A small (4.5 x 4 cm.) privately owned tablet, probably from Emar, records the repayment by a third party of a debt of wine. All of the PNN on the tablet are attested at Emar and Ekalte, but none of the father-son pairs is to be found in the data base of Emar PNN (Pruzsinszky 2003), nor could I find any in the Ekalte texts. The scribe, Ikun-Dagan, is not otherwise attested at Emar, but there is a scribe of that name at nearby Ekalte (Cohen 2009: 95). A vertical ruling creates a margin on the reverse, to the left of the witness list. The tablet is undated and not sealed.
Text 1:

obverse

1. 8 dug hu-pu kaš-geštin
2. hu-bu-ul-li
3. ša 1-a-wi-ri
4. dumu hi₂-ma-ši
5. 1-da-da
6. dumu ab-di₄-iš-ha-ra
7. dumu-meš zu⁴-da-gan
8. dumu i-ri-ib₄-da-gan

lower edge

9. i-pu-ul-šu-nu

reverse

1. igi ip-qis₂-da-gan
2. dumu mil-ka-ma
3. igi i-ku₄-da-gan dub-sar
4. igi da-gan-ma
5. dumu zi-ik-ri

Eight hupu-jars of wine, the debt of Awiri son of Himaši, Dada son of Abdi-Išhara paid to the sons of
Zu-Dagan son of Irib-Dagan.

Witnesses: Ipqi-Dagan son of Milkama, Ikun-Dagan the scribe, Dagan-ma son of Zikri.

This unusual debt payable in jars of wine is paid off by a third party to the sons of a creditor, probably deceased. The *hupu* or *hubu* vessel at Emar is used for wine alongside the *hizzibu* vessel (Fleming 1992: 143f.). The *hupu* is the larger vessel, judging from the fact that it is generally listed first and in smaller quantities when it occurs together with the *hizzibu*, but it most likely is not the same as the *huppum* at Mari made from 12 mina of copper, which must have been very large indeed (Guichard 2005: 201). That the debt in our document is expressed in *hupu*-jars indicates that the *hupu* was standardized, as does the use of *hupu* to establish the amount of wine to be provided annually to the NIN.DINGIR-priestess at Emar (Fleming 1992 29:87). Note, as well, Emar 6/3, 364, where four *hupu* and three *hizzibu* of wine for one month, and eight *hizzibu* for a second month, are said to total ten *hupu* of wine, implying that the *hupu* is about twice the size of the *hizzibu* (11 *hizzibu* = 6 *hupu*, thus 1 *hupu* = 1.8 *hizzibu*). (As Arnaud [1986] notes, the numeral ten is written as 4+4+2, rather than the customary U. It
might, then, be a misread numeral 8 \([3+3+2]\), implying about a 3:1 ratio \([4 \text{ hupu} + 11 \text{ hizzibu} = 8 \text{ hupu}, \text{ so } 11 \text{ hizzibu} = 4 \text{ hupu}, \text{ and } 2.75 \text{ hizzibu} = 1 \text{ hupu}]\).
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