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MLC 1308

JOHNS’s catalogue of cuneiform texts in the collection of J.P. MORGAN includes a diverse group of tablets that had previously belonged to Père SCHIELE. Number 150 of that group is now housed in the Yale Babylonian Collection as MLC 1308. JOHNS described it as an «Anzanite text, four-sided prism»; he mentioned Weissbach’s publication of Neo-Elamite letters catalogued with the Kuyunjik collection in the British Museum (WEISSBACH, 1902), and suggested that the Scheil-Morgan tablet was another such text (JOHNS, 1920, 36, 41-47).

JOHNS’s suggestion is correct in a loose sense. That MLC 1308 is a Neo-Elamite letter or letter-order is strongly indicated by the appearance of two personal names in the first two lines, presumably indicating the addressee and the sender; by the occurrence of a second-person pronoun in line 7; and by the use in line 17 of iddu, «to be issued», a form characteristic of letters in the Persepolis Fortification archive (HALLOCK 1969, p. 51). On the other hand, there is no specific connection with the Elamite «Nineveh» letters (the actual provenience of which is wholly uncertain: REINER, 1969, 63; MIROSCHDII, 1982, 61), and other texts that are generally comparable have been published since JOHNS made his comments: the Achaemenid Elamite letters from the Persepolis Treasury and Fortification, the Neo-Elamite letters in MDP 36, 79-82, Nos. 1 and 3 (PAPER, 1954a), JA 1977, 221-225, A and B (LAMBERT, 1977) (all from Susa), and Iran 18, 80, BM 62783 (WALKER, 1980) (registered as coming from Sippar). Although these texts are no more helpful than the «Nineveh» letters in establishing the provenience of MLC 1308, they do supply an enlarged field of reference and comparison. The cheerful frustration of JOHNS’s further remark on the tablet applies as well now as when he wrote it: «as yet it can hardly be said to be translatable, but every new text advances knowledge and eliminates errors» (JOHNS, 1920, 41).

Transliteration

(Note the following departures from the usual conventions of transliteration from cuneiform: v. = DIŠ (Personenkeil); m. = BE.)

* We thank Professor William W. Hallo, Curator of the Yale Babylonian Collection, for his permission and encouragement to publish these tablets. We are indebted also to Professor Gary Beckman and Dr. Ulla Kasten for their generous aid in preparing this edition.

Fragmenta Historiae Elamicae
Obverse
1. v.J-ki-iš-x-[(x) na-an tu₂-ru₂-]š
2. v.Hu-u₂-ra(?)-x [ ... na-a]n Ki+MIN
3. ṭi₂-ku-ri x [ ... ] x
4. x x mar 'te(?i) x² [ ... ]
Lower edge
5. -um(?) ŠE.GIŠ.1,MEŠ ti-ib-be
6. pi₂-ti ma₄n ta₃k 1 ra₂p₂₂-tam₂₂(PIR₂)
7. m.DINGIR.GAL-a₂₂-ah-pi nu
Reverse
8. in du₂-nu₂-iš u₄(?i) da
9. pi₂-ti na-an ši-ni ma₄n(?) x
10. 2 (GUR) ŠE.BAR.MEŠ m.DINGIR.GAL-
11. a₂₂-ah-pi-na id-du
Upper Edge
12. zap₂₂-pa(?)-pi KU₂(?) BABBAR.MEŠ-na [x]
13. UDU.NITA₃,MEŠ im(?)-ba₂₂-x-x²
14. (-)ša₃(?) ti₂₂-ib-be pi₂₂-[ti(?)-i(x)]
Left Edge
15. mu-taš
Comments

The tablet was originally unbaked, medium gray, 6.8 x 2.1 x 2.0 cm. There is no clear separation in the text to mark off the beginning of the obverse.

1-2. Letters in the Persepolis Treasury and Fortification archives normally use the Personennkühl (v.t) to mark the names of both the addressee and the sender, but the determinative m. (= BE) to mark names and titles in the body of the texts. The same is true of the Neo-Elamite letters JA 1977, 222f., A and B, and MDP 36, 81, No. 3 (according to Paper’s transliteration; the photograph on pl. xxiv is illegible). The «Nineveh» letters (WEISSBACH, 1902) mark the addressees’ names with v., but use no determinative to mark the senders’ names; MDP 36, 79, No. 1 apparently follows the same conventions, using f. ( = SAL) to mark the addressee, but no determinative with the sender’s name. These late also letters show much variation in the phrasing of the introductory formulas. The fact that the two letters in LAMBERT (1977) use different introductory formulas, although they are apparently addressed to the same person, indicates that chronological distinctions among the texts cannot be securely based on these formulas alone.

The restorations proposed for the ends of lines 1-2 follow the pattern of the Persepolis letters, since the traces at the ends of the lines are more amenable to this construction than to the restoration of a formula derived from other Neo-Elamite letters.

The addressee’s name may be a compound with ike-, «brother», or a hypocoristic derived from such a compound. We are unaware, however, of attested Elamite names with ike- in which the following element begins with -iš or -š-. The name may also be a compound with the divine name Igišta (STOLPER, 1984a, 67; ZADOK, 1984, 15), or a hypocoristic derived from such a compound, with the divine determinative omitted. The sender’s name is presumably a compound with the divine name Hutran, or a hypocoristic derived from such a compound, with the divine determinative omitted; cf. Hu-ur-ra, MDP 18, 162 r. 4 (Old Babylonian from Susa) (DOSSIN, 1927), Hu-ur-ra-ra, MDP 4, 173, No. 3:28 and 171, No. 2:2 (both «Mâlamir» texts) (SCHETL, 1902), and Hu-ur-ra-ra, HALLOCK, 1969, 699 s.v.

3. Cf. uk(?)-ku-ri x (perhaps for i-ku-ri x-< man-p[i- ...]) (immediately following the introductory formula), MDP 36, 81, No. 3:3. The readings uk-ku- and i-ki- are excluded in MLC 1308. STOLPER’s notes on the tablet from April 1983, before the text was copied, indicate that the chip at the beginning of the line had not yet become detached, that the first sign was approximately the same as the sign following v. in line 1, and that the next sign was clearly ku, not ki.

5-6. tibbe (tibba, tebbâ) is well documented with adverbial and prepositional meanings («forth, before») in Achaemenid Elamite (HALLOCK, 1969, 761 s.vv.). The same word probably recurs with similar senses, in Neo-Elamite rock inscriptions (EKL, 75 §§9, 22; 75A, 76 §§), and in a Middle Elamite administrative tablet (TTM 1, 90:4)

pitt, here and in lines 9 and 14, can be compared with three sets of forms:

(a) A nominal stem pi-ti in Neo-Elamite administrative texts published in MDP 9
(SCHIEL, 1907), apparently designating an object, since it is enumerated and coordinate with other enumerated items (SCHIEL, 1907, 62: a piece of martial equipment; YUSHOV, 1963, 251: (drinking) vessel; HINZ, personal communication: perhaps a container). For comparison with this immediate context, note particularly 1 pi-ti man-da-ka₄, MDP 9, 38:21; 2 KI+MIN (= pi-ti) man-ka₄, MEŠ-na, MDP 9, 62:2.

(b) Forms from a verbal stem pi-ti- in Persepolis Fortification texts. The stem is probably identical with common Elamite peti-, «be hostile, rebel» (commonly spelled pi-ti- in Middle and Neo-Elamite royal inscriptions, regularly spelled be- ti-, reduplicated be-ip-ti-, in the Elamite version of the Bisitun inscription). In the Fortification texts, however, it clearly has administrative senses: petika = «changed» or «replaced» in the two letters PF 2067:12 and PF 2068:14 (with HALLOCK, 1969, 745; 1977, 128; despite CAMERON, 1948, 53); petika = «transferred», «removed», or «reassigned» in accounts (type W) of livestock and poultry, where the form is commonly coordinate with halpika, «slaughtered», katuka, «alive», mazrika, «withdrawn» (GRILLOT, 1974, 180f.), and maka, «dispensed» or «owed» (GRILLOT and VALLAT, 1975, 215, n. 25). The stem peti- (peti-) therefore has an apparent range of meaning comparable to that of Akkadian nakaru and its derived stems.

(c) Forms from a verbal stem piti- in Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid Elamite letters: GIŠ·si·ni ... PN GIŠ·GEŠTIN·MEŠ PN, i du-mu-ha ti-ib-be pi-ti-be in si-ka₄·ma-ak-kub, MDP 36, 79, No. 1:7f.; ti-pi-iH AL·mu-uk-tu₃·ir-ra HAL·mu-uk-tu₃ ti-ib-be pi-ti mu-taš-ni, BA 4, 183, No. 5:33 (WEISSBACH, 1902); pi-ti [m]u(l)-taš, MDP 36, 81, No. 3:9; pi-ti-na mu-un te-el-te-en-ni, JA 1977, 223:3 and 222:3f.; and PN ... mu-ši-in ku-iz-Za pi(?)-ti(?)-man pa-raš, PF 1859:7f.

We propose that the forms cited under (b) and (c) come from a single stem, with meanings in the range «transfer, remove, reassign»; that the same stem appears in MLC 1308; that the construction in line 6 is stem peti + auxiliary ma + -n (= conjugation IIIm infinitive in HALLOCK’s descriptive terminology); that it is closely modified by tibbe; and that the passage may be rendered «... sesame was deposited for assignment (literally, to be transferred out)». The nominal stem piti in the MDP 9 administrative texts is probably a different and unrelated word.

6. UDU.NITA₃·MEŠ, «small cattle» (sheep and/or goats), in line 13 supports the reading rap-tam, here. The meaning of raptam, however, is perhaps not «adult male goat» (so HALLOCK, 1969, 16 and 748), but «ram». The age and sex categories of small cattle in the Fortification texts are clear, but the species (or variety) distinction is not. Two Middle Elamite administrative texts from Malyan, though, open with the sequence (a) number of hides of UZ₃·MEŠ (b) number of hides of hi-du (c) total number of hides (M-1461 and 1468, unpublished). Since the Sumeroagram UZ₃ indicates «she-goat», Elamite hi-du appears not to be «adult female goat» (HALLOCK, 1969, 696) but «ewe». Furthermore, as HALLOCK observed (1969, 16), in PF 695 Aramaic mmn, «lambs», glosses Elamite kariri, otherwise translated in HALLOCK, 1969 as «kids». Consequently, it is likely that the two series of translations «sheep, lamb, etc.» and «goat, kid, etc.» proposed in HALLOCK, 1969 are to be interchanged, and MLC 1308:6-8 may be translated «Napiriša-ahpi gave one ram to you».

8-9. Word division and clause division uncertain. The final sign of line 8 is written on the slope of the turn from face to right edge, and the relative orientation of the wedges is not clear.

10-11. «Two (gur) of barley are to be issued to Napiriša-ahpi.».

12. KU$_3$BABBAR: for similar sign forms see MDP 9, 143:1, 168:8, and passim; MDP 11, 301:1 (Scheil, 1911), etc.; CAMERON, 1948, 78, No. 118.

13. im(?)$: for similar sign forms see MDP 11, 301:1 and other Neo-Elamite administrative texts in MDP 11. The syllabic value im, however, does not appear in Neo-Elamite letters, in the Neo-Elamite administrative and legal texts of MDP 9 and 11, or in Achaemenid Elamite. The sign here is perhaps to be read da(1).  

14. The first sign is certainly ša$, not a (cf. a in lines 7 and 11, and the comparable contrast in form between a and ša, in other Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid Elamite tablets). The sign evidently concludes a verb form continued from the previous line, ending with third-person -š + a:»... the small cattle that he ...-ed.»

14-15. Cf. BA 4, 183, No. 5:33f. (near the conclusion of a letter) and MDP 36, 81, No. 3:9 (at the conclusion of a letter), both cited above to lines 5-6, and [... $pi(?)$]-ti mu-taš-ni, BA 4, 183, No. 5:30f. The reading mu-ur cannot be excluded: we prefer mu-taš because of the proximity and possible coordination between HAL.muktu tibbe piti mu-taš-ni and HAL.muktu i ti-ri-š-ni in BA 4, 183, No. 5:33 and 35, and because the most plausible form at the conclusion of a letter-order, both here and in MDP 36, 81, No. 3:9, is an imperative (see HALLOCK, 1959, 12f.; 1969, 51). We accordingly construe the phrase as adverbal tibbe, «forth» + infinitive (stem) piti, «transfer, remove» + imperative verbal complement muta-š (meaning unknown).

YBC 16813

YBC 16813 was acquired from the antiquities trade. Its provenience is not documented. It is certainly an Achaemenid administrative document. It resembles Persepolis Fortification texts in all general properties: shape, string holes on the left edge, seal usage, and ductus. Furthermore, the name of the supplier Parnuma recurs in Fortification texts dated between the eighteenth and twenty-fifth years of Darius I. In view of these resemblances, YBC 16813 is probably contemporary with the Fortification archive; if so, it is dated in 507 B.C.

At the same time, YBC 16813 differs from the known Persepolis tablets in many particulars, including features of orthography and vocabulary, the seal that is applied to the tablet, the month name that is mentioned, and the obscure closing of the text.
Furthermore, despite the loose definitions of the text categories identified by Hallock (1969, 13-69) and the formal variation among items in them, YBC 16813 fits only into the residual category R, «unclassifiable ration texts». Its general contents resemble those of texts of type L1-L3 (records of receipts of rations by unnamed persons or groups of persons), but it lacks the forms of the verb du- that are common in those texts. In its construction as a record of delivery, rather than of receipt, it is comparable to texts of type B (deliveries of commodities), but it lacks the characteristic verb ulla-, «deliver».

This apparent formal oddity, however, is not unusual in such texts. Many of the known Fortification texts are likewise without close formal parallels, and many hapax legomena and orthographic peculiarities occur in the Fortification archive. Such traits reflect the conditions under which the archive was assembled. Most of the Fortification tablets in shorter formats were temporary records of single transactions. They were drafted at sites away from Persepolis and subsequently brought to the central archive for auditing, for compilation into journals (text type V) and accounts (text type W), and for storage or disposal. Some of the variability in the texts may represent the idiosyncracies of individual scribes, but some certainly reflects local and regional differences in recording practices. Regional differences are most clearly exemplified in the distribution of Elamite and Iranian month names (Hallock, 1978, 111, 114).

Although the Persepolis tablets supply the best points of comparison for YBC 16813, Achaemenid Elamite tablets have also been found at other sites. MDP 11, 308 (see Hallock, 1969, 25) was found at Susa, fragments of Achaemenid Elamite tablets have been excavated at Old Kandahar in redeposited context (Helms, 1982, 13; Briant, 1984, 59), and an apparently Achaemenid Elamite tablet was found on the surface at Chogha Mish (H.J. Kantor, personal communication). There is therefore good reason to suppose that the Persepolis archives were not the only Elamite administrative archives in the Achaemenid realm, and that similar collections were made at other regional centers. By the same token, YBC 16813 can justly be characterized as a text of the Fortification type, but it cannot be confidently attributed to the Fortification archive. None of the text's peculiarities excludes such an attribution, but nothing in the text requires it, and its peculiarities may reflect an origin in a different administrative region.

Other Achaemenid Elamite texts present comparable problems. BM 56302 (Walker, 1980, 79 and 80, fig. 4), is unlikely to come from Sippar, despite its registration with the Sippar collections. It is partly similar in form and contents to Fortification tablets, and it mentions a name that recurs in the Fortification archive, but photographs indicate that the tablet differs in shape and ductus from the normal run of Persepolis texts. On the other hand, the tablet found at Qaṣr-i Abu Naṣr (Wilkinson, 1965, 344f. and pl. lxvii, fig. 24), is very likely to have come from Persepolis, as Achaemenid architectural pieces from the same site certainly did (Whitcomb, 1985, 32), but it cannot be shown to have belonged to the known Persepolis archives.

Transliteration

[For ease of reference and comparison, the transliteration follows the conventions used by Hallock for Achaemenid Elamite; see Hallock, 1958, 257-261 and 1969, 70].
Obverse
1. 23 w.ir-du-ma-um
2. 1 w.QA.BAR QA.lg-na 20-ir-ma
3. ZID.LA.lg ši-mi-ut kur-mi
4. m.Par-mu-ma-na hi ka-la
5. d.ITU.lg 1-na li-e-ka
6. be-ul 15-um-me-na d.
7. ITU.lg d.Nu-ša-an-na(?)
Lower Edge
8. hi(? text: še) m.aš-šu-ir-be-na
Reverse
9. a-ak m.mu-iz-ri-
10. be-na Ku'-ya'-raš hi-še
11. hi ka-la m.Har-ki-pi
12. hi-še m.ti-pi-ra(1 text: -na h.) m.
14. HAR
Translation

23 irtiba 1 BAR 1.5 QA [= 701.5 QA] of šimit flour, supplied by Parnuma: this (flour) was delivered as rations for one month. Fifteenth year, first(?) month. This (flour) is for Assyrians and Egyptians. Kuyaraš has delivered this (flour as) rations to Harkipi, the scribe of the Egyptians. ....

Comments

The tablet has evenly blackened surfaces, measures $5.2 \times 4.05 \times 1.7$ cm, has the impression of a seal with an Aramaic inscription on the left edge and three partial impressions of the same seal on the reverse and upper edge.

2. -ir-ma, for the expected -irmak(i), occurs in PF-NN S2-1203 and Q-1603. Cf. -kur-ma for the expected -kur-ma-ki, PF-NN M-963, M-1001, and M-2122, and -kur in the same use as -kur-ki (HALLOCK, 1969, 715).

3. ši-mi-ut is unattested in known Fortification texts or in other Elamite sources.

4. For the etymology of the name Parnuma and renderings of the same name in other languages, see MAYRHOFER, 1973, 214 and HINZ, 1975, 94. The name occurs in four published and seven unpublished Fortification texts: the earliest of them is PF 1963 (type V, year 18), the latest PF 415 (type E, year 25). These texts may refer to more than one individual, since there is no consistent pattern of administrative activity connected with the name. The most nearly parallel contexts are PF 415 and PF-NN E-158 and E-202, all dealing with wine kurmin Parnuma-na, «supplied by Parnuma».

In Achaemenid Elamite, hi as an object pronoun normally appears immediately before a verb. As a demonstrative it normally appears immediately after the substantive to which it refers (DB §9 and DE §1 cited in PAPER, 1954b, 103 may be calqued on Old Persian word order). The demonstrative also occurs in adverbial compounds (e.g., idaka, hi zila, hi ŠA₃,ma) and in independent substantival use. The last of these usages is extremely limited in the Persepolis tablets but it appears to be required here. For this context, cf. hi appa 6 d.ITU.ig-na dumanpa, «this is what they are to receive for six months», PT 79:15, cf. ibid. 18.

ka-la = gal, e.g., PF 1357:9f., 1605:9 and often in ka-la-ma = gal.ma (often co-occurring with the writing gal in gal makip).

5. li-e-ka: no such «plene» spellings are attested for forms of li- in known Fortification or Treasury texts. To put the matter more generally, although grammatical endings of common Elamite stems (as opposed to loanwords and non-Elamite proper names) are often spelled with either single or double consonants (e.g. du-ša vs. du-iš-ša, li-ka vs. li-ik-ka), and stem consonants are sometimes written either single or double (e.g. ši-in-nu- vs. ši-nu-, tal-li-iš(-) vs. tal-lš(-)), alternations between long and short writings of stem vowels in common Elamite forms are entirely absent in the Persepolis tablets, and rare in earlier Elamite texts (STOLPER, 1984a, 20; in EKI, 13b IV = MDP 41, 57:4 read li-e li-en-ra with STEVE, 1967, 101, against KÖNG, 1965, 201).
7. The month name is unparalleled among known Persepolis tablets. Hinz's suggestion (personal communication) that this spelling renders Babylonian Nisannu or Aramaic Nisan is entirely plausible. The Babylonian month names and their Aramaic counterparts were known and used in the administrative environment monitored from Persepolis: note Aramaic $<s>^maw$ corresponding to Elamite $Sâkurrizûš$, PF 857; Aramaic 'b and $lwl$ corresponding to Elamite $Tûnâbâziš$ and $Kârbašîyaš$, PF 855 and 968; Aramaic $lwl$ corresponding to Elamite $Kârbašîyaš$, PF 858; and the Sumerograms SIG, and GUD in PF 2055:10 and PFA 11 (Cameron, 1948, 41, n. 5; Hallock, 1978, 111). Aramaic month names (rather than transcriptions of Iranian month names) are the norm in the unpublished monolingual Aramaic tablets from Persepolis. $Nušanna$ would be an acceptable transcription of the month name Nisan; for the pertinent correspondences between Achaemenid Elamite graphemes and Iranian or Babylonian phonemes see Paper, 1954b, 20ff., Mayrhofer, 1973, 40. The obstacles to interpreting this month name as Nisan are in the writing of the tablet itself: the sign forms of most of the rest of the tablet conform closely to the standard of the Persepolis script, and the signs are written well and clearly; although the last sign of line 7 is written on the corner of the tablet, there is clear space around it, and no obvious cause for a distortion of the usual sign form; although the signs $hi$ and $še$ are easily confused in the Persepolis script, the uses of $hi$-$še$ in this tablet show a clear distinction between them, and the sign at the beginning of line 8 is $še$, not $hi$. Despite these difficulties, we favor the reading $Nušanna$ because the alternatives entail still greater problems: month names without following -na (or -ma, or other postposition, or hatuma) are rare among known Persepolis tablets (e.g., PF 1582); positing an unparalleled use of a Babylonian/Aramaic month name is more parsimonious than positing the use of an otherwise unknown month name; and the already troublesome syntax of the text becomes still more difficult in the absence of a pronoun $hi$ to govern the following phrase. For the word-order year + $na$, month + $na$-ma, cf. e.g., PF 68f., 71, 222ff.

8-9. There is no such co-occurrence of «Egyptians and Assyrians» in known Persepolis tablets. Most spellings of both gentilics are formed with -$iya$-, as in Old Persian, but note $Mîz-ri$-$ip$, PF 1547, PF-NN Q-1922, and Q-2510; $Aš-šû-ra$-$ap$, PF-NN T-34, L3-1185, M-1160, and M-1589; $Aš-šû-ra$-$ip$, PF-NN Q-622; and $Ha-šu-ra$-$ap$, PF 1009. Precisely what geographical or ethnic distinction was implicit in the term «Assyrian» (as opposed to $Bâphil$, «Babylonians» and $Attîp$, «Hattians» [= Syrians]) in the usage of the Persepolis Elamite scribes is far from certain in view of the well-known correspondence of Old Persian $A$ôrûiya, Elamite Aššûrap, and Babylonian Ebi-r-Nâri in DSf.

10. $hiše$ indicates a preceding proper name — usually a personal name, less often a place name — that was likely to have been unfamiliar to the persons required to process records at a central administrative clearing house (see Hallock, 1969, 76). The name cited here is unparalleled in known Persepolis tablets and the reading of the final sign is uncertain. In the absence of a determinative or a clear parallel context the identification of the name as personal name or place name is also uncertain. Nouns ending in -$a$raš are frequent in the Fortification texts; most of them are place names (e.g., $A$ddaraš, Hataraš, Ibbaraš, Abbadaraš, Mânharaš, Namakuraš, Parsaraš, Mištaš, Mišiukraš,
Tukraš, Uššaraš, Uzikurraš), common nouns for loci (e.g., amparaš, araš(?), baribaraš, halmarraš, kurakaraš), and occupational terms (e.g., amparbaraš, bazikaraš, karamaraš), few of them are personal names (Kuraš, Mitraš), and most of them are Iranian words. Nouns ending in -tuk are uncommon in Fortification texts (e.g., place names Atuk, Mituk, personal name Pirrataš). On grounds of economy we prefer to interpret the name as a personal name, probably in an Iranian form, ending in -raš. For personal names without determinatives cf., e.g., PF 122.2 and 129:4.

11. No personal name spelled Har-ki-pi occurs among known Persepolis tablets. Cf. Harkapi, PF 1461 (year 22) and (as a patronym) PF-NN T-525 (undated letter from Iruppiya). Harkapi may be an Egyptian name compounded with Hr-, but we are not aware of close parallels in approximately contemporary sources (see Ranke, 1977, 95ff.).

12. There is no example of a «scribe» similarly qualified in known Persepolis tablets. For the construction, cf., e.g., 1 f.MUNUS.1g arašara f.Pašabbena, PF 875:2f., 876:3ff., 1012:3ff..

13. In the Fortification texts, the form lišta is most common in the subscript formula that is frequent in letters (type T) and official receipts (type H) and that occurs intermittently in texts of other types (Hallock, 1969, 51f.; Lewis, 1977, 10ff., nn. 38ff.; Stolper, 1984b, 305, n.17). It is uncommon as the final, operative verb of the administrative record proper and it is not distinctive for any text type. Examples of this usage are PF 362 and 371 (both type E), and six unpublished texts of type E, most dealing with religious expenditures of beer and wine; PF 1085 (type M, special rations) and three unpublished texts of type M; PF 1703 (type S1, rations for animals). The preceptive form of the same verb, lišni, is especially common in texts of type U (labels): PF 1862-1876 and fourteen unpublished texts of type U, most of them dealing with flour. With the present context, compare especially ZID₂.DA.1g ... gal m.Baktiyapna lišni, «let him deliver the flour as rations for people from Baktiya», PF 1592 (type R, unclassifiable).

14. HAR, set off by indentation from the preceding text, is without parallel among the known Persepolis tablets. The reading and meaning are obscure. Ha-ir and ha-har are probable variants of araš in Fortification texts (Hallock, 1969, 670, 687, and 690), but if HAR in this text is another spelling variant, the conclusion of the text is an extremely imprecise form of address or administrative specification, whether araš means «granary» (Hallock, 1969, 670), «Hofintendantur» (Hinz, 1971, 280), or anything similar (cf. Stolper, 1984a, 99ff. on HAR.ŠI).

Left edge, reverse, and upper edge. Of the preserved Aramaic characters on the seal impression only h is clear : perhaps whv[x], i.e., a transcription of an Iranian name beginning with Va(h)w-. The impression is not identifiable among the inscribed seal impressions that were recorded by Hallock from published and unpublished Fortification texts. The composition is of a type common among the Persepolis seals, but details of style and execution are unusual and perhaps uncharacteristic of the Persepolis seal.
repertoire (M. Root, personal communication). Nevertheless, the fact that the seal impression has no parallel should not be overemphasized, since there are many impressions with only one identifiable occurrence among about 4,500 Fortification tablets.

ABBREVIATIONS

BA: Beiträge zur Assyriologie.
EKI: KÖNIG, 1965/
JA: Journal Asiatique.
MDP: Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse; Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Suse; Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Perse; Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique en Iran. MDP 4 = SCHEIL, 1902; MDP 9 = SCHEIL, 1907; MDP 11 = SCHEIL, 1911; MDP 18 = DOSSIN, 1927; MDP 36 see PAPER, 1954a; MDP 41 = STEVE, 1967.
PF-NN: unpublished texts from the Persepolis Fortification transliterated by R.T. HALLOCK; the letter after NN indicates the text category according to the classification described in HALLOCK. 1969, 13ff.; the following number refers to a single series of numbers assigned by Hallock arbitrarily, according to the order in which the texts were studied.
PN: personal name.
PT: texts from the Persepolis Treasury published in CAMERON, 1948.
TTM 1: STOLPER, 1984a.
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