§1. Introduction
§1.1. Frayne (1997) and Sigrist & Damerow (2001) both provide recent examples of lists of year names for the Ur III period.\(^1\) Whilst there are differences between these two versions, they are largely in agreement and the differences can readily be summarized. The aim here is to consider the practical application of these lists of year names to dating the tablets in the CDLI catalogue for the years, Šulgi 20 to 30. This paper also considers the statistical distribution of the numbers of tablets for this period across their different proveniences.

§1.2. For the reign of Ur-Namma and the first twenty years of Šulgi, the overwhelming majority of the tablets that have been preserved and documented originate from Girsu. However, during the latter part of this period, the number of tablets from any location is quite small. The numbers of tablets per year increases during Šulgi 20 to 30 but most of these tablets are from Umma, with smaller numbers from Girsu and other locations. This increase in the numbers of tablets presents some problems of scale, although these do not reach the levels of later years.

§1.3. Anyone who has tried to assign dates to administrative tablets of the Ur III period will recognise the problem of being confronted with a year name that, at first sight, could be an abbreviation of the names of several different years. Consideration of the application of year names for the period Šulgi 20 to 30 raises many of the issues that are found more generally. Indeed, it is important to achieve a correct allocation of tablets to these years in order to avoid them drifting into lists for later years.

§1.4. For the period in question, there are two apparent school tablets that list the sequence of year names (Frayne 1997: 91). The first is BE 1/2, 125 (Ist Ni 394), from Nippur that is likely to have been Old Babylonian or later and that lists the year names from Šulgi 5 (or Šulgi 6) to Šulgi 43. The second is OrNS 54, 299-303 (IB 542a+), an Isin tablet of which only fragments are preserved, giving the year names of Šulgi 4-5 (or Šulgi 5-6) and Šulgi 19-24.\(^2\) It is useful also to mention CU-SAS 17, 101, that lists the year names of Amar-Suen, Šu-Suen and the first three years of Ibbi-Suen.

§2. Practical Application of Year Names for Šulgi 20-30
§2.1. If the year names on the administrative tablets were always written in full and if it were simply a matter of matching the year name on the tablet to an almost identical one on a list, then this process would be straightforward. However, it rapidly becomes clear that a large proportion of the year names appearing on administrative tablets are abbreviations. This naturally creates a problem in cases where year names for different years have the same, or nearly the same abbreviations. This difficulty is exacerbated because we are confronted with a mass of tablets, most of which have not been

---

\(^1\) The Sigrist & Damerow (2001) lists of year names appear as web-pages within the CDLI web domain and have not been formally published. Since these were originally used as the basis for dating the tablets in the CDLI catalogue, it is necessary to refer to them here, slightly updated with current readings. Therefore, for the sake of completeness, the relevant part of the Sigrist & Damerow lists of year names has been included below as Appendix A.

\(^2\) BE 1/2, 125, is transcribed by Ungnad (1938: 137-138) and discussed by Kraus (1951). OrNS 54, 299-303, is considered by Wilcke (1985).
properly excavated and, in those cases, each tablet has to be considered separately, with no possibility of guidance from the archaeological context.

§2.2. The matter of correctly identifying the year of some random tablet would have been different for the scribes of Ur III. While they may have been instructed to use year names containing grandiose and often lengthy statements of the achievements of the king and state, it is readily understandable that they would have chosen to write an abbreviated form of a lengthy year name so long as this did not cause ambiguity for themselves or their colleagues. However, they would usually have been dealing with tablets at specific locations, within an accounting period of a reasonable length. Our problems tend to arise when we have tablets from an unknown location, and we try to place their abbreviated year names somewhere within the whole span of the Ur III period.

§2.3. Whilst it would be possible to list all of the years that could be represented by an abbreviation, this would be cumbersome and could produce misleading results. For example, the abbreviated year name ‘mu dumu-munuś lugal,’ frequently encountered, could refer to:

- mu li₂-wir-mi-ta₂-šu dumu-munuś lugal nam-nin mar-ḫa-šī₂-ṣe₃ ba-il₂, Year: “Liwwir-mipitu, the daughter of the king, was elevated to the queenship of Marhashi” (Šulgi 18)
- mu dumu-munuś lugal ensi₂ an-ša-an₄-ke₄ ba-an-tuku, Year: “The governor of Anšan took the king’s daughter into marriage” (Šulgi 30)
- mu tu-ki-in-pa-mi-ig-rī₇₂ dumu-munuś lugal ensi₂ za-ab-ša-li₄-ke₄ ba-an-tuku, Year: “The governor of...

However, these are not equally likely since the number of tablets expected for Šulgi 30 far exceeds the numbers expected for Šulgi 18, Ibbi-Suen 5 and Iddin-Dagan 2. Therefore, listings of tablets usually give a preferred date, even though it is recognized that there is some ambiguity. However, this leads to problems if the allocation of dates is made considering only (abbreviated) year names, without considering other contextual information that is available.

§2.4. An example of this can be found in CatBM 2; page 274 gives the distribution of numbers of tablets per year for the period Šulgi 20-30 recorded in figure 1. It is, of course, possible that CatBM 2 accurately lists the dates of the unpublished tablets. However, it seems more likely that the spike in the apparent numbers of tablets for Šulgi 25 actually arises because tablets with the year name ‘mu si-mu-ru-umki ba-ḥul’ have been preferentially assumed to be dated to Šulgi 25, rather than, for example, Šulgi 26, 32, 44 or Ibbi-Suen 3.⁴

There are examples in tablets containing sequences of dates where the scribes included some quite severe abbreviations in the year names, but they are not ambiguous because the abbreviated date can be interpreted in relation to the sequence of dates.

⁴ Statistically, CatBM 2 lists a markedly low number of tablets for the year Ibbi-Suen 3. Therefore, it seems likely that a number of the tablets listed in that catalogue as Šulgi 25 might actually be attributed to Ibbi-Suen 3. However, since many of these tablets have not been
§2.5. The above example is taken from a catalogue of several thousand tablets. However, in principle, for full publication of tablets, it would be possible to improve the accuracy of the dates if the contents of each tablet were considered based on detail study on onomastics and other factors. However, such studies are time consuming, particularly prior to the ready availability of searches using electronic databases. Therefore, it seems reasonable to question whether detailed studies have always been done to underpin each date listed in publications containing several hundred tablets. This problem becomes compounded when we consider the very large numbers of texts listed in electronic databases. In principle, a large group of researchers could take on the task of ensuring that each text in the database was correctly dated using all the available data. However, in practice, this would not be a good way of deploying limited resources—indeed, in a perfect funding world, we can well imagine that, with sufficient IT support, chronologically significant word associations would result from well tagged and analyzed texts, but this too is a vision of the future. Since the perfect should not be the enemy of the good, the objective here has been to improve the dating of texts in the CDLI database using methods that are more realistically achievable. It is not claimed that the resulting allocation of tablets to dates is beyond correction, but it is suggested that the results are a marked improvement on previous results.\(^5\)

§3. Year Names of Šulgi 20-30

§3.1. This section provides a discussion on the year names for Šulgi 20-30 that is sufficient to form a basis for the analysis that follows. In particular, it considers the source of the year names listed by Sigrist & Damerow and, where applicable, differences between their list and the one given by Frayne (1997: 101-104). It should be noted that Frayne almost always quotes the specific form of the year name given on \(BE\ 1/2, 125\) published, it is not readily possible to check this observation. It is also worth noting that \(CatBM\ 3\) does not list any tablets for Šulgi 25 and only a small number for Ibbi-Suen 3, but lists a relatively large number for Šulgi 44. This would seem to indicate that Šulgi 44 was used as the default option for tablets with the year name ‘\(mu\) si-mu-nu-um\(^{81}\) ba-ḥul’ in \(CatBM\ 3\).

\(^5\) Pertinent pages from CDLI’s Wiki site, since this year hosted by Oxford University (<http://cdli.ox.ac.uk/wiki/doku.php?id=shulgi>), give a summary of the lists of tablets and year names for Šulgi 21 to 29. The webpage dedicated to these years excludes an explicit list of tablets for Šulgi 30 because it would exceed 150 tablets, but such a list can readily be obtained using the link provided on that web page.

§3.2.1. Šulgi 20

Frayne and Sigrist & Damerow give two year names for year 20.\(^6\)

20a. \(\text{mu} \ 4\text{in-ḥur-sag-ga}_3\ \text{nu-tur} \ e_2-a-na \ b-a-an-ku_{\gamma}\). \(Year:\) "\(\text{Ninḫursaga of Nutur was brought into her temple}\)"

20b. \(\text{mu} \ \text{dumu} \ \text{u}r_{\gamma}^1 \ \text{ki}-\text{ma} \ \text{lu}_2 \ \text{geš-gid}_1\text{-šê}, \ \text{ka} \ \text{ba-ab-keš}_2\). \(Year:\) "\(The sons of Ur were bound as long-pole men\)"

20a is taken from \(OrNS\ 54, 299-303\), and 20b is from \(BE\ 1/2, 125\) (obv. 16).

§3.2.2. Šulgi 21

Sigrist & Damerow give three year names for year 21,

21a. \(\text{mu} \ 4\text{in-urta} \ \text{ensi}_1\text{-gal} \ 4\text{en-lil}_1\text{-la}_2\text{-ke}_4 \ \text{e}_2\text{-bar} \ \text{kin} \ b-a-an-du_{\delta} \text{a-ša}_3 \ nîg_{\gamma} \ \text{ka}_4, \ 4\text{en-lil}_1, \ 4\text{in-lil}_2\text{-ra} \ s_{\gamma} \ \text{bi}_1, \text{in-sa}_5\text{-sa}_2\text{-a}\). \(Year:\) "\(\text{Ninurta, the big-governor of Enlil, having pronounced an oracle, (Šulgi) reorganized the fields and accounts of Enlil and Ninlil}\)"

21b. \(\text{mu} \ 4\text{in-urta} \ \text{ensi}_1\text{-gal} \ 4\text{en-lil}_1\text{-la}_2\text{-ke}_4 \ e_2\text{-en-lil}_2, \ 4\text{in-lil}_2\text{-la}_2\text{-ke}_4 \ \text{e}_2\text{-bar} \ \text{kin} \ b-a-an-du_{\delta} \text{a-ga} \ 4\text{ül-}\text{gi} \ \text{lugal} \ \text{u}_r\text{i}_{\gamma}^1\text{-ma}-\text{ke}_4 \ \text{aša}_3 \ \text{nîg}_{\gamma} \ \text{ka}_4, \ \text{ša}_3 \ e_2\text{-en-lil}_1, \ 4\text{in-lil}_1\text{-la}_2\text{-ke}_4 \ \text{si} \ \text{bi}_1, \text{in-sa}_5\text{-sa}_2\text{-a}\). \(Year:\) "\(\text{Ninurta, the big-governor of Enlil, having pronounced an oracle in the temples of Enlil and Ninlil, Šulgi, the king of Ur, reorganized the fields and accounts belonging to the temples of Enlil and Ninlil}\)"

21c. \(\text{mu} \ \text{BAD}_1\text{AN}^\text{ka} \text{ba-ḥul}, \ Year:\) "\(\text{Der was destroyed}\)"

Clearly 21a and 21b are very similar. 21a & 21c are based on \(OrNS\ 54, 299-303\), 21b is taken from tablet \(Irak\ 22, \text{pl.} 18 \text{SN-T}490\) (Nippur) rev. 4-13 (see also \(BE\ 1/2, 125\)). Frayne (1997: 102-103) notes the above but also includes an additional year name

\(\text{mu} \ nîg_{\gamma} \ \text{ka}_4 \ \text{ak}_1 \ \text{al-la}, \ Year:\) "\(\text{The accounting of the hoes}\)"

which, he suggests, is apparently an abbreviated form of 21a.b. This is not listed by Sigrist & Damerow in this form although they do include 23\(^*\) as the second year

\(^6\) For 20a, Sigrist & Damerow read \(4\text{in-ḫur-sag} \ e_2\text{-nu-tur} \ (\text{Ninḫursag} \ of \ Ennutur) \ instead \ of \ 4\text{in-ḫur-sag-ga}_2\text{-nu-tur} \ (\text{Ninḫursaga} \ of \ Nutur, \ as \ given \ by \ Frayne), \ although \ the \ reference \ is \ given \ as \ Wilcke \ (1985: 302) \ who \ gives \ the \ reading, \ 4\text{in-ḫur-sag-ga}_2\text{-NU}x.\)
after this year. The administrative tablets that carry this year name are from Umma.7

§3.2.3. Šulgi 22
Sigrist & Damerow give two names for Šulgi 22 and both are ‘year after’ versions of names from the previous year, 22a. mu us₂-sa ₄nin-urta ensi₂-gal ₄en-lil₂-la₂-ke₂ e₂ ₄en-lil₂, ₄nin-lil₂-la₂-ke₂ e₂-bar kin ba-an-du₂, ₄ga ₄šul-gi lugal ur₂ ki₂-ma-ke₂ ṣa₂-nig₂-ša₂ e₂ ₄en-lil₂ ₄nin-lil₂-la₂-ke₂ si bi₂-sa₂-a, Year following: “Šulgi, the king, having been granted great power by Enlil, … ”

In addition, there are a group of tablets from Umma with an abbreviated year name, mu us₂-sa₂, which form part of small sequence of year names,

mu ₂-kam us₂-sa-bi, 12
mu ₃-kam us₂-sa-bi, 13
mu ₄-kam us₂-sa-bi, 14

In order to understand how these abbreviated year names should be interpreted, the following discussion concentrates on mu ₄-kam us₂-sa-bi, since there are only two Ur III year names that include the phrase mu ₄-kam us₂-sa-bi:

mu nig₂-ka₃ ak al-la₄-ka mu ₄-kam us₂-sa-bi
mu ₄-kam us₂ e₂ [PU₃.ŠA]-i₄-da-gan ba-du₃

It is also useful to distinguish between permanent year names that are used throughout the year, and temporary year names (usually mu us₂-sa) that are used for a few months at the beginning of year until the new year name becomes established (Yuhong 2000: 83; Dahl 2010).

There are currently 26 known examples of tablets that

tablet BM 23455 as an example of a text that includes year name 23⁎; however, CatBM 2, p. 266, gives the date of that tablet as Šulgi 7, although details of the year name are not quoted. CatBM 2, p. 134, states that the unpublished Girsu tablet, BM 19298, is dated Šulgi 23, although again the year name is not given. In addition, the CDLI catalogue also lists the unpublished Girsu tablet BM 109555 as being dated Šulgi 23.

AMN 3953 (unpublished); BIN 5, 52; BPOA 6, 1234; BPOA 6, 1350; MVN 4, 135; PPAC 4, 130, 131; Princeton 1, 562; SANTAG 6, 2, 3; SANTAG 7, 24; SAT 2, 644; Syracuse 403.

BIN 5, 26; BPOA 6, 1098; MVN 15, 208; TCNU 536. It also appears on PPAC 4, 133, where the provenience is unclear. RA 79, 32 26, is dated to Šulgi 41 based on the seal.

Found on the following tablets from Umma: BPOA 4, 1710; BPOA 6, 1068; MVN 13, 214; MVN 15, 296; NYPL 170, 318; PPAC 4, 132; SANTAG 6, 5; TSU 13; YOS 18, 77.

Found on the following tablets from Umma: AAS 52, 91; Aitugur 4, pl. 9 48; BCT 2, 46; BPOA 6, 1062, 1346, 1494; Gratz AJS 3 Mes 1; MVN 1, 187; MVN 4, 42, 51, 102, 126, 134, 163; MVN 13, 175; Nebraska 48; NYPL 175; OrSP 47-49, 460; Princeton 2, 13; SANTAG 6, 8, 10; Syracuse 324, 325; TJA pl. 56 IOS 27; TJA pl. 61 IOS 41.

22b. mu us₂-sa BAD₃-ANki ba-hul, Year following: “Der was destroyed”

22a appears on the Nippur tablets, BE 1/2, 125, as ‘mu us₂-sa ₄nin-urta’ and AS 17, 35 27, as ‘mu ₄nin-urta-ka₄ mu ib₂-sa₂-a’. The ‘fuller’ version of 22a given above seems to be the construction of a mu us₂-sa year from 21b. 22b appears on OrNS 54, 299-303, NATN 119 (Nippur) and NATN 351 (listed by Owen 1982: 26 as being from Nippur, although it carries a Drehem month name). However, the majority of administrative tablets that have a Šulgi 22 year name are from Umma and have

mu nig₂-ka₃ ak al-la₄-ka mu us₂-sa-bi, Year following: “The accounting of the hoes” or slight variations of this.8

§3.2.4. Šulgi 23
Sigrist & Damerow give two names for Šulgi 23,

23. mu ₄šul-gi lugal-e₃ a₄ mah ₄en-lil₂, šum₃-ma-ni …, Year: “Šulgi, the king, having been granted great power by Enlil, … ”

23⁎. mu us₂-sa nig₂-ka₃ ak al-la₄-ka mu us₂-sa-bi, Year following the year following: “The accounting of the hoes”9

23 appears on OrNS 54, 299-303, and in an abbreviated form on BE 1/2, 125 (rev. 2), RTC 268 (Girsu) and TSU 92 (Umma). Sigrist & Damerow suggest that 23⁎ is used on a tablet from Girsu.10 However the form of

[Note: The remaining content of the page is not visible in the image provided.]

7 BCT 2, 3; BPOA 7, 1745; JAC 24, 62 12; MVN 21, 270; Nebraska 62; SANTAG 6, 1. Note also BPOA 6, 983 (Umma) left 1: mu nig₂-ka₃ ak al-la.
8 AS 9, 274 88; BIN 5, 89; BPOA 2, 2422; BPOA 6, 931; MVN 4, 68; MVN 20, 83; SAT 2, 638, 639.
9 Sigrist & Damerow translate this as “second year after the accounts of the pickax (sic) were made”.
10 Sigrist & Damerow (2001) list the unpublished Girsu
use the abbreviated year name, mu 4-kam us₂-sa. These are all found on tablets with months dated throughout
the year, and so it is a permanent year name. On the
basis of the available evidence, its usage appears to have
been confined to Umma.

There are seven examples of the use of the year name
‘mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka mu 4-kam us₂-sa-bi’. These ap-
pear for months 2, 4, 5, 6 & 9. Thus, it can be regarded
as a permanent year name and, again, its usage appears
to have been confined to Umma.

mu 4-kam us₂ e₂ |PU3.ŠA|-iš-dda-gan ba-du₃ is prob-
ably intended to represent Šulgi 43, although it is nei-
ther the permanent year name for that year nor a widely
used temporary year name. The only known example
of this year name appears on AUCT 1, 791, and this
implies that the usage of the year name was a temporary
name of limited usage or possibly a scribal error.¹⁵

On this basis, it is concluded that mu 4-kam us₂ is an
abbreviation for mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka mu 4-kam us₂-
sa-bi and more generally,
  mu 2-kam us₂
  mu 3-kam us₂
  mu 4-kam us₂

are abbreviations for
Šulgi 23: mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka mu 2-kam us₂-sa-bi
Šulgi 24: mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka mu 3-kam us₂-sa-bi
Šulgi 25: mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka mu 4-kam us₂-sa-bi

§3.2.5. Šulgi 24
Sigrist & Damerow list one year name for this year,
24*. mu kara₂-har₉i ba-ḫul, Year following: “Karāḥar
was destroyed”

This year name appears on BE 1/2, 125 (rev. 3), and
on administrative tablets from a range of locations: BPOA
1, 286 and TUT 278 (Girsu); NATN 385, 740 (Nippur);
MVN 4, 27, NATN 231, SAT 2, 1, Syracuse 458
(Umma); UET 3, 293, 324, 772 and (unpublished) U
15624 (Ur). In addition, we should include,
  mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka mu 3-kam us₂-sa-bi: Three years
following: “The accounting of the hoes”
and its abbreviated form,

¹⁵ For the sake of completeness, it is noted that mu us₂-sa
e₂ |PU₃.ŠA|-da-gan ba-du₃, mu 2-kam us₂-bi (or close
variants) appears on MVN 3, 192; MVN 13, 316; SAT
2, 264; YOS 4, 99; and mu e₂ |PU₃.ŠA| mu us₂-sa a-ra₂, 3
on OsSP 47-49, 205. These tablets are all from Umma,
except YOS 4, 99, from Girsu and AUCT 1, 791, whose
provenience is unclear.

§3.2.6. Šulgi 25
Sigrist & Damerow list two year names for this year,
25*. mu us₂-sa kara₂-har₉i ba-ḫul, Year following: “Karāḥar
was destroyed”
25. mu si-mu-ru-um₂i ba-ḫul, Year: “Simurrum was
destroyed”

The latter year name is listed on BE 1/2, 125 (rev. 4).
There are a number of year names for years in which
Simurrum was destroyed¹⁷:
Šulgi 25. mu si-mu-ru-um₂i ba-ḫul, Year: “Simurrum was
destroyed”
Šulgi 26. mu si-mu-ru-um₂i a-ra₂, 2-kam-ma-ši ba-ḫul,
Year: “Simurrum was destroyed a 2nd time”
Šulgi 32. mu a-ra₂, 3-kam si-mu-ru-um₂i ba-ḫul, Year:
“Simurrum was destroyed for the 3rd time”
Šulgi 44. mu si-mu-ru-um₂i u₂, lu-lu-bu-un(var.
-bum₂) a-ra₂, 10 la, 1-kam-āš ba-ḫul, Year: “Simurrum
and Lullubum were destroyed for the 9th time”
Ibbi-Suen 3. mu 4i₂.bi₂.suen lugal uri₂,ma-ke₂ si-mu-
ru-um₂i ba-ḫul, Year: “Ibbi-Suen, the king of Ur, destroyed
Simurrum”

In principle, each of the later year names could be ab-
abbreviated to mu si-mu-ru-um₂i ba-ḫul. However, these
are not equally likely. There are many examples of ad-
ministrative tablets covering periods as long as 10 or
12 years. From an accounting point of view, it would
seem undesirable to use a year name abbreviation which
could give rise to confusion within such a time span.
Thus, whilst mu si-mu-ru-um₂i ba-ḫul is an abbrevi-
ation for Šulgi 26, “the year that Simurrum was de-
stroyed for the second time,” it seems highly unlikely
that scribes would use this abbreviation since it would
lead to confusion between two consecutive years. Simi-
larly, Šulgi 32 is well within a ten year period and again
it seems unlikely that its year name would be abbrevi-
ated to mu si-mu-ru-um₂i ba-ḫul.

On this basis, mu si-mu-ru-um₂i ba-ḫul is most prob-
ably used for Šulgi 25, 44 or Ibbi-Suen 3. These years

¹⁶ The fuller form of this year name is given on the fol-
lowing tablets from Umma: BPOA 6, 977, 1092, 1380;
BPOA 7, 1660; MVN 1, 186, 212; MVN 4, 103, 137,
160; MVN 21, 271, 272; PPAC 4, 134; SANTAG 6, 4;
SAT 2, 641, 643; YOS 4, 322.

¹⁷ It is noted that the year name 45b listed by Sigrist &
Damerow as Šulgi 45 is effectively identical to that for
Šulgi 44 and so is assumed to be an error.
are separated by about 20 years and so there is less possibility that abbreviations would have caused ambiguity for the scribes. It is necessary to consider the contents of the text for each tablet in order to determine which of these dates is most likely to be appropriate.\(^{18}\)

In addition, for Šulgi 25, we should include,

\[
\text{mu \ niš₂-ka₂ ak al-la-ka \ mu 4-kam \ us₂-sa-bi, \textit{Four years following: "The accounting of the hoes"}}\text{\(^{49}\)}
\]

and its abbreviated form

\[
\text{mu 4-kam \ us₂,}
\]

which, again, appears on tablets that are predominantly from Umma. Whilst this is a logical development on the basis of the lists of year names presented by Frayne (1997) and Sigrist & Damerow, it implies that there was the active use of three different year names simultaneously at Umma. This will be discussed further below.

### §3.2.7. Šulgi 26

Sigrist & Damerow list two year names for this year,

\[
\begin{align*}
26^* \cdot \text{mu us₂-sa si-mu-ru-umki ba-hul, Year following: \textit{"Simurrum was destroyed"}} \\
26 \cdot \text{mu si-mu-ru-umki a-ra₂ 2-kam-ma-aš ba-hul: Year: \textit{"Simurrum was destroyed for the 2nd time"}}
\end{align*}
\]

The latter year name is listed on \textit{BE 1/2, 125, rev. 5}. This year name is straightforward and unambiguous, but unfortunately it only appears on a relatively small number of tablets.\(^{20}\)

Identifying the tablets associated with Šulgi 26* carries the same difficulties as those described above for mu si-mu-ru-umki ba-hul. Thus, in a similar way, tablets that have the year name mu us₂-sa si-mu-ru-umki ba-hul could potentially be Šulgi 26, 45 or Ibbi-Suen 4 (or possibly Šulgi 33) and it is necessary to consider the contents of the tablet in order to determine which of these is most likely.

### §3.2.8. Šulgi 27

Sigrist & Damerow again list two year names for this year,

\[
\begin{align*}
27 \cdot \text{mu šul-gi nita kal-ga lugal an ub-da limmu₄-ba-ke₄ si-mu-ur-umki a-ra₂ 2-kam-aš mu-hul-a \ mu us₂-sa-bi, Year following the year: \textit{"Simurrum was destroyed for the 2nd time"}} \\
27^* \cdot \text{mu šul-gi nita kal-ga lugal an ub-da limmu₄-ba-ke₄ si-mu-ur-umki a-ra₂ 2-kam-aš mu-hul-a \ mu us₂-sa-bi, Year following the year: \textit{"Simurrum was destroyed"}}
\end{align*}
\]

27* is based on \textit{MVN 6, 128}\(^{21}\); however, it appears more frequently in the form mu us₂-sa a-ra₂ 2-kam si-mu-ru-umki ba-hul. As for 26, 27* is unambiguous but it only appears on a small number of tablets.\(^{22}\)

27 is listed on \textit{BE 1/2, 125, rev. 6}. This year name could be confused with an abbreviation of Šulgi 48c, mu a-ra₂ 2-kam-aš ha-ar-ši₂ ba-hul.

At first sight, \textit{BPOA 7, 1617 (Umma), rev. 6: mu us₂-sa a-ra₂ 2-kam ma-aš lu-lu-bu-um si-mu-ru-um ba-hul would appear to correspond to the year Šulgi 27}, giving the additional information that Lullubum was also destroyed during that year. However, there is a marked similarity between \textit{BPOA 7, 1617}, and \textit{BPOA 7, 2136}. Both are tablets of a similar size from Umma that describe the distribution of barley (še-ba lugal). These are the only two tablets within the CDLI database that have the two-line seal šeš-kal-la / ARAD₂ dšara₂.\(^{23}\)

27 is listed on \textit{MVN 6, 128 21}; however, it appears on 25 tablets dated Šulgi 31-43.\(^{22}\)

### \textit{SACT} 2, 267, and \textit{SAT} 3, 2043 (both from Umma),

have the abbreviated year name, mu us₂-sa a-ra₂ 2-kam. It is possible that this could be an abbreviation of 27*. However, on closer inspection of the contents of these tablets and comparison with similar tablets, it seems more likely that mu us₂-sa a-ra₂ 2-kam is an abbreviation of Šulgi 37a, mu us₂-sa ेnanna kar-zi-da₂ a-ra₂ 2-kam e₂-a-na ba-an-ku₂.\(^{23}\)

---

\(^{18}\) It is also worth making the practical point that there is usually a limit to the level of precision that modern researchers could hope to achieve for dating a tablet based on the contents of the tablet other than a year name.

\(^{19}\) The fuller form of this year name is given on the following tablets from Umma: \textit{BPOA 6, 1149, 1192; MVN 4, 54; Nik 2, 422; Princeton 1, 545; TSU 20; YOS 18, 96.}

\(^{20}\) \textit{CDLI 2007/11, § 3.06 (Umma); JCS 28, 213 20 (Umma); MVN 6, 116 (Girsu); SET 134 (Umma); TRU 1 (Drehem); UET 3, 295 (Ur); USC 6624 (Drehem); and possibly on TRU 2 (Drehem).}

\(^{21}\) More correctly, the hand copy of the Istanbul text \textit{MVN 6, 128} (from Girsu), rev. 10 reads mu ɗu šul-^[gi] nita kal-ga lugal an ub-da limmu₄-ba-ke₄ si-mu-ur-umki a-ra₂ 2-kam-aš mu-hul-a mu us₂-sa-bi. That is, the text has the unusual orthography limmu₄ (the sign ZA), not limmu₂ (TAB.TAB) as given by Sigrist & Damerow.

\(^{22}\) \textit{Aleppo 292; BPOA 7, 2399; Ontario 2, 312 (all from Umma).}

\(^{23}\) \textit{SACT} 2, 267, has the 4-line seal legend: ur-dišara₂ / dub-sar / dumu lugal-ušur₂ / nu-banda₂-gu₂ šara₂, which appears on 25 tablets dated Šulgi 31-43. \textit{SAT} 3, 2043,
§3.2.9. Šulgi 28

For this year, Sigrist & Damerow list two variations of the same year name,

28a. mu en-nam-šita₄ ₄šul-gi-ra-ke₄ ba-gub ba-še₃ šud₃-sag en ₄en-ki eridu₄-ga dumu šul-gi nita kal-ga lugal uri₂₃-ma lugal an ub-da limmu₂₂-ba-ka ba-a-hun. Year: “Šita-priest-who-piously-intercedes-for-Šulgi, the son of Šulgi, the strong man, the king of Ur, the king of the four corners of the universe, was installed as en-priest of Enki in Eridu”

28b. mu en-nam-šita₄ ₄šul-gi-ra-ke₄ ba-gub en ₄en-ki eridu₄-ga dumu ₄šul-gi nita kal-ga lugal uri₂₃-ma lugal an ub-da limmu₂₂-ba-ka ba-a-hun. Year: “Šita-priest-who-piously-intercedes-for-Šulgi, the son of Šulgi, the strong man, the king of Ur, the king of the four corners of the universe, was installed as en-priest of Enki in Eridu”

The references given for these are BM 26209 and YBC 859, respectively. Actually, the year name given on YBC 859 (SAT 2, 6, from Drehem or Ur) is an abbreviation, mu en-nam-šita₄ ₄šul-gi-ra-ke₄ ba-gub-ba-še₃. There are fuller versions of this year name on Iraq 22 pl. 18 6N-T147 (Nippur), mu ₄šul-gi lugal uri₂₃-ma-ke₄ en-nam-šita₄-dr šul₄-gi-ra-ke₄ ba-ʃ gub ₁šud₃sag en ₁en-ki eridu₄-ki ₁šed₃ in-ḥun-ga₂ and Nisaba 6, 17 (Umma), mu ₁šul-gi nita [kal-ga] lugal uri₂₃-ma lugal an ʃ ub-l [da limmu₂₂-ba-ke₄ en-nam-šita₄ ₄šul-gi-ra-ke₄ ba-gub en ₂en-ki eridu₄-ʃ g a ₃ in-ḥun-ga₂. Note also, AAICAB 11/1, pl. 38-39, 1911-229 (Umma), mu ₁šul-[gi] nita ʃ kal₄ [ga] lugal uri₂₃-ma lugal an-[ub-da] limmu₂₂[ba-ke₄ en-nam-šita₄ ₄šul-gi-ra-ke₄ ₂muru₂₂ unu ₂en₄ ₁en-ki eridu₄-ga x- [...].

Given this that a particularly long year name, there would have been a clear need to abbreviate it on administrative tablets; indeed, in numerous instances, the number of signs in the year name would have exceeded that in the main text.

One abbreviation found on a number of tablets is, mu en-nam-šita₄ ₄šul-gi-ke₄ ba-gub ba-ḥun (and its close variants). This is unambiguous since it includes reference to both the šita-priest (en-nam-šita) and to Šulgi. An analogous form is found on Princeton 2, 216 (Umma), mu en eridu₄šita₄ ₄šul-gi-ke₄ ba-ḥun.

In the year names for Ur III, the šita priest is specifically associated with Enki of Eridu. Thus, it would have been readily acceptable to give emphasis to eridu₄ or ²en-ki instead of en-nam-šita. However, the omission of Šulgi in the abbreviation leaves open ambiguities with other year names noting the installation of šita priests of Enki at Eridu.

The version listed on BE 1/2, 125, rev. 7 is the abbreviated form, mu en eridu₄ ba-ḥun-ga₂. This is very similar to the abbreviated form quoted for Amar-Suen 8 (mu en-nun-gal-an-na / en-nun-e₄amar₄-su-si₄-ki₄-ag₂ en eridu₄ ba-ḥun). The abbreviated version listed on CUSAS 17, 101, obv. 8 is mu en eridu₄ ba-ḥun. Although these two abbreviated forms of year names are taken from different lists, there is some indication that a small distinction was drawn between them, i.e.,

Šulgi 28: mu en eridu₄ ba-ḥun-ga₂
Amar-Suen 8: mu en eridu₄ ba-ḥun

Whilst the scribes did not adhere strictly to this distinction, the findings of this work demonstrate that it can be used as a rough indicator.

There are also examples of less severe abbreviations, but these too give rise to ambiguities in the year names. As an example, BM 28502 has ‘mu en-nun-gal-an-na = en-nun-e₄amar₄-su-si₄-ki₄-ag₂ en eridu₄ ba-ḥun’ which was identified in CatBM 3, p. 332²², as Ibbi-Suen 11 and specifically listed as the reference for the Sigrist & Damerow year Ibbi-Suen 11b. However, this tablet is listed as being from Girsu and, if it were indeed Ibbi-Suen 11, this would be the latest tablet from this city with a transcribed year name in the CDLI database. Therefore, it is much more likely that the tablet should be dated to Šulgi 28. More generally, the only location that has produced Ur III tablets in the CDLI

(p. 332) but omits the sign nita.

25 CST 739 (Umma); Fs Greenfield 617 6 (Umma); JCS 31, 133 1 (Drehem); MVN 9, 104 (Umma), 105 (Drehem); MVN 15, 242 (Drehem); NATN 230, 235, 242, 386 (all from Umma); SAT 2, 6 (Drehem); UET 3, 289, 290 (Ur). Note the use of both en-nam-šita and en-nam-šita₄.

26 Other abbreviations of a similar type include: DoCu 236 (Umma) with mu en ²en-ki x ²ba-ḥun]; NATN 382 (Umma) with mu en ²en-ki ba-gub-ba x; and SAT 2, 5 (Umma), with mu en ²en-ki eridu₄ ba-ḥun-ga₂.

27 The same year name is given as šita₄ on CatBM 3, p. 181.
database that can be securely dated later than Ibbi-Suen 10 is Ur. On this basis, there is scarce probability that tablets from Drehem, Girsu, Nippur or Umma could be dated to Ibbi-Suen 11.

§3.2.10. Šulgi 29
This year has a ‘year after’ version of the name for the previous year. According to Sigrist & Damerow, the year name is,

29. mu us₂-sa en-nam-šita₄di-sul-gi-ra-ke₄-ba-gub-ba-še₃-sud₃-sag en₄-en-ki eridu₅-ga dumu sul-gi nita kal-ga lugal uri₂₅-ma lugal an ub-da ṭimmu₂₅-ba-ke₄ ba-a-ḫun, Year following: “Šita-priest-who-piously-intercedes-for-Šulgi, the son of Šulgi, the strong man, the king of Ur, the king of the four corners of the universe, was installed as en-priest of Enki in Eridu”

This appears to be a hypothetical formation based around year name 28. The most complete version of this year name in the CDLI database is found on Iraq 22, pl. 20 6N-T850 (Nippur) rev. 3-8: mu di₄-sul-[gi] lugal uri₂₅[ki-ma-ke₄] en-nam-šita₄di-sul-[gi-ra]-ke₄-ba-gub-šud₃-sag en₄-en-[ki] in-hun-[ga₂] mu ib₂-[us₂].

The discussion of abbreviations follows similarly to that given for year 28. There are unambiguous abbreviations given on Iraq 22, pl. 19 SC 555 and Iraq 22, pl. 19 MLC 42 (both from Drehem), mu us₂-sa en-nam-šita₄di-sul-gi-ra-ke₄-gub-ba ba-a-ḫun-ga₂.

The form given on BE 3/1, 134 (Umma), and NATN 678 (Nippur) omits the name of Šulgi and so is more ambiguous, mu us₂-sa en di₄-en-ki eridukib₅-ba-ḫun. However, the most common form of this year name is that given on BE 1/2, 125, rev. 8, mu us₂-sa en eridukib₅-ba-ḫun-ga₂ (and is more often found with ba-ḫun-ga₂ rather than ba-ḫun). These can be readily confused with Amar-Suen 9, mu us₂-sa en eridukib₅-ba-ḫun and in such cases, it is necessary to consider the contents of the tablet in order to establish which date is correct.

§3.2.11. Šulgi 30
Sigrist & Damerow list two variations of the same year name,

30a. mu dumu-munus lugal ensi₂ an-ša-an₅-ke₄ ba-an-tuku, Year: “The governor of Anian married the king’s daughter”

30b. mu dumu-munus lugal ensi₂ an-ša-an₅-ke₄ ba-an-du, Year: “The governor of Anian married the king’s daughter”.

The reference given by Sigrist & Damerow for 30a is RA 2, 137 49, which is for BE 1/2, 125, rev. 9, mu dumu-munus lugal ensi₂ an-ša-an₅-ke₄ ba-tuku (note ba-tuku rather than ba-an-tuku as quoted above). The reference given for 30b is BM 28662 (i.e. CatBM 3, p. 186, with no transliteration offered). There are over a hundred tablets for Šulgi 30, often with abbreviated year names. All of these year names include the words dumu and lugal. If they also include an-ša-an₅ then the abbreviation is unambiguous. However, shortened forms such as mu dumu-munus lugal and mu dumu lugal could be mistaken for abbreviations for other years, for example,

Ibbi-Suen 5, mu tu-ki-in-pa-mi-ig-ri₂-ša dumu-munus lugal ensi₂ za-ab-ša-li₅-ke₄ ba-an-tuku, Year: “Tukin-hattimagriša, the daughter of the king, was married off to the governor of Zabāti”

Iddin-Dagan 2, from the Isin period, mu di₅-din-da-gan ma-tum-ni-a-tum dumu-munus lu₂ an-ša-an₅ ba-an-tuku, Year: “Matum-niatum, the daughter of Iddin-Dagan, was married off to the man of Anian”

and some caution should be taken with the identification of the year in these cases.

§4. Discussion
§4.1. The discussion that follows is based on the results of the analysis described above, having made best endeavours to date the tablets within the years Šulgi 20-30. The following table summarizes the distribution of tablets through this period according to provenience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Drehem</th>
<th>Girsu</th>
<th>Nippur</th>
<th>Ur</th>
<th>Umma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that, whilst there is a scattering of tablets for Drehem, Girsu, Nippur and Ur, the large majority of tablets from the years Šulgi 20-30 are from Umma. For Drehem, Girsu and Umma, the table shows the first indication of a dramatic increase in the numbers of tablets per year found for the years that follow.

§4.2. The main focus of the discussion that follows is on tablets from Umma because there are sufficient numbers to allow a statistical analysis. The main feature of the distribution of the Umma tablets is a ‘spike’ in the numbers, corresponding to year 25, that persists despite specific attention given to that year. It arises because, according to the numbering of year names proposed by Frayne and Sigrist & Damerow, there were three year names being used simultaneously at Umma in that year,
mu us₂-sa kara₂-ḫar₃ ki ba-ḫul, Year following: “Karāhar was destroyed”
mu si-mu-ru-um₃ ki ba-ḫul, Year: “Simurrum was destroyed”
mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka mu 4-kam us₂-sa-bi: Four years following: “The accounting of the hoes”

The sequence of year names including the first two of these is based on BE 1/2, 125, and is well understood. It is worth considering the arguments around the attribution of the year name ‘mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka’ to year 22, since this inevitably leads to the situation described above for year 25.

§4.3. The following table is based solely on the data for Umma and separates out, firstly, the year names explicitly derived from mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka and, secondly, those of the form mu n-kam us₂-sa-bi, which are inferred to be abbreviations for mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka mu n-kam us₂-sa-bi (where n = 2, 3 or 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where row (A) is the number of tablets from Umma with abbreviated year names of the form mu n-kam us₂-sa-bi, row (B) is the number with year names based explicitly on mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka and row (C) is the remainder.

§4.4. In this paper, the abbreviated year names of the form mu n-kam us₂-sa-bi have been assumed to relate to the mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka years because this is the only sequence of year names in Ur III which show a clear progression of 2-kam us₂, 3-kam us₂, 4-kam us₂. As already noted above, there are six examples of 2-kam us₂, 3-kam us₂, or 4-kam us₂ names based on the year name mu e₂ [PU₃,ŠA]-iš₄-da-gaš ba-du₃ (Šulgi 39) as noted above. However, this would seem to be an inadequate basis for moving the dates for the 40 tablets counted in row A. Frayne (1997: 102) states that mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka is “an apparently abbreviated form of” the full year name of year 21, and this wording suggests that there is some scope for doubt. It is clear from BCT 2, 3, that mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la precedes mu si-mu-ru-um₃ ki ba-ḫul. In its initial publication, Watson dated BCT 2, 3, to Šulgi 44.29 If we followed this suggestion, it could be argued that mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka is much later than Šulgi 21. This would have the effect of removing all the tablets from rows A and B. However, this would still leave a spike a year 25 and it would also increase the number of years where three year names were being used simultaneously at Umma.

§4.5. A better solution would be achieved if it was permitted to move mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka to year 20. This would avoid three year names being used simultaneously at Umma and it would substantially flatten the spike in the distribution of tablets around year 25.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, this could be regarded as an overly pragmatic approach based on the snapshot of data that are currently published and included in the CDLI database. The alternative is to accept that mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la-ka is year 21 and that three year names were used simultaneously at Umma but argue that the spike is simply due to the randomness of the preservation and recording of Ur III tablets.

§4.6. In §3, a distinction was drawn between permanent year names and temporary names that were used until the new year name became established. From Šulgi 30, the temporary year names were usually only used for the first few months of the year.30 However, it is interesting to note that during the earlier period considered in this paper, the transition from temporary to permanent year name was longer. Thus, Šulgi 25* was used for the first 6 months of the year, Šulgi 26* was used throughout the year, Šulgi 27* was used for the first 10 months of the year.

§4.7. It is worth giving some consideration to whether it is possible to use the data for year names for the period Šulgi 20-30 to draw wider conclusions. A large group of about 20 of the tablets from Umma for the period Šulgi 20-30 record the transactions of Lugal-si-NE-e (frequently abbreviated to si-NE-e), described as

28 *CatBM* 3, p. 247, also lists BM 85129 as being dated to Ibbi-Suen 11 but the year name is not given explicitly and so it is not readily possible to verify this date.

29 Strictly, Watson used the Schneider dating scheme and thus dated the tablet to Šulgi 42, suggesting that the reader should correct this by adding two years (Watson 1993: 3).

30 Firth, Šulgi 31-48, forthcoming
a merchant (dam-garš; cf. *BPOA* 6, 1149) and this is presumably the same man also described as an overseer of weavers (ugula uš-bar, *MVN* 21, 278). In principle, it should be possible to use this group of tablets to study the practical use of year names within an archive. However, closer examination shows that there is not a clear pattern. On reflection this is not surprising, since a group of twenty tablets spanning ten years does not approach a sample size that is statistically large enough for such a study.

§4.8. Similarly, the problem of the small numbers of tablets from all locations other than Umma means that it is not possible to draw firm conclusions about whether there are variants specific to locations. However, there are clear indications that tablets with the ‘mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la’ group of year names are most likely to originate from Umma. This is evident from the fact that all the published tablets using these year names that have proveniences are from Umma. Furthermore, the tablets listing year names, *BE* 1/2, 125, from Nippur and *OrNS* 54, 299-303, from Isin, do not contain examples from the ‘mu nig₂-ka₉ ak al-la’ group of year names. Nevertheless, as already noted, there is a possibility that there are a small number of occurrences amongst unpublished Girsu tablets in the British Museum. An additional finding is that the use of the phrase ‘mu ib₂-us₂-sa’, including the conjugational prefix (i.e. instead of mu us₂-sa), appears to be peculiar to Nippur.\(^3\)

---

\(^3\) *AS* 17, 35 27; *ASJ* 11, 323 07; *AUCT* 3, 233; *BBVO* 11, 292, 6N-T606₉; *Iraq* 22, pl. 20 6N-T850; *MVN* 16, 739; *NATN* 184, 729+764, 897, 947, 973; *NRVN* 1, 34, 171, 188; *TMH NF* 1-2, 67. Later tablets from Nippur also use mu ab-us₂-sa (Firth, “Šulgi 31-48,” forthcoming).
Appendix A: List of Year Names According to Sigrist & Damerow (2001)

20a mu ₄nin-ḫur-sag-sag nu-tur e₂-a-na ba-an-ku₄
   Year: “Ninḥursag of Nurat (Tell ‘Ubaid) was brought into her temple”

20b mu dumu uri₂ ki-ma lu₂ geš-gid₂-še₃ ka ba-ab-keš₂
   Year: “The sons of Ur were bound as long-pole men”

21a mu ₄nin-urta ensi₂-gal ⁴en-lil₂-la₂-ke₄ eš-bar kin ba-an-
   du₁₁-½a a-ša₃ ni₂-g₂-ka₄ ⁴en-lil₂ ⁴nin-lil₂-ra si bi₂-in-sa₂-
   sa₂-a
   Year: “Ninurta, the big-governor of Enlil, having pronounced an ominous decision, (Šulgi) put in order the accounts for (the temples of) Enlil and Ninlil”

21b mu ₄nin-urta ensi₂-gal ⁴en-lil₂-la₂-ke₄ e₂-den-lil₂ ⁴nin-
   lil₂-la₂-ke₄ eš-bar kin ba-an-du₁₁-ga dšul-gi lugal uri₂
   ki-ma-ke₄ GAN₂ ni₂-g₂-ka₄ ša₃ e₂ ⁴en-lil₂ ⁴nin-lil₂-la₂-ke₄ si bi₂-sa₂-a
   Year: “After Ninurta, the big-governor of Enlil, had pronounced an ominous decision in the temple of Enlil and Ninlil, Šulgi, the king of Ur, put in order the field accounts in the temples of Enlil and Ninlil”

21c mu BAD₃-ANₜ₂ ki ba-ḥu₢
   Year: “Der was destroyed”

22a mu us₂-sa ₄nin-urta ensi₂-gal ⁴en-lil₂-la₂-ke₄ e₂ ⁴en-
   lil₂ ⁴nin-lil₂-la₂-ke₄ eš-bar kin ba-an-du₁₁-½a dšul-gi lugal uri₂
   ki-ma-ke₄ GAN₂ ni₂-g₂-ka₄ ša₃ e₂ ⁴en-lil₂ ⁴nin-lil₂-la₂-ke₄ si bi₂-sa₂-a
   Year: “After the year in which Ninurta, the great governor of Enlil, after having pronounced an ominous decision in the temple of Enlil and Ninlil, Šulgi, the king of Ur, put in order the field accounts in the temples of Enlil and Ninlil”

22b mu us₂-sa BAD₃-ANₜ₂ ba-ḥu₢
   Year following: “Der was destroyed”

23* mu us₂-sa ni₂-g₂-ka₄ ak al-la-ka mu us₂-sa-bi
   Year following the year following: “The accounts of the hoes were made”

23 mu dšul-gi lugal-e a₂ mah ⁴en-lil₂ šum₃-ma-ni...
   Year: “The divine Šulgi, the king, was given supreme power by Enlil ...”

24 mu kar₂-ḥar₂ ba-ḥu₢
   Year: Karahar was destroyed

25* mu us₂-sa kar₂-ḥar₂ ba-ḥu₢
   Year following: “Karahar was destroyed”
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