§1 Introduction
§1.1 The following six tablets belong to the collection of the Clinton Historical Society of Clinton, MA.¹ A newspaper clipping from the Clinton Daily Item dated to July 2, 1913, says about the acquisition of the tablets that they “were purchased from Dr. Edgar J. Banks of Greenfield who has spent years in archaeological work in the east and who was present when they were uncovered so that their genuineness is undoubted.”² Banks directed a University of Chicago expedition to the site of Adab in the early 1900’s. However, as Foster (2006: 55) noted, “his reputation for acquiring and smuggling antiquities eventually aroused the Ottoman authorities, [and] his project was terminated.” Nevertheless, Banks “deal[t] in tablets and antiquities for the rest of this life, selling small collections of tablets with highly enthusiastic labels to schools, libraries, and seminars.” These tablets here are yet another such example of Banks’ legacy.³

§2 Transliterations and Commentary
§2.1 No. 1
Provenience: Uruk
Size: 80 × 55 × 22mm
Date: no date

obv.
1) ḍu-en-ga-ši-id
2) nita kal-ga
3) lugal unuki-ga
4) lugal am-na-nu-um
5) u₂-a
6) e₂-an-na

rev.
1) e₂-gal
2) nam-lugal-[erasure]-la-ka-ni
3) mu-du₃

§2.1a. This text is identical to Frayne (1990: 444-447) E4.4.1.3.

§2.2 No. 2
Provenience: Umma
Size: 22 × 21 × 13mm
Date: no date

obv.
1) 1(u) la₂ 1(diš) udu
2) 1(diš) maš₂
3) la-a-mu agrig

rev. blank

§2.2a. The provenience of this tablet is suggested by the name La’amu, which is not an uncommon name at Umma. A steward (agrig) by that name is attested several times, e.g. SAT 2, 507 (Šulgi 46) and MVN 21, 410 (Amar-Suena 3 xiii).

¹ These tablets were brought to our attention by David I. Owen, who, in turn, was made aware of them by Christine Latini of the Clinton Historical Society of Clinton, MA. We wish to thank the Clinton Historical Society for making the tablets accessible to us, and for their permission to publish them here. Thanks in particular go to Ms. Latini, who arranged for the loan of the tablets to Cornell and provided information on the history of the Society’s collection. Tablet measurements given are in millimeters, H × W × T.
² The same notice appeared three days later on July 5 in the now-defunct Clinton Courant.
³ For more on Banks, see the comments in Englund (2004) and Owen and Wasilewska (2000) with bibliography.
§2.2b. This type of text is rare, noting only a quantity of animals and a personal name with no verb or action indicated. Likewise, no date or other information is provided. A similar example is Buffalo SNS 11-2 144, 12. It is possible that these were small ‘chits’ serving to remind a scribe of a transaction to be recorded on a larger tablet at some future time.

§2.3. No. 3
Provenience: Umma
Size: 48 × 41 × 21mm
Date: Šu-Sin 9 v

obv. 1) 2(geš) 4(u) 1(aš) 1(barig) 3(ban,) še gur
2) ugula gu-ú₂-gu-a
3) 2(geš) 1(u) 7(aš) 4(barig) še 1-gur 1
4) ugula kas₄
5) a-ša₃ ša-ra-ḫum-ma

rev. 1) še geš e₄-a
2) ki-su₄ i₃-sum-ma
3) iti RI
4) mu ʾšu₂-suenugal-e e₂-dšara₂ umma₃-ka mu-du₃

§2.3a. Obv. 2) Gu’ugu’a appears as an foreman (ugula) in five other texts, all dated between Šu-Sin 2 and Ibbi-Sin 3 vii. In MCS 7, 21 AO 19544 (Šu-Sin 9), he appears as a foreman together with Kas as in this text. In BPOA 1, 84 (Ibbi-Sin 3 vii 22), he is the foremen of a work team involved with hoeing and cutting boxthorn in the Šarra È field, almost certainly a variant writing for Sarraḥuma.

§2.3b. Obv. 4) This name always appears as Kas (written kas₂) in Umma tablets, but, as already noted in Dahl (2007: 87 n. 309), his seal always reads en-kas₄.

§2.3c. Rev. 3) For the reading of this month name as dal, “flight,” see now Englund (2004: 38).

§2.4. No. 4
Provenience: Umma
Size: 45 × 40 × 17mm
Date: Amar-Suen 7 iv

obv. 1) 4(barig) še ba lugal
2) 2(diš) šila₃ i₃-ges
3) lu₂-šiskur
4) 4(barig) še ba
5) 2(diš) šila₃ i₃-ges
6) a-ad-da-mu
7) šar₂-ra-ab-du-me

rev. 1) iti nesag
2) kišib₃ ensi₄-ka
3) imin gu-zá-ni
4) šar₂-ra-ab-du-ta
5) ugula ḫu-ba-a
6) mu ḫu₂-ḫu₂-nu₂-rî₂-ba ḫul

§2.4a. Obv. 7 and rev. 4) The term šar₂-ra-ab-du as a type of official occurs not infrequently at Umma and elsewhere in the Ur III corpus, but its exact meaning is unclear. The CAD, s.v. šarrabtû, notes that the function “may be connected with surveying fields and agricultural work.” In the Ur III period, this title seems to have been a function held only on a temporary basis.

§2.5. No. 5
Provenience: Unknown
Size: 85 × 52 × 22mm
Date: no date

obv. 1) [n] sar kin ṣahar 1-ra
2) nam-zí-tar-ra
3) 5(diš) me₃-gal-ta
4) 5(diš) ur⁻³-nun-gal
5) 1(diš) 1/3(diš) ur⁻³-an-na
6) 5(diš) ᵁ₁₃(diš) ur⁻³-maḥ
7) 8(diš) 1/3(diš) e₂-dšul-gi-ra
8) 1(diš) tu-gara₃-aš
9) 1(diš) 2/₃(diš) šu₃-ma-am₃
10) 1(diš) 2/₃(diš) ṣa₂-gigir-re
11) 3(diš) sipa 1(diš) 2/₃(diš)-ta
12) [n] 2/₃(diš) ḫa-da-da
13) [n] šeš-kal-la

rev. 1) 2(diš) 1/2(diš) ba-sag₁₀
2) 1(u) aga₃-us₃
3) 5(u) 6(diš) (erasure?)

§2.5a. This unusual text appears to list earth-work performed by various individuals. Most such documents
provide other information such as the place where the work was performed, the wages of the workers, overseers or other officials, a date, and so on (e.g. BPOA 2, 2383 [Amar-Suena 9]).

§2.5b. Obv. 6) KU is clear in the text; one might still suggest a reading tug₂, though Lu-tugma is only sparsely seen, and then only in texts from Girsu.

§2.5c. Obv. 8) Other attestations of this name make it uncertain whether the scribe intended it to be tu-gara₂-aš as is seen here (cf. UTI 5, 3425:6 [Amar-Suena 9], where the copy clearly shows a gara₂) or tu-ga-aš, as is more commonly attested (cf. SANTAG 7, 68: 11 [Amar-Suena 3]). Alternatively, these could be two different but similar names.

§2.6. No. 6
Provenience: Umma
Size: 154 × 87 × 27mm
Date: Šu-Sin 7

obv. i
1) 7(aš) 3(barig) še numun gur
2) 1(aš) gur a₂ lu₂ ḫun-ga₂
3) kišib₂ is-pa-e₁
4) 7(aš) še numun gur
5) kišib₂ šeš-kal-la
6) '5(aš) 'še numun gur
7) kišib₂ gur-a₂ ši₉-ga₂
8) 5(aš) še numun 'gur ¹
9) 2(barig) a₂ lu₂ ḫun-ga₂ ¹
10) kišib₂ ur-e₂-nun-na ¹
11) 6(aš) 2(barig) 5(ban₂) (diš) ša₉-ga₂ še zi₅-da ¹
12) 4(barig) sa₂-du₁₁ ḫara₂
13) kišib₂ al-ù₂-a
14) 1(aš) 4(barig) 4(ban₂) še zi₅-da gur
15) kišib₂ ab₁ ¹-gi-na
16) '1(geš₂) ¹ 'gur 'še ¹ gi-a sa₁₀-sa₁₀
17) kišib₂ šeš₁-kal-la dumu lugal-par-gur₉-re
blank line
18) [SU+NIGIN₂ 1(geš₂)] 1(aš) 4(barig) 4(ban₂) gur ¹
19) gur ¹ zabar-ta ¹
20) [SU+NIGIN₂ 1(geš₂)] 2(u) 4(aš) 3(barig) gur ¹
21) gur še numun-ta ¹
22) ŠU+NIGIN₂ 6(aš) 2(barig) 5(ban₂) gur ¹
23) ŠU+NIGIN₂ 8(aš) 3(barig) ziz₂ gur ¹
24) gur sa₂-du₁₁-ta ¹
25) 2(geš₂) 3(u) 8(aš) 1(barig) 1(ban₂) gur ¹
26) ki-su₂-gur₂-edin-na-ta ¹
27) 2(geš₂) gur ¹
28) [SU+NIGIN₂ 2(geš₂)] 1(u) 3(aš) 2(barig) 4(ban₂) gur ¹
29) še numun-ta ¹
30) 2(geš₂) gur ¹
31) ma₂-a si-ga nibru₂-ši₇-ši₇

rev. i
1) kišib₂ lu₂-dingir-ra ¹
2) 1(u) 3(aš) 2(barig) 4(ban₂) še zi₅-da [gur] ¹
3) kišib₂ ab₂ ¹-ba ¹-gi-na ¹
4) 3(aš) 1(barig) gur a₂ lu₂ ḫun-ga₂ ¹
5) 2(barig) ¹ [1(ban₂) še ¹ ba ¹]
6) '1(geš₂) ¹ 'gur ¹ 'še ¹ numun ¹ [ša₂]
7) 4(barig) ¹ 'gur ¹ 'numun ¹
8) kišib₂ ¹ ur-e₂-nun-na ¹
9) 3(aš) gur a₂ lu₂ ḫun-ga₂ ¹
10) 2(ban₂) še ba ¹
11) kišib₂ ¹ zabar-ta ¹
12) 1(barig) 2(ban₂) še ba iti-da ¹
13) 2(aš) 2(barig) gur sa₂-gal anšekunga₂ ¹
14) lu₂-ša₂-ga₂ ¹ munsuh (PA.GU₂ gunû)
15) 2(aš) 1(barig) gur ¹ nu₉-si₉₇
16) 1(aš) 4(ban₂) gur ¹ 'sma₂-a si-ga ¹ nibru₂-ši₇-ši₇
17) kišib₂ šeš₁-kal-la
blank line
18) [SU+NIGIN₂ 2(geš₂)] 1(u) 3(aš) 2(barig) 4(ban₂) gur ¹
19) gur zabar-ta ¹
20) [SU+NIGIN₂ 4(aš) ziz₂ gur ¹
21) ŠU+NIGIN₂ 1(aš) 4(barig) 4(ban₂) gur gur ¹

Cuneiform Digital Library Bulletin 2007:2
The entry for each location is similarly structured with subtotals divided into up to three distinct categories, gur zabar, gur še numum, and gur sa₂-du₁₁. The literal translation of gur zabar-ta is “from the bronze gur-measure,” but such a reading in this context makes little sense. For instance, in the sub-totals from the Gu’edena threshing floor, we find for gur zabar-ta (obv. ii 19-20):

\[\text{ŠU+NIGIN}_2 2(geš₂) 3(u) 2(bariq) 2(ban₂) gur} \]
\[\text{šu-nu-kuš₂-ta} \]

The latter total matches exactly the entry in obv. ii 16-17:

\[\text{šu-nu-kuš₂-ta} \]

But while the numbers properly add up there is nothing in the qualifications mu-ša, ma₂-a si-ga nibru₄-še₄, or zi₂-da to suggest any connection to the bronze gur-measure. Similarly, while the totals labeled sa₂-du₁₁ are made up of entries with that qualification, they also include entries with other qualifications, most often “wages for hired workers” (a₂ lu₂ un-ga₂). Only the summaries labeled še numum are composed entirely from entries qualified as such.

§2.6b. Obv. i 3) I-pa’e also appears in obv. ii 15 and rev. ii 3. According to Vanderroost (forthcoming), he is not among the several chief plot managers (nu-banda₃ gu₄) working in this district under Lu-Šulgira (cf. iv 23). It is unclear if this person is the same as the I-pa’e attested as a plot manager for the Da-Umma district. However, as Studevent-Hickman (2006: 34-35) has already shown, there is often an overlap of activities among the four Umma districts.

§2.6c. Obv. i 7) Gu TAR was one of four chief plot managers for the Gu’edena and Mušbiana districts (Vanderroost forthcoming). He appears in this text again in rev. i 11 and ii 5.5

§2.6d. Obv. i 10) Like Gu TAR, Ur-Enuna was one of the district’s chief plot managers under Lu-Šulgira. He appears again in rev. i 8 and ii 4.

---

4 As will be argued in Vanderroost (forthcoming), the Umma districts of Gu’edena and Mušbiana were usually considered to be a single administrative unit.

5 See also Studevent-Hickman (2006: 49).
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§2.6e. Obv. i 28) Lu-dingira was another chief plot manager of this district. He appears again in rev. i 1 and rev. i 29. Each of his entries concerns grain loaded on a boat bound for Nippur (ma₂-a si-ga nibru₆⁻šē₃).

§2.6f. Rev. ii 21) The total here is correct. As noted in Englund (1991: 269 n. 20, with references), wheat (gig) was artificially converted into barley (še) at the rate of 2:1. Thus, the entry in rev. ii 16 counts as 6;1.2 and not 3;0.4 for the purpose of arriving at a total value.