Additional Early Dynastic Tablets Possibly from Mari
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Notwithstanding the fact that Mari (Tell Hariri) flourished throughout the Early Dynastic period, the number of Mari’s administrative documents is extremely meagre. This is surprising because more than fifteen thousand tablets and fragments from the Early Dynastic period have been unearthed at Ebla (Tell Mardikh), which shared a close political relationship with Mari. To date, we know of only forty-two of Mari’s administrative tablets, made available through the publications of D. Charpin. These tablets may be dated to the reign of King Ip-LUL-Il.

The eight clay tablets (Nos. 1–8) that I publish in this paper will partly compensate for the lack of evidence surrounding the administrative and economic aspects of Early Dynastic Mari. This is because these texts clearly show a close relationship with the Mari documents in three respects. Firstly, identical calendar systems, system of dates, and capacity measurements have been found in both sets of documents. Secondly, the terminology and cuneiform signs for ‘donkeys’ used in the Mari documents are almost identical to those adopted in Nos. 3 and 4 presented here. Thirdly, both No. 3 and one of the Mari documents chronicle the existence of a workers’ group with highly similar composition. Thus, it is highly probable that people of both groups worked for the same public institution.
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The eight clay tablets published in this paper are the property of the Idemitsu Museum of Arts and are kept in custody of the Museum of the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan (Mitaka City in Tokyo). I extend my gratitude to the Museum of the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan for permitting me to publish these tablets, which are reportedly from northern Syria. In this paper, I will refer to all the texts using Nos. 1 to 8.

Subsequent sections discuss the fact that these documents are approximately contemporary with the Early Dynastic (ED hereafter) documents unearthed in Tell Hariri (ancient Mari), Tell Beydar (ancient Nabada), and Tell
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Above all, these documents appear to be related to the documents of ED Mari. Therefore, in the following study, I will analyze these texts in the light of the tablets of Mari, Nabada, and Ebla. I will refer to the corpus published by Charpin as ‘Mari documents’, with those tablets as ‘Charpin 1–41’, and the corpus of the Tell Beydar documents published by Sallaberger as ‘Nabada documents’, with those tablets as ‘Sallaberger 1–216’. When necessary, I will also describe the general corpus of the Ebla texts as ‘Ebla documents’.

I. Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Text Description</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Account of barley</td>
<td>5.1cm × 4.9cm × 2.5cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**i 1)** 3 la₂, 0.4.0 ’še1 a-gar₃ 15,600 liters (of) barley
2) egir (which is) the later (expenditure)
3) aš₂-ti from

**ii URI. šE + KIN**

Rs. iti i-ri₂-sa₂ 20 la₂ 2 mu
The 6th month
(of) the 18th year.

Commentary on the text

With regard to the quantity of barley mentioned towards at the beginning of this text, I infer that barley was sown because the month i-ri₂-sa₂ was the month of sowing.²

i 1: The capacity measurement a-gar₃ is used in ED Mari. Although the a-gar₃ continued to be used in Mari during the second millennium BC, it is unclear whether or not the quantity represented by the a-gar₃ system remained unchanged in the third and second millennia BC.

Sallaberger mentioned that the capacity measurement of a-gar₃, though its name differs, has the same measurement structure as mi’at, which is used in the Nabada documents. According to Sallaberger, the capacity of the a-gar₃ units can be identified based on that of mi’at. Sallaberger showed as a-gar₃ follows:

1(ban₂) = 10 sila₃, 1(barig) = 6(ban₂), 1 gur = 10(barig), 1 a-gar₃ = 10gur.³

i 2: For the interpretation of egir, see CAD under arkû 7’, ‘said of deliveries: ŠE wa-ar-ki-um “later (delivered) barley” HSS 10 69: 5 and 68 r. 1’.

ii: To the upper left of the second sign, some oblique lines are visible. Since these lines appear to be a part of the sign ŠE, this sign could be understood to be ŠE + KIN Although the personal name URI. ŠE + KIN often occurs in the
Nabada documents, it is not observed in the Mari text.  

**No. 2 — Account of silver**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i 1)</td>
<td>14 ku3-babbar ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>6.0 cm × 6.2 cm × 2.5 cm</td>
<td>7 kilograms (of) silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>'X1:N1</td>
<td>(to/from) X.NI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>3 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>1.5 kilograms (of silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>lu2 'X2:kir</td>
<td>(to/from) a subordinate (of) X-kir.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>5 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>2.5 kilograms (of silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>'TUM3:BU</td>
<td>(to/from) TUM.BU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii 1)</td>
<td>ŠES</td>
<td>(whose occupation is) ŠES.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>1 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>0.5 kilograms (of silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>BU.TUM</td>
<td>(to/from) BU.TUM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>5 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>2.5 kilograms (of silver).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>gi-gi</td>
<td>(to/from) Gi-gi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>5 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>2.5 kilograms (of silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>URI.KIN</td>
<td>(to/from) URI.KIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>4 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>2.0 kilograms (of silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii 1)</td>
<td>ME-nu-nu</td>
<td>(to/from) ME-Nu-nu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>3 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>1.5 kilograms (of silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>i3-lili2</td>
<td>(to/from) I3-lili2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>5 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>2.5 kilograms (of silver).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>5 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>3.0 kilograms (of silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. i 1)</td>
<td>A. HU. MU. 'X3:NE</td>
<td>(to/from) A.HU.MU.X.NE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>1 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>0.5 kilograms (of silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>aš-bu3</td>
<td>(to/from) Aš-bu3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>5 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>2.5 kilograms (of silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>ir3 'X4-il</td>
<td>(to/from) Ir3-X-il.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii 1)</td>
<td>1 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>0.5 kilograms (of silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>lu2 ku3-bir3</td>
<td>(to/from) a subordinate (of) Ku3-bir3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>1 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>0.5 kilograms (of silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>lu2 za3-gi-lum3</td>
<td>(to/from) a subordinate (of) Za-gi-lum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>1 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>0.5 kilograms (of silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>ME-3:da-gan</td>
<td>(to/from) ME-Da-gan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>2 ma-na (NA:MA)</td>
<td>1.0 kilograms (of silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>i-ti-lum</td>
<td>(to/from) I-ti-lum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii 1)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commentary on the text

Unlike other texts (Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8), the terms indicating month name and year are not written in this text.

This text contains mentions of a quantity of silver and names of persons. The question of whether or not sixteen persons, other than the supervisor zi-NI, either received or paid silver cannot be answered.

i 1 and passim: The order of signs for ma-na (weight measurement) is always reversed in this text.5

iii 1: ME-Nu-nu is a personal name associated with the Semitic deity (d)Nu-nu. This deity appears solely in personal names in the ED, Old Akkadian and Old Babylonian periods in northern Mesopotamia and Syria, and also in An = Anum (the list of gods) where the deity is described as maškim-edin-na, ‘policeman of steppe’, and one of the demons.6 As for the first element in the name, i.e. ME, there are some theophoric names beginning with this element in texts from both northern and southern Mesopotamia. For example, in the Old Akkadian period in northern Mesopotamia, the names ME-6EN.ZU, ME-Iš-ha-ra, etc., are observed.7

Rs. i 5: Two possible instances of names containing both IR3 and IL are found in the Ebla documents. One such reference is to Ir3-a3-II who is an official from Mari, although the sign between IR3 and IL is not legible as it has worn away.8 The other instance pertains to Ir3-az-II who is ‘a tax collector’ (from) Mari.9

The second sign in this line, however, comprises a short horizontal line crossing a vertical line in the left side such that the sign cannot be identified as either A or AZ. Consequently, I am unable to determine how the second sign in this line should be transliterated.

Rs. ii 6: The personal name ME-Da-gan is attested to in Charpin 4, appearing as a supplier of grain.10

No. 3 — Distribution of barley ration and fodder for donkeys

7.6cm × 7.7cm × 2.7cm

1) 1[+] x še gur 600+x litres (of) barley
2) da-ti Da-ti (received).
3) 1 še3 gur 600 litres (of) barley
4) bi2-bi2 Bi2-bi2 (received),
5) iš for
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6) kaskal (his travelling (expenses)).
7) 0,6.0 'še' 360 litres (of) barley
8) dag-ne Dag-ne (received).

ii 1) 0,2.0 'e 120 litres (of) barley
2) nagar the carpenter
3) alₐₐ-ₐₐ (and) Alₐₐ-ₐₐ
4) zi-ra (and) Zi-ra
5) Xₐₐ, ŞAR₢ₐ₋ₐₐ.TUM (and) X. ŞAR₢ₐ₋ₐₐ.TUM
6) buₐₐ-za-za (and) Buₐₐ-za-za
7) 'iₐₐ-ku-a-ha (and) I-ku-a-ha
8) iₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐ}_{129}
Commentary on the text

i 4-6: Bi₂-bi₂ received barley for travelling expenses.¹¹ Apparently, his caravan travelled with donkeys, as it is mentioned in No. 4 (ii 3) that Bi₂-bi₂ received fodder for donkeys. Thus, Bi₂-bi₂, who also appears in Charpin 38 (ii 1) and 39 (ii 2) as a recipient of donkey fodder, could be the donkey driver mentioned in this text and in No. 4.¹²

ii 1-iii 1: A hundred and twenty litres of barley were disbursed to a group of nine people. Almost all members of this group appear in another group mentioned in Charpin 22.¹³ The latter group was composed of eleven people. They received GIŠGAL.TITAB-malt (a kind of malt) together.

The first persons in both of the documents are mentioned by their professional names. The carpenter (nagar) in No. 3 and the gardener (nu-kiri₆) in Charpin 22 are probably the supervisors of each group.

Six (underlined) among the nine personal names in No. 3 coincide with the names (underlined) of the Charpin 22’s group, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 3</th>
<th>Charpin 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii 2) nagar</td>
<td>i 6) nu-kiri₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) al₉-ma</td>
<td>ii 1) i₉-lum-a-bir₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) zi-ra</td>
<td>2) a-ku-il</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) X₇ŠAR₇.TUM</td>
<td>3) i-ku-a-ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) bu₇-zaz-a</td>
<td>4) i-dur₇-sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) i-ku-a-ha</td>
<td>5) bu₇-zaz-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) i₉-lum-a-bir₅</td>
<td>6) la-i-mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) a-ku-il</td>
<td>7) la-li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii 1) la-li</td>
<td>iii 1) zi-ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) me-šar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) lu-lu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although La-i-mu and Lu-lu found in Charpin 22 (ii 6 and iii 3) do not occur in No. 3, they do appear in No. 4 (La-i-mu Rs. i 6) and No. 5 (Lu-lu iii 2) separately.

ii 5: The last sign looks like TUM. It is expected to be the sign BAD instead of TUM, because the personal name ₇Inana-šar₇(SUM)-bat(be), meaning ‘the goddess Inana of the Euphrates poplar’, is known.¹⁴

iii 5; 8; iv 2; 6: This text and No. 4 (i 2; 6; ii 6; Rs. i 1) below did not indicate the number of donkeys that were provided fodder. Therefore, the amount of fodder provided to each donkey is unknown. In Nabada, each donkey was given five litres of barley,¹⁵ however, we are unable to know whether the donkeys mentioned in the Nabada documents were female or not. In Mari, each
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female donkey was given three litres.16

iii 3: The first sign is not clear because it is worn away. If it is BA, then it is
the same personal name of Ba-ba found in Charpin 3.17

iv 3: Ad-da appears with Bi2-bi2 in Charpin 38 and 39, which are similar to
this text.18 Since Ad-da always appears as a recipient of fodder for donkey(s) in
the Mari documents except in one case, it is quite possible that he was a donkey
driver.19

Rs. i 3: A trace of erasure is noticeable in the upper left half of the sign EN.
This line is understood to be a personal name: BALA-En-ki. A few
personal names containing the element BALA are evident in the Ebla documents
and in the documents of the Old Akkadian period. Since BALA is exclusively
associated with Enki/Ea and Ilum in the personal names mentioned in the third-
millennium texts of northern Mesopotamia and Syria, with one exception in
Syria,20 I agree with Fronzaroli’s view that BALA implies ‘lord’.21 I infer that
there was a religious tradition headed by the god Enki in contrast to that of the
god Enlil.22 Actually, Enki was frequently offered clothes, flour, bread, and
sacrifices in ED Mari and Ebla, but Enlil was not.23

Rs. i 4: Although never mentioned in the ED documents, the god Mešar is
enlisted in the Old Babylonian votive list of Mari.24

Theophoric names such as ME-Da-gan, beginning with the sign ME, are
usually found in Mesopotamia. For example, Me-En-lil2, Me-NE, Me-Nin-
kur, Me-(d)Nin-PA, Me-(d)Tu, and Me-Utu are attested to in Fara.25 These names
are all Sumerian. Therefore, ME could be interpreted to mean ‘divine power’.
According to Pomponio, isib, meaning ‘purify-priest’, is also a probable
reading.26 Hence, with respect to the Akkadian names, the meaning of ME
remains undecided.27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 4 — Distribution of barley ration and fodder for donkeys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i 1) 0,0.1 5 qa še 15 litres (of) barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) ANŠE.MUNUS (as fodder for) female donkey(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) pa₂-bu₂₃ Pa₂-bu₂₃ (received)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) 24 u₄ (at) the 24th day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) 0,0.1 ’še’ 10 litres (of) barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) ANŠE.MUNUS ’X,’ (as fodder for) female donkey(s) (of) X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii 1) 24 u₄ (at) the 24th day,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 9 qa še (and) 9 litres (of) barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) bi₂ - bi₂ (received)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) iti SAR (at) the beginning day (of) the month.
5) 6 qa šē 6 litres (of) barley
6) ANŠE.DU (as fodder for) ANŠE.DU
7) iti SAR (at) the beginning day (of) the month,
8) 4 [+] x qa 'šē' (and) 4+ x litres (of) barley

Rs. i 1) amar- ANŠE.MUNUS (as fodder for) female donkey foal(s)
2) iti SAR (at) the beginning day (of) the month,
3) 0,0.2 šē (and) 20 litres (of) barley (as his ration)
4) ib-BU-tum Ib-BU-tum (received).
5) 0,4.0 šē 240 litres (of) barley (as his ration)
6) la-i-mu La-i-mu (received).
ii iti 'MA × GAN₂tenû'-sag The 11th month
7 mu (of) the 7th year.
1 še a-gar₂ 1,2.0 la₂ 0,0.1 6710 litres (of) barley.

Commentary on the text

i 6: The lower sign(s) remain(s) unclear. It could be hypothesized that this refers either to an adjective of ANŠE.MUNUS or to a personal name for an owner.

ii 2-3: Bi₂-bi₂, received nine litres of barley as his ration. For Bi₂-bi₂, see the commentary of No. 3 i 4-6 and note 10.

ii 4; 7, Rs. i 2: Charpin interpreted iti-SAR as 'the beginning of a month'.

ii 6: No term indicating gender (NITA₂ or MUNUS) is given to ANŠE.DU, while other terms for donkeys contain an element indicating the gender of the animals. The meaning of ANŠE.DU remains unclear.

ii 8: The number describing the amount of barley looks like five.

Rs. i 6: The personal name found in Charpin 22 is the same as that belonging to a member of the group mentioned in No. 3. La-i-mu is probably an additional member who joined the group mentioned in Charpin 22.

No. 5 — Account of a kind of donkey’s skin

7.0cm × 7.6cm × 2.4cm

i 1) ¹UD- a-ba₂ ¹UD- a-ba₂
2) ba-zi (and) Ba-zi (received)
3) 'ŠE'.ANŠE kuš aš-ti skin (of) donkey(s)’ (delivered) from (following twelve persons),
4) X₈ MAŠ -il X.MAŠ-ll
5) ip-LUL-il (and) Ip-LUL-ll
Additional Early Dynastic Tablets Possibly from Mari

ii 1) a-ha-ar-ši (and) A-ha-ar-ši
2) lu₂ ME-kisal a subordinate (of) ME-kisal
3) du-ra-az (and) Du-ra-az
4) LA.GA.MA.MAH (and) LA.GA.MA.MAH
5) i-bur-rum₂ (and) I-bur-rum₂
6) ME.NU-²da-²gan (and) ME.NU-²Da-gan

iii 1) ba-KA (and) Ba-KA
2) lu-lu (and) Lu-lu
3) GA₂[ ] (and) GA₂...
4) i-ku₁₅-lum (and) I-ku₁₅-lum,
5) a-gi-a (and) A-gi-a
6) lu₂ ba-LI-lum a subordinate (of) Ba-LI-lum.
7) [blank]

iv [blank]

Rs. [uninscribed]

Commentary on the text

I have concluded that the scribe of this text might have belonged to a group that was different from the group to which the scribes of Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 belonged. This inference is drawn on account of the following two reasons. Firstly, there is no description of date in this text. Secondly, the sign AN‰ used in this text differs from the signs used in Nos. 3 and 4. This point is discussed below.

i 1: The personal name ⁴UD-ₐ-bₐ₄ belonged to one who was a recipient of clothes, as mentioned in an Ebla document. He is revealed as a merchant from Mari.²⁰ Moreover, in Sallaberger 5, a certain UD-ₐ-bₐ₄ comes across as a recipient of barley, but without the dingir determinative for the god UD.²¹

i 3: The sign in question lacks the two oblique lines that are usually written to the upper right and the two horizontal lines in the lower left side of AN‰. This variant form is also found in the Abû Ṣalâbîkhh and the Ebla documents.²² Two different names of she-goats (ud₃ and ŠE-ud₃) were used in the Nabada documents. In regard to oxen: gu₄ and ŠE-gu₄ were also used.²³ The terms niga(ŠE)-ud₃ and niga(ŠE)-gu₄ represent animals that are fattened by barley fodder. I have also interpreted the term ŠE.ANŠE in this text as conveying 'donkeys given barley fodder', because barley was used as fodder for the donkeys drafting carts in the Ur III period.²⁴

ii 2: The same personal name appeared among the recipients of copper in Charpin 13.²⁵
ii 3: Du-ra-az is possibly a variant of a personal name Du-ra-PIRIG which is found in an Ebla document.36

ii 6: The dingir determinative preceding the sign GAN is unnecessary. It can be attributed to the scribe’s error.

iii 2: The same personal name is attested to in Charpin 22. This person is a member of the group under consideration.37

iii 4: I-ku-lum might be a variant of I-hu-lum, a personal name that appears in Charpin 28 to be a recipient of GIŠGAL × TITAB-malt and semolina.38

No. 6 —Account of barley 4.6cm × 4.4cm × 1.9cm
i 1) 0,4,0 še 240 litres of barley
2) aš-ši from
3) da-ga-ga Da-ga-ga
4) šu ba-ti received.
5) 1,0,0 la₃ 0,0,4 še gur 560 litres of barley

ii 1) in in
2) du₆ ‘the Mound’
3) kir'-ba'-num₂ (from) Kir-ba-num₂, (received).
4) 0,2,0 še 120 litres of barley
5) aš-ši from
6) la-la La-la

Rs. i 1) šu ba-ti received.
2) 0,1,1 še 70 litres of barley
3) aš-ši from
4) šu [erased]-i a barber
5) šu ba-ti received.
6) [blank]

ii 1) iti i-ku-Za The 2nd month
23 'mu' (of) the 23rd year.

Commentary on the text

The text records that four men brought barley; however, the motive behind their act is unknown. There is no information regarding the recipient(s), which could lead to the conclusion that the recipient(s) was/were the same official(s)/office. Moreover, he/she could be the official(s)/office who authored this text.

i 4, iii 1; 5: The Sumerian accounting term šu ba-ti is used to indicate a receipt of barley. Whereas the general orthography in northern Mesopotamia
used the sign BA₄, the scribe of this text used BA instead of BA₄. The Mari documents also used BA.³⁹

ii 2: This sign is similar to but slightly different from DU₆ which is mentioned in Charpin 27 iii 2. I have found a clue to interpret this sign based on its occurrence in Charpin 27. The section containing du₆ in Charpin 27 is interpreted as the issuing of GIŠGAL × TITAB-malt for the workers belonging to ‘the Mound’ of the god Iškur.⁴⁰ Almost all the places by the name of du₆ are apparently located in a temple or temple complex, as indicated by some names of sacred places which include du₆.⁴¹ The term du₆ iškur in Charpin 27 also most likely refers to ‘the Sacred Mound’ in the temple of the god Iškur. I opine that the term du₆ in No. 6 can be interpreted as referring to du₆ Iškur.

ii 3: In my opinion, aš₂-ti (‘from’) was abbreviated before Kir-ba-num₂. As all the other persons mentioned in this text are recipients, Kir-ba-num₂ must be a recipient too. According to No. 7, Kir-ba-num₂ worked both as a distributor and receiver of barley. Therefore, he was certainly a high-ranking official in charge of the granary. Kir-ba-num₂ might have disbursed barley as necessary expenses pertaining to ‘the Mound’.

The same personal name was recorded as a recipient of barley flour in Charpin 25.⁴²

ii 6: The same personal name of La-la is found in Charpin 41.⁴³

Rs. i 4: The traces of an erased sign can be seen after ŠU.

Rs. ii 1: I-ku-za is probably a variant of Iq-za/I-iq-za, the name of the twelfth month in the Semitic calendar. Iq-za/I-iq-za is found in Ebla, Mari, Gasur, Lagaš and Nippur.⁴⁴

No. 7 —Account of barley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4.3cm × 4.3cm × 2.6cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i 1)</td>
<td>1,0.0 še gur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>600 litres of barley,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>the latter (expenditure).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Kir-ba-num₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii 1)</td>
<td>X₉ 1 še³ a-gar₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>…. 6000 litres of barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Kir-ba-num₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs.</td>
<td>iti ha-li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 mu</td>
<td>The 5th month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(of) the 23th year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary on the text

i 2: The term egir is interpreted as ‘later expenditure’, also found in No.1.⁴⁵
i 4, ii 2: Kir-ba-num2 of i 4 and Kir-ba-num2 of ii 2 undoubtedly refer to the same person, because there is no title for distinction between the first and the second mention.

ii 1: We do not know the purpose of the issuance of a large quantity of barley to Kir-ba-num2. For Kir-ba-num2, see the commentary of No. 6 ii 3 above.

No. 8 —Distribution of barley and bread 4.7cm × 4.8cm × 2.5cm

i 1) 0,0.1 4 qa ninda 14 litres of bread
     0,0.1 5 qa še (and) 15 litres of barley
2) nig2-SA10.A (as expenditure for) a purchase
3) kuš (of) fishes
4) simug (were issued to) the smith
5) 1 ū4 (at) the 1st day.
ii 1) 4 qa ninda 4 litres of bread
2) 3 ū4 (at) the 3rd day
3) simug (were issued to) the smith.
4) 2 qa ninda 2 litres of bread
5) 3 ū4 (at) the 3rd day
6) baharš (were issued to) the potter.
7) [blank]
iii 1) 0,2.0 še 120 litres of barley
2) nig2-SA10.A (as expenditure for) a purchase
3) nagga (of) tin,
4) 0,1.2 ninda-babbar (and) 80 litres of white-bread
5) 0,0.1 5 qa še (and) 15 litres of barley
Rs. i 1) um- maš-EN (were issued to) Um-maš-EN
2) in turš in a stall
3) kuš for consumption.
4) AB-i ...........
5) [blank]
ii iti ha-liš The 5th month
23 mu (of) the 23th year.

Commentary on the text

The archival office mentioned in No. 8 was in all probability a tin mill, as it disbursed bread as wages to a smith and barley for the purchase of tin to a certain Um-maš-EN.
i 1, 2: Although it is mentioned that both bread and barley were disbursed to the smith for purchasing fish, there is no supporting information about the purpose for which the smith purchased fish.

ii 1, 4: It is assumed that the smith and the potter received four litres of bread (ii 1) and two litres of barley (ii 4), respectively, as wages.

iii 2: The sign SA_{10}.A contained in the term for ‘price’ is occasionally used instead of SA_{10} in the Sumerian documents of Isin in the Old Akkadian period and those of Nippur in the Ur III period. The sign A is interpreted as a phonetic indicator.\textsuperscript{46}

iii 4: ninda-babbar, which is the name of a kind of bread, is also found in Charpin 22.\textsuperscript{47}

Rs.ii 1: As far as I know, the term tur_{3} means a ‘stall’ where cattle are kept. However, we cannot rule out the possible interpretation that tur_{3} was used in this context to indicate the smithy.

Rs.ii 4: I cannot provide any comment for AB-i.

II. Relationship with the Mari Documents
All references to the close relationship between Nos. 1–8 and the Mari documents, though mentioned in no particular order in the previous chapter, will be organized in this chapter. Additionally, a comparative study of the Ebla documents and the Nabada documents reveal that a close association clearly exists between Nos. 1–8 and the Mari documents.

1. Language
All of Nos. 1–8 are administrative texts recorded in the Early Dynastic Akkadian language; occasionally, Sumerograms were used. It is particularly noteworthy that the Akkadian prepositions are same as the ones used in the Mari documents.\textsuperscript{48}

Almost all the personal names are written in the Akkadian or another Semitic language.

2. Dating Formula, Calendar
The dating formula is mentioned at the end of Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 in the following order: month (name of month) and year (number + the sign MU).\textsuperscript{49} This convention is also followed in the Mari documents.\textsuperscript{50} On the other hand, in most of the ED Ebla documents, each text is either undated or dated using only the name of the month.\textsuperscript{51} Neither the day nor the year is mentioned in the Nabada documents, while the names of months are recorded in over one hundred
documents. It is assumed that the practice of using a dating formula originates from Mari. Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 must be closely connected to the Mari documents, since the same dating system is adopted in both.

Five month names, *I-ku-za* (the 2nd month, No. 6), *Ha-li* (the 5th month, Nos. 7, 8), *I-ri₂-sa₂* (the 6th month, No. 1), *Za-LUL* (the 9th month, No. 3) and *MA × GAN₂* (the 11th month, No. 4) appear in the documents. All these names are attested to in the Mari and some part of the Ebla documents, which use the Early Semitic calendar that subsequently came to be widely used in Mesopotamia. The order of months were safely reconstructed by G. Pettinato, I. J. Gelb and M. E. Cohen. In this paper, I have followed Gelb’s reconstruction. *I-ku-za* in No. 6 is, however, unusual.

All the month names found in the Nabada texts are completely different from those in Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8. As an indigenous calendar was used in Nabada, it is natural that the month names do not match those of our documents.

3. Terms and Cuneiform Signs for Donkeys

In Nos. 3 and 4, barley was reportedly disbursed for donkeys, mentioned as ANŠE.MUNUS, ANŠE.MUNUS-gal, ANŠE.DU, amar-ANŠE.NITA₂, and amar-ANŠE.MUNUS.

A donkey was designated as (ANŠE.)IGI in Ebla and Nabada, as (ANŠE.)SIG₇ in Fara and Nippur, and as (ANŠE.)DUN.GI in Lagaš and Ur. In other words, the sign(s) IGI/SIG₇/DUN.GI was added to the sign ANŠE in ED Mesopotamia and Syria, though occasionally ANŠE was omitted. In contrast, the scribe of the Mari documents never omitted the sign ANŠE and never added the sign(s) IGI/SIG₇/DUN.GI. Nos. 3 and 4 contain the same orthography as was used in the Mari documents.

Regarding the indicators of gender, in the Mari documents, Nos. 3 and 4 either add the sign NITA₂ ‘male’ or MUNUS ‘female’ with the exception of ANŠE.DU.

Considering the term for ‘female donkey’, the signs MUNUS and ANŠE seem to be combined with the intention of representing them as one sign in the Mari documents, Nos. 3 and 4. Whereas MUNUS is written on the lower left of the sign ANŠE in the Old Akkadian Lagaš (Girsu) and Umma, MUNUS is placed on the upper right of ANŠE in Nos. 3 and 4. The Mari documents present two methods: in the first, MUNUS is placed on the upper right of ANŠE, while in the second, MUNUS appears on the lower right of ANŠE.
ANŠE.BAR × AN (Persian onager) is not mentioned in Nos. 1–8. The term ANŠE.BAR × AN denotes the same kind of Persian onagers as are depicted in the Standard of Ur, pulling the war chariot.\(^{68}\)

The cuneiform sign for donkeys, which was used in Nos. 3 and 4, is the same in its form as its counterpart in the Mari documents.\(^{69}\)

4. Personal Names
Twenty personal names from among fifty-six found in Nos. 1–8 are mentioned also in the Mari documents.\(^{70}\) Furthermore, eight persons: Ad-da, Bi₂-bi₂, Da-gne, I₂-lum-a-bir₅, La-li, (d)Me-šar, Zi-ra, appear on more than two occasions in the Mari documents. For example, Zi-ra appears six times in five texts, and Bi₂-bi₂ occurs in seven texts.\(^{71}\) I suppose that the appearance of many identical personal names in Nos. 1–8 and the Mari documents cannot be merely coincidental. These documents might be contemporary. Additionally, the fact that groups comprising the same men were found in both No. 3 (ii 2-iii 1) and Charpin 22 (i 6-iii 3) constitutes another item of evidence in support of the contemporariness of the document.\(^{72}\)

III. Date
As mentioned above (Chapter II–2), the dating formula used in Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 was the same as that used in the Mari documents. This leads to two conclusions: both groups of documents are contemporary, and all these texts were written during the reign of the same king, Ip-LUL-II. The reasons are as follows. In Sallaberger 23, nearly thirty people were given rations of donkey fodder and barley. Sallaberger concluded that Pa₄-ba₄, the first recipient, was the same person as the wife (nin) of Ip-LUL-II, the king (lugal) of Mari, as evidenced in the votive inscription dedicated by AMAR.AN.\(^{73}\) When Sallaberger 23 was written, both the queen of Mari and the lord of Nagar came to Nabada, which was one of the satellite towns under Nagar. Sallaberger also assumed that Pa₄-ba₄, mentioned in Charpin 4, was the wife of Ip-LUL-II.\(^{74}\) It is therefore not unreasonable to suggest that the Nabada and Mari documents are contemporaneous by judging the appearance of Pa₄-ba₄.

Viewed in this light, the contemporariness of Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 and the Mari documents could also date to the era of Pa₄-ba₄ and Ip-LUL-II.

By comparing the forms of the cuneiform signs in different ED archives, Sallaberger also concluded that the signs used in Nabada highly resembled those in Isin at the time of Ur-zag-e₃ of Uruk (the latter half of ED IIIb).\(^{75}\) He went on to date Ip-LUL-II as living approximately forty years prior to the end of the Ebba
documents. On the other hand, Archi came to the conclusion that Ip-LUL-II died during the reign of either Igiš-Halab of Ebla or his successor Irkab-Damu. When Ebla was destroyed, (in Archi’s opinion, this event was caused by Mari), Isar-Damu, the successor of Irkab-Damu, was the king of Ebla. Archi estimated the time span between Irkab-Damu’s succession to the throne and the fall of Ebla to be forty-two years.

Consequently, there is no substantial difference between the opinions of Archi and Sallaberger regarding the period of rule of Ip-LUL-II. The reign of this king of Mari is dated to the middle of the third millennium BC.

IV. Background of the Documents
Mari’s power extended over the Euphrates during the reign of Ip-LUL-II. The frequent references to Ip-LUL-II and his successors: Ni-zi and Enna-Dagan, in the Ebla documents indicate close political and commercial ties between Mari and Ebla. This is confirmed by the texts, since dozens of merchants and officials from Mari are listed in the Ebla documents. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to assume that $^4$UD-a-ba₄ and A-ha-ar-$šl$, who appear in No. 5, might be the same as $^4$UD-a-ba₄ lu₂-kar ma-ri₂$^k₁$ (merchant from Mari) and A-ha-ar-$še₂$ lu₂-kar ma-ri₂$^k₁$, who appear in the Ebla documents. This point, however, requires further consideration.

In the second millennium BC, tin was exported to Mari from Afghanistan and Iran. The donkey caravans carried not only gold, silver, and copper, but also tin, along the land route. Moreover, in the third millennium BC, a number of registers mention that tin and silver were exchanged in Ebla. For example, TM.75.G.1406 is a register that recorded the trade in silver, gold, bronze, tin, and copper. However, there is not evidence in the ED Mari documents to prove that tin trading occurred. Therefore, No. 8 is considered to be one of the most important sources for research on tin trading in ED Mari.
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Notes


2 More than fifteen thousand ED documents, which were discovered at Tell Mardıkh (ancient Ebla), are being published, mainly in two series, Archivi Reali de Ebla Testi (= ARET), Naple, and Materiali Epigrafici di Ebla (= MEE), Rome. Regarding to the history of Ebla, see, for example, Astour 1992 and 2002, Archi & Biga 2003.

3 See Talon 1992, 190.

4 In Charpin 13, ma-na is not reversed. (i 5).

5 For the god Nunu in detail, see Cavigneaux & Krebernik 2001, 620.

6 ME-\(\text{d}\)-EN.ZU: IMGULA 3/1 92, ME-\(\text{d}\)-ha-ra: Tutub 36 7, IMGULA 3/1 51, Tutub 1 ii 10), ME-\(\text{d}\)Nin-SAR: MAD 5 65, Umm-el-Jir 1932, 347 ii 6.

7 \(\text{Ir}_{1}^{1}\text{-a}^{\text{-i}}\text{-il}: \text{MEE 7 34 Rs. xi 5}\)\(\text{Ir}_{1}^{2}\text{-a}^{\text{-i}}\text{-il 6}\)\(\text{ma}^{\text{-ri}}\text{-li}^{7}\)\(\text{ma}^{\text{-r}^{8}}\text{ga}^{\text{-ra}}\).

8 \(\text{Ir}_{2}^{\text{-az-Il}}\): Archi 1985c, 76. no. 80 TM.75.G.2267 Rs. iii 10)\(\text{Ir}_{1}^{\text{-az-Il}}\) ur\(\text{Ma}^{\text{-ri}}\text{-li}^{8}\).

9 Charpin 4 i 3.

10 Sallaberger translated \(\text{b}^{1}\) kaskal as ‘for expeditions’. See the translation of Sallaberger 99 i 4. He mentioned that it was difficult to understand the expedition correctly. Sallaberger 1996c, 105, fn. 53.

11 No. 4 ii 3, Charpin 38 ii 1, 39 ii 2. A person called \(B_{1}^{2}-b_{1}^{2}\) received \(\text{Gi}^{\text{SGAL}}\times\text{TITAB-malt} in Charpin 23 (i 4) and Charpin 27 (ii 4). On the other hand, another \(B_{2}^{1}-b_{1}^{2}\) received a kind of bread (ninda sikil) in Charpin 23 (i 6). The record mentions him with the title of \(\text{g}^{2}\) apin, which differentiates him from the former \(B_{1}^{2}-b_{1}^{2}\). Therefore, two different men with the name \(B_{2}^{1}-b_{1}^{2}\) might have worked in Mari. In Charpin 28 (iii 6, iv 5), two men called \(B_{1}^{2}-b_{1}^{2}\) are also mentioned. There is a high probability that \(B_{2}^{1}-b_{1}^{2}\) in No. 3 is the same \(B_{1}^{2}-b_{1}^{2}\) without a title, but not the same one with the title \(\text{g}^{2}\) apin.

12 Charpin 22 i 6-iii 3.

13 Charpin 38 ii 2)\(0.0.1.5\) qa \(\text{e}\) 3)BAR.AN\(\text{-AN}\)\(\text{-AN\(\text{-S}\)}\)\(\text{-MUNUS}\) 4)\(\text{ad-da}\) 5)25 \(\text{ua}\). ‘Ad-da (received) 15 litres of barley as fodder for female BAR.AN-donkey(s) (at) the 25th day’. Charpin 39 i
1)0.1.5 <qa> še-gu; 2)11u₄ 3)ANŠE-gal 4)ad-da. ‘Ad-da (received) fifteen (litres) of barley as fodder for big/powerful (male’) donkey(s) (at) the eleventh day’. However, in Charpin 41, Ad-da received apparently GIŠGAL × TITAB-malt or semolina. (ii 1’).


21 Fronzaroli interpreted BALA as ‘lord’ based on the spelling of /ba’l/ at Ebla. For his view, see Tonietti 1998, 95, fn.140. A. Archi interpreted BALA as ‘standard’ which disagreed with Fronzaroli’s opinion. 1₂-lum-bal ‘Le dieu est (mon) étendard’, Archi 1985b, 53.

22 In one shrines and gods list from Fara, Enki and his consort Ninki are placed prior to Enlil and Ninlil. (See SF 23 v 17-20). An Old Babylonian inscription from Mari mentions that the god Enki is lord of the assembly; 4ën-ki be-al puhrim (Lambert 1985, 537).

23 For the instances of offerings to 4Enki in ED Mari, see Charpin 7 i 1-3, 9 iV 1-3. For ED Ebla, see Pomponio & Xella 1997, 164-166.

24 Lambert 1985, 530.


26 Ibid. 169. See under me-₂nin-kur.

27 For examples of Akkadian personal names including ME, see note 7 above.


29 Charpin 22 ii 6)²a-la-i-mu. For the group in question, see the commentary of No. 3 ii 1-iii 1 above.

30 4tUD-a-ba₃ Ga-ga lu₃-kar Ma-ri, Archi 1985c, 76, no.72.

31 Sallaberger 5 i 6.


33 ud₃: Sallaberger 4 Rs. vi 1, ŠE ud₃: Sallaberger 4 Rs. vi 3; vii 2; 6; viii 3; 7; x 2; 8.

34 TCT 1 (= ITT 2/1) 639, 21-34, see also Maekawa 2006, 9.

35 Charpin 13 i 3.


37 Charpin 22 iii 3.

38 Charpin 28 iii 9) 0,0.2 GIŠGAL × TITAB 10) 0,0.1 dabin 11) i-hu-lum.

39 Charpin 34 i 3’) šu ba-ti.

40 Charpin 27 ii 5) 0,1.0 GIŠGAL × TITAB iii 1) ir₁₁₂-ir₁₁₁ 2) du₄ 3) šiškur.

41 See George 1993, 76-78. For example, 174 du₄-bara₁₂-gal-maḥ, cultic location in the temple of Ur known from a hymn to Rim Sin, 179 du₄-kur, the shrine for the Enlil’s ancestors in Ekur, 182 e₂-du₄-kur₃, a shrine of Enki/Ea in e₂-abzu at Eridu (Temple Hymns 4).

42 Charpin 25 ii 4.

43 Charpin 41 ii 4’, as a recipient of flour and GIŠGAL × TITAB-malt.


45 See the commentary of No.1 i 2 above.

46 For a discussion on the function of the sign A as a phonetic indicator and references to SA₁₀ₙ, see Steinkeller 1989, 153.

47 Charpin 22 iii 4.

48 ak-ti ‘with, from’ (Old Akkadian: itšu, ittī, Eblaite: ‘aštū, ‘aššū) No. 1 i 3, No. 6 i 2; Rs. i 3, No. 7 i 3. iš ‘to, towards’ (Akkadian: ana, Eblaite: ‘aš(N)-na) No. 3 i 5. in ‘in’ (Akkadian: ina, Eblaite: in) No. 6 i 1, No. 8 Rs. i 2. As for Akkadian and Eblaite language, see Michalowski 1992, 260. As for iš, see Sallaberger 1996d, 180.

49 No. 1: iš i-ri₂-ga₂ 20 la₂ mu, No. 3: iti za-LUL 20 la₂ 2 mu, No 4: iti MAxGAN₂-tén₃-sag 7 [mu], No. 6: iti i-ka₂-zu₂ 23 ‘mu’, No. 7: iti ha₂-li 23 mu, No. 8 iti ha-li₂ 23 mu.

50 Charpin 5: iti za-LUL 6 mu, 6: iti MA × GAN₂-tén₃-sag 6 mu, 7: iti i₃-nun₃ na 7 mu, 8: iti ik₂-za 8 mu, 9: iti ik₂-za 8 mu, 10: iti i₃-[a] 8 mu, 11: iti [i …] 77 mu. 16: iti ha₂-li 3 mu, 17: iti ik₂-za 8 mu,
Additional Early Dynastic Tablets Possibly from Mari

19: iti i-3-num-na 7 mu, 20: iti i-3-num 4 mu, 21: iti i-3-za 20 mu, 22: iti i-3-a-a-tum 20 mu, Charpin 23: iti i-ri-sa-sa 22 mu, 24: iti i-ba-ra-sa 22 mu, 25: iti i-3-za 26 mu, 27: iti i-st 25 mu, 28: iti i-3-za 26 mu, 31: iti gi-NI 33 mu, 32: iti MA × GAN3-tê-nu-sag 34 mu, 33: iti ha-li 35 mu, 37: iti gi-NI 18 mu, 39: iti i-st 20(+) x mu, 40: [iti gi]-NI [x mu], 41: iti i-ri-sa-sa 20 + x + 2 mu.

51 For example, ARET 7 14 ii 5 iti i-ri-sa-sa, ARET 8, 531 xxvi 7 iti za-LUL, MEE 7, 16 Rs. iii 5 iti i-ri-sa-sa, 20 Rs. 19 ii iti MA × GAN3-tê-nu-gudu, 25 Rs. 14 ii iti i-ba-ra-sa. The combination of the Mari king’s name and year (number + the sign MÛ) very rarely appears as a date formula in the ED Ebla documents. For example, ARET 7, 16 Rs. v 5 (in u4 6) Ni-zî 7 lulugal 8(+) mu, ARET 7, 17 Rs. v 3 (in u4 vi 1) En-na–Da-gan 2 lulugal 3) i mu.

52 Sallaberger 1996b, 85.

53 It is quite possible that the dating formula of No. 2 was lost due to wearing. For No. 5, see the commentary of this text above.

54 For the calendar used in ED Mari, see note 51 above. For Ebla, see, e.g., iti in the indexes of Archi 1988, D’Agostino 1996, Edzard 1981 and Sollberger 1986.


56 Furthermore, an independent local calendar was used in Ebla, too. See Milano 1990, 353-354.


58 Sallaberger, 1996b, 85-87.

59 Maekawa 2006, 1, Table.

60 Ibid. Table and 3-5.

61 Maekawa 2006, 1, Table.

62 See Charpin 24 i 3; ii 3; 6; iii 1, 38 i 4; ii 3; 7; iii 4, 39 i 3; 6.

63 For ANSE.DU, see the commentary of No. 4 ii 6.

64 For example, Guršu: ITT 1 1053, 4, 1431, 1; Rs. 4, and Umma: Foster 1982, 57, passim, 74 3; 5.

65 No. 3 iii 8; iv 2; Rs. i 1, No. 4 i 2; 6; Rs. i 1. There is an exception (No. 3 iii 5).

66 Charpin 24 i 3, 38 i 7.

67 Charpin 24 ii 3; 6; iii 1, 38 i 2; 5; ii 3, 39 i 6.


69 As for the same form of the sign ANSE attested in the Mari documents, cf. Charpin 38 i 5; ii 3; 7; iii 4, 39 i 13; 6. However, the form used in Charpin 24 shows a slight difference at the angle of two horizontal lines in the lower left side of ANSE. See Charpin 24 i 3; ii 3; 6; iii 1.

70 A-ku-Il: No. 3 ii 9, Charpin 22 ii 2, Ad-da: No. 3 iv 3, Charpin 38 ii 4, 39 i 4, 41 ii 1’, Ba-ba: No. 3 iii 3, Charpin 3 i 3’, Bi-bi-bi: No. 3 i 4, 4 ii 3, Charpin 23 i 4, 24 i 7, 27 ii 4, 28 ii 3, 30 i 2, 38 ii 1, 39 ii 2, Bu-su-za-sa: No. 3 i 6, Charpin 22 ii 5, Da-ga-ga: No. 6 i 3, Charpin 25 Rs. i 4, Da-ga-ne: No. 3 i 8, Charpin 25 ii 7, 28 Rs. i 1, 35 i 5, I-kû-â-ha: No. 3 ii 7, Charpin 22 ii 3, I-ku-su-hu-lum: No. 5 ii 4, Charpin 28 iii 11, I-lum-a-bir: No. 3 ii 8, Charpin 22 ii 1, 26 iv 6, KIR-ba-nam: No. 6 ii 3, 7 i 4; ii 2, Charpin 25 ii 4, La-a-ma: No. 4 Rs. i 6, Charpin 22 ii 6, La-la: No. 6 ii 6, Charpin 41 ii 4, La-di: No. 3 i 1, Charpin 22 ii 7, 23 iii 2, 25 ii 2, Lu-hu: No. 5 ii 2, Charpin 22 iii 3, ME–Da-ga-an: No. 2 Rs. ii 6, Charpin 4 i 3, ME-kâšal: No. 5 ii 2, Charpin 13 i 4, ME-ka-ar: No. 3 Rs. i 4, Charpin 22 iii 2, 25 i 4, 26 Rs. ii 7, 27 Rs. i 4, 28 ii 5, URI.KIN: No. 2 ii 7, Charpin 19 ii 3, Zi-ra: No. 3 ii 4, Charpin 22 iii 1, 25, i 2, 28 iii 3, 31 ii 2; iv 2, 40 ii’ 10.

71 See ibid.

72 See note on No. 3 ii 1–ii 1.

73 His opinion was based on two pieces of evidence. First, he adopted the same view as the one propounded by F. Pomponio and M.G. Biga (Pomponio–Biga 1989, 89-90). AMAR.AN, the son of the ruler of Nagar UR–UTU.ŠA, offered a statue to the goddess Inana–ZA.ZA for the long life of Mari’s king Ip-LUL–Il and his wife Pa₃-ha₄ (FAOS 7, MP 12). (As regards AMAR.AN.
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being the ruler of Nagar, see Sallaberger 1998, 35). Second, Nagar had diplomatic relations with Mari when Pa-4-ba4 was Ip-LUL-Il’s wife (Sallaberger 1998, 35). Apparently, Pa-4-ba4 was ranked higher than the ruler (EN) of Nagar, because Pa-4-ba4 is recorded first among the recipients, which include EN (of Nagar), in Sallaberger 23. This fact confirms the dominance of Mari over Nagar; see Sallaberger 1998, 35.

74 Charpin 4 iv 3) ([p-4-ba4] ku pa4-ba4.
76 Sallaberger 1998, 32-34.
77 See Archi & Biga 2003, 1-4.
78 Ibid. 6-7.
80 See Archi 1985b, 53-58.
81 For 4UD-a-ba4, see note 30 above. For A-ha-ar-si, see ARET 8 529 xiv (clothes) 3-4)PN1, 5)a-ha-ar-si 6-7)PN1, 8)lu2-kar 9)ma-ri. 31.
82 See Moorey 1999, 298.
83 TM.75.G.1406. See Pomponio 1998, 129. Other occurrences of tin are as follows: ARET 7, 16 i 2, 42 iii 1, 139 i 1, 141 i 2, ii 1, Rs. iii 2, ARET 8, 528 vi 2, 534 x 7; xiii 1; xx 19; xxii 20; xxiv 13, 537 vi 6; 11, 539 v 17; vi 6, etc..
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