

## The Groton School Cuneiform-Text Collection

Andrew Pottorf  
*University of Cambridge*

Andrew A. N. Deloucas  
*Harvard University*

**Abstract:** This article features the Groton School cuneiform-text collection, including a discussion on its provenance as well as photographs, transliterations, translations, notes, and commentaries on the three texts in the collection. Two of the texts are from the Ur III period (ca. 2110–2003 B.C.E.), whereas one is from the Late Babylonian period (ca. 5th century B.C.E. through 1st century C.E.). The Ur III texts are an expense report from Puzriš-Dagān and a sealed receipt from an unknown provenience. Their commentaries focus on key terminology such as the term šu-gid<sub>2</sub> in the former and the phrase apin-la<sub>2</sub>-ta ba-a in the latter. The Late Babylonian text is a loan document from Sippar concerning silver for a house sale. It is utilized for a detailed reconstruction of the provenance of the Maštuk archive, first postulated by Caroline Waerzeggers (2002). The commentaries for all three texts also highlight prosopographical observations, especially for the Late Babylonian text.

**Keywords:** Ur III period, Late Babylonian period, Maštuk archive, administrative texts, house sales, loans

### §0. Acknowledgements

§0.1. We would like to extend our gratitude to the many individuals and institutions that have made this work possible. We are thankful to Andy Reyes, John Tyler, and Groton School (Groton, MA) for granting us permission to publish their cuneiform-text collection and for their aid in its access and study. We are grateful to Peter Der Manuelian, Kristen Vagliardo, Adam Aja, and Katherine McGaughey, who have generously allowed us use of the Harvard Museum of the Ancient Near East for the conservation, photography, storage, and study of these texts. For their thoughtful input on our work, we are indebted to Eric Aupperle, Heather Baker, Gojko Barjamovic, Erica Ciallela, Laura Fox, Agnete Lassen, Manuel Molina, Clemens Reichel, Nadia Ait Said-Ghanem, Curtis Small Jr., Piotr Steinkeller, Caroline Waerzeggers, Klaus Wagensohn, and Taha Yurttaş. Letters and related documents from (1) Groton School, (2) the Morgan Library & Museum, and

(3) the Yale Babylonian Collection (YBC) have been made available to us by (1) Reyes, (2) Ciallela, (3) Lassen, and Said-Ghanem. Any mistakes or shortcomings are our own.

### §1. Introduction

#### §1.1. The Provenance of the Groton School Cuneiform-Text Collection

§1.1.1. The Groton School cuneiform-text collection consists of three texts that have been designated as Nos. 1, 2, and 3. They are referred to here as Groton School Cuneiform Text(s) (GSCT) 1 (P547617), 2 (P547618), and 3 (P547619). GSCT 1 and 2 are dated to the Ur III period (ca. 2110–2003 B.C.E.) and GSCT 3 is dated to the Late Babylonian period (ca. 5th century B.C.E. through 1st century C.E.).<sup>1</sup> On 23 November 1932, J. P. Morgan Jr. wrote to G. Arthur Jorgensen, the first press master of Groton School, about an indefinite loan of three cuneiform texts. On 7 December 1932, Junius S. Morgan, Morgan Jr.'s

<sup>1</sup> Dates during the Ur III period are according to Sallaberger and Schrakamp 2015, but they remain tentative. Dates during the Neo- and Late Babylonian periods are according to Waerzeggers 2014. Factoring in the months of text dates makes their annual dates also approximate. Abbreviations are according to CDLI (<https://cdli.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/abbreviations>). When a text is first mentioned, its CDLI number is provided.

brother and the president of the board of trustees for the Pierpont Morgan Library (now the Morgan Library & Museum), wrote to Groton School headmaster Endicott Peabody to authorize this loan. On the same day, Belle da Costa Greene (1932), the first director of the Morgan Library, packaged these three texts and sent them to the school. Two days later, Peabody (1932) wrote to Morgan Jr., thanking him for “the specimens of cuneiform tablets which Mr. Jorgensen has been eager to get for some time.”

**§1.1.2.** According to a 1982 letter from Jorgensen to Douglas Brown, the Groton School archivist then, these texts arrived on loan to the now-defunct Groton School Press. Jorgensen states specifically that the texts “were lent to the Press by the Morgan Library before the library was turned over to the City of New York.” This is surely misremembered since the Morgan Library was transferred to New York City in 1924 (*New York Times* 1924), eight years prior to the letter from Peabody. In the same letter, Jorgensen notes that a professor, thought to be from Yale, made translations of the texts. We can surmise that this professor was Albrecht Goetze, who, along with Ferris J. Stephens, catalogued small collections throughout the United States and Canada when Goetze joined Yale University as a Visiting Professor in 1934 (Finkelstein 1972). Those translations are currently unknown to either Groton School or Yale University according to Reyes and Lassen (pers. comm.).

**§1.1.3.** The provenances of Ur III texts in general are tragically marred by looting and smuggling. Molina (2020, 325) estimates that “of the 90,575 texts from collections formed before 1991, only 15% were properly excavated by Iraqi or foreign archaeological teams.” Whereas the details in GSCT 1 may not be of much help, GSCT 2 includes an individual named Guzana, who can be identified in seventeen other texts (Steinkeller 2022, 182 n. 40). Of these texts, eight are in the John Frederick Lewis collection, four are in the New York Public Library (NYPL), four are

in the YBC, and one is in a private collection in the United Kingdom. The Lewis collection was accessioned in 1930 when it was donated to the Free Library in Philadelphia (FLP).<sup>2</sup>

**§1.1.4.** GSCT 3 belongs to a dossier similarly divided between the Lewis collection and the Nies Babylonian Collection (NBC) at Yale, accessioned in early 1922. Waerzeggers (2002, 323; 2014, 148) argues that this dossier, bound together by the familial name Maštuk, was acquired overall during the 1910s and 1920s.<sup>3</sup> Although James Nies died in 1922, acquisitions continued for several years through the YBC (Lassen [pers. comm.]), including numerous texts that Michael Jursa (2005, 130–31) assigns to this group. Those texts were accessed in mid- to late 1935 (Lassen [pers. comm.]). Unlike the NBC, the Lewis collection did not purchase texts after its accession; rather, the majority of his purchases occurred between 1928 and 1929 (Frame 2013, 12–13).<sup>4</sup> In light of Jorgensen’s recollection of the texts’ provenances, the Morgan Library had access to them without communicating with the YBC, indicating that 1922 may be the *terminus post quem*. Since the Lewis collection did not have any posthumous accessions, 1930 may be the *terminus ante quem*.

**§1.1.5.** It is most likely that the Maštuk dossier is a part of 120 texts that were purchased by Ettalene M. Grice, the acting curator of the YBC after Albert T. Clay’s death in 1925, from Ibrahim Elias Gejou on 29 June 1926. Using the Nies Fund, it was authorized by Yale University’s treasurer office and signed by H. J. Ostrander (Gejou 1926a, 1926b; Grice 1926). There are two other known transactions that predate 1930 between Gejou and YBC curators regarding Neo-Babylonian texts. The first possible transaction was by Clay, who discussed purchasing a set of 410 Neo-Babylonian contracts in a 1922 letter, but this transaction cannot be corroborated with regard to price nor is there any information on the quality of said texts (see Gejou 1922). The other possibility is a group of 478 Neo-Babylonian texts that were

<sup>2</sup> For the FLP texts, see MVN 3 260 (P113820), 278 (P113838), 291 (P113851), 298 (P113858), 299 (P113859), 304 (P113864), 305 (P113865), and 377 (P113937). For the NYPL texts, see AOS 32 P3 (P122918), S1 (P122914); NYPL 263 (P122801), and 264 (P122802). For the YBC texts, see BPOA 6 17 (P210088); SAT 3 1902 (P145102), 1935 (P145135), and 1937 (P145137). Note that Sollberger, *JCS* 19, 28 3 (P111948) is in a private collection in the UK. A brief history of the Lewis collection is given in Owen 1975, 13. Aupperle (pers. comm.) draws a compelling connection between the Groton School texts and a small collection of texts formerly in the now-defunct Chase Manhattan Bank Money Museum (Molina 2008, 37 n. 76), but this possibility is not further investigated.

<sup>3</sup> Note that Waerzeggers makes a connection between these two institutions, in addition to the later-mentioned Royal Ontario Museum (ROM). We do not see a direct connection regarding any singular provenance among the FLP, the NBC, and the ROM for this specific dossier, however (see §1.1.7). For the Maštuk dossier, see §2.3.4.1.

<sup>4</sup> The Morgan Library Collection was officially accessioned into Yale’s custody in 1926 (Beaulieu 1994, viii). It is almost certain that there were posthumous purchases after this accession that remain unassociated with the Morgan Library Collection at the YBC.

shipped to Yale on 1 March 1927, but these texts are noted as being from Uruk. The 120 texts are said to have been of “excellent quality” compared to these 478 texts from Uruk, which had been purchased along with nearly 60 clay figurines (Dougherty 1928; Stahlschmidt and Co. 1927).<sup>5</sup>

**§1.1.6.** These 120 texts were sent on 23 March 1926 through the American Consulate, along with two cones that were requested for years by Gejou (1926c) to be sold through the YBC.<sup>6</sup> On 27 December 1928, Gejou encouraged passing on material that needed help being sold to his brother-in-law Alexander D. Messayeh (see also Dougherty 1928). Given the state of the Laffon Trust around this time, purchasing the lot of figurines and Uruk texts earlier that year likely gave reason for the YBC to sell some texts in addition to the items belonging to Gejou that had been in the collection for several years (document “217”; Dougherty 1929b).<sup>7</sup>

**§1.1.7.** The material that Raymond Dougherty, the curator of the YBC then, sent to Messayeh was explicitly uncertain for either party. In his letter dated 31 January 1929, Dougherty (1929a) asks Messayeh: “Did [Gejou] give you a list of the things belonging to him which are held temporarily in the Yale Babylonian collection?” The following day, Dougherty received Messayeh’s (1929) response: “I ... regret to advise that I have no list of the items belonging to Mr. Gejou. Whatever you have in your possession that belongs to him, you may forward to me upon receipt of which I shall advise him.” It took several more weeks before Dougherty ascertained what to send Messayeh; the antiquities dealer received five boxes of texts on 30 March 1929. Being one year after Grice’s passing in late 1927, this is the likely moment when the Maštuk dossier, and perhaps others, became separated from the larger collections at Yale—included with these boxes were two objects being negotiated by Grice and Gejou, such as a Warad-Sîn cone referenced as early as 1925, soon after Clay’s death. In being shipped to Messayeh, the texts reentered the art market, wherein Lewis and Morgan, possibly among others, purchased several of them.

**§1.1.8.** There is also a text connected to the Maš-

tuk dossier in the ROM (965.262.2 [P417490]) according to both A. C. V. M. Bongenaar (1997) and Waerzeggers (2002). This and three unrelated texts (965.262.1 [P417427], 965.262.3 [P417428], 965.262.4 [P417515]) were purchased through A. D. Tushingham, the ROM’s chief archaeologist then (Fox [pers. comm.]). It is noted that these texts came from Jerusalem, where Tushingham was the associate director of the British-Canadian-French Joint Expedition to Jerusalem from 1962 to 1967. Thus, at least one text from this dossier remained on the market outside of the United States until the 1960s. While it is possible that this text may have a connection to the YBC, this is a tenuous suggestion because there were likely texts related to this dossier existing outside of the proposed 120 texts first offered to Grice in 1926.

**§1.1.9.** Said-Ghanem (2021, 2022) notes that smuggled artifacts could exchange hands prior to bulk purchases. While this allows for the possibility that Lewis, the Morgan family, and the YBC could have separately purchased texts from the same dossier, this is an unlikely scenario. On the contrary, texts were more often sold in bulk and then later divided and purchased by various collections and individuals. As indicated by Grant Frame (2013, 12–13), the Lewis collection was acquired in large part by Elias Solomon David and the Khayat family.<sup>8</sup> Although David and the Khayat family both shared correspondence with the Morgan family, Nies, and the YBC, we are unable to find any connection to the Khayat family and any texts that appear related to the Maštuk dossier. It is equally the case that Gejou and the Messayeh family shared close contact with these three institutions. Though it is possible that David was a source of these texts, we are unable to find a connection within the timeline of events that connect Groton School with the Morgan family. More broadly, we cannot establish a connection to Edgar J. Banks, whose prolific acquisitions almost exclusively defined collections like that of the World Heritage Museum of the University of Illinois (Sack 1994), and it is unlikely that this dossier came directly from Gejou without an intermediary figure as there is no known correspondence between him and Lewis.

**§1.1.10.** American cuneiform collections often have

<sup>5</sup> These tablets are tallied along with terracotta figurines sold by Gejou on an undated document marked “217” (Said-Ghanem [pers. comm.]).

<sup>6</sup> The price for these texts was negotiated downward (Grice 1926) and was paid on 29 June 1926 (document “217”).

<sup>7</sup> It is well known that, as far back as Clay’s tenure, the YBC sold and donated texts to individuals and institutions in order to facilitate the purchasing of more objects for the museum (Foster 2013, 128).

<sup>8</sup> Small Jr. (pers. comm.), the associate librarian and coordinator of public services for special collections at the University of Delaware, is in agreement with Frame.

single figures who provided the majority of their texts (Dessagnes 2017; Said-Ghanem 2021, 2022). Ultimately, we agree with Waerzeggers that texts of the Maštuk dossier were purchased through single sellers. To contribute to her proposal, we can ascertain that these sales most likely took place in June 1926 by Gejou and then after March 1929 by Dougherty through Messayah. The text located at the ROM is ultimately unrelated to the provenance of the Maštuk dossier located within the United States even though its provenience is still intimately connected.

## §1.2. Formatting

**§1.2.1.** Text dates are formatted according to regional year, month, and day. For the units of measure referenced here, see Powell 1989–1990. Filiation in GSCT 3 is formatted as follows: PN<sub>1</sub>/PN<sub>2</sub>//PN<sub>3</sub> means “PN<sub>1</sub>, child of PN<sub>2</sub>, descendent of PN<sub>3</sub>.” These individuals are usually identified by their PIDs established in Prosobab (Waerzeggers, Groß et al. 2019).

## §2. Text Editions

### §2.1. Groton School Cuneiform Text 1

#### §2.1.1. Overview

Dimensions (Height x Width x Thickness):	107mm x 49mm x 24mm
Mass:	176g
Period:	Ur III
Provenience:	Puzriš-Dagān
Date:	Šū-Suen 2/5/- (ca. 2034 B.C.E.)
Genre:	expense report

#### §2.1.2 Transliteration and Translation

##### *Obverse*

1.	1(diš) ʿab <sub>2</sub> ʿšu-gid <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> -muḫaldim	1 cow (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax (for) the kitchen:
2.	u <sub>4</sub> 3(diš)-kam	the 3rd day (of the month).
3.	1(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> ba-uš <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 5(diš)-ʿkam	1 cow died: the 5th day.
4.	1(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> šu-gid <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 8(diš)-kam	1 cow (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax: the 8th day.
5.	2(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> šu-gid <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 1(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš)-kam	2 oxen (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax: the 9th day.
6.	2(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> šu-gid <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 1(u)-kam	2 oxen (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax: the 10th day.
7.	1(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> ba-uš <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 1(u) 2(diš)-kam	1 ox died: the 12th day.
8.	1(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> 4(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> šu-gid <sub>2</sub>	1 ox (and) 4 cows (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax:
9.	u <sub>4</sub> 1(u) 4(diš)-kam	the 14th day.
10.	2(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> šu-gid <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 1(u) 5(diš)-kam	2 oxen (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax: the 15th day.
11.	2(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> šu-gid <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> ba-uš <sub>2</sub>	2 cows (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax, 1 cow died:
12.	u <sub>4</sub> 1(u) 6(diš)-kam	the 16th day.
13.	2(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> šu-gid <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> ba-uš <sub>2</sub>	2 cows (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax, 1 cow died:
14.	u <sub>4</sub> 1(u) 7(diš)-kam	the 17th day.
15.	2(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> 1(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> mu 2(aš) šu-gid <sub>2</sub>	2 oxen (and) 1 two-year-old cow (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax:
16.	u <sub>4</sub> 1(u) 8(diš)-kam	the 18th day.
17.	2(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> šu-gid <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 2(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš)-kam	2 cows (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax: the 19th day.
18.	2(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> šu-gid <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 2(u)-kam	2 cows (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax: the 20th day.
19.	1(diš) ʿgu <sub>4</sub> 1(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> šu-gid <sub>2</sub>	1 ox (and) 1 cow (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax:
20.	u <sub>4</sub> 2(u) 1(diš)-kam	the 21st day.
21.	1(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> 2(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> mu 2(aš) šu-gid <sub>2</sub>	1 ox (and) 2 two-year-old cows (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax:
22.	1(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> amar ga ba-uš <sub>2</sub>	1 milk-fed bull calf died:
23.	u <sub>4</sub> 2(u) 2(diš)-kam	the 22nd day.
24.	1(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> 1(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> šu-gid <sub>2</sub>	1 ox (and) 1 cow (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax,

##### *Reverse*

1.	1(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> ba-uš <sub>2</sub>	1 ox died:
2.	u <sub>4</sub> 2(u) 3(diš)-kam	the 23rd day.
3.	1(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> 1(diš) ʿab <sub>2</sub> mu 2(aš)	1 ox (and) 1 two-year-old cow

- |     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
| 4.  | šu-gid <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 2(u) 4(diš)-kam  | (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax: the 24th day.                     |
| 5.  | 1(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> mu 2(aš)  | 1 cow (and) 1 two-year-old cow                                      |
| 6.  | šu-gid <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 2(u) 5(diš)-kam  | (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax: the 25th day.                     |
| 7.  | 1(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> 1(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> mu 2(aš)                                       | 1 ox, 1 cow, (and) 2 two-year-old cows                              |
| 8.  | šu-gid <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 2(u) 6(diš)-kam  | (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax: the 26th day.                     |
| 9.  | 1(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> mu aga <sub>3</sub> -us <sub>2</sub> -e-ne-še <sub>3</sub>                                   | 1 ox for the guards (as well as)                                    |
| 10. | 1(diš) <sup>anše</sup> kunga <sub>2</sub> munus 1(diš) ṛdusu <sub>2</sub> nita <sub>2</sub> <sup>ṛ</sup>            | 1 female donkey-onager hybrid (and) 1 male donkey                   |
| 11. | mu ur-ṛmaḥ <sup>ṛ</sup> -še <sub>3</sub>  | for the lions   |
| 12. | šu-gid <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 2(u) 7(diš)-kam  | (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax: the 27th day.                     |
| 13. | 1(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> 1(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> šu-gid <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 2(u) 8(diš)-kam                    | 1 ox (and) 1 cow (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax: the 28th day.    |
| 14. | 2(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> mu aga <sub>3</sub> -us <sub>2</sub> -e-ne-še <sub>3</sub>                                   | 2 cows for the guards (as well as)                                  |
| 15. | 1(diš) <sup>anše</sup> kunga <sub>2</sub> nita <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) <sup>anše</sup> kunga <sub>2</sub> munus         | 1 male donkey-onager hybrid (and) 1 female donkey-onager hybrid     |
| 16. | mu ur-maḥ-še <sub>3</sub>   | for the lions   |
| 17. | ṛšu <sup>ṛ</sup> -gid <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš)-kam<br><i>blank line</i>              | (as) the šu-gid <sub>2</sub> tax: the 29th day.                     |
| 18. | šunigin ṛ1(u) 8(diš) <sup>ṛ</sup> gu <sub>4</sub> 1(diš) gu <sub>4</sub> amar ga                                    | Total: 18 oxen, 1 milk-fed bull calf.                               |
| 19. | šunigin ṛ2(u) 4(diš) <sup>ṛ</sup> ab <sub>2</sub> 7(diš) ab <sub>2</sub> mu 2(aš)                                   | Total: 24 cows, 7 two-year-old cows.                                |
| 20. | šunigin 1(diš) <sup>anše</sup> kunga <sub>2</sub> nita <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) <sup>anše</sup> kunga <sub>2</sub> munus | Total: 1 male donkey-onager hybrid, 2 female donkey-onager hybrids. |
| 21. | šunigin 1(diš) dusu <sub>2</sub> nita <sub>2</sub><br><i>blank line</i>   | Total: 1 male donkey.   |
| 22. | ki <sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> -ta ba-zi  | It was expended from (the account of) Enlila.                       |
| 23. | iti ezem- <sup>d</sup> nin-a-zu   | Month: the festival of Ninazu.                                      |
| 24. | mu ma <sub>2</sub> -dara <sub>3</sub> -abzu <sup>d</sup> en-ki-ka / ba-ab-du <sub>8</sub>                           | Year: the boat (named) “Ibex of the Abzu” of Enki was caulked.      |

*Left edge*

1. 5(u) gu<sub>4</sub> 4(diš) anše

(Total:) 50 cattle, 4 equids.

**§2.1.3. Notes**

Obv. 6: While there is damage towards the end of this line, the text appears to be fully intact.

Rev. 10: For a recent discussion on the identification of <sup>anše</sup>kunga<sub>2</sub> and dusu<sub>2</sub>, see Recht 2022, 20–23, which is the basis for the translations of equids here.

**§2.1.4. Commentary**

**§2.1.4.1.** This expense report details the expenditure of livestock from the account of Enlila. He was a well-known livestock fattener who worked at Puzriš-Dagān, an Ur III administrative center for the accounting of livestock and various goods (Sigrist 1992; Steinkeller 1995, 49; Tsouparopoulou 2008, 227–31). The livestock expended here were modified by the

term šu-gid<sub>2</sub>, a description for livestock utilized over 2,000 times in Ur III texts from mainly Puzriš-Dagān as well as ĜARšana, Ĝirsu, Irisağrig, Nippur (possibly), Umma, and Ur. Marcel Sigrist (1992, 40–42) addresses this term, noting that it describes livestock selected for delivery often by herders to an administrative kitchen.<sup>9</sup> These deliveries were a livestock tax paid by at least the periphery of the Ur III state like the gu<sub>2</sub> ma-da tax, among others, as is indicated by Steinkeller (1991, 32), Walther Sallaberger (1999, 267), and Piotr Michalowski (2008, 118–19), among others. Whereas Herbert Sauren (1969, 358), Marc Cooper (1985, 103), and Robert Englund (2004, 40; 2010, 104) connect this term to extispicy, this is challenged by Christina Tsouparopoulou (2013, 153). Despite various treatments on this term, its exact translation and purpose remain challeng-

<sup>9</sup> Although the kitchen is only mentioned for the first šu-gid<sub>2</sub> tax of livestock, all the šu-gid<sub>2</sub> taxes of livestock were for the kitchen.

<sup>10</sup> For other discussions on šu-gid<sub>2</sub>, see Brumfield and Allred 2016; Hilgert 2003, 21–22, 52–53, 64; Jones 1967, 141–42; Lafont 2009; Liu 2017; Patterson 2018; Tsouparopoulou 2013, 153–56; Widell 2005, 20–22; and 2020, 220. Note that Daniel Patterson (2018, 459) equates the gu<sub>2</sub> ma-da and šu-gid<sub>2</sub> taxes since they appear to have been interchangeable. This is plausible, but it is possible that rather than being interchangeable, they may have referred to separate but similar taxes. This term is also used rarely for milled beans in presumably a similar sense, as noted in Brunke 2011, 60 n. 54.

ing.<sup>10</sup>

§2.1.4.2. These livestock were typically adults that could be fattened but were not in this case. They were suitable to be eaten, sometimes specifically by guards, dogs, or lions, though they may not have been considered suitable for fattening or work. While details regarding the purpose of these lions are limited, they were kept for the aggrandizement and entertainment of the king.<sup>11</sup> He watched them feed upon live animals (*TAD* 44 [P131086] obv. 7). He also probably hunted them for spectacle, as is de-

picted as early as the Late Uruk period and in extensive detail in the Neo-Assyrian period (Lladó Santaeularia 2019, 61–84; Watanabe 2002, 42–56, 76–88). Though there is no explicit evidence for these hunts during the Ur III period, Šulgi boasts in one of his royal hymns of killing a lion he encountered in the wild (Klein 1981, 16). As for the dogs, which are not mentioned in this text, they were kept for mainly military use (Tsouparopoulou 2012) and were probably also utilized for these hunts (Aupperle [pers. comm.]).

## §2.2. Groton School Cuneiform Text 2<sup>12</sup>

### §2.2.1. Overview

Dimensions <sup>13</sup> (Height x Width x Thickness):	Tablet: 45mm x 39mm x 17mm Envelope: 35mm x 51mm x 30mm
Mass:	Tablet and Envelope: 88.8g Tablet, Envelope, and Fragments: 108.9g
Period:	Ur III
Provenience:	Unknown
Date:	Šū-Suen 7/8/- (ca. 2029 B.C.E.)
Genre:	sealed receipt

### §2.2.2. Transliteration and Translation

#### Tablet

##### Obverse

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | 7(aš) 1(barig) 5(ban <sub>2</sub> ) še-geš-/i <sub>3</sub> gur | 7 gur 1(barig) 5(ban <sub>2</sub> ) (ca. 2210l) of sesame |
| 2. | ṛapin <sup>ṛ</sup> -la <sub>2</sub> -ta ṛba <sup>ṛ</sup> -a    | allotted (as rent) from tenant land                       |
|    | <i>remaining lines covered</i>                                 | [...]   |

##### Reverse

*preceding lines covered*

- |     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 1'. | ṛiti ezem <sup>ṛ</sup> -[ṛšul]-/ṛgi <sup>ṛ</sup>               | Month: the festival of [Šul]gi.          |
| 2'. | mu ma-da za-ab-/ša-li-um <sup>ki</sup> / ṛba <sup>ṛ</sup> -ḥul | Year: the land of Zabšali was destroyed. |

#### Envelope

##### Obverse

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | 7(aš) 1(barig) 5(ban <sub>2</sub> ) še-geš-i <sub>3</sub> ṛgur <sup>ṛ</sup>   | 7 gur 1(barig) 5(ban <sub>2</sub> ) of sesame |
| 2. | apin-la <sub>2</sub> -ta ba-a   | allotted (as rent) from tenant land,          |
| 3. | ki ṛgu <sup>ṛ</sup> -za-na-ta   | provided by Guzana,                           |
| 4. | ṛšu <sup>ṛ</sup> -[eš <sub>18</sub> ]-ṛtar <sub>2</sub> <sup>ṛ</sup>          | (which) Šū-[Eš]tar,                           |
| 5. | ṛlu <sub>2</sub> sag <sup>ṛ</sup> -ṛnanna-/[i <sub>3</sub> ]-ṛzu <sup>ṛ</sup> | the representative of Saĝ-Nanna-[i]zu,        |

##### Reverse

- |    |                           |           |
|----|---------------------------|-----------|
| 1. | ṛšu ba-an-ti <sup>ṛ</sup> | received. |
|----|---------------------------|-----------|

<sup>11</sup> Helpful comments on the feeding of such animals to dogs and lions are provided in Owen 1979, 63; Recht 2022, 143–44; and Sigrist 1992, 30–31. Sallaberger (2004, 49) and William Hallo (2008, 101 and n. 17) indicate that these animals were not suitable for cultic use, but they do not discuss this further. Like lions, bears were also kept for aggrandizement and entertainment (Michalowski 2013).

<sup>12</sup> Several fragments of the tablet and especially the envelope have been glued together with polyvinyl butyral. No envelope fragments have been glued in any way that would obstruct the tablet, but these envelope fragments can be pieced together to restore the text.

<sup>13</sup> The height of the tablet is estimated by measuring the height of the tablet and the envelope, which is then subtracted by the approximate thickness of the envelope. The dimensions of the envelope do not include the fragments.

<p><i>blank space</i></p> <p>2. ʾiti ezem-<sup>d</sup>šulʾ-[gi]</p> <p><i>blank line</i></p> <p>3. mu ma-da ʾza-abʾ-/ša-li-um<sup>kiʾ</sup> [ba]-/hul</p> <p><i>Seal 1</i></p> <p>1. ʾšu-eš<sub>18</sub>-tar<sub>2</sub>ʾ</p> <p>2. ʾdumu šu<sup>2</sup>-we<sup>2</sup>-er<sup>2ʾ</sup></p>	<p>Month: the festival of Šul[gi].</p> <p>Year: the land of Zabšali [was] destroyed.</p> <p>Šū-Eštar, son of Šū-Wer (?).</p>
---	--

### §2.2.3. Notes

Tabl. rev. 2' = env. rev. 4: We appreciate Steinkeller's (pers. comm.) observation that the writing of Zabšali with the final -um is only attested elsewhere in a few texts from Nippur (BPOA 7 2815 [P303596]), Puzriš-Dagān (SACT 1 104 [P128859]), and possibly the Šāt-Eštar archive (UCTDUP 29 [P517134] and Ismael and Abdulrahman, ZA 109, 130-131 3 [P519374]), which is near Umma (al-Tae and Felio 2021, 23 and n. 17). Unfortunately, this does not help much with determining this text's provenience.

Env. obv. 4–5: We are grateful to Molina (pers. comm.) for his suggestions in restoring these lines, which he relates to MVN 3 299.

Seal 1: While the seal is preserved in multiple locations, it is unfortunately difficult to read. It appears to include a two-line legend and a presentation scene. The name in the second line is particularly difficult to determine. It may be šu-we-er, like ša-at-we-er (attested only in the ĠARšana text CUSAS 3 340 [P323783]), but šu-we-er is not found anywhere else. The presentation scene, perhaps a salutation scene more specifically, features three standing figures, including (from right to left) a deity as the primary figure, the presentee (Šū-Eštar), and a supporting deity (Tsouparopoulou 2015, 28–34). Both deities are challenging to identify in the iconography.

### §2.2.4. Commentary

**§2.2.4.1.** This text (tablet and envelope) is a sealed receipt of sesame that was rent from tenant land. The rent for tenant land was usually paid in barley and silver that could be worth up to about half of the land's yield, depending on the quality of the land (Maekawa 1977; Steinkeller 1981). Note that sesame is only otherwise clearly associated with tenant land in the Irisaḡrig texts Nisaba 15/2 364 (P453796) and 423 (P387858) as well as the Umma texts *Farmer's Instructions* 8.3.2 (P109462) and MVN 4 2 (P113954), among possible others, but this does not necessitate that this sealed receipt originated from either location.<sup>14</sup> While it is not stated who paid this rent, this sesame was provided by a certain Guzana (env. obv. 3) known for managing various staples, especially sesame, on behalf of the Ur III state. The sesame he managed was typically from Karaḡar (GAN<sub>2</sub>-har according to BDTNS), probably in the Diyala region. This sesame was received by Šū-Eštar, a representative of Saḡ-Nanna-izu. It is difficult to ascertain whether Šū-Eštar is attested anywhere else, but Saḡ-Nanna-izu was probably the supervisor of citizens (eren<sub>2</sub>) receiving sesame-oil allotments from Guzana in MVN 3 299, which has an unknown provenience as well.<sup>15</sup> The month name in this sealed receipt is used in several locations for different times of the year, and it is utilized in the *Reichskalendar*, which is typical for texts involving Guzana (Steinkeller 1982, 640–44; 2022, 182–84) and assumed here. Despite these details, the provenience of this text is uncer-

<sup>14</sup> For recent treatments on the cultivation of sesame, including on tenant land, in Ur III Irisaḡrig and Umma, see Salaberger 2021 and Paoletti 2022, respectively. Although Paola Paoletti states that tenant land was minimally attested in Umma texts and that it was generally regarded as subsistence land, this is based on a misunderstanding of the Umma text Gomi, *Orient* 21, 2 (P112846). While this text is fragmentary, it actually documents extensive amounts of tenant land that is separate from subsistence land, especially in obv. i 1'-rev. ii 29 (line citations follow CDLI). There are many other explicit and implicit attestations of tenant land in Umma texts, which are addressed in Pottorf 2022, 366–67, 380–85, and which are further investigated in ongoing studies.

<sup>15</sup> According to Aupperle (pers. comm.), this Šū-Eštar could be in Puzriš-Dagān texts as a person from Karaḡar (Owen, *Studies Astour*, 372 Nesbit C [P109323] obv. ii 5) or a colonel (nu-banda<sub>3</sub>) (PDT 2 959 [P126313] obv. iii 32), and this Saḡ-Nanna-izu could be Saḡ-Nanna-zu in the Puzriš-Dagān text Goetze, *JCS* 17, 21 YBC 13087 (P111945) obv. iii 5, which lists high-ranking military officers and governors, but neither of these individuals must be limited to Puzriš-Dagān texts. Elsewhere, this Saḡ-Nanna-izu may be in UET 3 1160 (P137485), which lists prisoners who received sesame-oil allotments and were seized by Saḡ-Nanna-zu, but this text's Ur provenience challenges this connection. For a recent treatment on eren<sub>2</sub> as citizens, see Pottorf 2022. The sesame-oil allotments in MVN 3 299 and elsewhere are highlighted in Steinkeller 2022, 184.

<sup>16</sup> See Molina's (2006, 314) discussion of the uncertain provenience of other texts relating to Guzana, specifically AOS 32 P3; MVN 3 305; *NYPL* 263, and 264. The uncertain provenience of texts detailing Guzana's involvement with sesame is also addressed in Paoletti 2021.

tain.<sup>16</sup>

**§2.2.4.2.** The phrase apin-la<sub>2</sub>-ta ba-a (tabl. obv. 2 = env. obv. 2) is not attested anywhere else. It is comparable, however, to apin-la<sub>2</sub>-da ba-a, which occurs nearly 50 times in mostly Umma texts as well as a few Ur texts from the Ur III period only.<sup>17</sup> še apin-la<sub>2</sub>-da ba-a is translated by G. Contenau (1915, 7) as “orge à répartir pour la culture; (?),” by Steinkeller (1981, 121) as “barley received as rent,” by Sigrist (2004, 159) as “barley requisitioned for (those) plowing,” by Nicolas Vanderroost (2013, 2:32) as “orge de la rente saisie,” and by Fabienne Huber Vulliet (2019, 248 n. 1140) as “sur les céréales saisies des parcelles affermées.” They all read the last three signs as da-ba-a, and all of them, perhaps except for Contenau, consider da-ba to be a syllabic writing for dab<sub>5</sub>-ba.<sup>18</sup> Claus Wilcke (2007, 88) understands this phrase as a

reference to rent as well, but he reads it as še apin-la<sub>2</sub>-da ba-a. Given -ta instead of -da in this text as well as the limited clear evidence, especially in the Ur III period, that dab<sub>5</sub>-ba was written as da-ba or da<sub>2</sub>(TA)-ba, apin-la<sub>2</sub>-da ba-a and apin-la<sub>2</sub>-ta ba-a are preferred.<sup>19</sup> While apin-la<sub>2</sub>-ta ba-a is not known to occur anywhere else, this slight variation may be due to the fact that this sealed receipt was likely produced neither near Umma nor Ur. Though there do not appear to be any other phrases besides apin-la<sub>2</sub>-da ba-a in any period structured as X-da ba-a (“allotted with X”), there are several phrases in addition to apin-la<sub>2</sub>-ta ba-a structured as X-ta ba-a (“allotted from X”) in Early Dynastic IIIb (*DP* 577 [P221227], 644 [P221294]; HSS 3 40 [P221349]; VS 14 72 [P020088]), Ur III (MVN 7 76 [P115002]), and Old Babylonian (Nanshe A [P473750]) texts, including examples in which X is arable land.

## §2.3. Groton School Cuneiform Text 3

### §2.3.1. Overview

Dimensions (Height x Width x Thickness):	43mm x 58mm x 21mm
Mass:	70.7g
Period:	Late Babylonian
Provenience:	Sippar
Date:	Darius I 12/6/23 (ca. 510 B.C.E.)
Genre:	loan document

### §2.3.2. Transliteration and Translation

#### *Obverse*

1. 5(u) 3(diš) gin<sub>2</sub> ku<sub>3</sub>-babbar qa-lu-u<sub>2</sub> ina na-ši pu-ut
2. ša<sub>2</sub><sup>md</sup>en-ik-šur a-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub><sup>md</sup>en-mu a<sup>m</sup>maš-tuk
3. <sup>m</sup>suḫ<sub>3</sub>-sur a-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub><sup>m</sup>numun-ia a<sup>lu<sub>2</sub></sup>sanga-<sup>d</sup>utu
4. ina šu<sup>II</sup> <sup>m</sup>ib-na-a a-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub><sup>m</sup>na-din pu-ut <sup>md</sup>en-ik-šur
5. na-šu-u<sub>2</sub> ku<sub>3</sub>-babbar a<sub>4</sub> 5(u) 3(diš) gin<sub>2</sub> qa-lu-u<sub>2</sub>
6. <sup>m</sup>ib-na-a a-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub><sup>m</sup>na-din a-na ugu<sup>hi</sup> <sup>md</sup>en-ik-šur
7. a-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub><sup>md</sup>en-mu a<sup>m</sup>maš-tuk ina šu<sup>II</sup> <sup>m</sup>suḫ<sub>3</sub>-sur a-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub>
8. <sup>m</sup>numun-ia a<sup>mlu<sub>2</sub></sup>sanga-<sup>d</sup>utu ma-<sup>hi</sup>-ir ku<sub>3</sub>-babbar
9. 5(u) 3(diš) gin<sub>2</sub> qa-lu-u<sub>2</sub> re-eh-tu<sub>2</sub> 7(diš) 1/2(diš) ma-na

<sup>17</sup> Note that *Ontario* 2 268 (P209474) rev. 1 actually reads: še apin-la<sub>2</sub>-da ba-/a.

<sup>18</sup> Concerning this phrase, Huber Vulliet (2019, 248 n. 1140) also writes, “ailleurs écrit še apin-la<sub>2</sub> dab<sub>5</sub>-ba-a (SAT 2 473 [P143673]), ce qui exclut une lecture še apin-la<sub>2</sub>-da ba-a «distribué avec les céréales des champs à bail».” Based on a recently available photo, dab<sub>5</sub> there is actually da. Note that Vanderroost (2013, 1:255, 2:69) sometimes transliterates this phrase as apin-la<sub>2</sub>-da ba-a.

<sup>19</sup> We are thankful for Molina’s (pers. comm.) insights on this phrase. While some have considered whether dumu da-ba is a syllabic writing for dumu dab<sub>5</sub>-ba (see Pottorf 2022, 89 n. 89 for details), Armas Salonen (1968, 322–24) distinguishes these terms well, noting that the former means “»an dessen (-ba<bi-a, scil. des Pfluges) Seit (da) (stehende) Kinder», d.h. »Gehilfe des Pflügers».” There are a few attestations of lu<sub>2</sub> da-ba, including as a personal name, in Early Dynastic IIIb (CUSAS 33 282 [P322947]; 35 382 [P250937]) and Sargonic (MVN 3 52 [P215706]) texts, but perhaps da-ba in some or all of them shares a meaning similar to da-ba in dumu da-ba. Vitali Bartash (2017, 353), however, understands lu<sub>2</sub> da-ba to be analogous to lu<sub>2</sub> šuku dab<sub>5</sub>-ba. There may be an attestation of lu<sub>2</sub> da-ba in the Ur III text *OLP* 8, 21 19 (P124357) from Girsu according to Sauren (1977, 21), who translates it as “«Arbeitsverpflichtete»,” but it is dumu da-ba in the BDTNS. Based on the context, dumu da-ba is more likely than lu<sub>2</sub> da-ba.



10. šam<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> e-ṭir-u'

Reverse

1. lu<sub>2</sub> mu-kin-nu<sup>md</sup> en-ik-ṣur a-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub><sup>md</sup> en-mu
2. a<sup>m</sup> ir<sub>3</sub>-d gir<sub>4</sub>-ku<sub>3</sub><sup>md</sup> ag-pap a-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub><sup>m</sup> mu-še-zib<sup>d</sup> en
3. m<sup>m</sup> qi<sub>2</sub>-bi<sup>d</sup> en a-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub><sup>md</sup> en-mu a<sup>m</sup> maš-tuk
4. m<sup>m</sup> sum<sup>na</sup>.d ag a-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub><sup>md</sup> ag-numun-gal<sub>2</sub><sup>š</sup>i
5. md<sup>d</sup> utu-tin a-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub><sup>md</sup> a-e<sub>2</sub>-lugal-uru<sub>3</sub>
6. m<sup>m</sup> ip-ri-ia a-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub><sup>m</sup> ip-ri-ia<sup>md</sup> en-a-su-u<sub>2</sub>-a
7. m<sup>m</sup> šad-din-nu lu<sub>2</sub> umbisag<sup>m</sup> da-tin<sup>d</sup> amar-utu a-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub>
8. m<sup>m</sup> ki-rib-tu<sub>4</sub> a lu<sub>2</sub> i<sub>3</sub>-sur-gi-na sip-par<sup>ki</sup>
9. i<sup>iii</sup> kin u<sub>4</sub> 2(u) 3(diš)-kam<sub>2</sub> mu 1(u) 2(diš)-kam<sub>2</sub>
10. m<sup>m</sup> da-ri-muš lugal e<sup>ki</sup> lugal kur-kur

obv. 1–8 (Concerning) the 53 shekels (ca. 0.44kg) of refined silver in the care of Bēl-ikṣur/Bēl-iddin//Maštuk, of which Tēšī-ēṭir/Zēriya//Šangū-Šamaš assumes responsibility on behalf of Bēl-ikṣur against Ibnāya/Nādin, Ibnāya/Nādin received these 53 shekels of refined silver on behalf of Bēl-ikṣur/Bēl-iddin//Maštuk from Tēšī-ēṭir/Zēriya//Šangū-Šamaš.

9–10 The 53 shekels of refined silver—the remainder of the 7.5 minas (ca. 3.75kg), the price of a house—are paid.

rev. 1–10 The witnesses: Bēl-ikṣur/Bēl-iddin//Arad-Nergal, Nabû-nāšir/Mušēzib-bēl, Qibi-Bēl/Bēl-iddin//Maštuk, Iddin-Nabû/Nabû-zēru-ušebši, Šamaš-uballit/Mār-bīti-šarru-ušur, Iprīya/Iprīya, Bēl-asūa, Šaddinnu. The scribe: Ile' i-bulluṭ-Marduk/Kiribtu//Šāḥit-ginē. Sippar. The month of *Ulūlu*, the 23rd day, the 12th year of Darius, king of Babylon, king of the lands.

### §2.3.3. Note

Rev. 5: After uru<sub>3</sub> is an erasure of the name <sup>md</sup>en-mu.

### §2.3.4. Commentary

**§2.3.4.1.** GSCT 3 belongs to a dossier related to the Maštuk family, one of several families from Babylon who established themselves at Sippar in the mid-6th century B.C.E. after revitalization efforts by the Neo-Babylonian kings Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar II. The Maštuk dossier relates to several other archives, such as the Balihu family, Bēl-aplu-iddin, son of Iddinā, and the Šāḥit-ginē family (Jursa 2005, 130–31; Waerzeggers 2014, ix, 148). The Maštuk family was part of what Waerzeggers (2014, 47) calls an “immigrant network,” which included the Arad-Nergal, Nappāḥu, Raksu, Šāḥit-ginē, and Ša-nāšišu families, and she highlights how they often “turned towards each other for legal, financial, and social support.”<sup>20</sup> While the Maštuk family did not necessarily rise to the highest echelon of political and economic status, several close-knit families surrounding them did (Waerzeggers 2018, 95–98).

**§2.3.4.2.** This is a tablet concerning the final pay-

off amount of a mortgage—53 shekels of refined silver constituted the last principal payment of a loan totaling 7.5 minas (of silver).<sup>21</sup> Bēl-ikṣur undertook this loan against Ibnāya's credit, though Tēšī-ēṭir is the one who paid off the final mortgage. Eight individuals witnessed this exchange, including immediate family members. House ownership was an important part of business ventures. One of the earliest house purchases by this family took place in ca. 618 B.C.E. (FLP 1518 [P460026], see Waerzeggers 2014, 46). Another occurred about a century later (FLP 1467 [P459975], see Jursa 2005, 131 and n. 1007), just a few years before GSCT 3.

**§2.3.4.3.** The total 7.5 minas of silver are a large amount of capital, especially for real estate. It is three times the cost of a house at Sippar settled next to a courtier and majordomo of the crown prince (VS 5 60 [P371794], see Waerzeggers 2014, 108), greater than the 5 minas (ca. 2.5kg) of silver indebted to Bēl-ikṣur's sister Tabluṭ after her husband's death (NBC 6184 [P293101] and its duplicate NBC 6230 [P293145], see Waerzeggers 2002, 330). This is because house sales were relatively rare; more commonly, rooms or suites were sold, the larger estate

<sup>20</sup> For more detail on these families, see Waerzeggers 2014, for the Nappāḥu family, see Baker 2004, and for the Ša-nāšišu family, see Bongenaar 1997; Waerzeggers 2016, and 2018.

<sup>21</sup> For refined silver in the 1st millennium, see Vargyas 2001, 13–16.

tended to remain in the hands of families (Baker 2014, 13).

**§2.3.4.4.** House lots in the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid periods were substantially larger than in earlier history (Baker 2011, 541). Whole estates measured anywhere from about 150 to nearly 1500m<sup>2</sup>, such as that of a double-courtyard house including several households in YOS 6 114 (P305246), or that of the Merkes House I, which contained four suites (Baker 2015, 382–85). Houses could be used to generate revenue through rent, as evidenced by business-venture documents and general tenant contracts.<sup>22</sup> However, this may not have been common practice, especially for families who rented their own houses.<sup>23</sup>

**§2.3.4.5.** Generally, this text speaks to the significance that families placed on real estate to build up generational wealth during a tumultuous time, relying on trusted networks to help manage the inevitable debt. Just one decade earlier, contenders for the Babylonian crown erupted out of Sippar, causing Persian king Darius to impose new taxes upon protected citizens (Waerzeggers 2014, 93 n. 79).<sup>24</sup> The peak of Late Babylonian texts occurs soon thereafter, no doubt related to these changing hands of debt that had been growing already for several decades (Pirngruber 2018, 23; Waerzeggers 2014, 20).

**§2.3.4.6.** This tablet is a testament to 30 years of close social relationships between the Maštuk, Arad-Nergal, and Šāhit-ginê families. The debtor Bêl-iḫsur/Bêl-iddin//Maštuk is a central actor within the Maštuk dossier. This tablet dates to the first few years of his activity (the 9th to 22nd years of Darius), which followed his marriage to Šin-banâ, niece of his paternal uncle.<sup>25</sup> He is known to have been a business partner to Amêl-Nabû (Waerzeggers 2014, 48).

**§2.3.4.7.** (Nergal-ina-)têšî-êtir/Zêriya//Šangû-Šamaš (PID 6025), the individual who assumed responsibility for Bêl-iḫsur's final principal payment, owned a high-capacity warehouse on the quay of Sippar for trade among other cities in the greater region of Babylonia, bridging a necessary gap between the massive temple complexes and the local econ-

omy. Similar to Bêl-iḫsur's father, he shared a role that connected the local Sipparean temple community with the larger economic network that migrated from Babylon. It is not the first time that Têšî-êtir assured bonds for others: in *MR* 47, he drafted a surety bond against Marduk-rêmanni. However, he was more often a creditor, as seen in both the Šāhit-ginê A and Šangû-Šamaš A archives (Waerzeggers 2014, 12, 93, 122–23).

**§2.3.4.8.** The lender, Ibnāya/Nādin (PID 13979), connects this text to the ascension of power by this immigrant community. In BM 42299 (Prosobab tablet 886), Ibnāya is mentioned alongside the brother of our first witness (PID 13166) as part of Sippar's committee of elders (*šībūtū āli*), the city's legal authority managed by local priestly families prior to Darius's reign (Waerzeggers 2014, 74, 116). Though a link cannot be corroborated, the appearance of Šaddinnu (PID 14739) as the final witness in both BM 42299 and GSCT 3 gives us pause.

**§2.3.4.9.** Our witness Bêl-iḫsur/Bêl-iddin//Arad-Nergal was the brother of the debtor's business partner Amêl-Nabû (Waerzeggers 2014, 48). (Ina-)Qîbi-Bêl/Bêl-iddin//Maštuk (PID 14689) can be seen as a witness alongside Têšî-êtir in *MR* 80, a debt note concerning 1000 kor (ca. 180,000l) of dates and barley by Marduk-rêmanni cited in the city of Zazannu, near Sippar. Little can be said about Nabû-nāšîr/Mušêzib-Bêl (PID 28591) and Iddin-Nabû/Nabû-zêru-ušebši//Basiya (PID 25104), otherwise witnesses attested elsewhere.

**§2.3.4.10.** The identities of the remaining three witnesses, Šamaš-uballî/Mâr-bîti-šarru-ušur, Iprîya/Iprîya, and Bêl-asûa, are uncertain based on their lack of patronymic certainty. The name Mâr-bîti-šarru-ušur is so far unattested; it should be noted that the name Bêl-iddin (<sup>md</sup>en-mu) is erased after this name. We are uncertain if Iprîya/Iprîya is scribal dittography or otherwise a new attestation, and there are too many attestations of Bêl-asûa for us to identify him in other texts.

**§2.3.4.11.** The scribe Ile"i-bulluṭ-Marduk/Kiribtu//Šāhit-ginê is likely Bulluṭāya, son of Kiribtu/Iqîšāya of the Šāhit-ginê family, in BM 42633 (Prosobab

<sup>22</sup> The most prominent example of leasing houses for income is Iddin-Nabû/Nabû-bân-zêri//Nappāhu (Baker 2004, 47–49). For the inclusion of rent within business-venture practice, see *MR* 24 (note that *MR* stands for texts published in Waerzeggers 2014).

<sup>23</sup> For Marduk-rêmanni family's renting practice, see Waerzeggers 2014, 154.

<sup>24</sup> For the *pasâ du* tax, see Waerzeggers 2014, 117; on the effect of Persian taxation and the Babylonian market, see Pirngruber 2018.

<sup>25</sup> Bêl-iḫsur's marriage is a case study in Waerzeggers 2002 regarding the practice of endogamy during the Neo-Babylonian Period.

tablet 1415, see Jursa 1999, 219–20). In that text, his family owned bow-land; Bēl-rēmāni received their annual stipend on behalf of Kiribtu.<sup>26</sup> If this reconstruction is right, then Kiribtu is certainly Kiribti-

Marduk (PID 14121). This differs from Waerzeggers (2014, 414), who suggests Bulluṭ as Šamaš-uballit, citing the unpublished tablet NBC 6244 (P293158), crediting Jursa.

---

<sup>26</sup> For information on the ownership of royal-decreed lands in the Late Babylonian period, see Stolper 1985.



Figure 1: [GSCT 1](#)



Figure 2: [GSCT 2 \(tablet and envelope\)](#)



Figure 3: [GSCT 2 \(envelope reconstructed\)](#)



Figure 4: [GSCT 3](#)

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baker, Heather D. (2004). *The Archive of the Nappāḫu Family*. AfO Beih. 30. Vienna: Institut für Orientalistik der Universität Wien.
- (2011). “Babylonian Land Survey in Socio-political Context”. In: *The Empirical Dimension of Ancient Near Eastern Studies – Die empirische Dimension altorientalischer Forschungen*. Ed. by Gebhard J. Selz and Klaus Wagensonner. Wiener Offene Orientalistik 6. Vienna: LIT, 293–323.
  - (2014). “House size and household structure: Quantitative data in the study of Babylonian urban living conditions”. In: *Documentary Sources in Ancient Near Eastern and Greco-Roman Economic History: Methodology and Practice*. Ed. by Heather D. Baker and Michael Jursa. Oxford: Oxbow, 7–23.
  - (2015). “Family Structure, Household Cycle, and the Social Use of Domestic Space in Urban Babylonia”. In: *Household Studies in Complex Societies. (Micro) Archaeological and Textual Approaches*. Ed. by Miriam Müller. Oriental Institute Seminars 10. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 371–407.
- Bartash, Vitali (2017). *Sumerian Administrative and Legal Documents ca. 2900–2200 BC in the Schøyen Collection*. CUSAS 35. Bethesda, MD: CDL.
- Beaulieu, Paul-Alain (1994). *Late Babylonian Texts in the Nies Babylonian Collection*. Ed. by Ulla Kasten. CBCY 1. Bethesda, MD: CDL.
- Bongenaar, A. C. V. M. (1997). *The Neo-Babylonian Ebabbar Temple at Sippar: Its Administration and Its Prosopography*. PIHANS 80. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul.
- Brumfield, Sara and Lance Allred (2016). “The Cuneiform Tablet Collection of the Los Angeles Unified School District”. CDLB 2016.1. URL: [https://cdli.ucla.edu/pubs/cdlb/2016/cdlb2016\\_001.html](https://cdli.ucla.edu/pubs/cdlb/2016/cdlb2016_001.html).
- Brunke, Hagan (2011). “Food in the Garšana Texts”. In: *Garšana Studies*. Ed. by David I. Owen. CUSAS 6. Bethesda, MD: CDL, 31–65.
- Clay, Albert T. (1922). *Albert T. Clay to Ibrahim Elias Gejou*. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection, 12 June.
- Contenau, G. (1915). *Contribution à l'histoire économique d'Umma*. BEHEH 219. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion.
- Cooper, Marc (1985). “The Dyke College Texts”. *ASJ* 7, 97–128.
- Dessagnes, Magali (2017). “La circulation des tablettes cunéiformes mathématiques et la constitution des collections de la fin du XIXe siècle à la première moitié du XXe siècle: Une contribution à l'historiographie des mathématiques mésopotamiennes”. PhD thesis. Paris-Sorbonne University.
- Dougherty, Raymond (1928). *Raymond Dougherty to Ibrahim Elias Gejou*. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection, 28 November.
- (1929a). *Raymond Dougherty to Alexander D. Messayeh*. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection, 31 January.
  - (1929b). *Raymond Dougherty to Ibrahim Elias Gejou*. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection, 25 March.
- Englund, Robert K. (2004). “Banks in Banning”. In: *Von Sumer nach Ebla und zurück: Festschrift Giovanni Pettinato zum 27. September 1999 gewidmet von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*. Ed. by Hartmut Waetzoldt. HSAO 9. Heidelberg: Heidelberger Orientverlag, 35–44.
- (2010). “BU!” In: *Why Should Someone Who Knows Something Conceal It? Cuneiform Studies in Honor of David I. Owen on His 70th Birthday*. Ed. by Alexandra Kleinerman and Jack M. Sasson. Bethesda, MD: CDL, 95–114.
- Finkelstein, J. J. (1972). “Bibliography of Albrecht Goetze (1897–1971)”. *JAOS* 92.2, 197–203.
- Foster, Benjamin R. (2013). “Albert T. Clay and His Babylonian Collection”. In: *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman*. Ed. by Billie Jean Collins and Piotr Michalowski. Atlanta: Lockwood, 121–135.

- Frame, Grant (2013). *The Archive of Mušēzib-Marduk, Son of Kiribtu and Descendant of Sin-nāšir: A Landowner and Property Developer at Uruk in the Seventh Century BC*. BabAr 5. Dresden: ISLET.
- Gejou, Ibrahim Elias (1922). *Ibrahim Elias Gejou to Albert T. Clay*. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection, 31 May.
- (1926a). *Ibrahim Elias Gejou to Ettalene M. Grice*. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection, 22 March.
  - (1926b). *Ibrahim Elias Gejou to Ettalene M. Grice*. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection, 3 June.
  - (1926c). *Ibrahim Elias Gejou to Ettalene M. Grice*. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection, 11 December.
  - (1928). *Ibrahim Elias Gejou to Raymond Dougherty*. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection, 27 December.
- Greene, Belle da Costa (1932). *Belle da Costa Greene to G. Arthur Jorgensen*. New York: Morgan Library & Museum, 7 December.
- Grice, Ettalene M. (1926). *Ettalene M. Grice to Ibrahim Elias Gejou*. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection, 12 June.
- Hallo, William W. (2008). “Day dates in texts from Drehem”. In: *The Growth of an Early State in Mesopotamia: Studies in Ur III Administration; Proceedings of the First and Second Ur III Workshops at the 49th and 51st Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, London July 10, 2003 and Chicago July 19, 2005*. Ed. by Steven J. Garfinkle and J. Cale Johnson. BPOA 5. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 99–118.
- Hilgert, Markus (2003). *Drehem Administrative Documents from the Reign of Amar-Suena. Cuneiform Texts from the Ur III Period in the Oriental Institute Vol. 2*. OIP 121. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Huber Vulliet, Fabienne (2019). *Le personnel cultuel à l'époque néo-sumérienne (ca. 2160–2003 av. J.-C.)*. BPOA 14. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Jones, Tom B. (1967). *Paths to the Ancient Past: Applications of the Historical Method to Ancient History*. New York: The Free Press.
- Jorgensen, G. Arthur (1982). *G. Arthur Jorgensen to Douglas Brown*. Groton, MA: Groton School, 7 February.
- Jursa, Michael (1999). *Das archiv des Bēl-rēmanni*. PIHANS 86. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul.
- (2005). *Neo-Babylonian Legal and Administrative Documents: Typology, Contents and Archives*. GMTR 1. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Klein, Jacob (1981). *The Royal Hymns of Shulgi King of Ur: Man's Quest for Immortal Fame*. TAPS 71.7. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society.
- Lafont, Bertrand (2009). “The Army of the Kings of Ur: The Textual Evidence”. *CDLJ* 2009.5. URL: [https://cdli.ucla.edu/pubs/cdlj/2009/cdlj2009\\_005.html](https://cdli.ucla.edu/pubs/cdlj/2009/cdlj2009_005.html).
- Liu, Changyu (2017). *Organization, Administrative Practices and Written Documentation in Mesopotamia during the Ur III Period (c. 2112–2004 BC): A Case Study of Puzriš-Dagan in the Reign of Amar-Suen*. Kārum – Emporium – Forum 3. Münster: Ugarit Verlag.
- Lladó Santaularia, Alexandra (2019). “Animales salvajes en Mesopotamia: los grandes mamíferos en el tercer milenio a. C.” PhD thesis. University of Barcelona.
- Maekawa, Kazuya (1977). “The Rent of the Tenant Field (gán-APIN.LAL) in Lagash”. *Zinbun* 14, 1–54.
- Messayeh, Alexander D. (1929). *Alexander D. Messayeh to Raymond Dougherty*. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection, 1 February.
- Michalowski, Piotr (2008). “Observations on ‘Elamites’ and ‘Elam’ in Ur III Times”. In: *On the Third Dynasty of Ur: Studies in Honor of Marcel Sigrist*. Ed. by Piotr Michalowski. JCS SS 1. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 109–123.



- (2013). “Of Bears and Men: Thoughts on the End of Šulgi’s Reign and on the Ensuing Succession”. In: *Literature as Politics, Politics as Literature: Essays on the Ancient Near East in Honor of Peter Machinist*. Ed. by David S. Vanderhooft and Abraham Winitzer. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 285–320.
- Molina, Manuel (2006). “Review of The Administrative and Economic Ur III Texts from the City of Ur”. *BiOr* 63.3–4, 311–314.
- (2008). “The corpus of Neo-Sumerian tablets: an overview”. In: *The Growth of an Early State in Mesopotamia: Studies in Ur III Administration; Proceedings of the First and Second Ur III Workshops at the 49th and 51st Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, London July 10, 2003 and Chicago July 19, 2005*. Ed. by Steven J. Garfinkle and J. Cale Johnson. BPOA 5. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 19–53.
- (2020). “The Looting of Ur III Tablets after the Gulf Wars”. In: *Dealing with Antiquity: Past, Present & Future RAI Marburg*. Ed. by Walter Sommerfeld. AOAT 460. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 323–352.
- Morgan J. P., Jr. (1932). *J. P. Morgan Jr. to G. Arthur Jorgensen*. New York: Morgan Library & Museum, 23 November.
- Morgan, Junius S. (1932). *Junius S. Morgan to Endicott Peabody*. New York: Morgan Library & Museum, 7 December.
- New York Times (1924). “MORGAN LIBRARY BILL A LAW: Senate Committee Reports in Favor of Phone Rate Inquiry”. 28 March.
- Owen, David I. (1975). *The John Frederick Lewis Collection*. MVN 3. Rome: Multigrafica Editrice.
- (1979). “A thirteen month summary account from Ur”. In: *Studies in Honor of Tom B. Jones*. Ed. by Marvin A. Powell Jr. and Ronald H. Sack. AOAT 203. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 57–70.
- Paoletti, Paola (2021). “A.1.1.01 – The Supply of Sesame by Guzana”. In: *Vegetable Oils and Animal Fats in Early Urban Societies of Syro-Mesopotamia: Digital Data Collection*. Ed. by Walther Sallaberger. URL: <https://www.i3-mesop-oil.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dossier/a-1-1-01/>.
- (2022). “A.1.1.05 – The Cultivation of Sesame in Ur III Umma”. In: *Vegetable Oils and Animal Fats in Early Urban Societies of Syro-Mesopotamia: Digital Data Collection*. Ed. by Walther Sallaberger. URL: <https://www.i3-mesop-oil.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dossier/a-1-1-05/>.
- Patterson, Daniel (2018). “Elements of the Neo-Sumerian Military”. PhD thesis. University of Pennsylvania.
- Peabody, Endicott (1932). *Endicott Peabody to J. P. Morgan Jr*. Groton, MA: Groton School, 9 December.
- Pirngruber, Reinhard (2018). “Towards a Framework for Interpreting Social and Economic Change in Babylonia During the Long 6th Century BCE”. In: *Xerxes and Babylonia: The Cuneiform Evidence*. Ed. by Caroline Waerzeggers and Maarja Seire. OLA 277. Leuven: Peeters, 19–33.
- Pottorf, Andrew Richard (2022). “Social Stratification in Southern Mesopotamia during the Third Dynasty of Ur (ca. 2100–2000 BCE)”. PhD thesis. Harvard University.
- Powell, M. A. (1989–1990). “Maße und Gewichte”. *RIA* 7.5/6–7/8, 457–517.
- Recht, Lærke (2022). *The Spirited Horse: Equid–Human Relations in the Bronze Age Near East*. Ancient Environments. London: Bloomsbury.
- Sack, Ronald H. (1994). *Cuneiform Documents from the Chaldean and Persian Periods*. Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press; London: Associated University Presses.
- Said-Ghanem, Nadia Ait (2021). *Ibrahim Elias Gejou and Old Babylonian Omens*. SOAS History Blog. 6 May. URL: <https://blogs.soas.ac.uk/soashistoryblog/2021/05/06/ibrahim-elias-gejou-and-old-babylonian-omens/>.
- (2022). “Smuggling Cuneiform Tablets in Aniseed Bags: Profile of a Sale Made by Elias Gejou to the British Museum in 1896”. *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* 32.1, 1–12.

- Sallaberger, Walther (1999). "Ur III-Zeit". In: *Mesopotamien: Akkade-Zeit und Ur III-Zeit*. Ed. by Pascal Attinger and Markus Wäfler. OBO 160/3. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 121–390.
- (2004). "Schlachtvieh aus Puzriš-Dagān: Zur Bedeutung dieses königlichen Archivs". *JEOL* 38, 45–62.
  - (2021). "A.1.1.10 – Sesame Cultivation at Irisağrig". In: *Vegetable Oils and Animal Fats in Early Urban Societies of Syro-Mesopotamia: Digital Data Collection*. Ed. by Walther Sallaberger. URL: <https://www.i3-mesop-oil.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dossier/a-1-1-10/>.
- Sallaberger, Walther and Ingo Schrakamp (2015). *History & Philology*. ARCANE 3. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Salonen, Armas (1968). *Agricultura Mesopotamica: Nach sumerisch-akkadischen Quellen; Eine lexikalische und kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung (mit 44 Tafeln und 6 Zeichnungen)*. AASF 149. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Kirjapaino Oy Helsinki.
- Sauren, Herbert (1969). *Umschrift und Übersetzung, Indizes. Wirtschaftsurkunden aus der Zeit der III. Dynastie von Ur im Besitz des Musée d'Art et d'Histoire in Genf Vol. 1*. Naples: Istituto Orientale di Napoli.
- (1977). "Keilschrifturkunden in den Sammlungen zweier deutschen Museen". *OLP* 8, 5–31.
- Sigrist, Marcel (1992). *Drehem*. Bethesda, MD: CDL.
- (2004). *Administrative Texts Mainly from Umma. Neo-Sumerian Texts from the Royal Ontario Museum Vol. 2*. Toronto: Royal Ontario Museum.
- Stahlschmidt, F. and Co. (1927). *F. Stahlschmidt & Co. to Raymond Dougherty*. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection, 1 March.
- Steinkeller, Piotr (1981). "The Renting of Fields in Early Mesopotamia and the Development of the Concept of 'Interest' in Sumerian". *JESHO* 24.2, 113–145.
- (1982). "On Editing Ur III Economic Texts". *JAOS* 102.4, 639–644.
  - (1991). "The Administrative and Economic Organization of the Ur III State: The Core and the Periphery". In: *The Organization of Power: Aspects of Bureaucracy in the Ancient Near East*. Ed. by McGuire Gibson and Robert D. Biggs. 2nd ed. SAOC 46. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 15–33.
  - (1995). "Sheep and Goat Terminology in Ur III Sources from Drehem". *BSA* 8, 49–70.
  - (2022). "Economic Growth in Early Mesopotamia: General Considerations and Some Specific Examples". In: *The Earliest Economic Growth in World History: Proceedings of the Berlin Workshop*. Ed. by David A. Warburton. PIHANS 133. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten; Leuven: Peeters, 171–191.
- Stolper, Matthew W. (1985). *Entrepreneurs and Empire: The Murašû Archive, the Murašû Firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia*. PIHANS 54. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul.
- Tae, Ammar M. al- and Lluís Feliu (2021). *Neo-Sumerian barley allotment rolls from the Umma region*. BMO 18. Barcelona: Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona.
- Tsouparopoulou, Christina (2008). "The Material Face of Bureaucracy: Writing, Sealing and Archiving Tablets for the Ur III State at Drehem". PhD thesis. University of Cambridge.
- (2012). "The 'K-9 Corps' of the Third Dynasty of Ur: The Dog Handlers at Drehem and the Army". *ZA* 102, 1–16.
  - (2013). "Killing and Skinning Animals in the Ur III Period: The Puzriš-Dagan (Drehem) Office Managing of Dead Animals and Slaughter By-products". *AoF* 40.1, 150–182.
  - (2015). *The Ur III Seals Impressed on Documents from Puzriš-Dagān (Drehem)*. HSAO 16. Heidelberg: Heidelberg Orientverlag.
- Vanderroost, Nicolas (2013). "Organisation administrative du bureau de l'agriculture d'Umma à l'époque de la Troisième Dynastie d'Ur". PhD thesis. Free University of Brussels.

- Vargyas, Péter (2001). *Prices of the Basic Commodities. A History of Babylonian Prices in the First Millennium BC Vol. 1*. HSAO 10. Heidelberg: Heidelberger Orientverlag.
- Waerzeggers, Caroline (2002). “Endogamy in Mesopotamia in the Neo-Babylonian Period”. In: *Mining the Archives: Festschrift for Christopher Walker on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday, 4 October 2002*. Ed. by Cornelia Wunsch. BabAr 1. Dresden: ISLET, 319–342.
- (2014). *Marduk-rēmanni: Local Networks and Imperial Politics in Achaemenid Babylonia*. OLA 233. Leuven: Peeters.
  - (2016). “The Silver Has Gone... Temple Theft and a Divided Community in Achaemenid Babylonia”. In: *Silver, Money and Credit: A Tribute to Robartus J. van der Spek on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Ed. by Kristin Kleber and Reinhard Pirngruber. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 73–85.
  - (2018). “The Network of Resistance: Archives and Political Action in Babylonia Before 484 BCE”. In: *Xerxes and Babylonia: The Cuneiform Evidence*. Ed. by Caroline Waerzeggers and Maarja Seire. OLA 277. Leuven: Peeters, 89–133.
- Waerzeggers, Caroline, Melanie Groß, et al. (2019). *Prosobab: Prosopography of Babylonia (c. 620-330 BCE)*. URL: <https://prosobab.leidenuniv.nl>.
- Watanabe, Chikako E. (2002). *Animal Symbolism in Mesopotamia: A Contextual Approach*. Wiener Offene Orientalistik 1. Vienna: Institut für Orientalistik der Universität Wien.
- Widell, Magnus (2005). “The Administrative Texts from the Ur III Period in the Medelhavsmuseet”. *Medelhavsmuseet* 2, 11–44.
- (2020). “Destined for Slaughter: Identifying Seasonal Breeding Patterns in Sheep and Goats in Early Babylonia”. *JNES* 79.2, 209–223.
- Wilcke, Claus (2007). “Markt und Arbeit im Alten Orient am Ende des 3. Jahrtausends v. Chr.” In: *Menschen und Märkte: Studien zur historischen Wirtschaftsanthropologie*. Ed. by Wolfgang Reinhard and Justin Stagl. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Historische Anthropologie e.V. 9. Vienna: Böhlau, 71–132.