

years 1835, 1836 and 1837: preceded by geographical and historical notices of the regions situated between the rivers Nile and Indus (repr. in 2 vol.). – Cole S. W./Gasche H. 1998: Second- and first-millennium BC rivers in northern Babylonia, dans: H. Gasche/M. Tanret (ed.), *Changing watercourses in Babylonia: towards a reconstruction of the ancient environment in lower Mesopotamia* (= MHEM 5/1) 1–64.

Gasche H. 1986: Tell ed-Der: la Sippar des Amnanu, *Dossiers Histoire et Archéologie* 103, 56–58; id. 1989: La Babylonie au 17<sup>e</sup> siècle avant notre ère: approche archéologique, problèmes et perspectives (= MHEM 1). – Gasche H./De Meyer L. 1980: Ebauches d'une géographie historique de la région Abū Habbah/Tell ed-Dēr, TD 3, 1–13. – Gasche H. et al. 2002: Fleuves du temps et de la vie: permanence et instabilité du réseau fluviale babylonien entre 2500 et 1500 avant notre ère, dans: P. Briant (ed.), *Politique et contrôle de l'eau dans le Moyen-Orient ancien*, *Annales. Histoire, Sciences sociales* 57/3, 531–544. – Harris R. 1962: Biographical notes on the nadītu women of Sippar, *JCS* 16, 1–12. – Horsnell M. J. A. 1999: The year-names of the First Dynasty of Babylon, vol. 2. – Janssen C. et al. 1994: Du chantier à la tablette: Ur-Utu et l'histoire de sa maison à Sippar-Amnānum, Fs. L. De Meyer (= MHEO 2) 91–123. – Joannès F. 1992: Les temples de Sippar et leurs trésors à l'époque néo-babylonienne, *RA* 86, 159–184. – Nashef K. (ed.) 1987: Ausgrabungen und Geländebegehungen: Irak (III), *AfO* 34, 98–236. – Pinches T. G. 1885: The antiquities found by Mr. H. Rassam at Abu-Habbah (Sippara), *TSBA* 8, 164–171. – Powell M. A. 1991: Narām-Sin, son of Sargon: ancient history, famous names and a famous Babylonian forgery, *ZA* 81, 20–30. – Rassam H. 1885: Recent discoveries of ancient Babylonian cities, *TSBA* 8, 172–197; id. 1897: Asshur and the land of Nimrod: being an account of the discoveries made in the ancient ruins of Nineveh, Asshur, Sepharvaim, Calah, Babylon, Borsippa, Cuthah, and Van, including a narrative of different journeys in Mesopotamia, Assyria, Asia Minor, and Koordistan.

Scheil V. 1902: Une saison de fouilles à Sippar (Abou Habba), janvier–avril 1894. – Sollberger E. 1968: The Cruciform Monument, *JEOL* 20, 50–70. – Tanret M. 1998: Le namkarum: une étude de cas dans les textes et sur la carte, dans: H. Gasche/M. Tanret (ed.), *Changing watercourses in Babylonia: towards a reconstruction of the ancient environment in lower Mesopotamia* (= MHEM 5/1) 65–132; id. 2001: As years went by in Sippar-Amnānum, dans: Tz. Abusch et al. (ed.), *Historiography in the cuneiform world* (= CRRAI 45/1) 453–466; id. 2002: Per aspera ad astra: l'apprentissage du cunéiforme à Sippar-Amnānum pendant la période paléobabylonienne tardive (= MHET 1/2); id. 2004: Verba volant, scripta non manent: tablettes no-

mades dans les archives des gala.mah à Sippar-Amnānum, dans: Ch. Nicolle (ed.), *Nomades et sédentaires dans le Proche-Orient ancien* (= CRRAI 46 = Amurru 3) 249–270; id. 2008: Find the tablet box ...: new aspects of archive keeping in Old Babylonian Sippar-Amnānum, Fs. M. Stol 131–147. – Van Lerberghe K./Voet G. 1991: Sippar-Amnānum: the Ur-Utu Archive 1 (= MHET 1). – Walker C. B. F./Collon D. 1980: Hormuzd Rassam's excavations for the British Museum at Sippar in 1881–1882, *TD* 3, 93–114. – Ward W. H. 1886: Report on the Wolfe expedition to Babylonia 1884–85 (Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America).

H. Gasche – M. Tanret

### Šippaziti (<sup>m</sup>Ši(-ip-)pa-LÚ-i-).

1. Wahrscheinlich Urenkel Tuthalijas II./III.\* und daher Mitglied der heth. Königsfamilie, Sohn von Arma-Tarḫunta (Arma<sup>d</sup>U-aš\*), wie sein Vater ebenfalls Gegner Ḫattušilis III.\*, bezeugt in dessen Apologie (Laroche, NH 1156 und *Hethitica* 4, Nr. 1156.1).

H. Otten, *StBoT* 24 (1981) 18 iii (22, 27); 22 iv (3,) 5; 24 iv 36.

2. Schreiber unter anderem der Šahurunuwa-Urkunde (Laroche, o.c. 1156.2). Er hat die Tafel nicht selbst geschrieben, sondern andere Schreiber beaufsichtigt und beschädigte Tafeln „restauriert“. Siehe van den Hout 1995, 237; Otten, *StBoT* 13 (1971) 49 Anm. 108.

3. Ein anderweitig unbekannter S. bringt dem Inventartext KBo. 16, 83+ KBo. 23, 26 zufolge ein Opfer (SISKUR) dar, s. J. Siegelová, *Verwaltungspraxis* 1 (1986) 258f., 264f.; Š. Košak, *THeth.* 10 (1982) 90.

Zum Gesamtkomplex des Namens Š. und zur Chronologie s. ausführlich van den Hout 1995, 235–238 mit Lit. – Zur Namenbildung s. Laroche, o.c. S. 285, 324: Ortsname Sippa + luw. -ziti „Mann“ wie z. B. bei den heth. Namen Ḫalpaziti\*, Malaziti\*.

Bryce T. 2005: The kingdom of the Hittites. – van den Hout Th. 1995: Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag (= *StBoT* 38). – Houwink ten Cate Ph. H. J. 1974: The early and late phases of Urhitešub's career, Fs. H. G. Güterbock<sup>1</sup> (= *PIHANS* 35) 138, 149. – Klengel H. 1999: Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches (= *HdOr.* 1/34) 344 Anm. 88, 230f.

G. Frantz-Szabó

### Sippe (extended family, clan, tribe).

§ 1. Introduction. – § 2. Mesopotamia in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and early 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium. – § 3. Amorites. – § 4. Kassites. – § 5. Suteans, Chaldeans and Arameans. – § 6. Ancient Arabs.

§ 1. Introduction. This article covers kinship units higher than the nuclear family (Familie\*). According to Gelb 1979, 58f., we can distinguish three such units: a) Extended family: “a multi-generational unit composed of the *pater familias* as the head of the family, his unmarried brothers and sisters, his wife (or wives), their unmarried children, married children ... with their wives and children, and a few attached relatives”. b) Clan: “grouping of extended families, nuclear families, and single individuals who trace their relationship, real or assumed, through belief in descent from a common ancestor”. c) Tribe: “loose association of clans, families, and individuals, who generally believe in a common descent from a mythical ancestor”.

These definitions are, however, disputed in several points. For example, Postgate 1992, 88 quotes P. Laslett for a different definition of extended family: “all relatives in habitual contact with a person, irrespective of whether they live with him”. A further problem is that Mesopot. sources are rarely explicit enough to distinguish neatly between these kinship units.

The German word “Sippe” imperfectly covers all these units. Extended family can also be called “Großfamilie”, tribe is usually “Stamm”.

§ 2. Mesopotamia in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and early 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium. According to Gelb 1979, 25, kinship units higher than the nuclear family were more important in the 3<sup>rd</sup> mill. up to and including the Sargonic period than in later periods because he thinks that the early period was marked by the “transition from a folk society to an urban society”. Sale contracts of lands and houses (Gelb 1979, 79) and the so-called *kudurrus* pertaining to land property (ibid. 81–91) prove the joint ownership of land and the existence of extended families and clans. Postgate 1992, 95 stresses the “strong practical incentives not to divide the land but to cultivate it jointly” and also mentions the role of the extended family in the area of marriage (ibid. 91). Tribes are “hardly ever alluded to in the texts” (Gelb 1979, 91).

The correlation of households and (extended) families and the role of the extended family in the OB period are still disputed. See Diakonoff 1965 and 1996 (joint ownership of land points to the existence of extended families), Stone 1996 (extended families living in square houses), Leemans 1986 (only one family per house), Miglus 1999, 27f. and 240 (no correlation between house types and family structures) and the summaries of Postgate 1992, 91 (“extended family households are more a feature of rural than of urban life”), 96 (the question of the importance of the extended family in the OB period is difficult to decide: “that other members of the family no longer feature in documents of the OB period does not necessarily reflect a diminution of their role”) and of Stol 2004, 706f. (remains undecided whether extended families lived together in a single household).

Sum. and Akk. have several words for kinship groups: *im-ri/ru-a*, *su*, *kimtu*, *nišūtu*, *salātu*, *illatu*.

See Gelb 1979, 92–94; Wilcke 1985, 220 n. 11 and 235 n. 33; Stol 2004, 694f.

According to Stol *ibid.*, *kimtu* and *nišūtu* are “blood relatives”, *salātu* “kin by marriage”; the CAD (N/2, 297) translates, however, *nišūtu* “family, relatives (by consanguinity or by marriage)”. See also CAD I 82 *illatu* “kinship group, clan” and Schloen 2001, 287–291 on *bābtum* as “kin-based urban quarter”. Whether the nuclear family (according to RIA Familie\* *kimtu*) is sometimes or always terminologically clearly distinguished from the extended family, the clan and the tribe remains to be investigated.

§ 3. Amorites. The Amorite nomads of the OB period were organized in clans and tribes (see Nomaden\* § 2.5. with previous lit.; Streck 2002, 175–179). The three most important tribes around Mari were the *Yamīn* (Jamin\*, Jaminiten), the *Šim'al* (Sim'al\*, Simaliten) and the *Sūtū* (Sutäer\*).

*Hanū* (Ḫana\*), however, is not a tribal designation but means “inhabitant of Ḫana” > “nomad”. See Streck 2002, 175 with previous lit.

These tribes were organized in several subunits (“subtribes” or “clans” or “(ex-

tended) families”), sometimes also known by names (e.g., *’Awnān*, *Rabbū\**, *’Uprabū*, *Yabrur* and *Yariḥ* are subtribes or clans of the *Yamīn*). The Amorite/Akk. terminology, however, usually does not clearly distinguish the different units: *gayyu*, *limu*, *ḥibru* (lit. “community”) and *ra’su* (lit. “unit”) seem to describe kinship units of different rank (Streck 2000, 89, 97 and 102; id. 2002, 176 and 180). *gayyu* and *limu* are also used in the Amorite onomasticon as theophoric elements describing the relationship between man and god in kinship terms (Name\*, Namengebung. E. Amurritisch § 5.2).

Fleming 2004 distinguishes between Šim’alite *gayyus* and Yamīnite *limus*. Since also the Yamīnite tribes had *gayyus* and the Šim’alite kings of Mari bore names with the element *limu* this distinction cannot be maintained (pers. comm. B. Kärger).

The relationship among the different tribes can be characterized in the following terms (Streck 2002, 177–179): a) Variety: Awareness of the differences between the tribes. People were identified by their affiliation with one of the tribes. Tribes sometimes had conflicts with each other. b) Unity: Bonds between the tribes. Šim’al and Yamīn are like white and red beads in a single necklace, or like flood-waters confronting each other from above and below (Streck 2000, 51f. § 1.46). The relation between Šim’al and Yamūt-ba’al is described by the words “brothers” (*atḥūlahḥū*), “family” (*salātu*) and “bond” (*ḥibsum*) (Streck 2002, 178 with an etymology of the last word). c) Transparency: It was possible to change tribal affiliation (Streck 2000, 52f. § 1.48), which shows that tribal genealogies are more ideological than biological.

The most important tribal institutions (Nomaden\* § 2.6. with previous lit.; Streck 2002, 179–182) were the sheik (*sugāgu*) at the head of tribal units of different rank, the elders (*šībūtu*) and the assembly (*pubru*). The “heads” (*qaqqadu*) were the leaders of the (extended) families.

§ 4. Kassites. The construction *Bīt-PN* with PN being a Kassite personal name has been interpreted as a designation for tribes

or clans; see Kassiten\* § 2. This interpretation has been contested by Oelsner 1982, 404f. and Sassmannshausen 2001, 140 with n. 2378. The first understands these terms as designations for administrative districts, the latter for large estates.

§ 5. Suteans, Chaldeans and Arameans. The Suteans in the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> mill. were organized into several tribes known by name, e.g. *Qa’irānāju* BATSH 4/1, 13: 19f. (Dūr-Katlimmu). Some of these tribes had clans called *palgu* (unpubl. texts from Tall Šabīy Abyaḍ, pers. comm. F. Wiggerman; see Sutāer\*); see also PA<sub>5</sub>, JCS 34, 246: 4, 13 (Emar), probably the same word. The same text also mentions in l. 5 a *nasīku* “sheik”. Four *nasīkus* “sheiks”, apparently of Suteans, are probably attested in WVD OG 102, 34: 10 (Ekalte).

Note the GAL LÚ<sup>mes</sup> *Su-té-e* “chief of the Suteans” in l. 7 and the Northwest Semitic names in the text. Wa. Mayer reads *na-sī-ḳū* “Arbeitspflichtige”. For JCS 34, 246: 5 see the commentary of M. Sigrist *ibid.* and cf. the discussion in Pentiuč 2001, 132f. If the interpretation is correct, the word *nasīku* represents an important link between the Suteans of the late 2<sup>nd</sup> mill. and the Arameans of the 1<sup>st</sup> mill. since the latter also had *nasīkus*.

The Chaldeans of the 1<sup>st</sup> mill. were organized into *bītus* “houses”, a designation for tribes. Five Chaldean tribes are known by names of the type *Bīt-NN* with NN probably being the name of an eponymous ancestor.

See Kaldu\* § 2, Bīt-Amukkāni\*, Bīt-Dakkūri\*, Bīt-Jakini\*, Bīt-Sa’alla\*, Bīt-Šillani\*. For the etymology of these names see Lipiński 2000, 419f.

Individual Chaldeans were described as PN son of (*mār*) NN, e.g. *Ea-zēra-qiša mār Amūkānu* (Frame 1992, 37). The leaders of the Chaldean tribes were called *ra’s/sānū* “heads”.

Kaldu\* § 2; PHPKB 265 n. 1705; Frame 1992, 37. – The Aramean states of northern Syria were also called *bītus*. Whether *bītu* here refers to tribes or rather to dynasties is, however, unclear. See Bīt-Adīni\* and Bīt-Baḥiāni\*; Lipiński 2000, 78, 119, 161, 163, 196, 225 for Bīt-Adīni, Bīt-Agūsi, Bīt-Baḥiāni, Bīt-Ḥalupē, Bīt-Zammāni and *Byt Šll*.

The Arameans of Babylonia in the 1<sup>st</sup> mill. were organized in more than 40 nomi-

nally attested tribes (PHPKB 270–277; Zadok 1985, 63–70; Lipiński 2000, 409–489). Although they are not specifically designated as Aramean at least some of the West Semitic tribes listed by Zadok 1985, 70–74 probably also belong here.

See Adilê\*, Amatu\*, Amlate\*, Damûnu\*, Dunânu\*, Gambulu\*, Gulusu\*, Gurasimmu\*, Guru-mu\*, Hindirû\*, Itu\*, Jadaqu\*, Jad/tburu\*, Jaš'an\*, Kibrê\*, Labdudu\*, Lakabru\*, Li'ta'u\*, Nabatu\*, Namhânu\*, Naširu\*, Puqûdu\*, Rab(b)ilu\*, Rub-bû\*, Rupûu\*, Ru'uja\*.

The leaders of the Aramaic tribes were called *nasiku* (PHBKB 274f.).

§ 6. Ancient Arabs. A dozen ancient Arab tribes are named in the cuneiform sources (Eph'al 1982, 215–230; Isamme\*; Qedar\*). The tribal leaders were called “kings” (*šarru*) or “queens” (*šarratu*) by the Assyrians, but once also *nasiku* “sheik” (Eph'al 1982, 93 with n. 300).

Diakonoff I. M. 1965: Extended families in Old Babylonian Ur, ZA 75, 47–65; id. 1996: Extended family households in Mesopotamia (III–II millennia B.C.), in: K. R. Veenhof (ed.), Houses and households in ancient Mesopotamia (= CRRAI 40) 55–59. – Eph'al I. 1982: The ancient Arabs: nomads on the borders of the Fertile Crescent 9<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C. – Fleming D. E. 2004: The Sim'alite *gayum* and the Yaminite *l'mum* in the Mari archives, Amurru 3, 199–212. – Frame G. 1992: Babylonia 689–627 B.C.: a political history (= PIHANS 69). – Gelb I. J. 1979: Household and family in early Mesopotamia, in: E. Lipiński (ed.), State and temple economy in the Ancient Near East (= OLA 5–6) 1–97. – Leemans W. F. 1986: The family in the economic life of the Old Babylonian period, Oikumene 5, 15–22, esp. 19–22. – Lipiński E. 2000: The Aramaeans: their ancient history, culture, religion (= OLA 100). – Miglus P. 1999: Städtische Wohnarchitektur in Babylonien und Assyrien (= BagF 22). – Oelsner J. 1982: Zur Organisation des gesellschaftlichen Lebens im kassitischen und nachkassitischen Babylonien, CRRAI 28 (= AfO Beih. 19) 403–410.

Pentiuc E. J. 2001: West Semitic vocabulary in the Akkadian texts from Emar (= HSS 49). – Postgate J. N. 1992: Early Mesopotamia: society and economy at the dawn of history, esp. 94–96. – Sassmannshausen L. 2001: Beiträge zur Verwaltung und Gesellschaft Babyloniens in der Kassitenzeit (= BagF 21). – Schloen J. D. 2001: The house of the father as fact and symbol: patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East (= Studies in the Archaeology and History of the Levant 2). – Stol M. 2004: Wirtschaft und Ge-

sellschaft in altbabylonischer Zeit, Annäherungen 4 (= OBO 160/4) esp. 706f. – Stone E. C. 1996: Houses, households and neighborhoods in the Old Babylonian period: the role of the extended families, in: Veenhof, o.c. 229–235. – Streck M. P. 2000: Das amurritische Onomas-tikon der altbabylonischen Zeit (= AOAT 271/1); id. 2002: Zwischen Weide, Dorf und Stadt: sozio-ökonomische Strukturen des amurritischen Nomadismus am Mittleren Euphrat, BagM 33, 155–209. – Wilcke C. 1985: Familiengründung im Alten Babylonien, in: E. W. Müller (ed.), Geschlechtsreife und Legitimation zur Zeugung (= Kindheit, Jugend, Familie 1 = Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Historische Anthropologie 3) 213–317. – Zadok R. 1985: Zur Geographie Babyloniens während des sargonischen, chaldäischen, achämenidischen und hellenistischen Zeitalters, WO 16, 19–79.

M. P. Streck

**Sipylos.** Die sog. „Kybele“ oder „Niobe“ des S.(-Berges) ist ein 6 km westl. von Manisa in einer steilen Felswand etwa 100 m hoch über dem Tal des Hermos (Gediz Nehri) bei der Ortschaft Akpınar eingehauenes Hochrelief (André-Salvini/Salvini 1996; idd. 2003). Das grobe, unfertige Bild, fast vollrund wie eine Statue, ist ca. 7 m hoch und wurde in eine ca. 9 m hohe Felsnische eingehauen (Börker-Klähn 1982, Nr. 310). Das Denkmal ist seit der Antike bekannt und wurde mit der versteinerten Niobe identifiziert (Homer, Ilias XXIV 614–617; Ovid, Metamorphosen VI 309–312; Pausanias, Ἑλλάδος περιήγησις I 21, 3). An einer anderen Stelle (III 22, 4) erkennt Pausanias in diesem Denkmal die älteste aller Darstellungen (griech. ἄγαλμα) der Göttermutter Kybele, eine Ansicht, die manchmal auch von der modernen Kritik geteilt wird (z. B. Akurgal 1970, 132). Die Anwesenheit von zwei verschiedenen hier-luw. Inschriften auf der Felswand rechts der Nische hat Anlass gegeben, die Skulptur mit Sicherheit der heth. Kultur zuzuschreiben (Garstang, Bossert, Bittel, Muhly, Güterbock, Mellaart, Spanos, Kohlmeyer; Lit. bei André-Salvini/Salvini 1996, Anm. 25, und idd. 2003). Diese Inschriften bieten jeweils einen Personennamen und einen Titel: Sipylos I Kuwalanamuwa REX FILIUS (Poetto 1982), Sipylos II Zuwani + Titel und Ortsname (Poetto 1988).