

АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК СССР
ИНСТИТУТ ВОСТОКОВЕДЕНИЯ

ИМ ДЪЯКОНОВ

ОБЩЕСТВЕННЫЙ
И
ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ
СТРОЙ
ДРЕВНЕГО ДВУРЕЧЬЯ



ШУМЕР

ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО ВОСТОЧНОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ
Москва 1959

ОТВЕТСТВЕННЫЙ РЕДАКТОР
доктор исторических наук
В. И. АВДИЕВ

ОТ АВТОРА

Материал, имеющийся по истории Двуречья Евфрата и Тигра, достаточен, чтобы попытаться выяснить характер начальных форм классового общества и древнейшего государства, которые слагались впервые, если не считать Египта, именно здесь, и при этом без всякого воздействия других уже более развитых обществ. Поэтому понятен тот большой теоретический интерес, который вызывает этот материал в советской науке.

Настоящий том нашего исследования посвящен Шумеру—от зарождения классового общества и государства до падения III династии Ура и наступления так называемого старовавилонского периода, когда шумерский язык уже находился в процессе вымирания и полностью уступил в Двуречье свое господствующее положение аккадскому (вавилонскому) языку. К чему привели позже разбираемые здесь процессы, рассматривается в другой нашей работе, посвященной общественному и государственному строю древнего Двуречья следующего периода, которая будет опубликована отдельно.

Географически предлагаемое исследование ограничено пределами Южного Двуречья от города Сиппара до лагуны Персидского залива.

Основание социально-экономическому изучению истории Шумера положили труды академика В. В. Струве, который впервые раскрыл характер древневосточных обществ как обществ рабовладельческих. Дальнейшее исследование, даже в тех случаях, когда оно приводит к расхождению с В. В. Струве по тем или иным частным положениям, стало возможным лишь на основе сделанной им работы. Огромное значение имеет и труд академика А. И. Тюменева, обобщивший материалы храмовых и царских архивов Шумера, а также работы Н. М. Никольского, благодаря которым было обращено особое внимание на роль древневосточной общины. Следует также отметить роль «Истории древнего Востока» В. И. Авдиева в обобщении представлений советской науки о древности.

Настоящая работа создавалась в течение длительного времени. Здесь нет возможности отметить всех тех, чьи исследования и личные советы способствовали работе автора. Во всяком случае этот труд не мог бы осуществиться без того, чем автор обязан своему учителю А. П. Рифтину. Чрезвычайно много дали автору его личные беседы с товарищами по специальности, в особенности с ныне покойными И. М. Лурье и академиком А. И. Тюменевым, с Н. М. Постовской и с учеными, не занимавшимися непосредственно историей древнего мира, — Д. А. Ольдерогге, Я. М. Магазинером, В. Н. Казиним. Критика работ автора академиком В. В. Струве также способствовала улучшению настоящей книги. Помогли автору и замечания, сделанные его чешскими коллегами Л. Матоушем и И. Климой; многому пришлось научиться от собственных учеников.

Вполне естественно, что при охвате такого продолжительного периода и большого фонда источников автор мог упустить те или иные обстоятельства, и многое в его построениях поневоле должно было остаться гипотетичным.

Несмотря на обилие источников, дошедших от раннего периода истории Двуречья, многие стороны общественной и государственной жизни освещены ими весьма слабо. Поэтому для отдельных периодов и частных проблем документация может показаться недостаточной. Однако если проследить одни и те же явления на протяжении более длительного времени, то результаты исследования, выведенные независимо один от другого на основании различного материала для каждого периода и по каждой из частных проблем, подтверждают друг друга. Поэтому о доказательности выводов следует судить по всей совокупности аргументации, приведенной как в настоящей книге, так и в тех работах автора, посвященных общественному и государственному строю Двуречья, которые явятся ее продолжением. Некоторые моменты в картине, которую мы попытались нарисовать, продолжают оставаться недостаточно ясными.

Мы надеемся, что наше исследование даст толчок к дальнейшему изучению важной исторической проблемы, которая положена в основу работы, и позволит лучше, чем до сих пор, осветить события всемирно-исторического значения, которые происходили в Двуречье в столь давние, отделенные от нас многими тысячелетиями, времена.

Прежде чем ставить вопрос о возникновении классового общества в Шумере и о формировании там государственной власти, необходимо, учитывая скудость древнейших источников и трудность их понимания, ясно представить себе характер уже сложившегося раннешумерского классового об-

щества и государства, так как, чтобы ставить генетические вопросы, нужно прежде всего обрисовать то явление, генезис которого предстоит проследить.

Поэтому настоящая работа начинается со статической характеристики шумерского общества того времени, для которого имеются не только обильные, но и вполне ясные во всех основных моментах документальные источники, — времени так называемого раннединастического периода, в особенности его второй части (XXVI—XXIV вв. до н. э.). Мы последовательно рассмотрим вопросы, связанные с территориальным охватом государств этого времени, с социальным составом их населения, а затем перейдем к существовавшему тогда государственному строю.

Лишь обрисовав классовый характер и социальный состав шумерского общества в той форме, в какой оно сложилось к XXV в. до н. э., а также выяснив, в какие государственные формы облекалась в этом обществе власть господствующего класса, мы постараемся установить пути предшествовавшего развития этого общества начиная с первобытнообщинного строя и проследить дальнейшее развитие общества и государства Двуречья вплоть до сложения вавилонского рабовладельческого общества и рабовладельческой деспотии в начале II тысячелетия до н. э., нашедших классическое отражение в законах и деловых документах времени царя Хаммураби.

При рассмотрении шумерского общества и государства раннединастического периода, привлекая документы из различных частей Шумера и разного времени, мы возьмем за основу памятники, происходящие с городища Телло (Талль-Лух), из древнего Лагаша. Мы делаем это не потому, что шумерская история начинается с истории Лагаша, и не потому, что более древние документы совершенно недоступны для понимания, — ни то, ни другое не соответствует действительности. Причиной такого выбора является то обстоятельство, что документы из Лагаша рисуют наиболее полную и ясную картину, необходимую для той цели, которую мы ставим перед собой, — сначала охарактеризовать уже сложившееся шумерское общество и государство и лишь затем перейти к вопросу о его сложении и дальнейшем развитии.

SOCIETY AND STATE
IN ANCIENT MESOPOTAMIA

SUMER

Summary

PART I. STRUCTURE OF THE SOCIETY AND STATE
IN EARLY DYNASTIC SUMER

*Chapter I. Area of the Sumerian «city-state»
and the temple area*

Most scholars (A. Deimel, A. Schneider, H. Frankfort, A. Falkenstein) have described the early Sumerian temple estates as encompassing practically the whole of the Sumerian society, and the early Sumerian state as a theocratic state. Thus, the rôle of the temple estate in Sumerian society is the first thing to be considered.

The main object of our primary analysis is the best known of the Sumerian states, namely, Lagaš. According to the calculations of A. Deimel, not less than 66 km² of land belonged in Lagaš to the temple estate of ^dBa-U, including 44,65 km² of fields. The temple of ^dBa-U was the second largest temple of Lagaš, most of the other ca 20 temples being much smaller. This fact has enabled A. Deimel to estimate the total area of temple estates in Lagaš at ca 200–300 km², which, according to this author, would cover the entire territory of the Lagaš state.

Treating the question of the area of the Lagaš state one should take into consideration the list of tracts of land on a stela belonging to the period of the Dynasty of Akkad and certainly originating from Lagaš (Déc. ép., LVIIa). The sum total of the area given in this list seems to be 1339 km² (the reading proposed by F. Thureau-Dangin, 422 km², is probably incorrect). But, as can be shown, the Lagaš state lost more than 50% of its territory in the end of the reign of Urukagina, hence in the Early Dynastic period its territory must have comprised about 3000 km², and even if we accept the reading of F. Thureau-Dangin, about 1000 km² (assuming that the list encompasses

all the territories of the state). The frontier between Lagaš and Umma extended over a stretch of *ca* 45 km, and the distance from this frontier to the sea was about 60—65 km.

The state of Lagaš included the communities of Lagaš, Girsu, Siraran, URU, É-Ninmar, Kinunir, Guaba etc. An attempt at locating these towns shows that the territory of the state must have covered an area which in modern times comprises not less than 2000 km² of naturally irrigated land.

Several considerations lead to the conclusion that the state of Lagaš had a free population of about 100 000¹.

The document DP 159 gives us the total² number of slave-girls in several temples of Lagaš. We are in possession of the following data for the ten most important temples: ^d*Nin-ġir-su*—unknown, ^d*Ba-U*—188 slave-girls, ^d*Nanše*—180 slave-girls ^d*Gá-tum-dug*—unknown, ^d*Dumu-zi*—23 slave-girls, ^d*Ig-alim*—23 slave-girls, ^d*Šul-ša-ga(n)*—unknown, ^d*Nin-Mar^{ki}*—21 slave-girls, ^d*Utu*—unknown, ^d*Nin-dar*—13 slave-girls.

Similar data, although less dependable, can be found referring to the number of the free workers of several temple estates, including that of ^d*Nin-ġir-su*. The percentage of the different categories of workers among the personnel of the temple of ^d*Ba-U* is known. Taking this percentage to be the average³, we may compute the approximate number of the working members of the temple personnel of all the temples in Lagaš. The number of the freemen connected with the temples can be shown to be certainly much lower than the figure 36 000 given by Urukagina as the number of freemen in Lagaš, even if we take it as giving only the order of the number⁴.

The computed total area of the temple estates is only a very rough approximation based on the assumption that the dimensions of these estates were in proportion to the number of the working personnel. The area of temple land, by this estimate, did not exceed 500 to 1000 km². The lower figure is the more probable by far. In any case, it is safe to assume that the temple estates did not encompass the entire territory of Lagaš.

¹ According to H. Frankfort who judged from the dimensions of the site of Tello, its population must have numbered *ca* 19 000. But this figure, not very dependable in itself, refers only to one of the communities of the state of Lagaš.

² This can be proved to be fairly certain.

³ There are grounds to think that the number of free workers in the temple of ^d*Ba-U* was higher than the average.

⁴ The figure 3600 given by Entemena refers probably only to heads of free families outside the temples, and the figure 216 000 given by Gudea refers to «the Land», i. e. the whole of the extensive part of Sumer ruled by this prince.

Chapter II. The Sumerian community and the social structure of the population

The documents referring to sale of land show us the conditions existing on the land outside the temple estates. Such documents dating from at least the XXVIIth century B. C. and down to 2000 B. C., have been found at all the more important sites of southern and northern Babylonia. It can be shown that they do not refer to any of the categories of temple land known to us.

Temple land in Lagaš at the end of the Early Dynastic period was divided into three categories: 1) *niġ-en-(n)a* or *gán-en-land*, reserved for the maintenance of the temple; 2) *kur₆-(r)a-land*, divided into non-hereditary and interchangeable, strictly individual parcels allotted to men working on *niġ-en-(n)a-land* and to temple artisans and administrative personnel for their service; 3) *uru₄-lal-land*, allotted against a share in the crop to different persons (mostly to members of the temple personnel as a supplement to what they got of *kur₆-land*)⁵.

There is no evidence that land of any of these categories could ever be bought or sold. Even after the reforms of Urukagina the *šub-lugala*, i. e., probably agricultural personnel dependent, in most cases, on the temples, acquired in Lagaš only 1) the right to sell their house and movable property and 2) the right of undisturbed possession of water on their plot, but not the right to sell their plot itself.

A detailed analysis of the documents of sale (the most important of which are “the Enġeġal document”, the documents from Šuruppak, “the Adab Document”, “The Nies and Keiser Tablet”, “the Obelisk of Maništusu”, “the Sippar Tablet”, the fragments of documents of sale from the Diyala Region, etc) shows that they all reveal a fairly homogenous picture of the agrarian conditions in the Early Dynastic and the Akkadian periods,—conditions entirely different from those revealed by the documents of the vast temple archives.

In the hereditary possession of patriarchal families there existed land which could be alienated (*gán-sám*)⁶ and was sometimes bought up by important personages—mostly by big functionaries in the administration, by kinsmen of the princes and the ruling princes themselves. The land was sold by the head or

⁵ In earlier times and in other Sumerian cities the categories of temple land had sometimes other denominations; in the beginning *niġ-en-(n)a-land* did not exist. But in most cases the division of temple land in Early Dynastic times was in principle more or less the same.

⁶ The economics of Sumer being at this period still very primitive, cases of sale of land naturally happened but rarely.

by another member of the family not in the character of the proprietor of the land but in the character of an elected representative of the family community. As often as not, the sale was effected by a group of family representatives (brothers or other kinsmen). Other family members (or, in the case of the sale of larger plots of land, members of a whole patriarchal clan) took part in the transaction as witnesses, whereby their agreement to the transaction was made manifest. Such witnesses received a payment (more or less nominal) alongside of the vendors. In many cases there also appeared unpaid witnesses on the side of the purchaser, probably members of the Council of Elders. Sometimes paid representatives of the administration took part in the transaction. Deeds by which big tracts of land were alienated needed, it seems, the approbation of the popular Assembly of the community or even of the «nome» in question. Such a «nome» united several rural communities and was the primary cell within which the state had been created. In Early Dynastic times it was usually identical with the so-called «city-state», later it was a more or less self-governing unit in the larger state which comprised the whole of the lower valley of the Euphrates and the Tigris.

It is evident that these conditions have nothing in common with the conditions on temple land mentioned above. We have every reason to assume that the freely sold private land (which practically, in many cases, was family property) so well known in Mesopotamia in the II millennium B. C. originated in the land outside the temple estates to which the Early Dynastic documents of sale refer.

It seems that from the start there existed alienable land belonging to free members of the community, alongside of temple land (which, beginning with the latter part of the Early Dynastic period, was being taken over by the rulers and becoming crown land). The free community members were organized in large patriarchal families or family communities, these again forming part of patriarchal clans and village communities united in «nomes» or «city-states». In the family communities the principle of electiveness certainly existed, and it may be supposed to have existed in the village communities and in the «nomes» as well. The village and the «nome»-communities had their own organs of self-government — popular Assemblies and Councils of Elders.

On the other hand, the temple personnel had no organization of their own and took part in no organs of self-government. They got their plots individually by an arbitrary decision of the temple administration and could lose them by another arbitrary decision.

The parallel existence of two main types of land — temple or royal land, on the one hand, and community land (including private possessions within the limits of the community), on the other — is typical of the history of Southern Mesopotamia in ancient times. Only in its earliest stages (not later than the beginning of the Early Dynastic period) was temple land a part of community land, being cultivated, according to A. I. Tyumenev, by community members. Later the temple estates had their own personnel (originally fugitives from other communities, perhaps also junior kinsmen of the more well-to-do community members, etc). During the Early Dynastic period all agricultural work including irrigation work, as well on the temple estates as in the communities, was done by freemen (free dependants of the temple⁷ and free community members respectively), while slaves, although they existed in considerable numbers, were used only as auxiliary workers and in some branches of the crafts (for instance, slave-girls in the weavers' shops, etc).

In accordance with the division of land into temple (or royal) land and community land, the population of Sumer was divided into 1) men dependent on, or receiving land from the king and the temple on condition of service, and 2) men enjoying full citizens' rights and having a part in community property in land or (later) owning private property, their property rights being in this case restricted only by the necessity of membership of the proprietor in the community.

The beforementioned documents of sale show the existence, outside of temple land, not only of plots belonging to the common members of the community, but also of large estates belonging to the hereditary nobility of the community — the princes (*ensí, lugal*), the *sag-sug*₄ etc. The priests probably also belonged to this nobility, since there is no evidence of their being usually among those to whom land was allotted from the temple estates. The noble families possessed estates measuring hundreds of hectares. This nobility was later extirpated by the Akkadian and Ur III kings and supplanted by a new bureaucratic nobility whose possessions never reached such dimensions.

It is very difficult to say who worked on the estates of the nobility but it could hardly be only slaves. We may assume that the work was to a great extent done by clients. Their social status would be similar to the status of the dependants of the temples. These latter were mostly not directly dependent on the temples themselves but were clients (*šul-a*) of the more pro-

⁷ Later they lost their plots of land and received only food and wool rations; in Ur III times they became practically slaves (called *guruš*).

sperous among the members of the temple personnel and temple administration.

Thus, the population of a Sumerian state consisted of 1) the nobility of the communities (members of the administration, including the rulers and the more important priests), owning large estates partly in private, partly in family possession, and probably using the labour of clients and slaves; the temple land was also under their control, although in time it passed under the individual control of the ruler and later became his property; it was probably this nobility that the Council of Elders represented; 2) common members of the communities (probably not less than half of the population), having plots of community land in family possession. They were probably represented by the Assembly; 3) clients, including a) well-to-do clients of the temple (the temple administration, the more important of the artisans, etc); b) other clients of the temple — the great mass of the temple personnel; they got small plots of temple land for their service; some of them got only food and wool rations; c) (probably) clients of the nobility; 4) slaves, including temple and private slaves.

Chapter III. The structure of the early Sumerian state

The state administration was in the Early Dynastic period headed by a ruler who bore the title *en, ensi or lugal*.

En early became a purely priestly title. It is difficult to define the scope of the authority of the *ensi* as opposed to that of the *lugal*. It seems the situation differed in the several states of Sumer. Some states never had *lugals*, others never had *ensis*. In Lagaš there sometimes existed a *lugal* and sometimes an *ensi*, in some of the «*nomes*» a *lugal* and an *ensis* apparently existed simultaneously.

The opinion is current that an independent ruler was called *lugal*, while a ruler who was dependent on a *lugal* was called *enss*. But we know of some *ensis* who certainly were quite independent (Eanatum in Lagaš), while some *lugals* as certainly were dependent on other *lugals* (several *lugals* were dependent on Lugalzagesi, ruler of Umma and Uruk). It seems that in states where both titles were in use the difference consisted in the character and scope of their respective authority. Thus, Eanatum had the title of *lugal* at a period when he was less powerful in comparison with the other Sumerian rulers than when he had the title of *ensi*, but it is probable that when he was a *lugal* he enjoyed greater authority in his own state because he headed a levy of the citizens of Lagaš during its struggle against Umms. (We know of several cases when the *ensi* headed his personal

military following or the military force of the temple but we do not know for certain if he ever headed a levy.) Urukagina changed his title of *ensi* to that of *lugal* when starting at his reforms and beginning a war against Umma and Uruk. It is probable that an *ensi* could be temporarily elected to be a *lugal*.

An *ensi* or a *lugal* of a «*nome*»-state exercised the supreme priestly function, the function of leading the work of the construction of temples and the irrigation work (in his own name), and fiscal functions. Legislative functions of the ruler are so far known only in connection with the *lugals*. The ruler apparently did not act as a judge — at any rate, not individually. In the latter part of the Early Dynastic period the rulers assumed the function of control over the temple estates and later turned them into their own property. But, as both the *ensis* and the *lugals* had to buy land just as any other mortal, they were not the supreme owners of all the land in the state.

Alongside of the *lugals* of the separate «*nome*»-states there existed as early as the beginning of the Early Dynastic period another type of *lugals* bearing such titles as «*lugal* of the Land» (in Uruk) or «*lugal* of the Universe» (*lugal kiši* — in Kiš and elsewhere). A *lugal* of this type had supreme control over «*nomes*» other than his own, and over their rulers, who in this case mostly (though not always) had the title of *ensi* or *ensi-ġar*. Such a *lugal* stood above the possibility of control by the Councils of Elders and the Assemblies and was a forerunner of the despotic king of later times. It is probable that many rulers did not dare to assume the title of *lugal* in their own «*nome*» unless there was no powerful *lugal* of the second type sufficiently near to claim supreme control.

Within a temple estate ruled by an *ensi* or a *lugal*, as well as in his irrigation and building activities, the authority of the ruler was not restricted by any other government organs. But in other cases the organs of community self-government shared the power with the ruler. These were 1) The Council of Elders (*ab-(b)a uru*, AB+ĀŠ *uru*) and 2) The Assembly of all able-bodied men (*guruš uru*, or *mes*). Both organs were called *unken* (lit. «circle of the people»), later they were also called by the Akkadian term *puġrum*.

Of course, these organs can but seldom be found mentioned in the administrative documents of the temple estates or in the building inscriptions. But there is sufficient evidence of their existence throughout nearly all the periods of the history of ancient Southern Mesopotamia. The *ab-(b)a* are mentioned in lexical texts and as administrators of temple estates in Jemdet Nasr times when the temple estate was not yet separated from the community. In Šuruppak (XXVII century B. C.) the documents

were dated by «turns» of eponyms—the eponyms being probably representatives of different territorial and clan units (i. e., Elders presiding by turn in the Council? Cf. the conditions in Aš-šur). The Elders are also mentioned in documents of the Akkadian and Ur III Periods.

There is evidence of the activities of both the Council of Elders and the Assembly in the epic tales of Gilgameš and Aka, of Enmerkar and probably also in the text of the Obelisk of Maništusu.

A tale of Naram-Suen mentions the election of Iphur-Kiš as ruler of Kiš by the Assembly. One of the inscriptions of Gudea mentions the *unken*. In the later Akkadian epic of Gilgameš the Assembly plays a more or less passive rôle while the Council of Elders continues to be very active.

Although religion, beginning with the XXIst century B. C., was wholly in the service of the kings and propagated the idea of autocratic power, the kingdom of the gods was still pictured as ruled by the king of gods not individually but conjointly with a Council of Elders; this kingdom was a «celestial city» where the gods were «citizens» (*mēsi*). The same is true of the «city» of the Nether World.

The council of Elders (*šibūtum*) and the popular assemblages of a city (*ālum, kārum, puhrum*) or of a city-ward (*bābtum*) still played an important rôle in the state life of Babylonia in the times of Hammurabi, but now they were no more than organs of the local administration. We are well acquainted with their functions in this period. These organs being a survival of the primitive clan society, we can assume that their authority could not be less in Early Dynastic times than it was in the time of Hammurabi. And as the states of Sumer were in most cases confined to one «nome» each, it is clear that the Councils of Elders and the Assembly of the «nome» were at that time organs of the state as a whole.

In the Old Babylonian period the community self-government had different administrative, fiscal, notarial, judicial and police functions. It had its own functionaries distinct from the royal administration. The same functions, and others, must be supposed to have existed in the Early Dynastic period. The epics show that the ruler could not exercise his military functions without consultation with the community organs. The Assembly, as can be indirectly deduced from the epics, had the power to grant citizenship rights.

It seems that in principle the source of authority of the ruler was his election by community organs, though in practice his authority was hereditary. It is probable that the same organs had the right to depose the ruler. As late as in the «*Enūma eliš*»-

epic (dating from post-Hammurabian times) which was recited at the temple in connection with the ritual of investment of the king with royal power, the authority of the king of the gods, Marduk, is pictured as emanating from his election by the Council, the functions of the king being clearly defined in terms of the real state practice of the II millennium B. C. (leadership of the army, questions of strategy, presiding in the Council, consultation with community organs).

PART II. HISTORY OF THE SUMERIAN SOCIETY AND STATE

The second part of the treatise is a detailed history of Southern Mesopotamia from the Jemdet Nasr period to 2000 B. C. as seen in the light of the formation of the social conditions and public law characteristic of the Early Dynastic period and delineated above (*Chapter I. The military democracy and the aristocratic oligarchy. The struggle for power between the king and the aristocracy*). The history of the rise of despotic royal power during the reign of the Dynasty of Akkad and its full development under the IIIrd Dynasty of Ur is then closely followed (*Chapter II. The rise of despotism and the struggle for its consolidation. Chapter III. The despotic state under the IIIrd Dynasty of Ur*). Specially emphasized are the problems of the Reforms of Urukagina, the chronology and social rôle of the Akkadian Dynasty⁸ and of the rulers of Lagaš preceding the IIIrd Dynasty of Ur; the specific character of the Qutium rule; and the social background of the fall of Ur.

⁸ The author tries to show that the final destruction of Urukagina's state was effected by Sargon and not by Lugalzagesi.

ОГЛАВЛЕНИЕ

	Стр.
От автора	3
<i>Часть I</i>	
СТРУКТУРА ОБЩЕСТВА И ГОСУДАРСТВА РАННЕДИНАСТИЧЕСКОГО ШУМЕРА	
Глава I. Территория шумерского «города-государства» и хра- мовая территория	9
Глава II. Шумерская община и социальный строй населения	40
1. Общинная земля вне храмовой территории	40
2. Община и храм	83
Глава III. Государственный строй древнейшего Шумера	120
<i>Часть II</i>	
ИСТОРИЯ ШУМЕРСКОГО ОБЩЕСТВА И ГОСУДАРСТВА	
Глава I. Военная демократия и аристократическая олигархия. Борьба царя и аристократии за власть	153
Глава II. Возникновение деспотии и борьба за ее упрочение	196
Глава III. Деспотическое государство при III династии Ура	249
Список сокращений	275
Указатель исторических собственных имен	278
Указатель географических и этнических названий	283
Summary	289