

## Acknowledgments

It was a distinct privilege for us when Dr. Afif Behnassi, Director General of Antiquities and Museums of the Syrian Arab Republic, asked us to write an introduction to the site which we have been excavating for the last seven years. The idea of such an introduction was especially welcome inasmuch as each new year brings more visitors to Terqa. The rapid development of the Eastern Syrian region, including the opening of the new highway linking Damascus and Der ez-Zor over Palmyra, the resumption of old excavations and the start of many new ones in the Khabur and middle Euphrates area, the construction of a major new museum in Der ez-Zor -- all of this is making Terqa more and more accessible touristically. It is thus important to make it more accessible archaeologically as well.

Dr. Behnassi's offer to produce a dual edition in Arabic and English was therefore a wonderful opportunity which we accepted with eagerness and gratitude. With a view toward the development of the new museum in Der ez-Zor, where all the artifacts from Terqa are stored, we thought it best to divide the presentation in two parts: this first one is an introduction to the site itself (by Giorgio Buccellati) while the second one will be an introduction to the artifacts (by Marilyn Kelly-Buccellati).

To Dr. Behnassi then we wish to express our gratitude for offering us a forum for our presentation in the distinguished series of guidebooks published by the Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Also to Dr. Behnassi, as well as to Dr. Adnan Bunni, Director of Excavations and Archaeological Studies, and to Mr. Kassem Toueir, Director of the Center for Research and Archaeological Training, we are indebted for their longstanding and unflinching support of the Expedition. If the results of our work as embodied in this Introduction may serve to shed light on an important moment of ancient Syrian history it is because of their confidence, which we have so generously been shown from the beginning.

Mr. As'ad Mahmud, Director of the National Museum of Der ez-Zor, is our firm point of reference at the local level. His wonderful combination of scholarly expertise and practical knowhow, his familiarity with available resources and readiness to help securing them—these and other qualities have become a major factor for the smooth progress of our work.

The funding for the excavations at Terqa has come from many sources, but we should especially remember here the S. H. Kress Foundation, the Ambassador International Cultural Foundation, the Ahmanson Foundation and the American Schools of Oriental Research. For their personal interest in our work we wish especially to thank, among the officers of these foundations, Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, Herbert W. Armstrong, and Dr. James A. Sauer. A special grant for the production of the English part of this Introduction was made generously available by the Ambassador International Cultural Foundation.

The local authorities, from the Governor of Der ez-Zor to the Mudir Mantaqa of Meyadin, the Mudir Nahia of Ashara and the Ra'is Belediya of Ashara, have always been the most gracious hosts in accommodating and in fact anticipating every need we might have. The graciousness of Syrian hospitality, so overwhelming for any foreigner who first comes to experience it, has blended in every case with such efficiency of organization that we have come to look forward with genuine enjoyment to even the most formal and official of contacts.

But it is fitting that this Introduction be dedicated to the people of Ashara. We personally and all the members of the Expedition over the years have come to develop a real attachment for the modern town which extends into the present the life of an ancient city that would otherwise remain a mere intellectual construct. As we accept with gratitude their welcome, we try to reciprocate by offering in return the insights we have gained into their earlier history. Not only have we indeed made "their house our house," as the Arab saying goes, we are also making more and more their history our history.

Giorgio Buccellati  
Marilyn Kelly-Buccellati  
Directors,  
Joint Expedition to Terqa

## 1. Setting the Stage

Ancient Terqa is located at the heart of the Middle Euphrates region. Right on the banks of the Euphrates, it is only a few kilometers south of the point where the Khabur enters the Euphrates—at an important crossroad between the hills and mountains to the north and the flat alluvial plain to the south.

Just before 1750 B.C., the kingdom of Mari was one of the great powers of southwestern Asia. Then, as of about 1760, Mari was no more: its erstwhile ally, Hammurapi of Babylon, suddenly attacked and razed the city to the ground. The region of Mari came thus under Babylonian control, as a province of a newly established pan-Mesopotamian kingdom. Yet only a few years later the Babylonian presence had already vanished from the middle Euphrates. The preexisting conditions for autonomous rule were still operative and real, so that by at least 1720 the region was independent again. Only, this time the center of gravity had shifted—from Mari to Terqa (Fig. 1).

The significance of Terqa is naturally tied to that of its region. It is interesting to note that at any given point in time, there has always been one, and only one, major regional center within a radius of some 100 km from Terqa (Fig. 2). What was this region? A glance at the map shows that it can be identified with the drainage basin characterized by the confluence of the Khabur and the Euphrates. It should be noted in this respect that the headwaters of the Khabur have traditionally formed a separate region, which has only occasionally been integrated politically with the lower basin. In the period of Mari, this northern region was called the “upper land,” or *mätum elitum* in Akkadian.

The region of Terqa appears to be of a size that is characteristic for most of the “expanded” territorial states in ancient Mesopotamia, i.e. those states that are larger than a city-state but not as comprehensive as kingdoms like those of Sargon or Hammurapi. Thus, for instance, the kingdom of Terqa was approximately equivalent in size to the kingdom of Babylon throughout most of its history.

One of the characteristics of Syria and northern Mesopotamia generally, in contrast to southern Mesopotamia, is that political regions have often a name of their own that is different from the name of the principal city. Thus, while the region and the state under the control of

the city Babylon was also called "Babylon," the name for the region and the state of Terqa was "Khana." This was the name of a tribal group that came to be especially associated with the area. Similarly, the full name of the kingdom of Mari was "Mari and Khana." After the demise of Mari and the ascendancy of Terqa, only the name of the region remained as the full name of the kingdom: thus it is that the kings of Terqa called themselves "kings of Khana." As a result, the name "Khana" is commonly used in modern terminology to refer to the period after the fall of Mari.

Important surface finds were made at Terqa long before full-fledged excavations were begun. Such discoveries were favored by the erosion activity of the Euphrates, which is amply documented by the high section overlooking the banks of the river. A walk along this section, beginning from the landing of the bridge at the southern tip of the tell, is instructive. You can imagine the ancient city extending all around you, for a perimeter probably twice as long as the one preserved today (see Ill. 2). You will feel then as if the city had been parted in two, and you were walking along the side of a huge trench. The cliff facing the river is, in fact, one of the largest exposed sections in the Near East (Ill. 3). The action of the river, which has created it through its damaging erosion, has now been stopped as a result of the new Tabqa dam, which has flooded archaeological sites upstream but saved the ones downstream, especially Terqa. The face of the section is not clearly visible now, because the cliff has been used as a dumping ground both by the city of Ashara and by our own excavations. This detritus, which adds a slope to the vertical cut of the section, provides a useful function in that it protects the face of the ancient layers as exposed in the section. One of the future goals of the Joint Expedition to Terqa is to clear gradually the section and to link it to excavation areas that abut it, so as to provide a monumental showcase for the process of cultural stratification, so aptly illustrated by the Terqa evidence. For now the visitor can enjoy the general view from the river and establish at least some links to basic stratigraphic facts.

As already mentioned, river erosion favored for many years the recovery of artifacts from the big section. Similarly, the presence of a modern settlement on top of much of the ancient city entails an ongoing organic interaction between ancient and modern. As a result, Terqa was one of the first Syrian sites from the third and early second millennia to be positively identified by its ancient name. In 1910 a German scholar, E. Hertzfeld, happened to pass by Ashara: he picked up a cuneiform tablet that related the building of a local temple to the god Dagan and gave the name of the city as *Ter-qa* (in Akkadian). As a result, two French scholars, F. Thureau-Dangin and P. Dhorme, came to Terqa for a brief study season in 1923. Their hurried and limited excavations (two operations in five days with 10 legionnaires!) gave an insight into a rich

chronological sequence going back to the third millennium, but— they yielded no tablets. (Ironically, they were probably digging a few meters away from the archive of Puzurum, which we excavated in 1977-78. Their report does not indicate where the excavations were carried out on the site, hence our identification of their operation is only inferential.)

A few years later Mari was discovered and all the best French energies were devoted to its excavation. Neither the discovery in Mari of a large number of letters originating from Terqa nor the accidental find in 1948 at Terqa itself of an Assyro-Aramaic stela from the 8th century stirred any new interest in the site.

Thus it was only in 1974 that Th. Carter of Johns Hopkins University secured a permit for excavations there and conducted some preliminary work at Terqa. A brief 10-day season by Johns Hopkins followed in 1975, under the direction of D. Hillers: this we consider as the first season of our current sequence of excavation seasons. In 1976, the expedition became a Joint Expedition under the direction of Giorgio Buccellati and Marilyn Kelly-Buccellati, with regular excavations undertaken each year. The last season as of this writing was the seventh successive season, carried out in spring 1982. The institutions currently associated with the Joint Expedition to Terqa are

IIMAS—International Institute for Mesopotamian Area Studies  
The University of California, Los Angeles  
California State University, Los Angeles  
Johns Hopkins University  
The University of Arizona  
The University of Rome  
The Centre National des Recherches Scientifiques, Paris.

It has been one of the goals of the Joint Expedition to Terqa to put a special effort in the presentation of the site for the visitor. To this end, we prepared special posters to be set up at the site to illustrate certain features of the excavations. Unfortunately, it has proven impossible to preserve these posters in their present format while the expedition is not in session, so we have been forced to remove them from the site at the end of each season. Also, our efforts at conservation and ground maintenance during the absence of the Expedition are still experimental, so that an off-season visitor will be at a disadvantage in understanding the site. Until our plans for a well-integrated Archaeological Park can be implemented, this introduction will serve as the best guide we can offer toward an appreciation of the results obtained and the goals we aim for.

## **2. Urban Beginnings (3200-3000 B.C., Qraya)**

There are no prehistoric remains in evidence anywhere at Terqa; we begin with a full-blown city, like Athena who sprang full grown from the head

of Zeus. There is, however, a site in the vicinity of Terqa that preserves the evidence of the immediate prolog that must necessarily have preceded the establishment of the city. Qraya is the first mound you encounter north of Terqa, some 5 km upstream the Euphrates and right on the river banks, like Terqa. Unlike Terqa, the site of Qraya (no ancient name is as yet known for it) does not appear to have been as badly eroded by the action of the river. It rests on top of a sizable glaucis of river pebbles congealed into some sort of rock formation, as hard as concrete, clearly visible as you walk along the edge of the water on the northern slope of the tell. The river current, in its constant lapping at the edge of this natural formation, has not succeeded in eroding it in the same fashion as Terqa; instead, it has formed something like a bay on the northern side of the tell.

The whole setting at Qraya is particularly scenic, with a beautiful sight of fields and trees, a big bend in the river and the desert in the distance. Also, the drive up from Terqa is quite attractive and instructive, if one stays away from the main road and ventures into the small lanes alongside the river. There are many mudbrick houses that retain a rural flavor now lost in the larger towns like Ashara and are suggestive of what the situation may have been in ancient times.

Excavations at Qraya were undertaken by the Joint Expedition to Terqa over a period of three seasons, the first two concomitant with work at Terqa and the third independent of it and under the direction of Daniel Shimabuku. The first two seasons consisted of brief sounding operations, which established the main chronological sequence. The third season provided some horizontal exposure; this, however, was still too limited in scope, and no single building has been excavated in its entirety. From the area excavated, three building phases could be identified, all three phases belonging to the late Protoliterate period. Of particular interest, among the finds, are a collection of protoliterate seal impressions, a large number of beveled-rim bowls and a diversified inventory of fine stone implements. The protoliterate settlement extended over all of the present tell (some 200 meters in diameter) but also beyond it under the present plain level, as established by several trenches dug in the surrounding fields. The exact perimeter is not known, but certainly Qraya was a considerable settlement, all the more important since it is the only one for this period known and excavated along the Euphrates from Southern Mesopotamia to the Tabqa dam or the upper Khabur.

It may be interesting to note in connection with these brief remarks about Qraya that other ancient sites are unexpectedly rare in the region of Terqa—unexpectedly, because the ancient texts speak of many settlements that were to be found in the district. An intensive survey conducted by the Joint Expedition over a radius of some 10 kilometers around Terqa has produced evidence of only a handful of early sites, although some 200

medieval and more recent sites (generally small) were found. The likely explanation is that the ancient sites were abandoned after relatively short periods of occupation, and in any case before they had developed any sizable depositional accumulation. As a result, they came to be covered by the alluvium (which has probably risen by a factor of 3 meters in historic times) and are thus altogether invisible to a regular surface survey.

It appears then that Qraya was one of very few sites in the area to have had occupation over a period of many centuries and thus one of the few that are extant today. It is especially unfortunate, in the light of these considerations, that destruction at the hand of the few families that are settled today on the tell has deprived us of practically all the top layers belonging to the Khana period: these were bulldozed away to make room for flimsy structures just before we came to the site and in part even after our first inspection. It was only after a strong intervention by the Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums that this senseless, if unintentional, destruction could be stopped.

### **3. A Strong City (3000-2400 B.C., Areas B and D)**

The site of Terqa exhibits no traces of occupation before 3000 B.C. And then suddenly, around that date, a momentous change takes place: a massive city wall came to be built there, the largest by far known to us for this early period from Syria and Mesopotamia. Was it the people from Qraya who moved south and established the new city? We have no proof for this hypothesis, but it is a tempting one in view of the fact that no third millennium strata have been found in Qraya.

The present situation at Terqa does not do justice to the monumentality of this ancient defensive system. The visitor will have to use some imagination to fill in the picture. This is partly because some of our excavations have been back-filled, and partly because the overall situation has been understood especially through long trenches that were cut across the walls and revealed their structural make-up, but did not expose the walls in their monumental appearance. In the coming seasons we plan to carry out more work between Areas B and A, where we expect there may be a city gate and where we hope to show the relationship between the wall and the city quarter adjacent to it (see Fig. 6). Also, we plan to undertake some restoration and partial reconstruction of the city wall along the river embankment. For now, the visitor will have to be satisfied with what is visible in Area B and with the reconstructed drawings offered below.

First, a word about the general layout of the wall. The plan in Fig. 3 and the aerial photo in Ill. 2 give a good idea of the original perimeter of the wall. Our projection beyond the existing limits of the tell and into the river is based on the knowledge that much of the tell has been eroded by

the river, and by the reported presence of large boulders in the middle of the river at this particular point. It is possible, on the other hand, that the perimeter may have been not fully circular in shape, but more rectilinear along one side, namely the side that was presumably flanked by the main course of the river. While an answer to this question may or may not come from future research in the field, if we accept for now the reconstruction proposed here we obtain a perimeter of almost two kilometers (1½ miles). This is not enormous by later standards; it is, however, impressive, considering that it was built from scratch without any demonstrable previous settlement at the site.

What is more significant is the structural buildup of the defensive system, which we know rather well and which has been documented in detail by our excavations. The schematic section in Fig. 4 summarizes the main pertinent facts: three concentric and contiguous rings made of mudbrick with two rows of boulders, for a total width of some 20 meters (without counting the projections of the towers)! These are extraordinary dimensions even by later standards. It is only several centuries later that walls reach this thickness, and then normally they are built of packed fill (*terre pisée*) rather than in mudbrick.

The date of the wall is secured by two convergent sets of considerations. First, pottery found immediately inside the city wall and outside on the slopes of the moat belongs typologically to the Early Dynastic I period for the earlier strata and the Early Dynastic II period for the later strata. Second, one carbon 14 determination just inside the wall yielded the calibrated range of 3000-2700 B.C. (Three more determinations from material recovered in the moat yielded much higher dates, between 4000 B.C. and 27,000 B.C. Upon examination, the samples appeared to have been contaminated in antiquity by varying amounts of asphalt; the greater the asphalt content, the higher the date. These findings, while eliminating from our historical consideration the evidence of certain stratigraphically important samples, proved to be an important discovery in the realm of methodology. Our published results demonstrate for the first time the real danger of ancient contamination by asphalt, which had been suspected but never proven.) The walls of Terqa, then, began around 3000 B.C. and continued in uninterrupted use until about 1600 B.C. The three major rings were built at about one-century intervals between 2900 and 2700 B.C. In the Khana period repair work was undertaken at various points, but the system as a whole continued in regular use. This is shown especially by a 2-meter section in Area D, which exhibits a continuous stratigraphic sequence along the face of the wall from virgin soil to Khana period.

Much of our knowledge about the city wall came from long and narrow trenches that had been cut by the municipality of Ashara to make room for a new sewer system. These trenches were left open for our



inspection for a period of three months in 1978 and have since been back-filled after completion of the sewer system. None is therefore visible today, and our map shows merely the location of the trenches. We will concentrate here on the part that is visible (Area B), drawing on our knowledge of the covered sections where necessary.

It may be appropriate to make at this juncture a few remarks about the interaction between the modern town and archaeology. The sewer system was one of a few major public projects that had been planned by the municipality shortly before our excavations. Since the beginning of these projects coincided more or less with the beginning of our work, and since the importance of ancient Terqa came to be appreciated slowly with the progress of our work, there was an initial period when archaeology and city projects had to contend with each other. In subsequent years, through the enlightened collaboration of all concerned officials from the governor of Der ez-Zor to the local mayor and through the understanding of the local inhabitants, and under the guidance of the Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums, it was agreed to put a halt to all improvements on the tell and to prevent all constructions by private parties as well. We hope that the progressive recovery of ancient Terqa will continue to provide adequate compensation for modern Ashara and its people.

The walls of Terqa can best be appreciated in Area B, both from the top and from the river banks. The view from above provides an insight into the structure of the defensive system. As shown in Fig. 5 and Ill. 4, a portion of the two inside rings is in evidence here; the outermost ring is visible only in section from the river bank. In the middle of the inner wall there is a well and a vertical drain, which were sunk into the structure in later times. The present appearance of the wall, cut vertically along a slightly curved line and horizontally more or less along a plane level, is the result of modern activities. When we started our excavations, this was the major dumping ground of the city, and we theorized that this might have been the general area of the French soundings of 1923. In any case, the visitor should realize that we have here a continuous brick mass along the lines shown in Ill. 4 and that the cutting and stepping is secondary. At the eastern end of Area B the inner wall makes a corner. Too little of it is preserved to allow us to decide whether the wall that projects to the inside may have been part of a structure leaning against the city wall, or a structural jog in the overall design of the city wall, or even a major corner in the overall defensive system.

A second major vista point for the city wall is from the banks of the river, next to the landing of the bridge. From a distance (Ill. 5) one obtains an approximation of how the wall may have looked in antiquity. In spite of modern scalloping from above, in spite of river erosion from the side, in spite of partial collapse at the top, the wall is still impressive in its

present configuration. It stands some 6 meters above the modern plain level, which is about 8 meters above the ancient plain level (which has been reached in our trenches, see Fig. 4). In antiquity it was certainly higher, although how much higher we cannot say. As one comes closer to the side of the tell (Ill. 6), one can appreciate the nature of the brickwork and the massiveness of the boulder substructures. Note especially how the remains of the brickwork jut out in angular fashion. This is not, of course, the original appearance of the wall (we are looking at the inside of the structure), but it demonstrates the great cohesive strength of the brick structure. The vertical planes are very steep and even the deep undercutting by the river action (still clearly visible at the base) has not succeeded in tumbling down these brick masses from the core of the wall.

The installations just inside the city wall were relatively modest. Those in evidence at the present stage of the excavation reflect a period of occupation from about 2500 B.C.: two rectangular bins, one semicircular silo, two kilns (Fig. 5). Nothing of importance was found inside these structures.

From a slightly higher stratum, and now removed, were two burials of women (see Fig. 5), who had been laid to rest inside simple shaft graves, with a matting cover and with a fair amount of objects, especially pottery and personal jewelry, next to them (Ill. 7). The jewelry (mostly bronze and mother-of-pearl) was of a type that is well illustrated by the shell inlays found at Mari (Ill. 8). The French excavation of 1923 at Terqa reported the discovery of a large third millennium burial, with a brick structure and a richer inventory of objects. While the excavators neglected to indicate the location of the burial, it appears from circumstantial evidence that it may have been in this area. If so, by the Early Dynastic III period, Area B had come to serve as a burial ground *intra muros* but in an open area (i.e. not within a house complex) for individuals of some status, although not of the ruling class.

#### **4. Provincial Capital and Religious Center (2400-1750 B.C., Area F and the Mari Texts)**

Around 2400 B.C. the city of Mari, some 60 km south of Terqa, held sway over the Khabur basin, and it remained the predominant city in the area down to its destruction by Hammurapi around 1760 B.C. Terqa was certainly under the control of Mari throughout this period, although clear evidence of this is extant only for the last few decades before the destruction of Mari. It is interesting that while Mari is mentioned prominently in the texts from Ebla, Terqa does not seem to figure at all. We may surmise that by the middle of the third millennium Terqa had become a provincial center of its more powerful neighbor downstream. If

the construction of the massive defensive system a few centuries earlier is any indication of political independence, it would appear that such independence did not continue. If so, we have no indication as to what events affected the history of Terqa. A possible hypothesis is that there was a progressive dislocation of the center of power downstream, such as we have postulated for the sequence Qraya/Terqa at the beginning of the third millennium.

It is a fact that Terqa remained the cult center of the major god of the region, Dagan, even during the period of political ascendancy of Mari. Sargon of Akkad claims that it was Dagan who handed Ebla over to him (a politico-ideological statement referring to the need for strategic control of the Khabur basin and the middle Euphrates as a precondition for his western conquests. Dagan is mentioned prominently and regularly in the Mari texts from the Old Babylonian period as the main god of Terqa. There is also some indication that the Zimri-Lim dynasty of Mari may have originated in Terqa.

At any rate, most of our current information for this period comes from Mari, and then only for the Old Babylonian period, rather than from excavations at Terqa. The royal archives of Mari contain more than 200 letters that had originated in Terqa and were sent to Mari where they were stored in the royal palace. They deal with a number of items of the greatest interest, some of them quite picturesque and intriguing, and provide a lively account of what seems to have been the most important provincial capital and religious center of the kingdom. At the current stage of excavations at Terqa, we are coming down to Mari levels, and it is likely that future editions of this Guide may afford us a direct opportunity to integrate new texts from Terqa of the Mari age with the texts of Terqa already found in Mari.

The most promising developments in this direction are the excavations in Area F. During the last season of 1982, parts of a large architectural complex have been uncovered, framed nicely by a street along the northwestern side. They have a tortured architectural history—quite interesting because it shows palpably how these early urbanites coped with the problem of limited space within the confines of the city even at a time when the overall population pressure was much less than it is today. Yet here they were, trying to make the most use of narrow spaces, with odd corners, small rooms, tight alleyways. You can appreciate this as you first look down at the current excavations and then raise your eyes and look beyond into the wide open spaces of the surrounding desert. Being closely hemmed in by each other, almost living on top of each other—was this a psycho-urban need of man from the beginning? Certainly, they liked the cloistered feeling of a bustling town, and paid high prices for every square foot of it as seen from the cuneiform tablets found at Terqa.

From the tablets strewn on top of the floors, just below the brickfall that lay underneath the higher strata, we can now begin to piece together a fair slice of Terqa history during the last phases of its life as a provincial capital. It is no small feat to piece together such sequences from stratigraphic bits and pieces. Here are the two major building sequences:

**1800 SHAMSHI-ADAD:** the lower strata in Area F contain a bulla with the name (almost complete) of this king who ruled from somewhere a few hundred kilometers to the north, possibly at the site of Tell Leilan. Another tablet from the same context exhibits a month name that was used only during the reign of this king.

**1775 KIBRI-DAGAN:** the next strata in area F contain a letter addressed to [K]ibri-Dagan, almost certainly the governor of king Zimri-Lim, who was now ruling Terqa from Mari, some 60 km to the south. Whether or not this building can be named after Kibri-Dagan is too soon to tell, but certainly we have here another captivating working hypothesis.

Other tantalizing pieces of evidence come from several fragments of various cuneiform texts found on the surface and dated to this period. One is a building inscription of Zimri-Lim, the last king of Mari, who boasts of having built an "Ice House" in Terqa—possibly for storage at a station closer to the point of origin, which may have been the mountains in the north. Fragments of the inscription had been found on the surface before our excavations, and then we also found one fragment in Area C, but out of context, in later, medieval fill. It is intriguing to speculate how we might be able to recognize an "ice house" from the layout of the architecture or the appurtenances contained therein. Hopefully, if remains of such a building still exist, they will have preserved at least one of the foundation deposits of the same type from which came the fragments of the building inscriptions we have found so far. However, the very fact that several pieces of the foundation inscription have appeared on the surface does not bode well for a chance of still being able to find such a structure in the ground.

Another important surface find is a piece of a building inscription by Shamshi-Adad in which he claims credit for work on the great Dagan temple of Terqa. This was the tablet found by Hertzfeld in 1910 that first gave us a clue as to the name of the site.

Finally, the earliest text found at Terqa also comes from a chance find: a small tablet with a roster of workmen who had not reported for work on account of sickness. This unassuming text is significant in that it can be dated to around 1900 B.C. on the basis of close typological similarities with a corpus of similar administrative texts found at Mari, which in turn show some connections with the language of Ebla. The Terqa text was found shortly before our excavations near Area H.

## **5. Capital of the Lower Khabur Basin (1750-1600 B.C., Areas C and F)**

The period best documented archaeologically for Terqa corresponds to the century and a half or more that followed the destruction of Mari. It is generally assumed that Terqa became the capital of the region at that time. This is the most likely hypothesis, although there is no certain proof for it. The titulary of the kings omits the name of any city and refers only to Khana, the name of the region (which, as we saw earlier, was also a part of the titulary of the kings of Mari), hence we have no clue in this direction. On the other hand, Terqa is the only known site to date to have yielded cuneiform tablets with names of kings of Khana, and its general urban layout is significant enough to qualify as a capital city. In addition, it seems likely that the dynasty of Zimri-Lim, defeated by Hammurapi of Babylon, was originary of Terqa, so that a retrenchment to that city after the destruction of the former capital would be historically justified.

Finally, Terqa is at the geographical center of the region of Khana. We know that the political boundaries at this period reached as far north as the middle Khabur and coincided to the south with the boundaries of Babylon, i.e. at some distance along the Euphrates, possibly around the region of Hit and Ana in modern Iraq. The indication for the northern boundary is drawn from a reference in a year name of Terqa to the building of a canal parallel to the Khabur and ending at Dur-Yaggid-Lim. Since this city is likely to be identified with Tell Sheh-Hamid, half way on the Khabur north of Terqa, the northern boundary must have reached up to at least the apex of the Khabur triangle. The indication for the southern boundary is derived from another year name, but this time of Samsu-Iluna, son and successor of Hammurapi on the throne of Babylon. In his 19th year, Samsu-Iluna boasts of a victory against a certain king Yadikh-Abu. While the name of the country of Yadikh-Abu is not mentioned, it is likely that this is the same Yadikh-Abu mentioned prominently in the archive of Puzurum (see presently) as king of Khana. If so, the victory of Samsu-Iluna must refer to a border skirmish, since there is no claim or other indication of a widespread penetration in Khana territory or of massive destructions there. This would mean that by the late 18th century Babylon had lost its ascendancy in the area and that an equilibrium similar to that prevailing before Hammurapi had been restored to the region. The kingdom of Khana, then, controlling as it probably did most of Eastern Syria, was an integral part of this mechanism as Mari had been earlier.

We know by now the names of 13 kings of the dynasty of Khana (see below, Section 9). The most important ones, in terms of our documentation, are the following:

1750? **ISI-SUMU-ABUM** and **YAPAH-SUMU-[ABUM]**. The first kings bear names that have embedded in them the name of the founder of Hammurapi's dynasty (Sumu-Abum). It is tempting to assume that they were ruling under the orbit of Babylon, and were trying to please their overlord by using the name of his ancestor. (This may not necessarily be the case if *Sumu-Abum* is to be taken as a generic name, rather than as the name of the ancestor of Hammurapi.) The top strata in Area F may still belong to this phase: whatever followed this phase, came to be obliterated a long time ago in antiquity.

1721 **YADIKH-ABU**. This is the next known king of the Terqa line; he fought Samsu-iluna of Babylon, and by now Terqa had most likely obtained full autonomy and controlled all of the Middle Euphrates and the Khabur. Yadikh-Abu is known from the first strata in Puzurum's house.

1690? **KASHTILASHU**. By now a new ethnic group was beginning to stir in Mesopotamia—the Kassites, who will eventually take over the throne of Babylon. Kashtiliash is a typical name borne by kings of the Kassite dynasty. The Terqa king by the same name may not have been a Kassite himself, but may simply have paid onomastic tribute to a newly emerging powerful neighbor. Most of the buildings in area C as exposed today are attributable to this king: the early phase of the Temple of Ninkarrak, the building to the south of it, the plaza between them and the house of Puzurum.

1660? **SHUNUHURU-AMMU**. The middle building phase of the Temple is dated to this king by a tablet found on the floor; several other tablets mention this king, but they were found unstratified before our excavations.

1630? **AMMI-MADAR**. He is known only from unstratified tablets found before our excavations: he can be placed chronologically because his titulary mentions Shunuhru-Ammu as being his father.

1600? **ABI-LAMA**. Known only as the son of Ammi-Madar, but not documented as king.

?? Five other names of kings are known from unstratified Terqa tablets, plus two names of individuals who are mentioned as being the fathers of kings but do not bear a royal title. These we cannot place as yet in a chronological sequence—but then again, our work at Terqa is far from being finished.

Two buildings are primarily associated with this period, both of them in Area C: the Temple of Ninkarrak and the House of Puzurum. Other evidence from the Khana period comes from Area F (mentioned briefly above) and from Area H. In the latter excavation, we found the remnants of a massive structure, with thick walls and paved floors. Because of these structural details, and because of its choice location in what must have been the center of the ancient tell, it is likely that this may be a major

public building, perhaps even the central palace. However, horizontal exposure is impossible here on account of the modern houses that cover the area to the west of our excavations, so that a clarification will have to wait for quite some time. In what follows, we will limit ourselves to the two main buildings of Area C: they are located at the periphery of the ancient city, and they represent a more average city quarter than those characterized by palaces or major temples.

**THE TEMPLE OF NINKARRAK.** This structure has been excavated in its entirety for three superimposed building phases (Fig. 7 and III. 9). A fourth one is lurking underneath, indicating that the building had a long and complex stratigraphic history, the early phases of which may even reach back into the third millennium. At present, the visitor can only see the remnants of two phases of the Temple of Ninkarrak (II and III), while the uppermost (phase I), which was extant only in a minor way, has been removed in the course of excavations. The two phases are distinguished by recently applied coats of plaster, colored differently so as to represent the different phases: brown for phase II and gray for phase III (by extension, white has been used in the adjacent house of Puzurum to mark phase IV). This coloration has been added by us to the gypsum plaster with which we have covered the top of the walls in an effort to enhance their preservation. While the coloring is not original and is clearly recognizable as such, it is hoped that it will appear nuanced enough not to offend the visitors, yet sufficiently marked to help them recognize in the ground the complexities of the stratigraphic relationships.

Since we expect to have more phases underneath, our numbering proceeds from top to bottom, with approximate dates as follows:

I (removed)—1630 B.C.?

II (brown)—1660 B.C.: Shunuhru-Ammu

III (gray)—1690 B.C.: Kashtiliashu

IV (white)—1720 B.C.: Yadikh-Abu (?).

Phase II is dated to Shunuhru-Ammu on the basis of one tablet found on the floor of this phase. Phase III is the one that is best represented in the excavations (see Fig. 8); it is dated to Kashtiliashu on the basis of several tablets found on floors of this phase with the name of the king as part of year names. Phase IV (largely unexcavated as yet) is dated by way of stratigraphic reference to the house of Puzurum (see presently), where several tablets dated to Yadikh-Abu were found. The absolute dates in turn are computed beginning from the synchronism between Yadikh-Abu and Samsu-Iluna, corresponding to 1721 B.C. according to the middle chronology (see Section 6 for further details on the chronological question).

The complexity of the stratigraphic situation is apparent especially in Phases II and III. The buildings of these phases look a bit like Russian wooden dolls, because one temple was encased in the other (Fig. 7). This

was the result of deliberate architectural planning, aimed at preserving as much as possible the earlier building phases by aligning the new foundations neatly around the walls of the old temple, rather than directly on top of them. It was apparent, that the foundations were not sunk inside a trench. Instead, they were erected *against* the face of the existing, earlier walls. The upper section of the earlier walls was then demolished, and the rubble piled up inside the new foundations, to serve as a fill and as a subfloor for the new building phase. The process is rendered schematically in Fig. 9.

Apart from the minor shifts in alignment, the layout of the temple remained pretty much the same. The approach is not through a straight axis but rather angled ("bent axis approach," a classical pattern for Mesopotamian architecture): a worshiper had to turn to the left to face the main hall and then the cella beyond it, thus providing perhaps an element of slight concealment or screening of the more sacred areas. The main doorway to the cella is decorated with multiple recesses on the doorjambs ("rabetted" doorways in the technical terminology), while engaged columns lined the walls. These are still clearly visible, although they have been eroded by the weather since they were exposed. Engaged columns decorate the entire southern facade of the temple toward the plaza (Fig. 8) and would add considerably to the monumental appearance of the building. At present, however, they are hidden by the remains of Phase II. A large pit was sunk in medieval times just in the middle of the wall of the cella behind the engaged columns and makes conservation precarious. The extensive pitting activity of medieval times is also responsible for the almost complete destruction of the altar, of which only the base is preserved.

Only a few inches from the medieval pit sunk behind the engaged columns and a couple of feet from the altar (see Fig. 7), we made the most important artifact discovery within the temple. A small bag had been deposited on the floor, and came to be covered up and perhaps forgotten, in spite of its precious content: 6,737 beads, more than 10 pounds in weight, originally contained in a bag about 10 inches in diameter. The beads are all of semiprecious stones, mostly carnelian and agate, but also lapis, rock crystal, hematite, gypsum and frit. While the majority are geometrical in shape, a few are zoomorphic—like ducks, frogs and quadrupeds. Seven scarabs or scaraboids were also included in the cache, presumably of Egyptian manufacture, but in any case indicative of early Egyptian influence this far east along the Euphrates. The beads were strung by us according to simple typological criteria, and are now on exhibit in the Der ez-Zor museum.

The name of Ninkarrak as the patron goddess of the temple is suggested by three different clues. None is fully conclusive, but the identification proposed seems at least quite probable. Final confirmation



may come only from such explicit evidence as a foundation deposit, which might be expected below walls at some important structural joint such as a corner or a doorway; but this is reserved for future excavations. The first clue was the presence of a miniature bronze dog next to the altar—the dog is the symbol of the goddess of healing, known as Ninkarrak in Sumerian and as Gula in Akkadian. More important was a cuneiform tablet found near the door connecting the ceremonial quarters with the service areas: the first line of the tablet bears the name of Ninkarrak, the second the word for “king” and the other lines are a list of personal names followed by a year-name mentioning Kashtiliashu. Finally there are two seal impressions that also have the name Ninkarrak in the legend, although they were part of a personal name.

**THE HOUSE OF PUZURUM.** Along the northwestern side of the temple runs an alleyway that separates the temple from a section of private houses, one of which was excavated in its entirety: the house of Puzurum (Fig. 7). Part of the house, perhaps half, was actually lost to river erosion, but we have enough left to reconstruct its layout and to understand something of its character. Even though built in close proximity to the temple, it seems to have had no relationship to it. Certainly the general circulation pattern excludes this, because the house of Puzurum does not seem to have had a doorway opening onto the alleyway, and the temple had at best a service doorway there. In any case, the main entrance of the temple was onto a plaza on the south, in an opposite direction from the house of Puzurum.

The house had been burned in antiquity: you may still see on the walls clear traces of the fire that must have been intense as the roof collapsed and buried the contents of the house for us to retrieve some 3,700 years later. The fire was, however, contained, because its traces are localized and certainly did not extend to the temple. The layout of the house, still clearly visible if you walk down through the excavation area or if you look down from the northern edge of the excavations at the highest point near the river, very much resembles the layout of a modern village mudbrick house. A central courtyard serves as the main living area, where most of the household activities occur, including cooking. The three rooms on the northern side of the courtyard served primarily as storage.

One of these rooms, the one at the corner with one wall flanking the alleyway, was the most important of all, at least for us. It contained some 100 pieces of written documents, 15 of which were in a good state of preservation. Together, they form an interesting archive of a middle-class person who was buying land and houses in the area of Terqa. While constituting an archive in terms of its contents, the room itself was no archive at all; rather, it was a storage for a number of items that had lost current value, but could be used at some later point in time. A bathtub,

for instance, had been stored broken and most of the tablets had also been broken before being placed in the room. You are looking, then, at the ancient equivalent of an attic room (Ill. 11).

The tablets themselves are now on prominent display at the museum in Der ez-Zor, but some good casts are also on view at the Expedition House. They were small, pillow-like in shape and easily held in one hand. Most of the documents found in the "archive" were contracts attesting to the purchase of land or real estate by Puzurum himself (that is actually how we have come to call this particular structure the "house of Puzurum"). They were normally enclosed in an envelope of clay, sealed with cylinder seal impressions. In the case of a dispute over the terms of the agreement, the contestants would break the envelope in front of a judge; the content of the tablet as sealed inside the envelope would bear the authentic text of the document. Now most of the envelopes in the "archive" were open, and the fragments of tablets and envelopes were scattered throughout the room, mixed in with the debris: clearly, they had not been "filed" in any archival fashion, for purposes of precise retrieval. Instead, they had been "expended" or invalidated by being opened, and had then been stored haphazardly.

The importance of the tablets lies in their content. They describe to us many interesting details about legal practices (for example, in the case of breach of contract the transgressor would have to pay a fine to the state, i.e. the palace, and may incur the dire physical penalty of hot asphalt poured over the head). They contain a wealth of personal names (about 300) of individuals involved in the transactions, either as main parties or as witnesses; this gives us some insight into the social system and the linguistic affiliation of Terqa. Finally, they give us several year names, which contribute toward the knowledge of the political history of that period. Most of the dates are from the period of Yadikh-Abu. This was the time when the tablets had been written; the breaking up of the envelopes, the storing in the "attic," the burning of the house must have occurred some time later, either in the later years of Yadikh-Abu or under Kashtiliashu.

While the tablets of Puzurum provide us with the most specific signature that history can place on any artifacts—names and dates—another room of his house was almost as important for a different reason. The small room closest to the cliff, with only two walls remaining (the other two have been lost to river erosion), was a pantry, in use at the same time as the "attic." Now this room has yielded two important, though quite different, pieces of evidence. The first is a vast assemblage of pottery vessels, 76 in number, preserved intact on the floor (Ill. 11). They were probably used for storing staples or liquids, or were simply ready to be used for any type of household chores. Unsophisticated and common as this assemblage is, it provided us with an excellent diagnostic inventory of

complete Khana ceramic vessels right at the beginning of our excavations (this room was excavated in 1976). It was like a textbook for our subsequent work. Khana ceramics, and in fact Khana material culture in general, were hardly known before the Terqa excavations. The discovery of good assemblages such as the pantry of Puzurum meant that our site could serve aptly as a type site for this period. Many of the second millennium vessels on display at the Museum in Der ez-Zor come from the house of Puzurum, and you can also see a few good replicas in the Expedition House, where a typological chart of profiles and wares is also available for inspection.

The content of one of the jars was little short of extraordinary; a handful of cloves was well preserved in a partly overturned jar of a medium size. The significance of this find lies in the fact that cloves are by no means native to Syria; they came from a long distance away, at least as far as India, but ultimately even farther east, specifically the Molucca islands in the Far East. As you look at the setting of the room where the cloves were found you will appreciate even more its significance; this is obviously no palace or upper class mansion. It is at best a middle-class house. And yet such a fragile commodity as cloves was stored on the floor amongst a pile of common crockery. We do not know the ancient name for cloves nor their price; but we know that even though they had come over a long distance indeed, they had been made generally accessible through an obviously efficient trading system.

## **6. "Dark Ages" and Chronology (1600-1000)**

One of the original goals of our excavations at Terqa was to find material for the history of the middle second millennium, a period little known from this area or, in fact, from most other areas of Southwestern Asia. Even before our excavations Terqa was known to have been occupied for some time after the fall of Mari: it was our intent to investigate just how long, in the expectation that perhaps its history might stretch into the 16th century B.C. This is a "dark" century not in the sense of a decline in the material culture, but in the sense that there is little documentary information to shed light on events and institutions. Could Terqa bridge the gap?

The answer is for now rather in the negative. If anything, the problem looms even larger as a result of recent research. First, as to our excavations. It appears from the chronological chart discussed in the preceding section that the last archaeological level of the second millennium excavated so far dates in the late 1600s. We have found no stratum that extends beyond 1600, and we are unlikely to find any elsewhere on the site. The trenches dug by the municipality of Ashara for the city sewer system were dug to a depth of some 2 m at various points at

the top of the tell and nowhere did we find strata that were either typologically more recent or stratigraphically higher than the Khana strata in Area C. Standing in Area C, you can appreciate that you are pretty much on top of the depositional accumulation of Terqa. So it appears that in Terqa too history vanishes at the threshold of the 16th century.

The lack of documentation for the period between 1600 and 1500 is such that some scholars have even wondered if there "was" a 16th century. Put in other terms, the question might be: Should we lower the entire chronological system of the early periods by a few decades? This is not as strange as it may sound at first, and several authorities in the field have argued for a LOW chronology, according to which all the dates normally used in the standard chronology should be lowered by some 60 years. This standard, or MIDDLE, chronology is the one most scholars use and it is the one that is also employed in this Guide. If we were to follow the low chronology, the date for the synchronism between Yadikh-Abu and Samsu-iluna would be 1655, and the possible date for phase I of the Temple of Ninkarrak would be 1570. On the face of it, the lack of documentation from Terqa for periods stratigraphically posterior to phase I of the temple would seem to argue in favor of such a low chronology.

And yet . . . a carbon 14 determination from the "attic" of Puzurum gives a calibrated range of 1900-1700. Granted that this is only one sample and that its range is rather broad, still it would fit better with the high chronology. In point of fact, some recent research based on a new evaluation of astronomical data and on a vast textual documentation has come to the unexpected result that the HIGH chronology might in fact be the more correct one. If so, the synchronism of Yadikh-Abu would have to be pushed back in time to 1781 and the latest phase of the temple would be dated to about 1690. This would cause us to face a gap of almost 200 years in our documentation for the middle of the second millennium!

For the purpose of this Guide, the result of these considerations is along the following lines. Urban Terqa seems to disappear shortly after the time of the last phase of the Temple of Ninkarrak. The only evidence that we have after this period are jar burials in Areas F, A and C. The context of these burials is not known, because they were sunk in shafts dug from higher levels that have disappeared. Typologically, the ceramics associated with these burials is of a later style, but exactly how late we cannot say. In any case, the question remains: Was there a settlement associated with the burials, and if so how could it have disappeared so entirely?

In a purely speculative vein, the possible alternatives are three. (1) There was a settlement at Terqa in the same area of the burials, but it has disappeared completely. (2) The settlement had shifted to the east, and has now been eroded by the river. (3) There was no more settlement at

Terqa and the mound was used only as a burial ground. Since this is meant as a guide to existing monuments, we will have to leave you with a sense of wonderment as you look around you at the present surface of the tell and try to picture the process through which the topmost structures fell into decay.

## **7. Nomadic Gathering Center (1000-700, Areas C, E and Soundings)**

Whatever your thoughts and imaginations about the last periods of urban Terqa, it does seem that for a few centuries after the end of the city we have come to know, the site underwent a drastic change in its sociopolitical function and hence in its outward appearance. The evidence is scanty, but there are some clues to suggest the following development.

Let us refer first to sources outside our site. The Annals of the kings of Assyria describe the military campaigns of the kings throughout the regions of the ancient Near East. The accounts are detailed with regard to the geographical setting, and for the area of the middle Euphrates they clearly refer to our site—but under the slight variant of Sirqu. The Assyrian army would march north along the Euphrates on its eastern banks: at Sirqu, the chieftains of the Aramean tribe of Laqé would deliver a tribute to the Assyrians, who would then continue without apparent concern for actual administrative annexation. This would seem to imply that the western banks of the Euphrates were both sufficiently submissive to make direct raids unnecessary and insufficiently attractive to make annexation desirable. The emerging picture, then, is that of a region that had reverted from an urban to a nomadic adaptive system, with the consequent decline of its earlier economic basis and political power. We have found no trace of Assyrian presence in Terqa or elsewhere on the western banks. There is instead a small site across the river a few kilometers south of Terqa, and almost visible from it, which has material from the late second millennium on the surface. Whether this low and unassuming site, by the name of Meshteli, is an Assyrian camp or not we cannot say, but it is at least a tempting hypothesis.

If there is no trace of Assyrian occupation at Terqa/Sirqu, is there any trace of Aramaic occupation? Yes, and of quite a varied nature. The first piece of evidence is a stone stela that was found by accident before our excavations began, in 1948. Its find spot is not known, but it seems to have come from the southern edge of the tell, near the landing of the bridge. The stela, now in the Museum of Aleppo, is interesting in that it exhibits a curious mixture of traits: the iconography is Mesopotamian, but the style is most likely Aramaic. There is a cuneiform inscription, barely readable, which begins with the name of Tukulti-Ninurta II. It all seems to indicate

that the inscription was prepared by the Arameans of Laqé on the occasion of a campaign of the Assyrian king, to commemorate his passing by Sirqu and to acknowledge in a solemn way the supremacy of the Assyrian suzerain. The crudeness of the style may be an index of the rather low level of artistic expertise of the Arameans at this time and place.

From our own excavations comes the evidence of burials. These were found in shafts, normally within jars, with pottery of a distinct type, quite different from that of the earlier periods. They come from Area E and from some of the excavations for the sewer system. In one case, a woman was found with a gold nose ring and bronze armlets—indicating a modicum of wealth. But in no case did we find traces of an Aramean settlement.

Instead, a peculiar situation is to be found in Area E. Still visible in the western section of the excavations are some layers of sand, up to 4 m in depth. The accumulation extended over the entire exposure of Area E and it showed a clear depositional pattern of alternating thin layers of wind-blown but mostly water-laid sand, with some limited amounts of sherds scattered thinly between the sand layers. This may well be an indication of a period of abandonment of the tell.

Thus the general picture that emerges, albeit tentatively, is that of a gathering center for a nomadic group that did not reside at Terqa/Sirqu, but used it for ceremonial purposes: the burying of the dead and the acknowledgment of the political suzerainty of the Assyrian king. Standing on top of the site in Area E and looking across the river, you are probably at the same vantage point as the ancient Arameans when they were looking at the approaching Assyrian army.

## **8. A Medieval Craft Village (A.D. 1200, Areas C, E and Soundings)**

The few centuries of nomadic occupation at the site were followed by a long hiatus, during which the site seems to have been totally uninhabited—some 20 centuries, from about 700 B.C. until about A.D. 1200. An interesting question that we encounter in the ground is that of the interface between the building remains of the Khana period and the remains of the medieval period. In other words, what is the trace of some 2,000 years or more of abandonment? The answer can only be given during the excavation process itself, and is not apparent in any extant remains for the visitor to see. In general, what we notice is a gradual process of decay and debris accumulation that merges imperceptibly with the modest occupational deposition of the medieval period. It would appear, in other words, that no trace of ancient architecture was visible at the site during the medieval period, but that it had all come to be covered by a uniform and indistinct natural cover.

The main type of intrusion into earlier strata is represented by storage pits, up to 2 meters deep and by some large and amorphous "hollows," which seem to have been dug out to be used as dumping grounds. Two such large hollows, up to 15 meters in width and some 3 or 4 meters in depth, are visible in the sections at the northeastern corner of the excavations in Area F, and the northeastern corner of the excavations in Area C.

Apart from such excavations, the building activities of medieval times were modest and did not affect the lower strata. We have some simple private houses in Areas C and E, with shallow foundations, and shallow burial shafts in Areas A, G and F. The graves are found side by side with modern graves and are practically indistinguishable from each other. Up until recent years, the cemetery of Ashara was on the southern side of the tell from where it was removed to the western escarpment of the river valley to make room for the Municipal Garden.

An interesting installation of medieval times includes a few pottery glazing kilns, found just outside the perimeter of the tell at its southern edge (now covered by the fields). Whole vessels were found next to the kilns, ready to be glazed, and tripods and fire-dogs were still in place inside the kiln, ready to receive the vessels. The large amounts of glazed sherds and of glass bracelets scattered throughout the site may be an indication that production of such items was indeed an active local enterprise, even though the simple aspect of the architectural remains seems to indicate that the settlement itself was little more than a village.

The date of the medieval remains is set to A.D. 1200 in the Ayyubid period on the basis of a coin and of ceramic typology. We have no indication of what happened to the village after that, for how long it was occupied and when the modern settlement originated. It is also unknown whether the modern name "Ashara" was already in use in medieval times, or whether it came to be used later.

## 9. Chronological Outline

### KINGS OF KHANA

| DATE   | NAME                        | STRATIGRAPHY                                 | OTHER EVIDENCE   |
|--------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| (1750) | ISI-SUMU-ABU                | Puzurum                                      | onomastics   |
|        | YAPAH-SUMU-[ABU]            | Puzurum                                      | few discarded contracts<br>different contract type                                     |
| (1721) | YADIKH-ABU                  | Puzurum                                      | Samsu-iluna synchronism<br>carbon 14<br>many opened contracts<br>one unopened contract |
| (1700) | KASHILIASIU                 | Puzurum<br>Ninkarrak (early)<br>unstratified | prosopography<br>one opened contract<br><br>one unopened contract                      |
| (1650) | SHUNUHRU-AMMU               | Ninkarrak (middle)<br>unstratified           | year name  |
| (1625) | AMMI-MADAR                  |  | filiation  |
| (1600) | (ABI-LAMA)                  |  | filiation  |
|        | (IDPIN-KAKKA)<br>ISHAR-LIM  | unstratified                                 | year name<br>prosopography   |
|        | IGID-LIM                    | medieval fill                                | year name  |
|        | (ZITRI-DAGAN)<br>ISHI-DAGAN | unstratified                                 | year name and seal   |
|        | YASSI-DAGAN                 |  | year formula of Hammurapi  |
|        | HAMMURAPI                   | unstratified                                 | year name<br>Dur-Isar-Lim and<br>Dur-Igid-Lim  |



## GENERAL TIMETABLE

| DATE      | PERIOD              | EVIDENCE   |
|-----------|---------------------|--|
| 4000 B.C  |                     |  |
|           | Protoliterate       | Qraya  |
| 3000      |                     |  |
|           | Early Dynastic I-II | City wall  |
| 2500      |                     |  |
|           | Early Dynastic III  | Burials by city wall (Area B)  |
| 2100      |                     |  |
|           | Ur III, early Isin  | Early tablet (unstratified in Area E)                                |
| 1800      |                     |  |
|           | Amorite             | Building with tablets dated to Shamshi-Adad and Kibri-Dagan (Area F) |
| 1750      |                     |  |
|           |                     | House of Purzurun: Yadikh-Abu, Kashtiliashu (Area C)                 |
|           | Khana               | Temple of Ninkarrak: Kashtiliashu, Shunuhru-Ammu (Area C)            |
|           |                     | Burials (Areas A, C, F)  |
| 1600      |                     |  |
|           | Dark ages           | Burials (Areas A, C, F)?   |
| 1500      |                     |  |
|           | ?                   |  |
| 1000      |                     |  |
|           | Aramaic             | Aleppo stela (unstratified; southern edge of tell ?)                 |
|           |                     | Burials (Area E, soundings)  |
| 700       |                     |  |
|           | —                   | Abandonment  |
| A.D. 1200 |                     |  |
|           |                     | Private houses (Areas E, C and F)                                    |
|           | Ayyubid             | Pottery kilns (southern edge of tell)                                |
|           |                     | Unstratified finds (scattered)                                       |
| 1300      |                     |  |

## 10. Publications of the Joint Expedition to Terqa

### Modular Preliminary Reports

- TPR 1:** G. BUCCELLATI and M. KELLY-BUCCELLATI  
*General Introduction and the Stratigraphic Record of the First Two Seasons,*  
Syro-Mesopotamian Studies 1/3 (1977).
- TPR 2:** G. BUCCELLATI  
*A Cuneiform Tablet from the Second Season,* Syro-Mesopotamian Studies 1/4 (1977).
- TPR 3:** M. KELLY-BUCCELLATI and L. MOUNT-WILLIAMS  
*Object Typology of the Second Season (Excluding Vessels and Lithics),*  
Syro-Mesopotamian Studies 1/5 (1977).
- TPR 4:** M. KELLY-BUCCELLATI and W.R. SHELBY  
*Ceramic Vessel Typology of the First and Second Seasons,* Syro-Mesopotamian Studies 1/6 (1977).
- TPR 5:** A. MAHMOUD  
*Die Industrie der islamischen Keramik aus der zweiten Season,*  
Syro-Mesopotamian Studies 2/5 (1978).
- TPR 6:** G. BUCCELLATI and M. KELLY-BUCCELLATI  
*Chronicle and Stratigraphic Record of the Third Season,*  
Syro-Mesopotamian Studies 2/6 (1978).
- TPR 7:** O. ROUAULT  
*Les Documents épigraphiques de la troisième saison,*  
Syro-Mesopotamian Studies 2/7 (1979).
- TPR 8:** L. MOUNT-WILLIAMS  
*Object Typology of the Third Season: The Third and Second Millennia,*  
Syro-Mesopotamian Studies 3/2 (1980).
- TPR 9:** E. GRIFFIN and W.R. SHELBY  
*Ceramic Vessel Typology of the Third Season.* Forthcoming in Syro-Mesopotamian Studies.

**TPR 10:** G. BUCCELLATI with the collaboration of M. KELLY-BUCCELLATI and J. KNUDSTAD  
*The Fourth Season: Introduction and the Stratigraphic Record,*  
*Bibliotheca Mesopotamica Vol. 10 (1979).*

**TPR 11:** N.M. MAGALOUSIS, *et al.*  
*Sourcing Techniques for Ceramics and Soils, Syro-Mesopotamian Studies 3/4 (1980).*

#### Final Reports

**TFR 1:** O. ROUAULT  
*L'Archive de Puzurum.* Forthcoming in *Bibliotheca Mesopotamica*

#### Audio-Visual

G. BUCCELLATI, M. KELLY-BUCCELLATI, J.S. MEIGHAN  
*By the Meadows of the Euphrates.* 21 minutes, 16 mm motion picture (1977).

G. BUCCELLATI and M. KELLY-BUCCELLATI, Editors; R. CLAYTON, Systems Director  
*The Joint Expedition to Terqa: The Second Season, Fall 1976,* 123 slides, 25 min. cassette (1977).

G. BUCCELLATI, M. KELLY-BUCCELLATI and W.R. SHELBY  
*Terqa 1977,* 125 slides, 25 min. cassette (1979).

G. BUCCELLATI and M. KELLY-BUCCELLATI  
*Terqa 1978,* 123 slides, 25 min. cassette (1980).

G. BUCCELLATI and R. HAUSER  
*Faces of Terqa,* Videotape, forthcoming.

#### Ancillary Reports

G. BUCCELLATI and M. KELLY-BUCCELLATI  
*IIMAS Field Encoding Manual (Non-Digital),*  
*Aids and Research Tools in Ancient Near Eastern Studies*  
*Vol. 2 (1978).*

# **TERQA**

## **An Introduction to the Site**

*by* Giorgio Buccellati

Preprint on the Occasion of the  
Symposium of Der ez-Zor

October 1983

© 1983 by Giorgio Buccellati

## **Acknowledgments**

- 1. Setting the Stage**
- 2. Urban Beginnings (3200-3000 B.C., Qraya)**
- 3. A Strong City (3000-2400 B.C., Areas B and D)**
- 4. Provincial Capital and Religious Center (2400-1750, Area F and the Mari Texts)**
- 5. Capital of the Lower Khabur Basin (1750-1600, Areas C and F)**
- 6. "Dark Ages" and Chronology (1600-1000)**
- 7. Nomadic Gathering Center (1000-700, Area E and Aleppo Stela)**
- 8. A Medieval Craft Village (A.D. 1200, Areas C, E and Soundings)**
- 9. Chronological Outline**
- 10. Publications of the Joint Expedition to Terqa**