

Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie

Begründet von
E. Ebeling und B. Meissner

fortgeführt von
E. Weidner, W. von Soden und D. O. Edzard

herausgegeben von M. P. Streck

unter Mitwirkung von
G. Frantz-Szabó · M. Kreberník · D. Morandi Bonacossi
J. N. Postgate · U. Seidl · M. Stol · G. Wilhelm

Redaktion
S. Ecklin · S. Pfaffinger

Band 13 · 3./4. Lieferung

Steuer. E – Susa. B

2012

Sonderdruck

De Gruyter

Soldt 2005, 316–332. – Sallaberger W. 1997: Nippur als religiöses Zentrum Mesopotamiens im historischen Wandel, in: G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Die orientalische Stadt: Kontinuität, Wandel, Bruch* (= CDOG 1), 147–168. – van Soldt W. H. (ed.) 2005: *Ethnicity in ancient Mesopotamia* (= CRRAI 48 = PIHANS 102). – Steiner G. 2005: Gibt es ein vor-sumerisches Substrat im südlichen Mesopotamien?, in: van Soldt 2005, 340–355. – Streck M. P. 1998: The tense systems in the Sumerian-Akkadian linguistic area, *ASJ* 20, 181–199. – Tuna O. N. 1990: Sumer ve Türk dillerinin târihi ilgisi ile Türk dili'nin yaşı meselesi (= *Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları* 561). – Whittaker G. 2005: The Sumerian Question: reviewing the issues, in: van Soldt 2005, 409–429. – Wilcke C. 1974: Zum Königtum in der Ur III-Zeit, in: P. Garelli (ed.), *Le palais et la royauté* (= CRRAI 19), 177–232; id 2005: ED Lú A und die Sprache(n) der archaischen Texte, in: van Soldt 2005, 430–445.

J. S. Cooper

Sumer, Geschichte.

§ 1. The concept of Sumer. – § 2. The 'Ubaid period. – § 3. The Uruk and Gamdat Naşr period. – § 4. The Early Dynastic period and First Dynasty of Lagaş. – § 5. The Sargonic period. – § 6. The Gutian period. – § 7. The Second Dynasty of Lagaş. – § 8. The Third Dynasty of Ur.

§ 1. The concept of Sumer as an object of historical research depends on different linguistic, political or cultural approaches, which have changed through the last decades. On the other hand, the association of Sumerians with Sum. speakers, the identification of the Sum. language in proto-cuneiform texts, and the problem of "whence and when did the Sumerians arrive in Babylonia" are also issues contemplated in discussions (see Sumer*, Sumerisch § 6). All these matters are relevant to define the chronological and geographical frame where the history of S. developed. S. will be here identified with southern Babylonia (Babylonien*), in a similar sense as the term *ki-en-gi(r)* (Akk. *šumerum*) was used in cuneiform texts (Sumer*, Sumerisch § 3), and its history will be considered as the result of an evolution which began by the middle of the 7th mill. and ended with the fall of the Third Dynasty of Ur.

§ 2. The 'Ubaid period ('Ubaid(-Kulturen)*). The earliest known settlement of

southern Babylonia was excavated at Tall al-'Uwaili* and was dated to the 7th mill. in its lowest levels. Older settled life in this part of Mesopotamia could have been covered by alluvium, or was perhaps almost nonexistent due to difficult environmental conditions. Tall al-'Uwaili belonged to the so-called 'Ubaid period (7th to 4th mill.), also attested, e.g., at Tall al-'Ubaid*, Ur* and Eridu*. Urbanization and agriculture significantly developed during its second phase, when an expansion – perhaps of commercial nature – to other areas of the Middle East preceded the Uruk period.

§ 3. The Uruk and Gamdat Naşr period. The Uruk (or Proto-urban) period, named after the city of Uruk*, lasted for about 1000 years (ca. 4100–3100). It witnessed important changes in southern Mesopotamia: cities increased in number and size, being particularly remarkable the growth of Uruk and its surrounding region during the Late Uruk period (ca. 3500–3100); the economic, social, and political structure of the city grew in complexity, leading to a deeper integration with the surrounding secondary settlements; and accounting techniques developed into the cuneiform writing system (Keilschrift*), first attested around 3200–3100 on the clay tablets found in the level IVa of the Eanna sequence at Uruk. People from this city, in ventures of probably commercial purposes, established deep cultural contacts with territories of southern Mesopotamia, Susiana, and Upper Mesopotamia, reached eastern Anatolia, northern and western Syria, and possibly Egypt, and even colonized the region of the Middle Euphrates (Habūba*; Iran*, *Vorgeschichte* § 4; Türkei*, *Vorgeschichte*). This so-called "Uruk expansion", which stimulated the urbanization process in the Middle East, extended from 3800 to 3100, when it collapsed (cf. Stadt* §§ 3.3, 3.6). During the Gamdat Naşr period (ca. 3100–2900), Uruk (layer III) and other cities of southern Mesopotamia reorganized and developed a different kind of political equilibrium. The city-state (for a definition see Stadt* § 6.5) thus became the basic

political organization in the land of S. throughout the following Early Dynastic (ED) period (ca. 2900–2300).

§ 4. The Early Dynastic period and First Dynasty of Lagaš*. This period has been subdivided into ED I (ca. 2900–2750), ED II (ca. 2750–2600), ED IIIa (ca. 2600–2450), and ED IIIb (ca. 2450–2300). ED I and II are still essentially archaeological periods, being the archaic tablets from Ur the most relevant source of written documentation. The quality of the information provided by cuneiform texts significantly changes for ED III: the administrative tablets from Fāra (ancient Šuruppag*) and Tall Abū-Šalābiḥ for the ED IIIa, and those from Ġirsu*, Ur, Nippur*, Adab* or Zabala(m)* for the ED IIIb, allow the reconstruction of the social and economic life of S. during this period. It is also possible to sketch now the political frame of some of the most important city-states of southern Babylonia (a complete relative chronology and synchronisms of Sum. rulers from the Early Dynastic period can be found in Marchesi/Marchetti 2011, 118–128; see also Sallaberger 2004, 17–27).

Thus, administrative tablets and royal inscriptions documenting the Lagaš-Umma border conflict have preserved the history of the First Dynasty of Lagaš. It extended for ca. 110/120 years, with Ur-Nanše*, Akurgal*, E'annatum*, Enanatum I (Enannadu* I), Enmetena (Entemena*), Enanatum II (Enannadu* II), Enentarzi*, Lugalanda*, and Iri'iniḡina (Uru-iniḡina*). Its contemporaneous rulers of Umma* were PA:BIL(GA)-gal-tuku*, UŠ*, Enakale (Enakalli*), Ur-Lumma*, Il*, Giššakidu*, Me'anedug, U'u, and Lugalzagesi*. On the other hand, the rulers from Ur (Ur-Pabilsaḡ*, Meski'aḡ-Nunna*, Akalamdug, Meskalamdug*, Mesannepadda*, A'ane-pada [Aannipadda*], Lugal-kiniš(e)-dudu*, Lugal-gipare-si*, and Elili*) are mainly known through votive inscriptions (some of them from the Royal Tombs of Ur), like those from Uruk and Adab (rulers from this city are also attested on recently excavated administrative tablets).

Perhaps under the influence of northern Babylonia, and particularly of Kiš*, the tendency to form broader and stronger political entities in S. began to crystallize with Enšakušana* of Uruk, and culminated with Lugalzagesi (ruled for 25 years, according to SKL). This ruler, probably native of Umma, took control over Uruk and Ur, de-

feated Iri'iniḡina of Lagaš, and finally ruled over the whole S.

§ 5. The Sargonic period. The process of political centralization in southern Babylonia continued with the rise of Sargon* of Akkad, first king of the Sargonic dynasty, around 2300; this date (given according to the Middle Chronology) could be moved backward in time depending on the duration assigned to the Gutian period (see below). On the other hand, the length of the reigns of Sargon and his successors is still conjectural and is mainly based on the information provided by the different versions of the Sumerian King List (SKL; Ur III version: USKL).

From his position as cup-bearer at Kiš, Sargon (ruled for 56/55/54 [SKL] or 40 [USKL] years) gained control over northern Babylonia, moved to Akkad*, and defeated a Sum. coalition led by Lugalzagesi. Independent city-states of the south were thus integrated in the Akk. state as provinces (Provinz* A), and their rulers became governors politically subordinated to the Akk. king. Apparently, Sargon and his two sons, Maništūšu* (ruled for 15/7 [SKL] or 15 [USKL] years) and Rīmuš* (ruled for 15/7/9 [SKL] or 8 [USKL] years), who succeeded him in a sequence now suggested by USKL, concentrated their efforts in the territorial expansion of the empire, reaching western and southeastern Iran, northern Mesopotamia, northern Syria, and even perhaps Turkey and Oman. Narām-Sīn* (ruled for 56 [SKL] or 54 ½ [USKL] years), the son of Maništūšu, faced a general rebellion in which cities from northern and southern Babylonia took part. He defeated the coalition and then devoted his efforts to reinforcing the structure and the organization of the empire. His deification deeply impacted on the southern population, and his military, administrative and economic reforms had lasting effects in the life of S. During Šarkališarri*'s reign (ruled for 25/24 [SKL] or 21+[x] [USKL] years), the empire declined and finally collapsed, pressed by Elamites, Amorites and Gutians (Gutium*). After a short period of anarchy (3 years [SKL]), Sargonic kingship ended with

Dudu* (ruled for 21 [SKL] years) and Šu-Turul* (ruled for 18/15 [SKL] years).

§ 6. The Gutian period. In the span of time between Šarkališarri's reign and the Third Dynasty of Ur, commonly estimated in 40 years (although Steinkeller [in press] assigns 100 years to this period), the political status of the Sum. city-states changed: Dudu and Šu-Turul, even if under Gutian pressure, managed to control southern Babylonia, but Gutian rulers finally formed a dynasty and achieved hegemony over the region (Gutium* §§ 5–7). Nevertheless, city-states such as Lagaš and Uruk soon regained independence.

§ 7. The Second Dynasty of Lagaš, well-known thanks to the archaeological and textual evidence, witnessed the defeat of the Gutians and coexisted with the rulership of Ur-Namma. The rulers of the dynasty were: Ur-Ningirsu* I, Piriġme*, Ur-Bau*, Gudea*, Ur-Ningirsu* II, Urġar*, Urabba*, Ur-Mama*, and Nammaġani*.

§ 8. The Third Dynasty of Ur. It was a king from Uruk, Utuġeġal*, who defeated the Gutian king Tir(i)gan*, put an end to the Gutian power, and gained some kind of supremacy over the land of S. This task was continued by Ur-Namma* (2110–2093), his governor in Ur and founder of the Third Dynasty of Ur (2110–2003) (cf. Gutium* § 8).

Šulgi* (2092–2045), the son of Ur-Namma, was the real architect of the Neo-Sum. state. He first secured the control over southern and northern Babylonia, and then launched military campaigns towards east and northeast. On the other hand, he completely transformed the administration of the state, now organized in core and peripheral provinces (Provinz* A. § 4), and set up a redistributive system in which certain establishments, such as Puzriš-Dagān* played a central role. This activity gave rise to an efficient bureaucracy, which led to the writing of thousands of administrative documents.

During the reigns of Šulgi's sons, Amar-Suen (Amar-Sin*) (2044–2036) and Šu-

Suen* (2035–2027), the Sum. state enjoyed a period of stability, only disturbed by the Amorites' incursions and the Šimaškian threat (Šimaški*). Under the rule of Ibbi-Suen* (2026–2003), these problems increased to such an extent that the contributions from the peripheral areas ceased, provoking the collapse of the system. The core provinces abandoned Ibbi-Suen successively, and Išbi-Erra* (2019–1987) challenged his authority from Isin*, extending his influence over the neighbouring provinces. In the end it was Kindattu*, the king of Anšan* and Šimaški, who defeated Ibbi-Suen, sacked Ur, and put an end to its Third Dynasty.

Attinger P./Wäfler M. (ed.) 1998: *Annäherungen* 1; idd. (ed.) 1999: *Annäherungen* 3. – Butterlin P. 2003: *Les temps proto-urbains de Mésopotamie: contacts et acculturation à l'époque d'Uruk au Moyen-Orient*. – Charvát P. 1993: *Ancient Mesopotamia: mankind's long journey into civilisation*. – Cooper J. S. 1983: *Reconstructing history from ancient inscriptions: the Lagash-Umma border conflict* (= SANE 2/1). – Cooper J. S. et al. 1999–2002: *Sumer*, in: J. Briand/M. Quesnel (ed.), *SDB* 13, 77–359. – Edzard D. O. 1997: *RIME* 3/1. – Frayne D. R. 1997a: *RIME* 1; id. 1997b: *RIME* 3/2; id. 1999: *RIME* 2. – Gelb I. J. 1988: *Ebla and the Kish civilization*, in: L. Cagni (ed.), *La lingua di Ebla: Atti del Convegno Internazionale* (Napoli, 21–23 Aprile 1980) (= IUO 14), 9–73. – Glassner J. J. 1993: *La chute d'Akkadé: l'événement et sa mémoire* (= BBVO 5). – Hallo W. W. 2005: *New light on the Gutians*, in: W. van Soldt (ed.), *Ethnicity in ancient Mesopotamia* (= CRRAI 48 = PIHANS 102), 147–161. – Huber P. J. 1999–2000: *Astronomical dating of Ur III and Akkad*, *AfO* 46–47, 50–79. – Huot J.-L. 2004: *Une archéologie des peuples du Proche-Orient 1: des premiers villageois aux peuples des cités-états (X^e–III^e millénaire av. J.-C.)*. – Kramer S. N. 1963: *The Sumerians: their history, culture and character*. – Liverani M. 1988: *Antico Oriente: storia, società, economia*; id. (ed.) 1993: *Akkad: the first world empire* (= HANES 5).

Marchesi G./Marchetti N. 2011: *Royal statuary of Early Dynastic Mesopotamia* (= MesCiv. 14). – Michalowski P. 2006: *The lives of the Sumerian language*, in: S. L. Sanders (ed.), *Margins of writing, origins of cultures* (= OIS 2), 159–184. – Nissen H. J. 1988: *The early history of the Ancient Near East: 9000–2000 B.C.* – Nissen H. J./Damerow P./Englund R. K. 1993: *Archaic bookkeeping: writing and techniques of economic administration in the Ancient Near East*. – Postgate J. N. 1992: *Early Mesopotamia: society and economy at the dawn of history*. – Rothman M. S. (ed.) 2001: *Uruk*

Mesopotamia & its neighbors: cross-cultural interactions in the era of state formation. – Sal-laberger W. 2004: Relative Chronologie von der frühdynastischen bis zur altbabylonischen Zeit, CD0G 3, 15–43; id. 2007: From urban culture to nomadism: a history of upper Mesopotamia in the late third millennium, in: C. Kuzucuoğlu et al. (ed.), *Sociétés humaines et changement climatique à la fin du troisième millénaire: une crise a-t-elle eu lieu en Haute Mésopotamie?* (= *Varia Anatolica* 19), 417–456. – Steinkeller P. 1987: The administrative and economic organization of the Ur III state: the core and the periphery, in: McG. Gibson/R. D. Biggs (ed.), *The organization of power: aspects of bureaucracy in the Ancient Near East* (= SAOC 46), 15–33; id. 1988: The date of Gudea and his dynasty, JCS 40, 47–53; id. 1992: Mesopotamia in the third millennium B.C., *AncB* 4, 724–732; id. 1993: Early political development in Mesopotamia and the origins of the Sargonic Empire, in: Liverani 1993, 107–129; id. 2003: An Ur III manuscript of the Sumerian King List, *Fs. C. Wilcke* 267–292; id. in press: The Gutian Period period in Chronological chronological Perspective perspective (Paper presented at the ARCANE meeting, München 2006). – Van De Mieroop M. 2004: A history of the Ancient Near East, ca. 3000–323 BC.

M. Molina

Sumi-rapa. Old Bab. period king of the city of Tuba*, son of a certain Yarim-Lim, known only from the plaster impression of a seal of the king in the Louvre. Tuba is conventionally identified with modern Tall Umm* al-Marā in the al-Ğabbūl plain of Syria.

Collon D. 1987: FI 127f. no. 543. – Frayne D. R. 1990: RIME 4, 804. – Nougayrol J./Amiet P. 1962: Le sceau de Sumirapa, roi de Tuba, RA 56, 169–174. – Schwartz G. M./Curvers H. H./Stuart B. 2000: A third millennium B.C. elite tomb from Tell Umm el-Marra, Syria, *Antiquity* 74, 771f.

D. R. Frayne

Šummiri (*Šu-um-mel-mi-ri/Šum-mi-ri*). Heth. Königin aus dem Mittleren Hethitischen Reich (1. Hälfte 15. Jh.), wohl Gattin von Huzzija* III. Nach Freu 1996, 23–37 und id. 2004, 278 ist sie die Mutter von Him(m)uili* und Kantuzzili*, den Mördern von Muwatali* I. (KUB 34, 40+ 41: 8'–10'). Š. ist in den sog. Königslisten* (C) belegt, wo sie zweimal zusammen mit dem

König Huzzija III. (1307/z, Vs. ii? 9 [], KUB 11, 8+9 Vs. ii 13) und einmal alleine erwähnt wird (KUB 36, 124 Vs. i 2').

Ferner wird sie in dem Fragment KUB 58, 105+ KUB 59, 41 Vs. ii? 11' (CTH 626) über das *nuntarri-ašpaš*-Fest erwähnt; aber hier ist der Kontext so beschädigt, dass man nicht sicher sein kann, ob es sich um diese Königin oder um eine andere, gleichnamige Frau handelt.

Carruba O. 2008: Analisi delle liste reali etee, in: K. Strobel (ed.), *New perspectives on the historical geography and topography of Anatolia in the II and I millennium B. C.* (= *Eothen* 16), 71f. – Freu J. 1995: De l'ancien royaume au nouvel empire: les temps obscurs de la monarchie hittite, in: O. Carruba/M. Giorgieri/C. Mora (ed.), *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia* (= *StMed.* 9), 136–139; id. 1996: La „révolution dynastique“ du grand roi de Hatti Tuthaliya I, *Hethitica* 13, 17–38; id. 2004: Le grand roi Tuthaliya, fils de Kantuzzili, *Fs. R. Lebrun* 1, 271–304, bes. 275–296. – Freu J./Mazoyer M. 2007: Des origines à la fin de l'ancien royaume hittite (= *Les Hittites et leur histoire* 1 = *Kubaba Série Antiquité* 7) 171–184.

F. Fuscagni

Sumpf s. Schilf. § 1.

Sumu-abum. Early OB ruler in northern Babylonia.

On the basis of the OB list of year names and a late OB king list (J. J. Finkelstein, *The genealogy of the Hammurapi dynasty*, JCS 20 [1966] 95–118; Königslisten* und Chroniken. B. § 3.7), he has for a long time been considered to be the founder of the 1st dynasty of Babylon. However, letters excavated at Tall ad-Dēr (Kh. A. al-A'dami, Old Babylonian letters from ed-Der, Sumer 23 [1967] 151–165) reveal that S. and Sumu-la-el* of Babylon are contemporaries. Moreover, S. is never associated with Marduk, but he is rather accompanied by the local god when he is mentioned in an oath. Also, the rulers of the OB dynasty refer to Sumu-la-el instead of S. as their ancestor. Finally, there are some remarkable parallels between the year names of S. and Sumu-la-el (Goddeeris 2005, 14of.). Thus, the inclusion of S. in the list of year names appears to be a late OB construct to add prestige to the dynasty. Contemporary early OB sources illustrate that S. was