

“KING OF KISH” IN PRE-SARGONIC SUMER*

TOHRU MAEDA

Waseda University

1 The title “king of Kish (lugal-kiš^{ki}),” which was held by Sumerian rulers, seems to be regarded as holding hegemony over Sumer and Akkad. W. W. Hallo said, “There is, moreover, some evidence that at the very beginning of dynastic times, lower Mesopotamia did enjoy a measure of unity under the hegemony of Kish,” and “long after Kish had ceased to be the seat of kingship, the title was employed to express hegemony over Sumer and Akkad and ultimately came to signify or symbolize imperial, even universal, dominion.”⁽¹⁾ I. J. Gelb held similar views.⁽²⁾ The problem in question is divided into two points: 1) the hegemony of the city of Kish in early times, 2) the title “king of Kish” held by Sumerian rulers in later times. Even earlier, T. Jacobsen had largely expressed the same opinion, although his opinion differed in some detail from Hallo’s.⁽³⁾ Hallo described Kish’s hegemony as the authority which maintained harmony between the cities of Sumer and Akkad in the First Early Dynastic period (“the Golden Age”). On the other hand, Jacobsen advocated that it was the kingship of Kish that brought about the breakdown of the older “primitive democracy” in the First Early Dynastic period and lead to the new pattern of rule, “primitive monarchy.”

Hallo seems to suggest that the Early Dynastic I period was not the period of a primitive community in which the “primitive democracy” was realized, but was the period of class society in which kingship or political power had already been formed.

It seems to me that the difference in opinion about the hegemony of Kish arose from a difference in their historical perspective about this Sumerian period, not from their analysis of historical source materials.

The evidence which Hallo and Jacobsen cited concerning the hegemony of the city of Kish in early times was from epic, myth, and the Sumerian King List. These scholars accepted as fact the First Dynasty of Kish after the Deluge as recorded in the Sumerian King List, and subsequently based their concept of Kish’s hegemony on this. However, these are not original source materials

of history.

The Sumerian King List was composed after the Ur III Dynasty, when all lands were unified. The King List embodied the idea of the unity of the whole land under a single sovereignty. The actual emergence of the empire, the Akkadian Dynasty or the Ur III Dynasty, in fact lead to the development of idea of unity. The cities which the King List named as holding kingship were not only Sumerian cities, but also cities in Elam and Syria. The period when these regions united politically and economically with Sumer must have been after the Akkadian Dynasty came in.

Probably because the King List was composed relatively late, contents of the latter half of the King List can be assumed to be reliable since it coincides with other original materials, but the first half, the Early Dynastic period, is unreliable. Among the rulers before the time of King Sargon in the King List, only the real existence of a few rulers can be confirmed by examination of royal inscriptions. These are Enmebaragesi=Mebarasi of Kish, Mesannepada of Ur, Enshakushanna of Uruk, and Lugalzagesi of Uruk. It seems to me that the number of rulers is too small. I will cite here another "king list" called "the rulers of Lagash."⁽⁴⁾ The existence of only a few rulers named in this list are confirmed by other royal inscriptions: 16 ur-^dnanše, 17 an-né-túm (=é-an-na-túm), 19 en-en-tar-zi, 34 ur-^dnin-gír-su, 35 ur-^dba-ú, and 36 gù-dé-a. However, their family relationship and regnal year are not correct at all. The reason for the unreliability of the list can be attributed to the fact that its contents had been transmitted orally.

Similarly, the first part of the Sumerian King List may also have been based on the oral tradition. A. Westenholz said, "It would seem to me, however, that at least the earlier sections of the King List rest on oral traditions of the same sort as the sages, to which the King List occasionally refers, rather than on some (hypothetical) lists of dynasties or year dates."⁽⁵⁾ Therefore, we must reevaluate H. G. Güterbock's idea: "Diese beiden Herrscher (e. g. Lugalzagesi and Sargon) stehen auf der Grenze, denn einerseits beginnt ungefähr mit ihnen der zweite, historisch zuverlässige Teil der Liste, andererseits gehört gerade das, was sie von Sargon berichtet, durchaus der Sage an,"⁽⁶⁾ and "Ungefähr mit Sargon erreicht die Tradition historischen Boden. Während die Gestalten der vorhergehenden Zeit alle mehr oder weniger schattenhaft sind und nur aus der Mythologie einiges Leben erhalten, werden von den Königen von Akkad Einzelheiten berichtet wie Kriegszüge, Revolten u. ä., die

durchaus einer historisch-politischen Wirklichkeit angehören."⁽⁷⁾

We must be more careful in interpreting historical facts in the Sumerian King List. We, moreover, need to think of the Sumerian King List as one of the pseudo-historical texts and the King List must be studied in comparison with other pseudo-historical and "historiographic"⁽⁸⁾ texts, that is, Tummal Inscriptions, historical omen texts, and chronicles, in which people from the Isin-Larsa period onward expressed their idea of history.

Contrary to Hallo and Jacobsen, D. O. Edzard proposed another view: "N'était-ce pas plutôt un empire archaïque construit dans le bureau de l'historien? Voici un essai de solution plus simple que celui de l'empire-fantôme: quand un babylonien du sud s'appelait "roi de Kiš", cela voulait dire que Kiš était à lui. Or, qu'est-ce que veut dire Kiš? C'était le nord de la Babylonie, région vague, avec, comme ville principale, mais pas forcément capitale, Kiš. C'était, peut-être, ce qu'on appellera *māt Akkadim*. — De toute façon, il vaudrait mieux laisser tomber l'idée d'un empire bien organisé, ce qui serait un anachronisme. Les rois d'Accad s'exerceront à réaliser cette tâche et seulement les rois d'Ur III s'approcheront d'une solution."⁽⁹⁾

While the existence of Kish's hegemony in early times seems to have no confirmation in fact, Edzard's view is quite worthy of consideration.

In this paper, I will not study Kish's hegemony in early times, which is obscured from lack of source materials, but rather will study the "king of Kish" which Sumerian rulers held, by examining original source materials of history, such as royal inscriptions and administrative documents.

2 The Sumerian rulers who held the title "king of Kish" are Mesanepada of Ur and Lugalkiginnedudu of Uruk.⁽¹⁰⁾ Eannatum of Lagash was also given the title by the goddess Inanna.⁽¹¹⁾ Only one inscription of Lugaltarsi was unearthed. The tablet was dedicated to the god An and the goddess Inanna.⁽¹²⁾ The fact that the two deities were worshipped in Uruk suggests that Lugaltarsi may also have been a ruler of Uruk. Mesilim's inscriptions were unearthed in Lagash and Adab, but his capital is still not known. Therefore, it is not clear whether he was a ruler of some Sumerian city or a ruler of Kish itself.

What are the dates in the Early Dynastic period in which these five rulers reigned?

Mesilim is contemporaneous with Lugalsaengur, who is dated some generations before Urnanshe of Lagash.⁽¹³⁾

Eannatum is the grandchild of Urnanshe of Lagash.⁽¹⁴⁾

Concerning the date of Mesannepada of Ur, Jacobsen, in an early paper, set him two generations before Urnanshe.⁽¹⁵⁾ This date is accepted by many scholars.⁽¹⁶⁾ However, in a later paper, Jacobsen assumed that Aannepada and Eannatum were approximately contemporaneous, based on Aannepada's orthography.⁽¹⁷⁾ There seem to be good grounds for accepting this date, and it is the one I support. Mesannepada, father of Aannepada, therefore, may be a near contemporary of Urnanshe, grandfather of Eannatum.

Lugalkiginnedudu was identical to Lugalkinshedudu, who was named in an inscription of Entemena of Lagash.⁽¹⁸⁾ The two writings of the personal name arose from a difference in orthography between northern and southern Sumer. Therefore, Lugalkiginnedudu is the same generation as Entemena, a great-grandchild of Urnanshe.

Lugaltarsi seems to be the same generation as or before Urnanshe, because in his inscription the determinative -ki is not written.⁽¹⁹⁾

Urnanshe's reign itself stands on the border between Early Dynastic IIIa and Early Dynastic IIIb. Since the other four rulers, with the exception of Mesilim, were contemporaneous with or followed Urnanshe, their reigns must have been concentrated in the first half of the Early Dynastic IIIb period.

ED IIIa	—2		Mesilim?
	—1		
	0	Urnanshe	Lugaltarsi?
ED IIIb	1		Mesannepada
	2		Eannatum
	3		Lugalkiginnedudu

3 Appearance of "king of Kish," which was held by Sumerian rulers, was concentrated in the first half of the Early Dynastic IIIb period. In this section, I will consider to what stage the royal title had developed in the first half of the Early Dynastic IIIb period.

The title befitting overlord of all the land are appropriately "king of the four quarters (lugal-an-ub-da-limmú-ba)," "king of Sumer and Akkad (lugal-ki-en-gi-ki-uri)," and "king of the Land (=Sumer) (lugal-kalam-ma)."

Naramsin of Akkad and Shulgi of Ur, who took the title "king of the four

quarters," expanded their sphere of influence from the east coast of the Mediterranean in the west to Elam in the east. The title "king of the four quarters" was suitable for the ruler of this expanded domain.

Urnammu of Ur who founded the Dynasty, proclaimed the reunification of Sumer and Akkad with his title "king of Sumer and Akkad." Many rulers of the Isin-Larsa Dynasties held the same title. This may be a result of the Akkad region winning a socio-economic advantage over Sumer. These royal titles thus paralleled the development of political institutions.

The first title befitting overlord of all the land of Sumer was "king of the Land," later succeeded by the titles "king of the four quarters" and "king of Sumer and Akkad." This first title was taken by Enshakushanna and Lugalzagesi.

Jacobsen notes in his *The Sumerian King List*, that Enshakushanna ruled before Lugalkiginnedudu. However, all copies of this part of the List were damaged heavily, and the order in which the dynasty appears is different for each copy unearthed in Susa, Nippur, and Larsa respectively.⁽²⁰⁾ Consequently, it is difficult to decide if Jacobsen's placement of Enshakushanna is accurate or not, based only on the Sumerian King List.

M. B. Rowton said, "As pointed out to me by Professor I. J. Gelb, the script of a text which dated to Enshakushanna by the oldest known year-name is very close to the Sargonic script. It therefore supports a date for Enshakushanna not long before Lugalzagesi."⁽²¹⁾ Another scholar, A. Westenholz also said, "From internal evidence it would further seem that the great majority of these texts were written within the span of one generation, and that consequently, the distance in time between Enšakušanna and Sargon was one generation's time, or some 40 years. The chief evidence for this comes from *TMH* V 81, dated to Enšakušanna, and *TMH* V 84, which mentions offerings made for Sargon on the New Moon festival. Both texts are accounts of oxen, and both mention a person with the rather unusual name Ur-ra-ni as the responsible official. It follows, then, that this person served under both Enšakušanna and Sargon."⁽²²⁾

Texts are as follows:⁽²³⁾

- i *TMH* V 81: 42 gu₄ ur-ra-ni an-da-ŠE dub an-da-bal-a an-ta-IGI.GAR
itu-du₆[-kù] mu en-š[à-kúš-an-na] ag-¹ga¹-dè^[ki] tùn-šè bí-¹si-ga¹ —
"42 oxen, Urrani fattened them, he inspected them with the tablet taken
over. Month of Duku, year when Enshakushanna ¹defeated Akkad.¹
—"

ii *TMH* V 84: < > gu₄ ki ur-ra-ni-ta 10 udu ki a-gír-gal-ta nidba sar-um-GI sag-ITU-SAR itu-du₆-kù ab-kú

“(one?) ox from Urrani, 10 sheep from Agirgal, Offerings of Sargon, New Moon, month of Duku, Food offering.”

Agirgal also appeared in *TMH* V 86. The text is similar to *TMH* V 84, and is dated as mu URU.A^{ki} ħul-a “year when the city of Urua was defeated.” This year-date is one of Sargon’s reign. Cf. mu sar-um-GI-né URU.A^{ki} mu-ħul-a “year when Sargon defeated the city of Urua” (*TMH* V 181).

A food offering for Sargon was made during his lifetime. Therefore, Urrani actually served during Sargon’s reign.

Westenholz assumes that 40 years was the length of the reigns of Enshakushanna, Lugalkiginnedudu, Lugalkisalsi, Lugalzagesi and Sargon. However, if we compare the length of a person’s service in a profession in Ur III period, 40 years seems to be too long for one person to be engaged in the same profession. But, it is also too short for the duration of the reigns of five rulers.

In the administrative document of Nippur, the year-name of Enshakushanna, Lugalzagesi, and Sargon appear.⁽²⁴⁾ Lugalkisalsi, the king of Uruk, is mentioned in *TMH* V 140, but Lugalkiginnedudu does not appear. The script of Enshakushanna’s text is close to the Sargonic script. Therefore, I assume the order of their reigns was as follows: Lugalkiginnedudu, Lugalkisalsi, Enshakushanna, Lugalzagesi, and Sargon. The duration of the period when the latter three rulers governed all Sumer seems to be short, totalling some 30 years or so.

After the reigns of Lugalkiginnedudu and his son Lugalkisalsi, the family no longer ascended to the throne of Uruk. We know of two sons and a daughter of Lugalkisalsi; Meskalamsi, Lugalbarasi, and Megirimta.⁽²⁵⁾ There is no proof that Meskalamsi was enthroned in Uruk.⁽²⁶⁾ Munihursag, the husband of Megirimta appeared with no title. He was not a king.⁽²⁷⁾ About Lugalbarasi:

sá-tam dumu lugal-bará-si dumu lugal-kisal-si lugal-unu^{ki} sá-tam <ki>-ág girim-si ensí (!) unu^{ki}

“Satam, the son of Lugalbarasi (no title), the son of Lugalkisalsi, the king of Uruk. Satam who was beloved by Girimsi, govenour of Uruk.”⁽²⁸⁾

Lugalbarasi and Satam were never enthroned, but could merely boast about their Lugalkisalsi family lineage.

After the reign of Lugalkisalsi, Enshakushanna, the son of Elilin, who did

not have a title as king in the inscription,⁽²⁹⁾ sat on the throne of Uruk, and besieged Kish and Akkad.⁽³⁰⁾ Lugalzagesi from Umma followed Enshakushanna as the ruler of Uruk, and was defeated by Sargon of Akkad.

The title "king of the Land" which was held by Enshakushanna and Lugalzagesi appeared at the very end of the Early Dynastic period.

Before the title "king of the Land" was used, Sumerian rulers' titles were formed regularly in the following way: "king (lugal) + city name." Lugal-kiginnedudu and Lugalkisalsi took the title "the king of Uruk (and) the king of Ur,"⁽³¹⁾ but they did not create a new title appropriate to the rank of a regional ruler. With the appearance of the title "king of the Land", it becomes clear that there had been a shift in the role of the king from a ruler over an independent city-state to a king governing all Sumer.

"King of Kish" also follows the pattern "king + city name". There is no deviation in the pattern from other titles of city rulers. The title "king of Kish" parallels the stage in the development of the kingship as sovereign an individual city-state, rather than over all of Sumer.

4 In this section, I will describe some characteristic features of the "king of Kish" as noted in their royal inscriptions, and compare these to those of "king of the Land" as the title of overlord of Sumer.

(i) Goddess Inanna had a close relationship to the "king of Kish".

Eannatum was given the title by goddess Inanna.

é-an-na-túm ensí lagaš^{ki}-ra ^dinanna ki-an-na-ág-gá-da nam-ensí-lagaš^{ki}-ta
nam-lugal-kiš^{ki} mu-na-ta-sum

"To Eannatum, the ruler of Lagash, Inanna gave the kingship of Kish in addition to ensi-ship of Lagash, because she loved him."⁽³²⁾

Lugalkiginnedudu as "king of Kish" appeared in an inscription which was dedicated to the god An and the goddess Inanna.

an lugal-kur-kur-ra ^dinanna nin-é-an-na-ra lugal-ki-gin-né-du₇-du₇ lugal-
kiš^{ki} u₄ ^dinanna-ke₄ lugal-ki-gin-né-du₇-du₇-ra nam-en nam-lugal-da
e-na-da-tab-ba-a unu^{ki}-ga nam-en mu-ak-k[e₄] urí^{ki}-ma nam-lugal
mu-ak [-ke₄]

"For An, king of all the lands, and for Inanna, mistress of Eanna. Lugal-kiginnedudu, the king of Kish. When Inana gave to Lugalkiginnedudu en-ship in addition to kingship, she allowed him to exercise en-ship in Uruk, and she allowed him to exercise kingship in Ur, —"⁽³³⁾

The feature that the “king of Kish” was named especially is shown more clearly by comparing it with a similar text which was dedicated to the god Enlil, and in which “king of Kish” did not appear.

^den-líl lugal-kur-kur-ke₄ lugal-ki-gin-né-du₇-du₇-ra u₄ ^den-líl-le gù-zi e-na-dé-a nam-en nam-lugal-da e-na-da-tab-ba-a unu^{ki}-ga nam-en mu-ak-ke₄ urí^{ki}-ma nam-lugal mu-ak-ke₄

“Enlil, king of all the lands, to Lugalkiginnedudu; When Enlil told him honestly, he gave to him en-ship in addition to kingship, (and) he allowed him to exercise en-ship in Uruk and he allowed him to exercise kingship in Ur, —”(34)

Lugaltarsi was called “king of Kish.” His title also seems to be related to his dedication of an inscription in which his title is named, to the god An and the goddess Inanna, similar to the case of Lugalkiginnedudu.

an lugal-kur-kur-ra ^dinanna nin-^dINANNA-ra lugal-tar-si lugal-kiš bàd-kisal mu-na-dù

“For An, king of all the lands, and for Inanna, mistress of —, Lugaltarsi, king of Kish, built the wall of the courtyard.”(35)

A cylinder seal of Mesannepada bears the inscription:

mes-an-né-pà-da lugal-kiš^{ki} dam-nu-gig

“Mesannepada, the king of Kish, the spouse of nu-gig.”(36)

The nu-gig is undoubtedly identified as the goddess Inanna if we look at the nu-gig who appeared in the Sumerian Flood Story: “Badtibira, he gave to the nu-gig (=goddess Inanna).”(37)

Eannatum also had an epithet, “lovely spouse of goddess Inanna (dam-ki-ág-^dinanna).”(38) This epithet is apparently connected with his title “king of Kish.”

Therefore, in all cases, “king of Kish” when held by Sumerian rulers had a close relationship to the goddess Inanna, but not to the god Enlil, the chief god of Sumer. This relationship between the “king of Kish” and Inanna stands in contrast to the kingship of the Land given by the god Enlil to Lugalzagesi.

Westenholz hypothesized that “the concept of a king of all Babylonia was an ancient one, based on the role of Enlil as the bestower of kingship. Presumably, any ruler who aspired to the prestigious title variously known as “king of Kish” or “king of the Land” had to be officially recognized and enthroned in Nippur.”(39)

The god Enlil had already been acknowledged the overlord of all the lands since the time of Eannatum.⁽⁴⁰⁾ Lugalzagesi said of himself:

lugal-zà-ge-si lugal-unu^{ki}-ga lugal-kalam-ma KIN-KIN-KA ʾen-líl
lugal [-na] nibru^{ki} [-a] nidba-ke₄ e-na-gíd

"Lugalzagesi, the king of Uruk, the king of the Land, brought food-offering for the meal of Enlil, (his) king, in Nippur."⁽⁴¹⁾

The god Enlil of Nippur, the lord of all the lands, transferred his sovereignty to the human rulers with the title "king of the Land." But I cannot decide whether they were enthroned at Nippur or not. Furthermore, since the "king of Kish" had a close relationship to the goddess Inanna, and not to the god Enlil, it is very doubtful that the king of Kish had to be officially recognized and enthroned in Nippur. Lugalkiginnedudu dedicated his inscription to the god Enlil of Nippur. However, he did not take the title "king of Kish" in this inscription, while conversely he had taken the title in the inscription which was dedicated to the goddess Inanna. We must consider the contrast between "king of Kish" and "king of the Land."

(ii) We have only a small number of inscriptions in which Sumerian rulers declared themselves the "king of Kish." For example, we can cite only one instance of "king of Kish" of Eannatum, in an examination of his many inscriptions. So far we have found that each Sumerian ruler had only one inscription in which he took the title "king of Kish." This is in sharp contrast with other titles, such as "king of Ur" and "king of Uruk," which the rulers continually used.

Mesilim continually held the title "king of Kish". This is in contrast to other Sumerian rulers who held the title only when there was occasion to. Mesilim's "king of Kish" had no relationship to the goddess Inanna. Judging from this, the "king of Kish" held by Mesilim should not be regarded as belonging to the same group of "king of Kish" which other Sumerian rulers held. The title "king of Kish" which Mesilim held was possibly the title of his own city, in the same way other Sumerian rulers held the titles of their own cities. Thus, Mesilim's capital would have been the city of Kish.

The titles befitting the overlord, such as "king of the Land", "king of the four quarters," and "king of Sumer and Akkad," appeared along with the title "king of his own city=capital." Lugalzagesi took the royal titles: lugal-unu^{ki}-ga lugal-kalam-ma "the king of Uruk (=his capital), the king of the

Land (=the title of the overlord).”(42) The attending titles manifested the political ideology or institution of the power of the regional state or empire being centralized in the capital. However, “king of Kish” appeared alone, and was not used with a ruler’s own city titles.

There were few case in which the Sumerian rulers declared themselves the “king of Kish.” Furthermore, according to the study in (i) of this section, the title, except in the case of Mesilim, had a close relationship to the goddess Inanna. We can assume from this that the title “king of Kish”, with the exception of its use by Mesilim, was something like an honorary royal title, or a mark of a ruler’s own personal greatness, not a mark of his real control of city-states. Personal greatness was acquired when one had entered into a relationship with Inanna as “the spouse of the goddess Inanna (dam-^dinanna).” However, I do not have any material upon which to make a decision about the principal function of the goddess Inanna in her relationship to the “king of Kish.” I do not know whether her function was that of chief goddess of the city of Uruk, or that of the battle goddess.(43)

(iii) We have scarcely any knowledge of the rulers’ political acts. In only the case of Eannatum do we have any material about the political activities of a ruler who held the title “king of Kish.”

Even Poebel’s and Jacobsen’s study is not a persuasive argument for the chronology of events of Eannatum’s reign.(44) The survey of royal inscriptions has not yet made clear whether the events described in inscriptions were in the order in which they actually occurred. We must keep in mind that the royal inscriptions were written as if they were “literary compositions”, for the purpose of glorifying the greatness of the ruler, rather than as “chronicles” recording actual events occurring in the course of time. For example, in the inscription of Eannatum similar phrases appear:

an-ta-sur-ra-^dnin-gír-su-ka-ta zu-zu lugal akšak^{ki} akšak^{ki}-šè mu-gaz
mu-ḥa-lam

“He (Eannatum) defeated Zuzu, the king of Akshak, from the Antasurra of Ningirsu up to Akshak and destroyed him.”

lugal-akšak^{ki} kur-ra-na bé-gi₄

“The king of Akshak ran back to his land.”

kiš^{ki} akšak^{ki} ma-rí^{ki} an-ta-sur-ra-^dnin-gír-su-ta tùn-šè bé-sì

“He defeated Kish, Akshak, and Mari from the Antasurra of Ningirsu.”(45)

These phrases seem to be a repetition of the same event, that is, the battle against the cities of the north-west country which Zuzu, the king of Akshak, took control of.

We must be more careful in interpreting the chronology of events in the royal inscriptions. We need to study the royal inscriptions as self-contained units with their own internal integrity, rather than as a recording of real, external events.

Royal titles and epithets are particularly important in the study of royal inscriptions, because they express and emphasize various aspects of the ruler's role and function. It seems to me that the titles have a close relationship to the events which appear before and after the titles in the inscription. For example, in a few of his inscriptions, Sargon, as the king of Akkad, fought against the Sumerian cities Uruk, Ur, Umma, and Lagash. After he had defeated the Sumerian cities, he proclaimed himself the king of the Land.⁽⁴⁶⁾ In these inscriptions, Sargon held the titles "king of Akkad" and "king of the Land." Nonetheless, he continued to use the title "king of Kish" as did his successors Rimush and Manishtusu. Though Sargon usually had the title "king of Kish," in the inscriptions under discussion here, he selected the title "king of the Land" in order to emphasize that he had defeated and conquered Sumerian cities.

In these inscriptions, Lugalzagesi, who was defeated by Sargon, was purposely not called by the title "king of the Land," but named only the "king of Uruk (lugal-unu^{ki}-ga)" or "the lord of Uruk and the king of Ur (EN KI-UNU^{KI} LUGAL KI-UR^{ki})."⁽⁴⁷⁾ The two titles befit the ruler of city-states and are rather inferior titles compared to the title "king of the Land". Though the use of the title "lord of Uruk and king of Ur" carried back to the time of Lugalkisalsi, and was perhaps the traditional title for kings of Uruk, Lugalzagesi never used the title in his own inscriptions. This is a good example of when an inscription does not reflect historical facts, but rather reflects the personal viewpoint of the author.

I will cite the inscription of Eannatum which is concerned with the title "king of Kish."

é-an-na-túm ensí-[lagaš^{ki}]-ra ʹinanna-ke₄ ki-an-na-ág-gá-da nam-ensí-lagaš^{ki}-ta nam-[lugal]-kiš^{ki} mu-na-ta-sum

é-an-na-túm-da NIM sag e-da_x-sìg NIM kur-ra-na bé-gi₄ kiš^{ki} e-da_x-sìg lugal-akšak^{ki} kur-ra-na bé-gi₄

"To Eannatum, the ruler of Lagash, Inanna gave the kingship of Kish,

in addition to the ensi-ship of Lagash, because she loved him.

Elam trembled with fear of Eannatum (who had been given the kingship of Kish), (and) the Elamites ran back to their land. Kish trembled with fear (of Eannatum, and) the king of Akshak ran back to his land.”⁽⁴⁸⁾

Since Eannatum declared himself the ruler who had been given the kingship of Kish, he had the power to defeat Elam and Kish. The title “king of Kish,” thus, was a symbol of his power to overwhelm the enemy lands.

On the other hand, Lugalzagesi wrote about himself.

u₄ ^den-líl lugal-kur-kur-ra-ke₄ lugal-zà-ge-si nam-lugal-kalam-ma e-na-sum-ma-a igi-kalam-ma-ke₄ si e-na-sá-a kur-kur gir-na e-né-si-sì-ga-a utu-é-ta utu-šú-šè gú e-na-gar-ra-a

“When Enlil, the king of all the lands, gave the kingship of the Land to Lugalzagesi, he justified “eyes” of the Land; he made all the lands throw themselves at his feet; from the rising of the sun to the setting of the sun, he made them prostrate before him.”⁽⁴⁹⁾

We do not know whether Lugalzagesi was actually ruler of what is described as the land from the rising of the sun to the setting of the sun. However, he proclaimed himself “king of the Land,” including the Sumerian land itself, just the same.

Eannatum as the king of Kish did not proclaim his sovereignty of all Sumer, but only proclaimed his great power over the enemy lands. The title “king of Kish”, thus, characterized a mighty ruler who was able to defeat the enemy lands.

5 I will summarize the three points in which the title “king of Kish” held by Sumerian rulers stands in contrast to the title “king of the Land.” (1) There are few instances of “king of Kish” appearing in Sumerian rulers’ inscriptions. (2) The instances when it does appear are in inscriptions whose contents have some connection with the goddess Inanna. But it is still unknown what the religious and political role and function was of the relationship between “king of Kish” and the goddess Inanna. (3) Furthermore, the “king of Kish” was characterized as the mighty ruler who was able to defeat the people in enemy lands.

I wish to suggest, as Edzard has already done,⁽⁵⁰⁾ that the title “king of Kish” shows that the ruler is a mighty one who is able to or wants to take his campaign even to Kish. Kish had been a strong city ever since the Early

Dynastic IIIa period, as revealed by the activities of Mesilim, the king of Kish. It is not certain whether the Sumerian rulers actually did conquer the city of Kish or not. But we can say with certainty that the "Kish" in the title "king of Kish" designated the city of Kish itself. The title "king of Kish" did not designate the overlord of Sumer and Akkad. In fact, there are no materials that prove that the Sumerian rulers who held the title "king of Kish" ever reigned over all Sumer. On the contrary, when a ruler actually did have control over a great part of Sumer, he did not take the title "king of Kish."

Entemena of Lagash had political control in the southern cities from Badtibira to Uruk.

u₄-ba en-te-me-na-ke₄ ^dlugal-é-mùš-ra é-mùš pa₅-ti-bir₅-ra^{ki}-ka é-ki-
ág-gá-ni mu-na-dù ki-bi mu-na-gi₄
dumu-unu^{ki} dumu-larsa^{ki} dumu-pa₅-ti-bir₅^{ki}-ra-ka [ama]-gi₄-bi e-gar
"At that time, Entemena built and reconstructed the E-mush, his be-
loved temple, in Badtibira, for the god Lugalemush, (and) he set free the
citizens of Uruk, Larsa, and Badtibira."⁽⁵¹⁾

Despite this great power, he never took the title of overlord, or "king of Kish," but merely announced that he had formed a partnership with Lugalkinshedudu, the ruler of Uruk.

u₄-ba en-te-me-na ensí-lagaš^{ki} lugal-ki-ni-šè-du₇-du₇ ensí-unu^{ki}-bi nam-šeš
e-ak
"At that time (when he built the temple Emush), Entemena, the ruler
of Lagash and Lugalkinshedudu, the ruler of Uruk, made (a contract of)
brother-in-law."⁽⁵²⁾

We need to make it clear that the use of the title "king of the Land" marked a dramatic step in the developing political ideology of empire, and that before the royal title appeared, that is, during the Early Dynastic period, Sumerian city-states were in a stage of conflict with no political institutions unifying them. At this time, the title "king of Kish" was a symbol for a mighty ruler who could exert his power during conflicts between the city-states.

Lastly, we will consider the title "king of Kish" as held by Sargon and his successors Rimush and Manishtusu.

The title "king of Kish" when held by the kings of the Akkadian dynasty, did not have a determinative -ki at all, in spite of the fact that the city of Kish normally carried the determinative -ki.

Su. sar-um-GI lugal-kalam-ma-ke₄ kiš^{ki} ki-bi bí-gi₄

Akk. sar-ru-GI LUGAL-KALAM kiš^{ki} a-ša-rí-su i-ni

“Sargon, the king of the land, rebuilt the city of Kish.”⁽⁵³⁾

These two instances of “Kish” are clearly different from each other. This use of the title without *ki* does not imitate the earlier usage of Mesilim.⁽⁵⁴⁾ It rather seems to me that the difference in the writing of “kish” shows a difference in meaning. I interpret the title “king of Kish” held by Akkadian kings to mean the king of *māt akkadim* or *šar kiššati*, and not to mean the ruler of only the city of Kish.

Edzard has remarked that “king of Kish” means the king of *māt akkadim* when the title was held by Sumerian rulers in the Early Dynastic period.⁽⁵⁵⁾ However, I believe the title as used by Sumerian rulers denoted the ruler of only the city of Kish, and not the ruler of all the lands. The title “king of Kish” had a different political function in the Early Dynastic period from that in the Akkadian period. That is, the title “king of Kish” held by Akkadian kings was a title befitting the ruler of the regional state or empire.⁽⁵⁶⁾

Notes

* Abbreviations used here follow those in R. Borger, *Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur* I, Berlin, 1967.

(1) W. W. Hallo and W. K. Simpson, *Ancient Near East, A History*, New York, 1971, p. 39.

(2) I. J. Gelb, *Thoughts about Ibla*, Malibu, 1977.

(3) T. Jacobsen, “Early political development in Mesopotamia”, in *Toward the Image of Tammuz and Other Essays on Mesopotamian History and Culture (TIT)*, Cambridge, 1970, pp. 151–152. (First published in *ZA* 52 (1957)).

(4) E. Sollberger, “The rulers of Lagash”, *JCS* 21 (1967), pp. 279–291.

(5) A. Westenholz, “Early Nippur year dates and the Sumerian King List,” *JCS* 26 (1974), p. 156 n. 7.

(6) H. G. Güterbock, “Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babylonien und Hethitern I”, *ZA* 42 (1934), p. 4.

(7) *Ibid.*, p. 11.

(8) S. N. Kramer defines “historiographic” in the following way: “‘Historiographic’ denotes a type of poetic narrative composition concerned with some significant historical event interpreted in a style and manner consonant with the Sumerian world view.” in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament* 3rd edition, ed. J. B. Pritchard, Princeton, 1974, p. 646 n. 1.

(9) D. O. Edzard, “La royauté dans la période présargonique”, in *Le Palais et la royauté* (ed. P. Garelli) Paris, 1974, pp. 147–148.

(10) Mesannepada: C. L. Woolley, *UE* II, p. 191. Cf. E. Sollberger, “Notes on the early inscriptions from Ur and el-Obēd,” *Iraq* 22 (1960), pp. 71–72. n. 35.

Lugalkiginnedudu: A. Goetze, “Early kings of Kish,” *JCS* 15 (1961), p. 106: 5N–274.

(11) E. Sollberger, *Corpus des inscriptions “royales” présargoniques de Lagaš (Corpus)*, Genève, 1956, pp. 17–18: EAN 2 Galet A. And V. E. Crawford, “Inscriptions from Lagash, Season Four, 1975–76,” *JCS* 29/4 (1977), pp. 209–210: 4H-T7.

(12) L. W. King, *CT* III, p. 1: 12155.

(13) L. Heuzey, “La construction du roi Our-Nina,” *RA* 4/4 (1897), p. 109 Fig. 15=F.

Thureau-Dangin, *Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königsinschriften (SAK)*, Leipzig, 1907, p. 160, VII 2. me-silim lugal-kiš é-dù ḏnin-SU. GÍR ḏSU. NIN. GÍR mu-DU lugal-ša-engur ensi BUR. L[A. ŠIR].

(14) E. Sollberger, *Corpus* p. 18: EAN 2, VIII 1-7: (é-an-na-túm) dumu a-kur-gal ensi lagaš^{ki}-ke₄ pa-bil-ga-ni ur-ḏnanše ensi lagaš^{ki}-kam "Eannatum — son of Akurgal, the ruler of Lagash, his grandfather is Urnanshe, the ruler of Lagash."

For the term pa-bil-ga see A. W. Sjöberg, "Zu einigen Verwandtschaftsbezeichnungen in Sumerischen", in *Heidelberg Studien zum Alten Orient, Adam Falkenstein zum 17. September 1966*, Wiesbaden, 1967, pp. 212-219.

(15) T. Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List*, Chicago, 1939, Table II after p. 180.

(16) For example, *The Cambridge Ancient History* 3rd edition (CAH) I/2, 1971, and E. Sollberger et J.-R. Kupper, *Inscriptions royales sumériennes et akkadiennes (IRSA)*, Paris, 1971.

(17) Jacobsen, *TIT*, p. 386 n. 73.

(18) Sollberger, *Corpus*, p. 43: ENT 45 à 73 clous B 1 à B 29.

(19) Lugal-tarsi is regarded as identical to Lugal-TAR who appeared in J. J. A. van Dijk, "Textes divers du Musée de Bagdad III," *Sumer* 15 (1959), p. 5 ff. n. 1: lugal-TAR ensi unu^{ki} "Lugal-TAR, the ruler of Uruk". However, Lugal-TAR seems to be a ruler of Uruk under the Akkadian Empire. The two rulers are not the same person. Cf. CAH I/1, p. 223, and Sollberger et Kupper, *IRSA*, p. 41: IA4a n. 2.

(20) Cf. F. R. Kraus, "Zur Liste der älteren Könige von Babylonien," *ZA* 50 (1952), pp. 29-60.

(21) M. B. Rowton, in *CAH* 3rd edition I/1, p. 223.

(22) A. Westenholz, *Old Sumerian and Old Akkadian Texts in Philadelphia chiefly from Nippur*, Part One (OSP I), Malibu, 1975, p. 4.

(23) Cf. A. Westenholz, *Early Cuneiform Texts in Jena*, Kobenhavn, 1975.

(24) Cf. Westenholz, *OSP* I, p. 115 f., Index of Year Dates.

(25) Mekalamsi: *TMH* V 140.

Lugalbarasi: F. Thureau-Dangin, "Notes assyriologiques", *RA* 20 (1923), pp. 3-5.

Megirimta: Clay, *BRM* 4, 45.

(26) *TMH* V 140, II 4-III 1: 'mes¹-'kalam¹-si dumu-lugal "Meskalamsi, son of the king". Cf. Col. I 3-4: lugal-kisal-si lugal-unu^{ki} "Lugalkisalsi, the king of Uruk."

(27) *BRM* 4, 45: AN. NE. KE₄ me-girimx-ta dumu lugal-kisal-si tu-da dam mu-ni-ḥur-sag a mu-ru "To — Megirimta, the child born to Lugalkisalsi, the wife of Munihursag, has dedicated." (translated by W. W. Hallo, in *Ancient Mesopotamian Art and Selected Texts*, The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, 1976, p. 27). Cf. Sollberger et Kupper, *IRSA*, p. 86: IE2b.

(28) Thureau-Dangin, *RA* 20, pp. 3-4.

(29) V. K. Šilejko, *Votivne nadposi šumerijskich pravitelej*, Petrograd, 1915, n. V.

I think it is still questionable whether Elilin, father of Enshakushanna, is identical to Elili, the king of Ur. Inscriptions of Elili, the king of Ur, were published in S. Smith, "Notes on the Gutian period," *JRAS* 1932, p. 306, and W. Schramm, "Ein altsumerischer Tonnagel," *WO* 7/1 (1973), p. 16.

(30) For Enshakushanna's campaign against Akkad: *TMH* V 81 year-date: mu en-š [à-kúš-an-na] ag [-ga-] dè^[ki] tùn-šè bí-š¹-l-ga "Year when Enshakushanna defeated Akkad."

For his campaign against Kish:

(i) Poebel, *PBS* IV/1, pp. 151 ff. and Legrain *PBS* XV, 15, ls. 3-11: en-ša-kúš-an-na en ki-en-gi lugal-kalam-ma u₄ dingir-re-ne e-na-NI-eš-a kiš^{ki} mu-ḥul en-bí-eštár lugal-kiš^{ki} mu-KU "Enshakushanna, the lord of Kiengi, the king of the Land, when gods said to him, (he) defeated the city of Kish, and captured Enbi-Eshtar, the king of Kish."

(ii) Hilprecht, *BE* I 91-92: ḏen-líl-lá en-ša-kúš-an-na níg-ga kiš^{ki} ḥul-kam a mu-na-ru "To the god Enlil, Enshakushanna offered the materials of Kish (which he)

defeated.”

(iii) *TMH* V 110 year-date: mu en-ša-kúš-an-na kiški-da ab-da-KU-a “Year when Enshakushanna defeated the city of kish.”

It can be assumed that Enshakushanna was responsible for the destruction of Kish, which made it necessary for Sargon to rebuild. This viewpoint is based on the fact that there is only a generation separating the reigns of Enshakushanna and Sargon, and Lugalzagesi does not record anything about the destruction of the city. However, The Sumerian King List presents serious problems for this hypothesis. According to the edition of Jacobsen, there were four rulers and some 95 years between Enbi-Eštar and Urzababa. Original inscriptions of the four rulers of Kish have never been unearthed.

(31) Thureau-Dangin, *SAK*, p. 156, 3 c+d. Cf. Sollberger et Kupper, *IRSA*, pp. 85–86, IE2a.

(32) Sollberger, *Corpus*, p. 18, EAN 2 Cols V 23–VI 5.

(33) Goetze, *JCS* 15, p. 106.

(34) Hilprecht, *BE* I 86=J. Oelsner, “Historische Texte der Hilprecht-Sammlung”, *WZJ* 18 (1969), pp. 51–55 n. 1=Buccellati, *AS* 17 (1969), p. 14 n. 36, ls. 1–16.

(35) King, *CT* III, 1.

(36) Woolley, *UE* II, pl. 191.

(37) W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *Atra-hasis*, London, 1969, pp. 138–145 and 167–172, particularly p. 170 n. 94. Cf. Sollberger, *IRSA*, p. 42, IB4a n. 2.

(38) Sollberger, *Corpus*, p. 15: EAN 1 Stèle des Vautours, Rs. VI 8–9.

(39) Westenholz, *JCS* 26, pp. 155–156.

(40) lugal-an-ki-ka “the king of heaven and earth”: Sollberger, *Corpus*, p. 12 EAN 1 Face XVI 22.

This is more of a mythological epithet than a political epithet.

lugal-kur-kur-ra “the king of all the lands” appeared in texts of early rulers: Sollberger, *Corpus*, p. 37: ENT 28–29 Cônes A-B (Entemena) and Hilprecht, *BE* I, 86 (Lugalkiginnedudu).

(41) Hilprecht, *BE* I 87, col. III 3–11.

(42) *Ibid.*, col. I 4–5 and III 4–5.

(43) In royal inscriptions of the Early Dynastic period, epithets of the goddess Inanna appeared as follows:

nin-^dinanna, King, *CT* III, 1 (Lugaltarsi).

Meaning of the epithet is still uncertain. Sollberger translated it as “reine des déesses” in *IRSA*, p. 40. On the contrary, J. S. Cooper called this in to question by asking, “Is it a scribal error for nin-é-an-na(-ra) “mistress of Eanna?” Cooper, *JNES* 33 (1974), p. 415.

nin-é-an-na “mistress of Eanna,” Goetze, *JCS* 15, p. 106 (Lugalkiginnedudu).

nin-kur-kur-ra “mistress of all the lands,” Sollberger, *Corpus*, En I 21 Galet B (Enannatum I). The epithet is probably connected to the phrase, é-an-na kur-kur-ra mu-na-diri “(for the goddess Inanna) he made E-anna prominent throughout all the lands” (*ibid.*, col. II 12–13).

(44) Poebel, *PBS* IV/1, pp. 157–169, and Jacobsen, *TIT*, pp. 390–393.

(45) Sollberger, *Corpus*, pp. 17–18 EAN 2, cols. IV 27–V8, VI 10–11, and VI 21–VI 2.

(46) H. Hirsch, “Die Inschriften der Könige von Agade,” *Afo* 20 (1963), pp. 1–82. Sargon Inschrift b 1 and b 6.

(47) Hirsch, *Afo* 20, p. 34 col. I 21–23; II 20–22; p. 37, IV 44–46; p. 41, VIII 4–6; p. 45, X 31–35.

(48) Sollberger, *Corpus*, p. 18, EAN 2, cols. V 23–VI 11.

(49) Hilprecht, *BE* I 87, cols. I 36–II 2.

For meaning of sag-sig see B. Alster, *Dumuzi’s Dream*, Copehngagen, 1972, p. 92.

(50) Edzard, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

(51) M. Lambert, “L’expansion de Lagash au temps d’Entemena,” *RSO* 47 (1972), p. 3 cols. IV 6–V 8.

(52) Sollberger, *Corpus*, p. 43 ENT 45 à 73 col. II 4-10.

Lugalkinshedudu was not named "king of Uruk" in this inscription. The author of the inscription was the ruler of Lagash and changed Lugalkinshedudu's title to complement his own title of "ruler (ensl) of Lagash". It is very doubtful that Lugalkinshedudu actually held the title "ruler (ensl) of Uruk".

(53) Hirsch, *AfO* 20, p. 36 cols. III 27-32 and IV 27-32.

(54) Cf. W. W. Hallo, *Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles*, New Haven, 1957, pp. 23ff.

(55) Edzard, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

(56) The phrase, nir-gal, sag-kurún kiši ki-en-gi-gé "le héros, 'échanson' de Kiš et de Sumer" transliterated and translated by E. Sollberger, "La frontière de Šara," *Or NS* 28 (1959), pp. 336-350, col. I 7-8 (also, Sollberger et Kupper, *IRSA*, p. 91), has been accurately translated by C. Kraus, in "Zum Königtum in der Ur III-Zeit", *Le palais et la royauté*, p. 204, as nir-gál sag-ḫuš-ki-en-gi-ke, "Der angesehene von ki-en-gi mit dem furchterregenden Haupt".

The unique character ḫuš appeared in R. D. Biggs, "An archaic Sumerian version of the Kesh temple hymn from Tell Abū Šalābikh," *ZA* 61 (1971), p. 196 Fig. I col. III 4.

I intend in this paper to present part of the results of the study made under the 1981 Ministry of Education's Grant in Aid for Scientific Research.