

# An Archive of Pasture Plots from Ur-III Ĝirsu

Angela Greco  
*Sapienza Università di Roma*

## §0. Introduction

**§0.1** The present contribution<sup>1</sup> seeks to analyze different tablets from Ur-III Ĝirsu belonging to a single archive, many of which share the characteristic of having a lenticular shape.<sup>2</sup> These texts record accounts (nig<sub>2</sub>-ka<sub>9</sub> aka) concerning the number of sheep, which have grazed in a given field within a given year, and mention the individuals who were responsible for, or somehow connected to them. All the tablets are already been published, yet their information has been dispersed in the tangled network of information from the thousands of Ur-III documents; by treating them as a unit, we can appreciate the consistent insight they offer us (in their own way).

### §1.0. The tablets (cited according to primary publication)

#### §1.0.1. Lenticular tablets

**1:** [MVN 2, 78](#) (Š 32/-); **2:** [Amherst 20](#) (Š 44//IS 3/-); **3:**

**TLB 3, 88** (AS 5/-); **4:** [TLB 3, 89](#) (ŠS 1/-); **5:** [CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230](#) (ŠS 1/-); **6:** [TLB 3, 87](#) (ŠS 6/-); **7:** [HLC 1, 37](#) (ŠS 8/-); **8:** [MVN 5, 203](#) (ŠS 8/-); **9:** [MVN 5, 204](#) (ŠS 8/-); **10:** [Ontario 2, 435](#) (ŠS 9/-); **11:** [TCTI 1, 743](#) (ŠS 9/-); **12:** [TCTI 1, 802](#) (ŠS 9/-); **13:** [TCTI 1, 850](#) (IS 3/-); **14:** [TCTI 2, 4176](#) (IS 3/-); **15:** [TCTI 2, 4178](#) (IS 3/-); **16:** [DAS 274](#) [...]; **17:** [TCTI 1, 771](#) [...]; **18:** [TCTI 2, 4177](#) [...].

#### §1.0.2. Tablets with unrecorded shape<sup>3</sup>

**19:** [MVN 7, 583](#) (Š 35/-); **20:** [MVN 6, 140](#) (Š 36/-); **21:** [MVN 6, 276](#) (Š 27//48/-);<sup>4</sup> **22:** [MVN 6, 415](#) (AS 1/-); **23:** [MVN 6, 545](#) (AS 1/-); **24:** [MVN 6, 145](#) (AS 9/-); **25:** [MVN 5, 176](#) (ŠS 1/-); **26:** [MVN 6, 544](#) (ŠS 1/-); **27:** [TCTI 2, 2702](#) (ŠS 8/-); **28:** [TÉL 250](#) (IS 3/-); **29:** [MVN 6, 546](#) [...].

**§1.0.3.** Tablets from this archive (see §1.1) are now scattered in different museums and collections, though about half of them (17 tablets) are housed in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Electronic databases of texts represent an invaluable source and support in the study of cuneiform tablets and I extensively use them for finding, checking and studying texts; indeed all the texts quoted in this contribution can be found at the [Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative \(CDLI\)](#), and at the [Data Base of Neo-Sumerian Texts \(BDTNS\)](#). In particular, BDTNS was a fundamental instrument in sorting the tablets according to shape and contents, and analyzing the texts grouped here. I would like to thank M. Molina for this precious tool in Neo-Sumerian studies and for his comments and suggestions on an early draft of this paper. I'm also grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions, to R. Dorado Puntch for his help with the English, and to L. Hawkins and J. Dahl for having improved the final draft. All mistakes and inaccuracies are of course mine. Abbreviations follow the [CDLI List of Abbreviations](#).

<sup>2</sup> This group of texts was already recognized as such by Civil, who described it as a: 'handful of small lenticular tablets from Ĝirsu dated from Š 27 to IS 3, with the subscript nig<sub>2</sub>-ka<sub>9</sub> ak a-ša<sub>3</sub> GN. They are inventories of sheep, presumably grazing on the mentioned field'; see Civil 2011: 274.

<sup>3</sup> Since Civil (2011) recognized the group by the occurrence of the expression NE.RI (see below), he supposed a lenticular form also for Text 21 ([MVN 6, 276](#)); Text 22 ([MVN 6, 415](#)); Text 29 ([MVN 6, 546](#)).

<sup>4</sup> In my opinion, the presence of a left edge inscription on this tablet would suggest a squared format.

<sup>5</sup> The French archaeological campaigns at Ĝirsu (modern Telloh), one of the earliest Mesopotamian sites to be excavated, started at the end of the XIX century, when Iraq was still under control of the Ottoman Empire. Consequently, most of the recovered texts went to the Archaeological Museum of Istanbul, while only a part of them reached the Louvre Museum (Kraus 1947: 106). In addition, finds from illicit excavations flowed onto the antiquity market and from there they were bought by private collectors (some of them eventually acquired by Western museums, as e.g. is the case of Text 2 ([Amherst 20](#)); see Everling 2005) or directly by museums (as is the case of Text 5 ([CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230](#)); see Verderame 2008: 239, fn. 46).

No.	Tablet	Museum	No.	Tablet	Museum
1	<b>MVN 2, 78</b> MAH 16511	Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, Geneva, Switzerland	16	<b>DAS 274</b> AO 2541	Musée du Louvre, Paris, France
2	<b>Amherst 20</b> 51.2392	Museum of Fine Arts, Bu- dapest, Hungary	17	<b>TCTI 1, 771</b> L 771	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey
3	<b>TLB 3, 88</b> LB 920	Netherlands Institute for the Near East, Leiden, The Netherlands	17	<b>TCTI 2, 4177</b> L 4177	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey
4	<b>TLB 3, 89</b> LB 921	Netherlands Institute for the Near East, Leiden, The Netherlands	19	<b>MVN 7, 583</b> L 8191	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey
5	<b>CT 1, pl. 35</b> BM 12230	British Museum, London, United Kingdom	20	<b>MVN 6, 140</b> L 7141	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey
6	<b>TLB 3, 87</b> LB 2440	Netherlands Institute for the Near East, Leiden, The Netherlands	21	<b>MVN 6, 276</b> L 7284	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey
7	<b>HLC 1, 37</b> A 31707	Oriental Institute Museum, Chicago, IL, USA	22	<b>MVN 6, 415</b> L 7436	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey
8	<b>MVN 5, 203</b> Amherst 144	Private collection: Lord Amherst (dispersed)	23	<b>MVN 6, 545</b> L 7575	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey
9	<b>MVN 5, 204</b> Amherst 145	Private collection: Lord Amherst (dispersed)	24	<b>MVN 6, 145</b> L 7148	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey
10	<b>Ontario 2, 435<sup>6</sup></b> ROM 967.287.67	Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, ON, Canada	25	<b>MVN 5, 176</b> /	Private collection: Rassam 18 (dispersed)
11	<b>TCTI 1, 743</b> L 743	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey	26	<b>MVN 6, 544</b> L 7574	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey
12	<b>TCTI 1, 802</b> L 802	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey	27	<b>TCTI 2, 2702</b> L 2702	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey
13	<b>TCTI 1, 850</b> L 850	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey	28	<b>TÉL 250</b> /	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey
14	<b>TCTI 2, 4176</b> L 4176	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey	29	<b>MVN 6, 546</b> L 7576	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey
15	<b>TCTI 2, 4178</b> L 4178	Istanbul Archaeological Mu- seum, Istanbul, Turkey			

#### §1.0.4. Chronological distribution of the tablets (lenticular tablets in bold)

Year	Tablets	Year	Tablets
Š 27	Text 21?	AS 9	Text 24
Š 32	<b>Text 1</b>	ŠS 1	<b>Text 4; Text 5;</b> 25; 26
Š 35	Text 19	ŠS 6	<b>Text 6</b>
Š 36	Text 20	ŠS 8	<b>Text 7; 8; 9;</b> 27

<sup>6</sup> Assigned to Umma.

§ 44	<b>Text 2?</b>	§§ 9	<b>Text 10; 11; 12</b>
§ 48	Text 21?	IS 3	<b>Text 2?; 13; 14; 15; 28</b>
AS 1	Text 22; 23	[...]	<b>Text 16; 17; 18; 29</b>
AS 5	<b>Text 3</b>		

### §1.1. Archival and administrative context

**§1.1.1.** Archive is here understood as a group of tablets responding to a single administrative question, drawn up by a single office, hence very likely physically kept in the same place for the sake of convenience.

**§1.1.2.** Although these texts represent *de facto* sheep inventories, the underlying perspective is that of the fields, a perspective that conveys the information derived from other economic realities, which shared the convenience of benefitting from those plots.

**§1.1.3.** For multiple reasons, the texts of this group resemble the well-known corpus of the so-called *Runde Tafeln* (or Round Tablets), land surveys of the Ġirsu province focused on yield projections and dating from § 27 to IS 3.<sup>7</sup>

**§1.1.4.** Both groups share indeed some suggestive features: they are both concerned with the provincial land management (the ‘Round Tablets’ for its main concern, the yield; our texts for a complementary concern, the pasture areas), they both roughly encompass the same time frame (§ 32 is likely the earliest in our case). As for their shape, many, but not all, tablets of that corpus have a lenticular form, a common characteristic also in our corpus.<sup>8</sup>

**§1.1.5.** They differ in the underlying purpose (control of the yield vs control of the pasture areas) and in the way the information was gathered. Indeed, the ‘Round Tablets’ report direct information taken outdoors and the totals could be calculated and added, for the sake of convenience, to the already dry tablet, after the scribe returned to his ‘office’.<sup>9</sup> Our texts consist instead of summarizing tablets reporting information gathered by different single documents

and therefore have been likely completely compiled ‘indoors’. In addition, they do not report total sections,<sup>10</sup> and the ‘missing information’ (<...>) we can find in them (see e.g. Text 16 (DAS 274)) probably tells us that something went wrong in the transmission of the primary information.

**§1.1.6.** That we are dealing with secondary information is made clear by the note , 2 im-bi’, “the relevant tablets (are) 2” (Text 1 (MVN 2, 78); Text 19 (MVN 7, 583); Text 21 (MVN 6, 276), and Text 23 (MVN 6, 545)) and the even more explicit (albeit by default): nig2-ka9 NE nu-aka, “this account was not compiled” (Text 29 (MVN 6, 546), obv. II, 8’), in reference to the sheep managed by a herdsman (na-gada).<sup>11</sup>

**§1.1.7.** Our texts are indeed summarizing accounts based on the information from:

1. texts concerning pasture areas;
2. accounts of herdsmen (which usually report only the center or the district of activity);<sup>12</sup>
3. information that we can imagine as complementary to shepherd inspections, since it refers to people involved in herding;
4. information from specific administrative units or about (high-ranking) individuals who somehow benefited from specific areas of the field which the document focuses on.

**§1.1.8.** Not necessarily every single text combines all this information, since it was not relevant for every single pasture area.

**§1.1.9.** Texts explicitly concerning pasture areas are clearly drafted from the point of view of the field management and concern the optimization of plots in a supplementary way to their ‘main role’ as pro-

<sup>7</sup> See Pettinato (1969); Liverani (1990: 155); Maekawa (1992b); Mander & Notizia (2009).

<sup>8</sup> Mander & Notizia (2009: 236). It is difficult to guess the reason of this peculiar form, especially taking into account that this shape is very unpractical for archival conservation, see Pettinato 1969: 6.

<sup>9</sup> Liverani (1990: 155).

<sup>10</sup> Although the label nig2-ka9 aka is commonly associated with ‘balanced accounts’ of items under state control, the availability of the counted animals was not a concern of our texts (see §1.2).

<sup>11</sup> However, such a plurality of the sources of information can be taken for granted in most of the cases.

<sup>12</sup> These are what Snell defined as ‘shepherd texts’. See Snell 1986, p. 134. Single accounts of na-gada could be summarized in ‘multiple accounts’ concerning different herdsmen in a given district (e.g. Gu’aba) or administrative units (e.g. sheep-pen) or high ranking individuals (e.g. royal family).

duction units.<sup>13</sup> Portions of fields were indeed allocated to professional shepherds as grazing areas. Texts of this type are for instance [PPAC 5, 1670](#) (IS 3/-), listing the plots located in unnamed fields and taken over by shepherds (rev. 16: aša<sub>5</sub> dab<sub>5</sub>-<ba> sipa-e-ne) quoted by name and differentiated by category (*n iku* PNs (na-gada) sipa udu eme-gi-rame/sipa ud<sub>5</sub>-da-me/sipa udu gukkal-na-me). The specific expression ‘aša<sub>5</sub> dab<sub>5</sub>-ba’ also occurs in [ITT 4, 7048](#) (-/-), very likely a tag for tablet-containers, which reports: obv. 1-rev. 2: a-ša<sub>3</sub> dab<sub>5</sub>-ba sipa udu gi / a-ša<sub>3</sub> dab<sub>5</sub>-ba sipa gukkal / a-ša<sub>3</sub> giri<sub>3</sub>-se<sub>3</sub>-ga e<sub>2</sub> uš-bar / u<sub>3</sub> a-ša<sub>3</sub> zi-<ga> lugal / e<sub>2</sub> <sup>d</sup>nanše, “fields taken over by shepherds of local sheep, fields taken over by shepherds of fat-tailed sheep, fields of the personnel of the weaving mill, and royal fields ‘expanded’, in the household of Nanše”. The same expression is probably to be reconstructed in [SNAT 126](#) (ŠS 1/-), listing the portions of plots located in different fields of Gu’aba to be understood as grazing areas taken over by unnamed shepherds (rev. 13-14: gur<sub>11</sub>-gur<sub>11</sub>-ra a-ša<sub>3</sub> <dab<sub>5</sub>-ba> sipa ša<sub>3</sub> gu<sub>2</sub>-ab-<sup>ba</sup>ki<sup>ti</sup>).<sup>14</sup> A more precise insight is offered by [MVN 2, 42](#) [...], made up of a fragmentary tablet and envelope, which records the allocation of plots to different shepherds of the province as grazing areas. The initial section of [MVN 2, 42](#), that is the ‘capital section’, distinguishes plots located in fields allotted to state dependents (*e* a-ša<sub>3</sub> FN du<sub>3</sub>-du<sub>3</sub>-a eren<sub>2</sub>-na-ta),<sup>15</sup> plots located in fields administratively owned by the state/province (*e* a-ša<sub>3</sub> FN <sup>ni</sup>g<sub>2</sub>-gal<sub>2</sub>-la-ta), and plots located in temple households (*e* a-ša<sub>3</sub> FN ki sagga DN-ta). Due to the condition of the document, we cannot follow this subdivision in the ‘expenditure section’ (that is the allocation of plots to shepherds), but at the end of a subsection concerning the plots allocated to at least three herdsmen one

can find the expression “plots taken over (by shepherds and that are) administrative property of the state/province” (Tab. rev. II, 12’: aša<sub>5</sub> dab<sub>5</sub>-ba / nig<sub>2</sub>-gal<sub>2</sub>-la). Further information provided by this text concerns “fields yielding rent” (aša<sub>5</sub> ku<sub>5</sub>-ra<sub>2</sub> ba-ab-us<sub>2</sub>) and “fields not yielding rent” (aša<sub>5</sub> ku<sub>5</sub>-ra<sub>2</sub> nu-us<sub>2</sub>), offering a hint at the presence of tenants among the individuals who profited from the pasture areas (for more detail, see §2.3.3).

**§1.1.10.** Pasture areas clearly represented an optimization in the agricultural cycle of the plots,<sup>16</sup> regardless of the administrative temporary ownership of the fields, where they were located (see §1.2). This may be the reason why our texts could disregard the administrative condition of the pasture plots (leased out, allotted, directly managed), as well as that of the listed animals (on the ownership of the animals, see §3.4).

## §1.2. Management of the fields and herds: traces of interaction among different sectors and particular households

**§1.2.1.** The fields mentioned in our texts lay in the agricultural landscape managed by provincial offices, the same ones which commissioned our texts. In general, texts from Ĝirsu come from the provincial state archive, in particular the governor’s archive, and thus give little information on the land (and other assets) pertaining to the royal sector.<sup>17</sup> Our texts are not exception to this, yet they apparently offer a glimpse into plots located in provincial fields, but directly assigned by the crown to royal dependents in return of their service. [ITT 4, 7048](#) (see §1.1), suggests that within a temple household (e<sub>2</sub> <sup>d</sup>nanše) plots allocated to provincial institutional shepherds occur alongside plots defined as ‘zi-ga lugal’, thus allotted to individuals who worked for the royal sec-

<sup>13</sup> With regard to the occurrence of pasture plots in the *Runde Tafeln*, see Pettinato 1969: 18 *ad* 8, a.

<sup>14</sup> I have interpreted these lines as “total stock of fields (taken over by) shepherds in Gu’aba”. Given the lack of any key-terms, an interpretation of this text as recording the assignment of subsistence plots to shepherds is theoretically possible. Note, however, the correspondence between the pasture area of the field of Išara in Text 5 ([CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230](#)) (where the animals assigned to herdsmen are recorded according to the parameters of availability of the central administration, therefore referring to state-held herds; see §2.1) and [SNAT 126](#) (rev. 8), both referring to the same year (ŠS 1).

<sup>15</sup> For an interpretation of this expression as referring to subsistence plots, see Maekawa 1992a: 215 fn. 7.

<sup>16</sup> Fallow rotation was an integral part of the agricultural system of Southern Mesopotamia, as it was essential to restore and improve soil fertility, especially on alluvial soils that are particularly prone to salinization; see Charles 1990: 60. With regard to the fallow areas within the agricultural units in Ur III times, see Maekawa 1987: 97-98. However, cattle and sheep were also allowed, under certain restrictions, in land with young barley plants, a kind of practice, which presented the double convenience of feeding animals and preventing the lodging of crop; see Civil 1994: 145. Moreover, it is interesting to note that §§57-58 of the Code of Hammurabi concern the regulation of sheep grazing in farmlands, suggesting it was a quite commonplace practice, as well as a process which optimized the economic use of fields.

<sup>17</sup> On this topic, Sallaberger (1999: 286); Steinkeller (2013: 360).

tor.<sup>18</sup> Therefore, pasture areas falling in those fields were a royal concern. Nevertheless, the information about the animals that grazed there was transmitted to the office that produced our texts. This consideration also applies to the herds belonging to the royal family and entrusted to shepherds, whose activity is attested elsewhere in the provincial documentation, and to herds and plots pertaining to households that had a particular status or connection to the provincial central government, such as those of the high priestess of BaU and of the grand vizier.

**§1.2.2.** In order to explain the reason why our texts can bear traces of interaction among different sectors or households, we should consider their particular point of view. The absence of total sections in our corpus already betrays that the main concern of the texts was not the total number of animals in the grazing areas of each field, but the tracking of the total number of animals for each listed individual (§2).<sup>19</sup> Therefore, one can note a particular focus on the ones who were entitled to profit from the pasture plots, and the list of their names, each with their relevant information, already represents what can be seen as the ending point of the interlocution of different administrative realities: provincial and temple households, the household of the high priestess of BaU, that of the grand vizier, but also the royal sector. This kind of information is indeed made clear by the attribution of the sheep or some professionals (involved in herding or not) to the high priestess, the grand vizier, the king, the queen (e.g. *udu ereš-dingir, na-gada nin, dub-sar lugal*). Such characterizations can be considered as a re-elaboration of the primary information (§1.3.7), and, at the same time, they hint at the ownership of the herds or plots, which these professionals were tied to. Sections assigned to professional shepherds belonging to a specific household or sector record exclusively a given number of sheep and goats. Thus, we can imagine that the relative primary information was transmitted by the administration of those particular eco-

nomic units or households without details on the availability of their sheep. In some cases, even the presence of shepherds tied to the sheep assigned to some individuals can be omitted, since the name of the professionals (somehow tied to the sheep) already satisfied the required information (see below §2.3.2.3).

**§1.2.3.** The lack of any characterization for the professionals involved in herding could indicate that they were institutional shepherds, and the lack in general of any characterization to professionals or untitled individuals would indicate that these individuals were tied to plots of institutional concern or were involved for labor duty in the herding of state-held flocks. However, in some cases, this type of information can be considered irrelevant or taken for granted, as may have been the case of the administrator of the household of the high priestess of BaU (see §2.3.1.2).<sup>20</sup>

**§1.2.4.** Naturally, not all the texts report the presence of individuals pertaining to different sectors or particular households, as the ownership of the plots varied according to the fields where the grazing areas were located.

**§1.2.5.** The presence of individuals tied to royal (*nin/lugal*) herds<sup>21</sup> or plots can be found<sup>22</sup> in Text 3 (TLB 3, 88); Text 4 (TLB 3, 89); Text 5 (CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230); Text 7 (HLC 1, 37); Text 9 (MVN 5, 204); Text 17 (TCTI 1, 771); Text 22 (MVN 6, 415); Text 24 (MVN 6, 145); Text 25 (MVN 5, 176); thus the fields concerned are: *a-ša<sub>3</sub> bara<sub>2</sub><sup>?</sup>-[si-ga gu<sub>2</sub>]<sup>?</sup> i<sub>7</sub>; a-ša<sub>3</sub><sup>d</sup> nin-e<sub>2</sub>-gal; a-ša<sub>3</sub> i-šar-ra; a-ša<sub>3</sub> du<sub>6</sub>-lugal-u<sub>3</sub>-a; a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub><sup>?</sup> [...]; a-ša<sub>3</sub> bad<sub>3</sub>-[...] / a-ša<sub>3</sub> bad<sub>3</sub>-da-ri<sub>2</sub> u<sub>3</sub> ar-la-AN; a-ša<sub>3</sub> gibil; a-ša<sub>3</sub> gir<sub>2</sub>-nun.*

**§1.2.6.** The presence of professionals tied to the household of the high priestess of BaU can be found in Text 8 (MVN 5, 203); Text 20 (MVN 6, 140); and Text 28 (TÉL 250). At the time of Text 20, § 36, the high priestess of BaU was Geme-Lamma, the wife of

<sup>18</sup> In this regard, we should also consider that, when the grand vizier became the provincial governor, he enacted a policy by which large areas were taken away from the provincial domain to be distributed to royal dependents; see Molina & Steinkeller 2016: 244.

<sup>19</sup> Note however that this kind of information may be lacking (see §3.3.3), or may be split according to parameters of availability in the case of the sheep and goats assigned to institutional herdsmen (§2.1.1.3).

<sup>20</sup> The presence of individuals that can be identified as beneficiaries or tenants as well could vary according to the field. Maekawa noted that, after the reign of Šulgi, the fields where component parts were either allotted or leased out were usually situated near the dwelling quarters, being rather distant from the domain fields; see Maekawa 1999: 67.

<sup>21</sup> The royal family held herds in Ġirsu and the relative wool was directed to Ur, where it could be further manufactured; see Weiershäuser 2008: 148-149, with literature.

<sup>22</sup> Further alleged connections to the royal sector inferred through the prosopographical analysis are not included here.

the governor Ur-Lamma.<sup>23</sup> Differently, at the time of Text 8, ŠS 8, and Text 28, IS 3, the high priestess was BaU-ea, wife of the grand vizier.<sup>24</sup> The fields concerned are: a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> lu<sub>2</sub>-<sup>d</sup>šara<sub>2</sub> and a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> ur-<sup>ges</sup>gigir, unclear if referring to the same village, whose name might have changed in the course of time.<sup>25</sup>

**§1.2.7.** The herdsman of a no further specified high priestess occurs in Text 1 (MVN 2, 78) (Š 32/-), the account of the a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> ša<sub>3</sub>-ku<sub>3</sub>-ge,<sup>26</sup> while sheep of a high priestess in Pasir<sup>27</sup> occur in Text 29 (MVN 6, 546) [...], where the field name(s) is(are) lost in the breaks of the tablet.

**§1.2.8.** Professional shepherds tied to the grand vizier are in: Text 8 (MVN 5, 203); Text 10 (Ontario 2, 435); Text 13 (TCTI 1, 850); Text 22 (MVN 6, 415); and Text 28 (TÉL 250); the fields concerned are: a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> ur-<sup>ges</sup>gigir, alongside with shepherds of the high priestess of BaU; a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> <sup>d</sup>inanna; a-ša<sub>3</sub> gibil, alongside with a herdsman of Nanna and a shepherd tied to the sheep of a royal cook. In Text 9 (MVN 5, 204) a certain number of sheep is assigned to an individual tied to the grand vizier (lu<sub>2</sub> sukkal-maḥ) in the a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub><sup>?</sup> [...], where also the sheep entrusted to a shepherd tied to his cook have grazed.

Except for Text 22, dating to AS 1, the other texts have been drawn up when the grand vizier Urdu-Nanna, connected to the royal family, was also the provincial governor.<sup>28</sup>

**§1.2.9.** Professional shepherds tied to cultic personnel or temples can be found in Text 2 (Amherst 20), reporting the presence of a herdsman of the E-maḥ (na-gada e<sub>2</sub>-maḥ)<sup>29</sup> in the a-ša<sub>3</sub> <sup>d</sup>lugal-a<sub>2</sub>-zi-da or a-ša<sub>3</sub> ur-<sup>d</sup>ig-alim; in Text 9 (MVN 5, 204), reporting the presence of a herdsman of Enki (na-gada <sup>d</sup>en-ki) in the a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub><sup>?</sup> [...]; and in Text 26 (MVN 6, 544), reporting the presence of a herdsman of the *en*-priest (na-gada en) in the field a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-anše or a-ša<sub>3</sub> da-lugal. Differently, Text 13 (TCTI 1, 850) and likely Text 10 (Ontario 2, 435) report the presence of a *lumaḥ*-priest of Inanna (lu<sub>2</sub>-maḥ <sup>d</sup>inanna) in the a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> <sup>d</sup>inanna, without mention of the responsible shepherds. Finally, Text 22 (MVN 6, 415) and Text 24 (MVN 6, 145) report the presence of professionals and herds tied to the god Nanna<sup>30</sup> in the a-ša<sub>3</sub> gibil and a-ša<sub>3</sub> gir<sub>2</sub>-nun.

### §1.3. Particular features

**§1.3.1.** Although we can recognize the sections assigned to herdsmen as having been obtained from their accounts (see §2.1.1.3), information in these

<sup>23</sup> Maekawa (1996). With regard to the economic activities tied to her household, see Yuhong 2011.

<sup>24</sup> Dahl (2007: 23).

<sup>25</sup> As noted by Pettinato (1967: 20), fields and villages named after personal names are attested for short periods, therefore we can wonder whether the village of Lu-Šara was in later documents attested as the village of Ur-gigir. While that in Text 20 is the only attestation of the village of Lu-Šara, to the best of my knowledge, the earliest attestation of the village of Ur-gigir dates to Š 43 (ASJ 13, 230 74, obv. I, 4). With regard to the relationship between e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> (village) and e<sub>2</sub> (house, household) in Third Millennium Mesopotamia, see Lecompte 2013.

<sup>26</sup> Even assuming that the village of Lu-Šara and that of Ur-gigir referred to the same settlement, the village of Šakuge was a different one; it is indeed attested both in Š 32 and AS 5.

<sup>27</sup> In Pasir there was a temple of Enki (abzu pa<sub>5</sub>-sir-ra<sup><ki></sup>) built by Enmetena, thus a hypothetical high priestess of that temple can be meant; see Frayne 2008: 214 (EI.9.5.12 col. IV 5-col. V 1). VS 14, 128 from ED III Ĝirsu records the presence of a shepherd of Pasir as provider of hides labelled as property of Enki of Pasir (kuš udu u<sub>2</sub>-rum <sup>d</sup>en-ki pa<sub>5</sub>-sir<sub>2</sub>-ra<sup>ki</sup>). However, Selz (1989: 83-84) notes that people from Pasir are oddly recorded among the 'properties' of BaU (lu<sub>2</sub> u<sub>2</sub>-rum <sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub>) in Nik 1, 3 from ED III Ĝirsu. This could imply that these individuals were tied to assets in Pasir belonging to the temple of BaU. Consequently Text 29 (MVN 6, 546) may refer to sheep of the high priestess of BaU held in Pasir.

<sup>28</sup> Dahl (2007: 23).

<sup>29</sup> It refers to the temple of Ninhursag in the Ĝirsu province; see George 1993: 119. See also the notes to obv. II 5 in Text 2 (Amherst 20).

<sup>30</sup> It is unclear whether the personnel of Nanna may have been a royal concern in terms of labor duties and allotment of subsistence land. The connection between the royal family and the god Nanna, whose main place of worship was Ur, is known (Sallaberger 1993: 38). See comments to Text 10 (Ontario 2, 435) (ŠS 9/-), obv. III, 4, mentioning a land-recorder of Ĝirsu, who is elsewhere said to be responsible for a worker employed among the shepherds of Nanna in a text from Ur. TCTI 2, 3506 (ŠS 1/-) shows that the herds of the temple of Nanna provided huge amounts of wool to be manufactured by Ĝirsu weavers, thus very likely referring to herds held in Ĝirsu. It should be noted, however, that the field where the Nanna personnel was likely involved for labor duty (see §2.4) in Text 24 (MVN 6, 145) lay in the household of Ningirsu.

<sup>31</sup> See the considerations about the *Sammelurkunden* of Puzriš-Dagan, where the original single document is no longer

texts appears to have been processed<sup>31</sup> to a certain extent and in a uniform way, as is suggested by a series of characteristics: the peculiar terminology (NE.RI),<sup>32</sup> the consistent scribal abbreviations (KU), and the use of maš<sub>2</sub> in place of ud<sub>5</sub> as generic term for goats.

**§1.3.2.** As far as the sign **KU** is concerned, two uses can be distinguished:

- **KU** as an abbreviated form of dab<sub>5</sub>-ba referring to sheep; see NE.RI KU (Text 5 (CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230), rev. I 6) or NE.RI nu-KU (Text 21 (MVN 6, 276), obv. II 7). To be interpreted as: *n* udu NE.RI **dab<sub>5</sub>-<ba>** = “sheep ‘dead’ (while) under charge (of someone)”; *n* udu PN-<e> **dab<sub>5</sub>-<ba>/PN-<e>** <i<sub>3</sub>>-dab<sub>5</sub> = “sheep (that) PN took over”, hence “sheep ‘entrusted to PN” (see §2.3.3).
- **KU** as an abbreviated form of the worker category ‘dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba’ (likely Text 3 (TLB 3, 88), obv. I, 6 and Text 21 (MVN 6, 276), rev. II 3, 5, 9). To be interpreted as: *n* udu PN <dumu> dab<sub>5</sub>-<ba> (see §2.2).

**§1.3.3.** As far as the expression **NE.RI**<sup>33</sup> is concerned, it can be interpreted as a form of the verb de<sub>5</sub>.g, ‘to collect, gather, pick up’ referring to animal corpses gathered on the grazing place.<sup>34</sup> Therefore to be interpreted as: *n* udu NE.RI = \**n* udu <a-ša<sub>3</sub>-ge> **bi<sub>2</sub>-de<sub>5</sub>-<ga>** = “*n* udu gathered on (the field)”.<sup>35</sup>

**§1.3.4.** In one case (Text 29 (MVN 6, 546), rev. I 1; III, 5), the expression ‘udu bi<sub>2</sub>-de<sub>5</sub>’ is associated with the term ‘iri’, “town”, likely meaning that the sheep had died (and their corpses have been gathered) before reaching the grazing area of the field, whereas ‘town’ can be interpreted as whatever village in the rural landscape.

**§1.3.5.** In some cases, the expression ‘udu bi<sub>2</sub>-

---

recognizable (Sallaberger 2003/4: 49).

<sup>32</sup> Outside this group of texts, this expression occurs in a text from Ur: UET 3, 86 rev. 1’-2’: udu NE.RI [...] / udu si-il-la.

<sup>33</sup> Civil interprets NE.RI as being related to ne-ra/nam-ra; comparable to nam-ra-aš ba-ak (robbed/stolen/taken in a predatory incursion); see Civil 2011: 274.

<sup>34</sup> Sallaberger (2005: 250).

<sup>35</sup> Compare to Nisaba 11, 41 (AS 6/iv), from Umma (obv. 5): 1 maš<sub>2</sub> ma<sub>2</sub>-e bi<sub>2</sub>-/de<sub>5</sub>-ga, “1 goat picked up on the boat”. Since the point of view of our texts is that of the fields, but they have been very likely written in ‘office’ (therefore, far from the fields themselves; see above), the prefix bi<sub>2</sub>- could be understood as stressing ‘there’, sheep gathered there, on the field.

<sup>36</sup> In two cases the relevant plot is under the charge of a chief livestock administrator (see §2.1.3) or a fattener (see §2.1.4).

<sup>37</sup> Of course, also the arrangement of the information gathered in our texts can –to a certain extent– be interpreted as a form of re-elaboration of the primary information (see §2.5).

de<sub>5</sub>’ is followed by KU, referring to the fact that the sheep had died (and consequently had been gathered) while being (or still not being, in the case of Text 21 (MVN 6, 276), obv. II 7) entrusted to someone.

**§1.3.6.** In most of the cases, the information about the dead sheep is specifically connected to the plot under the charge of the herdsman responsible for them (see §2.1.1.3, fn. 43).<sup>36</sup>

**§1.3.7.** An additional particular feature is the use of contextual descriptions, such as: “royal herdsman” (na-gada lugal) or “herdsman of the queen” (na-gada nin), referring to herdsmen actually involved in the management of the sheep of the royal family; “royal cook” (muḥaldim lugal) referring to a cook actually tied to the royal palace, or the title of “chief administrator” (šabra) for Lu-Kalkala, the administrator of the ‘new sheep-pen’ (see §2.1.5), whose seal attests to his scholarly title of scribe (dub-sar). Lastly, in some cases, the omission of the name of the responsible shepherds as well could be considered a form of re-elaboration of the primary information, whereas the name of the professionals somehow tied to the sheep or plots satisfied *per se* the requirements for the tracking of the sheep (see §2.3.2.3).<sup>37</sup>

## §2. Shepherds, herdsmen and other individuals

### §2.1. Skilled personnel

**§2.1.0.1.** Our texts mention those individuals who were entitled to profit from pasture plots, regardless of the ownership of the herds. Sheep and goats are indeed assigned to skilled personnel, personnel purposely hired, professionals not belonging to the management of herds, and several individuals quoted just by name.

**§2.1.0.2.** Herdsmen (na-gada) or shepherds (sipa.d), shepherd assistants (gab<sub>2</sub>-us<sub>2</sub>), and chief livestock

administrators (šuš<sub>3</sub>) can be understood as being the skilled personnel (with obvious different degrees of responsibility, competence and involvement) in the managing of state-held herds.

### §2.1.1. Herdsmen and shepherds

§2.1.1.1. The difference between herdsmen and shepherds in the administrative documentation can be elusive. Already Stepień<sup>38</sup> and Snell<sup>39</sup> noticed that the difference between the two titles is not completely clear. In his study of the SLA-a archive, Garfinkle<sup>40</sup> noted that such differentiation can be blurred by the perspective of the texts: evidence from that ‘private’ archive indicates that the position of sipa was subordinate to that of na-gada, being that of na-gada a promotion from the sipa-level. Conversely, according to him, administrative documents belonging to the institutional economy may not describe the manner in which the shepherds organized themselves in their local hierarchies. Differently, Stepień<sup>41</sup> argued that there was no hierarchical relationship between the two professional titles; texts can indeed use the two terms alternately and often herdsmen, mentioned throughout the document as na-gada, collectively are referred to as sipa in the summary lines.

§2.1.1.2. The term sipa can indeed be understood

as a generic label, while the title na-gada refers to a specific administrative level in herding (concerning also the cattle keepers, generically referred to as unu<sub>3</sub>) and what we find in our texts can be a generic or a specific designation. Nevertheless, the particular insight they offer can sometimes help in finding a criterion in the use of both terms.

§2.1.1.3. In our documents, it is clear that the account sections assigned to na-gada, explicitly defined as **na-gada**, concern the management of sheep and goats in terms of availability, that is “present/expended/shortfalls/dead” (gub-ba/zi-ga/la<sub>2</sub>-ia<sub>3</sub>/bi<sub>2</sub>-de<sub>5</sub>),<sup>42</sup> which clearly recall the structure of their single accounts or account sections: “present/expended/shortfalls/dead” (gub-ba/zi-ga/la<sub>2</sub>-ia<sub>3</sub>/de<sub>5</sub>-de<sub>5</sub>-ga),<sup>43</sup> where the title ‘na-gada’ is however not always explicit.<sup>44</sup>

§2.1.1.4. Therefore **na-gada** is the title of the usual administrative interlocutors<sup>45</sup> having directly to do with the managing of state-held sheep,<sup>46</sup> as well as with the individuals subordinated to them and the provincial institutions allocating grazing areas.

§2.1.1.5. Differently, individuals labelled as shepherds (**sipa**) occur in our texts exclusively in connection with sheep belonging to specific administra-

<sup>38</sup> Stepień (1996: 40).

<sup>39</sup> Snell 1986: 186 fn. 29: “The relation between the titles na-gada “herdsman” and sipa “shepherd” is not clear in these texts (i.e. ‘Shepherd Texts’). The latter occurs twice, once as a title of someone receiving expended sheep, another time where one would expect na-gada. In Old Babylonian Larsa the na-gada is a ‘chief shepherd’ with other shepherds under him, as also in the Neo-Babylonian Uruk texts, with the actual grazing being done by persons called sipa ‘shepherd’”.

<sup>40</sup> Garfinkle (2003: 164 fn. 11).

<sup>41</sup> Stepień (1996: 40).

<sup>42</sup> See also §3.2.

<sup>43</sup> Note however, that the information about the number of dead sheep in our texts is recorded as a separate entry following the name of the responsible herdsman, and not preceding it, as is the case with the number of sheep ‘present’ or ‘expended’. Indeed, in most of the cases the number of dead sheep is directly connected to a plot under the charge of that very herdsman (ki PN na-gada), a kind of information that follows the main section assigned to a herdsman and that can also concern the occurrence of other individuals in that plot (see §2.4).

<sup>44</sup> Snell notes that the persons in charge of the herds are not usually explicitly termed as na-gada. Only 28 of the 121 ‘Shepherd Texts’ available to him specify the title of the subscribers (Snell 1986: 139). Temple or state-held sheep could however be entrusted also to other professionals, as corroborated by ‘herdsmen accounts’ assigned to other professionals, where na-gada can be meant as a function (*ibidem*). Since the actual title of these individuals was not a concern of the scribes who compiled our texts, we cannot exclude that some herdsmen in our texts may have actually been individuals only acting as such, especially in those cases where further attestations of a herdsman quoted in our texts are lacking in other administrative documents.

<sup>45</sup> Using Adams’ words (2006: 147), the shepherds [i.e. our herdsmen] belong to the general ‘foreman’ category, that is they were those “who were given (or sometimes assumed?) responsibility for gangs of workmen during their assigned periods of corvée duty or for other, related activities”. In this regard, see also below §3.1, especially fn. 91.

<sup>46</sup> According to Adams (2006: 149), herds of temple- and state-held sheep were handed over to shepherds for care, subject to annual counting and inspection, and prescribed deliveries of wool, proportions of offspring, and dairy products.



tive units or households. Thus the information on the sheep entrusted to them concerns exclusively a given number of sheep and goats, as it is the case of non-institutional herdsmen (see §1.2.2).

**§2.1.1.6.** By comparing the information concerning the sheep of the high priestess of BaU, we can note that Au'u, Ba'aga, Ur-gula (Text 8 (MVN 5, 203)) and Ba-za, Ur-Nanše and Bazaga (Text 28 (TÉL 250)) are defined as **na-gada**, while Au'u, Baza, Ba'aga, Iabidu (TÉL 262, outside this group) and Ba'a, Baga, Iabidu, BaU-IGI.DU (Text 20 (MVN 6, 140)) are defined as **sipa**.<sup>47</sup> Therefore, it may be assumed that, when not considering the availability of sheep, texts can arbitrarily<sup>48</sup> refer to professional herdsmen with the generic title of shepherds. The issue concerning shepherds is however a little bit more nuanced. Many administrative texts from Ĝirsu on the topic show as direct subordinates of the herdsmen the "shepherd assistants" (**gab<sub>2</sub>-us<sub>2</sub>**), who in our texts are not mentioned. In one case, text 4 (TLB 3, 89), an individual defined as **sipa** occurs as clearly subordinated to an individual defined as **na-gada nin**, herdsman of the queen, thus probably referring to a shepherd assistant (**gab<sub>2</sub>-us<sub>2</sub>**), rather than to a herdsman.

**§2.1.1.7.** In addition, we can note that in MVN 2, 42 [...], which records an allocation of plots to skilled personnel as grazing areas (see §1.1), **sipa** is used as a generic designation or instead of 'shepherd assistant' in specific cases. This text substantially distinguishes plots entrusted to herdsmen (**na-gada**) and those to shepherd assistants (**gab<sub>2</sub>-us<sub>2</sub>**), the latter falling under the supervision of a herdsman<sup>49</sup> and uses the title **sipa** as referring to:

- the **main categories**, which the administrative designations (**na-gada/gab<sub>2</sub>-us<sub>2</sub>**) belong to (Env. obv. V, 8: **sipa ud<sub>5</sub>-me**; Tab. rev. V, 10': **sipa udu** [...]; in opposition to rev. VI, 7': **unu<sub>3</sub>-me**);
- **administrative designation** (Tab. rev. VI, 6':

**sipa ab<sub>2</sub>**) for one individual attested among the large cattle herdsmen (**unu<sub>3</sub>**) in the total section of the tablet; this specific section (Tab. rev. VI, 3'-7') does not mention shepherd assistants, thus one may wonder whether "shepherd of cows" could refer to a sort of assistant for cattle herdsmen in place of the more common term **gab<sub>2</sub>-ra**;<sup>50</sup>

- **specific individuals** (Tabl. obv. III, 5': <sup>d</sup>utu-igdul<sub>3</sub> / sipa<sup>2</sup> ud<sub>5</sub>, under the supervision of Ur-barasiga; Tab. rev. III, 18: Lugal-sukkal 'sipa' [...], followed by broken lines). Unfortunately the many breaks of the tablet hamper a clear understanding of the structure of the text, but we can note that the formula **PN sipa** only occurs in these two cases. This can hypothetically be interpreted as referring to individuals belonging to a main category, which differs from that of the supervisor, as for example Utu-igdul, defined as "shepherd of goats" (assistant level), whom is assigned a plot under the supervision of Ur-barasiga, who hypothetically may have been a herdsman (administrative level) belonging to the local sheep shepherds (main category).

**§2.1.1.8.** Since there is also no trace of shepherd assistants (**gab<sub>2</sub>-us<sub>2</sub>**) in the SIA.a's archive, one may wonder whether **sipa** was a generic term consistently used in place of **gab<sub>2</sub>-us<sub>2</sub>** in that very archive, whereas, at least in the institutional documentation of Ĝirsu, the generic term could apply to both herdsmen and shepherd assistants in contexts or texts disregarding their actual administrative level and the availability of sheep (as it already happens in colophons and tags, where the generic terms assume however a collective meaning).

## §2.1.2. The shepherd assistants

**§2.1.2.1.** As already noted, many documents on the topic show shepherd assistants (**gab<sub>2</sub>-us<sub>2</sub>**) as the di-

<sup>47</sup> The different spellings (ba-a/ba-za ba-a-ga/ba-za-ga) may derive from possible mistakes in the transliteration (A= 3 vertical strokes; ZA= 4 vertical strokes) due to the condition of the tablets.

<sup>48</sup> This scribal choice could be considered a further form of re-elaboration enacted by the compilers of our texts (see §1.3) or a direct consequence of an inconsistent use of such terms in the documentation bearing the primary information.

<sup>49</sup> The text does not specify the title of the supervisors, but the names of well-known herdsmen of the province can be recognized: see e.g. Ur-Ĥendursaĝ (Text 21 (MVN 6, 276)), Atu son of Lugal-igisa (Text 16 (DAS 274)), Ude-niĝsaga (Text 9 (MVN 5, 204)), Ur-barasiga (Text 29 (MVN 6, 546)).

<sup>50</sup> ASJ 11, 129 59 (Š 48/-), a worker inspection of the cattle herdsmen of the queen Ninkala (rev. 10 gurum<sub>2</sub> aka unu<sub>3</sub> nin<sub>9</sub>-kal-la nin), shows that the working groups were made up of a herdsman (**na-gada**), who supervised the whole group, the son of the herdsman, and a pair of assistants (**gab<sub>2</sub>-ra**). The title **gab<sub>2</sub>-ra** also refers to the shepherd assistant of donkeys and sows (**gab<sub>2</sub>-ra anše šagan**); see ASJ 19, 144 128, rev. II, 28.

<sup>51</sup> The shepherd assistants can be indeed considered as belonging to that part of the supporting staff of the herders that

rect subordinates of herdsmen.<sup>51</sup> For example, [CT 10, pl. 16-17, BM 12921](#) (AS 4/iv), a barley account concerning “shepherd assistants of fat-tailed sheep” (rev. II, 33: gab<sub>2</sub>-us<sub>2</sub> udu gukkal-me) of Gu’aba and [PPAC 5, 2](#) (§ 48/ix), a wool account of “shepherd assistants of fat-tailed sheep” (rev. II, 19: siki-[la<sub>2</sub>] gab<sub>2</sub>-us<sub>2</sub> udu gukkal), both list the assistants by subdividing them in groups supervised by individuals who can be identified with herdsmen of Gu’aba.<sup>52</sup> At this point, the substantial absence of shepherd assistants in our texts may be probably explained by considering them as being ‘hidden’ in the sections assigned to herdsmen or by identifying them with the individuals quoted just by name, but with a certain degree of responsibility for state-held sheep (PN KU; §2.3.3.2).

### §2.1.3. The chief livestock administrator

**§2.1.3.1.** A chief livestock administrator (*šuš<sub>3</sub>*), official at the top of herd management, occurs only once in our texts (Text 1 ([MVN 2, 78](#)), obv. II, 7), in connection to a number of sheep, for which no further information is given, and a further number of sheep that had died while being entrusted to state dependent workers in a plot under his charge. Except for this single case, the absence of these officials in our group of texts is probably due to the fact that they acted on a higher level than that concerning the single pasture plots which our texts focus on. Indeed, as is made clear by the administrative documentation, they were responsible for more groups headed by herdsmen (regardless of the categories of herds) and managed their transactions on a larger scale.

### §2.1.4. Fatteners

**§2.1.4.1.** A fattener (*kurušda*)<sup>53</sup> is attested only once in our texts, in Text 21 ([MVN 6, 276](#)) (obv. I, 6), where he occurs in connection to a number of sheep, for which no further information is given, and to a further number of sheep that had died while not be-

ing entrusted to anyone in a plot under his charge. Since the specification of the title there is required by the occurrence of a homonymous herdsman, I would not exclude that other fatteners can occur in our texts among the individuals simply quoted by name, but with a sort of responsibility for the counted sheep (PN KU; see §2.3.3.2) or for the grazing plots (ki PN; see §2.4), as is probably the case of Text 19 ([MVN 7, 583](#)) (obv. 2 and rev. 4).

### §2.1.5. The sheep-pen administrator

**§2.1.5.1.** A high official involved in animal fattening, Lu-Kalkala, occurs in Text 2 ([Amherst 20](#)) (obv. I, 6), Text 14 ([TCTI 2, 4176](#)) (obv. I, 4), and Text 18 ([TCTI 2, 4177](#)) (obv. II, 6). As already noted (§1.3.7), our texts describe him as a chief administrator (*šabra*), while his seal ascribes him the title of scribe. He can be identified with the scribe, son of Ur-Lamma, who administrated the ‘new sheep-pen’ (*e<sub>2</sub> udu gibil*), that is, a provincial institution for animal fattening.<sup>54</sup> As noted by Maekawa,<sup>55</sup> sheep kept in the sheep-pens for fattening likely pastured in grasslands or fallow land in the favorable seasons. In each text of our group the sheep managed by Lu-Kalkala rely on different shepherds (regardless of the administrative level) to graze in different fields: in Text 2 ([Amherst 20](#)) (§ 44//IS 3/-) the sheep are entrusted to the shepherds KAgena (532 fat-tailed sheep and 5 goats) and Ur-metena (65 fat-tailed sheep and 2 goats) for grazing in the field of Lugal-azida or in that of Ur-Igalim; in Text 14 ([TCTI 2, 4176](#)) (IS 3/-) the sheep (501 sheep and 25 goats) are entrusted to Au’u for grazing in the field of Duabi; in Text 18 ([TCTI 2, 4177](#)) [...], the sheep are entrusted to Halah (91 sheep and 11 goats) and Kilula (271 sheep and 15 goats) in a field, whose name is lost in the break of the tablet.

### §2.2. Additional personnel

**§2.2.1.** Apart from skilled personnel, also additional, likely unskilled, individuals could be employed in

---

Adams (2006: 154) describes as being able to act with independent responsibility, to have broad regional familiarity, and to be adept in a variety of semi-specialized pastoral skills.

<sup>52</sup> Aside the PNs which related to herdsmen attested in our group, the occurrence ([PPAC 5, 2](#) rev. I, 6) of the Gu’aba herdsman Irduga, bearing an uncommon name, confirms that the supervisors were na-gada. See [HSS 4, 37](#) (AS 2/-), which attests (specifying the title) the herdsman Irduga as responsible for the sheep assigned to five different shepherd assistants. Irduga himself is generically defined as sipa (rev. 5) in [MVN 12, 154](#) (§ 46//AS 3/-), a text concerning the payment of the irrigation fees (maš a-ša<sub>3</sub>-ga) of plots located in the field of Du’eš in Gu’aba.

<sup>53</sup> On their activity, see [Stepień 1996](#): especially 86-87.

<sup>54</sup> For this person, see [Maekawa 1983](#): 87-94.

<sup>55</sup> [Maekawa \(1983: 83\)](#).

<sup>56</sup> The category of state dependents is a broad one and encompasses individuals of different statuses, from the provincial governor to low-ranking workers, all of them subject to corvée duties toward the state. On this topic, see [Steinkeller 2013](#): 350-351.

herding. This is clear by the employment of “state dependent workers” (**eren<sub>2</sub>**),<sup>56</sup> who were recruited on a rotational-term basis as corvée labor, occurring in the following texts: in Text 1 (MVN 2, 78); Text 7 (HLC 1, 37); Text 21 (MVN 6, 276); Text 25 (MVN 5, 176); Text 29 (MVN 6, 546).

**§2.2.2.** Beside them, we find individuals belonging to the category of **dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba**,<sup>57</sup> lit. “seized children”,<sup>58</sup> in Text 3 (TLB 3, 88); Text 7 (HLC 1, 37); Text 12 (TCTI 1, 802); Text 15 (TCTI 2, 4178); Text 16 (DAS 274); Text 23 (MVN 6, 545); Text 25 (MVN 5, 176) and probably in Text 21 (MVN 6, 276). Their employment in herding was common, although not exclusive.<sup>59</sup>

**§2.2.3.** CBT 2, BM 15294, likely a tag for tablet-containers, lists the *dumudaba* among the shepherd categories: sipa udu gi-me / sipa ud<sub>5</sub>-me / ša<sub>3</sub> gir<sub>2</sub>-su<sup>ki</sup> / unu<sub>3</sub>-me / sipa e<sub>2</sub>-gal-me / **sipa dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba-me** / sipa udu gi-me.

**§2.2.4.** The easily understandable categories concern the type of animals (sipa udu, sipa ud<sub>5</sub>, unu<sub>3</sub>) or the institution (sipa e<sub>2</sub>-gal), i.e. categories which were functional to worker inspections and relative payments. Therefore, we can wonder whether the category of *dumudaba* shepherds might have con-

cerned the type of recruitment and consequent payment. Steinkeller<sup>60</sup> interprets them as a variant of lu<sub>2</sub> dab<sub>5</sub>-ba, a term specifically describing conscripted **eren<sub>2</sub>**.

**§2.2.5.** In our group of texts, Text 7 (HLC 1, 37) and Text 25 (MVN 5, 176) are particularly enlightening on this topic, as they clearly show that PNs **dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba** contrast with PNs **eren<sub>2</sub>**. This would explain the barley payments of the type described in MVN 22, 23 (Š 39/-) as (rev. II. 6): ša<sub>3</sub>-gal **eren<sub>2</sub> u<sub>3</sub> [dumu]-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba**<sup>61</sup> “food for state dependent workers and *dumudaba*”.

**§2.2.6.** As usual with state dependent workers, Ontario 2, 190 (AS 3/-, prov. unknown) shows that *dumudaba* workers contrast with UNġa<sub>6</sub> workers, “menials”, and geme<sub>2</sub>, “female workers”. In addition, as state dependent workers, they could be described as dumu-gi<sub>7</sub> “citizen”.<sup>62</sup> In our texts, this is made clear by the comparison between Text 17 (TCTI 1, 771), where Šunia, Ušalum and Ur-saga are defined as dumu-gi<sub>7</sub>, and Text 25 (MVN 5, 176), where Šunia, Ušalum and Ur-sasa are defined as dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-(ba).<sup>63</sup>

**§2.2.7.** The *dumudaba* probably were adult male workers, whereas the kinship term (dumu) may have

<sup>57</sup> Maeda penned a study on the topic, “On the dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba occurring in the Lagaš documents of the Ur III Dynasty”, in Bulletin of the Graduate Division of Literature of Waseda University, Post Graduate Course: Philosophy-History 37 (1991) 47-58 [in Japanese], which I am not able to consult.

<sup>58</sup> According to Heimpel (2009: 33), “the literal meaning of this term, which is typically found in texts from Ġirsu, indicates orphaned children who were seized, that is, taken in charge as workers when they were able to carry a full workload. By the time they were registered as recipients of rations they were adults”. This interpretation is a most intriguing one, since the employment of children in herding is convincingly discussed by other scholars (Adams, Snell). Nevertheless, HLC 92 [...] may suggest that they were not necessarily orphans nor children (see obv. V’ 13-14: 1c 0.0.3 da-ga / dumu gu-gu dumu // dab<sub>5</sub>-ba x [erasure]). There is probably no trace of children in our texts, as their employment was likely disregarded by the office which commissioned them. Snell (1986: 133-134) noted how the employment of children in herding, who might not be too useful in the fields anyway, was a way to exploit human labor which might be otherwise dissipated.

<sup>59</sup> For their non-herding activities, see Borrelli 2020: 14-17.

<sup>60</sup> Steinkeller 2013: 350 fn. 8.

<sup>61</sup> At this point, one may wonder if the following references should be interpreted in the same way: TCTI 2, 4058 (AS 1/ix): ša<sub>3</sub>-gal **eren<sub>2</sub> <u<sub>3</sub>> dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba-še<sub>3</sub>**; TCTI 2, 3939 (AS 8/iii): ša<sub>3</sub>-gal **eren<sub>2</sub> <u<sub>3</sub>> dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba-še<sub>3</sub>**; MVN 12, 455 (ŠŠ 9/xi): obv. 2-3: ša<sub>3</sub>-gal **eren<sub>2</sub> bala gub-ba / <u<sub>3</sub>> dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba-me**; TCTI 2, 3400 (AS 8/xi): obv 2: še dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba <u<sub>3</sub> **eren<sub>2</sub>> bala gub-ba**; TCTI 1, 664 (AS 8/xi): ša<sub>3</sub>-gal **eren<sub>2</sub> bala gub-ba / <u<sub>3</sub>> dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba**.

<sup>62</sup> The total section of Ontario 2, 190 refers to the *dumudaba* as dumu-gi<sub>7</sub>. While Steinkeller (2013: 350, following Koslova 2008: 152-153 and 171-173) finds in this text a key attestation for the equation **eren<sub>2</sub>=dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba=dumu-gi<sub>7</sub>** (all of them contrasting with menials), in my opinion, it seems plausible that dumu-gi<sub>7</sub> was a designation which could regard both **eren<sub>2</sub>** and **dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba** (therefore, regardless of the recruitment), when contrasting with UNġa<sub>6</sub>. Since in Text 17 there is no mention of menials, an interpretation as dumu-<dab<sub>5</sub>-ba> ħug-<ga<sub>2</sub>>, “hired *dumudaba*” is also possible.

<sup>63</sup> The inconsistency could derive from the texts bearing the primary information.

<sup>64</sup> Note the existence of a ‘captain of *dumudaba*’, after whom 2 fields occurring in our texts are likely named (Text 17 (TCTI 1, 771) and Text 25 (MVN 5, 176)). With regard to them and further designations of officials responsible for *dumudaba*, see Borrelli 2020.

been conceived to stress the subordinate role to those who take charge (dab<sub>5</sub>) of them,<sup>64</sup> or to refer to their condition of citizens. Therefore, the difference with the *eren<sub>2</sub>* probably concerned the recruitment. One possibility is that *dumudaba* may have been state dependent workers hired outside their period of conscription (see e.g. [MVN 12, 47](#), obv. 5: a<sub>2</sub> *ḥug-ga<sub>2</sub> eren<sub>2</sub> bala tuš-a*, “hired labor of state dependent workers ‘sitting out the duty’”),<sup>65</sup> whereas attestations referring to ‘hired *dumudaba*’<sup>66</sup> do not mention the duty cycle (*bala*), since, in this case, it should supposedly be taken for granted. However, since our texts were compiled on a yearly basis, a temporal distinction of the recruitment of the same individuals would have been pointless within a single text, as those very individuals would have been both *dumudab<sub>5</sub>-ba* and *eren<sub>2</sub>* during the whole year.<sup>67</sup> Another possibility is that the *dumudaba* were not recruited from the ‘reservoir’ of state dependent workers, who the state via the province put at the disposal of the foremen or chief administrators, but hypothetically directly from a ‘reservoir’ of local population,<sup>68</sup> who – for some reasons – did not fall in the former category. Recently, Borrelli<sup>69</sup> assumed a connection of the *dumudaba* with the governor’s estates and the royal sector. In our texts, such a connection could be found in Text 3 ([TLB 3, 88](#)), Text 7 ([HLC 1, 37](#)), Text 17 ([TCTI 1, 771](#)), Text 23 ([MVN 6, 545](#)) and Text 25 ([MVN 5, 176](#)), where one can infer the presence of royal plots (see §1.2) or, from the field names, connections

to an official (Badari)<sup>70</sup> or a settlement (Ursaĝpa’e)<sup>71</sup> tied to the governor’s holding.

**§2.2.8.** In addition, Text 15 ([TCTI 2, 4178](#)) (IS 3/-) suggests a sort of territoriality and reiteration of employment, as attested (obv. I, 4’) by the *dumudaba* Gu’umu (bearing an uncommon name),<sup>72</sup> among the workers employed in a field of Gu’aba. The same *dumudaba* was already attested in [CUSAS 16, 104](#) (ŠS 1/-), an account concerning sheep and goats ‘taken over’, drawn up 12 year earlier, where we can recognize the name of the herdsmen of Gu’aba.<sup>73</sup>

**§2.2.9.** Moreover, Text 23 ([MVN 6, 545](#)) and Text 25 ([MVN 5, 176](#)) show a possible hierarchy within the category during their employment in herding, as they attest *dumudaba* employed in plots under the responsibility of a herdsman (Text 23), or *dumudaba* responsible for the plots where the sheep entrusted to other *dumudaba* have grazed (Text 23 and Text 25; see §2.4.4). This feature is supported by texts recording sheep accounts subscribed by *dumudaba*,<sup>74</sup> acting therefore as herdsmen. In any case, our texts do not report information about the availability of the sheep entrusted to them.

**§2.2.10.** Finally, Text 4 ([TLB 3, 89](#)) (obv. II 9; rev. II 4) attests the involvement of Amorreans (**mar-tu**), very likely as a generic workforce in herding.

<sup>65</sup> With regard to the duty cycle which the *eren<sub>2</sub>* were subjected to, see Steinkeller 2003: 44-45. According to him, *eren<sub>2</sub>* people worked half of the year via conscription and hired themselves out for wages the other half, likely working in the same gangs all year round.

<sup>66</sup> See *dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba ḥug-ga<sub>2</sub>*, “hired *dumudaba*”, in [CT 1, pl. 4-5, BM 17744](#) (Š 35/-), rev. I, 11, or a<sub>2</sub> *ḥug-ga<sub>2</sub> dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba*, “hired labor of *dumudaba*”, in [TCTI 2, 2705](#) (IS 2/vii): obv. 2.

<sup>67</sup> Note that the opposition between *eren<sub>2</sub>*/*dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba* in our texts hardly could reflect an inconsistency in the documentation reporting the primary information. Indeed in Text 25 ([MVN 5, 176](#)) (rev. 5’-7’) a state dependent and a *dumudaba* occur in connection to a plot under the charge of the same individual, a kind of information surely reported by a single document.

<sup>68</sup> Note that they bore both Sumerian and non-Sumerian names, thus, regardless of the provenance, they could have been people living (or forced to live) in the province.

<sup>69</sup> Borrelli (2020: 18-19).

<sup>70</sup> Noteworthy, the seal of Badari shows a dedication to the king; see Borrelli 2020: 13.

<sup>71</sup> At the time when Text 23 ([MVN 6, 545](#)) was drawn up (AS 1/-), the sons of the provincial governor Ur-Lamma held assets in that small rural settlement; see Maekawa 1996: 118.

<sup>72</sup> Although a quick search in CDLI or BDTNS gives back quite a few attestations of this name (*gu<sub>2</sub>-u<sub>3</sub>-mu*), they basically concern very few individuals: a well-attested garden administrator (see Greco 2015: 243-247, always written as *gu<sub>2</sub>-u<sub>3</sub>-mu*), and two individuals involved in herding, a *dumudaba* and a herdsman (see Text 15, obv. I 4’ and obv. II 4’ for the variations in writing of the name). With a different spelling (*Gu-u<sub>2</sub>-mu*) a scribe of the shipyard in Ġirsu is attested (see Alivernini 2013: 58-59).

<sup>73</sup> See e.g. Guzani in Text 16 ([DAS 274](#)) obv. II 6; Atu son of Alla in Text 16 ([DAS 274](#)) obv. III 4; Kuda in Text 29 ([MVN 6, 546](#)) rev. II 3.

<sup>74</sup> See e.g. [MTBM 281](#) (AS 1/-).

## §2.3. Individuals occurring in connection with sheep

§2.3.0.1. Since our texts reflect the perspective of the field management, they do not necessarily mention the workers actually involved in herding, but whatever individual entitled to profit from the pasture areas and acting as interlocutors for the tracking of the sheep.

### §2.3.1. Single professionals

§2.3.1.1. Hypothetically, these individuals can be understood as beneficiaries or tenants of the plots where the counted sheep have grazed, or even as professionals occasionally involved in herding as fulfillment of their labor duty. This would not imply that they were actively involved in the herding of flocks which grazed on ‘their’ plots or that high-ranking individuals actually looked after flocks for labor duty; rather, this only means they were the administrative interlocutors for the tracking of the counted sheep, whereas the administration was not interested in private agreements, such as substitutions or compensations,<sup>75</sup> at least in our documents.

§2.3.1.2. In some cases, the professionals are clearly tied to a specific household, but the number of sheep assigned to them follows the section concerning that household’s sheep. Indeed, in two texts of our group (Text 8 (MVN 5, 203); Text 28 (TÉL 250), and TÊL 262 outside our group), a small section concerning the sheep assigned to Imtidam (respectively: obv. II 4-5; obv. II 2-3; rev. 7), the chief administrator (**šabra**) of the household of the high priestess of BaU, follows the section concerning the sheep of the high priestess. In a similar way, in Text 20 (MVN 6, 140), the section concerning the sheep of the high priestess is followed by a section concerning the sheep assigned to Ur-Damu (obv. 9), a scribe (**dub-sar**) tied to that household. At this point, one may wonder

whether they were beneficiaries of assets belonging to the household they served or whether their labor duties were fulfilled within that very household.<sup>76</sup> Differently, the presence of professionals tied to the grand vizier apparently does not follow sections concerning his herding personnel; individuals tied to the grand vizier occur indeed in Text 9 (MVN 5, 204) (**lu<sub>2</sub> sukkal-mah**, rev. I, 6, and **muḥaldim sukkal-mah**, rev. III, 1-2), while his herding personnel in Text 8 (MVN 5, 203); Text 10 (Ontario 2, 435); Text 13 (TCTI 1, 850); Text 28 (TÉL 250).

§2.3.1.3. As seen in §1.2, a further conjecture can be conceived: a connection between the professionals described as being royal in our texts (**dub-sar lugal** in Text 3 (TLB 3, 88) (obv. I 4) and Text 17 (TCTI 1, 771) (rev. II 1); **šu-i lugal** in Text 7 (HLC 1, 37) (rev. I 9); **muḥaldim lugal** in Text 9 (MVN 5, 204) (rev. II, 1) and Text 22 (MVN 6, 415) (rev. 2) and the plots defined as a-ša<sub>3</sub>/aša<sub>5</sub> zi-ga lugal in texts concerning land management. Such a connection could lead us to interpret those professionals as being beneficiaries of royal plots within institutional households.<sup>77</sup>

§2.3.1.4. In some cases it is clear that the sheep assigned to some professionals were actually entrusted to shepherds (**sipa**). This is the case of the sheep of the royal cooks in Text 9 (MVN 5, 204) (rev. I, 9-II, 1) and Text 22 (MVN 6, 415) (rev. 1-2), which are indeed entrusted to shepherds, or the case of the sheep of a cook of the grand vizier in Text 9 (MVN 5, 204) (rev. II, 13-III, 1), and those of a captain in Text 10 (Ontario 2, 435) (rev. II, 11-12). However, the presence of such shepherds is a kind of information, which our texts can omit<sup>78</sup> (see §2.3.2.3). Thus it can be inferred also in the cases, where the sheep are simply assigned to professionals. Differently, in the case of the boatman (**ma<sub>2</sub>-gal**) in Text 5 (CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230) (obv. II, 5), one can infer that he was involved in herding for labor duty, since in CUSAS 16, 104 (ŠS 1/-), individuals defined as ma<sub>2</sub>-gal occur alongside *dumudaba* and herdsman in connection to sheep ‘taken over’

<sup>75</sup> The state dependents were required to do corvée for the state, either by performing it themselves or by providing substitutes or monetary compensation; see Steinkeller 2015: 141 and p. 173.

<sup>76</sup> Actually, both possibilities could co-exist. In particular TÊL 262 (IS 3/-), concerning a number of sheep ‘taken over’, may hypothetically suggest a direct involvement in herding as labor duty.

<sup>77</sup> It seems likely that also the individual tied to the rest station for royal messengers (*sikkum*) attested in text 3 (TLB 3, 88) (obv. II, 4) could have benefited from a royal subsistence plot. With regard to individuals tied to the royal sector and possibly involved in herding as labor duty, see §2.4.5.

<sup>78</sup> In the case of professionals tied to specific households, we can wonder whether such an omission could be assigned to the document bearing the primary information.

<sup>79</sup> Boatmen of large ships were likely employed in the trade of textiles manufactured in the weaving establishment of Gu’aba and then exported into the Gulf; see Laursen & Steinkeller 2017: 77. The field of Text 5 lay in Gu’aba and the same location is suggested by the names of the herdsman mentioned in CUSAS 16, 104. Their employment in herding would thus represent an involvement in a different phase of the same ‘production chain’.

(see §3.3.1).<sup>79</sup>

**§2.3.1.5.** In other cases, the involvement in herding for labor duty can be inferred thanks to the arrangement of the listed individuals according to a specific scheme (see §2.4).

### §2.3.2. Professional groups

**§2.3.2.1.** In some texts of our group, we can notice the consistent occurrence of individuals belonging to the same professional category:<sup>80</sup> in text 4 (TLB 3, 89), merchants (**dam-gar<sub>3</sub>**); in Text 18 (TCTI 2, 4177) [...] and Text 26 (MVN 6, 544) (ŠS 1/-), builders (**šidim**).

**§2.3.2.2.** They can be interpreted as professionals involved in herding as fulfillment of their labor duties or as beneficiaries of subsistence plots.

**§2.3.2.3.** By comparing the information of Text 18 (TCTI 2, 4177) and Text 26 (MVN 6, 544), we can notice that the sheep of these professionals could be entrusted to shepherds. Since the compilers of our texts were not particularly interested in the management of herds or in the payment of the involved individuals, they do not necessarily report such an information.

Text 18 (TCTI 2, 4177) (obv. I 1-II-1): *n* udu/maš<sub>2</sub> **PN sipa udu** ur-<sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub>/ur-<sup>d</sup>ig-alim **ugula šidim**

Text 26 (MVN 6, 544) (rev. I 1-5): *n* udu/maš<sub>2</sub> **udu** ur-<sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub>/ur-<sup>d</sup>ig-alim **ugula šidim**.

**§2.3.2.4.** Differently, in text 4 (TLB 3, 89) the entries concerning the sheep assigned to the merchants (obv. I 4-9) are separated from that concerning the sheep assigned to unquantified and unnamed shepherds possibly tied to merchants (obv. II, 5: **sipa** [dam<sup>1</sup>-[gar<sub>3</sub><sup>2</sup>-e]-/r<sup>ne</sup>]).

**§2.3.2.5.** Hypothetically, there could be a connection with the fields tied to these professions as a

whole, likely as beneficiaries of sustenance allotments, and their involvement in a given pasture plot. This would be suggested by the field name of Text 26 (**a-ša<sub>3</sub> da-lugal**), where the sheep assigned to six builders (**šidim**) have grazed and which is described as being related to builders in *Managing the land T* 11 (rev. 12: **a-ša<sub>3</sub> da-lugal šidim-e-ne**).<sup>81</sup>

### §2.3.3. Untitled individuals

**§2.3.3.1.** Several individuals are simply quoted by name in our texts: some of them are followed by the sign KU, others lack any further information.

**§2.3.3.2. PN KU:** this expression implies a kind of responsibility for the counted sheep; since dab<sub>5</sub> (KU) indicates the act of taking over, we can suppose that state-held sheep are meant. As seen in §2.1.2-3, in our texts there is no mention of shepherd assistants (gab<sub>2</sub>-us<sub>2</sub>), thus we can wonder whether this formula can refer to them. Indeed, MVN 2, 42 (see §2.1.1.7) clearly ascribes plots to shepherd assistants as grazing areas under the supervision of a herdsman. In some cases (Text 5 (CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230), obv. I 12; Text 8 (MVN 5, 203), obv. I 7; and likely 15 (TCTI 2, 4178) obv. I 1'; Text 26 (MVN 6, 544), obv. I 8), it apparently refers to the herdsman quoted with his title some lines before. In addition, since in the expenditure section of the accounts of herdsmen we can find the expression *n* udu PN i<sub>3</sub>-dab<sub>5</sub> (*n* sheep PN took over), a connection between these individuals and the individuals followed by KU in our texts can also be thought of.<sup>82</sup> In addition, in some specific cases KU can be interpreted as an abbreviation for <dumu>-dab<sub>5</sub>-<ba>, (see §1.3.2).

**§2.3.3.3. PN:** PNs may hypothetically refer to anyone, whether they were individuals involved in herding in low-ranking roles or beneficiaries or tenants of the pasture plots, or even individuals involved in the management of particular economic units. The choice to omit such information about their title or role remains unclear, whether it was taken

<sup>80</sup> In the definition of consistent occurrence I excluded Text 23 (MVN 6, 545) (AS 1/-), quoting 2 farmers (**engar**), and Text 24 (MVN 6, 145) (AS 9/-), quoting 2 royal soldiers (**aga<sub>3</sub>-us<sub>2</sub> lugal**). A consistent occurrence of royal soldiers can be further found in MVN 6, 297 (Š 30/-), showing in part a structure similar to that of the texts of this group (*n* udu *n* maš<sub>2</sub> / PN) and listing at least 10 royal soldiers. The reverse of this tablet is mostly unreadable so that it is impossible to ascertain whether a field account (nig<sub>2</sub>-ka<sub>9</sub> aka a-ša<sub>3</sub> FN) is meant. However, the main reason for having decided to exclude MVN 6, 297 from this group is that the information reported in the first column of the left edge (2 PNs [šub<sub>a</sub>]-ti-eš<sub>2</sub>) would suggest that the purpose of the text was a different one.

<sup>81</sup> That in such a text the occurrence of professional titles associated with fields could concern the allotment of subsistence plots is clearly suggested by the indication “allotment plots in Ġirsu for the personnel of the ‘house of the fattener(s)’” (rev. 4-5: šuku du<sub>3</sub>-du<sub>3</sub>-a gir<sub>2</sub>-su-ki / giri<sub>3</sub>-se<sub>3</sub>-ga e<sub>2</sub> kurušda), referring at least to the “field of fattener(s) in front of the field ba-x-tur” mentioned in the preceding line (rev. 2: a-ša<sub>3</sub> kurušda gaba a-ša<sub>3</sub> ba-x-tur).

<sup>82</sup> See e.g. MVN 9, 34 (AS 1/-), an account of the herdsman Lu-melam of Gu'aba, where in the expenditure section a certain number of sheep is taken over by an unnamed fattener (obv. 8: kurušda i<sub>3</sub>-dab<sub>5</sub>) and another one by an untitled individual (obv. 9: ur-gu-la i<sub>3</sub>-dab<sub>5</sub>).

for granted in the text bearing the primary information or considered irrelevant for the tracking of the sheep. However in all these cases (if not in very specific ones), it is impossible to carry out a reliable prosopographical analysis. The occurrence of tenants of institutional plots in our texts is suggested by the plots classified as “yielding rent” in *MVN 2, 42*, which fall under the supervision of a herdsman. In this text, indeed, plots classified as “fields yielding rent” (aša<sub>5</sub> ku<sub>5</sub>-ra<sub>2</sub> ba-ab-us<sub>2</sub>) and “fields not yielding rent” (aša<sub>5</sub> ku<sub>5</sub>-ra<sub>2</sub> nu-us<sub>2</sub>) can occur under the supervision of a herdsman, but are not included in the surfaces directly allocated to him or to a shepherd assistant. Therefore, one may wonder whether such plots were used as well as grazing areas and, in this case, if at least someone of the several untitled individuals occurring in our texts in connection with sheep can be considered as a tenant.

**§2.3.3.4.** Finally, an individual simply quoted by name in a text can be followed by the sign KU in another text. This is the case of Ur-anki in Text 10 (*Ontario 2, 435*) (obv. III 6) and Text 13 (*TCTI 1, 850*) (rev. I 6), without necessarily implying a shift in the administrative role played by him.

## §2.4. Roles of the listed individuals

**§2.4.1.** Individuals can be simply listed or be framed in a scheme that can suggest an active involvement in herding. After a section concerning the sheep entrusted to a herdsman a section can follow that includes the sheep assigned to individuals in the plot under the charge of that very herdsman. Such sections ends, indeed, with the formula **ki PN na-gada** <\*ak-a>, “(in) the plot (under charge of) PN, the herdsman”.<sup>83</sup>

**§2.4.2.** This function is clarified by the expression **ugula PN <na-gada>** in *MVN 2, 42*, the text recording the allocation of plots as grazing areas to different herdsman, and may indeed refer to a physical plot under the supervision of a herdsman, where sheep entrusted or pertaining to other individuals, skilled (shepherd assistants) and unskilled ones (unnamed), have grazed.

**§2.4.3.** At this point, when **PN KU** or **PN** is connected to **ki PN na-gada**, we can wonder whether individuals tied to the plots allocated as grazing areas under the supervision of a herdsman are meant. The difference between **PN KU** and **PN** would consist of an individual having an administrative responsibility for

state-held herds and an individual somehow tied to the plots or the sheep which have grazed there (see §2.3.3).

**§2.4.4.** Responsibility for the plots is also assigned to: a chief livestock administrator (šuš<sub>3</sub>) in Text 1 (*MVN 2, 78*) (obv. II, 7-rev, I, 1); a fattener (kurušda) in Text 21 (*MVN 6, 276*) (obv. I, 6-8); cattle herdsman (unu<sub>3</sub>) in Text 24 (*MVN 6, 145*) (rev. 7-11 and likely rev. 4-6); purposely hired personnel (dumu-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba) in Text 23 (*MVN 6, 545*) (obv. I, 1-rev. II, 1) and Text 25 (*MVN 5, 176*) (obv. 1-3; rev. 8-11); maybe an individual responsible for state-held sheep (KU) in Text 24 (*MVN 6, 145*) (obv. 9-12); untitled individuals apparently not quoted elsewhere in Text 25 (*MVN 5, 176*) (obv. 7; rev. 7), and Text 29 (*MVN 6, 546*) (rev. II, 9); an untitled individual to whom a gardener is subordinated in Text 24 (*MVN 6, 145*) (rev. 5). A singular case can then be found in Text 29 (*MVN 6, 546*), where (rev. II, 12-14) part of the sheep of the high priestess in Pasir is entrusted to a state-dependent worker (eren<sub>2</sub>) in a plot under the responsibility of the priestess herself (ki ereš-dingir). This could imply that the name of the herdsman (or skilled professional) who took charge of the grazing area was not transmitted or considered irrelevant to the compilers of the text.

**§2.4.5.** Summing up, individuals can occur without any indication of their actual role in herding (**PN**), with a certain degree of responsibility for state-held sheep (**PN KU**), or for the grazing plot (**ki PN**), whereas the individuals listed according to this scheme could have had a subordinate role to the individual responsible for the grazing plot. When this scheme does not involve skilled personnel or purposely hired workers, one can wonder whether the quoted individuals and professionals had been involved in herding while being subjected to labor duty. This could be the case of the royal soldiers attested in Text 24 (*MVN 6, 145*), who apparently occur in a subordinate role to an untitled individual (obv. 1-5). By interpreting them as actively employed in herding, we should consider that they were contracted for works in the institutional economy<sup>84</sup> or that royal data have been (or had to be; see §3.3) transmitted to an institutional office (§1.2). In this text, also professionals tied to Nanna (a cook, a garden administrator and a cattle herdsman) occur in a subordinate role to a cattle herdsman of Nanna, thus we can infer an unordinary involvement in sheep

<sup>83</sup> Note, however, that in some cases the section referring to a plot under the charge of a herdsman concerns the number of sheep dead and gathered on field (see §1.3.6).

<sup>84</sup> On this topic, see Steinkeller 2013: 381-383.

herding as fulfillment of their labor duties.

## §2.5. Supposed order of the listed individuals

§2.5.1. As discussed in §1.1, our texts summarize the information deriving from different documents and this situation may have affected the order in which the information is reported in each tablet. In those cases where the information derives from two tablets, one can infer that the sequence was conditioned by this twofold source of information (Text 19 (MVN 7, 583); Text 21 (MVN 6, 276); Text 23 (MVN 6, 545)), as well as in the texts concerning the pasture areas of two different fields (Text 2 (Amherst 20); Text 26 (MVN 6, 544)).

§2.5.2. Regardless of these cases, wherever the condition of the tablets allows for evaluation, it seems that the scribes basically started by listing the individuals that were assigned the largest number of sheep, although they do not continue by following a linear, decreasing, order.<sup>85</sup> In addition, each category of workers or professionals can be introduced by the individual responsible or connected to the largest number of animals. In any case, one may speak about trends, rather than proper rules, so that considerations on the alleged listing criteria are discussed in the sections following each text. Below, just some considerations.

§2.5.3. In text 4 (TLB 3, 89), we can note that the largest number of animals (including both sheep and goats) is recorded in the second section. Therefore in that case, the largest number of sheep does not match the largest number of animals assigned to a single individual. In Text 12 (TCTI 1, 802), the text begins by listing in a decreasing order the sheep tied to the workshop, then those entrusted to a *dumudaba*, and only then does it record the largest number of sheep assigned to a single individual. Text 17 (TCTI 1, 771), instead, completely disregards a sequence based on the number of animals.

§2.5.4. In any case, texts reporting partial numbers or incomplete drafts (see §3.3) suggest that the size

of the flocks was somehow secondary to the list of individuals allowed to profit from the pasture area of a given field.

§2.5.5. A sort of ratio can also be found in the affiliation of the listed individuals. Indeed it seems that, where present, institutional herdsmen, shepherds tied to institutional sheep-pens, or additional personnel were recorded first, followed then by royal personnel, specific professionals or untitled individuals. Also in this case, however, we do not find a fixed rule, and indeed Text 18 (TCTI 2, 4177) starts by recording the animals assigned to builders (on them, see above §2.3.2). Texts concerning the sheep of the high priestess of BaU start by listing her flocks, followed then by those assigned to individuals tied to that very household and then to that of the grand vizier.

## §3. Animals

§3.0.1. Animals counted in this group of texts are sheep (**udu**) and goats (**maš<sub>2</sub>**) without any information on age, gender and quality. Sheep could be however fat-tailed (**udu gukkal**) or mountain sheep (**udu kur**,<sup>86</sup> or implicitly, through the title **na-gada kur** in Text 22 (MVN 6, 415), rev. 4-5). Thus it can be assumed that, when not further specified, local sheep are meant (**udu gi**). Further characterizations of sheep could be found in Text 24 (MVN 6, 145) (obv. 9:BU.KU) and in the shepherd's title (**gab<sub>2</sub>-KU**) in Text 20 (MVN 6, 140) (obv. 1).

§3.0.2. Finally, in one case, text 4 (TLB 3, 89) (obv. I 3), a lamb (**sila<sub>4</sub>**) is mentioned, which can however be interpreted as a mistake for **udu**.

### §3.1 Herds

§3.1.1. Herds under the charge of herdsmen can be made up of sheep (local or fat-tailed ones), goats or both.<sup>87</sup>

§3.1.2. The number of animals assigned to each herdsman varies widely<sup>88</sup> and this could reflect the difference in the size of the plots assigned to each of them and the consequent number of individu-

<sup>85</sup> This may reflect the order in which the information was reported in the texts bearing the primary information or be a conscious arrangement operated by the compilers of our texts (§1.3). Note that 'multiple sheep accounts' do not arrange the information according to the size of the herds; see e.g. TCTI 1, 632 (§§ 7/-).

<sup>86</sup> Mountain/foreign sheep can be understood as an alternative designation for 'fat-tailed sheep', both contrasting to the category of 'local sheep' (**udu gi**); on this topic, see Heimpel 1993: 137-138 and Steinkeller 1995: 54. The inconsistent use of both designations in our texts likely depended on the way the sheep have been classified in the documents bearing the primary information.

<sup>87</sup> According to Stępień (1996: 54), the main categories which the shepherds' titles reflect possibly refer to the breed which predominated in a herd.

<sup>88</sup> See Adams 2006: 151.



als employed under their charge, a kind of information that our texts do not report, but which can be found in other administrative documents of the province.

**§3.1.3.** For example, [PPAC 5, 2](#) (§ 48/ix), the wool account of shepherd assistants of fat-tailed sheep of Gu'aba, counts 93 individuals unevenly grouped under the supervision of 8 different herdsman: the herdsman Ur-BaU heads a group of **8 assistants** (obv. I, 1-10), while the herdsman Irduga a group of **35 assistants** (obv. I, 11-rev. I, 6), the herdsman Ur-Ĥendursaĝ a group of **4 assistants** (rev. II, 8-12), the herdsman Lugal-ezem only **1 assistant** (rev. II, 13-14). One can compare an account of the sheep managed by Lugal-ezem in that very year in Gu'aba, recorded in [MTBM 289](#) (§ 48/-), where only 18 sheep 'present' (gub-ba) are counted with the 2259 sheep assigned to 6 shepherd assistants under the charge of Irduga two years later in [HSS 4, 37](#) (AS 2/-). Five of the shepherd assistants attested in [HSS 4, 37](#) (Lugal-KAgena, Lugal-ušime, Ur-Suen, Dada and Lu-Dumuzi) also occur in the group headed by Irduga in [PPAC 5, 2](#).

**§3.1.4.** In addition, [CT 10, pl. 16-17, BM 12921](#) (AS 4/iv), the barley account concerning "shepherd assistants of fat-tailed sheep" (see §2.1.2.1), indicates that there were 111 shepherd assistants of fat-tailed sheep active at the same time in the Gu'aba district under the supervision of 15 different herdsman. Here, the herdsman Ur-BaU heads a group of **12 assistants** (obv. I, 1-15), among whom it is possible to recognize some assistants attested four years earlier under his supervision in [PPAC 5, 2](#) (Ezi, Ur-zikuma, Ur-Suen, Lu-Narua, Lu-Ninšubur, and probably Lu-

kigula), while a group of **30 assistants** is headed by the herdsman Lugal-dalla<sup>89</sup> and a group of **25** by Abba-kala, both absent in [PPAC 5, 2](#).

**§3.1.5.** In addition, [MVN 2, 42](#) clearly shows that the pasture areas assigned to herdsman may vary as far as both size and administrative features are concerned. In this text, indeed, we can note herdsman responsible for plots assigned to themselves, while other herdsman occur as responsible for plots assigned to themselves and to assistants under their supervision, or still other herdsman responsible for plots assigned to themselves, to assistants under their supervision and additional plots classified according to the rent capacity, or even herdsman responsible for the plots assigned to themselves and those classified according to the rent capacity. As far as the dimension of the plots is concerned, they vary from **186 iku** (rev. VI, 1': [šunigin 1] na-gada 9.2.0 iku), 669,600 m<sup>2</sup> (in plots yielding rents) to **5 iku** (0.0.5) 18,000 m<sup>2</sup>, (obv. V, 4'-5'). Such an inconsistency is also reflected in their benefit and consequent duties. *Priests and Officials* 101 App. 4a-b (-/-), recording an account of ziKA flour, indicates the presence of about 100 herdsman<sup>90</sup> of local sheep and goats in Gu'aba and in the Inanna temple (rev. II, 8-14). The flour amounts assigned to them vary<sup>91</sup> from **360 liters** (rev. II, 8: 1.1.0 <1?> na-gada) to **60 liters** (rev. II, 11-13: 6 na-gada 0.1.0-ta / 90 na-gada 0.1.0-ta).<sup>92</sup>

**§3.1.6.** Having said that, trying to sort out an average of the animals assigned to each herdsman in our texts can be pointless, since there were considerable differences depending on the case; differences that surely affected the actual fulfillment of their job and

<sup>89</sup> Lugal-dalla is not mentioned in [PPAC 5, 2](#) although a sheep account taken in Gu'aba subscribed by him ([PPAC 5, 634](#)) attests his activity already in § 48. Conversely, there is no mention of Irduga in [CT 10, pl. 16-17, BM 12921](#), although he is probably still attested in AS 5, as [UNT 20](#), a wool account of Gu'aba, shows (rev. III, 7). The possibility he was a namesake in this case still remains.

<sup>90</sup> They are all unnamed except for a certain Ur-egaledenka (rev. II, 13). There is no mention of assistants or chief livestock administrators in this text. If the absence of the assistants can be assigned to their too low-ranking level for additional rewards, the absence of chief livestock administrators is unexpected.

<sup>91</sup> As illustrated by Such-Gutiérrez (2003: 401) this text records the quantities of wheat that each individual receiving subsistence plots had to pay for each bur<sub>3</sub> of land they were entitled to. In this light, this text offers an interesting comparison with the garden management: the section (rev. II, 25-28) concerning garden experts (um-mi-a <sup>geš</sup>kiri<sub>6</sub>) and garden administrators (santana) shows that to each garden expert (21) 60 liters are assigned, while 120 liters to the garden administrators (2). From this, we can assume that garden experts were rewarded with plots of similar size. Given their role of mid-level managers, garden experts are administratively comparable to herdsman, but evidently the 'homologation' of their subsistence plots corresponded to more stable technical criteria in the size and impact of their work responsibilities (Greco 2015: 69-76).

<sup>92</sup> The differentiation of the entries likely follows that of shepherd categories (of local sheep or goats).

<sup>93</sup> This set of wide variations in the number of entrusted animals, subordinate assistants, and size of the assigned plots suggest that the role of the herdsman was not necessarily strictly tied to technical criteria aimed at the optimization of the actual herding or based on a realistic work capacity. Their role (and consequently their social position) could rather underlie administrative factors reasonably connected to their function as administrative interlocutors.

their role in society.<sup>93</sup>

**§3.1.7.** An example of these variations can be found in the first column of Text 1 (MVN 2, 78), where we can notice the difference between the sheep managed by the herdsmen **Lu-Urub** (930 sheep and 240 goats present; 13 expended and 2 recorded after the plucking), **Lu-Utu** (21 sheep present), and **Ur-mes** (15 sheep present). The average deduced from this sample, that is 428 animals per herdsman, perfectly agrees with the average estimated in Umma, which is about 400 sheep per shepherd, with a size of the flocks ranging from 38 to 1,287.<sup>94</sup>

**§3.1.8.** The same considerations apply to sheep and goats assigned to other professionals and untitled individuals, whose connection to sheep or plots cannot even be considered univocal, nor the presence of ‘hidden shepherds’ could be sufficiently detected (see §2.3-2.4).

### **§3.2. Expended animals, animal shortfalls, old accounts, and ‘sheep after sheep’**

**§3.2.1.** The state-held sheep and goats managed by herdsmen have already been classified according to the parameters of availability of the central administration at the moment our texts were drawn up. The office which conceived our texts was not interested in the final destination of the animals and the **zi-ga** section occurring in them probably simply refer to the herdsmen’s accounts, highlighting the way the compilers tracked the total number of sheep and goats which have grazed in a given field (see §1.2.2; §2.1.1.3). In this context, however, a mention of the ‘weapon of Ningēšzida’ is found in connection to goats classified as ‘present’ in the section concerning the goats managed by the herdsman KITUŠLU, since he was also responsible for their fattening (see notes to Text 10 (Ontario 2, 435), obv. I, 1-II-4; §5.1.10.2).

**§3.2.2.** In addition, some other texts (Text 2 (Amherst 20); Text 12 (TCTI 1, 802); Text 20 (MVN 6, 140); Text 27 (TCTI 2, 2702)) attest sheep assigned to

untitled individuals and associated with workshops (**ša<sub>3</sub> geš-kin-ti**, lit. “in the workshop”). As places where skins and hides were collected,<sup>95</sup> we would have expected animal carcasses in connection with them. Hypothetically, it can be assumed that the sheep described as being in the workshop are those that had grazed in the mentioned fields under the responsibility of a shepherd (regardless of the administrative level), but already deceased and transferred to the workshop at the time of the inventory.<sup>96</sup> This information could indeed contrast or complete that referring to dead sheep gathered on the field (bi<sub>2</sub>-de<sub>5</sub>; see §1.3). However, only in one case can the individual tied to the workshop in our texts be identified with a herdsman, that is in Text 20 (MVN 6, 140), where the name of Ba’a can refer to a herdsman of the high priestess of BaU (§2.1.1.6), who was also responsible for the plot where the sheep have grazed.

**§3.2.3.** The reason why our texts report the shortfalls (**la<sub>2</sub>-ia<sub>3</sub>**) is that shortfalls did not depend on the number of sheep present and those expended, but they concern the sheep which the central administration eventually claimed from herdsmen, likely as part of their share of the growth of the herds.<sup>97</sup> Thus they can be counted as physical animals which have grazed in fields.

**§3.2.4.** In economic documents **libir** may refer to the information of an older (previous) account, rather than to the physical age of animals.<sup>98</sup> Were this the case, sections referring to animals recorded as being “old” in our texts (Text 6 (TLB 3, 87); Text 10 (Ontario 2, 435); Text 16 (DAS 274); and probably in Text 29 (MVN 6, 546)) would imply that an ‘old herd’ (checked and counted in a previous account) was enriched with a new acquisition of animals. In Text 10 (Ontario 2, 435), the ‘new acquisition’ concerns the goats that the herdsman KITUŠLU took over for fattening in view of their allocation to the “weapon of Ningēšzida” (obv. I 3-4). In Text 16 (DAS 274), the ‘new acquisition’ concerns someone’s sheep (obv. I 4-5), which the herdsman could have taken over dur-

---

It seems indeed unlikely, that herdsmen responsible for thousands of state-held sheep did actually look after all of them while grazing, but rather they could rely on a high number of subordinate workers.

<sup>94</sup> See Adams 2006: 151, with literature. For an overview on the size of flocks in Ġirsu and elsewhere in Babylonia according to a chronological order, see Snell 1986: 185 fn. 25.

<sup>95</sup> See Tsouparopoulou 2013: 158.

<sup>96</sup> Adams (2006: 152) notes how unlikely it seems that entire carcasses or even hides would always need to be brought over considerable distances in order to be present for inspection. In this context, we can imagine that the information on these animals (or carcasses) came directly from the place where they have been destined.

<sup>97</sup> Snell (1986: 139).

<sup>98</sup> See de Maaijer-Jagersma 1997-98: 287.

ing his service.<sup>99</sup> Notwithstanding the lack of hints about possible ‘new acquisitions’, this consideration also applies to Text 6 (TLB 3, 87) and Text 29 (MVN 6, 546).

**§3.2.5.** Lastly, among the parameters of availability of the animals, in Text 1 (MVN 2, 78) and Text 29 (MVN 6, 546), we find the expression (*n* udu/maš<sub>2</sub>) egir udu. It seems plausible that such an additional information could have concerned the number of sheep or goats, which - for unknown reasons - have been counted after the plucking, hence a possible reconstruction as udu/maš<sub>2</sub> egir udu <ba-ur<sub>4</sub>>.<sup>100</sup> Counting and plucking were indeed contextual to the cyclic control of herds, after which they return to the shepherds’ custody.<sup>101</sup>

### §3.3. Partial number of animals counted and incomplete drafts

**§3.3.1.** Some texts of the group apparently record only a partial number of the animals, which probably grazed in a given field. This is particularly evident in texts using a peculiar system for counting a few units of sheep and goats, where each AŠ corresponds to a sheep and each DIŠ to a goat.<sup>102</sup> Texts of our group reporting such a system are: Text 20 (MVN 6, 140); Text 22 (MVN 6, 415); Text 24 (MVN 6, 145); Text 25 (MVN 5, 176). Outside our group of texts, this system is used in CUSAS 16, 104 (ŠS 1/-), a ‘multiple account’ of sheep and goats ‘taken over’ (šunigin 50 udu 3 maš<sub>2</sub> dab<sub>5</sub>-ba) and TÉL 262 (IS 1/-), a text very similar to those of our group, which however reports the total number of sheep taken over (rev. 8-10: a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> ur-geš<sup>5</sup> gigir / udu ba-dab<sub>5</sub> / 12 udu 10 maš<sub>2</sub>). This situation can be reflected in texts that, for this reason, cannot be considered as proper pasture texts (see §1.1). This is the case, for example, of PPAC 5, 601 (AS 5/-), listing fields of the whole province, to which a few units of sheep and goats are assigned (*n* udu FN), without mention of the responsible shepherds or information on the size of the involved plots. The total section of this text (rev. III, 5-6) simply reports the total number of sheep and

goats, while the specification giri<sub>3</sub> šid-da “counted *en route*” (obv. 3) seems to concern only part of the sheep assigned to the first listed field.

**§3.3.2.** In some cases, the small number of sheep can be understood as referring to a proportional fee to be paid (za<sub>3</sub>-1(u) or 5(diš)-bi ba-dab<sub>5</sub>) in case of loss (udu zaḥ<sub>3</sub>) of state-held animals while grazing in a given field, as for example in ITT 4, 7085 (Š 46/-), where a small number of sheep is assigned to different individuals (one of them being a herdsman) for this very purpose. However, a connection between the small number of sheep consistently assigned to the plots in our texts and the payment of the fee at loss of animals is unlikely, since Text 22 (MVN 6, 415) refers to an expected number of sheep (corpses) gathered on field (obv. 9: <...> <udu> bi<sub>2</sub>-de<sub>5</sub> didli), a kind of information incompatible with disappeared animals.

**§3.3.3.** In this regard, we can note that texts reporting what we can understand as partial numbers also present missing information on the numbers of animals assigned to each listed individuals, and Text 27 (TCTI 2, 2702) even shows only missing information. This would imply that the office which produced our documents already knew who was entitled to let sheep graze in the plots allocated as pasture areas, but were still missing the information about the number of sheep involved, leaving the document incomplete. The presence of the peculiar notation for counting sheep would hypothetically suggest that the primary information was obtained from texts that used it, hence the information about the sheep assigned to herdsmen would not have derived from their own accounts, but rather from texts such as CUSAS 16, 104 or TÉL 262, both specifying sheep ‘taken over’. Both texts also present a total section, which justified the employment of that peculiar counting system. In addition, in CUSAS 16, 104 the mention of a field (or more than one) could be lost in the breaks of the tablet, while TÉL 262 refers to sheep taken over in the field of the village of Ur-Igalim, hence the 22 animals counted there in IS 1

<sup>99</sup> See the case presented by CT 10, pl. 42, BM 21456 (AS 1/-), showing a herdsman taking charge of the sheep of someone. At the end of the account concerning the sheep managed by the herdsman Lamlama, the text specifies that Lamlama took charge of (i<sub>3</sub>-dab<sub>5</sub>) the sheep of a certain Ur-Lamma son of Ur-Suen, whose professional title is not specified, but who was apparently not involved in herding (see MVN 4, 133, where Ur-Lamma son of Ur-Suen is attested as conveyor of silver for the repayment of unspecified items). How the sheep were tied to Ur-Lamma is unclear to me.

<sup>100</sup> This kind of information may have been copied as well by the text reporting the primary information and indeed it can be found in a few documents from Ur (UET 3, 84 [...] rev. II' 2'; UET 3, 85 (ŠS 2/iv) rev. II' 4'; UET 9, 1094 [...] obv. II' 1) and Umma (AnOr 1, 179 (ŠS 3/vii) obv. 3; Nisaba 32, 28 (-/-) obv. 2; SA 128 (X/iii/23) obv. 3).

<sup>101</sup> See Stępień 1996: 91.

<sup>102</sup> See Greco 2020.

(TÉL 262) can be compared with the 2108+ animals counted there in IS 3 (Text 28 (TÉL 250)) and the 2033+ animals counted there in ŠS 8 (Text 8 (MVN 5, 203)).

**§3.3.4.** It is unclear to me, whether one could imagine these ‘partial texts’ as being complementary to the main accounts recording a presumably complete number of animals (although no element in their colophons would suggest this), or if they actually reflect a minor presence of sheep in a given field in a given year (although the entries with missing information would be meaningless).

#### **§3.4. Who all the counted animals belonged to**

**§3.4.1.** We can suppose that sheep and goats entrusted to institutional herdsmen belonged to the state, like those entrusted to individuals as fulfillment of their labor duties, while those entrusted to royal herdsmen concerned the herds the royal family held in the Ĝirsu province, like probably those entrusted to individuals tied to the royal sector as fulfillment of their labor duties. The sheep of the high priestess of BaU may have been private property disguised as institutional property, as well as those of the grand vizier. Individuals and professionals, who can hypothetically be understood as beneficiaries of plots, may have been the owners of sheep assigned to them. This would explain why our texts can disregard the shepherds whom they were entrusted to, as they would not be paid by the central administration. The right to use rented fields for grazing was included in the payment of the irrigation tax,<sup>103</sup> thus untitled individuals without administrative relevance, who can hypothetically be understood as tenants, were very likely the owners of the sheep assigned to them. Lastly, a case of private ownership can be found in Text 29 (MVN 6, 546) (rev. I, 12), which specifies that the sheep assigned to a certain Ur-BaU and entrusted to the herdsman Lugal-Kušig have been bestowed (a-ru-a) by Ur-BaU, entering therefore into state-held herds.

#### **§4. Location of the fields within the province**

**§4.1.** Agricultural lands (and related pasture areas) stretched over the three main districts of the province, that is Ĝirsu, Gu-Iniĝšedu and Gu’aba.

However, only 24 out of 29 tablets preserve data on the location the accounts refer to. Among them, fields located in Ĝirsu are: a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> <sup>d</sup>inanna (Text 10 (Ontario 2, 435) <e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub>>; Text 13 (TCTI 1, 850)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> gir-nun (Text 24 (MVN 6, 145)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> ur-sag-pa-e<sub>3</sub> (Text 19 (MVN 7, 583); Text 23 (MVN 6, 545)).

**§4.2.** Fields located in Gu-Iniĝšedu are: a-ša<sub>3</sub> da-lugal (Text 26 (MVN 6, 544)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> lagaš (Text 27 (TCTI 2, 2702)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> <sup>d</sup>lugal-a<sub>2</sub>-zi-da (Text 2 (Amherst 20)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> ur-<sup>d</sup>ig-alim (Text 2 (Amherst 20)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-anše (Text 26 (MVN 6, 544)). Probably also a-ša<sub>3</sub> du-a-bi (Text 14 (TCTI 2, 4176)) was located in Gu-Iniĝšedu, while Text 18 (TCTI 2, 4177) hints to a location in that district.

**§4.3.** Fields located in Gu’aba are: a-ša<sub>3</sub> du<sub>6</sub>-eš<sub>3</sub> (Text 11 (TCTI 1, 743)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> du<sub>6</sub>-lugal-u<sub>3</sub>-a (Text 7 (HLC 1, 37)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> ur-<sup>geš</sup>gigir (Text 8 (MVN 5, 203); Text 28 (TÉL 250)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> [...] (Text 9 (MVN 5, 204)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> ħu-rim<sub>3</sub><sup>ki</sup> (Text 15 (TCTI 2, 4178)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> i-šar-ra (Text 5 (CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> kun-zi-da gu<sub>2</sub>-ab-ba<sup>ki</sup> (Text 21 (MVN 6, 276)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> <sup>d</sup>nin-a<sub>2</sub>-zi-da (Text 6 (TLB 3, 87)). The a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> lu<sub>2</sub>-šara (Text 20 (MVN 6, 140)) as well was probably located in Gu’aba; finally both Text 16 and 29 hint to a location in Gu’aba.

**§4.4. Unclear location:** a-ša<sub>3</sub> bad<sub>3</sub>-[...] (Text 17 (TCTI 1, 771)); a-ša<sub>3</sub><sup>2</sup> bad<sub>3</sub>-da-ri<sub>2</sub> u<sub>3</sub> ar-la-AN (Text 25 (MVN 5, 176)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> bara<sub>2</sub><sup>2</sup>-si-ga gu<sub>2</sub> i<sub>7</sub> (text 3 (TLB 3, 88)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> ba-zi (Text 12 (TCTI 1, 802)); aša<sub>5</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> ša<sub>3</sub>-ku<sub>3</sub>-ge (Text 1 (MVN 2, 78)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> gibil (Text 22 (MVN 6, 415)); a-ša<sub>3</sub> <sup>d</sup>nin-e<sub>2</sub>-gal (text 4 (TLB 3, 89)).

**§4.5.** Finally, at least 8 fields are named after a village (e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub>)<sup>104</sup> or a small rural settlement (ur-sag-pa-e<sub>3</sub>). In two cases this information can be inferred by the readable signs (Text 9 (MVN 5, 204); Text 25 (MVN 5, 176)), while in one case by the information within the text (Text 29).<sup>105</sup> In addition, in two cases (Text 17 (TCTI 1, 771); Text 25 (MVN 5, 176)) the field names are likely contextual descriptions referring to the name of the officials who were responsible for the employed workers.

<sup>103</sup> See Steinkeller 1981: 139. Steinkeller notes that this tax was paid in animals before Ur-III times.

<sup>104</sup> Duabi and Du’eš were also names of villages; see e.g. MVN 12, 153, (Š 46/-) obv, 4 and rev. 1. This text also quotes the village of Šakuge, although nothing suggests that there was an actual contiguity.

<sup>105</sup> Very likely, this text concerns the pasture areas of more than one field.

## §5.0 Texts

### §5.1 Lenticular Tablets

#### §5.1.1. Text 1: MVN 2, 78 (Š 32/-)

WMAH 78; Sauren 1969

MVN 2, 78; Sauren 1974

CUSAS 17, 273; Civil 2011

Photo/hand copy

#### Obverse

##### I

1. 1(geš'u) 6(geš<sub>2</sub>) 3(u) 3(diš) udu / kur 993 mountain sheep
2. 4(geš<sub>2</sub>) maš<sub>2</sub> 240 goats
3. udu gub-ba-am<sub>3</sub> sheep 'present'
4. 1(u) 3(diš) udu zi-ga 13 sheep 'expended'
5. 2 udu egir udu<sup>1</sup>(KU) <ba-ur<sub>4</sub>> 2 sheep (counted) after sheep (have been plucked)
6. lu<sub>2</sub>-urub<sub>x</sub>(URU×KAR<sub>2</sub>)<sup>ki</sup> na-gada Lu-Urub, the herdsman
7. 2(u) 1(diš) udu kur 21 mountain sheep
8. udu gub-ba-am<sub>3</sub> sheep 'present'
9. lu<sub>2</sub>-<sup>d</sup>utu na-gada Lu-Utu, the herdsman
10. 1(u) 5(diš) udu kur 15 mountain sheep
11. udu gub-ba-am<sub>3</sub> sheep 'present'

##### II

1. ur-mes na-gada Ur-mes, the herdsman
2. 3(geš<sub>2</sub>) 1(u) 4(diš) udu 3(diš) maš<sub>2</sub> 194 sheep 3 goats
3. urdu<sub>2</sub>-da-ni / la<sub>2</sub>-<NI> 6(diš) <udu> na-gada ereš-dingir Urdudani, the herdsman of the high-priestess, (whom) a shortfall of six sheep (is counted)
4. 1(u) <udu> lu<sub>2</sub>-<sup>d</sup>na-ru<sub>2</sub>-a / eren<sub>2</sub> 10 (sheep), Lu-Narua, the state dependent,
5. ki urdu<sub>2</sub>-da-ni (in) the plot (under charge of) Urdu-dani
6. 1(geš<sub>2</sub>) la<sub>2</sub> 3(diš) udu 1(u) 5(diš) maš<sub>2</sub> 57 sheep 15 goats
7. udu šeš-kal-la / šuš<sub>3</sub> sheep of Šeškala, the chief livestock administrator
8. 1(u) <udu> bi<sub>2</sub>-de<sub>5</sub> didli eren<sub>2</sub> 10 (sheep) gathered there (while entrusted to) various<sup>106</sup> state dependents

#### Reverse

##### I

1. ki šeš-kal-/la (in) the plot (under charge of) Šeš-kala  
*blank space*

##### II

*blank space*

*in blank space:* 2(diš) im-bi

1. [nig<sub>2</sub>]-ka<sub>9</sub> aka the relevant tablets are 2  
accomplished account
2. aša<sub>5</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> ša<sub>3</sub>-ku<sub>3</sub>-ge field of the village of Šakuge
3. mu si-mu-ru-um<sup>ki</sup> / a-ra<sub>2</sub> 3(diš)-kam-aš / year: (when) Simurum was destroyed for the 3rd time  
ba-ḫul

#### §5.1.1.1. General considerations

§5.1.1.1.1 The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 3 institutional herdsmen, 1 herdsman of a no further specified high priestess, 1

state dependent employed in the plot under authority of the herdsman of the high priestess, 1 chief livestock administrator, who is also responsible for the plot where a number of sheep that had died while

<sup>106</sup> It seems plausible that didli refers to eren<sub>2</sub>, although it precedes that substantive.

being entrusted to various unnamed state dependent workers is counted. The text begins by recording the largest number of sheep assigned to a single person, but it does not continue in a linear, decreasing, order. For 2 sheep of the herdsman Lu-Urub, the text specifies that they have been counted after the plucking (see § 3.2.5). In addition, the text specifies that the reported information was obtained from 2 different documents; hypothetically one referring to the sheep of the herdsman and the other one to the sheep of the chief livestock administrator.

§§5.1.1.1.2 The concerned pasture plot was located in the field of the village of Šakuge, whose location within the provincial territory is unclear. This field is attested (obv. II, 7) among those listed in [PPAC 5, 601](#) (AS 5/-), which ascribes it 1 sheep and 3 goats (see § 3.3.1) to be compared with the 1573 animals (1315 sheep and 258 goats) counted here.

#### §5.1.1.2. Prosopographical and further notes

(obv. I, 6) Lu-Urub was the name of different herdsman of the province. One of them is apparently tied to the household of the high priestess (ereš-dingir) of BaU, therefore he might have been a namesake.<sup>107</sup> Both [CT 10, p. 45, BM 21252](#) (§ 47/-) and [Amherst 62](#) (AS 2/-) record sheep accounts of Lu-Urub, respectively in Kinunir and Ġirsu, thus likely referring to different individuals. In [PPAC 5, 615](#) (AS 1/-/3), an account of repaid sheep shortfalls and unplucked sheep (udu la<sub>2</sub>-ia<sub>3</sub> su-ga udu mu<sub>2</sub>) in Lullubu,<sup>108</sup> Lu-Urub is (obv. 3) among the herdsmen repaying a deficit. However, none of these texts mentions fat-tailed or mountain sheep.

(obv. I, 9) Lu-Utu is a common name and may refer to various herdsmen attested in different periods. [RIAA 172](#) records an account of wool concerning Lu-Utu (r. 2: lu<sub>2</sub>-<sup>d</sup>utu ṛna<sup>-</sup>[gada]), but since its year name can refer to § 25/32/44 or IS 3, it is not clear which herdsman is implied. Other attestations of herdsmen named Lu-Utu are from texts dating to AS 5, thus 21 years after Text 1 was drawn up: [TUT 37](#) (AS 5/-), recording a sheep account of Lu-Ninšubur son of NIM and Lu-Utu taken in Ġirsu; the wool accounts of Gu'aba [SAT 1, 381](#) (AS 5/-), rev. I, 13, specif-

ically referring to lamb wool and wool shortfalls (siki sila<sub>4</sub> u<sub>3</sub> siki la<sub>2</sub>-ia<sub>3</sub>), and [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-) obv. I, 5. Finally, [Fs Hilprecht 140 2](#) (IS 2/xi) records an account (nig<sub>2</sub>-ka<sub>9</sub> aka) of a herdsman named Lu-Utu; however, the late date would suggest he was a namesake. Also in this case, however, none of these texts mentions fat-tailed or mountain sheep.

(obv. II, 1) Ur-mes was a common name, consequently it may refer to different herdsmen of the Ġirsu province. In this group of texts, herdsmen named Ur-mes occur in Text 9 ([MVN 5, 204](#)) (§§ 8/-), Text 13 ([TCTI 1, 850](#)) (IS 3/-), Text 15 ([TCTI 2, 4178](#)) (IS 3/-), Text 22 ([MVN 6, 415](#)) (AS 1/-), and Text 26 ([MVN 6, 544](#)) (§§ 1/-). Texts 9, 13, and 26 specifically refer to herdsmen to whom a certain number of goats is assigned, while fat-tailed sheep are assigned to the shepherd Ur-mes in Text 18 ([TCTI 2, 4177](#)), who took care of the sheep of a supervisor of builders, thus also in this case likely a namesake. [CT 10, pl. 16-17, BM 12921](#) (AS 4/iv), see § 2.1.2, attests two herdsmen (Ur-mes son of Utu-ġu in obv. II, 21 and Ur-mes son of Lu-Inanna in rev. II, 1) as responsible for groups of shepherd assistants of fat-tailed sheep in Gu'aba, unclear whether both namesakes of the herdsman attested here in connection to just 15 sheep.

(obv. II, 3-5) To the best of my knowledge, a herdsman named Urdudani occurs only in this text. The sheep under his responsibility are not recorded according to the parameters of availability (see § 1.2; § 2.1.1), yet the shortfall assigned to him could refer to a specific entry of a hypothetical sheep account of this herdsman. In any case, it seems plausible that the information on the sheep entrusted to him was already transmitted in this form (i.e. split) to the compiler of Text 1.<sup>109</sup> Urdudani also occurs (obv. II, 5) as responsible for the plot, where the state dependent Lu-Narua was employed. A possible further attestation of this herdsman could be found 13 years later in [RA 66, 21](#) (§ 45/-), where a certain Urdudani, generically defined as sipa (obv. II, 1), is attested as donor (a-ru-a) of a woman to the temple of Nanše. Text 1 does not specify which high priestess is meant, whether the most attested priestess of BaU or another one.<sup>110</sup>

<sup>107</sup> The herdsman tied to the high priestess of BaU occurs (obv. 12) in [CT 7, pl. 34, BM 18407](#) (§ 46/-), as supplier of goat by-products (wool, ghee, cheese) to the household of the high priestess. He is also attested in [TUT 164-15](#) [...] (obv. III, 2') alongside with Ba'aga, another herdsman connected to the high priestess of BaU (see Text 8 ([MVN 5, 203](#))).

<sup>108</sup> It refers to the settlement located in the provincial territory.

<sup>109</sup> A similar situation can be found for the sheep assigned to Au'u in Text 8 ([MVN 5, 203](#)) obv. I 5-7.

<sup>110</sup> If the attestation of [RA 66, 21](#) refers to him, then we can imagine that the high priestess of Nanše was meant (see [TSU 7](#)).

(obv. II, 7-rev. I, 1) The chief livestock administrator Šeš-kala occurs here in connection with a certain number of sheep and goats, among them, those that had died (and gathered on field) while being entrusted to various and unnamed state dependents in a plot under his charge. Information on his activity can be sought for in [CT 1, pl. 4-5, BM 17744](#) (Š 35/-), a barley account of the governor, which attests him (obv. II, 14-16) as responsible for the barley allocated

as fodder for horses; [ASJ 19, 144 128](#) (-/-), a report of the barley and garments distributed in the palace<sup>111</sup> to state dependents, farmers, ox drivers, and various workers (eren<sub>2</sub> engar ša<sub>3</sub>-gu<sub>4</sub> u<sub>3</sub> lu<sub>2</sub> didli), where Šeš-kala occurs (rev. II, 27-29) as responsible for the barley allocated to shepherd assistants of donkeys and sows (gab<sub>2</sub>-ra anše šagan). In addition, [TLB 3, 50](#) (AS 4/-) records an account of carcasses and hides of fat-tailed sheep subscribed by him.

### §5.1.2. Text 2: [Amherst 20](#) (Š 44//IS 3/-)

Pinches 1908

BMHBA 90-91, 9 2; Everling 1999

Specimina Nova 19, 28 2005

Handcopy

#### Obverse

##### I

- |    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | 5(diš) [maš <sub>2</sub> <sup>?</sup> ] <sup>112</sup>                               | 5 [goats <sup>?</sup> ]                      |
| 2. | 8(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(u) ʾ2(diš)ʿ / udu gukkal                                      | 532 fat-tailed sheep                         |
| 3. | KA-ge-na / sipa  | KAgena, the shepherd                         |
| 4. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(diš) udu gukkal / 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                     | 65 fat-tailed sheep 2 goats                  |
| 5. | ur-mete-na / sipa  | Ur-metena, the shepherd                      |
| 6. | udu lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>&lt;d&gt;</sup> kal-kal/-la šabra                         | sheep of Lu-Kalkala, the chief administrator |
| 7. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(diš) udu  | 65 sheep                                     |
| 8. | udu nig <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> / ša <sub>3</sub> geš-<kin-ti> | sheep of Niġ-BaU in the workshop             |

##### II

- |    |  |                                  |
|----|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. | [...] udu  | [...] sheep                      |
| 2. | 5(geš <sub>2</sub> ) maš <sub>2</sub>  | 300 goats                        |
| 3. | udu na-ba-sa <sub>6</sub> / ša <sub>3</sub> geš-<kin-ti>                                     | sheep of Nabasa in the workshop  |
| 4. | 3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                                 | 178 goats                        |
| 5. | a <sub>2</sub> -lu <sub>5</sub> -mu / na-gada e <sub>2</sub> -maḥ                            | Alumu, the herdsman of the E-maḥ |
| 6. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) udu 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> | 59 sheep 62 goats                |
| 7. | udu ur-mes KU  | sheep 'entrusted' to Ur-mes      |
| 8. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(diš) udu 5(geš <sub>2</sub> ) maš <sub>2</sub>                        | 61 sheep 300 goats               |

#### Reverse

##### I

- |    |  |                                |
|----|--|--------------------------------|
| 1. | udu ab-ba-/ge-na KU  | sheep 'entrusted' to Abba-gena |
| 2. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                               | 62 goats                       |
| 3. | udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>   | sheep 'present'                |
| 4. | na-a-na na-gada  | Na'ana, the herdsman           |
| 5. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 5(diš) udu 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) maš <sub>2</sub> | 75 sheep 120 goats             |
| 6. | udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>   | sheep 'present'                |
| 7. | ur- <sup>d</sup> nanše na-gada   | Ur-Nanše, the herdsman         |
| 8. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                          | 75 goats                       |
| 9. | [udu] gub-ba-[am <sub>3</sub> ]  | sheep 'present'                |

<sup>111</sup> According to Maekawa (1997: 131), this text can be dated to AS 7, when Urdu-Nanna became governor of Ġirsu.

<sup>112</sup> The tentative reconstruction as maš<sub>2</sub> instead of udu here is due to the comparison with the following section, where a number of fat-tailed sheep and few goats are assigned to a shepherd. In any case, nothing suggests that the herds of the two shepherds were similar in composition, nor it is clear why the number of goats would precede (rather than follow) the number of sheep.

10.	ṛku <sub>3</sub> ṛ <sup>d</sup> nanna / na-ṛgada	Ku-Nanna, the herdsman
<b>II</b>		
1.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 6(diš) udu	66 sheep
2.	udu gub-ba	sheep 'present'
3.	<sup>d</sup> nanše-kam na-gada	Nanšekam, the herdsman
<i>blank line</i>		
	<nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka>	(accomplished account)
4.	a-ša <sub>3</sub> ṛ <sup>d</sup> lugal-a <sub>2</sub> -/zi-da	field of Lugal-azida
5.	ṛa-ša <sub>3</sub> ṛ ur-ṛ <sup>d</sup> ig-/alim	field of Ur-Igalim
6.	mu si-mu-ru-um/ <sup>ki</sup> ba-ṛḥul	year: (when) Simurum was destroyed

### §5.1.2.1 General considerations

**§5.1.2.1.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 2 shepherds (regardless of the administrative level) under the authority of a chief administrator, 2 individuals in connection to a workshop, 1 herdsman of the Emaḥ temple, 2 individuals somehow responsible for state-held sheep (KU), and 4 institutional herdsmen. The text apparently<sup>113</sup> begins by recording the section with the largest number of sheep assigned to a single person, but it does not continue in a linear, decreasing, order.

**§5.1.2.1.2.** The reported information concerns the pasture plots of 2 different fields. The field of Ur-Igalim may refer to the field attested elsewhere (AFO 24 pl. 17, Truro 1, Š 36/-; MCS 8 AO 8106, -/-) as “field of Ur-Igalim, the Amorrean” (a-ša<sub>3</sub> ur-ṛ<sup>d</sup>ig-alim mar-tu), likely lying in the western border of the province,<sup>114</sup> while there is no information on the location of the “field of Lugal-azida”. In any case, the area of activity of the herdsmen mentioned in this text would suggest a location in the Gu-Iniḡinšedu district. The total number of animals counted in both fields is 2025+ (923 sheep and 1104 goats). The label ‘accomplished account’ was very likely accidentally omitted.

### §5.1.2.2. Prosopographical and further notes

**(obv. I, 1-6)** This section concerns the sheep managed by the chief administrator Lu-kalkala and entrusted to the shepherds KAgena and Ur-metena for grazing in (one of) the mentioned field(s) (rev. II, 4-

5). With the title of chief administrator Lu-kalkala occurs only in this group of texts (see § 1.3), yet the uncommon name suggests he can be identified with the scribe son of Ur-Lamma, who administrated the “new sheep-pen” (see § 2.1.5).<sup>115</sup> In addition, KAgena can hypothetically be identified with the shepherd of “fat-tailed sheep” (sipa udu gukkal) son of Atu, whom RTC 1, 411 (ŠS 7/-) ascribes (obv. 1) a surface of 72 *iku* (2592 m<sup>2</sup>) defined as ‘shortfall of allotments of shepherds’ (rev. 8: la<sub>2</sub>-ia<sub>3</sub> šuku sipa-ne-ka) in the area of Gu’edena.

**(obv. I, 8-II 3)** Sheep described as being in the workshop are very likely sheep which have grazed in the mentioned fields (rev. II 4-5), but already deceased and transferred to the workshop at the time of the inventory (see § 3.2.2). It is unclear, whether the individuals attested here in connection to the workshop were herdsmen. Nabasa is the name of the herdsman attested in Text 22 (MVN 6, 415) (AS 1/-), which refers to a field of unclear location (Kinunir or Gu’aba); Niḡ-BaU is probably the name of a herdsman of Gu’aba attested in Text 9 (MVN 5, 204) (ŠS 9/-), thus very likely a namesake.

**(obv. II, 5)** To the best of my knowledge, both the title ‘herdsman of the E-maḥ’<sup>116</sup> and a herdsman named a-lumu occur only in this text. Given the similarity of the two signs, a possible interpretation as herdsman of the sukkal-maḥ can however be inferred.

**(rev. I, 2-4)** Na’ana was a goat herdsman of the Kinunir-Niḡin area of the province, as his few attestations suggest.<sup>117</sup> UDT 77 (AS 5/-) records his own goat account in that specific area, while Fs Sigrist 103

<sup>113</sup> The broken line in obv. II. 1 hampers a unequivocal evaluation.

<sup>114</sup> Greco (2015: 193-194).

<sup>115</sup> Note that sheep from this sheep-pen in Text 14 (TCTI 2, 4176) (IS 3/-) have been entrusted to a different herdsman in a different field, thus dating Text 2 to IS 3 would be theoretically possible.

<sup>116</sup> The title shepherd of the E-maḥ (sipa e<sub>2</sub>-maḥ) occurs in the seal of a certain Ur-Bagara attested in 3 documents dating to ŠS 9.

<sup>117</sup> Other attestations of individuals with this name involved in animal transactions may refer to the homonymous fatter of the goddess Nanše (kurušda ṛ<sup>d</sup>nanše) or the cattle herdsman (unu<sub>3</sub>).



10 [...], listing the goats available in the different districts of the province, attests to (obv. IV, 14) Na'ana among the herdsmen of Niĝin.<sup>118</sup> Finally, [MVN 11, 98](#) (-/-), which records the goat carcasses (and relevant skins) available to the provincial governor (Ur-Lamma), attests to Na'ana (obv. 11) as responsible for a number of goats in Kinunir-Niĝin.

(**rev. I, 7**) Ur-Nanše is a widespread name, especially in the Niĝin area of the province, hence it may refer to different herdsmen; a homonymous herdsman occurs in Text 28 ([TÉL 250](#)) (obv. I, 6') in connection to the sheep of the high priestess of BaU. A further namesake was connected to sheep belonging to the royal family.<sup>119</sup> Without any hints about the pertinence of the herds (as in our text), attesta-

tions of a herdsman with this name are in [DAS 268](#) [...] (obv. IV, 5), and [TCTI 1, 905](#) [...] (obv. IV, 12), both 'multiple sheep accounts' involving different herdsmen.

(**rev. I, 10**) Ku-Nanna is the name of a goat herdsman attested in [TCTI 1, 897](#) (IS 3/-) (obv. IV, 14), an account of the provincial governor (Urdu-Nanna), recording the goats available to the palace and gods in Niĝin (ud<sub>5</sub> gub-ba e<sub>2</sub>-gal u<sub>3</sub> dingir-re-ne ša<sub>3</sub> nigin<sup>ki</sup>). If we consider him as the same individual quoted in our text, we should assume that he was active for at least 23 years or that Text 2 should be dated to IS 3.

(**rev. II, 3**) To the best of my knowledge, this is the only attestation of the herdsman Nanšekam.

### §5.1.3. Text 3: [TLB 3, 88](#) (AS 5/IS 4)

Hallo 1963

OrAnt 15, 331; Waetzoldt 1976 (coll.)

Photo/handcopy

#### Obverse

##### I

*blank line*

1.	[...]+ 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	[...] 2+ goats
2.	[udu] lugal-si-gar / dumu-dab <sub>5</sub>	[sheep] of Lugal-siĝar, the <i>dumudaba</i>
3.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(diš) udu 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	62 sheep 5 goats
4.	udu ur- <sup>d</sup> nanše / dub-sar lugal	sheep of Ur-Nanše, the royal scribe
5.	3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	28 sheep 1 goat
6.	[udu ur- <sup>d</sup> ]amma KU	sheep of Ur-Lamma, the ( <i>dumu</i> ) <i>daba</i> (<dumu>-dab <sub>5</sub> <sup>?</sup> )
7.	[...]+1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) 4(diš) udu gukkal	84+ fat-tailed sheep
8.	1(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	15 goats
9.	<sup>d</sup> iškur-an-dul <sub>3</sub> / na-gada lugal	Iškur-andul, the royal herdsman

##### II

*blank line*

1.	1(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) [udu] [...]	9 [sheep]
2.	udu ur-dingir-ra [...]	sheep of Ur-diĝira [...]
3.	2(u) 4(diš) udu 2(u) 1(diš) ṽmaš <sub>2</sub> ṽ	24 sheep 21 goats
4.	udu a <sub>2</sub> -lu <sub>5</sub> -ṽlu <sub>5</sub> ṽ [...] / zi-gum <sub>2</sub>	sheep of Alulu, [...] of the <i>sikkum</i>
5.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) 5(diš) udu	95 sheep
6.	1(u) 4(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	14 goats
7.	udu ur- <sup>d</sup> [...]	sheep of Ur-[...]
8.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) 1(diš) udu	101 sheep
9.	3(u) 6(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	36 goats

#### Reverse

##### I

*ca. 6/7 broken lines*

(...)

<sup>118</sup> All the listed individuals occur without title. In any case, the single sections (made up of: mu-ku<sub>x</sub>/la<sub>2</sub>-ia<sub>3</sub>/diri) assigned to each of them suggest they were herdsmen.

<sup>119</sup> [DAS 51](#) (AS 8/-), obv. III, 15; [TCTI 1, 903](#) [...], obv. IV, 3.

1'. [4(u)]+ [... udu] <sup>120</sup>	40+ [sheep]
2'. udu ṛur <sup>1</sup> -sukkal ṛna <sup>1</sup> -[gada nin <sup>2</sup> ]	sheep of Ur-sukkal, the her[dsman of the queen <sup>2</sup> ]
3'. 3(u) 2 (diš) udu 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	32 sheep 5 goats
4'. udu ṛgub <sup>1</sup> -ba-am <sub>3</sub> <sup>2</sup>	sheep 'present' <sup>2</sup>
5'. 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) [... udu] 3(u) ṛmaš <sub>2</sub> <sup>1</sup>	70+ [sheep] 30 goats
<b>II</b>	
1. 2(u) 3(diš) udu	23 sheep
2. 1(u) 1(diš) [maš <sub>2</sub> ]	11 [goats]
3. udu [...]	sheep [...]
<i>ca. 2 broken lines</i>	
4'. [a]-ša <sub>3</sub> ṛA.KU-si-ga gu <sub>2</sub> <sup>1</sup> / i <sub>7</sub>	field of Bara <sup>2</sup> -siga on the banks of <sup>2</sup> the river
5'. mu en <sup>d</sup> inanna / ba-a-ḥuḡ	year: (when) the en-priest of Inanna was appointed

### §5.1.3.1 General considerations

**§5.1.3.1.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 1 *dumudaba*, 1 royal scribe, 1 individual involved in herding (KU or *dumudaba*), 1 royal herdsman, 2 individuals (possible information on them is lost), 1 individual tied to the *sikkum*.<sup>121</sup> The occurrence of further individuals is surely lost in the several breaks of the tablet, among them, at least 1 herdsman tied to the sheep labelled as being 'present' in the first column of the reverse. The breaks in the tablet hamper the understanding of a possible decreasing order in the arrangement of the sections.

**§5.1.3.1.2.** The interpretation of the first part of this field name is unsure; thus, it is unclear whether it can be connected with the field *bara<sub>2</sub>-si-ga gu<sub>2</sub> i<sub>7</sub>* attested (obv. III, 11) in [PPAC 5, 601](#) (AS 5/-), which ascribes 13 animals to it. In addition, we cannot exclude that a further field name is lost in the broken lines of the last column of the reverse. The total number of animals counted in this text is 708+ (568 sheep and 140 goats).

### §5.1.3.2. Prosopographical and further notes

**(obv. I, 3-4)** The royal scribe Ur-Nanše occurs in this text and in Text 17 ([TCTI 1, 771](#)) [...], rev. II, 1. Documentation offers attestation of at least 2 scribes whose seal is dedicated to Šu-Suen: the son of Namu ([AUCT 3, 454](#) from Puzriš-Dagan) and the son of Ur-ebabbar ([JCS 54, 4 18](#) from Nippur). It seems plausible that both texts of our group refer to the same individual, who was likely beneficiary of a

subsistence plot, without mention of the shepherds or workers responsible for the sheep assigned to him (see § 2.3.1.1-4).

**(obv. I, 6)** In this case, the sign KU could also be interpreted as an abbreviation of *dumudaba*, fully written in obv. I, 2 (see § 1.3.2).

**(obv. I, 9)** The herdsman Iškur-andul is attested in [DAS 51](#) (AS 8/-) (rev. III, 13), a wool account of the sheep belonging to members of the royal family and the sheep-pen of the palace (e<sub>2</sub> udu e<sub>2</sub>-gal), where he is simply defined as *na-gada* (see § 1.3.7) and connected to the wool amounts counted in the palace under the supervision of the chief livestock administrator Ur-Ninazu (rev. III, 21-22). Other attestations of him can be found in: [TCTI 1, 729](#) (AS 7/-), a wool account under the supervision of the chief livestock administrator Ur-Ninazu (obv. II, 3); [TCTI 2, 3517](#) (§S 1/-), which records the sheep of the palace under the supervision of the chief livestock administrator Ur-Ninazu (obv. 8); [TCTI 2, 3409](#) (§S 1/-), his sheep account under the supervision of Ur-Ninazu in ASUHUR; [TCTI 1, 632](#) (§S 7/-) and [TCTI 1, 623](#)<sup>122</sup> (IS 2/-), both sheep accounts under the supervision of Namḥani, involving different herdsmen, among them Iškur-andul (respectively obv. I, 15 and obv. I, 14).

**(obv. II, 4)** Alulu, supervisor ([u<sub>2</sub>gula<sup>2</sup>]) or man ([lu<sub>2</sub><sup>2</sup>]) of the *sikkum*, is apparently not attested elsewhere. It seems plausible that, like the royal scribe occurring in obv. I, 4, he was beneficiary of a subsistence plot of royal concern.

**(rev. I, 2)** Ur-sukkal is the name of one of the herds-

<sup>120</sup> From Waetzoldt's collation.

<sup>121</sup> According to Heimpel (1994: 29), it was a service for the benefits of royal messengers on their travels.

<sup>122</sup> This account is conveyed by a royal messenger (rev. II, 14: ṛgiri<sub>3</sub><sup>2</sup> šu-al-ṛla<sup>1</sup> ṛlu<sub>2</sub><sup>2</sup>-kin-gi<sub>4</sub>-a lugal).

<sup>123</sup> According to Weiershäuser (2008: 105), the wife of Amar-Suen, the only 'nin' during his reign. On her herds in the

men attested in [DAS 51](#) (obv. VI, 5) (see also above obv. I, 9) in connection with the sheep of the queen Abi-Simti<sup>123</sup> under the supervision of the chief livestock administrator SLA-a (rev. I, 7-8). Another attestation of this herdsman could be found in [TCTI 1, 903](#) [...] (obv. V, 14), a ‘multiple sheep account’ involving different herdsman likely tied to royal herds. If he

was the same herdsman, then we have to supposed that his title was originally reported as na-gada nin in this text, in the same way Text 4 ([TLB 3, 89](#)) (rev. II, 2) and Text 5 ([CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230](#)) (rev. II, 9) define as herdsmen of the queen herdsmen attested in connection to the herds of royal women.

#### §5.1.4. Text 4: [TLB 3, 89](#) (ŠS 1/-)

Hallo 1963

OrAnt 15, 331; Waetzoldt 1976 (coll.)

Photo/handcopy

#### Obverse

##### I

*blank line*

- |           |  |   |
|-----------|--|---|
| 1.        | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) 2(diš) udu   | 102 sheep   |
| 2.        | 1(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>   | 11 goats  |
| 3.        | sil <sub>4</sub> ( <i>sic</i> ) <sup>124</sup> nam-maḥ KU  | lamb <sup>2</sup> ‘entrusted’ to Nammaḥ                   |
| 4.        | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) 5(diš) udu 4(u) la <sub>2</sub> / 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                    | 95 sheep 39 goats   |
| 5.        | udu nig <sub>2</sub> -gur <sub>11</sub> dam-gar <sub>3</sub>   | sheep of Niġgur, the merchant                             |
| 6.        | 3(u) udu 4(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>   | 30 sheep 4 goats  |
| 7.        | udu ur- <sup>d</sup> uš-gid <sub>2</sub> -/da dam-gar <sub>3</sub>                                     | sheep of Ur-Ušgida, the merchant                          |
| 8.        | 3(u) udu   | 30 sheep  |
| 9.        | udu ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> / dam-gar <sub>3</sub>  | sheep of Ur-BaU, the merchant                             |
| <b>II</b> |  |   |
| 1.        | [... udu]  | [sheep]   |
| 2.        | 3(u) [maš <sub>2</sub> ]   | 30 [goats]  |
| 3.        | ur- <sup>d</sup> [...]   | Ur-[...]  |
| 4.        | 2(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) [udu]  | 19 [sheep]  |
| 5.        | sipa <sup>r</sup> dam <sup>r</sup> -[gar <sub>3</sub> <sup>?</sup> -e]-/ <sup>r</sup> ne <sup>2r</sup> | (entrusted to) shepherds of the mer[chants <sup>?</sup> ] |
| 6.        | 1(u) 6(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>   | 16 goats  |
| 7.        | en-ša <sub>3</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> - <sup>r</sup> ge-/en <sup>r</sup>                                 | En-šakugen  |
| 8.        | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 4(diš) udu   | 74 sheep  |
| 9.        | udu lu <sub>2</sub> -gu-/la mar-tu   | sheep (entrusted to) Lu-gula, the Amorreean               |

#### Reverse

##### I

*blank line*

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | 2(u) maš <sub>2</sub>  | 20 goats                                  |
| 2. | udu ur- <sup>d</sup> suen KU / ša <sub>3</sub> šu-[...]-na               | sheep ‘entrusted’ to Ur-Suen in the [...] |
| 3. | 1(u) 8(diš) udu / lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> ba-[u <sub>2</sub> ...] | 18 sheep, Lu-Ba[U] [...]                  |
| 4. | [...]  |   |

*ca. 6/7 broken lines*

##### II

*blank line*

- |    |                 |                                     |
|----|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | a-kal-la / sipa | (entrusted to) A-kala, the shepherd |
|----|-----------------|-------------------------------------|

<sup>123</sup> Ġirsu province, see Weiershäuser 2008: 148-150, with literature.

<sup>124</sup> The sign is visibly longer than udu; it seems however plausible that it was a mistake for udu, since here we would expect a collective term, rather than a characterization by age of the listed goats.

2.	lu <sub>2</sub> -me-lam <sub>2</sub> / na-gada nin	(under charge of) Lu-melam, the herdsman of the queen
3.	4(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu	38 sheep
4.	udu gu <sub>3</sub> -de <sub>2</sub> -a mar <sup>2</sup> -/tu <sup>2</sup>	sheep (entrusted to) Gudea, the Amorrean <sup>2</sup>
	<i>blank line</i>	
5.	nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka	accomplished account
6.	a-ša <sub>3</sub> <sup>d</sup> nin-e <sub>2</sub> -gal	field of Nin-egal
7.	mu <sup>d</sup> šu- <sup>d</sup> suen lugal (EN./ZU)	year: (when) Šu-Suen (became) king

#### §5.1.4.1. General considerations

**§5.1.4.1.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 1 individual somehow responsible for state-held sheep (KU), at least 3 merchants, unquantified and unnamed shepherds of merchants(?), 1 individual quoted just by name, 2 Amorreans, 1 individual with some responsibility for the sheep and tied to an unclear place (šu-[...]-na), 1 individual quoted just by name (further information on him may be lost), 1 shepherd under the charge of a herdsman of the queen. The text begins by recording the largest number of sheep assigned to a single person, although the number of goats in the following section entails it was not the largest flock.

**§5.1.4.1.2.** The exact location of the ‘field of Nin-egal’ within the provincial territory is unclear and the individuals quoted in this text do not provide reliable hints on this matter. The number of animals that have grazed there in ŠS 1 is 526+ (406 sheep and 120 goats).

#### §5.1.4.2. Prosopographical and further notes

**(obv. I, 3)** Nammaḥ is a common name and a homonymous herdsman is attested in Text 9 (MVN 5, 204) (ŠS 8/-). However, given the lack of a title, it seems plausible that another individual was meant here, someone who was responsible, on a lower level, for the sheep ascribed to him (see § 2.3.3.2).

**(obv. II, 5)** If the interpretation of the line is correct, this would be the only attestation of ‘shepherds of the merchants’. In any case, it would remain unclear why the whole section was assigned to unnamed and

unquantified shepherds of equally unnamed and unquantified merchants (see § 2.3.2).

**(obv. II, 7)** Enšakuge(n) is an uncommon name and hypothetically can refer to the untitled individual, who subscribed SNAT 76 (AS 2/-), a sheep account taken in Gu’aba. However, it should be noted that our text ascribes to him only goats, while in SNAT 76 both sheep and goats are counted.

**(rev. I, 2)** Ur-Suen is a common name, thus it may refer to several individuals employed in herding. The notation ‘ša<sub>3</sub> šu-[...]-na’ is unclear to me.

**(rev. II, 1-2)** Unfortunately these lines follow a break of the tablet, therefore, what the mentioned shepherd and herdsman were responsible for remains unknown. Akala is a widespread name and it may refer to a shepherd assistant under the charge of Lu-melam (see § 2.1.1.6-8). Lu-melam is attested with the simple title of herdsman (see § 1.3.7) in some tablets concerning sheep belonging to royal women: in CT 7, pl. 19, BM 12946 (Š 42//AS 6), a wool account taken in Ġirsu<sup>125</sup> under the supervision of the chief livestock administrator Ur-Iškur and concerning the sheep belonging to the concubine (lukur) of Šulgi Ea-niša<sup>126</sup> (obv. 9); in MVN 9, 39 (AS 2/-), an account taken in Ġirsu concerning the sheep managed by Lu-melam, who he is defined as “herdsman of Ea-niša” (rev. 9-10); in TCTI 1, 747 (AS 9/-), a record of the skins of the dead sheep belonging to Ea-niša (kuš udu ug<sub>7</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-a-ni-ša) under the supervision of the chief livestock administrator Ur-Iškur (obv. 2); in TCTI 1, 873 [...], a wool account concerning the sheep of Abi-simti (obv. IV, 2); in TCTI 1, 903 [...], a ‘multiple sheep account’ likely tied to royal herds (obv. II, 12).

<sup>125</sup> Here, as in the following attestations, Ġirsu may refer to the province, rather than to the district.

<sup>126</sup> See Weiershäuser 2008: 206. In addition, Weiershäuser (2008: 114, fn. 442) suggests that the titles of Lu-melam and Ur-BaU (see below, Text 5 (CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230), rev. II, 9) refer to the wife of the provincial governor, rather than to the queen of Ur. However, since the herds of the wife of the provincial governor are clearly referred to as sheep of the high priestess of BaU in our texts, it seems plausible that ‘nin’ in our group of texts refers to the royal women (regardless of their actual status of queens or concubines), who held herds in Ġirsu.

§5.1.5. Text 5: CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230 (§§ 1/-)

King 1896

MVN 17, 1; Pettinato 1993

CUSAS 17, 274; Civil 2011

Handcopy

**Obverse**

**I**

*blank line*

1.	1(šar <sub>2</sub> ) 9(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(u) / 3(diš) udu	4193 sheep
2.	1(aš) maš <sub>2</sub>	1 goat
3.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
4.	3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu zi-ga	180 sheep 'expended'
5.	da-da na-gada	Dada, the herdsman
6.	1(geš'u) 4(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) udu	869 sheep
7.	1(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	11 goats
8.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
9.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) udu zi-ga	90 sheep 'expended'
10.	lu <sub>2</sub> -giri <sub>17</sub> -zal na-/gada	Lu-girizal, the herdsman
11.	5(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu	300 sheep
12.	udu da-da / KU	sheep 'entrusted' to Dada

**II**

1.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) maš <sub>2</sub>	120 sheep 120 goats
2.	udu in-u <sub>9</sub> -u <sub>9</sub> <sup>127</sup>	sheep of Inu'u
3.	3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu ma-an-sa <sub>6</sub>	180 sheep, Mansa
4.	4(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu bi <sub>2</sub> -du <sub>11</sub> -i <sub>3</sub> -/sa <sub>6</sub>	240 sheep, Biduisa
5.	3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu la-la-mu ma <sub>2</sub> -gal	180 sheep, Lalamu, the 'boatman'
6.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu lugal-sukkal-du <sub>8</sub>	120 sheep, Lugal-sukkaldu
7.	3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub>	180 sheep, Lu-BaU
8.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu urdu <sub>2</sub> -dam	120 sheep, Urdudam
9.	3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) udu na-ni KU	200 sheep 'entrusted' to Nani
10.	5(geš <sub>2</sub> ) <udu> dam lu <sub>2</sub> -/giri <sub>17</sub> -zal KU	300 (sheep) 'entrusted' to the wife of Lu-girizal
11.	ki da-da	(in) the plot (under charge of) Dada
12.	4(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) 6(diš) udu	266 sheep

**Reverse**

**I**

1.	2(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	18 goats
2.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
3.	1(u) 3(diš) udu zi-ga	13 sheep 'expended'
4.	ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> na-gada	Ur-BaU, the herdsman
5.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) 4(diš) udu 2(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	154 sheep 25 goats
6.	bi <sub>2</sub> -de <sub>5</sub> KU	gathered there (while) 'being entrusted'
7.	ki ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub>	(in) the plot (under charge of) Ur-BaU
8.	6(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu 1(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	388 sheep 9 goats
9.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
10.	2(u) udu zi-ga	20 sheep 'expended'
11.	ab-ba-ge-na na-gada	Abba-gena, the herdsman
12.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(u) udu <sup>d</sup> inanna-ka	110 sheep, Inannaka

<sup>127</sup> Civil (2011: 274, fn. 113) interprets in-u<sub>9</sub>-u<sub>9</sub> as in-ug<sub>5</sub>-ug<sub>5</sub>, referring to "killed" sheep in opposition to "abandoned" (da-da in place of tak<sub>4</sub>-tak<sub>4</sub>) or "stolen" (NE-ri) sheep in this text. I understand in-u<sub>9</sub>-u<sub>9</sub> and Dada as PNs, one of them belonging to a herdsman (obv. I, 5).

13.	ki ab-ba-ge-na	(in) the plot (under charge of) Abba-gena
14.	3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) udu	200 sheep
15.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub> (A./AN)	sheep 'present'
<b>II</b>		
1.	1(u) 1(diš) udu zi-/ga	11 sheep 'expended'
2.	la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> 4(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu	shortfall: 38 sheep
3.	ur-gu-la na-gada	ur-gula, the herdsman
4.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 2(diš) udu	132 sheep
5.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
6.	5(diš) udu zi-ga	5 sheep 'expended'
7.	nam-sipa-da-ni-du <sub>10</sub> / na-gada	Namsipanidu, the herdsman
8.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu ʾgukkalʾ	118 fat-tai[led] sheep
9.	ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> na-gada nin	Ur-BaU, the herdsman of the queen
<i>blank line</i>		
10.	nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka	accomplished account
11.	a-ša <sub>3</sub> i-šar-ra	field of Išara
12.	mu <sup>d</sup> šu- <sup>d</sup> suen / lugal	year: (when) Šu-Suen (became) king

### §5.1.5.1. General considerations

**§5.1.5.1.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 6 institutional herdsmen, 1 herdsman of the queen, 6 untitled individuals, 1 boatman, and 2 individuals employed in herding (KU) in the plot under the charge of one of the institutional herdsmen, and 1 untitled individual in the plot under the charge of another herdsman. The text begins by recording the largest number of sheep assigned to a single person, the largest attested in our texts, but it does not continue in a linear, decreasing, order. By considering the section comprised between obv. I-11 and obv. II, 11 with its highest value (as reported in the transliteration), we can notice a consistent presence of round numbers.

**§5.1.5.1.2.** The field of Išara lay in Gu'aba, as shown in [SNAT 126](#) (§§ 1/-) (rev. 8), which lists the surfaces of different fields assigned as grazing areas to shepherds in Gu'aba (see § 1.1.9). Since both texts have been drawn up in the same year, we can estimate that 8911 animals (8727 sheep and 184 goats) grazed over an area of 71 *iku* (3.2.5), 225,600 m<sup>2</sup>, with a ratio of 1 animal per 25.3 m<sup>2</sup>. By considering the section comprised between obv. I-11 and obv. II, 11 with its lowest value, the total number would be 7377 with a ratio of 1 animal per 30.5 m<sup>2</sup>.

### §5.1.5.2. Prosopographical and further notes

(obv. I, 5; obv. I, 12; obv. II, 11) The herdsman Dada occurs three times in this text: the first one concerns

the sheep recorded according to the parameters of availability, data likely reported from a hypothetical account of the sheep managed by him (obv. I, 1-5); in the second one, he occurs as responsible for an additional number of sheep (obv. I 11-12); the third one shows him as responsible for the plot where the sheep assigned to different individuals have grazed (obv. II 1-11; see below). Dada may be identified with the herdsman of Gu'aba, son of Namḥani (see [PPAC 5, 1046](#), § 48/-; rev. 9). Despite the lack of title, other attestations that may reference him are: [PPAC 5, 608](#) (§ 48/-) and [CT 7, 10 BM 12929](#) (§ 48/-), both 'multiple sheep accounts' taken in Gu'aba (resp. rev. 14 and rev. 7);<sup>128</sup> [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-) and [UNT 63](#) (-/-), both 'multiple wool accounts' concerning herdsmen of Gu'aba (resp. rev. I, 3 (da-da dumu nam-ḥa-ni) and obv. 7); [SAT 1, 381](#) (AS 5/-), a 'multiple account' of lamb wool and wool shortfalls taken in Gu'aba (obv. II, 16); [PPAC 5, 609](#) (-/-), a 'multiple wool account' concerning herdsmen of Gu'aba (obv. 16). In addition, Dada son of Namḥani is likely attested as supervisor of the plot entrusted to himself in [MVN 2, 42](#) [...] (see § 1.1.9), obv. III, 13' (ugula da-da dumu ʾnam<sup>ʔ</sup>-[ḥa]-/ʾni<sup>ʔ</sup>).

(obv. I, 10) Lu-girizal is a common name and may refer to different herdsmen; on the basis of the co-occurrence with other herdsmen quoted in this text, we can suppose that the Lu-girizal meant here is the same one attested in [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-), obv. I, 5; in [MVN 5, 260](#) (AS 3/-), a 'multiple sheep account' concerning herdsmen of Gu'aba (obv. 10).

<sup>128</sup> [PPAC 5, 608](#) (§ 48/-) and [CT 7, pl. 10, BM 12929](#) (§ 48/-) substantially report the same text, with a different arrangement of the information and minor differences, which however can be ascribable, hypothetically, to the different condition and legibility of the tablets.

**(obv. II, 1-11)** This section lists different individuals, each of them in connection with a certain number of sheep in the plot under responsibility of the herdsman Dada; six of them are simply quoted by name, one with the professional title (*ma<sub>2</sub>-gal*), two are followed by KU, thus denoting a responsibility for state-held sheep (see § 2.3.3). One of them is the unnamed wife of Lu-girizal, who could have been the herdsman quoted above in obv. I, 10, although the underlying dynamics would remain unclear to me. In addition, as seen in § 2.3.1, an active involvement in herding of people defined as *ma<sub>2</sub>-gal* (“the ones of the large boat”) can however be supposed on the basis of CUSAS 16, 104 (ŠS 1/-), where individuals defined as *ma<sub>2</sub>-gal* occur alongside *dumud-aba* and herdsmen in connection to sheep ‘taken over’.

**(rev. I, 4)** Ur-BaU is absolutely the most common name in the Ġirsu province, therefore it can refer to different herdsmen in charge at the same time in the same district. Hypothetically, here the son of Atu<sup>129</sup> could be meant, as he is attested alongside with other herdsmen of Gu’aba quoted here. Ur-BaU son of Atu occurs in MVN 9, 55 (AS 3/-), rev. 13; MVN 5, 260 (-/-), rev. 25, both ‘multiple sheep accounts’; SAT 1, 381 (AS 5/-), obv. II, 9; UNT 20 (AS 5/-), rev. III, 10, both ‘multiple wool accounts’.

**(rev. I, 11)** As with other herdsmen quoted in this text, Abba-gena may be identified with the herdsman of Gu’aba attested in UNT 20 (AS 5/-), obv. I, 13; SAT 1, 381 (AS 5/-), obv. I, 4; MVN 5, 260 (-/-), obv. 21; PPAC 5, 632 (-/-), a ‘multiple wool account’

concerning herdsmen of Gu’aba (obv. 5).

**(rev. I, 12-13)** This section may refer to a certain Inannaka in the plot under responsibility of the herdsman Abba-gena. Although Inannaka is not a common name in the province, it seems plausible that the shepherd(s) (regardless of the administrative level) attested in connection to a royal cook in Text 22 (MVN 6, 415) (AS 1/-) and to a cook of the grand vizier in Text 9 (MVN 5, 204) (ŠS 8/-) was(were) namesake(s). Indeed, nothing suggests that the individual quoted in this section had some responsibility for state-held sheep (see 2.3.3).

**(rev. II, 3)** Ur-gula can be identified with the herdsman of Gu’aba occurring in MVN 9, 55 (AS 3/-), rev. 8; UNT 20 (AS 5/-), obv. I, 8; SAT 1, 381 (AS 5/-), obv. I, 3; MVN 5, 260 (-/-), rev. 10; PPAC 5, 632 (-/-), obv. 4. The herdsman of the high priestess attested in Text 8 (MVN 5, 203) was very likely a namesake.

**(rev. II, 7)** Namsipanidu is a unusual name and refers to the herdsman of Gu’aba attested in PPAC 5, 632 (-/-), obv. 2; SAT 1, 381 (AS 5/-), rev. II, 1; TCTI 1, 876 [...], a ‘multiple sheep account’ involving herdsmen of the entire province (rev. II, 11’).

**(rev. II, 9)** As herdsman of the queen, the activity of Ur-BaU can be traced back in: DAS 51 (AS 8/-), a wool account concerning the sheep of the royal family and the sheep-pen of the palace, where he occurs (rev. VII, 14) as responsible for some sheep of the queen Abi-simti,<sup>130</sup> TCTI 1, 873 [...], a wool account concerning the sheep of Abi-simti (rev. V, 14).

#### §5.1.6. Text 6: TLB 3, 87 (ŠS 6/-)

Hallo 1963  
OrAnt 15, 331; Waetzoldt 1976 (coll.)  
CUSAS 17, 274; Civil 2011  
Handcopy

#### Obverse

##### I

*blank line*

- |    |  |                       |
|----|--|-----------------------|
| 1. | 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) / udu | 148 sheep             |
| 2. | udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub> (A./AN)                     | sheep ‘present’       |
| 3. | 1(u) 2(diš) udu zi-ga                                  | 12 sheep ‘expended’   |
| 4. | libir-am <sub>3</sub>                                  | (of the) ‘old’ (herd) |

<sup>129</sup> Not to be confused with the homonymous scribe; see MVN 2, 47 (Š 44/v).

<sup>130</sup> In this text, a homonymous herdsman occurs as responsible for some sheep of the prince Ur-Ištaran (rev. V, 17). The Ur-BaU quoted (obv. II, 13) in DAS 53 (AS 8/-), an account of fat-tailed sheep belonging to the princess Taddin-Eštar and the prince Ur-Ištaran, likely refers to a further namesake.

- |    |                                    |  |
|----|------------------------------------|--|
| 5. | 4(u) 6(diš) udu                    | 46 sheep                               |
| 6. | udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub> (A./AN) | sheep 'present'                        |
| 7. | ki sipa-du <sub>10</sub>           | (in) the plot (under charge of) Sipadu |
|    | [...]                              | ...                                    |

## II

*blank line*

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | uš-ge-/na na-gada   | Ušgena, the herdsman                   |
| 2. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(diš) udu   | 65 sheep                               |
| 3. | bi <sub>2</sub> -de <sub>5</sub>  | gathered there                         |
| 4. | ki uš-ge-na   | (in) the plot (under charge of) Ušgena |
| 5. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 6(diš) udu 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                         | 66 sheep 2 goats                       |
| 6. | udu lu <sub>2</sub> -urub <sub>x</sub> (URU×KAR <sub>2</sub> ) <sup>ki</sup> KU | sheep 'entrusted' to Lu-Urub           |
| 7. | 3(u) [...]  | 30                                     |

*ca. 2 broken lines*

### Reverse

## I

- |    |   |                                |
|----|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. | udu ab-[ba]-/ge-na 'KU'                                 | sheep 'entrusted' to Abba-gena |
| 2. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(diš) udu 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> | 65 sheep 2 goats               |
| 3. | udu ur-zikum-ma / KU                                    | sheep 'entrusted' to Ur-zikuma |

*blank space*

## II

*blank space*

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka  | accomplished account                              |
| 2. | a-ša <sub>3</sub> nin-a <sub>2</sub> -zi-/da   | field of Nin-azida                                |
| 3. | mu na-<ru <sub>2</sub> -a> maḥ <sup>d</sup> en-/lil <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> ba-ru <sub>2</sub> | year: (when) the great stele of Enlil was erected |

### §5.1.6.1. General considerations

**§5.1.6.1.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 2 institutional herdsman and at least 3 individuals somehow responsible for state-held sheep (KU). The text begins by recording the largest number of sheep assigned to a single person, but it does not continue in a linear, decreasing, order.

**§5.1.6.1.2.** The field of Ninazida lay in Gu'aba; from [SNAT 126](#) (§S 1/-) we know that a surface of 10.75 *iku* (obv. 10: 0.1.4 1/2 1/4 *iku*), 38,600 m<sup>2</sup>, in this field had been allocated as grazing plot 6 years earlier. With a total of 436 animals (432 sheep and 4 goats) in §S 6 the ratio would have been 1 animal per 88.5 m<sup>2</sup>.

### §5.1.6.2. Prosopographical and further notes

(obv. I, 1-7) This section concerns the sheep managed by the herdsman Sipadu. Part of them is described as being of an 'old' herd, although references to a possible 'new acquisition' lack (see § 3.2.4). To

the best of my knowledge, the name Sipadu is not attested elsewhere. However, it can be interpreted as a hypocoristic form of the name Namsipadanidu, hence referring to the herdsman of Gu'aba attested in Text 5 ([CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230](#)) (§S 1/-), rev. II, 7. Here, we can note that his name is not simply juxtaposed at the end of the section assigned to him, but it relates to the plot, where the counted sheep have grazed.

(obv. II, 1-4) To the best of my knowledge, the herdsman Ušgena is attested only here. The number of sheep managed by him is lost in the break of the tablet, what is still readable is the number of dead sheep gathered in the plot under his charge (obv. II, 2-3).

(obv. II, 6-rev. I, 3) This section concerns the sheep under control (KU) of three individuals: Lu-Urub, Abba-gena, and Ur-zikuma. In addition, a number of sheep is assigned to an untitled Ur-zikuma in Text 29 ([MVN 6, 546](#)) [...] in the plot under the charge of the herdsman Lamlama (rev. I, 6), although nothing suggests they were the same individual.



### §5.1.7. Text 7: HLC 1, 37 (ŠS 8/-)

Barton 1905-1914

ASJ 2, 197; Maeda 1980 (coll.)

Photo/Handcopy

#### Obverse

##### I

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | 6(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 1(diš) udu                              | 371 sheep                              |
| 2. | 3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                 | 195 goats                              |
| 3. | udu ur- <sup>d</sup> lamma / dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba            | sheep of Ur-Lamma, the <i>dumudaba</i> |
| 4. | 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) 1(diš) udu 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>      | 141 sheep 5 goats                      |
| 5. | udu gu <sub>4</sub> -KU dumu-dab <sub>5</sub>                     | sheep of GuKU, the <i>dumudaba</i>     |
| 6. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 1(diš) udu 5(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> | 71 sheep 51 goats                      |
| 7. | udu ur-mes dumu-dab <sub>5</sub>                                  | sheep of Ur-mes, the <i>dumudaba</i>   |
| 8. | 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 5(diš) udu 2(u) maš <sub>2</sub>        | 135 sheep 20 goats                     |
| 9. | udu ur-eš <sub>2</sub> -da / dumu-dab <sub>5</sub>                | sheep of Ur-ešda, the <i>dumudaba</i>  |

##### II

- |    |   |                                    |
|----|---|------------------------------------|
| 1. | 5(u) 1(diš) udu   | 51 sheep                           |
| 2. | 4(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                      | 38 goats                           |
| 3. | udu ħu-ba dumu-dab <sub>5</sub>                                   | sheep of Ĥuba, the <i>dumudaba</i> |
| 4. | 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 2(diš) udu 1(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> | 132 sheep 15 goats                 |
| 5. | udu ba-a-a dumu-dab <sub>5</sub>                                  | sheep of Ba'a, the <i>dumudaba</i> |
| 6. | 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) [...]                                   | 280 ...                            |
| 7. | 4(u) 1(diš) [...]   | 41 ...                             |
| 8. | udu [...]   | sheep of ...                       |

*blank line?*

- |    |                                 |         |
|----|---------------------------------|---------|
| 9. | 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) [...] | 150 ... |
|----|---------------------------------|---------|

#### Reverse

##### I

- |    |  |                                       |
|----|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1. | 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                   | 125 goats                             |
| 2. | udu <sup>1</sup> (siki) la-a-a                                 | sheep of La'a                         |
| 3. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(diš) udu                                | 65 udu                                |
| 4. | udu in-da-a / dumu-dab <sub>5</sub>                            | sheep of Inda'a, the <i>dumudaba</i>  |
| 5. | 3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu           | 198 sheep                             |
| 6. | 3(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                                   | 35 goats                              |
| 7. | udu ur-mes eren <sub>2</sub>                                   | sheep of Ur-mes, the state dependent  |
| 8. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(diš) udu 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>        | 63 sheep 5 goats                      |
| 9. | udu ur- <sup>d</sup> šul-pa-e <sub>3</sub> (UD./DU) šu-i lugal | sheep of Ur-Šulpa'e, the royal barber |

##### II

- |    |   |                                       |
|----|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1. | 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu                             | 28 sheep                              |
| 2. | 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                                     | 5 goats                               |
| 3. | udu lu <sub>2</sub> -du <sub>10</sub> -ga eren <sub>2</sub> | sheep of Lu-duga, the state dependent |

*blank space*

- |    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 4. | nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka                          | accomplished account                       |
| 5. | a-ša <sub>3</sub> du <sub>6</sub> -lugal-u <sub>3</sub> -a     | field of Dulugalua                         |
| 6. | mu ma <sub>2</sub> -gur <sub>8</sub> maḥ / ba-dim <sub>2</sub> | year: (when) the great barge was fashioned |

#### §5.1.7.1. General considerations

§5.1.7.1.1. This text does not quote skilled personnel, but state dependent workers (at least 2) and *dumudaba* (at least 7; see § 2.2), 1 individual quoted

just by name, and 1 royal barber. The text begins by recording the largest number of sheep assigned to a single person, but it does not continue in a linear, decreasing, order.

§5.1.7.1.2. The field of Dulugalua lay in Gu'aba;

SNAT 126 (ŠS 1/-) shows that 8 years earlier 71.75 *iku* (obv. 2: 3.2.5 1/2 ¼ *iku*), 258,300 m<sup>2</sup>, have been allocated as pasture area. With a total of 2220 animals (1726 sheep and 494 goats) in ŠS 8 the ratio would have been of 1 animal per ca. 116.3 m<sup>2</sup>. In addition, PPAC 5, 601 (rev. II, 13-14: a-ša<sub>3</sub> du<sub>6</sub>-lugal-u<sub>3</sub>-a / u<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> ur-geš<sup>g</sup>gigir) suggests that it was contiguous to the field of the village of Ur-gigir, which Text 8 (MVN 5, 203) and Text 28 (TÉL 250) refer to.

### §5.1.7.2. Prosopographical notes

(rev. I, 9) It seems plausible that the royal barber Ur-Šulpa'e was the beneficiary of a subsistence plot in the field of Dulugalua, without mention of the shepherds or workers responsible for the sheep (§ 2.3.1). Without any reference to the king, in HLC 384 [...] a boat of 20 gur of barley is assigned to Ur-Šulpa'e the barber within the provincial bala-duty toward the state.<sup>131</sup>

### §5.1.8. Text 8: MVN 5, 203 (ŠS 8/-)

Sollberger 1978

Specimina Nova 19, 29; Everling 2005

CUSAS 17, 274; Civil 2011

Handcopy

#### Obverse

##### I

*blank line*

1.	3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 6(diš) udu	196 sheep
2.	3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) maš <sub>2</sub>	180 goats
3.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
4.	7(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu zi-ga	420 sheep 'expended'
5.	a <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>2</sub> na-[gada]	Au'u, the her[dsman]
6.	[...] la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	... minus 1 goat
7.	[...] a <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>2</sub> KU	... 'entrusted' to Au'u
8.	[...] + 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	... +102 goats
9.	[ba]-a-ga na-gada	Ba'aga, the herdsman

##### II

1.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) 2(diš) / udu	102 sheep
2.	ur-gu-la / na-gada	Ur-gula, the herdsman
3.	udu <sup>1</sup> (KU) ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub>	sheep of the high priestess of BaU
4.	4(u) 2(diš) udu 4(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	42 sheep 240 goats
5.	udu <sup>1</sup> (KU) im-ti-/dam šabra	sheep of Imtidam, the chief administrator
6.	2(u) 3(diš) udu	23 sheep

#### Reverse

##### I

1.	udu <sup>1</sup> (KU) lu <sub>2</sub> -giri <sub>17</sub> -/zal KU	sheep 'entrusted' to Lu-girizal
2.	5(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(diš) udu ṛgukkal <sup>ṛ</sup>	301 fat-tailed sheep
3.	en-i <sub>3</sub> -na-kal na-[gada]	En-inakal, the her[dsman]
4.	4(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu 60+40 maš <sub>2</sub>	238 sheep 100 goats
5.	udu <sup>1</sup> (KU) bi <sub>2</sub> -de <sub>5</sub> KU	sheep gathered there (while) 'being entrusted'
6.	udu en-i <sub>3</sub> -na-kal	sheep of En-inakal
7.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu 1(u) maš <sub>2</sub>	58 sheep 10 goats
8.	udu <sup>1</sup> (KU) lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> utu ṛKU <sup>ṛ</sup>	sheep 'entrust[ed]' to Lu-Utu
9.	2(u) 1(diš) udu [...]	21 sheep ...
10.	udu lugal-[...] / ṛKU <sup>ṛ</sup>	sheep 'entrusted' to Lugal-[...]

##### II

*blank space*

<sup>131</sup> See Sharlach 2004: 336.

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | [nig <sub>2</sub> ]-ka <sub>9</sub> aka  | accomplished account                                |
| 2. | [a-ša <sub>3</sub> e <sub>2</sub> ]-duru <sub>5</sub> <sup>1</sup> ur <sup>1</sup> - <sup>&lt;geš&gt;</sup> gigir <sup>1</sup> | [field] of the village of Ur-gigir                  |
| 3. | mu ma <sub>2</sub> -gur <sub>8</sub> maḥ / <sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> ba-/dim <sub>2</sub>              | year: (when) the great barge of Enlil was fashioned |

### §5.1.8.1. General considerations

**§5.1.8.1.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats of the high priestess of BaU entrusted to 3 herdsmen, those assigned to the chief administrator of that household, 1 herdsman, likely tied to the sheep of the grand vizier, and 2 individuals somehow responsible for state-held sheep (KU). The text begins by recording the largest number of sheep assigned to a single person, but it does not continue in a linear, decreasing, order.

**§5.1.8.1.2.** At the time this text was drawn up, the high priestess of BaU was BaU-ea, wife of the grand vizier (see § 1.2). The interpretation of the field name is based on a possible reading of the signs reported in the handcopy and a comparison with Text 28 (TÉL 250) (IS 3/-) and TÉL 262 (IS 1/-). PPAC 5, 601 (rev. II, 13-14: a-ša<sub>3</sub> du<sub>6</sub>-lugal-u<sub>3</sub>-a / u<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> ur-<sup>geš</sup>gigir) suggests that it was contiguous to the field Dulugalua (see Text 7 (HLC 1, 37)), both located in the Gu'aba district. Animals counted in this field in ŠS 8 are 1797+ (1401 sheep and 396 goats), to be compared to the 2108+ animals counted there 4 years later in IS 3 (see Text 28 (TÉL 250)).

### §5.1.8.2. Prosopographical and further notes

**(obv. I, 5-7)** Au'u occurs twice in this text, the first one at the end of the section reporting the parameters of availability of the sheep, the second one as responsible (KU) for an additional number of sheep. Information on the availability of the sheep of the high priestess is unexpected in our texts (see § 1.2.2 and § 2.1.1.6), nevertheless we can infer that the relevant information was transmitted in this form to the compiler of the text.<sup>132</sup> The herdsman Au'u is probably to be identified with the herdsman Au'mu attested in Text 28 (TÉL 250) (IS 3/-), where however he is not directly connected to the sheep of the high priestess (see notes to rev. I, 2-3; § 5.2.28.2), and very likely with the [A]u'u attested (rev. 2) in TÉL 262 (IS 1/-) among the shepherds of the high priestess of BaU (sipa ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub>-me). In addition, it is unclear whether MVN 2, 42 [...] (see § 1.1.9), Tab. obv. IV, 21', attesting (A)u'u as supervisor of a plot assigned to himself (6 *iku*, 21,600 m<sup>2</sup>), may

have referred to this herdsman. Although it is an uncommon name, the shepherd tied to the provincial sheep-pen attested in Text 14. TCTI 1, 4176 (IS 3/-) was very likely a namesake.

**(obv. I, 9)** The herdsman Ba'aga can be identified with the herdsman connected to the sheep and goats of the high priestess of BaU attested in Text 20 (MVN 6, 140) (obv. 7: ba-ga), notwithstanding the early date, and Text 28 (TÉL 250) (obv. I, 8': ba-za-ga), see § 2.1.1. In CT 7, pl. 34, BM 18407 (Š 46/-) Ba'aga is (obv. 4) among the herdsmen who supplies goat by-products (wool, ghee, cheese) to the household of the high priestess (ereš-dingir) of BaU, and in TUT 164-15 [...] he is listed (obv. III, 7') alongside with Iabidu, another herdsman of the high priestess<sup>133</sup> (see Text 20). Moreover, like Au'u, he is very likely to be identified with the Ba'aga attested (rev. 5) in TÉL 262 (IS 1/-) among the shepherds of the high priestess of BaU (sipa ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub>-me). Moreover, one can suppose a further identification with the herdsman Bazaḡu attested (rev. i, 12) in RTC 296 (AS 3/-), an account of the goats available to the priestess (ud<sub>5</sub> gub-ba [ereš]-dingir <sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub>).

**(obv. II, 2)** To the best of my knowledge, this is the only attestation of the herdsman Ur-gula in connection with the sheep of high priestess of BaU. He was probably a namesake of the herdsman of Gu'aba attested in Text 5 (CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230) (ŠS 1/-), rev. II, 3.

**(obv. II, 5)** Imtidam was very likely the chief administrator (šabra) who succeeded the most attested Inim-BaU-idab in managing the household of the high priestess of BaU. He also occurs in Text 28 (obv. II, 3), and in TÉL 262 (rev. 7), both concerning the sheep of the high priestess which had grazed in the field of the village of Ur-gigir. As noted in § 2.3.1.2, one may wonder whether he was beneficiary of assets belonging to the household he served or subjected to additional labor duties within it.

**(rev. I, 3 and 6)** En-inakal(a) can be identified with the herdsman of the grand vizier (na-gada sukka-maḥ) and provincial governor, as Text 28 (rev. I, 5), shows. In TÉL 262 (IS 1/-), his name precedes (rev. 1) those of the shepherds of the high priestess, although he is not defined as shepherd. One can note

<sup>132</sup> A similar situation can be found for the sheep assigned to Urdudani in Text 1 (MVN 2, 78) obv. II 2-3.

<sup>133</sup> Note, however, that TUT 164-15 does not describe them as herdsmen of the priestess.

that the impressive number of dead sheep assigned to him in this text is not connected to the plot under his charge (ki PN na-gada; see § 1.3), but it is rather defined as ‘sheep of En-inakal’ and described as being under the charge of someone (KU).

§5.1.9. Text 9: MVN 5, 204 (ŠS 8/-)

Sollberger 1978

CUSAS 17, 274; Civil 2011

Handcopy

**Obverse**

**I**

*blank line*

1.	1(geš <sup>2</sup> u) 4(geš <sup>2</sup> ) 1(u) 2(diš) / udu	852 sheep
2.	2(u) maš <sup>2</sup>	20 goats
3.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub> (A./AN)	sheep ‘present’
4.	3(u) 5(diš) udu zi-/ga	35 sheep ‘expended’
5.	[u <sub>4</sub> -de <sub>3</sub> -nig <sub>2</sub> ]- <sup>1</sup> sa <sub>6</sub> -/ga na-gada	[Ude-niġsa]-ga, the herdsman
6.	[...]+ 5(diš) udu	+5 sheep
7.	[udu] bi <sub>2</sub> -de <sub>5</sub> KU	[sheep] gathered there (while) ‘being entrusted’
8.	ki u <sub>4</sub> -de <sub>3</sub> -/nig <sub>2</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub> -/ga	(in) the plot (under charge of) Ude-niġsaga

**II**

1.	4(u) 1(diš) udu gub-ba	41 sheep ‘present’
2.	ur- <sup>d</sup> šul-<pa-e <sub>3</sub> > na-gada	Ur-Šul(pa’e), the herdsman
3.	4(u) 4(diš) udu	44 sheep
4.	udu gub-ba	sheep ‘present’
5.	<sup>d</sup> utu-kalam-/e na-<gada>	Utu-kalame, the herdsman
6.	5(u) 2(diš) udu	52 sheep
7.	udu gub-ba	sheep ‘present’
8.	[...]	...
9.	ur- <sup>d</sup> lamma na-/gada	Ur-Lamma, the herdsman
10.	3(u) 5(diš) udu	35 sheep
11.	udu gub-ba	sheep ‘present’
12.	la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> 8(diš) udu	shortfall: 8 sheep
13.	nam-maḥ na-gada	Nammaḥ, the herdsman
14.	1(geš <sup>2</sup> ) 5(diš) udu	65 sheep

**III**

1.	udu gub-/ba	sheep ‘present’
2.	nig <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> <na-gada <sup>?</sup> >	nig <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> , (the herdsman?)
3.	4(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu	38 sheep
4.	udu e <sub>3</sub> - <sup>1</sup> lugal <sup>1</sup>	sheep of E-lugal <sup>1</sup>
5.	1(geš <sup>2</sup> ) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu 5(diš) maš <sup>2</sup>	58 sheep 5 goats
6.	udu <sup>1</sup> UN-ga <sup>1</sup> <sub>6</sub> <sup>?</sup>	sheep of UNġa
7.	7(geš <sup>2</sup> ) 1(u) 2(diš) udu 1(u) maš <sup>2</sup>	432 sheep 10 goats
8.	nig <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> [...] / na-gada lugal <sup>?</sup>	Niġ[...], the royal herdsman
9.	1(geš <sup>2</sup> ) 2(diš) udu	62 sheep
10.	ur-ma-ma na-gada nin <sup>?</sup>	Ur-mama, the herdsman of the queen
11.	3(geš <sup>2</sup> ) 2(u) udu 1(u) maš <sup>2</sup>	200 sheep 10 goats
12.	lu <sub>2</sub> -sukkal / sipa	Lu-sukkal, the shepherd

**Reverse**

**I**

1.	2(geš <sup>2</sup> ) 4(u) 1(diš) udu	161 sheep
2.	5(geš <sup>2</sup> ) maš <sup>2</sup>	300 goats

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 3. | [...] sipa (ʿPAʿLU)   | ... the shepherd                                     |
| 4. | [...]-AMAR  | [...]-AMAR   |
| 5. | [... udu] / [...] maš <sub>2</sub>  | ... sheep ...goats                                   |
| 6. | udu <sup>d</sup> šul-gi-/nin-e-ki <sup>1</sup> (KU)-ag <sub>2</sub> / lu <sub>2</sub><br>sukkal-maḥ | sheep of Šulgi-ninekiaḡ, the one of the grand vizier |
| 7. | 6(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(diš) udu   | 364 sheep  |
| 8. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) 7(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>   | 87 goats   |
| 9. | dingir-sa <sub>6</sub> -ga [...] / sipa   | Diḡir-saga, the shepherd                             |

## II

- |     |   |                                     |
|-----|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1.  | udu uri <sub>5</sub> <sup>ki</sup> -/ki-du <sub>10</sub> muḥaldim / lugal | sheep of Urim-kidu, the royal cook  |
| 2.  | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) 2(diš) udu                                      | 82 sheep                            |
| 3.  | 3(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>  | 35 goats                            |
| 4.  | udu sipa [...]  | sheep of the shepherds...           |
| 5.  | aša <sub>5</sub> /e <sub>2</sub> [...]                                    | field/house ...                     |
| 6.  | 5(u) 2(diš) [udu]   | 52 [sheep]                          |
| 7.  | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) [maš <sub>2</sub> ]                                  | 60 [goats]                          |
| 8.  | ʿlugal-[u <sub>2</sub> ]-šim-/e na-gada / <sup>d</sup> en-ki              | Lugal-[u]šime, the herdsman of Enki |
| 9.  | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>              | 58 goats                            |
| 10. | udu gub-ba  | sheep 'present'                     |
| 11. | ur-mes-«mes» / na-gada  | Ur-mes, the herdsman                |
| 12. | 6(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(diš) udu 1(u) maš <sub>2</sub>                     | 363 sheep 10 goats                  |
| 13. | <sup>d</sup> inanna-ka sipa   | Inannaka, the shepherd              |

## III

- |                    |   |  |
|--------------------|---|--|
| 1.                 | udu a-ḥu-/ʿni <sup>7</sup> muḥaldim   | sheep of Aḥuni, the cook                   |
| 2.                 | sukkal-maḥ  | of the grand vizier                        |
| <i>blank space</i> |   |  |
| 3.                 | nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka   | accomplished account                       |
| 4.                 | [a]-ʿša <sub>3</sub> <sup>7</sup> e <sub>2</sub> -ʿduru <sub>5</sub> <sup>7</sup> [x] | [f]ield of the village <sup>2</sup> ...    |
| 5.                 | mu ma <sub>2</sub> -gur <sub>8</sub> maḥ ba-dim <sub>2</sub>                          | year: (when) the great barge was fashioned |

### §5.1.9.1. General considerations

**§5.1.9.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 6 institutional herdsman, 2 royal herdsman (1 of the king and 1 of the queen), 1 herdsman of the god Enki, 2 individuals quoted by name, 1 shepherd (unclear whether tied to a specific household), 1 individual tied to the grand vizier, 1 shepherd (regardless of the administrative level) tied to the sheep of a royal cook, 1 shepherd (regardless of the administrative level) tied to the sheep of the cook of the grand vizier, unquantified and unnamed shepherds tied to a household or a field (aša<sub>5</sub>/e<sub>2</sub>). The text begins by recording the largest number of sheep assigned to a single person, but it does not continue with a linear, decreasing, order.

**§5.1.9.1.2.** The name of the field is no longer readable; the interpretation of the visible sign as e<sub>2</sub> is tentative and based on the occurrence of several fields lying in villages (e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub>) in this group of texts and on the possibility to read the following sign as A(=duru<sub>5</sub>). The names of the involved herdsman and the presence of a herdsman of Enki suggest a

location in the area of Gu'aba. In §§ 8 3544+ animals (2949 sheep and 595 goats) have grazed in this field.

### §5.1.9.2. Prosopographical and further notes

**(obv. I, 1-8)** This section concerns Ude-niḡsaga, who was a herdsman of Gu'aba attested in the wool accounts recorded in [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-), rev. I, 30; [SAT 1, 381](#) (AS 5/-), obv. II, 2; [PPAC 5, 632](#) (-/-), rev. 8, alongside with other herdsman of that district occurring in Text 5 ([CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230](#)) (§S 1/-). [MVN 2, 42](#) [...] (see § 1.1.9), attest him (rev. II, 11) as supervisor of the plots entrusted to himself (6 *iku*, 21,600 m<sup>2</sup>), to a unnamed shepherd assistant (3 *iku*, 10,800 m<sup>2</sup>) and of one plot classified according its rent capacity (2 ½ *iku*, 9000 m<sup>2</sup>). This section is followed by the indication: aša<sub>5</sub> dab<sub>5</sub>-ba nig<sub>2</sub>-gal<sub>2</sub>-la, "plots taken over (which are) administrative property of the state/province". Although we cannot know which year [MVN 2, 42](#) refers to, we can note a connection between the large number of sheep assigned to Ude-niḡsaga here and the size of the plots under his supervision in [MVN 2, 42](#).

**(obv. II, 2)** Ur-Šul may be a hypocoristic form of Ur-Šulpa'e, thus probably referring to the herdsman attested in: [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-), obv. IV, 26 and [CUSAS 16, 104](#) (ŠS 1/-), the account of sheep and goats 'taken over' (rev. 14), both involving other herdsmen of Gu'aba. The Ur-Šulpa'e attested in Text 23 ([MVN 6, 545](#)) (AS 1/-), obv. II, 6, in the field of Ur-saĝpa'e was very likely a namesake.

**(obv. II, 5)** To the best of my knowledge, this is the only attestation of the herdsman Utu-kalame.

**(obv. II, 9)** Ur-Lamma is a very common name and may refer to different herdsmen. However, we can suppose that the Ur-Lamma occurring here is to be identified with the herdsman of Gu'aba attested alongside with Ude-niĝsaga in [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-), rev. I, 14, and in [SAT 1, 381](#) (AS 5/-), rev. II, 4 (ur-<sup>d</sup>lamma dumu ab-ba).<sup>134</sup> An Ur-Lamma is attested as supervisor of the plot (6 *iku*, 21,600 m<sup>2</sup>) entrusted to himself in [MVN 2, 42](#) [...] (Tab. obv. IV, 11'). Moreover, Ur-Lamma is also the name of a herdsman attested in Text 29 ([MVN 6, 546](#)) [...], obv. II, 9'.

**(obv. II, 13)** Nammaḥ could be identified with the herdsman of Gu'aba attested (rev. 12) in [PPAC 5, 84](#) (AS 1/-), an account taken in Gu'aba of sheep shortfalls, sheep for slaughter and plundered sheep already plucked (udu la<sub>2</sub>-ia<sub>3</sub> su-ga udu šu-gid<sub>2</sub> u<sub>3</sub> lu<sub>2</sub>-la-ga ur<sub>4</sub>-ra).<sup>135</sup> The Nammaḥ attested in text 4 ([TLB 3, 89](#)) (ŠS 1/-), obv. I, 3, was very likely a namesake.

**(obv. II, 14-III, 2)** This section refers to the sheep managed by Niĝ-BaU who, despite the lack of any title, may have been an institutional herdsman, as the description of the sheep assigned to him as 'sheep present' suggests. An untitled Niĝ-BaU occurs in Text 2 ([Amherst 20](#)) in connection to a workshop, obv. I, 8, likely referring to a namesake, while a connection to the herdsman of Gu'aba Niĝĝu occurring in Text 29, [MVN 6, 546](#) [...], obv. II, 3 can be inferred.

**(obv. III, 7-8)** This section refers to a royal herdsman, whose complete name cannot longer be read.

**(obv. III, 10)** To the best of my knowledge, this is the only attestation of the herdsman Ur-Mama.

**(obv. III, 11-rev. I 4)** This section refers to the sheep

entrusted to 2 shepherds tied to some household or facility, whose name cannot longer be read. The occurrence of calves (rev. I 4) in this text is unexpected and the visible sign could hypothetically be part of household's name ([...]-AMAR).

**(rev. I, 5-6)** Šulgi-ninekiaĝ, the one of the grand vizier, could be identified with the untitled messenger attested in [CTPSM 1 146](#) (-/i/14), rev. 8. It seems plausible that he was the beneficiary of the plot where the sheep have grazed, without mention of the shepherd or worker responsible for them.

**(rev. I, 7-II, 1)** This section probably concerns the sheep of the royal cook entrusted to the shepherd Diĝir-saga. The cook Urim-kidu is attested in several texts from Puzriš-Dagan dating to ŠS 8-IS 2 in connection to the 'e<sub>2</sub> uz-ga', the private area of the royal palace.<sup>136</sup> His occurrence here may entail he held a subsistence plot of royal pertinence in Gu'aba.

**(rev. II, 2-5)** These lines may refer to the sheep entrusted to the shepherds of some particular facility or place, whose name is not longer readable.

**(rev. II, 8)** The title na-gada <sup>d</sup>en-ki occurs only in this text and may refer to a herdsman somehow tied to the temple of Enki in Gu'aba. Lugal-ušime is a common name, thus it may refer to different herdsmen. Without any connection to Enki, attestations of herdsmen named Lugal-ušime are present in [MVN 9, 20](#) (Š 48/-) a sheep account taken in Gu'aba; [TCTI 1, 903](#) [...], obv. I, 6, a sheep account, and [TCTI 1, 873](#) [...], obv. I, 9, a wool account of the sheep of Abi-simti.

**(rev. II, 11)** As already noted, Ur-mes is one of the most common Sumerian names and may refer to different herdsmen. Here a herdsman of Gu'aba is probably meant, thus very likely a namesake of the ones attested in Text 13 ([TCTI 1, 850](#)) (from Ĝirsu), and in Text 26 ([MVN 6, 544](#)) (from the Gu-Iniĝinšedu). [TIM 6, 5](#) (Š [...]) attests (rev. III 24) the son of Zezani as responsible for a number of goats allocated to the goddess NinMAR.KI in Gu'aba (rev. VII, 8-10: ud<sub>5</sub> gub-ba / <sup>d</sup>nin-MAR.KI-ka / ša<sub>3</sub> gu<sub>2</sub>-ab-ba<sup>ki</sup>). The same herdsman is then attested in [Fs Sigrist 103, 10](#) ([...]), rev. IV, 3, among the herdsmen

<sup>134</sup> The son of Anna-hilibi was probably a homonymous goat herdsman, who is attested in [DAS 50](#) (IS 3/-) (obv. I, 15), recording the goats available to the palace and gods in the province (ud<sub>5</sub> gub-ba e<sub>2</sub>-gal u<sub>3</sub> dingir-re-ne ša<sub>3</sub> gir<sub>2</sub>-su<sup>ki</sup>), and in [TCTI 1, 878](#) [...], obv. IV, 4, an account of goat and cattle by-products involving different herdsmen of the whole province.

<sup>135</sup> The goat herdsman attested in [DAS 50](#) (IS 3/-), obv. VI, 7 (nam-[...]) and [TCTI 2, 2815](#) [...], recording a similar account (rev. II, 25), was probably a namesake.

<sup>136</sup> With regard to cooks and kitchens of this area in Puzriš-Dagan, see Sallaberger 2003/4: 58-60.

of Gu'aba. In addition, [CT 10, pl. 50, BM 14344](#) (Š 48/-) records an account subscribed by Ur-mes son of Zezani concerning both sheep and goats.<sup>137</sup> Finally, [MVN 2, 42](#) [...] (see § 1.1.9) (Tab. obv. III, 17'-20'), attests to Ur-mes son of Zezani as supervisor of the plots entrusted to him (9 *iku*, 32,400 m<sup>2</sup>), to a shepherd assistant (4 ½ *iku*, 16,200 m<sup>2</sup>) and one classified according to its rent capacity (2 ½ *iku*, 9000 m<sup>2</sup>). In any case, it is unclear whether the herdsman attested here in Text 9 can be identified with the son of Zezani.

(rev. II, 12-III, 2) This section concerns the sheep of the cook of the grand vizier entrusted to the shepherd Inannaka. To the best of my knowledge, the

cook Aḫuni is not attested elsewhere. [UF 25, 2](#) (ŠS 3/-) quotes a boat of an unnamed cook of the grand vizier, alongside a barge of the wife of the grand vizier (rev. 1). Inannaka can likely be identified with the shepherd attested 16 years earlier in Text 22 ([MVN 6, 415](#)) (AS 1/-), rev. 1, in connection with the royal cook Ur-BaU. In addition, it is unclear whether he can be identified with the shepherd occurring in [PPAC 5, 1122](#) (AS 1/-) as receiver of goats, whose seal defines him as 'sipa<sup>d</sup>nin-[...]' and in [Zinbun 21, 1 37](#) (AS 3/-) rev. III, 35, in connection to a plot of the e-Namḫani leased out. The Inannaka attested in Text 5 ([CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230](#)) (ŠS 1/-), rev. I, 12, was very likely a namesake.

#### §5.1.10. Text 10: [Ontario 2, 435](#) (ŠS 9/-)

Sigrist 2004

Photo

#### Obverse

##### I

*blank line*

1.	5(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	341 goats
2.	libir-am <sub>3</sub>	(of the) 'old' (herd)
3.	2(u) maš <sub>2</sub>	20 goats
4.	maš <sub>2</sub> geš <sup>eš</sup> tukul / <sup>d</sup> nin-geš-zi-/da	goats for the weapon of Ningešzida
5.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub> (A./AN)	sheep 'present'
6.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	62 goats
7.	[udu] <sup>r</sup> zi-ga <sup>r</sup>	[sheep] 'expended'

*2/3 broken lines*

##### II

1.	ki-tuš-lu <sub>2</sub> / na-gada	Kitušlu, the herdsman
2.	3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu	178 sheep
3.	bi <sub>2</sub> -de <sub>5</sub> KU	gathered there (while) 'being entrusted'
4.	ki ki-tuš-lu <sub>2</sub>	(in) the plot (under charge of) Kitušlu
5.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(diš) udu	61 sheep
6.	udu ur- <sup>d</sup> iškur / KU	sheep 'entrusted' to Ur-Iškur,
7.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(diš) udu	122 sheep
8.	udu i <sub>3</sub> -tur-ra / KU	sheep 'entrusted' to Itura
9.	3(u) 5(diš) udu	35 sheep
10.	[...]-u <sub>2</sub>	[...]-u

*ca. 2 broken lines*

##### III

1.	udu ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> / šabra	sheep of Ur-BaU, the chief administrator
2.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) 1(diš) udu	151 sheep
3.	3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	29 goats
4.	udu ur- <sup>d</sup> lamma / sa <sub>12</sub> -du <sub>5</sub>	sheep of Ur-Lamma, the land recorder

<sup>137</sup> [Nisaba 33, 745](#) (AS 4/iv) records a sheep account (mostly concerning sheep) subscribed by Ur-mes son of Zezani the *dumudaba*. The uncommon patronymic would suggest he was not a namesake of the herdsman, thus one may wonder whether the title of *dumudaba* refers to the father of the herdsman; otherwise, the underlying dynamics are unclear to me.

5.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(diš) udu 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	62 sheep 2 goats
6.	udu ur-an-ki	sheep of Ur-anki
7.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(u) 2(diš) udu	112 sheep
8.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	89 goats
9.	[udu] lu <sub>2</sub> -mah <sup>2</sup> [...]	[sheep] of the <i>lumah</i> -priest ...

ca. 1 broken line

...

## Reverse

### I

blank line

1.	4(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) [udu]	38 [sheep]
2.	udu lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> šul-gi KU	sheep 'entrusted' to Lu-Šulgi
3.	5(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	48 sheep 2 goats
4.	udu amar-ku <sub>3</sub> KU	sheep 'entrusted' to Amarku
5.	1(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) udu 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	9 sheep 1 goat
6.	udu ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> ugula <sup>2</sup> kikken(HAR) <sup>2</sup>	sheep of Ur-BaU, the supervisor of the mill <sup>2</sup>
7.	5(u) 2(diš) udu 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	52 sheep 62 goats
8.	udu lu <sub>2</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub> -/ga KU	sheep 'entrusted' to Lu-saga
9.	2(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) udu 3(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	19 sheep 3 goats
10.	udu nig <sub>2</sub> -lagar-DI-e / KU	sheep 'entrusted' to NiġlagarDie

### II

2/3 broken lines

1'.	[... udu]	... [sheep]
2'.	[...] maš <sub>2</sub>	... goats
3'.	udu lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> en-ki / [šeš ga]-eš <sub>8</sub>	sheep of Lu-Enki, [brother of Ga]'eš
4'.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 2(diš) udu 1(u) maš <sub>2</sub>	132 sheep 10 goats
5'.	ur-du <sub>6</sub> <sup>1</sup> sipa	Ur-du, the shepherd
6'.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) 1(diš) udu 2(u) maš <sub>2</sub>	101 sheep 20 goats
7'.	lu <sub>2</sub> -me-lam <sub>2</sub> sipa	Lu-melam, the shepherd
8'.	udu sukkal-maḥ	sheep of the grand vizier
9'.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) 1(diš) udu	91 sheep
10'.	4(u) 6(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	46 goats
11'.	la-gu <sub>2</sub> sipa	Lagu, the shepherd
12'.	udu lu <sub>2</sub> -giri <sub>17</sub> -zal / nu-banda <sub>3</sub> ki-[...]	sheep of Lu-girizal, the captain of Ki-[...]

### III

2/3 broken lines

blank space

1'.	nig <sub>2</sub> -[ka <sub>9</sub> aka]	accomplished account
2'.	a-ša <sub>3</sub> e <sub>2</sub> -<duru <sub>5</sub> > <sup>2</sup> <sup>d</sup> inanna	field of the temple/village of Inanna
3'.	mu e <sub>2</sub> <sup>d</sup> šara <sub>2</sub> / ba-du <sub>3</sub>	year: (when) the temple of Šara was built

blank space

#### §5.1.10.1. General considerations

**§5.1.10.1.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 1 institutional herdsman, at least 6 individuals somehow responsible for state-held sheep (KU), 1 chief administrator, 1 land recorder, 2 individuals quoted by name, 1 *lumah*-priest, 1 individual (likely supervisor of the mill), 2 shepherds tied to the sheep of the grand vizier and 1 shepherd tied to the sheep of 1 captain. The text begins by recording the largest number of goats assigned to a single person, and it continues with no linear decreasing order concerning both sheep and

goats.

**§5.1.10.1.2.** A field named after the temple of Inanna is attested only here. Given the analogies with Text 13 (TCTI 1, 850) (IS 3/-), drawn up 4 years later and concerning the sheep which have grazed in the field of the village of Inanna (a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-<duru<sub>5</sub>> <sup>d</sup>inanna), one can wonder if the field meant here must be interpreted as a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-<duru<sub>5</sub>> <sup>d</sup>inanna, hence referring to the field located in the Ġirsu district. PPAC 5, 601 (ŠS 1/-) ascribes to that field (obv. III, 5) 5 sheep and 14 goats to be compared to the 1898+ animals (1211 sheep and 687 goats) recorded in ŠS 9 and the 1963+



(1077 sheep and 886 goats) recorded in IS 3 (see Text 13).

#### §5.1.10.2. Prosopographical and further notes

**(obv. I, 1- obv. II, 4)** Notwithstanding the broken lines at the end of the first column, this whole section may have regarded the goats managed by the herdsman Kitušlu. Among the 'present' goats, there are those allocated to the 'weapon of Ningêšzida', hence apparently not yet expended. BAOM 2, 33 81 (AS 5/-), a running account of the gudu-priest Ur-Damu concerning the goats allocated for 'the weapon of Ningêšzida', attests to Kitušlu taking charge of part of the listed goats in the expenditure section (obv. 8). The text specifies (obv. 9-10) that the relevant goats are 'fattened by shepherd' (sipa-de<sub>3</sub> sul-a).<sup>138</sup> This would explain the occurrence of goats allocated to this very purpose in the section concerning goats still 'present', since Kitušlu was also involved in their fattening. Moreover, as seen in § 3.2.4, the goats allocated to 'the weapon of Ningêšzida' could be considered a 'new acquisition' contrasting with the goats defined as being 'old' (libir). Kitušlu is also attested in: DAS 50 (IS 3/-), obv. II, 2 (ki-tuš-[lu<sub>2</sub>]), recording the goats available to the palace and gods in the province (ud<sub>5</sub> gub-ba e<sub>2</sub>-gal u<sub>3</sub> dingir-re-ne ša<sub>3</sub> gir<sub>2</sub>-su<sup>ki</sup>); TCTI 2, 2815 [...], a similar account (obv. IV, 7); TCTI 1, 878 [...], obv. IV, 4, an account of goats and cattle by-products involving different herdsmen of the whole province. In addition, Kitušlu can be identified with the herdsman attested in Text 13 (TCTI 1, 850) (IS 3/-), obv. I, 6.

**(obv. III, 1)** Ur-BaU was the name of at least 3 chief administrators of Ġirsu during the reigns of Šu-Suen and Ibbi-Suen: the son of Unġa tied to the temple of Šulgi,<sup>139</sup> the son of Halili,<sup>140</sup> and the son of Atu.<sup>141</sup> Therefore, it is unclear whom Text 10 may refer to.

**(obv. III, 4)** Ur-Lamma is to be identified with the provincial land recorder attested (obv. 4: ki ur-<sup>d</sup>lamma / sa<sub>12</sub>-du<sub>5</sub> gir<sub>2</sub>-su<sup>ki</sup>-/ka) in a text from Ur,

UET 3, 179 (ŠS 4/-) as responsible for the recruitment of a worker (dumu-gi<sub>7</sub>), who abandoned his employment among the shepherds of the god Nanna. However, nothing in our text suggests a work responsibility for the sheep, nor a connection to the Nanna personnel. His occurrence here may rather betray a connection to the plot where the sheep have grazed.

**(obv. III, 6)** The Ur-anki attested here in connection to 62 sheep and 2 goats also occurs in Text 13 (TCTI 1, 850) (IS 3/-), rev. I, 6, where he is responsible for (KU) 62 sheep and 4 goats. At this point, one may wonder whether the sign (KU) in this text was omitted (see § 2.3.3.4).

**(obv. III, 9)** This line probably refers to the priest of Inanna, who also occurs in Text 13 (TCTI 1, 850) (obv. II, 4). His connection to the sheep or the plot is unclear.

**(rev. I, 6)** One may wonder whether this line may refer to the supervisor of the mill attested elsewhere in the provincial documentation.<sup>142</sup>

**(rev. II, 3)** It seems plausible that this line may refer to the same individual attested in Text 13 (TCTI 1, 850) as brother of Ga'eš (rev. II, 3: lu<sub>2</sub>-[...] -ki<sup>2</sup> šeš ga-eš<sub>8</sub>).

**(rev. II, 4-8)** This section concerns the sheep of the grand vizier entrusted to the shepherds Ur-du and Lu-melam for grazing in the mentioned field. In addition, Ur-du may be identified with the shepherd attested in connection to the sheep of the grand vizier in Text 13 (rev. I, 3: ur-du<sub>6</sub> [sipa]). As far as Lu-melam is concerned, nothing suggests a connection between him and the herdsman of the queen attested in Text 4 (TLB 3, 89) (ŠS 1/-) rev. II 2.

**(rev. II, 9-12)** This section concerns the sheep assigned to the captain Lu-girizal entrusted to the shepherd Lagu for grazing in the mentioned field (rev. III, 2). To the best of my knowledge, both the captain and the shepherd occur only in this text. In this case as well, a connection between the captain and plot can be inferred.

<sup>138</sup> Sheep and goats could also be privately fattened by shepherds (sipa-de<sub>3</sub> sul-a), as opposed to the professional fattening done by the kurušda; see Civil 2011: 272.

<sup>139</sup> See e.g. MVN 2, 109 (ŠS 6/-), rev. 1.

<sup>140</sup> See e.g. MVN 12, 510 (IS 1/ix), obv. 5.

<sup>141</sup> See e.g. MVN 5, 230 (IS 2/-), obv. 4.

<sup>142</sup> See e.g. Comptabilité 17 (-/-), obv. 13.

§5.1.11. Text 11: TCTI 1, 743 (ŠS 9/-)<sup>143</sup>

Lafont-Yildiz 1989  
Transliteration

**Obverse**

- |    |  |                                     |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | [...]+ 5(diš) udu  | +5 sheep                            |
| 2. | [...] 1(u) 4(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                                 | + 14 goats                          |
| 3. | [udu] lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> nin-gir <sub>2</sub> -su [KU] | [sheep] [‘entrusted’ to] Lu-Niġirsu |
| 4. | [...] 5(diš) udu 3(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                      | +5 udu 35 goats                     |
| 5. | udu gu <sub>3</sub> -de <sub>2</sub> -a KU                         | sheep ‘entrusted’ to Gudea          |
| 6. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 2(diš) udu 1(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>  | 72 sheep 15 goats                   |
| 7. | udu lu <sub>2</sub> -sukkal <sup>1</sup> -an-ka KU                 | sheep ‘entrusted’ to Lu-sukkalanka  |

**Reverse**

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka                      | accomplished account                        |
| 2. | a-ša <sub>3</sub> ṛdu <sub>6</sub> ṛ-eš <sub>3</sub>       | field of Du’eš                              |
| 3. | [mu e <sub>2</sub> ] ḏšara <sub>2</sub> ba-du <sub>3</sub> | [year: (when) the temple] of Šara was built |

§5.1.11.1. General considerations

§5.1.11.1.1. This text only quotes individuals somehow tied to state-held sheep (KU), see § 2.3.3.2.

§5.1.11.1.2 The field of Du’eš was located in Gu’aba

and, as shown (rev. 5) in [SNAT 126](#) (ŠS 1/-), 9 years earlier 36 *iku* (rev. 4: 2.0.0), 129,600 m<sup>2</sup>, had been allocated as pasture areas. With a total of 146+ animals (82 sheep and 64 goats) in ŠS 9 the ratio would have been of 1 animal per ca. 887.6 m<sup>2</sup>. However, the breaks in the tablet hamper a reliable evaluation.

§5.1.12. Text 12: TCTI 1, 802 (ŠS 9/-)

Lafont-Yildiz 1989  
Transliteration

**Obverse**

**I**

- |    |   |                                    |
|----|---|------------------------------------|
| 1. | 4(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) 2(diš) udu                                    | 272 sheep                          |
| 2. | 3(u) 4(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>  | 34 goats                           |
| 3. | udu dingir-bu <sub>3</sub> -ka ša <sub>3</sub> geš-kin-<ti>             | sheep of Diġirbuka in the workshop |
| 4. | 3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu                         | 178 sheep                          |
| 5. | 8(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>   | 8 goats                            |
| 6. | [udu] ur- <sup>d</sup> da-ṛmu <sup>ṛ</sup> ša <sub>3</sub> geš-[kin-ti] | sheep of Ur-Damu in the work[shop] |

**II**

- |    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(u) [udu]  | 110 [sheep]                                |
| 2. | 1(u) 2(diš) [maš <sub>2</sub> ]  | 12 [goats]                                 |
| 3. | udu ḥu-[...] ša <sub>3</sub> geš-[kin-<ti>]                            | sheep of Ḥu-[...] in the work[shop]        |
| 4. | 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) [udu]                                      | 28 [sheep]                                 |
| 5. | udu ur- <sup>d</sup> [šul]-pa-e <sub>3</sub> dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba | sheep of Ur-[Šul]pa’e, the <i>dumudaba</i> |

**Reverse**

**I**

- |    |  |              |
|----|--|--------------|
| 1. | 1(geš’u) 6(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(u) [udu] | 1010 [sheep] |
|----|--|--------------|

<sup>143</sup> The arrangement of the information in only one column per side is unusual in administrative round tablets; see Greco 2017: 37.

2.	2(u) 5(diš) [maš <sub>2</sub> ]	25 [goats]
3.	udu <sup>d</sup> utu- [...]	sheep of Utu- [...]
4.	1(geš'u) 1(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) 'udu'	609 sheep
5.	udu NE- [...]	sheep of NE- [...]
<b>II</b>		
1.	'nig <sub>2</sub> '-ka <sub>9</sub> aka	accomplished account
2.	a-ša <sub>3</sub> e <sub>2</sub> -duru <sub>5</sub> ba-zi	field of the village of Bazi
3.	mu e <sub>2</sub> <sup>d</sup> šara <sub>2</sub> ba-du <sub>3</sub>	year: (when) the temple of Šara was built

### §5.1.12.1. General considerations

§5.1.12.1.1. The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 3 individuals in connection to a workshop, 1 *dumudaba*, and to 2 individuals, for whom further information is lost in the breaks of the tablet. The text begins by recording the largest number of sheep tied to the workshop.

§5.1.12.1.2. The exact location of the village of Bazi is unknown. The total number of animals which have grazed there in ŠS 9 is 2286 (2207 sheep and 79 goats).

### §5.1.12.2. Prosopographical and further notes

(**obv. I 2-II, 3**) This section concerns sheep 'in the workshop' assigned to untitled individuals (see § 3.2.2). Among them, only Ur-Damu might possibly be identified with a herdsman; herdsmen bearing this name are attested in [CT 9, pl. 23, BM 19055](#) (AS 1/-), **obv. 8**, a sheep account taken in Kinunir, and in [TLB 3, 140](#) (AS 1/-), **obv. 3**, a 'multiple sheep account' taken in Lullubu.

(**rev. I, 4-5**) These lines refer to sheep somehow related to an individual (possible names are bi<sub>2</sub>-[du<sub>11</sub>-ga] or bi<sub>2</sub>-[du<sub>11</sub>-i<sub>3</sub>-sa<sub>6</sub>]). An interpretation as dead sheep gathered on the plot (bi<sub>2</sub>-de<sub>5</sub>) under the responsibility of Utu- [...] is also plausible, although we would expect a further line (ki utu- [...]); see § 1.3.6 after the number of dead sheep.

### §5.1.13. Text 13: [TCTI 1, 850](#) (IS 3/-)

Lafont-Yildiz 1989  
CUSAS 17, 274; Civil 2011  
Transliteration

#### Obverse

##### I

1.	4(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) 4(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	274 goats
2.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
3.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	65 goats
4.	zi-ga	'expended'
5.	la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> 3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	shortfall: 215 goats
6.	ki-tuš-lu <sub>2</sub> na-gada	Kitušlu, the herdsman
7.	4(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(diš) udu	245 sheep
8.	udu bi <sub>2</sub> -de <sub>5</sub> didli KU	sheep gathered there (while) 'being entrusted' to various (individuals)
9.	3(u) 5(diš) <sup>2</sup> udu	35 <sup>2</sup> sheep
10.	udu 'ur'- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub>	sheep of Ur-BaU
11.	[...] KI	....

##### II

1.	ki ki-tuš-lu <sub>2</sub>	(in) the plot (under charge of) Kitušlu
2.	5(u) 1(diš) udu	51 sheep
3.	2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	2 goats
4.	udu lu <sub>2</sub> -maḥ <sup>1</sup> <sup>d</sup> inanna	sheep of the <i>lumaḥ</i> -priest of Inanna
5.	5(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu	48 sheep
6.	2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	2 goats
7.	udu lu <sub>2</sub> - [...]	sheep of Lu- [...]

8.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) 2(diš) [udu]	142 [sheep]
9.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) ṛmaš <sub>2</sub> ṛ	58 goats
10.	lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> nin-[...] na-gada	(under charge of) Lu-Nin[...], the herdsman

#### Reverse

#### I

1.	3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) udu	229 sheep
2.	[...] maš <sub>2</sub>	[...] goats
3.	ur-du <sub>6</sub> [sipa]	Ur-du [the shepherd]
4.	udu sukkaḫ-maḫ	sheep of the grand vizier
5.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu 4(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	58 sheep 4 goats
6.	udu ur-an-ki KU	sheep 'entrusted' to Ur-anki
7.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(diš) udu	65 sheep
8.	udu ur-sukkaḫ KU	sheep 'entrusted' to Ur-sukkaḫ
9.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	71 goats
10.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
11.	ur-mes na-gada	Ur-mes, the herdsman
12.	3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) 4(diš) udu	204 sheep
13.	3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	195 goats

#### II

1.	[...]	...
2.	[...]	...
3.	[udu] lu <sub>2</sub> -[...] -ki <sup>2</sup> šeš ga-eš <sub>8</sub>	...(sheep) of Lu-[En]ki <sup>2</sup> , the brother of Ga'eš

*blank line*

4.	nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka	accomplished account
5.	a-ša <sub>3</sub> e <sub>2</sub> -duru <sub>5</sub> <sup>d</sup> inanna	field of the village of Inanna
6.	mu si-mu-ru-um <sup>ki</sup> ba-ḫul	year: (when) Simurum was destroyed

### §5.1.13.1. General considerations

**§5.1.13.1.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 3 institutional herdsmen, at least 3 individuals quoted by name, 1 *lumah*-priest, 2 individuals somehow responsible for state-held sheep (KU), 1 shepherd (regardless of the administrative level) tied to the sheep of the grand vizier. Some of the individuals quoted here also occur in Text 10 (Ontario 2, 435) (ŠS 9/-), drawn up 4 years earlier. As in Text 10, Text 13 begins by recording the largest number of goats assigned to a single person, also in this case the herdsman Kitušlu, but it does not continue with a linear, decreasing, order.

**§5.1.13.1.2.** The field of the village of Inanna was located in the Ġirsu district. Notwithstanding the breaks in both tablets, the comparison between the two shows that in ŠS 9 (1898+) and in IS 3 (1963+) roughly the same number of animals grazed there.

### §5.1.13.2. Prosopographical and further notes

**(obv. I, 1-II, 1)** This section concerns the goats managed by Kitušlu, who can be identified with the herdsman attested in Text 10 (obv. II, 1). After a sub-

section (obv. I, 1-6) presumably referring to his own account, this text ascribes him a number of dead sheep while being entrusted to various individuals in the plot under his charge (obv. I, 7-8; see below) and those assigned to an untitled Ur-BaU. An identification between the Ur-BaU quoted here and the homonymous chief administrator or supervisor of the mill attested in Text 10 (obv. III, 1) is appealing, but uncertain.

**(obv. I, 8)** An interpretation of this line as: 'udu bi<sub>2</sub>-de<sub>5</sub> didli <dumu>-dab<sub>5</sub>' seems also plausible; cf. Text 1 (MVN 2, 78) obv. II, 8: 10 <udu> bi<sub>2</sub>-de<sub>5</sub> didli eren<sub>2</sub>. Therefore, a possible interpretation would be 'sheep gathered there (while) being entrusted to various *dumudaba*'.

**(obv. II, 2-4)** This section refers to the sheep assigned to a *lumah*-priest of Inanna, very likely to be identified with the unnamed priest attested in Text 10 (obv. III, 9), where he is connected to a larger number of animals (112 sheep and 89 goats).

**(rev. I, 1-4)** This section refers to the sheep of the grand vizier entrusted to the shepherd Ur-du, also attested in Text 10 (rev. II, 5), where he occurs alongside another shepherd. The animals of the grand vizier counted in ŠS 9 are 233 sheep and 30 goats

entrusted to 2 shepherds, to be compared with the 229 sheep (number of goats lost) recorded in IS 3 entrusted to only one shepherd. This could hypothetically imply that Ur-du took over the sheep earlier managed by Lumelam or that the presence of a further shepherd was omitted for unknown reasons.

**(rev. I, 5-8)** This section regards the sheep assigned to two individuals somehow responsible for state-held sheep. Ur-anki is also attested in Text 10 (obv. III, 6), where he occurs, simply quoted by name, in connection to a similar quantity of sheep (see § 2.3.3.4).

**(rev. I, 11)** Ur-mes is a very common name and may refer to various herdsmen active in the province in different period of time. However, we can suppose that the herdsman attested here is to be identified with the son of Lu-Gudea occurring alongside with Kitušlu in the following goat accounts: [DAS 50](#) (IS 3/-), obv. III, 13; [TCTI 2, 2815](#) [...], (obv. IV, 19); [TCTI 1, 878](#) [...], obv. IV, 17.

**(rev. II, 3)** The transliteration has [udu] lu<sub>2</sub>-x-su. However, since the misinterpretation of similar signs (SU and KI) can be due to the tablet condition, a connection between this individual and the Lu-Enki attested in Text 10 ([Ontario 2, 435](#)) (rev. II, 3) can be supposed.

#### §5.1.14. Text 14: [TCTI 2, 4176](#) (IS 3/-)

Lafont-Yildiz 1996

Transliteration

##### Obverse

###### I

- |    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | 8(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) 1(diš) / udu                         | 501 sheep                                    |
| 2. | 2(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                                   | 25 goats                                     |
| 3. | a <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>2</sub> / sipa          | Au'u, the shepherd                           |
| 4. | udu lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>&lt;d&gt;</sup> kal-/kal-la / šabra | sheep of Lu-Kalkala, the chief administrator |

###### II

- |    |   |                    |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 1. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(diš) ʾudu                  | 62 she[ep]         |
| 2. | 5(diš) ʾmaš <sub>2</sub>                          | 5 goa[ts]          |
| 3. | udu lu <sub>2</sub> -[...]-/i <sub>3</sub> -[...] | sheep of Lu-[...]  |
| 4. | 3(u) 3(diš) [... udu]                             | 33+ [sheep]        |
| 5. | 2(u) 1(diš) [maš <sub>2</sub> ]                   | 21 [goats]         |
| 6. | udu TAR-[...]                                     | sheep of TAR-[...] |

##### Reverse

###### I

*uninscribed*

###### II

- |    |  |                                    |
|----|--|------------------------------------|
| 1. | nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>3</sub> aka          | accomplished account               |
| 2. | a-ša <sub>3</sub> du-a-/bi                     | field of Duabi                     |
| 3. | mu si-mu-ru-/um <sup>ki</sup> ba-ḫul (IGI./UR) | year: (when) Simurum was destroyed |

#### §5.1.14.1. General considerations

**§5.1.14.1.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep entrusted to 1 shepherd (regardless of the administrative level) tied to a provincial sheep-pen and those assigned to individuals, about whom further information is no longer available. The text begins by reporting the largest number of sheep assigned to a single person and continues according to a decreasing order.

**§5.1.14.1.2.** To the best of my knowledge, this is the

only attestation of this field. The exact location of the village Duabi (e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> du-a-bi), after which the field is named, is unknown. We can note, however, that the sheep from the same sheep-pen both in Text 2 ([Amherst 20](#)) (§ 44//IS 3/-) and Text 18 ([TCTI 2, 4177](#)) [...] have grazed in fields of the Niġin area. The total number of animals which have grazed here in IS 3 is 647+ (596 sheep and 51 goats).

#### §5.1.14.2. Prosopographical and further notes

**(obv. I, 1-4)** This section concerns the sheep of the

new sheep-pen managed by the chief administrator Lu-kalkala and entrusted to the shepherd Au'u for grazing in the field of Duabi. With regards to the other attestations of sheep belonging to the new sheep-pen in our texts, see § 2.1.5. The number of sheep entrusted to Au'u here (501 sheep and 25 goats) is similar to the number of fat-tailed sheep entrusted to the shepherd KAgena (532 sheep) in Text 2 (Amherst 20) (Š 44//IS 3/-). Although Au'u is an uncommon name, it is unclear whether he can be identified with the homonymous herdsman of Niġin at-

tested in TCTI 1, 620 (ŠS 8/-) (obv. IV, 6'), an account of Urdu-Nanna concerning the local sheep available (udu eme-gi gub-ba) to the palace and gods (e<sub>2</sub>-gal u<sub>3</sub> dingir-re-ne) in Niġin, and in TCTI 1, 876 [...], a sheep account concerning different herdsmen of the province, where an Au'u occurs (rev. I, 14') in the section of Niġin. Moreover, a homonymous herdsman was responsible for the sheep of the high priestess of BaU in Gu'aba (see notes to Text 8 (MVN 5, 203) obv. I, 5-7; § 5.1.8.2).

### §5.1.15. Text 15: TCTI 2, 4178 (IS 3/-)

Lafont-Yildiz 1996

Transliteration

#### Obverse

##### I

ca. 3 broken lines

1'. ʾudu ʾlugal-ur-/sag KU	...
2'. [...] udu	sheep 'entrusted' to Lugal-ursaġ
3'. [...] 4(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	... sheep
4'. ʾudu ʾgu <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>3</sub> -mu / dumu-dab <sub>5</sub>	41+ goats
5'. 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu	sheep of Gu'umu, the <i>dumudaba</i>
6'. udu KU-gu-za-na / KU	28 sheep
7'. [... udu] 3(u) maš <sub>2</sub> gub-/ba	sheep 'entrusted' to KUGuzana
8'. ʾlu <sub>2</sub> ʾ-kal-la na-gada	... sheep 30 goats 'present'
	Lu-kala, the herdsman

##### II

1. 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu	78 sheep
2. udu gub-ba-ʾam <sub>3</sub> ʾ	sheep 'present'
3. 1(u) udu ʾzi ʾ-[ga]	10 sheep 'expended'
4. gu <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>3</sub> -[mu na-gada]	Gu'u[mu, the herdsman]
5. 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) udu 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	100 sheep 2 goats
6. udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
7. 2(diš) udu zi-ga	2 sheep 'expended'
8. ur-mes na-gada	Ur-mes, the herdsman
9. 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) 4(diš) udu	154 sheep
10. udu gub-ba	sheep 'present'

#### Reverse

##### I

1. 6(diš) udu	6 sheep
2. zi-ga	'expended'
3. ab-ba-sa <sub>6</sub> -ga / na-gada	Aba-saga, the herdsman
4. 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 2(diš) udu 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	132 sheep 2 goats
5. udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
6. 5(diš) udu zi-ga	5 sheep 'expended'
7. lu <sub>2</sub> -nam-tar-ra na-gada <sup>1</sup>	Lu-namtara, the herdsman
8. 3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) 1(diš) udu 3(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	201 sheep 3 goats
9. udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
10. 1(u) udu zi-ga	10 sheep 'expended'
11. a-kal-la na-gada	A-kala, the herdsman
12. 2(u) 6(diš) <sup>2</sup> udu 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	26? sheep 2 goats

13.	gub-[ba-am <sub>3</sub> ]	'present'
<b>II</b>		
1.	3(diš) udu zi-ga	3 sheep 'expended'
2.	la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu	shortfall: 98 sheep
3.	ḥa-ba-lu <sub>5</sub> -ge <sub>2</sub> / na-gada	Ḥabaluge, the herdsman
4.	5(u) 2(diš) udu gub-ba	52 sheep 'present'
5.	3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu zi-ga	28 sheep 'expended'
6.	la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(diš) udu	shortfall: 65 sheep
7.	ṛnig <sub>2</sub> ṛ-sa <sub>6</sub> -ga na-gada	[N]iḡ-saga, the herdsman
<i>blank space</i>		
8.	[nig <sub>2</sub> ]-ka <sub>9</sub> aka	accomplished account
9.	<a>-ša <sub>3</sub> ḥu-rim <sub>3</sub> <sup>ki</sup>	field of Ḥurim
10.	ṛmu ṛ-si-mu-ru-um <sup>ki</sup> / ba-ḥul	[ye]ar: (when) Simurum was destroyed

### §5.1.15.1. General considerations

**§5.1.15.1.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 2 individuals somehow responsible for state-held sheep (KU), 1 *dumudaba*, and 8 institutional herdsmen.

**§5.1.15.1.2.** The field of Ḥurim was located in the Gu'aba district. The interpretation of r. II 9 as referring to the field named after Ḥurim, rather than to center of Ḥurim itself, is based on the comparison with the other texts of the group. The total number of animals which have grazed there in IS 3 is 1078+ (998 sheep and 80 goats).

### §5.1.15.2. Prosopographical and further notes

**(obv. I, 1')** An untitled Lugal-ursaḡ involved in herding is attested in [BPOA 1, 22](#) (IS 2/-) (rev. 2), a sheep account taken in Gu'aba involving other untitled individuals, who however may have been herdsmen. It is possible that Lugal-ursaḡ was originally quoted with the title of na-gada in a section lost in the breaks of the tablet (see § 2.3.3.2).

**(obv. I, 4')** The *dumudaba* Gu'umu is attested in [CUSAS 16, 104](#) (§S 1/-) (obv. 13), the account of Gu'aba recording sheep and goats defined as being 'taken over'. He was homonymous of a herdsman of Gu'aba attested some line below (see obv. II, 4).

**(obv. I, 6')** In this section, an interpretation of KU as an abbreviation for *dumudab(a)* is hampered by the sequence: PN KU (obv. I 1') / PN dumu-dab<sub>5</sub> (I 4') / PN KU (I 6'). Indeed, in the administrative documentation abbreviations are usually used after a fully

spelled writing in the first entry.

**(obv. I, 8')** Lu-kala is a common name, thus it is unclear whether he can be identified with the herdsman of Gu'aba attested in [PPAC 5, 84](#) (AS 1/-), rev. 2, a text concerning shortfalls, sheep for slaughter, and plundered sheep already plucked. In addition, a herdsman with this name (unclear whether a namesake) occurs as supervisor of the plot entrusted to himself (9 *iku*, 32,400 m<sup>2</sup>) and to a shepherd assistant (4 ½ *iku*, 16,200 m<sup>2</sup>) in [MVN 2, 42](#) [...], obv. III, 11' (see § 1.1.9). The Lu-kala attested in Text 29 ([MVN 6, 546](#)) (obv. II, 2') was probably a homonymous goat herdsman.

**(obv. II, 4)** Gu'umu is to be identified with a well-attested herdsman of Gu'aba.<sup>144</sup> His name was spelled in different ways, with gu<sub>2</sub>-u<sub>3</sub>-mu being the most common writing next to gu<sub>2</sub>-u<sub>3</sub>-gu<sub>2</sub>, whereas it is only written gu<sub>3</sub>-u<sub>2</sub>-gu<sub>3</sub> once. His long activity can be traced back in: [PPAC 5, 631](#) (§ 48/-) recording his own sheep account; [UDT 73](#) (§ 48/-), a 'multiple sheep account' (rev. 4); [PPAC 5, 608](#) (§ 48/-) and [CT 7, pl. 10, BM 12929](#) (§ 48/-), both 'multiple sheep accounts' (resp. obv. 4 (gu<sub>2</sub>-<u<sub>3</sub>>-gu<sub>2</sub>) and obv. 12); [SNAT 68](#) (AS 1/-), recording his own sheep account;<sup>145</sup> [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-) and [UNT 63](#) (-/-), both 'multiple wool accounts' (resp. obv. IV, 35 and obv. 10); [SAT 1, 381](#) (AS 5/-), a 'multiple account' of lamb wool and wool shortfalls, obv. II, 19; [PPAC 5, 1591](#) (§S 7/-), an account of the sheep of the governor taken in Gu'aba and involving other herdsmen (rev. 1); [PPAC 5, 609](#) (-/-), a 'multiple wool account' (rev. 4).

**(obv. II, 8)** Ur-mes is a very common name and may refer to various herdsmen active in the province in different period of time; the herdsman of Gu'aba

<sup>144</sup> It is unclear whether he can be further identified with the untitled Gu'umu attested in [TÉL 213b](#) (§S 3/-) as responsible for sheep skins in Niḡin (obv. 9-10).

<sup>145</sup> The barely visible sign NA (na-<gada>) following his name would suggest that this account concerns the herdsman, rather than the homonymous *dumudaba*.

son of Irduga might be meant here. He is attested alongside with Lugal-ursaĝ in [BPOA 1, 22](#) (IS 2/-) (obv. 10); [Berens 66](#) (IS 2/-), and [TCTI 1, 753](#) (IS 2/-) both recording account of the sheep managed by him; [MTBM 221](#) (IS 2/-) and [MVN 2, 117](#) (IS 2/-), both recording wool accounts of the sheep managed by him. Moreover, [SAT 1, 381](#) (AS 5/-), where also Gu'umu is attested, reports the presence of two herdsmen bearing this name (obv. II, 8 and rev. I, 1), one of them likely being the son of Irduga.

**(rev. I, 3)** Although this would be the only attestation of Abba-saga with a title, there may have been at least two different herdsmen of the province named Abba-saga: one, son of NIM and active in Ĝirsu,<sup>146</sup> thus very likely a namesake, the other one, son of Enšakugen,<sup>147</sup> without any reference to the area of activity. Further attestations of Abba-saga without a title and patronymic can be found in [TLB 3, 56](#) (-/-) (obv. 6), a sheep account also involving the herdsman of Gu'aba Lamlama, who occurs in Text 29 ([MVN 6, 546](#)), rev. I, 7.

**(rev. I, 7)** To the best of my knowledge, this is the only attestation of the herdsman Lu-namtara. Hypothetically, a connection with the herdsman Kuda attested in Text 29 ([MVN 6, 546](#)) (rev. II, 3) can be supposed.

**(rev. I, 11)** A-kala is a common name and may refer to different herdsmen. It seems plausible that the herdsman attested here is to be identified with the one attested in [CUSAS 16, 104](#) (ŠS 1/-), obv. 8. As shown by [PPAC 5, 632](#) (-/-), a 'multiple wool account' concerning different herdsmen of Gu'aba, were at least two individuals named Akala and acting as herdsmen: the first one in rev. 1,<sup>148</sup> the other one, son of Kuda, in rev. 7. A homonymous herdsman was involved in the management of the sheep belonging to the royal family.<sup>149</sup>

**(rev. I, 12-II, 3)** This section concerns the sheep managed by the herdsman Ḫabaluge. The number of sheep claimed as shortfall looks impressive (98), if compared to the total number of sheep managed by him (about 29). In any case, the underlying dynamics are unclear to me. Ḫabaluge is the name of at least two different herdsmen: one active in Niĝin,<sup>150</sup> thus very likely a namesake, the other one in Gu'aba. The herdsman of Gu'aba is the one attested in the wool account [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-), rev. I, 19, while is unclear whom the following sheep and wool accounts may refer to: [TLB 3, 141](#) (IS 4/-) obv. I, 6 ; [PPAC 5, 611](#) (-/-), obv. I, 8.

**(rev. II, 7)** The herdsman Niĝ-saga is to be identified with the herdsman of Gu'aba attested in the wool account [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-), rev. IV, 32.

#### §5.1.16. Text 16: [DAS 274](#) [...]

Lafont 1985

Handcopy

#### Obverse

##### I

1.	3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) 6(diš) / udu	226 sheep
2.	1(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	11 goats
3.	udu libir-/am <sub>3</sub>	sheep (of the) 'old' (herd)
4.	6(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu 8(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	360 sheep 8 goats
5.	udu a-lu <sub>5</sub> -a	sheep of Alua
6.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
7.	2(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) udu	19 sheep
8.	zi-ga	'expended'
9.	la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> 1(u) 6(diš) udu	shortfall: 16 sheep
10.	lu <sub>2</sub> -ge-/na <sup>7</sup> na-/gada	Lu-gena[a], the herdsman

<sup>146</sup> See e.g. [MVN 6, 62](#), (ŠS 4/-).

<sup>147</sup> See [TCTI 1, 879](#), [...].

<sup>148</sup> One may wonder whether he is to be identified with the son of Gu-gilim attested (rev. I, 22) in [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-) alongside with other herdsmen of Gu'aba.

<sup>149</sup> [TCTI 1, 905](#) [...], obv. V, 20; [DAS 51](#) (AS 8/-) obv. III, 7 and [TCTI 1, 873](#) [...], rev. III, 12.

<sup>150</sup> [TCTI 1, 741](#) (AS 2/-), obv. III, 10; [BPOA 2, 1885](#) (AS 5/-), obv. II, 20; [TCTI 1, 620](#) (ŠS 8/-), obv. II, 9.



## II

1.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu	58 sheep
2.	4(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	4 goats
3.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
4.	5(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu zi-ga	300 sheep 'expended'
5.	la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> 1(u) 2(diš) udu	shortfall: 12 sheep
6.	gu-za-ni na-/gada	Guzani, the herdsman
7.	4(u) udu 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	40 sheep 2 goats
8.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
9.	la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> 5(diš) udu	shortfall: 6 sheep
10.	ur- <sup>d</sup> nin-šubur / na-gada	Ur-Ninšubur, the herdsman
11.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) 4(diš) udu	144 sheep
12.	1(u) maš <sub>2</sub>	10 goats
13.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'

## III

1.	4(u) 1(diš) udu	41 sheep
2.	zi-ga	'expended'
3.	la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) 'udu'	shortfall: 28 she[ep]
4.	a-tu na-'gada'	Atu, the her[dsman]
5.	<...> udu	... sheep
6.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
7.	lugal-KA-ge-/na na-gada	Lugal-KAgena, the herdsman
8.	<i>blank line</i> <...>	
9.	lugal-KA-/ge-[na] 'na-gada' ( <i>sic</i> )	Lugal-KA[ge][na], the [he]rdsman[an]

## Reverse

### I

1.	5(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu	48 sheep
2.	1(u) 3(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	13 goats
3.	[...]-sizkur <sub>2</sub>	[...]-sizkur
4.	[... udu] 1(u) 3(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	...[sheep] 13 goats
5.	[...]-ga	[...]-ga
6.	[... udu] 7(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	...[sheep] 7 goats
7.	[... udu] <sup>2</sup>	... sheep <sup>2</sup>
8.	[... udu] 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	... [sheep] 5 goats
9.	[...]	...
10.	[... udu] 5(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	...[sheep] 51 goats
11.	[...] 'dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> '	..., the <i>dumudaba</i>
12.	[...] 1(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) udu 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	9+ sheep 5 goats
13.	'udu ku'-li 'KU'	sheep 'entrusted' to Kuli
14.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) 5(diš) udu	145 sheep
15.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	59 goats

### II

1.	udu ba-zi	sheep of Bazi
2.	[...] dumu [...]	...
ca.	10 lines lost	...
3'.	3(u) <sup>2</sup> [...]	30 ...
4'.	udu lu <sub>2</sub> -bala-/sa <sub>6</sub> -ga dumu-/dab <sub>5</sub>	sheep of Lu-balasaga, the <i>dumudaba</i>

### III

*blank line*

1.	2(u) 2(diš) udu	22 sheep
2.	5(diš) [maš <sub>2</sub> ]	5 [goats]
3.	udu [...]	sheep ...
4.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) [...]	60 ...
5.	udu [...]	sheep ...

blank line

- |    |   |                                |
|----|---|--------------------------------|
| 6. | nig <sub>2</sub> -[ka <sub>9</sub> aka]     | [accomplished ac]count         |
| 7. | a-[ša <sub>3</sub> ...]                     | fiel[ld] ...                   |
| 8. | mu [...] ba-a- <sup>⌈</sup> du <sub>3</sub> | year: (when) [...] was bui[lt] |

### §5.1.16.1. General considerations

**§5.1.16.1.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to at least 5 institutional herdsmen, 2 *dumudaba*, 1 individual quoted by name and 1 individual somehow responsible for state-held sheep (KU). The text begins by recording the largest number of sheep assigned to a single person, but it does not continue in a linear, decreasing, order.

**§5.1.16.1.2.** As suggested by the involved herdsmen, the concerned field(s) may have been located in Gu'aba. Disregarding the missing entries (<...>), the total number of animals is 1776+ (1583 sheep and 193 goats).

### §5.1.16.2. Prosopographical and further notes

**(obv. I, 1-10)** This section refers to the sheep managed by the herdsman Lu-gena, who apparently is not attested elsewhere. Part of the sheep managed by him is associated with a certain a-lu<sub>5</sub>-a (obv. I, 5), likely to be understood as a 'new acquisition' contrasting with the sheep labelled as being "old" (*libir*), see § 3.2.4.

**(obv. II, 6)** Guzani is the name of a herdsman of Gu'aba attested in [PPAC 5, 642](#) (Š 48/-), recording his sheep account, and in [PPAC 5, 632](#) (-/-), obv. 11, a wool account concerning different herdsmen of the district. Moreover, Guzani may be identified with the herdsman of Gu'aba attested as Guzana in the following wool accounts: [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-), obv. II, 15; [SAT 1, 381](#) (AS 5/-), obv. I, 12 and obv. II, 11; [PPAC 5, 609](#) (-/-), obv. 4; [UNT 63](#) (-/-), obv. 2; and in the account of sheep 'taken over' recorded in [CUSAS 16, 104](#) (ŠS 1/-), obv. 14.

**(obv. II, 10)** Ur-Ninšubur was a herdsman of Gu'aba, also attested in [HSS 4, 36](#) (AS 1/-), recording his sheep account. He also occurs in the wool accounts of Gu'aba recorded in [UNT 53](#) (Š 48/-), obv. 6; [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-), obv. II, 12; [SAT 1, 381](#) (AS 5/-) obv. I, 5; [PPAC 5, 609](#) (-/-), rev. 5.

**(obv. III, 4)** Atu is a common name and may refer to

at least two different herdsmen of Gu'aba: Atu son of Lugal-igisa and Atu son of Alla. Atu son of Lugal-igisa is attested in the 'multiple sheep accounts': [CT 7, pl. 10, BM 12929](#) (Š 48/-), obv. II, 1; [PPAC 5, 608](#) (Š 48/-), obv. 11; [UNT 53](#) (Š 48/-), rev. 1, and in [SAT 1, 73](#) (AS 1/-), recording his sheep account. In [MVN 2, 42](#) [...] he is attested (Tab. obv. V, 2') as supervisor of plots as grazing area (see § 1.1.9); unfortunately, only the size (3 ½ *iku*, 12,600 m<sup>2</sup>) of the plot classified according to its rent capacity can be read. Atu son of Alla occurs in the 'multiple sheep accounts' of Gu'aba recorded in [CUSAS 16, 73](#) (Š 48/-), rev. I, 15; [UDT 73](#) (Š 48/-), rev. 19; [TCTI 1, 741](#) (AS 2/-), obv. IV, 18; and in the 'multiple wool accounts' recorded in [PPAC 5, 609](#) (-/-), obv. II, 15; [UNT 63](#) (-/-), obv. 6. Moreover, in [ITT 5, 6913](#) (ŠS 3/-) Atu son of Alla is responsible for a number of sheep skins (obv. 2). In [CUSAS 16, 104](#) (ŠS 1/-), Atu son of Alla is attested in obv. 10, while a possible patronymic of the Atu attested in rev. III is lost in a break of the tablet. In [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-), the name Atu occurs twice (obv. IV 6 and rev. I 6) without further information. [SAT 1, 381](#) (AS 5/-), obv. 12, attests to a herdsman Atu, without any mention of the father's name.

**(obv. III, 7-9)** Lugal-KAgena occurs twice in this text and both times with his title: the first one he occurs in connection to a unspecified number of sheep 'present', the second one in connection to a blank line. One can wonder whether this line was supposed to report the number of sheep dead while being under his charge, a kind of information which in our text occurs as a separate entry, although usually relating to the plot the herdsman was responsible for (see § 1.3.6). Lugal-KAgena may be identified with the herdsman of Gu'aba attested in [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-), obv. IV, 3; [SAT 1, 381](#), obv. II, 6; [PPAC 5, 632](#) (-/-), rev. 13, alongside with other herdsmen occurring here in [Tex 16](#). Finally, [UDT 76](#) (Š 48/-), an account of sheep of Gu'aba, attests to an untitled Lugal-KAgena son of Murguzi (obv. 4). A homonymous herdsman was involved in the management of the sheep belonging to the royal family.<sup>151</sup>

**(rev. I, 3)** It seems plausible that this line refers to a PN, possibly [lugal]-sizkur<sub>2</sub>-<re>.

<sup>151</sup> [DAS 51](#) (AS 8/-), rev. VI, 6 and [DAS 53](#) (AS 8/-) rev. 1.

§5.1.17. Text 17: TCTI 1, 771 [...]

Lafont-Yildiz 1989

Transliteration

**Obverse**

**I**

- |    |                                      |                                |
|----|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. | 5(u) 4(diš) udu                      | 54 sheep                       |
| 2. | 1(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>         | 15 goats                       |
| 3. | udu u-ša-lum dumu-gi <sub>7</sub>    | sheep of Ušalum, the 'citizen' |
| 4. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) 1(diš) udu | 91 sheep                       |
| 5. | [...] 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>        | 5+ goats                       |
| 6. | udu šu-ni-a dumu-gi <sub>7</sub>     | sheep of Šunia, the 'citizen'  |

**II**

- |    |   |                                      |
|----|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1. | 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 3(diš) udu   | 27 sheep                             |
| 2. | 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>   | 2 goats                              |
| 3. | udu ur-sa <sub>6</sub> -ga dumu-gi <sub>7</sub>                                   | sheep of Ur-saga, the 'citizen'      |
| 4. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu 4(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> | 88 sheep 41 goats                    |
| 5. | udu ur- <sup>d</sup> igi-zi-bar-ra dumu-gi <sub>7</sub>                           | sheep of Ur-Igizibara, the 'citizen' |

**Reverse**

**I**

- |    |   |                                 |
|----|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. | 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu                                 | 28 sheep                        |
| 2. | 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>   | 5 goats                         |
| 3. | udu nig <sub>2</sub> -du <sub>10</sub> -ga dumu-gi <sub>7</sub> | sheep of Niğduga, the 'citizen' |
|    | <i>ca. 3 broken lines</i>                                       | .....                           |

**II**

- |    |   |                                     |
|----|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | udu ur- <sup>d</sup> nanše dub-sar lugal  | sheep of Ur-Nanše, the royal scribe |
| 2. | nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka     | accomplished account                |
| 3. | a-ša <sub>3</sub> bad <sub>3</sub> -[...] | field of Bad[...]                   |
| 4. | mu [...]ki [...]                          | year: ....                          |

§5.1.17.1. General considerations

§5.1.17.1.1. The tablet report the number of sheep assigned to at least 5 *dumudaba*, here defined as 'citizens' (see § 2.2.6), and 1 royal scribe. As already noted,<sup>152</sup> an interpretation as *dumu-<dab<sub>5</sub>-ba>* ḥug-<ga<sub>2</sub>>, "hired *dumudaba*" seems also plausible.

§5.1.17.1.2. The presence of the same royal scribe attested in Text 3 (TLB 3, 88) (AS 5//IS 4/-), likely as beneficiary of a subsistence plot located in the field mentioned there ([a]-ša<sub>3</sub> [A.KU ]-[si-ga gu<sub>2</sub>] i<sub>7</sub>), would suggest that both Text 3 and Text 17 concern the same field. Were this the case, discrepancies in the field names can be due to the fact that Text 3 originally quoted two fields (as for example Text 2 does), one of them being lost with the breaks affecting the reverse, or that Text 17 used a contextual description to refer to the field. Indeed, hypothetically a further connection between a-ša<sub>3</sub> bad<sub>3</sub>-[...] and the field of bad<sub>3</sub>-da-ri<sub>2</sub> attested in Text 25 (MVN 5, 176) (ŠS 1/-)

can be supposed.

§5.1.17.1.3. In this case, the text does not begins by recording the highest number of sheep. The total number of animals recorded in this text is 356+ (288 sheep and 68 goats).

§5.1.17.2. Prosopographical and further notes

(obv. I, 3) Ušalum also occurs in Text 25 (MVN 5, 176) (ŠS 1/-), obv. 8, where he is defined as *dumudaba* (see § 2.2.6)

(obv. I, 6) Šunia also occurs in Text 25, obv. 1, where he is defined as *dumudaba* (see § 2.2.6).

(obv. II, 3) Ur-saga is probably to be identified with the *dumudaba* Ur-sasa attested in Text 25, obv. 4.

(rev. II, 1) With regard to this royal scribe, see notes to Text 3 (TLB 3, 88) (AS 5/-), obv. I, 3-4 (§ 5.1.3.2).

<sup>152</sup> See fn. 62.

§5.1.18. Text 18: TCTI 2, 4177 [...]

Lafont-Yildiz 1996

Transliteration

**Obverse**

**I**

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| 1.  | [...] 1(u) 5(diš) / udu gukkal                           | 15+ fat-tailed sheep                            |
| 2.  | [...] maš <sub>2</sub>                                   | ... goats                                       |
| 3.  | ur-mes sipa  | Ur-mes, the shepherd                            |
| 4.  | [1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) <sup>3</sup> ] 3(u) 2(diš) udu     | 92? sheep                                       |
| 5.  | [...] maš <sub>2</sub>                                   | ... goats                                       |
| 6.  | [...]- <sup>d</sup> iškur sipa                           | [...]-Iškur, the shepherd                       |
| 7.  | [udu ur- <sup>d</sup> ba]-u <sub>2</sub> / [ugula] šidim | [sheep of Ur-Ba]U, the [supervisor] of builders |
| 8.  | [...] udu  | ... sheep                                       |
| 9.  | [...] ṽmaš <sub>2</sub> ṽ                                | ... g[oats]                                     |
| 10. | [PN sipa]  | ... [PN, the shepherd]                          |

**II**

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | [udu] ur- <sup>d</sup> ig-alim / ugula šidim                      | [sheep] of Ur-Igalim, the supervisor of builders |
| 2. | 4(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) 1(diš) udu 1(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> | 271 sheep 15 goats                               |
| 3. | ki-lu <sub>5</sub> -la sipa                                       | Kilula, the shepherd                             |
| 4. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) 1(diš) udu 1(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> | 91 sheep 11 goats                                |
| 5. | ḥa-laḥ <sub>5</sub> sipa  | Halah, the shepherd                              |
| 6. | udu lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>&lt;d&gt;</sup> kal-kal-la / šabra     | sheep of Lukalkala, the chief administrator      |
| 7. | 3(u) 1(diš) udu 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>                           | 31 sheep 5 goats                                 |
| 8. | [...] šidim   | ... builder                                      |

**Reverse**

**I**

- |     |   |                                      |
|-----|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1.  | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu  | 88 sheep                             |
| 2.  | 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>   | 5 goats                              |
| 3.  | [udu] ba-zi KU  | [sheep] 'entrusted' to Bazi          |
| 4.  | 2(u) 1(diš) <udu> lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>&lt;d&gt;</sup> igi-ma- <sup>&lt;še<sub>3</sub>&gt;</sup> KU | 21 (sheep) 'entrusted' to Lu-Igimaše |
| 5.  | 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) <udu> ur- <sup>d</sup> lamma KU   | 28 (sheep) 'entrusted' to Ur-Lamma   |
| 6.  | 5(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> KU                                 | 48 sheep 'entrusted' to Ur-BaU       |
| 7.  | [...] ṽuduṽ 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>   | ... s[heep] 2 goats                  |
| 8.  | [... udu...- <sup>d</sup> ]ba-u <sub>2</sub> KU   | [sheep] 'entrusted' to [...]-BaU     |
| 9.  | [... udu] 1(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>  | ... [sheep] 11 goats                 |
| 10. | [...- <sup>d</sup> ba]-u <sub>2</sub> / [...]-ba  | ... [...]-BaU...                     |

**II**

*rest broken*

...

§5.1.18.1. General considerations

§5.1.18.1.1. The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to at least 3 shepherds (regardless of the administrative level) tied to the sheep of 2 supervisors of builders, 2 shepherds (regardless of the administrative level) tied to a provincial sheep-pen, 1 builder, 5 individuals somehow responsible for state-held sheep (KU).

§5.1.18.1.2. The occurrence of the same supervisors of builders attested in Text 26 (MVN 6, 544) (ŠS 1/-) would suggest that the field where the sheep counted

here have grazed was that of Dalugal, likely located in the Niġin area, once attested as a-ša<sub>3</sub> da-lugal šidim-e-ne, 'field of Dalugal (of the) builders' (see § 2.3.2.5). Due to the condition of the tablet, it is not possible to find a possible decreasing order in the succession of the sections.

§5.1.18.1.3. The detectable total number reports 734+ animals (685 sheep and 49 goats).

§5.1.18.2. Prosopographical and further notes

(obv. I, 1-II, 1) This section concerns the sheep of

Ur-BaU and Ur-igalim, both ‘supervisors of builders’, entrusted to 3 shepherds. In Text 26 (MVN 6, 544), the sheep are simply assigned to the supervisors without mention of the shepherds responsible for them (see § 2.3.2). Ur-Igalim can be identified with the builder son of Lu-Utu attested in JCS 16, 81 HSM 1659 (ŠS 8/-) in connection to works defined as ‘a<sub>2</sub> lugal-e gar-ra’, “work established by the king”, in an area defined as ‘a-ša<sub>3</sub> lugal-e gar-ra gaba ambar-lagaš<sup>ki</sup>’, “field established by the king before the marsh of Lagaš”. At this point, one may wonder a connection with the field that *Managing the land* 11 (-/-) described as ‘a-ša<sub>3</sub> da-lugal šidim-e-ne’ (rev. 12) alongside ‘a-ša<sub>3</sub> ambar-lagaš<sup>ki</sup> šidim-e-ne’ (rev. 8). This connection could imply that the builders have received royal subsistence plots in return for their

service.

(**obv. II, 6**) This section refers to the sheep of the “new sheep-pen” (e<sub>2</sub> udu gibil) run by Lu-kalkala, which have been entrusted to the shepherds Kilula (271 sheep and 15 goats) and Ḫalaḫ (91 sheep and 15 goats). With regards to the other attestations of sheep belonging to the new sheep-pen in our texts, see § 2.1.5. A comparison of the quantities of sheep coming from that sheep-pen in our texts shows that the smallest number is recorded here in Text 18: 362 sheep and 26 goats, to be compared to the 501 sheep and 25 goats assigned to Au’u in Text 14 (TCTI 2, 4176) (IS 3/-) and the 597 sheep and 7 goats assigned to KAgena and Ur-metena in Text 2 (Amherst 20) (Š 44?/-).

## §5.2.0. Additional tablets

### §5.2.0.1. Tablets with unrecorded shape

#### §5.2.19. Text 19: MVN 7, 583 (Š 35/-)

Pettinato-Pecchioni-Waetzoldt 1978

Transliteration

#### Obverse

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | 5(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) 2(diš) udu 3(u) maš <sub>2</sub> | 342 sheep 30 goats                          |
| 2. | udu ur- <sup>d</sup> nin-pirig                             | sheep of Ur-Nin-pirig                       |
| 3. | 7(diš) <udu> <sup>d</sup> utu-kam                          | 7 (sheep) Utukam                            |
| 4. | 4(diš) <udu> ba-ge-ne <sub>2</sub>                         | 4 (sheep) Bagene                            |
| 5. | ki ur- <sup>d</sup> nin-pirig                              | (in) the plot (under charge of) Ur-Ninpirig |
| 6. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 2(diš) udu                       | 72 sheep                                    |
| 7. | udu a-tu   | sheep of Atu                                |

#### Reverse

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | 5(diš) <udu> <lu <sub>2</sub> ?>- <sup>d</sup> mes-lam-ta-e <sub>3</sub>        | 5 (sheep) Lu?-Meslamta’e                           |
| 2. | 5(diš) <udu> <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> -IGI.DU                             | 5 (sheep) BaU-IGI.DU                               |
| 3. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) udu ur-mes                          | 59 Ur-mes  |
| 4. | ki a-tu   | (in) the plot (under charge of) Atu                |
| 5. | 2(diš) im-bi  | the relevant tablets are 2                         |
| 6. | nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka aša <sub>5</sub> ur-sag-pa-e <sub>3</sub> | accomplished account (of the) field of Ur-saḡpa’e  |
| 7. | mu us <sub>2</sub> -sa an-ša-an <sup>ki</sup> ba-ḫul                            | year following (the year when) Anšan was destroyed |

#### §5.2.19.1. General considerations

**§5.2.19.1.1** This tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 2 untitled individuals and the individuals connected to the plots under their charge (see § 2.4). The text specifies that the information was obtained from 2 different documents, very likely corresponding to the 2 recognizable sections (obv. 1-5 and obv 6-rev. 4). This text begins by recording the section with the largest number of sheep, listing first the individual, whom the largest number of

sheep is assigned and who was also responsible for the plot.

**§5.2.19.1.2.** This field is also attested in Text 23 (MVN 6, 545) (AS 1/-), drawn up 13 years later. However, none of the individuals attested here in Text 19 occurs in Text 23. PPAC 5, 601 (AS 5/-) assigned to the field the presence of 10 sheep and 21 goats to be compared with the 524 animals (494 sheep and 30 goats) recorded here in Š 35 and the 840+ recorded in AS 1 (Text 23). The field is named after a small ru-

ral settlement outside of Ĝirsu.

### §5.2.19.2. Prosopographical and further notes

(obv. 1-5) This section refers to the sheep assigned to Ur-Ninpirig and to two individuals in the plot under his charge. The title of Ur-Ninpirig is unknown, although it might hypothetically be identified with a untitled individual receiving animals in some documents dating from Š 30 to Š 33. Ur-Ninpirig occurs indeed as receiver of sheep in STA 1, 196 (Š 30/iv), obv. 5 (*n* udu kišib ur-<sup>d</sup>nin-pirig), SAT 1, 194 (Š 32/iii), obv. 6 (*n* udu ur-<sup>d</sup>nin-pirig i<sub>3</sub>-dab<sub>5</sub>),

and MVN 7, 191 (Š 32/xi), obv. 5, where he took charge of grain-fed sheep (udu niga) as provision of the kitchen (sa<sub>2</sub>-du<sub>11</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-muḥaldim), and as receiver of oxen in MVN 7, 270 (Š 33/-), obv. 7. One can wonder whether he can be understood as being a fattener (kurušda).

(obv. 6-rev. 4) This section refers to the sheep assigned to Atu, whose title is unknown, but who can have been a fattener as well,<sup>153</sup> and 3 individuals in the plot under his charge. Among them, <sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub>-IGI.DU, very likely a namesake of the shepherd of the high priestess of BaU attested in Text 20 (MVN 6, 140) (Š 36/-), obv. 5.

### §5.2.20. Text 20: MVN 6, 140 (Š 36/-)

Pettinato-Waetzoldt-Pomponio 1977  
Transliteration

#### Obverse

1. <...> da-da <sipa> gab<sub>2</sub>-KU
2. 1(aš) ba-a ša<sub>3</sub> geš-kin-ti
3. 1(diš) u<sub>2</sub>-šim-e ki-geš-i<sub>3</sub>
4. ki ba-a
5. <...> <sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub>-IGI.DU sipa
6. <...> i<sub>7</sub>-a-bi-du<sub>10</sub> sipa
7. 1(diš) ba-ga sipa
8. udu ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub>
9. 1(aš) 1(diš) ur-<sup>d</sup>da-mu dub-sar
10. [x x x x]

- ... Dada, (the shepherd of) gab<sub>2</sub>-KU (sheep)  
1 (sheep) Ba'a in the workshop  
1 (goat) Ušim'e (in) the sesame-plot  
(in) the plot (under charge of) Ba'a  
... BaU-IGI.DU, the shepherd  
... Iabidu, the shepherd  
1 (goat) Baga, the shepherd  
sheep of the priestess of BaU  
1 (sheep) 1 (goat) Ur-Damu, the scribe  
...

#### Reverse

1. nig<sub>2</sub>-ka<sub>9</sub> aka
2. aša<sub>5</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub> lu<sub>2</sub>-<sup>d</sup>šara<sub>2</sub>
3. mu <sup>d</sup>nanna kar-zi-da e<sub>2</sub>-a ba-ku<sub>4</sub>

- accomplished account  
field of the village of Lu-Šara  
year: (when) Nanna of Karzida entered the temple

### §5.2.20.1. General considerations

§5.2.20.1.1. This text shows the peculiar system of counting a few units of sheep and goats, thus it is subject to the issues discussed in § 3.3. Here, the number of sheep and goats (as well as the missing information <...>) is assigned to: 1 shepherd (regardless of the administrative level) of gab<sub>2</sub>-KU sheep, 4 shepherds (regardless of the administrative level) tied to the sheep of the high priestess of BaU, one of them occurring in connection to a workshop and as responsible for the plot where the sheep entrusted to another individual have grazed, 1 scribe tied as well to the household of the priestess. At the time this text was drawn up, the high priestess was Geme-Lamma,

wife of the provincial governor (see § 1.2.6).

§5.2.20.1.2. This is the only attestation of this village and the field named after it. As noted in § 1.2.6, one can wonder whether the village of Lu-Šara is to be identified with the village that in later documents was named after Ur-gigir and where the sheep of the high priestess have grazed in ŠS 8 (Text 8 (MVN 5, 203)), IS 1 (TÉL 262) and IS 3 (Text 28 (TÉL 250)). Thus, a location in Gu'aba may be inferred. The total number of counted animals is 2 sheep and 3 goats.

### §5.2.20.2. Prosopographical and further notes

<sup>153</sup> MVN 6, 308 (Š 33/x/18) attests to a fattener named Atu (rev. I, 22).

(**obv. 1**) The actual professional title of Dada may have been that of sipa gab<sub>2</sub>-KU, attested only in [MVN 6, 40](#) (§ 40/-; obv. 2), whereas gab<sub>2</sub>-KU is an unclear category of sheep and goats. The herdsman attested in Text 5 ([CT 1, pl. 35, BM 12230](#)) (§S 1/-), obv. I 5, was very likely a namesake.

(**obv. 2, 4**) Ba'a occurs twice: the first time in connection to a workshop (see § 3.2.2), the second time as the one responsible for the plot where the goat assigned to Ušime (whose professional title is unknown) has grazed, specifically a sesame-plot. Notwithstanding the early date of Text 20 ([MVN 6, 140](#)), one may wonder whether Ba'a can be identified with ba-za, the shepherd of the high priestess attested in [TÉL 262](#) (IS 1/-), rev. 4 (ba-za sipa), defined as herdsman in Text 28 ([TÉL 250](#)) (IS 3/-), obv. 2 (ba-za na-gada), see § 2.1.1.6. Noteworthy his absence in Text 8 ([MVN 5, 203](#)) (§S 8/-).

(**obv. 5**) BaU-IGIDU may be identified with the homonymous herdsman (na-gada) attested (obv. I, 21) in [HLC 34](#) (§ 46/-), an account of the fat-tailed sheep available to the household of the high priestess of BaU (udu gukkal gub-ba / ereš-dingir<sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub>). Without any reference to the high priestess, other attestations of BaU-IGIDU can be found in (obv. 4) [PPAC 5, 668](#) (§ 47/-), a wool account. The BaU-IGIDU attested in Text 19 ([MVN 7, 583](#)) (§ 35/-) was very likely a namesake.

(**obv. 6**) Iabidu can be identified with herdsman occurring in [CT 7, pl. 34, BM 18407](#) (§ 46/-) (rev. 3), an account of the goats and their by-products available to the household of the high priestess. In [TUT 164-15](#) [...] (obv. III 8'), he is listed alongside with Ba'aga. As for Ba'a and Baga/Ba'aga, one may wonder whether he can be identified with the homonymous shepherd attested in [TÉL 262](#) (IS 1/-), rev. 2.

(**obv. 7**) Baga as well can be identified with the shepherd of the high priestess attested in [TÉL 262](#) (IS 1/-), rev. 5 (ba-a-ga sipa), defined as herdsman in Text 8 ([MVN 5, 203](#)) (§S 8/-), obv. I 9 (ba-a-ga na-gada), and in Text 28 ([TÉL 250](#)) (IS 3/-), obv. 8' (ba-za-ga na-gada), see § 2.1.1.

(**obv. 9**) Ur-Damu can be identified with the scribe son of Ur-saga, whose seal was dedicated to Geme-Lamma, as shown in [ASJ 2, 22 62](#) (§ 35/ii):

I 1-3

geme<sub>2</sub>-<sup>d</sup>lamma / ereš-dingir / <sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub>

II 1-4

ur-<sup>d</sup>da-mu / dub-sar / dumu ur-sa<sub>6</sub>-ga / urdu<sub>2</sub>-zu.

As noted in § 2.3.1, one may wonder whether he was beneficiary of a plot belonging to the household he served or subject to labor duties within that very household.

### §5.2.21. Text 21: [MVN 6, 276](#) (§ 27/48)

Pettinato-Waetzoldt-Pomponio 1977

CUSAS 17, 274; Civil 2011

Transliteration

#### Obverse

##### I

1.	1(u) udu [...]	10 sheep ...
2.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) ʿ4(diš)ʿ [...]	94 ...
3.	3(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	3 goats
4.	udu ur- <sup>d</sup> ḥendur-sag na-gada	sheep of Ur-Ḥendursaĝ, the herdsman
5.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) udu 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	79 sheep 132 goats
6.	udu ur- <sup>d</sup> ḥendur-sag kurušda	sheep of Ur-Ḥendursaĝ, the fattener
7.	1(u) <udu> bi <sub>2</sub> -de <sub>5</sub> nu-KU	10 (sheep) gathered there (while) not 'entrusted'
8.	ki ur- <sup>d</sup> ḥendur-sag <sup>154</sup>	(in) the plot (under charge of) Ur-Ḥendursaĝ
9.	4(u) 2(diš) udu	42 sheep
10.	2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	2 goats

##### II

<sup>154</sup> Despite the ambiguity, it seems plausible that this section refers to the fattener, since the section assigned to the herdsman ends at l. 4.

*beginning broken*

1'. 2(diš) [...]	2 ...
2'. 4(u) 5(diš) udu 1(u) [maš <sub>2</sub> ]	45 sheep 10 [goats]
3'. udu ur-e <sub>2</sub> -an-na šeš ur- <sup>d</sup> hendur-sag	sheep of Ur-Eanna, brother of Ur-Ḥendursag
4'. 6(diš) <udu> ur- <sup>d</sup> [...]	6 (sheep) Ur-[...]
5'. 2(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) udu gub-ba	19 sheep 'present'
6'. 7(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> mu la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> -še <sub>3</sub>	7 goats for the shortfall
7'. udu gub-ba-a	among the sheep 'present'

**Reverse**

**I**

1. 1(diš) <udu> nigir-ša <sub>3</sub> -kuš <sub>2</sub> [...]	1 (sheep) Niġir-šakuš ...
2. 7(diš) <udu> nigir-ša <sub>3</sub> -kuš <sub>2</sub> [...] <sup>155</sup>	7 (sheep) Niġir-šakuš ...
3. 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 3(diš) udu 2(u) maš <sub>2</sub>	57 sheep 20 goats
4. udu ab-ba-gu <sub>10</sub> KU	sheep 'entrusted' to Abbaġu
5. ki ur-e <sub>2</sub> -an-na	(in) the plot (under charge of) Ur-Eanna
6. n udu <sup>156</sup> [...] 3(u) maš <sub>2</sub>	... sheep 30+ goats
7. [...]	...
<i>ca. 4 broken lines</i>	...
8'. [...]	...
9'. 1(u) [...]	10+ ...

*rest broken*

**II**

1. ur-kisal na-gada	Ur-kisal, the herdsman
2. 4(u) udu 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	40 sheep 5 goats
3. udu a-ab-ba-[...] KU	sheep of A'abba[...], the ( <i>dumu</i> ) <i>daba</i> (<dumu>-dab <sub>5</sub> <sup>?</sup> )
4. 1(u) 4(diš) <udu> ṽka-ka <sup>7</sup>	14 (sheep), Kaka
5. 1(u) <udu> ur-mes KU	10 (sheep), Ur-mes, the ( <i>dumu</i> ) <i>daba</i> (<dumu>-dab <sub>5</sub> <sup>?</sup> )
6. 6(diš) <udu> lugal-sukkal eren <sub>2</sub>	6 (sheep), Lugal-sukkal, the state dependent
7. 6(diš) udu 3(u) 3(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	6 sheep 33 goats
8. udu ur- <sup>d</sup> šul-pa-e <sub>3</sub> eren <sub>2</sub>	sheep of Ur-Šulpa'e, the state dependent
9. 5(diš) <udu> al-ba-ni-du <sub>11</sub> KU	5 (sheep) Albanidu, the ( <i>dumu</i> ) <i>daba</i> (<dumu>-dab <sub>5</sub> <sup>?</sup> )
10. ki ur-kisal	(in) the plot (under charge of) Ur-kisal
11. niġ <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka	accomplished account
12. aša <sub>5</sub> kun-zi-da gu <sub>2</sub> -ab-ba <sup>ki</sup>	field by the weir of Gu'aba

*Left edge*

1. mu ḥa-ar-ši <sup>ki</sup> ba-ḥul	year: (when) Ḥarši was destroyed
2. 2(diš) im-bi <sup>?</sup>	the relevant tablets are 2

**§5.2.21.1. General considerations**

**§5.2.21.1.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 2 institutional herdsmen, 1 fatter, 1 untitled individual with administrative relevance, 1 or 3 ([...]) individuals quoted by name, 2 state dependent workers, 4 individuals somehow responsible for state-held sheep (KU), unclear whether (at least some of them) to be interpreted as *dumud-*

*aba* (see below). The text begins by recording the largest number of animals assigned to a herdsman, since that assigned to the fatter is larger by a few units. The text specifies that the information was obtained from 2 different documents, hypothetically corresponding to the sheep assigned to skilled personnel and untitled individuals, on the one side (obv. I, 1-rev. I, 5 ca.), and the sheep assigned to additional personnel, on the other one (ca. rev. II, 1-10).

<sup>155</sup> The differentiation of the two homonymous individuals (title or patronymic) is probably lost with the breaks of the lines. In [TÉL 265](#) [...] a Niġir-šakuš is attested (obv. I, 5) acting as a herdsman, but nothing suggests a connection with the individuals quoted here.

<sup>156</sup> Here, we would expect *n* udu. Pettinato tentatively reads ṽšunigin<sup>?</sup>. If LAGAB (*nigin*<sub>2</sub>) can derive from a misunderstanding of the sign LU (udu), both squared, it is unclear to me which numeral can resemble the sign ŠU.



**§5.2.21.1.2.** To the best of my knowledge, this is the only attestation of this field. The readable total number of animals which have grazed there is 693+ (451 sheep and 242 goats).

**§5.2.21.2. Prosopographical and further notes**

(**obv. I, 4**) It is worth noting that the name of the herdsman is not simply juxtaposed at the end of the section assigned to him; the text indeed specifies ‘sheep of PN, the herdsman’. Moreover, despite the breaks on the tablet, it seems that these animals are not recorded according to the parameters of availability, thus one can wonder whether they can be considered state-held sheep or if the relevant information was transmitted in this form to the compiler of the text.<sup>157</sup> Ur-Ḫendursaġ, a herdsman of Gu’aba, is attested in several documents, the wool accounts recorded in: **UDT 73** (§ 48/-), rev. 15; **UUNT 20** (AS 5/-), rev. II, 1; **SAT 1, 381** (AS 5/-), obv. I, 11; **PPAC 5, 632** (...), obv. 10; the sheep accounts recorded in: **MVN 9, 16** (§ 47/-); **OBTR 160** (§ 48/-), rev. I, 10; **PPAC 5, 84** (AS 1/-), rev. 10; **MVN 6, 260** (-/-), obv. 14; **TCTI 1, 876** [...], obv. VI, 15. In **PPAC 5, 2** (§ 48/ix), listing ‘shepherd assistants of fat-tailed sheep’ (gab<sub>2</sub>-us<sub>2</sub> udu gukkal), Ur-Ḫendursaġ occurs (rev. II, 12) as the supervisor of a group of 4 individuals (igi-turtur, Abba-gula, Namḫani, Šeš-kala). In **CT 10, pl. 16-17, BM 12921** (AS 4/iv), listing as well shepherd assistants of fat-tailed sheep, Ur-Ḫendursaġ occurs (rev. I, 3) as the supervisor of a group of 3 individuals (igi-turtur, Abba-gula, A’adabi). A possible characterization of the sheep as ‘fat-tailed’ in Text 21 is however no longer readable. In addition, **MVN 2, 42** [...] (see § 1.1.9), attests to (Tab. rev. III, 16’) Ur-Ḫendursaġ son of Abba (unclear whether a namesake) as super-

visor of a plot entrusted to himself (3 *iku*, 10,800 m<sup>2</sup>) and one classified according to its rent capacity (18 *iku*, 64,800 m<sup>2</sup>). A homonymous *dumudaba* is attested in **MTBM 281** (AS 1/-), a sheep account taken in Gu’aba, where he acted as a herdsman.<sup>158</sup>

(**obv. I, 5-8**) This section concerns the sheep under the responsibility of the fattener Ur-Ḫendursaġ, whom a number of dead sheep in the plot under his charge is assigned, apparently while not yet entrusted to anyone (obv. I, 7). A further attestation of this fattener can be found in **MVN 7, 525** (-/xi), obv. 3, where he occurs as receiver of barley allocated as food for sheep to be fattened (ša<sub>3</sub>-gal udu niga).

(**obv. II, 1’; rev. I, 5**) The profession of Ur-Eanna brother of Ur-Ḫendursaġ is unclear, just as it is unclear whether the herdsman or the fattener is meant. Since this whole section (comprising the sheep labelled as being present and those assigned to 4 individuals in the plot under his charge) refers to him, he could have been a herdsman,<sup>159</sup> or someone acting as such. In this case, the omission of the title could be explained by considering the information about the kinship more meaningful for the compiler of the text.

(**rev. II, 1-10**) This section concerns the sheep managed by the herdsman Ur-kisal, who is not attested elsewhere, and those entrusted to different individuals employed in the plot under his responsibility. In addition, given the presence of state dependent workers (eren<sub>2</sub>), the sign KU after the PNs of this section can hypothetically be understood as an abbreviation of *dumudaba* (see § 2.2.5). In this context, however, the absence of further specifications for Kaka (rev. II, 4) would remain unclear.

**§5.2.22. Text 22: MVN 6, 415 (AS 1/-)**

Pettinato-Waetzoldt-Pomponio 1977  
CUSAS 17, 274; Civil 2011  
Transliteration

**Obverse**

1. [...] lu<sub>2</sub>-<sup>d</sup>dumu-zi na-<gada> ... Lu-Dumuzi, the herdsman

<sup>157</sup> See also Text 29 (**MVN 6, 546**), rev. I, 8-13.

<sup>158</sup> Compare the total sheep present in the account of Ur-Ḫendursaġ the *dumudaba* (49) and that counted in the account (**MVN 9, 16**) of the homonymous herdsman (445).

<sup>159</sup> **TIM 6, 5** (§ [...]), the account of goats allocated to the goddess NinMAR.KI in Gu’aba, attests to a Ur-Eanna acting as a herdsman (obv. VI, 29); **Fs Sigrist 103, 10** [...], an account of goats of the whole province, quotes a Ur-Eanna acting as a herdsman (rev. III, 13) in the Gu’aba section. Differently, **CT 7, pl. 39, BM 18436** (AS 1/-), which records the sheep account of an untitled Ur-Eanna in Niġin, may refer to a namesake.

2.	<...> nam-ḥa-ni na-gada	Namḥani, the herdsman
3.	1(aš) sukkal-ka-ka-gen <sub>7</sub>	1 (sheep) Sukkalkakagen
4.	1(aš) lu <sub>2</sub> -nigir na-gada	1 (sheep) Lu-nigir, the herdsman
5.	ki lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> dumu-zi	(in) the plot (under charge of) Lu-Dumuzi
6.	<...> na-ba-sa <sub>6</sub> na-gada	... Nabasa, the herdsman
7.	<...> ur-mes na-gada	... Ur-mes, the herdsman
8.	<...> igi-sa <sub>6</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub> na-gada sukkal-maḥ	... igi-sasa, the herdsman of the grand vizier
9.	<...> <udu> bi <sub>2</sub> -de <sub>5</sub> didli	(sheep) gathered there (while entrusted to) various (individuals)
10.	ki ur-mes	(in) the plot (under charge of) Ur-mes
11.	<...> ur- <sup>d</sup> li <sub>9</sub> -si <sub>4</sub> na-gada	... Ur-Lisi, the herdsman
12.	<...> ur-ki-gu-la na-gada <sup>d</sup> nanna	... Ur-kigula, the herdsman of Nanna
<b>Reverse</b>		
1.	<...> <sup>d</sup> inanna-ka sipa <sup>1</sup> (PA)	... Inannaka, the shepherd
2.	<udu> ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> muḥaldim lugal	(sheep of) Ur-BaU, the royal cook
3.	[... a] a-zi-gu <sub>10</sub> na-gada sanga	... A'a-ziḡu, the herdsman of the temple administrator
4.	<...> a-tu na-gada kur	... Atu, the herdsman of mountain (sheep)
5.	<...> ur- <sup>d</sup> dumu-zi na-gada kur	... Ur-Dumuzi, the herdsman of mountain (sheep)
<i>blank space</i>		
6.	nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka	accomplished account
7.	a-ša <sub>3</sub> gibil	new field
8.	mu amar- <sup>d</sup> suen lugal	year: (when) Amar-Suen (became) king

### §5.2.22.1. General considerations

**§5.2.22.1.1.** This text uses the peculiar system for counting few units of sheep and goats, thus it is subject to the issues discussed in § 3.3. However, except for two cases (obv. 3-4), information on the number or sheep counted for each individual is lacking, also in the case of the dead sheep gathered in the plot under the charge of the herdsman Ur-mes (obv. 9).

**§5.2.22.1.2.** In any case, in this text the number of sheep (as well as the missing information <...>) is assigned to: 6 institutional herdsman, 2 herdsman of mountain sheep, 1 herdsman of the grand vizier, 1 herdsman of the temple administrator, 1 herdsman of the god Nanna, 1 shepherd (regardless of the administrative level) tied to the sheep assigned to a royal cook, 1 individual quoted by name.

**§5.2.22.1.3.** The label “new field” refers to at least two different fields of the province, one located in Kinunir,<sup>160</sup> the other one in Gu’aba.<sup>161</sup> **PPAC 5, 601** (AS 5/-) ascribes (rev. II, 7-8) to a no further specified “new field” 7 sheep and 6 goats, to be compared with the 2 sheep counted in this text.

### §5.2.22.2 Prosopographical and further notes

**(obv. 1-5)** This section apparently concerns the sheep managed by the herdsman Lu-Dumuzi and those, which - for unclear reasons - have been entrusted to the herdsman Namḥani and Lu<sub>2</sub>-niḡir, and to the untitled person Sukkalkakagen in the plot under charge of Lu-Dumuzi. Lu-Dumuzi is the name of a herdsman of Gu’aba attested in **DAS 277** (AS 1/-), recording his own sheep account. Namḥani is a common name and may refer to:<sup>162</sup> the herdsman who supervised a plot assigned to himself (27 *iku*, 97,200 m<sup>2</sup>) in **MVN 2, 42** [...] (Tab. obv. IV, 3’) (see § 1.1.9); the herdsman who subscribes the sheep account taken in ASUHUR (in the Niḡin area) and recorded in **DoCu 596** (-/-); the herdsman who subscribes the sheep account taken in Gu’aba and recorded in **OBTR 171** (-/-); the herdsman who recruits female workers, Amorrean people and shepherd assistants of fat-tailed sheep (geme<sub>2</sub> mar-tu gab<sub>2</sub>-us<sub>2</sub> udu-gukkal-me) in Niḡin, as reported in **CUSAS 16, 29** (AS 5/-) (obv. 4). Lu-niḡir is the name of a herdsman attested in Text 27 (**TCTI 2, 2702**) (ŠŠ 8/-), obv. 1, concerning the sheep which have grazed in the field of Lagaš, unclear whether a name-

<sup>160</sup> See e.g. **PPAC 5, 321**, obv. II, 12, which ascribes the new field to the household of Dumuzi.

<sup>161</sup> See e.g. **TCTI 1, 723**, obv. I, 26, where the new field is listed among the plots of the household of NinMAR.KI.

<sup>162</sup> The herdsman Namḥani (obv. II, 8) responsible for sheep of the palace (rev. I, 4: udu e<sub>2</sub>-gal) in **HSS 4, 34** (AS 1/-) and that responsible for the sheep of the queen Abi-Simti (obv. II, 7) in **DAS 51** (AS 8/-) were probably namesakes.

sake.

**(obv. 6)** Nabasa is a common name and may refer to different herdsmen attested in: [MTBM 287](#) (§ 47/-), recording the sheep account of Nabasa taken in Kinunir; [Fs Sigrist 101, 03](#) (§ 47/-), an account of sheep of Nabasa and Kuli son of Ur-Ḫendursaĝ taken in Kinunir; [BPOA 2, 1885](#) (AS 5/-), an account of wool and sheep (obv. I, 7). Nabasa is also the name of the individual attested in connection to the workshop in Text 2 ([Amherst 20](#)) (obv. II, 3).

**(obv. 7-10)** This section apparently concerns the sheep managed by the herdsman Ur-mes and those entrusted for unknown reasons to the herdsman of the grand vizier Igi-sasa (who is not attested elsewhere) in the plot under charge of Ur-mes. Ur-mes is a very common name and refers to different herdsmen; here a herdsman of the Kinunir-Niĝin area or Gu'aba may be meant. Attestations referring to a herdsman of Kinunir-Niĝin are found in [SAT 1, 220](#) (§ 47/-), a sheep account involving different herdsmen (obv. 4); [CT 10, pl. 45, BM 19101](#) (§ 47/-), an account of the sheep managed by Ur-mes son of Šakuge; [UNT 14](#) (AS 4/-) a wool account (obv. 7). Both Text 9 ([MVN 5, 204](#)) (§S 8/-) and Text 15 ([TCTI 2, 4178](#)) (IS 3/-) refer to herdsmen bearing this name and active in Gu'aba; in Text 9 likely the son of Zezani is meant, while in Text 15 likely the son of Ir-duga.

**(obv. 11)** To the best of my knowledge, this is the only attestation of the herdsman Ur-Lisi.

**(obv. 12)** The title 'herdsman of Nanna' occurs only in this text, but it may refer to herdsmen elsewhere defined as 'shepherds of Nanna'.<sup>163</sup> It is unclear to me, whether this herdsman can be somehow connected to the royal sector (see § 1.2.9, fn. 30). Without any reference to Nanna, Ur-kigula is the name of a herdsman attested in [MTBM 275](#) (AS 2/-), recording a sheep account taken in Gu'aba, and in [MVN 2, 42](#) [...] (see § 1.1.9), where a Ur-kigula is attested (Tab. IV, 7') as supervisor of a plot assigned to himself (6 *iku*, 21,600 m<sup>2</sup>).

**(rev. 1-2)** Inannaka, here associated with the royal cook Ur-BaU, may be identified with the shepherd attested in connection with Aḫuni, the cook of the grand vizier, in Text 9 ([MVN 5, 204](#)) (§S 8/-), rev. II, 13, drawn up 16 years later. Attestations of the royal

cook<sup>164</sup> Ur-BaU can be found in texts from Ĝirsu: [MVN 22, 34](#) (AS 6/i), where the royal vizier (sukkal lugal) Namḫani receives an amount of sesame oil and fruit for Ur-BaU (obv. 5); [PPAC 5, 95](#) (AS 7/-), a tablet sealed by the grand vizier Urdu-Nanna attesting the receipt of fish, sheep, vegetables and sesame oil for Ur-BaU (rev. 1); [DAS 218](#) (AS 9/-) attesting to the royal cook as receipt of goods labeled as provision (igi-kar<sub>2</sub>); [BPOA 2, 1896](#) (-/v) attesting to Ur-BaU (rev. 1) as receipt of goods for cakes (šuku saĝ se<sub>3</sub>-ga, ninda i<sub>3</sub>-de<sub>3</sub>-a). Finally, a further attestation of this royal cook can be found in [MVN 2, 278](#) [...], where the recipient of goods allocated as food for the king (obv. I, 21': ša<sub>3</sub>-gal lugal) is Ur-BaU, here defined as cook of BaU-ea (obv. I, 19'-20: ur-<sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub> muḫaldim / <sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub>-e<sub>3</sub>-a), wife of the grand vizier and high priestess of BaU. In addition in the same text, Ur-BaU occurs as recipient of sesame oil expended while the king was sick (obv. III, 22: ur-<sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub> muḫaldim lugal / u<sub>4</sub> tu-ra i<sub>3</sub>-me-a).

**(rev. 3)** A'aziĝu is the name of a herdsman of Gu'aba attested in the wool accounts recorded in [SAT 1, 381](#) (AS 5/-) and [PPAC 5, 632](#) (-/-), alongside with other herdsmen of that district (respectively rev. II, 3 and rev. 10: a-zi-gu<sub>10</sub>). However, both texts do not offer any connection to a temple administrator.

**(rev. 4)** The title 'herdsman of mountain sheep' occurs only in this text, but it may refer to herdsmen described elsewhere as 'shepherd of mountain sheep' (sipa udu kur-ra) or "shepherds of fat-tailed sheep". Atu is a very common name and may refer to different herdsmen; relevant attestations can be found in [CT 9, pl. 23, BM 19055](#) (AS 1/-), 'a multiple sheep account' taken in Kinunir (rev. 14), which however does not mention fat-tailed or mountain sheep, and [CT 10, pl. 16-17, BM 12921](#) (AS 4/iv), listing shepherd assistants of fat-tailed sheep of Gu'aba, where he occurs as supervisor of 1 assistant. With regard to other attestations of herdsmen named Atu in Gu'aba, see notes to Text 16 ([DAS 274](#)), obv. III, 4 (§ 5.1.16.2).

**(rev. 5)** Ur-Dumuzi is the name of different herdsmen<sup>165</sup> of Gu'aba: the son of Ur-Nanše attested in [PPAC 5, 84](#) (AS 1/-) (rev. 14), an account of sheep shortfalls, sheep for slaughter and plundered sheep, where however there is no mention of fat-tailed or

<sup>163</sup> See [Nisaba 15, 1069](#) (-/-) from Iri-saĝrig, where individuals defined (obv. 1-rev. 7) as herdsmen (na-gada) are then described (rev. 8) as being 'shepherd of Nanna' (sipa <sup>d</sup>nanna-me).

<sup>164</sup> Note that most of the texts define him as "royal cook". Differently, the cook Urim-kidu attested in Text 9 ([MVN 5, 204](#)) (rev. II, 1) is simply defined as cook outside our group of texts.

<sup>165</sup> The herdsman tied to the sheep belonging to the royal family (see [DAS 51](#), rev. IV, 16; [DAS 53](#), obv. I, 12) was probably a namesake.

mountain sheep; and the son of Abba-saga attested in [MVN 2, 42](#) [...] (Tab. rev. II, 6') (see § 1.1.9), where his section occurs immediately before that of the herdsman of Gu'aba Ude-niġsaga. In [CT 10, pl. 16-17, BM 12921](#) (AS 4/iv), listing shepherd assis-

tants of fat-tailed sheep of Gu'aba, Ur-Dumuzi (without patronymic) occurs (rev. II, 6) as supervisor of 3 shepherd assistants. In addition, in Text 29 ([MVN 6, 546](#)) [...], an individual bearing this name acts as a herdsman (rev. II, 9).

### §5.2.23. Text 23: [MVN 6, 545](#) (AS 1/-)

Pettinato-Waetzoldt-Pomponio 1977

Transliteration

#### Obverse

##### I

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(u) 6(diš) udu                                    | 116 sheep                                 |
| 2. | udu ir <sub>3</sub> -ib-ri dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba                    | sheep of Iribri, the <i>dumudaba</i>      |
| 3. | [...] du-du dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba                                   | ... Dudu, the <i>dumudaba</i>             |
| 4. | [ki <sup>?</sup> ] ir <sub>3</sub> -ib-ri                               | [(in) the plot (under charge of)]? Iribri |
| 5. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) [...] 3(diš) udu                                   | 63+ sheep                                 |
| 6. | udu ʿeb <sup>ʾ</sup> -na-da-ad ʿdumu <sup>ʾ</sup> -dab <sub>5</sub> -ba | sheep of Ebnadad, the <i>dumudaba</i>     |
| 7. | [... ma]-an-sum dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba                               | ... Mansum, the <i>dumudaba</i>           |
| 8. | [...] udu   | ... sheep                                 |
| 9. | [...]-AN dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba                                      | [...]-AN, the <i>dumudaba</i>             |

##### II

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | ki ir <sub>3</sub> -ib-ri   | (in) the plot (under charge of) Iribri |
| 2. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) [udu]                | 98 [sheep]                             |
| 3. | udu gaba-[ba-am <sub>3</sub> ] ( <i>sic</i> <sup>2</sup> )            | sheep 'pres[ent]'                      |
| 4. | 1(u) 2(diš) ʿudu <sup>ʾ</sup> zi-[ga]                                 | 12 sheep 'expe[nded]'                  |
| 5. | la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) 3(diš) udu | shortfall: 103 sheep                   |
| 6. | ur- <sup>d</sup> šul-pa-e <sub>3</sub> na-gada                        | Ur-Šulpa'e, the herdsman               |
| 7. | 2(u) maš <sub>2</sub>   | 20 goats                               |
| 8. | ur- <sup>d</sup> šul-pa-e <sub>3</sub>                                | Ur-Šulpa'e                             |

#### Reverse

##### I

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | 2(u) 6(diš) udu 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) maš <sub>2</sub> | 26 sheep 120 goats                         |
| 2. | amar-šuba <sub>3</sub> dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba      | Amar-šuba, the <i>dumudaba</i>             |
| 3. | ki ur- <sup>d</sup> šul-pa-e <sub>3</sub>             | (in) the plot (under charge of) Ur-Šulpa'e |
| 4. | 3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) udu 1(u) maš <sub>2</sub>   | 210 sheep 10 goats                         |
| 5. | udu ḥe <sub>2</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub> engar            | sheep of Hesa, the farmer                  |
| 6. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>      | 60 sheep 2 goats                           |
| 7. | udu ur- <sup>d</sup> ḥendur-sag engar                 | sheep of Ur-Ḥendursaġ, the farmer          |
| 8. | engar UD.IM.MU-me                                     | (they) are farmers of UD.IM.MU             |

##### II

- |    |   |                                      |
|----|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1. | 2(diš) im-bi-am <sub>3</sub> <sup>?166</sup>  | the relevant tablets are 2           |
| 2. | nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka         | accomplished account                 |
| 3. | a-ša <sub>3</sub> ur-sag-pa-e <sub>3</sub>    | field of Ur-saġpa'e                  |
| 4. | mu <sup>d</sup> amar- <sup>d</sup> suen lugal | year: (when) Amar-Suen (became) king |

<sup>166</sup> Pettinato reads: 2 im-bi-a ½. One can wonder whether this line should be read as 2 im-bi-am<sub>3</sub> (A.AN), whereas the sign AN could have been misread as ½.

### §5.2.23.1. General considerations

**§5.2.23.1.1.** The tablets reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 5 *dumudaba* (one of them also responsible for the plot), 1 institutional herdsman and 1 *dumudaba* in the plot under his charge, 2 farmers characterized by an unclear notation. The text begins by recording the sheep of the group of *dumudaba*, likely starting with the largest number of sheep assigned to a single person in that group, as it does in connection to the sheep assigned to the 2 farmers. In addition, the text specifies that the reported information was obtained from 2 different documents. It is unclear, whether this bipartition might have concerned the work categories (skilled personnel, additional personnel, professionals) or some kind of specific information: on the plot(s) under charge of a *dumudaba* (obv. I, 4 and II, 1), or on the sheep and goats reported as distinct entries in the section concerning the herdsman (obv. II 2-5 and obv. II, 6-8).

**§5.2.23.1.2.** Although it can be accidental, we can note that in Text 19 (MVN 7, 583), also recording an account of the field of Ur-saĝpa'e, the information has been obtained from 2 documents. The field of Ur-saĝpa'e was located in Ĝirsu. As seen in Text 19 (MVN 7, 583), 540 animals have grazed there in § 35, to be compared with the 840+ animals (688 sheep and 152 goats) counted 19 years later.

### §5.2.23.2. Prosopographical and further notes

(obv. I, 1-4) This section might concern the sheep

entrusted to the *dumudaba* Iribri and those entrusted to the *dumudaba* Dudu in the plot under the responsibility of Iribri. Iribri occurs once again (obv. II, 1) as responsible for the plot where the sheep assigned to other *dumudaba* have grazed. It is unclear whether these two sections concerning Iribri reflect the information on two different plots, or whether the information on the same plot derived from different documents. In any case, one can note that Iribri had a more prominent role than the other *dumudaba* (see § 2.2.9).

(obv. II 2-rev. I, 3) This section concerns the sheep assigned to the herdsman Ur-Šulpa'e, who occurs 3 times: the first one at the end of the section concerning only sheep and drawn up according to the parameters of availability (obv. II, 6); the second one in connection to an additional number of goats (obv. II, 8); and the third one in connection to the plot where the sheep entrusted to a *dumudaba* have grazed (rev. I, 3). Ur-Šulpa'e is a very common name and may refer to different herdsman; here the one attested (rev. 5) in CT 7, pl. 28, BM 18382 (...), a wool and sheep account taken in Ur-saĝpa'e, can very likely be meant.

(rev. I, 4-8) This section concerns the sheep assigned to the farmers Ur-Ĥendursaĝ and Hesa, defined as farmers of UD.IM.MU, the meaning of which is unclear to me. In any case, their occurrence in this text arises the same issues of the other professionals mentioned, if they have been employed in herding as fulfillment of their labor duties or if they were somehow tied to sheep or plots where the counted sheep have grazed (see § 2.3.1.1).

### §5.2.24. Text 24: MVN 6, 145 (AS 9/-)

Pettinato-Waetzoldt-Pomponio 1977  
Transliteration

#### Obverse

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| 1.  | 1(aš) 1(diš) bur-ma-ma dumu gu <sub>2</sub> -a   | 1 (sheep) 1 (goat) Bur-Mama, son of Gua   |
| 2.  | 1(aš) 1(diš) e-zu  | 1 (sheep) 1 (goat) Ezu                    |
| 3.  | <...> a <sub>2</sub> -da- <sup>r</sup> BA <sup>2</sup> aga <sub>3</sub> -us <sub>2</sub> lugal | ... AdaBA, the royal soldier              |
| 4.  | <...> a-za-ba- <sup>r</sup> ni <sup>r</sup> aga <sub>3</sub> -us <sub>2</sub> lugal            | ... Azabani, the royal soldier            |
| 5.  | ki bur-ma-ma   | (in) the plot (under charge of) Bur-Mama  |
| 6.  | <...> lam-lam-ma   | ... Lamlama                               |
| 7.  | <...> ur-sa <sub>6</sub> -ga KU  | ... 'entrusted' to Ur-saga                |
| 8.  | <...> lugal-ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-ni KU  | ... 'entrusted' to Lugal-kugani           |
| 9.  | 1(aš) BU.KU ur-eš <sub>3</sub> -lil <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> KU                           | 1 (sheep) BU.KU 'entrusted' to Ur-ešlila  |
| 10. | <...> lu <sub>2</sub> -me-lam <sub>2</sub> KU  | ... 'entrusted' to Lu-melam               |
| 11. | <...> ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> KU  | ... 'entrusted' to Ur-BaU                 |
| 12. | ki ur-eš <sub>3</sub> -lil <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub>                                       | (in) the plot (under charge of) Ur-ešlila |

13. <...> ur-sa<sub>6</sub>-ga KU ... ‘entrusted’ to Ur-saga  
 14. <...> <sup>d</sup>utu-gu<sub>10</sub> na-gada ... Utu-ĝu, the herdsman  
 15. <...> me-an-ta KU ... ‘entrusted’ to Me-anta

**Reverse**

1. <...> ur-sukkal KU ... ‘entrusted’ to Ur-sukkal  
 2. <...> ur-<sup>d</sup>ba-u<sub>2</sub> ... Ur-BaU  
 3. ki <sup>d</sup>utu-gu<sub>10</sub> (in) the plot (under charge of) Utu-ĝu  
 4. <...> inim-<sup>d</sup>inanna ... Inim-Inanna  
 5. <...> eš<sub>3</sub>-sa<sub>6</sub> nu-<sup><geš></sup>kiri<sub>6</sub> ... Ešša, the gardener  
 6. ki inim-<sup>d</sup>inanna (in) the plot (under charge of) Inim-Inanna  
 7. <...> ur-<sup>d</sup>nanše unu<sub>3</sub> <sup>d</sup>nanna ... Ur-Nanše, the cattle herdsman of Nanna  
 8. <...> amar-šuba<sub>3</sub> santana <sup>d</sup>nanna ... Amar-šuba, the garden administrator of Nanna  
 9. <...> ša<sub>3</sub>-bi unu<sub>3</sub> <sup>d</sup>nanna ... Šabi, the cattle herdsman of Nanna  
 10. <...> urdu<sub>2</sub> muḥaldim <sup>d</sup>nanna ... Urdu, the cook of Nanna  
 11. ki ur-<sup>d</sup>nanše (in) the plot (under charge of) Ur-Nanše  
 12. 1(aš) ur-tur KU 1 (sheep) ‘under control’ of ur-tur  
*blank line*  
 13. nig<sub>2</sub>-ka<sub>9</sub> aka aša<sub>5</sub> gir<sub>2</sub>-nun accomplished account field Ĝirnun  
 14. mu us<sub>2</sub>-sa en eridu<sup>ki</sup> ba-a-ḥug year following (the year when) the en-priest of Eridu was appointed

**§5.2.24.1. General considerations**

**§5.2.24.1.1.** This text uses the peculiar system for counting few units of sheep and goats, thus it is subject to the issues discussed in § 3.3. Most of the entries do not provide indication about the number or sheep counted for each listed individual. Except for five ‘loose’ individuals (obv. 6-8; 13; rev. 12), the other ones are grouped in 5 sections: 1 concerning royal soldiers, 1 concerning untitled individuals with a certain degree of responsibility for the sheep (KU), 1 concerning a herdsman and the individuals in the plot under his responsibility, 1 concerning an untitled individual and a gardener in the plot under his responsibility, and 1 concerning the personnel of the god Nanna. Each section begins by quoting a kind of foreman who occurs again at the end of the section as responsible for the plot where the sheep assigned to the listed individuals have grazed, suggesting that the professionals and the officials listed here can be understood as being subject to labor duties (see § 2.4.5). The presence of royal soldiers, and likely of the personnel of Nanna,<sup>167</sup> would suggest that at least part of the pasture area was located in plots of royal pertinence within an institutional household.

**§5.2.24.1.2.** The field of Ĝirnun lay in the household of Ningirsu in the Ĝirsu district.<sup>168</sup> This text ascribes to it 4 sheep and 2 goat.

**§5.2.24.2. Prosopographical and further notes**

**(obv. 1-5)** This section concerns the sheep assigned to Bur-mama, whose professional title is unknown, and those related to 2 royal soldiers and an untitled individual, who can be as well be identified with a royal soldier,<sup>169</sup> although the lack of the title here would be unexpected.

**(obv. 9-12)** This section refers to Ur-ešlila and to Lu-melam and Ur-BaU, who were employed in the plot under Ur-ešlila’s responsibility. Hypothetically the sheep described as BU.KU can be interpreted as šu-gid<sub>2</sub> (BU:ŠU), “sheep for slaughter”,<sup>170</sup> whereas the misinterpretation of the signs can be due to the tablet condition.

**(obv. 13)** Given the lack of further specifications, it is unclear whether the Ur-saga quoted here was a namesake of the one attested in obv. 7. It seems also plausible that the compiler of the text had erroneously reported the same information twice.

<sup>167</sup> Regardless of the presence of a temple of Nanna in Ĝirsu, it is unclear to me whether professionals specifically tied to Nanna may have been a royal concern (see § 1.2.9 and fn. 30).

<sup>168</sup> See ASJ 8, 113 30 (§ 40/-).

<sup>169</sup> Indeed, Ezu as well may have been a royal soldier, see in [Nisaba 22, 127](#) (-/-), rev. 4.

<sup>170</sup> See Tsouparopoulou, 2013: 153-154.

(**obv. 14-rev. 3**) This section concerns the sheep assigned to the herdsman Utu-ĝu and those entrusted to three individuals, two of them somehow responsible for state-held sheep (KU), in the plot under charge of Utu-ĝu. To the best of my knowledge, this is the only attestation of this herdsman.

(**rev. 4-6**) This section concerns Inim-Inanna, whose professional title is unknown, and the gardener Ešša, not attested elsewhere, employed in the plot under his responsibility. [SNAT 91](#) (AS 4/-) attests the cattle herdsman Inim-Inanna as receiver of barley allocated as food for calves from the governor of Ĝirsu Nanna-zišagal. The seal on the tablet, dedicated to Šulgi, belongs to the scribe Šarakam, son of a royal “land-surveyor” (sa<sub>12</sub>-du<sub>5</sub> lugal). A part from [SNAT 91](#), this seal is exclusively attested in documents

from Puzriš-Dagan. It seems plausible that Inim-Inanna could have been a cattle herdsman occasionally involved in the herding of sheep and goats, like the ones attested in the following section.

(**rev. 7-11**) This section concerns the sheep assigned to the cattle herdsman Ur-Nanše (who was also responsible for the plot) and to other individuals likely pertaining to the personnel of the god Nanna, a garden administrator, Amar-šuba, another cattle herdsman, Šabi, and the cook Urdu. While these are the only attestations of Amar-šuba, Šabi, and Urdu, a cattle herdsman named Ur-Nanše is attested in a letter order ([TCS 1, 105](#)) and in connection to a plot leased out in the household of Dumuzi ([Zinbun 14, 45 1, AS 1](#)), both from Ĝirsu.

#### §5.2.25. Text 25: [MVN 5, 176](#) (ŠS 1/-)

Sollberger 1978  
Transliteration

##### Obverse

- |     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
| 1.  | <...> šu-ni-a dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba                                     | ... Šunia, the <i>dumudaba</i>          |
| 2.  | <...> a-kal-la dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -<ba>                                  | ... Akala, the <i>dumudaba</i>          |
| 3.  | ki šu-ni-a  | (in) the plot (under charge of) Šunia   |
| 4.  | 1(aš) ur-sa <sub>6</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub> [...] dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -<ba> | 1 (sheep) Ur-sasa, the <i>dumudaba</i>  |
| 5.  | <...> A.NE.KI   | ... A.NE.KI                             |
| 6.  | <...> puzur <sub>4</sub> -ZA dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -<ba>                    | ... PuzurZA, the <i>dumudaba</i>        |
| 7.  | ki a-eš <sub>4</sub> -tar <sub>2</sub>                                      | (in) the plot (under charge of) A-Eštar |
| 8.  | 1(diš) u-ša-lum dumu-[dab <sub>5</sub> -ba]                                 | 1 (goat) Ušalum, the <i>dumu[daba]</i>  |
| 9.  | <...> lu <sub>2</sub> -gu-la [...]  | ... Lu-gula                             |
| 10. | <...> ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> [...]                              | ... Ur-BaU                              |
| 11. | <...> lugal-ezem [...]  | ... Lugal-ezem                          |

*rest lost*

##### Reverse

*beginning broken*

- |      |   |   |
|------|---|---|
| 1'.  | <...> ur-[...]  | ... Ur-[...]                                      |
| 2'.  | <...> NE.NI [...]   | ... NE.NI ...                                     |
| 3'.  | 1(diš) a-ga-igi-zu-ma dumu-[dab <sub>5</sub> -ba]   | 1 (sheep) Aga-igizuma, the <i>dumu[daba]</i>      |
| 4'.  | u <sub>3</sub> ze <sub>2</sub> -ki dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -<ba>  | and Zeki the <i>dumudaba</i>                      |
| 5'.  | <...> a-tu eren <sub>2</sub>  | ... Atu, the state dependent                      |
| 6'.  | <...> ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba  | ... Ur-BaU, the <i>dumudaba</i>                   |
| 7'.  | ki ša-gu-ze <sub>2</sub>  | (in) the plot (under charge of) Šaguze            |
| 8'.  | 1(diš) a-gu-a dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba   | 1 (goat) Agua, the <i>dumudaba</i>                |
| 9'.  | <...> a-pu <sub>3</sub> -gi <sub>4</sub> eren <sub>2</sub>  | ... Apugi, the state dependent                    |
| 10'. | 1(diš) ħu-wa-wa dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba   | 1 (goat) Ĥuwawa, the <i>dumudaba</i>              |
| 11'. | ki a-gu-a   | (in) the plot (under charge of) Agua              |
| 12'. | 1(diš) nam-maḥ-šu   | 1 (goat) Nammaḥšu                                 |
| 13'. | nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka a-ša <sub>3</sub> <sup>?</sup> (A.A) bad <sub>3</sub> -da- <sup>r</sup> ri <sub>2</sub> <sup>?</sup> u <sub>3</sub><br>ar-la-AN | accomplished account, field? of Badari and ArlaAN |
| 14'. | mu <sup>d</sup> šu- <sup>d</sup> suen lugal   | year: (when) Šu-Suen (became) king                |

### §5.2.25.1. General considerations

**§5.2.25.1.1.** This text shows the peculiar system for counting few units of sheep and goats, thus it is subject to the issues discussed in § 3.3. Most of the entries do not provide information on the number of sheep counted for each listed individual. The structure of the text does not allow us to clearly recognize distinct groups and 'loose' individuals: the individuals occurring at the beginning of what we can understand as a section not necessarily are the same individuals occurring at the end of that section (see § 2.4). The 2 recognizable sections concern a *dumudaba*, also responsible for the plot where another *dumudaba* has been employed (obv. 1-3), and a *dumudaba*, also responsible for the plot where another *dumudaba* and a state-dependent worker have been employed (rev. 8'-11'). Except for the untitled individuals, for whom nothing can be said, all the others are additional workers employed in herding (state dependent workers (at least 2) and *dumudaba* (at least 9); see § 2.2).

**§5.2.25.1.2.** The field(s) of Badari and ArLAN is(are) not attested elsewhere. In the first place, one may wonder whether the initial sequence of signs (A.A) was misinterpreted due to the tablet condition, therefore whether a field (a-ša<sub>3</sub>) or the related village (e<sub>2</sub>-duru<sub>5</sub>) was meant.

**§5.2.25.1.3.** In any case, it seems plausible that the field name was a contextual description referring to two captains responsible for the employment of *dumudaba* and state dependents: "field (where the captains) Badari and ArLAN (have employed the abovementioned workers)".<sup>171</sup> Were this the case,

then we should assume that also the name of the field reported in Text 17 (TCTI 1, 771) (a-ša<sub>3</sub> bad<sub>3</sub>-[...]) was as well a contextual description and, consequently, that the actual name of that field is that reported in Text 3 (TLB 3, 88) (or lost in its broken lines), since both Text 3 and 17 concern plots tied to the royal scribe Ur-Nanše.

**§5.25.1.4.** The total number of animals counted is 1 sheep and 5 goats.

### §5.2.25.2. Prosopographical and further notes

**(obv. 1-3)** Šunia, responsible for the plot where the *dumudaba* Akala is employed, also occurs in Text 17 (TCTI 1, 771) [...], where he is responsible for 91 sheep and 5+ goats (obv. I, 5-6).

**(obv. 4)** Given the presence of the *dumudaba* Šunia and Ušalum in this text as in Text 17 (TCTI 1, 771), a connection between the *dumudaba* Ur-sasa attested here and the Ur-saga attested there (obv. II, 3, as responsible for 27 sheep and 2 goats) can be supposed.

**(obv. 5)** One can wonder whether A.NE.KI (not attested elsewhere) is to be connected to A-Eštar, the one occurring as responsible for the plot in obv. 7.

**(obv. 8)** The *dumudaba* Ušalum also occurs in Text 17 (TCTI 1, 771) [...], where he is responsible for 54 sheep and 15 goats (obv. I, 1-3).

**(rev. 12')** To the best of my knowledge the name Nammaḥšu occurs only here. The text does not specify neither his professional title<sup>172</sup> nor the work category.

### §5.2.26. Text 26: MVN 6, 544 (ŠS 1/-)

Pettinato-Waetzoldt-Pomponio 1977  
Transliteration

#### Obverse

#### I

- |    |  |                           |
|----|--|---------------------------|
| 1. | 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) maš <sub>2</sub>       | 90 goats                  |
| 2. | udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>                       | sheep 'present'           |
| 3. | lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> nin-šubur na-gada | Lu-Ninšubur, the herdsman |

<sup>171</sup> Badari was indeed an official known as 'captain of the *dumudaba*', whereas further attestations of the name ArLAN are not known to me. On Badari, see Borrelli 2020: 13. For the different spellings of this name, see there fn. 24. In any case, it should be noted that the spelling with the sign bad<sub>3</sub> is not reported among the abovementioned variants. Therefore it can be a peculiar feature of our archive (see § 1.3).

<sup>172</sup> Since the name Nammaḥšu is not attested elsewhere, one can wonder whether the sign ŠU was part of the title, as for example šu-<i>, barber. To the best of my knowledge, however, not even a Nammaḥ barber is attested elsewhere.



4.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) maš <sub>2</sub>	140 goats
5.	udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
6.	ur-mes na-gada	Ur-mes, the herdsman
7.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(u) udu	110 sheep
8.	udu lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> nin-šubur KU	sheep 'entrusted' to Lu-Ninšubur
<b>II</b>		
1.	5(u) la <sub>2</sub> 3(diš) udu	47 sheep
2.	udu ur-sa <sub>6</sub> -ga	sheep of Ur-saga
3.	1(u) udu	10 sheep
4.	udu ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> KU	sheep 'entrusted' to Ur-BaU
5.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) 4(diš) udu	84 sheep
6.	udu lugal-igi-huš	sheep of Lugal-igihuš
7.	4(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) udu 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) maš <sub>2</sub>	270 sheep 120 goats
8.	udu za-na-a nu-banda <sub>3</sub> šidim	sheep of Zana'a, the captain of builders

#### Reverse

#### I

1.	4(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) udu	280 sheep
2.	2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) maš <sub>2</sub>	120 goats
3.	udu ur- <sup>d</sup> ig-alim ugula šidim	sheep of Ur-Igalim, the supervisor of builders
4.	5(u) udu 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) maš <sub>2</sub>	50 sheep 120 goats
5.	udu ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> ugula šidim	sheep of Ur-BaU, the supervisor of builders
6.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) udu	60 sheep
7.	udu lu <sub>2</sub> -giri <sub>17</sub> -zal šidim	sheep of Lu-girizal, the builder
8.	u <sub>3</sub> ur-zikum-ma šidim	and Ur-zikuma, the builder

#### II

1.	u <sub>3</sub> <sup>1</sup> (IGI) ur-ku <sub>3</sub> -nun <sup>173</sup> šidim	and Ur-kunun, the builder
2.	5(geš <sub>2</sub> ) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	298 goats
3.	4(u) 3(diš) udu	43 sheep
4.	ur-zikum-ma na-gada en	Ur-zikuma, the herdsman of the priest
5.	nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka	accomplished account
6.	a-ša <sub>3</sub> e <sub>2</sub> -anše	field of E-anše
7.	<a>-ša <sub>3</sub> da-lugal	(and) field of Dalugal
8.	mu <sup>d</sup> šu- <sup>d</sup> suen lugal	year: (when) Šu-Suen (became) king

### §5.2.26.1. General considerations

**§5.2.26.1.1.** The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned to 2 institutional herdsmen, 1 herdsman of the en-priest, 2 individuals with some responsibility for state-held sheep (KU), 2 untitled individuals, 1 captain of builders, 2 supervisors of builders, and 3 builders. The information in this text clearly do not follow a decreasing order, although we can assume that it begins by listing the sheep which have grazed in the first mentioned field. The comparison between this text and Text 18 (TCTI 2, 4177) [...] shows that at least the sheep assigned to the supervisors of builders were actually entrusted to shepherds (sipa). It seems indeed plausible that in the field of da-lugal there were subsistence plots allotted

to builders (see § 2.3.2).

**§5.2.26.1.2.** Probably due to a spatial proximity, these two fields are quoted together also in PPAC 5, 601 (obv. II 23-24: a-ša<sub>3</sub> e<sub>2</sub>-anše u<sub>3</sub> da-lugal), which ascribes to them 2 sheep and 5 goats. The total number of animals counted in both fields is 1842 (954 sheep and 888 goats). Their location was in the Gu-Iniğinšedu area.

### §5.2.26.2. Prosopographical and further notes

(obv. I, 1-3) Lu-Ninšubur is the name of a herdsman attested in CUSAS 16, 76 (AS 2/-), rev. I, 11, an account of garments taken in Kinunir. This section exclusively refers to the goats managed by him, thus we

<sup>173</sup> The PN hul(IGI.UR)-ku<sub>3</sub>-nun seen by Pettinato is not attested elsewhere. It seems plausible, that this line could be read as u<sub>3</sub>(IGI.<DIB>) ur-ku<sub>3</sub>-nun.

can wonder whether the section recorded below as an additional entry (obv. I, 7-8) may have recorded the number of sheep under his control or may have referred to a namesake.

**(obv. I, 6)** Ur-mes is a common name and may refer to different herdsmen. Here it is likely that a goat herdsman active in the Niġin area (therefore a namesake of the one attested in Text 9 (MVN 5, 204) from Gu'aba and in Text 13 (TCTI 1, 850) from Ġirsu) is meant.

**(obv. II, 7-rev. II 1)** This section concerns the sheep of builders. Zana'a, here defined as "captain of builders" is simply defined as builder in Amorites 18 (AS 5/xii/29) from Puzriš-Dagan, where he occurs as supplier of 3 sheep (obv. IV, 10-13) for the king. With the title supervisor of builders, Ur-Igalim and

Ur-BaU are attested also in Text 18 (TCTI 2, 4177) [...], respectively in obv. II, 1 and obv. I, 7. The number of sheep of Ur-igalim, as well as the name of the shepherd whom were entrusted to in Text 18 (TCTI 2, 4177) [...], are lost in the breaks of the tablet. Differently, information on the sheep of Ur-BaU (15+ fat-tailed sheep and 92 sheep) entrusted to two different shepherds ([...]-Iškur and Ur-mes) is partially preserved. With regards to Ur-BaU and Ur-igalim, see notes to Text 18, obv. I, 1-II 1 (§ 5.1.18.2). As already supposed there, it seems plausible that they benefitted from royal subsistence plots.

**(rev. II, 4)** It is unclear which priest or priestess here is meant; with no reference to any priest or temple household, an Ur-zikuma is attested in DAS 50 (IS 3/-) (obv. VI, 24), recording the goats available to the palace and gods in the province.

#### §5.2.27. Text 27: TCTI 2, 2702 (ŠS 8/-)

Lafont-Yildiz 1996  
Transliteration

##### Obverse

1. <...> lu<sub>2</sub>-niġir na-gada
2. <...> ki-tuš-lu<sub>2</sub> KU
3. <...> lugal-me-lam<sub>2</sub> KU
4. <...> igi-lu<sub>5</sub>-lu<sub>5</sub> KU
5. <...> lu<sub>2</sub>-niġin<sup>ki</sup> ša<sub>3</sub> geš-kin-ti

- ... Lu-niġir, the herdsman  
... 'entrusted' to Kitušlu  
... 'entrusted' to Lugal-melam  
... 'entrusted' to Iġilulu  
... Lu-Niġin in the workshop

##### Reverse

1. niġ<sub>2</sub>-ka<sub>9</sub> aka
2. a-ša<sub>3</sub> lagaš<sup>ki</sup>
3. mu ma<sub>2</sub>-gur<sub>8</sub> maḥ / ba-dim<sub>2</sub>

- accomplished account  
field of Lagaš  
year: when the great barge was fashioned

#### §5.2.27.1. General considerations

**§5.2.27.1.1.** In this text, the information on the number of sheep and goats assigned to the listed individuals is completely missing; this was probably still unavailable to the compiler of the text, differently from the information on the individuals entitled to let sheep graze in the mentioned field (see § 3.3). These are: 1 institutional herdsman, 3 individuals with some responsibility for state-held sheep (KU), 1 individual quoted by name in connection to a workshop.

**§5.2.27.1.2.** As the name itself indicates, the field of Lagaš was located in the area of the homonymous urban centre, which in Ur III time fell in the Gu-Iniġinšedu district. PPAC 5, 601 (AS 5/-) ascribes (rev.

III, 2) to this field 13 goats.

#### §5.2.27.2. Prosopographical and further notes.

**(obv. 1)** It is unclear whether lu<sub>2</sub>-niġir can be identified with the herdsman attested in Text 22 (MVN 6, 415) (AS 1/-), obv. 4, concerning the pasture area of a field located in Gu'aba or in the Kinunir-Niġin area.

**(obv. 5)** This line was supposed to report the number of sheep which have grazed in the mentioned field, but already deceased and transferred to the workshop at the time of the inventory (see § 3.2.2). It is unclear whether Lu-Niġin was a herdsman; attestations of herdsmen bearing this name lack.

§5.2.28. Text 28: TĒL 250 (IS 3/-)

Virolleaud-Lambert 1968

Transliteration

**Obverse**

**I**

*two lines lost*

1'. 1(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	...
2'. ba-za na-gada	11 goats
3'. 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) 3(diš) udu	Baza, the herdsman
4'. udu [...]	163 sheep
5'. 5(geš <sub>2</sub> ) maš <sub>2</sub>	sheep ...
6'. ur- <sup>d</sup> nanše na-gada	300 sheep
7'. 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) 4(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	Ur-Nanše, the herdsman
8'. ba-za-ga na-gada	164 goats
9'. udu ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub>	Bazaga, the herdsman

*rest lost*

**II**

1. [...] 4(u) 1(diš) udu	...
2. 1(u) 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	41+ sheep
3. udu im-ti-dam šabra	15 goats
4. 3(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(diš) [udu]	sheep of Imtidam, the chief administrator
5. 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) maš <sub>2</sub>	182 [sheep]
6. udu en-i <sub>3</sub> -na-kal-la	125 goats
7. 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 7(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	sheep of En-inakala
8. udu da-[-...]	67 goats

*two lines lost*

**Reverse**

**I**

1. [...]	...
2. [... udu] zi-[ga <sup>2</sup> ]	...[sheep] 'expen[ded <sup>2</sup> ]'
3. a <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>2</sub> <sup>2</sup> -mu na-gada	A'umu, the herdsman
4. 6(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(diš) udu gukkal	365 fat-tailed sheep
5. en-i <sub>3</sub> -na-kal-[la] na-gada sukkal-maḥ	En-inaka[la], the herdsman of the grand vizier
6. 5(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 1(u) 5(diš) udu gukkal 1(u) maš <sub>2</sub>	315 fat-tailed sheep 10 goats
7. a <sub>2</sub> -pi <sub>5</sub> -li <sub>2</sub> na-gada	Apili, the herdsman
8. 5(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) 1(diš) udu gukkal	341 sheep
9. 9(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	9 goats

**II**

1. il-ki-ri <sub>2</sub> na-gada	Ilkiri, the herdsman
----------------------------------	----------------------

*blank space*

2. nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka	accomplished account
3. a-ša <sub>3</sub> <sup>1</sup> e <sub>2</sub> -duru <sub>5</sub> <sup>1</sup> ur- <sup>geš</sup> gigir	field of the village of Ur-gigir
4. mu si-mu-ru-um <sup>ki</sup>	year: (when) Simurum
5. ba-ḥul	was destroyed

§5.2.28.1. General considerations

§5.2.28.1.1. The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned at least to 3 herdsman tied to the sheep of the high priestess of BaU, the chief administrator of her household, a further herdsman who

can also be tied to the household of the priestess, a herdsman of the grand vizier, and 2 institutional herdsman.

§5.2.28.1.2. The interpretation of the field name is based on a possible reading of the signs reported in

the transliteration<sup>174</sup> and a comparison with Text 8 (MVN 5, 203) (ŠS 8/-) and TÉL 262 (IS 1/-), both concerning sheep of the high priestess of BaU and of the grand vizier. The total number of animals which have grazed there in IS 3 is 2108+ (1407 sheep and 701 goats) to be compared to the 2033+ counted in ŠS 8.

#### §5.2.28.2. Prosopographical and further notes

(obv. I, 1-I-9) This section concerns the sheep of the high priestess of BaU managed by the herdsmen Ba'a or Baza (see § 2.1.6), Bazaga or Ba'aga (see § 2.1.6), and Ur-Nanše, to the best of my knowledge, not attested elsewhere.<sup>175</sup>

(obv. II, 1-3) This section concerns the sheep assigned to Imtidam, who was the chief administrator of the household of the priestess at the time of the draft (see notes to Text 8 (MVN 5, 203), obv. II, 5; § 5.1.8.2).

(obv. II, 6 and rev. I, 5) En-inakala can be identified with the herdsman also attested in Text 8 (MVN 5, 203) (rev. I, 3-6), where he occurs in connection to fat-tailed sheep and a number of dead sheep. His double occurrence in Text 28 is unclear; indeed the 2 sections assigned to him (obv. II 3-6 and rev. I, 4-5) are reported separately for no apparent reason and the first one describes the sheep as being 'sheep of En-inakal'. Therefore, one may wonder whether the first section concerns sheep of the grand vizier or sheep somehow tied to En-inakal; it should be noted however that the expression 'sheep of En-inakal' also occurs in Text 8, where we would expect the mention

of the plot under his responsibility ('ki PN').

(rev. I, 2-3) A'umu might possibly be identified with the herdsman Au'u employed in the household of the high priestess in Text 8 (MVN 5, 203) (obv. I, 5), and TÉL 262 (rev. 2); were this the case, we have to assume that at some point after IS 1 he started to manage sheep not directly tied to the priestess. It is interesting to note, that in Text 8 the sheep assigned to him are recorded according to the parameters of availability, as probably in this text.

(rev. I, 7) Apili could refer to the herdsman son of Ali or to the herdsman son of Lu-šalim, who sometimes co-occur in a same text, alongside with the herdsman Iškur-andul, who in Text 3 (TLB 3, 88) (obv. I, 9) is defined as royal herdsman. In TCTI 1, 729 (AS 7/-), a wool account of fat-tailed sheep (rev. II, 2: udu gukkal [...]), the son of Ali is attested in rev. I, 1, while the son of Lu-šalim in obv. I, 14; in the sheep account recorded in TCTI, 1 632 (ŠS 7/-), the son of Ali is attested in obv. II, 16, while the son of Lu-šalim in obv. II, 2. In addition, the son of Lu-šalim also occurs in DAS 51 (AS 8/-) (rev. III, 4), a wool account of the sheep belonging to members of the royal family and the sheep-pen of the palace, and in TCTI 1, 623 (IS 2/-) (obv. II, 2), an account of fat-tailed sheep conveyed by a royal messenger (rev. II, 14: 'giri<sub>3</sub>' šu-al-'la lu<sub>2</sub>'-kin-gi<sub>4</sub>-a lugal). However, it should be noted that the title of the herdsman does not show any characterization, differently from that of Iškur-andul in Text 3.

(rev. II, 1) To the best of my knowledge, this is the only attestation of the herdsman Ilkiri.

#### §5.2.29. Text 29: MVN 6, 546 [...]

Pettinato-Waetzoldt-Pomponio 1977

CUSAS 17, 274; Civil 2011

Transliteration

#### Obverse

#### I

*beginning broken*

1'. [udu] gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	...
2'. 3(u) la <sub>2</sub> 3(diš) udu 1(u) maš <sub>2</sub>	[sheep] 'present'
3'. [...] -NE-KA	27 sheep 10 goats
4'. [udu gub]-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	[...] -NE-KA <sup>176</sup>
	[sheep 'pr]esent'

<sup>174</sup> Rev. III, 3: a-na e<sub>2</sub>-za ur-geš<sup>5</sup> gigir.

<sup>175</sup> With regard to the homonymous herdsman (without any connection to the high priestess), see notes to Text 2 (Amherst 20), rev. I, 7 (§ 5.1.2.2).

<sup>176</sup> This expression referring to a number of 'present sheep' is unclear to me. In any case, a PN would be unexpected.

5'. [la <sub>2</sub> ]-ia <sub>3</sub> 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 4(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu	[short]fall: 98 sheep
6'. [...] 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> egir udu <ba-ur <sub>4</sub> >	2+ goats (counted) after sheep (have been plucked)
7'. ʾur <sup>ʾ</sup> -bara <sub>2</sub> dumu kum-dur <sub>2</sub> na-gada	Ur-Bara son of Kumdur, the herdsman
8'. ʾ6(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 5(u) ʾ udu 6(geš <sub>2</sub> ) maš <sub>2</sub> kur	410 mountain sheep 360 goats <sup>177</sup>
9'. ʾudu gub <sup>ʾ</sup> -ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'
10'. la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> 5(diš) udu	shortfall: 5 sheep
11'. [...] ʾ5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> ʾ egir udu <ba-ur <sub>4</sub> >	5+ goats (counted) after sheep (have been plucked)
12'. ʾmu <sup>ʾ</sup> -ni-šu-ta-ʾa-lu <sup>ʾ</sup> na-gada	Munišutalu, the herdsman
13'. [...] maš <sub>2</sub>	... goats
14'. udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep 'present'

## II

### *beginning broken*

1'. 4(diš) <udu> bi <sub>2</sub> -de <sub>5</sub> [...]	...
2'. ki lu <sub>2</sub> -kal-ʾla <sup>ʾ</sup>	4 (sheep) gathered there ...
3'. 2(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) la <sub>2</sub> 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> -duru <sub>5</sub> du-du- <sup>d</sup> na-ru <sub>2</sub> -a	(in) the plot (under charge of) Lu-kal[a]
4'. lu <sub>2</sub> -kal-la na-gada	139 goats of the village of Dudu-Narua
5'. 1(u) 3(diš) udu 7(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	Lu-kala, the herdsman
6'. udu lu <sub>2</sub> -bala-sa <sub>6</sub> -ga	13 sheep 7 goats
7'. 2(u) 4(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	sheep of Lu-balasaga
8'. nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> NE <sup>178</sup> nu-aka	24 sheep 'present'
9'. ur- <sup>d</sup> lamma na-gada	this account is unaccomplished
10'. 1(u) <udu> bi <sub>2</sub> -de <sub>5</sub> [...]	Ur Lamma, the herdsman
11'. ki ur- <sup>d</sup> lamma [...]	10 sheep gathered there ...
12'. 1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 6(diš) udu 7(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	(in) the plot (under charge of) Ur-Lamma
13'. udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	66 sheep 7 goats
14'. 4(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) udu egir udu <ba-ur <sub>4</sub> >	sheep 'present'
15'. lu <sub>2</sub> -kisal na-gada	38 sheep (counted) after sheep (have been plucked)
	Lu-kisal, the herdsman

## III

### *beginning broken*

1'. ʾ6(diš) <sup>179</sup> maš <sub>2</sub> egir udu <ba-ur <sub>4</sub> >	...
2'. nig <sub>2</sub> -gu <sub>10</sub> na-gada	6? goats (counted) after sheep (have been plucked)
3'. 1(u) 1(diš) udu 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	Niġġu, the herdsman
4'. udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	11 sheep 2 goats
5'. ab-[...] ʾdumu <sup>ʾ</sup> Lugal-sukkal	sheep 'present'
6'. ʾ3(u) 1(diš) ʾ [udu] 1(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	ab-[...] son of Lugal-sukkal
	31 [sheep] 11 goats

### *ca. 6 broken lines*

7'. [...] udu 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	...
8'. udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	... sheep 5 goats
9'. lam-lam-ma na-<gada>	sheep 'present'
	Lamlama, the herdsman

## Reverse

### I

1. 7(diš) <udu> bi <sub>2</sub> -de <sub>5</sub> iri	7 (sheep) gathered there in town
2. 4(diš) <udu> bu <sub>3</sub> -ki-ʾka <sup>ʾ</sup> -ka [...]	4 (sheep) Bukikaka ...
3. 4(u) la <sub>2</sub> 3(diš) udu [...] maš <sub>2</sub>	37 sheep ... goats

### *blank line?*

<sup>177</sup> It seems plausible that the specification 'mountain' refers to the sheep, rather than to the goats.

<sup>178</sup> To the best of my knowledge, the expression 'nig<sub>2</sub>-ka<sub>9</sub> NE' does not occur elsewhere in the Ur III corpus. The element NE could be understood as an unorthographic writing for the enclitic demonstrative -bi (-bi<sub>2</sub>) or as the independent demonstrative ne(n) used as an apposition to a noun. In any case, both possibilities would convey the same meaning.

<sup>179</sup> Pettinato reports 360 (60×3 + [60×3]). However, by comparing the few units of sheep recorded after plucking elsewhere, it seems plausible that the number of goats recorded may have been 6.

4.	[...]	...
5.	4(u) udu 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	40 sheep 2 goats
6.	udu ur-zikum-ma	sheep of Ur-zikuma
7.	ki lam-lam-ma	(in) the plot (under charge of) Lamlama
8.	5(u) 6(diš) udu 2(u) 6(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	56 sheep 26 goats
9.	udu lugal- <sup>d</sup> ku <sub>3</sub> -sig <sub>17</sub> <na-gada>	sheep of Lugal-Kusig, (the herdsman)
10.	2(u) <udu> ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub>	20 (sheep) Ur-BaU
11.	1(u) udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	10 sheep 'present'
12.	a-ru-a ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub>	<i>ex-voto</i> of Ur-BaU
13.	ki lugal- <sup>d</sup> ku <sub>3</sub> -sig <sub>17</sub>	(in) the plot (under charge of) Lugal-Kusig
14.	4(u) 2(diš) udu 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> libir <sup>1</sup> [-am <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>2</sup>	42 sheep 5 goats (of the) 'old' herd <sup>2</sup>
<b>II</b>		
1.	2(u) udu 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub> gub-ba	20 sheep 2 goats 'present'
2.	la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> 4(diš) udu	shortfall: 4 sheep
3.	ku <sub>5</sub> -da na-gada	Kuda, the herdsman
4.	1(u) 1(diš) udu gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	11 sheep 'present'
5.	la <sub>2</sub> -ia <sub>3</sub> 6(diš) udu	shortfall: 6 sheep
6.	ur-bara <sub>2</sub> -si-ga na-gada	Ur-barasiga, the herdsman
7.	5(u) 1(diš) udu 2(u) la <sub>2</sub> 3(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	51 sheep 17 goats
8.	udu ħu-ru simug	sheep of Ĥu-ru, the smith
9.	ki ur- <sup>d</sup> dumu-zi	(in) the plot (under charge of) Ur-Dumuzi
10.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 2(u) 4(diš) udu 5(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	84 sheep 5 goats
11.	udu ereš-dingir pa <sub>5</sub> -sir <sub>2</sub> < <sup>ki</sup> >	sheep of the priestess in Pasir
12.	3(u) udu 1(u) 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	30 sheep 12 goats
13.	lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> eren <sub>2</sub>	Lu-BaU, the state dependent
14.	ki ereš-dingir	(in) the plot (under charge of) the priestess
15.	1(geš <sub>2</sub> ) 3(u) 3(diš) udu 1(u) 1(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	93 sheep 11 goats
16.	udu inim-du <sub>10</sub> -ga-ni	sheep of Inim-dugani
17.	[...] 3(u) 1(diš) udu 6(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	31+ sheep 6 goats
18.	[udu gub-ba <sup>2</sup> ]-am <sub>3</sub>	...
19.	[...]- <sup>r</sup> šubur <sup>1</sup> eren <sub>2</sub>	... [...]-Šubur, the state dependent
<b>III</b>		
1.	udu a-tu šabra kas <sub>4</sub>	sheep of Atu, the 'chief administrator of the couriers?'
2.	7(diš) udu 1(u) maš <sub>2</sub>	7 sheep 10 goats
3.	<sup>r</sup> lu <sub>2</sub> <sup>r</sup> -nam <sub>2</sub> -maḥ	Lu-nammaḥ
4.	3(u) udu 2(u) la <sub>2</sub> 2(diš) maš <sub>2</sub>	30 sheep 18 goats
5.	[udu] <sup>r</sup> bi <sub>2</sub> <sup>r</sup> -de <sub>5</sub> didli iri	[sheep] gathered there in the town (while being entrusted to) various (individuals?) <sup>180</sup>
6.	[...]-ga-KI/NA.BI	...
7.	[... udu] 5 maš <sub>2</sub> gub-ba	... [sheep] 5 goats 'present'
8.	[...] udu	... sheep
9.	[...] dumu ur-[...]-zu	... son of Ur-[...]-zu
10.	[...]-am <sub>3</sub>	...
11.	[...] udu	... sheep

*rest broken*

### §5.2.29.1. General considerations

§5.2.29.1.1. This text is the most eloquent in our group, as it provides types of information lacking

in other texts: information about the goats managed by the herdsman Lu-kala (obv. II, 3') or about those managed by Lugal-kusig (rev. I, 12), information about the document from which the number

<sup>180</sup> In this line 'didli' has been interpreted as referring to various unspecified individuals responsible for the sheep; see Text 1 (MVN 2, 78), obv. II 8 (fn. 106), § 5.1.1.2; Text 13 (TCTI 1, 850), obv. I, 8, §5.1.13.2.

of sheep managed by the herdsman Ur-Lamma was supposed to be obtained (obv. II, 8'), and probably other features lost in the many breaks of the tablet. Differently from other texts, where the information about the number of dead sheep refers to the sheep that had died while grazing in the field (and were therefore gathered there), Text 29 specifies that the sheep had died (lit. were gathered) while being still in town, likely referring to a rural settlement, whose name may have been lost in the reference to the field likely named after it. The tablet reports the number of sheep and goats assigned at least to 11 institutional herdsmen (2 of them without title), 2 state dependents, 7 untitled individuals, 1 smith, 1 chief administrator of couriers(?), and to a high priestess. Moreover, the text specifies that part of the sheep assigned to 4 institutional herdsmen (Ur-bara, Munišutalu, Lu-kisal, Niġġu) have been counted after the plucking (see § 3.2.5).

**§5.2.29.1.2.** The name of the involved herdsmen would suggest a location of the concerned field(s) in Gu'aba. The total readable number of animals which have grazed there is 1993+ (1296 sheep and 697 goats).

#### **§5.2.29.2. Prosopographical and further notes**

(obv. I, 7') Ur-bara son of Kumdur is the name of a herdsman attested in [MVN 6, 518](#), an account of the "sheep of the palace" (rev. 11: udu e<sub>2</sub>-gal) dating to UNE//IS 7.<sup>181</sup> However, it seems unlikely that the herdsman attested here in Text 29 was the same one attested in UNE or IS 7. Conversely, it seems plausible that Ur-bara can be identified with the herdsman of Gu'aba attested (rev. 2), without patronymic, in the wool account [PPAC 5, 632](#) (-/-), likely dating to the reign of Amar-Suen.

(obv. I, 12') To the best of my knowledge, this is the only attestation of the herdsman Munišutalu.

(obv. I, 13'-II-4') This section likely reports the animals managed by the herdsman Lu-kala, but is only partially readable. After a break of the tablet, there is indeed mention of the number of sheep that had died while being under his charge and of an additional number of goats assigned to him and associated with the village of Dudu-Narua.<sup>182</sup> Lu-kala was probably the goat herdsman also attested in [DAS 280](#)

(§ 48/-), a goat account taken in Gu'aba. The herdsman of Gu'aba attested in Text 15 ([TCTI 2, 4178](#)) (IS 3/-), obv. I, 8' was probably a namesake.

(obv. II, 7-11) This section concerns the sheep managed by the herdsman Ur-Lamma: those 'present', for which it is specified that the relative account was not yet accomplished, and those dead and gathered on the plot under his charge. Ur-Lamma is a common name and may refer to different herdsmen of Gu'aba, thus it is unclear whether he can be identified with the herdsman attested in Text 9 ([MVN 5, 204](#)) (§S 8/-), obv. II, 9.

(obv. II, 15) Although Lu-kisal is not a common name, the only other attestation of a herdsman with this name can be found in [PPAC 5, 267](#) (§S 8/-),<sup>183</sup> an account of sheep by-products taken in Kinunir (obv. II, 11), thus possibly a namesake.

(obv. III, 2) To the best of my knowledge this is the only attestation of this herdsman. Nevertheless, one may wonder whether the name Niġġu can refer to Niġ-BaU, the herdsman of Gu'aba attested in Text 9 ([MVN 5, 204](#)) (§S 8/-), obv. III, 2.

(obv. III, 7'-rev. I, 7) This long section concerns the sheep managed by the herdsman Lamlama, which include the sheep gathered in town (presumably dead before reaching the grazing area) and those tied to two individuals in the plot under his charge. Lamlama was a herdsman of Gu'aba attested in [PPAC 5, 622](#) (§ 41/-), recording an account of the sheep managed by him,<sup>184</sup> and in [CT 10, pl. 42, BM 21456](#) (AS 1/-), an account of the sheep managed by him, which additionally specifies that Lamlama took charge (i<sub>3</sub>-dab<sub>5</sub>) of the sheep of Ur-Lamma son of Ur-Suen (see § 3.2.4, fn. 99). In the letter order [TCS 1, 170](#) (-/-) a certain Nani is asked to separate the fat-tailed sheep from those of Lamlama (obv. 3-4), verily likely the herdsman. Other attestations of this herdsman can be found in the sheep account recorded in [TLB 3, 56](#) (-/-), obv. 8; in the wool account recorded in [TCTI 1, 879](#) [...], obv. II, 28.

(rev. I, 8-13) This section concerns the sheep of Lugal-kusig, who, despite the lack of the title in this text, can be identified with the herdsman of Gu'aba attested in [MVN 9, 55](#) (AS 3/-), obv. 10; [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-), obv. II, 18; [MVN 5, 260](#) (-/-), obv. 17, alongside with other herdsmen of that district. As we can note,

<sup>181</sup> The year name is mu bad<sub>3</sub> ʾuri<sub>5</sub><sup>[ki]</sup> ba-du<sub>3</sub>.

<sup>182</sup> To the best of my knowledge, this village is not attested elsewhere.

<sup>183</sup> This text defines the involved individuals (acting as herdsmen) as 'shepherds of sheep' (rev. ii, 12: [...] sipa udu-me).

<sup>184</sup> This text does not specify his title.

the sheep recorded in l. 9 are not recorded according to the parameters of availability and the following line specifies that they are sheep of Lugal-kusig; whether these sheep could be considered among the state-held sheep is therefore unclear. The indication 'sheep present' concerns a number of sheep bestowed (a-ru-a) by an individual (whom a further number of sheep is assigned) and connected to a plot under the responsibility of Lugal-kusig. Since the label 'sheep present' hints at the availability of sheep from a state perspective, it seems plausible that Lugal-kusig was not just responsible for the plot where the sheep have grazed, but he was also accountable for them.

**(rev. I-14-II, 3)** This section concerns the sheep managed by the herdsman Kuda. Part of them is probably defined as being of an 'old' herd, although references to a 'new acquisition' lack (see § 3.2.4). Kuda can be identified with the herdsman of Gu'aba son of Zuluhu attested in the sheep accounts [PPAC 5, 630](#) (§ 41/-) and [CT 10, pl. 47, BM 21402](#) (AS 1/-). Without patronymic, attestations of Kuda can be found in [PPAC 5, 608](#) (§ 48/-), obv. 3; [CT 7, pl. 10, BM 12929](#) (§ 48/-), obv. 6; [SAT 1, 381](#) (AS 5/-), obv. II, 13; [TCTI 1, 741](#) (AS 5/-), obv. IV, 9; [UNT 20](#) (AS 5/-), obv. III, 9 (ku<sub>5</sub>-ra<sub>2</sub>); [CUSAS 16, 104](#) (§S 1/-); the wool account [PPAC 5, 632](#) (-/-) attests the son of Kuda, Akala, among other herdsmen of Gu'aba. It is unclear, whether a connection with the herdsman Lu-namtara attested in Text 15 ([TCTI 2, 4178](#)) (IS 3/-), rev. I, 7, can be supposed.

**(rev. II, 6)** A herdsman Ur-barasiga (unclear whether a namesake) is attested in [MVN 2, 42](#) [...] (see § 1.1.9), obv. III, 8' as supervisor of the plots entrusted to himself (9 *iku*, 32,400 m<sup>2</sup>), to a shepherd assistant (4 ½ *iku*, 16,200 m<sup>2</sup>) and to a goat shepherd (9 *iku*, 32,400 m<sup>2</sup>); see § 2.1.1.

**(rev. II, 7-9)** This section concerns the sheep assigned to the smith Huru in the plot under the responsibility of Ur-Dumuzi, whose title is unknown and who does not occur elsewhere in the text. With regard to the herdsman of Gu'aba Ur-Dumuzi see notes to Text 22 ([MVN 6, 415](#)) (AS 1/-), rev. 5 (§ 5.2.22.2).

**(rev. II, 11-14)** This section refers to the sheep of a high priestess in Pasir, with no mention of the shepherd(s) whom the sheep were entrusted to or who were responsible for the plot where the sheep assigned to a state-dependent worker have grazed (see § 2.4.4). It is unclear whether the sheep could pertain

to the high priestess of Enki in Pasir or to the high priestess of BaU who held assets in Pasir (see § 1.2.7, fn. 27).

**(rev. II, 17-III, 1)** This section concerns the sheep of the "chief administrator of the couriers"<sup>185</sup> (a title not attested elsewhere) entrusted to a state dependent worker. Rev. II, 18 ([...]-am<sub>3</sub>) would suggest that the number of sheep and goats was classified according to the parameters of availability established by the central administration (e.g. [gub-ba]-am<sub>3</sub>), although in this case such information would apparently not refer to any herdsman.

<sup>185</sup> One may wonder whether this title was a contextual description conceived by the compiler of the text to refer to an individual responsible for a road-house (e<sub>2</sub>-kas<sub>4</sub>).



## §6. Index

### §6.1. Personal Names

a-ab-ba-[...]	Text 21. rev. II 3 (KU)
a-a-zi-gu <sub>10</sub>	Text 22. rev. 3 (na-gada saĝĝa)
ab-[...]	Text 29. obv. III 5' (dumu Lugal-sukkal)
ab-ba-ge-na	Text 2. rev. I 1 (ku); Text 5. rev. I 11 (na-gada); rev. I 13 (ki); Text 6. rev. I 1 (KU)
ab-ba-gu <sub>10</sub>	Text 21. rev. I 4 (KU)
ab-ba-sa <sub>6</sub> -ga	Text 15. rev. I 3 (na-gada)
a <sub>2</sub> -da- <sup>ṛ</sup> ba <sup>ṛ</sup> <sub>7</sub>	Text 24. obv. 3 (aga <sub>3</sub> -us <sub>2</sub> lugal)
a-eš <sub>4</sub> -tar <sub>2</sub>	Text 25. obv. 7 (ki)
a-ga-igi-zu-ma	Text 25. rev. 3' (dumu-[dab <sub>5</sub> -ba])
a-gu-a	Text 25. rev. 8' (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba); rev. 11' (ki)
a-ḫu-ni	Text 9. rev. III 1 (muḫaldim sukkal-maḫ)
al-ba-ni-du <sub>11</sub>	Text 21. rev. II 9 (KU)
a-kal-la	Text 4. rev. II 1 (sipa); Text 15. rev. I 11 (na-gada); Text 24. obv. 2 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> )
a-lu <sub>5</sub> -a	Text 16. obv. I 5
a <sub>2</sub> -lu <sub>5</sub> -lu <sub>5</sub>	Text 3. obv. II 4 ([...] zi-gum <sub>2</sub> )
a <sub>2</sub> -lu <sub>5</sub> -mu	Text 2. obv. II 5 (na-gada e <sub>2</sub> -maḫ)
a <sub>2</sub> -pi <sub>5</sub> -li <sub>2</sub>	Text 28. rev. I 7 (na-gada)
amar-ku <sub>3</sub>	Text 10. rev. I 4
amar-šuba <sub>3</sub>	Text 23. rev. I 2 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba); Text 24. rev. 8 (santana <sup>d</sup> nanna)
A.NE.KI	Text 25. obv. 5
a-pu <sub>3</sub> -gi <sub>4</sub>	Text 25. rev. 9'
a-tu	Text 16. obv. III 4 (na-gada); Text 19. obv 7; rev. 4 (ki); Text 22. rev. 4 (na-gada kur); Text 25. rev. 5' (eren <sub>2</sub> ); Text 29. rev. III 1 (šabra kas <sub>4</sub> )
a <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>2</sub> -mu	<i>see</i> § 2.1.1; Text 28. rev. I 3 (na-gada)
a <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>2</sub>	<i>see</i> § 2.1.1; Text 8. obv. I 5 (na-gada); obv. I 7 (ku) (udu ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> ); Text 14. obv. I 3 (sipa)
a-za-ba-ni	Text 24. obv. 4 (aga <sub>3</sub> -us <sub>2</sub> lugal)
ba-a	Text 20. obv. 2 (ša <sub>3</sub> geš-kin-ti); 4 (ki) (udu ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> )
ba-a-a	Text 7. obv. II 5 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> )
ba-a-ga	<i>see</i> § 2.1.1; Text 8. obv. I 9 (na-gada) (udu ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> )
ba-ga	<i>see</i> § 2.1.1; Text 20. obv. 7 (sipa) (udu ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> )
ba-ge-ne <sub>2</sub>	Text 19. obv. 4
<sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> -IGI.DU	Text 19. rev. 2; Text 20. obv. 4 (sipa) (udu ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> )
ba-za	<i>see</i> § 2.1.1; Text 28. obv. 2' (na-gada) (udu ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> )
ba-za-ga	<i>see</i> § 2.1.1; Text 28. obv. 8' (na-gada) (udu ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> )
ba-zi	Text 16. rev. II 1; Text 18. rev. I 3 (KU)
bur-ma-ma	Text 24. obv. 1 (dumu gu <sub>2</sub> -a); 5 (ki)
bi <sub>2</sub> -du <sub>11</sub> -i <sub>3</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub>	Text 5. obv. II 4
bu <sub>3</sub> -ki-ka-ka	Text 29. rev. I 2
da-[...]	Text 28. obv. II 8

da-da	Text 5. obv. I 5 (na-gada); obv. I 12 (KU); obv. II 11 (ki); Text 20. obv. 1 (<sipa> gab <sub>2</sub> -KU)
dingir-bu <sub>3</sub> -ka	Text 12. obv. I 3 (ša <sub>3</sub> geš-kin-<ti>)
dingir-sa <sub>6</sub> -ga	Text 9. rev. I 9 (sipa)
du-du	Text 23. obv. I 3 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba)
eb-na-da-ad	Text 23. obv. 6 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba)
e <sub>3</sub> -lugal	Text 9. obv. III 4
en-i <sub>3</sub> -na-kal-(la)	Text 8. rev. I 3 (na-gada); I 5; Text 28. obv. II 6; rev. I 5 (na-gada sukkal-mah)
en-ša <sub>3</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ge-en	Text 4. obv. II 7
eš <sub>3</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub>	Text 24. rev. 5 (nu-<geš>kiri <sub>6</sub> )
e-zu	Text 24. obv. 2
gu <sub>3</sub> -de <sub>2</sub> -a	Text 4. rev. II 4 (mar-tu); Text 11. obv. 5 (KU)
gu <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>3</sub> -mu	<i>see</i> § 2.2; Text 15. obv. I 4 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> ); II 4 (gu <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>3</sub> -[mu na-gada])
gu <sub>4</sub> -KU	Text 7. obv. I 5 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> )
gu-za-ni	Text 16. obv. II 6 (na-gada)
ḫa-ba-lu <sub>5</sub> -ge <sub>2</sub>	Text 15. rev. II 3 (na-gada)
ḫa-laḫ <sub>5</sub>	Text 18. obv. II 5 (sipa)
ḫe <sub>2</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub>	Text 23. rev. I 5 (engar)
ḫu-[...]	Text 12. obv. II 3 (ša <sub>3</sub> geš-[kin-ti])
ḫu-ba	Text 7. obv. II 3 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> )
ḫu-ru	Text 29. rev. II 8 (simug)
ḫu-wa-wa	Text 25. rev. 10' (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba)
i <sub>7</sub> -a-bi-du <sub>10</sub>	Text 20. obv. 6 (sipa) (udu ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> )
igi-sa <sub>6</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub>	Text 22. obv. 8 (na-gada sukkal-mah)
igi-lu <sub>5</sub> -lu <sub>5</sub>	Text 27. obv. 4 (KU)
il-ki-ri <sub>2</sub>	Text 28. obv. II 1 (na-gada)
im-ti-dam	<i>see</i> § 2.3.1 (šabra)
<sup>d</sup> inanna-ka	Text 5. rev. I 12; Text 9. rev. II 13 (sipa); Text 22. rev. 1 (sipa)
in-da-a	Text 7. rev. I 4
inim-du <sub>10</sub> -ga-ni	Text 29. rev. II 16
inim- <sup>d</sup> inanna	Text 24. rev. 4; 6 (ki)
in-u <sub>9</sub> -u <sub>9</sub>	Text 5. obv. II 2
ir <sub>3</sub> -ib-ri	Text 23. obv. I 1 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba); 4 ([ki <sup>2</sup> ]); II 1 (ki)
<sup>d</sup> iškur-an-dul <sub>3</sub>	Text 3. I 9 (na-gada lugal)
i <sub>3</sub> -tur-ra	Text 10. obv. II 8 (KU)
ka-ge-na	Text 2. obv. I 3 (sipa)
ka-ka	Text 21. rev. II 4
ki-lu <sub>5</sub> -la	Text 18. obv. II 3 (sipa)
ki-tuš-lu <sub>2</sub>	Text 10. obv. II 1 (na-gada); II 4 (ki); Text 13. obv. I 6 (na-gada); II 1 (ki); Text 26. obv. 2 (KU)
ku <sub>5</sub> -da	Text 29. rev. II 3 (na-gada)
ku-gu-za-na	Text 15. obv. I 6' (KU)
ku-li	Text 16. rev. I 13 (KU)
ku <sub>3</sub> - <sup>d</sup> nanna	Text 2. rev. I 10 (na-gada)
la-a-a	Text 7. rev. I 2
la-la-mu	Text 5. obv. II 5 (ma <sub>2</sub> -gal)
lam-lam-ma	Text 24. obv. 6; Text 29. obv. III 9' (na-gada); rev. I 7 (ki)
la-gu <sub>2</sub>	Text 10. rev. II 11' (sipa)
lu <sub>2</sub> -[...]	Text 13. obv. II 7; Text 14. obv. II 3
lu <sub>2</sub> -bala-sa <sub>6</sub> -ga	Text 16. rev. II 4' (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> ); Text 29. obv. II 6'
lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub>	Text 4. rev. I 3; Text 5. obv. II 7; Text 29. rev. II 13 (eren <sub>2</sub> )

lu <sub>2</sub> -du <sub>10</sub> -ga	Text 7. rev. II 3 (eren <sub>2</sub> )
lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> dumu-zi	Text 22. obv. 1 (na-<gada>); 5 (ki)
lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> en-ki	Text 10. rev. II 3' (šeš ga-eš <sub>8</sub> ); Text 13. rev. II 3 (lu <sub>2</sub> -[...] -ki <sup>2</sup> šeš ga-eš <sub>8</sub> )
lugal-[...]	Text 8. rev. I 10 (KU)
lugal-ezem	Text 23. obv. 11 ([...])
lugal-igi-huš	Text 26. obv. II 6
lugal-ka-ge-na	Text 16. obv. III 7; III 9
lugal-ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-ni	Text 24. obv. 8 (KU)
lugal- <sup>d</sup> ku <sub>3</sub> -sig <sub>17</sub>	Text 29. rev. I 9 (<na-gada>); 13 (ki)
Lugal-me-lam <sub>2</sub>	Text 27. obv. 3 (KU)
lugal-si-gar	Text 3. obv. I 2 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> )
lugal-sukkal	Text 21. rev. II 6 (eren <sub>2</sub> )
lugal-sukkal-du <sub>8</sub>	Text 5. obv. II 6
lugal-ur-sag	Text 15. obv. 1' (KU)
lugal-u <sub>2</sub> -šim-e	Text 9. rev. II 8 (na-gada <sup>d</sup> en-ki)
lu <sub>2</sub> -ge-na	Text 16. obv. I 10 (na-gada)
lu <sub>2</sub> -giri <sub>17</sub> -zal	Text 5. obv. 10 (na-gada); obv. II 10 (dam I. KU); Text 8. rev. I 1 (KU); Text 10. rev. II 12 (nu-banda <sub>3</sub> ki-[...] ); Text 26. rev. I 7 (šidim)
lu <sub>2</sub> -gu-la	Text 4. obv. II 9 (mar-tu); Text 25. obv. 9 ([...])
lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> igi-ma-še <sub>3</sub>	Text 18. rev. I 4 (KU)
lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> kal-kal-la	<i>see</i> § 2.1.5 (šabra)
lu <sub>2</sub> -kal-la	Text 15. obv. I 8' (na-gada); Text 29. obv. II 2' (ki); 4 (na-gada)
lu <sub>2</sub> -kisal	Text 29. obv. II 15' (na-gada)
lu <sub>2</sub> -me-lam <sub>2</sub>	Text 4. rev. II 2 (na-gada nin); Text 10. rev. II 7' (sipa udu sukkal-maḥ); Text 24. obv. 10 (KU)
lu <sub>2</sub> <sup>?</sup> - <sup>d</sup> mes-lam-ta-e <sub>3</sub>	Text 19. rev. 1
lu <sub>2</sub> -nam <sub>2</sub> -maḥ	Text 29. rev. III 3
lu <sub>2</sub> -nam-tar-ra	Text 15. rev. I 7 (na-gada)
lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> na-ru <sub>2</sub> -a	Text 1. obv. II 4 (eren <sub>2</sub> )
lu <sub>2</sub> -nigin <sup>ki</sup>	Text 27. obv. 5 (ša <sub>3</sub> geš-kin-ti)
lu <sub>2</sub> -nigir	Text 22. obv. 4; Text 27. obv. 1 (na-gada)
lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> nin-[...]	Text 13. obv. II 10 (na-gada)
lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> nin-gir <sub>2</sub> -su	Text 11. obv. 3 (KU)
lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> nin-šubur	Text 26. obv. I 3 (na-gada); 8 (KU)
lu <sub>2</sub> -sukkal	Text 9. obv. III 12 (sipa)
lu <sub>2</sub> -sukkal-an-ka	Text 11. obv. 7 (KU)
lu <sub>2</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub> -ga	Text 10. rev. I 8 (KU)
lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> šul-gi	Text 10. rev. I 2 (KU)
lu <sub>2</sub> -urub <sub>x</sub> (URU×KAR <sub>2</sub> ) <sup>ki</sup>	Text 1. obv. I 6 (na-gada); Text 6. obv. II 6 (KU)
lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> utu	Text 1. obv. I 9 (na-gada); Text 8. rev. I 8 (KU)
ma-an-sa <sub>6</sub>	Text 5. obv. II 3
ma-an-sum	Text 23. obv. I 7 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba)
me-an-ta	Text 24. obv. 15 (KU)
mu-ni-šu-ta-a-lu	Text 29. obv. I 12' (na-gada)
na-a-na	Text 2. rev. I 4 (na-gada)
na-ba-sa <sub>6</sub>	Text 2. obv. II 3 (ša <sub>3</sub> geš-<kin-ti>); Text 22. 6 (na-gada)
nam-ḫa-ni	Text 22. obv. 2 (na-gada)
nam-maḥ	Text 4. obv. I 3 (KU); Text 9. obv. II 13 (na-gada)
nam-maḥ-šu	Text 25. rev. 12'
nam-sipa-da-ni-du <sub>10</sub>	Text 5. rev. II 7 (na-gada)
na-ni	Text 5. obv. II 9 (KU)

<sup>d</sup> nanše-kam	Text 2. rev. II 3 (na-gada)
NE.NI	Text 25. rev. 2' ([...])
NE-[...]	Text 12. rev. I 5
nig <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> [...]	Text 9. obv. III 8 (na-gada lugal)
nig <sub>2</sub> -gu <sub>10</sub>	Text 29. obv. III 2' (na-gada)
nig <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub>	Text 2. obv. I 8 (ša <sub>3</sub> geš-<kin-ti>); Text 9. obv. III 2 (<na-gada>)
nig <sub>2</sub> -du <sub>10</sub> -ga	Text 17. rev. I 3 (dumu-gi <sub>7</sub> )
nig <sub>2</sub> -gur <sub>11</sub>	Text 4. obv. I 5 (dam-gar <sub>3</sub> )
nigir-ša <sub>3</sub> -kuš <sub>2</sub>	Text 21. rev. I 1; I 2
nig <sub>2</sub> -lagar-di-e	Text 10. rev. I 10
nig <sub>2</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub> -ga	Text 13. rev. II 7 (na-gada)
puzur <sub>4</sub> -za	Text 25. obv. 6 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> )
sipa-du <sub>10</sub>	Text 6 obv. I 7 (ki)
sukkal-ka-ka-gen <sub>7</sub>	Text 22. obv. 3
ša <sub>3</sub> -bi	Text 24. rev. 9 (unu <sub>3</sub> <sup>d</sup> nanna)
ša-gu-ze <sub>2</sub>	Text 25. rev. 7' (ki)
šeš-kal-la	Text 1. obv. I 7 (šuš <sub>3</sub> ); rev. I 1 (ki)
<sup>d</sup> šul-gi-nin-e-ki-ag <sub>2</sub>	Text 9. rev. I 6 (lu <sub>2</sub> sukkal-maḥ)
šu-ni-a	<i>see</i> § 2.2; Text 17. obv. I 6 (dumu-gi <sub>7</sub> ); Text 25. obv. 1 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba); 3 (ki)
TAR-[...]	Text 14. obv. II 6
u <sub>4</sub> -de <sub>3</sub> -nig <sub>2</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub> -ga	Text 9. obv. I 5 (na-gada); I 7 (ki)
UN-ga <sub>6</sub>	Text 9. obv. III 6
ur-an-ki	Text 10. obv. III 6; Text 13. rev. I 6 (KU)
ur-[...]	Text 25. rev. 1'
ur- <sup>d</sup> [...]	Text 3. obv. II 7; Text 4. obv. II 3; Text 21. obv. II 4'
ur-bar <sub>2</sub>	Text 29. obv. I 7' (dumu kum-dur <sub>2</sub> na-gada)
ur-bar <sub>2</sub> -si-ga	Text 29. rev. II 6 (na-gada)
ur- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub>	Text 4. obv. I 9 (dam-gar <sub>3</sub> ); Text 5. rev. I 4 (na-gada); I 7 (ki); rev. II 9 (na-gada nin); Text 10. obv. III 1 (šabra); Text 10. rev. I 6 (ugula kikken <sup>?</sup> ); Text 13. obv. I 10; Text 18. obv. I 7 ([ugula] šidim; <i>see</i> § 2.3.2); Text 18. rev. I 6 (KU); Text 22. rev. 2 (muḥaldim lugal); Text 24. obv. 11 (KU); rev. 2; Text 25. obv. 10 ([...]); Text 25. rev. 6' (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba); Text 26. II obv. 4 (KU); rev. I 5 (ugula šidim); Text 29. rev. I 10; 12
ur- <sup>d</sup> da-mu	Text 12. obv. I 6 (ša <sub>3</sub> geš-[kin-ti]); Text 20. obv. 9 (dub-sar)
ur-dingir-ra	Text 3. obv. II 2 ([...]);
ur-du <sub>6</sub>	Text 10. rev. II 5' (sipa udu sukkal-maḥ); Text 13. rev. I 3 (sipa udu sukkal-maḥ)
urdu <sub>2</sub>	Text 24. rev. 10 (muḥaldim <sup>d</sup> nanna)
urdu <sub>2</sub> -dam	Text 5. obv. II 8
urdu <sub>2</sub> -da-ni	Text 1. obv. II 3 (na-gada ereš-dingir); obv. II 5 (ki)
ur- <sup>d</sup> dumu-zi	Text 22. rev. 5 (na-gada kur); Text 29. rev. II 9 (ki)
ur-e <sub>2</sub> -an-na	Text 21. obv. II 3' (šeš ur- <sup>d</sup> ḥendur-sag); rev. I 5 (ki)
ur-eš <sub>2</sub> -da	Text 7. obv. I 9 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> )
ur-eš <sub>3</sub> -lil <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub>	Text 24. obv. 9 (KU); 12 (ki)
ur-gu-la	Text 5. rev. II 3 (na-gada); Text 8. obv. II 2 (na-gada) (udu ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> )
ur- <sup>d</sup> ḥendur-sag	Text 21. obv. I 4 (na-gada); I 6 (kurušda); I 8 (ki); Text 23. rev. 7 (engar)

ur- <sup>d</sup> ig-alim	<i>see</i> § 2.3.2; Text 18. obv. II 1 (ugula šidim); Text 26. rev. I 3 (ugula šidim)
ur- <sup>d</sup> igi-zi-bar-ra	Text 17. obv. II 5 (dumu-<dab <sub>5</sub> > ħug)
ur <sub>5</sub> <sup>ki</sup> -ki-du <sub>10</sub>	Text 9. rev. II 1 (muḫaldim lugal)
ur- <sup>d</sup> iškur	Text 10. obv. II 6 (KU)
ur-ki-gu-la	Text 22. obv. 12 (na-gada <sup>d</sup> nanna)
ur-kisal	Text 21. rev. II 1 (na-gada); II 10 (ki)
ur-ku <sub>3</sub> -nun	Text 26. rev. II 1 (šidim)
ur- <sup>d</sup> lamma	Text 3. obv. I 6 (KU); Text 7. obv. I 3 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba); Text 9. obv. II 9 (na-gada); Text 10. obv. III 4 (sa <sub>12</sub> -du <sub>5</sub> ); Text 18. rev. I 5 (KU); Text 29. obv. II 9' (na-gada); 11' (ki)
ur- <sup>d</sup> li <sub>9</sub> -si <sub>4</sub>	Text 22. obv. 11 (na-gada)
ur-ma-ma	Text 9. obv. III 10 (na-gada nin)
ur-mes	Text 1. obv. II 1 (na-gada); Text 2. obv. II 7 (KU); Text 7. obv. I 7 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> ); rev. I 7 (eren <sub>2</sub> ); Text. 9 rev. II 1 (ur-mes-«mes» na-gada); Text 13. rev. I 11 (na-gada); Text 15. obv. II 8 (na-gada); Text 18. obv. I 3 (sipa); Text 19. rev. 3; Text 21. rev. II 5 (KU); Text 22. obv. 7 (na-gada); 10 (ki); Text 26. obv. I 6 (na-gada)
ur-mete-na	Text 2. obv. I 5 (sipa)
ur- <sup>d</sup> nanše	Text 2. rev. I 7 (na-gada); Text 3. I 4 (dub-sar lugal); Text 17. rev. II 1 (dub-sar lugal); Text 24. rev. 7 (unu <sub>3</sub> <sup>d</sup> nanna); 11 (ki); Text 28. obv. I 6' (na-gada) (udu ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> )
ur- <sup>d</sup> nin-pirig	Text 19. obv. 2; 5 (ki)
ur- <sup>d</sup> nin-šubur	Text 16. obv. II 10 (na-gada)
ur-sa <sub>6</sub> -ga	<i>see</i> § 2.2; Text 17. obv. II 3 (dumu-gi <sub>7</sub> ); Text 24. obv. 7 (KU); obv. 13 (KU); Text 26. obv. II 2
ur-sa <sub>6</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub>	<i>see</i> § 2.2; Text 25. obv. 4
ur- <sup>d</sup> suen	Text 4. rev. I 2 (KU)
ur-sukkal	Text 3. rev. I 2' (ṛna <sup>1</sup> -[gada nin <sup>2</sup> ]); Text 13. rev. I 8 (KU); Text 24. rev. I (KU)
ur- <sup>d</sup> šul-pa-e <sub>3</sub>	Text 7. rev. I 9 (šu-i lugal); Text 9. obv. II 2 (ur- <sup>d</sup> šul-<pa-e <sub>3</sub> > na-gada); Text 12. obv. II 5 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba); Text 21. rev. II 8 (eren <sub>2</sub> ); Text 23. obv. II 8 (na-gada); rev. I 3 (ki)
ur-tur	Text 24. rev. 12 (KU)
ur- <sup>d</sup> uš-gid <sub>2</sub> -da	Text 4. obv. I 7 (dam-gar <sub>3</sub> )
ur-zi-kum-ma	Text 6 rev. I 3 (KU); Text 26. rev. I 8 (šidim); Text 26. rev. II 4 (na-gada en); Text 29. rev. I 6
u-ša-lum	<i>see</i> § 2.2; Text 17. obv. I 3 (dumu-gi <sub>7</sub> ); Text 25. obv. 8 (dumu-[dab <sub>5</sub> -ba])
uš-ge-na	Text 6. obv. II 1 (na-gada); II 4 (ki)
u <sub>2</sub> -šim-e	Text 20. obv. 3 (ki-geš-i <sub>3</sub> )
<sup>d</sup> utu- [...]	Text 12. rev. I 3
<sup>d</sup> utu-gu <sub>10</sub>	Text 24. obv. 14 (na-gada); rev. 3 (ki)
<sup>d</sup> utu-kalam-/e	Text 9. obv. II 5 (na-gada)
<sup>d</sup> utu-kam	Text 19. obv. 3
za-na-a	Text 26. obv. II 8 (nu-banda <sub>3</sub> šidim)
ze <sub>2</sub> -ki	Text 25. rev. 4' (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> )
[...]-an	Text 23. obv. I 9 (dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba)
[...]- <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub>	Text 18. rev. I 8 (KU); I 10

[...]-ga	Text 16. rev. I 5
[...]- <sup>d</sup> iškur	Text 18. obv. I 6 (sipa)
[...]-sizkur <sub>2</sub>	Text 16. rev. I 3
[...]- <sup>r</sup> šubur <sup>7</sup>	Text 29. rev. II 19 (eren <sub>2</sub> )

## §6.2. Toponyms and Fields

a-ša <sub>3</sub> a.ku-si-ga gu <sub>2</sub> i <sub>7</sub>	§ 4; Text 3. rev. II 4'
a-ša <sub>3</sub> bad <sub>3</sub> -[...]	§ 4; Text 17. rev. II 3
a-ša <sub>3</sub> <sup>?</sup> (A.A) bad <sub>3</sub> -da- <sup>r</sup> ri <sub>2</sub> <sup>?</sup> u <sub>3</sub> ar-la-AN	§ 4; Text 25. rev. 12'
a-ša <sub>3</sub> da-lugal	§ 4; Text 26. rev. II 7 (<a>-ša <sub>3</sub> )
a-ša <sub>3</sub> du-a-bi	§ 4; Text 14. rev. II
a-ša <sub>3</sub> du <sub>6</sub> -eš <sub>3</sub>	§ 4; Text 11. rev. 2
a-ša <sub>3</sub> du <sub>6</sub> -lugal-u <sub>3</sub> -a	§ 4; Text 7. rev. II 5
a-ša <sub>3</sub> e <sub>2</sub> -duru <sub>5</sub> [x]	§ 4; Text 9. rev. II 4
a-ša <sub>3</sub> e <sub>2</sub> -duru <sub>5</sub> ba-zi	§ 4; Text 12. rev. II 2
a-ša <sub>3</sub> e <sub>2</sub> -duru <sub>5</sub> <sup>d</sup> inanna	§ 4; Text 10. rev. III 2' (e <sub>2</sub> -<duru <sub>5</sub> >); Text 13. rev. II 5
aša <sub>5</sub> e <sub>2</sub> -duru <sub>5</sub> lu <sub>2</sub> - <sup>d</sup> šara <sub>2</sub>	§ 4; Text 20. rev. 2
a-ša <sub>3</sub> e <sub>2</sub> -duru <sub>5</sub> ur- <sup>ges</sup> gigir	§ 4; Text 8. rev. II 2; Text 28. rev. II 3
aša <sub>5</sub> e <sub>2</sub> -duru <sub>5</sub> ša <sub>3</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ge	§ 4; Text 1. rev. II 2
a-ša <sub>3</sub> e <sub>2</sub> -anše	§ 4; Text 26. rev. II 6
a-ša <sub>3</sub> gibil	§ 4; Text 22. rev. 7
aša <sub>5</sub> gir <sub>2</sub> -nun	§ 4; Text 24. rev. 13
a-ša <sub>3</sub> ḫu-rim <sub>3</sub> <sup>ki</sup>	§ 4; Text 15. rev. II 9 (<a>-ša <sub>3</sub> )
a-ša <sub>3</sub> i-šar-ra	§ 4; Text 5. rev. II 11
aša <sub>5</sub> kun-zi-da gu <sub>2</sub> -ab-ba <sup>ki</sup>	§ 4; Text 21. rev. II 12
a-ša <sub>3</sub> lagaš <sup>ki</sup>	§ 4; Text 27. rev. 2
a-ša <sub>3</sub> <sup>d</sup> lugal-a <sub>2</sub> -zi-da	§ 4; Text 2. rev. II 4
a-ša <sub>3</sub> nin-a <sub>2</sub> -zi-da	§ 4; Text 6. rev. II 2
a-ša <sub>3</sub> ur- <sup>d</sup> ig-alim	§ 4; Text 2. rev. II 5
aša <sub>5</sub> ur-sag-pa-e <sub>3</sub>	§ 4; Text 19. rev. 6; Text 23. rev. II 3
e <sub>2</sub> -duru <sub>5</sub> du-du- <sup>d</sup> na-ru <sub>2</sub> -a	Text 29. obv. II 3'
pa <sub>5</sub> -sir <sub>2</sub> <sup>&lt;ki&gt;</sup>	Text 29. rev. II 11

## §6.3. Sumerian Terms and Expressions

aga <sub>3</sub> -us <sub>2</sub> lugal	see § 2.3.2
a-ru-a	Text 24. obv. 3; 4
	see § 3.4
bi <sub>2</sub> -de <sub>5</sub> -(ga)	Text 29. rev. I 12
	see § 1.3.3-6
	Text 1. obv. II 8; Text 5. rev. I 6 (KU); Text 6. obv. II 3;
	Text. 9 rev. I 5; Text 10. obv. II 3; Text 13. obv. I 8; Text
	21. obv. I 7 (nu-KU); Text 22. obv. 9); Text 29. obv. II 1';
	obv. II 10'; rev. 1
dam	Text 5. obv. II 10
dam-gar <sub>3</sub>	see § 2.3.2
	Text 4. obv. I 5; obv. I 7; obv. I 9; obv. II 5 (sipa <sup>r</sup> dam <sup>-</sup>
	[gar <sub>3</sub> <sup>?</sup> -e]-/ <sup>r</sup> ne <sup>?</sup> )
dub-sar	Text 20. obv. 9
	dub-sar lugal

dumu-dab <sub>5</sub> -(ba)	Text 3. obv. I 4; Text 17. rev. II 1 <i>see</i> § 2.2 Text 3. obv. I 2; Text 7. <i>passim</i> ; Text 12. obv. II 5; Text 15. obv. I 4'; Text 16. rev. I 11; rev. II, 4'; Text 23. <i>passim</i> ; Text 25. <i>passim</i>
dumu-gi <sub>7</sub>	<i>see</i> § 2.2 Text 17. <i>passim</i>
eren <sub>2</sub>	<i>see</i> § 2.2 Text 1. obv. II 4; obv. II 8; Text 7. rev. I 7; rev. II 3; Text 21. rev. II 6; rev. II 8; Text 25. rev. 5'; rev. 9'; Text 29. rev. II 13; rev. II 19
egir udu <ba-ur <sub>4</sub> >	<i>see</i> § 3.2.5 Text 1. obv. I 5; Text 29. obv. I 6'; 11'; II 14'; III 1'
engar	<i>see</i> § 2.3.2 Text 23. rev. I 5; rev. I 7; rev. I 8 (engar UD.IM.MU-me)
ereš-dingir	<i>see</i> § 1.2.6-7; § 2.3.1.2 na-gada ereš-dingir Text 1. obv. II 3 udu ereš-dingir <sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> Text 8. obv. II 3; Text 20. obv. 8; Text 28. obv. I 9' udu ereš-dingir pa <sub>5</sub> -sir <sub>2</sub> Text 29. rev. II 11
geš-kin-ti	ša <sub>3</sub> geš-(kin-ti) <i>see</i> § 3.2.2 Text 2. obv. I 8; II 3; Text 12. obv. I 3; obv. I 6; obv. II 3; Text 20. obv. 2; Text 27. obv. 5
n im-bi	<i>see</i> § 1.1.6 Text 1. rev. 1; Text 19. rev. 5; Text 21. left edge 2; Text 23. rev. II 1
iri	<i>see</i> 1.3.4 Text 29. rev. I 1; rev. III 5
ki	<i>see</i> § 2.4 <i>passim</i>
ki-geš-i <sub>3</sub>	Text 20. obv. 3
ku	<i>see</i> § 1.3.2; § 2.3.3 <i>passim</i>
kurušda	<i>see</i> § 2.1.4 Text 21. obv. 1.6
la <sub>2</sub> -ni	<i>see</i> § 3.2.3 Text 5. rev. II 2; Text 9. obv. II 12; Text 13. obv. I 5; Text 15. rev. II 2; rev. II 6; Text 16. obv. I 9; obv. II 5; obv. II 9; obv. III 3; Text 23. obv. II 5; Text 29. obv. I 10'; obv. II, 2; obv. II 5 mu la <sub>2</sub> -ni-še <sub>3</sub> Text 21. obv. II 6'
libir	<i>see</i> § 3.2.4 Text 6. obv. I 4; Text 10. obv. I 2; Text 16. obv. I 3; Text 29. rev. I 14(?)
lugal	<i>see</i> § 1.2.1-4; § 2.3.1.3
lu <sub>2</sub> -maḥ	Text 10. obv. III 10; Text 13. obv. II 4 ( <sup>d</sup> inanna)
ma <sub>2</sub> -gal	<i>see</i> § 2.3.1.4 Text 5. obv. II 5
mar-tu	<i>see</i> § 2.2.10 Text 4. obv. II 9; rev. II 4

maš <sub>2</sub>	<i>passim</i> maš <sub>2</sub> geš <sup>2</sup> tukul <sup>d</sup> nin-geš-zi-da <i>see</i> § 3.2.1
muḫaldim	Text 10. obv. I 4 <i>see</i> § 1.3.7; § 2.3.1.2-3 muḫaldim lugal Text 9. rev. II 1; Text 22. rev. 2 muḫaldim <sup>d</sup> nanna Text 24. rev. 10 muḫaldim sukkal-maḫ Text 9. rev. III 1-2
na-gada	<i>see</i> § 2.1.1 <i>passim</i> na-gada en Text 26. rev. II 4 na-gada e <sub>2</sub> -maḫ Text 2. obv. II 5 na-gada <sup>d</sup> en-ki Text 9. rev. II 8 na-gada ereš-dingir Text 1. obv. II 3 na-gada kur Text 22. re. 4; 5 na-gada lugal <i>see</i> § 1.3 Text 3. obv. I 9; Text 9. obv. III 10 na-gada <sup>d</sup> nanna Text 22. obv. 11 na-gada nin <i>see</i> § 1.3 Text 3. rev. I 2 ([na]-[gada nin <sup>2</sup> ]); Text 4. rev. II 2; Text 5. rev. II 9; Text 9. obv. III 10 na-gada sagga Text 22. rev. 3 na-gada sukkal-maḫ Text 22. obv. 8; Text 28. rev. I 5
nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> aka	<i>see</i> 1.1.5 <i>passim</i> nig <sub>2</sub> -ka <sub>9</sub> NE nu-aka Text 29. obv. II 8'
nin	<i>see</i> 1.2.5; na-gada nin
nu-banda <sub>3</sub>	Text 10. rev. II 12' (nu-banda <sub>3</sub> ki-...) nu-banda <sub>3</sub> šidim Text 26. obv. II 8
nu- <sup>&lt;geš&gt;</sup> kiri <sub>6</sub>	Text 24. rev. 5
sa <sub>12</sub> -du <sub>5</sub>	Text 10. obv. III 4
santana	santana <sup>d</sup> nanna Text 24. rev. 8
silā <sub>4</sub>	<i>see</i> § 3.0.2 Text 4. obv. I 3
simug	Text 29. rev. II 8
sipa	<i>see</i> § 2.1.1; <i>passim</i> (sipa) gab <sub>2</sub> -KU Text 20 obv. 1



sukkal-maḥ	<p><i>see</i> § 1.2.8; § 2.3.1.2  lu<sub>2</sub> sukkal-maḥ  Text 9. rev. I 6  muḥaldim sukkal-maḥ  Text 9. rev. III 1-2  na-gada sukkal-maḥ  Text 22. obv. 8; Text 28. rev. I 5  udu sukkal-maḥ  Text 10. rev. II 8'; Text 13. rev. I 4</p>
šabra	<p><i>see</i> § 2.1.5; § 2.3.1.2  Text 2. obv. I 6; Text 8. obv. II 5; Text 10. obv. III 1; Text  14. obv. I 4; Text 18. obv. II 6; Text 28. obv. II 3  šabra kas<sub>4</sub>  Text 29. rev. III 1</p>
šidim	<p><i>see</i> § 2.3.2  Text 18. obv. II 8; Text 26. rev. I 7; 8; II 1  ugula šidim  Text 18. obv. I 7; II 1; Text 26. rev. I 3; 5  nu-banda<sub>3</sub> šidim  Text 26. obv. II 8</p>
šu-[...]-na šu-i	<p>Text 4. rev. I 2 (ša<sub>3</sub> šu-[...]-na)  šu-i lugal  Text 7. rev. I 9</p>
šuš <sub>3</sub>	<p><i>see</i> § 2.1.3  Text 1. obv. II 7</p>
UD.IM.MU udu	<p>Text 23. rev. I 5; 7; 8 (engar UD.IM.MU-me)  <i>see</i> § 3.0.1  <i>passim</i>  udu BU.KU  Text 24. obv. 9  udu gub-ba-(am<sub>3</sub>)  <i>see</i> § 2.1.1; <i>passim</i>  udu gukkal  <i>see</i> § 3  <i>passim</i>  udu kur  <i>see</i> § 3  Text 1. obv. I 1; obv. I 7; obv. I, 10  udu zi-ga  <i>see</i> § 2.1.1; § 3.2  <i>passim</i></p>
unu <sub>3</sub>	<p>unu<sub>3</sub> <sup>d</sup>nanna  Text 24. rev. 7; 9</p>
zi-gum <sub>2</sub> [...]-amar [...]-ne-ka	<p>Text 3. obv. II 4  Text 9. rev. I 4  Text 29. obv. I 3'</p>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, R. McC. (2006). "Shepherds at Umma in the Third Dynasty of Ur: Interlocutors with a World beyond the Scribal Field of Ordered Vision". *JESHO* 49, 133–169.
- Alivernini, S. (2013a). *La Struttura Amministrativa del mar-sa nella Documentazione della III Dinastia di Ur*. RSO 86. Rome: Fabrizio Serra editore.
- Borrelli, N. (2020). "The Central State and the Provincial Authorities in Late Third Millennium Babylonia: Badari and the Governors of Ĝirsu/Lagaš". *Kaskal* 17, 1–21.
- Charles, M. P. (1990). "Traditional Crop Husbandry in Southern Iraq 1900-1960". *BSA* 5, 47–64.
- Civil, M. (2011). "The Law Collection of Ur-Namma". In: *Cuneiform royal inscription and related texts in the Schøyen Collection*. Ed. by A. W. George. CUSAS 17. Bethesda: CDL Press, 221–286.
- Dahl, J. L. (2007). *The Ruling Family of Ur III Umma: A Prosopographical Analysis of an Elite Family in Southern Iraq 4000 Years Ago*. PIHANS 108. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Everling, J. (2005). "The Modern History of a Sumerian Tablet". *Specimina Nova Universitatis Quinqueecclesiensis* 19, 25–30.
- Frayne, D. (2008). *Pre-Sargonic Period (2700-2350 BC)*. RIME 1. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Garfinkle, S. (2003). "SI.A-a and His Family: the Archive of a 21st Century (BC) Entrepreneur". *ZA* 93, 161–198.
- George, A. (1993). *House Most High: The Temples of Ancient Mesopotamia*. MC 5. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- Greco, A. (2015). *Garden Administration (ĝeš<sup>6</sup> kir<sub>6</sub>) in the Ĝirsu province during the Neosumerian Period*. BPOA 12. Madrid: CSIC.
- (2017). "A Round Tablet Concerning Gardens from Ur-III Ĝirsu: Ordinary Administration or Scribal Training?" *RSO* 90, 29–40.
- (2020). "A Graphic Expedient for Counting Sheep in Ur-III Ĝirsu". *NABU* 2020/46.
- Heimpel, W. (1993). "Zu den Bezeichnungen von Schafen und Ziegen in den Drehem- und Ummatexten". *BSA* 7, 115–60.
- (1994). "Towards an Understanding of the Word *Sikkum*". *RA* 88, 5–31.
- (2009). "The Location of Magda". *JCS* 48 61, 25–62.
- Koslova, N. (2008). "Bezeichnungen der Arbeitskräfte in Umma der Ur III-Zeit". 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 J.C. Johnson and S.J. Garfinkle. BPOA 5. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 145–201.
- Kraus, F. R. (1947). "Die Istanbuler Tontafelsammlung". *JCS* 1, 93–119.
- Laursen, S. and P. Steinkeller (2009). *Babylonia, the Gulf Region, and the Indus. Archaeological and Textual Evidence for Contacts in the Third and Early Second Millennium B.C.* MC 5. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Lecompte, C. (2013). "Zu Dörfern, Weilern und ländlichen Siedlungen in vorsargonischer Zeit: die Entwicklung der Bezeichnungen E<sub>2</sub> und E<sub>2</sub>-DURU<sub>5</sub>". *RSO* 86, 103–120.
- Liverani, M. (1990). "The Shape of Neo-Sumerian fields". *BSA* 5, 147–186.
- Maaijer, R. de and B. Jagersma (1997/98). "Review of A.W. Sjöberg (ed.) The Sumerian Dictionary of the Museum of Pennsylvania. A I/II, Philadelphia, 1992". *AoF* 44/45, 277–288.
- Maekawa, K. (1983). "The Management of fatted sheep (udu-niga) in Ur III Girsu/Lagash". *ASJ* 5, 81–111.
- (1987). "The Agricultural Texts of Ur-III Lagash of the British Museum (V)". *ASJ* 9, 89–130.

- (1992a). “The Agricultural Texts of Ur-III Lagash of the British Museum (VIII)”. *ASJ* 14, 173–243.
  - (1992b). “The Shape and Orientation of the Domain Units in the “Round Tablets” of Ur III Girsu: A Critical Review of Liverani, “The Shape of Neo-Sumerian fields”, *BSA* 5 (1990), 147-186, esp. pp. 155ff”. *ASJ* 14, 407–423.
  - (1996). “Confiscation of Private Properties in the Ur III Period: a Study of the e<sub>2</sub>-dul-la and nig<sub>2</sub>-GA”. *ASJ* 18, 103–168.
  - (1997). “The Agricultural Texts of Ur-III Lagash of the British Museum (XI)”. *ASJ* 19, 113–145.
  - (1999). “The “Temples” and the “Temple personnel” of Ur III Girsu-Lagash”. In: *Priests and Officials in the Near East. Proceeding of the Second Colloquium on the Ancient Near East: Priests and Officials in the Ancient Near East*. Ed. by K. Watanabe. Heidelberg, 61–102.
- Mander, P. and P. Notizia (2009). “Testi relativi all’agricoltura e ai lavori di manutenzione fluviale dell’Harvard Semitic Museum”. In: *Dallo Stirione al Tigri, dal Tevere all’Eufrate, Studi in Onore di Claudio Saporetti*. Ed. by P. Negri-Scafa and S. Viaggio. Rome: Aracne, 233–251.
- Molina, M. and P. Steinkeller (2016). “New Data on Garšana and the Border Zone between Umma and Girsu/Lagaš”. In *The first Ninety Years. A Sumerian Celebration in Honor of Miguel Civil*. In: *The first Ninety Years. A Sumerian Celebration in Honor of Miguel Civil*. Ed. by F. Karahashi L. Feliu and G. Rubio. Boston Berlin: de Gruyter, 231–149.
- Pettinato, G. (1967). *Untersuchungen zur neusumerischen Landwirtschaft*. Naples: Istituto Orientale.
- (1969). *Texte zur Verwaltung der Landwirtschaft in der Ur III-Zeit. Die Runden Tafeln*. AnOr 45. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Sallaberger, W. (1993). *Der kultische Kalender der Ur III-Zeit*. UAVA 7. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Selz, G. J. (1989). *Die Altsumerischen Wirtschatsurkunden der Ermitage zu Leningrad. Altsumerische Verwaltungstexte aus Lagaš*. FAOS 15/1. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Sharlach, T. M. (2004). *Provincial Taxation and the Ur III State*. CM 26. Leiden: Brill.
- Snell, D. C. (1986). “The Rams of Lagash”. *ASJ* 8, 133–217.
- Steinkeller, P. (1981). “The Renting of Fields in Ancient Mesopotamia and the Development of the Concept of “Interest” in Sumerian”. *JESHO* 24, 113–145.
- (1995). “Sheep and Goat Terminology in Ur III Sources from Drehem”. *BSA* 8, 49–70.
  - (2003). “Archival Practices in Third Millennium Babylonia: Some General Observations and the Specific Case of the Archives of Umma in Ur III Times”. In: *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions: Concepts of Record-Keeping in the Ancient World*. Ed. by Maria Brosius. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–16.
  - (2013). “Corvée Labor in Ur III Times”. In: *From the 21st Century B.C. to the 21st Century A.D. Proceedings of the International Conference on Sumerian Studies Held in Madrid, 22-24 July 2010*. Ed. by Steven J. Garfinkle and Manuel Molina. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 347–424.
  - (2015). “The Employment of Labor in National Building Projects in the Ur III Period”. In: *Labor in the Ancient World. Volume V: A Colloquium held at Hirschbach (Saxony), April 2005*. Ed. by P. Steinkeller and M. Hudson. Dresden: Islet-Verlag, 137–236.
- Stępień, M. (1996). *Animal husbandry in the Ancient Near East: A prosopographic study of third-millennium Umma*. Bethesda: CDL Press.
- Such-Gutiérrez, M. (2003). “Überlegungen zu der sumerischen Zeichen-Gruppe ŠE.KA”. *Sefarad* 63, 393–410.
- Tsouparopoulou, C. (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, 150–82.

- Verderame, L. (2008). "Rassam's Activity at Tello (1879) and the Earliest Acquisition of Neo-Sumerian Tablets in the British Museum". In: *On the Third Dynasty of Ur: Studies in Honor of Marcel Sigris*. Ed. by P. Michalowski. JCS Supplemental Series 1. Boston: American School of Oriental Research, 231–244.
- Yuhong, W. (2011). "19 years' Finance of the Household of Geme-Lamma, the High Priestess of Baba in Girsu of Ur III (Š 31-AS 1 = 2065-2046 B.C)". *JAC* 26, 1–40.