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§1. Introduction

§1.1. The overwhelming majority of Ur III administrative tablets from the city of Ur were formally excavated and included in the official publications UET 3 and UET 9. However, in Part II of his book, “The administrative and Economic Ur III Texts from the City of Ur” [UCU], Widell (2003) lists 105 administrative and economic tablets which he considers to be from Ur but which were not included in the UET volumes. These are tablets that were unearthed unofficially and sold on the antiquities market and so their provenience is open to question. The main aim of this paper is to consider the tablets from the list that deal with textiles and, in particular, to verify that the provenience of these tablets was Ur.

§1.2. UCU was written during the early stages of CDLI and BDTNS, so the access to electronic databases was substantially less than currently available. Therefore, it is perhaps not surprising that the present verification process shows that a substantial number of these textile tablets nominally given a provenience of Ur are not actually from Ur.2

§1.3. In some cases, the justification for an Ur provenience is given explicitly within UCU and in others references are made to publications in journals.3

Unfortunately, in many cases, UCU states that the provenience of tablets is Ur without providing any justification.4 It is shown here that the textile tablets from the UCU list, which have relatively early dates, are less likely to be from Ur. The paper goes on to consider whether this finding is more generally applicable to the other tablets that are nominally listed in UCU as being from Ur.

§2. Verification of the Provenience of the “Ur” Textile Tablets

§2.1. Table 1 lists the textile tablets included in the UCU list (pp. 23-24) that are suggested to be from Ur but not included in UET 3 or UET 9. The table also includes the provenience as given in the original publication. It is convenient to follow UCU and consider the tablets in order of their date.

§2.2. UCU 5: RA 73, 278 (Š 42 / AS 6)5

This tablet lists textiles manufactured (?) using the Girsu gešTAG (heddle), supervised by the overseer, AÌum-ilum. UCU (p. 119) notes that AÌum-ilum, is well attested in texts from Girsu but attributes the tablet to Ur because the month name (ezem-mah) is only found in Ur or Puzriš-Dagan.

The first line states that the tug₂ guz-za were large (gal) and of a fine quality (us₂ šar₃).6 This tablet and CT 7, 37 BM 18376, are dated mu ša-aš-ru-umli ba-hul which could represent either Š 42 or AS 6. Since the earliest date for AÌum-ilum based on the remaining tablets is AS 1, it seems more prudent to assume that RA 73, 278, and

---

1 I would like to thank Marie-Louise Nosch and the Danish National Research Foundation’s Centre for Textile Research for funding my visit to the Bibliothèque d’archéologie et des sciences de l’Antiquité at the University of Nanterre in November 2012, to Cécile Michel for hosting that visit and to Françoise Rougemont for her help during the visit. Finally, I am grateful to Manuel Molina for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

2 See also, Molina’s (2006) review of UCU.

3 See, for example, MVN 3, 261, 314 & 318, that were originally listed by Owen (1975: 18) as being from Drehem, but that are convincingly shown by UCU to have a provenience of Ur.

4 As an example, Owen (1975) gave the proveniences of MVN 3, 233, 313 & 315-316 as Drehem. In UCU (pp. 134-135, 140-141, 156, 155), these are listed as being from Ur without any explanation. See also the discussion below on ASJ 18, 91 27, MVN 8, 189, MVN 13, 133-135, and SAT 3, 2014.

5 Listed in UCU as Durand 1979: 8.

6 Waetzoldt 1972: 47.
CT 7, 37 BM 18376, are dated to AS 6. Since there was a coherent archive of Ašûm-ilûm tablets at Girsu it seems most probable that RA 73, 27 8, was retained as a receipt as part of that archive.

§2.3. UCU 6-8: MVN 13, 14, 21 & 600 (all § 44)

MVN 13, 14, was not given a provenience in its initial publication. However, there are two records of this distribution of a clothing ration to AN-zu-a for the New Year (tug₂-ba za₃-mu):

**MVN 13, 14 (§ 44)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obverse</th>
<th>reverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 tug₂ us-[bar x']</td>
<td>1 tug₂ us-bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki-l₃₂-bi 3 [ma-na]</td>
<td>ki-l₃₂-bi 3 ma-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-zu-a lu₃₂ dab₃₂-ba</td>
<td>AN-zu-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is general agreement that MVN 3, 205, is from Adab;⁷ therefore, it is reasonable to suggest that MVN 13, 14, is also from Adab.⁸

Widell (2003:120) lists MVN 13 14, 21 & 600 together, drawing attention to the similarity of the form of the tablets. These are each disbursements of garments for the New Year and are all dated § 44. In each case, the reverse of the tablet has tug₂-ba za₃-mu at the top, followed by a large space, with the date at the bottom. Based on the drawings, the tablets look very similar. Further, it is noted that these three tablets have similar museum numbers (i.e. the numbers for MVN 13, 14, 21 & 600, are, respectively FLP 1748, 1742 & 1741), which is consistent with the suggestion that these three tablets had been in the same deposit, had been unearthed and subsequently stored together.⁹ Statistically, it is highly improbable that such similar tablets could have appeared within such close proximity in the museum inventory by random chance. On this basis, it seems reasonable to suggest that, if MVN 13, 14, is from Adab, then MVN 13, 21 & 600, are probably also from Adab.

§2.4. UCU 9: NYPL 104 (§ 46)

UCU does not offer any commentary on why this tablet might be from Ur.¹⁰ The tablet is analogous to AnOr 7, 152, and MVN 15, 6 (both § 47, Drehem), where the latter describes dišul-gi₁₃-li₂ as an overseer of weavers (uqala uš-bar). Note also TCNU 606 (§ 47), that is very similar to the above tablets and, although listed as being from Umma, is more probably from Drehem. In addition, the Drehem tablets CST 256, Tavolette 350, and AnOr 7, 145, also include dišul-gi₁₃-li₂ in connection with textiles. Thus it seems highly likely that the provenience of NYPL 104 is Drehem.

§2.5. UCU 104: AF 40-41, 60 6 (undated)¹¹

Widell (2010) gives a detailed discussion of this tablet, that is a record of Iddin-Erra receiving tug₂ ta₂-ki-ru-um sent to the center of Ur. In respect of the provenience he notes that:

- there were fullers named Iddin-Erra both in Drehem, during the reigns of Sulgi and Amar-Suen, and in Ur, during the reigns of Šulgi and Ibbi-Suen.
- scribes from Ur preferred the usage of šu ba-an-ti over šu ba-ti and, in particular, all of the tablets from Ur concerned with Iddin-Erra use šu ba-an-ti.
- the tug₂ ta₂-ki-ru-um (takkīrum) garments are rare and attested in similar scripts from Ur but do not appear in Drehem texts.
- the tablet would possibly have been written in the city of Ur but was more likely to have been archived in the location of the origin of the garments in the text rather than in Ur where the garments were delivered.
- if ša₃ uri₃₂ ma-še₃ tag-tag-ta is interpreted as “to the center of the city of Ur from all of the stacks,” then there is an implication that the textiles were moved from storage on the outskirts of Ur before they were ordered to be sent to the center of the city.

In this way, Widell concludes that the tablet would have been unearthed at a location in the outskirts of Ur.

However, there are a number of difficulties with that line of reasoning:

---

⁷ See, for example, Molina 2008: 52 and Such-Gutiérrez 2005/6: 2 n. 2.

⁸ Note that Molina (2006) lists MVN 13, 14, as having a provenience of Adab, although at a later stage (Molina 2008: 52) this was changed to Adab⁹.

⁹ They are probably not written by the same scribe since MVN 13, 14 & 21, use the si-mu-ur₁₃-ru-um spelling in the date, whereas MVN 13, 600, uses si-mu-ur-um.

¹⁰ The term tug sa gi₄-a refers to a fulling process and frequently appears on tablets from Ur (see Waetzoldt, 1972: 55). However this term is also known at other locations, and so is not a certain guide to the provenience of tablets. For example, tug₂ sa gi₄-a appears on the Drehem tablets OIP 115, 368, and PDT 2, 995.

The phrase, šu ba-an-ti, appears frequently in Drehem texts\(^{12}\) and, in particular, the Drehem text, *ASJ* 17, 317 (§ 46), is a receipt of wool by Iddin-Erra using šu ba-an-ti and has an impression of Iddin-Erra’s seal. Thus, it cannot be assumed that this phrase necessarily implies that the tablet was written in Ur and refers to the Iddin-Erra from Ur.

\(^{13}\) According to the CDLI database. Strictly, Ozaki & Yildiz (2002) give a provenience of Drehem\(^{1}\) for *JCS* 54, 12 82; however, the presence of the wife and daughter of Isaramaš, whose name is closely associated with Drehem (Sigrist 1992: 368), implies that it is highly likely that this text is in fact from Drehem.

\(^{14}\) Waetzoldt 1972: 143 n. 551.

\(^{15}\) This combination also appears in *BPOA* 6, 292, that is listed as being from Umma, although it is clearly from Ur. *UCU* also includes girî₁ lugal-dumu-še₃ (line rev. 6) but this requires more faith. On *UET* 3, 1581: šu-u₂-u₂ (obv. i 3), tu-ur-am-i₃-li₂ (obv. i 18), lu₂-bala-sa₆-ga (rev. i 2), ip-qu₂-ša (obv. i 6).

On this basis, it is suggested that the provenience of *AJO* 40-41, 60 6, remains unclear.

\section{§2.6. *UCU* 19: *AUCT* 1, 967 (SSI 7)}

This tablet records lu₂-dingir-ra receiving (šu ba-an-ti) textiles from Iddin-Erra, the fuller. It is also discussed by Widell (2010), since there is some overlap with the subject matter of the previous tablet. He notes that, during the reign of Šu-Suen the official Iddin-Erra with connections to the textile industry at Ur is found on *UET* 3, 1585 rev. v 2’ (SSI 5), and *UET* 3, 1647 (SSI 9). Widell makes the reasonable observation that, in view of the date, it is more likely that *AUCT* 1, 967, refers to this official from Ur than the fuller with this name from Drehem, who first appears 34 years earlier on *BIN* 3, 405 (SSI 30).

\section{§2.7. *UCU* 29: *MVN* 13, 42 (IS 3)}

As *UCU* notes, this text is almost identical with *UET* 3, 1561, apart from line 3 and the dating formula (see also *UET* 3, 1556). This allows readings, where the text has become damaged, to be supported by comparison. Thus *MVN* 13, 42, is from Ur.

\section{§2.8. *UCU* 38: *MVN* 3, 331 (IS 5)}

*MVN* 3 (p. 18) suggests that the provenience of this tablet is Ur\(^{1}\) and it is included in *UCU* (p. 142) without further discussion. The text is considered by Sallabenger (1993: 178 n. 838), and deals with clothing for the fist fighter and wrestler (in the) court in the Akītu(-feast house) at Ur. Sallabenger compares this text with *UET* 3, 189, 191, and *UET* 9, 1050, and also gives the provenience of *MVN* 3, 331, as Ur\(^{3}\).

\section{§2.9. *UCU* 41 & 94: *MVN* 13, 15 (IS 5) & 20 (year name not preserved)}

*UCU* does not give a reason for including *MVN* 13, 15, but it is clearly from Ur because *UET* 3, 1676, and *UET* 9, 1294, give the same combination of ur-šul-gi-ra and girî₁ lugal-dumu-še₃. Also there are a total of 8 texts that contain both šul-gi-iri-mu (fuller) and ur-šul-gi-ra, including *MVN* 13, 20, that also appears in *UCU*’s list.

\section{§2.10. *UCU* 45: *MVN* 13, 22 (IS 5)}

This text also shows ur-šul-gi-ra receiving garments from a fuller. The combination of ur-šul-gi-ra and girî₁ ur-dingir-ra also appears in the Ur texts, *UET* 3, 1620-1621, 1623 & 1740, demonstrating that *MVN* 13, 22, is from Ur.\(^{15}\)

\section{§2.11. *UCU* 49: *MVN* 13, 9 (IS 5)}

*UCU* (p. 146) notes that this text includes the personal names ip-qu₂-ša (obv. 2), šu-u₂-u₂ (obv. 4), lu₂-bala-sa₆-ga (line 6) and tu-ur-am-i₃-li₂ (rev. 2), that also appear on *UET* 3, 1581.\(^{16}\) Taken individually, these names are not so unusual, but the combination of the four names appearing on the same tablet leaves little doubt that *MVN* 13, 9, is from Ur.

\section{§2.12. *UCU* 59: *MVN* 13, 725 (IS 5)}

*UCU* states that its reconstruction of rev. 4 is based on a similar text, *UET* 3, 1740, so that […]-ra-ka is interpreted as [ša₃ ki-mu]-ra-ka. The *UCU* argument then follows that ki-mu-ra is a store-house for clothes situated in Ur,
citing Sollberger (1966: 141-142) in support. However, Sollberger notes that a ki-mu-ra is also listed as a building in the Girsu tablets *ITT* 2, 902 + *ITT* 5, 6850, and *ITT* 4, 7300+9151. Thus, taken on its own, the argument for suggesting that *MVN* 13, 725, is from Ur seems weak. The IS 5 date is a stronger indicator, since statistically most IS 5 tablets are from Ur. It is also worth noting that *UET* 3, 1762, includes lugal-inim-gi-na in an undated textile tablet from Ur. On this basis, the provenience might be regarded as Ur.

§2.13. **UCU 60: SAT 3, 2009 (IS 5)**

*UCU* does not give a reason for including this tablet. However, ur-dušul-gi-ra dub-sar also appears on *UCU* §2.13. It might be regarded as Ur?.


*UCU* follows Sigrist (2000: 56) stating that this tablet has a provenience of Ur. The personal name, ṅanna-ḫi-li lu₂ azlag₂, is only found at Ur and appears on *UET* 3, 1584, 1591 & 1660, and *UET* 9, 345. So it is clear that *SAT* 3, 2017, is from Ur.

*SAT* 3, 2018 (IS 9), is also a textile tablet that includes the lines ur-dušul-gi-ra šu ba-an-ti giri₃ d₃suen-dan, where giri₃ d₃suen-dan appears in a number of Ur texts. Thus, *SAT* 3, 2018, is also from Ur (although it was not listed as such by *UCU* or Sigrist 2000).

§2.15. **UCU 86: MVN 13, 17 (IS 8)**

*UCU* (p. 160) implies that this tablet is from Ur because “it seems likely that this town or village [viz., geš₃(MAN)-banda₃-[<ki>]] was situated somewhere in the vicinity of Ur.” The late date also makes it likely that the tablet is from Ur. Sallaberger (1993: 147 n. 696) states that *MVN* 13, 17, is from Ur.

§2.16. **BPOA 6, 745 (IS 1)**

For completeness, it is worth adding here the textile tablet, *BPOA* 6, 745, which was published after *UCU* with a provenience of Ur². This text analogous to *UET* 3, 1544, as they are both wool tablets naming šu-ku₈-bu-um. All of the other 11 tablets naming šu-ku₈-bu-um and dated to the reign of Ibbi-Suen are from Ur (including 9 recorded in *UET* 3 and *UET* 9). Thus, it is reasonable to suggest that *BPOA* 6, 745, is from Ur.

§3. **Wider Discussion of the Provenience of “Ur” Tablets**

§3.1. It is evident from the above discussion (summarized in table 1 at the end of this paper) that the validity of the proveniences given in *UCU* for textile tablets is most vulnerable to challenge when the tablets are dated prior to the reign of Ibbi-Suen. While it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss all of the tablets listed in *UCU* part II, this section extends the discussion to include some of the non-textile tablets, considering briefly the validity of the proveniences assigned in *UCU*, particularly for tablets pre-dating Ibbi-Suen. A list of the tablets considered is given in table 2 below.

§3.2. **UCU 2: Fish & Lambert 1963, 1 = RA 57, 94 1 (§31)**

This tablet was re-published as *NATN* 60.¹⁹ Fish & Lambert do not suggest a provenience for this tablet and *UCU* provides no discussion on this. However, in *NATN* Owen states that it was excavated from Nippur (Owen, 198: 11). Although the early excavation records for Nippur do not meet modern standards, the museum number for the tablet is listed amongst hundreds of tablets from Nippur and so it is very likely that *NATN* 60 was excavated in Nippur.

§3.3. **UCU 3: SAT 2, 192 (§38)**

*UCU* follows Sigrist (2000: 15) and assumes that this tablet is from Ur without explanation. The tablet notes a large quantity of apples recorded in the course of an orchard inspection, some having been credited to the palace household. *SAT* 2, 192, includes the PN i-di₃-e₂-a, which also appears on *SAT* 2, 217. During the reign of Šulgi, this name is predominately found on Drehem texts. Furthermore, *SAT* 2, 217, refers to e₂ sag-da-na nibru₄, which was the early name for Drehem. Therefore, it is suggested that *SAT* 2, 192 & 217, were found at Drehem.

§3.4. **UCU 4: MVN 13, 26 (§41)**

This tablet is now listed as being from Adab following Gomi’s observation (1987: 147) that šu₄-ma-ma dub-sar named on this tablet (as [šu₄]-ma-ma dub-sar) also appears on the seals on the Adab tablets *MVN* 3, 204-205 & 209.

---

¹⁷ More recent publications include e₂ ki-mu-ra at Garšana (CUSAS 3, 84, 194, 198, 242 & 1325) and a ki-mu-ra at Nippur (NATN 407). ePSD identifies ki-mu as “storage, a store house” (i.e. not specifically a store house for clothes).

¹⁸ *SAT* 3, 2017; *UET* 3, 1585, 1682, 1702 & 1745.

¹⁹ There is a small glitch in that Fish & Lambert give the museum number as UP 9159, whereas the actual no. (as written on the tablet) is 8159A and the prefix CBS is conventionally used now instead of UP for the Catalogue of the Babylonian Section in the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology.
§3.5. UCU 10: ASJ 11, 328 26 (Š 48)
There is a set of eight other very similar texts all dating to Š 48 and all containing the sequence of lines n guruš u₂₄ n-še₃, gurum₂ ak, a₂ lu₂ hun-ga₂, ki lugal-a₂-zì-da: MCS 7, 13 AO 11739 & 11740; MCS 7, 14 AO 11741; MVN 15, 147 & 152; KM 89496, KM 89497 & KM 89529 (unpubl.). Since these tablets are all listed as coming from Nippur, then it follows that ASJ 11, 328 26, is also from Nippur.

§3.6. UCU 11: Princeton 1, 128 (Š 48)
It is suggested in UCU (p. 122) that, "The month name [diri me-ki-gal₂] shows that the text derives from Ur and that Š 48 had an intercalary month." However, although iti diri ezem-me-ki-gal₂ is the usual form of the intercalary that Š 48 had an intercalary month. However, although iti šu-eš-ša-ta iti še-sag 11-ku₅-še₃ is indeed 6 months, as stated in the text.²⁴

Princeton 1, 128, describes the issuing of sickles (ũrūdā-gur₁₀) to zi-ma by ur-šu-ba-ba₆, with the seal of zi₂₄ ma sipa gu₄ ᵃ-en-ki. Zima is not found on other tablets; however, the main cult center of Enki was at Eridu, that would be sun-gi-na deducted from lu₂-gi-na.²² However, ePSD interprets ū-a-gi-na in this text as a type of offering.

Princeton 1, 80, is analogous to BIN 3, 425 (AS 4, Drehem), that also concerns lu₂-gi-na disbursing man-power, in that case for two months. This, taken together with the use of the Drehem calendar, suggests that Princeton 1, 80 has a provenience of Drehem.

§3.7. UCU 13: Princeton 1, 80 (AS 3)
UCU (pp. 123-124) suggests that, Princeton 1, 80, is an Ur text because it uses Drehem/Ur month names and includes an intercalary month, which would not be expected at Drehem in AS 2. However, the year name given in this text corresponds to AS 3 and Drehom had an intercalary month after the 11th month (iti diri ezem me-ki-gal₂ us₂⁻sa), thus iti šu-eš-ša-ta iti še-sag₁₁₄-ku₄-še₃ is indeed 6 months, as stated in the text.²¹

UCU (p. 106) describes the contents of Princeton 1, 80,

20 For example, MVN 13, 444; PDT 1, 404; TBL 3, 136; TRU 60.
21 Whiting 1979: 22. There are many examples of Drehem texts with an intercalary year in AS 3 (Yuhong 2002: table 4).
22 The UCU p. 123 reading of the text has lugal-gi-na, instead of lu₂-gi-na and omits line 11.
23 Note also BPOA 2, 2605, dated four years later (AS 8).
24 Snell (1982: 141) states that the provenience is Ur (naming the text as MAOG 188: 1 and giving the date as IS 2).
throne carrier named ur-^dnin-geš-zi-da also appears in a
seal impression on *Ontario* 2, 197 (§ 46, Girsu), and on
both tablets, *CT* 9, pl. 42 BM 18425 (§ 48, Girsu), and
*TUT* 154 (AS 2, Girsu). Considering the dates of these
tables, it is much more likely that the latter texts are rec-
ording the same throne bearer ur-^dnin-geš-zi-da as *OrSP*
47-49, 145, suggesting that this tablet is more probably
from Girsu.

Instead, Molina (2006) draws attention to lu2-ama-na di-
kus, who appears in tablets from Umma (*MVN* 10, 217,
and *MVN* 18, 635). However, lu2-ama-na di-kus also
appears in tablets from Girsu (*OIP* 121, 83, and *Ontario*
1, 128). Therefore, the provenience of *OrSP* 47-49, 145,
remains uncertain.

§3.11. *UCU* 17: *TMH* NF 1-2, 131 (§S 5)
*UCU* appears to have included this tablet because it re-

cords barley sent to Ur. However, five of the personal
names on this tablet (lugal-kuszu, lu2-ama-na-su, ur-

šem3-kus3-ga, lu2-^dges-bar-e2, and ki-lu5-la2) also appear in
*TMH* NF 1-2, 149, dated to the following month in §S 5.
*TMH* NF 1-2, 149, is not included in *UCU* and is gen-
erally listed as being from Nippur. There are five tablets that
name ur-šem3-kus3-ga, all dated to §§ 5, and clearly part
of the same archive: *TMH* NF 1-2, 131 (§S 5 iv), *NATN*
464 (§S 5 x), *TMH* NF 1-2, 149 (§S 5 x), *TMH* NF 1-2,
82 & 144+349 (§S 5 xi) and *NATN* 455 (§S 5). These
tablets are all from the Nippur excavations.25 While there
is some potential for odd tablets to have been purchased,
this is a coherent group of tablets and therefore it is very
likely that they were actually excavated at Nippur.

§3.12. *UCU* 18: *MVN* 13, 368 (§S 6)
This tablet includes the seal also found on *UET* 3, 157 (IS
6), 999 (IS 6), 1016 and *MVN* 3, 261 (IS 6). In addition,
the phrase ki ga-ti-le-ta is also found on *UET* 3, 1182 (IS
8), that is analogous in content to *MVN* 13, 368. Thus, it
is very likely that *MVN* 13, 368, has a provenience of Ur.

§3.13. The “Guzana Tablets”
Steinkeller (1982) sets out a clear basis for regarding the
“Guzana tablets” as part of the same archive: i.e., *MVN*
3, 257, 260, 270, 278, 291, 298-299, 304-305 & 377;
*NYPL* 263-264, 377 & 381; and *Fs Gordon* 1, 135 3.26

25 Note in addition the undated text *JCS* 54, 5 32 Ni
2090 from the Nippur collection of the Archaeological
Museum, Istanbul.

26 Steinkeller (1982) also considers that *MVN* 3, 261 & 318,
might possibly be part of the same archive. However, in
this case, the discussion set out by Widell (2004) would
seem to preclude this possibility. Thus, Widell (2004)
gives a good basis for regarding *MVN* 3, 261 & 318, as
being from Ur. By extension, *MVN* 3, 368, has the same
seal as *MVN* 3, 261, *UET* 3, 157, 999 & 1016, and so is
likely to have the same provenience.
relatively small number of other tablets of the same form, including this phrase and dated within this short time span, were also unearthed at Ur. These include: ASJ 18, 91 27; BPOA 6, 46; MVN 8, 189; MVN 13, 133-135, 800; and SAT 3, 2014. All of these are listed in UCU except for BPOA 6, 46, that was published later in 2009.

§3.15. UCU 46: TUT 276 (IS 5)
UCU included this tablet because it was sealed by a scribe at Ur. However, it was published in 1901, many years before the start of excavations at Ur, making it unlikely that the tablet was unearthed in Ur.

TUT 276 (IS 5 vii) records ki-tuš-šu giving dates as a maš-da-ri-a contribution for the a2-ki-ti festival. It is very similar to RA 58, 108, 117, that has the same date and records ki-tuš-šu disbursing figs. The latter has the British Museum museum no. BM 16108 and is listed as being from Girsu (Sigrist et al. 1996). Note, in addition: ki-tuš-šu disbursing silver and dates in BRM 3, 147 (IS 5 vii, Girsu); ki-tuš-šu disbursing dates in RA 58, 102 55 (AS 1, Girsu); and acting as an intermediary for a delivery including dates, figs, raisins and dried apples in TÉL 72 (SS 5, Girsu).

On this basis, it seems more likely that, although TUT 276 was sealed by a scribe in the city of Ur, it was retained by ki-tuš-šu and found in Girsu. This draws attention to an important distinction between where the tablet was written and where it was unearthed.

§3.16. UCU 98: SET 245 (no year given)
This tablet was probably included in UCU on the basis of the provenience given in the original publication (Jones & Snyder 1961: 142). In that publication the seal is rendered as,

1. ur-[gar]
2. dub-sar
3. dumu lugal-ušur3
4. nu-bandā3-gū4 dšara2

However, CDLI, following BDTNS, renders it as

1. ur-[dšara2]
2. dub-sar
3. dumu lugal-ušur4
4. nu-bandā3-gū4 dšara2

and on that basis the tablet can readily be given a provenience of Umma, since there are to date 51 other texts known with this seal (in CDLI: S005355) with this provenience.

§3.17. UCU 99: MVN 2, 267 (no year given)
The sequence ki ur-bad3-tibirx(KU)-ra-ta ur-dig-alim šu ba-ti appears on two other tablets, SNAT 132 and Nisaba 10, 55, both from Girsu (and registered in the British Museum in 1896 and 1898, many years before excavations began at Ur). The latter identifies ur-dig-alim as a musician/singer (nar). Note also a similar form on TCTI 2, 2746, also from Girsu. The likelihood therefore is that MVN 2, 267, is from Girsu.
Table 1: Textile tablets from Ur according to UCU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UCU no.</th>
<th>CDLI no.</th>
<th>Prov. in orig. ref.</th>
<th>Prov. according to this paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA 73, 27 8</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P127997</td>
<td>Drehem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 13, 14</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P116787</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 13, 21</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>P116794</td>
<td>Adab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 13, 600</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P117373</td>
<td>Adab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPL 104</td>
<td>$46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>P122640</td>
<td>Drehem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUCT 1, 967</td>
<td>SS 7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>P103812</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 13, 42</td>
<td>IS 3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>P116815</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 3, 331</td>
<td>IS 5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>P113891</td>
<td>Ur ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 13, 15</td>
<td>IS 5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>P116788</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 13, 22</td>
<td>IS 5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>P116795</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 13, 9</td>
<td>IS 5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>P116782</td>
<td>Drehem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 13, 725</td>
<td>IS 5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>P117498</td>
<td>Ur ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT 3, 2009</td>
<td>IS 5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>P145209</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT 3, 2017</td>
<td>IS 6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>P145217</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 13, 17</td>
<td>IS 8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>P116790</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 13, 20</td>
<td>IS ?</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>P116793</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF 40-41, 60, 6</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>P100301</td>
<td>Drehem ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: A selection of non-textile textile tablets from Ur according to UCU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UCU no.</th>
<th>CDLI no.</th>
<th>Prov. in orig. ref.</th>
<th>Prov. according to this paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATN 60</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P120758</td>
<td>(Nippur in NATN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT 2, 192</td>
<td>$38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P143393</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 13, 26</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P116799</td>
<td>Adab ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASJ 11, 328 26</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>P102464</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton 1, 128</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>P126817</td>
<td>Drehem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton 1, 80</td>
<td>AS 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>P126769</td>
<td>Drehem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAT 346</td>
<td>AS 4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>P130106</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAOG 4, 188 2</td>
<td>AS 5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>P112549</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or 47-49, 145</td>
<td>AS 7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>P125034</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMHN 1-2, 131</td>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>P134443</td>
<td>Nippur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 13, 368</td>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>P117140</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 3, 305</td>
<td>SS 9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>P113865</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPL 381</td>
<td>SS 9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>P122918</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPL 264</td>
<td>SS 9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>P122802</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPL 263</td>
<td>IS 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>P122801</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUT 276</td>
<td>IS 5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>P135870</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASJ 18, 091 27</td>
<td>IS 5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>P102656</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET 245</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>P129655</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVN 2, 267</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>P113566</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 However, Sigrist (1992: 401 n. 117) clearly assumes that AUCT 1, 967, is from Drehem.
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