

# OBSERVATIONS ON THE SUMERIAN PERSONAL NAMES IN EBLA SOURCES AND ON THE ONOMASTICON OF MARI AND KISH

Piotr Steinkeller

*Harvard University*

## I.

In an article published in *JAOS* 108 (1988) 481-83, P. Mander studied a group of twenty-four personal names, borne by a contingent of "junior singers" (NAR.TUR) from Mari, which are recorded in ARET 1 7 rev. i 4 - ii 4 (= TM 75.G.1828). Several of these names were recognized by Mander as being genuinely Sumerian. The tablet in question has recently been republished by Mander in his *Administrative Texts of the Archive L.2679, Materiali per il Vocabolario Sumerico 1* = MEE 10 (Rome, 1990), pp. 41-52 no. 14, with similar conclusions about the nature of the names in question (pp. 52, 244).

However, Mander had missed the important point that the majority of the singers listed in ARET 1 7 appear also in TM 75.G.2649 x 16ff.,<sup>1</sup> which records twenty-five NAR.NAR Ma-ri<sup>ki</sup>. The connection between these

two sources was recognized already by M.V. Tonietti<sup>2</sup> and A. Archi,<sup>3</sup> although neither of them had realized that, as is shown by the comparison with TM 75.G.2649, in ARET 1 7 the rubric NAR.TUR Ma-ri<sup>ki</sup> extends to three individuals who are listed in the immediately preceding section (rev. i 1-3). These persons are identical with the first three singers appearing in TM 75.G.2649; since in the latter source these three men receive twice as many garments as the other singers, they undoubtedly represented supervisors or senior singers. Accordingly, when the three supervisors are included, the actual number of singers appearing in ARET 1 7 is twenty-seven.

Yet another text that bears directly on the same group of singers is TM 75.G.10185 vii 9'-16'.<sup>4</sup> This source records the garments issued to three named supervisors (Ur-sa-nu-ù-du, Gi-iš-Īl-šu, and Lu-gi-na-šu-WA — two of whom can positively be identified with the supervisors appearing in the earlier two texts) and twenty-two unnamed junior singers (NAR.NAR.TUR). The total number of singers listed (twenty-five) is thus identical with that found in TM 75.G.2649.

The comparison of the variant spellings appearing in ARET 1 7 and TM 75.G.2649, with further information provided by TM 75.G.10185, makes it possible to arrive at improved readings and analyses of several of the names. At the same time, this sample of Mari names provides one with a representative and convenient body of evidence to reach some general conclusions about the onomasticon of Mari in Pre-Sargonic times.

Offered below is a list of the names found in ARET 1 7 (henceforth Source A), juxtaposed with the name-forms found in TM 75.G.2649 (henceforth Source B). The sequence is according to Source A; the numerical positions of names in Source B are indicated in parentheses. The names which appear only in Source B (or cannot be identified at present in Source A) were placed

Abbreviations used are those of the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* and the *Philadelphia Sumerian Dictionary* with the following additions:

- ARES *Archivi reali di Ebla, Studi*
- ASJ *Acta Sumerologica* (Japan)
- ELTS I.J. Gelb, P. Steinkeller, and R.M. Whiting, *The Earliest Land Tenure Systems in the Near East: Ancient Kudurrus*, OIP 104 (Chicago, 1991)
- Himrin F. Rasheed, *The Ancient Inscriptions in Himrin Area* (Baghdad, 1981)
- Krebernik, *Personennamen*  
*Die Personennamen der Ebla-Texte* (Berlin, 1988)
- MC *Mesopotamian Civilizations*
- Mélanges Kupper  
*De la Babylonie à la Syrie, en passant par Mari: Mélanges offerts à Monsieur J.-R. Kupper* (Liège, 1990)
- OSP A. Westenholz, *Old Sumerian and Old Akkadian Texts in Philadelphia Chiefly from Nippur*, vol. 1 (Malibu, CA, 1975), vol. 2 (Copenhagen, 1987)
- Pomponio, *Prosopografia*,  
F. Pomponio, *La prosopografia dei testi presargonici di Fara* (Rome, 1987)
- QS *Quaderni di Semitistica*
- SEb *Studi Eblaïti*
- TSS R. Jestin, *Tablettes sumériennes de Šuruppak conservées au Musée de Stamboul* (Paris, 1937)
- Westenholz, ECTJ  
A. Westenholz, *Early Cuneiform Texts in Jena* (Copenhagen, 1975)

1. Cited by A. Archi in *MARI* 4 (1985) 78 no. 126.

2. QS 15 (1988) 84 n. 15, 86-89.

3. ARES 1 (Rome, 1988), pp. 283-84.

4. ARES 1, p. 284. I am grateful to A. Archi for bringing this text to my attention.

at the very end of the listing. The variants from TM 75.G.10185 are noted in the respective commentaries.

SOURCE A	SOURCE B
1. Ur-sá-[Utu(?)]	Ur-zu-Utu (1)
2. Lú-gi-na	Gi-gi-na (2)
3. Gú-li-li	Gú-li-li (3)
4. A-si	A-si (4)
5. Nu-gal-zi-ga	Nu-gal-zi-ga (5)
6. Ur-Na-zi-a(!)	Ur-Na-zi(wr. GI)-a (8)
7. Da-da	Da-da (7)
8. NE-na	NE-na (6)
9. Ma-za-lu	Ma-za-lu-ĤI (9)
10. Lu-maš	Lu-mu-šú (10)
11. Û-du- <sup>1</sup> a(?) <sup>1</sup>	Û-du-NI-a (12)
12. Mu-mu	
13. Û-nu-NE-NE	Û-mu-NE (14)
14. Šum-BAD-li	Šum-BAD-li (17)
15. Ba-zi	Ba-zi (15)
16. Lu-KASKAL-DU	
17. Bù-la- <sup>1</sup> lu <sup>1</sup>	
18. Na-za	
19. Nu-gal-NI-zi	Nu-gal-NI-zi (11)
20. Ur-Na-na	Ur-Nu-nu-na (18)
21. NI-rí-NE-UD	
22. Û-gú-NE-NE	Û-gú-NE-NE (22)
23. Nu-gal-mu-da-káš	
24. Û-NE-NE	Û-NE-NE (24)
25. Si-la-mu-Utu	Si-li-mu-du (25)
26. Ar-šè-a-ĥu	
27. Īr-am <sub>6</sub> -a-ĥu	
	28. Sá-gi-il-da (13)
	29. Nu-gal-ÁŠ.DA (16)
	30. U <sub>9</sub> -la-nu (19)
	31. BAD-KUR.KI (20)
	32. Li-lum (21)
	33. ĤAL-da-ba (23)

As shown by the above listing, nineteen names appear in both sources. It is interesting to note that these names are listed in much the same sequence in both sources, with the first eleven names following virtually the same order. Among the remaining names, eight seem to be found only in Source A, while six appear only in Source B. Assuming that no further matches between both sources are possible, the combined total of names listed can be put at thirty-three.

#### Comments on individual names:

1. Ur-sá-[Utu(?)] / Ur-zu-Utu. The name of the same senior singer is spelled Ur-sa-nu-ù-du in TM 75.G.10185 (see above). Without any doubt, we find here the Sumerian name Ur-sag-Utu, which is well-known from Fara (F. Pomponio, *Prosopografia*, pp. 275-77) and Pre-Sargonic sources (OSP 1, p. 103; BIN 8 74:10; ELTS, p. 179). In other Ebla texts, the same name is alternatively written Ur-sag-da (ARET 3 526 ii 6'; 7 I rev. viii 7), Ur-sa-da (ARET 2 6 ii 6; SEB 4, p. 149 rev. i 6 [both examples involving citizens of Mari]), and Ur-Ē(for SA?)-da (ARET 7 16 rev. viii 9). Cf. also the name Ur-sag, borne by a merchant (LÚ.KAR) from Mari, in ARET 8 525 xxi 14. For another name invoking Utu, see no. 25.

2. Lú-gi-na / Gi-gi-na. The name of the same senior singer is written Lu-gi-na-šú-WA in TM 75.G10185 (see above). In a personal communication, A. Archi informs me that the latter name could alternatively be read as Lu-gi-na-WA-šú. If so, the name is very likely to be analyzed as /lu-kīnā-pīšū/. For the value pi of PI, cf. I-ku-pi-DINGIR /ikūn-pī-illum/, attested in ARET 1 30 ix 9 (a man from Mari), SEB 3, p. 15 rev. viii 5 (a man from Mari), and MEE 2 35 rev. ii 2.

3. Gú-li-li. Almost certainly identical with Gu-li-lí of MAD 5 65:11 and Ku-li-li of HSS 10 52 i 4, 51 i 5. This name is probably to be interpreted as *kulīlu*, "dragonfly." Our Gú-li-li, a senior singer according to both sources, is very likely identical with Gú-li-lu, a NAR.MAĤ, who appears in ARET 1 5 rev. i 4, 6 rev. ii 15. The puzzling thing is that Gú-li-li would be expected to be the same person as Gi-iš-ĤI-šú, the remaining (third) senior singer listed in TM 75.G.10185 (see above). However, Gi-iš-ĤI-šú, for which compare Gi-iš-ĤI, the name borne by a man from Kish (*Eblaitica* 1, p. 138 no. 9),<sup>5</sup> cannot be readily connected with Gú-li-li/lu.

4. A-si. This name, of uncertain affiliation, is also attested in the Pre-Sargonic and Sargonic sources from northern Babylonia (ELTS, p. 164). Cf. A-zi, a merchant (LÚ.KAR) from Mari (ARET 1 7 xi 16).

5. Nu-gal-zi-ga. The name contains the word *lugal*, and thus is assuredly Sumerian. Cf. Mander, JAOS 108, p. 482. However, since \*Lugal-zi-ga is not documented in 3rd millennium Babylonian sources, the interpretation of -zi-ga remains uncertain.

6. Ur-Na-zi-a(!) / Ur-Na-zi(wr. GI)-a. To be analyzed as Ur-Nazi-a(k) = Ur-Nanše-a(k). The possibility that this name invokes Nanshe was considered already by Mander, JAOS 108, p. 482, though with an interpretation Ur-Nanše-(nin-)uru<sub>16</sub>, based on the reading of the last sign in Source A as -lu (the sign is almost certainly a; see the photograph in MEE 10, pl. IX). Our Ur-

5. See also below p. 243.

Nanše cannot but bring to mind a senior singer (NAR. MAH) of the same name, the servant of the king Ip-lu<sub>5</sub>-il, who dedicated his statues to the goddess INANNAxZA. ZA of Mari (I.J. Gelb and B. Kienast, FAOS 7, pp. 13-14 MP 14 and MP 15). Whether the same person is meant in both instances depends on the immensely complicated questions concerning the royal sequences of Ebla and Mari,<sup>6</sup> which have not yet been definitively resolved.

7. Da-da. Cf. Da-da, a man from Kish, who is documented in SEB 4, p. 78 no. 3.<sup>7</sup> This name is common in Babylonia, both in the south and in the north, from the Fara through the Ur III period (Pomponio, *Prosopografia*, p. 63; MAD 5, p. 96; ELTS, p. 166; H. Limet, *Anthroponymie*, p. 392). Its background is probably Sumerian, although a Semitic derivation is also possible (MAD 3, pp. 103-04).

8. NE-na. Reading and analysis uncertain.

9. Ma-za-lu / Ma-za-lu-ĜI. Cf. Ma-zu-ra-Ĝu (ARET 8 529 xxi 2), and conceivably also Na-sa-ra-NI, designating a man from Mari (ARET 1 7 xi 2). This name may contain the root NSR, with a possible interpretation /mašsar(u)-aĝi/. Cf. ma-za-lum /mašsarum/, "guard," of Ebla economic texts (e.g., ARET 1, pp. 294-95), and the names Ma-za-ar-su (Gelb, OAIC 5:2), Ma-za-ir-su (UCP 9, p. 204 no. 83 ii 7 [collated]), Ma-za-ir-za (MVN 3 102:18), Na-aš-ru-um, and Na-zi-ir-i-li (MAD 3, p. 207) of Babylonian sources.

10. Lu-maš / Lu-mu-šu. Mander, JAOS 108, p. 482, assumes that Lu-maš is a Sumerian name, but the variant spelling Lu-mu-šu raises a possibility that this name may in fact be Semitic. Cf. La-mu-sa (Himrin 4 ii 2; ELTS, p. 172).

11. Û-DU-<sup>r</sup>a(?) / Û-DU-NI-a. Reading and analysis uncertain.

12. Mu-mu. This name, of uncertain affiliation, is common in Babylonian sources (HSS 10, p. XXXV; ELTS, p. 174; MAD 5 66 vi 1; Himrin 3 iii 15; etc.).

13. Û-nu-NE-NE / Û-mu-NE-NE. Possibly identical with the Babylonian name Û-mu-NI-NI (Westenholz, OSP 1, p. 100; ELTS, p. 178), if the latter name is to be read Û-mu-ni-ni. Cf. the name NE.NE, identifying individuals from Mari (MARI 4, p. 76 nos. 63 and 83). The same name is attested in the sources from Mari (MARI 5, p. 97; 6, p. 247 nos. 38 ii 1 and 39 ii 2- under bi-bi) and Babylonia (JCS 10 [1956] 26 no. 2 iii 12; BIN 8 11 iii 4; ELTS nos. 41 rev. ix 12, 43 i 11). Cf. also NE-NE-um in *Iraq* 50 (1978) 114 no. 531 ii 6 (Abu Salabikh). See also nos. 22 and 24.

6. According to Archi, ARET 7, p. 79, Source A belongs to the "reign" of either Ibrium or Ibbi-Zikir. On the other hand, Archi, MARI 4 (1985) 48, dates Ip-lu<sub>5</sub>-il before both Ibrium and Ibbi-zikir. This would make the identification of our Ur-Nanše with the senior singer of Ip-lu<sub>5</sub>-il very unlikely.

7. Cf. below p. 243.

14. Šum-BAD-li. Attested as Šum-BAD in MARI 4, p. 77 no. 98, where it identifies a Mari citizen, and in a Pre-Sargonic votive inscription from Mari (Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, p. 19 MP 24:1, 7). This name corresponds to the Babylonian Šum(u)-bēli, which is written Šu<sub>4</sub>-mu-be-lí in A 1087:2 (Sargonic), published by Zhi Yang, *A Study of the Sargonic Archive from Adab* (Univ. of Chicago Diss., 1986), p. 397. Cf. the name Šum-da-ar, borne by a Mari prince (MARI 4, p. 76 nos. 81 and 84), which appears as Su-mu-da-ar and Su-mu-tar in the sources from Babylonia (MAD 3, p. 274). For other examples of names with šumu, see MAD 3, p. 274, and ELTS, pp. 176-77, and further, note Su-mu-Eš<sub>4</sub>-tár (ARM 19 462:8) and Šu-mu-<sup>d</sup>Da-gan (ARM 19 283:3) of Mari *šakkanakku* sources.

15. Ba-zi. Attested also in MARI 4, p. 76 no. 84, where it identifies a man from Mari.<sup>8</sup> This name, which is documented in Babylonia from the Fara (Pomponio, *Prosopografia*, p. 57; Names and Professions List line 132 = SEB 4, p. 184) through the Ur III period (Limet, *Anthroponymie*, p. 389), is very likely Sumerian. Cf. the name Zi-zi, borne by a man from Mari (ARET 1 7 rev. xi 1; MARI 4, p. 78 no. 125), which is also found in the Names and Professions List line 238 (SEB 4, p. 187) and in the sources from Babylonia (Pomponio, *Prosopografia*, p. 279). Cf. also Zi-zi of Hamazi (*Rivista Biblica* 25 [1977] 240 iv 10, v 3). In this connection note that, according to the ms. of the Sumerian King List from Tell Leilan,<sup>9</sup> Ba-zi and Zi-zi were the names of two rulers of the Mari Dynasty.

16. Lu-KASKAL-DU. The name appears to be Sumerian (cf. Mander, JAOS 108, p. 482). Probably to be analyzed as Lu-káš-ša<sub>4</sub> = lú-kas<sub>4</sub>-a(k), for which compare LÚ.KAS<sub>4</sub> (ELTS no. 41 ii 12) and Ur-kas<sub>4</sub>-sá (BIN 8 212:4). For the value káš of KASKAL, see below under no. 23. The value ša<sub>4</sub> of DU is documented in the Pre-Sargonic sources from Lagash (J. Bauer, RA 64 [1970] 188; J.N. Postgate, AfO 24 [1973] 77). For Ebla, see zú-ur<sub>5</sub>-ša<sub>4</sub>, glossed as zu-'à-ar-ša, in VE 208 and 0151 (MEE 4, pp. 221 and 358).

17. Bù-la-'lu'. The same name, spelled Bù-la-lum, is borne by a merchant (LÚ.KAR) from Mari (MARI 4, p. 76 no. 73). Probably to be analyzed as Pū-lalú or Pū-lalí, "Mouth-Of-Happiness." Cf. Bu/Bù-la-lum (MAD 3, p. 96) and Bù-la-lí (ELTS no. 23 x 1; Zhi Yang, *A Study of the Sargonic Archive from Adab* [Univ. of Chicago Diss., 1986], p. 484). Cf. also La-lí of Mari (MARI 4, p. 78 no. 137; 5, p. 98), La-lí of Babylonia (ELTS Appendix to no.

8. The same Ba-zi is apparently also mentioned in SEB 3, p. 14 x 2, where he is associated with the well-known Mari merchants Ib-gi-tum and Gul-la. For Ib-gi-tum, see below n. 30; for Gul-la, see MARI 4, p. 75 no. 24, p. 76 no. 73.

9. A preliminary discussion of this source was offered by Claudine-Adrienne Vincente in a paper entitled "The Leilan Recension of the Sumerian King List," read at the AOS meeting in Cambridge, Mass., April 1992.

32 vi 7, no. 40 A xiv 18), and A-ga-lá-lí of Mari (ARM 19 392:8, 404:1'). If this interpretation is correct, the name would be of Babylonian origin, since *lalú* is a Sumerian loanword in Akkadian (CAD L, p. 51b).

18. Na-za. Affiliation uncertain — no Babylonian parallels are available. Cf. the Mari name Za-na (ARET 7 16 vii 8).

19. Nu-gal-NI-zi. Assuredly a Sumerian name, because of the inclusion of the word *lugal*. However, Mander's assumption, JAOS 108, p. 482, that this name is to be analyzed as *Lugal-ì-zi* is most unlikely (the name *Inim-ì-zi*, which he cites as a parallel, in fact represents *Inim-(a)-ni-zi*). Among the possible analyses one might consider *Lugal-e-si*, *-ezen*, and *-nig-zu*, all listed in Pomponio, *Prosopografia*, *sub voce*. Cf. *Ur-NI-zi*, designating a Kishite visitor to Ebla (*Eblaistica* 1, p. 138 no. 8),<sup>10</sup> and *Lugal-ḫi-zi* / *Nu-gal-ḫi-zi* in ARET 5 24 iv 3 = 25 iv 1.

20. *Ur-Na-na* / *Ur-Nu-nu-na*. With Mander, JAOS 108, p. 483, this name very likely represents *Ur-(d)Nanna*, although the variant *-Nu-nu-na* leaves open the possibility that the divine element in question actually is *Nu-nu*, for which see below p. 243. Cf. the name *Ur-Na-ni*, which is attested, as the designation of an Ebla singer (NAR), in ARET 8 527 xv 1, 531 xvi 21, and also in OSP 1 44:5.

21. *NI-rí-NE-UD*. The name may invoke *Utu* or *Shamash*, but the analysis is uncertain.

22. *Ù-gú-NE-NE*. Reading and analysis uncertain. Cf. nos. 13 and 24.

23. *Nu-gal-mu-da-káš*(KASKAL). Undoubtedly the same name as the Pre-Sargonic *Lugal-mu-da-kúš* (e.g., HSS 3, p. 24; J. Bauer, *Lagash*, p. 554; ELTS, p. 173), also attested in ARET 5 24 iii 5 = 25 iii 1 (*Lugal-mu-da-kúš* / *Nu-gal-me-ga-šu-ù*). The value *káš* of KASKAL is frequent in the Pre-Sargonic sources from Lagash, as a variant writing of *kaš*, "beer" (Y. Rosengarten, *Répertoire*, p. 26 no. 116). The fact that *Lugal-mu-da-kúš* does not seem to appear in Fara sources could be of importance for the date of the archaic Mari and Ebla sources.

24. *Ù-NE-NE*. Attested also in MARI 4, p. 75 no. 54, p. 78 no. 118, in both cases identifying a man from Mari, and in the sources from Abu Salabikh (OIP 99, p. 35). This name is possibly identical with the Babylonian *U-NE-NE* (ELTS no. 31 iv 3) and *Ù-NI-NI* (Gelb, MAD 5, p. 120; ELTS no. 40 B xii 8), if the latter names are to be read *Ù-ne-ne* and *Ù-ni-ni*, respectively. Cf. nos. 13 and 22.

25. *Si-la-mu-Utu* / *Si-li-mu-du*. The same name is written *Si-la-mu-da* in MARI 4, p. 76 no. 73, where it describes a merchant (LÚ.KAR) from Mari. Without any

doubt, the name hiding behind these variant spellings is the Sumerian *Silim-(d)Utu* (usually transliterated as *Di-(d)Utu* by Sumerologists), which is abundantly documented in Fara (Pomponio, *Prosopografia*, pp. 64-66), Abu Salabikh (OIP 99, p. 35), and Pre-Sargonic texts (e.g., Bauer, *Lagash*, p. 546; OSP 1, p. 80; ELTS, p. 166), and which is also attested in Ebla sources (ARET 3 526 i 2; SEB 4, p. 144 rev. v 3, p. 145 iii 4 [apparently a citizen of Mari in each case]). Since all three spellings use the sign *SI*, it appears quite certain that the name was vocalized *Silim-Utu*, and not *Salim-Utu*; this is in agreement with the testimony of lexical texts, which give primacy to the reading *silim* (see Proto-Ea 262).

26. *Ar-šè-a-ḫu*. Attested in Babylonia, Mari, and Ebla. See MAD 3, p. 236; Krebern timer, *Personennamen*, pp. 143-44. For the Mari evidence, see especially *Ar-šè-a-ḫu*, a merchant (LÚ.KAR) from Mari (MARI 4, p. 77 no. 104), and *Ar-šè(!)-a-ḫa* (Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, p. 21 MP 29:1). Cf. also *A-ḫa-ar-šè* of Mari (MARI 4, p. 77 no. 94, p. 78 no. 134).

27. *Ìr-am-a-ḫu*. The element *Ìr'am-* is attested in names from Babylonia, Mari, and Ebla (MAD 3, p. 230; Krebern timer, *Personennamen*, p. 225), but the combination *Ìr'am-aḫu* is represented only by this occurrence.

28. *Sá-gi-il-da*. Possibly a Sumerian name. Cf. *Sag-bil-da* (TŠŠ 467 iv 3') and *Sag-dEn-lil-da* / *Sag-Ilil-da* (BIN 8 154 ii 6; OSP 1, p. 97).

29. *Nu-gal-ÁŠ.DA*. Probably a Sumerian name. Possibly to be read *Nu-gal-áz-da* and identified with *Lugal-á-zi-da* (Pomponio, *Prosopografia*, p. 153; etc.).<sup>11</sup>

30. *U<sub>9</sub>-la-nu*. Undoubtedly a Semitic name, though the interpretation is uncertain. Cf. *U<sub>9</sub>-li-NI* (ARET 2 4 vii 4) and *U<sub>9</sub>-NI* (MARI 4, p. 76 no. 78) of Mari.

31. *BAD-KUR.KI*. Attested as *BAD-ḫi-KUR* in a Pre-Sargonic tablet from Mari (MARI 5, p. 119 no. 26 v 4). This name assuredly corresponds to the Babylonian *Bēli-SA.TU* (MAD 3, p. 264; ELTS, p. 165). Cf. *A-bù-KUR.KI* (MARI 4, p. 76 no. 73, p. 79 no. 155), *A-ba<sub>4</sub>-KUR.KI* (ARET 4 1 x 13), and *A.MU-KUR.KI* (ARET 8 531 ix 2),<sup>12</sup> in all instances describing the same Mari merchant (LÚ.KAR), which corresponds to the Babylonian *A-bù/bi-SA.TU*, once appearing as *A-bi-KUR* (MAD 3, p. 264). Further, note the name *KUR.KI-ì-lum*, borne by a merchant (LÚ.KAR) from Mari (MARI 4, p. 77 no. 92), which is clearly the same as the Babylonian *SA.TU-DINGIR* (MAD 3, p. 264) and *DINGIR-SA.TU* (JCS 28 [1976] 228 iii 2). Although these examples establish that *KUR.KI* = *šadi*, it is possible that, in some instances at least, *KUR.KI*

11. Still other examples of names employing the element *lugal*, as attested in Ebla sources, may be *Nu-ga-ma-na* (= *Lugal-men*?) (ARET 2 6 ii 5), *Nu-ga-mu* (ARET 7 145 ii 1), and *Nu-ga-mu-ba* (Krebern timer, *Personennamen*, p. 271).

12. For the writing, cf. the Mari names *A.MU-da-ab* / *abi-fāb* / (MARI 5, p. 103 no. 2 i 8) and *A.MU-DÜG* (MARI 4, p. 79 no. 154).

10. Cf. below p. 243.

may actually stand for Dagan. This is suggested by the name  $\dot{I}r-am_6-KUR.KI$ , borne by a cupbearer (SAGI) from Mari (MARI 4, p. 78 no. 137), which finds a close parallel in  $\dot{I}r'am-Dagan$  of Babylonian sources (MAD 3, p. 230).

32.  $Li-lum$ . Collated by A. Archi (personal communication). In all probability, to be analyzed as *lillu*, "fool, moron," which is documented as a PN in Sargonic and later sources. For the Sargonic examples, see  $Li-lum$  (Gelb, OAIC 23:1; RTC 91 iii 16'),  $Lú-lil-lum$  (CT 50 56:4, 59:2'; Grégoire, AAS 2:4),  $Lil-la$  (TuM 5 16:9),  $Lú-lil-la$  (Boston Museum of Fine Arts, 669-86, unpublished Sargonic seal), and  $Lu-lil-la$  (OSP 2, p. 196). For later occurrences, see CAD L p. 189b.

33.  $HAL-da-ba$ . Reading and analysis uncertain. The same name designates a  $PA_4\text{-}\dot{S}E\dot{S}$  priest of  $^dNI-da-KUL$  in MEE 2 19 rev. vi 1.

## II.

Within this group, nine names can be recognized as genuinely Sumerian (nos. 1, 5, 6, 16, 19, 20, 23, 25, and 29), while three other (nos. 7, 15, and 28) are possibly Sumerian. Twelve other names, either Semitic or of uncertain affiliation (nos. 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 17, 22?, 24, 26, 27?, 31, and 32), are documented also in Babylonia. Among all these names, only three (nos. 26, 27?, and 33) seem to be represented also in the onomasticon of Ebla.

As is suggested by this sample, Sumerian names were fairly common in Pre-Sargonic Mari. Although one could theoretically argue that the large concentration of Sumerian names in our sample is due to the specialized occupational background of their bearers, the examples of Sumerian names designating Mari citizens other than singers, which were cited in the commentary above,<sup>13</sup> show that this is not the case.

On the other hand, we lack any certain examples of Sumerian names designating the citizens of Ebla and other northern Syrian cities. That such names, though common at Mari, were unknown or at least extremely rare at Ebla is not surprising, if one considers the simple factor of geography and the fact that Ebla's contacts with Babylonia, unlike those of Mari, appear to have been sporadic and generally of an indirect nature.

It comes as a considerably bigger surprise to conclude that, even when the Sumerian names are excluded, the onomasticon of Pre-Sargonic Mari, as represented by the above sample and the examples noted in the commentary, is very closely connected with that of Babylonia (including the Diyala Region), though it shows little affinity with Ebla and northern Syria in general. In fact, it is easy to cite numerous other examples of onomastic an-

alogues between Mari and Babylonia, as the following, haphazardly collected sample will demonstrate:

(1)  $Ad-da$  of Mari (MARI 6, p. 247 nos. 38 ii 4 and 39 i 4, p. 251 no. 41 ii 1') and  $Ad-da$  of Babylonian sources (Pomponio, *Prosopografia*, pp. 19-20; OSP 1, p. 77; 2, p. 195; ELTS, p. 164; etc.).

(2)  $Ag-ga$  of Mari (MARI 4, p. 76 no. 63; MARI 5, p. 103 nos. 2 i 6 and 3 iii 7, p. 105 no. 4 iii 3') and  $Ag-ga$ , the famous ruler of the First Dynasty of Kish. Cf. the divine(?) element  $A-ga$ , found in the Mari names of the *šakkanakku* period:  $A-ga-lá-lí$  (ARM 19 392:8, 404:1'),  $Iš-má-A-ga$  (ARM 19 424:1'), and  $MI-lá-A-ga$  (ARM 19 319:6; Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, p. 364 MŠ 10:4).

(3)  $A-rí-ik-BAD$  of Mari (MARI 4, p. 76 no. 78), as compared with  $A-rí-ik-i-li$  and  $Be-lí-a-rí-ik$  of Babylonia (MAD 3, p. 64).

(4)  $Du-du$  of Mari (ARET 8 542 x 7; MARI 5, p. 123 no. 31 iii 3) and  $Du-du$  of Babylonia (Pomponio, *Prosopografia*, pp. 66-67; MAD 5, p. 97; ELTS, p. 60; etc.).

(5)  $\dot{E}\dot{S}-bum$  of Mari (MARI 4, p. 79 no. 152; Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, p. 8 MP 5:2 [read as *šē-bum*]) and  $\dot{E}\dot{S}_4-bum$  (Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, p. 80 Maništušu B 2:4) — also  $Iš-bù-um$  (HSS 10 135:5) or  $Iš-bum$  (HSS 10 24:11, 146:14, 153 ii 19) — of Babylonia.

(6)  $Ga-rí-ù$  (MARI 4, p. 78 nos. 134 and 139; ARET 8 521 vü 2, 539 ii 15), also  $Ga-rí-u_9$  (MARI 4, p. 76 no. 62), of Mari and  $Ga-rí$  and  $Ga-rí-um$  of Babylonia (MAD 3, p. 119; Himrin 6 iv 6 [Ga-rí-um]).

(7)  $Ib-bu-bu$  of Mari (MARI 6, p. 251 no. 40 iii' 8) and  $Ib-bu-bu$  of Babylonia (OSP 1 14:3, 129 iv 2'; Gelb, OAIC 3:11; HSS 10 108:14; Himrin 10 ii 2, 18:5; ELTS nos. 40 B vi 1, 41 i 11, 48 rev. iii 6).

(8)  $Ip-lu_5-il$  /*iplus-il(um)*/ of Mari (Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, p. 12 MP 12:1, p. 13 MP 13:1, MP 14:1, p. 14 MP 15:1; Krebernik, *Personennamen*, p. 215) and  $Ip-lu_5-il/DINGIR$  (MAD 3, p. 96) — also  $Ip-lu_5-zi-DINGIR$ ,  $Ip-lu-us-DINGIR$ , and  $Ip-lu-zi-DINGIR$  (SEL 1 [1984] 11) — of Babylonia. Cf. Steinkeller, NABU 1988/49 n. 14.

(9)  $Ib-u_9-mu-ud/du$  of Mari(?) (Krebernik, *Personennamen*, p. 216) and  $Ib-am_6-mud$  (OIP 99, p. 35) or  $Ib-mud$  of Babylonia (ELTS App. to nos. 22-23 i 3, iii 7). The name is possibly to be analyzed as /*ibū-mutu*/ (Ebla examples) or /*ibā'-mutu*/ (Abu Salabikh); cf. *ibū* at OB Mari, against *ibā'* in Babylonia (CAD B, p. 178b). For the possibility that  $Ib-u_9-mu-ud/du$  was a Mari official, see especially ARET 7 3, 6, and 7.

(10)  $\dot{I}r-ra-ra$  of Mari (ARET 1 5 rev. xii 24) and  $\dot{I}r-ra-ra$  of Babylonia (ELTS no. 40 A v 2; HSS 10 31:3, 153 iv 17; BIN 8 142:2; Himrin 2 iii 16).

(11)  $Kir-ba-núm$  of Mari (MARI 5, p. 119 no. 25 ii 4) and  $Kir-ba-núm$  of Babylonia (MAD 1, p. 210; cf. also MC 4 no. 55:5).

13. See also  $Ur-é-gal$ , a functionary of Enna-Dagan (of Mari), appearing in ARET 7 16 rev. iv 1, and  $Ur-é$  (of Mari), found in SEB 4, p. 152 rev. ix 10.

(12) Ku-ku of Mari (MARI 5, p. 103 no. 2 iii 2; ARET 1 5 rev. xiii 7; 4 24 ii 13) and Ku-ku of Babylonia (MAD 1, p. 211; 5, p. 110; OSP 1, p. 86; ELTS, p. 172; Himrin 6 iv 2; etc.).

(13) La-la of Mari (MARI 6, p. 251 no. 41 ii 4') and La-la of Babylonia (Pomponio, *Prosopografia*, p. 142; Names and Professions List line 24 [SEB 4, p. 181]; Bauer, *Lagasch*, p. 552; etc.).

(14) Mám(SAL)-ma-ĥir-sù /*man-māĥiršū*/ of Mari (Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, p. 13 MP 13:3) and Ma-ma-<sup>b</sup>ĥir (OSP 1 47 i 11) and Ma-ma-ĥir(-su) (MAD 3, p. 177) of Babylonia. Cf. Mám-ma-ĥir, designating a person from Gú-la-AN<sup>ki</sup> (localization unknown), in ARET 7 38 ii 1.

(15) Ma-āš-da-su /*ma(n)-ašāšū*/ (MARI 4, p. 78 no. 125) of Mari and Ma-an-iš-tu-su of Babylonia (MAD 3, p. 80).

(16) Ma-si-gi-BAD-li of Mari (MARI 5, p. 113 no. 19 ii 5) and Ma-siki-be-li of Babylonia (ELTS Appendix to no. 32 vi 6). Cf. Ma-siki (Westenholz, ECTJ 28 ii 7, 35 ii 4) and the feminine name variously written in Ebla sources as Ma-si-gi-ba-u<sub>4</sub> (OA 18 [1979] 135 viii 26), Ma-sa-gi-ba-um (ARET 8 525 v 1), Ma-si-gi-iš-ba-<sup>f</sup>um<sup>1</sup>, Ma-sa-gi-iš-ba-um (P. Fronzaroli, CRRAI 33, p. 71), Ma-si-gi-sa-um (HSAO 2, p. 168 viii 27), and Ma-si-gi-si-ba (ARET 9 43 iv 4).<sup>14</sup>

(17) Me-kisal of Mari (MARI 5, p. 111 no. 13 i 4) and Me-kisal-li of Babylonia (HSS 3 20 iv 13, 21 v 17; BIN 8 345:91; etc.).

(18) Me-me of Mari (ARET 4 19 rev. vi 10) and Me-me of Babylonia (MAD 1 7 i' 13, 276:5'; HSS 3, p. 25; TuM 36 i 6; Himrin 1 ii 13; etc.) — a feminine name in both instances.

(19) Me-sar of Mari (MARI 5, p. 98) and Me-sar of Babylonia (HSS 10 14:5, 25 iii 12, 30:8, 14).

(20) Mi-su-wa of Mari (MARI 5, p. 121 no. 28 iii 1; 6, p. 247 no. 38 iii 7) and Mi-su<sub>4</sub>-a of Babylonia (JCS 1 [1947] 348 St. Louis 11:6; ELTS no. 40 C xv 12). The same name is alternatively written Mi-su-ad (unpublished Pre-Sargonic Mari tablet in the Borowski Museum, Jerusalem — to be published by J.G. Westenholz), Mi-su-wa-du (MARI 4, p. 75 no. 44, p. 76 no. 63, p. 78 no. 131), Mi-su-wa-ti (ARET 8 529 viii 6), and Me-si-a-du (MARI 4, p. 74 no. 15 — in all instances describing individuals from Mari, and Mi-su<sub>4</sub>-ad in the Fara and Pre-Sargonic texts from Babylonia (Pomponio, *Prosopografia*, p. 177; Steinkeller, MC 4, p. 28).<sup>15</sup> Cf. also Mi-su<sub>4</sub> of Mari in MARI 6, p. 251 no. 40 iii' 2, 4. Because

14. The meaning of the element Ma-si-gi- is obscure. Cf. perhaps *nišikku/našikku* (=“Nin-ši-kū), “prince” (CAD N/2, pp. 282-83).

15. In view of this new interpretation, the name MI-AB.SI<sub>1</sub>, attested in the Pre-Sargonic texts from Isin, apparently is unrelated to Mi-su<sub>4</sub>-ad (against this author, MC 4, p. 28).

of the use of the sign SU<sub>4</sub> in the spellings from Babylonia, this name is almost certainly to be analyzed as /*mi(n)-šū'ati*/ “Why-Ĥim?”<sup>16</sup> For the spelling *su<sub>4</sub>-a* as representing *šū'at(i)*, see DUB *su<sub>4</sub>-a* and similar examples listed in MAD 3, p. 248. For the disappearance of vocalic endings in Old Akkadian pronouns and the examples of similar abbreviated writings, see Steinkeller, NABU 1988/49.

(21) Pa<sub>4</sub>-ba<sub>4</sub> of Mari (Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, p. 12 MP 12:3; MARI 5, p. 105 no. 4 iv 4; F. Pomponio and M.G. Biga, NABU 1989/114) and Pa<sub>4</sub>-pa<sub>4</sub> of Babylonia (MAD 1 163 ii 25; MVN 3 100:11; BIN 8 148:62, 152:87, 156:1; etc.) — a feminine name in both instances.

(22) Puzur<sub>4</sub>-ra-sù-DÜG of Mari (MARI 4, p. 76 no. 73) and Puzur<sub>4</sub>-sù/su-DÜG of Babylonia (ELTS no. 37 ii 3; MVN 3 27:2). Cf. also the Mari name Zi-lu-su-DÜG /*šillūšu-tāb*/ (MARI 4, p. 79 no. 154).

(23) Ū-da-a-ĥa (MARI 4, p. 78 no. 131), also Ū-da-a-ĥu (ARET 4 1 rev. iii 17; MARI 4, p. 77 no. 99) and Ū-da-aĥ (ARET 4 2 vi 1), of Mari and Ū-da-aĥ and Ū-ta-a-ĥi of Babylonia (MAD 3, p. 82).

(24) The pronoun *šuma*, “he himself” (MAD 3, p. 248), seems to be found primarily in the names from Mari and Babylonia. For the Mari examples, see Su-ma-a-ba<sub>4</sub> (MARI 4, p. 78 no. 134), Šu-ma-<sup>d</sup>Aš-dar (ARET 8 525 xx 16), and Su-ma-LAGAB (MARI 5, p. 119 no. 25 v 2, p. 121 no. 27 i 4); for the Babylonian evidence, see Su-ma-a-ba<sub>4</sub> and Su/Sù-ma-a-ĥa in the sources from Abu-Salabikh (OIP 99, p. 35), Su/Sù-ma-me-ru in the Names and Professions List line 256 (SEB 4, p. 188), and the examples listed in MAD 3, p. 248, and ELTS, p. 177.

(25) The word *mudūl*, “knowing,” is documented only in Mari and Babylonian names. See A-ĥu-mu-da-a (ARET 1 5 rev. xiii 3) and A-ĥu-ma-da (MARI 4, p. 76 no. 78) of Mari, as compared with the Babylonian DINGIR-mu-da and other examples collected in MAD 3, p. 18. Note that DINGIR-mu-da appears already in the Fara text TSS 150 i 2.

The observation — though admittedly preliminary — that the primary onomastic affinities of Pre-Sargonic Mari were with Babylonia and not with Ebla would obviously be of great importance for the evaluation of the linguistic situation in the region in question prior to the Sargonic period. The existence of close onomastic links between Mari and Babylonia, coupled with the absence of such links between Mari and Ebla, would force us to consider that, in the sphere of language, too, Pre-Sargonic Mari was much closer related to (northern) Babylonia than to Ebla and northern Syria.

This is a new and a rather startling conclusion, which contradicts the position of I.J. Gelb, firmly and repeated-

16. Probably referring to the death of an older sibling.

ly stated in his article "Mari and the Kish Civilization,"<sup>17</sup> that "the native language of Mari is identical, but for insignificant local and temporal variations, with that of Ebla."<sup>18</sup> While a thorough discussion of this complex issue is not possible here, the sharp divergence between Gelb's and our position demonstrates, if nothing else, that the question of the language of Mari is far from settled, and that a fresh evaluation of this problem is urgently needed. Such a new evaluation should of course be preceded by a systematic prosopographic study of the Mari personal names in Ebla sources, which would be of critical importance not only for the matters of language, but also for the broader questions of Mari's place in the geo-political picture of greater Mesopotamia in Early Dynastic times.

### III.

For the evaluation of the onomastic and linguistic picture involving Mari, Babylonia, and Ebla, some aspects of which have just been discussed, of considerable importance is a group of roughly thirty names borne by the individuals who are identified in Ebla sources as coming from or being in various ways associated with the toponym *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>*.<sup>19</sup>

Although it had been questioned, by at least two different scholars,<sup>20</sup> whether this toponym is in fact identical with Kish of northern Babylonia, any doubts that may have remained were subsequently removed by the treatment of this problem by Archi.<sup>21</sup> That *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* of Ebla is the Babylonian Kish was proved by Archi primarily, but not exclusively, through the demonstration that the names in question, while lacking any transparent connections with the onomasticon of Ebla, share various unique features with the names of northern Babylonia and Mari.

One was understandably surprised, therefore, to read a recent article by F. Pomponio,<sup>22</sup> who claims that the names studied by Archi do not show any characteristics that would link them securely with the northern Babylonian onomasticon, and suggests that the toponym *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* of Ebla sources was situated somewhere in the Habur re-

gion. Pomponio bases the latter conclusion on three passages in which *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* is mentioned in conjunction with the toponym Nagar, which is generally believed to have been situated in the Habur region, and on the fact that, with the exception of two occurrences of Adab's name, no other Babylonian city is ever mentioned in Ebla sources.

Pomponio's treatment of the onomastic evidence is far from objective, as he either ignores or obscures the importance of the names that are indicative of the connections with the Babylonian onomasticon.<sup>23</sup> Instead, he concentrates on a few problematic names, forcing on them interpretations — either highly questionable or simply wrong — that could conceivably provide links with the onomasticon of Ebla. Thus, *e.g.*, the difficult name *Zi-NE-ĪAR*<sup>24</sup> is connected by Pomponio with *NE-ĪAR-*, which is claimed (without any solid basis) to be "un elemento teoforo caratteristico di Ebla"; the element *ir-AN-* becomes "una forma verbale largamente diffusa a Ebla, come a Mari" (this form actually represents *ir-am<sub>6</sub>- /ir'am/*, which of course is also documented in Babylonia); the element *Dab<sub>6</sub>*, found in the name *Dab<sub>6</sub>-si-ga* (for which see below), is explained as *ṭāb*; and so on. This type of analysis brings Pomponio to the conclusion that "questi dati onomastici non sembrano giustificare in alcun modo una localizzazione di *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* in Accad."

To put this claim to rest, and to settle, once and for all, the question of *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* at Ebla, I offer below, building on the earlier investigations by Archi, a listing of the onomastic features that prove, beyond any reasonable doubt, the northern Babylonian background of the names in question:<sup>25</sup>

(1) *Dab<sub>6</sub>-si-ga*. Of all the Kishite names found in Ebla sources, this is perhaps the single most important datum for the issue under discussion. For the reading and identification with the Pre-Sargonic and Sargonic *Dab<sub>4</sub>* (*DUB*)-*si-ga*, see already Steinkeller, RA 78 (1984) 88. While the spelling *Dab<sub>4</sub>-si-ga* is the most common (ELTS nos. 37 R.E. 15, 40 C vi 9, 17, 22, x 1, 18, xi 24; UCP 9, p. 204 no. 83 iv 2 [collated]; AnOr 7 372 i 7' [collated by A. Westenholz]; HSS 10 145 iii 4, 150:12, 157 iii 4; MAD 1 255 v 6, 321:3'; BIN 8 160:12; Himrin 4 iii 3; ASJ 4 [1982] 43 no. 13 iii 2; OSP 2 98 v 1), this name is also attested under the writings *Tab-si-ga* (Gelb, OAIC 3:2), *Dab<sub>6</sub>(URUDU)-si-ga* (CT 50 172:49), and *Tab-su-ga* (MAD 5 9 iii 20; OSP 2 130 i 11). Disregarding whether or not we find here the word *tupšikku*, "bas-

17. *Mari in Retrospect*, ed. by G.D. Young (Winona Lake, IN, 1992), pp. 121-202.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 197.

19. See Archi, *Eblaïtica* 1, pp. 131, 137-40. To be added to this list is the name *İš-kūn-Nu-nu*, appearing in MARI 5, p. 45 TM 75.G.10091 iii 5. Cf. Archi, *ibid.*, p. 46. There may also survive the name of a king of Kish, as is suggested by the comparison of the following three passages: A.MU-šù EN *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* (SEB 4, p. 87 no. 45), 'A'.MU LUGAL (*Kiš<sup>ki</sup>*) (*Eblaïtica* 1, p. 139 no. 28), and A-bi LUGAL *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* (MARI 5, p. 45 iv 2-4). Based on these spellings, the name could be analyzed as */abišū/*. For A.MU as representing */abi/*, see above n. 12. Cf. Archi, MARI 5, pp. 46-47.

20. P. Michalowski, JAOS 105 (1985) 297-98; E. Sollberger, ARET 8, p. 46.

21. *Eblaïtica* 1 (1987) 125-40. Cf. already *idem*, SEB 4 (1981) 77-87.

22. *Mesopotamia* 25 (1990) 175-84.

23. *Ibid.*, pp. 176-78.

24. *Zi-NE-ĪAR* is very likely identical with the Mari name *I-zi-NE-ĪAR* (ARET 1 5 xii 10). I propose to read this name as *I-zi-ne-ār /iṣi-niwar/*, for which interpretation cf. the Mari names *Ni-wa-ar-Me-er* (Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, p. 363 MŠ 8:1) and *I-ši-<sup>d</sup>Dagan* (*ibid.*, p. 356 no. 8). Cf. also the usage of *nimnu* in Old Assyrian names (CAD N/2, p. 235a).

25. Cited after Archi, *Eblaïtica* 1, pp. 131, 137-40.

ket,<sup>26</sup> which is a Sumerian loanword in Akkadian, Dab<sub>4</sub>-si-ga is a characteristically and uniquely Babylonian name, and this point alone is sufficient to determine the identity of Kiš<sup>ki</sup>.

(2) The divine element Su'en, appearing in the names Ìr-am<sub>6</sub>-Zu-i-nu and Du-NE-Zu-i-nu.<sup>27</sup> Su'en is not invoked in personal names outside of Babylonia, and, as a matter of fact, these two examples, plus the occurrences in VE 799 (MEE 4, p. 289) and ARET 5 6 viii 5, seem to represent the only references to Su'en in the entire Ebla corpus. As convincingly argued by W.G. Lambert,<sup>28</sup> the cult of Su'en was unknown in northern Syria during the period in question, the name of the Syrian moon-god at that time apparently being NI-da-kul.

(3) The divine element Nu-nu, appearing in the names Ìr-gum-Nu-nu and IŠ-kùn-Nu-nu.<sup>29</sup> The deity Nunu or Nuni is attested only in the sources from Babylonia and the *Šakkanakku* texts from Mari. Cf. J.J.M. Roberts, *The Earliest Semitic Pantheon* (Baltimore, 1972), p. 47; Archi, MARI 5, p. 46 n. 28. For the Babylonian occurrences, see Dan-Nu-nu (MAD 1 98:4), Da-Nu-nu (MAD 1 2 iii 8), Šu-Nu-nu (ELTS no. 40 A xv 17), Su<sub>4</sub>-Nu-nu (MDP 14 6 ii 3), Pù-Nu-nu (ELTS no. 38 i 5), and Puzur<sub>4</sub>-(<sup>d</sup>)Nu-ni (ELTS no. 40 D iii 12; MAD 5 9 i 9). The Mari examples are represented by the names Amì-ir-<sup>d</sup>Nu-nu, I-din-<sup>d</sup>Nu-nu, [Ì]-lì-<sup>d</sup>Nu-nu, IŠ-ma-ni-<sup>d</sup>Nu-nu, MI-lá-<sup>d</sup>Nu-nu, Ni-id<-na>-at-<sup>d</sup>Nu-nu, <sup>d</sup>Nu-nu-tá-mur, <sup>d</sup>Nu-nu-da-ti, <sup>d</sup>Nu-nu-É, <sup>d</sup>Nu-nu-lì-ti-a/wa, and <sup>d</sup>Nu-nu-um-mì (ARM 19, pp. 159-62). Cf. above p. 239 no. 20.

(4) The use of *šaṭāpu* in the names IŠ-dub-<sup>d</sup>Šamaš, IŠ-dab<sub>6</sub>-NI, IŠ-dub-bù, IŠ-du-bù, IŠ-du-bu<sub>x</sub>(NI), and IŠ-du-bù-um. As far as one can ascertain at this time, the usage of *šaṭāpu* in personal names is a feature unique to Babylonia and Mari. For the Babylonian examples, see MAD 3, p. 291; ELTS, pp. 171-72; OIP 99, p. 35 (IŠ-dub-<sup>d</sup>KA.DI). For the Mari evidence, see IŠ-dub-sar (OA 19 [1980] 239 v 3), IŠ-dub-NI, a merchant (LÚ.KAR) from Mari (MARI 4, p. 75 nos. 44 and 50, p. 79 no. 156 [= ARET 8 534 xiii 3]; Mélanges Kupper, p. 204 no. 24), IŠ-dub-il, a merchant ([LÚ.KAR]) from Mari (MARI 4, p. 75 no. 35; Mélanges Kupper, p. 207 no. 59),<sup>30</sup> IŠ-dub-il, a smith (SIMUG) from Mari (SEB 4, p. 160 no. 9 iv 9), IŠ-dub-DINGIR (Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, p. 361 MŠ 5:1, p. 362 MŠ 6:4, MŠ 7:1), and IŠ-du-bù(-um), a merchant

(LÚ.KAR) from Mari (MARI 4, p. 76 no. 73, p. 78 no. 134).

(5) The use of RGM in the name Ìr-gum-Nu-nu. The root RGM is otherwise documented only in the onomasticon of Babylonia. See Ìr-gu-mu (Himrin 3 iv 15), Rí-ig-mu-uš-al-su (JCS 28 [1976] 228 i 12; Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, p. 104 Narāmsīn A 4:1), Rí-ig-mu-uš-dan (ZA 51 [1955] pl. 2 [after p. 74] iii 8, 9), and Rí-ig-mu-um (MAD 1 215:37, 235:4, 317 i 3, 324 i 2; 5 9 iii 14).

(6) The use of *šakānu* in the name IŠ-kùn-Nu-nu. The verb *šakānu* is documented only in the Babylonian onomasticon. See IŠ-kùn-DINGIR (ELTS no. 40 A xiv 12), IŠ-ku-DINGIR (MAD 5 48:5'), IŠ-ku-Èr-ra (ITT 4 7449:5), IŠ-ku-un-<sup>(d)</sup>Da-gan (ITT 1 1167, 1316:2; Limet, *Documents* 14:19; etc.), and the examples listed in MAD 3, p. 268.

(7) Da-da. Dada, whose background may be Sumerian, is a characteristically Babylonian name. Documented also at Mari. See above p. 238 no. 7.

(8) Ur-NI-zi. This is possibly a Sumerian name. Cf. Lugal-NI-zi of Mari, discussed above p. 239 no. 19.

(9) Ur-ra-nu. This name is very likely identical with the Sumerian name Ur-ra-ni, which is attested in Westenholz, ECTJ 81:2, 84:2. Cf. also Úr(-ra)-ni (OSP 2, p. 199).

(10) Bù-šu-sum. Almost certainly identical with the Babylonian name Bù-sa-šum, which is attested in MAD 5 102:13 (Kish).

(11) Da-li-lum. Although not documented in Babylonian sources, Da-li-lum is attested at Mari (ARET 1 5 rev. xiii 23).

(12) Gi-iš-ĪI. Probably identical with the Mari name Gi-iš-ĪI-šu, discussed above p. 237 no. 3.

The status of the remaining Kishite names is inconclusive, although it is significant that most of them, like I-rí-šu / I-rí-sum,<sup>31</sup> Sa-mu-nu / Su-mu-nu,<sup>32</sup> Ìr-am<sub>6</sub>-mu,<sup>33</sup> and the names constructed with Ìr-am<sub>6</sub>,<sup>34</sup> find good parallels in Babylonian sources. Even more signif-

26. As assumed by Gelb, MAD 3, p. 298. AHw, p. 1371, does not include this name under *tupšikku*.

27. The interpretation of the element Du-NE-, attested also in the names Du-NE-Da-mu, Du-NE-Ma-lik, and Du-NE-Zi-kir (Krebernik, *Personennamen*, pp. 169-70), remains unclear. This element is usually interpreted as Tù-bí- (see, e.g., G. Pettinato, MEE 2, p. 352; Limet, ARÉS 1, p. 43), but this analysis is grammatically unconvincing. Cf. the name Du-kil-<sup>d</sup>EN.ZU / *tukkil-Su'en* (MAD 1 233 i 3), which raises the possibility that NE may have a reading gi<sub>1</sub>.

28. OA 23 (1984) 43-44; RA 83 (1989) 96.

29. For this name, see above n. 19.

30. Since in Mélanges Kupper, p. 204 no. 24, and p. 207 no. 59, IŠ-dub-NI and IŠ-dub-il are each described by the phrase MAŠKIM RAŠ.GA Du-du-lu<sup>ki</sup>, Archi, *ibid.*, p. 202 (also QS 13 [1984] 244; *Eblaïtica* 1, p. 131), assumed that these two individuals were citizens of Tutul. However, it is clear that this designation merely attests to their involvement in the trade with Tutul. That IŠ-dub-NI and IŠ-dub-il were Mari merchants is made absolutely certain by the occurrence in MARI 4, p. 75 no. 35: IŠ-dub-il [LÚ.KAR] Ma-rí<sup>ki</sup> MAŠKIM RAŠ.GA Du-du-lu<sup>ki</sup>, as well as by the similar data bearing on two other Mari merchants: Ú-rí-rí, a LÚ.KAR Ma-rí<sup>ki</sup> in MARI 4, p. 79 no. 155, who is identified as Ma-rí<sup>ki</sup> MAŠKIM RAŠ.GA Du-du-lu<sup>ki</sup> in Mélanges Kupper, p. 205 no. 33; and Ib-gi-tum, a LÚ.KAR Ma-rí<sup>ki</sup> in MARI 4, p. 74 no. 19, p. 75 no. 45, p. 76 no. 73, p. 77 nos. 92 and 100, p. 78 no. 137, and p. 79 no. 159, who appears as MAŠKIM RAŠ.GA Du-du-lu<sup>ki</sup> in Mélanges Kupper, p. 207 no. 59.

31. See I-rí-sum (ELTS no. 48 iv 12), I-rí-ša (Himrin 19:5), and Í/I-rí-iš (OSP 1, p. 84). Cf. Ìr-rí-su of Mari (MARI 4, p. 75 no. 54).



icant is the fact that these names do not contain any linguistic or theophoric features that would ensure a connection with the northern Syrian onomasticon, to the exclusion of Babylonian affinities.

It hardly needs stressing that the presence in this small sample of so many features that are shared also by the names of Babylonia, and, though to a lesser extent, by the onomasticon of Mari cannot be accidental. The only feasible accounting for this situation is that the names in question originated in northern Babylonia. In turn, this means that the toponym *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>*, with which the bearers of those names are associated, stands for Kish of Babylonia.

Turning now to the alleged connection between *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* and Nagar, which is Pomponio's other argument for rejecting the identification of *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* with the Babylonian Kish, we note that none of the passages cited by Pomponio even remotely suggests a link between these two toponyms. Two of those passages refer to the citizens of Nagar either travelling to or returning from *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>*,<sup>35</sup> while the third one concerns a person who went to *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* and Nagar.<sup>36</sup> Such conjectural evidence cannot be considered indicative of the geographical proximity between *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* and Nagar, since, as the Ebla sources bear it out very clearly, the international trade in Upper Mesopotamia, which appears to have been dominated by the Mari merchants, involved an exceedingly complex network of connections, with trade routes and individual itineraries often taking very complicated courses.

Far more important for the localization of *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* is the case of a group of matrons and female singers from that place who came to Ebla with a Mari caravan: (7) SAL.AB×ĀŠ.AB×ĀŠ *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* (6) SAL.NAR *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* LÚ Ì.TI in NÍG.-KAS<sub>4</sub> Ma-ri<sup>ki</sup> in SA.ZA<sub>x</sub>.KI ŠU.BA<sub>4</sub>.TI, "(7) matrons/ladies of Kish (and) (6) female singers of Kish, who were present in / came here<sup>37</sup> with the Mari caravan, received (allotments of silver) in the palace" (*Eblaïtica* 1, p. 139 no. 16).<sup>38</sup> As Pomponio's theory would require one to assume, these women travelled from the Ḥabur region to Ebla by taking a lengthy and not very convenient detour through Mari. A considerably more likely scenario is that they travelled from northern Babylonia to Mari, where they hitched up with a local caravan going to Ebla.

We need, finally, to address the issue of the rarity of references to Babylonian cities, other than *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>*, in Ebla

sources. Here Pomponio is unquestionably right, but this situation can be explained in a much simpler way. First, as we learn from the published Ebla sources, the direct contacts and exchanges between Ebla and Babylonia were very rare, being largely limited to occasional official exchanges between the royal houses of Ebla and Kish.<sup>39</sup> As for the indirect, especially commercial, exchanges, those seem to have been conducted almost exclusively through the intermediary of Mari. Thus, the mentions of Babylonian cities, such as Kish, Adab, and Akshak,<sup>40</sup> are usually confined to contexts involving Mari merchants, to whom the Ebla administration assigned capital and wares for joint ventures in Babylonia. Since the information as to where exactly the transactions took place was at best of secondary importance to the Ebla administrators, this type of data is comparatively rare in Ebla documents.

Second, it is safe to surmise that, during the period in question, Kish held sway over the entire territory of northern Babylonia, which enabled it effectively to monopolize commercial exchanges between Lower and Upper Mesopotamia. In other words, all trade relations between these two geographical areas appear to have been controlled by and conducted via Kish, with other Babylonian cities being largely excluded from participation in such exchanges.<sup>41</sup> Not surprisingly, the only exceptions here, as documented in Ebla sources, were Akshak<sup>42</sup> and Adab.<sup>43</sup> The former city, located on the margin of Babylonia proper, was a great power in its own right, which competed with Kish for the hegemony over northern Babylonia. As for Adab, we may speculate that it was Adab's advantageous location near the Tigris that provided it with enough independence to enjoy at least a measure of direct contacts with the cities of Upper Mesopotamia.

39. For examples of such exchanges, see A. Archi, *Eblaïtica* 1, pp. 125-126; *idem*, MARI 5, pp. 43-49.

40. For Adab, see below n. 43; for Akshak, see below n. 42.

41. For the primacy of Kish in northern Babylonia, see especially the following passage: 30 (G<sup>n</sup>) KUG.BABBAR NÍG.BA Wa-ru-tum Ma-ri<sup>ki</sup> NÍG.AN.AN.AN.AN in URU.KI.URU.KI *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* ŠU.BA<sub>4</sub>.TI, "30 (shekels) of silver, the allotment of Warutum of Mari, was received (by him) as votive gifts(?) for the cities of (the kingdom of) Kish" (MARI 4, p. 75 no. 35). The involvement of Warutum in the commercial contacts with Kish is documented also in MARI 4, p. 78 nos. 138 and 143. The same individual had also dealings with Akshak (see the following note). For the meaning of NÍG.AN.AN.AN.AN, see Archi and M.G. Biga, ARET 3, pp. 377-78.

42. See 2 MA.NA KUG.BABBAR NÍG.BA Ab-NI Ma-ri<sup>ki</sup> NÍG.AN.AN.AN.AN Ak-sa-gú<sup>ki</sup> ŠU.BA<sub>4</sub>.TI (...) 1 MA.NA KUG.BABBAR NÍG.BA Wa-ru-tum Ma-ri<sup>ki</sup> NÍG.AN.AN.AN.AN Ak-sa-gú<sup>ki</sup> ŠU.BA<sub>4</sub>.TI (MARI 4, p. 77 no. 100). See also [...] Du-du-lu<sup>ki</sup> NÍG.AN.AN.AN.AN Ak-sa-gú<sup>ki</sup> ŠU.BA<sub>4</sub>.TI (Mélanges Kupper, p. 205 no. 41); [...] Du-du-lu<sup>ki</sup> NÍG.AN.AN.AN.AN Ak-sa(!)-gú(!)<sup>ki</sup> ŠU.BA<sub>4</sub>.TI (ARET 3 316 ii 1'-4' = Mélanges Kupper, p. 203 no. 6).

43. 1 MA.NA KUG.BABBAR NÍG.BA Šu-ga-du Ma-ri<sup>ki</sup> NÍG.AN.AN.AN.AN Adab<sup>ki</sup> ŠU.BA<sub>4</sub>.TI (MEE 10 29 rev. iii 22-28 = MARI 4, p. 76 no. 62).

32. See Sa-ma-nim (Gen.) (AnOr 7 372 iii 10 [collated by A. Westenholz]) and Su-mu-nim (ELTS, p. 177; MC 4 no. 48:18 [read as Su-mu-hum]). Cf. also Su-mu-nu-um at Mari (Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, p. 365 MS 12:3).

33. See Īr-a-mu (ELTS no. 40 B v 2; PBS 14 126) and Īr-a-mu-um (MC 4 no. 56:10).

34. See MAD 3, p. 230. Cf. also above p. 11 no. 27.

35. SEb 4, p. 81 no. 22; *Eblaïtica* 1, p. 138 no. 7.

36. SEb 4, p. 77 no. 1.

37. For the meaning of Ì.TI in Ebla economic sources, see J. Krecher, QS 13 (1984), pp. 78-83.

38. The same thirteen women are also mentioned in *Eblaïtica* 1, p. 138 no. 12, where they are identified as (7) AB×ĀŠ.AB×ĀŠ *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>* and (6) NAR *Kiš<sup>ki</sup>*.

ADDENDUM

Subsequent to the submission of this article to the editors, I discovered that the contingent of the Mari singers discussed above (pp. 237-240) is also listed in TM 75.G.1917 x 14-xi 10 (to be published by me in a future volume of ARET). As read from the original, the passage in question can be transliterated as follows:

3 GU.DÙL.TÚG 3 ÍB-3-TÚG GÙN / Ur-sa-Utu /  
Lu-gi-na / Gú-li-li / 22 SAL.TÚG / 10 LAL 3 ÍB-  
3-TÚG GÙN / A-si / Û-zi-ga / NE-na / Da-da  
/ Lugal-en (wr: EN:LUGAL) / Ur-Nu-nu / BAD.  
'KUR'.KI / LÚ ÍB-3-TÚG.ÍB-3-TÚG / wa / 15  
DUMU. NITA NAR.TUR / [M]a-r[i<sup>ki</sup>]

The resulting correspondences with the name-forms found in Sources A and B are:

Ur-sa-Utu = 1. Ur-sá-[Utu(?)] / Ur-zu-Utu.

Lu-gi-na = 2. Lú-gi-na / Gi-gi-na.

Gú-li-li = 3. Gú-li-li.

A-si = 4. A-si.

Û-zi-ga = 5. Nu-gal-zi-ga.

NE-na = 8. NE-na.

Da-da = 7. Da-da.

Lugal-en (written EN:LUGAL) = 19. Nu-gal-NI-zi. In view of the new spelling, Nu-gal-NI-zi can quite confidently be analyzed as Nu-gal-ì-zi = Lugal-ezen. The same interpretation apparently also applied to Lugal/Nu-gal-ĥi-zi (see above p. 239). Accordingly, the Kishite name Ur-NI-zi (see above p. 243) is very likely to be explained as Ur-ì-zi = Ur-ezen. For Ur-ezen, see ELTS, p. 179.

Ur-Nu-nu = 20. Ur-Na-na / Ur-Nu-nu-na. The new spelling seems to assure that the divine element is Nunu, as I speculated above p. 239.

BAD.'KUR'.KI = 31. BAD-KUR.KI.