In der abendländischen Rezeption bleibt sie über die christliche Universalgeschichte als aktive Herrscherin des ersten Weltreiches wie als Bauherrin in Babylon präsent. Seit der frühen Neuzeit wird sie auch mit den „Hängenden Gärten" in Verbindung gebracht (Brodersen 1996, 57; Rollinger 1999, 377–380; Bichler/Rollinger 2005, 158).

Bichler R. 2000: Herodots Welt: der Aufbau der Historie am Bild der fremden Länder und Völker, ihrer Zivilisation und ihrer Geschichte; id. 2004: Ktesias „korrigiert" Herodot: zur literarischen Einschätzung der Persika, in: H. Heftner/K. Tomaschitz (ed.), Ad Fontes! Festschrift für Gerhard Dobesch zum fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag am 15. September 2004, 105–116. – Bichler R./Rollinger R. 2005: Die Hängenden Gärten zu Ninive: die Lösung eines Rätsels?, Fs. M. Schretter (= AOAT 325) 153–217. – Brodersen K. 1992: Reiseführer zu den sieben Weltwundern: Philon von Byzanz und andere antike Texte; id. 1996¹: Die sieben Weltwunder: legendäre Kunst- und Bauwerke der Antike. – Comploi S. 2000: Die Darstellung der Semiramis bei Diodorus Siculus, in: R. Rollinger/Ch. Ulf (ed.), Geschlechterrollen und Frauenbild in der Perspektive antiker Autoren, 223–244. – Eilers W. 1971: Semiramis: Entstehung und Nachhall einer altorientalischen Sage (= Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte Bd. 274, Abh. 2). – Frahm E. 2001: Semiramis, Der Neue Pauly 11, 377f. – Madreiter I. i. Dr.: Ktesias und Babylonien: über eine nicht existierende Größe in den Persika, in: Wiesehöfer et al. i. Dr., 130–161. – Jacobs B./Rollinger R. (ed.) 2010: Der achaimenidische Hof. The Achaemenid court (= Classica et Orientalia 2). – Kwasman Th. 1998: Rezension zu Weinfeld 1991, BiOr. 55, 465–468.

Labow D. 2005: Flavius Josephus, Contra Apionem, Buch I.: Einleitung, Text, textkritischer Apparat, Übersetzung und Kommentar (= Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament NF 7). – Lehmann-Haupt F. 1965: Semiramis, in: W. H. Roscher (ed.), Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie 4, 678–702. – Lenfant D. (ed.) 2004: Ctésias de Cnide: La Perse, l'Inde, autres fragments: texte établi, traduit et commenté. – Lenschau Th. 1940: Semiramis, RE Suppl. 7, 1204–1212. – Lewy H. 1952: Nitokris-Naqî'a, JNES 11, 264–286. – Nagel W. 1982: Ninus und Semiramis in Sage und Geschichte: iranische Staaten und Reiternomaden vor Darius (= BBV NF 2). – Nothers Th. 1992: Kommentar, in: Diodoros, Griechische Weltgeschichte, Buch I–X, Teil 1: übersetzt von Gerhard Wirth und Otto Veh (= Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 34). – Novotny J. R. 2002: Sammu-rāmat, PNA 3/1, 1083f. – Oelsner J. 1992: Griechen in Babylonien und die einheimischen Tempel in

hellenistischer Zeit, in: D. Charpin/F. Joannès (ed.), La circulation des biens, des personnes et des idées dans le Proche-Orient Ancien (= CRRAI 38) 341–347. – Pettinato G. 1988: Semiramis: Herrin über Assur und Babylon. – Phillips E. D. 1972: Semiramis at Behistun, Classica et Mediaevalia 29, 162–168.

Radner K. 2005: Kubaba und die Fische: Bemerkungen zur Herrin von Karkemiš, Fs. M. Schretter (= AOAT 325) 543–556. – Röllig W. 1975: Semiramis, Der Kleine Pauly 5, 94f. – Rollinger R. 1993: Herodots babylonischer Logos (= IBK 84); id. 1999: Babylon, Der Neue Pauly 13, 371–382; id. i. Dr.: Assur, Assyrien und die klassische Überlieferung: Nachwirken, Deutungsmuster und historische Reflexion, in: J. Renger (ed.), Assur: Gott, Stadt, Land (= CDOG 5); id. 2010a: Ktesias' medischer Logos, in: Wiesehöfer et al. 2010; id. 2010b Der Hof als Strafgericht, in: Jacobs/Rollinger 2010. – Schramm W. 1972: War Semiramis assyrische Regentin?, Historia 21, 513–521. – Weinfeld M. 1991: Semiramis: her name and her origin, Fs. H. Tadmor 99–103. – Wiesehöfer J./Lanfranchi G. B./Rollinger R. (ed.) 2010: Die Welt des Ktesias. Ctesias' world (= Classica et Orientalia 1).

R. Rollinger

Semiten, Semitisch (Semites, Semitic).

§ 1. Name. – § 2. The extralinguistic irrelevance of the terms. – § 3. The Semitic languages.

§ 1. Name. The name "Semites" derives from Sem, Noah's oldest son. The table of nations in Gen. 10, 21–31 and 11, 10–26, records as his descendents, among others, Hebrews, Aramaens, Assyrians and Old South Arabians, for whose languages the name "Semitic" has been adopted, following A. L. Schlözer apud Eichhorn 1781, 161. Also included among the descendants of Sem, however, are speakers of the linguistically non-Semitic Lydian and Elamite.

§ 2. The extralinguistic irrelevance of the terms. Today, the terms "Semites" and „Semitic" are mostly confined to their linguistic sense in the humanities and sciences for two reasons:

Firstly, the abuse of the terms by racist ideologies has partly put their use under a taboo.

Secondly, no common anthropological, historical or cultural heritage of the speakers of Semitic languages can be recon-

structed: there is no Semitic race; the question of an original homeland is unanswered; the old wave theory, according to which Semites from the heart of the Arabian peninsula periodically infiltrated the Fertile Crescent, is only rarely held today, though it has also not been replaced by any other theory; the cultural identities of the Semitic speaking peoples appear to have mainly developed only after the divergence from the supposed common Proto-Semitic ancestor. Therefore, further questions, e.g. about an original Semitic religion, are largely meaningless.

§ 3. The Semitic languages. The Semitic languages, together with Ancient Egyptian, the Lybico-Berber, Cushitic and Chadic language families, belong to the Afroasiatic (Semito-Hamitic or Hamito-Semitic) language phylum. They are attested from about 2600 BC until today and constitute the dominant language family in the Near East throughout this period.

A generally accepted division of the Semitic languages doesn't exist. Most widespread is the family tree model that, although it employs geographical terminology, reflects significant linguistic realities.

According to one variant of this model (Hetzron 1974), the Semitic languages fall into two principal branches, East and West Semitic.

East Semitic mainly consists of one language only, Akkadian, the pre-eminent language spoken in Mesopotamia for most of its ancient history, serving as the *lingua franca* of the Near East in the 2nd and the first half of the 1st mill. and written in cuneiform (Keilschrift*). Within Akkadian, the dialects of Babylonian in the south are distinguished from the dialects of Assyrian in the north. The language of Ebla (Ibla*) in northern Syria is either a dialect of (Old) Akkadian (Krebernik 1996) or a separate subbranch of East Semitic closely related to Akkadian.

West Semitic comprises two subbranches, Central and South Semitic. Central Semitic falls into Northwest Semitic and North Arabic. Northwest Semitic consists of Amorite, Ugaritic (Ugaritisch*), the Canaanite languages (Phoenician, Hebrew and others) and Aramaic. Whereas Amorite is only attested in a large number of personal names (Name*, Namengebung. E) and some hundred loan words in Akkadian texts, Ugaritic, Phoenician (Phönizien* § 4), Hebrew and Aramaic (Aramäische* Inschriften aus Assur und Hatra) are also known from texts written in different variants of the alphabet, all of which are already attested during the Ancient Near Eastern period. For Aramaic, Phoenician, Hebrew, Moabite and Edomite names in cuneiform texts see Name*, Namengebung. F. §§ 3–7. Still debated is the affiliation of the almost unknown language of the Chaldeans (Kaldu* § 1); most scholars classify it as Aramaic.

North Arabic consists of early inscriptional dialects, Classical Arabic and modern Arabic dialects. Early dialects are attested by a couple of loanwords and names in Akkadian texts of the 1st mill. (Name*, Namengebung. F. § 8).

South Semitic comprises two subbranches, South Arabic and Ethiopic. South Arabic consists of Old South Arabic (Sabaic and others; Südarabien*) and Modern South Arabic languages (Mehri etc.). Very few Sabaic names occur in Akkadian texts of the 1st mill. (Name*, Namengebung. F. § 9). Ethiopic consists of Old Ethiopic and Modern Ethiopic languages (Amharic and others).

Basically the same division of the Semitic languages is achieved by another model using a chronological terminology (Oelsner 1994): Again Akkadian is opposed as Old Semitic to all other Semitic languages, labeled Young Semitic. Young Semitic in turn is divided into Early Young Semitic (corresponding to South Semitic) and Late Young Semitic (corresponding to Central Semitic).

Bergsträsser G. 1928: Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen: Sprachproben und grammatische Skizzen. – Brockelmann C. 1908–1913: Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen. – Eichhorn J. G. 1781: Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Literatur vol. 8. – Fronzaroli P. 1964–69: Studi sul lessico comune semitico, Academia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche 8, vol. 19, fasc. 5–

6 p. 1–54; vol. 20, fasc. 3–4 p. 135–150; fasc. 5–6 p. 250–269; vol. 23, fasc. 7–12 p. 267–303; vol. 24, fasc. 7–12 p. 1–36. – Hetzron R. 1974: La division des langues sémitiques, in: A. Caquot/D. Cohen (ed.), Actes du premier congrès international de linguistique sémitique et chamito-sémitique, Paris 16–19 juillet 1969, 181–194; id. 1998 (ed.): The Semitic languages. – Huehnergard J. 1995: Semitic languages, CANE 4, 2117–2134.

Kienast B. 2001: Historische Semitische Sprachwissenschaft: mit Beiträgen von Erhart Graefe (Altaegyptisch) und Gene B. Gragg (Kuschitisch). – Krebernik M. 1996: The linguistic classification of Eblaite: methods, problems, and results, in: J. S. Cooper/G. M. Schwartz (ed.), The study of the Ancient Near East in the twenty-first century, 233–249. – Lipiński E. 1997: Semitic languages: outline of a comparative grammar (= OLA 80). – Militarev A./Kogan L. 2000: Semitic etymological dictionary. Vol. 1: Anatomy of man and animals (= AOAT 278/1); idd. 2005: Vol. 2: Animal names. – Moscati S. et al. 1980: An introduction to the comparative grammar of the Semitic languages: phonology and morphology. – Oelsner J. 1994: Gedanken zur Klassifizierung der semitischen Sprachen, ZDMG Suppl. 10, 52–61. – Stempel R. 1999: Abriß einer historischen Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen (= Nordostafrikanisch-westasiatische Studien 3). – Voigt R. 2002: Rekonstruktion oder Konvergenz?: zur Methodik in der semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, OLZ 97, 6–26.

M. P. Streck

Šēmītum „Die Erhörende". (Bei-)Name einer in altbab. Zeit in Uruk (BagM 18, 155 f. Nr. 36: 3) und Larsa (VS 1386: 9; TCL 10, 115: 25 f.) verehrten Göttin, s. Richter, Panthea (2004²) 329 bzw. 401.

M. Krebernik

Šemšārā s. Šušarrâ.

Šemti-šilhak. Father of Kudurmabuk* of Yamutbal (Jamutbal*). Š.'s name is only known as patronymic in inscriptions by Kudurmabuk (Frayne, RIME 4, 267–269) and in inscriptions commissioned by Kudurmabuk on behalf of Š.'s grandsons, Warad-Sîn* and Rīm-Sîn* I of Larsa (ibid. 205–216, 219–222, 272–275). His name, like that of his son Kudurmabuk and his daughter Manzi-wartaš (R. Zadok, Iran 25 [1987] 6, 25 n. 31), is Elamite and may be interpreted as "Lord-Mighty" (*Temti-šilhak; cf. Zadok, AION Suppl. 40 [1984] nos. 220b, 246). These names, and the notable increase in Elamite personal names in general during the reigns of Š.'s grandsons and shortly afterwards (Zadok, Iran 25 [1987] 6–10; A. J. Marchant, Old Babylonian tablets from Larsa [1990] 234–244) suggests an Elamite influence or even presence at Larsa. (Rīm-Sîn did *not*, however, build a temple for "Ninlil of Elam" but for "Ninenimma*"). Altogether, it remains difficult to decide whether Š. himself was an Amorite sheikh of the Yamutbal, who had strong cultural and political ties to Elam (as most commentators assume), or was in fact himself Elamite or of Elamite descent (cf., most recently, Steinkeller 2004, 30 f.; M. Van De Mieroop, A history of the Ancient Near East [2007²] 101).

A king or local leader with the name of Š. has not been securely identified in texts from Iran: König's (in Elam* 328–330) and Cameron's proposal to identify Š. as Šilhaha*, son of Eparti, mentioned as dynastic founder by a number of Elamite kings, based on the resemblance of the two names, implies very long reigns for Šilhaha and Kudurmabuk. It has been argued, however, that the parallel between Šilhaha's epithet, ad-da ka[lam], "father of the land? (of Anšan and Susa)", and those of Kudurmabuk, ad-da E-mu-ut-ba-la, "father of Yamutbal", and ad-da kur mar-tu, "father of the Amorite land" has a historical significance (Elam* 329; P. Koschaker, Or. 4 [1935] 78 f.; W. W. Hallo, AOS 43 [1957] 108–112; id., AnSt. 30 [1980] 194; F. Vallat, NABU 1989/101).

Cameron G. G. 1936: History of early Iran, 70, 75–80. – Carter E./Stolper M. W. 1984: Elam (= NESt. 25) 28–30. – Charpin D./Durand J. M. 1991: La suzeraineté de l'empereur (sukkalmah) d'Élam sur la Mésopotamie et le "nationalisme" amorrite, in: Mésopotamie et Elam (= CRRAI 36 = MHEO 1), 59–66. – Edzard D. O. 1957: ZZB 167 f. – Potts D. T. 1999: The archaeology of Elam, 166–168. – Steinkeller P. 2004: The role of Mashkan-shapir in early second millennium political history, in: E. C. Stone/P. Zimansky, The anatomy