Undressing, and Changing Clothes as
Navigating through Life 193

Abstract: The concepts of boundary and interaction are deeply interrelated. On one hand, a boundary is a physical or intangible line separating two or more entities, giving them a definition. On the other, the interaction between such entities requires that the two objects are somehow distinguishable and relatively close. According to George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) the human conceptual system is metaphorical in nature and the human being tends to conceptualize, structure, and delineate the reality according to their own ability to perceive the self and the “other.” By structuring the self as an entity separated from the outer world, the human being is enclosing all that belongs to his persona as something inside a border. Thus, when they encounter the other, the self does it through an interface that may be physical or ethical. The individual meets the other at their own boundaries. In the Mesopotamian world the skin is not the only surface that encloses and delimits the human body. Together with the skin there is an extra layer that protects and mediates the interaction of the individual with the outer world: their dress. Dress in the ancient Near East was not merely an embellishment, but a way to display and build someone’s identity. It is well known that the hem of somebody’s dress was used in legal context and that the cutting of the hem of a woman’s dress was part of the divorce process. The hem of the dress may also come into contact with impurities causing illnesses. In this study I will investigate the function of dress as both a fixed and adjustable identity element to meet the needs of the individual but also as a social construct in which multiple actors play a role.

Keywords: boundary – self – otherness – identity – skin – dress – ancient Near East

Paul Delnero

Going to Heaven, Hell, and Egypt: Mesopotamian Myths and Scribal
Training at Amarna 213

Abstract: Among the many official cuneiform letters found at the Egyptian city of Amarna, a small group of Mesopotamian scholarly texts, which included copies of three Akkadian literary narratives—Nergal and Ereškigal, the Myth of Adapa, and Sargon, King of Battle—were also discovered. In addition to addressing subjects like diplomatic practice and the role of messengers in transmitting messages between high officials in distant places, these three texts were also

pedagogical tools for teaching Egyptian scribes how to compose and copy texts in cuneiform. In this article, how these texts and the other cuneiform scholarly material found at Amarna were used for scribal training in Egypt, and what they reveal about the interaction of Egyptian and Mesopotamian scribal practices, are examined.

Keywords: Akkadian literature – scribal training – Mesopotamian and Egyptian scribal practices

Federico Giusfredi

Was Hurrian Spoken in Central Anatolia during the Middle Bronze Age and the Early Age of Hatti? 239

Abstract: While contacts between the Anatolian world and Hurrian culture certainly existed already during the Middle Bronze Age, assessing the importance of the presence of Hurrian peoples in Cappadocia at the time of the Old Assyrian trading network and in the earliest stages of Hittite history is a difficult task. In this contribution, I will try to tackle the problem from a linguistic, philological, and historical point of view.

Keywords: Hurrian – Hittite – Old Assyrian – language contact – early Anatolian history

Anne Goddeeris

Ceci n'est pas un *kudurru*: Or How Adad-ēṭir Climbs the Social Ladder 255

Abstract: A diorite stele from Babylon, BBSt 34, depicts two men facing each other under a register of divine symbols. The inscription tells us that the stela is erected for Adad-ēṭir, butcher of Marduk, by his son Marduk-balāssu-iqbi. The two men on the stela are father and son, with the attributes associated with their cultic office. Images of humans unaccompanied by a king or a god are extremely rare in Mesopotamia. As a butcher of Marduk, Adad-ēṭir belongs to the middle echelons of the clergy of Babylon. What makes him stand out is the fact that he is a *kārib šarri*. This phrase should not be understood as an adjective, but as a title given to a priest who represents the interests of the king in front of Marduk in return for an injection of funds in the temple estate. The iconographic and literary stylistic features of the monument show how the artist reused existing motifs to convey a new type of message, in which a private person is remembered for posterity.

Keywords: Adad-ēṭir – Babylonian stele – *kārib šarri* – BBSt 34 – clergy of Babylon – butcher of Marduk – audience scene – divine symbols

Adam E. Miglio

Uta-napišti's Reconnaissance-Birds as Celestial Signs and the Transmission of Antediluvian Knowledge 265

Abstract: This essay draws upon divinatory texts such as Enūma Anu Enlil and the astrological compendia MUL.APIN, among other astronomical sources, and demonstrates that Uta-napišti's reconnaissance-birds are celestial symbols. Moreover, it shows that the symbolism of these birds helps explain the seasonal patterns of ancient Mesopotamian life.

Keywords: Gilgamesh Epic – Uta-napišti – flood stories – reconnaissance-birds – astrological omens – Enūma Anu Enlil – MUL.APIN – Genesis 6–9

Kevin McGeough

Migration, Mobility, Diffusion, Social Evolution, and Culture History:
How Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Archaeological Theory Has
Impacted Our Vision of the Bronze Age 279

Abstract: The Bronze Age Near East is often studied in relation to the emergence of states and the rise and collapse of international relations. Change in the region has been explained through mechanisms that have been *au courant* in other areas of archaeological enquiry that have been typically oriented around ideas of mobility or in antagonism toward such ideas. Evolution, diffusion, and migration were seen as the main drivers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The culture-historians of the early to mid-twentieth century tended to explain change through external factors, whereas the 1970s and 1980s saw greater emphasis on internal dynamics that could be explained through social scientific analysis. Whether positing externalist or internalist models, issues of movement have been further complicated by the overlapping of ancient and modern conceptions of ethnicity, race, and statehood. Given the complex emic categories of people known from the Bronze Age Near East, this region and period is both rich in evidence and problematic for interpretation in regard to the movement of people. This study shall explore how different scholarly and social trends of the past 200 years have both helped and hindered contemporary understandings of migration and mobility in the Bronze Age.

Keywords: diffusion – migration – social evolution – assemblage – archaeological theory – archaeological explanations of change

Part 3. Materiality and Administration

Jacob C. Damm

Pottery as Practice: Multilevel Social Analyses of Egyptian-style Ceramics
in the Late Bronze Age Southern Levant 295

Abstract: Despite varying interpretations regarding the social significance of the phenomenon, the presence of large quantities of locally manufactured Egyptian-style pottery at Late Bronze Age sites throughout the southern Levant has been regarded as a key datapoint for understanding local manifestations of the New Kingdom empire. Treatments have differed but have largely sought to assess whether the forms provide direct evidence for the presence of Egyptians. In this study, I propose a new, multilevel approach for assessing the social significance of Egyptian-style pottery as it pertains to Egypto-Levantine interaction. Drawing on theories of practice, I analyze the phenomenon within three distinct tiers of social interaction: the community of specialists that produced Egyptian-style pottery, the imperial administration that saw to the provisioning of the garrison community, and the garrison community that adopted, adapted, and—at times—rejected the new forms. By examining ceramic production and consumption patterns over time within the key garrison sites of Jaffa (Israel) and Beth Shean (Israel), several points about social relations can be clarified. First, at the level of the potters, the community of practice that produced Egyptian-style ceramics remained fully separate from their Levantine counterparts over three centuries of imperial occupation. Indeed, the group was potentially derived from potters from Egypt brought in specifically to supply the garrison and cycled out regularly. At the level of the garrison administration, there seems to have been a certain degree of top-down provisioning wherein a select group of ceramic forms were deemed necessary to sustain specific foodways derived from Egyptian modes of doing. While this top-down initiative likely structured the body of forms made available at the site, it must be separated from the use and appreciation of Egyptian-style forms that occurred on a day-to-day basis. This final social sphere, the garrison population that utilized these ceramic forms, demonstrates dynamic shifts in consumption patterns that often correspond with major—sometimes violent—sociopolitical shifts. Collectively, the three tiers reveal a situation wherein the production and consumption of

Egyptian-style ceramics must be viewed as an extension of the empire itself, with the availability and desirability of these forms being inseparable from the imperial and colonial institutions that sustained New Kingdom territorial control in the region.

Keywords: Late Bronze Age – New Kingdom – imperialism – colonialism – Egyptian-style pottery – practice theory

Ann-Kathrin Jeske

The Expansion of the Egyptian Administrative-Economic System in the Southern Levant: A Comparison of the Proto- and Early Dynastic Period (Late EB IB) and the Eighteenth Dynasty (LB I to IIA) 319

Abstract: The expansions of Egypt's sphere of influence into the southern Levant were often labeled empire, hegemony, colony, and so on. The use of these terms helps us to illustrate Egyptian activities and to compare them with those of states in other regions and times on a macro level. However, the widely used application of these terms more as labels than models does not help us fully understand the processes behind them. This contribution proposes an alternative approach by comparing the establishment and maintenance of the domestic Egyptian administrative and economic system with how the administration of the Egyptian king employed its power in the southern Levant. The late EB IB and the LB I to LB IIA were selected as case studies because Egypt established settlements in both periods. Further, the almost complete lack of textual evidence in the late EB IB allows the study of different types of data sets. It is shown that the comparison with internal mechanisms facilitates a comprehensive description and explanation of how the Egyptian administrative and economic system expanded into the southern Levant without the need to use multiple organization models or even aspects of them.

Keywords: administration – organization model – southern Levant – New Kingdom – Early Dynastic Period

Marie-Kristin Schröder

Migration and Mobility in the Archaeological Record of the “C-Group” Culture between Egypt and Kerma 343

Abstract: The so-called C-Group culture has been in the focus of research for over one hundred years, since its first discovery in the area of Aswan in the course of rescue excavations preceding the building projects of the Aswan dams. Since the flooding of the Lower Nubian Nile Valley south of Aswan in the 1960s, further research of this distinct culture has become nearly impossible, and the state of research stagnated. However, in 2007 excavations in a formerly unknown cemetery at the site of Hierakonpolis were begun and this cemetery, HK27C, is the northernmost attested archaeological evidence for a long-term settlement activity of a C-Group community. Further, but less prominent evidence for C-Group activity were found at numerous other sites, stretching from Kerma at the Third Cataract to Upper Egypt. The known settlement area of the C-Group thus expanded and the questions of migration to Egypt and mobility within Lower Nubia and Upper Egypt arose. A recent reevaluation of the C-Group chronology resulted in a shorter duration of this culture, which has a severe impact on the relationships of the C-Group with Egypt and Kerma. This contribution therefore aims at presenting and discussing the evidence of migration and mobility in the archaeological record of the C-Group in the light of recent research at a number of sites, such as Elephantine, Kerma, and Kubbaniya.

Keywords: C-Group – Lower Nubia – Middle Kingdom – Elephantine – Hierakonpolis – Kubbaniya

Sandra Veprauskienė

The Establishment of the Western Frontier: A Study of the Middle Kingdom Enactment Practices in Dakhla Oasis

371

Abstract: The conceptual demarcation of the boundaries of the Egyptian state, as expressed in official iconography and ideological narrative, is a pivotal feature of the ancient Egyptian mind-set. From the Twelfth Dynasty onward, this delineation of the Egyptian territory materialized itself through solid man-made structures, which physically set the frontiers in the south and northeast of the country. However, there have been few scholarly efforts to investigate the Middle Kingdom borderlands in the region located immediately to the west of the Nile Valley, in the area today broadly defined as the Western Desert. This study, therefore, explores the *wh3t* region and attempts to define the western frontier of the Middle Kingdom through the reconstruction of the functional parameters of the main governing agents—the members of the administration and the military—active in the region of Dakhla Oasis. By studying a corpus of the titles held by these agents, a performative framework is obtained that aids us both in outlining the enactment practices of the Egyptian western frontier, as well as in accommodating the southern oases of the Western Desert into the wider geopolitical setting of the Middle Kingdom.

Keywords: Western Desert – frontier – Dakhla Oasis – Middle Kingdom – nomads – practices – titles

Index of Names

395

PREFACE

Since 2010, every four years, researchers from diverse specializations have convened at the Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague. These scholars encompass historians, philologists, linguists, archaeologists, and experts in ancient religions, all of whom focus their professional attention on the geographically extensive region spanning from modern Sudan to Anatolia and Elam. Their common research interest is the selected theme of the conference. In 2022, during the fourth iteration of the Crossroads conference, the central theme was “Migration and Mobility.” From September 19–22, 2022, this conference, organized as a collaboration between the Institute of Ancient Near Eastern Studies and the Czech Institute of Egyptology, featured a total of 34 papers, 19 of which are included in this volume.

Movement and mobility represent intertwined concepts that have persisted throughout human history. The act of moving from one place to another is, however, intricately tied to the challenges that hinder it. These obstacles can either be natural in origin or the product of human design aimed at constraining the movement of individuals or groups. Furthermore, movement and mobility can also manifest themselves within society, encompassing the fluid shifts of people within the social hierarchy and the transitions between various social groups. The transfer of words, technologies, and religious ideologies often accompanies these human movements. The region of ancient western Asia and northeast Africa serves as a rich repository of evidence for these forms of movement and mobility, extensively documented through written sources and material culture.

The initial part of the volume comprises contributions that share a collective interest in the political dimensions of migration and the mobility of individuals and populations. Aaron A. Burke delves into the intricate relationship between empires and refugees within the Late Bronze Age eastern Mediterranean, while Andrew Burlingame explores the fortunes of specific Ugaritic merchants abroad. Yoram Cohen and Eduardo Torrecilla focus on the precarious political circumstances, population movements, and safeguarding of trade routes on the eastern fringes of the Hittite Empire. Susan Cohen offers an archaeological perspective on the boundaries of what we traditionally identify as the southern Levant during the Middle Bronze Age. Steven Garfinkle revisits the recurring theme of Amorite mobility during the Third Dynasty of Ur, presenting both a spatial and social perspective. Jacob Lauinger analyzes population movements in the Alalakh region during the Middle and Late Bronze Age. Ellen Morris provides a profound examination of the forced mobility of women in the ancient world through compelling narratives, while Jana Mynářová sheds light on the existence and understanding of borders and boundaries in the Late Bronze Age Levant. Seth Richardson’s contribution scrutinizes the social aspect, examining the situation in Mesopotamia during the Old Babylonian period.

The second part of the volume delves into the mobility of ideas, concepts, and languages. Ludovica Bertolini reflects on the boundaries imposed by different life stages, while Paul Delnero traces the movement of ideas and languages through the journey of Mesopotamian literary works to Tell el-Amarna in Egypt. Related to the use of language is Federico Giusfredi’s contribution, which raises the crucial question of whether Hurrian served as a spoken language in Central

Anatolia during the Middle Bronze Age and the early days of the Hittite state. Anne Goddeeris's study centers on the social ascent of an individual named Adad-ētir, whose story is elucidated through an inscription from the British Museum. Adam Miglio's contribution delves into the realm of Gilgameš, divinatory texts like Enūma Anu Enlil, and the astrological compilation MUL.APIN. Finally, Kevin McGeough contemplates how archaeological theories concerning migration, mobility, social evolution, and other pivotal elements influence our understanding of the Bronze Age.

The third and final part contains four contributions pertaining to material culture and administration. Jacob Damm scrutinizes Egyptian-style pottery discovered at sites in the southern Levant during the Late Bronze Age, while Ann-Kathrin Jeske examines the role of the Egyptian administrative and economic system in the southern Levant through a comparison of material culture and written evidence from the Proto- and Early Dynastic periods and the Eighteenth Dynasty. Marie-Kristin Schröder utilizes ceramic material from the so-called C-group, one of the Middle Nubian cultures from the late third to the early second millennium BCE, to trace interactions between Egypt and Kerma. Sandra Veprauskienė's paper explores local enactment practices in the Dakhla Oasis, the westernmost point of interest for the Egyptian rulers of the Middle Kingdom.

This conference owes its existence to the support of the European Regional Development Fund project "Creativity and Adaptability as Conditions for the Success of Europe in an Interconnected World" (Reg. No.: CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16_019/0000734). The preparation of the manuscript received support from the Czech Science Foundation within the project GA ČR 23-05181S "Archaeology of Texts: Tradition, Transmission, and Transformation in the Ancient Near East" and the Charles University Cooperatio program (Archaeology). The editors of this volume extend their heartfelt gratitude to all participants of the Crossroads IV conference, whether their papers are featured in this volume or not. Their contributions, along with their comments, suggestions, advice, and critiques, formed the foundation for the constructive discussions and friendly atmosphere that permeated our gathering. We also express our appreciation to the numerous anonymous reviewers who generously offered their assistance and expertise, significantly enhancing the quality of the studies published in this volume. Additionally, we thank our undergraduate and graduate students for their invaluable contributions, which played a pivotal role in the overall success of the conference. We would also like to thank everyone at Lockwood Press, especially Billie Jean Collins, for providing a new home for the Crossroads series and for making the results of our collaboration available to other researchers.

In Prague and Cambridge, September 10, 2023
Jana Mynářová, Ludovica Bertolini, Federico Zangani

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

Ludovica Bertolini is assistant professor of Sumerian literature at the Institute of Ancient Near Eastern Studies at Charles University in Prague. Her research focuses mainly on Sumerian literature of the Old Babylonian period. Her field of expertise includes literature related to royal power and Mesopotamian religion, with a particular focus on the poems concerning the relationship between the gods Dumuzi and Inanna and the significance of these compositions featuring the divine pair within the broader framework of the Sumerian literary tradition.

Aaron A. Burke is professor of the archaeology of ancient Israel and the Levant, and the Kershaw Chair of Ancient Eastern Mediterranean Studies in the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures at The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). He is a member of UCLA's Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, serving as its editor-in-chief since 2016. His research addresses the Bronze and Iron Ages in the Levant and eastern Mediterranean with a particular interest in social identity and the contexts of cultural transformations including warfare, forced migration, and long-distance exchange. He has directed excavations of a New Kingdom Egyptian fortress in Jaffa, Israel, and expanded upon this research with the inauguration of *Turning Points*, an initiative aimed at exploring the transition between the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age in the southern Levant from 1300 to 1000 BCE.

Andrew Burlingame is assistant professor of Hebrew in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages at Wheaton College. He specializes in Northwest Semitic languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, Phoenician, and Ugaritic) with particular focus on the history of textual production in the eastern Mediterranean of the late-second and early-first millennia BCE. His current research brings together linguistics, prosopography, and study of the physical characteristics of inscribed materials in order to shed light on the history of alphabetic writing and scribal and administrative practice at Ugarit.

Susan L. Cohen is a professor of history in the Department of History and Philosophy at Montana State University (Bozeman). She is also a coeditor of the *Bulletin of the American Society of Overseas Research (BASOR)*. She received her PhD in Syro-Palestinian Archaeology and Hebrew Bible from the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations at Harvard University, and her AM and AB in History from the Department of History at Brown University. She has directed the excavations at the Middle Bronze Age cemetery at Gesher (2002–2004), and the small rural multiperiod site of Tel Zahara (2005–2009), both in the Jordan Valley, and was a codirector for the excavations at Legio (2019, 2022). Her research focuses on the southern Levant in the Middle Bronze Age, with specific attention to urbanism, rural-urban interactions, and southern Levantine interconnections with Egypt.

Yoram Cohen (PhD Harvard University, 2003) is a scholar of the ancient Near East, specializing in Assyriology. He is a full professor at the Department of Archaeology and Ancient Near Eastern Cultures, Tel Aviv University. His research

interests are 1) history of Bronze Age Syria; 2) ancient Near Eastern wisdom literature, and 3) intellectual history of the ancient Near East. He is the single author of four books and the author of over 80 articles and reviews. Among his recent publications are *Wisdom from the Late Bronze Age* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature 2013); *The Babylonian šumma immeru Omens: A Study of Textual Transmission, Reception and Standardization* (Münster: Zaphon 2020); with N. Wasserman, “Mesopotamian Wisdom Literature,” in W. Kynes, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Wisdom and Wisdom Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press 2021); and “Of Gods and Men: Animal and Plant Disputation Poems and Fables in Babylonia, Persia and Greece,” in A. Kelly and Ch. Metcalf, eds., *Of Gods and Mortals* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2021), 145–153.

Jacob C. Damm is Hirsch Postdoctoral Fellow at Cornell University. He completed his BA in Religious Studies and Classics at the University of South Carolina, his MA in Levantine Archaeology at Harvard University, and his PhD at UCLA’s Cotsen Institute of Archaeology where he focused on the archaeology of the southern Levant. In his research, he focuses predominantly on the archaeology of foodways, identity, colonialism/imperialism, ceramics analysis, and archaeological science. To date, he has excavated throughout Israel at the sites of Khirbet Qeiyafa, Ashkelon, Jaffa, and Tel Dan.

Paul Delnero is an associate professor in the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Johns Hopkins University. His first book, *The Textual Criticism of Sumerian Literature*, JCS Supplemental Series 3 (Boston: ASOR Publications 2012), considers how semantic, orthographic, and grammatical variants in copies of Sumerian mythological compositions and hymns provide an essential, but overlooked source of evidence for tracking how cultural knowledge was transmitted and consumed in ancient Mesopotamia, while also proposing a methodology for critically evaluating textual variation in the sources for Sumerian literary works. His second book, *How to Do Things with Tears: Ritual Lamenting in Ancient Mesopotamia*, SANER 26 (Berlin: de Gruyter 2020), which provides a comprehensive overview of cultic lamenting in Mesopotamia as a ritual means of averting catastrophes, also examines the use and functions of ritual language. In addition to articles on the topics of the role of memorization in Mesopotamian scribal education, the role of Sumerian religion and mythology in identity formation, the social and cultural contexts for lamenting in early Mesopotamia, and other subjects relating to Mesopotamian religion, literature, education, textual archives, and ritual, he is the coeditor of the book, *Texts and Contexts: The Circulation and Transmission of Cuneiform Texts in Social Space*, SANER 9 (Berlin: de Gruyter 2015), a collection of studies on the materiality and social function of ancient Near Eastern texts from different periods and genres.

Steven J. Garfinkle is professor of ancient history at Western Washington University, and editor of the *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* (de Gruyter). His research focuses on the social and economic history of early Mesopotamia, with emphasis on the intersections between commerce, state formation, and violence. He is the author of numerous studies on the kingdom of Ur and the history of the

late third millennium BCE, including *Entrepreneurs and Enterprise in Early Mesopotamia*.

Federico Giusfredi is associate professor of Ancient Near Eastern Studies at the University of Verona. His research focuses on the languages, texts, and history of the Preclassical Near East.

Anne Goddeeris (PhD KU Leuven, Belgium) teaches cuneiform studies and history of the ancient Near East at Ghent University. She has published Old Babylonian archival documents from Kisurra and Nippur that are now kept in the British Museum, the Hilprecht Sammlung, and the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania. Her research focuses on Old Babylonian social and economic history and on diplomatic practices of Old Babylonian scribes.

Ann-Kathrin Jeske is an Egyptologist who has been studying different facets of Egyptian administration and military since her bachelor's degree. She researched the Egyptian administrative system outside of Egypt during her MA at Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz and her PhD at the University of Vienna, with a focus on Sinai and the southern Levant. She began working with the German Archaeological Institute Cairo in 2019 and has been involved in a number of excavation and data management projects in Egypt since then.

Jacob Lauinger is associate professor of Assyriology at Johns Hopkins University and a staff epigrapher of the Mustafa Kemal University's Expedition to Alalakh/Tell Atchana, the University of Toronto's Tayinat Archaeological Project, and the Siwan Regional Project's Khani Masi Excavations. He has a particular interest in the use of cuneiform Akkadian outside of Mesopotamia proper. His monograph, *Following the Man of Yamhad: Settlement and Territory at Old Babylonian Alalah*, CHANE 75 (Leiden: Brill 2015) studied the cuneiform texts from Middle Bronze Age Alalakh that record the purchase or exchange of entire settlements and the socioeconomic practices that these texts reflect. His current book project is on the statue of Idrimi.

Kevin M. McGeough is professor of archaeology in the Department of Geography and Environment at the University of Lethbridge in Canada and holds a Board of Governor's Research Chair in Archaeological Theory and Reception. McGeough has excavated in Israel, Turkey, Egypt, Jordan, and Canada and is currently a codirector of the University of Lethbridge archaeological excavations at Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, UNESCO World Heritage Site. He has been the editor of the *Annual of the American Schools of Overseas Research*, ASOR's *Archaeological Report Series*, and is currently coeditor of the *Alberta Archaeological Review*. McGeough is the author of a three-volume series on the reception of archaeology, called *The Ancient Near East in the Nineteenth Century*. McGeough has also written extensively on economic issues at the Late Bronze Age site of Ugarit, including two books, *Exchange Relationships at Ugarit* and *Ugaritic Economic Tablets: Text, Translations, and Notes*. His most recent book, *Representations of Antiquity in Film: From Griffith to Grindhouse* is a study of the ancient world in cinema.

Adam E. Miglio is associate professor of archaeology at Wheaton College. His research and writing focus on the languages, history, and literatures of ancient Mesopotamia and Israel.

Ellen Morris is an associate professor in ancient studies in the Department of Classics and Ancient Studies at Barnard College. She has published extensively on subjects related to ancient Egyptian imperialism, including *The Architecture of Imperialism: Military Bases and the Evolution of Foreign Policy in Egypt's New Kingdom*, PAe 22 (Leiden: Brill 2005), *Ancient Egyptian Imperialism* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell 2018), and numerous articles. Her ongoing research interests and other publications, including *Famine and Feast in Ancient Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2023), however, focus on the dynamics of sociopolitical and socioeconomic insecurity, state formation, sexuality and sacred performance, retainer sacrifice, landscape theory, and divine kingship. She has excavated in the Nile Valley at Abydos, Deir el-Ballas, and Mendes, as well as at the site of Amheida in the Dakhleh Oasis.

Jana Mynářová is professor of history and cultures of Asia and Africa at Faculty of Arts, Charles University (Prague), specializing in Assyriology and Egyptology. She is also a coeditor of the *Bulletin of the American Society of Overseas Research* (BASOR). In her research she focuses on relations between Egypt and the Near East, political, social, and economic history of the regions during the Late Bronze Age. She is the author of numerous studies on the Amarna letters, including *Language of Amarna – Language of Diplomacy: Perspectives on the Amarna Letters*.

Seth Richardson has been at the University of Chicago since 2003 as managing editor of *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* (JNES) and associate at ISAC. He earned his PhD at Columbia University in 2002. He is a historian working on Mesopotamia's Old Babylonian period and political-economic questions about infrastructural power, violence, subjectivity, and the nature of state sovereignty. He is committed to generalist-comparativist work on topics as diverse as liver divination, animal personhood, ancestor cult, icons, emblems, slavery, food security, labor value, taxation, and ancient historiography. He has written on disappearing princesses, bawdy jokes, and long-lost words for wine jars, angry mobs, and hallucinations.

Marie-Kristin Schröder is an Egyptologist and has been working on excavations in Egypt, Germany, Jordan, and Sudan since 2002. The main expertise was acquired during the many years of work at the settlement of Elephantine Island, where she has been a member since 2010. She took part in further excavations in Egypt, for example, Buto, Hierakonpolis, and Heliopolis, as well as Kerma in Sudan. Her main interests are intercultural relations between Egypt and its neighbors and is focusing on ancient Nubia in her recent research. Her current research focuses mainly on the so-called Middle Nubian cultures (i.e., C-Group, Kerma, Pan-Grave cultures) with the main interest in changing relations based on ceramic inventories from contexts that include settlements as well as necropoleis.

Eduardo Torrecilla has a PhD in history (UCLM) and MA in international relations (CEU-San Pablo University). His scientific work focuses on the geopolitical landscape and the diplomatic relations of the ancient Near East in the Late Bronze Age. He has published a monograph and several articles analyzing the sociopolitical context stemming from the archives of Ugarit and the middle Euphrates (modern Syria). He enjoyed two postdoctoral fellowships at the Tel Aviv University, awarded by the Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology (2017–2018) and the Gerda Henkel Foundation (2019–2022). He is now a postdoctoral researcher at the Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, UCLM (Albacete, Spain), his alma mater; his work is financed by the UCLM HR Excellence in Research Plan and by the European Social Fund Plus (FSE+). He belongs to the recently created research group Próximo Oriente y Mediterráneo Antiguos (POMA).

Sandra Veprauskienė studied Egyptian archaeology at the University of Liverpool (BA, 2012) and received her Master's degree in Egyptology from Leiden University in 2021. Her primary research interests include cultural diversity in ancient Egypt, desert politics, ancient landscapes, and nomadism. Sandra is also an active long-term member of the Lithuanian Archaeologists Society and a keen explorer of ancient Egyptian collection at the M.K. Čiurlionis National Museum of Art in Kaunas, Lithuania.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAR	<i>African Archaeological Review</i>
AAS	<i>Les Annales Archéologiques Syriennes</i>
AbB	Altbabylonische Briefe im Umschrift und Übersetzung
AbB 9	Stol, M. <i>Letters from Yale</i> . AbB 9. Leiden: Brill 1981.
AbB 10	Kraus, F.R. <i>Briefe aus kleineren westeuropäischen Sammlungen</i> . AbB 10. Leiden: Brill 1985.
AbB 12	van Soldt, W.H. <i>Letters in the British Museum</i> . AbB 12. Leiden: Brill 1990.
ABS	Archaeology and Biblical Studies
AfO	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>
AfOB	Archiv für Orientforschung: Beihefte
AgAbh	Ägyptologische Abhandlungen
AGI	<i>Archivio Glottologico Italiano</i>
AHw	von Soden, W. <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> . 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1959–1981.
AIL	Ancient Israel and Its Literature
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
AJS	<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>
AKT 5	Veenhof, K. <i>Kultepe Tabletleri V: The Archive of Kuliya, Son of Ali-Abum (Kt. 92/k 188-263)</i> . Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları Sayı 33c. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu 2010.
AIT	Wiseman, D.J. <i>The Alalakh Tablets</i> . Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara 2. London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara 1953.
<i>Am. Anthropol.</i>	<i>American Anthropologist</i>
AMD	Ancient Magic and Divination
AMethTh	<i>Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory</i>
<i>Andr.</i>	Euripides, <i>Andromache</i>
<i>Ann Assoc Am Geogr</i>	<i>Annals of the Association of American Geographers</i>
ANET ³	Pritchard, J.B. <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> . Princeton: Princeton University 1969 (3rd edition).
<i>AnSt</i>	<i>Anatolian Studies</i>
<i>AntOr</i>	<i>Antiguo Oriente</i>
AO	Museum siglum, Louvre, Paris (Antiquités orientales)
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AoF	<i>Altorientalische Forschungen</i>
APPJ	<i>Asia-Pacific Population Journal</i>
ARA	<i>Annual Review of Anthropology</i>
ARM	Archives royales de Mari
Ashm.	Museum siglum, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford
<i>AsiAnA</i>	<i>Asia Anteriore Antica: Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Cultures</i>
AT	Excavation siglum, Alalakh

<i>ÄuL</i>	<i>Ägypten und Levante</i>
<i>AuOr</i>	<i>Aula Orientalis</i>
<i>AWE</i>	<i>Ancient West & East</i>
<i>BaghM</i>	<i>Baghdader Mitteilungen</i>
BARIS	British Archaeological Reports: International Series
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research/</i> <i>Bulletin of ASOR</i>
BATSH 4	Cancik-Kirschbaum, E. <i>Die mittellassyrischen Briefe aus Tall Šēḥ Ḥamad</i> . Berichte der Ausgrabung Tall Šēḥ Hamad/Dūr katlimmu 4. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag 1996.
BATSH 9	Röllig, W. <i>Land- und Viehwirtschaft am unteren Ḥābūr in mittellassyrischer Zeit</i> . Berichte der Ausgrabung Tall Šēḥ Hamad/Dūr katlimmu 9. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2008.
<i>BBSt</i>	King, L.W. <i>Babylonian Boundary Stones and Memorial Tablets in the British Museum</i> . London: British Museum 1912.
BBVO	Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient
<i>BES</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar</i>
<i>BIFAO</i>	<i>Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale</i>
BIN	Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of J. B. Nies
BIN 3	Keiser, C.E. <i>Neo-Sumerian Account Texts from Drehem</i> . BIN 3. New Haven: Yale University Press 1971.
BIN 4	Clay, A.T. <i>Letters and Transactions from Cappadocia</i> . BIN 4. New Haven: Yale University Press 1927.
BIN 7	Alexander, J.B. <i>Early Babylonian Letters and Economic Texts</i> . BIN 7. New Haven: Yale University Press 1943.
BIN 10	van de Mieroop, M. <i>Sumerian Administrative Documents from the Reigns of Išbi-Erra and Šū-Ilišu</i> . BIN 10. New Haven: Yale University Press 1987.
<i>BiOr</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Orientalis</i>
BM	Museum siglum, British Museum, London
BMes	Bibliotheca Mesopotomia
<i>BSOAS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</i>
<i>CA</i>	<i>Current Anthropology</i>
<i>CAD</i>	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago</i> . Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago 1954–2010.
<i>CAJ</i>	<i>Cambridge Archaeological Journal</i>
CCEM	Contributions to the Chronology of the Eastern Mediterranean
CCT 1	Smith, S. <i>Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets in the British Museum</i> , Part 1. London: Trustees of the British Museum 1921.

CCT 5	Smith, S. – D.J. Wiseman. <i>Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets in the British Museum</i> , Part 5. London: Trustees of the British Museum 1956.
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
CHD	<i>The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago 1980–.
CID	<i>Clinical Infectious Diseases</i>
Class. Antiq.	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
Cloth Text Res J	<i>Clothing and Textiles Research Journal</i>
CM	Cuneiform Monographs
CRAIBL	<i>Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres</i>
CRIPeL	<i>Cahiers de Recherches de l'Institut de Papyrologie et d'Égyptologie de Lille</i>
CT 3	King, L.W. <i>Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum</i> , Vol. 3. London: Trustees of the British Museum 1898.
CT 4	Pinches, T.G. <i>Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum</i> , Vol. 4. London: Trustees of the British Museum 1898.
CT 6	Pinches, T.G. <i>Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum</i> , Vol. 6. London: Trustees of the British Museum 1898.
CT 8	Pinches, T.G. <i>Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum</i> , Vol. 8. London: Trustees of the British Museum 1899.
CT 11	Thompson, R.C. <i>Cuneiform Texts from the Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum</i> , Vol. 11. London: Trustees of the British Museum 1900.
CT 12	Thompson, R.C. <i>Cuneiform Texts from the Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum</i> , Vol. 12. London: Trustees of the British Museum 1901.
CTA	Herdner, A. <i>Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939</i> . MRS 10; Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 79. Paris: Geuthner 1963.
CTH	Laroche, L. <i>Catalogue des textes hittites</i> . Études et Commentaires 75. Paris: Klincksieck 1971.
CULC	Columbia University Cuneiform Collection
CUSAS	Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology
CUSAS 8	Van Lerberghe, K. – G. Voet. <i>A Late Old Babylonian Temple Archive from Dūr-Abiešuḫ</i> . CUSAS 8. Bethesda, MD: CDL 2009.

CUSAS 29	Abraham, K. – K. Van Lerberghe. <i>A Late Old Babylonian Temple Archive from Dūr-Abiešuḥ: The Sequel</i> . CUSAS 29. Bethesda, MD: CDL 2017.
DMOA	Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiquae
E	Arnaud, D. <i>Recherches au pays d'Aštata. Emar VI: Les textes sumériens et accadiens</i> , 4 vols. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations 1985–1987.
EA	Knudtzon, J.A. <i>Die El-Amarna-Tafeln</i> . 2 vols. Vorderasiatische Bibliothek 2. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich 1915.
EI	<i>Eretz Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies</i>
ETCSL	The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature. https://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk .
FArch	<i>Forum Archaeologiae: Zeitschrift für klassische Archäologie</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FM 7	Durand, J.-M. <i>Le Culte d'Addu d'Alep et l'affaire d'Alahutum</i> . Florilegium Marianum 7. Paris: Société pour l'Étude du Proche-Orient Ancien 2002.
HANE/M	History of the Ancient Near East/Monographs
HANE/S	History of the Ancient Near East/Studies
Haradum 2	Joannès, F. <i>Haradum II: Les textes de la période paléo-babylonienne (Samsu-iluna – Ammi-šaduqa)</i> . Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations 2006.
HdO	Handbook of Oriental Studies
Hec.	Euripides, <i>Hecuba</i>
Hist Religions	<i>History of Religions</i>
Home Econ. Res. J.	<i>Home Economics Research Journal</i>
HS	Museum siglum, Hilprecht Collection, University of Jena
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICK 3	Matouš, L. – M. Matoušová-Rajmová. <i>Kappadokische Keilschrifttafeln mit Siegeln: Aus den Sammlungen der Karlsuniversität in Prag</i> . Prag: Karlsuniversität 1984.
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
IJP	<i>The International Journal of Psychoanalysis</i>
Indo-Eur. Linguist.	<i>Indo-European Linguistics</i>
IO	<i>International Organization</i>
IOS	<i>Israel Oriental Studies</i>
ISACS	Institute for the Study of Ancient Cultures Seminars
J. Am. Eth. Hist.	<i>Journal of American Ethnic History</i>
J. Int. Relat. Dev.	<i>Journal of International Relations and Development</i>
J. Popul. Econ.	<i>Journal of Population Economics</i>
JA	<i>Journal asiatique</i>
JAA	<i>Journal of Anthropological Archaeology</i>
JACR	<i>Journal of Applied Communication Research</i>

JAEI	<i>Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections</i>
JAH	<i>Journal of Ancient History</i>
JANEH	<i>Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JAR	<i>Journal of Archaeological Research</i>
JARCE	<i>Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt</i>
JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
JCS 14	Kennedy, D.A. – P. Garelli. Seize tablettes cappado-ciennes de l'Ashmolean Museum d'Oxford. <i>JCS</i> 14 (1960), 1–22.
JEA	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>
JEH	<i>Journal of Egyptian History</i>
JEOL	<i>Jaarbericht van het Voor-Aziatisch-Egyptisch-Gezelschap/Genootschap ex oriente lux</i>
JESHO	<i>Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient</i>
Jew Law A S	<i>Jewish Law Association Studies</i>
JFA	<i>Journal of Field Archaeology</i>
JGS	<i>The Journal of Global Slavery</i>
JMA	<i>Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology</i>
JMC	<i>Le journal des médecines cunéiformes</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Refugee Studies</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSQ	<i>Jewish Studies Quarterly</i>
JUA	<i>Journal of Urban Archaeology</i>
KAR	Ebeling, E. (ed.). <i>Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts</i> . Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1916–1923.
KBo 1	Figulla, H.H. – E. Forrer – E.F. Weidner. <i>Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi: Erstes bis viertes Heft</i> . 4 vols. WVDOG 30. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1923.
KBo 6	Hrozny, F. <i>Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi: Fünftes und sechstes Heft</i> . WVDOG 36. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1921.
KBo 9	Otten, H. <i>Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi: Neuntes Heft (vorwiegend Texte der Grabungen 1955 und 1956)</i> . WVDOG 70. Berlin: Gebr. Mann 1957.
KBo 18	Güterbock, H.G. <i>Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi: Achtzehntes Heft (hethitische Briefe, Inventare und verwandte Texte)</i> . WVDOG 85. Berlin: Gebr. Mann 1971.
kt	Inventory numbers, Kültepe texts
GTK	Jankowskaja, N.B. <i>Клинописные Тексты Из Кюль-Тепе в Собраниях СССР: Письма и Документы Торгового Объединения в Малой Азии XIX в. До н.э. Памятники Письменности Востока</i> 14. Moscow: Hayka 1968.
KTU ^(1–3)	Dietrich, M. – O. Loretz – J. Sanmartín. <i>Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit einschließlich der keilalpha-</i>

	<i>betischen Texte außerhalb Ugarits. Teil 1 Transkription.</i> AOAT 24/1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 1976; M. Dietrich – O. Loretz – J. Sanmartín, <i>The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places.</i> Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas und Mesopotamiens 8. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag 1995 (2nd enlarged edition); M. Dietrich – O. Loretz – J. Sanmartín, <i>The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places.</i> AOAT 360/1. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag 2013 (3rd enlarged edition).
KUB	<i>Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi</i>
Labat	Labat, R. – F. Malbran-Labat. <i>Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne: Signes, syllabaire, idéogrammes.</i> Paris: P. Geuthner 1995 (6th ed.).
MAA	Museum siglum, Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Cambridge
MAARAV	<i>MAARAV: A Journal for the Study of the Northwest Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
MARV 3	Freydank, H. <i>Mittelassyrische Rechtsurkunden und Verwaltungstexte, III.</i> WVDOG 92. Berlin: Gebr. Mann 1994.
MC	Mesopotamian Civilizations
MDAIK	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo</i>
MRS	Mission de Ras Shamra
MSL	Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon
MSL 8/2	Landsberger, B. – A. Draffkorn Kilmer. <i>The Fauna of Ancient Mesopotamia, Part II: HAR-ra = ḫubullu tablets XIV and XVIII.</i> MSL 8/2. Rome: Biblical Institute Press 1962.
MSL 9	Landsberger, B. <i>HAR-ra = ḫubullu Tablet XV.</i> MSL 9. Rome: Biblical Institute Press 1967.
MVCAE	Material and Visual Culture of Ancient Egypt
MVN	Materiali per il vocabolario neosumerico
MVN 11	Owen, D.I. <i>Selected Ur III Texts from the Harvard Semitic Museum.</i> MVN 11. Roma: Multigrafica Editrice 1982.
MVN 13	Sigrist, M. – D.I. Owen – G.D. Young. <i>The John Frederick Lewis Collection, Part II.</i> MVN 13. Roma: Multigrafica Editrice 1984.
NABU	<i>Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires</i>
NEAHL	Stern, E. – J. Aviram – A. Lewinson Gilboa. <i>The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land.</i> 5 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society 1992–2008.
Nisaba	Studi Assiriologici Messinesi

Nisaba 33	Tohru O., in collaboration with D.I. Owen and P. Notizia. <i>The Lost and Found Cuneiform Collections Rediscovered</i> . With copies by Herbert Sauren. Nisaba 33. Messina: DICAM 2020.
Neşr. C 1	Neşredilmemiş C 1, “unpublished” tablet, mentioned in DTCFD 5, 440, then published in M.T. Larsen, Status and Offices of an Anatolian Gentleman: Two unpublished letters of Huharimataku from Karum Kanish. In K. Emre – M. Mellink – N. Özgüç, eds., <i>Anatolia and the Ancient Near East. Studies in Honor of Tahsin Özgüç/Tahsin Özgüç’e armağan</i> . Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi 1989, 515–525 (based only on a transliteration by B. Landsberger).
OA	<i>Oriens Antiquus</i>
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
obv.	obverse
OECT	Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts
OECT 15	Dalley, S. <i>Old Babylonian Texts in the Ashmolean Museum, Mainly from Larsa, Sippar, Kish, and Lagaba</i> . OECT 15. Oxford: Clarendon Press 2005.
OIP	Oriental Institute Publications
OIP 27	Gelb, I.J. <i>Researches in Anatolia</i> , Vol. 6: <i>Inscriptions from Alishar and Vicinity</i> . OIP 27. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1935.
OIS	Oriental Institute Seminars
OJA	<i>Oxford Journal of Archaeology</i>
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OLZ	<i>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</i>
OpAth	<i>Opuscula Athenensia</i>
ORA	Orientalische Religionen in der Antike
ORACC	The Open Richly Annotated Cuneiform Corpus. http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/ .
OrNS	<i>Orientalia</i> , Nova Series
PAe	Probleme der Ägyptologie
PBS	Publications of the Babylonian Section, University of Pennsylvania
PBS 8/1	Chiera, E. <i>Legal and Administrative Documents from Nippur, Chiefly from the Dynasties of Isin and Larsa</i> . PBS 8/1. Philadelphia: University Museum 1914.
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
PIHANS	Publications de l’Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul
PRU 2	Virolleaud, C. <i>Le Palais Royal d’Ugarit II: Textes en cunéiforms alphabétiques des archives est, ouest et centrales</i> . MRS 7. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale 1957.

PRU 3	Nougayrol, J. <i>Le Palais Royal d’Ugarit III: Textes accadiens et hourrites des archives est, ouest et centrales</i> . MRS 6. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale 1955.
PRU 4	Nougayrol, J. <i>Le Palais Royal d’Ugarit IV: Textes accadiens des archives sud (Archives internationales)</i> . MRS 9. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale 1956.
PRU 6	Nougayrol, J. <i>Le Palais Royal d’Ugarit VI: Textes en cunéiformes babyloniens des archives du grand palais et du palais sud d’Ugarit</i> . MRS 12. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale 1970.
r	recto
RA	<i>Revue d’Assyriologie et d’Archéologie Orientale</i>
RdE	<i>Revue d’Égyptologie</i>
rev.	reverse
RHR	<i>Revue de l’Histoire des Religions</i>
RIH	Ras Ibn Hani; P. Bordreuil – D.G. Pardee. <i>La trouvaille épigraphique de l’Ougarit 1. Concordance</i> . RSO 5. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations 1989. P. Bordreuil – D.G. Pardee – C. Roche-Hawley (eds.). <i>Ras Ibn Hani II: Les textes en écritures cunéiformes de l’âge du Bronze récent (fouilles 1977 à 2002)</i> . Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 214. Beirut: Institut Français du Proche-Orient 2019.
RIMA	Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods
RIME	Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods
RIME 4	Frayne, D. <i>Old Babylonian Period (2003–1595 BC)</i> . RIME 4. Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1990.
<i>Riv. Stor. Ital.</i>	<i>Rivista storica italiana</i>
RLA	<i>Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie</i> , 15 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter 1922–2018.
RS	Ras Shamra; P. Bordreuil – D.G. Pardee, <i>La trouvaille épigraphique de l’Ougarit, 1: Concordance</i> . RSO 5. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations 1989.
RSO	Ras Shamra-Ougarit
RSO 7	Bordreuil, P. <i>Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville*. Les textes de la 34e campagne (1973)</i> . RSO 7. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations 1991.
RSO 14	Yon, M. – D. Arnaud, eds. <i>Études ougaritiques I: Travaux 1985–1995</i> . RSO 14. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations 2001.
RSO 23	Lackenbacher, S. – F. Malbran-Labat. <i>Lettres en akkadien de la “Maison d’Urtēnu”: Fouilles de 1994</i> . RSO 23. Leuven: Peeters 2016.
RSQ	<i>Refugee Survey Quarterly</i>
S&N	<i>Sudan & Nubia</i>
SAA	State Archives of Assyria

SAA 6	Kwasman T. – S. Parpola. <i>Legal Transactions of the Royal Court of Niniveh</i> , Part 1: <i>Tiglath-Pileser III through Esarhaddon</i> . SAA 6. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press 1991.
SAAB	<i>State Archives of Assyria Bulletin</i>
SAHL	Studies in the Archaeology and History of the Levant
SAK	<i>Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur</i>
SANER	Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization
SEL	<i>Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico</i>
SemClas	<i>Semitica et Classica</i>
SHAJ	<i>Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan</i>
SHCANE	Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East
SMEA	<i>Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici</i>
SpTU III	von Weiher, E. <i>Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk, Teil III</i> . Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka 12. Berlin: Gebr. Mann 1988.
StBoT	Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten
STT	Gurney, O.R. – J.J. Finkelstein. <i>The Sultantepe Tablets</i> , Vol. 1. Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara 3. London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara 1957. O.R. Gurney – P. Hu-lin, <i>The Sultantepe Tablets</i> , Vol. 2. Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara 7. London: The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara 1964.
TA	<i>Tel Aviv</i>
TBR	Arnaud, D. <i>Textes syriens de l'âge du bronze récent</i> . AuOr Supplementa 1. Barcelona: AUSA 1991.
TCL 2	de Genouillac, H. <i>Tablettes de Dréhem, publiées avec inventaire et tables</i> . Textes cunéiformes du Louvre 2. Paris: P. Geuthner 1911.
TLOB 1	Richardson, S.F.C. <i>Texts from the Late Old Babylonian Period</i> . JCS Supplemental 2. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research 2010.
Tro.	Euripides, <i>Trojan Women</i>
UF	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen</i>
Ugaritica 5 _N	Nougayrol, J. Textes suméro-accadiens des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit. In <i>Ugaritica V: Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit, commentaires des textes historiques (première partie)</i> . MRS 16. Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 80. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale 1968, 1–446.
UM	Museum siglum, Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania

VAT	Museum siglum, Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin
VO	<i>Vicino Oriente</i>
VS 7	Ungnad, A. <i>Kontrakte und Listen</i> . Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin 7. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1909.
VS 11	Schroeder, O. <i>Die Tontafeln von El-Amarna in akkadischen Sprache</i> . Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin 11. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1915.
VS 22	Klengel, H. <i>Altbabylonische Texte aus Babylon</i> . Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin 22. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1983.
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WAW	Writings from the Ancient World
<i>World Dev.</i>	<i>World Development</i>
WVDOG	Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft
YNER	Yale Near Eastern Researches
YOS	Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts
YOS 2	Lutz, H.F. <i>Early Babylonian Letters from Larsa</i> . YOS 2. New Haven: Yale University Press 1917.
YOS 5	Grice, E.M. <i>Records from Ur and Larsa Dated in the Larsa Dynasty</i> . YOS 5. New Haven: Yale University Press 1919.
YOS 13	Finkelstein, J.J. <i>Late Old Babylonian Documents and Letters</i> . YOS 13. New Haven: Yale University Press 1972.
YOS 14	Simmons, S.D., with the collaboration of E.C. Kingsbury. <i>Early Old Babylonian Documents</i> . YOS 14. New Haven: Yale University Press 1978.
ZA	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie</i>
ZAR	<i>Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte</i>
ZÄS	<i>Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde</i>
ZDPV	<i>Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>
ZSR	<i>Zeitschrift für Sozialreform</i>

PART 1

Politics

CREATING CRISIS: EMPIRE AND REFUGEES AT THE END OF THE BRONZE AGE IN THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

Aaron A. Burke*

1. Introduction

Refugee crises in recent years have raised questions concerning the extent of the role that forced migration has played in earlier historical periods in different regions. The issue is an apt one for ancient Near Eastern history, wherein the impact of warfare and natural disasters have been studied for more than a century among historical sources and archaeological contexts. Yet, for a variety of reasons, little consensus has emerged about how to approach the study of refugees and even if the term *refugee* is applicable in premodern contexts. Although such questions can be readily addressed, foremost by textual sources, this alone has not moved the discussion forward into productive avenues for the exploration of refugees in the ancient Near East through archaeological research. While I have explored the question in a variety of periods in different archaeological contexts, principally in the Levant (Burke 2011; 2012; 2018a; 2018b; 2021), the present work seeks to take a step back and to examine the provisions of state treaties and correspondence, specifically during the Late Bronze Age (LBA; ca. 1550–1100 BCE). These, I argue, provide important confirmation not only of the existence of refugees as a historical phenomenon in this period, but they also offer an important testimony to the intensive curation of refugees by the Hittite and Egyptian Empires, their vassals, and contemporary states. This effort was undertaken because of the strategic concern refugees posed to both the sovereignty of these states, namely, control of populations within their political realms, and their greater political aims. At the end of the Bronze Age, with the decline and ultimate disappearance of the institutional mechanisms through which these empires had sought to manage refugee flows, relatively short-distance forced migration likely played a greater role in the shaping of the political and social landscape of the early Iron Age than has been considered to date. Consequently, this may help to better contextualize some components of the migrations that have been previously discussed in connection with the close of the Bronze Age.

* University of California, Los Angeles, e-mail: aaburke@ucla.edu. Acknowledgments. I would like to thank Jana Mynářová for allowing me to participate in *Crossroads IV*, and I am grateful to the other organizers and participants, as well as the anonymous reviewer, for their useful comments and suggestions regarding this article. I would also like to thank members of the Archaeological Institute of the Österreichisches Akademie der Wissenschaften in Vienna, and in particular the Levantine Archaeology group led by Felix Höflmayer, for stimulating discussions concerning refugees and archaeology during the writing of this article, while in residence as a guest researcher.

2. Textual Sources for the Imperial Curation of Refugees

Textual sources provide the most direct data for the scale and frequency of refugee phenomena during the LBA in the Levant and Anatolia. In Hittite, Egyptian, and Levantine sources, refugees, whether directly labeled or otherwise implied by context, are seen to constitute a significant socioeconomic phenomenon that warrants closer consideration, historically and archaeologically. In particular, Hittite diplomatic correspondence, Hittite vassal treaties and edicts, parity treaties between states, and the Amarna letters preserve direct evidence for the role of warfare as well as the diplomatic wrangling that contributed to the production of refugee flows throughout the LBA. In addition to the Anatolian mainland, the geographic locations of these texts encompass both the northern Levant, including the vassal kingdoms of Ugarit, Alalakh, Amurru, Halab (Aleppo), and greater Canaan (i.e., the southern Levant).

2.1. Diplomatic Letters, Treaties, and Edicts from the Hittite Empire

Refugees are well-acknowledged in Hittite historical studies (see Snell 2001: 91–95; Elgavish 2004; Bryce 2005, esp. 549; Beckman 2013: 209). The sources include diplomatic correspondence as well as a collection of treaties and edicts that outline in detail vassal obligations to return refugees to their Hittite overlords (Liverani 1990: 106–112; Beckman 1996; Garny – Tavernier 2018).¹ The geographic coverage of the sources spans from western, coastal Anatolia to the northern Levant, with a temporal span from the fifteenth century BCE through at least the late twelfth century BCE. As with earlier uses of the term *munabtu*/pl. *munabtūtu* (CAD M₂ *sub* *munabtu*) in Akkadian, Hittite vassal treaties also characterize refugees as “fugitives,” whether using the Akkadian term or the Akkadogram equivalent in Hittite texts, and thereby adopting a predominantly imperial understanding of the term’s semantic range (del Monte 1983; Liverani 1990: 106–112). This has obscured, however, the term’s straightforward identification of a group of individuals who have fled in the face of a perceived threat to their well-being and who would be otherwise readily identified as refugees in modern contexts. The net effect of this has been to overlook the importance of considering the impact of the autonomy and agency of refugees that is intentionally downplayed in these sources, but can be explored archaeologically and should be given greater consideration in historical interpretations.

The following excerpt concerning refugees in a treaty between Šuppiliuma I of Hatti and the king of Nuhašše demonstrates the general character of legal requirements placed by the Hittite Empire on its vassals with respect to refugees:

No. 8 §13–15. If some population or fugitive sets out, travels toward Hatti, and passes through your land, set them well on their way and point out the road to Hatti. Speak favorable words to them. You shall not direct them to anyone else. If you do not set them on their way and do not show them the road to Hatti, but direct them to the mountains—or if you speak evil words before them, you will transgress the oath. §14 Or if the King of Hatti beleaguers some country through

¹ Concerning the identification of some documents identified as treaties and their reconsideration as edicts, see Devecchi (2012; 2013).

battle, and it flees before him, and comes into your country—or if you [want] to take anything, ask the King of Hatti for it. You shall not take [it on your own initiative]. If you take [anything] on your own initiative and conceal it, you will transgress the oath. §15 Furthermore, if a fugitive comes [into your land in flight], seize him and [turn] him [over]. (Beckman 1996: 58)

Although in this case flight before Hittite imperial armies is explicitly mentioned, it is remarkable how infrequently the precise factors for flight are identified in association with provisions for the return of “fugitives.” In the context of treaty provisions relating to diplomatic concerns, border negotiations, and the like, refugees were clearly a potential, if unintended, social byproduct of these circumstances.

Although it is never made explicit in the texts, refugees could be seen as a threat to the legitimacy and stability of the empire, since such freedom of movement was diametrically opposed to the imperial perspective that declared such groups the subjects and property, most often, of the ruler whose land they had fled (Liverani 1990: 106–107). They represented a loss of labor, and for this reason their addition to the population of other states, vassals or otherwise, represented a shift in labor force but also of military force, representing the potential for future resistance and political challenges to the authority of the states from which they had fled. A practical example of the results of defying the oaths taken concerning the return of refugees is perhaps nowhere more evident than among the Ahhiyawa texts, and the defiance of such stipulations has been suggested as possibly the primary impetus for Muršili II’s campaigns in the west (Beckman – Bryce – Cline 2011: 46).

In the case of Hittite vassal treaties, harboring refugees was an act of rebellion (no. 1 §1–2; citations here are to Beckman 1996), as was aiding and abetting their flight (no. 5 §11). They were to be extradited to their overlord’s territory (no. 9 §13). Occasionally, a new vassal, who was being courted by Hatti, like Ugart, might be allowed to retain refugees from neighboring states outside Hatti’s sphere, reflecting special circumstances (no. 4 §3).² There was, however, no standard reciprocity in this, but instead a seemingly traditional exception for Hatti, which was not obliged to return fugitives to its vassals (no. 5 §13), but might do so if they were craftspersons: a “cultivator, or a weaver, a carpenter, or a leatherworker” (e.g., no. 10 §6).

Provisions for the return of refugees, whether in vassal or parity treaties, addressed the flight of individual slaves, freemen, nobility, and dignitaries, but also small groups, entire populations, and countries or “lands” (nos. 7 §9, 8 §§13–14), as well as fleeing war captives (no. 7 §7). Stipulations in some treaties clarify that refugees and their goods (e.g., cattle; see no. 1 §§1–2) were, in fact, regarded as the property of the ruler from whose land they had fled. These same treaties also reveal that false testimony or misunderstandings could accidentally lead to the identification of whole communities (Akk. *ālu*) as “fugitives.” In one example, the male inhabitants of a population, who were away during pastoralist activities, were mistakenly identified for a time as fugitives (see Beckman 1996: no. 1 §5). Thus, treaty provisions did not aim to curb the flight of only isolated escapees here and there, as the term “fugitive” might tend to imply. Rather, they also accounted

² Beckman’s text no. 4 is regarded by E. Devecchi to be an edict (Devecchi 2012; 2013).

for the displacements of larger groups, and the possibility that inhabitants could be scattered, with individuals fleeing in different directions for different reasons (i.e., due to both push and pull factors). From an imperial perspective, without such provisions, emigration of larger groups would subvert imperial hegemony, a fact clearer among the correspondence than in the treaties, as highlighted below.

Through enumeration of the different types of illegal emigres, as in the case of the Egypt-Hatti treaty, treaties also sometimes provide indications of the types of refugees in question, with particular emphasis on political refugees (i.e., nobility, dignitaries) and refugees from hostilities (i.e., populations, settlements). Although the language often references males, occasional stipulations mention women war captives and female slaves (no. 9 §7 and §9). Within Hittite diplomatic correspondence we also understand that contingents of foreign troops (no. 20 §1) and craftspersons (no. 27 §6) might seek refuge in neighboring lands. Although stock phraseology typifies these texts, that the treaty stipulations concerning the return of refugees are not, in fact, more consistent with regard to scope and composition is an interesting phenomenon that underscores the significance of avoiding precedence for such free movements and of the importance of controlling the flow of imperial property, as these individuals and their communities were viewed. Nevertheless, the range of circumstances covered leaves no room for doubt that refugees were a consistent byproduct of warfare and political rivalries throughout Anatolia and the Levant, which is again even more evident in diplomatic correspondence.

Lastly, Hittite treaties and correspondence reveal that these stipulations and the concern with the flight of refugees away from imperial powers were not simply a phenomenon exclusive to Hatti and its vassals. This is brought to the fore in the treaty between Hatti and Egypt during the reigns, respectively, of Hattušili III and Ramesses II during the thirteenth century, wherein the provisions concerning refugees are of an identical nature and scope as other treaties, albeit with an emphasis on reciprocity between these two great powers (Beckman 1996: 90–95). While we cannot be sure if this also represented Egypt's approach to its own vassals prior to this treaty (though we have no reason to doubt that such a traditional approach to vassal obligations concerning fugitives was also practiced by Egypt earlier), it almost certainly represents at least how Egypt would have addressed the repatriation of refugees from this point on, particularly in light of the newly fixed border between Egyptian and Hittite spheres of control in the Levant early in the thirteenth century BCE. Thus, this text fills important lacunae in both the identification of refugees in the Levant during the New Kingdom but likely also for our understanding of Egypt's own expectations for its vassals regarding the repatriation of refugees, given the absence thus far of evidence for Egyptian vassal treaties.

2.2. Treaties and Correspondence between Levantine States (Fifteenth Century BCE)

Treaties with similar stipulations existed not only between Hatti and its vassals and those it viewed as peer states, but also between lesser states in the Levant. At least two such treaties are attested from Alalakh. Treaty AT 3, which dates to the

fifteenth century BCE, was made between Idrimi of Mukiš and Pilliya king of Kiz-zuwatna and provided for the extradition of refugees caught fleeing either state. Treaty AT 2, made with the king of Tunip in the same century, provided greater detail concerning specific types of fugitives, some of which might be regarded simply as escaped prisoners or slaves rather than refugees. As at Alalakh, Ugaritic letters also document the extradition of refugees (Liverani 2021: 232–235).

2.3. The Amarna Letters (Mid-Fourteenth Century BCE)

For understanding the potential role and sociopolitical significance of refugees in the southern Levant early in the LBA, the Amarna correspondence of the fourteenth century BCE plays a critical role. Here, in contrast to Hittite treaties, the Amarna letters do not employ the Akkadian term *munnaḫtu* for refugee. Rather, various individuals and inhabitants of towns may be identified as refugees by virtue of the fact that they are said to have fled (Akk. *abātu*) in the face of attacks or in the face of resistance. Examples of this are prevalent in the context of the conquests by Abdi-Aširta and Aziru of Amurru in the northern Levant (see EA 185, among others).

The letters also raise the question whether some of the many references to Habiru, a socially marginalized class identified in texts across the Near East during the second millennium (von Dassow 2012), are to be identified as refugees. While a full review of the term cannot be taken up in this essay, this question has to some extent already been considered. Early in his work, Mario Liverani (1965), for example, identified the Habiru as exiles, as the Italian term *fuoriuscitismo* is sometimes translated. However, more recently an English translation of the original article, for a selected-studies volume of Liverani's (2021) work, simply translated the Italian term as "refugee," suggesting that at least some of the Habiru should be identified explicitly as such. As Liverani notes, Habiru were enlisted as soldiers or mercenaries among other professions; they inhabited towns, captured settlements, and individuals, including rulers, and entire villages joined their ranks after fleeing their own communities. This certainly embodies activities one might expect refugees to participate in and one might conclude that, indeed, the term could be employed as a synonym to *munnaḫtu*.

This raises, however, the question of the exact relationship between the term *munnaḫtu*, "fugitive" or "refugee" as discussed earlier, and the term Habiru. This has been taken up directly by Giorgio Buccellati, who suggests that "as socially uprooted they were known as *ʿapiru*, as politically displaced they were known as *munnaḫtūtu*" (1977: 146).³ While this seems mostly accurate, until the same individual, group, or community is identified with both terms, it will be impossible

³ I disagree, however, with Buccellati's assertion that, "The growth of the universal state (the 'empire') in the first millennium accounts for the disappearance of the phenomenon and therefore of the two terms in their meaning described here: the political centralization achieved by the Assyrians, and others after them, left no interstices within the politico-territorial fabric of the Near East through which the 'fugitives' could slide" (1977: 147). The abundant evidence for stipulations concerning fugitives among Neo-Assyrian vassal treaties makes clear the extent of the refugee problem—in this case, again, largely as a result of imperial expansion—irrespective of the disappearance of the term Habiru, which should not be taken, *pars pro toto*, as evidence for the lack of the social dislocation and marginalization that accompanied the refugee experience during the Iron Age, just as it had during the Bronze Age.

to be entirely sure. The problem remains that various circumstances could result in one's identification as a Habiru (Schloen 1993; 2001). This is demonstrated in that all the activities identified with Habiru in the Amarna letters constitute political, including military, activities. While such activities can be undertaken by refugees, they are not a priori outcomes of the refugee experience. Perhaps for this reason more than any other, while the term Habiru can and may even often be used to identify refugees, it is best identified as a sociopolitical state that likely often included refugees among its members. Socially disaffected or outcast are likely better ways to describe Habiru, rather than its translation as refugee in all or even most contexts. Perhaps the following clarification may suffice to explain the distinction: "the term *munabtu* was invoked by any political power seeking to clarify its jurisdiction over fleeing populations, while '*apiru* was an appellative that took for granted the statelessness of an individual or group" (Burke 2012: 268). Thus, *munabtu* appears to be used in contexts where the relationship of the individual or group to a presumed point of origin (and owner) could be readily identified (in a quasi-legal sense), whereas the term Habiru presumed that such associations were no longer possible but that they were also no longer relevant.

3. The Imperial Curation of Refugees and Its Demise

The occurrence of so many provisions for the repatriation of refugees reveal the extent to which at the height of the imperial and military power of both the Hittite and Egyptian states refugees were a predictable byproduct of conflict during the period, evidently warranting deliberate curation. While the main concern may have been to retain political authority over state subjects, this represented the de facto management of potential sources for social and political unrest and the destabilization of states, as without populations states are powerless. This went much further, however, than a superficial challenge to the legitimacy of a state that would surrender its population to a neighboring state through unchecked migration. Rather, refugees represented the social, political, and military will of the inhabitants of the territory they fled (Liverani 2021). A very legitimate concern was that, as such, refugees represented a reservoir of human labor, the very means for the mounting of an armed resistance in the future. This is evident in Hattušili III's letter to Adad-nārārī (see also Mora – Giorgieri 2004: 57–75), wherein he states:

When Turira plunders the land, they keep taking the booty to Turira. My subjects who flee also keep going up to Turira. If Turira is yours, smash (?) it! But you shall not claim the possessions of my subjects who are dwelling in the city. If Turira is not yours, write to me, so that I may smash (?) it. The possessions of your troops who are dwelling in the city shall not be claimed. (Beckman 1996: 140)

This concern therefore transcended the likelihood that large groups of refugees were of concern because they might simply provide military intelligence. Rather, their traditional desire to return, as sociologists have observed in other contexts (e.g., Kolaja 1952), marked a serious threat to the very powers that had displaced them. For this reason, it is not surprising that the failure to return refugees constituted *casus belli* (Elgavish 2004: 43–45). It was not towns that LBA empires

were conquering, but rather the populations of these towns, and flight therefore represented a challenge not just to the sovereignty of these empires, but to their ideological aims.

As these sources illustrate, throughout most of the LBA, notably during the height of Egyptian and Hittite imperialism, refugee movements were circumscribed and curated, seemingly, whenever and wherever possible. Unchecked flows of persons, both large and small, were of concern for the potential destabilizing effect they could pose to vassal and neighboring states. While it could be argued that this was simply a question of the state's view of property, where refugees were chattel (e.g., *munabtu*), this overlooks the evident role that refugees and the disaffected could play in resistance to imperial aims (e.g., Habiru). This is more evident among the correspondence, including the Amarna letters, than among the treaties. The Amarna letters illustrate a period during which New Kingdom imperial power seems to have lapsed, for whatever reasons, in its enforcement of population movements, creating opportunities for upstart rulers (e.g., Labayu, Abdi-Aširta) and renegade groups to coalesce.

Although a detailed diachronic evolution of the curation of refugees by imperial powers like Egypt and Hatti during the LBA is not possible, there is little doubting that by the twelfth century BCE movements of both local and foreign groups were at a high point in the Near East and eastern Mediterranean. The increasing concern with which these movements were characterized by the thirteenth and twelfth centuries BCE, whether among the archives of Ugarit, Hatti, or on the temple walls of Medinet Habu, reflect a well-deserved angst. Examples of the increasing presence of Sea Peoples enclaves in coastal regions and local population movements into the highlands of the southern Levant—as throughout the eastern Mediterranean as well (e.g., Vokotopoulos – Michalopoulou 2018)—suggest that such movements were increasingly common and now largely unimpeded (Burke 2018a: 241). Indeed, with the decline of the imperial powers, which were increasingly facing the destabilization of their own regimes at home, resistance to refugee movements by local groups and small polities presented the only potential barriers to relocation.

One of the primary reasons for the neglect of the study of refugees throughout the Bronze Age, but especially after its end, has been the focus placed upon identifying macro events that could be considered the principal triggers of this so-called collapse. These include climate change, drought, famines, earthquakes, and invasions and migrations. This is unquestionably the legacy of an uncritical embrace of catastrophism in Near Eastern studies during the first half of the twentieth century, dominated as it was by the cultural-historical paradigm and its views of grand, sweeping movements of people groups as an explanatory framework (e.g., Drews 1988; 1993); see discussion in the context of migration archaeology below. At its core, this view of the end of the Bronze Age resulted from a selective emphasis that was placed primarily on sources from the very empires whose narratives have served as the main perspective from which our understanding of the history of this period has been constructed. Consequently, these sources—biased as we may expect them to be—sought to assign blame to external forces, whether drought, famine, foreign invaders, or divine wrath. As such, however, they shine no light on the deleterious socioeconomic impact of prolonged imperial inter-

vention or the internal unrest of the failing dynasties of both Hatti and Egypt (Bryce 2005: 328; Cooney 2022: 328–341). Although efforts have been made to emphasize that multiple factors were at work in the so-called LBA collapse (Cline 2021), it remains the case that little consideration has been given to the self-inflicted nature of this collapse by the very political regimes that would bear the brunt of the decline, particularly concerning imperial control of foreign lands. This decline, in large part, centered on the depopulation of regions like the Levant that is 1) attested by textual sources referencing the taking of war captives and deportations (Langer 2021), 2) can be inferred from centuries of violent conflict in the region (Redford 1992: 125–237), and 3) measured by a decline in site numbers and site sizes (Gonen 1984). However, smaller, regional displacements of populations, as identified among the textual sources discussed earlier, also present an important basis for understanding the enduring changes to settlement patterns that spanned the course of the LBA, with the most notable differences to be expected during the early Iron Age, following the withdrawal of the Hittite and Egyptian Empires.

4. Migration Archaeology and Refugees

In light of this textual evidence for periodic forced migration resulting from warfare and border and diplomatic disputes throughout the LBA (to say nothing of other causes of forced migration in the same period, like drought), and none of it particularly new, it is fair to ask why more has not been done until recently to identify refugees in the archaeological record. After all, most of these movements are not suggested to be of particularly great distance and thus settlements in nearby regions may be likely candidates for identifying relocated refugees. The answers to this may reside in the situation of refugee archaeology within the broader field of migration archaeology that has experienced its own challenges.

The study of migration in archaeology has been undergoing a steady rehabilitation only since the 1990s. In particular, European and classical archaeologies have expended considerable efforts in developing methodologies that might permit consideration of this area of human activity, which has been far more studied by other social sciences (Daniels 2022b). A review of scholarship over the past century exposes, however, the fundamental persistence of bipolar approaches to the question of the role of migration in the eastern Mediterranean and Near East at the end of the LBA. On the one hand, early cultural-historical approaches were obsessed with mass-migration hypotheses that provided limited data, and little nuance or explanation for the alleged migration phenomena they identified, usually seeking singular triggers for what were characterized as monolithic, *en masse* population movements (Trigger 2006). On the other hand, and largely in response to earlier approaches, an about-face by processualists—a “retreat from migrationism” as it has been called—led largely to the downplaying of migration in a bid to reevaluate cultural change (Burmeister 2000: 539), often as a predominantly endogenous process. David Anthony summarized well the state of migration studies more than thirty years ago:

Most archeologists would agree that although migrations might well affect cultural evolution, their apparent unpredictability and the difficulty of identifying them

archeologically combine to make migration an explanatory construct of limited utility. In other words, migration has been avoided because archeologists lack the theory and methods that might allow them to incorporate migration into the explanation of culture change, not because migration is regarded as unimportant. Instead of developing the needed tools, archeologists have avoided the subject. Many of the needed tools already exist in the form of models developed by geographers, biological anthropologists, applied anthropologists, and sociologists. (Anthony 1990: 895)

Until at least the mid-2010s, processualist efforts had largely replaced those of migrationists, while often disregarding emergent approaches shaped by observable historical phenomena, as is the case in refugee studies. While some rehabilitation of migration studies in archaeology has taken place, Anthony's statement rings especially true for the archaeological study of refugees.

Despite acknowledgment of the realities and varieties of migration that likely occurred in antiquity as much as in the present, until recently little has materially changed in the archaeological study of refugees outside of a select group of researchers.⁴ A seeming reticence persists, however, in efforts to explicitly articulate archaeological approaches to the identification of refugees. At best, passing references are usually made to "refugees" by scholars regarding certain archaeological contexts (e.g., Knapp – Manning 2016; Cline 2021), but with no targeted effort to identify an approach or method for their identification. Furthermore, various other references to archaeological phenomena that may relate to refugee study, such as squatter occupations (Itkin 2022), population displacements, and sedentarization, remain unexplored (Burke 2018b: 1). Even recent treatments of migration in the LBA fail to explicitly address refugee movements as a major structural element within migration as a whole (e.g., Knapp 2021). That refugees have been largely ignored as discrete socioeconomic agents warranting direct investigation is perhaps clearest in their systemic omission from the indexes of most archaeological and historical works in which the term *refugee* or the concept otherwise appears, even in passing, within the text itself. Even recent works dedicated to the study of human migration in archaeology largely give limited and passing attention to refugees and forced migration (Daniels 2022a).⁵ The problem for archaeologists may stem from early omissions of reference to the category of refugees in landmark studies of migration and archaeology, especially since 1990 (i.e., Anthony 1990; Burmeister 2000).

Although a correction may be underway to address refugees in archaeology as with migration as a whole, it is occurring more slowly than might be expected in light of the highly visible migrations of the past decade and the types of textual evidence discussed earlier. Several reasons may be suggested for this. First, as mentioned above, old antimigrationist tendencies continue to conflate the fantastic en masse migrations and invasions imagined by early twentieth-century scholars with more recent and methodologically sound attempts that are informed by fields such as anthropology and sociology, both of which have extensively studied

⁴ Burke 2011; 2012; 2021; Killebrew 2017; 2018; Driessen 2018; Webster 2021; Camaño 2022; Itkin 2022.

⁵ Particularly revealing, e.g., is that the introduction to *Homo Migrants* does not once mention refugees as part of migration (Daniels 2022b), despite that at least a couple contributions in the volume discuss refugees (Camaño 2022; Porter 2022).

refugees for more than half a century (see Fiddian-Qasmiyeh et al. 2014). There is little of utility to such reductionist perspectives and for scholars willing to dismiss migrations of any sort, such archaeological research is panned as retrograde (e.g., Homsher – Cradic 2018).

Second, that archaeology has not interrogated refugee archaeology appears also to result from mistaken assumptions that the Westphalian order—a world with clearly delineated borders and international laws—is responsible for the creation of an entirely different world, and that refugees are, therefore, effectively only a byproduct of this late historical development. While there is merit to considering the degree to which the Westphalian order has exacerbated modern refugee crises (Loescher 2021), this perspective is, of course, only possible if one entirely ignores premodern textual sources for the identification of refugees, where refugees are present despite the absence of clear cartographic borders drawn by geographic information systems and enforced with the construction of physical barriers. This may explain why only in the last fifteen years ancient Near Eastern historians and biblical scholars have begun to really take up the question of refugees, although usually under the banner of “forced migration” or “displacement” and quite often, first and foremost, with primary interest in imperial deportations (e.g., Kelle – Ames – Wright 2011).⁶ This shortcoming may in part result from assumption that the United Nation’s definition of refugees is the exclusive basis for the definition and application of the term refugee.⁷ Ancient texts, as illustrated earlier, prove that such assumptions are deeply flawed and are rife with modern, exceptionalist thinking. Ancient borders may be difficult to define, more often fluid, and possibly more frequently shifting. However, they did conceptually exist and are, most importantly, simply less clear to us in the absence of all the sources we may wish to possess. That they existed is perhaps clear in the emphasis on the status of refugees as “fugitives,” namely as possessions of the states that laid claim to a region, whether defined by their geographic boundaries, networks of settlements and their productive lands, or both of these.⁸ Indeed, it is not the existence of borders but the claim to sovereignty over individuals, whether as the inhabitants of towns, villages, or hamlets, and attempts to flee that, in fact, result in their identification as a *munnaḫtu*. In this respect, the translation “fugitives” for *munnaḫtu* for what are clearly refugee populations, while avoiding defining borders and boundaries in relation to the possession of individuals by the state, implicitly recognizes that such sovereignty over individuals is itself, in fact, the main issue.

Third, a recent rise in indigentist-focused scholarship, which ideologically favors endogenous explanations that are often rooted in a predilection for identifying local cultural continuity, has opposed and obscured the potential for identifying other forms of migration. Thus, exogenous influences, which are evident

⁶ Even so, despite extensive work on *flight* some have still managed to hardly address refugees, with the term as such (Snell 2001: 31).

⁷ The UN Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees identifies a refugee as “an individual who owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable, or owing to such fear, unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or, who, not having a nationality or being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it” (Article 1(2), 1951).

⁸ For a critique of cartographic representations and the role of networked understandings, see Smith 2005.