

^dSUM. Logogramm für einen Namen des Nabû*, erwähnt in CT 25, 35: 26 // 36/25 und V R 43 Rs. 18.

M. Krebernik

Šumah (^dŠu-mah) „(Der/Die mit der) gewaltige(n) Hand“. Beiname mehrerer Gottheiten.

A. Gott aus dem Kreis der Heilgöttin, zuerst in Ur III-zeitl. Opferlisten aus Nippur und Isin neben deren lokalen Erscheinungsformen Nintinuga bzw. Nin-Isina bezeugt, s. Sallaberger, KultKal. 1, 100 und 102 bzw. 153. Eine aB Erbteilungsurkunde aus Nippur erwähnt ein gud₄-Priesteramt des Š. (PBS 8, 146: 6, 19, 32; vgl. Richter, Panthea 122). In einer wohl aus Nippur stammenden aB Urkunde ist mehrfach der mit Š. gebildete PN Ur-^dŠu-mah bezeugt (JAOS 36, 35f. mit Taf.). Der aB An = Anum-Vorläufer TCL 15, 10 nennt Š. in Z. 395. In der kanonischen Fassung An = Anum entspricht V 174, Š. ist dort die 2. von 5 „Schutzgottheiten“ (udug) des Egalmah (Name von Tempeln der Heilgöttin in Isin und anderswo). Zu derselben Gruppe rechnet ihn auch CT 24, 36: 45. Dagegen wird Š. in einer zweisprachigen Hymne an Nin-Isina als „rechter Wesir“ (sukkal zi) des Egalmah bezeichnet, der der Göttin vorangeht (KAR 16: 23f., s. SAHG 69; M. Cohen, JAOS 95 [1975] 609; Richter, Panthea 213f.).

B. An = Anum VII 53 (Litke, God-Lists 223) nennt Š. unter den Namen Marduks.

C. In der Beschwörungsserie Muššu'u (B. Böck, BPOA 3 [2007] 185 Va 6) findet sich Š. als Var. von ^dAma-šu-mah(-a/ām), der „Hausfalterin“ (agrig/abarakkat) des Ekur (Enlils Tempel in Nippur). Dass es sich um eine Gottheit aus dem Kreis der Heilgöttin handelt, geht aus AO 17662: 20 (RA 43, 36) hervor, wo Ama-šumah unter den Gottheiten des Egalmah der Nin-Isina/Nintinuga erwähnt ist.

M. Krebernik

Šumah-ana (^dŠu-mah-an-na) „Gewaltige Hand des Himmels“. Beiname des Pabilsaĝ*/Ninurta* in Klageitaneien:

CLAM 1, 232: a+205 = 2, 448: 177; 2, 442: 30 = 2, 459: 30 = 2, 470: 30 (ohne Determinativ); 2, 472: a+103 (ohne Determinativ); 2, 486: d+118 (ohne Determinativ).

M. Krebernik

Šumaliĝa s. Šuqamuna und Šu/imaliĝa.

Šumanda/ir s. Sumu/andar, Simudar.

Sumê, Sumiĝa. Varianten des Theonyms Us(u)mû (s. Isimu*) ohne anlautenden Vokal finden sich in spB Ritualtexten: ^dSumé-e (G. Çaĝırgan/W. G. Lambert, The Late Babylonian Kislîmu ritual for Esagil, JCS 43–45 [1991–1993] 89–106, Z. 84, 88 und 111); ^dSu-mi-ia (CTMMA 2, 20: 1).

M. Krebernik

Sumer, Sumerisch (Sumer, Sumerian).

§ 1. Introduction. – § 2. Discovery. – § 3. Geographic usage. – § 4. Ethno-linguistic usage. – § 5. Etymology. – § 6. The Sumerian Question/Problem.

§ 1. Introduction. “Sumer” and “Sumerian” derive from Akk. *šumeru* (1 × *šuwurum*; adjectival form *šumerû*), used by the ancients to translate Sum. ki-en/ĝi(r) “Sumer” (*šumeru*, *māt šumeri*) and eme-ĝi/ĝi(r) “Sumerian (language)” (*šumeru*, 1 × *šuwurum*, *lišān šumeri*).

§ 2. Discovery. The decipherment of Akk. cuneiform in the middle of the 19th cent. revealed a logosyllabic writing system in which a given cuneiform sign could be used as a logogram for an Akk. word that had no discernable relationship to the sign's syll. reading(s), e.g. syll. *ki* as a logogram for *eršetu* “earth”. E. Hincks* soon realized that this was because cuneiform had been invented to write an earlier non-Sem. language in which, e.g., the word for “earth” was *ki*, and Hincks' intuition was confirmed when G. Rawlinson* in 1852 established the existence of bilingual texts among the tablets excavated at Nineveh. It

was quickly seen that the non-Sem. language, Sumerian, was agglutinative and it was characterized by early scholars as Scythian or Turanian, what today would be called Uralo-Altaic (Pallis 1956, 175–180; Cooper 1992; id. 1993; Daniels 1994; Parpola 2010; Cathcart 2011).

The ancient name of the language was controversial: Rawlinson and F. Lenormant called it Akkadian, as did P. Haupt, who used Sumerian to refer to the Emesal dialect. J. Oppert was the first (1869) to divine the correct name, Sumerian, which would only be proved correct in 1889, when C. Bezold noted that eme-ĝi₇ was translated *lišān šumeri* “the Sum. language” on a bilingual tablet (*Examenstext A*) in the British Museum (Bezold 1889; Pallis 1956, 175–185; Cooper 1999–2002).

Bezold C. 1889: Rev. of R. E. Brünnow: A classified list of all simple and compound cuneiform ideographs... 1–2 (1888–1889), ZA 4, 427–440. – Cathcart K. 2011: The earliest contributions to the decipherment of Sumerian and Akkadian, CDLJ 2011/1. – Daniels P. T. 1994: Edward Hincks' decipherment of Mesopotamian cuneiform, in: Cathcart (ed.), The Edward Hincks bicentenary lectures, 30–57. – Pallis S. A. 1956: The antiquity of Iraq: a handbook of Assyriology.

§ 3. Geographic usage. The *locus classicus* is in a hymn to the Ekur in Nippur, whose right (south) and left (north) are said to be ki-en-ĝi-ki-uri “Sumer and Akkad” (TCS 3, 18: 28; Ur III ms. A, ibid. pl. XXXVIII has ki-ĝi:en). This accords well with the Ur III royal title lugal ki-en-ĝi ki-uri “king of Sumer and Akkad” used by Urnamma* and in the first half of Šulgi's reign (Herrscher* A. § 3; Sallaberger 1999, 180; Šulgi* § 4.1; for later use of the title in Sumerian and Akkadian down to the time of Cyrus, see Seux 1967, 302f.), suggesting that in Ur III times, S. (ki-en-ĝi) and Akkad (ki-uri) referred to Babylonia (Babylonien*) south and north of Nippur* respectively. Similarly, the hymn to the temple of Ninazu in the southern town of Eneĝi (see § 5) calls that town ĝu-du₈-a ki-en-ĝi-ra “the Kutha* (a town in northern Babylonia) of Sumer” (TCS 3, 27: 180). This geographic usage fits the linguistic geography of Babylonia in the 3rd mill., when

Sum. language use was strongest in the south, and Semitic (eventually Akkadian) in the north and beyond. In an unpublished inscription from the 18th cent., Samsuiluna* of Babylon called the southern rebel Rīm-Sin II of Larsa lugal ki-en-ĝi-ra, the only time anyone is “king of Sumer” without “Akkad”.

In the cylinders of Gudea (RIME 3/1, 1.7. CylA xi 16, CylB xxii 20) ki-en-ĝi(r) seems to refer to an area ruled by Gudea, which may at one time have included much of southern Babylonia (Falkenstein 1966, 42–46; Sallaberger 1999, 132f.). Utuĝeĝal (RIME 2.13.6.4) uses ki-en-ĝi(r) for southern Babylonia, without indicating where a northern limit might lie; once he uses kalam “homeland” as a clear parallel to ki-en-ĝi(r) (7f. // 13f.), but later speaks of ki-en-ĝi(r) “to the south” and kalam (“homeland”) “to the north” (41–45). He claims to have restored the kingship of ki-en-ĝi(r) (29f., 129) by defeating the Gutī, but his kingship probably never extended beyond the regions of Ur*, Uruk* and Lagas*, and the final expulsion of the Gutī was accomplished by Urnamma of Ur (Sallaberger 1999, 132f.; cf. Sumer*, Geschichte § 8; Gutium* § 8).

In the Sargonic period, Rīmūš speaks of three victories over *šumerum* (RIME 2.1.2.4); Ur is the only southern city mentioned there, but, in other inscriptions, he names Adab*, Zabala(m)*, Umma*, KLAN*, and Lagas. On his return from S., Rīmūš defeats the rebelling northern Babylonian city Kazallu*. A year date of Šarkali-šarrī reports that he “went down” (e₁₁) to ki-ĝi:en^{ki} (RIME 2 pp. 182, 184), presumably from his capital Akkade* (§ 3), which should be in the very north of Babylonia.

At the end of the ED period, Lugalzagesi claims that bāra-bāra ki-en-ĝi énsi kur-kur-ra “all the suzerains of S. and rulers of foreign lands” paid homage to him at Uruk (RIME 1.14.20.1; Wilcke 1990). His own title there is lugal Unu^{ki}-ga lugal kalam-ma “king of Uruk, king of the homeland” and kalam “homeland” is contrasted elsewhere in the inscription with kur-kur “foreign lands,” as is ki-

en-gi in the passage just cited. The inscription itself was found on nearly 100 vase fragments at Nippur, and specifically mentions the cities Ur, Larsa, Umma, Zabala(m) and KI.AN, so, with Nippur, a considerable stretch of southern Babylonia. A bit earlier, Giššakidu* of Umma is called the “fierce head” (sag huš) of ki-en-gi (followed by “unrivalled in foreign lands”; RIME 1.12.6.2), and Enšakušanna* of Uruk is “lord (en) of ki-en-gi and king (lugal) of the homeland” (RIME 1.14.17.1 and 3). Giššakidu is not known to have reigned beyond the Umma area, but Enšakušanna probably controlled much of Babylonia at one time (he conquered Kiš*, Akšak* and possibly Akkade; A. Westenholz, OSP 1, 115). No more than a century earlier, Eannatum* of Lagaš mentions ki-en-gi in a broken passage cataloging his victories (RIME 1.9.3.1 r. viii).

ki-en-gi(r) thus seems to be used for the territory controlled by rulers from southern Babylonia, without, before Ur III, any indication of its extent. Sargonic kings use it to refer to adversaries or territory ruled in the south. In Sum. inscriptions, it is often paralleled by kalam “homeland”, and contrasted with kur-kur “foreign lands”, though Utuḥegal seems to use ki-en-gi and kalam for the southern and northern areas under his rule. For ki-en-gi^{ki} at late ED Girsu, and en:gi:ki in administrative texts at Fāra, both probably referring to the city Enegi(r), see § 5. An UD.GAL.NUN* text from Abū Šalābīḥ (IAS 247 ii' 3'-7') lists rulers from Adab, Aratta and gi:en:ki in that order (Krebernik, BFE 280; id. 1998, 242 with n. 60), where the last could refer either to a region ki-en-gi (parallel to Aratta), or to the city Enegi (parallel to Adab). For ki-en-gi in the Abū Šalābīḥ ms. of the *Keš Temple Hymn*, see D. R. Frayne, RIME 1 (2008) p. 10; for other UD.GAL.NUN references to ki-en-gi (written in various ways), see Zand 2009. Frayne (RIME 1 p. 12) has suggested that in ED, the town Kisurra*, whose name means “border”, was on the border between a southern ki-en-gi and a northern region dominated by Kiš.

The only Presargonic use of the Semitic equivalent of ki-en-gi is found in two sections of a hymn to Nisaba from Ebla (ARET 5, 7) but surely originating in Babylonia: *Šum-ar-rū[m]* bāra kur-kur “Sumer and the rulers of the foreign lands” or “Sumer, ruler of the foreign lands”; *Šubur^{ki} Šum-ar-rūm^{ki} Tilmun^{ki}* “Subartu, Sumer, and Tilmun” (9.5, 12.2, cited after Krebernik 1992, 89f.). The latter suggests a north-south progression: Upper Mesopotamia, Babylonia, and the Persian Gulf region, a clear indication that the Sem. term did not refer to the south of Babylonia only. Indications that ki-en-gi(r) refers to all of (sedentary) Babylonia can be found in Sum. literary texts known from OB mss.: goods arrive from ki-en-gi(r), Amorites, Meluḥḥa, Elam and Subir in *Curse of Akkade* ll. 45–50; Enki determines fate for ki-en-gi(r) // kalam and Ur, then Meluḥḥa, Elam and Marḥaši, and Amorites in *Enki and the World Order* ll. 192–249; ki-en-gi(r) // ma-da is contrasted with kur = Tidnum, Gutium and Anšan in the *Sumer and Ur Lament* ll. 486–490.

Other Sum. literary texts use ki-en-gi(r) either for unspecified regions of southern and middle Babylonia, or for Babylonia as a whole. The *Lamentation over Sumer and Ur*, and the *Ur Lament*, for example, use only ki-en-gi(r), whereas the *Nippur Lament* uses only ki-en-gi ki-uri, and the *Uruk Lament* uses both. Significantly, ki-uri is never used alone in Sum. texts, and ki-en-gi(r) is contrasted only with kur(-kur) “foreign land(s)” or specific foreign countries, never with northern Babylonia.

In the 1st mill., the spelling ki-in-gi(r) predominates, and in addition to *šumeru* or *māt šumeri*, is equated with just *mātum* “land” (CAD s.v.) and rarely with the cities Nippur and Ur (MSL 11, 11; King, STC 1, 217: 5'). The Sargonid kings of Assyria uniquely wrote ^{kur}EME.GL^(ki) for *māt šumeri* (always in *māt šumeri u akkadī*; RGTC 7 and 8 s.v. *šumeru*).

S. and Sumerian were unknown to Classical authors (Klassische* Autoren), but S. appears in the Old Testament as Šin'ar, a name for Babylonia, recalling *šum'ar(um)*

of the ED Ebla hymn (above). The argument of Zadok (1984) against the derivation of Šin'ar from S. is improbable (Cooper 1999–2002).

Falkenstein A. 1966: Die Inschriften Gudeas von Lagaš (= AnOr. 30). – Krebernik M. 1992: Mesopotamian myths at Ebla: ARET 5, 6 and ARET 5, 7, in: P. Fronzaroli (ed.), Literature and literary language at Ebla (= QuadSem. 18), 63–149; id. 1998: Die Texte aus Fāra und Tell Abū Šalābīḥ, Annäherungen 1, 237–427. – Sallaberger W. 1999: Ur III-Zeit, Annäherungen 3, 121–390. – Seux M.-J. 1967: Épithètes royales akkadiennes et sumériennes. – Wilcke C. 1990: Orthographie, Grammatik und literarische Form: Beobachtungen zu der Vaseninschrift Lugalzagesis, Fs. W. L. Moran 455–504. – Zadok R. 1984: The origin of the name Šinar, ZA 74, 240–244. – Zand K. V. 2009: Die UD.GAL.NUN-Texte: ein allographisches Korpus sumerischer Mythen aus dem Frühdynastikum (unpubl. Diss. Jena).

§ 4. Ethno-linguistic usage. A small Sargonic tablet (MAD 4, 161) contains only the terms lú a-uri²-me “men of Akk. seed” and eme-gi₇ “Sum. language”, each preceded by a number. The unavoidable conclusion is that Akkadians and Sumerians are being tallied and distinguished from one another, but this is unique. When Ibbi-Suen*, in a pseudographic letter known from OB mss. (Michalowski 2011, No. 24 [IbP1]), characterizes his opponent, Išbi-Erra*, as numun ki-en-gi-ra nu-me-a “not of Sumerian seed” (l. 17), he means he is from outside Babylonia, lú Mā-rī^{ki} “a man from Mari” (l. 32), not that he is not a Sumerian as distinct from an Akkadian or Semite. *Šulgi B* 266f. divides native Babylonians into uri “Akkadians” and dumu ki-en-gi-ra “sons of Sumer”, but as an *inclusio* that is contrasted with Gutians.

In the same hymn, *Šulgi* claims to be dumu ki-en-gi-ra numun-ba “a son of Sumer, from its seed” (l. 209), as a way to assert his mastery of Sumerian (in addition to Elamite, Amorite, Subarian = Hurrian, and Meluḥḥan). In *Šulgi C* 121 and 124, he phrases it differently: Amorite/Elamite níg eme-gi-ra-gin₇ hē-en-ga-zu-ām “I know just as well as Sumerian”. These passages, which almost certainly go back to the time of *Šulgi*, pass over the Akk. lan-

guage in silence, a telling indication that it, and not Sumerian, was *Šulgi*'s native tongue (Rubio 2006). When *Šulgi* bragged that during his youth in school dub ki-en-gi ki-uri-ka nam-dub-sar-ra mi-ni-zu “I learned reading and writing from the tablets of Sumer and Akkad” (*Šulgi B* 14), he meant that he studied Sumerian.

Likewise, the school curriculum that we know from the tablets of OB Ur and Nippur, and from the OB Sum. Edubba compositions set in the school (Sjöberg 1976; Volk 1996; id. 2000; Veldhuis 1997, 24f.; George 2005; Schule* esp. § 11), is a Sum. curriculum in which Sum. literature is studied and the ability to write and speak Sumerian is valorized, but it is also clear that the Sum. language must be learned. The OB corpus of Sum. literature was certainly conscious of Bab. bilingualism: eme ḥa-mun ki-en-gi kur gal me nam-nun-na-ka / ki-uri kur me-te gál-la “complementary tongued Sumer, great ‘mountain’ of princeliness, and Akkad, ‘mountain’ proper in every way” (*Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta* 142f., see Vanstiphout 2003, 64; Mittermayer 2009, 122f., 169). These “complementary tongues” were juxtaposed in OB bilingual lex. lists (Lexikalische* Listen), glosses (Glossen*) and grammatical texts (Grammatik*), but the Akk. language is hardly mentioned (lú eme-gi₇-ra-ke₄ eme-uri bí-in-du₁₁ “The Sum. monitor (said): ‘You spoke Akkadian!’” George 2005, 128). A more realistic portrayal of the bilingual nature of scribal education is found in a late northern OB fragment portraying an oral examination in which a teacher challenges his student to translate from eme-uri “Akkadian” to eme-gi₇(r) “Sumerian” and vice-versa (Civil 1998; Schule* § 11.3). Similar situations are evoked in the bilingual so-called *Examination Texts* of the 1st mill. (Sjöberg 1972; id. 1975; s. citations in CAD s.v. *šumeru*), which may go back to late OB forerunners. See George 2009, 106–112 for the translation of texts from Akkadian into Sumerian, and his text No. 14 for a late OB example of such.

Šamši-Adad's son and viceroy at OB Mari, Jasmaḥ-Adad, in a letter asked his fa-

ther to send him someone who could read (*biātum*) Sumerian (*šumerum*), but his father replied that Jasmaḥ-Adad instead should learn to speak (*dabābum*) Amorite (Charpin/Ziegler 2007, 69–72). The father's and son's native tongue and language of the letters, Akkadian, went unmentioned, as with Šulgi (see above).

For *eme-gi₇(r)* or *šumeru* used to identify or refer to songs and incantations in Sumerian in the 1st mill., and for Assurbanipal's claim to be able to read a text whose Sumerian was obscure (*šullulu*) see CAD s.v. In the later 1st mill., *šumerū* "Sumerian" qualifies the owner of some Nippur tablets or his ancestor (Oelsner 1982), but the suggested *bīt šumeri* "house/temple of Sumer" written *Ē šu-me-ri₆(DU)*, is probably just the Ninurta temple *ē-šume-ša₄(DU)*.

"Sum. (language)" was used in the Sargonic period to describe a measure (*šila eme-gi₇*; Wilcke 1974, 205f., 227), and in the Ur III period there were *udu eme-gi(r)* "Sum. (language) sheep" and rarely sheep and goats qualified as *ki-en-gi* "Sumer" (Wilcke 1974, 218f., 226f.). Presumably, such qualification referred to the southern Babylonian character of the measure or animal. A tree *mes-ki-in-gir*, despite the spelling with *gir*, must be "Sumer(ian) mes-tree" in Hh. III 206f. (= *mēsu*, *ḫulamēsu*; MSL 5, 109), because of the OB forerunners from Nippur (*mes-ki-en-gi-ra* 1x, others *-ki-gar-ra*; Veldhuis 1997, 207: 051c) and Isin (ibid. 261: 051c).

The conclusion of Kraus (1970, 99), writing of Sumerians and Akkadians as ethno-linguistic groups, retains its validity: "Die Sumerer und Akkader ... haben wir nirgends mit Sicherheit feststellen können, obwohl sie uns doch in ihren Sprachen einen unwiderleglichen Beweis ihrer Existenz hinterlassen haben."

Charpin D./Ziegler N. 2007: Amurritisch lernen, WZKM 97, 55–77. – Civil M. 1998: Bilingual teaching, Fs. R. Borger 1–7. – George A. R. 2005: In search of the *ē.dub.ba.a*: the ancient Mesopotamian school in literature and reality, Fs. J. Klein 127–137; id. 2009: Babylonian literary texts in the Schøyen Collection (= CUSAS 10). – Michalowski P. 2011: The correspondence of the kings of Ur (= MesCiv. 15). –

Mittermayer C. 2009: Enmerkara und der Herr von Arata (= OBO 239). – Oelsner J. 1982: Spätachämenidische Texte aus Nippur, RA 76, 94f. – Rubio G. 2006: Šulgi and the death of Sumerian, Fs. H. L. J. Vanstiphout 167–179. – Sjöberg A. W. 1972: In praise of the scribal art, JCS 24, 126–131; id. 1975: Der Examenstext A, ZA 64, 137–176; id. 1976: The Old Babylonian Eduba, Fs. Th. Jacobsen 159–179. – Vanstiphout H. L. J. 2003: Epics of Sumerian kings (= SBL WAW 20). – Veldhuis N. 1997: Elementary education at Nippur: the lists of trees and wooden objects (Diss. Univ. Groningen). – Volk K. 1996: Methoden altesopotamischer Erziehung nach Quellen der altbabylonischen Zeit, Saeculum 47, 178–216; id. 2000: Edubba'a und Edubba'-Literatur: Rätsel und Lösungen, ZA 90, 1–30.

§ 5. Etymology.

For earlier discussions and theories, see Kraus 1970, 367–371; Wilcke 1974, 229f.; Sallaberger 1997, 151f.

There is general agreement that the elements */gi(r)/* in *ki-en-gi(r)* and *eme-gi₇(r)/gi(r)* are identical, and identical also with the same element in *dumu-gi₇(r)* "noble, free citizen", *ur-gi₇(r)* "dog" and the PN *Šul-gi(r)* (Šulgi* § 1). Steinkeller (1993, 2005) understands the element as meaning "native" (native tongue, native son, native beast, native youth), but "noble" fits as well and sometimes better (noble beast, noble youth), and fits the lexical evidence (which Steinkeller 2005 dismisses as secondary) better as well. *eme-gi₇(r)* is thus "noble tongue", but *ki-en-gi(r)* remains difficult. Steinkeller (2005; also Römer 1999², 9; Frayne, RIME 1, p. 10) proposes that */gi(r)/* is actually */ḡi(r)/*, so that the EN in *ki-en-gi(r)* would just be expressing the nasalization of the initial consonant, so that *ki-en-gi(r)* < **ki-ḡir* "noble (Steinkeller 'native') land". But the writing of a word with initial */ḡ/* using the sign GI (regularly in *ki-en-gi* and *Šul-gi*, as an alternate orthography in *eme-gi₇/gi*) is incompatible with the norms of Sum. orthography.

It has been convincingly argued that the toponym written EN:GI:KI or EN:GI₄:KI in administrative texts at Fāra and *ki-en-gi₄* at ED Girsu does not signify later *ki-en-gi* "Sumer", but rather the city Ene-gi(r), seat of the netherworld god Nin-azu.

Nin-azu* § 4 with bibl.; Beld 2002, 174–180; Krebernik/Postgate 2009, 15; cf. Steinkeller 1995, 542f.

Add to Steinkeller's suggestion that the burial place called *gi^dEn-ki-ka* in a *Reform Text* of Iri-kagina RIME 1.9.9.1 vi 15, ix 35 is a play on Ene-gi, the possibility that the place of royal burials at Ebla was called AN.EN.KI, proposed by Archi 2009. EN GI KI in the archaic text CUSAS 1, 93 is probably not a toponym; see Monaco 2007, 30.

In the ED collection of hymns to various deities, the hymn to Ninazu of Ene-gi(r) (OIP 99 p. 50) is longer than any other save the introductory hymn to Enlil. If this indicates a special early importance of Ninazu, Ene-gi(r) and the netherworld, possibly connected to the large-scale human sacrifice accompanying royal burials at contemporary Ur, perhaps a name for southern Babylonia was *ki-eneg-i(r)* "region of Ene-gi", written *ki-en-gi(r)*, with the specific reference to Ene-gi(r) forgotten by the end of ED III (s. also Frayne, RIME 1 p. 10). Otherwise, there remains the implicit suggest of Wilcke (1974, 229f.) that *ki-en-gi(r)* be etymologized literally as "place, noble *en*", leaving open whether *en* is to be understood as a priestly title, or as "lord, ruler".

Steinkeller (1993, 112) has proposed a "highly speculative" but intriguing etymology for Akk. *šumerum*. Semites, he reasons, first encountered the Sumerians in northern Mesopotamia during the so-called Uruk Expansion (ca. 3400), and called them by the name they used for that region, *Subir* > *Sumer*. When Semites later encountered the Sumerians in southern Babylonia, they continued to call them and the place they inhabited by the name derived from the northern region of their earlier contact. The argument seems too clever; certainly, by the time we have the earliest evidence for Semites in northern Mesopotamia (ED III), S. and Subartu* are written very differently (see § 3). Frayne (RIME 1 p. 10) derives *šumeru* from the name of the city Ene-gi(r), but this depends on his interpreting the */g/* as */ḡ/*, which is untenable. The origin of *šumeru* thus remains unknown.

Archi A. 2009: AN.EN(KI) en tant que lieu de sépulture à Ebla, NABU 2009/24. – Beld S. G. 2002: The queen of Lagash: ritual economy in a Sumerian state (PhD Diss. University of Michigan). – Krebernik M./Postgate J. N. 2009: The tablets from Abu Salabikh and their provenance, Iraq 71, 1–32. – Monaco S. 2007: The Cornell University archaic tablets (= CUSAS 1). – Steinkeller P. 1993: Early political development in Mesopotamia and the origins of the Sargonic Empire, in: M. Liverani (ed.), Akkad: the first world empire (= HALES 5), 107–129; id. 1995: Rev. of J. Marzahn, Altsumerische Verwaltungstexte aus Girsu/Lagaš (= VS 25 = VS NF 9, 1991), JAOS 115, 540–543; id. 2005: The priest-

ess *ēgi-zi* and related matters, Fs. J. Klein 301–310.

§ 6. The Sumerian Question/Problem. In 1874, J. Halévy asserted that the language we call Sumerian was not the language of a people, the Sumerians, but rather a hieratic mode of writing used by the Bab. clergy. Although only a small and shifting number of scholars ever supported Halévy, the question – was Sumerian an actual language? – loomed large in Assyriology during the last quarter of the 19th cent. By the early 20th cent., careful study of the tablets recovered at Girsu and Nippur settled the question in the affirmative (Jones 1969; Cooper 1991; id. 1993).

The Sum. Problem – whence and when did the Sumerians arrive in Babylonia? – persists (for earlier discussion, see Jones 1969; Potts 1997, chap. 2). Sumerian has no known cognate languages, ancient or modern, but attempts – all unsuccessful – have been made to link it to numerous languages or language families, which like Sumerian, are agglutinating (Römer 1999², 11–14, 44f. and bibl. on p. 29–31). The main thrust of these attempts has been to establish whence the Sumerians arrived in Babylonia, although some have tried rather to use Sumerian as the ancestor for an ethno-linguistic group of more recent pedigree (e.g. Komoróczy 1976; Tuna 1990). Most surprising has been Whittaker's attempt to show that Sumerian (or a substrate thereof) is Indo-European, a position that has won few adherents (s. Rubio 2005; Whittaker 2005). Pärpola (2010) has revived the notion that Sumerian is Uralic, and imagines that the Sumerians arrived in Babylonia from a homeland in the Caucasus toward the end of the Late Uruk period. Streck (1998), arguing from structural convergence, and Civil (2007), studying loanwords, have concluded that Sum. and Akk. (or Sem.) speakers were in contact from very early times, but this says more about the early presence of Semites in Babylonia than about Sum. origins.

Just as philology has so far failed to identify an extra-Bab. origin for the Sumerians, so archeological arguments from con-

tinuity or innovation have not been conclusive. The identification of groups of Sum. words as vocabulary taken from earlier, autochthonous peoples (Landsberger 1974) is also no longer considered compelling (Rubio 1999; Steiner 2005). Many scholars, following Komoróczy (1978), would see the Sumerians among the earliest settlers of the alluvium, with their identifiably Sum. qualities developing only once they were there (e.g. Oates 1986; Huot 1989, 58; Michalowski 2006). Reade (1997) sees the early presence of Sumerians in Mesopotamia in the context of rising Gulf waters in the 5th mill. pushing more southerly populations (among whom were Sumerians) northward into southern Babylonia, whereas Potts (1997, chap. 2) places the Sumerians among the earliest groups settling the alluvium from several directions. Nissen (1999, 160f.), however, asserts that the large increase in population in Babylonia during the Uruk period (4th mill.) can be accounted for only by immigration, and that the Sumerians may have been those immigrants.

An even later entry of the Sumerians has been suggested by Englund (1998, § 4.4), who argues that there is no compelling evidence for the Sum. language prior to the archaic Ur texts of the early ED period (ca. 2700), and there are a number of indications that the earliest cuneiform (or proto-cuneiform) from the late Uruk and Ġamdat Našr periods (late 4th mill.) is not Sumerian at all. The Sumerians would thus have entered the alluvium only at the beginning of the ED period (Englund 1998, 81). Many arguments have been marshalled against this position (e.g. Cooper 1999–2002; Glassner 2005, Rubio 2005, and Wilcke 2005; Michalowski 2006; partial response by Englund 2009, n. 18), but the strongest argument in its favor remains unchallenged: Not a single Sum. PN has been identified on the many thousands of late 4th mill. tablets. Englund (2009) has bolstered this argument by isolating over 400 names of slaves on late 4th mill. tablets, none of which appears to be Sumerian.

Proponents of the consensus that Sumerians were in Babylonia by the late 4th mill. and were the inventors of proto-cuneiform

must find compelling evidence to refute Englund. Until then, it can only be said that it is probable, though not certain, that Sumerians were (primary among) the creators of the Uruk civilization of the 4th mill., and may well have been in Babylonia even earlier. Although it has not been established whence and when they entered the alluvium, it must be said, with Komoróczy (1978), that whatever qualities scholars identify as Sumerian very probably developed within Babylonia itself, and not in some elusive extra-Bab. homeland.

Civil M. 2007: Early Semitic loanwords in Sumerian, *Fs. R. D. Biggs* 11–33. – Cooper J. S. 1994: Posing the Sumerian Question: race and scholarship in the early history of Assyriology, *Fs. M. Civil* 47–66; id. 1993: Sumerian and Arayan: racial theory, academic politics and Parisian Assyriology, *RHR* 210/2, 169–205; id. 1999–2002: Sumer et Sumériens: questions de terminologie, *SDB* 72, 78–93. – Englund R. K. 1998: Texts from the Late Uruk period, *Annäherungen* 1, 15–233; id. 2009: The smell of the cage, *CDLJ* 2009/4. – Glassner J.-J. 2005: Les sumériens, inventeurs de l'écriture cunéiforme, in: van Soldt 2005, 134–137. – Huot J.-L. 1989: Les Sumériens: entre le Tigre et l'Euphrate. – Jones T. B. 1969: The Sumerian Problem: major issues in history. – Komoróczy G. 1976: On the idea of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation: critical notes on a pseudo-scholarly phenomenon, *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de R. Eötvös nominatae. Sectio historica* 17, 259–303; id. 1978: Das Rätsel der sumerischen Sprache als Problem der Frühgeschichte Vorderasiens, *Fs. L. Matouš* 1, 225–252. – Kraus F. R. 1970: Sumerer und Akkader: ein Problem der altesopotamischen Geschichte. – Landsberger B. 1974: Three essays on the Sumerians (= *MANE* 1/2). – Michalowski P. 2006: The lives of the Sumerian language, in: S. L. Sanders (ed.), *Margins of writing, origins of culture* (= *OIS* 2), 159–184. – Nissen H. J. 1999: *Geschichte Alt-Vorderasiens* (= Oldenbourg Grundriss der Geschichte 25).

Oates J. 1986: *Babylon* (= *Ancient Peoples and Places* 94). – Parpola S. 2010: Sumerian: a Uralic language (I), in: L. Kogan et al. (ed.), *Language in the Ancient Near East* (= *CRRAI* 53 = *Orientalia et Classica* 30 = *Babel* und *Bibel* 4), 181–209. – Potts D. T. 1997: Mesopotamian civilization: the material foundations. – Reade J. 1997: Sumerian origins, in: I. L. Finkel/M. J. Geller (ed.), *Sumerian gods and their representations* (= *CunMon.* 7), 221–229. – Römer W. H. Ph. 1999: *Die Sumerologie* (= *AOAT* 262). – Rubio G. 1999: On the alleged “pre-Sumerian substratum”, *JCS* 51, 1–16; id. 2005: On the linguistic landscape of early Mesopotamia, in: van

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 tarihi ilgisi ile Türk dilinin 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 Ġamdat Našr period. – § 4. The Early Dynastic period and First Dynasty of Lagaš. – § 5. The Sargonic period. – § 6. The Gutian period. – § 7. The Second Dynasty of Lagaš. – § 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-šir* (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 Ġamdat Našr 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 Ġamdat Našr 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