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CHAPTER FOUR

The Age of the Hurrian Expansion
Assuming that the Hurrians came from the north or northeast (see below), the first place they would reach would be the mountainous regions of the northern Transtigris and eastern Anatolia. However, while the earliest available evidence, namely the year-names of Narām-Sīn of Akkad, shows a Hurrian presence in the Transtigris, there is no evidence for Eastern Anatolia. But evidence of a Hurrian presence in the Habur Region as early as the OAkk. period most probably indicates a Hurrian immigration through Eastern Anatolia. Since powerful centralized states, such as Akkad and Ur III, were controlling the Mesopotamian plains up to the Nineveh Region in the time when the Hurrians are thought to have immigrated, these newcomers would have been able to move only along the borders of these states. It is slightly to the southeast, i.e. towards the Hamrin Region, and westwards, to the Habur Region, that they make one of their earliest attestations in the written records.

The hypothesis that the Hurrians have come from the northeast of Mesopotamia fits well geographically with the year-name of Narām-Sīn recording that the first encounter with the Hurrians was in Azu'inum. Azu'inum can be located somewhere in the East Tigris region, on the Lower Zāb or slightly to the south of it. This again raises the question about the original home of the Hurrians. Unfortunately, no textual material of any kind is available that can help to solve this problem. They most likely came from the north or northeast, from the Trans-Caucasus or from across the Caspian Sea and were present in the mountains north of Urkeš.

1 The modern name ‘Hurrian’ is derived from the Akkadian geographic appellation Hurri and its ethnic derivative Hurri. However, the name was known to other peoples of the ancient Near East and found its way into their written records; cf. Hittite Ürri (used for the first time by Ḫattušiliš I); Ugaritic ḫr; even actual Hurrian (KUR)ḫur-uru-ḫé and KURḫur-wa-uru-ḫé; Egyptian ḫuru (used for the first time by Thutmose III), cf. Astour, M., “Les Hourrites en Syrie du nord, rapport sommaire,” Revue Hittite et Asiatique (RHA), 36 (1978), p. 1. The Egyptian rendering of this name was ʒhrw, cf. Vernus, P., Les Hurrites dans les sources égyptiennes, in Problèmes concernant les Hurrites, I, Paris, 1977, p. 42. The Biblical Hebrew ḫōri was earlier wrongly understood as derived from Hebrew ḫwr with the meaning ‘cave-dwellers,’ cf. Wilhelm, G., “Gedanken zur Frühgeschichte der Hurriter und zum hurritisch-urartäischen Sprachvergleich,” Hurriter und hurritisch, ed. Volkert Haas, Xenia 21, Konstanz, 1988, p. 43. The Hurrian form of the name shows that the ethnonym is built on the root hur-, cf. Edzard, D. O. and A. Kammenhuber, “Hurritier, Hurritisch,” RIA 4 (1972-75), p. 508.

2 Discussed below under “The Old Akkadian Period.”

3 For the location of Azu'inum and the problems raised by its identification, see note 24 in chapter two. Steinkeller and Salvini think that Azu'inum mentioned in this campaign of Narām-Sīn was situated in the Habur area, not in the east Tigris region; cf. note 24 in chapter two.


5 Cf. Kammenhuber, A., “Die Arier im Vorderen Orient und die historischen Wohnsitze der Hurriter,” Or. NS 46 (1977), p. 134; Kammenhuber, “Die Hurritier und …,” RHA, 36 (1978), p. 88. In this respect, one must point to the hypothesis of Ungnad, who wrote about the Hurrians as the aboriginals of the region between Palestine in the southwest and the Armenian mountains in the northeast. Later he called them the Subarians and considered them the founders of the prehistoric Halaf Culture, cf. Wilhelm, “Gedanken zur Frühgeschichte...,” Hurritier und hurritisch, p. 44. The hypothesis is hardly tenable, for the Hurrians we know now were distinct from the Subarians (see Chapter Two, under the Subarians). Moreover, the point given as the western presence of the Hurrians in Palestine proved to be a biblical allusion to a small group of Hurrians who lived in Edom: Wilhelm,
since the fifth millennium BC, according to Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati. Since the Hurrian word *turišhe*, “west,” is apparently derived from *turi*, “down,” Richter thinks it indicates the eastern mountainous homeland of the Hurrians. Hurrian mythology, as found in later copies in Hittite archives, is also in favour of a northern mountainous homeland, since these myths are set in a mountainous environment. Other Hurrian traditions found in the material culture of Urkeš show a culture cradled in the old rural Hurrian communities of the northern highlands, in northern and eastern Anatolia. Among these were the iconographic styles and elements later found in the iconography of Kültepe level II, such as the bull standing on an altar, the slaying of a reversed bull using the long triangular knife, the fashion, particularly headdresses, and the early Transcaucasian sherds and andirons found in Urkeš. There is evidence of trade relations between Urkeš and the northern mountains, in which metals, stones, timber and wild animals were exchanged. This fact leads to the conclusion that the inhabitants of the northern highlands were in fact rural Hurrians rather than urban Hurrians of the Habur region. In any case, recent discoveries in northeastern Syria show that the regions of southeastern Anatolia must have played a significant role in the prehistory of the Hurrians.

**Earliest Evidence**

**The Old Akkadian Period**

*The Transtigris*

In the northern Transtigris, the first attestations of Hurrian PNs and GNs date to the Akkadian period. A year-name of Narām-Sīn mentioned for the first time a ruler called T/Daḡiš-atili during one of his campaigns to the northeast. The year-name can be translated: “The ye[ar] Narā[m-S]in was victorious over the land of Subir at Azuhīnum and took prisoner T/Daḡiš-atili.” The place-name connected to this Hurrian named ruler also has

---

op. cit., p. 43. The same is true for the scattered Hurrian names attested in Layašum (= Tell al-Qāhī) in Palestine from the period of the Mari Archive: Richter, “Die Ausbreitung der Hurriter …,” p. 290. The purport of Chiera and Gelb’s theory is that the Hurrians were present from the end of the 3rd millennium BC in the mountainous regions to the east and northeast of Assyria and in the plains northeast of Assyria, and that they moved to the west and southwest in the first half of the 2nd millennium BC., cf. Wilhelm, op. cit., p. 44.


8 Marilyn Kelley-Buccellati, “Urkesh and the North: Recent Discoveries,” SCCNH 15 (2005), p. 40. Note that the Hurrian myth of silver states that silver was a boy living with his mother in the mountains and has rough encounters with the other children. He then sets out to look for his father Kumarbi, who administers justice for all the lands from his main seat in Urkeš as told by his mother. When silver arrives at Urkeš, Kumarbi had already departed to walk in the mountains, symbolizing the city control over the villages “by being recognized as the ancestral dimension of public life,” Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, “Urkesh and the Question of …,” p. 150. (the summary of the myth after Buccellati and Kelly Buccellati, *ibid*.)


11 Kelly-Buccellati, “Urkesh and the North,” p. 30 and 40, where she says that even iconography in Urkeš has its closest parallels in the later Kültepe level 2 iconography.

12 Richter, “Die Ausbreitung…,” p. 266.


14 Frayne, *RIME* 2, p. 86, q.
distinctive Hurrian characteristics in the suffixes -ḫini and -ḫina. More significant, as Steinkeller noted, is that this is the first time in recorded history that the Hurrians are associated with Subartu. The story of the Great Uprising against Narām-Sīn, although a later compilation, mentions a certain Puttim-atal, king of Simurrum, who joined that uprising. In another year-name of Narām-Sīn the name of Simurrum occurs in combination with a clear Hurrian place-name, Kirašeniwe: “The year Narām-Sīn was victorious over (the yoke?) of Simurrum in Kirašeniwe and took Baba, the ensi of Simurrum (and) DUB.UL, ensi of Arame prisoner.” Another inscription that is believed to be by Narām-Sīn, judging by the royal titles, mentions Hurrian-like GNs located in Subartu, such as Zumhinnum, Šewin-[…], Šu’awe, […]-we in addition to Ažuḫinum. In the Hanrin region and lower Diyala some PNs from the OAkk. period show a Hurrian presence. Some good examples are Dup-ki-a-šum (= Tūpki-ašum), probably A-ru-um, al-la, Še-eb-ru-ug, and probably Zu-zu from Ḥaḍāji. Tūl-pī-ip-še and Wi-(ir-)ri from Tell Suleima. These few PNs, although some of them such as Wi(r) and probably his boss (?) Tulpipše held priestly functions, do not necessarily imply a dense Hurrian population, but they could have been individuals moving there in this period.

Talmuš has been referred to as a formerly Hurrian GN in the Transtigris region by Michalowski. He proposes that it is composed of the Hurrian word talmi “great.” He further suggested replacing the name formerly read as Rīmūs with Talmuš, since the royal name Rīmūs was always written with Rī not RI and royal names are used only as parts of compound names.

---


16 Steinkeller, “The Historical Background…,” p. 91.

17 Based on Gelb and Girbal, Salvini analysed the name as *Puttum-atal, the first part of which is presumably connected to putukki ‘achievement,’ and the second part ‘strong, mighty;’ Salvini, “The Earliest…,” p. 103.


19 *Kirašeniwe=*ni=we: kiraši can be the adj. ‘lengthened,’ or the PN Keraš (cf. NPN 223) + the identifying suffix –ni + the genitive suffix –we: Salvini, “The Earliest…,” p. 103. The GN is also compared with later Tašeniwe and Ur III Da-si-ne-we by Steinkeller, “The Historical Background…,” p. 93. Salvini considers Kirašeniwe one of the cities of the land of Simurrum, cf. Salvini, “The Earliest Evidence …,” p. 102.


21 For the inscription cf. Frayne, RIME 2, p. 141f (E2.1.4.30).

22 Richter, p. 304, referring to Sommerfeld, W., Die Texte der Akkade-Zeit. 1. Das Dijala Gebiet: Tutub, Münster, 1999. Richter analysed the name as tutki-až=öm of, which the last part consists of the transitive/ergative construction annexed to the rarely used and still unexplained verb aš-: ibid. The first part of which is almost identical with Tukpiš, endan of Urkeš.

23 Al-Rawi, F. N. H., “Two Old Akkadian Letters Concerning the Offices of kala’um and nārum,” ZA 82 (1992), p. 181. The two PNs occur in IM 85455, l. 1 (Tūl-pī-ip-še); 9 (Wi-ri) and IM 85456, l. 5 (Wi-ir-ri). Wi-ri has been compared to PNs from Nuzi (NPN 173 and 275). It is probably related to wiri “sword” (GLH), or fori-according to Wilhelmi, who would like to keep it apart from fir-. As for Tūl-pī-ip-še; it may terminate in an abbreviated form of –senni, with tulpī as a verbal base or a structure showing nominal endings: Al-Rawi, op. cit., p. 81, note 13.


Also from the Old Akkadian period the stone tablet from Nippur bears Hurrian names and Hurrian linguistic features. The white marble tablet (BE I nr. 11) lists 92 garments handed over by a lady called Tupin to a certain Šehrī-ewri, whose name is doubtless Hurrian. In the description of the garments Hurrian terms also occur: *hišelu=hina, zimze=hina* and *'aku=hina.*

The Gasur tablets yielded some Hurrian PNs, such as *A-šir-a-sar* (185 II 6; 188 III 3), *A-ri-ta-lu-ha* (153 VIII 4), *E-wa-ri-ki-ra* (185 II 3), *Ki-ip-tu-ru* (129: 11; 153 IV 31; 199: 5), *Ši-ri-ša-um* (51 I 2; 52 I 3); I would add *Bu-da-u-ī-ki* (23: 6), perhaps < *puttukki.* Such names have been also detected in Babylonia, presumably prisoners of war taken from northern Mesopotamia or the Transalpine to Babylonia.

Even in the far east there was a king of Tukriš with a good Hurrian name, according to a Hittite-Hurrian ritual from Hattuša (KUB XXVII 38 iv 14). He seems to have ruled sometime in the Akkadian Period, since the text refers to events that took place in that period. His name was Kiklip-atal of Tukriš. An inscription of Hammurabi from Ur linked Tukriš with Elam, Subir and Gutium when describing their landscape as distant mountains and their language as difficult. Tukriš deserves more detailed comments. The oldest official attestation of this land after its occurrence in the ritual text is in the Ur III period. It is recorded in a school tablet from Nippur (Ni. 2126+4178=ISET I 211) as a source of gold and lapi-lazuli. An association of gold with Tukriš is also found in another version of the Sumerian mythological text ‘Enki and Ninhursag’ from Ur. The land was also known for metal working, for the texts from OB Mari mention bull-headed cups of Tukriš-type.

---

26 Wilhelm, The Hurrians, p. 8. Concerning the tablet cf. Gelb, “Hurrians at Nippur in the Sargonic Period,” p. 183-195. It was not usual to write an everyday document on a marble tablet, which is why it was designated a “pageantry inscription accompanying a gift” by Edzard and Kammenhuber: Edzard and Kammenhuber, *RlA* 4, p. 509. It is also possible that the garments, the subject of the text, were being forwarded from one of the Hurrian states of Upper Mesopotamia or the Zagros: Salvini, “The Earliest…” p. 103.


28 Cf. *HSS* 10, pp. xxviii-xxxi. Gelb is the first to point out ‘Hurrian’ names in the Gasur tablets, in *Hurrians and Subarians,* p. 52-53, when he cited parallel Hurrian names from later Nuzi texts. For the discussion and analysis of these names see Richter, op. cit., p. 297. The PN Atal-ḫuha (adal-ḫuha(u)-a) includes the well-known *adal* with the nominal element *ḫuha* in the esseive case. Ewari-kir (ewari-kir(i)=a) includes ewri “lord, king,” with an unknown adj. *kiri* in the esseive case. Kip-turu is understood as ki-ip-, a transitive/non-ergative structure of the verb ke “to put, to place” followed by the nominal form *tu-ruu* from *turi* “man,” functioning here as subject: ke=i=b=uru (MAD 4 167:17), and A-ša-ki, found in female PNs, such as Aššum-sašu, Aššum-sašlā, Sī-ša-ku, found in female PNs, such as Aššum-sašu, Aššum-sašlā, Sī-ša-ku, found in female PNs, such as Aššum-sašu, Aššum-sašlā, Sī-ša-ku.

29 Steinkeller, “The Historical Background...,” p. 90, n. 53. The names are Ū-na-ap-šē-na, A-ri-nin (OSP 1 47 v 3-4); Dup-ki-a-šum (MAD I 231: 11); ‘Ūnu-na-ap-[šē-na(?)] (MAD 4 167:17), and A-šu-ša-na (Donbaz-Foster STT 142:2). He lists also the two Hurrian names Tu-pi-in, Šē-ē-hir-in-ip/ew-ri (BE I 11: 13-14) of the marble tablet.


33 Michalowski, P., “Magan and Meluhha...,” p. 162, for its occurrence cf. p. 158, l. 7”.


(Tukrišûtum) in 6 entries. Ivory products, such as kannu-stands, are also mentioned. Textiles in the Tukriš-style occur also in the inventories of gifts sent to Egypt by Tušratta with his daughter. Textiles labelled Tukrišian are recorded in some MB textile lists from Nippur, although their distinguishing characteristics are not clear. From Qatna too, in a list of jewellery, “product of Tukriš,” occurs several times. Guichard thinks this denotes high quality rather than the place of origin. Men from Tukriš are found in the Middle Euphrates area, such as a highly prized Tukrišian cook sent by a retainer to his lord. Tukriš is not yet precisely located, but from the Mesopotamian sources, particularly OB, it appears to have been to the east of Mesopotamia. Nevertheless, Guichard proposed a location to the west, in the mountains of Amanus, basing himself on several criteria. One of these is the inscription of Šamš-Adad I, who claims that:

---

37 These are “1 city-shirt, Tukriš-style” (EA 22 ii 37) and “1 garment, Tukriš-style, of many-coloured cloth” (EA 25 iv 45), Moorey, op. cit., p. 443, referring to Moran, W. L., The Amarna Letters, Baltimore and London, 1992, p. 53 and 80.
38 Moorey, ibid. and the bibliography there.
39 Guichard, op. cit., p. 322.
40 Guichard, op. cit., p. 321.
41 Michalowski has compiled a list of its occurrences in his article on Magan and Meluḫḫa, p. 162-3, which is especially pertinent here:
   a) The Sumerian text Enki and Ninhursag mentioned above: a source of gold and lapis-lazuli.
   b) The inscription of Hammurabi from Ur (UET 1 146): mentioning Tukriš with Elam, Gutium, and Subartu.
   c) An inscription of Šamš-Adad I: stating that he received the tribute of Tukriš and the Upper Land (mātēm ellītum); cf. Grayson, RIMA 1, p. 50 (A.0.39.1).
   d) An adjective in a Mari list: for vessels made of precious metals, cf. ARM 7 239:12’ (1 GAL SAG GUD GAL Tu-uk-ri-šu-û KÜ.BABBAR) and 18’ (GAL SAG GUD Tu-û[k]-rî-[š]û[t-û]).
   e) A unique OB seal inscription: as a source of terebinth seeds.
   f) A Hurrian ritual text from Bogazköy: concerning the early rulers (mentioned above), preceded by Elam, Awan, and Lullubum.
   g) A description in the Qatna documents: designating the style of gold objects (ARM 7 312) as Tukrišû, Tukrišûha and ša qa-ti XI[û]Tu-uk-ri-šûki.
   h) MB documents from Nippur: describing coloured wool, see PBS 2/2 135 44:1 and Aro, Kleidertexte 33.
   i) A decration of garments in the Amarna letters (EA 22 ii 37; 25 iv 45).
   j) Lexical texts: Tu-uk-ri-šu, Ḡar-gud B V to Ḫḫ XX-XXII 13 (MSL 11 36); ša-ad Tu-uk-ri-šû in OB Forerunner 1 (MSL 11 133:19).
   k) The NA text “Geography of Sargon of Akkad” (l. 34): here it is mentioned between Marḫaši and Elam.
42 Wilhelm, The Hurrians, p. 10; Michalowski, “Magan and Meluḫḫa …,” p. 163.
This, as can be noted, is the only historical section in the inscription. The rest of the text is about building activities. The concise summary of the situation under his rule alludes to the eastern and western extremities of the area he controlled. Therefore, it cannot be understood as an indication to locate Tukriš in the west. A similar description is recorded in a literary text discovered in Kaniš, which enumerates the lands and peoples Sargon of Akkad conquered. It begins with Amanus and Tukriš, then runs through Ḥuttura (near Puruşḫanda), Amurrū, Kīlārū (mentioned in the texts of Kaneš, but not identified), Kaneš, Ḥ[at]u (Central Anatolia), Luḫme, Gutium, Lullum and Ῥaḫḫum. To Guichard, this indicates the proximity of Tukriš to Amanus, contrary to Van de Mieroop, who sees simply an enumeration of lands that were located between Amanus and Tukriš.46 Guichard further emphasizes a western location for Tukriš based on the sources of gifts labelled ‘Tukrišian’.47 There is some risk in drawing such conclusions. Often products are sold far from their original home and bear the name of that home like a trademark; a distinctive local style may also be replicated elsewhere.48 Small luxury items, such as metal or stone vessels, could easily be transported for trade, and the place of purchase does not determine the location of manufacture.

An important criterion for locating this land is the fact that it was a source of lapis-lazuli, or its firm association with that source. This leads to an eastern, not a western, location. The only known source of this stone to have been exploited in antiquity was in Badakhshan, Afghanistan.49 Importing it to Mesopotamia would have followed one of the main routes that

---

44 73) i-nu-mi-šu 74) bi-la-at LUGAL.MEŠ 75) ša Tu-uk-ri-šu 76) ;y LUGAL ma-a-tim 77) e-li-tim 78) i-na gé-re-eh a-lí-ia 79) A-Su₄₃ 80) ša-lum-Ša₄₄ 81) ša-mi ra-bé-em 82) ū na-re-ia 83) i-na ma-a-at 84) Lu-la-ba-an 85) i-na a-ah A.AB.BA 86) ra-bi-tim 87) lu-ú aš-kù-tim, Grayson, RIMA 1, p. 50 (A.0.39.1).


46 Guichard considers that it would be more logical to point to Amurrū rather than Lebanon if the suggestion of Van de Mieroop is correct, cf. Guichard, *op. cit.*, p. 321, note 597.


48 Three modern examples come to mind. The mosaic known as Ḫaššiš, used to decorate façades of buildings all over the Middle East, derives its name from the city of Kashán in Iran. But it is not necessarily produced there now; it has become simply a mark of style. Similarly the name angora denoting a textile is derived from the city of Ankara (= Phrygian Ancyra). Particularly interesting is the name of a special kind of dried lime known in Iraq and in Iran. It was imported into Iraq by sea, and first landed in Basra, so Iraqis called it ‘Basra lime.’ But the Iranians call it ‘Oman lime’ since it was imported into Iran via Oman. In fact the product comes neither from Basra nor from Oman but from much further afield.

49 For this cf. Moorey, “The Eastern Land of Tukriš,” p. 442. Although other sources of lapis lazuli are known, such as the southern shores of Lake Baikal and in the Pamirs, the almost exclusive source in antiquity was the mines of Badakhshan, cf. Herrmann, G., “Lapis Lazuli: The Early Phases of its Trade,” *Iraq* 30 (1968), p. 21 and 28; Herrmann, G. and P. R. S. Moorey, “Lapislazuli,” *RIA* 6 (1980-83), p. 489-90. Tosi and Piperno state that the
bound Mesopotamia with the east, either the northern route running along the southern foothills of the Elburz Range, or the southern route through Kerman and Elam, or by the sea. Komoróczy notes remains of gold and lapis-lazuli in Tepe Hissar in Dameghan, suggesting that that was a station for storage and re-distribution of these two materials. Other interpretations of this data that infer somewhere not on the way to Mesopotamia through Tepe Hissar would be too difficult to accept. Komoróczy concluded that Tukriš must have been on the way from Kirmashān to Hamadan, and Ḥarali was located beyond.51

That Hurrian PNs appear among Marhašians52 from the OAkk. to the Ur III periods is interesting. A list of such names has been compiled by Steinkeller53 and Zadok:54 Ḥuşšum-kibi, 55 Ḥāvurna-nigī, 56 Miši-niši, 57 Kuš-elli, 58 Purašhe 59, Ḥašip-atal, 60 Ḥul(l)ib/par, 61 Šimšelah62 and kuk-ulme.63 It must be said that these early attestations do not necessarily indicate the very beginning of Hurrian immigration to the north and northeast of Mesopotamia. The seizure of power by a Hurrian ruler in Azuḫinum and Simurrum, the organization of a military force, and more significantly giving Hurrian names to regions such as Azuḫinum and Kirašeniwe must have had a previous history, before Narām-Sīn. This would be a history of immigration, self-establishment, replacement of sedentary populations by the new arrivals and finally the formation of a sufficiently serious threat to require a military response by Narām-Sīn.64 The


51 Komoróczy, ibid.

52 It is even stranger that no Hurrian PNs are found among the Šimaškians (cf. Zadok, “Elamite Onomastics,” p. 228-229), where Hurrians would be expected more than in Marhaši, since Šimaški is further north and apparently larger.


56 Ḥavur(ni) “heaven” and ni-gi which is found in other PNs, cf. Richter, ibid.

57 The meaning of the second element, according to Richter, is probably a cultic object, the first element remains unknown, cf. Richter, ibid.

58 The element kuš- is unidentifiable, while é-li can be understood as elli, a form of the Hurrian word ela “sister.” Cf. Richter, ibid.

59 The word ending –(a=)šhe can be Hurrian. As for w/puri there are several possibilities according to the Hurrian lexicon. One of these is wuri “view.” The form and structure of the name looks very much like the word puramše “slavery” or purme “servant,” Richter, op. cit. p. 308.

60 A frequently attested name consisting of the verbal base ḥaš- “to hear” and the word adal, “strong, powerful,” giving “the powerful (one) heard.” However, Richter has translated it mistakenly as “the brother heard,” cf. ibid.


62 Zadok, “Elamite …,” p. 230, nr. 109. He says the name is linguistically Hurrian but resembles the Elamite name Šim-še-il-ḥa.

63 Zadok, op. cit., nr. 140, An Elamite-Hurrian hybrid name according to Zadok.

64 A similar conclusion has been drawn by Steinkeller, who thinks the Hurrians must have begun their self-establishment at least one generation before Narām-Sīn: Steinkeller, “The Historical Background…,” p. 94. To Kammenhuber, loan-words in Hurrian are evidence of an older Hurrian presence in North Mesopotamia: Kammenhuber, A., “Historisch-Geographische Nachrichten aus der althurrischen Überlieferung, dem
available evidence is scanty concerning this point, due to the fact that the Mesopotamian historical records that precede the Akkadian dynasty deal principally with the internal conflicts between the Sumerian city-states. The few indications about the lands outside the alluvium do not help to draw relevant conclusions. Some think an older Hurrian presence is shown by the assumed Hurrian loan-word ta/ibira in Sumerian, used for a smith or copper-worker.\textsuperscript{65} This etymology presumes a derivation from the Hurrian verbal root tab/v, ‘to pour’ or ‘to cast.’ The word ta/ibira in Sumerian is so old that it formed part of the name of one of the predeluvian cities, Bad-tibira. Although not certain, the borrowing by the Sumerians of such a technical word from the mountainous regions of the Zagros or even the Taurus is quite possible. Mountaineers in the Zagros and Taurus became skilful metallurgists in earlier times, because their land was, in contrast to the Mesopotamian alluvium, rich with metal ores. They used the plentiful supply of wood as fuel for extracting the metal. Moreover, since the Uruk Period, trade networks that connected the Mesopotamian ‘core’ with the northern, northeastern and northwestern ‘peripheries’ were principally based on the exchange of raw material from the peripheries and worked products from the core.\textsuperscript{66} One of these vital raw materials was metal in the form of ingots, cast by the sellers in the mountains. It is from this that the word ta/ibira has probably come. The medieval GN Tabaristān also deserves attention. This name was given to the costal strip and the inner steep mountainous region of the Alburz Chain to the south of the Caspian Sea from ancient times until the Seljūqs, and is known today as Mazandarān.\textsuperscript{67} Folk etymologies of this GN mean ‘The land of axes’, associated with the abundance of woods widely exploited by cutting,\textsuperscript{68} taking Tab(a)r as “axe” (in New Persian) and the Iranian word ī/astān as “land” or “country.” However, the Hurrian word tab/v could be connected with the Tab(a)r of the geographical name Tabaristān and even the New Persian word Tabr and Kurdish Tawr “axe” could be related to the Hurrian verbal root tab/v, for axes as metal tools have been cast in these regions for millennia.

When returning to the question of the earliest date of a Hurrian presence, two possibilities can be assumed. The first favours an older presence in the region, but assumes that they were not in touch with the Mesopotamian rulers before Narām-Sīn, who was the first to record a Hurrian name. In this case they appear not yet to have reached such great numbers to overshadow the older inhabitants, such as the Gutians and Lullubians, as can be seen from the role these two peoples played in the Akkadian Period. The second possibility is that the Hurrians were still moving towards the Transtigris and North Mesopotamia during the Old Sumerian Period, but had not penetrated it. The supposed Sumerian contacts with them took place in north(west) Iran, the land with which the Sumerians had always cultural, political and trade contacts. The word ta/ibira is one example of such an exchanged cultural element. At

\textsuperscript{65} Cf. Wilhelm, “L’état actuel et les perspectives des études Hourrites,” \textit{Amurru}, I, p. 176, and more recently Wegner, \textit{Einführung in ...}, p. 15. This Hurrian verb is attested in some texts from Boğazköy: KBo XXXII 14 obv. I 42 ff.: \textit{kazi tabal=le=ž .. tav=ašt=o=m “a smith cast a goblet;” tabiri=ma ove=n=ž šid=ar=a kabal=le=ž “the foolish curses the one who cast (it);”} and \textit{tabrenni, “(copper)smith,”} cf. Wilhelm, \textit{Amurru}, p. 176, note 8.

\textsuperscript{66} See for this the theory of G. Algaz presented by Rothman, M. in “The Origin of State in Greater Mesopotamia,” \textit{The Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies Bulletin (SMS)}, 38, September 2003, p. 25. One important note here is that there is evidence for the presence of merchants in South Mesopotamia with probable Elamite or Hurrian origins since the OAk and UR III periods; see Neumann, H., “Bemerkungen zum Problem der Fremdarbeit in Mesopotamien (3. Jahrtausend v.u. Z.),” \textit{AOF} 19 (1992), p. 269.

\textsuperscript{67} Bearman, et al., \textit{ibid.}
any rate, the Hurrians were a minority in the Transtigris during the Old Akkadian Period, under the overwhelming power of the Gutians and Lullubians.

Northern Syria

Northern Syria at this time was inhabited by Semitic and non-Semitic-speaking peoples, and it can be shown that the Hurrians also arrived there about then. Whether the Hurrian presence there predates the OAkk period is a difficult question to answer with certainty at the moment. G. Buccellati and M. Kelly-Buccellati wonder whether the archaeological data, such as the continuity of the temple of Urkeš from the fourth millennium (Ninevite V) and the eight meters (and perhaps more) depth of the ābi (see below under ‘Urkeš’) and others, indicate a fourth millennium Hurrian presence. Wilhelm is convinced that this is evidence that there had been a continuous Hurrian presence there for such a long period, pointing also to an early linguistic bond between Hurrian and ancient Semitic languages. This is seen in a certain type of sentence-names common to Hurrian on the one hand and Akkadian, Amorite and Canaanite on the other. As to written data no GNs attested in the Pre-Sargonic texts from Ebla, Mari and Nabada (modern Beydar) offer any certain hint of a Hurrian etymology. The Pre-Sargonic PN bū-gū-e from Nagar, attested in an Ebla tablet, is thought to have Hurrian characteristics: the final –ue and a comparable Hurrian element puk(k) are both found in later Hurrian names. However, it is difficult to draw a firm conclusion from such a short name.

In the Akkadian Period, the situation changed. Texts from the Habur region and from Subartu Proper show Hurrian PNs, such as ʾāl-wa-tu-rī (Urkeš), Šē-ni-za-sa-am (Urkeš), Šu-pa-ē (Urkeš), Ṣu-na-ap-šē-ni (Urkeš),77 Dal-pu-za-ti-li (Nagar), Tup-ki-iš (Urkeš), saʾ/sa-tar-


72 Ibid.

73 Bonechi doubts whether a dozen of the possible non-Semitic Pre-Sargonic Ebla GNs, which belong to the region north of Karkamiš, were in fact Hurrian, cf. Bonechi, “Remarks on the III Millennium Geography of the Syrian Upper Mesopotamia,” Subartu IV/1, Turnhout, 1998, p. 237.

74 Richter, op. cit., p. 274. Even in the 24th century no Hurrian element is detected. As Archi says: “It should be stressed, once and for all, that the Hurrian element is entirely absent from the whole area of the Habur Plains during the 24th century (BC),” Archi, A., “The Regional State of Nagar,” Subartu IV/2, p. 4. However, Richter says later that the first Hurrian attestation in cuneiform sources dates back to the Pre-Sargonic period, as indicated by the texts of Tell Beydar and Ebla; cf. op. cit., p. 310.

75 Cf. Catagoniti, A., “The III Millennium Personal Names from the Hārub Triangle in the Ebla, Brak and Mozan Texts,” Subartu, IV/2, p. 46 and 62. In fact, Catagoniti is not sure whether the name is a Personal Name, but she stresses that the value e is rare at Ebla, although possible. It is noteworthy that Archi and Astour think the Hurrians began to appear in the Habur area only after the Ur III Period, after which their PNs started to appear: Archi, A., Subartu IV/2, p. 4; Astour, “Toponymy of Ebla and Ethnohistory…,” JAOS 108 (1988), p. 547. According to Astour, the first Hurrian PN in the Habur region is attested only in a text from the second year of Šu-Sin, a certain Tā-sal-tī-ri, a messenger of Uršu (BIN III, 221: 35-36).

76 For this terminology cf. Steinkelel, “The Historical Background …,” p. 76 ff.; see also Chapter Two above.

ku-ni and šu-gu-zi (Beydar) and Ul-tum-ḫu-ḫu, son of the king of Nagar. They also include Hurrian GNs. A handful of non-Semitic GNs in the Habur region that appeared in the texts from Nagar and Urkeš were “quite certainly Hurrian.” Even the name Nagar itself could be Hurrian in origin. From Urkeš, modern Tell Mozan, we also have the important discoveries of the inscriptions of Tupkiš, endan of Urkeš, and his wife, Queen Uqnitum. In the two Akkadian texts found in the 1990 campaign in Mozan, the Hurrian PN Unap-šeni occurs. The king of Urkeš bears on his sealings the title endan, which is somewhat controversial, at least etymologically. Suggestions have been presented to analyse it as consisting of the Hurrian suffix for professions –dan, preceded by the en, which is either the Sumerian logogram EN “ruler” or a classical form of the Hurrian eni “god.” Others associate it with the Akkadian word entu “high priestess.” However, the recent discoveries in Mozan, especially the collocations “Tupkiš, endan of Urkeš” and “Uqnitum, the wife of

and note 6. However, Richter appears to be reticent about calling them Hurrian. He says they can be understood with a high degree of probability as Hurrian: Richter, “Die Ausbreitung…,” p. 275. Later he presented a philological analysis of some of these names: the first element of the name Ḡā-wa-tu-ri, i.e. Ḡā-WA-, though not certain, probably comes from the verbal root aw/b attested in Nuzi and OB names. Its second element is turi “man” (but note that turi in GLH, p. 273 is given as “inferior”). Unapšeni is clearly un-a-b-šen(a)=ni meaning “the brother came,” cf. Richter, op. cit., p. 279-280.

Richter, p. 276 and 279 (referring to Subartu II; Milano, Mozan 2, and Subartu IV/2). He analysed the name Talpuš-atili as talav=ɔ=ž(i)=adili (by Wilhelm, G., “L’état actuel …” Ammurru, p. 175, note 5), containing the lexeme talawaši “great, big” and atal “strong.” The name Tupkiš (tupki=ž) consists of the very common but unexplainable tupki. Salvini thinks it is possibly an abbreviated form of Tupkiš=šenni, as Unapšiše relates to Unap=šenni, cf. Salvini, M., “Excursus: The Name Tupkiš” in Buccellati, G. and M. Kelly-Buccellati, “The Seals of the King of Urkesh: Evidence from the Western Wing of the Royal Storehouse AK,” in Ambros, A. A. and M. Köhbach (eds.), Festschrift für Hans Hirsch zum 65. Geburtstag, Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes (WZKM), Band 86, Wien, 1996, p. 84. There are some other similar names like Dub-ki-šē-en’ni li Gu-ma-ra-āšī (RGTC 2, 174) and the above mentioned Dup-ki-a-šum from Tutub. For other occurrences of names with the element Tupki(i), cf. Salvini, “Excursus…,” op. cit. p. 85-86. The name Ši/Sapoturni includes šad (“give back”) =ar (iterative/factitive) + gu-ni, a common element in Hurrian PNs, as in the OB Mušum-kune/u, a person from Mardaman, and Teššup-kuni (Aït *33:10) (Richter, p. 276). As for the name šu-gu-zi, the number “one” forms its first element sog(i), with uazzi attached to it and means “To befit one, fitting for one,” cf. Richter, op. cit., p. 276. However, Talon in a study of the PNs of Beydar tablets did not recognize any Hurrian names: Talon, Ph., “Personal Names,” in Administrative Documents from Tell Beydar (Seasons 1993-1995), Subartu II, Turnhout, 1996, p. 75; 80. Van Lerberghe as well sees no Hurrian linguistic elements in the Beydar tablets: Van Lerberghe, K., “The Beydar Tablets and the History of the Northern Jazirah,” in Subartu II, p. 120.

Biga, M. G., “The Marriage of Elbatie Princess Tagriš-Damu with a Son of Nagar’s King,” Subartu IV/2, Turnhout, 1998, p. 19. According to Bonechi, the compact archaic Semitic toponym “started in the northeastern part of ancient Syria, and was partially substituted by a non-Semitic, Hurrian toponymy during the Sargonic Period,” Bonechi, op. cit., p. 237.


For the analysis of the name Nagar and its identification with Nawar, see below, under ‘Nawar.’


William, The Hurrians, p. 11.

For a possible derivation from Sumerian EN after the Early Dynastic Period cf. Wilhelm, “Die Inschrift…,” p. 122, where he states that the title EN was known in Northern Mesopotamia and Syria from that time to mean “city ruler.”

The second millennium eni could have been just en in this (classical) period of Hurrian.


Tupkiš90 with “Uqnitum the queen”,91 lead to the conclusion that endan means ‘king’92 and has nothing to do with Akkadian entu.

For the third quarter of the 3rd millennium BC no Hurrian names have been found in those texts of Ebla concerned with the middle Euphrates and the region between the Balih and the Mediterranean coast up to the Taurus slopes in the (north)west (Tuttul, Emar, Harrān and Mari).93

Expansion

Gutian and Ur III Periods:

The inscriptions of Erridu-Pizir of Gutium mention Niriš-ša, the ensi of Urbilum. By analysing this PN as Hurrian,94 we have another Hurrian governor in the city of Erbil from the Gutian Period. This implies that the Hurrians were, at least in the Gutian period if not earlier, already masters of Erbil and very probably of its vicinities.95 The Hurrians also had the upper hand in some large urban centres in the Habur region, as seen above. A seal impression from the early post-Akkadian period from Brak, ancient Nagar,96 bears the name and title of the city ruler Talpuš-atili: “Talpuš-atili, the sun of the country of Nagar, son of ….97 From his name, which means in Hurrian “The strong one is great,”98 it appears that he was of Hurrian stock, and this is another indication of the range of Hurrian expansion in this

90 Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, op. cit., p. 16.
92 Salvini, “The earliest…,” p. 104-105. But Salvini, although not sure about the connection, points to the comparable forms 9d)entanni ‘(high)priestess,’ and to the epithet entašši of the goddess Hēp/bat in Hititite-Hurrian texts in the regions of Kizzuwatna, Cilicia and Cappadocia from the 14th-13th centuries: Salvini, “The earliest…,” p. 104. Wilhelm seems to discard this etymology and gives only the meaning ‘king’, particularly when we know with certainty that Tupkiš of Urkeš was male and not female: Wilhelm, “Die Inschrift des Tiš-atal von Urkeš,” p. 121-122.
94 Steinkeller has listed in his “The Historical Background …” the Hurrian PNs that contain some elements of this name: Ni-iš-ša from Nuzi (Gelb et al. OIP 57, p. 107); Sargonic A-ri-šu-ša (Meek, Old Akkadian, Sumerian, and Cappadocian Texts from Nuzi, HSS X, 153 viii 4); the Ur III Šu-bi-iš-šu-ša (of Kakmi) and the OB Ip-šu-šu and Ka-di-iš-šu-ša (Zadok, in Kutscher Memorial Volume, p. 225). Hallo as well, although in a different context, mentioned the name Neriš-atal of Mardaman, which contains the same first element: cf. Hallo, “Simurrum and the Hurrian Frontier,” RHA 36, p. 72, note 16. I would add Ultum-šu-šu, son of the king of Nagar, about whom see Biga, “The Marriage of Eblaite Princess Tagris-Damu …,” Subartu, IV/2, p. 19; also see Richter, “Die Ausbreitung der Hurriten,” p. 299, who has analyzed the name as consisting of the modal structure =i(=)ž of the unidentified verb ni/er- or ni/ēr-, followed by the word ūḥu in the essive: nir=i(=)ž-ūḥ(u)=a. Richter also refers to Haas, V., ZA 79, p. 267 with note 25, and Neu, E., Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I, Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Ḥatušša, Wiesbaden, 1996, p. 500 for such a verb. As for the verb ni/er or ni/ēr, it might be the same nēri which Wilhelm translates as “good,” cf. Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 382.
95 Archival texts from the Ur III mention Hurrian PNs associated with the city of Talmuš, e.g. A-ri-ip-šu-up-pi-lú Tal-muš91 (AB 25, 92, 21), cf. Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 157 (under Rimuš).
98 Matthews, D. and J. Eidem, ibid., in consultation with G. Wilhelm.
period and of their ability to seize power in almost all large urban centres of the Zagros and Taurus foothills, in addition to the mountainous territories to the north and northeast. Hurrian PNs that occur in texts relating to cities like Ebla, Mardaman, Nawar, Urkeš and Uršu prove this expansion.99

As for the Iranian territories, Tukriš has been known from the Akkadian Period, to which can now be added another Hurrian name, Šu-ni-ki-ip ruler of Pil, to be placed tentatively in Iran.100

From about the end of the Gutian Period or the first decades of the Ur III Period,101 the first royal inscription by a Hurrian king in Akkadian appears. This is the inscription of Atal-šen or Ari-šen,102 son of a certain Satar-mat, otherwise unknown but also bearing a Hurrian name.103 The date given to the inscription would mean he was one of the successors of Tupkiš, king of Urkeš. However, his name was known before Tupkiš because his inscription was found early in the twentieth century.104

Obviously the Hurrians pushed further westwards across the Euphrates from the middle of the third millennium BC105 according to onomastic evidence.106 The evidence from the middle of the third millennium sheds new light on the history of Hurrian population movements. So it

99 Richter, op. cit., p. 280; for their identification see notes 73-77.
100 Locating Pil in northwestern Iran is suggested by Zadok: Zadok, R., “On the Geography, Toponymy and Anthroponymy of Media,” NABU 2000, no. 30, p. 34, and note 4. He further identifies Pil with NA *Wilu (written kurU-i-la-A+A).
102 For the name and inscription cf. Finet, A., “Adalšenni, roi de Barundum,” RA 60 (1966), p. 17f.; Kammenhuber, “Historisch-Geographische Nachrichten…,” p. 165, note 21; Kammenhuber, “Die Arier im Vorderen Orient,” Or 46 (1977), p. 139; Gelb et al., NPN, p. 207. Both readings are theoretically possible. The reading Atal-šen means “The strong brother” or “The brother is strong,” and the reading Ari-šen means “There is a brother” from the verbal root ar(i)- (See Kammenhuber, “Die Arier…,” ibid.). For this reading compare the PN Arip-šenniš from Tigun-šu-ni (OB). However, Wilhelm confirms that the verbal form ar(i)- is not attested in early Hurrian PNs: Wilhelm, “Die Inschrift des Tišatal von Urkeš,” Urkesh and the Hurrians, p. 120. Therefore the most likely and most accepted reading is Tiš-atal.
103 Wilhelms, The Hurrians, p. 9.
104 The inscription was first published by F. Thureau-Dangin in RA 9 (1912), p. 1-4. The foundation statue with the inscription was reported to have come from Tell Shermola, close to Mozan, but Shermola has no archaeological levels dating to the time of the inscription. Therefore it must have come from Mozan; for this cf. Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, “The Royal Storehouse of Urkesh …,” AJO 42 (1995), p. 1. For the text itself, see below, under ‘Nawar.’
is wrong to speak of their emergence as beginning in the east and ending in the west, and to say that because they are first mentioned in the Narām-Sîn year-name in the Transtigris necessarily implies that the Hurrian presence there predates their presence in the Ebla region.

In this period (Ur III), the kingdom of Mukiš first appears in the written sources. This GN was associated in some Ur III sources with a certain Ga-ba-ba, the man of Mukiš (A 2852 in the Oriental Institute- Chicago). The kingdom, located in the Plain of Antioch, (the Amuq Plain), is thought to have had a concentrated Hurrian population. Although Hurrians were there, they do not appear to have formed a majority in general, at least at this stage. That there was a Hurrian element in the local population is shown by the names of messengers mentioned in the texts. Of the 13 messengers sent by Ebla (7 messengers), Uršu (5 messengers) and Mukiš (1 messenger) to Ur, two bore Hurrian names: Memesura of Ebla and Tašal-ibri of Uršu.

During the same period archival texts indicate a Hurrian presence in the regions from the Sirwān in the Transtigris to the Habur and Euphrates valleys in the west. The personal names from these regions are mainly Hurrian, and the names have mainly entered Ur III archival texts as a consequence of the Ur III warfare there. Ur III was deeply involved in the Transtigris region and beyond in this period, waging severe wars that lasted for generations. The numerous military campaigns, especially those under Šulgi, resulted not only in the control of large parts of the region mentioned above but also in a forced movement of Hurrians into Sumer, mainly as prisoners of war and deportees.

Richter, basing himself on the available source material, concludes that only parts of north Mesopotamia, between the Habur Triangle and the headwaters of the Tigris (Aranzaḥ in Hurrian) and the northern Transtigris, eventually linking to the Hamrin basin, can be counted as Hurrian populated areas.

A look at the data discussed above shows that the Hurrians entered the Mesopotamian sphere of influence as early as the Akkadian Period (in the reign of Narām-Sîn). We think their penetration was somewhat earlier, assuming that their first recorded encounter with Akkadians is not necessarily contemporaneous with their first presence in that region, but that they were actually present some time before their presence was recorded. During that period the Hurrian groups had immigrated, established themselves and organized themselves into political entities, and had even given Hurrian names to the territories where they lived (Azuḥinum). While it is not easy to set a precise date for this, it might have been in the last part of the ED Period, parallel to the Nineveh V period in the north of Mesopotamia and the Transtigris. Interestingly, this date is almost the same as that given to Khirbet-Karak

---

107 Mukiš was identified with Mu-kiš-ḫi/e of the Hittite texts by Gelb: Gelb, I. J., “Studies in the topography of Western Asia,” AJSL 55 (1938), p. 81-82. The fragmentary Mu-x-gi-iš† attested in an Ur III text from the reign of Šū-Sîn is listed as one of the peripheral states of the Ur III Empire: Astour, “Les Hourrites…,” p. 4, note 29. Nevertheless, the identification of this GN with Mukiš seems unlikely, taking into account the great distance between Sumer and the area round Aleppo and the Plain of Antioch where Mukiš was located.

108 Gelb, op. cit., p. 82.

109 Mukiš was the name of the region as well as the name of a city that appears to have functioned as a regional capital, cf. Von Dassow, E., State and Society in the Late Bronze Age: Alalah under the Mittani Empire, SCCNH 17, Bethesda, p. 12. The city of Mukiš, the location of which is still open, had served as a capital for the kingdom of Alalah after the destruction of the city of Alalah by the Hittites in the 15th century under Hīmilimma of Alalah, cf. Von Dassow, op. cit., p. 62.

110 Astour, “Les Hourrites…,” p. 4. While he does not exclude that the name Mukiš is a Semitic name with a third radical š, he thinks it is Hurrian with the Hurrian suffix –š, ibid.

111 Ibid.

112 Hurrian PNs are associated in the archival texts with the lands Gigibni, Ḥipilat, Kakmi, Arrapḫum, K/Gumarasi, Sašru(m), Setiša, Urbilum and others, all located in the Transtigris, cf. Richter, “Die Ausbreitung …” p. 295 and 300.

113 Richter, op. cit., p. 310.
pottery,\textsuperscript{114} which has been associated for years with the advent of the Hurrians. However, later studies have shown that this association cannot be proved, and in some cases it does not correspond to the area of Hurrian expansion.\textsuperscript{115} The place where the Hurrians originated, although not established, according to the available evidence would be to the east or northeast of Mesopotamia, perhaps across the Caspian Sea or in the Trans-Caucasusus. In this connection the early appearance of Hurrian groups in the Habur region, almost at the same time as their appearance in the Transtigris, should be noted. This indicates that wide ranging Hurrian immigrations occurred over a large area simultaneously. Hurrians in the Habur region could have arrived from the mountains in the north and northeast, where they had kinsmen and with whom they maintained relations later, as in Urkeš and its contacts with the north (see above). Or they came through the mountain valleys and hilly lands of the Transtigris. The latter route would have passed through the territory east of the Tigris and have crossed the river in the plain south of Cizre (Jazira). This easy access to the Habur region was used later in the OB Period, when the Turukkians who were active in the Rāniya Plain entered the plains of Qabrā and Arrapĥa and then emerged in the Habur (see Chapter Six). The Hurrian expansion appears to have been steady and continuous, for there were areas that became populated with Hurrians later than the Akkadian period, such as the Diyāla-Hamrin region (Simurrum) and the regions of Alalah and Ugarit.

\textit{The Inflamed Hurrian Lands}

Once the kings of the Ur III Empire had established their rule at home and purged the land of the remnants of the Gutians, they began to look forward to expanding their territory in the same direction from which the Gutians had come. This process of self-establishment and organization appears to have occupied the whole reign of Ur-Namma, who has not left any evidence of foreign military actions except a campaign against Elam and some operations in the Diyāla and Hamrin regions.\textsuperscript{116} It is possible that Ur-Namma perished during one of these campaigns in the Diyāla, as indicated in the Sumerian literary tradition ‘Death of Ur-Namma:’

“In the place of slaughter they abandoned Ur-Namma like a broken pitcher.”\textsuperscript{117}

The aim of the campaigns of the Ur III Empire is often seen as merely to destroy the foreign lands, following the mood of the date-formulae. Others see them more as a means of securing trade routes\textsuperscript{118} or pursuing a greed for booty: “They campaigned in those lands to

\textsuperscript{114} This is a type of hand-made, red-black burnished pottery, imitating metal or stone vases, with relief decorative motifs. Some specimens show they were wheel-made and without relief decorations. It spread from the region between the Kura and Araxes to Eastern Anatolia, Northern Anatolia as far as Khirbet-Karak on the southwestern shore of the Tabaria Lake; cf. Börker-Klähn, J., Die archäologische Problematik der Hurritier-Frage und eine mögliche Lösung, in \textit{Hurritier und Hurritisch}, ed. V. Haas, Konstanz, 1988, p. 213; Hrouda, B., “Zur Problem der Hurriter,” \textit{MARI} 5, p. 597.

\textsuperscript{115} For more arguments against this correspondence cf. Börker-Klähn, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 213-4.

\textsuperscript{116} Sallaberger, W., \textit{Ur III Zeit, in Mesopotamien, Akkade-Zeit und Ur III-Zeit}, Hrsg. von P. Attinger und M. Wäfler, \textit{OBO} 160/3, Göttingen, 1999, p. 134. His operation, as he says in his inscriptions, was to liberate some territories (Awal, Kismar, Maškan-Sarrum, the lands of Ešnunna, Tutub, Zimudar and Akkad) from Elamite occupation, cf. Frayne, \textit{RIIME} 3/2, p. 65 (E3/2.1.1.29). However, he also clashed with the Gutians in the territory of “Guti and Zimudar.” In another inscription he speaks aggressively towards a Gutian named Gutarla (Gū-tar-lā), who had been chosen as king, but Ur-Namma declared his kingship false, cf. Frayne, \textit{RIIME} 3/2, p. 67 (E3/2.1.130) and Civil, M., “On Some Texts Mentioning Ur-Namma,” \textit{Or} 54 (1985), p. 27ff.

\textsuperscript{117} “[ki]-lul-la ur-\textsuperscript{4}Namma dug-gaz-gin; ba-ni-in-tag\textsubscript{r}-aš,” Frayne, \textit{RIIME} 3/2, p. 20 (referring to Kramer, \textit{JCS} 21 (1967), pp. 113 and 118).

carry off people, animals, metals and stones.” It is true that the texts speak clearly of booty, but there are other serious strategic issues to be discussed which also played a role.

1. Šulgi

Šulgi (2094-2047 BC), the deified king of Ur and successor of Ur-Namma, was the first monarch since the fall of Akkad to wage war against the northern lands. The destruction of Dēr, in his 21st-22nd regnal year, was perhaps a preparation for war against the Hurrian lands to the north. Two years later, a military campaign approached the Transtigris. By this campaign Šulgi aimed at subduing the strategic city of Karhar (see below, ‘Historical Geography’). Karhar was targeted first since it was an important city, probably a stronghold, controlling the main routes to the north and northeast, due to its location in Halwān. This region during ancient times was a very important route from Mesopotamia to the east via Iran. It was known as the Great Khorasan Road and later formed part of the Silk Road. The marriage of Šulgi with Šulgi-simtī, a princess who appears to have come down from the Diyāla-Hamrin region, must be counted as an appendage to the Hurrian war. By doing this, he tried to bind the rulers of that region in a pact with Ur. This is perhaps why Ešnunna enjoyed a special status in the bala system of Ur, into which only the cities of the core-land (plus Susa) were incorporated. Such a pact could have been directed only against the Hurrians.

Probably under Šulgi another dynastic marriage was concluded, this time with Simanum, to the north or northwest of Nineveh, perhaps close to the confluence of the Batman tributary with the Tigris. Kunši-mātum, a daughter of Šū-Sîn, was given as a daughter-in-law to

---

119 Sallaberger, Ur III Zeit, OBO, p. 165.
120 Texts such as Šulgi Hymn D speaks of the booty from Gutium, saying that Šulgi brought home lapis-lazuli packed in bags, “the property of the land,” together with cows and donkeys, and offered them to Enlil and Ninlil; cf. Klein, J., The Royal Hymns of Shulgi King of Ur: Man’s Quest for Immortal Fame, Philadelphia, 1981, p. 13; see also Sallaberger, Ur III Zeit, OBO, p. 165.
121 For the year names, cf. Sallaberger, Ur III Zeit, OBO, p. 142.
122 Dēr was usually the Mesopotamian port leading to Elam, but it seems to have played a similar role in relation to the lower Diyāla region too.
124 This is inferred from the names of her personal goddesses Bēlat-Šušnir and Bēlat-Teraban, cf. Sallaberger, Ur III Zeit, OBO, p. 160.
126 This is the suggestion of Frayne, who identifies it with the OAkk. (A)simānum, later Sinān(u), MA URU Si!-nal-nu! and Sinas of Procopius of Caesarea (said to have been in the region of Amida, modern Diyarbakır) and medieval al-Sinan and the modern GN Sinan, cf. Frayne, RIME 3/2 (Ur III), p. 288. It appears that Simanum was located in the region from the west of the Tigris to the Habur region, cf. Whiting, R. M., “Tiš-atal of Nineveh and Babati, Uncle of Šu-Sîn,” JCS 28 (1976), p. 177, or generally to the north of Nineveh: Sallaberger, Ur III Zeit, OBO, p. 161. However, some put it farther away, north of Mardin: Edzard and Farber, RGTS 2, p. 166. Astour, on the contrary, proposed a closer location, south of the Mount Bahir and Tang-i-Daria ranges, to the south of Duhok: Astour, “Semites and Hurrians…,” SCCNH 2, p. 47.
127 Her name means “Submit. O land!” cf. Michalowski, P., “The Bride of Simanum,” JAOS 95 (1975), p. 717, note 10. This name does not seem to have been chosen arbitrarily, for it has a political overtone. It can be compared to the name of the wife of Šulgi from Mari, Tarām-Urium “One who loves Ur.” The name of the bride sent to Simanum aimed not only at establishing good relations but also at pacifying that front and bringing the ruling class of Simanum on her side. This policy was completely contrary to that implemented in the Diyāla-Hamrin region.
the ruling family of Simanum, where the ruler was called Pušam. He had two sons, Arib-atal and Iḫuḫa, and a son-in-law called Pūhī-lišī. Since the Sumerian princess has been referred to as the é-gi₄₄-a (Akkadian kallatu(m) = daughter-in-law) of Pušam’s son Arib-atal, she could have been married to the younger brother Iḫuḫa according to Michalowski. However, the text PDT 572, rev. l. 7ff calls her the é-gi₄₄-a of Arib-atal (dated to ŠS 1, II, 22), and the text Ch. Jean, ŠA LVIII, 35 the é.gi₄₄-a of Pušam (dated to AS 5, VI, 12). Although the term é.gi₄₄-a is not quite clear as Michalowski states, one may conjecture that she was first married to a son of Arib-atal and later to the younger son of Pušam, Iḫuḫa. Perhaps her first husband perished during the rebellion that later broke out in Simanum (see below).

Now that the road had been opened for him, Šulgi marched further in the next two years (Š 25 and 26). He campaigned against Simurrum, a barricade to the northern lands of the Transtigris. The next year (Š 27) evoked the memory of the war against Ḥarši, and it seems that the campaign of the year before had guaranteed clear access to that place. The campaign against Ḥarši ends the first Sumerian war against the northeastern territories, according to the chronological presentations by Frayne and Hallo.

After four years of silence the second war began with another campaign against Karḫar (Š 31), against Simurrum for the third time (Š 32) and against Karḫar also for the third time (Š 33). Apparently the first campaigns had not been enough to destroy the infrastructure of power of the two lands and they had recovered sufficiently for new campaigns to be made. But now the power of what we may call ‘the southern Hurrian prince doms or kingdoms’ in the Diyālā and Hamrin regions was so exhausted that nothing about them is heard for seven years. Even after then they were not able to show any resistance. At this time the third war began with a campaign against Šašrum (Š 42), deep in the north. After the first war Šulgi had built a defensive wall in Š 36 (date formula Š 37) called Bàd ma-da, “Wall of the unincorporated lands.” This clearly indicates the threat Ur felt from the young Hurrian princes in the middle of their expansion. A few important royal letters were exchanged between the king and the military commander (šagina) Puzur-Šulgi. He was in charge of the defence lines, referred to in the letters as Bàd-igi-ur-sag-gá, “The fortifications facing the highlands.” According to Michalowski, these highlands were the Zagros or the northern

---


129) This PN is considered Hurrian by Gelb, consisting of the element puš with the ending –am: Gelb, HS, p. 114.

130) Wilhelm analysed it as Pušš(i?)=a=m “He is like…,” Wilhelm, Hurrians in Kültepe Texts, in Anatolia and the Jazira …, p. 185.


133) Michalowski, op. cit., p. 718.


135) Frayne, op. cit., p. 718.


part of the Hamrin range.\(^{138}\) This fortification wall in these letters, according to Michalowski, was undoubtedly the same Bād ma-da constructed by Šulgi.\(^{139}\)

Two years after the campaigns against Šašrum, Simurrum and Lullubum for the ninth time (Š 44), and Urbilum, Simurrum, Lullubum and Karḫar, “within one day” (Š 45), there were campaigns in the next two years against Kimaš, Ḫuwa/murumu and their lands (Š 46-47).\(^{140}\) and finally Kimaš, Ḥarši, Ḫuwa/murumu and their lands (Š 48). One can assume that the later campaigns against Simurrum (Š 44 and 45), followed by other lands such as Karḫar (Š 45), Kimaš (Š 46 and 48), Ḥarši (Š 48) and Ḫuwa/murumu (Š 46, 47 and 48), all located in the lower part of the Transtigris, were probably undertaken because of their attempts to reject their dependence on Ur when it was occupied in the far north, in lands such as Šašrum and Urbilum. That Simurrum was targeted in Š 44 together with Lullubum is reminiscent of the role Simurrum played in instigating hostility of Lullubum against Gutian rule under Enridapizir, father of Erridupizir. A similar scenario in this period is not impossible. The same is true for the campaigns of Š 45. There are texts that speak about a two-day banquet at the temples of Enlil and Ninlil, “when the ensi of Kimaš was captured,” and also about “booty from Kimaš, Ḥarši [and] x⁻²[x⁻³…]x⁻³\(^{141}\) A royal inscription alludes to the destruction of Kimaš and Ḫurtum, referring to piled up corpses and digging a moat (perhaps to drain away the blood).\(^{142}\) Ḫurtum was probably another spelling of Ḫum/wurum. It is noteworthy that Urbilum was attacked and probably conquered by Šulgi after Š 45, and then again by Amar-Sín, but no Sumerian governor in that city is attested until Šū-Sín, when Arad-Nanna was governor.\(^{143}\)

Among all these military campaigns only one was undertaken outside the Hurrian lands. Although there were attempts to make good relations with Anšan by a dynastic marriage (Š 30), when a daughter of Šulgi was married to its ensi,\(^{144}\) Šulgi attacked it four years later (Š 34-35).\(^{145}\) Ur’s efforts were then essentially directed against the Hurrians of the Transtigris.

Of special importance are the royal letters exchanged between Šulgi and two of his high officials, Urdu-gu\(^{146}\) and Ur-dun. The letters show some of the conditions in the northern or

---

\(^{138}\) Michalowski, ibid. He says that this part of Hamrin, known as Ebiḫ, was also called in Ur III administrative texts as kur mar-dā “The highland of the Amorites,” cf. ibid. (referring to his own Royal Correspondence of Ur).

\(^{139}\) Michalowski, “Königsbriefe,” RLA 6, p. 53.

\(^{140}\) The reference to “booty of Šimaški” in an archival text from Puzriš-Dagān might indicate a conflict with Šimaški. Šimaški was ruled at this time by a certain Badudu; cf. nam-ra-ak Ba-du-du LŪ.SU\(^{ki}\), “From the booty of Badudu, the Šimaškian…” see further Steinkeller, P., “New Light on Šimaški and its Rulers,” ZA 97 (2007), p. 217, note 12.

\(^{141}\) Šul-gi 2) DINGIR ma-ti-šu 3) da-nūm 4) LUGAL UR1, 5) LUGAL ki-ib-ra-ti-[m 6) ar-ha-im 7) i-mu 8) m-at Ki-šaški 9) Šu-ar-ti-[m 10) Šu-ša-li-qā-na 11) šu-ri-tam 12) ši-ku-un 13) ši-ru-tam 14) ib-ni, “Šulgi, god of his land, the mighty, king of Ur, king of the four quarters, when he destroyed the land of Kimaš and Ḫurtum, set out a moat and heaped up a pile of corpses,” Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 140-41 (E3/2.1.2.33). Neither in the text nor in the translation has a logical link been drawn between the digging of the moat and the pile of the corpses. I believe the mention of a moat here together with the pile of corpses refers to its use as a means of ducting the streams of blood.


\(^{143}\) For this year name cf. Sallaberger, p. 143; 160.

\(^{144}\) Steinkeller thinks there were two campaigns undertaken against Anšan, cf. Steinkeller, “New Light on Šimaški …,” p. 226, note 45.

\(^{145}\) There is controversy whether to read this name Arad-mu, Ir-mu or even Ir-Nanna. The former two names are generally considered hypocoristic forms of the latter and thus equivalent, as noted by Huber: Huber, F., “Au sujet du nom du Chancelier d’Ur III, Ir-Nanna ou Ir-mu,” NABU 2000, no. 6, p. 10 and Steinkeller, P., “The Administrative and Economic Organization of the Ur III State: The Core and the Periphery,” in Gibson, McG.
northeastern territories and the way they were ruled. According to this correspondence, this part of the land Subir was ruled by Apillaša, the high commissioner, in the name of Šulgi. He sat in a glorious palace with expensive furniture, guarded by select troops. As a person, he was prodigal, tyrannical and arrogant, installing and removing officials and city governors from their positions at will; and he would blind or even kill people.

Urdu-gu was sent to the land of Subir/Subartu in order to:

Establish the provincial taxes, to inform (me) of the state of the provinces, to counsel concerning Apillaša, the royal commissioner (of Subir) and to come to an agreement.\(^{147}\)

But he seems to have been on bad terms with Apillaša, for he disparaged the royal commissioner in his letter to the king, describing Apillaša as an arrogant, disrespectful and corrupt character. Even before entering the palace disrespect was shown towards the king’s representative:

> When I went to the gate of his palace no one inquired about the well-being of my lord. The one who was sitting did not rise for me, did not bow down, (and) I became nervous about him.\(^{148}\)

According to Urdu-gu, Apillaša was corruptly misusing the state’s wealth to satisfy his own desires:

> When I came nearer, (I discerned that) your expedition house was made of combs and built up with pins inlaid with gold, silver, carnelian, and lapis-lazuli; they covered an area of 30 sar. (Apillaša himself) was decked out in gold and lapis-lazuli. He sat on a throne which was placed in a high-quality canopy (and) had his feet set on a golden footstool.\(^{149}\)

The rude high commissioner not only dared to disdain the king’s representative but showed power and wealth as if he was impressing an enemy:

> He would not remove his feet in my presence. His personal guards, (groups of) five thousand each, stood to his right and left. (He ordered) six grass-fed oxen and 60 grass-fed sheep (to be) placed (on the tables) for a lunch.\(^{150}\)

---


\(^{150}\) 20) àga-ús sag₃-ga₃-na 5 li-mu-um-ta-aš i-ib-tuš 21) 6 gud niga 60 udu niga ninda-zü-gub-sè in-gar, Michalowski, ibid.
For his part, honest Urdu-gu was respectful towards his lord. He knew how to behave properly towards his king, even in such a far country, and insisted on showing him esteem and honour:

At the gate at which I had not been greeted a man bade me to enter. After I came in a man brought me a chair with a knob encrusted with red gold and told me, “Sit down!” I answered him, “When I am under the order(s) of my king I stand, I never sit.”

On the other hand, it seems that Apillaša knew how he should treat Urdu-gu, the intruder, since he was there concerning taxes:

Someone brought me two grain-fed oxen and twenty grain-fed sheep for my table. Although I had not (even) seen/noticed (?), my king’s troops overturned my table. I was terrified. I was in fear (about it).

The attempts of Urdu-gu must have been disappointing and fruitless. Apparently Apillaša was favoured by the king more than Urdu-gu. The answer the king gave in response to accusations against Apillaša of tyranny is especially interesting, for it shows that the king considered him a necessary tool for running the kingdom:

If my high commissioner had not elevated himself as if he were me, if he had not sat down on a throne placed in a quality canopy, if he had not set his feet on a golden footstool, had not appointed every one by his own authority and removed governors from the office of city governors, royal officers from the position of royal officer, had not killed or blinded anyone, had not elevated by his own authority those of his own choice (to positions of power) - how else could he have maintained order in the territory?

The king urges them both to be reconciled for the benefit of the state, but does not forget to reprimand his servant Urdu-gu:

If you (truly) love me you will not set your heart on anger. You have made yourself too important. You do not know your (own) soldiers. Be aware of (the power) of your own men and of my might! If you are (indeed) both my loyal servants, you will both read carefully my written message. That both of you come to an understanding and make fast the foundation of the land is urgent.

---


Another official of Šulgi was Ur-dun, who was sent to the mountainous regions of the north to purchase juniper resin. He too complained about Apillaša, but we do not know how the king responded to him:

My king has given us (?) capital and dispatched us (?) to a distant foreign land to purchase juniper resin. But once I had entered the foreign land and purchased the resin, Apillaša, the royal commissioner, was very firm with me, and they appropriated my purchases. When I stood at the gate of his (local) palace, no one wanted to investigate my complaint.\(^\text{156}\)

Since in the letters no specific part of Subir is stated, we cannot be sure where this incident happened, but available historical data gives a hint. As long as Ur had good relations with the independent Hurrian states of the Habur region who maintained their own Hurrian rulers, one would not expect a (high) royal commissioner to have been installed there by Ur. The northern Transtigris was far from stable during the long reign of Šulgi, and three wars, some consisting of several annual campaigns, were undertaken. Such circumstances makes the Transtigris region less probable. However, an allusion to the departure of Urdu-gu and a certain Babati from Zimudar to Simurrum in the letter of Ur-dun might be a hint about the region where the episodes of the three letters took place:

And as for Urdu-gu, your servant, and Babati, the archivist, they had gone from Zimudar to Simurrum, and to inform them..., [they have sent] their messengers of my lord. My king… This confiscation cannot be undone without using force.\(^\text{157}\)

Thus, it is the region of the Sirwān basin, i.e. the southern part of the Transtigris, that is explicitly mentioned. Because this region was subdued during the second Hurrian war under Šulgi, for a few years. Before that it would not have been possible to send officials of Ur to that area. These letters date in all probability to the phase that began in § 40, when maš-da-ri-a offerings from Simurrum are recorded in Puzriš-Dagān,\(^\text{158}\) a sign that it had been annexed to the Empire of Ur.

Hurrians were present in the land of Sumer, as we know from archival texts. Some of these Hurrians were prisoners of the numerous wars the Sumerians waged in their lands, and they were recorded in the texts as recipients of rations. Other Hurrians were in Sumer as diplomats, state visitors or envoys, particularly from kingdoms like Urkeš and Simanum, and so some Hurrians belonged to the highest classes of society.\(^\text{159}\) A certain Tašiš-atal was a prominent scribe in Puzriš-Dagān,\(^\text{160}\) and we know of Hurrian Šagina “military governors”\(^\text{161}\), but we cannot be sure from which category of society they emerged.

---


\(^{156}\) 3) kù lugal-gù10 mu-e-dè-šúm-ma 4) kur sù-rá-šè šim 26° erin-na 5) sa10-sa10-dè mu-e-ši-ge-na 6) ú₄ kur-šè <BI> ku₄-re-na-gù10 7) šim 26° erin-na bi-sa10-sa10-gù10 (8) “A-pi-la-ša gal-zu-unk-en-na ma-an-ge-ma 9) šám-gù10 mu-dan-kan-re-eš 10) kù e-gal-la-né u-un-gub 11) lù-na-me ka-gù10 én nu-bi-tar, Michalowski, P., *The Royal Correspondence of Ur*, (A dissertation presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Yale University), 1976, p. 217, 218; I would like to thank Dr. P. Michalowski for sending me the draft of his new edition of this letter and the next letter of Šarrum-bānī (below), which is now in press, and for allowing me to quote his new translation and transliteration.


\(^{158}\) For this, cf. next chapter.


2. Amar-Sîn

The successor of Šulgi, Amar-Sîn (2046-2038 BC), rapidly continued the Hurrian war. In AS 2 he destroyed Urbilum, modern Erbil. In the year AS 6 Šašrum was destroyed “for the second time.” The first time was in AS 4. Although that campaign was not given a date-formula, the date is known from offerings to Nanna and Enlil and deliveries of cattle said to have been provided from the booty of the lands Šašru and Šuruthum. An allusion to taking slaves as war booty from the city of Šašru by the ensi of Umma in the same month, VIII AS 4, is probably related to this same campaign. The year AS 7 witnessed the destruction of other places, Ḫuḫnuri, Yabru and its lands. In a newly found inscription, Amar-Sîn boasts of his victory after his “heroic troops had fought 30 (or 3) battles (؟).” There are texts recording shipments from lands not mentioned in the date-formulae, such as Madga (AS 1) and Ḫamazi (AS 2).

That the Hurrian lands of the Transtigris were firmly occupied by Ur can be inferred from the establishment of numerous garrisons in territories along the Zagros foothills. Archival texts provide evidence of the existence of such garrisons in Arrapḫum, Dūr-maš, Āgaz, Lullubum, Ḫamazi, Šuriḫum, Šuaḫ, Gablaš, Zaqtum and Dūr-Ebla, and also of shipments sent to officials or governors in Lullubum, “destroyed Šaššuru,” Arrapḫum, Kimaš, Awal, Tašil and a royal gift consisting of sheep to the bride of Nanib-atāl in Urbilum (AS 7).

Probably under Amar-Sîn a marriage was concluded with Ḫamazi, the Transtigridian principality known since the Early Dynastic period. According to this marriage, Tabur-ḫaṭṭum became daughter-in-law of Ur-[Iškur, the ensi] of Ḫamazi. We do not know whether Tabur-ḫaṭṭum was a royal princess or not. If she was, the act could be interpreted

---

162 Sallaberger, Ur III Zeit, OBO, p. 164 with bibliography.
163 Sallaberger, op. cit., note 143 with bibliography. Sallaberger, following Sheil and others reads the name of this GN as Šaripḫum, but this seems to be a misread Šaritḫum. Cf. about this note 209 in Chapter Five.
164 Cf. Sallaberger, Ur III Zeit, OBO, p. 163. Ḫuḫnuri appears to have been slightly to the southwest of Ramhormoz in Iran, cf. Steinkeller, “New Light on …,” p. 223.
167 Walker, ibid.
168 Walker, ibid. referring to the texts PDT 166 (Arrapḫum); Boson TCSD 140 (Kimaš); Owen 1981 NMM 303276 (Awal and Tašil).
169 Meaning “The sceptre (f.) appeared,” from buārum, thus not Dabur-ḫaṭṭum. I owe this translation to T.J.H. Krispijn.
171 Michalowski, op. cit., p. 719.
as a sign that this principality in this period was independent of Ur.\(^{172}\) In any case it seems that her visit in the year ŠS 7 was the last visit, in the absence of any new evidence.

It is notable that Ur had established good relations with Ḥamazi, presumably not yet Hurrianized, while the war on the Hurrian enclaves continued. Apparently the strategy of Ur was to beleaguer the Hurrians of the Transtigris by seeking allies in the land of the enemy, behind the lines of confrontation (see below).

3. Šū-Sīn

Šū-Sīn (2037-2029 BC) has only two military campaigns recorded in date-formulae: ŠS 3 against Simanum and ŠS 7 against Zabšāli.\(^{173}\) After the daughter of Šū-Sīn had been a daughter-in-law for Simanum for at least 12 years, in ŠS 2 a rebellion broke out in Simanum, Ḥabūra and the surrounding lands.\(^{174}\) The rebels overthrew their ruler Pušam/Arib-atal and chased away his daughter-in-law, who was Kunšā-mātum the daughter of Šū-Sīn.\(^{175}\) The reaction of Šū-Sīn was swift. He moved against the rebels (ŠS 3), conquered the city and its surroundings, reinstated Kunšā-mātum in her residence and put back the dethroned ruler on the throne.\(^{176}\) He also deported part of the city residents to Sumer, where he settled them in a camp, specially built for them.\(^{177}\) This camp-city was the very first of its kind built for deportees,\(^{178}\) and it is also the first attested case of mass deportation in history. It looks likely that the new town was called Simanum since the inscription twice states “(He) established Simanum,”\(^{179}\) including the determinative KI in both cases.

Giving a princess to marriage in Simanum and a military intervention to restore its kingship was not for nothing. Steinke\leller considers that the location of this kingdom was vital for Ur as an ally because it “policed the middle course of the Tigris (where principalities such as Nineveh and Ḥabūra were situated), at the same time providing Babylonia with a safety

172 Listing Ḥamazi together with lands which paid gūn mada, “territorial tax,” implies that it was subject to Ur. But the question is whether this was the case for the whole of the Ur III period. For Ḥamazi’s contribution to this kind of tax cf. Steinke\leller, “The Administration and Organization …,” p. 36, note 56.

173 Cf. his date-formulae in Sallaberger, OBO, p. 168. Zabšāli was, according to Steinke\leller, the largest part of the land of Šimaški and it served to describe the whole Šimaškian federation: Steinke\leller, P., “More on LÚ.SU.(A) = Šimaški,” NABU 1990, no. 13. For previous identifications and other attestations, also in Elamite sources, cf. Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 243.

174 30) [Si-ma-nú]m\^2 31) [Hä-bu-ra\^2] 32) [û ma-da-ma-da-bi 33) [lugal-da gú-ér]im 34) [ba-an-da-ab]-gál, Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 297 (E3/2.1.4.1, col. iii, l. 30-34); p. 298 (same text, col. iv, l. 4’-7’).

175 35) [dumu-namus-á]-nį 36) [ki-tuš-a-nį]-ta 37) săg [im-ta]-eš, Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 297 (E3/2.1.4.1, col. iii, l. 35-37); p. 298 (same text, col. iv, l. 8’-10’).

176 Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 288. The inscription adds also that he 29) Si-ma-nú\^4 30) Hä-bu-ra\^4 31) û ma-da-ma-da-bi 32) nam-urdu(?) da-mi-sê 33) săg-sê ma-ni-rig, “assigned to her service Simanum, Ḥabūra and the surrounding districts,” Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 298 (E3/2.1.4.1, col. iv, l. 29-33). It is not clear why Frayne says that Šū-Sīn has put back Pušam on the throne of Simanum, while he himself cites a text dated ŠS 1 (AUAM 73.1044 = Sigrist, AUCT 3 no. 294) that explicitly refers to Ku-un-si-ma-tum è-gli-[a] Ar-ba-tal lugal Ši-ma-nú\^4, “Kunšā-mātum, daughter-in-law of Arib-atal, king of Šimānmū,” cf. Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 288. According to the text Arib-atal, not Pušam, was king of Simanum in the year prior to the rebellion. Thus, it is logical that he, not his father, was put back on the throne. In the inscription ‘Collection B’ that narrates this episode there is no mention of Pušam.

177 34) săg-èrim-gál 35) nam-ra-aš-aka-nį 36) En-lil 4) Nin-lil-[r[a]] 37) ki-sūr-[r[a]] 38) Nibruki\^1-ka [xx] 39) Si-ma-nú[m\^1] 40) ki-[m(u-ne]-går 41) […] mu-[n]-e-du, “He settled the hostile persons, his booty, (namely) from Simanum, for the god Enlil and goddess Ninlil, on the frontier of Nippur, (and) built for them [a town],” Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 298 (E3/2.1.4.1, col. iv, l. 34-41).

178 It is also interesting that the king himself confesses that it was the very first time, since the days the fate he had been decreed, that a town was established for the sake of Enlil and Ninlil with the people he had captured: 47) u₄-[n]-m₄-ta-ra-ta 48) lugal-na-me 1) sag-nam-ra-aš-aka-nį ta 2) En-lil 4) Nin-lil-ra 3) ki-su-ra 4) Nibruki\^1-ka 5) iri\^6) 6) ki nu-ne-går, op. cit. col. iv 47- v. 6.

179 Si-ma-nú\^1 ki nu-ne-går, Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 299 (E3/2.1.4.1, col. v, l. 11; 22-23).
cordon against any potential threats coming from further north.”\(^{180}\) So it was important for Ur to protect such a buffer-state on its northern flank from falling into hostile hands.

This victorious campaign against Simanum was followed by a “state visit” of Tiš-atal, the ruler of Nineveh, to Ur,\(^{181}\) apparently to swear the oath of allegiance to the king.\(^{182}\) According to Steinkeller, Nineveh was a dependency of Simanum before the campaign and its ruler Tiš-atal remained loyal to Ur. Since his city was not mentioned as a target of the campaign, he may even have helped Ur in the campaign. After the success of the campaign, Tiš-atal seems to have been rewarded by promotion from being a vassal of Simanum to become a first-rank and direct vassal of Ur.\(^{183}\) Tiš-atal was escorted by more than 100 men on his way to Ur, and was received by Babati, the maternal uncle of the king, who held two other posts, šakkana(kkum) (military governor) of Maškān-šarri and ensi of Awal.\(^{184}\) Tiš-atal received a large amount of flour for his escort, as much as 150 quarts (silā).\(^{185}\) Both the fact that the mother of Šū-Sîn might have come from the Diyāla region,\(^{186}\) as well as the fact that Babati, a close family member of the king, held such important posts in this area, indicate how far the stability and firm control of this region was a priority to Ur.

Archival texts dated to the years following this campaign mention “soldiers from Simanum” and from other cities that were, according to some, conquered during the campaign.\(^{187}\) The other cities were Ḥabūra, Talmuš (associated with the man Tabliš),\(^{188}\) Ninua, Uruae and ‘ma’-ri-ma-nu-um mar-dū. Ninua’s location is known but not that of the others. Ḥabūra could be sited close to the Pēsh Ḥabūr, an eastern tributary of the Tigris. Frayne tentatively suggested a location at or near the confluence of this tributary with the Tigris, probably identifiable with Tell Basorin.\(^{189}\) Its identification with the Ḥabarātum of the Mari archives is unavoidable and the rebellion of both Simanum and Ḥabūra provides a hint that they were close to each other. As for Talmuš, it has been sited somewhere north or northwest of Nineveh.\(^{190}\) The location of Uruae escapes any attempt at identification.

---


\(^{181}\) For the discussion about the possible identification of this Tiš-atal and two other namesakes, see below.

\(^{182}\) This is confirmed by the publication of a tablet found in Nippur that mentions in line 5: ’nam’-ä-ērim ib-ku₃, “(they) swore an oath.” According to Steinkeller, such allegiance oaths were usually sworn by foreigners in the temple of Ninurta in Nippur and it appears that these hundred (eighty in the Nippur text) Ninevites were high-ranking individuals, perhaps Tiš-atal’s kinsmen, who swore the oath, as the collective form ib-ku₃ indicates. For this cf. Steinkeller, “Tiš-atal’s Visit to Nippur,” with reference to a new edition of the text by Zettler, R. L., “Tišatal and Nineveh at the End of the 3rd Millennium BCE,” in: \textit{If a Man Builds a Joyful House}, Fs Erle Verdun Leichty, Leiden, 2006, p. 503-14. It is interesting that the tablet is dated to the 29th day of the ninth month of SS 3, which is the same month and year given to their visit to Ešnunna.


\(^{184}\) This has become known from his seal legend found on a tablet from Tell Asmar, cf. Whiting, “Tiš-atal of Nineveh...,” p. 178 f.; Frayne, \textit{RIME} 3/2, p. 340-41 (E3/2.1.4.32).


\(^{186}\) It was thought that Amar-Sîn was a brother of Šū-Sîn, which means that the wife of Šulgi, who came from the Diyāla region, was also the mother of Šū-Sîn. But the seal of Babati shows that Amar-Sîn was his father not his brother. Additional evidence is that the wife of Šulgi was Šulgi-simti, and the mother of Šū-Sîn, mentioned in the seal of Babati, is Abi-simti; see further Sallaberger, \textit{OBO}, p. 168 and the table on p. 183.

\(^{187}\) Maeda, T., “The Defense Zone during the Rule of the Ur III Dynasty,” \textit{ASJ} 14 (1992), p. 137. The text lists deliveries from soldiers of Ḥabura, Talmuš, Ninua and Uruae in addition to ‘ma’-ri-ma-nu-um mar-dū. The frequent mention of Mardaman with Ḥabura in Ur III texts makes it possible to identify the Mariunum mentioned in this text with Mardaman if we assume the omission of a DA sign and KI determinative (= Ma-ri-<da>-ma-nu-um<₃>), cf. Frayne, \textit{RIME} 3/2, p. 288.

\(^{188}\) Maeda, T., “The Defense Zone during the ...,” p. 137.

\(^{189}\) Frayne, \textit{RIME} 3/2 (Ur III), p. 288.

\(^{190}\) Jacobsen has located it at Jarāḥiyyah, some 40 km northwest of Nineveh, but Kessler located it at modern Gīr-e Pan, slightly to the northwest of Jarāḥiyyah; see Frayne, \textit{RIME} 3/2, p. 288; cf. also Edzard et al., \textit{RGTC} 1, p. 139; Edzard and Farber, \textit{RGTC} 2, p. 158; Groneberg, B., \textit{RGTC} 3, p. 233; Nashef, Kh., \textit{RGTC} 5, p. 258 (north of
In Šš 3 another important project was undertaken, the restoration of “Wall of the Unincorporated Lands,” built earlier by Šulgi. This wall was renewed and given a new name, Mūriq-Tidnim, “The (wall) that keeps Tidnum at a distance” (UET 6/2, Nr. 183 = ISET II 115: Ni. 3083 obv. I = YBC 4672 = YBC 7149). The change of name followed the change of enemy. Now the Amorites were obviously the major threat coming from this direction, aided by an old, implacable enemy, Simurrum. Some details of this matter emerge in a few letters exchanged between Šu-Sin and Šarrum-bāni, the special commissioner (gal-zu-unken-na) appointed to oversee the work on the fortification wall. In the letter, after a reminder of what his mission was, Šarrum-bāni gives news about the situation:

You commissioned me to carry out construction on the great fortifications (wall) of Mūriq-Tidnim and presented your views to me as follows: “The Mardu have repeatedly raided the frontier territory.” You commanded me to rebuild the fortifications, to cut off their access and thus to prevent them from repeatedly overwhelming the fields through a breach (in the defences) between the Tigris and the Euphrates.

While he informs his lord how far his work has progressed, he warns him indirectly about imminent danger. The enemy is near, and even worse, Simurrum is collaborating with them. This is why he should engage in battle during his building duties:

When I had been working on the fortifications, that then measured 26 danna (269 km.), after having reached (the area) between the two mountain ranges, the Mardu camped in the mountains and turned his attention to my building activities. (The leader of) Simurrum came hither with him as his companion, and he went out against me between the mountain ranges of Ebih to do battle.

There was need for more men and reinforcements (probably resources) for the building work. That the country had changed its allegiance is the reason why he should fight while occupied with his building tasks. The change of allegiance was very probably inspired by the Amorites, whose presence was a good motive for those who sought liberation from the yoke of Ur. To collect information, he sent an envoy to the interior of the country:

If my king belongs to the heavenly beings, he will send extra labour forces and reinforce them to do (their) task. Although I have not been able to reach the most elevated part of the frontier territory, [as soon as I received] information, I sent an envoy to the interior. But the territory has changed its mind (= allegiance), and so I have not neglected to build the fortifications- (to the contrary), I have been building and fighting (at the same time).
Zimudar appears to have been at the final point of the fortifications, and was obviously incorporated into the Empire of Ur. According to the letter it promised to send troops / workmen to assist the man of Ur:

After I dispatched my envoy to you, right behind him I dispatched (another) envoy to Lu-Nanna, the governor of Zimudar, and he sent me a very large contingent (viz. 7200) of troops / workers.

The troubles were seemingly serious. There were not enough men to watch the cities and not enough men to fight. The emphasis on the profound lack of troops made him forget he had already said he needed workers. This passage makes it clear how far the Amorite infiltration troubled the country and how the lack of enough troops was one of the serious problems that was perhaps one of the reasons that led to the fall of Ur:

There are enough corvée labourers but one did not supply enough fighting men. Once my king gives the orders to release the corvée labourers (for military duty), then when (the enemy) raids I will fight with them. He (Lu-Nanna ?) dispatched the (same) man to the nobles of your frontier territory and they presented their case to me as follows: “We cannot even guard all the cities by ourselves. How can (we) give you (more) troops?”

The long letter of Šarrum-bāni closes with stating his determination to continue fighting, showing full obedience to the orders of his king:

Ever since my king commanded me, day and night I have been diligently doing the assigned work as well as fighting (the enemy). Because I am obedient to my king’s command (to build the fortifications) and I continue to battle again and again, even though the (requisite) force has not been assigned to me, I will not cease fighting. Now my king is informed (about all of this).

In some of his historical inscriptions, originally on statues but known from OB copies, a little more is stated about the wars of this king against Zabšali and Simaški. The ‘Historical Collection A’ consists of three inscriptions from three statues on two OB tablets. Two of the three commemorate the king’s victory over Simaški. Geographically significant is the section that identifies the lands of Zabšali as part of the greater territory of Simaški:
At that time, Simaški (which comprises) the lands of Zaβšali, whose surge is like (a swarm) of locusts, from the border of Anšan to the Upper Sea.200

Within Simaškian territory were lands whose lords came forth to do battle, and the remnants of the long list of lands enumerates Ni-bu-ul-m[a-a]ki, 'x'[-x-x-a][m]ki, Si-ig-ri-iš, A-lu-mi-da-timki, Ga-ar-taki, A-za-ža-arki, Bu-ul-maki, Nu-šu-uš-ma-aruki, Nu-šu-ga-ne-lumki, Zizi-ir-tumki, A-ra-ži-i[r]ki, Ša-ži-luki and Ti-ir-mi-ümki.201 As a consequence of his victory, the king killed many of them and took many others captive:

Their lords and enthroned ones, the governors of the lands of Zaβšali and the governors of the cities whom he had brought back from battle, he took as bound captives.202

It is interesting to note the names of the ensís of these lands together with the names of two kings of Zaβšali, Ži-rí-in-gu203 and In-da-su/sú,204 as preserved in the captions of the OB texts copied from the original inscriptions on the statues. The names are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S[a-a]m-ri ensí of [X]’-X’-li-[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu-[x]-li ensí of A-lu-žmi-id-da-tim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu-ni’-ri’ni ensí of [S]i-ig-ri-iški</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba-rí-hí-za ensí of A-ra(?)-hi-irki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne-ni-ib-zu ensí of Zí-zí-ir-tumki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti-rú’-bi’-ú ensí of Nu-šu-ga-ne-[I]u-ümki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

200 14) u₄-ba 15) Simaški (LÚ.SU)ki 16) ma-da-ma-da 17) Za-ab-ša-li[18] 19) a-ab-ba IGI.NIM-ma-še 20) buru-gin, zi-ga-bi, Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 303 (E3/2.1.4.3, col. ii, l. 14-20). It is important to point here briefly to the Simaškian King List found in Susa. Steinkeller could identify some of those kings recorded in the Sumerian and other inscriptions and equate them with the Simaškian King List. The King List runs as follows:

1) Ḡi-ir-ru-na-am-me
2) Ta-zi-ît-à
3) E-ba-ar-ti
4) Ta-zi-ît-à
5) Lu’-x-x-ak’?-lu-ùh-ža-an
6) Ki-in-da-at-f[b]
7) I-da-at-ù
8) Tan-ru-ùh-at-te-er
9) E-[ba]-ar-ti
10) I-da-at-ù
11) I-da-at-ta-na-pi-ir
12) I-da-at-ta-te-em-ti
13) LUGAL.MEŠ Si-maš-ki-lù

The names he equated were Yabrat with Ebarat/Ebarti I of the list; Kirname with Girnamme of the list; Ta’ažite either with Tazitta I or Tazitta II of the list; Kindattu and Idattu I with both Kindattu and Idattu of the list (nos. 6 and 7 respectively). For this and further details see his study in Steinkeller, “New Light on Šimaški and its Rulers,” ZA 97 (2007), p. 220-221.

201 Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 303 (E3/2.1.4.3, col. ii, l. 14-20). It is important to point here briefly to the Simaškian King List found in Susa. Steinkeller could identify some of those kings recorded in the Sumerian and other inscriptions and equate them with the Simaškian King List. The King List runs as follows:

1) Ḡi-ir-ru-na-am-me
2) Ta-zi-ît-à
3) E-ba-ar-ti
4) Ta-zi-ît-à
5) Lu’-x-x-ak’?-lu-ùh-ža-an
6) Ki-in-da-at-f[b]
7) I-da-at-ù
8) Tan-ru-ùh-at-te-er
9) E-[ba]-ar-ti
10) I-da-at-ù
11) I-da-at-ta-na-pi-ir
12) I-da-at-ta-te-em-ti
13) LUGAL.MEŠ Si-maš-ki-lù

The names he equated were Yabrat with Ebarat/Ebarti I of the list; Kirname with Girnamme of the list; Ta’ažite either with Tazitta I or Tazitta II of the list; Kindattu and Idattu I with both Kindattu and Idattu of the list (nos. 6 and 7 respectively). For this and further details see his study in Steinkeller, “New Light on Šimaški and its Rulers,” ZA 97 (2007), p. 220-221.


203 In text E3/2.1.4.3: RIME 3/2, p. 306.

204 In text E3/2.1.4.5: RIME 3/2, p. 310, variant on p. 311.

205 Note that Lullubum appears for the first time in the narrative of this war. The question is whether this land, or at least its eastern part inside the Iranian territory, was actually considered part of Simaški.
Dun-gá-at ensi of Nil-[bu-ul]-m[a-at³].

The names do not appear to be Hurrian, an important sign that the Hurrians were not a dominating element in Western Iran, at least not in this period. However, some of the GNs deserve comment. Nuššumar is very similar to the PN Na-aš-šu-ma-ar of the Shemshara tablets. Sigriš could be identical to later NA Sikris, a province in Media, mentioned together with Urikatu, Saparda, Uriakku and other localities in the course of the campaigns on Ḥarhar. The PN Wa-bur-tum might be understood as Semitic, similar to the OA word wabartum, “trading colony.”

After the cities and villages had been devastated, Šū-Sîn took the male captives, gouged out their eyes and forced them to work in the gardens and orchards of Enlil and Ninlil and other gods. The women he offered as a present to the weaving mills of the same gods. Šū-Sîn was one of the first rulers to use deportees from one region to work in another. He forced deportees from Ḥabūra and Mardaman to work in the mines of Bulma, a territory of Zabšali.

Sumerian foreign policy involved the direct rule of conquered lands through governors (ensi) or military generals (šakkanakku). They could inherit their posts within the family, especially in the latter part of the period. Ir-Nanna is perhaps the best example of this, who enumerated in one of his inscriptions the posts he held during his long career. In another inscription he referred to his father, who was likewise the grand-vizier. The posts Ir-Nanna held were grand-vizier, governor of Lagaš, sanga priest of the god Enki, military governor of Ušar-Garšana, general of Bašime, governor of Sabum and the land of Gutebum, general of Dimat-Enlila, governor of Ḥam(a)zi and Karḫar, general of NI, general of Simaški and the land of Karda. Similarly Šilluš-Dagān was named on a seal impression and was governor of Simurrum under Šū-Sîn.

4. Ibbi-Sîn

Ibbi-Sîn (2028-2004 BC), the last king of the dynasty, campaigned in Simurrum in the early years of his reign (IS 3) and later in Ḥuhnuri (IS 9). Between the two campaigns, he

---

206 Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 311-12 (E3/2.1.4.5). Steinkeller assumes that the last name, Dungat of Nibulmat, is identical with Dungat of Zi-da-ahe-ra of the archival texts. He also noted that the men of Zida-ri appeared together with some Simaškians at Nippur, cf. Steinkeller, “New Light on Šimaški …,” p. 223, note 32.

207 The first part of the last name Tungat has a parallel in the Nuzi PN Tun-Teššup, cf. Gelb et al., NPN, p. 158.


210 Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 304-5 (E3/2.1.4.3, col. iv 11-v 17); cf. also Sallaberger, OBO, p. 169.

211 Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 305 (E3/2.1.4.3, col. vi 8-v 18).


214 This can be a variant spelling of Niqum, see below.

215 Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 324 (E3/2.1.4.13, l. 11-26).


217 Cf. the table in Sallaberger, OBO, p. 173.
concluded a dynastic marriage (IS 5), marrying his daughter Tukīn-ḫaṭṭi-migriša to the ensi of Zabšali.\textsuperscript{218}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Šulgi} & (A) Dealing with the Hurrian Frontier & (B) Others \\
\hline
24: Karḫar 1 & «First Hurrian War» & 28-29: High priestess of Eridu \hline
25: Simurrum 1 & 30: King’s daughter married to Anšan \hline
26: Simurrum 2 & 31: Karḫar 2 & «Second Hurrian War» \hline
27: Ḥarši & 32: Simurrum 3 & \hline
 & 33: Karḫar 3 & \hline
(37-38: Wall of the land built) & 34-35: Anšan & 39-41: Puzriš-Dagān «built» \hline
42: Šašrum 1 & 43: High priestess of Nanna & \hline
44: Simurrum & «Third Hurrian War» & \hline
(and Lullubum) «9» & & \hline
45: Urbilum 1 (Lullubum, Simurrum and Karḫar) & & \hline
46-47: Kimaš and Ḥumurti & & \hline
48: Ḥarši (Kimaš and Ḥumurti) & & \hline
\hline
\textbf{Amar-Šin} & 1: Amar-Šin became king & \hline
2: Urbilum 2 & 3-5: various cultic acts & \hline
6: Šašrum 2 & 7: bītum-rāhiu, labrum ..etc. & \hline
 & 8-9: various cultic acts & \hline
\textbf{Šu-Šin} & 1: Šu-Šin became king & \hline
3: Simanum & 2: ship of Enki & \hline
(4-5: Amorite wall built) & 6: stele of Enlil and Ninlil & \hline
 & 7: Zabšali & \hline
 & 8-9: various cultic acts & \hline
\textbf{Ibbi-Šin} & 1: Ibbi-Šin became king & \hline
3: Simurrum & 2: high priest of Inanna of Uruk & \hline
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Table of the Ur III campaigns on the Hurrian territories (after Hallo, \textit{RHA}, p. 82).}
\end{table}

Now it is necessary to look at the sequence of dates of the campaigns of the Ur III kings. From the beginning of the reign of Šulgi, Simurrum and Karḫar were the first lines of confrontation between Ur and the Hurrians. Subsequent campaigns pushed the line farther from Ur, deeper into Hurrian territory, and under Šulgi it had reached Šašrum (§ 42) and Urbilum (§ 45). Later, under Ibbi-Šin, the line reverted to Simurrum, implying that Hurrian

\textsuperscript{218} mu Tu-ki-in-PA-mi-ig-ri-ša dumu-munus-lugal ēnsi Za-ab-ša-li\textsuperscript{b} ba-an-tuk, “Year Tukin-ḫaṭṭi-migriša, the king’s daughter, was married by the ensi of Zabšali,” Frayne, \textit{RIME} 3/2, p. 363.
power was recovering.\textsuperscript{219} This recovery explains the decision of Ur to establish good relations with its old enemy Zabšali and conclude a dynastic marriage.\textsuperscript{220} Confronting the Hurrians in the Transtigris and keeping them at bay was a primary aim of Ur, but the role the Amorite infiltration played in changing the balance of power at this time should not be forgotten.

\textit{The Historical Geography of the Ur III Campaigns to the Hurrian Lands}

To describe the historical geography of the Hurrian lands that were the object of Sumerian warfare under Ur III kings is difficult. This difficulty stems from the fact that the kings of Ur, with the exception of Šū-Sîn, did not leave any royal inscriptions with historical narratives or any annals like those left by the Assyrian kings. All we know has to be deduced from the date-formulae (year names) and from some passages in the literary compositions, although they are not considered as so reliable for writing history. Inscriptions of the other periods, especially the later ones, have to be studied for this purpose and the data compared with modern GNs in an attempt to identify the older GNs in the Ur III records. In this short survey the GNs that have already been dealt with in previous chapters, especially Chapter Two, will not be further discussed.

The GNs confronted by the kings of Ur in the Hurrian lands of the Transtigris can be listed in the chronological order of campaigns.

\textbf{Šulgi:}

Karhar: Š 24-25  
Simurrum: Š 25-26  
Simurrum (for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} time): Š 26  
Ḥarši: Š 27  
Karhar (for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} time): Š 31  
Simurrum (for the 3\textsuperscript{rd} time): Š 32  
Karhar (for the 3\textsuperscript{rd} time): Š 33  
Ṣašrum: Š 42  
Simurrum and Lullubum (for the 9\textsuperscript{th} time): Š 44  
Urbilum, Simurrum, Lullubum and Karhar (in one day): Š 45  
Kimaš, Ḫu(m/wu)rti and their lands (in one day):Š 46-47  
Ḥarši, Kimaš, Ḫu(m/w)rti and their lands (in one day): Š 48

\textbf{Amar-Sîn:}

Urbilum: Š 2  
Ṣašrum (For the 2\textsuperscript{nd} time): Š 6  
Ḫuḥnuri: Š 7

\textsuperscript{219} It is interesting to see this phenomenon also in the archival texts. Steinkeller drew attention to the large number of gún ma-da texts under Šulgi (35 texts) and Amar-Sîn (35 texts), when Ur’s control over the peripheral lands was still firm, but these texts decreased dramatically under Šu-Sîn (19 texts) and virtually ceased in the first years of Ibbi-Sîn (3 texts), indicating a loss of control: Steinkeller, “The Administrative and Economic Organization of the Ur III State…,” p. 36.

\textsuperscript{220} Steinkeller associates this dynastic marriage with the political situation in Simaški, where the long lasting alliance of Ebarat/Ebariti of Simaški with Ur (since Šulgi 44) turned into hostility when he felt the end of Ur was approaching. He occupied Susa and established himself there as an independent ruler (sometime after IS 3 and before IS 9): Steinkeller, “New Light on Šimaški …,” p. 228. This could be an explanation, but we cannot neglect the role the Hurrian threat played.
The first attack in the region under study was on Karhar, a strategic city on the Great Khorasān Road, on the Alvand River. Most probably Karhar was in or close to modern Qasr-i-Shīrīn. The name is first attested as Kā-kā-ra-an in the OAkk texts from Tell Sulaimeh. During the Ur III period the governor of Karhar was a certain Ea-rābi, known from a text dated to AS 5, from an undated text and from a tablet from ŠŠ 9. On a cylinder seal we find the name of one of its Hurrian kings, the deified Tiš-atal king of Karhar. Another king of Karhar was Zardamu, likewise deified. From his seal legend it appears he ruled later than Tiš-atal, sometime in the Early Old Babylonian period. The text also indicates that he was a mighty king, described as king of the four quarters of the world. Two points in the text of this seal legend are especially important: the prominent position of the god Nergal in the text and the description of the king as ‘Sun of his land.’ These two points show Zardamu sharing two important features with the Hurrian kings of the Habur. The special position of the god Nergal is also seen in the two foundation inscriptions of Tiš-atal and Atal-Šen. The text ‘Sun of his land’ was also borne by Talpuš-ATIL of Nagar (see below).

The road that now leads to Sar-i-Pul-i-Zahāb passes through Khanaqīn, another city on the Alvand River. Khanaqīn is generally identified with ancient Niqqu(m), which was ruled in the OAkk period by a certain Karšum. He styled himself “The one (in charge of the)
messengers, governor of Niqqum, his servant (i.e. servant of Narām-Sīn) in inscriptions on two mace-heads. At one period Niqqum was considered an enemy, according to a Hittite literary text. An OB letter refers to Niqqum in association with Ḥalman. It is very possible that this Niqqum is identical with NI.HI of Ur III documents. One of those documents is the inscription of Ir-Nanna, who once functioned as “Governor of Hamazi and Karḫar and general of NI.HI.” Frayne noticed that the alternation between the velar stop k and the spirant ḡ occurs elsewhere, such as Karḫar = kakkara(n) and Tikittiḫum = probably modern Taqtaq. The suggestion is strengthened by renderings of the name of the goddess Belat-Šu as Belat-Šu/Niqqum as Belat-Suknir, as noticed by Sallaberger.

Simurrum will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Little is known about Ḥaršī. Šulgi campaigned against it in his 27th and 48th regnal years, almost at the beginning and at the end of his Hurrian war. The name occurs several times in the archival texts, most of which are dated to Š 48. Although fragmentary, the name resembles the name Tabiti, son of Pišendēn, king of the Turukkeans, who were also Hurrians; cf. Chapter Six.

231 14) "Ur-[b]a (')-an-da LUGAL KUR [Ur]-ni-qi-q[il(+)…]." “Ur(b)anda, king of Niqqu[…], Güterbock, “Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische ..., ZA 10 (1938), p. 68; cf. also Potts, Mesopotamia and ..., p. 107, note 131.
234 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 149; 169.
236 For an overview cf. Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 74-5; Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 154-156.
237 Not to be confused with another Huršītum, located in the region of Akšak, cf. Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 80.
238 LUGAL ma-at Ḥu-ur-ši-ti-im.
239 Known also under its Turkish-Turkomenian name Aq-su.
240 For this cf. Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 156. He adds another attestation of Huršītum in an OB letter sent by a ruler of Ešnunna (referring to Van Dijk, 1973, p. 65).
241 Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 74-5.
242 This name also occurs with the variants In-ši-wi-ir and I-ša-wi-ir, cf. Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 74. The element iwir could be associated with Hurrian ewir, “lord.”
243 Although fragmentary, the name resembles the name Tabiti, son of Pišendēn, king of the Turukkeans, who were also Hurrians; cf. Chapter Six.
suggestions that all these places were in the same general area. 245 According to some OB texts Kimaš was located somewhere to the north of the Hamrin Range. 246 The occurrence of NIM-ki-maški in several texts 247 confirms its association with a highland region, and this is supported by the cylinders of Gudea that mention he had mined copper in the mountain of Kimaš. 248 But it is associated with Ekallātum in OB date-formulae from Išchali as targets of a king of Ešnumma, which pushes Kimaš further to the north, to the middle Tigris, for Ekallātum was to the north of Assur. 249 Locating it here does not seem correct, unless Kimaš was mentioned as a southerly target on the way to Ekallātum in the north. This is because Kimaš of the Ur III and Gudea sources was a highland city or district, not so far to the north as Assur or even close to Assur. In all probability Kimaš was located somewhere in the foothills of the Zagros, to the east of the Sirwān River, to the north of Hamrin, but not as far north as Arrapha or Zamua (= Shahrazūr).

The archival texts of Ur III provide the name of an ensi of Kimaš, a certain Ū-un-NI.NI or Ū-un-ḫi-li,250 who was also the military governor (šagin) of Madga.251 This association strengthens the idea of locating Kimaš in the region proposed above. Noteworthy is the mention of Ra-ši-ši together with this Ūun-ḫi-li (TCSD 140, 5),252 an important figure that will be discussed in the next chapter.

Hu(m/w)urti 253 was also associated with Ḫarši and Kimaš in the date-formulae of Šulgi, which again means that it was located in the same general area. If we place the date-formulae that mention these lands in chronological order as reflecting the passage of events, the first impression is that Karhar was controlling the gorge leading to the Upper Diyāla or Sirwān. The Sirwān region can be viewed as an inverted triangle, with the southern point marking the narrowest spot between the Zagros Mountains to the east and the Diyāla River and the Hamrin Range on the west (Map 1). This point was controlled by Karhar. Behind that point Simurrum controlled a wider area of the triangle and, as with Karhar, several successive campaigns were needed to clear it. Further back was the wider region in the middle of the triangle. There the Sumerian troops had to spread further eastwards and westwards, to Kimaš in the east, at the foot of the Zagros range, and to Ḫarši and Hu(m/w)urti in the west. This helps us to

245 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 159.
249 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 160.
250 Cf. Edzard and Farber, RTGC 2, p. 100, note also the rendering of the name on the seal as Ḫu-un-ḫi-li; according to them it has to be read as Ḫu-un-ḫi-li.
251 For the location of Madga in the region between Daqūq, Tūz Ḫurmātu and Kifri, cf. Chapter Three.
252 Edzard and Farber, RTGC 2, p. 100.
253 The writing of this GN in cuneiform gives the impression that the name must have been pronounced as something like /huur/wi. The sound /w/, as we know from NA and NB inscriptions, was written either as m or as w, as in the name of the Median king Uvāxšar(a)ra in OP (cf. Schmitt, R., “Die Sprache der Meder - eine grosse Unbekannte,” Continuity of Empire (?). Assyria, Media, Persia, eds. G.B. Lanfranchi, M. Roaf and R. Rollinger, Padova, 2003, p. 26); the name is Umakištar in Akkadian (cf. Gadd, C. J., The Fall of Nineveh, The Babylonian Chronicle no. 21,901 in the British Museum, London, 1923, Rev. 1. 47, p. 34) in the Babylonian sources; similarly the name of the Persian king Daryavaš is Darius. (cf. Von Voigtländer, E. N., The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great, Babylonian Version, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part I: Inscriptions of Ancient Iran, London, 1978, I. 1, p. 11). A parallel element to this virtual /huur/ may be found in the Hurrian word ḫawur ūn, “sky,” found in the PN Ḫawur(ni), “sky,” for this PN and the meaning of ḫawur(ni) cf. Richter, “Die Ausbreitung . . . .”, p. 307.
understand why these latter three regions were attacked in one day, according to date-formulae: Kimaš and Ḫu(m/w)urti in Š 46-47; Ḫarši, Kimaš and Ḫu(m/w)urti together in Š 48. Since Ḫarši was the first of the three to be attacked as early as Š 27, directly after the campaigns against Karhar in Š 25 and Simurrum in Š 26, it is very probable that Ḫarši was located to the south, midway between Kimaš and Ḫu(m/w)urti.

As for the location of Ḫu(m/w)urti, it seems very probable that it was on the western side of the triangle, behind Simurrum and in front of Arrapḫa. It could very well be at modern Tūz-Ḫurmātu, a town and locality to the south of Kirkuk on the Awa-Špī tributary. The modern name of this town may also be a reflection of the old name,254 as with many other GNs.

Ḫu(m/w)urti is mentioned in archival texts, one of which refers to the booty of this land.255 Others mention its ensī Ba-za-mu and Ḫu-ba-mi-r-si-ni.256 The latter name, especially the element –sini, appears to be affiliated linguistically to the famous Ḫišib-rasini, father of Luhīšan, king of Awan.257 The reference to NIM-ḫu-ur₅₇-ti in several texts258 indicates the high elevation of this land or its location in a hilly terrain. The way leading from Baghdad to Kirkuk crosses the Hamrin Range slightly to the south of Tūz-Ḫurmātu, and travellers easily appreciate the height of the land directly behind the range, with Tūz-Ḫurmātu just a few kilometers away.

It is very surprising that there is comparative silence about the two important centres Arrapḫa and Nuzi. The few occurrences of Arrapḫa may be understandable, but the total omission of Nuzi, the heir of ancient Gasur, is unexplainable.259 Arrapḫa made its first appearance in the written records in this period. It is attested in some archival texts, some of which mention troops of that city,260 and one, dated to v AS 5, mentions the general with a Hurrian name, Ḫašip-atal, in connection with soldiers from Arrapḫa.261

---

254 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 162.
256 Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 81.
257 For the kings of Awan, see Chapter Two.
258 Cf. Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 81.
259 The only occurrence of Nuzi as kaskal-na-me nu-zu-e-ŠÈ appeared to be a misunderstanding of a Sumerian verbal chain, cf. Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 151. One possible interpretation of the silence about Nuzi/Gasur is connected with the relative silence concerning the Gutians. The Gutians, except for few times, do not appear in the Ur III texts, not even in date formulae, despite the extensive military actions in or close to their territory. Only in the early phase of the Ur III state under Ur-Namma are they referred to in inscriptions such as the literary composition that mentions the death of Ur-Namma in a battle against the Gutians. Perhaps there was a pact between Sumer and Gutium, according to which no party would clash with the other. The city of Gasur/Nuzi might then have been under Gutian influence and hence not an object of Sumerian military operations. Since there is no hiatus in the archaeological strata for this period in Gasur, the silence about the city cannot be attributed to abandonment. For the continuity of occupation between Gasur and Nuzi cf. Starr, R. F. S., Nuzi, vol. I, Harvard, 1939, p. 18; for the discovery of an Ur III tablet (no. 228), cf. Meek, Old Akkadian, Sumerian and Cappadocian Texts from Nuzi, Excavations at Nuzi, vol. III in: HSS X, Harvard, 1935, p. vii.
The Tranquil Hurrian Lands

It is notable that only part of the Hurrian lands, the lands in the Transtigris and Zagros, probably with the exception of Simanum, became the targets of Sumerian warfare. The other parts, for instance those in the Habur area, were not mentioned in the list of lands attacked by the Ur III kings. On the contrary, Ur had diplomatic relations with Urkeš. Some think that northern Syria was not targeted in the military plans of Ur because of lack of interest, since the region was thinly populated. This does not seem likely, as we know that northern Syria, particularly the Habur Region, was a rich country, where such kingdoms as Urkeš and Nagar flourished with rich agricultural and trade economies. Nagar was famous for its expensive equids in the time of Ebla archives, and the same would have been true in the Ur III period. Urkeš was even more productive in agriculture since it was located in a zone of abundant rain and well placed for trade with the northern mountains in Anatolia. Proof of the richness of the Habur area comes from the Akkadian occupation of Nagar, where they built a centre (perhaps more than one) for the collection of local products. By contrast, the Transtigris consisted principally of rugged mountainous terrains, with poor agriculture and water resources unable to support large numbers of people. Why the Hurrians of the Transtigris were attacked so ferociously while their kinsmen in the Habur area enjoyed the peace and friendship of Ur is a question. The answer to this question must lie in the geopolitical conditions of the Transtigris, more specifically the lower parts in the Diyālā region. In the history of Mesopotamia this region was always (and it still is) a focal point, being midway between Mesopotamia and the Transtigris. As such it was on the one hand the base for attacks against the Mesopotamian lowlands, because of its closeness to the Zagros Mountains, the Hamrin Range, the Tigris and the Diyālā Rivers and on the other against the mountainous regions by powers of lowland Mesopotamia. Its position gives any attacking army coming from the north the advantage of hiding before launching an attack and easily retreating. This is why Sargon of Akkad carried out campaigns on Niqqum (Modern Khanaqīn) and Simurrum (on the upper Diyālā), most probably to make a base for his attack against Subartu. Besides being an ideal starting point for attacks, the region also provided easy passage for immigrants from the north on their way to the heart of Mesopotamia. The flow of Gutians from this region into Mesopotamia and their military role in the invasion, albeit in the service of the Akkadians, remained fresh in Sumerian memory. The Hurrians in this period were still on the move, and one of their destinations was certainly the south, along the Sirwān and Diyālā Rivers. There they succeeded after the time of Sargon of Akkad in establishing themselves in Simurrum, as is seen in the Hurrian name of its king, Daḫiš-ati. The rulers of Ur had no choice but to confront the Hurrians in the Diyālā region to safeguard

262 The aim of the Sumerian military involvement in Simanum, unlike in the Transtigris, was to restore its kingship, not to destroy it.
264 Sallabarger, Ur III Zeit, OBO, p. 159.
266 Eidem et al., p. 101.
267 From this same region the last Sassanian king, Yazdagird III (632-651 AD), fled to Iran, to Nihavand and to Hamadan, after his defeat by the Arabs. The invading Arab troops also used the same passage to penetrate Iran. In modern times the strategic importance of this region was recognized in the strong process of Arabization by successive Iraqi regimes, to keep the region in the firm hands of Arab nationalist governments.
their realm. To do this they made successive campaigns to loot and destroy their settlements and take as many prisoners and materials as possible to keep them weak.268

The Hurrians in the Ur III period were in no way disorganized objects to Sumerian campaigns, but rather they were organized into small states that dominated the whole area, from the Zagros Mountains to the Habur region and beyond. Among these states were Urkēš (see below), Nagar (see below, under Nawar), Simanum, Simurrum and probably Kakmum. The ruler of Urkēš was Tiš-atal. We know of a mighty ruler of Nineveh, probably a vassal of Ur in this period, also called Tiš-atal. He is named in two tablets from Ešnunna and described as “the man of Ninua,”269 and he “would therefore have ruled the northern part of Assyria, including the temple town of the Hurrian goddess Šawuška.”270 The text mentioning Tiš-atal and his unprecedented large number of escorts indicates his importance and status.271 Another Tiš-atal was king of Karḫar, mentioned already, known from a seal legend of unknown provenance from the Ur III or Proto Isin-Larsa Period.272 Collon and Whiting think these names represent the same Hurrian king of Urkēš,273 while others think the name Tiš-atal was a common PN among the Hurrians in this period.274 It is tempting to imagine a king of Urkēš exercising his authority on Nineveh, which is geographically connected with the Habur area, and from there exercising authority on the Diyālā region, which is geographically connected to the Nineveh region by main routes. This is theoretically possible, but it remains difficult to think about a large Hurrian kingdom from the Habur to the Diyālā under the shadow of the empire of Ur. The inscriptions do not mention the two places together as the domains of one single king at one time. Moreover, it is difficult to imagine that a king of Urkēš can be simply entitled “the man of Nineveh” in the texts mentioned above. The title king of Urkēš would have been more important or at least as important as “the man of Nineveh” and would have been the expected epithet, not restricted to the lordship of Nineveh.275 Furthermore, we would have expected Tiš-atal of Urkēš to mention Nineveh as his domain in his inscription, but he does not (see below). So it seems very likely that we are dealing with more than one Tiš-atal, and that Tiš-atal of Nineveh is to be distinguished from Tiš-atal of Urkēš. Accordingly, it becomes more difficult to identify Tiš-atal of Karḫar with Tiš-atal of Urkēš, since the Diyālā region would have been separated from the Habur region by the realm of Tiš-atal of Nineveh. We conclude, therefore, that in this period there are three different rulers named Tiš-atal.

268 Hallo points to the blockade of the northern Iranian trade routes against the Sumerians by the Hurrian kingdoms as a reason for the Ur III warfare: Hallo, “Simurrum and the Hurrian Frontier,” RHA 36 (1978), p. 71. While this could be a reason, it cannot be the only or the principal one.
269 Wilhelm, The Hurrians, p. 11.
270 Wilhelm, ibid. According to Wilcke the occurrences of the goddess Ša-uš (=ŪLU)-ša, Ša-ū-ša and Ša-u-ša are an Ur III rendering of the goddess Ša(w)uš(k)ša, which also appeared in Mari as Ša-ū-ša-ū-ša-an. The offerings listed to this goddess are related to Šu-Sin’s lukur Tiʾāmat-bāštī, and that could mean, in Wilcke’s view, that she was descended from a Hurrian country where this goddess was worshipped, perhaps from Nineveh; cf. Wilcke, C., “A Note on Tiʾāmat-bāštī and the Goddess Ša(w)uš(k)ša of Nineveh,” DV (Drevnie Vostok) 5 (1988), p. 225-227 (English Summary); see also the supplement, with an additional text mentioning her, in Wilcke, C., “Tiʾāmat-bāštī,” NABU 1990, no. 1. Mars, p. 28 (no. 36).
273 Salvini, p. 107 and n. 44. Collon thinks that even the scribe Tahjiš-atal of Puzriš-Dagān was the same man of Nineveh, later king of Karḫar and probably the endan of Urkēš, cf. Collon, RA 84 (1990), p. 129f. Matthews and Eidem, and also Frayne, do not exclude the possibility that Tiš-atal of Urkēš was the same Tiš-atal of Nineveh; cf. Matthews and Eidem, “Tell Brak and Nagar,” Iraq 55 (1993), p. 203; Frayne, RIME 3/2 (Ur III), p. 462.
275 Whiting considers it possible to think of one Tiš-atal with three different occurrences: Whiting, “Tiš-atal of Nineveh and …,” JCS 28 (1976), p. 175; 177. This hypothesis seems too difficult to prove, especially in the light of new discoveries in Mozan (for these see below, under Urkēš).
The Hurrians at this time seem to have been present in the region of Maraš in Anatolia but no farther. Their presence is reflected in the Old Assyrian archives from Anatolia, particularly Kaniš. In these archives there are few Hurrian Personal names and few Hurrian linguistic suffixes have been detected. Even those Hurrian names attested cannot be taken as evidence of a Hurrian presence there, since, for as Wilhelm explains, Assyria itself bordered Hurrian-speaking areas and Assyrians operating in Anatolia may have had Hurrian names. An important letter of the prince of the city of Mama, probably in the region of modern Maras to the east of Kaniš, was sent by someone with a supposedly Hurrian name, Anum-hirbi. This might indicate that a Hurrian population was already there, perhaps even a Hurrian ruling family. This sparse Hurrian presence in the Maraš region, compared with the fact that the same region was certainly within the Hurrian-speaking population area in the 14th century, means that the Hurrians were still on the move towards the west and northwest during the centuries that followed. Other evidence of Hurrians in Kaniš is found in other letters. One, sent from Northern Syria by a certain Ehli-Addu, is addressed to someone with a Hurrian name, Unap-še, in Kaniš. Among the witnesses is another supposedly Hurrian name, Tuḫuš-madi, who was from Ḫaššu in Northern Syrian. Another witness came from Zibuḫulwe. Another letter to Unap-še mentions “a scribe who can understand and read Hurrian.”


279 Balkan, K., Letter of King Anum-hirbi of Mama to king Warshama of Kaniš, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarindan VII, Seri 31 a, Ankara, 1957, p. 6ff, after Wilhelm, The Hurrians, p. 12. According to Garelli, Mama is probably identifiable with Göksun in the mountains that separate Syria from Cata’onia, cf. Astour, “Les Hourrites…,” p. 4-5. The OA sources indicate that Mama was closely associated with Uršu, and both were located on a southern alternative route leading to Kanesh, cf. Barjamovic, G., A Historical Geography of Anatolia in the Old Assyrian Colony Period, Copenhagen, 2011, p. 195.

280 Balkan (who published the letter) and Garelli consider the name Hurrian, while Laroche sees it only as a probability, cf. Astour, “Les Hourrites…,” p. 4. A similar name, in the form -we, “God Addu saved.” For the element -we cf. Richter, Th., Ein Hurritische Sprache erörtert, p. 509.

281 Wilhelm, ibid.


283 Wilhelm’s analysis of this GN is a genitive form, seen in the clear Hurrian genitive ending -we, based on a professional name, to which the suffix -uḫuli (-a=g(e)=a/i=li) is attached: Wilhelm, Amurrus, I, p. 176-7.
Urkeš:

Thanks to the archaeological efforts undertaken in recent years, Urkeš, modern Tell Mozan, has become one of the landmarks of Hurrian civilization and archaeology. It is perhaps the best example of a Hurrian city with a Hurrian material culture, Hurrian population and a Hurrian ruling family with its own regal priorities and its own artistic genre. It was also an autonomous urban efflorescence of the mountainous north, not an outpost of Mesopotamian civilization, in contrast to Nagar. The city of Urkeš was the centre of the kingdom of Urkeš and so it is appropriate to concentrate on the city with a side-glance at its neighbour Nagar. The name of the city was known from the inscription of Atal-šen, “king of Urkeš and Nawar,” and Hittite religious texts refer to it as the city of Kumarbi, father of the Hurrian gods, associated with Sumerian Enlil. In other mythological texts such as the myth of silver (CTH 364), Urkeš is also associated with Kumarbi. Hurrian was the language used there for display inscriptions, Hurrian anthromonyms denote the political elite and the royal titulary was Hurrian. In Urkeš Hurrians took over elements of Mesopotamian civilization, including cuneiform, as early as the Late Akkadian – Gutian period.

Based on the above mentioned text material, especially from the Ur III Period, the city of Urkeš appears to have been the most important Hurrian centre before the Mittanni Period. But it is surprising that the city is not attested in the Ebla texts or in OAkk. texts of Mesopotamia.

As pointed out earlier, the rulers of the city had Hurrian names from the third millennium BC, and they can be arranged in order according to middle-chronology:

Tupkiš and his wife Uqnītum (+/- 2280 BC)
[xxx], husband of Tar'am Agade (+/- 2240 BC)
Atal-šen son of Šatar-mat.
Tiš-atal.
Ann-atal.


Güterbock, op. cit., p. 325.
Güterbock, op. cit., p. 329.
Salvini, the earliest...” p. 107.
According to M. Kelly Buccellati eight rulers/kings of Urkeš are known from sealings and other textual sources, cf. M. Kelly-Buccellati, “Urkeš and the North: Recent Discoveries,” p. 29.
The reading Uqnītum: KUR.ZA.NI-tum or ZA.KUR.NI-tum, “the lapis-lazuli girl,” is suggested by Steinkeller. The doubtful reading Zakuryatum as an Amorite PN is not favoured for historical and orthographic reasons. However, although the PN Uqnītum occurs in OB, the reading Uqnītum is not absolutely sure, for, as the Buccellatis say, we still ignore the local peculiarities of the scribal traditions in Urkeš in dealing with logograms and syllables. There are further questions about the reading of the logogram and about the sign NI; for this cf. Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, “The Royal Storehouse ...” p. 16 and note 21.
Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, ibid.
The domain of these rulers was not restricted to the city of Urkesh, but the city together with the surrounding territories constituted the kingdom of Urkesh. It is thought that the kingdom included Nawar, since the titulary of Atal-šen refers to Nawar as a territory rather than a city.\textsuperscript{300}

The palace of Urkesh (Fig. 1)\textsuperscript{301} consists of two main wings but is only partially excavated. The excavated objects now known come principally from the so-called Service Wing that covers almost 1000 m\textsuperscript{2}. The Formal Wing seems to have suffered considerable damage, although parts of its walls reach a height of 3 m above the roof line of the Service Wing.\textsuperscript{302} The areas excavated so far point to an extensive palace according to the excavators: “The palace plan is looming larger and larger with each new season of excavation.”\textsuperscript{303} The palace conforms to a rectilinear layout and includes rooms and courtyards, hearths, ovens (later phase), basins (later phase), drains,\textsuperscript{304} staircases, platforms, a toilet and flagstone pavements (courtyard H3) (Fig. 2). A particularly interesting map, presumably of the rooms I1-I3 (Fig. 3) was also found.\textsuperscript{305} The main entrance of the palace appears to have faced west. Also there is an underground structure associated with necromancy, to the southwest of the palace (Fig. 4a-b), called in Hurrian ābi and related to a Hurrian cult.\textsuperscript{306} Some Hittite religious texts that describe rituals strongly influenced by Hurrian religion “make it possible to communicate with the underworld through pits.”\textsuperscript{307} Such pits are called ‘offering pits’\textsuperscript{308} and were used as passages through which the underworld gods were summoned. In Hurrian-Hittite texts the underworld gods, but never the spirits of the dead, are summoned. So these rituals had nothing to do with death, but the gods were summoned for purification purposes and offerings.\textsuperscript{309}

An old temple (c. 2400 BC),\textsuperscript{310} built on a monumental terrace of sun-dried bricks and surrounded by an oval line of stones (3 m. high), was the first architectural structure discovered in the city in 1984. The geomagnetic survey of the site in 2001 showed that this

\textsuperscript{300} Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, “The Seals of the King of Urkesh: Evidence from the Western Wing of the Royal Storehouse AK,” WZKM, p. 81 and note 82. Nag/war was not listed in the inscription of Tiš-atal as his domain, obviously because it was out of his control.


\textsuperscript{303} Buccellati, op. cit., p. 14.

\textsuperscript{304} For this in detail cf. Buccellati, op. cit., p. 19-21.

\textsuperscript{305} Buccellati, op. cit., p. 17-19.


\textsuperscript{307} Kelly-Buccellati, “Ein hurritischer Gang ...,” MDOG, p. 136. She points to the technical term ābi used to denote such cultic pits; it means pit in Hurrian, yet some texts refer to ʿābi as belonging to the god of the underworld, op. cit., p. 136-137 (referring to Archi, A., “The Names of the Primeval Gods,” Or 59 (1990), p. 114-129.)

\textsuperscript{308} Kelly-Buccellati, MDOG, p. 137 (referring to Archi, Or 59, p. 117); cf. now De Martino, S. and M. Giorgieri, Literatur zum hurritischen Lexikon (LHL), Band 1, Firenze, 2008, p. 1 and 8 under abi = “(Opfer)grube.”

\textsuperscript{309} Kelly-Buccellati, ibid. For the description of these rituals, the offerings and the pits in the Hittite texts, cf. Kelly-Buccellati, op. cit., p. 137-139. Recently, numerous bones of piglets were found at the bottom of the pit, indicating offerings (courtesy Diederik Meijer, October 2010).

line of stones was a surrounding wall with a diameter of 125 m from east to west and 75 m from north to south. The city wall was built during one of the older phases of the temple. It was fortified with a moat, which was filled in around 2450 BC when the city defences were probably extended. Buccellati thinks the temple was built by Tiš-atal and dedicated to Kumarbi. This rectangular, single-roomed building with a broken axis has a foundation of large stones and later excavations showed it was built on a high terrace. But it was not the only structure on the terrace. The foundation of a wall was discovered on the northern part of the terrace that runs from east to west.

It appears that the entire western and central part of Mozan was occupied by the monumental complex that combined the palace and the temple, with a surface diameter of 250 m. The Formal Wing of the palace stands at a higher level than the Service Wing. The plaza that separates the terrace, on which the temple was built, occupies a level higher than the Formal Wing. This impressive complex could have been seen from several kilometres away. As Buccellati states: “As such, this would be one of the most impressive third-millennium architectural complexes in Syro-Mesopotamia, covering a vast area and spanning a difference in elevation of almost 15 meters” (Fig. 5). Such a high temple complex reminds one of the south Mesopotamian temple-platforms of the Early Dynastic period, such as those at Nippur, Uruk and Ur. It can be listed among the tradition of early phases of Mesopotamian ziggurats. Not only is its high altitude impressive, but also its oval shape makes it the first oval temple known in northern Mesopotamia from the third millennium BC. The use of stone in the ramp (15.5-18 m wide) leading to the temple and in the surrounding wall is impressive. Very possibly the Hurrians of Urkesh have maintained the tradition of stone masonry they learned in their original mountainous homeland, as well as the tradition of building temples in elevated locations.

The palace of Tell Mozan shows at least two phases through the sealings found there. The older one was in the time of Tupkiš and his wife, Queen Uqnittum. The sealings show scenes from the court in the royal palace in Urkesh. The sealing k2 (Fig. 7) shows the king sitting on his throne raising a mace or sceptre, with a lion (most probably alive) at his feet. The person standing in front of him holds something in his hand. The headdress of the attendant is

---

311 Dohmann-Pfälzner and Pfälzner, op. cit., p. 168.
312 Hansen, The First Great Empire, ibid.
313 Buccellati, “The Monumental Urban Complex…,” p. 10. According to him, the term Nergal is to be interpreted as a logogram for Kumarbi, ibid., note 5.
314 Such temple plans consisting of a rectangular room with the entrance on one of the long sides and the cella at the short side were used in the Assyrian temples as well (see for example the Archaic Ishtar Temple in Assur). A similar temple was found in Tell Bazmusiān in Dukan; for these cf. Damerji, M. S. B., The Development of the Architecture of Doors and Gates in Ancient Mesopotamia, Tokyo, 1987, figs. 21 and 45.
316 Dohmann-Pfälzner and Pfälzner, op. cit., p. 177.
318 Buccellati, op. cit., p. 7.
319 Dohmann-Pfälzner and Pfälzner, op. cit., p. 175.
320 Pfälzner, “Das Tempeloval…,” p. 400.
321 Dohmann-Pfälzner and Pfälzner, op. cit., p. 172.
322 Holding the mace is considered to be a divine gesture made by Tupkiš, since the mace and dagger were the usual weapons of the gods. Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati cautiously propose that the kings might have adopted divine status, a suggestion strengthened by the possible etymology of the title endan as being from the Hurrian word eni, “god;” cf.: Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, “The Seals of the King of Urkesh: Evidence from the Western Wing of the Royal Storehouse AK,” WZKM, p. 75.
323 This is shown by representing the lion with his body and tail intertwined with the throne, and the feet of the crown-prince sunk into the lion’s mane while standing on the head of the lion in the presence of his father; cf. M. Kelly-Buccellati, “Urkesh and the North,” p. 30.
distinctive, made of leather or cloth, placed on the head without ribbons or any visible fastenings. The long flaps on the side (most probably on both sides) were lengthenings of part of the headdress. On the side of the headdress is an embossed rounded-shape. The top of the head is also shown as small and rounded. A cultic clay figurine from Urkeš has a similar headdress, but here it is worn by a woman (Fig. 8). Another kind of headdress is to be seen on the sealing k3 (Fig. 9), which was initially described as a helmet. It is very likely that it was also made of leather or cloth. Long flaps drawn from the side and behind are clearly visible. The one on the side has caused two soft folds in the headdress, a clear indication of the softness of the material. The side flap remarkably runs through the person’s beard, clearly emphasising the thickness of that beard.

The queen, on the other hand, is shown on the seals in familiar, everyday scenes in the palace. One of the sealings (q2) (Fig. 10) shows her sitting on a chair, facing the king, symbolically indicating her equal in position to the king. On other sealings she is shown bearing a drinking cup (Fig. 11), listening to music and songs (Figs. 12 and 13), sitting and having her hair braided by a servant (Fig. 14). Such intimacy has been seen as unprecedented in iconography. The queen had her own retinue, a nurse with the Hurrian name Zamena. Her close relationship with her mistress is indicated by her own sealing, showing an attendant combing and braiding the hair of Queen Uqnītu. Zamena not only had economic power, as can be seen from the numerous sealings, but also appears to have been an influential personality in the palace. The royal cook, Tuli, also had her own seal and was depicted performing her duties. The inscription on the seal of one of the servants of the queen is extraordinarily engraved horizontally, a feature otherwise unattested in the third millennium, and very seldom later. The queen and her daughter are distinguished by their distinctive hair-style. The hair is braided with an ornament attached close to the tip, apparently a symbol of the queen’s power and position. On some sealings, as seen above (Fig. 13), a high table has been placed in front of the queen and two musicians are playing harps. Children may also be depicted on the seals, mostly touching the lap of their mother (Fig. 10, 12 and 13) or father (Fig. 7) in a gesture of homage and filiation.

326 Out of 72 rollings, 8 seals are identified as belonging to the queen; the king had 5 seals reconstructed from 11 rollings and 4 seals belonged to the royal household, reconstructed from 81 rollings; cf. Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, “The Seals of the King of Urkesh...,” WZKM, p. 67.
327 On sealings q4, q6-7 and q8 the singer has put his/her hand beside the ear, a gesture still made by the (maqām) singers in the Near East.
328 Kelly-Buccellati, op. cit., p. 33.
329 According to Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, the interpretation of the name Zamena as Hurrian was presented by both Wilhelm and Salvini: Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, “The Royal Storehouse ...,” p. 21.
331 Kelly-Buccellati, op. cit., p. 33.
332 Kelly-Buccellati, op. cit., p. 31.
Tupkiš himself (Fig. 15). This suggests that the prisoners on the Annubanini stele were Hurrians, captured with their king, the first prisoner on the stele. Almost all the figures depicted on the seals of Urkeš wear long garments. The exceptions are two priests (?) on a cylinder seal with a cultic scene who wear short knee-length skirts (Fig. 16a-b). Sometimes the right arm and shoulder are naked. The dress of the king and the queen is usually tiered, as seen on sealings k2, q2, q3 and q4. The queen wears a fringed robe on the seals of the nurse Zamena. Thus it can be concluded that the tiered garment was considered more important in the iconography of Urkeš.

The sealings found in the royal storehouse belong to a narrow circle of users, and this implies that the royal household was involved in the economic activity. Perhaps they had a trade monopoly. It is likely that goods containers were sealed in the locations where the goods were prepared or manufactured for the seal owners in whose names they were to be stored until needed.

A clay tablet (A10.377), found in the palace of Urkeš near the main floor of room C4 (Fig. 17), has nine lines of cuneiform writing in Akkadian. The excavators stated that the tablet belongs stratigraphically to phase 2, the time of Tupkiš. The text refers to a class of individuals who are assigned to someone or to some task, and there is mention of a city governor in l. 5 and harvesting in l. 7. Another tablet, the school tablet A1j1 found in room B2, yields a six line text (five on the obverse and one on the reverse) that is an excerpt from the Early Dynastic LU E professions list. Since the tablet is found in the service quarter, it means that apprentice scribes were present within the storehouse. Further, a complete inscribed docket and more than forty tablet fragments were found in the building and just outside it. The significance of these finds lies in that they represent the “northernmost stratified cuneiform material in the third millennium.”

The use of the Hurrian word *endan* in the titulary of Urkeš is significant. It is thought that a Hurrian word spelled syllabically, in contrast to the tradition of Sumerian logograms, can be counted as a deliberate implication of ethnicity. Furthermore, Urkeš had its own strong and independent glyptic tradition that “helps to identify Urkeš as an autonomous centre of cultural innovation.” The continuity of some of the artistic traits of Urkeš in later traditions of Northern Mesopotamia and Anatolia, as noted by Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, shows that Urkeš was “an original centre of influence and point of diffusion.”

In the second phase of the palace an unnamed king or *endan* was the lord of the palace. His wife was Queen Tar’am-Agade, known to have been a daughter of Narām-Sin of Akkad from sealings found in room H2 (Fig. 1). It is she who fixes the date for this phase. These discoveries brought about a radical change of view, showing that Urkeš was a major power in the 3rd millennium BC, not a small peripheral one, and that the kingdom flourished during the

---

335 Hansen, The First Great Empire, p. 226.
336 This point will be touched upon in more detail in Chapter Five.
337 This seal belongs to the later phase, when Tar’am-Agade was queen of the city.
340 Buccellati, *ibid.*
347 Hansen, The First Great Empire, p. 225.
reign of the Akkadian dynasty, not after its fall. A reconstruction of the scene of the 22 sealing fragments shows a typical OAkk. theme found on other seals of the members of the Akkadian royal family who hold political or administrative posts (Fig. 18). It does not seem, then, that she was in Urkeš as a priestess, but rather as a royal spouse of its endan. But his name is not mentioned on the legend of her seal. Since Ebla and Nagar at this time had good relations, it seems likely that Narām-Sīn sought an alliance with Urkeš by such an inter-dynastic marriage to counter-balance the Ebla-Nagar axis. Perhaps related to this political marriage is the name Tar’am-Agade, meaning “She loves Agade,” is politically loaded, so it may not necessarily have been a name given at birth.

Other sealings of a certain Ukin-Ulmaš and Ewri-atal were also found together with the sealings of Tar’am-Agade. It is not known who the former was. He bears an Akkadian name, and could have been a brother or half-brother of the queen. The latter, i.e. Ewri-atal, has a Hurrian name meaning ‘The lord is strong’ or ‘The strong one is lord’ according to Wilhelm. The similarity between the composition on the seal of this person and the seals of other high-ranking and royal figures shows the importance of Ewri-atal. Other sealings have been found that belong to important officials, such as Išar-bēlī, with an Akkadian name, and a certain Unap-[…] The former appears to have been the same person who appeared in Umma and probably Akkad, where he served as steward of the estate of the wife of Šārkališarrī, and now found himself in Urkeš. As to the latter, very little is known.

Unfortunately, little is known about Urkeš in the next periods. It was mentioned in a royal inscription, probably of Šū-Sīn, together with Mukiš and Abarnum, but in an obscure context. Two other royal inscriptions of the kings of Urkeš shed some light on the matter.

Atal-šen:

Atal-šen is known as a king of Urkeš and Nawar from the discovery of his inscription in Samarra, far from his home in the Habur region. The inscription was first published by F. Thureau-Dangin in 1912, and has often been re-edited and discussed. The script and language (in Akkadian) dates it to about the end of the Gutian Period or the first decades of the Ur III Period. The name can be either Atal-šen or Ari-šen. He was a son of a certain Satar-mat, who is otherwise unknown, but he also bears a Hurrian name and seems to have been a king.

---

349 Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, AAS, ibid.
350 Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, AAS, ibid.; See also Buccellati and Buccellati, “Tar’am-Agade …,” Of Pots and Plans, p. 13. For arguments to identify her as a queen, not a priestess cf. op. cit., p. 15; 18.
352 Ibid.
353 Ibid.
356 Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, op. cit., p. 25.
357 Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 301 (E3/2.1.4.2, l. 6′-7′). Frayne thinks it recounts a campaign: op. cit., p. 300.
358 For a list of publications and studies cf. Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 461.
359 Cf. above on p. 179.
360 Cf. above on p. 179.
As king of Urkeš and Nawar he ruled two important cities in the Habur triangle. Formerly Nawar was identified with Namri or Namar in the Diyāla region, which led to the conclusion that there was a widespread Hurrian state or semi-empire at this early stage of Hurrian history. However, recent discoveries in the Habur region have shown that there were two places named Nawar, and one is to be identified with Tell Brak (see below, Nawar). Urkeš, as stated earlier, can be identified with the large tell of Mozan, near Amuda, on the Syrian-Turkish border. As for Ḥawi/alum, it appears to have been another place-name which is not yet located. Goetze wondered if it could be identified with Ka-wi-la-a, mentioned twice in the Mari texts (ARM II, 107 and ARM IV, 35), both together with Naḫur.

The inscription, written in Akkadian on a bronze tablet (Fig. 19) by a Hurrian-named scribe reads:

“To Nerigal, king of Ḥawi/alum, Atal-šen, the capable shepherd, the king of Urkeš and of Nawar, the son of King Šatar-mat, builder of the temple of Nerigal, he who destroys his rivals. As for the one who destroys this tablet, may Šamaš and Ištar eliminate their offspring. Šaum-šen did this.”

Tiš-atal:

Later in the Ur III period Tiš-atal occupied the throne of Urkeš. Tiš-atal has the distinction of having left the earliest original Hurrian text known to posterity. The inscription (Fig. 20a-b) is dated to the Ur III Period and, like the inscription of his predecessor Atal-šen, his inscription concerns the building of the temple of Nerigal:

---

363 About the tablet cf. Thureau-Dangin, “Tablette de Samarra,” RA 9, p. 1-4; Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 461. It is worth mentioning that the inscription was found in Samarra, far from the Habur. How it came there is uncertain; perhaps it was taken as booty in a later battle.
364 The name is analysed as ša=u=m=šen. The root ša- is, according to Salvini, common to both the noun ‘weapon’ (šauri) and the name of the goddess Šawuška. The rest is the word for ‘brother,’ cf. Salvini, “The Earliest…,” p. 106. Salvini compares an analysis of the Hurrian PN from the Ur III Period: Puš=u=m=šen after Gelb in HS, p. 111. Wilhelm has discussed the verbal suffix =u=m (=a=m) in PNs, cf. Wilhelm, G., in Texte, Sätze, Wörter und Moneme, Festschrift für Klaus Heger zum 65. Geburtstag, ed. S. R. Anschwitz, Heidelberg, 1992, p. 67f. For the element ša- in the divine name Šawuška, he points to the analysis given by Wegner in Xenia 21, p. 150 as ša=waš=k=a.
366 Wilhelm, The Hurrians, p. 11 with bibliography. The inscription was found together with the foundation bronze lion (cf. fig. 21 (left) of Chapter Two).
Tiš-atal, *endan* of Urkeš, has built a temple of Nergal. May Lubadaga protect this temple! He who destroys it, may Lubadaga destroy (him)! May his god not hear his prayer! He who destroys it, may the mistress of Nagar, Šimiga (= the Sun-god) and the Weather god … curse him! 369

If the etymology presented by Wilhelm for the word *endan* is correct (see above), it means that Tiš-atal was deified like other kings of Mesopotamia at that time. This is not surprising, seeing that we have deified kings of Ur and some kings of the Zagros in this period and slightly later. Among the latter were Hurrians, such as Tiš-atal of Karḫar, Zardamu of Karḫar, Iddi(n)-Si'n and his son Zabazuna of Simurrum.

Another king of Urkeš from the Ur III Period was Ann-atal, attested in an archival text as An-na-tal lū Ur-kiš 370 but unfortunately we know little about him, except an allusion to his departure from Urkeš. 371

**Nawar:**

The city of Nawar occurs several times in the inscriptions of the Hurrian rulers of the Habur Region. As earlier pointed out, this city was first identified with the famous Namri or Namar in the Transtigris region. 372 However, later discoveries and textual evidence revealed that other places with same ancient name existed in the Habur region. Among this textual evidence is its association with Kašijari Mountains (Țur-Abdîn) and the locating of Kahat “between Nawar and Nawar.” 373 A discussion of both these texts will follow. Some consider that the name Nawar is derived from the Hurrian verbal root *nav-* “to graze,” with iterative — ar; and that it is connected with the adverbial substantive *nauni-* “pasture.” 374 Others prefer an Indo-Aryan 375 and others a Semitic etymology for Nawar and Nagar, suggesting a derivation

---


370 Gelb, HS p. 114; *RGTC* 2, 224 (referring to Langdon *Bab*. 7, 240/tXXI: 14 Rev. 1 and TCL 2:5565, 2f.)

371 An-na-tal lū-Ui-kiš 1, Ur-kész 2, 2) i-im-gen-na-a, Edzard and Farber, *RGTC* 2, p. 224.


375 J. Harmatta considers the name Nawar to be from ancient Indic namra-. He treats the other names of the Atal-šen inscription similarly: *-ri-si-en* (Atal-šen) as *Arina-*, *Sá-dar-ma-at* as *Sadharmata-*, *Sá-um-se-en* as
from *nagwar,376 or even a South Semitic semantic connection with this toponym, comparing Sab.  ngaʿ “cultivated land” with the Yemenite place names Naʿgr, Naʿgra, Naʿgrān and Nuʿgayr.377

From the Hurrian itkalzi, “purification of the mouth,” a magical text found in Boğazköy,378 it appears that Nawar was a Hurrian religious centre. There its name occurs in the form URU₅Nawari together with the sacred cities of Talmušše, Nineveh and Urkeš (in the form URU₅Urkini(n)).379 In a treaty (L 87-1362)380 between the king of Apum (Tell Leylan) and the king of Kaḥat (Tell Barri); the domain of Kaḥat is identified as being “between Nawar and Nawar.” This raises a new problem. Apparently more than one place was called Nawar, even in Northern Mesopotamia.

This raises a new problem. Apparently more than one place was called Nawar, even in Northern Mesopotamia. The southern one was located in the southern central portion of the Habur basin, very probably at Nagar (Tell Brak).381 Eidem also believes that one of the places called Nawar was located to the south of Kaḥat and the other to the north of it.382 If the southern one is Tell Brak or very close to it,383 the northern one must be identified with the GN named in Tell Leylan texts as Nawali and in Mari texts as Nawala/u.384 According to Salvini, this Nawali can be identified with NA Nabula, located at Gir Navaz, and with the Nawar of the inscription of Atal-šen.385 The Hurrian magical text mentioned above associates the cities of Urkeš and Nawar with mountain names. Nawar is associated with Kašijari (HUR.SAG Gašijarri-), Türʿ-Abdin, and Urkeš (in the form Urkini) with the unidentified mountain Napri.386 This is extra proof to locate Nawar in the north rather than in the south.

We also know that Nagar was a Hurrian religious centre from the epithet “The lady of Nagar (belêt Nagar),” as evident in more than one source: the inscription of Tiš-atal; from a letter (L 87-1317) from prince Ea-Malik of Kaḥat to Till-Abnû of Šeʾnā.387 But one wonders whether there was any Indo-Aryan influence in third millennium BC Mesopotamia.

377 So Fronzaroli, who adds that the West Semitic root *ngr in Biblical Hebrew means “to gush forth,” from which a term for stream is derived, following Bonechi, “Remarks on the III Millennium …,” Subartu IV/1, p. 221. Unfortunately, the Arab lexicographers have not given any etymology for Nağrān, if Nağrān, meaning ‘door socket’ or ‘severe thirst’ is excluded; cf.:

[İbn Mandhür, Language of the Arabs, vol. Jm: najr (in Arabic)]

378 ChS I/1, nr. 5 col. I-II, with duplicate nr. 6 col. I; cf. Salvini, op. cit., 110, n. 64.
379 This form is, as Salvini states, the same form in the Hurrian OB tablet from Mari no. 2. (referring to F. Thureau-Dangin, RA 36 (1939), p. 5, no. 2.
386 Salvini, ibid.
Nagar;\(^{388}\) and from Ur III texts from southern Mesopotamia that mention sacrifices to her.\(^{389}\) Having identified Nagar with Tell Brak,\(^{390}\) it is not clear why Nagar was called (southern) Nawar in the text, as Salvini himself suggested.\(^{391}\) Perhaps the middle consonant of the name Nagar was the changeable Semitic consonant (or one influenced by Semitic) that could be variably pronounced, and consequently written either as \(-t-, -\text{a}-, -\text{a}-\) or even \(-h-\) or \(-h-.\(^{392}\) If such a change in the middle consonant of the name Nagar had taken place, the name could have become Nawar and be linguistically related to the form Nāḥur.\(^{393}\) It is also appropriate to refer to the name Nuhadra to refer to Northern Mesopotamia in the Parthian-Roman Periods,\(^{394}\) which is reminiscent of Nāḥur and Nawar.

Nagar was an extremely important centre from the third millennium BC due to its position between the major powers of the time, Ebla, Urkesh and the Mesopotamian kingdoms of the south. Its location on the main routes that connected Northern Syria to Mesopotamia was of additional importance. That is why Nagar figures more in the Syro-Mesopotamian textual material than Urkesh. The textual evidence concerning Nagar in the 3rd millennium comes essentially from the 24th century BC, from the reigns of the last three rulers of Ebla, Iğrîş-halab, Irkab-damu and Iš’ar-damu. They were roughly contemporary with the three Mari kings Iplul-Ili, NI-zi and Enna-Dagan.\(^{395}\)

The oldest known reference to Nagar we have comes from Mari, on the statue inscription from the Inanna-za-za temple, dedicated to Iplul-Ili, king of Mari, and his wife Paba. There the name Nagar\(^{ki}\) occurs in an obscure context.\(^{396}\) The sentence AMAR.AN dumu ur-\(^{4}UTU.ŠA […] nagar\(^{ki}\) li A.PA-MAH\(^{397}\) of the text is not clear enough to state that the PN mentioned was the name of the king of Nagar, even though it is so similar to the name Ma-ra-AN (Ma-ra-Ili? Ma-ra-an?), king of Nagar, in a text that can be dated to the reign of NI-zi of Mari.\(^{398}\) Nagar occurred also in the texts from Beydar, where references indicate a probable

---

\(^{388}\) DIN Na-gâr\(^{ki}\) is attested in a Mari text from the Pre-Sargonic Period: Cavigneaux, A., and M. Krebernik, “NIN-Nagar,” \(\text{RLA} 9\) (1998–2001), p. 475 (referring to Charpin, D., \(\text{MARY} 5\) (1987), 79, 20 II 4). There is also mention of NIN-nagar in the god-list from Fāra and \(\text{NIN}-\text{nagar}\) from Abu-Salabīḥ.

\(^{389}\) Eidem, “Nagar,” \(\text{RLA} 9\), p. 76.


\(^{392}\) Examples of the interchange between these consonants in the Semitic languages, particularly Akkadian, are numerous; for instance Akk. ḫadāru \(\rightarrow\) Akk. adāru; Akk. ḫana \(\rightarrow\) Arab. عنّة; Akk. ḫarrun \(\rightarrow\) Arab. حرن; Akk. Adad \(\rightarrow\) Ug. Hd(d); Akk. šemū(m) \(\rightarrow\) Ass. šm̃u(m) \(\rightarrow\) Amorite *samāhu(m) as in the name of Yasmah-Addu \(\rightarrow\) Arab. سمّح \(\rightarrow\) Heb. سمّح; Akk. alāku \(\rightarrow\) Heb. נחל.

\(^{393}\) It is thought that Nāḥur was located close to the sources of the Habur. The city was conquered in the time of Zimri-Lim and later annexed to Assyria under Adad-Nirari I; cf. Kupper, J.-R., “Nāḥur,” \(\text{RLA} 9\) (1998–2001), p. 86-7.

\(^{394}\) Cf. Frye, R. N., \(\text{The History of Ancient Iran}\), München, 1984, p. 223, 280. According to him, the regions to the northwest as far as Nisibis, were called Beth Nuhadra (in Aramaic), centred on Nineveh. However, this name can be seen as derived from nohodar, a Middle Persian military title borne by the governors of this province in the Parthian period, see \textit{ibid}.


\(^{397}\) Eidem et al., “Third Millennium Inscriptions,” \(\text{Excavations at Tell Brak}\), p. 99.

dependence of Beyder on Nagar in the time of Ma-ra-AN. This king was in Beydar on several occasions, to participate in an assembly and in cultic events, including the annual festival of the god Šamagan, the lord of wild animals. Numerous references come from Ebla. In the time of the Ebla archives mention is made of a kingdom ruled by a “king” whose son, Ultum-ḫuḫu (Ul-tum-ḫuḫu dumu-ni ta en Na-gârki: TM.75.G.1250 r. 1), had a Hurrian name and was married to the Eblaite princess Tagriš-Damu (Tag-riš-da-mu dumu-mi en: TM.75.G.10157, r. V 2 ff), daughter of Iš’ar-Damu. Some details of the formalities of this marriage are recorded. In the 3rd month of the year representatives of Ebla, Kiš and Nagar, including the king of Nagar and his son, met at Armi in Western Syria. After this meeting the king of Nagar and his son went to Ebla, presumably to settle the details of the royal wedding, and there they and their courtiers received costly garments as gifts. However, the Kiš envoy left after the meeting at Armi for the town of Ni-ahi, seat of the cult of the god Kamiš. A few months later, the actual marriage ceremony took place, when the groom “anointed the head … of Tagriš-damu, daughter [of the king].” The rich dowry that was given to the princess consisted of expensive garments, jewellery, other personal equipment and a group of personal attendants. Another text points to a shipment of 42 jars of wine to Nagar “on the occasion of the marriage of the king of Nagar.” That is considered by some to be an allusion to another marriage ceremony at Nagar.

Other events concerning the two kingdoms have been documented in the Ebla archives. There were shipments of silver from Ebla to the king of Nagar, who in all likelihood was the same Ma-ra-AN and to his vassal cities; large groups of men from Nagar were present at the court of Ebla; Ebla is victorious over Nagar, presumably meaning Irkab-Damu of Ebla conquered Mara-AN of Nagar, and a treaty was made between the two kings. It is thought that all these events, the war, the treaty and the dynastic marriage, took place within a short span of time, not too long before the period covered by the Ebla archives. Therefore, Ma-ra-AN, the king of Nagar, must have ruled very shortly before the Akkadian occupation of Brak, little more than a generation before. Other texts from the Ebla archive that date to the very last years before the destruction of palace G mention rations for groups from Nagar and shipments of large amounts of Eblaite items to Nagar. The mention of large groups of specialists (20 and 19) from Nagar in the Ebla court, such as ḫūb/hūbb-ki (Akk. huppum) ‘acrobats’ or ‘horsemen,’ and ‘qualified teachers’ “for groups of some 20 ḫūb of local

399 Eidem et al., op. cit., p. 99-100; Eidem, “Nagar,” RIA 9, p. 75.
400 Ismail, F., et al. 1996, nos. 80, 85 & 96 (assembly and cultic events); text 101 (festival).
402 Eidem et al., op. cit., p. 100.
403 Eidem et al., p. 100.
404 Ibid.
406 Eidem et al., ibid.
407 Ibid.
408 Ibid.
409 Eidem et al., op. cit. p. 101.
410 Ibid.
411 Or ‘cult dancers’ according to Eidem: Eidem, “Nagar,” RIA 9, p. 75.
origin,“

412 is a clear indication of the cultural importance of Nagar.413 Ebla officials were frequently sent to Nagar to buy ‘kūnga’ equids, male asses, sheep, and ‘wool of Nagar.’414

So textual evidence shows that Nagar was a kingdom in the time of the Ebla archives. From such texts it appears that places in the region of Nagar, such as AŠa, A-Bū-ı-um, LU-LU-M and Ša-bar-ti-um, had rulers entitled en.415 The text from Ebla about a shipment of silver from Ebla to the king of Nagar and eight of his vassal cities shows that the following cities were under Nagar’s hegemony: Gā-ga-ba-an, Da-ti-um, Ba-na-ı-lum (var. Ba-na-ı-um), Ter-š-ha-um, AŠa, Ša-bar-ti-um, Na-ba-ti-um, and Zu1 (SU)-mu-na-ni-um.416 There are also other place names mentioned as vassals: Ba-sa-ḥi-um, Du-nu, EN-šar (var. EN-šar-ı-um), Gu-zū-ta-ti-um, Ḥi-ša-zu-ı-um, La-dab-bi-um, Sag-gar, Su-du-ma-an, and Zār-‘a-ni-um.417 Although uncertainly, some of these GNs can be identified: Nabatium = Nabada = Tell Beydar; Datum = Tādum = Tell Hamidi; Kakkabān (Ga-ga-ba-an) could be located near modern Hassake; Abilum was probably Abi-ili to the north of Brak; Sarhanum was probably located to the east of Brak.418 Locating Saggar at the junction of the Euphrates and the Lower Habur, as suggested by some,419 is not the only possibility. From other sources we know about the mountain name KUR Sag-gar (Ebla), with the variants sa-de-em Sa-ga-ar (Mari), and the divine name ıŠag-gar (Ebla), occurring also in the forms ıŠa-nu-ga-ru, ıŠa-na-ga-ar (Ebla), ıŠa-ga-ar (Mari) (=ıšAR), ıŠa-ag-ga-ar (Emar), ıŠag-ga-ra (Hatti) and interestingly ıŠa-an-ga-ra (Hatti).420 This deity was in all likelihood the deified Jebel Sinjār.421 Yet, the god Zara, mentioned together with the god Saggar in the oath formula of the treaty from Tell Leylan, appears to have been part of Jebel Sinjār, according to Eidem.422 Thus it is probable that Saggar mentioned among the localities subject to the kingdom of Nagar was in fact Mount Saggar.423

The size of the cities and territories under the control of Nagar is not known exactly, but references to Nabada (Tell Beydar) and Saggar suggest a kingdom that extended over most of the lower part of the Habur basin. Nagar would have been one of the larger kingdoms of the Pre-Sargonic period there.

This period of independence was followed by the Akkadian occupation of Nagar. Akkadian control was short-lived or witnessed interruptions, according to some opinions. But recent archaeological discoveries favour a more sustained period of occupation, according to

412 Eidem et al., p. 101.
413 Ibid.
414 Ibid.
415 Ibid.
416 Ibid.
417 Ibid.
418 Ibid.
419 According to Eidem et al., p. 101.
420 For this identification cf. Eidem et al., p. 101.
423 That the GN ıŠag-gar and the second millenium Šaggarātūm probably refer to modern Jebel Sinjār is also suggested by Catagnoti and Bonechi: Catagnoti, A. and M. Bonechi, “Le volcan Kawak, Nagar et problèmes connexes,” NABU 1992, no. 65, p. 53.
425 That the place name Saggarātūm is to be located on the junction of the Habur with the Euphrates does not appear to be certain. It has been sited between Qattunān and Terqa, two days away from the former and one day away from the latter, when travelling via Bīt-Kapān and Dūr-Yahdun-Lim: Groneberg, B., RGTC 3, Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der altbabylonischen Zeit, Wiesbaden, 1980, p. 200.
the excavators. The texts of the Akkadian period from Brak mention Urkeš and Šeḫnā, but we cannot say for sure that these were under the control of Nagar. The late 3rd millennium corpus of inscriptions from Brak is comparatively small. Other texts found in recent excavations are usually short, fragmentary, poorly stratified or from fill, and therefore contribute little historical data. But we do have the brick inscriptions of Narām-Sîn, dedicatory inscriptions of Rūmuš and probably seal inscriptions of servants of Narām-Sîn. From the latest phase of the Akkadian period in Brak an interesting bulla was found. It bears the seal impression of the ensi of Gasur, a certain Itbe-laba (Fig. 21), whose date, according to the glyptic style, appears to be between Narām-Sîn and Šū-Turul. The text is quite short, “Itbe-laba, ensi of Gasur,” but the shape of the bulla is significant, in that the flat lens-shape was used from this phase on for official state purposes. The element –laba occurs also in the PN Innin-laba, father of Kikkia (?), the governor of Assur in the Ur III period. Archaeologically speaking, in the period contemporary or subsequent to the period of the Akkadian occupation, most of the urban centres of the Habur region, such as Leylan, Chuera, Beydar, Abu Hgaira and other minor sites, were deserted. But Brak and Mozan survived, and after the end of Akkadian control Nagar recovered its independence. This is confirmed by the inscription of King Talpūš-atili, who had a Hurrian-name and who bore the title ‘Sun of the land of Nagar, son of …. The inscription on the seal is too damaged to show whether his father also had a Hurrian name. A further disappointment is that the majority of the occupational levels of this period in Brak have been severely eroded or badly disturbed in former excavations by Mallowan. Nevertheless, some interesting finds are worth mentioning, such as two copper/bronze bowls and other small finds in area CH. The change in character of the buildings in area FS is also remarkable. Large residential units replaced formal or administrative structures. It has been noted that the roofing technique used in Nagar in this period was reed matting on wooden rafters, sealed by a thick layer of clay, exactly as in modern village houses in the region. The excavators concluded that there the society was prosperous in this period, with an economy based largely on agriculture.

---
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Comparing Nagar with Urkeš shows significant differences. The location of Nagar was less favourable for agriculture than that of Urkeš. It was located on the fringes of the dry-farming area and its hinterland offered no rich natural resources. However, it controlled essential trade routes to and from Mesopotamia. By contrast Urkeš was connected to the rich Anatolian hinterland through Tür-ʾAbdı̇n and had good average rainfall.441 Furthermore, Nagar was subject to invasions and hostile destruction in the Old Akkadian period. Both the Akkadian inscriptions and the texts from Ebla mention the involvement of Nagar in war and trade. So far we have no mention of Urkeš in the records as evidence that either power had occupied or destroyed it, a fact confirmed by the archaeological evidence.442 A distinction can also be made in the glyptic tradition and in the “dynastic programme” of Urkeš mentioned above, and in the independent line of its local endans, which are additional points of contrast with Nagar. We also know that Nagar was ruled at times by kings with Hurrian names, a fact that points to a noticeably strong Hurrian element in the city and its environs. Nevertheless, some scholars still do not consider the city to be a Hurrian centre.443 The evidence adduced here shows that Urkeš was apparently a ‘pure’ Hurrian kingdom, while Nagar had a mixed population. But in the time when the Hurrian expansion reached its culmination Nagar had Hurrian rulers, such as Ultum-ḫuḫu. Urkeš was close to the core of the Hurrian lands and Nagar on its edge.

The Hurrian states or kingdoms mentioned in this chapter were given a golden chance to grow and enhance their power by the collapse of the Ur III Dynasty. The whole region appears to have been populated by independent minor states consisting of a central city and its hinterland.444 Texts show that of these Simurrum and Kakmum in the Transtigris were the most powerful.

It has been noticed that the Hurrians were (and apparently preferred to remain) dependent on dry-farming rather than on irrigated agriculture. Wilhelm points out that the cultivated areas of the Middle Euphrates, the Lower Balih and Habur, which were entirely dependent on irrigation, remained free from Hurrian colonisation.445 Instead, they spread out in the self-contained dry-farming areas that run from Kirkuk (Nuzi and Arraphe) to Assyria, to the northeastern Syrian arable plain (Mittani/Hanigalbat), the Euphrates Valley to the north of Meskene (Emar), the area round Hama and Homs on the Upper Orontes (Qatna, Qadesh), Aleppo, the Amoq Plain on the Lower Orontes (Alalakh), and to Çukorova (the southern part of Kizzuwatna).446 He notes further, “these are regions, sometimes cut off from each other by strips of infertile land, which correspond with political sections of the kingdom of Mitanni.”447

It is supposed that the Hurrians began to spread over Northern Mesopotamia sometime in the Early Dynastic Period when the first Hurrian tribes arrived there. These tribes established themselves and succeeded, within a couple of generations, in taking power in places such as Azuḫinum and Kirašeniwe in Subartu, where they encountered Narām-Sîn. The Hurrians in the time of Narām-Sîn had not yet become the main population of Northern Mesopotamia, but this situation had changed by the end of the Ur III Period. Almost the whole of the region from Anatolia to the Zagros was then firmly in Hurrian hands. It was organized as petty states ruled almost exclusively by Hurrian rulers, or at least by rulers with Hurrian names.

---
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Map no. 1 the virtual inverted triangle of the Sirwān-Diyāla basin.

2) Aerial view of the palace. The drain in the service wing, the stone-paved courtyard of H3 area and the ābi in the bottom of the photo are visible. After: Buccellati, “The Monumental Urban Complex…,” fig. 4, p. 13.


9) Sealing k3, showing a different headdress made of leather or cloth. After: Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, “The Royal Storehouse of Urkesh,” fig. 5, p. 11.


15) A sealing fragment, probably of King Tupkiš, wearing a feathered headdress/crown. After: Hansen, Art of the Akkadian Dynasty, fig. 67, p. 226.


18) Seal of Tar’am-Agade, daughter of Narām-Sîn. After: Hansen, Art of the Akkadian Dynasty, fig. 68, p. 227.
