I examined the royal inscriptions of Lugalzagesi and Sargon on two subjects: 1) geographical views of the world as they appeared in the inscriptions, 2) phraseology of the inscriptions.

Lugalzagesi's inscription described geographical areas in three ways: the region from the sunrise to the sunset, the region from the lower sea to the upper sea, and regions described with a pair of the terms, kalam and kur. The first and the second views were based on people's commonsense. The third one was derived from political thought. It developed as the concept of the political sphere of influence shifted from the city-state to the regional state. This political concept had a strong influence on Mesopotamian kings until the first half of the second millennium B.C.

Royal inscriptions were not records of events simply written down as they occurred. To understand how the contents of royal inscriptions related to historical facts, we need to consider the phraseology used and their overall structure.
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I. Introduction

In this paper I will examine the geographical view of the world as represented in three royal inscriptions, one of Lugalzagesi (ABW II, Luzag. 1), and two of Sargon of Agade (RIME 2, Sargon 1 and 11).

The chart below summarizes the development of the Mesopotamian idea of kingship in the last half of the third millennium B.C. (Maeda 1981, 1984, 1985a, 1995).

In the period of city-states, the royal inscriptions of Sumerian rulers proclaimed that they only ruled over a city or cities, but did not mention the territory above the level of the city-state. For example, when Lugalkisalsi of...
Uruk extended his rule over the southern city Ur, his royal title was “king of Uruk (and) king of Ur (lugal unūki-ga lugal urū2-ki-ma)” (ABW II, 310: Lukis 5, 4-5). The title of Lugalkisalsi indicated that he ruled the two independent city-states separately. Lugalkisalsi did not conceive of a level of sovereignty beyond rulership of the city-state.

In contrast, we know that Lugalzagesi ruled many Sumerian city-states, and he took the royal title “king of the land (lugal kalam-ma).” From this title, we have placed him as a king in the period of the regional state. Lugalzagesi was the first king to describe the territory or region, as opposed to separate cities, over which he could claim sovereignty in his royal inscription. But just what was the territory or region which he referred to? To answer this question, I will first examine the geographical perception of territory that appeared in the Lugalzagesi inscription in Section II.

Later, Lugalzagesi was defeated by Sargon of Agade. Sargon was praised by ancient scribes as one of the great kings and an epoch-maker in Mesopotamian history, namely, “the first king of world empire” (Westenholtz 1997). This reputation continues to be supported by modern scholars. Despite the general acceptance of this reputation, I will argue that Sargon, like Lugalzagesi before him, was also a king of the regional state and not a king of “the world.” The period of king of “the world” began in the reign of Naram-Sin, the grand-son of Sargon of Agade, who declared himself a divine king and “king of the four quarters šar kibrātim arba’im”. Lugalzagesi and Sargon were in fact antagonists during the same stage in the development of kingship in Mesopotamia.

I will examine Sargon’s inscriptions more carefully in Sections III and IV. The purpose of this examination is to place Sargon’s rule in the period of
royal inscription.

"It is merely a record of something the writer knows for a fact." This phrase appears in the comments which Collingwood made on the Sumerian royal inscription of Enmetena, the ruler of Lagash (Collingwood 1946, 11). In contrast to this view, I will show that Sumerian scribes composed royal inscriptions based on certain principles of phraseology, that is, they selected material and composed them according to the contents and style of royal inscriptions. I will give some illustrative instances of this in each sections of II to IV.

II. Lugalzagesi’s Inscription

Lugalzagesi was given the title “king of the land” by the god Enlil, chief god of Sumerians and Akkadians.

“When Enlil, king of all lands, gave to Lugalzagesi the kingship of the land (en-lil₂ lugal-kur-kur-ra-ke₄ lugal-za₃-ge-si nam-lugal kalam-ma e-na-sum-ma-a)” (I 36-41).

In the first lines of the inscription, he declared “Lugalzagesi, king of Uruk (and) king of the land (lugal-za₃-ge-si lugal unuⁿ-ga lugal kalam-ma)” (I 3-5). The city Uruk was his capital and “king of the land” was the title for the overlord. The accompanying titles manifested his political power over the regional state.

In this inscription there are three kinds of expressions used for the term territory or region.

1. The region from the lower sea to the upper sea

The first geographical view of the world, “the region from the lower sea to the upper sea” appeared in this inscription as follows:

“At that time (when Enlil gave kingship of the land to him), (the region) from the lower sea, through the Tigris and Euphrates, to the upper sea, he (Enlil) put their routes in good order for him (u₄-ba, a-ab-ba, sig-ta-ta, idigna, buranun-bi, a-ab-ba, igi-nim-ma-še₃, gir₃-bi, si e-na-sa₂)” (II 3-11).

In this inscription, “the region from the lower sea (the Persian Gulf) to the
upper sea (the Mediterranean)” envisioned the territory ruled by the king of the regional state, though it was not a real domain, but an idealized view.

The geographical view of “the region from the lower sea to the upper sea” must have been fostered over the long history of the Mesopotamian people’s observation of nature, particularly the Euphrates, in the same way the Egyptians developed their view that the Nile basin was their own country. Inhabitants on the Euphrates basin in those days were influenced by the river, and their geographical sense of direction of lower and upper paralleled the flow of the Euphrates, not the magnetic south and north. As if to emphasize that “the region of the lower sea and the upper sea” was formed by the basin of the Euphrates, the river is included as part of the description of the region in this inscription: “(the region) from the lower sea, through the Tigris and Euphrates, to the upper sea.”

The kingship of the regional state newly established in Mesopotamia naturally demanded a domain beyond the rulership of city-state. No sooner had the idea of kingship of a regional state become a reality to some extent than it was linked up with “the region from the lower sea to the upper sea,” because the Euphrates basin was regarded as the territory of the Mesopotamian people.

The idea of kingship of the regional state became inseparable from its association with the region from the lower sea to the upper sea. Like the claim of Lugalzagesi, Sargon and Rimuš, his son, who bore the royal title “the king of the entire land (LUGAL KIŠ),” also declared sovereignty over the same territory.

Sargon:

“For Sargon, king of the land, the god Enlil never gave the rival, and he gave him (Sargon) the region from the upper sea to the lower sea (ürum-GI), [lugal], kalam-ma-ra, ù[en]-l-il-le, lu₂ e[rim₂ = GABA-RU?], nu-na-sum, a-[ab]-[ba], [i]-im[ma]-ta, a-[ab]-ba, sig-[sig]-ś-e₃, ù[en]-l-il₂-le₁, [mu-na-sum])” (RIME 2, 11: Sargon 1:62-73).

Rimuš:

“Rimuš, king of the entire land (LUGAL KIŠ), to whom Enlil gave the whole (civilized) land, held (the region) from the upper sea to the lower sea and all the mountains for the god Enlil’s benefit (Rimuš LUGAL KIŠ šu 4Enlil KALAM.MAki kalama iddiššum tiamtam alitam šapilram u šadē kalašunūma ana 4Enlil ukâl)” (RIME 2, 58: Rimuš 9, 1-17).

Regarding the Rimuš inscription cited above, we can see that both “LUGAL KIŠ” of the Akkadian kings, Sargon, Rimuš, and Maništušu, and “king of the land (lugal-kalam-ma)” of Lugalzagesi indicated the same idea of kingship as the rule over “the region from the lower sea to the upper sea”
ROYAL INSCRIPTIONS OF LUGALZAGESI AND SARGON (Maeda 1984, 79-80). LUGAL KIŠ held by Akkadian kings could not have denoted “king of the city Kish,” but king of the regional state.3

On the other hand, Naram-Sin, king of the four quarters, proclaimed he ruled over the insubordinate regions as far as the end of the world. Naram-Sin belonged to the period of king of “the world.” Over time there was a shift from the period of regional state to the period of king of “the world,” and with this shift, “the region from the lower sea to the upper sea,” which had a strong tie with the kingship of regional state, lost its political meaning.

Akkadian kings wrote “from the upper sea to the lower sea.” However, in Lugalzagesi’s inscription this order was the reverse, “from the lower sea to the upper sea.” For Lugalzagesi, a Sumerian king, the upper sea was far beyond the Akkadian country, and for Akkadian kings, the lower sea was far beyond the Sumerian country. Their positions relative to the upper and lower seas explain which one would appear first in an inscription.

2. The region from the sunrise to the sunset

The second expression “(the region) from the sunrise to the sunset (utu-e₃-ta utu-šu₂-še₃)” was also derived from observations of nature. “The region from the sunrise to the sunset” denoted the whole world from end to end. There are two references in this inscription.

(1) “(In the region) from the sunrise to the sunset he (Enlil) made them subject to him (Lugalzagesi) (utu-e₃-ta, utu-šu₂-še₃, gu₂ e-na-gar-ra-a)” (I 46-II 2).

(2) “(In the region) from the sunrise to the sunset, Enlil permitted him (Lugalzagesi) no rival (utu-e₃-ta, utu-šu₂-še₃, ēn-lil₂-le, gaba-šu-gar, numu-ni-tuk)” (II 12-16).

By describing “(in the region) from the sunrise to the sunset he (Enlil) made them subject to him,” Lugalzagesi was proclaiming himself king of the whole world as far as distant places. And he also emphasized he was the one and only king in the world in the expression “(in the region) from the sunrise to the sunset, Enlil permitted him no rival.” The term “no rival (gaba<-ri> nu-tuk)” had never been mentioned in royal inscriptions before Lugalzagesi. “No rival” was adopted as an epithet of the king of the regional state.

This is a case of self-aggrandizement. Lugalzagesi declared he was the one and only king in the world, but this was mere show without any basis in reality.

The expression “the region from the sunrise to the sunset” clearly aroused images of distant places where the sun rises and sets.4 Sumerian people imagined the end of the world as a place where Sumerian heroes and warrior
gods engaged in fighting and destroying monstrous creatures as narrated in "Gilgamesh and Huwawa" (Black, ETCSL 1.8.1.5.), “Epic of Lugalbanda” (Black, ETCSL 1.8.2.2.), and “The Exploits of Ninurta” (Black, ETCSL 1.6.2.).

Gilgamesh explains that the purpose of making an expedition to the mountains is to immortalize his fame:

“In my city people are dying, and hearts are full of distress.
People are lost -- that fills me with dismay.
I craned my neck over the city wall:
Corpses in the water make the river almost overflow. That is what I see.
That will happen to me too -- that is the way things go.
No one is tall enough to reach heaven;
No one can reach wide enough to stretch over the mountains.
Since a man cannot pass beyond the final end of life,
I want to set off into the mountains, to establish my renown there.
Where renown can be established there, I will establish my renown;
And where no renown can be established there, I shall establish the renown of the gods” (Black, ETCSL 1.8.1.5.“Gilgamesh and Huwawa, Version A” 23-33). 5

Heroes and gods were models for kings in later periods, who portrayed themselves in their royal hymns as heroes making expeditions to distant countries. 6

The expression “the region from the sunrise to the sunset” had a strong association with mystic images, and was less than a perfect reflection of political reality.

3. Center and periphery: kalam “civilized land” and kur “rebel land”

The third geographical view of the world is the pair of terms kalam and kur.

Kalam meant “civilized land” in contrast to kur meaning “rebel land.” The terms kalam and kur expressed “center and periphery.”

In the Lugalzagesi inscription, there are four references to the pair of terms “civilized land” and “rebel land.”

(1) “In the whole land he established peace and order for him,7 (and) put all of rebel lands at his feet (igi-kalam-ma-ke4, si e-na-sa2-a, kur-kur gir3-na, e-ni-se3-ga-a)” (I 42-45).

(2) “Rebel land rested contentedly, (the civilized) land made merry (kur-kur u2-sal-la, mu-da-na2, kalam-e, a<ne>-hul2-la mu-da-e)” (II 17-20).

(3) “The lords of Sumer (= the land) and rulers of rebel lands conceded
sovereignty to him at Uruk (bara₂-bara₂ ki-en-gi, ensi₂ kur-kur-ra, ki-enu₃-ge, me-nam-nun-še₂, mu-na-tar-e-ne)” (II 21-25).

(4) “May rebel land rest contentedly (kur u₂-sal-la, ḫa-mu-da-na₂)” (III 22-23)--- “May the (civilized) land be regarded as the propitious place (kalam-e, ki-ša₂-ga, igi ḫa-mu-da-du₂)” (III 29-31).

The four phrases are chiasmi, with the terms kalam “civilized land” and kur “rebel land” inverted in each successive phrase:


(A: kalam, civilized land; B: kur, rebel land)

The reference in (4) is a part of the prayer which Lugalzagesi offered to the god Enlil.

“Please now,⁸ may Enlil, king of all lands, supplicate the god An, his (Enlil’s) beloved father, on behalf of my prayer;
May (additional) life be added to my life,
May the rebel land rest contentedly,
May the people grow as widespread as the grass,
May the breasts of heaven function properly,
May the (civilized) land be regarded as the propitious place,
May they (An and Enlil) never alter the propitious destiny they have determined,
May I always be the leading shepherd.”

This prayer was narrated in direct discourse. It may be the record of a prayer which Lugalzagesi actually offered up in Nippur, though this is still speculation. More importantly, we would expect Lugalzagesi to pray first for his own country before praying for the rebel land, the periphery. However, in this inscription Lugalzagesi described himself praying for the rebel land first and then praying for the civilized land. This reversed order would not normally occur in a prayer of a king who is blessing his kingship and his kingdom.

The reason for the reversed order in reference (4) is due to the rules of chiasmus. The order of the rebel land appearing first and the civilized land second, while not suitable to the contents of the prayer, is appropriate according
to the rule of chiasmus in this inscription. Looking at this example, we can see that the scribe in those days did not simply record an event, but he arranged the narrative of the event in accordance with his particular phraseology.

Chiastic phrases appeared from line 42 of the first column to line 31 of the third column, that is, they covered almost three quarters of the inscription. Since chiastic phrases formed the centerpiece of this inscription, we can surmise that Lugalzagesi had a strong sense of the center (civilized land) as distinctive from the peripheral rebel land, and that Lugalzagesi wished to rule in peace and order both his civilized homeland, and the peripheral rebel lands.

Lugalzagesi drew an idealistic picture, and there is no hint of any political aims against the rebel lands. Kings of the regional state, generally speaking, wished to realize a polity in the civilized Land, and protect the polity against the invading barbarians. However, they did not seem to have any intention of extending their own polity over rebel lands, or of civilizing the rebel lands.

It is impossible to ascertain how the civilized land and rebel land were conceived of originally. But it is certain that the distinction between center and periphery functioned as an essential factor in unifying the Sumerian and Akkadian countries.

“Civilized land (kalam)” meant the Sumerian country in its narrow sense, but in its broader sense, it meant Sumerian and Akkadian countries. Sumerians and Akkadians recognized themselves as co-habitants in the civilized land. And for them, kur-land was not only barbarous, but also a hostile rebel land whose people could invade their civilized countries (Cooper 1983, 30-33).

After the fall of the Agade dynasty, Sumerians and Akkadians began to harbor hostile feelings toward “the periphery” in place of a sense of distinctness or “otherness.” They imagined that the barbaric Gutian people destroyed the Dynasty of Agade in the reign of Naram-Sin, as narrated in “The Curse of Agade” (Black, ETCSL 2.1.5. “The Cursing of Agade”). However, it is a historical fact that the dynasty of Agade was not destroyed by the Gutians in the reign of Naram-Sin and that his successors still continued to rule after his reign. We know that at some point the Gutians did invade the Sumerian country, but they influenced a more limited area around Adab and Umma than we had previously estimated (Michalowski 1993, 27; Maeda 1998).

Feelings of hostility gradually grew and exerted the greatest influence after the Ur III dynasty was destroyed by the Elamites (Maeda 1992a; 1998; 2003). In the Early Old Babylonian period, kings who bore the royal title “king of Sumer and Akkad (lugal ki-en-gi ki-uri)” wished to rule and protect wholly civilized countries against barbarians. It was in this period that Sumerian city-laments
were composed (Hallo 1995, 1872). These city-laments were narratives about the destruction of Sumerian cities by Elamites, Gutians, and Šimaškians, hostile invaders from the mountains.

Now, let us look at the geographic relationships between the area referred to as the "region from the lower sea to the upper sea" and references to "the center and periphery." Was the whole region "from the lower sea to the upper sea" a civilized land, or was there a boundary between civilized land and rebel land in the region of the lower sea to the upper sea? A possible answer to this question might be found in how the two areas were conceptualized: "the region from the lower sea to the upper sea" was based on observations of nature, while the concept of "center and periphery" was founded on political thought. Coming from two such differing concepts, we would have to say it is doubtful that people in those days thought of a relationship existing between the two.

I want to turn attention to another difference between the Lugalzagesi inscription and other inscriptions. Generally speaking, Mesopotamian kings had to fulfill two types of duties, one was to protect the homeland from hostile outsiders, and the other was to maintain fertility and peace in the homeland. The symbolic fulfillment of this latter duty was to build temples for deities, particularly for city-gods (Maeda 1991). Mesopotamian royal inscriptions mainly praised kings for fulfilling their duties, particularly building temples and conquering enemies.

But the inscription of Lugalzagesi never mentioned these politico-military activities. This is a peculiar characteristic which differentiates this royal inscription from others. Rather the activity recorded in this inscription is his prayer to the god Enlil: "Lugalzagesi, king of Uruk, king of the land, solicitously provides plentiful food offerings and libations of sweet water for Enlil, his master, in Nippur (lugal-za3-ge-si, lugal-unuki-ga, lugal-kalam-ma<-ke4>, kin-kin-ma, 4en-liil2, lugal-ni, nibrü3-a, nidba-gal-gal, e-na-su13-de3, a-du10 e-na-de2-e)" (III 3-12; Cooper 1986, 94). He prayed to the god Enlil, who gave him the kingship and everlasting peace and order in his realm. According to the contents, we can be sure this inscription was made to commemorate his enthronement as king of the land.

This inscription also contains relatively long phrases about six cities.

"At that time, Uruk spent its time rejoicing, Ur, like a bull, raised high its head, Larsa, the beloved city of Utu, made merry, Umma, the beloved city of Shara, lifted its huge arms, Zabalam cried out like a ewe reunited with its lamb,"
Kian raised high its neck.”

These six cities were described as existing in peace and having an air of prosperity. We can also observe something curious about the order of appearance of these six cities. We would expect the two cities, Uruk and Umma, both under Lugalzagesi’s influence, to be mentioned first. But as we see, Uruk is followed by Ur and Larsa, and Umma is followed by Zabalam and Kian. The reason for this sequencing can be explained quite reasonably by dividing the six cities into two co-existing circles as follows:

**Uruk circle** = Uruk, Ur, and Larsa.

**Umma circle** = Umma, Zabalam, and Kian.

If we look at the political background of these six cities, it is possible to divide them into two co-existing circles.

In the first circle, Uruk was the capital city of Lugalzagesi. Before his reign, Uruk had already expanded its sphere of influence over Ur. We know that Lugalkiginnedudu and his son Lugalkisalsi possessed the title “king of Uruk (and) king of Ur” (ABW I, Lukis 1, 5).

Larsa was a city which Uruk and Lagash competed to occupy. Enmetena, ruler of Lagash, proclaimed “he (Enmetena) gave the freedom (from debt) to the citizens of Uruk, citizens of Larsa, and citizens of Badtibira. And he restored Uruk to (the city-goddess) Inanna, Larsa to (the city-god) Utu, and Emush(-temple in Badtibira) to the god Lugalemush (= Dumuzi) (dumu unu ki, dumu larsa ki, dumu pa₂-ti-bir₂-ra-ka, [ama]-gi₄-bi, e-gar, [inanna-ra, unu ki-še₃, šu-na i₃-ni-gi₄, [utu-[ra], larsa ki-še₃, šu-na i₁-ni-gi₄, [lugal-e₂-muš₂-ra, e₂-muš₂-še₃, šu-na i₃-ni-gi₄)” (ABW I, 269: Ent 79, V 4-VI 6).

As Lagash began to decline in influence after the reign of Enmetena, Uruk controlled the region from Badtibira and Larsa to Ur.

In the second circle, Umma was Lugalzagesi’s home city. Several records revealed that Lugalzagesi shifted his capital from Umma to Uruk sometime during his reign. Lugalzagesi called his father Uu the (ex-)ruler of Umma in this inscription. Lugalzagesi was referred to as the ruler of Umma in Urukagina’s inscription (ABW I, 337: Ukg 16, VIII 11-13). There are administrative tablets found in Umma which were made “under the reign of Lugalzagesi, the ruler (of
Umma)" (Powel 1978).

Umma had influence over Zabalam and Kian, and had annexed the two cities by the time of the Ur III period. In the Early Dynastic Period, II, the sanga-priest of Zabalam (sanga zabalam\textsuperscript{ki}), returned to Umma and "received the rulership of Umma (nam-ensi\textsubscript{2} umma\textsuperscript{ki}-a šu e-ma-ti)" (ABW 238: Ent 28, III 28-37). II was a nephew of Ur-Lumma, former ruler of Umma.\textsuperscript{11} Since a member of the royal family of Umma was able to take over the office of sanga, the highest priest, of Zabalam, Zabalam must already have been within Umma's sphere of influence.

In the Akkadian dynasty period, Zabalam and Kian still maintained their independence, though they were in the circle of Umma. When Rimush, king of Akkad, subdued the Sumerian revolt, he captured the rulers of Sumerian cities. Among the captured rulers, appeared the rulers of Zabalam and Kian as well as the ruler of Umma (RIME 2, 43-44: Rimuš 2). From this we know that Kian and Zabalam still had their city-rulers.

By the time of Ur III dynasty, Zabalam and Kian had been absorbed into the city Umma. In an offering list of cattle skins for deities in Ur III Umma (TCL 5, 5672), the god Shara in Kian, the goddess Gula in Kian, and the goddess Inanna in Zabalam received the offerings. They were included among the deities of Umma.

Lugalzagesi described two circles, one circle consisting of Ur and Larsa and bound to Lugalzagesi's capital city Uruk, and the other circle consisting of Zabalam and Kian and bound to Lugalzagesi's home city, Umma. We could easily imagine these two circles or spheres as forming a single power base of Lugalzagesi. However, I maintain that these two circles formed separate bases of Lugalzagesi's sovereign power.

As mentioned above, three distinctions in geographical view appeared in the Lugalzagesi inscription: 1) the outside of the human world in distant places, 2) rebel lands in the periphery, and 3) the civilized land in the center. Moreover, Lugalzagesi divided the civilized land into two regions, one was the area of the six cities and the other region was the remaining area.

However, we cannot draw a boundary line around the realm that he actually ruled. Were the old Sumerian city-states Adab, Shuruppak, and Lagash under his rule? Lugalzagesi's inscription does not contain any evidence to support this. He did not even mention the conquest of Lagash, a neighboring city of Umma, in this inscription. We cannot ascertain when Lagash was merged into the realm of Lugalzagesi.

His actual domain was more like a patchwork of casual relationships
between Lugalzagesi as master and each Sumerian city-state as subject. There is no evidence that Lugalzagesi formed a centralized political organization appropriate to the title “king of the land.”

Finally, I will consider the political relationship between Umma and Lagash, a neighbor city-state of Umma.

It is usually assumed that Lugalzagesi fought against Urukagina, king of Lagash, after he ascended the throne of king of the land. This assumption is based on the evidence of the Lugalzagesi inscription which was examined above. This inscription recorded Lugalzagesi’s enthronement as king of the land, and did not mention the war between Umma and Lagash. But this assumption is contradicted by the fact that Urukagina named Lugalzagesi as ruler of Umma (ABW I, 337: Ukg 16, VIII 11-13), not the king of the city Uruk, or the king of the land as he would have after his ascension.

We cannot argue this point any further since there is no other evidence available. However the answer to why Lugalzagesi did not mention his conquest of Lagash in his inscription seems clear. This achievement was not selected for inclusion in this inscription because his military activities were incompatible with the contents and composition for commemorating his enthronement in this inscription.

III. Sargon’s Inscription 1

In the first inscription of Sargon cited here (RIME 2, Sargon 1), Sargon introduced himself as “Sargon, king of the city Agade, maškim-priest of Inanna, king of the entire land (LUGAL KIŠ), guda-priest of An, king of the land, ensigal of Enlil, (sar-um-GR, [lugal], [ag-ge-de₂KI], [maškim], [diInanna], [lugal-KIŠ], [guda]ₐ₄ an-na, [lugal], [kalam-ma], ensi₂-gal, [den]-li₂)” (1-11).

In this inscription, secular titles (king of the city Agade, king of the entire land, and king of the land) and religious titles (maškim-priest of An, guda-priest of Inanna, and ensigal of Enlil) were arranged alternately one after the other. There are no other royal inscriptions in the third millennium B.C. using this arrangement except for the Lugalzagesi inscription.

The king’s relationship to the deities which Sargon expressed in his religious titles was usually indicated in a king’s epithets following his titles. The style of long epithets began appearing in inscriptions of rulers of Early Dynastic Lagash.¹² Lugalzagesi’s inscription contains both religious titles and long epithets indicating his relations to deities:

“Lugalzagesi,
[titles =] king of Uruk, king of the land, išib-priest of An, lumah-priest of Nidaba,\(^{13}\)
[lineage =] son of Uu, ruler of Umma, lumah-priest of Nidaba,
[epithets =] whom An, king of all lands, looked upon favorably, the ensigal of Enlil, whom Utu selected name, "...
lugal-zaj-ge-si, lugal unu\(^{ki}\)-ga, lugal kalam-ma, išib an-na, lu\(^{2}\)-maḫ dnidaba, dumu u\(^{2}\)-u\(^{2}\), ensi\(^{2}\) umma\(^{ki}\), lu\(^{2}\)-maḫ dnidaba, igi-zi-bar-ra, an lugal-kur-kur-ra, ensi\(^{2}\)-gal d'en-lil\(^{2}\), geštu\(^{2}\)-sum-ma d'en-ki, mu-pa\(^{3}\)-da, d'utu,--- (I 3-20).

The inscriptions of Sargon and Lugalzagesi are the only ones which use this peculiar style consisting of secular and religious titles. Based on this observation, we can be certain that Sargon modeled this inscription on Lugalzagesi's.

Now, we turn to an examination of Sargon's Inscription 1 which described conquering Sumerian city-states.

"He conquered the city of Uruk, destroyed its walls, defeated the people of Uruk (in battle), he smashed with the tun.kara-weapon. He defeated Lugalzagesi, the king of Uruk, and captured him and led him off to the gate of Enlil in a neck stock. Sargon, the king of Agade, defeated the people of Ur, smashed with the tun.kar-weapon, conquered his city, and destroyed its walls. He conquered E-Ninmarki, and destroyed its walls. He conquered the territory from the neck of the land, (that is) city of Lagash, to the (lower) sea and washed his weapon in the sea. He defeated the people of Umma, smashed with the tun.kara-weapon, and he conquered his city, destroyed its walls."

12) uru unu\(^{ki}\), 13) e-bul, 14) ūbad\(^{3}\)-bi, 15) e-ga-si\(^{3}\), 16) lu\(^{2}\), unu\(^{ki}\)-ga-da, 17) giš.tukul, 18) ūe-ša-sig\(^{3}\), 19) TUN\(^{3}\).KARA\(^{2}\), 20) e-ni-si\(^{3}\), 21) lug[al-zaj-ge-si], 22) [lugal], 23) [unu\(^{ki}\)-ga-da], 24) [giš.tuku[l]], 25) [e]-d[a-sig\(^{3}\)], 26) ūe-ša-ga-dab\(^{5}\), 27) giš.si-ga-r[a]-ta, 28) ka\(^{2}\)-en-il\(^{2}\)-la\(^{2}\)-še\(^{3}\), 29) ūe-ša-de\(^{6}\)
30) šar-um-GI, 31) lugal, 32) [a]g-ge-de\(^{3}\)-ki, 33) lu\(^{2}\), uri\(^{2}\)-ma-da, 34) giš.tukul, 35) e-da-sig\(^{3}\), 36) TUN\(^{3}\).KARA\(^{2}\), 37) ūe-ši-si\(^{3}\), 38) uru-ni, 39) e-ḫul, 40) ūbad\(^{3}\)-bi, 41) e-ga-si\(^{3}\), 42) e-ša-in-mar-ki, 43) e-ḫul, 44) ūbad\(^{3}\)-bi, 45) e-ga-si\(^{3}\), 46) gu\(^{2}\) kalam-bi, 47) lagas\(^{ki}\)-ta, 48) ūa-ša-ba-še\(^{3}\), na-x-[n]e-ne, 49) e-ḫul, 50) giš.tukul-ni, 51) a-ab-ba-ka, 52) i\(^{3}\)-luḫ, 53) ūlu\(^{2}\) umma\(^{ki}\)-da, 54) [giš.tukul], 55) [e-da-sig\(^{3}\)], 56) [TUN\(^{3}\)-
And then Sargon became overlord.

“For Sargon, king of the land, the god Enlil gave no rival, and he gave him (Sargon) the region from the upper sea to the lower sea.”

Sargon referred to himself as the only king in the world (“Enlil gave no rival”) and overlord of the region from the upper sea to the lower sea. Both expressions appeared first in Lugalzagesi’s inscription. This fact is confirmation that Sargon and Lugalzagesi ruled in the same stage of kingship, that is, in the period of the regional state.

It is very curious that in his inscription Sargon acted as king of the city Agade and became king of the land, although he never took the titles “king of the city Agade” and “king of the land” in any of his other inscriptions. On the other hand, even though his formal title was “king of the entire land (LUGAL KIŠ),” it did not appear in this inscription. Moreover, Lugalzagesi, rival king of Sargon, was called king of the city Uruk in this inscription, instead of his own title “king of the land.” Why were their formal titles rewritten with these irregular titles? The answer to this question seems to hold the key to understanding the inscription.

Reading this inscription carefully, we notice that the narrative had a motif, that of two competitors, both kings of city-states, struggling to win supremacy over the whole land. This motif is similar to the contest (a-da-min₃)-motif in Sumerian literature, “Enmerkar and the Lord of Arrata” and “Emerkar and Ensuhkeshanna/ Ensukkheshdanna/ Ensukhgirana” (Alster 1995).

“Enmerkar and Ensuhkeshanna” narrates the contest between king of the city Uruk and king of the city Arrata to win the favor of the goddess Inanna. The last lines of this epic are as follows:

“He (Ensuhkeshanna) sent a man to Enmerkar:
‘You are the beloved lord of Inanna, you alone are exalted. Inanna has truly chosen you for her holy lap, you are her beloved. From the south to the highlands, you are the great lord, and I am only second to you; from the moment of conception I was not your equal, you are the older brother. I cannot match you ever.’

In the contest between Enmerkar and Ensuhkeshanna, Enmerkar proved superior to Ensuhkeshanna” (Black, ETCSL 1.8.2.4. “Enmerkar
and Ensuighirana” II 275-282).16

Contest motif flourished in Sumerian literature, such as “the debate between Winter and Summer,” “the debate between Silver and Copper,” “the debate between Sheep and Grain,” “the debate between Hoe and Plow,” “the debate between Heron and Turtle,” “the debate between Date Palm and Tamarisk,” “the debate between Bird and Fish” (Black ETCSL 5.3.1-7).

This “contest”-literature is a narrative of two competitors debating which one is more useful to God and/or Man. For example, the last lines of “the debate between Winter and Summer” are as follows:

“Enlil answered Summer and Winter: ‘Winter is controller of the life-giving waters of all the lands - the farmer of the gods produces everything. Summer, my son, how can you compare yourself to your brother Winter?’ ----.”

“Summer bowed to Winter and offered him a prayer. In his house he prepared emmer-beer and wine. At its side they spend the day at a succulent banquet. Summer presents Winter with gold, silver and lapis lazuli. They pour out brotherhood and friendship like best oil. By bringing sweet words to the quarrel they have achieved harmony with each other.

In the dispute between Summer and Winter, Winter, the faithful farmer of Enlil, was superior to Summer” (Black, ETCSL 5.3.3.: 304-317).17

The use of the contest-motif in narratives requires that the two competitors be on an equal footing. In the Sargon inscription, this condition was met by substituting their formal titles with titles of equal weight, that is the titles for kings of city states. Thus, the title of Sargon was changed from his formal title “king of the entire land” to “king of the city Agade,” and the title of Lugalzagesi was changed from his normal title “king of the land” to “king of the city Uruk.”

Sargon won against his rival Lugalzagesi and gained the title “king of the land,” again not his real title. We know that Sargon defeated Lugalzagesi and expelled him from the “king of the land” (“He captured him [Lugalzagesi] and led him off to the gate of Enlil [in Nippur] in a neck stock”: RIME 2: Sargon 26-29). This outcome took its literary expression in Sargon taking the title “king of the land” in this inscription.

The demands of this contest genre explain why the formal titles of the two kings were rewritten using those irregular titles. From this we can see that in order to fulfill the demands of the contest genre, fictitious titles were used.

We can clearly see that the Sargon inscription was composed with the
contest-motif, and we can conclude that the inscription was not a record which simply traced the events of Sargon's conquest of Sumer, but was a literary-oriented composition, though naturally based on these events.

Sargon is usually said to use the titles "king of the city Agade," "king of the land," and "king of the entire land (LUGAL-KISH)" successively.

"He (=Sargon) is 'King of Akkad' when he begins conquering and subjugating the city-states of Sumer, but afterward he is 'King of the Land [Sumer].' Subsequently, he expands his sphere of influence, north and east, to secure control of major trade routes. ----. From then on, Sargon calls himself 'King of Kish'" (Franke 1995, 832).

If we can believe the legends and literary-works for Sargon (Lewis 1980; Westenholz 1997; Grayson 1975), he started as an attendant in the court of the king of the city Kish, and then he was crowned the king of the city Agade. But, there is no contemporary document of Sargon before he conquered Sumer to substantiate this claim.

Sargon is commonly said to have taken the title "king of the land," based only on the evidence of the Sargon inscription which I examined above. However, this commonly held view is doubtful, because based on our argument above the title "king of the land" of Sargon is literary fiction. "King of the land" was not a real title of Sargon.

Then, there is still the question of when Sargon changed his royal title from "king of the city Agade" to "king of the entire land." I assume that before (not after) the conquest of Sumer, he had already declared he was the "king of the entire land," that is, I assume that Sargon fought Lugalzagesi as "king of the entire land." He chose his royal title "king of the entire land" in order to bolster his position against his Sumerian opponent, Lugalzagesi, "king of the land."

This assumption is based on my interpretation of the political situation in those days: Lugalzagesi united Sumerian city-states, and then Sargon gained sufficient political power to pit himself against Lugalzagesi. Sargon clearly placed himself in opposition to Lugalzagesi by using the title "king of the entire land." This would have aroused strong feelings of rivalry in Lugalzagesi. In the end, Sargon defeated Lugalzagesi, his opponent.

There is no conclusive evidence for this interpretation. However, we can say with assurance that the conflict between these two antagonists was politically motivated, rather than a racial conflict between Sumerians and Akkadians in the modern sense.
IV. Sargon’s Inscription 2

The second inscription of Sargon cited here (RIME 2: Sargon 11) summarized Sargon’s achievements. His royal title in this inscription was “king of the entire land (LUGAL KIŠ),” which was used in almost all inscriptions of Sargon.

“Sargon, king of the entire land, defeated (Sumerian rulers) in thirty-four battles, destroyed their walls as far as the shore of the (lower) sea.

He moored ships from Meluhha, Magan, and Dilmun at the quay of Agade.

Sargon, the king, bowed down and prayed to the god Dagan in Tutul. He (Dagan) gave him the upper land: Mari, Iarmutı, and Ebla, as far as the Cedar Forest and the Silver Mountains.

Sargon, the king, whom Enlil gave no rival.”

1) [sar-um-GI], 2) [lugal], 3) [KIŠ], 4) [34] SAḪAR-ra, 5) [TUN]-KA[R]A₂ bi₂-si₃, 6) bad₃-bi, 7) i₃-gul-gul, 8) za₃ a-ab-ba-ka-še₃, 9) ma₂ me-luh-ḥa₃, 10) ma₂ ma₂-gan₃, 11) ma₂ dilmun₃, 12) kar ag-gade₃-ka, 13) bi₂-keš₂, 14) ṛsar₇-un-GI, 15) ṛlugal₇, 16) du₅-du₅-li₇-a, 17) ḍa-gan-ra, 18) ki-a mu-na-za, 19) šud₃ mu-ᵯna-de₆₇, 20) kalam giatan, 21) mu-na-sum, 22) ma-ri₂, 23) ia₃-ar-mu-ti₇, 24) eb-la₃, 25) tir, 26) giš.erin, 27) ḫur-sag, 28) ku₃-ga-še₃, 29) sar-um-GI, 30) lugal, 31) ṛd⁻en-li₂-le, 32) lu₂ gaba-ru, 33) nu-mu-ni-tuk.

Sargon conquered Sumerian city-states. He condensed this achievement into the expression “thirty-four battles,” without mentioning the names of Sumerian kings or rulers. The description focused on the occupation of the entire Sumerian region as far as the lower sea (“[he] destroyed their walls as far as the shore of the [lower] sea”). Following this, Sargon recorded that he moored ships from Meluhha, Magan, and Dilmun at the quay of Agade. Meluhha is identified as India, and Magan is identified as Oman. These areas had contact with Mesopotamia across the Persian Gulf. Dilmun is identified as Bahrain in the Persian Gulf. Then, Sargon recorded that he was given the upper land. After Sargon proclaimed the whole world was under his hegemony, he declared himself the only king in the world (“Sargon, the king, whom Enlil gave no rival”) in the same manner as in his first inscription.

In this second inscription there are many place names, but Elam, one of the powerful opponents of Mesopotamian kings in those days, was not mentioned.
Sargon evidently had conquered Elam, because one of his year names is “Sargon conquered Elam” (RIME 2, p. 8). In the first inscription of Sargon, Elam was referred to in the following way: “the ruler of Mari and the ruler of Elam came and stood (in obedience) before Sargon, king of the land (lu₂ ma-[ri₂ ki], lu₂ NIM[i₃], i-gi sar-[u[m]₁]-GI₇, lugal, kal-am-ma-ka-še₃, i₃-su₅-ge-eš₂)” (81-87).

The area from Mari in the west to Elam in the east had formed a real political world beginning in the period of city-states. Eannatum, the ruler of the city-state Lagash, recorded the battles for Elam and Mari: “Eannatum, ruler of Lagash who subjugated the rebel land for Ningirsu, smashed with arms and routed Elam, Subir, and Urua at the Asuhur-canal, and he smashed with arms and routed Kish, Akshak, and Mari at the Antasurra (e₂-an-na-tum₂, ensi₂ lagas⁴ki, kur-gu₂-gar-gar d₃in-gir₂-su₂-ka-ke₄, elam ŠUBUR ki, URUxA ki, a-sužur-ta, TUN₃, ŠE₃ be₂-se₃, ki₃ki akšak⁴ki, ma-ri₂ ki, an-ta-sur-ra d₃in-gir₂-su₂-ka-ta, TUN₃, ŠE₃ be₂-s[e₃])” (ABW I, Ean 2, VI 17-VII 2).

Sargon also conquered Simurum. But this inscription did not record the conquest of Simurum. He only praised his conquest of Simurum in his year name (“the year Sargon went on a campaign to Simurum: mu šar-um-GI si-mur-um ki₃-še₃ i₃-gin-na-a”: RIME 2, p. 8).

The standard explanation for the conquests not being mentioned is that Elam and Simurum were captured after the inscription was made. This may be correct, but I would offer an alternative explanation, because the problem of chronology is, in my mind, crucial to the critical analysis of historical documents. I suggest that Sargon intentionally selected names of cities and areas for inclusion based on geographical factors, and not for their connection to his achievements.

Sumer was the heartland of the region “from the lower sea to the upper sea” along with the Akkadian country. The three names Meluhha, Magan, and Dilmun, were associated with the image of the Persian Gulf (= the lower sea) (Potts 1995). The upper land from Mari, Iarmut, and Ebla, as far as the Cedar Forest and the Silver Mountains were located in Syria, on the shore of the Mediterranean (= the upper sea). The place names in this inscription can be seen as representing regions, Sumer and Akkad in the center, the Persian gulf on the southern frontier, and the Mediterranean on the northern frontier. Thus, geographical locations in the Sargon inscription cover the area identical to “the region from the lower sea to the upper sea.”

This inscription did not simply trace the events of Sargon’s achievements, but was composed within the framework of the idea of “the region from the lower sea to the upper sea.”
Since the set phrase "the region from the lower sea to the upper sea" was associated with the idea of kingship of the regional state, Sargon, the king of the entire land, could have inserted this set phrase into this inscription. However, in place of this set phrase in this inscription he described the region with the place names to form a row that ran through the region. The events were selected on the basis of where they occurred, rather than on their importance as representations of Sargon's achievements.

Elam and Simmurum were not mentioned in his inscription. I do not believe they were omitted because they were not valuable to Sargon or that they were defeated after his inscription was made. Instead I think that because they were not part of the region covered by the expression "the region from the lower sea to the upper sea," they were not selected for the inscription. Here again the criterion for selection was geographic location, and not their importance as achievements. The royal inscription was written in a particular narrative style.

On the other hand, events described in this inscription were based on the Sargon's achievements, though they were adapted or modified to suit the literary style: Sargon actually fought several times against the Sumerian city-sates; the ships of Magan, Mellaḫa, and Dilmun went upstream to the quay of the city of Agade; Sargon prayed to the god Dagan in Tutul. For this last event, it seems to me that Sargon did not actually go on the military expedition to "Ilamu, and Ebla, as far as the Cedar Forest and the Silver Mountains," or if he did, his expedition was not marked by great military gains.

V. Concluding Remarks

We should not fail to notice that geographical perspectives always had strong ties with political thought in each period.

Extended territory beyond the area of city-states was never mentioned in royal inscriptions in the period of city-states. The conception of territory above the level of city-states appeared first in the royal inscription of Lugalzagesi. It paralleled the establishment of the kingship of the regional state. The king who established the position of overlord, conceptualized his realm as first "the region from the lower sea (the Persian Gulf), through the Tigris and the Euphrates, to the upper sea (the Mediterranean)." This was an ordinary Mesopotamian view of the world. Then, in the period of "king of the world," this geographical view was replaced by another geographical view, "center and periphery," the pair of terms for "civilized land (kalam)" and "rebel land (kur)." "Center and periphery" was not a simple natural distinction, but rather an ethnocentric bias against the
inhabitants of the periphery who were regarded as harmful barbarians invading civilized land. Kings in those days referred to themselves as mighty kings whose main aim was to protect the homeland against invading barbarians.

Royal inscriptions were not records simply tracing kings’ achievements. Lugalzagesi's inscription was made for just one purpose: to commemorate his enthronement and to give praise for the realization of a peaceful realm under the protection of gods and goddesses. For this reason, Lugalzagesi did not describe his military campaigns or the construction of temples in this inscription.

In the same way, one of the Sargon's inscriptions which was composed in the "contest"-motif, namely, narrated the story of Sargon, king of the city Agade, fighting with Lugalzagesi, king of the city Uruk, and after conquering him, Sargon became king of the land. This narration runs contrary to the historical fact that Sargon's formal royal title was “king of the entire Land (LUGAL KIŠ)” and that Lugalzagesi’s own title was “king of the land.”

In another inscription of Sargon, place names were used as a substitute for “the region from the lower sea to the upper sea.” Elam, mighty opponent of Sargon, was not recorded in this inscription, because Elam was not located in “the region from the lower sea to the upper sea.”

Real historical events cannot be gleaned from the external appearance in written records. We also need to consider the phraseology of the royal inscriptions from which we verify historical facts.

Sargon of Agade borrowed the concept of kingship from Lugalzagesi, and he did not create a new or revolutionary geographical perception or concept of kingship. This dramatic change would not be realized until the reign of Naram-Sin. Sargon, like Lugalzagesi before him, was a king in the period of the regional state.

Notes

1 This is an English version revised and translated from a paper in Japanese read at the 45th meeting of the Society for Near Eastern Studies in Japan, October 26, 2003, at Kanazawa University, Kanazawa.

2 “All the mountains” seems to be the northern territory over which Rimuš had influence, because Rimuš’s vases were found at Tell Brak (RIME 2, 65: Rimuš 16; 71: Rimuš 20.43), and his mace head was also found in Assur (RIME 2, 71: Rimuš 20.42).

3 LUGAL-KIŠ held by Sargon of Agade has been discussed by many scholars. One of the recent discussions is: “The title LUGAL KIŠ is invariably translated “king of the world,” perhaps following Steinkeller’s suggestion (cf. FAOS 7, p. 64) without citing any evidence. Actually, Hallo’s well argued position (EMRT, p. 22ff) that KIŠ is the city Kish, written in archaizing fashion without KI and in old-fashioned sign forms, receives some support from the fact that the title had fallen into disuse after Lugalkinishedudu, a contemporary of Entemena of Lagash. Sargon and his sons revived it, no doubt as part of a political program” (Westenholz
ROYAL INSCRIPTIONS OF LUGALZAGESI AND SARGON

We can only grasp the meaning of lugal kiš<ki>, lugal kiški, and LUGAL KIŠ šar kiššati by understanding the different stages in the development of Mesopotamian kingship. I will set forth briefly my understanding of lugal kiš<ki>, lugal kiški, and LUGAL KIŠ šar kiššati (Maeda 1981).

Lugal kiš<ki> held by Mesilim in the period of city-states denotes “king of the city Kish.” Although Mesilim intervened in the border conflict between Lagash and Urnna in southern Mesopotamia, there is no evidence that allows us to interpret lugal-kiš<ki> as “king of regional state.” In the period of city-states, there were no political institutions unifying city-states.

Lugal kiški held by the Sumerian city-rulers denotes also “king of the city Kish.” In this case, the royal title “king of the city Kish” was a symbol for a mighty ruler who was able to or wanted to take his campaign as far as the city Kish during conflicts between city-states. Rulers used the title to flaunt their power, rather than lay claim to any real conquest. In this context, this title represented the last phase of the city-states period, and foreshadowed the period of regional state.

LUGAL KIŠ šar kiššati of Old Akkadian kings (Sargon, Rimuš, and Maništusu) denotes “king of the entire land.” This title was not a revival of the archaic style. Rather LUGAL KIŠ was newly created by Sargon in the context of rivalry with Lugalzaggesi, “king of the land (lugal kalam-ma).” The royal title LUGAL KIŠ is equivalent to lugal-kalam-ma “king of the land.”

At each stage in the development of the idea of kingship, the political meaning of LUGAL KIŠ šar kiššati varied. In the Old Babylonian period, LUGAL KIŠ šar kiššati held by northern Mesopotamian kings, Ipiq-Adad II of Eshnunna and Šamši-Adad I of Assyria, denotes king of “the world” which is equivalent to “king of the four quarters (lugal-an-ub-da-limmu2-ba/ šar kibrātim arabā’im)” (RIME 4, 546-7: Ipiq-Adad 4; 549: Ipiq-Adad 2002, 2003. RIMA 1, 48-63: Šamši-Adad 1 1, 2, 8, 12).

I assume that Sumerians in the time before the Ur III dynasty believed the sun-god Utu was the chief god of the outside of the human world. “Gilgamesh and Huwawa, A” referred to the god Utu as the lord of mountains.

“Things to do with the mountain are Utu’s concern,
Things to do with Cut-Cedar Mountain are Young Hero Utu’s concern, Utu should be informed!”

11 kur-ra dim2-ma-bi ātu-kam,
12 kur giš.erin lu₂ dim₂-ma-bi šul ātu-kam ātu ḫ₂-m-e-da-an-zu.
(Black ETCSL 1.8.1.5. “Gilgamesh and Huwawa, A” 11-12; translation cited from George 1999, 151).

The sun-god Utu is imagined on cylinder seals as a figure rising from mountains holding saw-like arms in his hand (Collon 1987, n.103, 761, and 853). I do not interpret his saw-like arms as a tool with which he cuts his way through mountains. Rather they seem to be a symbol for his brutal force. The sun is not a merciful light, but a ferocious red-hot heat in a dry land like southern Mesopotamia. I think the god Utu made monstrous creatures living in the mountains submissive with his ferocious force symbolized by his saw-like arms.

After the fall of the Akkadian Dynasty, the god Utu took on the function of protector of justice. There is no inconsistency between brutal force and the role of the protector of justice. Justice is fulfilled by punishing the sinners. The sun god Utu as the protector of justice also must destroy evildoers with his ferocious force.

5 Black, ETCSL 1.8.1.5. “Gilgamesh and Huwawa, Version A” 23-33
23 uruk₇-g₃₂ lu₂ ba-u₂ ša₂₃ ba-sig₂₃
24 lu₂ u₂-gu ba-an-de₂₃ ša₃-mu ba-an-gig
25 bad₂₃ da gu₂-g₃₂ im-ma-an-la₂
26 ad₂₄ a₂ ib₂₂-diri-ge i₂₂g im-ma-an-su
27 u₂₃₃ g₃₂-e ur₂₃-gig₂₃ nam-ba-ak-e ur₃₃-šē₂₃ ḫ₂₃-m-e-a
28 lu₂ sukud-ra₂ an-šē₂₃ nu-mu-un-da-la₂
Furthermore no one will assert under oath that to this day there is any mention in my inscriptions of a single city that I have not devastated, or wall that I have not demolished, or (rebel) land that I have not made tremble like a reed hut, or praise that I have not completely verified. Why should a singer put them in hymns? An eminent example deserves eternal fame.”

“I am a warrior whose might is enormous might. I am Shulgi, whose shadow lies over the mountain lands. I am the king, the weapon and the downfall of rebel lands. Thus I have spread far and wide my everlasting renown.”

7 Cf. Gudea Cyl. B, xviii 15-16: igi-an-ku3-ga-ke4, ne-te-ni bi2-zu “in the whole world which holy An looked out over, his (Ningirsu’s) awesomeness (ne-te-ni = ni2-te-ga2-ni) was recognized.” Cf. Edzard, RIME 3/1, p. 98: “In the face of bright heaven he showed who he was.”

8 See, Cooper 1983, 95, n. 7.

9 Cuneiform signs of female slave geme2 and male slave ir3 are formed MUNUSxKUR, and NITAxKUR respectively. According to these cuneiform signs, the distinction of civilized land and barbarous land (kur) might be traced back to the remote past.

Rulers of Lagash in the period of city-states did not record destruction (bul) of Sumerian cities in their inscriptions, though they did probably destroy Sumerian cities. They expressed battle against other Sumerian cities as “he defeated (tun3-se3--se3.)”: “the ruler of Lagash defeated the ruler of Umma (lu3 lagaš, lu3 ur3, tun3-še3 mu-se3)” (ABW I 115: Rev. I 6-II 2. For references, see Glossar ABW 337-8: TUN3,ŠE3--še3).

The reason for avoiding expressions about the destruction of Sumerian cities was derived from a belief of Sumerian rulers, namely, the destruction of a Sumerian city was a sin against the city-god, as we can see in an inscription of Urukagina, ruler of Lagash: “the ruler of Umma (a neighbor city-state of Lagash) committed a sin against Ningirsu (the city-god of Lagash), by reason that he destroyed the city Lagash. --- May Nidaba, his (Lugalzagesi’s) god, make Lugalzagesi, ruler of Umma, bear the sin (lu3 u[mm]a[k][e4], eg[ir] f[lagas]ba-hul-a-ta, nam-dag 4hin-gi2-su2-da, e-da-ak-ka-am6, ----, lugal-zu3-ge-si, ensi2 umma[ki-ka], dingir-ra-ni, 4nidaba-ke4, nam-dag-bi gu2-na 3e2-il2-il2” (ABW I 337: Ukg 16, VII 10-VIII 3, & VIII 11-IX 3).

In contrast with Sumerian cities, destruction of “barbaric” Elamite cities was recorded.

“He defeated (the ruler of) Uruk, defeated (the ruler of) Ur, defeated (the ruler of) Ki-
It is certain that the idea of center and periphery had already been conceived by the Sumerian rulers in the period of city-states.

10 The Sumerian term "to give freedom" in this inscription is usually interpreted as "to cancel obligations for people who had been conscripted for labor on the Emush-temple" (ABW II 127; Cooper 1986, 59).

I wonder if they would have expressed building a temple for a god as such hard work that people wanted to evade the work. This interpretation seems peculiar. In fact, when Gudea, ruler of Lagash, constructed the E-ninnu temple for Ningirsu, city-god of Lagash, he said, "the ruler issued orders to his city as to one single person, 'Oh, people of all districts of Lagash, be with one accord as the children of one mother.' They took tools in hand ---(ensi2 e2-ninnu du3-ra, gu3-de2-a-ar i5-gar-bi i3-u3 nu-ma-mi-ga-r)" (Gudea Cylinder A, XIII 10-11: RIME 3/1, 77).

Construction of the temple was only praised, in so far as the laborers worked joyfully. When he held the ceremony for the completion of the E-ninnu temple, Gudea proclaimed temporary manumission of slaves and remission of debt.

When his master (=Ningirsu) had entered his temple, for seven days, the female slave was allowed to be equal to her mistress, the male slave was allowed to walk side by side with his master (u4 lugal-ni e2-a ku4-ra, u4 7-ni-e3, geme2 nin-a-ni mu-da-sa3-am3, ir3-de3 lugal-e za3 mu-da-DU-am3)" (Gudea Cylinder B, XVII 18-21: RIME 3/1, 98).

"When I built for him the Eninnu, his beloved temple, I had remitted debts and purified all (sins). For seven days no grain was ground. The female slave was allowed to be equal to her mistress, the male slave was allowed to walk side by side with his master (u4 e2-ninnu, e2-ki-ag2-ga2-ni, mu-na-du3-a, ur5 mu-duq, su-su mu-lu7, u4-7-am3 še la-ba-ar3, geme2 nin-a-ni mu-da-sa3-am3, ir3-de3 lugal-ni za3 mu-da-DU-am3)" (Gudea Statue B, VII 26-33: RIME 3/1, 36).

As we saw in the Gudea text, we can interpret "to give freedom" in the Enmetena inscription as "to remit debt" on the occasion of the completion of the building of Emush-temple (Maeda 1985b, 304-305).

11 We can reconstruct the family tree of II on the basis of the inscriptions of II and Giššakidu (ABW II, 267: II 1; 268: Giš 1).

```
En-a2-kal-le
  ||
Ur-Lum-ma   E2-an-da-mu2-a
  |     ||
I2
Bara2-ir-nun = Gišša3-ki-du10
```

12 For example: "Eannatum, ruler of Lagash [=royal title], nominated by Enlil, granted strength by Ningirsu, chosen in her heart by Nanshe, nourished with special milk by Ninhursag, given a fine name by Inanna, granted wisdom by Enki, beloved by Dumuziabzu, trusted by Hendursag, beloved friend of Lugal-URUxKAR2 [=epithets], son of Akurgal, ruler of Lagash"
There is proof that Nidaba was the personal god of Lugalzagesi. Urukagina, king of the city Lagash, a neighborhood city of Umma, said: “May Nidaba, his (Lugalzagesi’s) god, make Lugalzagesi, ruler of Umma, bear the sin (lugal-za3-ge-si, ensi2 umma-ka, dingir-ra-ni dnidaba-ke4 nam-dag-bi gurna be2-i12-ih),’ (ABW I, 337: vii II-viii 3). Lugalzagesi bore a sin, “because he destroyed Lagash, he committed a sin against Ningirsu (city-god of Lagash) (egir lagas-ki, ba-bul-a-ta, nam-dag, dnin-gir2-su-da, e-da-ak-ka-am6)” (ABW I 337: vii 11-viii 3).

It is worth noting that Urukagina did not ask Shara, the city-god of Umma, nor Ningirsu, the city-god of Lagash, to make Lugalzagesi bear the sin which was committed against the god Ningirsu. The city-god Shara does not take responsibility for Lugalzagesi, the subject ruler of his city, rather Lugalzagesi’s personal god Nidaba does. The city-god had an absolute status.

A personal god acted for the sake of the person. Enmetena asked his personal god Shulutula to pray for him:

“For Enmetena, who built the E-Adda temple (for Enlil). May Shulutula, his personal god pray to Enlil for the life of Enmetena forever, en-me-te-na lu2-c2-ad-da du3-a, dingir-ra-ni dulu­tuli12 nam-ti en-me-te-na-ka-še1 4en-li2-la kiri3 šu še2-na-gal2” (AWB I 213: Ent 1, iv 2-10).

Lugalzagesi placed his personal god Nidaba in the row of chief deities of Sumer in the first lines of this inscription. But, in the period before him, that is, in the period of city-states, the names of personal gods were never placed in the row of great deities. In Lagash, the name of personal god was usually written along with the name of ruler in the last part of the inscription as cited above (Maeda 1992b). Personal gods were never mentioned as a member of the great deities. Lugalzagesi changed the status of his personal god from a minor, private deity to a member of the great deities.

Another change in personal gods as they related to rulers was that the ruler designated himself as son of his personal god. Lugalzagesi was “the son born of Nidaba” (I 26-27).

In the period of city-states, no ruler of Lagash proclaimed he was “son born” of his personal god (Kobayashi 1995, 152). However, he designated himself as “son born of Lugal-URUXKAR2,” “son born of Gatumdu,” or “son born of Bau” (Glossar ABW 90). The god Lugal-URUXKAR2 was chief god of the city URUXKAR2, Gatumdu was chief goddess of the city Lagash, and Bau was a consort of city-god Ningirusu. By indicating themselves as sons of great deities, rulers of Lagash praised their noble lineage.

Lugalzagesi extended his kingship from the ruler of the city state to the overlord. The status of his personal god also rose in the divine world.

While the status of personal gods changed, the status of city-gods never changed. The city god was master or lord of the city and city ruler, and the ruler was a servant of the city-god. Even though a king gained the status of overlord, he addressed deities as “his master/ mistress (lugal/nin-a-ni)” in each city. He still recognized his relationship to the city-god as that of master and obedient servant. This never changed in the time from the Early Dynastic Period to the III Dynasty of Ur Period.

Steinkeller assumes that Lugalzagesi was a native of the city Eresh, because his personal god Nidaba was the city-god of Eresh (Steinkeller 2003, 621-37), namely Lugalzagesi made Nidaba, the city-god of Eresh, his personal god. However, I cannot agree with his conclusion. We need to acknowledge that there was an insurmountable barrier between the superior city-gods and the inferior personal gods of rulers.

Steinkeller’s idea that Nidaba was the personal god of Lugalzagesi and also city-god of the city Eresh, seems to be the same line of reasoning used for the identification of the god Nergal, the chief deity of Mashkan-shapir as the personal god of Kudur-mabuk and his sons, Warad-Sin and Rim-Sin (Steinkeller 2004, 32). In the Old Babylonian period rulers were probably allowed
to select their personal god from the major deities or city-gods, though there is room to assume that Kudur-mabuk selected Nergal, a chthonic deity, not the city-god of Mashkan-shapir, just as rulers of Lagash in the third millennium B.C. tended to select chthonic deities (*nin-a-zu, *nin-igi2-zi-da, *dmes-an-du) for their personal god (Kobayashi 1989; 1995).

Furthermore, the inscription continued:

"And from the lower sea <to the Akkadian region> (namely, the Sumerian country), 'citizens of Agade' held the ensi-ship (U3 [a-ab]-ba, [sig-sig]-ta, [dumu-dumu], [ag-ga-de3ki], [n[am-ensi2]], mu 'kin(?)'5[x])" (RIME 2, 11-12: Sargon 2, 74-80).

This phrase is regarded as evidence for Sargon's direct control of the Sumerian city-states. However, I am skeptical about such direct control as Sargon sending Akkadian governors to Sumerian city-states. It seems to me that the crux of this problem lies in understanding dumu-dumu a-ga-de3ki. Another reference to dumu-dumu a-ga-de3ki appeared in the Manishtushu obelisk (Gelb 1991, n.40).

"Sum total: 49 persons, dumu-dumu of Agade, the witnesses of land (šu-nigin2 49 dumu-dumu a-ga-de3ki AB+AS2-AB+AS2-gan2)."

The group of dumu-dumu a-ga-de3ki consisted of a son of the king's brother and 48 other persons. They were witnesses for Manishutushu's purchase of land. In the group of dumu-dumu a-ga-de3ki, there are sons of highly placed functionaries, such as the king's brother (šēš-lugal), chief scribe (um-mi-a dub-sar), chief messenger (gal-sukkal), major-domo of royal house (šabr-e2), general (šagina). These high ranked people are undoubtedly considered the citizens of Agade. However, there was another type of person who was referred to as son of city-ruler.


We cannot confirm that the people were citizens of Agade, because at least Uruka-gi-na, son of Engil, the ruler of Lagash is not Akkadian. Uruka-gi-na and Engil are Sumerian personal names. Uruka-gi-na was assumed to be one and the same person who ruled Lagash and was defeated by Lugalzagesi of Umma. Though this identification is not yet confirmed, it is possible that Uruka-gi-na, son of Engil, was of Sumerian lineage in Lagash, and a descendant possible from noble Lagashaite. Other city-rulers in the group of dumu-dumu a-ga-de3ki, the ruler of the Sumerian city Umma, ruler of the Akkadian city Sippar, and ruler of the Elamite city Basime, also seem to be natives of these cities, not citizens of Agade.

The two terms, dumu a-ga-de3ki and dumu-dumu a-ga-de3ki are probably not the same. Although dumu a-ga-de3ki denotes certainly "native (citizen)" of Agade, dumu-dumu a-ga-de3ki does not mean lineage, but denote another category.

Pomponio and Visicato said that dumu-dumu in Fara texts has the meaning of "dependent" (Pomponio & Visicato 1994, 63). According to this, dumu-dumu should denote in general subordinate persons who were enrolled in royal organizations for administrative, economic, and military services.

Dumu-dumu a-ga-de3ki referred to in the Manishtushu obelisk were not from lower class, but higher ranked persons. I assume that they were in fact subjects of the Akkadian king, but they became members of the central organization of the Akkadian ruling system. Also I assume that rulers of Sumerian cities, Umma and Lagash, a ruler of the Elamite city Bshime, and a ruler of Sippar, were part of a pro-Akkadian ruling class in each city, and they governed each city and also either they or their relatives carried on activities in the central government. They bridged the gap between the ruling center and subject cities.

Sargon said in his inscription that dumu-dumu of Agade held the ensi-ship in Sumer.
understand that some Sumerian city-states, but not all of them, were under the direct control by Akkadians. Rather after he defeated Sumerian city-states, Sargon authorized the pro-Agade ruling class of Sumerian cities to govern these Sumerian cities. It seems to me that the Akkadian dynasty could not build a centralized bureaucratic administration covering all the kingdom.


16 Black, ETCSL 1.8.2.4. “Enmerkar and Ensunhgerana” 275-282:

275 en-me-er-kar₂-ra lu₂ mu-un-ši-in-gi₄-gi₄
276 za-e-me-en en ki ag₂₂₄ inanna-me-en dili-zi-ne maḥ-me-en
277 4:inanna-ke₄ ur₂₂ ku₃-ga-ni-še₃ zì-de₃-eš mu-un-pa₄-de₃-en ki-ра₂₂₄-ga₄₂⁻ni-me-en
278 sig-ta igi-nim-še₃ en ga₂₂-e en ga₂₂-e us₂₂-sa-zu-me-en
279 a ri-a-ta gaba-ri-zu mu-me-en šeš-gal za-e-me-en
280 ga₂₂-e nu-mu-da-sa₂₂-e-en u₄-da-r₄₂-še₃
281 en-me-er-kar₂ en-suḥ-keš₃/di₄₁-an-na a-da-min₃ du₁₁₂-ga
282 en-me-er-kar₂ en-suḥ-keš₃/di₄₁-an-na di-ri-ga-a-ba

17 Black, ETCSL 5.3.3. “The Debate between Winter and Summer” 304-317:

304 4:en-lılı₂-le e₂₂-m-eš en-te-en-bi-da mu-ne-ne-in-gi₄-gi₄
305 a zi-sa₃-ga₂₂₄ kur-kur-ra-ka en-te-en ku₃-gal₂₂-bi-im
306 engar dingir-re-e-ne-ke₄ ni₄₂₄-nam mu-un-na-gar-gar
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