

# ANNALI

VOLUME

72



NAPOLI 2012

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI “L’ORIENTALE”

## ANNALI

Sezione orientale  
AION (or)

DIPARTIMENTO ASIA, AFRICA E MEDITERRANEO

Redazione AION (or)  
Palazzo Corigliano, Piazza S. Domenico Maggiore 12 – 80134 Napoli (IT)  
Tel. (+39) 081 6909774/775 – Fax (+39) 081 5517852  
annas@unior.it; www.daam.pubblicazioni.unior.it

*Direttore:* Gianfrancesco Lusini

*Vice Direttore:* Natalia L. Tornesello

*Comitato di Redazione:*

Silvana De Maio, Anna Filigenzi, Roberta Giunta, Giancarlo Lacerenza, Gianfrancesco Lusini, Natalia L. Tornesello, Patrizia Zotti (segretaria di redazione).

*Consiglio Scientifico:*

Marilina Betrò (Università di Pisa), Salem Chaker (Aix-Marseille Université – INALCO, Paris), Riccardo Contini (Università degli studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”), Irmela Hijiya-Kirschner (Freie Universität Berlin), Birgit Kellner (Universität Heidelberg), Rudolf Leger (Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main), Ulrich Pagel (SOAS, London), Robert Rollinger (Universität Innsbruck), Adriano Rossi (Università degli studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”), Maurizio Tosi (Università di Bologna), Roberto Tottoli (Università degli studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”), Wang Xiaoming (Shanghai University – East China Normal University, Shanghai).

---

Prezzo del presente volume: UE € 90,00; altri Paesi € 110,00

Abbonamento annuale: UE € 90,00; altri Paesi € 110,00

*Per informazioni su ordini e abbonamenti:*

Arbor Sapientiae Editore S.r.l.  
Via Bernardo Barbiellini Amidei, 80 – 00168 Roma  
Tel. (+39) 06 83798683; (+39) 3468424032  
www.arborsapientiae.com  
info@arborsapientiae.com; ordini@arborsapientiae.com

ISSN 0393-3180

© Università degli studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”

---

Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Napoli B. 434/63 del 16-1-1964

---

## INDICE

### ***Scritti in onore di Pietro Mander***

a cura di Palmiro Notizia e Francesco Pomponio

Premessa	3
Profilo bio-bibliografico di Pietro Mander	5
LUCIANO ALBANESE, Adad e gli <i>Oracoli caldaici</i> .....	13
ODOARDO BULGARELLI, L'archivio paleo-babilonese di Ipqu-Sîn e la collezione di tavolette cuneiformi della Banca d'Italia .....	27
FRANCO D'AGOSTINO, Ti ricordi, Pietro? In margine alla prima campagna di scavi ad Abu Tbeirah, Iraq meridionale .....	41
MANUEL MOLINA, PALMIRO NOTIZIA, Five Cuneiform Tablets from Private Collections	47
MASSIMILIANO NUZZOLO, Man Approaching God: Some Remarks on the Egyptian and Mesopotamian Rituals of the <i>Opening/Washing of the Mouth</i> .....	65
ANTONIO PANAINO, Nuove riflessioni sulla stella dei Magi tra fonti canoniche e apocrife .....	77
FRANCESCO POMPONIO, Some Considerations on Rîmuš .....	99
ANNUNZIATA ROSITANI, The Role of the <i>nadiātum</i> of Šamaš and of Some Officials in Old Babylonian Sippar Organization of Agriculture Work .....	113
GABRIELLA SPADA, I modelli di contratto nell' <i>edubba</i> paleo-babilonese. Un esempio di contratto di adozione .....	133
LORENZO VERDERAME, Sedie, troni e portantine nell'antica Mesopotamia .....	149
GIUSEPPE VISICATO, Two Governors of Umma called Surus-kin in the Sargonic Period	169

## Note e Discussioni

BRUNO GENITO, <i>Archaeological History of Iran: the Post-Achaemenid and Hellenistic Time (Archaeological Horizon in Fārs in Late Iron Age, or Iron Age III-IV). A Review-Article</i> .....	177
R.K.K. RAJARAJAN, <i>Aihole Revisited</i> .....	211

## Recensioni

Robert Hillenbrand, <i>Studies in the Islamic Arts of the Book</i> (Maria Vittoria Fontana).....	223
Georg Bossong, <i>Poesía en convivencia. Estudios sobre la lírica árabe, hebrea y romance en la España de las tres religiones</i> (Francesca Bellino).....	230
<i>El Libro de las Plantas. Sección primera: de árboles y arbustos (al-Qazwīnī, S. XIII)</i> (Francesca Bellino).....	232
Barbara E. Barich, <i>Antica Africa. Alle origini delle società</i> (Andrea Manzo).....	234
Luciano Rocchi, <i>Il dizionario turco-ottomano di Arcangelo Carradori (1650);</i>	
Luciano Rocchi, <i>Il "Dittionario della lingua turchesca" di Pietro Ferraguto (1611)</i> (Luca Berardi).....	236
Winnie Cheng, <i>Exploring Corpus Linguistics: Language in Action</i> (Patrizia Zotti).....	240

<b>Libri ricevuti</b> .....	243
-----------------------------	-----

FRANCESCO POMPONIO

### Some Considerations on Rīmuš

Nations by violence are espous'd to kings,  
and men are hammer'd into wedding-rings  
(Walter Savage Landor)

Unlike Aage Westenholz (1999: 41), I will bore you with details of Rīmuš's reign. I have to do it, since our friend Pietro, to whom the present article is dedicated, has always had a deep interest in military events of the ancient history, probably a reminiscence of his brilliant career as second lieutenant of the Italian artillery. And Rīmuš, whatever were his faults and bad habits, was a very skilful man-at-arms, we have to recognize it. In fact, this is the merit for which till a few years ago, he was believed to have displaced his elder brother in the succession to the throne of Sargon.

At this regard, it should be noted that, since P. Steinkeller published the Neo-Sumerian manuscript of the Sumerian King List (Steinkeller 2003), the historians of the Old Akkadian period are in the unpleasant situation of the apprehensive owner of two clocks, who, awaked in the night, looks at his clocks and see that they indicate a different hour.<sup>1</sup> So, every reconstruction of the history of the Sargonic dynasty must now consider two distinct possibilities: the option M (Maništušu before Rīmuš) and the option R (Rīmuš before Maništušu).<sup>2</sup> I would be inclined to trust the scribe of Šulgi, but the fact that two among the most expert scholars of the period in question keep to follow the option R (see Visicato, Westenholz 2010: xxxiii *et passim*) suggests to use caution at this regard, and, of course, there is the weight of five manuscripts of the SKL (WB 444 and L<sub>1</sub> [Jacobsen 1939: 111-12], UM 29-15-199

---

<sup>1</sup> How this situation leads to the premeditated murder of the owner of two clocks by a clever and greedy nephew of his, the interested reader will find out by a fine tale of H. Kemelmann (*Time and Time Again*), published in the collection of short stories *Nine Mile Walk*.

<sup>2</sup> A sensible suspension of judgement is that of Sommerfeld (2007: 372) in his article in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, as it may be inferred by its title: 'Rīmuš 2. oder 3. König von Akkade'.

[Michalowski 1983: 246], IB 1564+1565 [Wilcke 1987: 91], and Tell Leilan Recension [Vincente 1995: 242]).<sup>3</sup> Sure, if the two historical *omina* which mention palace plots as cause of the death of both Maništušu and Rīmuš were true, the sequence supplied by the option M would be by long more reliable: the impatient Rīmuš would have eliminated the elder brother and, after about eight years, the young son of Maništušu would have avenged the father and in the meantime got the throne owing to him, as Hamlet would have done, if he had had the stamina of Narām-Sîn. But ‘if’, as the Spartans answered to Philip the Second: unfortunately, we have other *omina* which used to exchange the names of Old Akkadian kings: the defeat of Kazallu attributed to Sargon instead of Rīmuš and the ‘Great Revolt’ and the victory over the Amorites (Nougayrol 1944: 19-20, nos. 72 and 74)<sup>4</sup> transferred from Narām-Sîn to Sargon.

Both the reigns of Maništušu and of Rīmuš are noticed by two important military achievements. The former king was the only successor of Sargon who did not have to confront a vast rebellion, as incidentally it is suitable to the heir of a very firm throne, not defiled by brotherly blood. Moreover, his victory over Anšan seems to mark a progress in comparison with those of Sargon, Rīmuš and Narām-Sîn over the probably more Western Barahši.<sup>5</sup> The succession of the two achievements of Maništušu, who, immediately after the campaign against Anšan and Šerihum, raided the coast of Magan, is plainly indicated in his standard inscription. As regards Rīmuš, he suppressed a revolt, which involved six Sumerian cities and the Akkadian Kazallu, with four distinct battles, the destruction of their walls, and the dispatch to the concentration camps of many thousands of Sumerian prisoners, and launched an expedition against the king of Barahši and his allies. Now, only in the inscriptions of Rīmuš, among all the Akkadian kings, the narration of his achievements are related to precise temporal notations. For the revolt, we have the following sentence: *šurramma šarrūtam Enlil iddinušum* (Frayne 1993: 47, 4-7), that Sommerfeld (2007: 372, §2.1) translates: «unmittelbar nachdem Enlil ihm das

<sup>3</sup> The sequence Rīmuš – Maništušu was firmly established for the OB period: see also the *omen* inscribed on a liver model from Mari: *a-mu-ut A-ga-dē<sup>ki</sup> šá Ri-mu-uš ú Ma-na-áš-tu-šu* (Rutten 1936: 53) and the order of citation of the inscriptions of the two kings in the *Sammeltafel*n.

<sup>4</sup> In both the *omina* after the victory there is a reference to the ‘four quarters’ of the world of the title of Narām-Sîn.

<sup>5</sup> The affirmation that some highest officials, fugitives from a battle fought in Barahši, were seized by the Akkadian king near Susa (see *infra*) seems to me sufficient evidence in order to exclude that Barahši is a variant of the name of Marhaši, now to be identified with the region of Jiroft (see Steinkeller 2006: 1-2). The question has been discussed in detail by Westenholz (1999: 91-92), where this identification of Barahši is rejected. Differently Steinkeller (2006: 10-11). It should be also noted that Anum-muttabbil of Der, contemporary of Šū-ilīšu, the second king of the 1<sup>st</sup> Dynasty of Isin, commemorates to have defeated an army of Anšan, Elam and Simaški and then to have aided Barahšum (Frayne 1990: 677-79). This aid suggests that Barahšum was bordering on the territory of Der.

Königtum gegeben hatte». That *šurramma* has here the value of a temporal subordinate, and not that of an assertive adverb (so Gelb, Kienast 1990: 191, 54-57 and Frayne 1993: 47, 4-7) is demonstrated by the comparison with the phrase that concludes the narration of the latter exploit of Rīmuš, the Elamite campaign: *in šantim šalāštim šāti Enlil šarrūtam iddinušum*, «in the third year since Enlil granted the kingship to him» (Frayne 1993: 53, 68-73). Therefore, Rīmuš had just ascended the throne, when he had to face a vast revolt in Sumer and, on his return from the South, also the uprising of Kazallu, a signal of a general discontent not limited to Sumer. We do not know whether the death of Sargon (option R) or the disorders, unavoidable outcome of a *coup-d'état* (option M), roused the aspiration to the independence of the Sumerian cities, with the exclusion of Uruk, that had been probably the most seriously injured after the defeat of Lugal-zagesi, and Nippur, whose priests were not yet embittered by the behaviour of the Akkadian kings. But the revolt was widespread and the reaction ruthless. Only two years later Rīmuš seems to have dared to leave behind himself the cemetery that Sumer had become and to go East in order to settle up with the old Elamite enemies, who without doubt had taken advantage of the problems of the Akkadians on the home front. Such were the Southern and the Eastern successes of Rīmuš that no real danger seems to have troubled the last two-thirds of his brief reign.

The four battles won by Rīmuš in a year are a perfect demonstration of the efficiency of the Akkadian army and of the strategic competence of its king, as well as of the ineptitude of its enemies. And if something has to be forgiven to the venerable age of the commander of the Adab contingent, Mes-kigalla, who would have tried to make himself as an independent ruler for the first time in his life,<sup>6</sup> the chief of the coalition, Kaku of Ur, does not seem to have any excuse. The imaginative reconstruction of this campaign and of the monument which commemorated it is due to Buccellati (1993: 59-65).

Now, the distinct inscriptions which give an account of:

- a) the summary of the four battles,
- b) the victory over Ur and Lagaš
- c) the victory over Umma and Ki-dingir
- d) the victory over Adab and Zabalam
- e) the victory over Kazallu

present respectively the following colophons in the *Sammeltafel*:

- a) ki-gal an-ta igi-ni-šè a-ab-sar
- b) MUS ki-gal ki-ta igi-ni-šè
- c) MÜŠ ki-gal ki-ta gùb-bu-na

<sup>6</sup> The long career of Mes-kigalla, certainly one of the most prestigious *énsi* of the Akkadian empire, has been discussed by Visicato (2010).

- d) MUS ki-gal ki-ta egir-ra-ni-šè  
 e) MÜŠ ki-gal ki-ta á-zi-da-na.

Since the summary a) mentions first the three victories over Sumer and then, on the return of Rīmuš towards the North, the suppression of the revolt of Kazallu, and it is evident that the first battle must be described in the front-side, it results that the narration in the MÜŠ<sup>7</sup> of the lower pedestal goes from the front-side to the right-side, running around the monument, that is clockwise.<sup>8</sup> The upper pedestal seems to have been written in the front-side with the summary narration of the three battles against the Sumerian cities and Kazallu, and probably in the back-side with the curses of this inscription (ki-g[al an-ta] [egir]-ra<sup>9</sup> -ni-šè a<sup>10</sup> -[ab-sar], collation of W. Sommerfeld<sup>9</sup>). Finally, it is possible that the images of some distinguished captives, among whom there are Kaku of Ur, Amar-ki of Lagaš and Ašarēd of Kazallu, together with their inefficient gods,<sup>10</sup> were engraved on the basis of the pedestal (ki-gal ki<sup>?</sup>-ta éren LÚ×EŠ dingir á-tah).

So, the events of this campaign may be reconstructed as follows, in a sequence slightly different from that imagined by G. Buccellati: Rīmuš stroke first the head of the snake, Ur, the city of the chief of the revolt, and together with Lagaš, the southernmost of the rebel cities. Most likely the Akkadian king was well aware of where this head was. But did he come from the North, that is from his capital Akkad, and bypass the more northern Kazallu, Adab and Umma or was the attack launched from the coast? In support of the latter option it should be considered that an unforeseen attack from the South would reduce the otherwise abysmal incompetence of the Sumerian commanders and that the Akkadian kings had at their own disposal an efficient fleet, as it is proved by the sea raids of Maništušu and Narām-Sīn. After disposing of the first enemies, Rīmuš went upstream and confronted Umma with the neighbour Ki-dingir, and then, in the third battle, Adab and Zabalam. A strategic question: where were the Ummaite troops ranged while the Akkadians slaughtered their allies of Ur and Lagaš? And the troops of Adab and Zabalam, while more than four thousands of soldiers of Umma and Ki-dingir were massacred? Indeed, there are less than eight kilometres from Umma and Zabalam. Do we have to suppose that each force continued to scan the North, waiting for the arrival of Rīmuš from that direction and unaware of the havoc that happened behind them? Or that each force confined itself to protect its own town, while

<sup>7</sup> The sign MÜŠ is here probably a variant of suh (MÜŠ) with the meaning of «band» (see Steinkeller 1998: 93), referred to the written strip of the pedestal.

<sup>8</sup> Differently Buccellati (1993: 56).

<sup>9</sup> I am very grateful to prof. Sommerfeld for having provided me with his invaluable collations of the inscriptions of Rīmuš.

<sup>10</sup> Buccellati (1993: 62-63) poses these images to the front of the lower pedestal.

the enemy ate the artichoke leaf after leaf? Surely, in comparison with this strategy, that of Amar-girid of Uruk, who allowed Narām-Sîn to eliminate Iphur-Kiš and the northern coalition before falling upon Sumer, has some justifications in the distance existing between the sites of the two operations.

A feature of the inscriptions of Rīmuš, imitated by his nephew, is the recording of number of the casualties of the enemies up to the unities. Apparently there are awkward and gross mistakes in the figures of his calculations:

	dead	captives	deportees
the inscription of Ur-Lagaš (C 2)	7.804	5.460	5.985
the inscription of Umma (C 5)	4.100	4.140	3.600
the inscription of Adab-Zabalam (C 4)	15.718	14.576 <sup>11</sup>	[4.220] <sup>12</sup>
(sum of the three items)	27.622	24.176	9.585+x)
the inscription of Kazallu (C 3)	12.652	5.864	//
the summary inscription (C 1)			
the three battle against Sumer	17.262	24.176	13.805
the battle against Kazallu	12.051	5.862	//
ŠU.NIGIN	85.216[+?]		

Now, if the sum of the captives is exact even in the units (24.176), the mistake concerning the dead (17.262 versus 27.622) is inadmissible. Sommerfeld (2008: 229) has brilliantly proposed a mistake of the scribe of the *Sammetafel* that would have copied  $2 \times 6.000 + 2 \times 600$  instead of  $4 \times 6.000$ : so, the sum would be 28.062, of course by far nearer to 27.622 than 17.262. The inconsistency, although not glaring, between these two figures is based without doubt on the number of the dead of Umma: the similarity of the figures of the dead and of the captives could have confused the copyist, who would have written 4.100 instead of 4.540. As regards the summary inscriptions C 1, above all the copyist must have omitted a sign 600 for the dead of Kazallu (12.051 instead of 12.652 of C 3). So, the sum would be: 28.062 (instead of

<sup>11</sup> As regards these figures, Westenholz (1999: 41, n. 129) has pointed out the large number of the casualties attributed to Adab and has assigned it to the density of the population of this province. However, it should be also taken in consideration that, unlike Ur, Lagaš and Umma, Adab had not been defeated by Sargon in the battle against Lugal-zagesi and had not been attacked immediately after in a flight that caused the destruction of its wall and, of course, other casualties. But at this regard, it may be also noted that in the lists of guruš of Deimel (1924: 67, nos. 91 and 94), the by far long more numerous contingents among the towns of the Hexapolis are those supplied by Adab.

<sup>12</sup> This figure seems to be too low in comparison with those of dead and captives (about 30.000 guruš). On the other side, with such casualties, many young men do not seem to have been left to Adab, and to the relatively small centre of Zabalam, to be delivered *ana karašim*.

17.262)+24.176+13.805+12.651 (instead of 12.051)+5.862 = 84.556. Here the copyist could have redoubled the sign 600 and the original figure could have been: 60.000 (see Sommerfeld 2008: 231)+4×6000+600 (instead of 2×600) [l<sub>á</sub>-60]+16 = 84.556. In any case, the consistency of the units seems to demonstrate the correctness of the figures in the original inscriptions, and so the copyists of the *Sammeltafel*n, and not the scribes of Rīmuš, have to be charged with the inconsistencies between the sums of the single items and the totals (ŠU.NÍGIN) in the same inscriptions or in different inscriptions written on the same monument. These copyists most likely were not specialists of great numbers, and not even particularly interested in them, unlike our colleague Sommerfeld. On the contrary, Rīmuš was a butcher, but precise. His reiterated declarations that his statements «are not falsehoods, are indeed true», in my opinion, were sound and his figures reliable.

The revolt of Adab and Umma against Rīmuš was led by their énsi, respectively Meskigala and Amar-ki (see Sommerfeld 2007: 372). The previous events of two cities are very different. Meskigalla of Adab had abandoned the field of Lugal-zagesi and had fought at Sargon's side; so, he spared his city the lot of the vanquished and became an important collaborator of the Akkadian king. Mes-é was most likely appointed as governor of Umma by Lugal-zagesi, when the son of Ú.Ú left the throne inherited by his father for Uruk and the title of lugal. Umma had been defeated, its wall had been destroyed and Sargon had imposed a new énsi and in all probability a new sanga of Zabalam (Egalesi), the second echelon of the province (Marchesi 2011: 19).

The first governor of Umma appointed by Sargon was probably Ennanum: he is mentioned in a 'mu-iti' text of the Group A (Foster 1982: 27, AO 5656), in a register of barley, the colophon of which mentions his 5<sup>th</sup> year of governorship (CUNES 50-01-004 rev. II 4'), and in the seal of an official of his (Frayne 1993: 262). Another énsi of Umma occurs in a contract coming from Zabalam (Ozaki 2008: 58, no. 3 rev. III 1-2) with the name *Sur<sub>x</sub>-us-gin<sub>7</sub>*,<sup>13</sup> in two archival tablets from Adab (Visicato, Westenholz 2010: 54, no. 90 rev. I 3-8 and 70-71, no. 122 obv. I 5-7, rev. II 2-4), together with Meskigalla, with the name *Su-úš-gi*, and in the date formulae of two tablets from Umma, one of which is dated to the 6<sup>th</sup> year of his governorship (<http://cdli.ucla.edu/P250675> and [P250688](http://cdli.ucla.edu/P250688): cf. Marchesi 2011: 20), and in the inscription on a tenon from Umma (Frayne 1993: 263), as *Su<sub>4</sub>-ru-úš-gi*. So, an Akkadian énsi (probably Ennanum) replaced the Sumerian Mes-é at Umma after the defeat of Lugal-zagesi, in accordance with the Sargon's statement that «the Akkadians held the governorships», and a Sumerian (Amar-ki) replaced an Akkadian (probably Suruš-kīn), when Umma rebelled against Rīmuš. The governorships of Ennanum (at least 5 years) and of Suruš-kīn (at least 6 years) would cover well the part of the reign of Sargon that followed

<sup>13</sup> For this reading of the name of the governor of Umma, see Marchesi (2011).

the victory over Lugal-zagesi, and the office of Amar-ki the reign of Maništušu, if we choose the option M. On the other hand, Amar-ki could have taken command of Umma just at the time of the revolt of the city (option R) and held it only for a very short space of time: the latter reconstruction seems to be more likely. After the removal of Amar-ki, Suruš-kīn could have returned to Umma together with the occupying soldiers of Akkad.

As to Suruš-kīn, there is a sequence of the list of the ‘sons of Akkad’ of the Obelisk of Maništušu that mentions: <sup>1</sup>A-bil-dan <sup>1</sup>BAD-su-nu 2 dumu *Suru-úš-gi ši* PA<sub>4</sub>-ŠEŠ énsi Umma<sup>ki</sup> (Gelb, Steinkeller, Whiting 1991: 124 XII 19-24 *et passim*). It calls for two questions: was the father of the two ‘sons of Akkad’ the governor of Umma by the nearly similar name? Was Pašeš a governor of Umma? I am inclined to answer ‘No’ to both questions. For the former one, if Suruš-kīn was or had been the governor of Umma, what need was there to characterize him with the name of his father, an even former governor of Umma, or a more modest official? For the latter question, pa<sub>4</sub>-šeš must indicate the title of an official of the governor of Umma, and not his personal name.<sup>14</sup>

As regards Lagaš, notwithstanding the suggestive hypothesis of Powell (1996: 311-12), it is not possible that Ere-inimgina cooperated militarily with Sargon, since Lagaš, leaded by its new ruler, Meszi, fought against the Akkadian king, most likely at Lugalzagesi’s side. So, I assume that Engilsa succeeded his father Ere-inimgina, about three years after the destruction of Lagaš by Lugalzagesi, but in a short time he must have been deposed and, together with a son of his, Ere-inimgina (II),<sup>15</sup> have sought refuge at the Akkadian court: it is proved by the fact that his son placed himself at Maništušu’s service among the ‘sons of Akkad’ of the Obelisk (cf. Milone 1998). Meszi became the ruler of the statelet of Girsu, which had recovered the city of Lagaš, under the patronage of the Sumerian lugal. Then, Lagaš, as well as Ur and Umma, was conquered by Sargon, together with its centre of E-NinMAR.KI, its wall was destroyed and all its territory down to the sea was plundered.

<sup>14</sup> This profession name is attributed to two officials in the Sippar Stone (Gelb, Steinkeller, Whiting 1991: 144 obv. VII 11’ and 146 rev. II 10’), a stele of the same period and probably of the same author as the Obelisk of Maništušu, and in Cripps (2010: 35) the governor of Uruk is mentioned together with his pa<sub>4</sub>-šeš. In a tablet of Tutub it is the characterizing element of an official, Enna-Sîn (Sommerfeld 1999: 117, no. 61 rev. 6). For the use of this title in relationship to gods, see Kienast, Sommerfeld (1994: 262-63). In the Ebla texts pa<sub>4</sub>-šeš indicates a profession of middle rank frequently cited as at the service both of gods and of personages of the royal court (cf. Archi 1996). On the other side, pa<sub>4</sub>-šeš does not result to occur anywhere as personal name.

<sup>15</sup> The ‘sons of Akkad’ of the Obelisk belonged to the youngest generation, probably the lucky receivers-to-be of the land purchased by Maništušu. Therefore, to fancy that among them there was the old enemy of Lugal-zagesi is, in my opinion, absurd.

Also the reconstruction of the campaign of Rīmuš against the Elam presents some difficulties: according to Westenholz (1999: 91) the Akkadian king fought two battles, but it is more probable that the battle was only one, that against Abalgamaš, king of Barahšum, in whose territory troops of Elam and Zahara assembled against the common enemy, and, following a different version, also contingents of Gupin and Meluhha. Successively, Rīmuš captured an Elamite king and the šaginas of Zahara and of Barahšum, most probably the fugitive commanders of the main enemy forces. The place of this capture – and not of a second battle – is specified: between Awan and Susa, near the Middle River. Then the fugitives seem to have been taken into a town and executed, probably in order to give the maximum of publicity to their defeat and death, an aim also brilliantly fulfilled by the parades which carried the most important among the captured kings to Nippur. In the first part of an inscription regarding the Elamite campaign (C 6), Rīmuš records 16.220 fallen and 15.016 captives (in a variant, 16.210 fallen and 14.476 captives: see Sommerfeld 2008: 226) in reference to the battle against Abalgamaš, and the ŠU.NÍGIN gives 9.626 guruš-guruš *adi miqittim*, «men (captured?), including the fallen» (Frayne 1993: 52-53). The sum of the original inscription was exact, and incidentally it demonstrates that there was one single battle. Also in this case, as Sommerfeld (2008: 227) has pointed out, the mistake is to be attributed to the copyist of the *Sammeltafel* who read 6.000+6×600+16, instead of 5×6.000+2×600+16.

Another problem regarding the documentation of Rīmuš is the so-called Victory Stele from Girsu. It may be composed of three fragments, one with relief<sup>16</sup> (AO 2678; for its iconography see lastly Nigro 2001-2003) and two inscribed (AO 2679 and YBC 2409). The belonging of all these fragments to the same monument has been proposed by Foster (1985), rejected by Gelb, Steinkeller and Whiting (1991: 88) and, to some extent (at least at regard of AO 2678 and AO 2679), supported by Westenholz (1999: 42, n. 132). However, that the fragment with relief<sup>17</sup> belongs to a monument of Rīmuš is generally admitted, but at this regard Gelb, Steinkeller and Whiting (1991: 90) consider «unthinkable» that a monument displayed in Girsu would have depicted a slaughter of citizens of this state. This consideration is a credit of the sensibility of our colleagues, but, in my opinion, after the destruction of the wall of

<sup>16</sup> This small fragment of this large stele, which survived the iconoclastic fury of the Lagašite patriots, may be considered a mockery of history or a vagary of the archaeological research: it has survived only to provide us with the only representation of an Akkadian king engaged in battle. On the contrary, the fight for Sargon in Sb2 and for Narām-Sîn in Sb4 is over: the former one parades followed by his officials; the latter one, straight on top of the corpses of his foes, seems to look at far-off destinations and future victories.

<sup>17</sup> It depicts in the superior band the march of Akkadian archers and carriers of mace and in the other two registers the victorious fight of Akkadian high officials, among which is the king, with the enemies.

Lagaš by Sargon and the massacre and the deportation of thousands Lagašites by Rīmuš, every stele that portrayed a triumph of the Akkadian troops would have been an abuse for the onlookers of Girsu: whoever was the enemy<sup>18</sup> of Akkad slaughtered in that monument, they would see those maces, spears and arrows pierce the flesh of their fathers and brothers. And probably it was the purpose of the display of the stele: to hit thousands in order to educate thousands. No wonder that only one or at most three small fragments of this stele survived and on them the faces and even the weapons of the winners were erased so carefully. The destroyer of this stele was in all probability the unnamed governor of Lagaš who participated to the great revolt led by Amar-girid: too much hate must have accumulated on this monument to be delivered to the final liberation of Girsu from the Akkadian occupation by Puzur-Mama or to the wrath of the Elamite plunderers.

The two inscribed fragments, whether they belong to the same document and have to be united with the fragment with reliefs or not, register the allotment of land, in opinion of Foster an extensive redistribution of the tracts of land to the followers of the victorious king. But only one of the profession names yet readable regards the military activity (*nu-bānda-mar-tu-ne*); the others are *gal-nagar*, [*gal*<sup>?</sup>]-*sukkal*, and *i-rá-rá*. However, what is most interesting is the extension of the land recorded in the *ŠU.NIGIN* of AO 2679, which amounts to 6 (or 5) *sár-gal*+5 *sár-u-gunû*+1 *sár*+3 *bùr-gunû*+4 *bùr*+2 *eše*+1 *iku*+¼ *iku*, that is about 1.600,21 (or 1.366,9) square kilometres.<sup>19</sup> Now, this figure is more than the extension of the entire province of Umma in the Neo-Sumerian period according to the calculations of van Driel (1999-2000; 1.225 square kilometres) or the four-fifths of it, following Steinkeller (2007: 188; 2.000 square kilometres). It does not seem likely that such an extension of land was object of distribution or redistribution, even if after a catastrophic event as the victory of Rīmuš was beyond doubt for Girsu and Lagaš. Besides, it does not seem that there was enough space in the stele to record such a list of land allotments. But apart from the huge extension of land, two elements exclude that the land recorded in the total refers only to the allotted fields: the addition of the total «17 main towns and 8 main villages» (20 *lá*-3 *uru-sag* 8 *maš-ga-na-sag*) and the historical notation «after Akkad received the kingship» (*A-ga-de*<sup>ki</sup> *nam-lugal šu-ba-ab-ti-a-ta*), that in any case does not seem to befit the suppression of the revolt of Lagaš. All these elements suggest that the data supplied in the total of AO 2679 regard a

<sup>18</sup> In any case, as Amiet (1976: 26) has pointed out, the hairstyle of the vanquished warriors is that typical of the Sumerian chiefs.

<sup>19</sup> Strangely enough, the equivalent of 444.505 ¼ *iku* of the total would amount to 1568,37 square kilometres, following the calculations of Gelb, Steinkeller, Whiting (1991: 89).

summary of the entire province of Lagaš-Girsu.<sup>20</sup> However, this is totally at odds with the calculations of G. Pettinato<sup>21</sup> and P. Steinkeller.<sup>22</sup>

It is as a rule stated that only Sargon and Narām-Sîn were remembered and venerated by later generations. For the remaining kings, and leaving apart the star-crossed more than inept Šar-kali-šarrī,<sup>23</sup> we are used to mentioning together Rīmuš and Maništušu. The same happens in an above-cited historical *omen* from Mari, and the citation of two kings in a single *omen* is definitely a *hapax*, perhaps in reference to the similarity of their deaths. But, as Goodnick Westenholz (2008: 254-57) has pointed out, Maništušu was object of cult at least in a Neo-Sumerian city, Umma, where he received a throne, foodstuff and garments and Maništušu is the kyriophoric element of personal names and of a place name. His name paradoxically is always preceded by the god determinative, with an only exception, in the Neo-Sumerian texts, while the name of his son, deified in life, is rarely written with this sign. Moreover, a head and some fragments of diorite statues are recently been excavated in the Ur III levels of the temple of Šara: they may likely belong to the statues of Maništušu which received offerings. But the fame of this king survived till the middle of the I millennium BC. The discovery in the library of the temple of Šamaš at Sippar of a new manuscript of the Cruciform Monument has demonstrated beyond doubt that this forgery mentioned Maništušu, since the three initial lines of this manuscript are at long last readable: *a-na-ku / Ma-an-nu-uš-tu-us-su / dumu Lugal-gi-na* (see Al-Rawi, George 1994: 142).<sup>24</sup> It implies that at least one statue/stele of Maništušu survived at Sippar in the NB period: this monument would have provided the model for the Old Akkadian palaeography of the Cruciform Monument and, in addition to it, the information about the campaign of the king against Anšan and otherwise unknown

<sup>20</sup> It agrees with the calculation of Roaf (1991: 102) and Rost (2011: 219) (1.600 square kilometres).

<sup>21</sup> Only the farmland of Lagaš would have comprised between 3.000 and 5.000 square kilometres according to Pettinato (1967: 11).

<sup>22</sup> «The province of Umma formed a square with sides approximately 45 kilometres in length, with a resulting area of roughly 2,000 square kilometres» (Steinkeller 2007: 188) and «the territory of Girsu/Lagash was larger than that of Umma by at least a factor of four» (*ibid.*: 195). This figure of more than 8.000 square kilometres concerns the Ur III province, but I do not think that the situation was much different in the Sargonic period, not in any case at regard of the by that time fixed boundary between Umma and Girsu. The boundary between Ur and Lagaš was perhaps more uncertain, considering the claims of the Sargonic governors of Ur (Kienast, Volk 1995: 102-3).

<sup>23</sup> The greatest of the misfortunes of Šar-kali-šarrī was, in my opinion, that of succeeding his father. However, I do not refer to the inevitably hard comparison with Narām-Sîn (on this point see Westenholz 1999: 57-58), but rather to the fact that he was left to pay the bills of the victories and of the vows of his father.

<sup>24</sup> An admirable and convincing, though incorrect, demonstration that this forgery mentioned Narām-Sîn instead of Maništušu, had been presented by Powell (1991: 20-30).

Šerihum, which occurs in the historical prologue of the inscription.<sup>25</sup> However, this statue/stele, which would have survived to the looting of Šutruk-Nahhunte, unlike the other Old Akkadian documents of Sippar, would have contained the standard writing of the name of the king in the Old Akkadian texts (*Ma-an-iš-tu-su*) instead of that which occurs in the Cruciform Monument (*Ma-an-nu-uš-tu-us-su*) and would not have presented the epithet of «son of Sargon». Nevertheless, this *pia fraus* witnesses that still in the NB Maništušu was such a popular figure that he could be presented as a role-model and a paragon of perfection for the present king. The same is not true for Rīmuš, the only citations of whom from the Neo-Sumerian period to the I millennium BC come from historical *omina*. The two brothers differed at least in this.

Francesco Pomponio  
Università degli studi di Messina  
fpomponio@unime.it

## REFERENCES

- Al-Rawi, F.N.H., A.R. George (1994) Tablets from the Sippar Library. III. Two Royal Counterfeits. *Iraq* 56, 135-48.
- Amiet, P. (1976) *L'art d'Agadé au Musée du Louvre*. Paris.
- Archi, A. (1996) Eblaita: *pašišu* “colui che è addetto all'unzione; sacerdote purificatore; cameriere al servizio di una persona”. *Vicino Oriente* 10, 37-71.
- Buccellati, G. (1993) Through a Tablet Darkly. A Reconstruction of Old Akkadian Monuments Described in Old Babylonian Copies, in M.E. Cohen, D.C. Snell, D.B. Weisberg (eds.), *The Tablet and the Scroll. Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo*, 58-71. Bethesda.
- Cripps, E.L. (2010) *Sargonic and Presargonic Texts in The World Museum Liverpool*. Oxford.
- CUNES = Cornell University Near Eastern Studies (<http://cuneiform.library.cornell.edu>).
- Deimel, A. (1924) *Die Inschriften von Fara. III. Wirtschaftstexte aus Fara*. Leipzig.
- Driel, G. van (1999-2000) The Site of Institutional Umma. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 46/47, 77-91.
- Foster, B.R. (1982) *Umma in the Sargonic Period*. Hamden.
- (1985) The Sargonic Victory Stele from Telloh. *Iraq* 47, 15-30.
- Frayne, D.R. (1990) *Old Babylonian Period (2003-1595 BC)* (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Early Periods 4). Toronto.
- (1993) *Sargonic and Gutian Period (2334-2113 BC)* (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Early Periods 2). Toronto – Buffalo – London.
- Gelb, I.J., B. Kienast (1990) *Die altakkadischen Königsinschriften des dritten Jahrtausends v. Chr.* (Freiburger altorientalische Studien 7). Stuttgart.

<sup>25</sup> This is a jumble of achievements of Maništušu and Narām-Sîn: «When all the countless countries, which Sargon, my father, had trusted to me, like enemies revolted against me and nobody stood with me, I divided the whole of my troops into two contingents: I defeated and conquered Anšan and Šerihum. I introduced the king of Anšan and Šerihum, together with gifts and presents, into the presence of Šamaš, my lord» (Sollberger 1968: 54-55, 63; Al-Rawi, George 1994: 142, 146).

- Gelb, I.J., P. Steinkeller, R.M. Whiting (1991) *Earliest Land Tenure Systems in the Near East: Ancient kudurrus* (Oriental Institute Publications 104). Chicago.
- Goodnick Westenholz, J. (2008) The Memory of Sargonic Kings under the Third Dynasty of Ur, in P. Michalowski (ed.), *On the Third Dynasty of Ur. Studies in Honor of Marcel Sigrist*, 251-60. Boston.
- Jacobsen, T. (1939) *The Sumerian King List*. Chicago.
- Kienast, B., W. Sommerfeld (1994) *Glossar zu den altakkadischen Königsinschriften des dritten Jahrtausends v.Chr.* (Freiburger altorientalische Studien 8). Stuttgart.
- Kienast, B., K. Volk (1995) *Die neusumerischen und akkadischen Briefe* (Freiburger altorientalische Studien 19). Stuttgart.
- Marchesi, G. (2011) A New Historical Synchronism Relating to Sargon of Akkade. *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino oriente Antico* 28, 17-23.
- Michalowski, P. (1983) History as Charter. Some Observations on the Sumerian King List. *Journal of American Oriental Society* 103, 237-48.
- Milone, M.E. (1998) Irīkagina, figlio di Engisa, ensi di Lagaš. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*, 96-97, no. 106.
- Nigro, L. (2001-2003) La stele di Rimuš da Tello e l'indicazione del rango dei vinti nel rilievo reale accadico. *Scienze dell'Antichità* 11, 71-93.
- Nougayrol, J. (1994) Note sur la place des 'présages historiques' dans l'extispicine babylonienne, *Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, section des sciences religieuses, Annuaire 1944-1945*, 5-41. Paris.
- Ozaki, T. (2008) Three Early Dynastic Sumerian Sales Contracts of Immovables Housed in the Okayama Orient Museum. *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 23, 55-64.
- Pettinato, G. (1967) *Untersuchungen zur Neusumerischen Landwirtschaft*. Napoli.
- Powell, M.A. (1991) Naram-Sin, Son of Sargon. Ancient History, Famous Names, and a Famous Babylonian Forgery. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 81, 20-30.
- (1996) The Sin of Lugalzagesi. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 86, 307-14.
- Roaf, M. (1991) *Weltatlas der Kulturen: Mesopotamien*. München.
- Rost, S. (2011) Irrigation Management in the Ur III Period: A Reconsideration Based on a Case Study of the Maintenance of the id-NINA-šè-DU Canal of the Province Lagaš, in G.J. Selz, K. Wagensonner (eds.), *The Empirical Dimension of Ancient Near Eastern Studies. Die empirische Dimension altorientalischer Forschungen* (Wiener Offene Orientalistik 6), 211-69. Wien – Berlin.
- Rutten, M. (1936) Trente-deux modèles de foies en argile inscrits provenant de Tell Hariri (Mari). *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 33, 36-70.
- Sollberger, E. (1968) The Cruciform Monument. *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux"* 20, 50-70.
- Sommerfeld, W. (1999) *Die Texte der Akkade-Zeit. 1. Das Dijala-Gebiet: Tutub* (IMGULA 3/1). Münster.
- (2007) Rīmuš (Rí-mu-uš). 2. oder 3. König der Dynastie von Akkade. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 11, 372-75.
- (2008) Große Zahlen in den altakkadischen Königsinschriften. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 35, 220-37.
- Steinkeller, P. (1998) Inanna's Archaic Symbol, in J. Braun et al. (eds.), *Written on Clay and Stone. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Krystyna Szarzyńska on the Occasion of her 80<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, 87-100. Warsaw.
- (2003) An Ur III Manuscript of the Sumerian King List, in W. Sallaberger, K. Volk, A. Zgoll (eds.), *Literatur, Politik und Recht in Mesopotamien. Festschrift für Claus Wilcke*, 267-92. Wiesbaden.
- (2006) New Light on Marhaši and its Contacts with Makkan and Babylonia. *Journal of Mesopotamian Studies* 1, 1-17.

- (2007) City and Countryside in Third Millennium Southern Babylonia, in E.C. Stone (ed.), *Settlement and Society. Essays Dedicated to Robert McCormick Adams*, 185-211. Chicago.
- Vincente, C-A. (1995) The Tall Leilan Recension of the Sumerian King List. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 85, 234-70.
- Visicato, G. (2010) New Light from an Unpublished Archive of Meskigalla, Ensi of Adab, Housed in the Cornell University Collections, in L. Kogan *et al.* (eds.), *City Administration in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 53<sup>e</sup> Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, 2 (Babel und Bibel 5), 263-71. Winona Lake.
- Visicato, G., A. Westenholz (2010) *Early Dynastic and Early Sargonic Tablets from Adab in the Cornell University Collections* (Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology 11). Bethesda.
- Westenholz, A. (1999) The Old Akkadian Period: History and Culture, in P. Attinger, M. Wäfler (hrsg.), *Mesopotamien. Akkade-Zeit und Ur III-Zeit* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 160/3), 15-117. Freiburg – Göttingen.
- Wilcke, C. (1987) Die Inschriftenfunde der 7. und 8. Kampagnen (1983 und 1984), in B. Hrouda (hrsg.), *Isin-Išān Bahrīyāt*, III, 83-120. München.

## SUMMARY

The article presents some considerations on the reign of the Akkadian king Rīmuš: his suppression of a Southern revolt, his expedition against Elam, a Victory stele of his, and his relationship with his elder brother Maništušu.

*Keywords:* Rīmuš, Maništušu, southern revolt, victory stele

*Stampa:* Tipolito: Istituto Salesiano Pio XI – Via Umbertide, 11 – 00181 Roma – tel. 067827819 – fax 067848333

*Finito di stampare:* Aprile 2014