§0. Introduction and acknowledgments
The texts edited here belong to a small group of inscribed objects described by its present owner as having been acquired in northern Iraq during the late 1960s. Text 1 is a sales contract from ED IIIa Fara (ancient Šuruppak), some 50 km north-northwest of Uruk, and 340 km west-northwest of the head of the Persian Gulf. Since it can be linked to more than 50 other texts of a similar type and featuring some of the same personages, it is dealt with here in more detail than texts 2 and 3, which represent more commonly attested types of cuneiform documents. Olof Pedersén and Aage Westenholz read draft versions of the article and offered thoughtful comments; further, Professor Pedersén and Frands Herschend were instrumental in photographing the texts. They are all cordially thanked for their assistance.

§1. Text 1: A Fara sales contract
§1.1. The contract records the sale of three different tracts of land. Three other texts are so far known which list more than one transaction (ZA 72, 175 14 [fields], Fs Limet, pp. 149–159 [houses], and Fs Cagni 1107–1109 1 [houses]). Two other examples indicate a further subdivision of a house subsequent to its purchase (MFN 10, 82-83; see Wilcke 1996: 34 w. fn. 76; 35 w. fn. 78, involving the same family as the new owners of the property). The tablet is generally in a good state of preservation. Like other Fara contracts, it has been baked, intentionally or accidentally when the city was razed in antiquity (Martin et al. 2001: 128; Krebernik 1998: 242). On the characteristics of the Fara contracts, see the description by Visicato & Westenholz (2002: 3). Measurements: 90×92×26mm (H×W×T). Weight: 178g.

§1.2. Transliteration & Translation
obverse
i 1 40 uruda ma-na
2 sa₉ aš₅
3 (iku) aš₅-bi
4 60 uruda ma-na
5 niḡ₃-diri
6 20 uruda ma-r₃ na⁻³
ii 1 niḡ₃-ba
2 1 tug₂ aktum₂
3 2 siki ma-na
4 amar-AB.GAL₇
5 lu₂ sa₁₀ gu₇
6 10 še lid₂-ga
7 sa₁₀ aš₅
8 2(iku) aš₅-bi
9 10 rše⁻¹ lid₂⁻¹ ga⁻¹
iii 1 niḡ₃-diri
2 10 še lid₂-ga
3 niḡ₃-ba
4 2 tug₂ aktum₂
5 2 siki ma-na
6 1(ban₂) še ninda
7 60 ninda
8 10 PAP tu₇
9 10 PAP edakuaₐ (GA₂×H₂A₃)
10 1 i₄ sila₃
11 r-lugal⁻¹-mi₂⁻¹[zi²]-du₄⁻¹[ga¹] Lugal-miziduga(?),
the seller.
iv 1 lu₃ sa₁₀ gu₇
2 4 še lid₂-ga
3 sa₁₀ aš₅
4 1 (iku) aš₅-bi
5 3.2 še lid₂-ga
6 niḡ₃-diri
7 2 še lid₂-ga
§1.3. Comments

obv. v 4: lugal-ezem is the most common lugal-name from ED and Sargonic times (Andersson 2012: 235, 325–328). Two or three persons with this name appear in the Fara contracts alone (Martin et al. 2001: 151); and the name is common in the Fara documentation as a whole (Pomponio 1987: 156).

obv. v 5: I take it that the variant writing sa₄₀ gu₇ bears no specific distinction from the phrase lu₂ sa₁₀ gu₇ found in obv. ii 5 and iv 1, and passim in the Fara contracts.

obv. v 6: amar-dNE.DAG appears nowhere else in the Fara contracts. A person bearing the same name, written without the divine determinative, appears in WF 41 rev. i 4’, and with the determinative, written amar-dgibil-dag, in WF 65 rev. ii 4 (read NE by Pomponio & Visicato 1994: 39, but correctly “bí(l)” by Deimel in WF 41). The name appears also in ED IIIb Ur, UET 2 suppl. no. 14 obv. iii 3. Compare also the PN amar-dNE.DAG.DAG in two ED IIIb Zabala texts, BIN 8, 75 and 114. I have treated the meaning of this theonym elsewhere (Andersson 2013).

rev. i 1: il-igi is otherwise unattested and gives little meaning. One might consider reading IGI as a defective writing of il-IGI.LAK 527, found in the Abu Salabikh Names and Professions List (StEb 4, 183 l. 101; 186 l. 201); and the same bala written in the Ebla writing il-GIŠ.ERIM, to be understood as il-damīiq “Il is kind” (see generally Krecher 1987). A reading lim of IGI is only securely attested beginning in the early ED IIIb period; see e.g. the Mari PN ša₁₀-lim (Parrot and Dossin 1967: 40–41, 311, pl. xiv–xv; Boese 1974: 61–70).

rev. i 2: abzu-uzu-zu is totally new to the Sumerian onomasticon. The name presumably contains a hypocoristic trebling of the final syllable of Abzu.

rev. i 3: The name inim-utu-zi is borne by a sagi in Fs Unger 29-30 no. 1 rev. i 3.

rev. i 4: utu-ur-sag is found in several other texts (Martin et al. 2001: 162). In TMH 5, 71, an utu-ur-sag simug appears in the witness list just before lugal-ezem dub-sar, who might be identical with the seller in the present text, obv. v 4. Both texts feature inim-d₃-sud₃-da-zi as bala-official. The identity of either person is uncertain however, as utu-ur-sag and lugal-ezem were quite common names.

rev. i 5: ama-bar₃-si might be identical with ama-bar₃-ge, seller in WF 34 obv. iii 5, which has the same bala-official as the present text; and in the “witness list” WF 35 obv. vi 6 (bala ma₃₄-sud₃). Both these instances feature DARA₄ for bara₂. As does the name bara₂(DARA₄)-lal₃ in the latter text obv. vi 5; and bara₂(DARA₄)-ki-ba, WF 40 obv. iii 3 and 5.
rev. ii 1–2: Martin et al. (2001: 141, 148) point to the different writings of this personal name as (a)-HU/ RI-ti. The interchangeability of the signs HU and RI is well-known; see e.g. Pomponio 1987: 6 s.v. a-HU/RI-ti; Westenholz 1988: 115 (ED IIIb or Early Sargonic persons from Nippur and Marad). The persons from Fara so named appear with a few different professional titles; but until now, never with sipa.

rev. ii 4: The district of E-Šubur appears also in the final clause of Lambert Fs Unger 41–42 no. 4. For this type of remark on locality and its placement in contracts, see generally Visicato 1995: 290.

rev. ii 6: inim-âšâ₂-da-zi now appears as bala-official in seven texts (five listed in Martin et al. 2001: 140; and add Molina and Sanchiz 2007 no. 1).

§1.4. General notes on prices in the individual transactions

§1.4.1. In the first transaction (obv. i 1–ii 5, henceforth T1), the rate of 40 mina plus in all 80 mina as niĝ₂-diri and niĝ₂-ba for a 3 iku field is excessive. Considering only the main price, the sa₁₀ aša₅ of 13,33 mina copper per iku, it exceeds the 2–3 mina normally paid out as main price per iku in Fara contracts (OIP 104, pp. 265–267; Wilcke 1996: 11, 14). Another top combined price paid for a field is Fs Unger 37–38 no. 3, which notes the field as situated in the Emunsub-district. In the latter, a field of 2 iku merits payment of 4 mina as the main price, 4 as niĝ₂-diri and 52 mina plus 120 liters (1/2 lidga) of barley as niĝ₂-ba; in all more than 30 mina copper per iku. T1 with its 40 mina of copper per iku total is thus the most expensive parcel of land paid for in full in copper attested in the Fara contracts as a group.

§1.4.2. The second and third transactions (obv. ii 6–iv 1, obv. iv 2–v 5, henceforth T2 and T3, respectively) both have all price categories calculated in lidga of barley. The different price installments of T2 are all given as ten lidga each. Three Fara contracts state an exchange rate: 2–3 ban₂ of barley to the mina copper per iku, it exceeds the 2–3 mina normally paid out as main price per iku in Fara contracts (OIP 104, pp. 265–267; Wilcke 1996: 11, 14). Another top combined price paid for a field is Fs Unger 37–38 no. 3, which notes the field as situated in the Emunsub-district. In the latter, a field of 2 iku merits payment of 4 mina as the main price, 4 as niĝ₂-diri and 52 mina plus 120 liters (1/2 lidga) of barley as niĝ₂-ba; in all more than 30 mina copper per iku. T1 with its 40 mina of copper per iku total is thus the most expensive parcel of land paid for in full in copper attested in the Fara contracts as a group.

§1.4.3. The high-pitched prices of T2 and T3 rouse the suspicion that the exchange rate recorded in the aforementioned Fara contracts, were perhaps out of the ordinary, subject to some previous agreement between buyer and seller, which would merit the formulation u₄-ba, ‘on this (particular) day’, which is the formula used in the relevant contracts. However, this phrase is so commonly attested in texts of later date that it is hard to see in it a specific, technical term. Interestingly, in two texts stating the exchange rate for barley to copper (2 ban₂ per mina, WF 40; TSS pl. 33-34 “x”), barley does not figure among the principal payment categories of sa₁₀ diri or ba, but instead is part of the ceremonial donation of wool, clothing, and foodstuffs for the benefit of primary and secondary sellers in some contracts. In the third contract mentioning the exchange rate, the size of the house sold is not stated. It is thus not possible to see how the exchange rate of barley would affect the different price categories in that text. Given all this, I believe there are good reasons for using another rate for calculating the equivalencies of barley and copper in T2 and T3, along with all other examples of barley used as means of payment in other Fara contracts. The most obvious solution would be to take one lidga of barley as the equivalent of one mina copper. This might find support in the fact that the units of copper are always given in integers, while barley with one exception, is given in whole- and half-lidga’s. The one contract, besides T3, that deviates from this practice (FTP 97) has 1 lidga 3 ban₂ (1 1/8 lidga or 0.9 gur) of barley for an odd-sized field measuring 2.3 iku.

§1.4.4. Some tables might be illustrative of the benefit of reckoning with another equivalency than that given in the three aforementioned Fara contracts. Fig. 1 illustrates the consequences of calculating the total price given a 2-3 ban₂ barley to the mina copper equivalent. The comparison is based on an average taken from eight Fara contracts in which all price installments are given in mina copper (excepting T1 here) compared to the sums of T2 and T3. It is of course to be noted that the combined price (sa₁₀, diri and ba) in Figure 1 was subject to far greater variation than was the case with sa₁₀-price, which, as was mentioned above, was regularly set at 2-3 mina copper per iku. Figure 2 shows the combined price of Fara field contracts calculated against a rate of 1 lidga barley to the mina copper. Fig. 3 illustrates attested sa₁₀-prices per iku for the Fara field contracts preserving a figure for this installment, and with the equivalency of T2 and T3 given as 1 lidga of barley to the mina copper.

§1.4.5. It is clear from figures 2 and 3, that even when
using a 1 lidga per mina copper equivalency, the going rate of the field in T1 is still comparatively generous. The fields from T2 and T3, however, conform better with the other prices paid for Fara fields, both for the main price and for the total price paid per iku. Such variations in land prices are not totally unexpected. Factors like existing outbuildings, threshing floors or wells might have influenced the price somewhat. As an example of this, in Neo- and Late Babylonian Borsippa, the spread of prices in sales of garden plots was equally eye-catching, and factors like water access and number of date palm trees included in the sale would have had a potential impact on sales prices (Jursa 2010: 457-462). It is at any rate not totally certain that the lidga formed the basis for calculating an exchange rate between barley and copper, but it seems quite clear that the 2-3 ban₂ given by other Fara contracts can not be used to this end. A fuller investigation of the Fara contracts, taking into account also the house sales and transactions in which silver formed part of the payments, needs to be carried out.

§1.5. Overview of Fara Contracts with Notes on Publication and Treatment

§1.5.1. There appears to have been several waves of Fara contracts surfacing through the marketplace, the oldest recorded purchase took place in 1897 (FTP 97). One text published by Deimel was bought by the German expedition on location in Fara in 1902/03 (WF 33). Four contracts were purchased by the Louvre in a lot of seven Fara texts before 1903 when Thureau-Dangin published them (RTC 12-15; see Falkenstein 1936: 19). The text published by Gomi (1983) was acquired before 1956; its present whereabouts are unknown. The two documents published by Molina and Sanchiz (2007) were acquired some time in the 1950s. Maurice Lambert noted in his publication of four Fara contracts that they had entered into their present collections “depuis plusieurs années” (1971: 27), which at least indicates a date of acquisition prior to the mid-1960s. The De Marcellis tablet published by Viscidaco & Westenholz (2000: no. 1) was bought in Jerusalem in the late 1960s; and the contract published a few years later by the selfsame scholars (2002) was part of the inventory of an antiquities dealer who must have acquired the text in fairly recent times. The steady flow and physical state of contract tablets from Fara indicate that wind and weather regularly expose them for passers-by to find; and that this may have been the case also in ancient times, as some are known to have been found at other sites in the area (Visidaco & Westenholz 2000: 1123). With the present text, the total of known Fara contracts amounts to 53.

§1.5.2. A useful overview of the previously known ED IIIa texts was compiled by Krebernik (1998: 337-377). The following table and comments attempt to gather information on the form of publication of the Fara contracts with additional notes on systematic treatments of the same.

![Figure 1: Average total price per iku of eight Fara contracts compared to T2 and T3 using 2-3 ban₂ barley as the equivalent of 1 mina copper.](image1)

![Figure 2: Total price per iku using 1 lidga barley as the equivalent of 1 mina copper.](image2)
Fig. 3: Main price ($a_{10}$) per iku using 1 lidga barley as the equivalent of 1 mina copper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Museum number</th>
<th>Sale object(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 PBS 9, 3</td>
<td>CBS 6164</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 WF 30</td>
<td>VAT 12608</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 WF 31</td>
<td>VAT 12588</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 WF 32</td>
<td>VAT 12557</td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 WF 33</td>
<td>VAT 9122</td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 WF 34</td>
<td>VAT 12437</td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 WF 35</td>
<td>VAT 12443</td>
<td>gift: house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 WF 36</td>
<td>VAT 12523</td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 WF 37</td>
<td>VAT 12746</td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 WF 38</td>
<td>VAT 12605</td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 WF 39</td>
<td>VAT 12607</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 WF 40</td>
<td>VAT 12589</td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 SRU 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 UTB 10, W 17258</td>
<td></td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 WO 8, 180</td>
<td></td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Orient 19, 1–6</td>
<td></td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 ZA 72, 14</td>
<td>W 18581</td>
<td>[fields]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 MVN 10, 82</td>
<td>JMS A 74</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 MVN 10, 83</td>
<td>JMS A 75</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 MVN 10, 84</td>
<td>JMS A 76</td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 MVN 10, 85</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 MVN 10, 86</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 TSS 66</td>
<td></td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 TSS pl. 33-34 “x”</td>
<td>Š 1005</td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Fi Unger 29–30 no. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Fi Unger 33–34 no. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Fi Unger 37–38 no. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Fi Unger 41–42 no. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 PBS 13, 24</td>
<td>CBS 14123</td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 RA 32, 126 1</td>
<td>Charleston Museum</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§1.5.3. Notes to Figure 4


3 Treated by Edzard 1968: 55; OIP 104, 101.

4 Treated by Edzard 1968: 36–38; OIP 104, 114.


9 Treated by Edzard 1968: 28–29; OIP 104, 118.


15 Treated by Farber and Farber 1975–76; OIP 104, 136. The text was available to the editors only in the form of a cast with a few small gaps.

16 Treated by Gomi 1983. The text was available to the editor only in the form of a set of casts with only a few illegible signs.

17 Treated by Visicato & Westenholz 2000: 1111–1113.

18 = OIP 104, 113a. Referred to in Grégoire 1981, catalogue p. 33 and pl. 23, as M.d.S. 74.

19 = OIP 104, 113b. Referred to in Grégoire 1981, catalogue p. 34 and pl. 24, as M.d.S. 75.

20 = OIP 104, 127a. Referred to in Grégoire 1981, catalogue p. 34 and pl. 25, as M.d.S. 76.

21 = OIP 104, 112, 113c. Referred to in Grégoire 1981, catalogue p. 35, as “Tablette 'Lagrange'”.

Fig. 4: Published ED IIIa sales contracts.
§2. Text 2: A Gudea cone

§2.1. The inscription contains a standard inscription of Gudea, referring to the building of the E2-PA of Ningirsu. It duplicates without variants the edition of Edzard (RIME 3/1.1.7.48). For a list of other exemplars of the same inscription, inscribed on different media, see Steible 1991: 301; and Edzard 1997: 144. Length: 148mm. Weight: 242g.

§2.2. Transliteration & Translation

1. d₄nin-ĝir₂-su (For) Ningirsu,
2. ur-saĝ kal-ga mighty hero
3. d₃en-lil₁,la₂ of Enlil,
4. lugal-a-ni his lord,
5. gu₁,de₂-a did Gudea,
6. ensi₂ governor
7. lag₃₃ of Lagash—
8. ka₁, e₁-ninnu be who the Eninnu-temple
9. d₄nin-ĝir₂-su-ka of Ningirsu,
10. in-du₃-a built—
11. e₂-PA e₂ ub imin-a-ni the E-PA, his seven-sided house,
12. mu-na-du₃ build for him.

§3. Text 3: An Ur III document recording a delivery of fat

§3.1. The text is inscribed on a tablet which has been split down the middle at some point in its modern his-
tory, and then glued back together again. Since the oils scribe Bibi is securely attested in the texts edited by D. I. Owen in *Nisaba* 15 (cp. particularly the texts *Nisaba* 15, 476 & 578), we can safely assign this text to Irisagrig and must therefore assume the text is a recent removal from Iraq. Date: Šu-Suen 8; Measurements: 48×40×15mm (H×W×T). Weight: 46g.

§3.2. Transliteration & Translation

**obverse**

1 2.3 9 1/3 sila₃ i₃-ša₂
2 barig 3 ban₂ 9 1/3 sila₃ of lard,

2 la₂-ia₃ su-ga ki šu-dutu
ugula geme₂ ĝeš-i₃
sur-sur-ra-ta
from the restored deficit of Šu-Utu, foreman of the female sesame oil pressers;

3 bi₂-bi₂ dub-sar i₃
Bibi, the scribe of oils,

**reverse**

1 šu ba-ti
received (it);

2 mu dšu-dsuen lugal uri₅
ma-ke₂ ma₂-gur₃-maḥ
en-lil₂ ni₃-nin-lil₂-ra
mu-ne-dim₂
year: “Šu-Suen, king of Ur,
fashioned the august
processional barge for
Enlil and Ninlil.”

§3.3. Comments

obv. 3: To my knowledge, there are but few instances of a scribe associated exclusively with fat or oil, and outside of Irisagrig only the Girsu di-tila ITT 5, 6844 obv. 13. In other Girsu documents, a dub-sar i₃ zu₂-lum ‘scribe of oils and dates’ appears, e.g., *MVN* 2, 287 obv. 12. In Irisagrig, aside from seven references (including this one) to Bibi, one text dated to Amar-Suen 7 (*Nisaba* 15, 72) mentions an Ur-Dumuzi dub-sar i₃-ĝeš.
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