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§1. Introduction
§1.1. The Los Angeles Unified School District’s (LAUSD) Art and Artifact Collection1 is comprised mainly of a large assemblage of Greco-Roman antiquities acquired by Edward W. Clark, an artifact enthusiast and principal of Venice High School in Los Angeles from 1917 to 1938. In addition to Classical antiquities, however, the collection also features a small assortment of 15 cuneiform documents, consisting of 13 Ur III administrative texts, a Gudea cone, and a neo-Babylonian herding account.2 The collection is currently housed in downtown Los Angeles in the administrative offices of the LAUSD.

§1.2. Clark majored in Classics and graduated with an A.B. from Oberlin College in 1890. He continued his studies at the University of Chicago and later in Leipzig, earning his A.M. in 1895. When he returned from Germany, Clark accepted a position at Ripon College teaching Greek and Latin as well as archeology. Clark continued to travel abroad, occasionally purchasing Greek and Roman antiquities that he eventually used to form a small collection for the school. This collection at Ripon College now bears his name.3 Clark left Ripon College in 1909 and spent much of the next few years in Europe.

In 1916, he returned to the United States and moved to California, where he taught at several high schools before becoming principal of Venice High School. In 1932, he started the Venice High School Latin Museum using pieces mainly from his own collection that he had acquired while traveling abroad.

§1.3. Thirteen tablets from Clark’s collection of antiquities are presented below dating to the Ur III period (2112-2004 BC). Six come from the sites of Drehem (ancient Puzriš-Dagān) and Umma respectively, while one tablet likely comes from Girsu. As with most collections of this type, these tablets represent a medley of known Ur III archives. And, as is typical of such administrative miscellany, this potpourri of tablets offers certain insights into the terminology (šu- gid 2 , ab 2 -rig 5 ) and practices (ba la , abbreviating year names, sealing) of the Ur III state apparatus.

§2. Texts
§2.1. Girsu Tablet
§2.1.1. No. 1 = AA 69
This Girsu tablet is a reckoning of Aba-isege’s debt to a household within the Lagaš province—likely a grain equivalent of labor—from his role as a foreman of weavers. The tablet is dated to Amar-Suen 1 xi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>The carried over debt is 5 royal gur of barley; the remaining debt of the balanced account (by) Aba-isege to be replaced/repaid;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. la₂⁻ia₃⁻ 15(3) se gur fugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. si₇⁻i₁⁻tum nigung₂⁻ka₅⁻ak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. a⁻ba⁻i₃⁻se₃⁻ge-e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. su-su-dam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our thanks to Leslie Fischer, LAUSD’s Art and Artifact Collection Consultant, who brought the collection to our attention and who was gracious enough to allow digital imaging of the documents. Ms. Fischer also provided much of the biographical information regarding Edward Clark.

The neo-Babylonian herding account (AA 74) will be treated elsewhere by Michael Kozuh. The Gudea cone (AA 135) bears the same inscription as RIME 3/1.1.7.63. For artifact images, consult CDLI.

Several years after Clark left Ripon College, a professor of physics there, William H. Barber, agreed to purchase seven cuneiform tablets (EC.74.1, EC.74.2, EC.74.3, EC.74.4, EC.74.5, EC.74.6, and EC.74.7) from Edgar Banks and donated them to the school’s Clark Collection of Ancient Art.
§2.1.1.1. The provenience of this tablet is based on its prosopography; an Aba-isege occurs in a number of Gir-
su texts involving female weavers (ge.me₂ uš-bar) from late in Šulgi’s reign into Amar-Suen’s reign. In several
texts (e.g. ASJ 9, 327, 2 [AS 1 i]; HLC 68 [AS 2 iii 1]; UNT 34 [nd]; OTR 258 [AS 1 x]), Aba-isege is listed as a foreman
of weavers (u.gula uš-bar) and associated with the e₂ uš-bar. He appears in three additional texts concerning
female weavers (CT 7, pl. 32 BM 18395 [S 46]; MVN 22, 18 [...] ; SET 240 [S 45]), as taking amounts of grain
into his administrative control (i₃-dab₅). Based on the quantity of grain he receives in SET 240 and ASJ 9, 327, 2,
he supervised between 24 and 32 weavers during the first year of Amar-Suen’s reign.⁶

§2.2. Drehem Tablets
§2.2.1. No. 2 = AA 76
This text notes a transfer of animals from Intae’a to Ur-
kununa, both important officials within the Drehem live-
stock administration.⁷ This tablet was recorded in Am-
ar-Suen 6 vi.

§2.2.1.2. The most striking feature of this text is the phrase ab₂-rig₅-e, which only occurs in one other text
(CST 320 [AS 5 vi 20]), also qualifying the personal
name Ur-niĝar. An alternative orthography ab₂-rig₂-eš₃ occurs in Amorites 18, pl. 7-8 (AS 5 xii 1, 29) and
its related account MVN 15, 192 (AS 5 xii, 29), both in
conjunction with the personal name Ur-niĝar at Drehem.
Syntactically and contextually, the term indicates the of-
fice or position held by Ur-niĝar at Drehem, interpreted
here as abrig.¹¹

---

⁴ Jones & Snyder 1961: 134-135, assigned this text to
Umma, but it is almost certainly from Girisu. Umma’s
month one, še-sag₁₁-ku₅, is the same as Girisu’s month
eleven. Moreover, none of the names attested in SET 240
are particular to Umma.

⁵ In MVN 22, 18, Aba-isege takes administrative control
over unused rations/allocations from a weaver, Nin-
Šulgi, who has recently died. The logical inference is that
Aba-isege was her supervisor.

⁶ This calculation assumes a 30-sila₃ ration for ge.me₂
(Gelb 1965: 232).


⁸ Metcalf 2010: §2.1a with references. See also, Tsoupa-

⁹ Tsouparopoulou 2008: 218-220.

¹⁰ Tsouparopoulou 2008: 262.

¹¹ These two interrelated texts record Ur-niĝar amongst
the chief singer (gala - maḥ) and the šabra. Ur-niĝar receives
a single lamb, which tends toward a cultic interpretation

---
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§2.2.2. No. 3 = AA 79
This small tablet is an account of nine weaver garments (tug₂ uš-bar) given from Nūr-Suen into the administrative control of Lu-gina, the chief household administrator (šabra) during the 46th regnal year of Šulgi’s reign. The provenience is provisional, based on Nūr-Suen appearing in other Drehem texts from this time period.12

Obverse
1. 1(u) la₃ 1(diš) tug₂ uš-bar 9 weaver garments, from Nūr-Suen;
2. ki nu-ur₂-suen-ta Lu-gina, chief household administrator;
3. lu₂-gĩ-na šabra received.
Reverse
blank space
1. [mu] Ḥurti was destroyed.

§2.2.2.1. Nūr-Suen often conducts various transactions with the other Drehem offices, including the dead animals’ office; beginning in Amar-Suen’s reign, Nūr-Suen appears as a main official in the sub-division of this bureau that deals with the raw materials—hides and wool—and also the finished goods—leather and textiles.13

§2.2.2.2. It is unclear whether Lu-gina is the chief household administrator of a local cult near Drehem, or if he is in fact operating out of Numušda’s cult center of Kazallu.14 There are, however, three seals from Drehem that bear the title A R A D₂ d numušda (T urām-ilī [ŠS 9 iii-viii]; Šu-iškur [ŠS 9 vii-x]; Ḥalala [ŠS 9 v]), suggesting, at a minimum, that cultic activity related to Numušda’s temple was not uncommon at Drehem, at least in the latter Ur III period.

§2.2.2.3. The short forms of year names can be ambiguous and problematic.15 M. Sigrist discussed most recently difficulties in differentiating Šulgi 48 and Šulgi 46,16 over an association with the kitchen or slaughterhouse. For additional commentary on this term, see Brumfield 2011.

12 Nūr-Suen also appears in other textile accounts (e.g. VAMZ 3, 26-27 129 3 [AS 1 viii]; MVN 13, 11 [AS 3 viii]; TRU 304 [AS 1 xi]) within several years of this account. Moreover, the tablet shape adheres to the typology of Drehem tablets, in opposition to those from Umma.

14 See MVN 3, 364.
15 See, for example, Wu 2010.
§2.2.3.1. Despite the fragmentary state of this tablet, the preservation of the personal names helps situate it in its original context. Both Adda-kala and Ṣelluš-Dagān appear individually in a number of texts where they are delivering lambs for deities (Inanna and Nanna respectively) in Drehem. These two personal names appear together in at least two other texts where each is recorded giving a lamb into the possession of Nasa, the fattener of the king, at Drehem for cultic purposes ([PDT 2, 1019 [Ś 47 ii 4]; PDT 2, 1243 [Ś 48 xi 13]]).

§2.2.4. No. 5 = AA 136
This text records expenditures of animals from Abba-saga, one of the chief officials, to Šulgi-ayamu, a member of the disbursal office in Drehem dating to Amar-Suen 2 iii 10.

**Obverse**
1. 3(diš) gukkal babbar₂ 3 white fat-tailed sheep,
2. 1(diš) gukkal ĝeš-du₃ babbar 1 white pregnant fat-tailed sheep,
3. 3(diš) gukkal 3 fat-tailed sheep,
4. 2(diš) [U₈+HUL₂] 2 ewes,
5. 7(diš) udu 7 sheep,
6. 1(diš) sila₄ 1 lamb,

**Reverse**
1. 1(diš) maš₂ 1 goat,
2. 1(diš) ud₅ 1 nanny goat,
3. u₄ 1(u)-kam on the 10th day,
4. ki ab-ba-sa₃-ga-ta from Abba-saga,
5. 4sul-gi-a-a-mu i₃-dab₅ Šulgi-ayamu took (into his administrative control);
6. iti u₄-bi₂-gu₇ month: “Ubi feast,”
7. mu₄ amar-₄-suen lugal-e year: “Amar-Suen, the king,

**Left edge**
1. 2(u) la₄ 1(diš) 19 (total animals)

§2.2.4.1. Curiously, a virtual duplicate of this text is BPOA 6, 703 (AS 2 iii 10), attributed to Drehem, which reads as follows:

**Obverse**
1. 3(diš) gukkal babbar₂ 3 white fat-tailed sheep,
2. 1(diš) gukkal ĝeš-du₃ babbar 1 white pregnant fat-tailed sheep,
3. 3(diš) gukkal 3 fat-tailed sheep,
4. 2(diš) u₈ gukkal 2 ewes,
5. 7(diš) u₂₄ 7 sheep,
6. 1(diš) sila₄ 1 lamb,

**Reverse**
1. 1(diš) ud₅ 1(diš) ud₅ 1 goat,
2. 1(diš) ud₅ 1(nanny) goat,
3. u₄ 1(u)-kam on the 10th day,
4. ki ab-ba-sa₃-ga-ta from Abba-saga,
5. 4sul-gi-a-a-mu i₃-dab₅ Šulgi-ayamu took (into his administrative control);
6. iti u₄-bi₂-gu₇ month: “Ubi feast,”
7. mu₄ amar-₄-suen lugal-e year: “Amar-Suen, the king,

§2.2.4.2. M. Hilgert compiled duplicates from Drehem during the reign of Amar-Šuen. His list includes several texts involving Abba-saga and Šulgi-ayamu all dating from Amar-Suen 4-5. The pair presented here should be added to this list of Drehem duplicates.

§2.2.4.3. There are some small differences between these two texts, such as the line divisions and the use of |U₈+HUL₂| in AA 136 compared to u₈ gukkal in BPOA 6, 703. Moreover, our text appears to use in one instance (obv. 1) babbar₂ (U₄U₄) instead of babbar (U₄), for describing the white color of the small cattle, whereas only babbar is seen in BPOA 6, 703. The practice of using babbar₂ to qualify small cattle at Drehem, predominantly the fat-tailed (gukkal) variety, is seen only until ca. Amar-Suen 6. In the other provinces, babbar₂ continues to be used in similar contexts regularly throughout the Ur III period with no such temporal restriction observed. The use of both babbar and babbar₂ in the same text is attested in several tablets (e.g. Nik 2, 465 [Ś 46 v 21] and MVN 5, 107 [Ś 48 i 2]), but the distinction between their use and the significance of the variant orthographies remains unclear. In AA 136, Nik 2, 465 and MVN 5, 107, the choice appears to be one of aesthetic, where babbar₂ is used to fill out a short line and babbar is used in a crowded line.

§2.2.5. No. 6 = AA 77
This text records the expenditure from the Drehem administration of two lambs to the cult of the moon god, Nanna, and five ewes to the kitchen (e₃-muḫald₅m) in Šulgi 46 v 29. These animals were delivered on the same day that they were booked out, as recorded in OIP 115, 205. The delivery of two lambs ultimately destined for Nanna’s temple in Nippur agrees with Wu Y.’s and Li X.'s reconstruction of regular deliveries from Drehem to major cultic centers in Nippur during Šulgi’s reign and suggests that Enšakuge and Lu-Ninšubur were associated with the en of Inanna in Nippur.

---

20 For a brief overview of Nasa’s career at Drehem, see Wu & Li 2013: 445-446.
21 Possibly Abba-saga son of Nasa the royal fattener at Drehem under Šulgi (Wu & Li 2013: 446). Abba-saga assumed his father’s office under Amar-Suen.
23 Hilgert 2003: 40-42.
24 Wu & Li 2013: 446, 450. According to their analysis, the en of Inanna in Nippur, consistently identified by title alone, contributed two lambs or one lamb and one kid to
Obverse
1. 1(diš) sila₄ mu-ku₄(DU)
en-ša₃• kux(DU) lam-b delivery (fr om)
2. 1(diš) sila₄ niga mu-ku₄(DU) lu₂-dnin-šubur
3. nanna
4. zabar-dab₃ maškim

Reverse
1. 5(diš) u₈ šu-gi₃₂
2. e₂-mu₄aldim-še₃
3. zi-ga u₄₃(u) la₂₁(dišt)-kam
4. iti• ezem₃-nin-a-zu
5. mu u₃₂-sa ur-bi₄-lum ki

§2.2.5.1. This was one of at least two expenditures made to the kitchen on this day. The other, recorded in MVN 20, 185, notes that the kitchen received one barley-fed ox (gu₄ niga), four barley-fed sheep (udu niga) and one barley-fed billy goat (maš₂ gal niga) “on account of the runners” (mu kas₄-e-ne-še₃). Together, these texts represent a fraction of the likely dozens of tablets drawn up on this day to document the movement of animals within and without the Drehem administration.

§2.2.5.2. The exact meaning of the term šu-gi₃₂ remains elusive. Proposed translations include “general dues,” “tax,” “Ausschuss,” or as a designation of animals suitable to be eaten, among others. Based on literary contexts, Karahashi suggested “to accept” or, in the context of extispicy, “to examine” adopted by Englund.

§2.2.5.2.1. In general, the term šu-gi₃₂ in the Drehem texts is used for animals expended to the kitchen. In a number of texts, they are distinguished from animals qualified as “slaughtered” (ba-uš₂/ug₇) (e.g. BIN 3, 490 [Ṣ 43 vi 17], AUCT 1, 679 [AS 4 vi 27], etc.). However, not all animals are qualified as either “slaughtered” or šu-gi₃₂ and in many texts they appear with no designation at all (e.g. MVN 5, 103 [Ṣ 46 ix 13]; BIN 3, 63 [AS 3 xi 2]).

§2.2.5.2.2. An examination of same-day Drehem kitchen texts demonstrates another curious aspect of the use of the term šu-gi₃₂. The text ASJ 3, 189 1 is a summary account of large cattle expenditures by the fattener Enlil made during the second month of Sulgi 43. Included are expenditures of oxen to the kitchen on the 3rd (7 oxen), 10th (1), 11th (2), 12th (1), and 19th (1) of the month. These animals are not qualified as šu-gi₃₂. However, in NYPL 18, dated to the 12th day of the second month of Sulgi 43, there is an expenditure of some 20 small cattle of various types as well as one ox to the kitchen, all qualified as šu-gi₃₂.

§2.2.5.2.2.1. The expenditure of an ox in NYPL 18, listed as šu-gi₃₂, is unequivocally the same one listed in ASJ 3, 189 1 without any such designation. That there are other instances of this phenomenon (e.g. MVN 13, 805 and Nisaba 30, 8 [Ṣ 43 x 15]; AUCT 1, 876 and OIP 115, 314 [Ṣ 47 viii 11]; AUCT 2, 72 and AUCT 1, 327 [AS 3 i 5], etc.) indicate that this was not simply a scribal error or some other administrative aberration. Instead, the use of the term šu-gi₃₂ depended upon whose tablet the transaction was being recorded: in general, šu-gi₃₂ was used when the transaction came from the account of the main Drehem officials, e.g. Abba-saga and Intae’a. When that same transaction appeared in the records of fatteners such as Enlil, the designation šu-gi₃₂ was not used.

§2.2.5.2.2.2. Often, administrative records are abbreviated and, thus, omit non-compulsory information in the interest of time and/or space. Perhaps personal receipts, given to non-state employees, did not include supplementary information about the animals or transaction, especially if that information was informative only for internal record keeping. For additional discussion on this phenomenon, see §2.3.1.2. below.

§2.2.6. No. 7 = AA 70
This Drehem text records both large and small cattle received by members of the Ur III administration. Intae’a and Ur-mes have been identified as members working in...
the shepherd’s office by previous Drehem research. This tablet was recorded in Šu-Suen 2 vi 20-22.

### Obverse
1. 1(diš) ṃaš-da₃ m unos
   1 young gazelle doe,
2. u₂ 2(u)-kam on the 20th day,
3. 1(diš) sīla₄ 1(diš) ṃaš-da₃
   1 lamb, 1 gazelle,
4. u₂ 2(u)-kam on the 21st day,
5. 1(diš) sīla₄ 1(diš) gu₄
   1 lamb, 1 ox,
6. 7(diš) ab₂ 7 cows,
7. 1(u) la₂ 1(diš) dusu₂ 9 jacks,
8. 2(diš) dusu₂-munos 2 jennets,
9. šu-gid₂ u₂ 2(u)-kam šu-gid₂ on the 22nd day,
10. ki  in-ta- from Intae’a;

### Reverse
1. 5(diš) udu 5 sheep from Nalu;
2. ša₃ bi₃ ta 5 sheep to the kitchen via
   mu-haldim ţir₂, ţi₃-li₂ Šu-ili,
3. 2(diš) sīla₄ 2(diš) ṃaš-da₃
   2 lambs, 2 young gazelles,
4. ţir₂ in-ta-e₃-a via Intae’a,
5. ur-mes i₃-dab₃ Ur-mes took (into his admin-
   istrative control);
6. 8(diš) ab₂ 1(u) 1(diš)
   dusu₂ 8 cows, 11 donkeys,
7. en-lil₂ la₂ i₂-dab₃ Enlil took (into his admin-
   istrative control);
8. iti a₃ ki-ti month: “Akiti (festival),”
9. mu ma₂ dara₂-abзу 6th month: “The boat Dara-Abzu
   was caulked.”

§2.2.6.1. Here, a small number of animals are being transported via Intae’a to Ur-mes; however, the majority of Intae’a’s animal deliveries to the Ur III state are taken (i₃-dab₃) by the individual Duga and only sealed by Ur-mes.35 Ur-mes is a curious figure in the Drehem shepherd’s office. Tsoupapoulo speculates that he may have been an administrative link between the office of the shepherds and the shepherds themselves.36 His status is somewhat nebulous given that he is never described as a scribe.37 This is part of an intricate pattern of exchange between Intae’a, Duga and Ur-mes discussed fully by Tsoupapoulo.38

§2.3. Umma Tablets

§2.3.1. No. 8 = AA 72

This tablet records amounts of reeds (gi) and willow (ghem ma₃-nu) given from Šešani to Lugal-ezem, acting on behalf of the Ur III state. This text is marked as being part of the still poorly understood bala account of the administration. The date of this tablet is reconstructed as Šulgi viii based on the presence of Šešani in ša₃ bala accounts received or sealed by Lugal-ezem during the latter part of Šulgi’s reign. This would argue, contextually, for a placement of AA 72 in the second half of Šulgi’s reign.39

### Obverse
1. 1(u) gu₂ gi 10 talents of reed (~300 kg),
2. 1(u) gu₂ ḡem ma₃-nu 10 talents of willow wood,
3. ki šeš-a-ni₃-ta 3 sheep from Šešani;
4. lugal-ezem Lugal-ezem
5. šu-ba-ti received;
6. iti e₂-iti-6(diš) month: “House of the 6
   moons;” from the bala
    (account).

### Reverse
1. lugal-ezem Lugal-ezem,
2. dub-sar scribe,
3. dumu lugal-e₃ ma₃-abₑ son of Lugal-emahê,
4. šabra chief household administra-
   tor.

§2.3.1.1. Lugal-ezem, son of Lugal-emahê, dealt with reeds and related goods at Umma, recorded almost exclusively during the 8th month and often, but not consistently, denoted as ša₃ bala. For example, OrSP 47-49 176 and Aleppo 112 record a similar bala transaction between these two individuals, but in the seventh month of Šulgi 34.

§2.3.1.2. There are two distinct seals attested for Lugal-ezem, son of Lugal-emahê.40 The shorter seal inscrip-

---

34 Tsoupapoulo 2008: 211-248.
35 The last attestation of Ur-mes’ seal dates to Šu-Suen 4 vi, which likely indicates that Ur-mes retired/died sometime between the 6th and 10th month of that year.
37 Tsoupapoulo 2008: 237, fn. 111.
38 Tsoupapoulo 2008: 93, 240. For a brief discussion on sealing by proxy, see Mayr 1997: 139.
40 A broken attestation of a Lugal-ezem seal dating as late
§2.3.2.1. Ur-Šara, an archivist (ṣadubba), is a prominent official in the Umma administration whose career extended from the middle of Šulgi’s reign through his predecessor Amar-Suen.

§2.3.2.2. Lugal-iti-da, son of Šar-ļa, also possessed several seals throughout his career. Lugal-iti-da’s seals show a variant orthography for his name as Lugal-tida. In Šulgi 37, but possibly as early as Šulgi 34, his seal reads as follows:

W. Heimpel’s assertion that the second (incorrectly identified as sealed) text was given to Ur-e’e, an agent of the Ur III state, seems to be the most logical interpretation of the differences between administrative records (although see Widell 2009: §2.3.7 for the arguments in favor of scribal drafts). The more abbreviated record would be sufficient for the workers to prove their payment of reeds; however, the state would require supplementary details. Based on the duplicate accounts presented by Heimpel as well as those discussed in Brumfield, forthcoming, such supplementary details could include sealing agent/authorizing party, terminology used in running accounts, toponyms, commodity specification, additional agents or account type.

The family of Lugal-ūsûr is outlined in Mayr 1997: 150-151.


There does not appear to be a difference in the placement (e.g. obverse, reverse) of the "short" (three lines) and "long" (four lines) seals of Lugal-ezem, as outlined by A. Di Ludovico in his study of Ur III Umma administrative tablets (2012: 277-278).

There is extant evidence for variant practices for recording administrative transactions in the Ur III period. For example, compare BCT 2, 27 and 28 (§ 44 xi), two Umma tablets recording the same work of reed workers but with slightly different information recorded on each tablet (Heimpel 2009: 45):

15 male workers, the labor of 1 day: 45 bales, the total is 765 bales, being the labor of 17 days, Ur-e’e took (into his administrative control); month: "Pā’ue," year: "A shining throne for Enlil was built."

As Su-Suen 5 is found in Owen 1994: 23-24, no. 13, from Umma. Because of its fragmentary state, it is not certain which seal of Lugal-ezem is attested in Su-Suen 5.

There is extant evidence for variant practices for recording administrative transactions in the Ur III period. For example, compare BCT 2, 27 and 28 (§ 44 xi), two Umma tablets recording the same work of reed workers but with slightly different information recorded on each tablet (Heimpel 2009: 45):

15 male workers, the labor of 1 day: 45 bales, the total is 765 bales, being the labor of 17 days, Ur-e’e took (into his administrative control); month: "Pā’ue," year: "A shining throne for Enlil was built."

There does not appear to be a difference in the placement (e.g. obverse, reverse) of the "short" (three lines) and "long" (four lines) seals of Lugal-ezem, as outlined by A. Di Ludovico in his study of Ur III Umma administrative tablets (2012: 277-278).

There is extant evidence for variant practices for recording administrative transactions in the Ur III period. For example, compare BCT 2, 27 and 28 (§ 44 xi), two Umma tablets recording the same work of reed workers but with slightly different information recorded on each tablet (Heimpel 2009: 45):

15 male workers, the labor of 1 day: 45 bales, the total is 765 bales, being the labor of 17 days, Ur-e’e took (into his administrative control); month: "Pā’ue," year: "A shining throne for Enlil was built."

As Su-Suen 5 is found in Owen 1994: 23-24, no. 13, from Umma. Because of its fragmentary state, it is not certain which seal of Lugal-ezem is attested in Su-Suen 5.

There does not appear to be a difference in the placement (e.g. obverse, reverse) of the "short" (three lines) and "long" (four lines) seals of Lugal-ezem, as outlined by A. Di Ludovico in his study of Ur III Umma administrative tablets (2012: 277-278).
§2.3.2.2.1. Beginning in Šulgi 48 and continuing to Šu-Suen 5, Lugal-itīda assumes the office of nu-banda and adopts a fuller orthography for his name:

Lugal-itīda
overseer of the oxen
son of Ĝirine

§2.3.3. No. 10 = AA 82
Tablet AA 82 records the total fodder consumed by a herd of 30 sheep over the course of one month. These animals are being purposefully fattened in preparation for cultic slaughter by Alulu, a fattener (kur ušda) of the deity Šara, at Umma. This tablet dates to Amar-Suen 6 i.

Obverse
1. 3(u) udu niga 5/6(diš)
   sila₂ sē-ša-twara₃
   30 barley-fed sheep (fed) 5/6
   liters of grain each,
2. 2(ban₂) 3(u)-ša₂-du₂
   24 liters of bran,
3. 1(u₂) 3(u)-še₂
   for 30 days;
   the total of its barley is 750
   liters;
4. šu-ni₂-gin še-bi₂
   2(barig₂) gur₂
   the total of its bran is 720
   liters;
Reverse
1. sa₂-du₁₁ Šara₂ ša₃ umma₃
   regular offerings for Šara in
   Umma,
2. gib₁₃ a-lu₁₃-lu₁₅
   via Alulu;
3. iti še-sa₂-gi₂-kša₂
   month: "Barley harvest,"
4. mu us₂-sa en₂-mah₂-gal₁
   year after: "Enmatgalanna
   an-na ba-hu₂g was installed."

§2.3.3.1. This text is typical for Alulu’s activities as an animal fattener at Umma. He is involved in numerous transactions of fattened animals for the Umma cults (see NYPL 20 [AS v 2] for a similar account to AA 82). The hereditary nature of Alulu’s office has already suggested by Mayr, Stepien, and Widell.

§2.3.4. No. 11 = AA 81
This tablet records quantities of cord bundles (sa gu) transferred in four installments across non-consecutive months at Umma. The goods were delivered by Ur-Nintu and accounted to the Ur III state by Lu-Ninšubur, who is identified with both a profession and patronym on the accompanying sealing. This text is from Amar-Suen 6 with accounting entries for months: iii, iv, viii, xi.

Obverse
1. 3(u) sa gu
2. ni₂-gi₂-dab₁₃ iti še-kar₁₃-ša₂-gal₂-la
   30 bundles of cords,
   requisitions (during the)
   month: "Barley at the
   harbor;"
3. 1(geš₂) sa gu
4. ezem nes₂-g
   60 bundles of cords,
   (requisitions during the)
   month: "First offering;"
5. 1(geš₂) sa gu
6. ezem es₂-it₂-ša₂(diš)
   60 bundles of cords,
   (requisitions during) "Festi-
   val of the house of 6
   moons;"
Reverse
1. 3(u) sa gu
2. ezem pa₂₃-u₂-e
   (requisitions during) "Festi-
   val of Paeu,"
3. ki ur-d₂-nin-tu₂-ta
   from Ur-Nintu,
4. kiš₂š₂ lu₂₂-r₃₃-š₂₃
   sealed document of Lu-
   Ninšubur;
5. mu š₂₃-ša₂₂-šu₂₃-r₃₃-
   year: "Šašrum was destroyed
   a-ra₂ 2(diš)-k②a₃-
   for a second time."

Seal
1. lu₂₂-dnin-šubur
2. dub-sar
3. dumu še₂š-kal₂-la
4. šabra
   Lu-Ninšubur,
   scribe,
   son of Šeškalla,
   chief household administra-
   tor.

§2.3.4.1. This particular seal of Lu-Ninšubur appears on Umma texts beginning in Šulgi 34 until Šu-Suen 1. Variations of this seal are also attested at Umma, one as late as Šu-Suen 9 (e.g. PDT 1, 586). Mayr indicates that there may be as many as six distinct seals for Lu-Ninšubur at Umma throughout his lifetime. This leads to some confusion for seals without a clear patronym (e.g. Tabolette 360 [AS 7 iii]; BPOA 1, 700 [SS 3 xiii]), but in cases with patronyms, such as AA 81 here, his identity is more secure.

§2.3.4.2. SET 274 has a similar entry to this text, but dates several years earlier to Amar-Suen 2 iii, iv, viii, xi. This pattern extends to many other texts from Umma involving Ur-Nintu and Lu-Ninšubur (e.g. BPOA 6, 1442 [AS 2 xi]; USC 6612 [AS 3 viii]):

Reverse

49 Widell 2009: §3.3-3.5.
§2.3.4.3. Several texts from Umma that record bundles of cords transactions do not contain month information, so it is difficult to claim any pattern definitively (e.g. BPOA 2, 2652 [§ 44], and Nisaba 9, 220 [§ 44], for Ur-Nintu entries).

§2.3.5. No. 12 = AA 75
This Umma account records 355 liters of “large bread” (ninda gal) given by Gurzan and associated with the šunir. This text was sealed by Ayakala, the governor (ensi₂) of Umma from Šu-Suen 9 until the end of Šu-Suen’s reign. Accordingly, this text was recorded on Šu-Suen 3 xiii.

Obverse
1. 1(ĝeš₂) [guruš u₄ dšu-dsuen] 60 labor days,
2. ki-gur₄-zu-an-ta from Gurzan;
3. [ugula]₁ šeš₅-ka₄-la the foreman is Šeškala,
4. [kišib₃ ur₄]-<šul-pa-e₃ sealed document of Ur-Šulpa’ē;

Reverse
1. mu us₂-sa dšu-dsuen lugal year after: “Šu-Suen , the
2. -e₆ mar-tu king, built the western
3. [du₃] wall. ”

Seal
1. ur₄-šul-pa-e₃ Ur-Šulpa’e,
2. dub-sar scribe,
3. dumu lugal-ku₃-ga-ni son of Lugal-kugani.

§2.3.6.1. The place name ki-su₇ a-ša₃-dnin-ur₄-ra occurs only in Umma texts; moreover, this field features prominently in a list of Umma fields in SAT 2, 1114 (AS 8). There are several other work assignment records for this location, mostly groups of male laborers (guruš) filling and punting or towing (gid₂) boats (e.g. UTI 4, 2447 [§S 4], SAT 2, 76 [§S 1]).

§2.3.6.2. The reconstruction of ugula in obv. 3 is supported by BPOA 1, 10 (iv 10), and BPOA 1, 908 (ŠS 3). Specifically, BPOA 1, 10, lists the foremen responsible for work in the field of Ninurra in Umma:

Obverse
1. 3(ĝeš₂) guruš ša₃-gu₄ 180 ox driver workers,
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><code>ugula ur-dul-pa-e₃</code></td>
<td><em>the foreman is Ur-Šulpâe;</em></td>
<td>u₁ ₁(u)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><code>(še₂) ugula lu₂-zâ-zi-da</code></td>
<td><code>180 (ox driver workers), the foreman is Lugal-azida;</code></td>
<td>2. <code>itu nesâg</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><code>(še₂) ugula šeš-kal-la</code></td>
<td><code>120 (ox driver workers), the foreman is Šeškalla;</code></td>
<td>3. <code>ki-su₂₃ a-ša₃₃ din-ur-ra</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><code>(še₂) ugula lu₂-banda₃ da</code></td>
<td><code>60 (ox driver workers), the foreman is Lubanda;</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><code>(še₂) ugula ur-d₃-ma-mi</code></td>
<td><code>120 (ox driver workers), the foreman is Ur-mami;</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reverse*

1. `gurum₃([IGLERIM])` | *inspected on the 10th day;* |   |   |
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