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Introduction

This work aims to study the early history of a region known at present under the unofficial, but historical, name Kurdistan. During this early history important developments took place that influenced its fate for the millennia that followed. Among these was the formation of early states that, more or less, imitated Mesopotamian models but often kept or introduced local or particular traditions. The questions this study tries to answer include when the early states first appeared in this area, what was their identity and which peoples were responsible for establishing them, what was their history and what did they leave for posterity, what influence they had, what were the models they created and were these followed later by their descendants and whether the migration of new peoples into the territories had any effect on their history. Another question is how and why a country which was geographically divided produced large unified states, while one expects political formations to reflect physical geographical conditions.

To answer these and other questions one must go back to the beginnings of written history in Mesopotamia, which begins with the Early Dynastic period. At that time Kurdistan was populated by settlements of Ninevite V culture, a culture that produced complex societies that were ruled by chiefly lineages controlling the local surpluses produced by dry-farming agriculture. However, in the middle of the third millennium BC these chiefdoms developed into states, a phenomenon which coincided with the emergence of the Mesopotamian states in the south. The recorded history of the relations between the Mesopotamian states and the Northern states shows a warlike history with short peaceful intervals. Such conditions were the main stimulus for the formation of early states in this region. The constant threat and pressure exerted by the southern powers was a significant factor to the emergence of such socio-political organizations that could provide survival for the peoples of ancient Kurdistan. Before that, the natural conditions had allowed only smaller organizations such as chiefdoms to exist. But in times of threat and danger they formed federations and states. These federations and states must have been fragile because, once any threat had disappeared, they fragmented into smaller, independent, self-sufficient units. The few exceptions were the states that emerged in the plains of the region such as Gutium and Simurrum and perhaps also Urkeš, thanks to the plain territory that helped nucleation and eased communications.

The coming of the Hurrians was an important change that affected the history of this region for the subsequent millennia, especially the second millennium. The early states they founded, although not the very first ones, covered the majority of the area and coloured it with their culture and language. This was an auxiliary factor that later helped the emergence of the Mittani Empire.

The subject of state formation in such a region has been a forgotten matter in the shadow of the great civilizations of Sumer, Babylon, Assyria, Persia and the others. The region under study has always been seen as peripheral, unimportant and non-essential for investitative research for Mesopotamia or even for Iran and Anatolia. However, the fact that the foundations of these great civilizations were laid down in these peripheral territories should not be underestimated. Moreover, many of the natural resources that contributed to the
existence of these civilizations were found in ancient Kurdistan. Ancient Kurdistan was the
arena not only for the foundations, but also for the socio-political developments that led to
the formation of chiefdoms and early states on its territory as early as the mid-third
millennium BC. The historical circumstances that pertained then and the ethnic changes and
the process that led to the formation of chiefdoms and states deserve more detailed and
serious study.

In recent years new written material has appeared that has shed new light on the history of
the region under study. These were some historical inscriptions and iconographic material of
some of these early states, such as Simurrum, Urkeš and Gutium. They showed that the
socio-political organization of these peoples was similar in some aspects to those of
Mesopotamia and, more interestingly, dissimilar in some others. The question was always
which factors prompted the emergence of states there and which factors constrained the
emergence of large and highly centralized states or empires similar to those known from
Mesopotamia.

While preparing this project its title has raised, and will raise in future, some uncertainty
about combining the name ‘Kurdistan’ with ‘Ancient.’ This is a good reason to begin with a
presentation of the reasons why this title and this region have been chosen for this study. As
for the territories under study, they share three common characteristics:

1) The region under study, which is basically distributed over four contiguous modern
Middle Eastern states, is scarcely studied as a unit and archaeologically investigated.
Political conditions are the primary reasons for this. The territories have been since
the birth of scientific archaeology and Assyriology and even earlier politically
unstable. They were the arena for many political struggles and military clashes
between the great powers of the region in addition to local rebellions, uprisings and
conflicts. Because of this fieldwork was restricted to a large degree. Moreover, the
inhabitants of these territories were generally seen as intruders and strangers by the
governments in power because of ethnic differences between them and their rulers.
Those governments tried over the decades, if not the centuries, to keep the history of
those regions and those peoples unknown as a means of forced integration and
fighting nationalism. Gaps were created between the modern inhabitants of these
regions and their past, and as a consequence between them and their homeland. There
were no studies or investigations of these territories while neighbouring territories
were being well-studied and well-investigated.

2) The second common characteristic of the region under study is the ethno-cultural
integrity that can easily be noticed to have existed since ancient times. The region
was in prehistoric ages at the centre of the food-gathering culture because of its
generally speaking geographical and climatic uniformity. Later, the region became a
core of the Neolithic Culture and its subsequent cultures, such as Hassuna, Halaf, and
Ninevite V. These cultures have prevailed in almost all the territories under study,
although they have not been completely investigated. This fact makes it possible to
study the region as one cultural whole, which yields more realistic results than a
fragmented study of those cultures in Iraq, Iran, Turkey or Syria.

This cultural uniformity was not restricted to prehistoric times, for the same can
be said about historical times too. Cultural uniformity was in some cases coupled with
an ethnic uniformity, such as the predominance of the Hurrians in the second
millennium BC. A similar situation pertained in the first millennium BC with the
coming of the Indo-Iranians (the Medes) to the region, and similarly afterwards with
the Kurds ever since the beginning of this era.

However, the role of the other ethnic, cultural and religious minorities who were
always present in the history and culture of this region should not be forgotten. They
have always contributed to the cultures (in its fullest sense) of the ethnically
predominant peoples, particularly when they were aboriginals of the land or belonged
to an earlier migrant group. They have lived either in enclaves or became distributed
over other ethnic textures, exactly as they are in present-day Kurdistan.

It is noteworthy that similar geographical and climatic conditions make different
cultures adapt to similar ways of life and mould one similar culture, disregarding the
diversity of ethnicities inhabiting a certain region. This can be seen in the way of life
of the Kurds and the Turkomen in the Kirkuk region, in the nomadic Kurdish and
Chuchāny tribes in Sulaimaniya province, and in the sedentary Kurdish and Christian
communities in the Diana and Shaqlāwa regions to the northeast of Erbil.

3) Since there is a modern name for these regions, though it is not recognized formally
in some countries, the use of Kurdistan seemed to be the best solution to avoid a
cumbersome periphrasis such as “the regions of the northeast of Iraq, the west and
northwest of Iran, the southeast of Turkey and the north and northeast of Syria.”
Using Kurdistan as the name of a land first occurred formally under the Seljûq sultan
‘Sanjar’ (11th century AD), while the oldest occurrence of Kurd as an ethnonym goes
back to the beginning of our era. It is found in the Kârnâmê î Artakhshîr î Pâpakân,
composed to commemorate the victories of Ardashîr, founder of the Sassanian
dynasty. So it is then older than the country names of Iraq, Syria and Turkey, for
which expressions such as “Ancient Iran,” “Ancient Iraq,” “Neolithic in Turkey” are
still used.

It is also important to mention that the present study will sometimes touch upon territories
beyond Kurdistan, and conversely at other times neglects territories within Kurdistan. This is
determined by their significance for our theme, that fundamentally treats the lands inhabited
by the Hurrians and their predecessors. There are also territories not studied in detail because
of the scarcity of historical and archaeological data, especially for those parts of the region
which fall under what some call ‘bureaucratic illiteracy.’

The Arena

In the second common characteristic mentioned above, the geographical conditions of our
region have been pointed out as a means of unifying culture and the way of life. Yet, this
does not contradict the fact that rugged mountainous terrains form natural barriers between
different areas. This produces elements of diversity in cultural details, such as linguistic
dialects and some aspects of lifestyle particular to the plains and the mountains, or to
nomadic and sedentary communities. For a better understanding of this a short geographical
description of the arena on which the historical episodes took place would be of interest,
especially seeing that our study focuses on the process of state formation from a historical-
anthropological perspective.

The region under study is generally shaped like a great arc, beginning in the northwest in
the region west of Malatya, to the region of Lake Urmia through the region of Lake Van,
thence down along the Zagros to the southeast as far as the region round the cities Burujird and Ilam (see the map). It is mountainous for the greater part; mountains constitute more than half of its total area. However, plains, plateaus, undulating areas and lakes are not absent. The majority of the area falls within the range of dry-farming regions. It benefits from sufficient winter and spring rainfall and is watered with plentiful springs, karēzs, brooks and rivers with several lakes, natural (such as Van, Urmia and Zirēbār) and artificial (such as Dukān, Darband-i-khān and the GAP lakes in Eastern Anatolia).

The principal mountains of the region are the central and northern Zagros, the eastern two-thirds of the Taurus and Pontus and the northern half of the Amanus Mountains. These ranges have been formed by the Alpine movement that began in the Oligocene period through the Miocene until the beginning of the Pliocene. The region consists geologically of fragile layers that were subject to great pressure from both the Anatolian-Iranian plateaus in the northeast and the Arabian plateau in the southwest. This produced the shape of the mountain ranges of the region as a great arc in a generally northwest-southeast direction.

The heights of these mountains range from 500 to more than 5000 meters, some of the highest peaks still harbour glaciers that increased in size during the last glaciation and advanced to form tongues of ice protruding down into adjacent valleys. The northern part of the region has numerous old volcanoes that have filled many valleys and made plateaus. For millennia the territory around Lake Van has been a source of obsidian.

The mountain peak of Ararat (5165 m) is the highest peak in the region under study, followed respectively by Dinar (4432 m), Rashko (4135 m), Jīlō (4116 m), Sipān (4058 m), Halgurd (3600 m) and then other peaks.

The Zagros Mountains that branch off from the Caucasus in the northwest of Iran form the greater part of the mountains of our region. They extend for almost 1500 kilometres in length and 300 kilometres in width in a northwest-southeast direction, including the mountainous regions in the Iraqi side. In most places limestone predominates and shows a considerable topographic variation. It is remarkable that, apart from a string of granite masses along its northeastern edge, there are no volcanic deposits or ancient volcanoes in the Zagros, though there are in the Taurus.

The Zagros range can be divided into three main sections, northwestern, main or middle and southern (part of the second and the whole of the latter are beyond the region under study). The former extends from the frontiers with Turkey and Armenia as far as a line that linking Qazvin, Hamadan and Kirmashān. This section dominates the Iranian side of the
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3 All heights given are above sea level, unless otherwise stated.
5 Persia, (Geographical Handbook Series, edited by the Naval Intelligence Division), 1945, p. 47.
7 Ehlers, op. cit., p. 369.
8 Persia, op. cit., p. 16.
9 Ibid.
10 Fisher, W. B., Physical Geography, CHI vol. 1, Cambridge, 1968, p. 8. Kirmashān is the proper form of this city name as used by local residents. The Arab geographers rendered it as Qi/arma/isīn, sometimes pointing out that Kirmanshāhān is a Persian form of this older name, cf.
The region under study. The mountains of this section are amply spaced without crowding, but much disturbed, partly by folding and mostly by fracturing followed by differential warping. They belong chiefly to the Upper Cretaceous, Miocene and Plio-Pleistocene geological ages. The highest mountains of this section are those in the extreme north and west towards the border with Iraq. The average height of this northern section is 2000 m, forming a vast plateau that embraces numerous cities and towns and is cut by rivers such as Mahabād, Simine Rūd (= Tata’u), Zarine Rūd (= Jaghatu), Khur Khure (all pour into Urmia Lake), the two Zābs, Sirwān, Zimkān, Qarasu, Gamasīyāb, Alwand and others. Through this section main routes are running that link Anatolia, the Caucasus and Iran. Through the border between this section and that of the Middle Zagros runs the most important route in the region, the Great Khorasān Road, which Herzfeld called ‘The Gate of Asia.’ This was the main route that linked Mesopotamia with the eastern lands of Iran, Afghanistan and beyond and was a branch of the silk route in the Middle Ages. It came from Central Asia to Dameghān (ancient Hecatompylos), Rayy (ancient Rages) Hamadan, Kirmashān through Sar-i-Pul-i-Zohāb and terminated in Baghdad. Other minor routes are those linking it with the Iraqi side via a number of mountainous passes in Khaneh-Haji Omarān, Sardasht-Qala Dizeh, Mariwān-Penjwēn, and Prwēz Khān. The largest downthrow basin in this section of the Zagros is the complex pattern of drainage that flows into the central Urmia Basin, followed by Khoy to the north of Urmia. The water of the Lake Urmia is saline, although less than the Dead Sea, and the only flora on its shores are a few halophytic plants and shrubs. The volcanic cones of Mounts Savalan and Sahand, the likelihood of earthquakes and the erosion caused by rivers that have shaped the landscape are all geological characteristics of this section of the Zagros. The high altitude of the ground here makes the rainfall heavier, and this effect “is augmented by the sharply seasonal onset, which concentrates the erosive effects into a short period.” Annual rainfall ranges between 600 to above 1000 millimetres, while mean annual temperature ranges from 5 to 25°C according to position and altitude. This considerable swing of temperature, from freezing winters to markedly hot summers, results in a distinct zonation of vegetation. There is also an appreciable extent of woodland, which gives way to an alpine pasture at higher altitudes in addition to patches of alluvium supporting regular cropping. These conditions, i.e. the pastures in the higher altitudes and the crops in the relatively lower altitudes with the swing in temperatures, have stimulated the appearance of seasonal displacement of the (semi)nomadic groups living in the region, side by side with the majority population, the sedentary village dwellers.

[Le Strange, G., Lands of Eastern Caliphate, Beirut, 1985, p. 222 (Arabic version)].

The name Qi/arma/isān is said to be derived from King Kirmāzhīn, who is supposed to have ruled the city in antiquity. In the time of the Islamic republic the name was changed to Bakhtarān.
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11 Persia, op. cit., p. 17.
14 Fisher, op. cit., p. 10 and 11.
18 Fisher, op. cit., p. 18.
19 Fisher, op. cit., p. 20.
The two different ways of life in this section are pastoralism and cultivation. The former is found mostly in the higher parts and the latter, mostly of a settled kind, in the lower-lying areas. Cultivation covers a wide range of cereals such as wheat, barley and some maize, the basic crops and a wide range of fruit and vegetables.20

The main section of the Zagros (= Middle Zagros) lies to the south of the first section. It extends from the line Qazvin-Hamadan-Kirmashān down to the Kavir-i-Marvast and Lake Baktāgan in the vicinity of Shirāz (beyond our region). A smaller part of the region under study lies in this section that is the highest and most rugged part of the Zagros, especially between Khurramabād and Shirāz.21 The average height in this section approaches 2500 m, and its highest peak is Zardakūh (4571 m), slightly to the south of our region. One of the remarkable features of this part is the fold structures which for the most part are aligned from northwest to southeast.22 The folds of this whole section, from Hamadan-Kirmashān to Bushihr on the Gulf, are extremely regular, straight in form and parallel in strike, and relatively tightly packed together.23 Several rivers cut through this part or spring from its mountains and valleys and play a significant role in the life of its inhabitants, as they have done in the past. Among these are the Karūn, Diz, Karkha (of which the northern part is called Saimara), Zuhre, and Jarrāhi (known also as Marūn). The first three have contributed to the build up of the Mesopotamian alluvium by bringing silt and clay deposits. From the Zagros the Karūn and Diz flow into the Shāṭ el-ʿArab and the Karkha into the Al-Huwēza marsh.24 It is remarkable that the site of the city of Penjwēn, located to the east of Sulaimaniya, is the meeting point for three river basins, for the rivers that flow into Lake Urmia, into the Caspian Sea, and into the Persian Gulf.25 The Urmia and Zirebār lakes are the two natural lakes in the northern Zagros. The former gets its water from the mountainous slopes of Savalan and Sahand on the eastern side, together with western and southern tributaries that are of considerable value for agriculture.26 The latter is close to the city of Mariwān and is much smaller than Urmia. It gets its water from the mountain streams and springs around the lake. Among the artificial lakes, Dukan and Darband-i-Khān are well-known. These are the result of dams built in the 1950s. The lakes of Faida in Eski Mosul and Hamrīn date from the 1980s.

In the northern and western parts of the Saimara basin nomadic groups are also found. Between the deep valleys of this region some high level plains provide good natural grasslands.27 In the region of the River Diz the overall width of the Zagros is reduced and folding is more intense. Due to the extremely rigid terrain, seen in sheer mountain cliffs, bare rock faces, frequent landslides and poorer soil cover compared with the Northwestern Zagros, human occupation is reduced to small isolated groups of settled farmers, who are mostly pastoralists.28

The northern mountains that are located to the east of the Anatolian plateau cover almost the whole territory of the northern part and extend in ranges in a west-east direction. Towards the east, the ranges veer to the northeast and come close to the northern ranges of the Pontus.

21 Gehrke and Mehner, op. cit., p. 20.
22 Fisher, op. cit., p. 17.
23 Ibid.
24 Persia, p. 27.
25 See the map in: Ehlers, op. cit., Map no. 2 (opposite p. 38).
26 Persia, p. 31.
27 Fisher, p. 20.
They end with Mount Ararat to form the Armenian Knot. These mountains bear the characteristics of Southern Alpine systems and form the greater part of the Taurus Mountains. The highest mountain peak of our region, Ararat (5265 m), is located in this area, close to the border with Iran. According to some, these ranges can be divided into arches, internal and external. The external arches begin with the mountains of Hakari and extend in the direction of Siirt, Ergani, the north of Marash and from there southwards to reach the Amanus mountains. Some other ranges in these arches are those round Gaziantep in the west and the range to the south of Antioch. In general, the mountains located between Shemdinli and Shirnak are amongst the highest, being 3000-4000 m high. These begin in the east with Qaradagh, Sat, Jilo (Turkish Cilo), Sümül, Samur, Altin, Serdolusu, and Tanintanin and continue to the River Hızıl on the Iraq-Turkey border. Several river valleys run through these arches, such as Shemdinli between Qaradagh and Sat, İnjiai between Sat and Jilo, the greater Zâb and the upper part of the Habur to the west. Another river in this category is the River Nehil that cuts through the Yüksekova plain in the Hakari region, a plain at an altitude of 2000 m to the northeast of the Jilo and Sat mountains.

Because of the rugged terrain and the steep mountains, communications are quite difficult in this region, particularly in the winter months. Yet there are some main routes, such as Yüksekova-Shemdinli, Siirt-Chukurova and Siirt-Shirnak-Jazira (Turkish Cizre)-Silopi. The region is well-watered by plentiful permanent and seasonal springs, and it has sufficient rainfall for the abundant pastures which support large herds of cattle.

To the west of Hakari in the direction of Van Lake the area has lower mountains (1500-2500 m). Among them are the southern Mush, Akchara, Yumrutash, Akdagh, Maden, Gördük, the southern Malatya, Engizek, Ahir and the Amanus. The latter is a long range within the Taurus, 175 kilometres long by 20-30 kilometres wide. It begins in the vicinity of Mush and ends on the eastern shore of the Gulf of İskenderûn.

Communications are somewhat easier in this area as its terrain is less steep. The main routes are Bitlis-Siirt-Diyarbakir, Bingöl-Diyarbakir, Elazig-Diyarbakir, Malatya-Marash-Gaziantep, Adana-Gaziantep, and İskenderûn-Antakya. But one of the most important routes even in the antiquity is the one leading from Ararat to Maku on the Iranian side and from there to Tabriz. This route leads on to Qazvin, Tehran and Khorasân, with a branch to Hamadan, Kirmashân and Mesopotamia.

The internal mountain arches, known also as the Middle Taurus System, begin generally to the north of Chukurova in the west and extend in ranges between Mount Taseli and Uzunyayla. Their average height is 3000 m. The eastern part of these ranges fall within our region of study, such as Munzur and Sheytan ranges, known also as the Ante-Taurus Ranges.

The main communication route in this district passes through the deep Gülek pass that connects Adana with Konya. This pass is the same known as the Cilician Gate in antiquity. Another pass, Chakit, is 15 kilometres to the east of Gülek, controlling the route from central Anatolia to the Chukurova region.
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29 Izbirak, R., Geography of Turkey, Ankara, 1975, p. 19.
30 Izbirak, op. cit., p. 18.
31 Ibid.
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34 Izbirak, p. 19.
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Many of these mountains were formed by volcanic eruptions, such as Tendürek Sübhan near Van, Greater and Smaller Agri, Nemrut Dagh, and Qaradagh to the west of Mardin.

The mean annual temperature of the northern mountains varies according to the elevation. It is between 0-5° C in the higher mountains, where there can be snow for seven months of the year. In the less high mountains the figure is 5-10° C.

The plains in the region under study are of great significance, for this kind of terrain is scarce in comparison to the vast areas covered by steep mountains. The plains have always been important centres of economic and political power, particularly for those of Habur, Erbil and Kirkuk. Other plains that are of economic, as well as archaeological significance are Erzinjan, Mush, Erzurum, Kars, Jazira (= Cizre), Iğdır, Harûr, Râniya, Shahrazûr, Amirabad (in Kamyrân region), Bijûr, Tûl (near Baneh), Sîndî (near Zakho), Mardin, Mahi Dasht (near Kirmashân) and others. The plains are not restricted to the undulating areas where the mountains end, but also between some mountain ranges. There they resemble plateaus more than plains because of their high altitude, in some cases reaching 1800 m (Erzurum and Kars).

The vast plains connected to the southern piedmonts of the Taurus extend to the north of modern Syria and constitute part of our region under study. These plains are known for their fertility and abundant agricultural productivity, even in antiquity, and are sometimes called “the bread basket” of the Assyrians. They are watered by several rivers, such as those of the Habur system (springing from the mountains of Mardin) in the eastern section, and the Balikh and the Euphrates to the west of the Balikh. Underground water too is abundant and easy to reach in this region with wells 5-10 metres deep. The numerous archaeological tells in this region indicate an earlier prosperity and a density of population. Mean annual temperatures in these plains and the piedmont plains in the Iraqi side are 15-20 °C, and in a few areas it can reach 20-25 °C, as in Kirkuk, Kifri, Tûz-Khurmûtu, Khânâqîn and others.

Communication routes in these plains have always been important, such as the route along the Euphrates to Mesopotamia through al-Qâ’im and the route that connects Aleppo and southern Anatolia with Mosul.

The flora of the region consists primarily of oak and dwarf oak. Other trees, though less in number but valuable for their wood and fruits, are chestnut, juniper, pine, wild figs, almonds, mulberry, blackberry, walnuts, pears, cherry, azarol, grapes and many others. Wild fungi and other edible plants are and were always an important source of food to sustain the inhabitants. However, the forests of the Zagros and the Taurus suffer from deforestation and overgrazing. Archaeological evidence and historical allusions suggest that there used to be a greater variety of trees and thicker forests in these mountains and foothills, but they have now unfortunately disappeared.
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36 Izady, op. cit., p. 16.
37 Detailed figures of mean annual temperatures in the region under study can be found in tables 1, 2 and 3 in Ghafour, op. cit., p. 48 ff.
39 For more information about the agrarian lands of this plain cf. Wirth, E., Syrien, eine geographische Landeskunde, Darmstadt, 1971, p. 381 ff.
41 Wirth, op. cit., p. 421.
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A modern map of the region under study.
CHAPTER ONE

Before 2500 BC
The region under study counts as one of the earliest areas occupied by prehistoric man. It has been inhabited for almost half a million years. The humans living there in early societies formed the basis from which the early agriculturalists emerged.

**The Palaeolithic**

Early traces of human existence in the region have been found in several spots, including the upper Tigris valley to the north of Mosul, where pebble tools from the later quarter of the lower Palaeolithic (upper Acheulean c. 500,000 – 110,000 BP) have been found. To the east, in the middle Zagros, traces of lower Palaeolithic presence were identified in the 1970s. Better evidence has come from Shiwatoo, a site in the Mahabad region (in the northwest of Iran), where Acheulean pebble tools have been identified during recent investigations. The main discovery in this site was a typical cleaver made on a side-struck flake of a dark volcanic rock (Fig. 1). This classical Acheulean tool, well-known in the Levant and in the Indian subcontinent, is now attested for the first time at a site between those two areas. In Kagia, near Kirmashān, artefacts that appear to be semi-Acheulean have been found. Similar artefacts, although not certainly dated, have been found in the region between Tabriz and Miyaneh in the northwest.

From Bardabalka, an open site near Chamchamāl, between Sulaimaniya and Kirkūk, we have stone pebble tools dating to Acheullean-Taycian-Mousterian periods (c. 80,000 BP). They are tools, made out of flakes and core bifaces similar to hand-axes, and...
constitute evidence of tool manufacture at the site.\(^9\) Other interesting finds included faunal remains, including those of the Indian elephant, rhinoceros, large cattle, perhaps *Bos primigenius* and probably the onager, *Equus hemionus*.\(^10\) During surveys conducted before the Mosul dam was built Cham Bazar, Eski Kelek and some 22 other sites were identified in the Tigris valley to the north of Mosul as being from this period,\(^11\) Developed Mousterian tools have been found in the caves of *Behestūn, Ghār-i-Khar, Maraftāw, Mardudar* and the rock shelter of *Warwasi*, all near Kirmāshān,\(^12\) and at *Tamtameh* near Urmia,\(^13\) but skeletal material is quite scarce.\(^14\) In the same region of Kirmāshān almost 4000 Mousterian artefacts in the cave of *Do-Ashkaft* have been collected recently (1996-2001), consisting of tools, flakes, trimming flakes, shatters and cores. Most of the tools were single or convergent scrapers, but they also included other types of scrape, retouched pieces, notches, burins and other miscellaneous artefacts.\(^15\) *Hazarmērd* cave, opposite the modern city of Sulaimaniya, was excavated briefly by Dorothy Garrod in 1928. She found deposits of a mixed Levalloiso-Mousterian lithic culture (c. 50,000 BP).\(^16\) The diet of its ancient inhabitants, as shown by the bone remains, consisted of wild goat, red bear, gazelle, fieldmouse, mole-rat, hare, bat, snail and other food from a mixed environment of grassland, woodland and scrub, which would have been similar to the environment there today.\(^17\) *Zarzi*, another cave to the northwest of Sulaimaniya, produced evidence of Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic occupation.

**Shanidār** is a large cave in Erbil Province. It is located on the southern side of the Bradōst Mountains, close to the Upper Zāb (Fig. 3). It enjoyed maximum sunlight and its large size (c. 1000 m\(^2\)) made it ideal for prehistoric man, so it is no surprise that it contained almost 14 metres of prehistoric deposits. Its oldest occupation (Level D) yielded a mixture of bones, ash and stone implements dating to the Middle Palaeolithic (Mousterian). Its excavator, R. Solecki, thinks that the oldest human habitation of this cave goes back at least 100,000 years and lasted continuously for about 3,000 generations.\(^18\) Most interestingly, nine human skeletons from various levels of the cave could be identified as Neanderthal. They “form one of the most extensive and informative collections of Middle Palaeolithic hominoid remains from anywhere in the Near East.”\(^19\) There are seven adults and two children, datable according to radiocarbon analysis and stratigraphic comparisons to periods ranging from 70,000-46,000 BP.\(^20\) One of them seems to have been handicapped but was well cared for...
during a considerable period of his life by his family members with whom he had shared the cave. 21 Another one of the cave dwellers was probably honoured at his funeral with a garland of flowers placed on his body. 22 Such attention to burials as far back as 50,000 years ago is the earliest evidence anywhere for any careful ritual for the dead. 23 The later levels were no less significant, producing evidence of Aurignacian culture (level C), within which developed a typical local Aurignacian industry, called by Solecki ‘Bradostian’ after the Bradõst Mountains. 24 Bradostian culture is divided by Hole and Flannery into Old Bradostian (c. 38,000-30,000 BP) and New Bradostian (30,000-20,000 BP). 25

Levalloisean tools have been found in the cave of Mar Tarik at the foot of Mount Behistûn. 26 Other sites in the Khurramabâd valley provided evidence of Mousterian (Kunji and Arjeneh Caves), 27 Bradostian (Yafteh and Pa Sangar Caves) and Zarzian occupations (Pa Sangar Cave). From these remains it appears that the Mousterian culture was the first extensive habitation of the area of the Zagros Mountains and its lithic industry was distinct from that of the Levant. 28 In Yafteh Cave several coarse stones have been found that were used to grind ochre. This is the first evidence of a ground stone industry, a prerequisite for early agriculture. 29 A definite trend towards regional technological specialization in the Zagros after the Mousterian occupations has been noted by some scholars. This probably indicates that the hunters of that period were moving about less than their predecessors had. 30 In the north, in the Urfa region, tools have been found that range in age between Acheulean (stone hand-axes) and Levalloisean-Mousterian (stone scrapers). 31 Field surveys showed evidence of occupation in the Ergani region in the middle and late Palaeolithic, while the areas to the south of the Hilar rock outcrops showed Upper Palaeolithic traces. 32

Mesolithic and Neolithic

The drastic climatic changes at the end of the late glacial period (c. 10,000-9,000 BC) which are known to have occurred in the inhabited parts of the world were less severe in the Near East than in Europe. However, gaps in cave occupation, in our region and in Anatolia and in Lebanon, have been identified by archaeologists, together with a low population density between 25,000-10,000 BC for the whole region. 33 The new conditions forced man to
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23 Redman, op. cit. p. 61.
24 Solecki, “Shanidar Cave,” Old World Archaeology, p. 45; Garrod, op. cit., p. 87. Bradostian industry prevailed in the whole area of the Zagros Mountains. Its traces were found in Ghâr-i-Khar, Yafteh and Arjeneh. The arrow-heads from the latter cave were unique and replaced the Mousterian arrow-heads, cf. Shahmirzadi, 1327, 137. 177.
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28 Redman, p. 64.
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30 op. cit., p. 65.
adapt his way of life. With the retreat of glaciers to the north the large herds of herbivorous animals disappeared and consequently the food became more scattered and less abundant. Man turned to smaller and more agile animals like deer and wild boar. At this stage, a new era in human history began called Mesolithic. The people of this culture were still hunter-gatherers but they also domesticated dogs for the pursuit of game and fowl. Skeletal remains indicate that they were homo-sapiens who lived in larger and better organized communities with more technological specialization. In particular grindstones and storage pits were found in their settlements, such as those of Shanidār B I. The storage pits probably indicate extensive gathering of food stored for times of shortage.

A new feature of this culture was the appearance of microliths: small geometrical shaped stone tools that were fixed on bone or wooden handles to make composite weapons. Mellaart thinks the numerous small points indicate the use of the bow and arrow, but they could also have been the remains of small, fragile and delicate tools that were easily broken. Another new feature was the establishment of open settlements, close to water resources and at the gathering points of game. Yet man still lacked leisure and freedom from constantly looking for food, for so far no luxury articles have been found.

The presence of obsidian in the cave of Zarzi was for Mellaart enough evidence to suggest that Zarzian culture probably came from the north, perhaps from the Russian steppes behind the Caucasus. Similar obsidian tools from this period have also been discovered in the site of Palegawra, but with a larger variety of animal bones. Among these are gazelle, red deer, roe deer, wild cattle, wild goat and equid, and probably also wild sheep, pig, fox and wolf, as well a lynx-sized cat and what has been identified as a domestic dog.

The site of Āin Mrer in northeastern Syria, two caves at the northern side of Jebel Ābdul-Aziz, and the site of Dederiyeh near Āfrin, produced Late Natufian tools that correspond to the period under discussion (c. 10,500 BC). Shanidār Cave again is one of the richest Mesolithic sites in this respect. Radiocarbon dating gives a date for the Mesolithic deposits of the cave of 10,000 - 9,000 BC. The large number of microliths found here and the several pits suggest that the people at Shanidār were preserving vegetables for food. The lithic industry of this level of Shanidār resembles that of nearby Zawi Chemi Shanidār. This is a small site (275 by 215 m) dating to the ninth millennium BC, situated 4 kilometres downstream from Shanidār on a terrace above the Upper Zāb. In the lower levels of this site bones were found, perhaps of domesticated sheep dating to 8,900 or 9,200 BC (according to C14 dating) and bones of wild animals, such as red deer, wild sheep, wild goats, wild pigs, cattle, fallow deer and wolves; snail remains were also found. It seems that the site was in use for part of the year only; most probably it was the summer to be closer to the river for water and food and its opportunities for hunting any assembled game. A curved wall built of stones and river pebbles was found there, presumably to support a hut or tent. It is probably the
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oldest known man-made structure in this region.\textsuperscript{44} It is believed that the occupation of Zawi Chemi began in about 8,920 ± 300 BC, according to radiocarbon dating, and lasted for almost a millennium.\textsuperscript{45} Some other oval structures have been found in the site, probably roofed with flimsy superstructures of wattle and daub or reeds or matting. Traces of reed-matting or baskets were found in the contemporary level of Shanidār Cave (B1). Querns, mortars and pounders found in the site suggest an increasing dependence on vegetables for food. Obsidian and one piece of bitumen\textsuperscript{46} indicate trade contacts with far regions.\textsuperscript{47} Yet it is noteworthy that there are eight adults, all accompanied by a child, buried in Zawi Chemi Shanidār, which suggests some kind of ritual.\textsuperscript{48} The body of a young woman in the Shanidār Cave of this period was buried accompanied by red ochre, a grinding stone and a necklace of small beads.\textsuperscript{49} A complete cemetery of 28 burials at Shanidār has arc-shaped settings of stone which seem to be connected with some mortuary cult.\textsuperscript{50}

Two other sites from the same period are Karim Shāhir and Mu'ālafāt. The first is 10 km east of Chamchamāl, and consists of one occupational level in an open area of 6,000 m\textsuperscript{2}. It seems it was a camp for a semi-sedentary group of people.\textsuperscript{51} Grindstones, sickle blades, clay figurines, marble rings and bracelets in addition to other artefacts found there suggest a date later than Zawi Chemi Shanidār, c. 8000-6500 BC.\textsuperscript{52} Mu'ālafāt lies near the road between Erbil and Mosul, close to the Khāzir River, and was a settlement with a total of 10 round or oval houses. Some of these houses were built with cigar-shaped bricks, some of pisé, and some are pit-houses.\textsuperscript{53} Such houses were surrounded by walls of stone and the floors were paved with pebbles.\textsuperscript{54} Similar round pit-houses were also found in Qirmiz Dere (c. 8,000 BC) (Fig. 4) close to Tell A'far. In the middle of two of these houses erect stone slabs had been set up as pillars,\textsuperscript{55} probably comparable with those of Nemrik and Navali Çori and others.

The last phases of the Mesolithic, during which the Neolithic Revolution\textsuperscript{56} took place, is called by some ‘Proto-Neolithic.’ In this phase, as has been shown, querns, mortars, grinders, storage pits and sickle blades made their first appearance, indicating a change in economy. There also appear early permanent settlements that have been frequently rebuilt. The burials were furnished with luxury articles, such as beads and pendants “which show that man had
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leisure and time for other things than appeasing his hunger.”57 The art portrayed animals, mother goddesses and male figures. Trade was extended to more distant regions. Some think that the trade in obsidian through networks stretching to other parts of the Near East in this remote period could have started in eastern Anatolia.58 Luxury articles began to appear, including beads made of stone, bone and even copper, rings and bracelets.

The main reason that the Neolithic cultures of our region are better known than any others there is because of the numerous prehistoric sites adequately excavated, many during salvage campaigns. The large scale salvage campaigns conducted in the regions of Hamrin and Eski Mosul in Iraq and those of Urfa and GAP (Batman Dam) on the Turkish side are good examples. Another reason has been the attention paid to this region by American archaeologists and anthropologists since the 1940s, especially to Iraqi Kurdistan, which led to starting the well-known Jarmo and Shanidar projects.

Climatic changes around 9,000 BC were perhaps responsible for the transition from Mesolithic to Neolithic. However, the availability of the wild ancestors of cereals in our region, especially of emmer and einkorn, was fundamental to the Neolithic Revolution (Figs. 5 and 6). Abundant new material from this period comes from the village of Hallan Çemi, an important site (c. 7 ha) in the Botan region, on the western bank of Sason River, a tributary of the Batman River in Batman province. The site was discovered during salvage excavations in 1990 and is dated to the late 11th millennium BP. The settlement represents the oldest fully settled village site thus far known from eastern Anatolia.59 It was inhabited throughout the year by a society of essentially sedentary hunter-gatherers.60 The subsistence of its inhabitants was based on hunting and food gathering, though they also practised domestication, especially of the pig.61 The pre-pottery deposits of the settlement are distributed on four levels. The upper three contained architectural structures set around a central area, perhaps for common activities.62 Packed clay, river stones and wood have been used to build the C-shaped houses (level 3). The floors of the second level houses were paved with stone slabs. Obsidian was imported from regions about 100 km away, as well as copper ore from almost 150 km and sea shells probably from the Mediterranean.63

Among the significant discoveries of Hallan Çemi is a complete aurochs skull that appears to have once hung on the wall facing the entrance of one of the first level buildings.64 Its ritual function is uncertain. It might be associated with the tradition that continues until now, involving the practice of hanging skulls of hunted animals in the houses. The discoveries at the site show cultural affinities with its neighbours. The lithic industry has strong typological relations with Zarzi and particularly with Zawi Chemi. Noteworthy is the discovery of stone statues with birds’ heads, strikingly similar to those found in Nemrik to the north of Mosul, that were probably goddesses.65 Decorated stone bowls with incisions and sometimes in relief forming geometrical or naturalistic motifs (Fig. 7) are also significant.

Pre-pottery sites in the Upper Habur region are quite scarce (3-4 only). The excavations of the two sites of Fakhariya and Tell Feyda showed no traces of settlement. Only recently

57 Mellaart, Earliest Civilizations..., p. 18.
58 Redman, p. 152.
60 Rosenberg and Redding, ibid.; cf. also Belfer-Cohen and Bar-Yosef, op. cit., p. 31.
63 Rosenberg, p. 27.
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65 The Nemrik excavators call these statues ‘goddesses,’ while Rosenberg thinks they were just pestle handles made in the shape of birds’ heads.
some U-shaped ovens and floor pavements with gypsum together with stone vessels have been found in Tell Seker Al-Aheimer, near the town of Tell Tamer. Some other stone tools from Khazna from the late eighth or the beginning of the seventh millennium BC indicate pre-pottery occupation.

The large and important village of Çayönü is a key site of the pre-pottery culture of the region under discussion with its thick deposits and abundant material. The site is a low oval tell, c. 350 by 160 m and 4.5 -6 m high, located on a tributary of the Tigris to the north of the city of Diyarbakir. Although the settlement began as early as c. 10,000 BP, it flourished between c.7,300 and 6,750 BC, according to radiocarbon dating. That was a period in which the flora of the surrounding area was composed of steppe forest in the beginning of the Holocene. Pistachio and oak trees were abundant in addition to potentially domesticable plants, such as wild wheat and barley. The fauna was no less rich: bones of wild aurochs, pigs, sheep, goats and other animals have been found in the settlement. The subsistence of the people of Çayönü consisted of wild animals and a mixture of wild and domesticated plants.

But towards the end of the village’s life, between 6,800 - 6,500 BC, they possessed large numbers of domesticated sheep and goat. The size of the village leads to an estimated population of 100-200 individuals at any given time, who lived in 25-30 houses through all the phases of the village’s life except for the first. The skeletal remains showed that “its inhabitants belonged to the Proto-Mediterranean stock consisting of both gracile and robust types.”

The first and oldest phase yielded no buildings except circular pits for cooking, so it is called the BP (= Basal Pits phase). Perhaps at that time the site looked more like a camp than a permanent village, with groups of reed huts arranged around central areas, similar to Hallan Çemi. The following GP (= Grill Plan) Phase produced abundant architectural material. Five separate buildings have been uncovered, whose stone foundations are in the shape of grills (Fig. 8), on which beams seem to have been placed to lift the floors from the ground to avoid damp and allow air circulation. Buildings with similar plans have been uncovered in Tell Dja‘de al-Mughara (8100-8000 BC), north of Mureybet in Syria, but these were storage structures. This phase is important because of “its great diversity of activities and experimentation, using many different raw materials and techniques for working them.”

Yet the large buildings and their uniform orientation and spacing might indicate a rather advanced level of organization and cooperation in the community. In one of these buildings, known as ‘Flagstone Building,’ three monumental standing stones without decoration have
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been found, which were called by the excavators ‘stelae.’ It has been noticed that old buildings were cleared, with some artefacts left behind in them (perhaps as gifts), and then carefully filled with earth before new buildings were built there.79

The building floors of the next phase, the BPP (= Broad- Pavement Plan), were paved with white and pink stone slabs giving a brilliantly executed terrazzo floor.80 In two other buildings, one of them having an open courtyard, several free-standing monoliths were revealed.

The CP (= Cell-Plan) phase (Fig. 9) lasted a long time81 and followed the BPP phase, the remains of which are well-preserved thanks to a conflagration. The discovery of large numbers of ground stones and antler tools in the level of this phase indicates manufacturing. “In each of these buildings, different cells contained different types of artefacts, implying that specific parts of a building were used for specific tasks.”82 Possibly these parts were used only as work places, not dwellings, as no traces of food preparation activities have been noticed.

Among the interesting finds are two clay models of houses found in the middle cell of the southern part. These models provide a hint of building techniques in Çayönü. One of them has a rounded door jamb, the roof is supported by twigs and there is a parapet running around the roof with holes, probably for drainage (Fig. 10). The burials and small finds uncovered in two of the cells might imply that some rituals were performed in these buildings.

The last Pre-Pottery phase in Çayönü is called LPR (= the Large Room Plan) Phase83 (Fig. 11) for which we have several complete building plans. The best preserved of these is the one-chambered building 5m by 9m, in which large basalt hand-stones, pestles, mortars and querns have been recovered that indicate the preparation of vegetables for food.84

Some of the large and elaborate buildings from the previous levels had particular architectural features, and they were sometimes named after those objects, such as Flagstone Building, the monoliths of the so-called plaza, the Bench Building, the Skull Building and the Terrazzo Building. These features mean the buildings are not to be considered domestic but places for cultic purposes or at least communal gatherings. Among the most outstanding discoveries were the lower jaws of four large pigs that were buried together in the middle cell of the Cell Plan building. It could have been part of a primitive ritual, such as an offering under the foundation of a new building. If so, these buildings and those of Nevali Çori can be considered “the oldest sacral architecture in the Near East.”85

It is notable that the ratio of flint tools to obsidian86 in the BP Phase was 6:10, but in the CP phase it became equal. The most common obsidian tools in the site are borers, drills, scrapers and sickle blades. One finds all kinds and shapes of stone tools throughout the different phases of the village, but their ratios vary. Ground stone industry principally depended on basalt, which was imported from mines almost 32 km away. Nevertheless, tools such as awls and needles were made of bone, and large numbers of ornamental objects were made in the village itself, using raw materials provided by trade. Rectangular, tubular and uniquely shaped beads and pendants were made from hard stones, shells and bones;87 stone and lightly baked clay figurines of animals and tiny pregnant or sitting female figures were also found.88 Stone bowls, some (but only in the BPP phase) decorated, have been recovered
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from the site. Pottery was unknown, and instead they used unbaked clay vessels, sometimes modelled in the bottom of a basket. It is astonishing that the people of Çayönü knew of copper at an early phase of the village’s life. They probably brought the ore from Ergani, some 20 km to the north, and made pins, rings, hooks, reamers and flat-rolled tubular beads by cold striking or even by hot-hammering and heat-smelting the ore. However, they stopped using it after the GP Phase, but why they stopped after making such a technical breakthrough has to be still answered.

Domestication was in progress, especially of goat and sheep, until there were 13 times more bones of domesticated animals than of wild animals (aurochs and red deer). The pig was present in all phases, perhaps having been domesticated after the LRP phase. As to plants, we know that einkorn and emmer wheat, peas, lentils, bitter vetch and wild vetch were all domesticated. They collected pistachio and almonds and a little wild barley for food, linseed for oil with the flax used for textiles.

The burials of the early phases in Çayönü were in the open areas of the settlement or under the floors of the huts. Bodies were generally laid out north-south on their right sides in tightly flexed positions and without funerary gifts. Later the dead were buried in individual graves and still later they were left with simple funerary gifts and were sometimes buried in buildings dedicated for this purpose. One of these buildings is known as ‘The Skull Building’ by its excavator, where 70% of the human skeletal remains uncovered so far were found.

Another important Pre-Pottery site of our region is Nemrik, on the way between Mosul and Duhok. The site was discovered in the 1980s and consists of at least seven settlement phases, interrupted by six intervals of abandonment and erosion. Except for the first period, the other six represent a village type occupation “repeating the situation known from Guran and Jarma.”

The oldest finds of Nemrik are dated by the lithic industry to the Zarzian period (c. 10,500 BP) and the most recent to about 8,400 BP. This means the village had been occupied for approximately 2,700 years and during its early phases was contemporary with Mu’allafat and Qirmiz Dere in Iraq, with Mureybet, Sheikh Hassan and Jirf Al-Ahmer in Syria, and with Çayönü, Demirköy and Hallan Çemi in the north in Turkey. Its later phases were contemporary with Dja’da in Syria and Navali Çori and Göbekli in southeast Turkey and Tepe Abdul Hussein in Iran. The village was occupied by nuclear families, each comprising 6-10 individuals.

At least 27 architectural structures have been uncovered in the village, mostly houses but also burials and magazines. The houses are usually circular or oval in plan, some with an area of 30-45 m². Only in level V were semi-rectangular buildings built. Some houses still had walls up to 1.8 m high when excavated. The roofs in Nemrik were covered by heavy clay and were supported by pillars or posts without leaning on the walls. The interiors of the houses were divided into smaller units by low clay walls. Circular and rectangular platforms
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were found inside the houses built of plastered clay and attached to the walls. It is thought that they might have served as banquets. But, comparing them with their modern parallels, they are more likely to have been used as benches where skin containers of oil, water and other liquid food stuff could be kept cool and clean, out of reach of animals and some insects, exactly as is done in modern times. The vast majority of the walls have cigar-shaped mud bricks (51 by 12 by 6 cm), although yellowish clay lumps and pisé are also found. No windows and even no doors have been found in the walls of the houses, so the inhabitants probably used ladders and staircases through the roofs instead. There were storage pits, perhaps also burials as well as stone slabs and querns installed in the floor inside. Traces of dye show the floors were decorated with red paint in phase IV, and red and yellow painted dadoes are also reported.

The people of Nemrik seem to have had small stone statuettes associated with their religious beliefs, especially the heads of vultures and eagles, and also lionesses, leopards, snakes and one bull’s foot (Fig. 12). These statuettes were put sometimes in niches in the walls, but one was found on the floor of a burnt house (House 2A, phase III b) beside a human skeleton with hands outstretched towards the figure, probably trying to save it from the flames of the burning house before the roof collapsed. A total of 29 such complete or fragmentary statuettes have been found in Nemrik that date between 7,800-6,500 BC.

The burials were sometimes under the floors of houses but mostly between the houses or outside the settlement. They were provided with little funerary objects, such as stone tools or ornaments made from stone beads, shells and the like. The bodies were laid on their sides, most often contracted if under floors or in an embryonic position if outside. This difference in burial traditions implies most probably ethno-religious differences within the population of the settlement. It is important to mention the burials to the southwest and in the centre of the site that consist of small circular or oval structures dug in the ground.

Apart from some pure local features, the small finds of Nemrik bear both the features of the western Zagros and of southeast Anatolia. The most prominent finds from there were stone tools, querns, mortars, beads, needles, awls, clay tokens and a stone ring.

The site of Navali Çori in the Kantara Valley, east of the Euphrates, represents the best pre-pottery site hitherto known in the Urfa region. The excavations revealed five Neolithic levels that contained a total of 29 houses, with longitudinal plans, built of limestone bound together with a thick mud-mortar. The C 14 dating of Levels I and II pointed to 8,400-8,100 BP, so that the older level is contemporary with Çayönü 2 (GP). A series of square buildings have been uncovered in the northwestern end of the terrace that were seemingly devoted to cultic and ceremonial purposes. The inner walls of the unique building of Navali Çori II (Fig. 13) are plastered with white clay with traces of a red and black paint. Two steps lead downwards to its terrazzo floor, where a bench of quarry-stone bonded with clay and covered with slabs runs round the inner side of the hall, which is cut by a dozen monolithic pillars with T-shaped crowns. This cultic building contains the principal architectural elements of later Mesopotamian temple architecture and probably also the scene for its rites.
Its four angles are oriented towards the four cardinal points. The niche for the statue of the god is on a broken axis from the entrance. This was a feature which prevailed later in Assyria and in the mountainous regions to the east, as for instance in the Bazmuṣiān temple in the Bitwēn Plain that dates to the second millennium BC. The probable burying of old statues of gods under the floor is reminiscent of the buried group of statues in the Abu Temple in Tell Asmar. The discovery of 9 human skulls placed facing one another in pits under the floor of two houses in Navali Çori can be associated with this practice. The building in the next level contained two decorated pillars in the middle of the hall; although these were missing in the earlier level it can be supposed they existed there also. The decoration is executed in the form of low relief on the wider faces of the pillars. It represents two bent arms with hands joining under a ridge cut into the narrow face. In Göbekli Tepe two similar pillars have been uncovered, one of which is larger – c. 6.7m by 3m – decorated with fine reliefs of various kinds of animals, such as lions, foxes and interwoven snakes (Fig. 14). The lion catching a human head in its paws is perhaps a unique piece of round sculpture from this period. The stone human head with a snake on top (Fig. 15) found in Nevali Çori was probably part of a complete statue. Together with other pieces of art it shows the richness of the intellectual life of the people living in the region at that time. Astonishingly they knew how to make baked clay figurines and small clay models of stone vessels, but no pottery was found. The richness in this part of the region of Neolithic sites, including Göbekli Tepe, Çefer Höyük, Söğüt Tarlası, Gritille, Levzin Höyük, Hayaz, Biris Mezarlığı, Demirci Tepe, Papazgölü, Kikan Harabası, Gölbent Mevkii, Gri Havarisk, indicates a dense population during the Neolithic period in an economy that depended on hunting and gathering as well as some primitive agriculture.

To the southeast, close to Chamchamāl, Jarmo (c. 6750 BC) represents a well-known Neolithic site of the region under study. The site covers almost 1.5 ha with ca. 7 m of deposits at the edge of a deep valley. 16 levels have been identified by its excavators. The lower 11 yielded no pottery; stone vessels, baskets plastered with bitumen and perhaps skin containers were used. Pottery makes its appearance in the upper five levels and is described as ‘developed,’ although it was hand-made, thick and coarse. It appears that the village was a permanent settlement, lasting for three to five centuries. But it was small, consisting only of 20-25 houses made of tauf and inhabited by 150-200 individuals. It is noteworthy that a modern typical village in this same region has almost the same number of houses and inhabitants, because of the limited water resources and pastures. The walls of the houses of Jarmo were plastered with fine mud, and the floors with mats were also plastered with mud. The later houses had stone foundations and were provided with ovens and chimneys. The plans are rectilinear. Each house comprised several small rooms (1.5 by 2 m) and many had small courtyards. The roofs were made of reed and covered by thick clay. It seems that the dead were buried outside the village, because human skeletal remains inside the settlement are
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Scanty. Subsistence in Jarmo depended on settled agriculture, although gathering was still considerably significant. The discovery of the oldest carbonised cereals in Jarmo is of special importance, for we now know that the inhabitants there consumed emmer wheat, which was morphologically close to its wild type, and also einkorn wheat and two-row barley. Secondary cereals found in Jarmo included field peas, lentils, blue vetchling, pistachio and acorn. Faunal remains indicate a gradually increasing percentage of domesticated goat. Probably dogs were domesticated and sheep, pigs, gazelles and wild cats were hunted. The large amount of snails found in the settlement indicates that they were consumed as food.

The lithic industry of Jarmo was dominated by flint. The significant additions of imported obsidian were used for the manufacture of blades for composite tools, such as sickles and knives, fixed on wooden handles with bitumen (Fig. 16). Ground stone industry was developed; axes with polished cutting edges, saddle querns and grinders, mortars, panders, door-sockets, stone balls, fine palettes for grinding, spoons, mace-heads, perforated discs, and marble and alabaster rings and bracelets (sometimes with incised or grooved decoration). All these were made in the village.

Some elegant cups and bowls might be the most beautiful products of the ground stone industry at the site, for which veined stones had been carefully selected. Bones were used to make awls, spatulæ, rings, beads and pendants. More than 5,000 clay objects were recovered during the excavations that represent geometrical, faunal and human figures, including mother goddesses (Fig. 17).

On the Iranian side of the region Tepe Asiāb in the Kirmashān plain produced similar evidence of a Proto-Neolithic culture from 11,000-9,000 BP. Some pits have been found, one of them containing numerous human coprolites, covered by ochre, but no vegetable or cereal diet was identified. The subsistence of its inhabitants depended on lizards, frogs and toads, perhaps the seasonal diet of semi-nomadic herdsmen, while some think that they may also have had domesticated goat. Clay figurines, some human, were found. The only architectural evidence at the site is a semi-subterranean structure, 10 metres in diameter, but it is not known whether it was roofed. The flint tools of the site showed a similarity with those of Karim Shāhir. Pre-pottery levels have been excavated in the village of Ganj Dareh near Kirmashān, which seems to have been one of the oldest Neolithic sites of our region. This oval tell of 1 ha has 8 m of Early Neolithic deposits. Shallow pits and circular hollows containing ashes and burnt stones covered part of the site in the mid-ninth millennium BC. There was an area enclosed by an arc of stone slabs, probably for roasting or heating. Here too the people seem to have been semi-nomads. No pottery was found, but in a later phase they began to make pots and vessels of unbaked clay; these had been hardened later by an accidental fire in the settlement. The upper levels contained the remains of an early village
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built of solid mud-bricks, dated to c. 7000 BC, with rectilinear structures and small rooms built of long cigar-shaped bricks (50-95 cm long). This kind of brick, found in Nemrik, Choga Mami and also as far away as Jericho, seems to have been used over a large area of the ancient Near East. It seems very probably to be the prototype of the Mesopotamian ED Plano-Convex brick. Perhaps some houses in Ganj Dareh had a second storey, supported by tree trunks, with the ground floors used for storage, as in the corridor rooms of Beidha and cell-plan structures of Çayönü. As in other villages of the period, the roofs were covered by wooden beams and clay. The discovery of a number of very small compartments built inside one of the cubicles is interesting. The compartments were made of thin vertical plates of clay with bevelled edges that had apparently been prefabricated and dried by the sun before being placed in position and plastered. At this site specimens of what could be, according to Redman, the oldest known pottery in the Near East were found: a lightly fired, chaff-tempered coarse ware in large (80 cm high) and small (5 cm high) sizes. Clay was also the material from which geometrical and human figurines of mother-goddesses were made as well as animal figurines from levels E and D. The abundant stone tools of Ganj Dareh include no obsidian. Other tools have “undergone little change from the earliest to the latest levels of the site.” Some sickles and grindstones came from level D and were associated with settled agriculture, although these could equally well have been used for harvesting wild grain in our opinion.

It seems that the inhabitants of the village had domesticated goat and some plants but still depended largely on hunting and gathering. On the other hand, in view of the location of the village, the availability of wild cereals nowadays and the domesticated animal bones that have been found suggest that “Ganj Dareh holds evidence of the shift from hunting and gathering to an economy based on domesticates.”

The skulls of two wild sheep with the lower jaws missing, the one placed on the other, found in a cubicle and fixed on the plastered interior of a small niche are considered to be evidence of a shrine and to indicate some ritual practice in this remote period. A burial of an adolescent from level D contained a necklace made of 71 stone and shell beads. Some of the shells are marine, probably from the Persian Gulf or the Mediterranean, a rare indication of the site having distant contacts. Other burials showed both contracted and stretched positions of the bodies. They were buried in the houses, sometimes rolled in mats, but with no funerary objects found with the adults except for the one with the necklace.

Other sites from this period include Tepe Guran in Luristan, which yielded three Pre-Pottery levels from the 21 occupational levels dated to 6,500-5,500 BC. The inhabitants of Tepe Guran lived in wooden huts and used mats to cover the floors. It seems to have been a winter camp used by hunters and herders in its early age, but houses became numerous in
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136 For Çayönü, cf.: Yakar, op. cit., p. 47.
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the following phases, when there is evidence of agriculture and domestication, probably around 6,400 BC.148 The pottery that appeared later was coarse, plain and sometimes painted. In Tepe Sarab, east of Kirmashān, a culture typologically later than Jarmo149 produced a better type of pottery than that of Jarmo; it was red slipped and burnished or red painted.150 The famous mother-goddess figurine, known as ‘Venus of Tepe Sarab’ (Fig. 18), together with other well-made, more realistic and lively figurines (797 animal and 650 human figurines in total),151 imply a higher level of this kind of art in this community. The village had no substantial architecture. There is some fragmentary evidence of mud structures,152 and oval pits with reed and mud roofs, probably for seasonal occupation.153 But there is evidence of permanent occupation during the year, at least in parts of the settlement.154 Tepe Abdulhussein in Nihavand has architectural remains consisting of shallow pits in the early phases. But in the next level, still pre-pottery, there were houses of mud-brick (12 by 36 cm), rectangular in shape and plastered floors. The ovens were inside the rooms and beside the walls.155 The pottery, mostly small fragments, is coarse and poorly baked, sometimes with a thick buff slip and the inner sides of the vessels are red.156 Among the 1,800 sherds, only 70 were decorated, with simple geometric motifs in (dark) brown paint, and only 5 sherds were painted with a red paint. Numerous arrowheads, scrapers, blades, retouched tools, sickle-blades, grindstones, stone vessels and obsidian tools were also among the finds, in addition to beads, human and animal figurines and objects made of bone, such as awls, and beads.157 The dead were buried in the houses together with funerary objects. They were buried in both contracted and stretched positions.158

Later similar sites have been identified in the Mahidasht Plain near Kirmashān, such as Shian, Zibiri and Tepe Geneel, but Seh Gabi, close to Godin provided architectural evidence of a settled community around the year which kept pig, sheep and goat.159

Hassuna and Samarra

Recent investigations during the last few decades have shown that other cultures filled the gap between the Early Neolithic Culture, such as Jarmo, and the Hassuna Culture. These cultures show the first substantial movements of small groups of people, probably 20-30 individuals, over the northern Mesopotamian plains, where they practised the techniques of agriculture and specialised hunting.160 One such culture was found in Umm Dabbaghiyya.
outside our region. Another was Sotto, dating to c. 6,000 BC\textsuperscript{161} and containing large pits in its oldest level, seemingly semi-subterranean houses like those of Qirmiz Dere and Mu’alaffāt. Houses of tauf appeared only from level 2 onwards. They were one-roomed rectangular houses containing hearths, ovens and pots sunk into the floor.\textsuperscript{162} The burials were under the floors or next to the houses; some corpses had been dismembered before burying and others were strongly contracted. Funerary gifts have been found in 2 of the 9 burials, one of which is said to have consisted of beads of lapis lazuli. If this is correct, it would be one of the very first attestations of this stone in the region.\textsuperscript{163} The stone tools were made of available local flint; obsidian is rare. There are also clay figurines, tools made of bone, spindle whorls and clay sling missiles.\textsuperscript{164} Similar artefacts from this period have been found in Tulul Al-Thalathāt (55 km west of Mosul), Tell Kashkashuk II and Khazna II in the Habur region.\textsuperscript{165}

The Hassuna Culture (c. 5,800-5,500 BC) is known for its multi-roomed, small rectangular houses containing hearths, storage pits and occasional burials in pits. In Yarim Tepe (10 km south of Tell A’far) some houses had up to 10 rooms and in each complex one room had an oven, usually associated with a mortar. The structures (c. 5,600 BC) were made of pisé with reed matting on the floors plastered with clay and straw or gypsum,\textsuperscript{166} while the roofs were covered with mats, clay and gypsum. The dead were buried under the floors; some had been dismembered and provided with gifts.

Hassuna pottery has three main groups: plain coarse ware; plain ware with incisions; painted and incised ware (Fig. 19).\textsuperscript{167} Its quality had improved and had begun to be painted with a dark brown paint; some pieces were painted and incised.\textsuperscript{168} The decorative motifs were parallel lines, hatched triangles and a herringbone pattern, resembling ears of wheat or barley. The extent of Hassuna as well as its origin is not yet adequately known; except that it is distributed along a line from Sinjār, passing through Nineveh to Rawāndiz and then to the Urmia region. There, Hajji Firuz, slightly to the south of Lake Urmia, showed 6 occupational levels contemporary with Hassuna.\textsuperscript{169} Its small rectangular houses were built of pisé, set around an open courtyard and contained hearths and large storage jars. Some of the houses have an added area with a curved wall, without roofing, the purpose of which is unknown.\textsuperscript{170} Remnants of red paint were found on part of a wall of one of the houses and some of the floors were painted with red ochre.\textsuperscript{171} The dead were buried inside the houses, accompanied by few funerary gifts;\textsuperscript{172} sometimes after the flesh had decomposed the bones had been placed in ossuaries under the floors.\textsuperscript{173} The pottery found in the settlement is plain, painted and straw-tempered and poorly fired.\textsuperscript{174} Some clay figurines represent a few animals and the rest humans, whose lower parts are impressed by fingernails and pointed tools, a

\textsuperscript{163} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{164} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{166} Mellaart, The Neolithic of…., p. 146.  
\textsuperscript{167} Redman, p. 190.  
\textsuperscript{169} Hole, p. 45. However, according to Mellaart they are “roughly contemporary with Hassuna and Samarra,” cf.: Mellaart, \textit{The Earliest…..}, p. 71.  
\textsuperscript{170}  \textsuperscript{171} Hole, p. 45.  
\textsuperscript{172}  \textsuperscript{173} Mellaart, \textit{The Earliest…..}, p. 72.
characteristic of this site.\textsuperscript{175} The subsistence depended on a mixture of agriculture and herding.\textsuperscript{176} A remarkable Hassuna occupation has been found in Shemshāra, on the Lower Zāb (levels 9-16),\textsuperscript{177} and in some other sites of Rānīya Plain, such as Gird-i-Dēm\textsuperscript{178} and Kamariyān.\textsuperscript{179} But generally it appears that this culture was scantier in the regions south of the Lower Zāb, a line probably marking its southern borderline.\textsuperscript{180} Even the Habur culture and lithic industry is linked more tightly with Hassuna and Proto-Hassuna of Northern Iraq than with the cultures of (Western) Syria from the same period.\textsuperscript{181}

In many sites like Hassuna, Shemshāra and Matarra, a new kind of pottery appears in the upper layers of the Hassuna occupation which is mixed with that of Hassuna itself. This new kind of pottery was first discovered from excavations at the Abbasid site of Samarra on the Tigris; hence it was called Samarra pottery and its culture Samarra Culture (c. 5,600-4,800 BC). The new pottery gradually replaced the old one\textsuperscript{182} and it can be subdivided into three, as painted, painted and incised, and fine and plain (Fig. 20).\textsuperscript{183} Generally it is characterised by large bowls, jars and vessels, decorated with geometric, human and faunal motifs, arranged in balanced symmetrical designs and coloured with red, dark green or purple paint.\textsuperscript{184} The site of Tell es-Sawwan on the eastern bank of the Tigris to the south of Samarra is a typical site of this culture, where large houses with storage areas surrounded by a wall and a moat were found.\textsuperscript{185} The use of sun-dried bricks in the architecture of this period is remarkable.\textsuperscript{186} Moreover, the inhabitants of this site used the oldest known irrigation techniques by digging a network of canals, a technique best seen in the other important Samarran site of Choga Mami (4,800 ± 182 BC), near Mandali.\textsuperscript{187} Among the significant finds from both sites were the numerous clay (mostly in Choga Mami) and marble (in Es-Sawwan) figurines, mostly of women. The clay was painted and the marble inlaid with shells and bitumen. Samarra ware was also found in Kamariyan (mentioned above) in the Rānīya Plain.\textsuperscript{188} In the west it reached northern Syria, the southern edge of the western part of our region. As with Hassuna, the origin of Samaara culture is disputed. Some suggest an Iranian origin and others believe it was developed from Hassuna.\textsuperscript{189}

\textsuperscript{175} şehemrazâdî, ص. ٢٩١.
\textsuperscript{179} Es-Soof, Ibid.
\textsuperscript{180} Mellaart, The Neolithic of..., p. 144; cf. also: Mellaart, Earliest Civilizations..., p. 64.
\textsuperscript{181} Akkermans and Schwartz, p. 114-15.
\textsuperscript{182} Hence it is considered as a southern development from the Hassuna culture, not a new one. Its most important sites lay further to the south, cf. Forest, J.-D., Mésopotamie, l’apparition de l’état. VIIe-IIIe millénaires, Paris, 1996, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{183} Matsumoto, K., “The Samarra Period at Tell Songor,” Préhistoire de la Mésopotamie, p. 190.
\textsuperscript{184} Lloyd and Safar, p. 281-3; Mellaart, Earliest......, p. 66.
\textsuperscript{185} Mathews, p. 73-4.
\textsuperscript{186} Mellaart, The Neolithic of..., p. 150ff; Oates, D. and J. Oates, The Rise of Civilization, Lausanne, 1976, p. 64 (with photo). Cf. also Mathews, p. 73 ff. For the discoveries at Tell es-Sawwan see the series of excavations reports in Sumer, vols. 21 (1965); 23 (1967); 24 (1968); 26 (1970); 27 (1971); and in Arabic: 19 (1964); 25 (1969); 28 (1972).
\textsuperscript{187} Oates and Oates, Ibid. Cf. also Mellaart, The Neolithic of, p. 155.
\textsuperscript{188} Es-Soof, “Uruk Pottery from Dokan and Shahrazur Districts,” p. 39.
\textsuperscript{189} Mellaart, The Earliest..., p. 66.
One of the main characteristics of the Hassuna and Samarra cultures was the establishment of settlements outside the dry-farming area. This was a very significant step in the history of civilization as it proved the possibility of living outside that area. Botanical evidence recovered from both Tell es-Sawwan and Choga Mami indicates that irrigation was practised from at least the middle of the sixth millennium BC.\(^{190}\) The Samarra people were highly advanced farmers, their lives were more organized and developed and their settlements were comparatively large. Choga Mami, for instance, covered 6 ha and housed almost 1000 individuals.\(^{191}\) The entrance to the settlement was guarded by an angled gate with towers. Its houses were rectangular with small multiple rooms,\(^{192}\) as also seen in Shemshāra (level 16). The large buildings had external buttresses in the corners and wall junctions, a feature that later became a main feature of Mesopotamian architecture. Sun-dried bricks were used in the buildings of this period, although pisé was still in use in some places. The bricks of Choga Mami were cigar-shaped (60-90 by 12-18 cm).\(^{193}\)

The data obtained from the Samarran sites give some hints about further development of property rights. Most of the buildings were rebuilt directly on the foundations of the older ones. Moreover, the appearance of seals in this period, as in Hassuna, can be seen to concern ownership, especially when exchanging or communally storing goods.\(^ {194}\) Potter’s marks also refer to the increasing significance of craft activities and the sense of craftsmanship that might have accompanied the transformation of manufacturing activities from individual households to specialized manufacturing groups. The burials also indicate the ranking of individuals according to their wealth.

The spread of the Samarra Culture is similar to Hassuna. It extended from the north of modern Baghdad, through the Hamrin region, to northern Mesopotamia (Matarra, Ibrahim Bayis, Arpachiya, Sheshni)\(^ {195}\) and eastern Syria, where its pottery has been found in Baghouz on the Euphrates, Boueid II on the lower Habur, Chagar Bazar on the upper Habur and Sabi Abiyad.\(^ {196}\)

**Halaf**

Numerous cultural developments and innovations were introduced into **Halaf Culture** (c. 5500-4500 BC)\(^ {197}\) that succeeded Samarra. The houses were still built of sun-dried bricks (Tepe Gawra) and sometimes pisé (Arpachiya, the type-site of this culture) and mortared with gypsum. However, they were smaller, especially at these two sites\(^ {198}\) that are located to the east and northeast of Nineveh. Yet more interesting was the introduction of a new kind of architecture, which could have been borrowed or brought from abroad by the Halaffian immigrants, if that is what they were. This new architecture consisted of a circular building

\(^{190}\) Redman, p. 195.

\(^{191}\) Redman, p. 196.

\(^{192}\) It is remarkable that the rooms in Choga Mami are arranged in rows; there is a house of 12 rooms arranged in 3 rows of four; in another house 9 rooms are arranged in 3 rows of three.

\(^{193}\) Redman, p. 196.

\(^{194}\) *Ibid*.

\(^{195}\) Matthews, p. 73.

\(^{196}\) Akkermans and Schwartz, p. 116.

\(^{197}\) It is worth mentioning that some C14 tests of finds from Tell Sabi Abiadh in Syria have given an earlier date for the beginnings of Halaf as c. 6100-6000 B.C., cf. Forest, p. 27.

\(^{198}\) Matthews, p. 85 and 88; Mellaart, *The Neolithic of......*, p. 159. Arpachiya is located 6 km to the northeast of Nineveh, with a diameter of c. 125 m and 8 Halaf levels. Although it was a small settlement and its inhabitants did not exceed 200 persons, it yielded the best and largest examples of Halaf architecture; cf. Redman, p. 199.
with a rectangular ante-room attached (Fig. 21), thought to have had domed roofs of clay, at least at Arpachiya. Such a building is called a tholos for it looked similar to the Mycenaean tholoi. Some North Syrian villages around Aleppo still have such domed roofs. Different ideas have been presented about the function of a tholos; it may have been a cultic centre or a public building or simply a dwelling house. The tholoi of Arpachiya had walls 2-2.5m thick, with a dome 10m in diameter and an anteroom 19m long. The one found in Yarim Tepe III had walls up to 2m high and at opposite sides of the interior right-angled walls had been constructed, making an interior cruciform plan (Fig. 22). The presence of some paved paths between the buildings on the top of Arpachiya site may indicate the first municipal activities in this period. Another significant element of this culture is the pottery, according to which Halaf can be divided into Eastern Halaf (between the lower Zāb and Diyāla Rivers) and Western Halaf (at Jabbul and on the Queiq in Syria). A remarkable development in the use of colours took place. The pottery became polychrome and the designs delicate and beautiful, with the use of a rich collection of geometrical, floral and faunal motifs, the most prominent of which was the bucranium (Fig. 23). Although the potter’s wheel had not yet been invented vessels were well-made: thin-walled, included new distinctive shapes, hand-made, wet-smoothed and lightly burnished; bowls had flared rims, concave or rounded sides, some with small round mouths. Chronologically Halaf pottery can be divided into three phases. The first and oldest (Arpachiya phases 1-2, pre TT 10; Chagar Bazar levels 15-13) is characterized by relatively simple shapes, among which is the ‘cream bowl.’ The preferred decorations were naturalistic: heads of oxen or moufflon or complete animals, leopards, deer, snakes scorpions, birds, onagers, human figures, schematised trees, plants and flowers. The geometric patterns consist of closely packed lines, straight or wavy fields of dots and circles, often placed in panels. The colours of this phase are red and black on an apricot ground. In the second phase (Arpachiya: phase 3a- b TT10-TT 7, Chagar Bazar: level 12) elaborate shapes were made with sharp flaring rims. The naturalistic decoration disappeared, except the bucrania, that became more stylised. Typical decorations consist of elaborate fields of geometric designs, very similar to textiles and balanced by curved lines, scale patterns, dots, suns, stars, bands, cross-hatching, zig-zags,

199 Nevertheless, rectilinear architecture was not totally absent in this period. Rectangular buildings have been uncovered in Sabi Abiyad (18 by 10m), see Akkermans and Schwartz, p. 116-7; for Çavi Tarlasi in southeastern Anatolia and Yarim Tepe II-III see Matthews, op. cit., p. 89; cf. also the shrine of Tell Aswad on the Balikh; for the potter’s shop in Arpachiya see Mellaart, Earliest..., p. 122.

200 The tholoi uncovered in Tell Turlu to the west of the Euphrates contained ovens and storage pits perhaps indicating it was used as a dwelling, cf. Akkermans and Schwartz, p. 116.

201 Matthews, p. 91.

202 Mellaart, The Neolithic..., p. 159.


204 Cf.: Lloyd and Safar, op. cit., p. 283; Mellaart, Earliest Civilizations..., p. 120. The bull was and remained a fundamental element in the art and literature of the ancient Near East for a considerable period. As we see here, it was drawn on prehistoric pottery vessels and later appeared on many vases, stamp-seals and cylinder seals; also on sculptures of the proto-historical and the historical periods, particularly in Sumer. Bulls’ heads can be seen also on the wall paintings from Nuzi and on Middle Assyrian wall paintings down to later times. Even the Achaemenids depicted bulls on their bas-reliefs and made the column crowns in their capitals of Persepolis and Susa in the shape of doubled crouching bulls. Urartian, Elamite, Hittite and Babylonian cultures are no exceptions in this respect.

205 Some new excavations, particularly in Arpachiya in the 1970s, showed a mixture of Halaf-Ubaid, called Halaf-Ubaid Transitional, which is counted with Halaf itself; for this, cf. Matthews, p. 87.

206 Mellaart, Earliest Civilizations..., p. 120.
triangles and chequer-boards. In the third phase (Arpachiya: phase 4 TT6; Chagar Bazar: levels 12-6) large polychrome bowls appeared, with elaborate centre-pieces like rosettes, crosses composed of *bucrania*, Maltese Crosses in such a highly artistic style that it became the most outstanding ceramic production of the ancient Near East. Uniquely fine samples of this pottery have been found. For instance, a bowl from Arpachiya is decorated with long-haired women with a fringed rug and a figure hunting, possibly with a bow. In Yarim Tepe a spectacular 25 cm high vessel was found (Fig. 24), shaped as a woman with a huge pubic area raising her hands to her breasts. Other uniquely decorated pottery comes from Tell Hassan in the Hamrin region and is dated to the late Halaf phase. Nonetheless, the manufacture of stone vessels had not stopped, using different kinds of stone, including a rare obsidian jar from Arpachiya.

It is assumed that trade was well-organized and flourished during the Halaf period. This is indicated by the widespread distribution of pottery of the period over a large area, and the presence of obsidian in almost all sites as well as shells from the Indian Ocean.

It has been noted that the region of Halaf Culture in general was in the shape of a crescent corresponding to the dry farming areas of the north and northeast. Some scholars speak of the area of Mardin and Diyarbekir as a “suspected homeland of Halaf Culture,” while new investigations extend this original home southward to the Hamrin region. The geographical distribution of this culture in the dry-farming areas was perhaps the reason why no indications of Halafian irrigation agriculture, like its Samarran predecessor, have been found. Archaeological research has shown that Halaf extended from Mersin in the west to the Iranian ‘J’ ware in the east (c. 1200 km) and from the Araxes Valley in the north to the Biqa Valley in Lebanon (c. 900 km). In this respect, a distinctive pottery has been found in Dalma (4,036 ±87 BC) to the south of Lake Urmia. This pottery is not coloured but decorated by using tubes, combs, sticks and fingers to press, pinch and knob, and by what is known as the Barbotine technique (Fig. 25). This pottery spread south to Kirmashān and Hamadan Plains (Kangavar and Mahidasht), Seh Gabi (mound B) and Godin (level X), and some scattered
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207 Redman, p. 200.
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213 Mellaart, *Earliest…*, p. 64.
214 Matthews, p. 85. About this topic cf. also: Copeland and Hours, “L’expansion Halafienne……,” *Préhistoire de la Mésopotamie*, p. 212. Some think that Halaf was the outcome of a long continuous process of local cultural development, not a sudden change brought by immigrants, cf. Akkermans and Schwartz, p. 116.
215 Matthews, p. 85. The Iranian ‘J’ ware is the assemblage found in the sites of Mahidasht in western Zagros, especially known from Tepe Siahbid and Chogha Maran. It is a fine pottery analogous to Mesopotamian Halaf pottery, but the decorative motifs are simpler. For more details, cf. Levine, L. and T. Cuyler Young, “A Summary of the Ceramic Assemblages of the…. *Préhistoire de la Mésopotamie*, p. 19.
samples are found in the Khurramābād Valley in Luristan. It is interesting that this kind of pottery was also found in the Hamrin region together with Halaf and Ubaid.

The burials of Arpachiya contained contracted bodies accompanied by gifts, such as clay figurines, ornaments and pots. One of the skeletons was found with its hands placed over the mouth. Amazingly, some skulls, male and female, uncovered at the site were intentionally deformed and put inside pots. This practice was probably unique to Arpachiya, perhaps linked with a ritual function of the settlement. 223 24 skeletons were found in a well in Tepe Gawra, apparently victims of a raid or a natural disaster.

The Halafians were farmers who depended on dry-farming. Their flint sickles, mortars, pestles and querns have been found in their settlements. They produced emmer wheat, hulled two-row barley with the six-row barley that appeared for the first time at the end of this period, and they also cultivated lentils and flax, for producing textiles and to extract linseed. They domesticated cattle, goat, sheep and a dog like a saluki. Mellaart thinks the attention paid to oxen in art and cult does not necessarily imply domestication, but their large horns depicted on pottery indicate wild oxen, a venerated emblem of male fertility.

Pottery decorations show that textiles were apparently developed. The discovery of metal objects, awls and pendants made of copper and lead at Arpachiya, is seen as evidence of considerable progress. A unique copper pendant-seal found in Yarim Tepe indicates this development. Simple round or square seals were made with simple incised designs; some seals or seal impressions have been found in Arpachiya and Tepe Gawra, apparently to ensure control.

The excavations at Tell es-Sawwan showed that the Halafians reached this area at the end of the Samarra period, where the remains of a supposed tholos together with Halaf potsherds were identified. Further to the east, Halaf pottery was identified in Tell Hassan in the Hamrin basin, to the southwest of Kirkuk, Qalinj Agha in the Erbil Plain, Gird Bagim in Shahrazūr, Nineveh, Hassuna, Bana Hilik, Songor B, Kharab Shattani, Khirbet Derak, Tell Der Hall, Jikan and other sites on the Iraqi side of the region. In the west it was found in Brak, Aylun, Leylān, Kashkashok I, Khazna II, Chagar Bazar, Aqab, Halaf, Umm Qseir, Sabi Abiyad, Damishliyya, Tell Kurdu and elsewhere. In the north Sakçe Gözü, Domuz Tepe, Turlu (where a silo was found), Tilki Tepe (where a 10 kg piece of obsidian was found), Girkihaciyan have all yielded Halaf material.

Halaf is distinguished by its homogenous cultural elements, particularly the architecture and small artefacts. It shows much more homogeneity than its predecessors and at the same time over a much larger area. Although the Halafians were farmers like their predecessors,
in terms of social interaction and organization it is possible to speak about a widespread cultural horizon for the first time in the Near East. This can be seen in the pottery motifs, architectural styles and small finds in almost all Halaf sites.235

Ubaid

Until the emergence of Ubaid Culture our region had been in the forefront of all the developments in human civilization. This has been changed by this time. Although not everyone agrees with the theory of an Ubaidian conquest from the Mesopotamian lowland236 it remains most likely that the southerners were subjected to conditions that pushed them towards the north. While the communities of the north continued to subsist as they had done for the past millennia, the southern communities were compelled to reorganize their living pattern. Neither irrigation, nor large scale trade of raw materials were necessary for the northerners. It was possible for them to live from dry-farming and limited economic activity within small communities. Hence there were no motives for settlement growth and reorganization. But in the south irrigation techniques produced surplus supplies leading to population growth.237 Furthermore, it is not impossible that the southern plains had suffered from salinization at some time in that period. These circumstances had pushed them, according to Mellaart, to look for new lands to the north at the end of Halaf, and in doing so they put an end to Halaf culture. This theory implies that there should be some late Halaf settlements in the south, and perhaps some such traces are found that date to Ubaid 0.238 It seems that the Ubaid expansion was not always peaceful, for a massacre and traces of destruction by fire of the Halaf settlement in Arpachiya are interpreted as a sign of a violent incursion. Ubaid pottery proliferated over a vast area, even larger than that covered by Halaf, reaching to the north of the Taurus in the plains of Malatiya, Elazig, Palu and to the Solduz Plain, south of Lake Urmia at the site of Pisdeli. Although little is known about Ubaid in the west,239 its deposits have been found in Aqab (Halaf-Ubaid transitional),240 Brak, Leylān, ‘Abr, Hammam et-Turkman and Tell Kuran. In the north, especially in the east Tigris region, Ubaid Culture had its own characteristics that distinguished it from the Ubaid of Southern Mesopotamia.241 These characteristics are noticeable especially in the use of stone in architecture, in funeral customs as seen in Tepe Gawra, and in painted pottery that used a wider variety of colours.

An important development in the north was the manufacture of metal tools by the casting technique. For the first time axes of cast copper were found in addition to gold objects.242 In Tepe Gawra many significant remains of Northern Ubaid were found, such as stamp seals
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235 Redman, p. 199. Watson and Le Blanc suggested that the reason behind this similarity and homogeneity was the transformation of the Halafians from a nomadic way of life to the formation of chiefdoms and that this required more intensive communications between their sites and centres, cf. Redman, p. 199.

236 Akkermans and Schwartz state that there is no archaeological evidence to support the theory of conquests or invasions, and no drastic climatic changes or disasters that led to the end of Halaf and the coming of Ubaid, cf. Akkermans and Schwartz, p. 154.

237 Mellaart, Earliest..., p. 129; Lloyd, op. cit., p. 81. Forest thinks that no ethnic change took place in the north with the coming of the Ubaid culture but that the Halafians have simply adopted the new culture, cf. Forest, p. 53.


239 Akkermans and Schwartz, p. 158.


242 Lloyd, op. cit., p. 65.
made of various kinds of stones including lapis lazuli. The scenes depict extremely lively human figures surrounded by animals. The pottery of Tepe Gawra was decorated by naturalistic scenes that revived Halaf motifs. A distinctive jar from the late Ubaid period found at this site is worth mentioning. The jar (Fig. 26), although fragmentary, is decorated with the scene of a river flowing between two ranges of mountains; near the river bank there is a hunter walking with his dog, while two horned beasts, perhaps ibexes, are on the other side of the river.  

Ubaid pottery in general (Fig. 27) is fairly uniform except for some minor variations. It is hand-made with a poorer quality of clay and baking than that of Halaf. It is simply decorated with bold geometric designs, monochrome, seldom beautiful and is hardly likely to have “caused aesthetic satisfaction to people who had been used to the glories of Halaf ware.” Some have described this change in the pottery as ‘decadence’ or impoverishment, but the reason could have been the necessity for producing pottery on a large-scale and at low-cost. Excavations in Pisdeli brought chaff-tempered buff pottery to light with designs and shapes resembling Mesopotamian Ubaid, which is dated by radiocarbon to 4,500-3,900 BC. Ubaid material with local characteristics have been excavated in Godin Tepe (level IX, Local Ubaid; VIII, Terminal Ubaid; VII, local post-Ubaid) and in Seh Gabi close by. Among the significant finds here are a well-preserved structure in Seh Gabi (Mound A) and the remains of a house with walls preserved up to the doors and windows. The house had at least 8 rooms and is thought to have consisted of two or even three storeys. Seals also have been found at the site that suggest storage and perhaps administrative business.

The architecture of this period is characterized by the tripartite division of the house and the presence of what is thought by some authorities to be a central living hall in the middle of the building (Fig. 28). The so-called central hall was more probably the courtyard of the house with the living rooms around it, a characteristic of the ‘Oriental House’ that can still be seen throughout Mesopotamia. The multi-roomed house and the division was a new social development of the period. It was large enough to accommodate an entire family and a wide range of activities under one roof. This internal control of space meant a “desire for privacy and segregation of the sexes, creating a new social and work ethic.” Another development was the appearance of religious architecture with a series of buildings that could be identified as temples, such as those in Tepe Gawra. These buildings surround an open area on three sides, and on a wall of one of these buildings traces of red, black, ochre and vermilion, the colours of an old wall painting, were found. In this respect the Tepe Gawra temple sequence echoes the Eridu temples. One more point is similarity of the plans of these temples in Eridu and those in Tepe Gawra (Fig. 29), especially the northern temple. It is noteworthy
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that some round buildings have been uncovered in the Ubaid levels of Tepe Gawra and Yarim Tepe III, probably a continuation from the Halaf period. Also in the Rāniya Plain the remains of a small temple with buttresses and recesses, although in a bad state of preservation, were found in Qura Shīna. Ubaid potsherds have been found also in Gird-i-Dēm, Qalay Rāniya and Bōskēn. Further to the south, Ubaid pottery was found in the Shahrazūr plain in Duanze Imām, Arbat and Girda Rash. In the Kirkuk area this pottery was found in Nuzi and Matarra. In the Hamrin basin, pottery and good architectural remains were excavated at Abada, Tell Hassan, Abu Qasim, Kheit Qasim, Madhur, Songor and elsewhere.

Little is known about the economy of the Ubaid period. What is known about Northern Ubaid is that they depended on dry-farming and that goats, sheep and cattle were herded. Their settlements ranged from small to moderate in size. Unlike their southern neighbours they made tools of stone and metal. More stamp seals were used than in the south (600 were found in Tepe Gawra). That they wove textiles is indicated by the awls, needles, loom weights, spindles and whorls found in their settlements. The interesting discovery of stone “sandal models” at Tell al-'Abr, Level 3, could be lasts for making leather shoes.

Uruk

At some sites, such as Hacinebi in the upper Euphrates, just behind the Syrian-Turkish border, post-Ubaid levels showed a transition phase to the new era known as the Uruk period (c. 3500-3000 BC). In this period a considerable advance in material culture took place throughout Greater Mesopotamia. This progress precipitated another growth in the population, with more and larger complexes. The social structure developed also. The
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268 Some idea about this growth comes from the Early Uruk Period (mid fourth millennium BC) of southern Mesopotamia, where there were 17 small settlements and 3 large ones. But in the Late Uruk Period (end of the fourth millennium BC) they had increased to 112 small, 10 large and 1 central city. For these figures cf. Klengel, H. (Editor), Kulturgeschichte des alten Vorderasiens, Berlin, 1989, p. 26. For Uruk settlements and its urban patterns in general cf. reference works such as Adams, R. McC. and H. Nissen, The Uruk Countryside, The Natural Setting of the Urban Societies, Chicago, 1972; Rothman, M. (Ed.), Uruk Mesopotamia and its Neighbors, Santa Fe, 2001; Algaze, G., The Uruk World System, Chicago, 1993; for the Uruk period in the
society became more clearly hierarchical\textsuperscript{269} and the social classes appeared more distinctly. Luxury commodities were imported and manufactured for the higher classes by craftsmen of a lower class, and both of them lived from the products of a different class. The Northern Mesopotamian regions continued in the ways they had followed since the Ubaid period, thus broadening the distance between the two sides of North and South Mesopotamia, and making the cultural diversity greater. But Uruk of the south began to expand its cultural and economic hegemony to the region under study, and commenced what is usually called ‘Uruk Imperialism’ by founding colonies in the north with a typically southern Mesopotamian culture. However, the sites of Arslan Tepe (period VII) in the Malatya Plain, Hacinebi (later phase), Brak, Hamoukar and Tepe Gawra provided evidence of metallurgy and pottery mass-production, suggesting that “local highland communities had already begun to develop a fairly complex, specialized economic organization before the Uruk expansion.”\textsuperscript{270} The most important and best representative site of this period in our region is Tepe Gawra, a large mound situated c. 22.5 km east of the Tigris, to the northeast of Nineveh. The material culture of this period found in this region is so “distinctive in character that for the time being it was referred to as the ‘Gawra Period’ of Northern Iraq.”\textsuperscript{271} Copper was used on a large scale and there was an increase in the manufacture of golden ornaments, especially of golden beads, as found in the rich tombs of that site\textsuperscript{272} and those of Qālinj Agha (1 km south of Erbil fort).\textsuperscript{273}

The architectural structures found in Tepe Gawra are of special significance. The unique large circular building of level XI in the middle of the mound (Fig. 30) has a diameter of 18m and an outer wall 1m thick. It contained a granary and in another room a sanctuary, as the buttresses and the presence of a niche in the wall indicate.\textsuperscript{274} This building was perhaps the governor’s house, taking into account its large size, for it was in the middle of the mound and had a grand long hall in the middle of the building.\textsuperscript{275} Another building of this period is the temple of Level VIII, which has a tripartite plan with buttresses and recesses (Fig. 31a) recalling the Pre-Greek\textsuperscript{276} megaron. More interesting is its striking likeness to the Karaindash temple in the city of Uruk from the Kassite period (Fig. 31b).\textsuperscript{277} Yet another feature of this temple is the “deep porch” at its entrance, which Mallowan identified as a new architectural feature, probably introduced from the mountains of the northeast or Iranian Kurdistan.\textsuperscript{278} A closer examination of this element shows that it was actually the oldest occurrence of the well-known \textit{Iwán} of the Islamic architecture of the Iranian world. This has been in use from very ancient times till now. Two tripartite temples were also found in the third level of Qālinj Agha, and traces of a wall painting in red and black with geometric designs were found on
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one of the walls there. The Uruk layers of Tepe Gawra had richly furnished tombs which yielded a collection of golden ornaments and many beads made of metal, bone, ivory and various kinds of precious, semi-precious and common stones. One single tomb yielded 25,000 beads, and another tomb yielded 450 beads of lapis lazuli. Of all these finds an electrum wolf’s head (Fig. 32) was given special attention for the techniques used in its manufacture. Some pieces in its composition were made separately from another metal and were attached at a later stage to the bitumen-filled head. The tombs in Tepe Gawra were of a different type. Some of them were well built of stone and sun-dried bricks and situated on the top of the mound between other buildings, where they were probably used as shrines.

Some of the deceased were buried under the floors of the houses according to the old tradition, while others were buried outside the settlement in the ‘city of the dead,’ recalling the Indo-Iranian custom brought by them to Iran, as can be seen in Tepe Siyalk near Kashan. This remarkable diversity in funeral customs may reflect a diversity of religious beliefs, which may indicate in turn a diversity of ethnic background.

Other important finds in this site are the large collection of stamp seals. A wide variety of subjects is depicted on them, such as mythical, religious, ritual and natural scenes, and on some of them masked men appear. Some think that the abundant religious, administrative and productive activities of the site between Levels XII and VIII were more than enough for the needs of the residents and management of the town, which implies that it served as a centre or capital for the region around. The finds here proved that civilization could flourish in other areas too, outside Sumerian territory, at least in this period.

Extensive Uruk settlements in the western part of the region under study were excavated in the Tabqa Dam region on the Euphrates. These settlements proved to have been newly founded in the fourth millennium BC and yielded southern Mesopotamian material culture. This led to the conclusion that their settlers were southern Mesopotamian Uruk colonists. Habuba Kabira represents the largest and best example among these, but it is located outside our region. Inside the region we have the smaller site of Tell ‘Aabr, upstream from Habuba Kabira, where a Riemchen, a small square brick typical of Uruk buildings, was uncovered. In Jarablus Tahtani typical southern Mesopotamian pottery assemblages have also been found. It is important in this respect to note that there were other Uruk Culture settlements in the region, influenced by Uruk culture but out of the reach of its colonists. Sites such as Gawra, Hacinebi, possibly Hamoukar and Hawa and small sites in the Balikh valley proved to have had a purely local material culture. Among these Tell Brak is a good example; its Uruk deposits were laid on older layers, not on the virgin soil, but it was not free from southern influence, as can be seen from its eye-temples with thousands of eye-idols (Fig. 34). The temple has a tripartite plan, elaborate niches, buttresses and some clay-cone mosaic decoration. Three other lower eye-temples have been excavated, known as the White, the Red and the Grey eye-temples. The latter yielded more interesting finds, such as animal-
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shaped stone amulets, stamp and cylinder seals, and alabaster sculptured human heads. The southern influence on the pottery of Brak was substantial from Level 13 (middle Uruk) until Level 12 (Late Uruk).

A similar phenomenon is seen at Arslan Tepe, a site on the northwesternmost edge of the region under study. The seal impressions of the Uruk expansion phase show both local and Mesopotamian traditions, while there is no evidence of any physical presence of Mesopotamians. Rather the settlement was inhabited and ruled by its local inhabitants. The evidence of metallurgical industry and ceramic mass production indicates that the settlement had developed a highly centralized administrative system, controlling not only metallurgical and agricultural production but also the local exchange system.

These highland societies were outside the Mesopotamian colonization and show a high degree of variability in material culture. At the same time they had several common characteristics, such as regional centres with internal functional differentiation, monumental architecture, exotic raw materials obtained through long-distance exchange, advanced copper and silver metallurgy, mortuary evidence for hereditary elites and complex administrative systems based on seals. These seals have similar motifs, suggesting some kind of shared ideology across the regions among the elite where these sites are located. Such monumental architecture was found in Hacinebi, Arslan Tepe and Godin in the central Zagros. In Hacinebi, a series of storerooms (7 m long) in the west end of the site were revealed. In the southern end a stone monumental enclosure wall, preserved up to 3.3 m high with 2 m wide buttresses and recesses, was constructed along its east face. Inside the enclosure two platforms of stone and mud, one measuring 7 by 5 m and 3 m high and the other 8 by 7 m and 2.8 m high, were constructed. They were located at the northeastern end and used for special occasions, perhaps for cult ceremonies (Fig. 35).

Arslan Tepe revealed a local culture towards the mid-fourth millennium (c. 3400-3300 BC) which was distinctive and well-established. The internal hierarchy of its society is seen in the architecture and the manufacture of special products for new social needs. The buildings of level VII had columns of mud brick on the higher part of the mound, apparently a house for an elite person. A huge building in the ‘public’ area contained a central room, 18 m long with walls 1.6 m thick. A good example of wall-paintings, which were “an eastern Anatolian trait,” according to Frangipane, was recovered in the palace of Period VIA that depicts a complex narrative of mythical figures. The sealings and mass-produced bowls from the site indicate a centralized system based on corvée labour. The public area of this period (VIa) has complex buildings with unique features, such as the bipartite layout of the temples and wall-paintings (Fig. 36).

Turning to the east, to the central Zagros where Godin Tepe is located, important Uruk material has been recovered. The location of the site is strategically important because it can
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control the Great Khorasan Road from Mesopotamia to Iran and beyond and lead to the ancient copper mines on the plateau. The excavations of Level V of the site have yielded Uruk pottery and typical glyptic and accounting devices. Among these accounting devices are numerical notation tablets. These materials may indicate the presence of a group of Mesopotamians in the fort of Godin. During this period the settlement grew to include the whole area later covered by the citadel, comprising a building complex surrounded by an oval wall. The complex consists of buildings and rooms set around a central courtyard. The wall is c. 1.5 m thick, built of mud bricks, and seems to have included originally an area of c. 33 by 21 m. Standing at the entrance of the complex was a gate-room (no. 4), with a guard-room (no. 5) and storage rooms (nos. 2 and 3). In room 3, which one might call the archive, the tablets were found. A monumental building, perhaps a public building, stood on the northern side. It consists of a central room 18 m long with a carefully-built fireplace (not a cooking hearth) and two large niches flanking two small ones opposite each other on the western and eastern walls. The room has two windows looking on to the central courtyard and two doors at the back leading to two chambers. Another room (no. 6) in the southeastern part of the complex looks like the central room (no. 18) in layout and dimensions. Weiss and Young think it was a private structure as it is located in the corner and has a cooking hearth instead of a fireplace.

The pottery of Godin in this period is divided into two groups. One continued the local traditions and the other was new with parallels from Uruk Mesopotamia. However, most interesting was the discovery of 43 tablets and fragments of tablets. They bear numerical notations and one of them bears a pictographic sign. The notation system used five different numerical signs known from both Proto-Elamite and Proto-Sumerian tablets. The pictographic sign is similar to a sign known from Uruk IVa and Proto-Elamite. The presence of a blank tablet indicates that at least some tablets was made locally and the fact that none of the tablets was baked could mean that they were not intended to be transported.

Uruk pottery and other remains were also attested abundantly in the two plains of Rāniya and Shahrazūr: at Gird-i-Dēm, Kamariyān, Girde Bōr in the Rāniya Plain, and Duanze Imām, Bakrāwā, Husēn Fatāh, Chirāgh, Girdi Rash and Arbat in the Shahrazūr Plain. In the Hamrin Basin area Uruk pottery was identified in Tell Abu Hassan. Further to the south traces of Uruk culture have been found in the Diyālā region. More interestingly, here collections of clay tablets, sometimes called ‘archives,’ written in archaic cuneiform and dated to the late Uruk period, were discovered.

So the Uruk period and the invention of a writing system in Sumer marks the beginning of history in Southern Mesopotamia. The earliest known samples of this writing were found in

301 Forest, p. 145.
311 Es-Soof, “Mounds in the……………,” p. 66.
313 Al-Kassar, *op. cit.*, p. 59.
the city of Uruk (level IV, c. 3400 BC), but it took some time until it developed to a degree that enabled it to record historical events. However, historians do not enjoy such an advantage in the north at this time, for there is no such evidence there. For several more centuries they have to be dependent on archaeological material.

**Ninevite V**

The colonized sites of the Uruk period in the western parts of our region must have come to end peacefully for no signs of destruction or fire have been detected. Probably it was the same in the eastern part as well. This marks the end of the Uruk Period. The weakness of Southern Mesopotamia apparently coincided with an increasing power in the peripheral communities, who took advantage of this situation to assert their independence. The archaeological data collected from the settlements around Tell Leylān point to a regional return to dispersed, small, low-density communities in this period, after the collapse of the Late Uruk intensified settlement pattern. A transitional phase indicated by distinctive painted pottery has been noticed in the sites of Eski Mosul (Karrana 3 for instance) and possibly in Brak. This signified a new period in the north, culturally distinctive from the south, called **Ninevite V** (3100–2550 BC). This culture was approximately contemporary with southern late Uruk, Jamdat Nasr and Early Dynastic I, but it was clearly different. Unfortunately, our information about this culture is not as abundant as about its southern contemporaries, but the salvage excavation campaigns undertaken in the 1980s in the Eski Mosul and Hamrin regions have enriched our knowledge, although much still awaits publication. Archaeologically, it is characterized by its pottery, known as Ninevite V (Fig. 38), named after its first identification in the deep sounding of Mallowan in Nineveh. This pottery is painted or incised or both. Its motifs are different from those of previous cultures and consist generally of modified human figures and repeated zoomorphic figures (mostly with long necks), fishes, birds and geometrical designs such as ladders, crosshatch and hourglass patterns; there was a general *horror vacui*. The colours vary from black to red and purple. The distinguishing shapes are ‘fruit stands’ with pedestal bases, small pots with holes, perhaps to be hung as lamps or incense burners, and tall-necked jars with pedestal bases. The shapes, specifically the plain ware, indicate specialized mass production of pottery. The Ninevite V culture was distributed over a relatively wide area, around Nineveh (in Billa, Shenshi, Tepe Gawra, Erbil, Qalinj Agha, Rijim, Tell Muhamed Arab, Fisna, Thuwaij).
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and Jikan) and westwards (to the Sinjar, Chagar Bazar, Leylan, Brak and Hassek Hoyuk).\(^{327}\)

In the east it reached the Raniya Plain and both Kirkuk and Sulaimaniya.\(^{328}\) Its eastern extension to the Iranian plateau (at Ushnu, the Urmiya region, Dinkha Tepe, Gird Hasan Ali, Hissar, Siyali\(^{329}\) and Hasanlu\(^{330}\)) has motivated some to suggest an Iranian origin for this culture.\(^{331}\) This contradicts others who insist on a Northern Mesopotamian origin, or more precisely the Nineveh region.\(^{332}\) It has also been suggested that both lands as one whole cultural area share its origin.\(^{333}\)

Pottery is not the only characteristic of this culture, for during the earlier part of Ninevite V some kinds of cylinder seal were common in the region from Tepe Yahya and Susa across the Zagros, Diyala region (Gubba, Kheit Qasim and Khafaji), the upper Tigris, Sinjar as far as the Habur region. Hence these seals are called ‘Piedmont’ or ‘Glazed Steatite Cylinder Seals.’\(^{334}\) They are characterised by geometric motifs, such as rosettes, centre-dot circles and hatched bands of arches or lozenges (Fig. 39). The later part of Ninevite V witnessed the replacement of these seals by a new style which bore themes parallel to the southern Early Dynastic seals and to local traditions as well. The architecture of this period did not yield large monumental buildings such as those of Uruk period. Some simple temples in Chagar Bazar, Kashkashuk III and Brak have been uncovered which consist of single rooms with mud brick altars. Some find it possible that one of the eye-temples of Brak was built or was in use during this period.\(^{335}\) Several private houses have been excavated in Tell Kutan, 45 km to the northwest of Mosul. Although the houses are in a bad state of preservation and not completely excavated, the excavated portions show a very long central room with a hearth in its centre. A rectangular mud brick platform was constructed beside it.\(^{336}\) This plan is quite different from those of the earlier Gawra houses, and it is interesting that it contained a unique drainage system made of pottery tubes.\(^{337}\) In Hamrin also five fortified circular buildings were found and designated as ‘forts’ by the excavators. One of them is that of Tell Razuk (Fig. 40), a large building dating to c. 2700-2650 BC. In addition to being a fort it was a dwelling for a noble family.\(^{338}\) Similar buildings were found in Gubba,\(^{339}\) Madhur,\(^{340}\) Abu Qasim and Suleimeh, all with fortified walls. In 2001 a new round building was excavated in Tell an-


\(^{327}\) This site, located at the northwestern frontier of the Urfa province, also yielded good Uruk material; about this and its Ninevite V pottery cf. Behm-Blancke, M. R., “Northern Frontiers: Early Ninevite 5 Contacts with Southeastern Anatolia,” *The Origins of…*, Subartu 9, p. 481-2.
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\(^{333}\) Akkermans and Schwartz: “It is now recognized to be of local derivation,” p. 213.
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Naml, a site close to the junction of the Lower Zāb with the Tigris. This may indicate an insecure atmosphere in the region at that time. Two houses were also incompletely excavated in Leylān. The one consisted of at least 9 rooms constructed during more than one phase. Numerous seal impressions, grindstones and vessels were found in one of its rooms (no. 6). The other consisted of only 3 rooms and yielded c. 60 seal impressions. A partly vaulted mud brick structure was found in Tell Atij in the middle Habur, which had served as a grain store that measured 12 by 6 m. In Bderi, slightly to the south of Atij, the foundations of a town wall were identified.

The tombs of this period were provided with funerary items consisting in the first place of pottery vessels, sometimes in large quantities, such as the tomb at Tell Rijim (in Eski Mosul). It contained a crouching body lying on his right along a south-north axis on a reed mat (Fig. 41). Scraps of linen cloth were found close to the chest area. A total of 28 small vessels of all kinds accompanied the body. This is interpreted as indicating the attendance of 28 persons at the funeral. The burial practices in Hamrin of this period were similar to those in Gawra, where they buried the dead outside the settlements, as can be seen in Kheit Qasim (c. 2850-2800 BC, Early Dynastic I in Diyāla) and Ahmed al Hattu (tombs built of sun-dried bricks outside the settlement, dating to c. 2750 BC). Further to the east, in Pusht-i Kuh (to the west of Kabīr Kuh), tombs were excavated that date to the Early Bronze Age I, which is contemporary with Jamdat Nasr-ED I in Mesopotamia. These are cist tombs that range in length from 0.60 to several meters (Fig. 42). The long ones were communal tombs used for several consecutive burials. The four walls and the capstones of the tombs are built with stone slabs. Some of the tombs, such as those of Andjirah, have stone floors. For the construction of some other tombs boulders are used instead of stone slabs. The width of the chambers of these tombs narrows towards the top to form a vaulted ceiling (Fig. 42), a technique not used in the EBA IV. Although a little late, the end of the Early Bronze Age II (Late ED I and ED II) produced tombs of 13 m long that “may have been divided into separate rooms by inner walls and sometimes they had well constructed stepped entrances.”

As can be inferred from the finds in the Hamrin Basin area, the agriculture there depended in certain cases on irrigation. The traces of an old irrigation canal close to Kheit Qasim confirm this. Yet agriculture was not the sole activity. Trade was another economic activity, as in the Uruk Period. Evidence of this is a ritual vase found in the cemetery of Kheit Qasim bearing strong and clear Iranian influences. The copper axes and instruments found in Gubba, dating to the beginning of the 3rd millennium, show that their ores must have been imported from the Iranian copper mines. Furthermore, the seal impressions on the clay jar sealings, indicate commercial activity and commodity exchange.
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The results of recent excavations undertaken in the Habur area, especially at Leylān, indicate a rapid transformation in this period from small settlements sparsely scattered across the dry-farming region of north Mesopotamia into an urban civilization. This is best indicated by the architectural remains found in Leylān, where a flurry of building activity in levels 17, 16 and 15 has been noticed.\textsuperscript{353}

\textsuperscript{353} Calderone and Weiss, “The End of the Ninevite 5 Period at Tell Leilan,” Subartu 9, p. 194.
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Kurdistan
During the Early Dynastic III
and the Akkadian Periods
(c. 2500 - c. 2150 BC)
During the Jamdat Nasr, Early Dynastic I and Early Dynastic II Cultures, southern Mesopotamia experienced a noticeable development of its political and social organizations. In these same periods, it was the Ninevite V Culture that prevailed in the region now under study. Although some developments occurred in this period, they were not as marked as those in the south. During the early periods of prehistory any initiative in technical invention and cultural development had traditionally been taken from the mountainous lands of the north and northeast, and had then spread to the southern plains, as seen in the Neo- and Chalcolithic cultures. But this tradition ceased in and after Ninevite V. It seems that the physical aspects of the land, the environment and the natural resources of our region did not allow such economic growth or, as a consequence, any socio-political development which exceeded that of the Uruk and Ninevite V Periods. It could be said that motives for socio-political developments, further than chiefdoms, were missing. Firstly there were no large urban centres in the greater part of the region, and secondly, the low density of population compared with southern Mesopotamia was the result basically of the reliance on dry-farming agriculture and lastly, the absence of significant external perils. All this discouraged the formation of complex political systems with large administrative apparatuses and a political ruling class such as existed in southern Mesopotamia. Perhaps this status continued until the emergence of Mesopotamian dynasties that attempted to expand beyond the alluvium and to control the sources of the raw materials and the routes by which to transport them. This new situation apparently pushed the mountaineers to organize themselves in larger units as tribal federations, and/or in a later phase as united principalities and kingdoms. According to the available information, the first Mesopotamian power which clashed with the peoples of this region was the Lagaš dynasty under Eannatum, and then Umma under Lugalzaggesi.

Apart from the relatively large urban centres of the piedmont regions and the Habur area, such as Ḥarran, Mozan, Brak, Leylān, Erbil and Nuzi (see map no. 1), the region under study had smaller and more scattered centres, with locations determined by the distribution of water resources and pastures. In the mountains, the size of the centres was restricted to certain limits and the population remained correspondingly small. The limited resources of agricultural land, water resources and pastures for cattle were insufficient to support larger communities. The constant search for pastures made some large tribes choose a nomadic way of life. Until recent times similar nomadic tribes, such as the Ḥarki and Bradōšt, lived in Erbil Province, and the Jāf tribes in Sulaimaniya Province were one of the largest in the last century. In fact sometimes these nomads impeded the appearance of urban centres in certain regions. The famous Shahrazūr Plain, for instance, had remained essentially uninhabited until 1925 and

1 Although the later literary Mesopotamian compositions and royal inscriptions sometimes point to large numbers of peoples in the region, described as “numerous as the stars of heaven,” “hordes of locusts” (Curse of Agade), “grass” and the like, that could well be literary and political propaganda. However, huge armies could still have come from these regions, mobilized from numerous villages and smaller centres scattered over an extensive area of land.
was covered largely by reed and thick grass because, before then, it was the main passage of the seasonal migrations of the Jāf, between their summer and winter resorts.²

Yet it was not impossible for city-states to appear in the region of study as a whole. A city-state is a small independent self-sufficient unit ruled by a local ruler, aided occasionally by a council of the free citizens or elders. Mesopotamian sources allude to certain rulers of the mountainous area entitled énsi, en and slightly later lugal.³ We do not know for certain what they called themselves in their own languages, but these allusions indicate that their power and authority equalled that of the Southern Mesopotamian énsis. We know that large walled cities had existed in the Habur Region since 2600 BC and had produced their own indigenous culture that was distinct from that of Southern Mesopotamia.⁴ From the Ebla archives it appears that the Northern Syrian zone in the middle third millennium BC was controlled by a series of city-states, such as Nagar, Šehna and Urkeš, with triple-levelled political structures, the king, the royal officers, and the elders (probably men who represented important families).⁵ The settlements in the city-states of the upper Habur were more scattered than in the south, and their hinterlands were larger because they depended on dry-farming agriculture.⁶ In these regions the agricultural product per hectare was less than that of a south Mesopotamian irrigated hectare, so less people could live in the same area and less people were required to work there. Consequently, the cities were smaller and the countryside was more densely populated.⁷ Such a pattern of urban development and population distribution can be seen not only in northern Syria but also at sites like Tell Khoshi to the south of Sinjār, Tell Taya and Tell al-Hawa (all in Iraq), and at Titrīš Höyük and Kazan Höyük (in the plains of southeast Anatolia).⁸ The written sources imply that Ḥamazi, Assur and probably Gasur were city-states at this time.⁹ A principal distinctive point of the culture of the northern Mesopotamian city-states was its secularity in contrast to southern Mesopotamia. The Sumerian city-state economy and society centred on the temple, while the palace was the institution that played that role in the north.¹⁰ Thanks to the archives of Ebla we know much more about the northern city-states. Amidst the numerous wars there was still space for diplomacy, and the Ebla archives refer to the exchange of gifts and the visits of messengers, ambassadors and members of royal families.¹¹

Southern Mesopotamian city-states expanded their kingdoms by warring with neighbouring city-states. They apparently aimed to control agrarian land and to remove the control of water resources from rival city-states. Our region did not have this motivation for

² Sajjadi, S. ‘Ala’addin, Rishtey Mirwāri, vol. 7, Sulaimaniya, 2005 (new edition), p. 422-3. Originally published in Baghdad, 1980 (in Kurdish]). This may have been the situation ever since their mass immigration to this region. Earlier the Jāfs lived in Iran in Jwānrī region under Persian rule, but in the 18th century many left this traditional territory and migrated to what were then Ottoman territories.

³ In the Ebla texts the term ḫaddul occurs in places where en is expected, particularly when it concerns the city-states between the Euphrates and the Habur, more or less along the present Syrian-Turkish border. Rarely it occurs in contrast to en. The word appears to denote the holder of a post lower than kingship but who could act as a king. It was written with the Sumerian logogram UGULA =  = maškim and so could be translated ‘overseer,’ cf. Archi, A., “Ḫarran in the III Millennium B.C.,” UF 20 (1988), p. 2.


⁵ Akkermans and Schwartz, p. 239.

⁶ Van de Mieroop, op. cit., p. 52.

⁷ Van de Mieroop, op. cit., p. 51.

⁸ Akkermans and Schwartz, op. cit., p. 233.

⁹ See later in this chapter.

war since the communities there did not rely on irrigation for agriculture. Moreover, because of the limited resources, these city-states had hardly enough reserves to build armies capable of waging war on more than one city-state. The principal motive in the north for the formation of a state or kingdom was seemingly political and military defence against external threats. Tribal federations and alliances of states or kingdoms are mentioned frequently in the history of this region, which supports this idea. Not only in Northern Mesopotamia and the northern Transstigris but also in the early history of the Elamites, whose proper land was located in the mountainous regions of southern Luristan, indicates a similar political organization. According to Hinz, the structure of the Elamite state was federal, with governors (halmenik in Elamite, Sumerian ėnsi) ruling the numerous provinces under the leadership of a viceroy (šakkanakkum in Akkadian) who was subject to the Elamite king (sunkir in Elamite).

Since early days trade was a major factor in peaceful and warlike relations between our region and the southern powers. It established a mutual economic dependence between two parties based on exchange of raw materials and other commodities. This led to an accumulation of wealth in some parts of this region encouraging the rise of an aristocratic class with enhanced power. The abundance of natural raw materials in the land coupled with this newly accumulated personal wealth was an additional factor stimulating the neighbouring powers to raid, loot and sometimes occupy this region.

These northern powers, especially those on the Iranian side, have left us few (if any) written documents. Potts thinks this cannot be explained only by a lack of excavations but also by a bureaucratic illiteracy that prevailed in the third millennium Iran. It means that our knowledge remains full of gaps and subject to conjecture. The same is true for the mountainous city-states of the Taurus.

We have a rather vague political map of our region in the period that preceded the rise of Akkad. The general area of Subartu comprised smaller lands and provinces. At present we cannot be certain whether the toponyms are derived from the ethnonyms of the inhabitants, or whether the inhabitants took over the name of the place where they had chosen to live. Old Akkadian texts cite names such as Lullubum, Gutium and Kakmum, which must have also

12 This does not mean of course that these kingdoms had no other reasons for rivalry with each other.
13 For instance the oldest alliance between Elam, Šubur and Arawa (Uru’a) against Eannatum of Lagas in c. 2400 BC (cf. Steible, H., Die altsumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften, FAOS I, Wiesbaden, 1982, p. 150 l. 17-18; the general revolt against Narām-Sin by numerous powers in the north; the Hurrian alliance under Eḫili-Teššup in the MA period; and later the Median Tribal alliance.
15 There are numerous references in later periods, found in the Middle- and Neo-Assyrian royal correspondence and royal inscriptions, to the collection of grain, mining metals, felling trees and even collecting horses from different places in the north and northeastern regions of Mesopotamia; cf. Fuchs, A. and S. Parpola, The Correspondence of Sargon II, part III, SAA 15, Helsinki, 2001, p. 57, no. 84 (ND 2655), a letter concerning receiving tribute horses from Kār-Šarrukīn (Ḫarḫar); Lanfranchi, G. B. and S. Parpola, The Correspondence of Sargon II, part II, SAA V, Helsinki, 1990, p. 27-8, no. 34 (K 7336 + 7391 + 13008), concerning problems in cutting timber in Šubria, mentioning figures up to 1000 beams cut and laid on the river side to be transported to Assur; op. cit., p. 56, no. 64 (K 146), reporting the arrival of horses from the east, on the way to the king via Arzuḫina and Sarê; op. cit., p. 104, no. 133 (K 00676), the arrival of the king of Ḫubuška with horses, oxen, and sheep as tribute; Luckenbill, D. D., ARAB II, Chicago, 1927, § 24, p. 11, receiving horses, mules, sheep and cattle as tribute from the Medes in the time of Sargon; Grayson, A. K., Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC I (1114-859 BC), RIMA 2, Toronto, 1991, no. 1, p. 197, Ašurnasirpal received horses, mules, oxen and sheep, and also wine, bronze casseroles, silver, gold and tin as tribute from several lands in the Zagros.
existed in the earlier periods but have escaped mentioning because they have not played any role worth mentioning, or because they were not targets of the Mesopotamian rulers. The oldest known name of the region, Subir, appears in textual records of earlier historical episodes. The collective ethno-geographical name Subir referred somewhat vaguely to the regions of the north in general. Slightly later we find other names of lands and territories, mostly within Subir, such as Kakmum, Ḥamazi, Lullubum, Gutium and probably even Awan. Present available data makes it possible to approximately map the ethno-geographical divisions and political powers of our region in the third millennium.

Subartu

The general ethno-geographic appellation Subir/ Subartu is the oldest name under which the largest part of the region under study was known and it encompasses almost all lands and territories of the region. The two oldest occurrences of the name go back to the Early Dynastic Period. The first is in a hymn to Nisaba (ARET 5 7+), where it is grouped together with Sumer, Tilmun and an unidentified toponym.17 The second is in the inscription of Eannatum (c. 2454-2425 BC) of Lagaš, who fought the alliance of Šubur, Elam and Arawa (=Uru’a).18 In Sumerian, Babylonian and Assyrian sources it is attested in numerous forms and spellings, including Subar, Subir, Subur (Old Sumerian-Akkadian), Šupria (Neo-Assyrian), Ś/Subaru, Subartu.19

Location and extension

As a toponym the boundaries of Subir are difficult to determine. The Mesopotamians had vague ideas about the lands that were peripheral for them, and Subartu was one of these. Michalowski has shown that descriptions of foreign lands and territories depended on unreliable mental maps, particularly in the literary texts, royal inscriptions, hymns and city-lamentations, but not in administrative and economic texts.20 Some ancient references, such as the ‘Geography of Sargon,’ defined it as “[ultu šadē er]ēni adi An-za-an «ZA.AN» māti


18 About this, cf. below in this chapter under ‘The Region before the Akkadian Interlude.’


Subartu (SU.BIR₄) ki, “From the Cedar Mountains to Anšan: the land of Subartu.” This localization fits its northwestern limit but extends too far to the southeast. The sequence of lands in the inscription of ‘Lugalanemundu’ of Adab suggests (if we agree it is a geographical sequence) that the land Subartu was at that time to the north of Gutium and to the east of Amurru, since Subartu is listed in the text between Gutium and Marḫašī from one side and Martu and Sutium from the other. Marḫašī has been identified with Baraḫši and is thought to have been located in modern Fars and Kerman Provinces, or even in Makran.

331ff. Criteria for these judgments were the toponyms recorded in the text; some of them belong to the first millennium BC, according to their form, language, and some technical terms such as bēru. However, it is not impossible to date the text to the Old Akkadian period, subsequently copied, edited and translated into the Akkadian language of the Neo-Assyrian period. In other words, some GNs, which were no longer in use in the NA period, were replaced by the new names of the same toponyms when the text was copied for Neo-Assyrian readers. The same might have been done with the technical terms and also with the form and layout of the text to modernize and adapt it. Such modifications and adaptations were not unusual in the ancient Near East. When the story of the flood passed to the Levant through the Hurrians, the mountain name Nimuš (older Nisir) was changed to Mount Ararat, Utunapištum to Noah, etc. (to be discussed later in this chapter). On the other hand, it is possible that Sargon of Assyria ordered its compilation, perhaps based on older models, as part of his political propaganda and his desire to imitate Sargon of Akkad. In this case, one cannot treat the text as third millennium source material, but as a source from a later date, referring to some older GNs with the use of some ancient terminology. This does not mean that one must discard the text as historical material, for its geographical data still remains valuable; this text is no less credible than the NA royal inscriptions, for example, which were primarily for propaganda. But it must be used cautiously.

The Cedar Mountains are often identified with the Amanus Mountains in Lebanon as cedars exist there. This identification means that Subartu stretches from Anšan (its capital city ‘Anšan’ is modern Tell-i-Maliyan) in southwest Iran, to the Mediterranean Coast in Lebanon. Gadd was surprised that Subartu could really be so vast. Note that Akkad is listed in the text as the largest land, and then followed by Subartu and Amurru together, but the given limits make it surpass Akkad in surface, cf.: Gadd, C. J., “The Dynasty of Agade and the Gutian Invasion,” CAH 1, part 2, Cambridge, 1971, p. 431. However, cedar trees could have grown in northern Mesopotamian mountains and territories of the Transstigirius itself at that time, according to Th. Krispjin in a personal communication. Large scale felling through the ages has made them now disappear totally. The few cedar trees that still can be seen in the Duhok Province support this hypothesis. Moreover this might be confirmed by the inscription of the ‘Basitki’ statue discovered halfway between Duhok and Mosul, where Narām-Sin boasts of a victory in Subartu over LUGALU-šu-ut i-RIN-nim “the kings of the cedar (?) (tree mountains),” cf.: [Rashid, F., “A Preliminary Study of the Basitki Statue,” Sumer 32, part 1 and 2 (1976), p. 53, 1. 18, p. 57 (in Arabic). Fryane prefers another reading with a more complicated translation for line 18 of the Basitki inscription: i-ši-<u>-<n>-nim, “(the kings) whom they (the rebels[?]) had raised (against him),” cf. Fryane, D., Sargonic and Gutian Periods (2334-2113 BC), RIME 2, Toronto, 1993, p. 113 (text E2.1.4.10). Further evidence is the letter of Ur-dun to his king Šulgi of Ur III stating that he was sent by his lord, the king, to the mountains to purchase cedar resin but was plundered by Apillaša, governor/high commissioner of Subir, cf. Michalowski, P., The Royal Correspondence of Ur, (A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Yale University), Yale, 1976, p. 217-18. Furthermore, every mention of erin-trees in Sumerian texts do not necessarily refer to cedar trees, since other species were also labelled erin; cf. Hansman, J., “Gilgamesh, Humbaba and the Land of the Erin-Trees,” Iraq 38 (1976), p. 27. 22 A year-name of Narām-Sin states: iii 7) in M[U] 8) 4Na-ra-(am-4EN.ZU 9) REC 169 SUBIR ki iv 1) in A-zu-hi-nim 1) 2) i-sa-ra 3) Tā-hi-ša-ti-li 4) ik-mi-šu, “The ye[a]r Narā[m]-Sîn was victorious in the campaign against the land of Subir at Azuhum and took prisoner T/Dahī-ati-li,” Fryane, RIME 2, p. 86, q; Foster, B., “An Agricultural Archive from Sargonic Akkad,” Acta Sumerologica (ASJ) 4 (1982), p. 23 and 24. This indicates that Subartu comprised Azu; the latter is localized somewhere to the east of Arrapha, leading to the land of Lullu, cf.: Fryane, D., “The Zagros Campaigns of Šulgi and Amar-Suen,” SCCNH 10, Bethesda, 1999, p. 182; Levine, L. D., “K. 4675+ - The Zamua Itinerary,” SAA Bulletin 3, issue 2 (1989), p. 84, or generally on the Lower Zāb: Wilhelm, G., The Hurrians, Willshire, 1989, p. 8. According to Salvini, this latter localization might fit well with the identification suggested by Fincke (cf. Fincke, J., RGT 10, Wiesbaden, 1993, 66f), which was already proposed by Hannoan.
Possibly Subartu in earlier times was only a small territory in the northern Transtigris, but extended to comprise what was known later as Assyria, then in a later stage to the upper Habur westwards and central Zagros Mountains southeastwards. A similar suggestion was made by Steinkeller. Analysing inscriptional evidence, he concluded that there existed a smaller Subartu in the third millennium BC (2400 BC) in the northern Transtigris, from the northern Diyālā to the north, including Assyria, and that he calls ‘Subartu Proper.’ Another Subartu, first documented in 2200 BC, extended from the Zagros to the Amanus ranges in the west, which he calls ‘Greater Subartu.’ An OB copy of a royal inscription in Sumerian, perhaps of Narām-Sîn or Šū-Sîn, mentions “the land of Subartum on the shores of the [Upper

---

[Hanoon, N., Ancient Cities and Archaeological Sites, A Study in the Historical Geography of Northern Iraq in the Neo-Assyrian Periods, Damascus, 2009, p. 307 = a revised Arabic translation of Hanono’s Ph. D. Dissertation, published originally in 1986]; both identify Gök Tepe, to the north of modern Kirkuk, cf. Salvini, M., “The Earliest Evidence of the Hurrians before the Formation of the Reign of Mittanni,” Urkesh and the Hurrians, p. 100. Fadhil also considers the north of Kirkuk and does not believe in more than one Azuḫinum, including the variants A/Urzuḫinum: Fadhil, A., Studien zur Topographie und Prosopographie der Provinzstädte des Königsreichs Arraphe, Baghdader Forschungen, 6, Mainz, 1983, p. 67-81. But the textual material is not in favour of this. The relatively great distance between the two, as the texts describe, point to two distinct places. However, the textual material of Nuzi shows it was located on the way to the land of Lullubum, and this leads to a location in or near Chamchemāl. This identification agrees with that presented by Sagg in Sagg, W. F., “The Nimrud Letters, Part IV,” Iraq 20 (1958), p. 209 and by Lewy in Lewy, H., “A Contribution to the Historical Geography of the Nuzi Texts,” JAOS 88 (1968), p. 160. The textual data from Nuzi alludes to escorting a man from Nuzi to Nullu (= Lullu). The city governor (ṣākin māti, cf. CAD Ș I, p. 160), Akip-tašenni of Azuḫinum, was personally responsible for the life of the escorts in both Arraphe and Nullu (HSS XIII, 36) cf. Fincke, p. 67. In another document, Akip-tašenni was given orders to check the documents of merchants coming from Nullu to Arraphe: Fincke, ibid. Azuḫinum was in the time of the kingdom of Arraphe an important walled city (jalzu Azuḫinu), and a cult centre of the kingdom, the abode of deities, cf. Fincke, op. cit., p. 68. This Azuḫinu is comparable with the Middle Assyrian province of Azuḫinum/Azuḫina (Nashef, Kh., RGTC 5, Wiesbaden, 1982, p. 40), which is reported to be separated from Zamua by the Babite pass in the Baziyān range, cf. Levine, L. D., “Geographical Studies in the Neo-Assyrian Zagros I,” Iran 11 (1973), p. 19, or along the Lower Zāb according to Salvini, ibid. The Synchronistic History Chronicle (Chronicle 21) supports Salvini’s view, when it explicitly says that Azuḫuša was facing the Lower Zāb: 15’) U№/Za-han 16’) su-pa-le-e ina tar-si U№/Ar-zu-li-na, Grayson, A. K., Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles (ABC), New-York, 1975, p. 164. But this text raises more problems than offering solutions, since what is written is the city of Zabān, not the river Zāb, although Grayson thinks this is a scribal error. The most probable location for Azuḫuša according to the present writer is the large and high tell in Chemchemāl or the nearby tell of Gopale. This Azuḫuša should not be confused with another GN mentioned in the OB texts from Mari (Durand, J.-M., Archives épistolaires de Mari, 1/1, ARM 26/1, Paris, 1988, letters 431: 8’; 435: 48; 437: 4, 11, 14, 26) and Tell al-Rimāh (Groneberg, B., RGTC 3, Wiesbaden, 1980, 27f.; see also: ARM III 78 86f.) which was presumably identical with Uzuḫušum, a stage on the route between Assur and Kaniš (cf. Nashef, Kh., RGTC 4, Wiesbaden, 1991, 22f), probably to the north of Jebel Sinjūr or, according to others, identical with Tell el-Hawā, between Hamukar and the Tigris: RGTC 4, 132, or generally in the Habur Triangle: Kupper, J.-R., “Les Hourrites à Mari,” RHA 36 (1978), p. 124. The Old Babylonian itinerary published by Goetze (BM 77810 = “Ramsay 1”: PSBA 6 (1883/4), p. 18 f.) mentions this place name in a position flanked by other GNs in the Habur Region: Goetze, A., “An Old Babylonian Itinerary,” JCS 7 (1953), p. 67. Both Salvini in “The Earliest Evidence...,” p. 102, and Steinkeller in “The Historical Background...,” p. 92, note 61, think that the western Azuḫušum, not the eastern, was the target of Narām-Sīn in his Subarian campaign.

23 Cf. the maps of Steinkeller and Vallat in Potts, Mesopotamia and the East, p. 11.

26 This definition of Subartu Proper was offered over half a century ago by Gelb, cf.: Steinkeller, “The Historical Background...,” p. 77. In this respect, I would disagree with Steinkeller, who, in identifying Subartu Proper with third millennium Assyria, says “it is fair to conclude that, in this particular usage, Subartu is simply a third millennium designation of Assyria,” cf. “The Historical Background...,” p. 77. The territories from the northern Diyālā up to the mountainous regions of the northern Transtigris were not parts of historical Assyria.

27 Steinkeller, P., “The Historical Background of Urkesh...,” p. 77. Weiss prefers only the Habur Area as Subartu: Weiss, H., “The Origins of Tell Leilan,” in: The Origins of Cities..., p. 86. However, this is hardly acceptable and finds no support from textual material.
Se[a].”28 If this is historically reliable, not a literary fantasy, it can suggest that ‘Subartu’ was a general appellation of a greater widespread land that included minor territories and lands under other names. Such an example is the name of these regions in medieval historical sources, where it was called ‘The Province of the Mountains,’ that included many other minor provinces,29 or even the more general “Land of of ‘Ajams” that referred to all the northern and northeastern lands that did not speak Arabic. The OB copies of some Ur III letters speak of Subartu as territories to the northeast of Sumer, probably in the Jebel Hamrin above the Diyāla, as Michalowski argues.30 This reinforces letting Subir begin in the Zagros Mountains north of Elam in the east. The inscription of Daduša of Ešnunna too gives a hint in this regard; the king claims to have smitten the lands of Subartu, from Burunda and Eluḫti to Mount Diluba and the Mount (of) Lullum.31 Eluḫti is in all probability the same as Eluḫa/ut in the Habur area, and thus the territory from that place to the land of Lullubum fits almost what we conclude from the available data. In the Mari letters S/Subartum occurs in contexts referring generally to the northern mountains, north and northeast of the Jazirah.32 Later, in the middle and Neo-Assyrian periods, Subartu shrank gradually into smaller territories in the northern mountains, while it continued in use in Assyria by the Assyrians themselves as a toponym and ethnonym, but only in literary texts33 and astrological omina of Babylonian origin. It was also used disparagingly of the Assyrians by the Babylonians, alluding to the close connection between this name and the term for slaves in Babylonia and Assyria.34

People and Language

It is thought that the inhabitants of Assyria before the migration of the Semitic Assyrians were Subarians35 and the majority of them were pushed out to the northern and eastern mountains by the Assyrian newcomers. However, the Subarians seem to have remained the ethnic substratum of the land for a long time afterwards. This explains what Lewy describes as the Subarian cultural influence on Assyrian life, especially in art and religion.36 Even the names of the founders of the city of Assur, the kings Ušpia and Kikia, were, according to Ungnad, Subarian names.37 Moreover, later documents indicate that at the time the city Assur

---

29 For a good study of this province in the Middle Ages (Islamic Periods), maps and bibliography, cf.: LeStrange, G., The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge, 1930, Chapters XIII and XIV.
30 For these letters and the discussions concerning Subartu cf. Michalowski, cf. “Sumer Dreams of Subartu,” p. 313f.
32 See for example Chapter Seven.
33 Wilhelm, The Hurrians, p. 7.
34 Lewy, H., “Assyria, c.2600-1816 BC,” CAH I, part 2, Cambridge, 1971, p. 732-33. The land of Subartu was a main source of slaves for southern Mesopotamia, and references were often made to Subarian slaves in cuneiform sources. This made a close link between the two names. However, the word subrum, referred to by Lewy as meaning slave in the reference cited above, appears to be mistakenly confused with the word subāru, denoting an everyday commodity, or with suburum, subrum meaning ‘slave, (domestic) servant’ but with a different etymology. For the word subrum, cf. CAD, vol. S, p. 340-1.
35 Speiser called them ‘Hurrians,’ in: Speiser, E. A., Mesopotamian Origins, Philadelphia, 1930, p. 124-5, but it seems that the Hurrians were present there later than the Subarians. This opinion of Speiser might be due to the fact that the population of Subartu in the second millennium BC was principally Hurrian.
37 Gelb, op. cit., p. 5.
was called Baltil; the land was called Subir.38 Some have suggested that large archaeological sites like Tell Ta`aya (north of Assur), Tell Laylān (on the Habur) and Tell Chuera were principal Subarian urban centres, at least equivalent in importance to the city of Assur.39

The ethnic identity of the Subarians and their connection with the Hurrians in particular has been disputed by Assyriologists.40 However, Gelb proved that they were a distinct and independent ethnic group.41 The text CBS 8418 from Nippur, dated to the reign of Narām-Sîn records names of Subarian individuals who received rations; the names are foreign but not Hurrian.42 The proper name of the Subarians is thought by some to have been ‘Su.’43 Nevertheless, this assumption was subject to a discussion of whether the SU people were really Subarians or another distinct group. The OB geographical list recording the names Subi-šu, Su-ti-um, and LÚ. ‘SU(šu)’ in one sequence indicates that they were distinct and that LÚ.SU(šu) was a Puzri-Dagan (= modern Drehem) spelling of the toponym Šimāški.44

Through ancient contacts between the Subarians and peoples of the south (Sumerians and Akkadians) that are reflected in the documents, some scraps of information have been gathered. One finds what might be one of the oldest occurrences of Subarians in texts from Fara,45 most of their names combined with professions like bakers, smiths, scribes and others.46 Some crops and products were seemingly typically Subarian, like barley, figs, pomegranates, plums, as well as Subarian wool, dress, chariots47 and sheep.48 We know

38 Lewy, op. cit., p. 732.
41 Op. cit., p. 20 f. Gelb’s arguments are as follows: 1) the distinction between the Hurrian PNs and Subarian PNs handed down in Ur III documents, 2) the mention of Hurrians and Subarians as distinct peoples three times in one tablet from Ras Shamra, 3) the difference between the names of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers in Subarian and Hurrian, and 4) the attestation of Subarian elements in the Fara texts which precede the Hurrian presence, and in texts from Elam which was free of Hurrian influence in all periods. I would add the OB incantations, odd lines of which are written in the ‘Subarian’ language (YBC 1836= YOS 11 64) published by van Dijk (see below).
43 ‘SU (šu)’: op. cit., p. 25; Wilhelm, The Hurrians, p. 1. Rashid has analyzed the name SUBARTU as consisting of the ethnonym ‘SU’ + BAR (= out) + TU (to denote directions), meaning “The Su people (who live) outside/on the periphery.”
44 The OB geographical list is cited in MSL 11, p. 60 lines 22-24. It is actually tempting to consider SU a short form of Subir, comparable to GU or GUḫi for Gutium in lists of divine names and mantic texts, and LU for Lullubum. However, there are good reasons to read LÚ.SU(šu) as Šimāški, since Šimāški was written in Drehem (= Puzri-Dagan) as LÚ.SU(šu), and its Akkadian equivalent šuši-mashkim from LÚ.KUŠ(šu), cf. Steinkeller, P., “On the Identity of the Toponym LÚ.SU(šu),” JAOS 108 (1988), p. 198 f. About the forms of the name Gutium see below under ‘Gutium.’
45 The texts are published by Deimel and Jestin; for references cf. Gelb, op. cit., p. 31, note 61.
46 Gelb, op. cit., p. 31.
almost nothing about the Subarian language except for some personal names thought to be in Subarian since they were names of Subarian individuals. The names occurring in the above-mentioned list from Nippur bear three frequent and noticeable Subarian characteristics: the suffixes –ut and –e and the element zi. The final –e is seen again in many Shemshāra PNs and some GNs. If this was not a local dialectical influence from Hurrian, spoken there in that time, it might indicate an element of the Subarian language.\(^{49}\) That Subarian was known as a distinct language is attested by the text TuM NF 3 42 VIII 6-9 (4): “His… […] does not write in Sumerian; he could write in Subarian.”\(^{50}\) Of special significance in this respect are some Old Babylonian incantations written in “Subarian” in an Old Babylonian text (YBC 1836= YOS 11 64).\(^{51}\) One may assume that it were the Subarians who produced the Ninevite V Culture and were later submerged by the other peoples of the region. As a result their language was degraded until it disappeared before the age of writing. But the name of Subartu survived with a wider, more generalised sense, and their gods continued to be worshipped, as apparent from an Old Assyrian treaty mentioning swearing by the gods of Subartu.\(^{52}\)

**Awan**

Awan appeared together with Elam as early as the middle of the 3rd millennium BC in the SKL.\(^{53}\) Although it is located in the western Zagros, in “the modern provinces of Luristan, Kirmashān, Kurdistan, and Hamadan that extended to the east until Siyalik and probably farther to the north,”\(^{54}\) it formed a component land within the Elamite state. It appears to have

---

\(^{48}\) Cf. the reference to 10 Subarian sheep 10 UDU HÅ Ñu-ka-ri taken from the flocks of Kuwarī by Talpuš-šarrī in the Shemshāra letter 50 (=SH 813), l. 7 in: Eidem, E. and J. Lassoe, *The Shemshara Archives I, The Letters*, Copenhagen, 2001, p. 120.

\(^{49}\) This phenomenon is noticed only in the letters written by the natives, not those written by the scribes of Šamš-Adad or his son Išme-Dagan. This means that the phenomenon was of a local character. For the names see Chapter Six.


\(^{54}\) Vallat, F., *RGTC* 11, Wiesbaden, 1993, p. CXXII f. To Potts Awān was smaller to fit the Pusḥt-i-Kuh, cf. Potts, *The Archaeology of Elam*, p. 122. However, at the same time, he points out that the ceramic and metal weapon types known in the Pusḥt-i-Kuh are parallel to those of the Kangavar Valley, the Diyālā region, the Hamrin basin, Northern Khuzistan and Susiana, and the same is true for the cylinder seals of Bani Surmah. Thus “the demonstration of such links is consistent with the inclusion of this region in that of ancient Awān,” Potts, op. cit., p. 93. According to Scheil, it is possible that the capital city Awān was located close to Susa, as perhaps implied by a geographical allusion of the inscription of Rinūs, locating Sidgau “between Awān and Susa, by the river Qābitānum,” cf. Scheil, V., “Dynasties Élamites d’Awān et de Simaš,” *RA* 28 (1931), No. 1, p. 1; Potts, op. cit., p. 89. This was shared by Poebel, Goetzte, and Miroshedji, cf. Stolper, M. W., “Awān,” *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. III, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater, London, 1989, p. 114. But Hinz and others proposed the vicinity of Dīzfālī: Hinz, “Persia …,” *CAH* I, part 2, p. 647; Edzard D. O. and G. Farber, *RGTC* 2, Wiesbaden, 1974, p. 20; Edzard, D. O., G. Farber and E. Sollberger, *RGTC* 1, Wiesbaden, 1977, p. 21. Schacht thinks the most likely tell to be identified with the ancient city of Awān would be Tepe Charma, a 4 hectare site between the modern towns of Dīzfālī and Andimashk: Schacht, R., *Early Historic Cultures*, in *Archaeology of Western Iran*, p. 175; Dyson and Carter see it in Tepe Musiyan in the Deh Lurān Plain to the west of the Susiana Plain, but this appeared later to have been Uru’a (= Arawa) not Awān, cf. Schacht, op. cit., p. 175-6. Others state that
been the dynastic seat of the western Iranian state in the Early Dynastic and Akkadian Periods.\(^55\) A list of 12 kings of Awan was found in Susa composed in the OB Period\(^56\) but without any indication of the lengths of their reigns. Zadok analysed two of these names as Elamite: ‘Lu-uh-hi iš-ša-an,’ who ruled around 2300 BC according to Stolper,\(^57\) and ‘Hi-se-ip ra-te-ip’ or ‘Hi-še-ip ra-ši-ni.’\(^58\) Because these names do not agree with the name of the Awanite king partly preserved in the Sumerian King List (see below), the assumption is that the two lists enumerate two different series of rulers, rather than an extension of the tradition recorded in the Sumerian King List.\(^59\) In the federal kingdom of Elam the kings of Awan played a prominent role and ruled for several generations. The Old Akkadian inscriptions even make king Luḫiššan, son of Hišiprašini of Awan, the ruler of Elam.\(^60\) According to the Sumerian King List three kings ruled Awan after the deluge, but only the beginning of the third name is preserved: ‘Ku-ul-[-…].’\(^61\) He is said to have ruled 36 years. In total 356 years are attributed to the rule of the dynasty of Awan\(^62\) after it conquered Ur and brought the rule of its first dynasty (founded around 2500 BC by Mesanepada) to an end. After the 356 years of rule by those three kings, the King List records that Awan was attacked by Kiš and its kingship was brought to an end.\(^63\) The title ‘King of Awan’ borne by Kutik-Inšiškin\(^64\) and mentioned two times on the stelae of Susa are the only contemporary occurrences of Awan in the royal titulature from southwestern Iran.\(^65\) No mention of Awan as a political power has been detected from the Ur III period on, except by Ibbi-Sīn who used the name as a geographical

---


\(^{59}\) Stolper, “Awan,” p. 113.

\(^{60}\) See the inscription of Sargon of Akkad: 10) Lu-uh-hi-iš-ša-an 11) DUMU Hi-si-ib-ra-si-ni 12) LUGAL 13) NIM\(^68\), “Luḫiššan, son of Hišiprasini, king of Elam,” AfO 20 (1963), p. 47; see also Solper, “Awan,” p. 113.\(^69\)

\(^{61}\) Hinz reconstructed this name as ‘Kurriššak,’ cf.: Hinz, “Persia …,” CAHI I, part 2, p. 647.

\(^{62}\) Jacobsen, Th., The Sumerian King List (SKL), Chicago, 1939, p. 94, l. 8-16.

\(^{63}\) Jacobsen, SKL, p. 95-97.

\(^{64}\) Probably this king was not an Awanite, but rather from Susa as Potts suggests; his name associates him with Susa and his father was not listed among the kings of Awan: Potts, The Archaeology…, p. 122-3.

\(^{65}\) Stolper, “Awan,” p. 113.
term. It is quite possible it was absorbed by the dynasty of S/Šimaški that emerged as a grand power approximately in the same territory as Awan. Efforts have been made to correlate the archaeological material found in Luristan and the Kangavar Valley, particularly Godin III: 6 that is contemporary with the ED II and III in Mesopotamia, with historical Awan. An attempt has been made to link the Hôrên-Shêkhân rock-relief in Darband-i-Belûlû (Fig. 4) to the south of Sulaimaniya with an Awanite conquest in this area, but, as Stolper has stated, the reading of the toponym “Land of Awan (or Aban)” and “the historical context of the inscription are wholly uncertain, and its date is later than that of any other text mentioning Awan.”

Hamazi

Hamazi was the name of a city and a kingdom that was active from the early Dynastic period until the Isin- Larsa period as one of the powers of our region. It appeared in this period as one of the northern powers that played a role in the history of its own region and even southern Mesopotamia. A certain [P]û-zu-zu calls himself “conqueror of Hamazi” on an inscribed fragment of a stone vessel found in Nippur. As a kingdom, it was mentioned in the Sumerian King List and associated with King Ḥat/daniš, who apparently was the one who attacked Kiš. The list reports that Ḥamazi smote Kiš and took its kingship to Ḥamazi for 360 years, until it was defeated by En-šakuš-ann(k) of Uruk. It has been stated that En-šakuš-ann(k) lived one generation or about 40 years before Sargon of Akkad.

66 Stolper, op. cit., p. 114.
67 Potts, op. cit., p. 92. Henriksson suggested that the Godin III assemblage of Luristan represents the material correlate of Šimaški: ibid. Šimaški is of a later date and seems to have been located in almost the same geographical area. This poses some problems, but it is not impossible that the two have been neighbouring lands, Awan had become known earlier than Šimaški due to its early interference in Mesopotamian affairs. This is conjectural and the geographical identifications might change as well.
68 Stolper, “Awan,” p. 113. Note that the GN occuring in the inscription is read ‘Aban’ and its identification with Awan is conjectural. Diakonoff does not rule out ‘Zaban’ even at a later edition of the inscription cf. Farber, W., “Zur Datierung der Felsinschrift von Felsinschrift von Tello (Tell Chuera),” Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, 8 (1975), p. 48. Although the artistic characteristics of the relief seems to me earlier, the orthography of the inscription dates it to the OB or even to the MB Period; cf. op. cit., p. 50.
69 Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, vp 11 (Nippur 2), p. 32. This fragmentary inscription was wrongly pieced together with another fragment bearing the name of Uûhub of Kiš and the god Zababa; hence the inscription was attributed to Uûhub, the ruler of Kiš. Cooper showed that the pieces are from two different vases. This means that Uûhub was not the vanquisher of Ḥamazi, at least in this case: Cooper, J. S., “Studies in Mesopotamian Lapidary Inscriptions. III,” Iraq 46 (1984), p. 92-3, and plate Va. The vase fragment appears now to have been belonged to the spoils of Ḥamazi and was donated to one of the deities of Nippur, cf.: Steinkeller, “The Historical Background…,” p. 80, note 19. The variously spelled name Puzuzu is common in the PNs from northern Babylonia, Dîyâla and Gasur, cf. ibid. with bibliography; cf. also Frayne, RIME 1, p. 47. As for the name Uûhub, it was read before as U.tug/k, cf.: Thureau-Dangin, F., Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königsinschriften, Leipzig, 1907, p. 160: 1.
70 Jacobsen discussed the possibility of 360 or 6 years in Jacobsen, SKL, p. 98-99 and notes 168; 170; 171 and 172. However, Frayne points to the Weld-Blundell Prism exemplar that attributes him a reign of 360 (6 šu-šî) years, Frayne, RIME 1, p. 47.
Mesopotamia may have been subject to the rule of Ḥamazi for a certain time because its dynasty is listed in the Sumerian King List.\(^{73}\)

The name of Ḥat/daniš occurs in the An = \(^4\)A-nu-um list preceded by the divinity determinative.\(^{74}\) Jacobsen’s explanation was that he was introduced to the Sumerian pantheon as an ‘UTUK’ (=ghost or demon?) because he was worshipped as a sacred ghost in the Ekur of Nippur since he had seemingly put a statue of himself there.\(^{75}\) Erecting his statue in the Ekur “would seem to imply that Ḥat/daniš actually possessed Nippur” for a certain time.\(^{76}\) It is noteworthy that the PN ‘Ur-\(^\ast\)Ha-ma-zi’ found in a pre-Sargonic tablet from Lagaš (Sollberger, CT 50, no. 26, col. ii, l. 3) bears the name of this GN.\(^{77}\)

Ḥamazi appears to have been an important city, thought to have been the capital city of Subartu Proper.\(^{78}\) It was sometimes a conquered territory\(^{79}\) or a target for military operations and sometimes an independent kingdom. As for its location, different suggestions have been presented based on textual evidence. There is nothing to support the west of the Tigris, but rather we should think of the eastern side, not far from Gasur.\(^{80}\) According to Frayne it should be located at Kani Guwêz (written Jowez), \(ca.\) 10 km southeast of Halabja.\(^{81}\) Others think it was deep in the mountains of northwest Iran.\(^{82}\) This would make it more difficult for Ebla to have diplomatic relations with it, for the archives of Ebla confirm that the two kingdoms had such relations. It has been proposed that, although Ḥamazi was not mentioned any more in the sources of the second millennium BC, it continued under another name. Steinkeller suggested Ekalâtum or Qab(a)rā as the foremost candidates.\(^{83}\) This would mean a westerly location for Ḥamazi, contrary to previous suggestions, and contradicting even Steinkeller’s own identification of Ḥamazi as a neighbour of Elam and Karḫār.\(^{84}\) Although this cannot be proved at present, Ḥamazi seems to have been a city in the mountains rather than a city in the plains. This is suggested by the fact that it occurs between some GNs known to have been


\(^{75}\) Jacobsen, *op. cit.*, p. 98, note 168.

\(^{76}\) Steinkeller, P., “The Historical Background …,” p. 80, note 18.


\(^{78}\) Steinkeller, *op. cit.*, p. 79-80; 84.


\(^{81}\) Frayne, D., *RIME* 1, p. 47.


\(^{83}\) Steinkeller, *op. cit.*, p. 85. Ekalâtum might be located in modern Haikal on the east bank of the Tigris, north of Assur, and Qab(a)rā somewhere between the two Zābs, probably closer to the Lower Zāb. For these identifications cf. *ibid.* and Frayne, *SCCNH* 10, p. 165-6, also Chapter Six of this work. However, recent studies put Ekalâtum on the western bank of the river, to the north of Assur; cf. Ziegler, N., “Le royaume d’Ekalâtum et son horizon géopolitique,” *Florilegium Marianum (FM)* IV, Paris, 2002, p. 227, in this case, it would be impossible to equate Ekalâtum with Ḥamazi.

\(^{84}\) Steinkeller, *op. cit.*, p. 79, note 16c and p. 83.
mountainous in some geographical lists. These may be a corresponding clue to its location. Some examples are “between ….. and Gutium,” “between Tu-lu-um\(^k\) and Kar-gú-du\(^-s\)\(^d\)\(^k\),” and “between Marحاš and Elam.”\(^85\) Its northerly location is confirmed by some Ur III letters that point to Ḫamaz as the farthest northerly quarter under the control of the kingdom, as Magan was its farthest southerly one.\(^86\) The observation of Steinkeller that Ḫamaz could be reached by waterways as the text PDT 1 454 states is very important.\(^87\) The text concerns the delivery of provisions of the journey of Tabūr-ḫu-um, the daughter-in-law of Ur-Iškur, governor of Ḫamaz, on her journey to that city. But the text does not make it clear how far the river was navigable or whether part of the journey was on land. It is tempting in this regard to compare the modern village of ‘Ḥamze’ on the northwestern side of Mount Azmar, a few kilometres to the north of Sulaimania, with old Ḫamaz.\(^88\) The name of this modern village has no clear etymology in the modern languages of the region and makes one to think about old Ḫamaz. One of the variants of Ḫamaz in the textual material is Ḫa-ām-ź\(^k\)\(^i\) and “He’-mi-ź\(^k\)\(^i\),”\(^89\) which is still closer to the modern name, especially the first form. However, one difficulty in this identification is that the modern village is located on a steep mountainside, a rather difficult location to have been the right location of a large urban centre in antiquity. Perhaps ancient Ḫamaz was somewhere close to this village of which the name evokes the memory of the old town. The location suggested by Jacobsen for Ḫamaz near Sulaimanîya would support this proposal.\(^90\)

Apart from a few individuals linked to Ḫamaz, we do not know much about its people and their language. The personal names of these individuals are not necessarily those of Ḫamazite citizens but rather of governors installed by the kings of Ur. Some names were Sumerian, such as Ur-Iškur (\textit{JCS} 14, 102: 9; \textit{PDT} 449, 4; 454, 4; St. Langdon Drehem 53, 5),\(^91\) Arad-Nanna (\textit{SAK} 150, 22a II 5);\(^92\) Lu-Nanna son of Namḥani, \textit{ensis} of Ḫamaz in Ur III.\(^93\) Akkadian names occurred as well, such as Šu-Iš tar from the O\textit{Akk.} texts of Gasur (\textit{HSS} 10, 143, 15; 154 II 9-10; 155 II 7-8)\(^94\) and the local name ‘Ititi.’\(^95\) This is not surprising since there was great Sumerian and particularly Akkadian influence in this region and even in Iran since very early times. But other persons associated with Ḫamaz bear names typical of what Gelb calls ‘banana language,’ with two final reduplicated syllables, or only with two reduplicated syllables,\(^96\) such as the king of Ḫamaz named Zizi, or the man named Ititi.\(^97\)

\(^{85}\) Edzard, \textit{RlA}, p. 70.


\(^{87}\) Steinkeller, “The Historical…,” p. 79, note 16b. The text runs as follows: 10 udu ú 10 máš-gal ú Tā-bur-ḥatum é-gi 4-a Ur-ibaš-um, the daughter-in-law of Ur-Iškur, when she went to Ḫamaz, he placed (lit. made them stand) on a ship to her;” transliteration from Steinkeller, \textit{ibid.} Note that he reads DA instead of TĀ in the name Tabūr Ḫattum. Thanks go to Th. Krispijn for checking the translation.

\(^{88}\) The first one who pointed out this similarity between the two names was Rashid in an article published in a local cultural magazine in Iraq in the middle of the eighties, to which I have no access at the moment.

\(^{89}\) Edzard and Farber, \textit{RGTC} 2, p. 72.

\(^{90}\) Jacobsen, \textit{The Sumerian King List}, p. 98 note 166; cf. also Potts, \textit{Mesopotamia and the East}: “Perhaps located in the mountains east of Kirkuk,” p. 92.


\(^{92}\) See Edzard, \textit{ibid.}

\(^{93}\) See Edzard, \textit{ibid.}

\(^{94}\) Edzard, \textit{RlA}, p. 70; 71. In the case of governors’ names, like Arad-Nanna and Lu-Nanna, they might have been foreigners installed by the kings of Ur III, for example, and not necessarily aborigines.

\(^{95}\) Edzard, \textit{ibid.}

\(^{96}\) About this language see below.

\(^{97}\) Edzard, Farber and Sollberger, \textit{RGTC} 1, p. 69.
‘Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta’ epic makes an allusion to the language spoken in Ḫamazi, but in a somewhat confusing context that has led to different interpretations. The text states: "u₄₅-ba kur Šubur[ki Ḫa]-ma-zi₄₅ eme-ḥa-mun ki-en-gi...." this was interpreted as “Šubur, Ḫamazi, (peoples of) contrasting tongues, …,” but according to Jacobsen, Kramer, Vanstiphout and Mittermayer eme-ḥa-mun is attached to ki-en-gi, not Šubur and Ḫamazi. Then the translation would be “Bilingual Sumer.” However, if the text is to be translated, “At that time Subartu and Ḫamazi (spoke) a different language from Sumer,” it could mean that the Subarian language, of which very little is known, was spoken in Ḫamazi. Otherwise, according to the translation of Jacobsen, bilingual Sumer side by side with Šubur and Ḫamazi, distinguishes between the languages spoken in the two latter lands. Of course, further questions arise about the language of Ḫamazi, about whether it was a language/dialect affiliated to those of the Lulubians or the Gutians, or, less probably, quite distinct. These questions can not be answered for the moment and the answers remain speculations.

Of special significance is the allusion made to a Ḫamazian magician in the Enmerkar and Ensuḫkešdana text. In this text the magician had moved to Aratta after the destruction of Ḫamazi, and was employed by his new lord, the ruler of Aratta against Enmerkar. We cannot determine which episode of destruction is meant here. The text reads:

The magician whose skill was that of a Ḫamazite, ‘Urgirnuna,’ whose skill was that of a Ḫamazite; after Ḫamazi had been destroyed, he moved over to Aratta.

An important diplomatic letter from Irkab-Damu (around 2320 BC), king of Ebla, to Zizi, king of Ḫamazi, has been given special attention by many scholars. It was considered by some as the only example of international royal correspondence before the Old Babylonian Period. The letter, preserved as a copy, seems to have been made for the royal archive and was sent to Zizi through his ambassador in Ebla asking him for soldiers and speaking of brotherhood and gifts exchanged:

Thus, Ibubu, the superintendent of the palace of the king, to the messenger, <listen>: You (are my) brother and I (am your) brother; (to

---

103 Mittermayer translates it as “to each other translatable,” ibid.
104 Published by A. Berlin. For the reference cf. Steinkeller, p. 82, note 29.
105 Steinkeller, op. cit., p. 83.
107 Steinkeller, op. cit., p. 81.
you) man-brother, whatever desire issuing from your mouth I will grant and you the desire issuing (from my mouth) grant: send me good soldiers, I pray: You (are in fact my) brother. 10 pieces of wooden furniture, 2 knickknacks, I, Ibubu, have given to the messenger. Irkab-Damu, king of Ebla (is) brother of Zizi, king of Ḥamazi; Zizi, king of Ḥamazi, (is) brother of Irkab-Damu, king of Ebla. And thus Tira-il, the scribe has written (and) to the messenger of Zizi has given (the letter).110

The historical significance of this letter has several points. It reveals the position that a mountainous kingdom like Ḥamazi could enjoy at that time, as indicated by Irkab-Damu addressing its king as his ‘brother.’ It probably had a military and political pact with a remote kingdom such as Ebla, perhaps to confront the aggressive policy of Kiš or Mari. Moreover, the discovery of similar or almost identical lists of professions in Gasur and Ebla implies cultural contacts between the two.111 The commercial relations that Ebla had with Erbil, Kakmum and Gasur112 make it very likely that they also had such contacts with nearby Ḥamazi. The tight political, economic and cultural relations between the Transstigris and (northern) Syria documented in the later periods, particularly in the Mari period, present a good model of how relations could have been made in the Ebla period.113 These facts also confirm that this was the Ḥamazi indicated in the letter, not another one as supposed by some scholars.114

Gasur

Gasur was the city under the ruins of Nuzi, a chronological but not a cultural predecessor of Nuzi, since the cultural and ethnic contrast between the two is obvious.115 The older layers beneath the Nuzi occupation level have yielded structures datable to the third millennium BC.116 A significant collection of clay tablets (about 500)117 is scattered

---

113 For the relations between the two regions, cf. Chapters Four and Six. I would call attention to the examples of Tukriš with Mari, or the Turukkians with the Habur area.
114 Astour agreed to identify Ḥamazi with the one mentioned in the Ebla letter: Astour, M., “Semites and Hurrians …, SCCHN. 2, p. 8; but he changed his opinion in a later article without presenting any proof or convincing arguments stating that this Ḥamazi was another one in central northern Syria, not the one in the east Tigris region: cf. above, note 82. Frayne too, referring to Astour, sees it extremely unlikely to identify Ḥamazi with the Transstigridan one, rather with Qal at Homr: Frayne, RIME 1, p. 47-8.
115 Meek, Old Akkadian, Sumerian and Cappadocian Texts from Nuzi, op. cit., p. ix.
117 The tablets were found in the shaft dug in the palace area, room L 4 of the Nuzi occupation. They come from P. II A (one tablet + four in the next season); P. IV (two tablets); room S 151 (three tablets) and the rest, i.e. tablets 1-222 were found between P. III and P. IV and P. V and one tablet from P. VII, cf. Meek, op. cit., p. viii.
through 1.27m of occupational layers here and forms one single collection. Its date according to Foster is the time of Narām-Sîn or later. The collection contains personal names of great importance, since they reflect the ethnic background, demographic structure and contacts of the city with the surrounding areas. Most of the PNs are Semitic; a very small number are Sumerian and another number neither Semitic or Sumerian. Foster states that 4% are Sumerian, 72% Akkadian, 16% reduplicated, and 8% unassigned from 1242 in total. The dominance of Semitic led Meek to suggest that the basic population of the city was Semitic even with a slight west-Semitic influence. He suggested that the Akkadians dominated the Sumerian population of the city in the Akkadian Period. But it seems unlikely that the Sumerians were ever a dominant ethnic group in Gasur, for this region was not part of the Sumerian homeland. It is more likely that the region had an aboriginal population under Sumerian then later Akkadian cultural and linguistic influence, noticeable mostly in PNs. Such an influence is apparent not only here but in the whole of Mesopotamia and large parts of modern Syria. The large number of Semitic names in Gasur can be explained by the presence of Akkadians in the city, such as the Akkadian garrison stationed there in the Akkadian Period. Another possibility is that these foreign individuals were businessmen involved in the economic and agricultural activities of the palace, the city and its surroundings. As a result, their names were attested more often than those of local individuals, even though as foreigners they were a minority.

Turning to the reduplicated personal names, Meek noted that almost one-fifth of all PNs are of this kind, similar to those in documents in Sumer and known as Subarian and those from Ḫamazi. Some examples from Gasur are ‘Ababa,’ ‘Abubu,’ ‘Aḥaṣa,’ ‘Aḫuḫu,’ ‘Belili,’ and ‘Ititi.’ The oldest governor of Assur was also called ‘Ititi’ son of ‘Iakulaba.’ This Ititi of Assur left an inscription in which he states that he had dedicated something from the booty of Gasur to the goddess Ištar. Reduplicated names in Gasur are not restricted to PNs but include divine names such as Dada, Dudu, Mama, Mumu, Kuku, Nana, Zuzu, Bubu and Baba, which become theophoric elements in many reduplicated PNs. Meek also noted that this kind of name prevailed in the mountainous regions of the north and northeast (i.e. the Transtigris) and even in Elamite and Cappadocian documents, but disappeared after the Ur III Period. A votive sword found in the vicinity of Diyarbakir bears an inscription with the name of the dedicator, a certain Luluanum, son of Azizum, which are reduplicated names

118 Meek, op. cit., p. viii. For the description of the tablets, their dimensions, shapes, script and language cf. pp. viii-ix.
120 Foster, op. cit., p. 299.
121 Meek, op. cit., p. xiv.
123 Since the city appears to have been under the direct rule of the Akkadian kings as proposed by Westenholz: Westenholz, OBO, p. 64 (with bibliography and references), one expects then the presence of an Akkadian garrison.
124 For examples cf. Gelb, HS, p. 20; 40.
126 Grayson, RIMA 1, p. 7 (A.0.1001, No. 1). It is noteworthy that the only two attestations of Gasur outside the texts of Gasur itself are this royal inscription of Ititi and another text published in RA by Meek: Meek, T. J., “Note on the Early Texts from Nuzi,” RA 34 (1937), p. 65.
127 But see Foster: Foster, Or 20, p. 302, who noted that Baba as PN occurs in Sumer much more than in the north.
128 Meek, op. cit., p. xiii.
129 Ibid.
having parallels in Nuzi and Cappadocia.\textsuperscript{130} Landsberger also noted that these reduplicated names were widespread in Mesopotamia in the OAkk. period, but disappeared in the south during the Ur III period, while persisting for a longer time in Elam and Assyria.\textsuperscript{131} But Landsberger considers them as hypocoristic forms of normal names (such as Ahaha for Aham-ariš).\textsuperscript{132} Others, such as Edzard, Gelb, and Meek himself, think these names are Semitic.\textsuperscript{133} Foster notes that reduplicated names “tend to occur in families with other reduplicated names or in families whose language of name-giving is that predominating in the region,”\textsuperscript{134} implying that they belong to a language family independent of Semitic or Sumerian. Lewy considers the bearers of reduplicated names to be the substratum,\textsuperscript{135} which seems to fit the case best. I would add that the substratum was in all probability Subarian, but the question is whether the reduplicated PNs in the Cappadocian documents mean that Subartu ever extended to Central Anatolia.\textsuperscript{136} However it remains possible to suppose that this whole area at that time followed one cultural harmonious, if not ethno-linguistic, pattern.

**Gutium**

Gutium was mentioned together with Subartu by ‘Lugalanemundu,’ king of Adab as one of his subject lands: “The sukkal-maḫ of the Cedar Mountains, Elam, Marḫašši, Gutium, Subir, the Martu and Sutium.”\textsuperscript{137} Although the text is an OB copy this is the oldest occurrence of Gutium in written sources that date to the Early Dynastic Period.\textsuperscript{138} The Gutians were also mentioned in texts from Adab and Umma, cities that were seemingly closer to the Gutian land


\textsuperscript{132} Ibid. While this can be true for the Akkadian names occurring in the south Mesopotamian inscriptions, the non-Akkadian names need more consideration, especially those stemming from outside Semitic-populated regions. These were in other languages and accordingly other grammatical rules should be applied for the building of such forms. However, Landsberger did not make such a distinction between the two types of this rubric. The point here is that to him these names are forms derived from other original nouns, not names by themselves. The distinction Landsberger makes is between the PNs from Kaniš. There he distinguishes the ‘Assyrian names’ from the foreigners’ ‘short names,’ Landsberger, ibid.

\textsuperscript{133} Edzard, ZZB, p. 7 and 13; Gelb, Fieldiana 44/2 (1955), p. 325; Meek, RA 34 (1937), p. 55 (all referred to by Foster, ibid.).

\textsuperscript{134} Foster, ibid.


\textsuperscript{136} It is noteworthy that such names are found in south Mesopotamia too in small numbers, like the DNs Baba of Lagaš, Zababa (Frayne, RIME 1, p. 63 (E1. 7.42, l. 1), Zazari (RIME 1, p. 267 (E1.9.9.2, ii l. 11); and PNs like Dada, ensi of Nippur and another one ensi of Šurupak (Barton, G. A., RISA, London, 1929, pp. 10; 368), Elulu, a king of Akkad (SKL, p. 114) and another king of Ur (SKL, p. 94; RIME 1, p. 407 (E1.13.9)), Igiggi king of Akkad (SKL, p. 112), Dudu, father of Šud/turul of Akkad (SKL, p. 114), Bilala (RIME 1, p. 92 (E1.9.1.6b, iv l. 2)); Balulu, king of Ur (SKL, p. 94; RIME 1, p. 407 (E1.13.9)); Elili, father of En-šakūš-ana (RIME 1, p. 432 (E1.14.17.3, 1. 5)); Zuuzu, king of Akkāš (RIME 1, p. 148 (E1.9.3.5, v l. 4)); Puzuzu, father of Ubhub the prince of Kiš (not Akkadian! See about this name above. Note that Frayne reads [P]ũ-su-šis as ‘Pussussu:’ RIME 1, p. 442 (E1.15.1.1, l. 1) referring to Rômer, Or 57 (1988), p. 224-5, who thinks the name comes from the verb pasāsu ‘to break, cancel, annul, smash, obliterate.’ Cf. CAD, vol. P, p. 218 ff), and others. But more interesting is the name of the Cedar Forest guardian in the Epic of Gilgameš whose name is Ḫumbaba or Ḫuwwawa, a typical reduplicated (Subarian ?) name, keeping in mind that the cedar forests were thought to have existed, at least at this time, in the northeastern mountains of the Transtigris (see above). A suggestion presented by Hansman that the foray of Gilgameš against Ḫumbaba took the direction of the east, against Elam, to the land of Utu, the sun-god to bring timber; Hansman, “Gilgamešh, Ḫumbaba ...”, IRAq 38 (1976), p. 27 and 30.


or at least to the area dominated by the Gutians during their rule in southern Mesopotamia. They settled in such considerable numbers there that the local administrator installed a professional interpreter of Gutian for them.\(^{139}\)

The name ‘Guti’ is attested in different forms and with different logograms in the ancient written sources,\(^{140}\) especially for the first syllable, which can be read as Gu-, Ku- or Qu-. In some inscriptions, \(-b\) is inserted to make the name Gu-te-bu-um. Such a \(-b\) is found as well in the ethnic name of the Lulleans/ Lullubians ‘Lullubi.’ It might be linked to the Elamite plural suffix \(-p\)^{141}\ and show a link between these languages. The form ‘Quti’ (without inserted b/p) occurs in the Shemshāra tablets,\(^{142}\) the Mari letters\(^{143}\) and Middle and Neo-Assyrian inscriptions. This leads to the assumption that the Hurrian scribes of Shemshāra and Nuzi were familiar with the Lullean and Gutian languages and knew that the \(-b/p\) was a suffix, not part of the name, and so did not write it. By contrast, Sumerian and Babylonian scribes simply wrote the whole word as they heard it. The name Gutium was written in some MB texts with the logograms GU.DU₈.Aₓi, which was used also for the name of the city of Kutha.\(^{144}\) This may count for more than scribal variation and imply a historical link between the Gutian presence in Babylonia and this city.

**Location**

The location of Gutium is hard to determine. On the one hand, its frontiers were not clear to Mesopotamian scribes, as for other mountainous lands, perhaps because of presumed seasonal migrations. On the other hand, such domains expanded and shrunk according to the power of their rulers. Turning again cautiously to the ‘Geography of Sargon,’ Gutium extended from ‘Abul-Adad’ to ‘Ḫallaba.’\(^{145}\) While Ḫallaba cannot be located, some attempts to locate Abul-Adad have been made. It is thought it was the same as ‘Abullāt’ used for Mount Kimaš, but it is not to be confused with the Elamite Kimaš mentioned in later texts.\(^{146}\) Gudea of Lagaš mined copper there, and perhaps the city was also known by the mountain name Kimaš, and was located probably between Āwa Spi River (south of Kirkuk) and modern Dāqūq, in the large mound of ‘Quš Tepe.’\(^{147}\) The same text of Sargon refers to Abul-Adad also as the boundary of the land of Akkad, so it means that Gutium and Akkad were neighbours, although this boundary line of Akkad proper near Dāqūq seems too far north and probably refers to the empirical territories. The southern border of Gutium was identified by an inscription of Samsuiluna at Elam and its northern border at ‘Ida-maraz/š.’\(^{148}\) This

---

\(^{139}\) Westenholz, *OBO* p. 94, referring to OIP XIV 83 (published by Zhi Yang, see Chapter Three).


\(^{141}\) Such a suggestion was presented already by Lewy in the above-mentioned article in ZA 35 (1924).


\(^{145}\) Westenholz, *OBO* p. 94, referring to OIP XIV 83.


\(^{141}\) Such a suggestion was presented already by Lewy in the above-mentioned article in ZA 35 (1924).


\(^{145}\) Such a suggestion was presented already by Lewy in the above-mentioned article in ZA 35 (1924).


\(^{147}\) Such a suggestion was presented already by Lewy in the above-mentioned article in ZA 35 (1924).


\(^{150}\) Such a suggestion was presented already by Lewy in the above-mentioned article in ZA 35 (1924).
identification from the south fits with that of Lug alanemundu, king of Adab, in an inscription listing Gutium between Subartu from the north and Marhaši and Elam from the south, of course assuming that the order is geographical. That Gutium and Elam shared borders is supported by the fact that the Elamite king Šuršúthi aided the Turukkeans against the Gutian E/Indusša, according to the Shemshara archives (SH 827). Elam had seemingly tried to contain a strong impulsive king at its gates, called E/Indusša. A text relating some deeds of Ur-Nanna speaks of a joint military action of Gutium and Zimudar. The latter was in the Diyala region and very probably was a neighbour of Gutium. It is also interesting that the Gutian homeland was linked to mountains called Gubin in the literary text ‘Curse of Agade.’ In the text is said that:

He (=Enlil) looked toward the Gubin mountains. He scoured all of the broad mountain ranges- not classed among people, not reckoned as part of the land, Gutium, a people who know no inhibitions, with human instincts, but canine intelligence, and monkeys’ features- Enlil brought them out of the mountains.

Mount Gubin seems to have been a real place, not a ficticious GN created by the composer(s) of the Curse of Agade, because it is listed between Elam and Meluhha in the inscription of Rūmuš (Rūmuš C 10: [G]upin) that enumerates the countries he conquered in his Elamite campaign. The only problem is that a location between Elam and Meluhha seems too far from the Gutian lands.

The territory of Gutium probably extended at certain times from the south of the Lower Zab- or further to the north- to the Elamite territories near the Sirwan (Diyala) River. According to Hallo it was located approximately between the 35th and 36th parallel on both sides of the Lower Zab, according to the Old Babylonian sources. According to others, Gutium was situated between Elam and Meluhha from the north. Additional support for this geographical setting is the text “Nar-am-Sin and the Enemy Hordes” (Standard Babylonian version) that runs as follows: 55) u qereb Subartu kalisimu it[aggisīa(?)] 56) ispuhuma tiamati ana Gutium issan[gī] 57) ispuhuma Gutium ana māt Elamti issan[qīr], “55) And in the midst of Subartu, they all roamed. 56) They scattered the (army of the upper) seas, and reached Gutium. 57) They scattered (the army of) Gutium and reached Elam:” Westenholz, J. G., Legends of the Kings of Akkade, Winona Lake, 1997, p. 314/315.

For the text cf. Edzard, ZEZB, p. 32. Cameron identifies it in the north of the Lullubian homeland, in Shahrazur: Cameron, G. G., History of Early Iran, Chicago, 1969, p. 41; but this does not look likely, at least in this period.

Additional support for this geographical setting is the text “Nar-am-Sin and the Enemy Hordes” (Standard Babylonian version) that runs as follows: 55) u qereb Subartu kalisimu it[aggisīa(?)] 56) ispuhuma tiamati ana Gutium issan[gī] 57) ispuhuma Gutium ana māt Elamti issan[qīr], “55) And in the midst of Subartu, they all roamed. 56) They scattered the (army of the upper) seas, and reached Gutium. 57) They scattered (the army of) Gutium and reached Elam:” Westenholz, J. G., Legends of the Kings of Akkade, Winona Lake, 1997, p. 314/315.

51 Eidem J. and J. Læsøe, The Shemshara Archives J, no. 64.
55 Frayne, ibid. It can be noticed that the text gives the impression that ‘Ida-mara’s’ was the lands between the border of Gutium (from the north) and the border of Elam (from the south). Thus, it has applied the name (which was originally an Amorite ethno-geographical name) as a description (meaning “terrible/difficult flank”) to the mountainous regions located between the two lands, not as the traditionally known name of the Tür-‘Abdin mountains.151

The territory of Gutium probably extended at certain times from the south of the Lower Zab- or further to the north- to the Elamite territories near the Sirwan (Diyala) River. According to Hallo it was located approximately between the 35th and 36th parallel on both sides of the Lower Zab, according to the Old Babylonian sources.

149 For the text cf. Edzard, ZEZB, p. 32. Cameron identifies it in the north of the Lullubian homeland, in Shahrazur: Cameron, G. G., History of Early Iran, Chicago, 1969, p. 41; but this does not look likely, at least in this period.
150 Additional support for this geographical setting is the text “Nar-am-Sin and the Enemy Hordes” (Standard Babylonian version) that runs as follows: 55) u qereb Subartu kalisimu it[aggisīa(?)] 56) ispuhuma tiamati ana Gutium issan[gī] 57) ispuhuma Gutium ana māt Elamti issan[qīr], “55) And in the midst of Subartu, they all roamed. 56) They scattered the (army of the upper) seas, and reached Gutium. 57) They scattered (the army of) Gutium and reached Elam:” Westenholz, J. G., Legends of the Kings of Akkade, Winona Lake, 1997, p. 314/315.
Gutium extended to the region of Luristan, south of Kirmashān, to the left of the route leading from Dēr to Susa.156 Within this territory the lands mentioned in the Ur III texts, such as Ḥāršī, Ḥu(m)urti and Karhar, were located, and thus they were perhaps within Gutium as Steinkeller suggests.157 However, this should not lead to the conclusion that these lands were purely Gutian, since they were not the only ethnic group in that given region especially with the infiltration of the Hurrians in the Ur III period. Furthermore, the Gutians themselves seem to have been semi-sedentary tribes. It also appears that Gutium comprised large parts of the northern mountains during the MA period, where Šalmaneser I met them in the mountains of the northeast and described their land as the territory from Urua#ri (=Urartu) to Katmu#u.158 The kingdom of Uqumenu, against which Tukulti-Ninurta I campaigned, was also a Gutian kingdom in a mountainous region.159 These are indications that the Gutian territories had expanded towards the northern mountainous lands during the OB period. Their war on the Turukkeans as reflected in the Shemsāra and Mari letters shows that they were actively present in the regions bordering, or at least relatively close to, the Turukkean lands in the Urmia Basin (see Chapter Six). As suggested above, the Gutians were most probably nomads or semi-nomads and were on a seasonal move between their summer and winter pastures, which is why they were found in the mountains of the north and the plains to the south of Kirkuk and Sirwān (see also Chapter Eight).

In later times, Gutian territory seems to have been diminished or the Gutians spread into larger areas and mingled with other peoples of the region. This would explain why it was referred to in the sources of the first millennium BC as a minor territory of the Transtigris with obscure frontiers.

People

The Gutians,160 like other peoples of the Zagros, were present as individuals and groups in Mesopotamian urban centres, not only in the south, but also in the Habur and Middle Euphrates areas. Personal names ending with -an and –kan in Chagar Bazar texts could belong to Gutians, but this suggestion is rejected by Thureau-Dangin, Landsberger161 and J. Eidem.162 These PNs include Ḥa-ku-u(ka)-an/ni, Ḥu-ḥa-an, Ḥa-na-an, Ḥa-te-na-an, Ḥa-anza-an, Ḥa-te(AB)-ka-an, Ḥa-šu-ub-la-an, Ta-uk-ki-iz-zu-an, Ḥu-ḥa-an, (A)-ak-ka-an and Te-ri-ka-an,163 the same name as the last Gutian king.164 The name Ḥu-lu-uk-ka-di/ti-il in the

156 Van Dijk, J., “Le site de Guti’um et d’Ak-[a’-a]kā†” AJO 23 (1970), p. 72. A finely manufactured bronze head was found in the region of Hamadan (according to Diakonoff) which, it is suggested, represents one of the Gutian kings: Déjak.165
158 98) iš-tu mi-sir KUR U-ru-at-ri 99) a-di KUR Kut-mu-ši ši-id-di na-as-ku-ti 100) pe-er-ka be-re-e né-su-ti 101) na-pu-ul-ti ERIN.MEŠ-ti-su-nu 102) ra-ap-sá-ti ki-ma A.MEŠ lu at-bu-uk 103) šal-mai ku-ra-di-šu-nu 104) ra-pa-sá lu i-me-él-li, “I poured out the lives of their (= Qutu) extensive troops like water, from the border of the land Urua#ri to the land Kutmu#u, a remote region (and) a crossing of great distance. I filled the extensive countryside with the corpses of their warriors,” Grayson, RIMA 1, p. 184 (text A.0.77.1).
159 Cf. his inscription no. 1 (A.0.78.1) in RIMA 1, p. 234-5.
160 Gutian relics and the Gutian political organization are discussed in Chapter Three.
162 Personal communication.
letters of Shemshāra\textsuperscript{165} contains the element 
\textit{Hul-ukka}- which is similar to the first element of the name \textit{Ha-lu-uk-ka-an} cited above. But the name Ḥulukkan did was Hurrian, since it is attested in Nuzi as \textit{Hu-lu-uq-qa} and \textit{Hu-lu-uq-ga}\textsuperscript{166} but without the Hurrian element \textit{at/dal} meaning “powerful, mighty.” So the name Ḥulukkan can be tentatively considered a compound name, composed of a Hurrian element with the Gutian suffix \textit{-an}. In Mari and the Middle Euphrates Gutians have left traces and there are reports that they have been there since the Akkadian period together with the Amorites.\textsuperscript{167} The Gutians formed part of the Elamite garrison in Šubat-Enlil in the time of the Elamite invasion (ZL 8').\textsuperscript{168} There are OB references to Gutian mercenaries and guards in the service of some of the kings of eastern Syria, compared by some to the Swiss Guards.\textsuperscript{169} Among these is a reference to Gutian guards of Yasmāh-Addu of Mari, and there are similar cases in Razamā (ARMT 25, 624, rev. 11), Rimā (allocations of wine and beer to Gutian generals: \textit{OBTR}, 253, 260, 267, 268 and 271)\textsuperscript{170} and Leylān.\textsuperscript{171} Zimri-Lim asked Yamṣum, his representative in Ilan-ṣura (a city to the southeast of Šubat-Enlil in ZL 10’ and 11’), to send him as many Gutians as he could, most probably for such a purpose. Yamṣum sent him in reply 9 Gutians with a note that they can get fierce.\textsuperscript{172} In a fragmentary letter from Mari we find Gutians staying in Terqa who would leave for Mari.\textsuperscript{173} In another it is reported that 17 Gutians went out of the city of Eluhtum (=Eluḥat) and entered Susā (in the Habur) and stayed with its ruler Šup/bram, but afterwards they became angry and departed to Zimri-Lim.\textsuperscript{174} If the above-mentioned PNs from Chagar Bazar were really Gutian, they must have belonged to such a group of guards or mercenaries.

\textit{lišān mithurti, Festschrift Wolfram Freiherr von Soden zum 19. VI 1968}, herausgegeben von W. Röllig, Neukirchen-Vluy, 1969, pp. 244-250. Some of the names are disputed, for instance Tukkizzan can be Hurrian. It is notable that not one of these names or any similar name occurs in the Chagar Bazar tablets found in the recent excavations of 2000-2002, which mainly date to the Mari period: Tunca, Ō. and A. Baghdo (eds.), \textit{Chagar Bazar (Syrie) III, Les trouvailles épigraphiques et sigillographiques du chantier I (2000-2002)}, Louvain, 2008.\textsuperscript{164} Tirikan was also a city name that, according to a \textit{kudurrū} inscription, was located on river Tabān, cf. Nashef, Kh., “Der Taban-Fluss,” \textit{Baggerd. Mitteilungen} 13 (1982), p. 122.\textsuperscript{165} For this PN cf. the letters 49; 50; 51; 52 and 59 in Eidem and Læssøe, \textit{The Shemshāra Arhives 1}.\textsuperscript{166} Gelb, \textit{et al.}, \textit{PNP}, p. 217.\textsuperscript{167} Hallo, \textit{RIA}, p. 716; 719.\textsuperscript{168} Cf. for instance Charpin, D., “Les Elamites à Šubat-Enlil,” in \textit{Fragmenta Historicae Elamicae (Fs. Steve)}, eds. de Meyer, Gasche and Vallat, Paris, 1986, p. 131 and note 18. The letters ARM 26, 316; ARM 26, 338 (fragmentary) make allusions to the Gutian contingent with the Elamites who invaded the Habur.\textsuperscript{169} Eidem and Læssøe, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 32. They state that “most of the references to people called Gutians in administrative texts from Mari probably come under this category;” \textit{op. cit.}, p. 31.\textsuperscript{170} \textit{Ibid.} The relevant texts are as follows: No. 253, 1. 7: \textit{[x] DUG GEŠTIN a-na GAL.MAR.\textit{TU} Qú-ti}; 260, 1. 2: 10 DUG GEŠTIN a-na GAL.MAR.\textit{TU} Qú-ti-i-’i’; 267, 1. 7: 3 (BĀN) [-] a-na LÚ Qú-ti-i x x; 268, 1. 7: 20 (KAŠ tā-bu) 10 (KAŠ SI.GA) a-na Qú-ti-i x x; 271, 1. 14: 1 (BĀN a-na LÚ Qú-ti-i-’i’; Dalley, S., C. B. F. Walker and J. D. Hawkins, \textit{The Old Babylonian Tablets from Tell al Rimah (OBTR)}, London, 1976.\textsuperscript{171} \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 32, (referring to Ismail, F., \textit{Altbabylonische Wirtschaftsurkunden aus Tell Leilān (Syrien)}, (Ph.D. Dissertation), Tübingen, 1991 and Vincente, C., \textit{The Tell Leilan Tablets Dated by the limmu of Habil-kīnu}, (Ph.D. dissertation), Yale, 1991). Eidem and Læssøe think that the designation ‘Gutian’ was probably a broad term for ‘highlander,’ not a specific ethno-linguistic referent, \textit{cf. ibid.}; Diakonoff agrees, particularly for occurrences after the second millennium BC, cf. \textit{Diakonoff, L. ٢٦٢}. Even so, this is not compatible with the fact that other highland peoples are specifically named, such as the Kakkians in the Rimāh tablets: cf. 255, 1. 7: 6) 1 DUG GEŠTIN 7) a-na LÚ Ka-ak-mi-i-’i’; 261, 1. 5: 1 DUG GEŠTIN a-na LÚ Ka-ak-mi-i-’i’; for Lullians see 91, 1. 6’ (letter); [LÚ] Lu-ul-[i-lam’]; 195: 3: a-na LÚ\textsuperscript{198} Lu-ul-li-i, cf. Dalley, \textit{et al. op. cit.}

It is not likely that the terms ‘Gutian’ and ‘Lullubian’ were general designations for ‘barbarous’ or ‘highlanders’ as Eidem proposes, but there were individuals and groups of these Zagros peoples in Mesopotamia and Syria serving in the armies and as guards in the struggling kingdoms of the OB period. This phenomenon has later parallels in the Middle Ages, when groups from the same regions of Zagros and from Armenia and Central Asia became warriors in the armies of the Ayyūbids and Mamaliks in Syria and Egypt. Furthermore, one term for ‘barbarous’ or ‘highlander’ would be expected instead of ‘Gutian,’ ‘Lullubian’ and ‘Subarian.’ The Mari and northern Syrian scribes would have used the names of south Anatolian highlanders to designate a ‘highlander,’ not the names of far off Gutians and Lullubians of the Zagros.

In Sumer and Babylonia, the Gutians were often mentioned in the royal inscriptions and literary compositions as barbarous enemies, scorpions, snakes, mountaineers beyond the law. They were also described as one of the warring peoples of the region in the Erra and Išum epic. The above mentioned text of Lugalne mundu is one of the oldest attestations of this people. Later, they were referred to as instruments of divine punishment and revenge, summoned by the god Enlil, or in another case by Marduk against Narām-Sīn, as in ‘The Curse of Agade.’

A prominent Gutian personality was Queen ‘Nawarītum,’ “She of Nawar.” In a letter, she is reported, according to rumours, to have been arrested by her general and delivered to the Elamites during a raid in the land of the Gutians but soon released (see Chapter Seven). According to Durand this queen was named after the third millennium Nawar, located in the west of the Tigris and called Nagar in the Mari period. A closer look at the letter shows that the affairs all relate to Babylonia, Malgium and Ešnunna. Another letter (ARM 6, 27) from Mari reports that she has sent 10,000 troops against Larsa. These facts argue against the identification proposed by Durand. It seems more likely that the letter refers to the city and land of Namr, close and perhaps within the land of Gutium, but not to Nawar of the Habur area.

Ethnically, the Gutians were apparently part of the ‘Zagros peoples,’ known by some authorities as ‘Caucasians,’ which included Elamites, Kassites, Lullubians and others. Discussions about the term ‘namrū/namrū(tu)’ (meaning: bright, shining, or well-fed) used to describe Gutian slaves consider if it indicated an ethnic characteristic (fair-skinned). In an OB letter it seems to mean ‘good looking’ or the like instead of bright or fair-skinned.
term ‘nišē saklāti,’ “simpletons/ barbarous people” describes Gutians in later copies of inscriptions of the Kassite Agum-kakrime. As with Subartu, the Gutian country was known for some particular products, including figs, carnelian, wool, chariots.

Later sources continue to mention the Gutians as hostile. We read about them in the inscriptions of Aššurnasirpal II, Esarhaddon, Sargon II, Aššurbanipal and Nabuna’id. Mount Nimuš was located by Aššurnasirpal in the land of the Lullubians: “Mount Nimuš, which the Lullubians call Kinipa;” it was referred to in later texts as the mountain of the land of Guti: “….Mount Nimuš…., which is in Gutium;” this may be because the Gutians were better known by the scribes of that time than the Lullubians. Such attitudes towards the Gutians, Mount Nimuš, the Ark and the like were transformed through Hurrian in Hebrew, Syriac and Arabic literature into the story of the Ark, even as late as in the Koran, resting on the ‘Judi Mount’.

Language

The Gutian language must remain a mystery until texts - if there are any in that language - are discovered. Glimpses can be gathered from some personal names in the Sumerian King List and other texts, which indicate that it belonged to the larger group of languages of the Zagros area such as Elamite (?) and Lullubian. It was described as “difficult” in an inscription of Hammurabi. From these personal names Speiser deduced some characteristics including the prefix wa/iarla-, the element –laga- and the consonantal suffixes –b, –š and –(a)n. These suffixes occur in the names ‘Sarlagab,’ ‘Elulumeš,’ ‘Inimibakeš,’

ПИСЬМАХ,” ЭДУББА ВЕЧНА И ПОСТОЯННА (Edubba is Everlasting), Proceedings of the Conference Held in Commemoration of the 90th Birthday of Igor Mikhailovich Diakonoff, St. Petersburg, 2005, p. 194 (according to the English abstract). 186 Cf. CAD vol. S, under saklu, p. 80. 187 Hallo finds its meaning “vague and unexplainable:” Hallo, ibid. 188 Hallo, ibid. 189 Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 204 (A.0.101.1 (No. 1), ii 33b-38). For its identification with Ptra Magrūn cf. Streck, M. P., “NiSiR,” RIA 9 (1998-2001), p. 589 (referring also to Liverani); Speiser, E. A., “Southern Kurdistan in the Annals of Ashurnasirpal and Today,” AASOR 8 for 1926-27 (1928), p. 18 and the bibliography given in note 31. Note that reading this ancient mountain name as ‘Nimuš’ instead of the conventional reading ‘Nišir’ has become more likely in recent years, as a PN I-di-in-ni-mu-uš has been recorded: Lambert, W. G., “Notes Brèves,” RA 80 (1986), p. 186. Lambert added that deified mountain names were not infrequent in the northern Transstigris, cf. Lambert, ibid. Parpola, by contrast, gives only the reading ‘Nišir’ in Parpola, S., Neo-Assyrian Toponyms, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1970, p. 269. For a discussion about Nimuš or Nišir, cf. Streck, RIA, p. 590. 190 Reiner, E., “Lipišur Litanies,” JNES 15 (1956), No. 3, p. 135. 191 On the transformation of such literary pieces and influences from Mesopotamia through the Hurrians to Hebrew literature, cf.: Speiser, E. A., “The Hurrian Participation in the Civilization of Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine,” Oriental and Biblical Studies, Collected Writings of E. A. Speiser, Philadelphia, 1967, pp. 266-7. 192 It is valuable to repeat here the opinion of Speiser about this matter. He suggested that the mountain was originally Mount Nišir/ Nimuš in the Mesopotamian literature, but when the Hurrians translated this they are presumed to have replaced Nimuš by the highest mountain of their assumed homeland in and around Lake Van (later Urartu), which was Mount Ararat. This Hurrian version was the one, according to Speiser, that was borrowed and translated by the Hebrews and entered the Old Testament, and this is why Mount Ararat, not Nimuš, is the mountain on which the Ark rested according to the Biblical narrative, cf. Speiser, Oriental and Biblical Studies, p. 267. 193 To this, Diakonoff adds Kassite and “perhaps Caspian” groups as well: دیاکونوف، مهداه، ل. ۱۶۸. 194 Gadd, C. J. and L. Legrain, Ur Excavations. Texts (URI) I: Royal Inscriptions, London, 1928, No. 146, p. 44-45. 195 Speiser, Mesopotamian Origins, p. 97.
Igešauš, ‘Iarlagab, ‘Iarlaganda,’ ‘Tirigan,’196 ‘Lā-‘arāb,’ ‘Šarlak’ who was taken captive by Šarkalisharrī,197 the Gutian king ‘Enduššē’ of the Shemšāra letters198 and perhaps even ‘Ḥataniš’ of Ḥamazi.199 The –š suffix that seems to occur frequently in personal names and in toponyms like ‘Simāš, ‘kimaš’ and ‘Tukriš,’ is very likely connected to the Lullubian –si,200 while the suffix –an was common in the Zagros region. A very few Gutian words, all fragmentary, are found in lexical texts, including ḫara[mbi?], an equivalent for Akkadian ‘barirtu,’ a plant, elīnu for Akkadian ‘kurkanā,’ ‘goose plant.’ Of the Gutian deities in the ‘God list’ AN = šA-mu-um only the name of the last one is preserved, with a typical Gutian name ‘Abublab.’201

The Lullu(bi)

Appellation

The land of Lullu(bum) was also in the Transtigris. The names of the land and of its inhabitants, the Lullubians, were written in different forms,202 but with less variation than with the Gutians. The most often attested forms are ‘Lulu(l)ubu(m),’ ‘Lullume’ (Neo-Assyrian), and ‘Lulubuna.’ In Shemšāra it attested as ‘Lullu(um)’203 and in Nuzi as ‘L/Nulla.’204 The GN Lu-lu-ban, attested in a text from Ebla (L GN no. 230), was tentatively identified by Steinkeller with the land of Lullubum.205 This identification is not impossible if we remember the comparable form Lulubuna. According to Diakonoff and Klengel the name ‘Lullubi’ is associated in the second millennium BC texts with “foreigner” and “mountain dweller”206 in addition to its ethnic sense. Klengel’s statement is apparently based on data from Shemšāra which suggested to him that Lullubians menat the highlanders round Shemšāra. The fact is that Lullubian land, or at least the Lullubian political domains, in the Shemšāra period covered the mountainous regions as far as the Lower Žab,207 after that there was the land of Utûm with its capital city Šušarrā. In other words, Lullubum was a neighbour of Utûm. So

196 For these royal names cf. Jacobsen, SKL, pp. 118-121. A city called ‘Laga(b)laga’ was conquered by Aššurnasirpal during his Zamuan wars with the typical element ‘laga’ that belongs to this group; for the text cf. Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 203 (A.0.101.1, ii 19b-23a).


198 For example, 8: 13, 14; 11: 8, 36 etc. in Eidem and Læssøe, The Shemshara Archives 1, p. 79.

199 Speiser, op. cit., p. 98. But Jacobsen in trying to find an etymology for this name, suggests that it probably was an abbreviated form of Ḥataniš-qabi “He (a god) promises to protect:” SKL, p. 98, note 168.

200 Speiser, op. cit., p. 98. This suffix occurs in the Kassite names too, especially in toponyms. In this respect, Speiser has suggested that the name ‘Lagaš’ consists of two Gutian syllables, laga- and –š, adding that the brilliant age of that city under the Gutians was not coincidence but had something to do with the Gutian sphere and their contacts, cf. Mesopotamian Origins, p. 99.

201 Hallo, RIA, p. 719.

202 There are occasions in which this GN is attested as PNs, such as Nullu (NPN 108 a, AAN 102 b); ḪNullu (AAN 102 b); ḪLulu (AAN 90 b); ḪNullu (HSS 19 49); Nullia (NPN 108 a) and Nulluja (NPN 108 a, AAN 102 b). It is attested in GNs in the Nuzi documents such as dimtu Nullu and dimtu Nulluenašwe; for these cf. Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 192.

203 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., 3: 19; 12: 27; 36: 35; 39: 10 etc.

204 Klengel, H., “Lulu(bum),” RIA, Band 7 (1987-1990), Berlin, p. 164; Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 190-193; for other forms from different periods cf. RGTC 1 (Pre-Sargonic and Sargonic); RGTC 2 (Ur III); RGTC 3 (OB); RGTC 5 (MB/MA); RGTC 6 (Hittite); RGTC 9 (Urartian).


206 Klengel, op. cit., p. 165.

207 As evidence for this, the Assyrian annals explicitly say that Mount Nimuš, modern Pira Magrūn, was called by the Lullubians Kinipa, which means that the mountain, a few kilometres from the Rānīya Plain, was within the Lullubian country; for this allusion, see above.
when the letters of Shemshāra speak of Lullubians they mean real Lullubians, not unidentified mountain dwellers. In a time of hostility with Šušarrā this proximity would enable them to cut off grain supplies to and from Šušarrā, so peace was crucial (see Chapter Six). Agreeing with Klengel, J. Eidem adds that ‘Lullubians’ attested in the west of the Tigris was a name applied to highlanders from Tūr-Abdin and the Sinjār ranges, for they had a ‘permanent presence’ in that region and are frequently mentioned. But when we speak of contingents and military divisions, organized as groups, not individuals, serving as mercenaries in the armies of the kingdoms of northern Syria, we should expect a long term presence, for such men were highly prized and demanded by the kings of the region. They were tough warriors and, as foreigners, more reliable in inner conflicts between Amorite political entities. Another argument presented by Eidem is that they are occasionally mentioned in association with events in the west of the Tigris, but this is only because the relevant texts are from Mari and concerned with the affairs in its own region.

Location

The land of the Lullubians was centred in and around the Shahrazūr Plain in Sulaimaniya Province, with extensions inside modern Iranian territory, at least in the Neo-Assyrian period. From the Arrapḫa texts we know that Lullu was located to the east of Arrapḫa, its closest neighbour. This accords with the geography of Sargon, where the land of the Lullubians is mentioned immediately after Arrapḫa, “between ‘Uruna’ and ‘Sinu’.” According to Frayne, Uruna was located on or near the Tigris in the vicinity of the Lower Zāb. About Sinu we know at present almost nothing. But since the eastern border of Lullubum extended almost certainly to Iranian Kurdistan in the vicinity of modern Mariwān or parts of the territory south of Lake Urmia one may assume that Sinu was somewhere in that area. In other words, Uruna and Sinu formed the westernmost and easternmost boundaries of the land respectively, and with Uruna in the west, as Frayne states, Sinu must have been in the east. This eastern extension has been inferred from the account of Shalmaneser III’s (858-824 BC) campaign against the Lullubians in 855 BC, where he spoke of the “Sea” of inner Zamua, identified by some with Lake Urmia and by others with Lake Zīrēbār near Mariwān. A text from Boğazköy refers to a place called “Šudul” in Lullubum by the sea. The presence of a rock relief of Annubanini, king of the Lullubians, in Sar-i-Pul-i-Zahāb has been considered

---

208 Eidem, The Shemshāra Archives 2, p. 51.
209 Cf. that part of the letter cited above in which Zimri-Lim asks one of his subjects to send him as many Gutians as he can find.
213 Frayne, EDGN, p. 89. He identifies it with Urumu (U₃-ra-nu) mentioned in the Early Dynastic List of Geographical Names in the section that describes the route stations through the land of Zamua: Frayne, op. cit., p. 74.
214 Grayson, RIMA 3, Toronto, 1996, p. 28, (text A.0.102.5); p. 95 (text A.0.102.23); cf. also the older publication in Luckenbill, ARAB, vol. I, Chicago, 1926, p. 228, § 617; p. 247, § 686.
216 Speiser, “Southern Kurdistan…,” AASOR, p. 19. Note that the name there is incorrectly written ‘Zeribor.’
217 Klengel, op. cit., p. 166.
evidence that Lullubian land extended to that tract on the Alwand River in the south as a result of military expansion or peaceful migration. But this relief is not necessarily evidence of an ethnic extension, for it often happened in antiquity that victorious monarchs erected their steles in foreign territory. However, it is not impossible for the land of Lullu to have extended to Sar-i-Pul if we remember the 90 bērus assigned to it by the geography of Sargon. This expanse probably included all the territories from the sources of the Diyāla and the Lower Zāb to Lake Urmia. It is thought that it was their descendants who formed the state of ‘Manna’ south of the lake at the beginning of the first millennium BC.

Zamua seems to have been an essential part of the land of Lullu and indicated the modern Shahrazūr Plain, at least in the NA Period. The name Sidur[...] mentioned in the inscription of Narām-Sīn victory stele is thought to be a mountain name in Lullubian territory, and if so would have been in Zamua, the core of the Lullubian homeland. Zamua comprised most of the many cities and urban centres mentioned in the accounts of Aššurnasirpal in his military operations there, a campaign primarily directed against the Lullubians. The subdivisions of the area named in these accounts, such as ‘Zamua,’ ‘Mazamua’ and ‘Zamua ša bitāni,’ were discussed in some detail by Speiser and Medvedskaya to determine exact meanings and locations. Medvedskaya considers Mazamua as not exactly identical with Zamua, but a name given by Šamšī-Adad V to the province he founded out within Zamua. Zamua ša bitāni (Inner Zamua) indicated the land behind the chaîne magistrale, including the lake of Inner Zamua, meaning according to her Lake Urmia, not Zirebār.

People

The Lullubians seem to have lived in tribal communities that formed princesoms and kingdoms, probably under tribal rulers who united with each other in times of foreign attacks but were otherwise rivals. In the Shemshāra letters we read “kings of the Lulu” and in the annals of Aššurnasirpal we hear about numerous kings and princes in the land of the Lullu. If we rely on a historical-mythological text from Bogazköy, the Lullubians once had a ‘king of kings’ called ‘Immašku(š)’ ranking with the kings of Tukriš and Elam. Probably the same is true for the time of Aššurnasirpal. Then Nūr-Adad, sheikh (LÚ na-si-ku) of Dgara, appeared as a prominent personality beside the “numerous kings” of Zamua. But it seems to

---

218 Streck believed that Sar-i-Pul-i-Zahāb was their original home and later they spread to the mountainous regions between the Diyāla and the Lower Zāb: Streck, M., “Das Gebiet der heutigen Landschaften Armenien, Kurdistān und Westpersien nach den Babylonisch-assyrischen Keilinschriften,” ZA 15 (1900), p. 294. But Cameron thinks the opposite; i.e. that they descended from Shahrazūr to the south: Cameron, History of Early Iran, p. 40.


220 [Diakonoff, Media, p. 158 and the map on page 208].

221 Col. I 1) "[Na-ra-am-EN.ZU 2] da-nim (Lacuna) 1’ a-[...] 2’ Si-da[r-x] 3’ ŠA.DÜ-i 4’ Lu-lu-bi-[m] 5’ ip-hu-ru-[lim-ma]. The translation given by Frayne is “[Nar]jam-Sin, the mighty, (Lacuna) …, Sidur-[r-x] (and) the highlanders of Lullubum assembled together …,” Frayne, RIME 2, p. 144 (text E2.1.4.31). It is also possible to understand the sentence as “… (and) they assembled together in Sidur[…], the mountain of Lullubum.”

222 Westenholz, OBO, p. 94. Again, if it is correct that Sidur[...] was a mountain, the suggestion of Westenholz to identify it with the mountain depicted on the stele that was dedicated to the victory over the Lullubians is very probable. But, again, it is not certain that the name alludes to a mountain (cf. previous note).

223 Speiser, AASOR; and Medvedskaya, op. cit.

224 Medvedskaya, op. cit., p. 439; 441 and 443.


227 Cf. the account of his wars in Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 205 (A.0.101.1, ii 46): MAN.MEŠ-ni ša KUR Za-mu-a; and again on p. 207-8 (A.0.101.1, ii 77-78).

228 Ḫa-ri e-we-e-er-ne [m]Lu-ul-lu-e-ne-we, Klengel, RIA, p. 166; cf. also Cameron, op. cit., p. 29; 35.
have lost his position after the Assyrian campaign of limmu Assur-iddin, since Ameka took over his role in the next campaign of limmu Miqti-adur. According to the Mari version of the ‘General Insurrection against Narām-Sin’ the Lullubians were led by a king (not kings) called Paššanadgalî.229 The Lullubians were presented in many literary compositions less harshly than were the Gutians, who were presented as hostile, warlike mountain dwellers with supernatural powers, as in the legend of Narām-Sin;230 and the Erra and Išum Epic.231

Lullubians were present in Susa together with Akkadians, Parāašians, Gutians and Amorites, as soldiers of the Akkadian occupation,232 and together with the Simurrians in Lagaš, also seemingly from the Akkadian Period.233 It appears that Lullubian groups, like Gutians, served as mercenaries or allies in the armies of the neighbouring powers. Lullean troops are sometimes reported to be participating, as in Shemshāra with Kuwari (perhaps in an alliance),234 in Šerwunum with its king Arrap-ādal,235 in Burundum with its king Adal-šenni, and in Ašlakkā with Šadum-ādal (see Chapter Seven), all in the OB period.

Some depictions of individuals are identifiable as Lullubians on the victory stele of Narām-Sin found at Susa. They wear short tunics with a (sheep)skin on the shoulders (Fig. 5a and b), long braided hair and probably (long-tailed?) leather caps and boots. They are armed with spears and bows. It is not impossible that among prisoners depicted with long braided hair on Akkadian steles there are Lullubians. They were peasants producing grain and livestock for export, which can be concluded from a Shemshara letter (SH 812)236 and from Gasur (HSS X 99 and 176) that mention barley exported in exchange for livestock.237 In the texts of Nuzi they exported grain (HSS 16 37) and horses (HSS 15 108) in addition to slaves. These were highly valued in the Lullubum importations,238 and several Nuzi texts concern slaves and slave-girls (amtu) from Lullum (var. Nullu).239 A silver, copper and tin.240

231 Hecker and others, TUAT, p. 798.
232 Westenholz, OBO, p. 91, pointing to MDP XIV, nos. 18 and 23. Their name is written in these documents as LUL; some, such as Steinkeller, does not agree to identify this lexeme with the Lullubians.
233 Westenholz, OBO, p. 94, pointing to RTC 249.
234 They are mentioned several times, for instance in the letters 39 = SH 913, l. 10-11; 42 = SH 859 + 881, l. 28; 64 = SH 812, l. 44-45; cf. Eidem and Lessöe, The Shemshara Archives 1; and Chapter Six below.
235 As in ARM 26, 405, l. 15’.
236 Eidem and Lessöe, op. cit., p. 134-5. This is only an assumption, although a very probable one. It is not explicitly stated that grain will be imported from the Lullu land itself, but the author of the letter encourages the addressee to accept the peace offered by the numerous kings of the Lullum, because the granaries are empty. This might be interpreted as making peace in order to open the routes blocked by the hostile Lullubians, so that grain from other lands could be transported across Lullubum. However it needs to be pointed out that the Shahrazūr Plain, the assumed heartland of the Lulleans, is famous for its abundant grain crops. For example, the Middle Ages geographer Yaqūt al-Hamawi (who died in 1228 A. D.) cited a text from an older source stating that Sharazūr had abundant farms and most of the food for its people came from its plains, cf.: [Al-Hamawi, Y., Lexicon of Lands, vol. 5, Cairo, 1906, p. 312-3 (in Arabic)]
237 The text HSS 99 is a receipt of grain, measured by the Agade gur, from Zuzu, by the merchant Atē, to be sold in Lullubum: [a-na] ša samin ina Lu-ul-bi-im, cf. Meek, Old Akkadian……., Excavations at Nuzi, vol. III, HSS X, p. xlvii, no. 99. The other text (no. 176) records animals from Lullubum: šu-ut Lu-ul-bum дек; received by two individuals from Ḫišaṣa in the city of Adaṭa, cf. op. cit. p. li, text no. 167.
239 Such as: 2 amātu Lu-ul-lu-itsu (AASOR XVI 42: 32); amtu Lu-ul-[a-e] (TCL IX 7: 24); [amtu] ša māt Lu-ul-lu-e (JEN 1466: 8); ša māt Nu-ul-lu-a-ū (SMN 2492: 10; 3661: 6, 29); tup-pu ša ardu-tu ša Nu-ul-lu-ti (Gadd 61: 6); 10 sinissātu30 Nu-ul-lu-a-ū (AASOR XVI 32: 15); and garments brought [ina mātu] Nu-ul-lu-a-ī-ū (SMN 801: 9); straw for the oxen which went ina māt Nu-ul-la-a-ī-ū (SMN 3562: 9); Lachemann, E. R., “Nuzi Geographical Names,” AASOR 78 (1940), p. 22-3.
240 Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 192.
The numerous gods of Lullu are mentioned in the annals of Assyrian kings such as Tiglath-Pileser I (1115-1077 BC), who took 25 statues of Lullubian deities as spoil. Aššurnasirpal took a (sacred?) copper wild-ox. Annubanini lists the names of some gods he worshipped in his inscription at Sar-i-Pul-i-Zahāb: Anu, Antum, Enlil, Ninlil, Adad, Ištar, Šin, Šamaš, Nin-an-sianna and other broken or completely illegible names. Most of these DNs are written as logograms, which raises the question of what names they were given in the Lullubian language.

Language

Philologists are able to say very little about Lullubian. The word ianzu/i Diakonoff suggested meant ‘petty king’ in Gutian or Kassite, pointing out that it was used in the Assyrian annals as a personal name. But it was used by the Assyrians to denote rulers mostly in Lullubian-Mannean, not Gutian, territories, such as south of Lake Urmia, so we think it was Lullubian or Kassite rather than Gutian. Speiser tried to deduce features of the language from personal and geographical names recorded primarily in the Assyrian inscriptions. The suffix –ni occurs in personal names, such as ‘Annubanini,’ ‘Sabini,’ ruler of the Zamuan city ‘Kisirtu,’ and perhaps ‘Tar-dunni,’ the figure depicted on the relief of Darband-i-Bēlūle. The Lullubian ruler defeated by Narām-Sīn used to be known as ‘Satuni’ as on the victory Stele from Susa. However, the wife of Annubanini, mentioned in the legend of the king of Kutha, was called amazingly ‘Melili,’ a ‘banana’ reduplicated name, typical of Gasur. The Lullubian “king of kings” ‘Immaškuš’ mentioned above looks more Kassite or Gutian than Lullubian. In the ‘General Revolt,’ the name of the Lullubian king is fragmentary.

241 Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 34 (A.0.87.2, l. 23-24).
242 Luckenbill, ARAB I, p. 152, § 454. In the annals, until Aššurnasirpal, there is no mention of spoils made of iron from the Lullubian country. Primarily bronze and copper are mentioned, with smaller quantities of silver and gold. This is strange, for Iron Age technology had come some centuries earlier to the region, and Aššurnasirpal himself used iron axes to open paths through the narrow passes of Lulu; cf. RIMA 2, I, A.0.101.1 (No. 1), ii 49b-60a, p. 205.
244 Diakonoff, “Media,” CHI 2, p. 61. To Zadok too, the name is Kassite: Zadok, R., The Ethno-linguistic Character of Northwestern Iran and Kurdistan in the Neo-Assyrian Period, Jerusalem, 2002, p. 45 (3.7.1.2 and 3.9); 70 (7.1.2); 81 (7.16). Examples of the occurrences of ianzu as a PN are: a king of Nanri who sat in his capital city Adira called “Ianzu” (Luckenbill, ARAB I, § 573, p. 205; § 582, p. 206; § 637, p. 235; § 639, p. 236; § 682, p. 246); a king of the lands of Nairi (ARAB II, § 13, p. 6; § 21, p. 9; § 56, p. 29; § 168, p. 92); and a king of Ḥuššikša in Media (Lanfranchi, G. B. and S. Parpola (eds.), The Correspondence of Sargon II, part II, Letters from the Northern and Northeastern Provinces, SAA 5, Helsinki, 1990, p. 104, no. 133 (K 00676). For ‘Ianzu’ in Kassite cf. Balkan, K., Kassitenstudien 1. Die Sprache der Kassiten, New Haven, 1954, p. 155 and Gelb et al., NPN, p. 219.
245 If the name is not Akkadian: Ama-banini. It is noteworthy that Hüsing linked this name with the Elamite god ‘Humban,’’ cf.: Hüsing, G., “Der Zagros und seine Völker,” Die alte Orient 9 (1908), p. 16 ff.
246 Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 206 (A.0.101.1, ii 49b – 60a).
247 Or, according to Diakonoff, ‘Lšš-Pir’ini,’ cf. Diakonoff, “Media,” CHI, p. 39; Hüsing read it as Šil-x-dun(?)-ni, cf.: Hüsing, op. cit., p. 17. It is notable that the suffix –ni- is one of the suffixes often attested in both Hurrian and Urartian.
248 The word, formerly read as the royal name Sa-tu-ni, for instance in Barton, RISA, p. 142, is now preferred to be read as sa-dú-ì following the mountain name si-du[r-x] of Lullubum; cf.: Frayne, RIME 2, p. 144 (E2.1.4.31, 2’-3’).
‘[-a]-er\textsuperscript{250} or perhaps ‘Lapana-ilu/ila’.\textsuperscript{251} A fragmentary paragraph in the inscription of Šū-Sîn about his defeat of Šimaški alludes to “Wabartum, [é]nsi of [Lu?]labum.\textsuperscript{252} Potts regards this occurrence, if the restoration is correct, as indicating that Lullubum was under Šimaškian hegemony at this time. This is not impossible, for Šimaški later attacked Simurrum under Iddi(n)-Sîn; but in this case an alliance should not be excluded.

There is a frequent suffix -si in geographical and personal names as well as other suffixes reminiscent of Elamite,\textsuperscript{253} such as -k, -r, -s, -(a)n and the assumed plural formative –p or –b.\textsuperscript{254} Speiser cites these examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sim-aki</td>
<td>mountain range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Az-iru</td>
<td>mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kull-ar</td>
<td>mountain range\textsuperscript{255}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat-ir</td>
<td>mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed-ir</td>
<td>river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zam-rî</td>
<td>city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bâ-ri</td>
<td>city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lâ-ra</td>
<td>country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lal-ar</td>
<td>mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hašm-ar</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buna-sî</td>
<td>fortress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-zi</td>
<td>fortress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hud-un</td>
<td>city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sua-nî</td>
<td>mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radâ-nu</td>
<td>river\textsuperscript{256}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halm-an</td>
<td>country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kini-pa</td>
<td>mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niš-pî</td>
<td>(mountain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum-bî</td>
<td>(country, from the time of Sargon II of Assyria)\textsuperscript{257}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another dialect of Lullubian is suggested in the annals of Aššurnasirpal II. While he was in the city of ‘Zamri’ in Zamua he received tribute from the land of ‘Sipirmena,’ a part of Zamua where they “speak like women.”\textsuperscript{258}


\textsuperscript{252} Potts, Mesopotamia and..., p. 19-20.

\textsuperscript{253} This was perhaps behind the linking of the Lullubian language with Elamite by Hüsing, op. cit., p. 19ff.

\textsuperscript{254} Speiser, Mesopotamian Origins, p. 91.

\textsuperscript{255} If the identification of this mountain with the modern mountain range of Kôlare in the northwest of Sulaimaniya is correct, it would show that the Lullubian land extended to the vicinity of the Râniya Plain. In view of the Shemshâra letters showing that peace with the Lulubian kings was essential to ensure a grain supply to Kuwari, this extension seems more probable.

\textsuperscript{256} The occurrence of a river ‘çâ, Radân’ in the writings of the Muslim geographers to denote one of the Adhêm tributaries make it very probable that Radânû is the old name of Adhêm and its upper tributary the Tawuq River; cf. Adams, R. M., Land Behind Baghdad, Chicago, 1965, p. 78 (referred to by جنوب. ص. 267).

\textsuperscript{257} Speiser, op. cit., pp. 91-4. Speiser supposed some kings of early Assyria in the 19th and 18th century, such as ‘Lullai’ “The Lullean,” ‘Bazai’ ‘Lubai’ and ‘Adasi,’ were of Lullubian stock, cf. op. cit., p. 90, note 8.

\textsuperscript{258} ARAB I, p. 153, § 456. But according to the new edition of the inscriptions by Grayson, the translation is “who do their hair like women.” The text reads 75b) ina u-merged:ma ZABAR.MES tab-bi-li ZABAR kám-ma-
The Region before the Akkadian Interlude

The clashes between the city-state of Lagaš under its ruler Eannatum (c. 2454-2425 BC) and the northern powers constitute the most ancient record of hostile action between Southern Mesopotamia and our region. It has been long thought that the war was started by Eannatum to expand his domain. A new interpretation of the text could change this picture.259 This idea arises from the fact that the battle took place on Lagašite terrain, at a place called ‘Asuš.260 Even so Eannatum claims in another version of his inscriptions to have “[su]bjugated [Elam] and Subartu to him.”261 According to the royal inscriptions, this king fought Mari, Subir, Elam and Arawa:262

(He) [defeated] Elam and Šubur, mountainous lands of wood and treasure […], defeated GN, defeated Susa, [defeated] the ruler of Arawa, who stood with the (city’s) emblem in the vanguard.263

The impression Mesopotamian sources give about our region in this period is that it was ruled by small political entities, such as city-states. Such textual evidence of a political fragmentation of the region in this period into small powers is contradicted by archaeological material, at least by pottery assemblages. The Godin III: 6 Culture (2600-2300 BC) produced a monochrome ware that spread over a large area in the southern and eastern valleys of Luristan along the routes from Susiana to the Great Khorasān Road and perhaps even as far as Mahidasht. For such a uniform ware to be distributed over such a widespread area of western Iran (Godin III, Susiana: Susa IV, Fars: Late Banesh) would have been difficult with political

---

259 For this, cf. Michalowski, “Mental Maps and Ideology …,” Origins of Cities, p. 136. If so, it means that Subartu was at this early period so organized and powerful that it could wage war against the southern Lagašite power in alliance with Elam: Weiss, H., “The Origins of Tell Leilan and the Conquest of Space in Third Millennium Mesopotamia,” Origins of Cities, p. 86 (assuming that Subartu was the Habur Region); cf. also idem, “Sumer Dreams of Subartu,” p. 307.

260 According to Ur III material, Asušur was the name of a small rural settlement, a canal and a field belonging to the city-state of Lagaš, cf. Steinkeller, “The Historical Background…,” p. 78; for the occurrences of this GN in Lagaš texts cf. RGTC 1, p. 208; and as a departure point to Elam, Subur and URUXA, cf. RGTC 2, p. 16; 256.

261 ii 2) [NIM] ŠUBUR 3) [g]u mu-na-gar, Frayne, RIME 1, p. 153 (E1.9.3.7a).


263 Rev. vi 10) NIM [ŠUBUR] xii) kur GÍŠ. ’NÍG.GA’ 12) [GÍN.ŠÈ bi.sè] Lacuna vii 1‘ […] 2‘) G[ÍN.ŠÈ bi.sè] 3‘ Su-si-ni [ub]-na 4‘) GÍN.ŠÈ bi.sè 5‘) šu-nur-URUXA 6‘) ensi-bi 7‘) šu-gub-ba col. viii 1‘) [GÍN.ŠÈ bi.sè] Frayne, RIME 1, p. 139 (E1.9.3.1); cf. also the translation of Magid, G., “Sumerian Early Dynastic Royal Inscriptions,” in The Ancient Near East, Historical Sources in Translation, p. 13 (only translation); for the transcription cf. Steible, H. and H. Behrens, Die altsumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften, Teil 2, Freiburger altorientalische Studien (FASO) 5, Wiesbaden, 1982, En. 1 RS 6: 10; En. 2.6: 17; En. 5. 2:2. Uru’a (= Arawa) was located in the west of Elam, on the way to Elam, and is called in some sources sag-kul-NIM, ‘The bolt of Elam;' Frayne, EDGN, p. 71. This same place name is associated in some Ur III texts with bitumen, and, according to Potts, The Archaeology of Elam, p. 88. Dyson and Carter think it lies beneath Tepe Musiyian in the Deh Luran Plain: Schacht, op. cit., p. 175-6.
fragmentation. Henrickson has noted that “even when interregional political confederation is achieved later (in Godin III: 2), ceramic assemblages remain regionally distinct.” 264

As discussed above, Eannatum may not have campaigned against these lands. Rather the allied troops of these lands seem to have attacked Sumer and he defeated them, perhaps on Sumerian territory. Even so, the Sumerian material cultural influence noticed in the archaic Ištar temple in Assur has been attributed to this age of Sumerian expansion towards Assyria that was apparently in this time embodied in Subartu. 265 An inscription of Lugalzaggesi of Uruk states that:

(Enlil) put all the lands at his feet, and from east to west made them subject to him, then, from the Lower Sea (along) the Tigris and Euphrates to the Upper Sea, he (Enlil) put their paths in order for him. From east to west Enlil let him have no rival. 266

The motive behind these campaigns is not explicitly stated but expansionist ambitions, for booty, the control of trade routes and access to mines for raw materials come to mind. Or it could have arisen as a reaction to aggression from the mountain dynasties, as when Ḫamazi conquered Kiš and Awan conquered Ur.

**Kakm(i)um** was an important political entity of the region, with the name occurring often in the Ebla archives. But we know from other sources of a ‘Kakmum’ in the Transtigris. Whether the two GNs were identical or not is hotly disputed. 267 It has become clear that the Kakmum known from Ebla was in northern Syria, since it was associated with GNs within the sphere of Ebla. The city-states of ‘Ā-du̇ki, Ga-ra-mu̇ki/Gār-mu̇i, Gu-da-da-núm, Ī-ra-aṙki, Kab-lus-tu̇ki and Kak-mi-uṁki are “in the hand of the king of Ebla,” according to the treaty between Ebla and Abarsal. 268 In the Ebla archives Kakmum is very often involved in commercial exchange with Ebla. 269 The other Kakmum in the Transtigris region occurs in records from the end of the third millennium BC on, in Ur III documents 270 and later in inscriptions of Iddi(n)-Sin of Simurrum (see Chapter Five). It is certainly Transtigridian Kakmum that is mentioned by Sargon II of Assyria as one of the tough enemies of Assyria. In fact the texts of Gasur mention Lullubum, Ḫamazi, Agade, Simurrum and other surrounding GNs but never Kakmum. Perhaps Transtigridian Kakmum was not called by that name in the

264 Henrickson, R. C., Godin III and the Chronology of Central Western Iran circa 2600-1400 B.C., in: The Archaeology of Western Iran, p. 208.
265 Gadd, op. cit., p. 117.
269 A special relationship between Ebla and Kakmum is indicated by their frequently being mentioned together in the texts of Ebla without (or much less frequently) being mentioned with other Transtigridian GNs; this makes it clear that Ebla had close relations with the north Syrian Kakmum; for the occurrences of Kakmum in Ebla cf. the series ARET (Archivi Reali di Ebla- Testi) and Bonechi, M., RGTC 12/1, Wiesbaden, 1993, p. 142-145.
270 The text TAD 67 from Ur III mentions Kakmi, cf. Langdon, Tablets from the Archives of Drehem, no. 67, obv. l. 7.
time of Gasur texts, or perhaps it was not involved in politics or economic activities with Ebla. It is not impossible that there were always two Kaknums, as is the case with Ebla and Dūr-I/Ebla, Azuñinium and A(r)zuhina, and many others.

Other texts, from Ebla, Nuzi and elsewhere, mention important cities supposedly in the region under study, such as Abarsal,271 Kataru (Kà-tú-rú₂= Katiriwe of Nuzi?),272 Azuñinium and even Irar.273 Only scanty information about them is presently available, but the texts refer to a ruler as en (king) and to the ma-lik-tum (queen) of Irar.274

The Akkadian Interlude

A great change took place with the coming of Sargon of Akkad (2334-2279 BC) to power. He swept across the Mesopotamian alluvium, first overpowering the dynasty of Lugalsaggisi, his predecessor who had united the land. Then he began a long series of conquests outside Sumer and Akkad, mostly in the northeast and northern Syria, and so built the first Mesopotamian Empire. The frequent mention of the extension of his sway to the Cedar Mountains, the Silver Mountains and the like could point clearly to the economic goals of his conquests, and in particular control of sources for raw materials.276 The problem with understanding the reign of Sargon, and to a lesser extent his successors, is that the texts that concern his reign consist of later compilations, in a literary genre with mythical or epical traits. Historians, therefore, usually use such sources with great care and hesitation. He probably did commence his conquests by attacking Elam and Mari, as recorded by “The year Sargon destroyed Elam,”277 “The year Sargon destroyed Arawa”278 and “The year Mari was destroyed.”279 Other texts mention that he received tribute from the lands of Elam, Paraḫši, Awan and others,280 which would relate the same events. The king of Awan defeated by Sargon in this incident was Luh-iššan, son of Hišiprašši. These two names can be identified with the 8th and 9th names of the Susa list of Awan rulers, although the name of the father is


272 According to Frayne, EDGN, p. 76.

273 Attested together with Ḥasuwān and Kaknum: Kak-mi-um₂ Ḥa-zu-wa-an₂ I-ra-ši₂ i šeš-šeš 2 u₄ 3 u₄ me-na-'ma'₂ [u₄-ro kalam-tin] kaš₄-kaš₄ (5 v. III 11); Ḥa-zu-wa-an₂ ū Kak-mi-um₂₂ 1₄ [I-ra-ši₂ 2 u₄ 3 u₄] e₁₁ a₁₁₄, ṯa Da-bi-na-ad₂₂₂ di 'ar-ši₂-ši₂ ar-ši₂-ši₂ "bād₂₂-bād₂₂ [Ra-'a-ši₂] (10 v. VI 2): Fronzaroli, P., Testi di Cancelleria: I Rapporti con le Città, (Archivo L. 2769), ARET XIII, Roma, 2003. It is also noteworthy that one of the Gutian kings listed in the SKL bore the name 'Irarum,' cf. Jacobsen, SKL, p. 118, l. 42. Locating Irar has to be linked with Kaknum, since they are mentioned together. For Bonechi, Irar was in northern Syria, perhaps to the west of Quweiq; Pettinato locates it in the Tigris region; Saporetti proposes the Hurrian region round Nagar; according to Archi it is beyond the Ḥabar; for these opinions cf. Bonechi, RGTC 12/1, p. 268.

274 Waetzoldt, H., Wirtschaft- und Verwaltungstexte aus Ebla, Archiv L. 2769; Materiali per il Vocabolario Sumerico 7: Materiali Epigrafici di Ebla 12, Roma, 2001; en Ī-ra-ar ma-lik-tum i-na-sun; cf. also Archi, A., Testi Amministrativi di Tessuti, ARET I, Roma, 1985, table 1. Irar has been mentioned together with GNs that probably were also in its vicinity, such as 'A-za-ši₂, Ba-ru₁₂₂, Gu-la-a-tum₂₂, A-ba-ad₂₂, Il-wu-un₂₂ and 'A-ma₂₂-ši₂.

275 Cf. for instance RIME 2, text 11, p. 28-29.


278 mu Šar-um₂₂-Gl-n₂-UR₁₂₂, A₁₂₂ mu-ḫu-l-a: Frayne, ibid.

279 mu Ma-r₁²-aḫu-l-a: Frayne, ibid.

280 Frayne, op. cit., text no. 8 (E2.1.1.8) p. 22-24; Potts, Mesopotamia and the East, p. 98. Paraḫši, according to some, was the same as M/Waraḫšše; cf., for instance, Steinkeller, P., “The Question of Marhašši: A Contribution to the Historical Geography of Iran in the Third Millennium B.C.,” ZA 72 (1982), p. 237 ff., while Westenholz thinks they were different, cf. Westenholz, OBO, p. 91.
Sargon marched further to the north, to Subartu, in response to a Subarian attack. According to a later chronicle he “set an ambush and completely defeated them. He overpowered their extensive army and sent their possessions into Agade.” A date-formula mentions “The year Sargon went (on a campaign) to Simurrum.” In the famous ‘Geography of Sargon’ he mentions in addition to Subartu and Simurrum other territories in our region, such as Arrapha, Lullubum, Gutium, Assur and Armanum. The later literary compositions speak of a great general uprising Sargon faced during the last years of his reign. All the lands submissive to his yoke participated, but the text confirms that he could face and defeat them all. If so, then all the Transtigridian territories mentioned in his Geography must be reckoned as participants in the uprising.

Sargon was succeeded on the throne by Rimush (2278-2270 BC) and then by Manistusu (2269-2255 BC). Both carried on military campaigns against the Transtigris and Elam, but about these campaigns very little is known. Rimush began with re-conquering the eastern provinces of his empire, and then marched to southern Mesopotamia and Elam. In the east, he confronted an alliance of Elam, Barahsi, and Zahara, under the leadership of the king of Barahsi, a certain Abalgames and his viceroy Sidgau. Rimush was victorious according to the Akkadian narrative, captured 16,000 prisoners and took off a large amount of gold, copper and stone vessels. Rimush could then claim that “He holds for Enlil the upper and the Lower Seas and the mountains, all of them.” Zahara, according to Hinz, was a province to the northwest of Barahsi, in the vicinity of modern Ilam. It appears it was only after this victory that he could extend his control to the extreme north, where inscribed vessel fragments in Brak and the headwaters of the Habur were found. Under Manistusu and his successor Narâm-Sîn (2254-2218 BC) temples were built in Nineveh and Assur. Šamši-Adad I of Assyria has pointed out that one of the temples in Nineveh was built by Manistusu, of whom an inscription has been found in the city of Assur and another inscription of Narâm-Sîn in Nineveh. A copper bowl inscribed with “Manistusu, king of Kiš” is said to have come slightly different from Šhišpratep of the Susa list, and he occurs there as the son not the father of Luh-îššan. This might be, according to Stolper, an orthographic or grammatical variant of the name. The order, however, may reflect an error in one of the sources, or the existence of two distinct but nearly homonymous rulers, or “eccentricity in the royal succession at Awan.”

284 Cf. Weidner, “Das Reich Sargons von Akkad,” AJO 16 (1952-53), p. 4-5; also later Grayson, “The Empire of Sargon of Akkad,” AJO 25 (1974-77), p. 59-61. The authenticity of this text, whether it really belongs to Sargon of Agade or Sargon of Assyria and its date of composition has been discussed already in this chapter.
285 For the text of this narrative see Grayson and Sollberger, RA 70 (1976), p. 103ff.
286 Frayne, RIME 2, E2.1.2.6, p. 52f.
287 Westenholz, OBO, p. 42-3. According to Hinz, Sargon killed 17,000 people and took 4,000 prisoners, among whom were the viceroys Sidgav and Ungapi of Zahara, cf. Hinz, “Persia…,” CAH, p. 649.
288 8) ti-a-am-tám 9) a-li-tám 10) ú 11) ša-šili-tám 12) ú 13) ša-D[U]-e 14) kà-la-sî-nu-ma 15) a-na 16) En-líl 17) ú-kà-šal: Frayne, RIME 2, p. 59 (E2.1.2.9). The mountainous nature of this region was and has remained strikingly imposing; here, Sargon points to it clearly, and later, in the early Islamic periods, the region formally took the names ‘Iqlim al-Jibil’ / ‘Bilad al-Jabal,’ or in Iranian ‘K/Quhistān,’ “Province of the Mountains.”
290 Gadd, op. cit., p. 437.
291 Grayson, RIMA 1, p. 53 (A.0.39.2, I. 9-13).
from Qamishli in the extreme northeast of Syria, and belongs to this period of Akkadian widespread occupation of these regions.

During the relatively long reign of Naram-Sin much was accomplished, and that king has left a reasonable amount of both written and artistic material. However, this material still cannot help to form a complete and clear image of his reign. The scene remains vague because, as Gadd has said: “It is not possible to write a consecutive nor even factual account of Naram-Sin’s reign. There is no chronology of its thirty-seven years and no criterion for the truth of what is related, since nearly all this is in the form of later compilations and legends.”

What can be concluded from these source materials is that Naram-Sin followed the line of his predecessors in sending troops to the north and east and to the south and west. He calls himself in one of his inscriptions “Ruler of Elam up to Baraḫšu and (governor of) Šubartum up to the cedar forest.” He claims boastingly to have “smashed the weapons of all (of the land of) Subartum.” In a fragmentary section of his royal inscriptions he mentions Talmus together with the merchants of Subartu, who came to him, apparently to show their obedience and present their gifts. Year names state that he reached the headwaters of the Tigris and Euphrates, where he conquered Šenaminda (Year 1), and Maridaban. The latter is probably identifiable with Mardaman of the OB period. Other year names mention victories in the eastern mountains: “[The year Naram-Sin (?)] …defea[ted] [Bjibi-[…] and [was victorious] in battle in the mountains [at] Ḥašimār.” The reading of two names of rulers defeated in the campaign to the north is not certain; the first is ‘Ba-ba’ of Simurrum and the other is the name of the leader of ‘Arame.’ It is interesting that the name of a defeated Subarian ruler in this context is clearly Hurrian; he is mentioned in a year-formula as Daḫš-atal, probably of Azuḫinum. It is very probable that the bronze statue of Basitki (Fig. 6) belongs to this context. During his march to Subir and the highlands covered with cedar, he states: “(He could) triumph in nine battles within one year, and fettered the kings of the cedar (?) (tree mountains).” In the context of this march to the highlands of Subartu, Naram-Sin states that the rulers of Subartu and the highlands supplied him with provisions when he

293 Gadd, op. cit., p. 441. However, in recent years attempts have been made to formulate a chronology of his deeds, cf. Frayne, RIME 2, p. 85 ff. Some, using the deification of Naram-Sin as a chronological criterion, place the date of the Great Revolt before the conquests of Subartum, Simurrum, Lullubum, Armanum and Ebla, cf. Potts, Mesopotamia and ..., p. 106.

294 Gelb and Kienast, FAOS 7, p. 249.

295 Frayne, RIME 2, p. 141 (E2.1.4.30, i 8’-11’).


298 Potts, Mesopotamia and ..., p. 106. About the distinction between Mardaman and Mardin, cf. Chapter Seven.

299 Frayne, RIME 2, E2.1.4, Year jj, p. 87.

300 The first sign of his name can be UM, MES or DUB, the second is certainly not UL (collated by Sommerfeld). Cf.: Westenholz, OBO, p. 48, note 152. Arame is mentioned in the list of geographical names from the Early Dynastic Period published by Frayne as A-ra-mi-<<il>>, cf. Frayne, EDGN, p. 69-70.


302 According to Frayne, ‘Cedar Trees’ is not written. For this, see above, under ‘Subartu.’

303 ṇēlibī (EN.EN) <KUR.KUR> a-li-a-tim: Frayne, RIME 2, p. 131 (E2.1.4.25, l. 36-37). In both these passages, a distinction has been made between the local independent rulers and those installed by Naram-Sin, termed EN.SI.ÈNSI ŠUBUR, cf. Westenholz, OBO, p. 47, note 150. According to Westenholz, the title of ‘king’ was not restricted to the Babylonians, and EN should be translated as ‘king’ instead of bēlum (Lord) in the Old Akkadian period. The latter appeared only one millennium later as equivalent of EN. In this same period, the kings of Ebla and Tell Baydar called themselves EN exactly as the rulers of Subartu in the Basitki statue and those of the great revolt have been called; cf. Westenholz, op. cit., p. 47, note 151.
campaigned against the land of ‘Talḥatum.’

This implies that Talḥatum must have been within or at least on the borders of Subartu. This land was mentioned as one of the stations the Old Assyrian merchants passed through on their way to Cappadocia. It is now known that it was between the two tributaries of the Habur, Wadi Zerkan and Wadi Jirjib, to the south of Yapturum. Although too fragmentary, the inscription (RIME 2, E2.1.4.30) attributed to Narām-Sīn, judging by its royal titles, concerns campaigns to regions in Subartu with basically Hurrian-like GNs, such as Zumḥinnum, Šewin-[...]. Šu’awe, Azuhinnum, [...]-we.

The fragment of a stele of Narām-Sīn found in Pir-Hussein (Fig. 7), 25 kms to the northeast of Diyarbakir, can be attributed to this phase of Akkadian expansion to the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates.

On the eastern front Narām-Sīn needed to pacify relations with Awan, probably to concentrate his efforts on the Gutians in the north, who became active from his reign on. This was done in the beginning of his reign by the conclusion of a treaty with the king of Awan, who may have been Ḫitā. Later studies of the treaty, written in Elamite, revealed that Narām-Sīn had actually asked for support from Awan that sent in response some troops headed by an Elamite general. Niqqum (most probably at or near modern Khanāqīn) was close to the centre of Akkad’s power and may have been subdued earlier. It was ruled by a certain Karšum, styling himself as “Governor of Niqqum, his (i.e. Narām-Sīn) servant,” in an inscription on a mace-head. A Hittite literary text counts Niqqum among the king’s enemies, but this might be dated before or after the phase when Niqqum was under the firm control of this vassal of Narām-Sīn. A copper bowl bearing the name of Narām-Sīn is said to have come from Luristan, and an axe-head also from Luristan may relate to this event.

Although there is no evidence of direct enduring rule, it seems very likely that the Akkadians under Narām-Sīn could have expanded their influence, at least for a certain time, to the northern and northeastern territories, including to the east of the Tigris. This could be indicated by the presence of military garrisons scattered over the area, from northern Syria to

---


305 Gadd, “The Dynasty of Agade….” p. 442. Talḥat/dum was actually equated with Tilḥad of the OA tablets of Kaniš, an important station on the way to Kaniš. It has been identified with the Classical Ḫōlyq, probably in modern Tell Dülük, 11 kms to the north of Gazy ‘Antab (= Gaziantep), cf. Frayne, RIME 2, p. 129-130.


307 For the text cf. RIME 2, p. 141f. (text E2.1.4.30).

308 Hinz, “Persia…,” CAH, p. 651; Westenholz, OBO, p. 92. The suggestion was made by Cameron in his History of Early Iran. Hinz also thinks the treaty dates to an early stage of the reign of Narām-Sīn. His argument is that he is not deified in the text of the treaty: Hinz, W., “Elams Vertrag mit Narām-Sīn von Akkade,” ZA 58 (1967), p. 96. However, it is very probable that Narām-Sīn had used deification signs only in the inscriptions directed to his subjects, not to his international counterparts, especially because he treated the other party of the treaty, Ḫitā in all probability, as his equal partner, not a vassal.


311 Frayne, RIME 2, p. 167 (E2.1.4.2005, l. 17-19); p. 167-8 (E2.1.4.2006, l. 8-10).

312 Potts, Mesopotamia and ..., p. 107, note 131.

313 Frayne, RIME 2, p. 168-9 (E2.1.4.2007).

314 Potts, Mesopotamia and ..., p. 114.
west Iran, and the discovery of monuments bearing his name, in such areas as Basitki to the south of Duhok, the above-mentioned Prt-Hussein and his famous victory stele found in Susa commemorating a victory over the Lullubians. The Lullubians depicted on the stele (described above) are characterized by their long braided hair. Similar braided-hair prisoners have been depicted on other Akkadian steles (Fig. 8), but we cannot be sure if they were Lullubians. Other peoples in the Zagros could have had braided hair in this period. The depiction of a tree in a realistic style seems very likely to be an oak tree (Fig. 5b), a common tree in the region even now.

Some Akkadian cylinder seals that depict victory scenes over gods from the mountains have been attributed to this time, when the mountainous territories were controlled by Akkad. The legend of one of these seals reads “As long as Iṣhtar-anunītum holds sway over the mountain gods, dš and Ea provide abundant yields at home.” Military force was not the only means Narām-Sīn used to exercise his influence. The presence of his daughter Tar’am-Agade in Urkēš, where her sealings are found, means that the king of Agade used diplomacy too. Tar’am-Agade was most probably the wife of the ruler of Urkēš. A princess of Marhašiš was also married to Šarrakišarrī or to his son.

Narām-Sīn, like Sargon, had to confront a great revolt, one announced by the “four quarters of the world,” from Anatolia to Oman. Some later traditions say that Narām-Sīn had to fight the Babylonians and the hordes of barbarians, and that the latter had to be tested to see if they really were human. Among the rebels mentioned in two versions of the story were the kings Puttim-atal of Šimurrum, Ingi, king of the land of Namar, Riš-Adad, king of Apišal, Gula-AN of Gutium and Duhusu, king of Mardaman. There are also four other kings whose names are broken: […]-el of Kakmum, […]-a-i-el of Lullum, […]-a-[n]-da of Ḥaḥhum, and […]-ha-AN or […]-i-i-AN of Turukkum. Another version from Mari adds

315 Kuhrt, op. cit., p. 50. There are indications of what were presumably such garrisons in Brak and Gasur (see above), but, as far as I know, no such indications have been found in Western Iran. All we have is evidence of the temporary presence of Akkadian troops in Susa when on campaign.
316 The larger rock-relief of Darband-i-Gaur (Fig. 7a-d of Chapter Three), to the south of Sulaimaniya, is traditionally thought to have been a copy of the Narām-Sīn victory stele found in Susa, but it is very possible it was carved by a local king, a Lullubian or more probably the Gutian Erridu-Pizir, to commemorate his triumph over Ammili of Madga; for this and more details, cf. Chapter Three; for its attribution to Narām-Sīn cf., for example, Strommenger, E., Fünf Jahrtausende Mesopotamien, München, 1962, p. 26; Huot, J.-L., Une archéologie des peuples du Proche-Orient, vol. I, Paris, 2004, p. 142. Westenholz, OBO, p. 49, note 161.
317 Van de Mieroop, op. cit., p. 64; Potts, Mesopotamia and ..., p. 27.
318 It is not yet certain whether the revolt broke out in the beginning of his reign, as suggested by Gadd, “The Dynasty of Agade...”, p. 441; Jacobsen, Th., “Iphur-kishi and his time,” Gula-AN of Gutium and Duhsusu, king of Mardaman. There are also four other kings whose names are broken: […]-el of Kakmum, […]-a-i-el of Lullum, […]-a-[n]-da of Ḥaḥhum, and […]-ha-AN or […]-i-i-AN of Turukkum. Another version from Mari adds

315 Kuhrt, op. cit., p. 50. There are indications of what were presumably such garrisons in Brak and Gasur (see above), but, as far as I know, no such indications have been found in Western Iran. All we have is evidence of the temporary presence of Akkadian troops in Susa when on campaign.
316 The larger rock-relief of Darband-i-Gaur (Fig. 7a-d of Chapter Three), to the south of Sulaimaniya, is traditionally thought to have been a copy of the Narām-Sīn victory stele found in Susa, but it is very possible it was carved by a local king, a Lullubian or more probably the Gutian Erridu-Pizir, to commemorate his triumph over Ammili of Madga; for this and more details, cf. Chapter Three; for its attribution to Narām-Sīn cf., for example, Strommenger, E., Fünf Jahrtausende Mesopotamien, München, 1962, p. 26; Huot, J.-L., Une archéologie des peuples du Proche-Orient, vol. I, Paris, 2004, p. 142. Westenholz, OBO, p. 49, note 161.
317 Van de Mieroop, op. cit., p. 64; Potts, Mesopotamia and ..., p. 27.
320 Among the rebels mentioned in two versions of the story were the kings Puttim-atal of Šimurrum, Ingi, king of the land of Namar, Riš-Adad, king of Apišal, Gula-AN of Gutium and Duhusu, king of Mardaman. There are also four other kings whose names are broken: […]-el of Kakmum, […]-a-i-el of Lullum, […]-a-[n]-da of Ḥaḥhum, and […]-ha-AN or […]-i-i-AN of Turukkum. Another version from Mari adds

315 Kuhrt, op. cit., p. 50. There are indications of what were presumably such garrisons in Brak and Gasur (see above), but, as far as I know, no such indications have been found in Western Iran. All we have is evidence of the temporary presence of Akkadian troops in Susa when on campaign.
316 The larger rock-relief of Darband-i-Gaur (Fig. 7a-d of Chapter Three), to the south of Sulaimaniya, is traditionally thought to have been a copy of the Narām-Sīn victory stele found in Susa, but it is very possible it was carved by a local king, a Lullubian or more probably the Gutian Erridu-Pizir, to commemorate his triumph over Ammili of Madga; for this and more details, cf. Chapter Three; for its attribution to Narām-Sīn cf., for example, Strommenger, E., Fünf Jahrtausende Mesopotamien, München, 1962, p. 26; Huot, J.-L., Une archéologie des peuples du Proche-Orient, vol. I, Paris, 2004, p. 142. Westenholz, OBO, p. 49, note 161.
317 Van de Mieroop, op. cit., p. 64; Potts, Mesopotamia and ..., p. 27.
320 Among the rebels mentioned in two versions of the story were the kings Puttim-atal of Šimurrum, Ingi, king of the land of Namar, Riš-Adad, king of Apišal, Gula-AN of Gutium and Duhusu, king of Mardaman. There are also four other kings whose names are broken: […]-el of Kakmum, […]-a-i-el of Lullum, […]-a-[n]-da of Ḥaḥhum, and […]-ha-AN or […]-i-i-AN of Turukkum. Another version from Mari adds

315 Kuhrt, op. cit., p. 50. There are indications of what were presumably such garrisons in Brak and Gasur (see above), but, as far as I know, no such indications have been found in Western Iran. All we have is evidence of the temporary presence of Akkadian troops in Susa when on campaign.
316 The larger rock-relief of Darband-i-Gaur (Fig. 7a-d of Chapter Three), to the south of Sulaimaniya, is traditionally thought to have been a copy of the Narām-Sīn victory stele found in Susa, but it is very possible it was carved by a local king, a Lullubian or more probably the Gutian Erridu-Pizir, to commemorate his triumph over Ammili of Madga; for this and more details, cf. Chapter Three; for its attribution to Narām-Sīn cf., for example, Strommenger, E., Fünf Jahrtausende Mesopotamien, München, 1962, p. 26; Huot, J.-L., Une archéologie des peuples du Proche-Orient, vol. I, Paris, 2004, p. 142. Westenholz, OBO, p. 49, note 161.
317 Van de Mieroop, op. cit., p. 64; Potts, Mesopotamia and ..., p. 27.
320 Among the rebels mentioned in two versions of the story were the kings Puttim-atal of Šimurrum, Ingi, king of the land of Namar, Riš-Adad, king of Apišal, Gula-AN of Gutium and Duhusu, king of Mardaman. There are also four other kings whose names are broken: […]-el of Kakmum, […]-a-i-el of Lullum, […]-a-[n]-da of Ḥaḥhum, and […]-ha-AN or […]-i-i-AN of Turukkum. Another version from Mari adds
Pašahnadgalni, the man of Lullubum, which is different from the [...]-a-i/el of text L, l. 4'. It is noteworthy that these people are called ‘kings’ while others are called ‘the man of…’ such as those of Amurru, Kanišum, Dé, Meluḫḫa. This distinction may relate to the power, rank, legitimacy (from the Mesopotamian viewpoint), influence, and tribal (or non-tribal) structure of the communities under their rule. It could also be different political systems, unknown to Mesopotamians and so unclassified which prompted the title “man of… (GN).” Naram-Sin boasts of his victory, which brought about the defeat of them all, even though some details are missing because of the fragmentary state of the tablet. According to the text that narrates the revolt of Amar-girid of Uruk against Naram-Sin as part of the great Revolt, Amar-girid had asked the rulers of the highlands and the ensis of Subartu to join him, but they were, as the text says, afraid of the god Ilaba. This is why Amar-girid fled from Ašimanum in the eastern Transtigris to Mount Basar after he crossed Śišil on the Tigris.

As we can see, both conflicting sides, namely the states of the south and the mountainous peoples, whether organized in kingdoms, princehoods or tribal federations, were engaged in a bitter constant struggle. Again, the Gutians, who seemingly had had some bases in the Diyala region since the time of Naram-Sin, moved against Šårkališarrī (2217-2193 BC) at a time when the Akkadians were enduring hard times in Elam in the east and with the Amorites in Mount Basar in the west. Among the rebels were governors already installed by the Akkadians, such as ‘Epirmubi’ the šakkakakku of Elam and perhaps ‘Ititi,’ who was governor of Assur. Ititi had once raided Gasur, probably a sign of the loose control of Naram-Sin on his vassals. In the upper Diyala too, Kimaš and Ḫurti revolted. Hence Šårkališarrī seems to have asked his Elamite vassal ‘Kutik-Inšūšināk’ to carry out a campaign to subdue them. The inscription of the statue of this Elamite king enumerates over 70 place names which were “thrown beneath his feet at one blow.” One of these names is ‘Gutu,’ which means he had campaigned in the northwestern mountains, perhaps to support the Akkadians. Kutik-Inšūšināk concludes his inscription with the statement that the king of Simaški came to him and presented the tokens of obedience. It is noteworthy that the kings of Simaški followed those of Awan to the throne of Elam, with Kutik-Inšūšināk the last. From two date formulae it appears that Šårkališarrī had defeated the Gutians and even, according to one of them, taken prisoner “Šarlak, king of Gutium.” However, this could neither stop the growing threat of the Gutians, nor save the disintegrating empire of Akkad, which was

325 For this text cf. Grayson and Sollberger, RA 70, p. 115.
327 Kuhrt, op. cit., p. 52; 56.
328 Westenholz, OBO, p. 56, note 215. This is implied by his dedicatory inscription in which he says that the dedication was made from the booty of Gasur; for the inscription, cf. Grayson, RIMA I, p. 7 (A.0.1001).
331 Hinz, op. cit., p. 653; for the location of Š/Simaški, cf. Chapter Five, under the paragraph discussing l. 92-94 of the Haladiny Inscription.
332 Frayne, RIME 2, p. 183, k [?]n 1 MU…; šarr-la-ak LUGAL Gu-ši-um ša ik-mi-ä.
suffering an internal dispute for power. This can be deduced from the famous and expressive sentence of the Sumerian King List: “Who was king? Who was not king?” In an omen we read: “The omen of Šārkališarrī… ruin of Akkad; the enemy will fall upon thy peace.” Mesopotamian sources attest to being deceived by a sudden and overwhelming rush of the wild tribes, so that the Gutians occupied some parts of southern Mesopotamia. Even the god Enlil acknowledged the kingship of some of their kings, for they are listed in the SKL. The situation was now reversed, with the Gutians becoming a constant menace for Akkad, in contrast to the past, when Sargon and Naram-Sin were a threat to them and their neighbours. This new threat was expressed in a letter dated in the reign of Šārkališarrī and sent by a certain Iškun-Dagan to Lugalra. He orders him to plough the field without arguing that the Gutians are nearby: in case they raided the region he would have to collect the cattle and bring them into the city. The hoards discovered in Brak (see below), and other sites such as Tell Taya that date to the Akkadian period, might refer to unstable political conditions in which many rich families lost their feeling of security. It appears that the empire of Akkad had lost many, if not all, of its territories at this time and had shrunk to a mere city-state. This can perhaps be implied in the title “Šārkališarrī, the mighty, god of the land of Akkad” instead of that of his predecessors, “king of the universe, king of the quarters of the world.”

Although the great revolt under Naram-Sin was connected in the traditions with the fall of Akkad, “the great revolt was apparently a purely Mesopotamian affair, while the barbarians

334 Gadd, “The Dynasty of Agade…,” p. 457, referring to Nougayrol, J., “Notes sur la place des “presages historiques” dans l’extispicine babylonienne,” École Pratique des Hautes Études, Annuaire (1944-5), p. 1ff. Gadd has not determined from which period the omen derives, and the original article of Thureau-Dangin which he cited could not be consulted. This omen is also not listed in the article of H. Hirsch about the inscriptions of the kings of Akkad. Instead, he cites the OB version of the omen that mentions the death of Šārkališarrī: a-na-an-da-nu-kum Ša-ar-ka-al-šar-ri ša wa-ar-du-ú-šu in ra-ma-ni-kà. Hirsch reads the signs MÌ as MI (l. 22); AŠ as ÁŠ (l. 28); puts the divinity sign before the name of the king (l. 24); and translation cf. Michalowski, P., Before the Muses, Atlanta, 1993, p. 27-8. Note that Michalowski has Š as instead of u in l. 17 (compare the transcription in Smith, S., “Notes on the Gutian Period,” JRAS (1932), p. 296); for this letter cf. also Kienast, B. and K. Volk, Die sumerischen und akkadischen Briefe des III. Jahrtausends aus der Zeit vor der III. Dynastie von Ur, FAOS 19, Stuttgart, 1995, 89-94; Oppenheim, A. L., Letters from Mesopotamia, Chicago, 1971, p. 71-2; and compare Foster, Before the Muses, p. 70. Note that Foster reads the signs MI as MI (l. 22); AŠ as ÁŠ (l. 28); puts the divinity sign before the name of the king (l. 28); and TÀ as TA (l. 36): Foster, B., “The Gutian Letter Again,” NABU 1990, no. 46, p. 31.
337 The hoards discovered in Brak (see below), and other sites such as Tell Taya that date to the Akkadian period, might refer to unstable political conditions in which many rich families lost their feeling of security. It appears that the empire of Akkad had lost many, if not all, of its territories at this time and had shrunk to a mere city-state. This can perhaps be implied in the title “Šārkališarrī, the mighty, god of the land of Akkad” instead of that of his predecessors, “king of the universe, king of the quarters of the world.”

Although Hallo sees in the letter “an ambiguous piece of contemporary testimony” that needs to be used with utmost caution, it still testifies that the Gutians were involved in raids to rustle cattle in the Akkadian domains, whether widely or on a limited scale. For Hallo’s opinion cf. Hallo, W. W., The World’s Oldest Literature, Studies in Sumerian Belles-Lettres, Leiden, 2010, p. 437.
338 Although Hallo sees in the letter “an ambiguous piece of contemporary testimony” that needs to be used with utmost caution, it still testifies that the Gutians were involved in raids to rustle cattle in the Akkadian domains, whether widely or on a limited scale. For Hallo’s opinion cf. Hallo, W. W., The World’s Oldest Literature, Studies in Sumerian Belles-Lettres, Leiden, 2010, p. 437.
played a significant part in the Empire’s destruction.” 339 The fall of Akkad perhaps occurred in the time of Šu-d/turul (2168-2154 BC) as the result of a Gutian attack. Gutian soldiers had been serving in the Akkadian army, perhaps since the time of Narām-Sîn,340 and they must have been a good support for their kinsmen in that attack. Although this attack and the fall of Akkad took place more than 60 years after the reign of Narām-Sîn, later scribes of Sumer insist that it was a divine revenge taken for Narām-Sîn’s violation of the Ekur of Enlil in Nippur, as the ‘Curse of Agade’ states.341

In a later chronicle it is the god Marduk who acts: “The god Marduk twice raised against him (Narām-Sîn) the horde of the Gutians who harried his people and received his kingdom as the god’s gift.”342 It is more surprising that the Lullubians were probably the people who began to raid the whole dominion, according to an Old Babylonian copy of a literary composition known as ‘The Cuthean Legend of Narām-Sîn.’ There is an allusion in the text to a certain Annubanini as the king who led the attacking troops and whose name is identical to Annubanini of the Lullubu. According to the legend, they began to overwhelm the lands from the very north in Purušhanda in Asia Minor, entering northern Mesopotamia in Subartu, taking Šubat-Enlil, Gutium, Elam, Babylonia, reaching the Gulf in southernmost Mesopotamia, and also taking revenge on Narām-Sîn.343 The formidable power ascribed to the Lullubians in this composition was perhaps an attempt to express the enormity of the sin committed by Narām-Sîn.

Archaeology

Excavated materials dating to the Akkadian period in the region are not abundant, particularly in the east Tigris region. However, at Gasur, the city preceding later Nuzi, has come material from the Akkadian Period. The levels (‘pavements’ according to the excavator) IX to IIA have been attributed to the period when the city was called Gasur. In level IX remnants of a mud-brick enclosure wall, ovens, bowls of crude workmanship, whorls, stone-beads, some incised and some painted or knobbed sherds were found.344 In the following levels other material, such as different types of wares, human and animal figurines, small copper animal figurines, terra-cotta moulds for casting ornaments and tools, pieces of chariots, stamp-seal impressions, a few cylinder seals345 and the like were found. Compensation for this generally poor Gasur level came from the discovery of clay tablets, referred to previously in this chapter. They were found in the palace area, room L 4 of the Nuzi occupation, pavements P. II A to P. VII346 and consist of records regarding land, the payment of wages to workmen, purchases, records of instalments due to and received, records of interest due, deliveries of goods, lists of goods and the like, with a few school texts and eight letters.347 The Gasur texts deal with business at Aššur, Simurrum, Ḫamazi, Lullubum and Agade. Among the tablets is a small fragment of a house plan with an outer compound wall, neatly incised on a flat clay slab, showing a developed architectural technique.348 The important discovery of the tablet with the ‘map’ (Fig. 9) is “the oldest ever discovered in

339 Westenholz, OBO, p. 52.
340 Kuhrt, op. cit., p. 56.
341 For the relevant passage in the ‘Curse of Agade,’ see Chapter Three.
342 Gadd, op. cit., p. 454.
347 Meek, Old Akkadian ...., p. xviii.
348 Starr, op. cit., p. 22.
Mesopotamia, or anywhere else."³⁴⁹ It describes an estate. Where and on what scale is not precisely known, but it was situated, according to Meek, somewhere in the Transtigris, perhaps in the region round Gasur itself.³⁵⁰ Three geographic directions are preserved on the tablet: the west “IM.MAR.TU,” the east “IM.KUR,” and the north “IM.MIR.”³⁵¹ Two mountain ranges or hill chains are clearly given, but no names are recorded. The water courses could be rivers or canals. All that is why it is difficult to identify the place. But some precise data is given. In the centre is a circle, to the left of which is written 10 bur 10 bur minus 6 gân mà-a, meaning “180 + 180 - 6 (= 354) gân or iku of cultivated land” (slightly more than 3000 acres).³⁵² To the right of the circle is written ša-at A-za-la “belonging to Azala,” or less probably ša-ad A-za-la³⁵³ “Mount Azala,” which refers to the estate. Azala may be a personal or a geographic name.³⁵⁴ Other circles indicate city names, but only Maš-gân BĀD-ib-la is completely preserved. The suggestion to identify this GN with Dūr-ubla of the Nuzi texts³⁵⁵ seems very likely. Another city in the left-hand corner of the east side is probably Gu-zi-ad, which also occurs in the texts, but only the last sign is clearly preserved. A third city appears to the right of the centre of the map, but only the first signs are clearly preserved: Bi-ni-za-[-...]. Beside a watercourse flowing from the northwest is written Gur(?)-gi, and it joins two other tributaries, also flowing from the north towards the southeast corner of the tablet. Another river or canal flows from the western chain and joins the main stream in the southeastern corner (See Fig. 9). The main river is called Ra-ši-um “The fructifier,”³⁵⁶ but the name of the other is unfortunately badly damaged and only the last two signs are legible: [...]-ru-um; the preceding two signs could be im-da/šu.³⁵⁷ It is difficult to assume that these watercourses represent large rivers like the Tigris, the Lower Zāb or the Diyāla (Sirwān), as cautiously proposed by Meek.³⁵⁸ The area the map depicts is smaller than would be shown on a large-scale map of the Tigris and its tributaries, the Zāb and Sirwān, and the mountain chains of Hamrin and the Zagros. It rather shows a smaller district within the larger area, perhaps farther to the east or northeast, with which Gasur had economic relations. It was excavated together with business documents, implying that its purpose was economic rather than scientific, identifying parcels of land that had been bought or sold.

Level IIB yielded a mud brick structure consisting of two rooms and a courtyard. The room numbered 1 contained pottery of both Gasur and Nuzi types, indicating a transitional phase between the two cultures. Level IIA contained rooms in a similar plan to those of level IIB.³⁵⁹ The temple G and the northwestern unit of temple F of Nuzi were, according to its excavator, products of Gasur architecture.³⁶⁰ Thanks to the numerous excavations in northern Syria, and to a lesser degree in south-eastern Anatolia, more datable Akkadian Period material comes from the north-west than from other parts. Brak was already a significant centre in the ED III and the preceding periods, as indicated by its large public building. It was also one of the earlier excavated sites

---

³⁴⁹ Starr, op. cit., p. 23.
³⁵⁰ Meek thinks it is certainly located somewhere between the Zagros Mountains and the chain of hills running north and south through Kirkuk, cf. Meek, op. cit., p. xviii.
³⁵¹ Instead of IM.SI.SĀ!
³⁵² Meek, op. cit., p. xvii.
³⁵⁴ Meek, Old Akkadian ..., p. xvii.
³⁵⁵ For this cf. Fincke, RG 10, p. 312 (with bibliography); Röllig, W., “Landkarten,” RIA 6 (1980-1983), p. 464. According to the data from Nuzi, Dūr-ubla was a fortified city bordering the land of Kuššu(hhe) and was connected to Tūpsarr(we) with a road, cf. Fincke, op. cit., p. 311.
³⁵⁶ Cf. also CAD vol. R, p. 76, rāḫû, translated as “inseminator, incubus.”
³⁵⁷ Meek, Old Akkadian ..., p. xvii.
³⁵⁹ Starr, op. cit., p. 29.
to provide evidence of Akkadian material. The large fort (1 ha) there, built with bricks bearing Narām-Sīn’s name (Fig. 10), apparently served as an administrative centre of the upper Habur Plains. This was confirmed by the administrative texts found there concerning the delivery of rations, receipts and deliveries of silver and lists of textiles, livestock and the like. All date to the later part of the Akkadian Empire (the reigns of Narām-Sīn and Šārkališarrī). The numerous long narrow chambers and large courtyards were used to store grain, collected as tax from the surrounding territories and to provide provisions of the Akkadian army. Later excavations revealed temples with broken axes like those from the Diyāla region. Of the four phases of Akkadian occupation levels discovered during new excavations of Brak, phase 2 (HS 3 area) contained a building of red mud-brick with associated courtyard surfaces. A suite of two rooms, located to the east of the courtyard wall, was constructed with mud-bricks and its floors were paved with baked bricks. Under a stone slab on the floor of the room 1 were two complete pots buried in a pit, of which the clay sealings were still on the rim, contained valuable small items (Fig. 11) such as silver rings, ingots and sheets, bronze rings, a silver lamb figurine, two large gold leaf-shaped beads, an incised red jasper pendant, a lapis-lazuli date-cluster bead and eleven carnelian beads. The Anzu figure of lapis-lazuli and the golden mask must count as the most striking items of this group. Another unique piece is the golden plaque, showing two crossed lions with long necks, a motif that was well-known in the Uruk Period seals and reliefs. Two other pendants were found, one representing two bulls of lapis-lazuli, and the other two rams of stone. A similar piece had been found by Mallowan at the same site, also dated to the Akkadian Period. Another extensive brick structure in area HP also seems to date to the Akkadian Period. The building (29 by 8.5 m) consists of a mass of neat red brickwork (36 by 36 by 8 cm bricks) with additional grey brickwork (28 by 28 by 8 cm) at its eastern end. From this area came 277 sealings of the Akkadian period among which were 52 different seal impressions.

Two temples were uncovered in Tell Chuera also dating to the reign of Narām-Sīn. In front of the northern temple a large oblong slab was found with cavities alongside, perhaps to catch the blood of slaughtered animal offerings. Cult objects of Akkadian style have been found in a stone building to the south of the tell together with a row of monolithic standing pillars. This clearly indicates the building had a religious function and shows “links with Mesopotamia and the essentially northern, non-Sumerian characters of cult.” The sculpture of Chuera, represented by statues of men praying (Fig. 12), are strikingly reminiscent of those from the temple of Abu in Tell Asmar in the Diyāla region.

A significant discovery was made in Jebelat el-Beidha, some 80 km to the west of Halaf. Two stelae of black basalt (Fig. 13), one of them almost 12 feet high, depict a figure that

---

361 A fragmentary votive inscription bearing the name of Rimšu in the fortress makes it possible that the site was occupied since his time, not in the reign of Narām-Sīn; cf. Weiss, H., “Tell Leilan on the Habur Plains of Syria,” *Biblical Archaeologist*, vol. 48, no. 1 (March 1985), p. 25.

362 Akkermans and Schwartz, *The Archaeology of Syria*, p. 279.


366 The hoard can be older than Akkadian, cf. Akkermans and Schwartz, *op. cit.*, p. 280.

367 Matthews, *et al.*, *ibid.*


369 Matthews, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

369 There were problems with dating level I in the tell. At first it was all attributed to the Akkadian Period. Later study revealed that it dated to the ED Period; cf. Orthmann, W., The Origins of Tell Chuera, in *The Origins of Cities*, p. 62.


371 Bottéro, *ibid.* The ram’s pendant was found separately.

wears the fringed garments of Early Dynastic times. Bottéro thinks the stelae were erected by
the inhabitants of the city in memory of a Mesopotamian conqueror, perhaps Lugalzaggesi. Or
they could commemorate a local ruler, since several alabaster statues of votaries have been
found that show the same hairstyle, beard and the Mesopotamian sheep-skin skirt.373 A closer
look at the stelae374 especially at the bird-like faces with the pointed noses and receding chins,
evokes comparison with faces on reliefs from Luristan and Elam (for examples see figs. 14-
16). The typical hair style also is similar to what is depicted on a bronze plate from Luristan,
although later in date (Fig. 17).

The reliefs of Gunduk near Akrê (Fig. 18a) are relevant here. They consist of three panels,
the largest of which (6 by 3 m) represents a hunter, most probably a royal figure hunting an
ibex. The ibex has been shot with a spear375 and has fallen on its front knee, with one leg
stretched forward and the other bent under itself. Its large horns have been depicted clearly.
The hunter wears a short garment or tunic fastened with a belt. Traces of his braided hair are
still visible at the back of his head.376 Although eroded, the rounded head and face, without a
beard but with a moustache, can still be seen. The gesture of the figure captures the moment
when the hunter shot his spear. The lower panel represents a ceremonial scene that consists of
at least 5 adults and 3 children. There are no visible traces of beards on the faces of the adult
figures. They could be all female, but depictions of many royal figures from the Zagros show
them often beardless.377 Two seated figures wearing long garments appear to be central to the
scene. They are distinguished by their relatively large sizes. The one on the right is male with
braided hair and the other is apparently female. Al-Amîn thinks they are carrying cups,378 but
no cups are shown; they are holding children instead. The scene may be a ceremonial
occasion in which children are involved. The adults may be attending to the ceremonial
washing of two of the children in a large vessel placed between them, with the help of two
others on the left side of the scene. Could it be a sort of Baptism? Another woman on the right
perhaps is bringing water in a vessel positioned on her head. On the extreme right side of the
panel two persons wearing short tunics are butchering the game, with one pulling on the spear
stuck into the ibex as shown on the main scene.379 This scene was not directly drawn by
Bachmann, for he drew from his photographs, but they were drawn by Layard (Fig. 18b). The
other adult figures of this panel all wear long garments, and the belt of one of them is visible.

373 Bottéro, op. cit., p. 333. It is a strange suggestion that a conquered people would have made a statue of the
conqueror. Further, it is difficult to accept that Lugalzaggesi ever reached these territories.
374 The stelae were unfortunately lost in the Berlin Museum during the bombardments of WW II.
375 The white curved lines in front of the human figure was thought to be the bow, but better examination
showed they are lines caused by erosion. Thus the ibex is shot by a spear, not an arrow; cf.


About the relief cf. also Börker- Klähn, J., Altvorderasiatische Bildstelen und Vergleichbare felsreliefs, Mainz,
1982, p. 234 (text); no. 274-6 (plates), which is more succinct.

377This is reminiscent of the reliefs of Darband-i-Bêlûle and later figures of the Zagros in the second millennium
BC; cf. for instance the seals and reliefs of Iddin-Šin of Simurrum and the seal impression of Pišendênu
of Itiabalûm found in Shemshâra. For the seal impression, cf. Eidem, J. and E. Møller, “A Royal Seal from the

378 For detailed description of the reliefs cf.
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Another panel (Fig. 19), hardly visible, was discovered in 1947 by Al-Amīn. It depicts a horned figure (a god) sitting on a seat. This person wears a headdress with two upward pointing horns. He has no beard or moustache, but has braided hair at the back of his head. He has something in his hand to feed the animal in front of him. The other animals around this person are a lioness (?) and ibexes or wild goats, one of which is climbing up a tree. The headdress of this person seems to be a leather on to which horns are fastened. The horns could be integral to the leather, since no lines separate the horns from the headdress. If it is a leather headdress, it has a parallel in that of the sitting person on the Elamite Kurangūn rock-relief in Western Fārs, Iran (Fig. 20), dated to the 17th century BC. There, the headdress seems to be of leather with long tails at the rear. Another portion of the scene shows a female animal feeding its baby and cared for by a woman wearing a long garment. The reliefs are neither Sumerian nor Akkadian in style. They are apparently indigenous art carved by local craftsmen of this region, dating, judging by its style, costumes and headdress, to the middle of the third millennium BC or slightly later. Perhaps it is attributable to a Subarian ruler. To Wahbi too, the reliefs represent a local, non-Assyrian, religious ceremonial sphere, archaeologically related to the nearby tell in the Gunduk Village. A similar figure of the hunter of the Gunduk relief is depicted on the rock-relief of Darband-i-Bēlūle (Fig. 4) mentioned previously. The relief is about 24 km to the southeast of Hōrēn-Shēkhān, south of Sulaimaniya. Although the relief is thought to date to the OB or even the MB Period, it depicts a large person that wears a short skirt and a cap on his head. He has a short dagger in his right hand. Before the photographs taken by Edmonds this was thought to be a stone hand-axe. He holds a bow in his left hand and is also completely clean-shaven.

Tell Leylān (period IIb) was surrounded in the Akkadian period by a defensive wall. A relocation of the rural populations to the newly circumvallated (and better controlled?) urban centre was taking place. According to some collected data, a programme of agricultural intensification in this period seems to have been followed and there are indications of a food rationing system for dependent workers. Among the important discoveries in Leylān are the school tablets found in the “tablet room” (Room 1, measuring 4.83 X 4.35 m) in square 44 W 16. These are associated with the earliest Akkadian building (Leylān IIb3) indicating that scribal training was being practised alongside Akkadian administration at an early stage of the Akkadian occupation of this site. One of the fully preserved tablets (L02-17) shows that the
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380 al-amīn, ص.ص. 208, 209.
382 According to Al-Amīn, the animal is perhaps a bear, but this does not look likely:
384 Al-Amīn attributed it to the Hittites, cf.:
385 According to Layard, they are Assyrian: Layard, H. A., Nineveh and Babylon, p. 368 (referred to by Wahbi, op. cit., p. 553), but this is very hard to accept.
387 Akkermans and Schwartz, op. cit., p. 281. They state that the enclosure wall was built in this period for the first time around Tell Leylān. However, according to Weiss, this had been built around 2500 BC: Weiss, The Origins of Tell Leilan, p. 83; cf. also Weiss, “Tell Leilan on the Habur Plains of Syria,” Biblical Archaeologist, p. 24, 26.
388 Akkermans and Schwartz, ibid.
language of the tablet was Akkadian, reporting an assignment (i-di-in) of 5 eggs to a certain Ti-ḪAR.\textsuperscript{390}

Tell Mozan, ancient Urkeš, so far the most important Hurrian urban centre, was surrounded in about the mid-third millennium BC by a wall. A temple was uncovered on top of the tell dated to c. 2400 BC. It appears that a lion was the symbol of the deity worshipped in this temple, which was the city god as well. According to some written sources Urkeš was the home of Kumarbi, father of the Hurrian gods.\textsuperscript{391} Lions have been found on cylinder seals from Urkeš. A stone statue of a lion was also found in the temple, in addition to the copper foundation statues of Tišatal (Fig. 21)\textsuperscript{392} that also have lions represented. The royal palace of Urkeš (see Fig. 4 of Chapter Four) represents one of the largest (almost 3500 m\textsuperscript{2}) and best preserved palaces ever excavated in Syro-Mesopotamia.\textsuperscript{393} The seal impressions found in the palace provide valuable information about its rulers, their names, traditions, habits and even the royal ideology in this kingdom.\textsuperscript{394} The royal marriage in which Tar'am-Agade, the daughter of Naram-Sîn, married the endan of Urkeš,\textsuperscript{395} means that the kingdom of Urkeš was in a powerful position in this period and could play its political role so that it held parity with Akkad.\textsuperscript{396} That Ebla, Mari and Nagar were under the rule of Naram-Sîn with Urkeš as his ally says much about the position and power of this kingdom. Possibly Naram-Sîn chose to make alliance with Urkeš to act as a buffer kingdom between his empire and the mountainous peoples to the north of Urkeš, instead of imposing a direct rule and putting himself on the front line.\textsuperscript{397}

At Tell Beydar, distinguished by its central acropolis within a circular enclosure,\textsuperscript{398} 147 economic tablets dated to the second half of the third millennium have been excavated. These texts provide valuable information about the economic activity of the region, the calendar, metrology, cults, deities and the ethnic background of its inhabitants. They show, as the tablet from Leylān also do, that literacy had reached the dry-farming zone of Northern Syria in this period and that the administrative organization of this region was comparable to that in Southern Mesopotamia. The texts deal principally with the administration of livestock and agriculture, and appear to have been written in a variant of Old Akkadian, maintaining an old tradition of Semitic.\textsuperscript{399} According to Van Lerberghe, the absence of Hurrian words or linguistic influence may give a clue about the date the Hurrians arrived in the region.\textsuperscript{400} But Richter has identified at least two PNs in the texts that are Hurrian (See Chapter Four).

\textsuperscript{390} De Lillis et al, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 53 and 55.

\textsuperscript{391} See Chapter Four.

\textsuperscript{392} It is almost certain that these two foundation deposits were found in Mozan; cf. Buccellati, G., Urkesh as Tell Mozan: Profiles of the Ancient City, in \textit{Urkesh and the Hurrians}, p. 28.


\textsuperscript{394} Urkeš will be touched upon in detail in Chapter Four.

\textsuperscript{395} \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 63. The existence of a seal of the Hurrian-named Ewrim-atal in the same context of the seal of Tar’am-Agade, the queen of Urkeš, is seen as a sign of political alliance with Akkad, the first of this sort with the Syrian kingdoms; cf. \textit{op. cit.}, p. 64 and 69.

\textsuperscript{396} That Urkeš was a major political power at least in the time of Naram-Sin is shown by the recent discoveries in Mozan, cf. Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, \textit{ibid} and p. 69.

\textsuperscript{397} Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, \textit{AAS}, p. 69.

\textsuperscript{398} Huot, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 167.


\textsuperscript{400} Lerberghe, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 120.
The few tablets from Mozan and Chagar Bazar (levels 2-3) from the Akkadian period indicate the presence of Akkadian imperial administration in the Habur area, but without any dominance of Akkadian material culture.401 Harrān, according to the texts from Ebla, was a city-state in the third millennium BC. Its western border reached the city-state of ‘Ir-i-tumki,’ the ‘Irrita/e’ of Mari Period (the second millennium) and the Hittite documents, slightly to the north of Karkemiš.402 Harrān had an en (king) and a ‘badalum,’ who acted as a vizier, or “overseer” according to the Sumerogram UGULA.403 The Ebla archives identify its badalum as ‘Ir-[az-J].404 The queen of Harrān ‘Zu/Zā-ga-hum’ played a significant role in relations with Ebla. She received large quantities of gifts in precious stones when she visited the palace in Ebla. On one occasion she received objects for the elders of Harrān from the king of Ebla and the elders of the city. On another occasion she visited Ebla when its queen gave birth to a child and she was sent gifts in return when she gave birth.405 Workers from Harrān were present in Ebla: “10 people, na-se11 of Harrān.”406 The Ebla archives mention other city-states in the Upper Euphrates and Habur regions that were from west to east: ‘Ursaum’ (=Uršum to the north of Karkemiš and west of the Euphrates), ‘Utigu,’ ‘Dulu,’ ‘Iritum’ (probably modern Ordi),407 ‘Sanapzugum’ (=Şapanzum of Mari texts? East of Ras el-‘Ain) and Gudadanum” (Qattuna of Mari texts?).408

As the large cities of our region grew they were protected with enclosure walls, not only in Mozan, Leylān and Brak but also in Hamoukar, Khoshi, Gasur and Nineveh from the middle of the third millennium BC. From this Weiss concluded that “each of the extensive north Mesopotamian plains that receive more than 300 mm of rain per annum were dominated by large, walled cities in the mid-third millennium BC.”409 This line of walled cities of this period extended to the relatively dryer region of Tell Chuera and its periphery.

While the northern part of our region had numerous large urban centres, indicated by large tells up to 13-25 ha, without textual evidence little can be said about its history in this period. Archaeologically the culture of southeast Anatolia from the Early Bronze Age I (EB I), approximately contemporary with southern Mesopotamian Jamdat Nasr and Early Dynastic I, was unique. It was a parallel in development with the Tigris Valley, but there real cities appeared before they did in the other parts of Anatolia.410 Around 2300 BC EB III began in southeast Anatolia and this coincided with the rise of Akkad as an empire extending to the north, east, northwest and also here. The culture of this period is best distinguished by its painted pottery that is found from Malatya to Divirgi and from there beyond the Euphrates.411 This part of the region, according to Burney, formed the centre of this culture from which it dispersed with its distinctive traits.412 The pottery (Fig. 22) is hand-made and hard-fired. It is

---

401 Akkermans and Schwartz, op. cit., p. 282.
403 Cf. note 3 in this chapter.
404 Sollberger, E., Administrative Texts Chiefly Concerning Textiles, ARET VIII, Roma, 1986, 524 (l. 1); cf. also Archi, op. cit., p. 3.
405 Archi, op. cit., p. 3-4.
410 Joukowski, M. S., Early Turkey, An Introduction to the Archaeology of Anatolia from Prehistory through the Lydian Period, Iowa, 1996, p. 176. This parallel development is according to Joukowski due to the influences from both Syria (the Amuq Culture whose influence in the region has been noticed) and from Mesopotamia as a result of old and continuous trade relations based on the export of raw materials: Joukowsky, p. 173.
buff or pinkish in the core with a plain buff or yellow surface inside and outside.\textsuperscript{413} The shapes are two types: globular jars with thickened rims and shallow bowls with inverted rim\textsuperscript{414} and lugs for handles. The paint is brown or blackish on a buff or yellow slip. Designs are simple but distinctive, consisting of horizontal bands with zigzags, triangles, or multiple chevrons, often left ‘in reserve’.\textsuperscript{415} In the eastern parts of southeast Anatolia the pottery shows more affinity with that of the southern Caucasus and Azerbaijan than with that of central and western Anatolia. Such pottery type has been found around Lake Urmia and the upper reaches of the Kur-Araxes, characterized by a black-burnished ware, mostly plain, but sometimes ornamented with fine incisions, as at Karaz, Tepecik near Erzurum, Triateli above Tiflis and Zülfübulak northeast of Vān,\textsuperscript{416} Samsat in Adiyaman Province\textsuperscript{417} and Norşun Tepe. At this last site black-burnished pottery and painted pottery with red on white and black incised vessels are found. From this same period comes the Goey Tepe pottery that is located to the west of Urmia Lake on the Iranian side of the border. It was found in level K3 and had lugs that later developed into solid knobs with depressions on either side, but unpierced.\textsuperscript{418}

Archaeological investigations in this region have showed numerous EB III settlements which flourished between 2550-2000 BC. They ranged from villages of 0.5-1.5 ha to towns of 5 ha to large urban centres of 13-25 ha.\textsuperscript{419} The settlement patterns at these sites resembled those of Mesopotamia from the Uruk Period and were apparently centres of petty states or provincial capitals. Unfortunately the absence of textual material means the archaeological material must speak for itself. These ancient cities were surrounded by defensive walls. Even the villages had similar walls in many cases, evidence of the insecure feelings of their inhabitants. The wall in the southwest of Arslan Tepe had a semi-circular bastion.\textsuperscript{420} Millennia later there were still villages with defensive walls in the region round Lake Urmia, as mentioned in ‘Al-Faraj ba’da al-Shiddah’ written in about the 10\textsuperscript{th} century AD,\textsuperscript{421} indicating continuity of this tradition. The architecture of southeast Anatolia in this period does not seem confined to standardized forms. The predilection of these cities was for irregular buildings bunched together.\textsuperscript{422} Arslan Tepe provided EB III large terraced buildings constructed on stone bases. One contained an oven with a kitchen counter with mortars, grindstones and pottery. On the lower terrace is a shrine with an altar and cultic pottery.\textsuperscript{423} The houses were large and multi-chambered and divided by streets. Inside were terraces for sitting and circular hearths. A pottery workshop for the manufacture of clay figurines and coloured ceramics was also found.\textsuperscript{424} In the next phase (EB III b), rectangular buildings built on stone bases have been uncovered. Some were provided with underground stone drainage channels. The site of Titriş Höyük, 7 km east of Lidar, was an important urban centre during mid- to late EB, and it became the capital of a small state in around 2500 BC.\textsuperscript{425} The settlement consists of a city of 35 ha centred on an acropolis with almost 10 ha of suburbs. The outer city is built on a terrace, provided with a rampart and moat at the base of the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[413]{Burney, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 169-70.}
\footnotetext[415]{Mellaart, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 688-9.}
\footnotetext[416]{Mellaart, ‘Anatolia…’ \emph{CAH} I, part 2, p. 689.}
\footnotetext[417]{Joukowsky, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 176.}
\footnotetext[418]{Burney, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 171.}
\footnotetext[419]{Joukowsky, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 175.}
\footnotetext[420]{Joukowsky, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 179.}
\footnotetext[421]{\textsuperscript{[al-Tannūhī, \emph{Dispel after Distress}, vol. I, Cairo, 1955, p. 298 (in Arabic)].}}
\footnotetext[422]{Joukowsky, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 176.}
\footnotetext[423]{Ibid.}
\footnotetext[424]{Ibid.}
\footnotetext[425]{Ibid.}
\end{footnotes}
mound. The houses are rectilinear, oriented from northeast to southwest, built on stone bases, with floors paved with pebbles. One was a stone monumental building with basements and corridors.

In Norşun Tepe monumental buildings have also been uncovered at the summit of the tell (Fig. 23). The palatial building (Fig. 24) in the burned level (VI) dated to EB III is one such. The building is oriented north-south, rectangular, a timber-laced two-storied mud brick walled structure. Its importance is indicated by the fact that the outer walls are 1.80 m thick and the inner walls 1m thick. A corridor divides it into two main parts, which probably indicates it was the administrative centre of the settlement and the surrounding region. The southern part was domestic with a staircase at its eastern side. One of the four rooms of this part contains a clay altar on the northern wall and a central rectangular hearth with articulated edge and relief decoration. The northern part (25 x 15 m) was the place for economic affairs. In every 6 x 5m room there were storage facilities, with five rows of five pithoi embedded in a white-plastered floor (Fig. 25). About 100 jars were found there, and in addition there was another storage area to the west of this building, with 7 rows of rooms in an area of 22 x 8 m.

Metallurgy was well-developed in this period, as indicated by the many metal funerary objects in southeast Anatolia. The region was rich with metal ores, which helped some places to be manufacturing centres for finished metal products. Trade with Mesopotamia and the passage of Mesopotamian merchants to the regions of Urfa and Elaziğ brought prosperity and fortune which led to the growth of its settlements and the exchange of cultural ideas. Large urban centres grew up, with monumental architecture similar to that of Mesopotamia and Syria. These developments changed pre-existing social and economic relationships, now enriched by ideas from neighbouring lands. By EB III cultural traditions had commingled so as to give a more indigenous or local culture and the rise of an aristocracy. By this time Norşun Tepe and Korucutepe had become large, fortified urban centres or city-states with palaces, shrines, and large storage areas. The palace of Norşun Tepe VI covered almost 2700 m² and its large storage facilities had the capacity of some 200 tonnes, a complex structure almost as large as what was found by H. Schliemann in Troy IIIC.

Excavations in Luristan and the Kangavar Valley revealed cultures that are chronologically almost completely compatible with the period under study here. Godin III 6 (2600-2300 BC) and Godin III 5 (2300-2100 BC) show best the chronological sequence of cultural development in western central Iran, a significant part of our region. But archaeological material is still relatively meagre from this area as a whole. Henrickson states that “excavations and soundings are few in number and of limited size. Surveys of varying intensities have covered much of the region, but the documentation is often limited.”

---

428 Ibid.
429 Ibid.
430 Joukowsky, op. cit., p. 177.
431 Ibid.
432 Ibid.
433 Ibid.
434 Huot, op. cit., p. 174-175.
435 This phase is dated by similar pottery found in Lagaš associated with sealings and tablets with the names of Enannatum, Eannatum and Lummatur, son of Enannatum and by material from Susa IV A (Susa Dc) dated to the ED III Period, cf. Henrickson, Godin III, p. 208.
why no structure built early in the phase survived until the end. Remains of a large complex, presumably a public building, was uncovered in the western portion of the deep sounding, but it was later replaced by modest domestic architecture. Godin III: 6 pottery (Fig. 26) is distinguished by carinated pots and jars and related forms with rounded profiles in different sizes. Medium and large bowls with enlarged rims that were usually painted, are characteristic of this phase in Godin. A hand-made burnished gray-black ware was also made in this phase that continued to the next Godin III: 5 phase. The painted pottery (Fig. 27) is decorated with combinations of straight and wavy vertical lines and motifs “like shark’s teeth,” “bulls eyes” and a series of three arcs that form a triangle when seen from above. These decorations were executed mainly in a register above the carination or maximum diameter. Many bowls are decorated with a wavy line incised below the rim on both the interior and exterior. The distribution of Godin III:6 covered the southern and eastern valleys of Luristan along routes from Susiana to the Great Khorasan Road and has probably reached the Mahidasht. Although this pottery has a close relationship with Susa Dc-d (or Susa IV A), regional stylistic variability is noticeable throughout its distribution. Relations between this part of central Zagros and Mesopotamia were, from the economic point of view, weak and not as strong as between central Zagros and Susiana. The contrast between the Mesopotamian Lowland and the Zagros Highland was marked by a natural borderline represented by the mountain ranges that separate modern Iraq from Iran. This contrast, that isolated to a certain degree the Highlanders from the Lowland population of Mesopotamia, was pointed out by Potts, who noticed that the border was not only a natural division but also a major ethno-linguistic division. The division is also emphasized by the evidence of Godin III: 6 pottery. It is related to Susa Dc-d and reflects a sphere of extensive economic interaction between Godin- Central Iran on the one hand, and Godin- Susa on the other, but did not prove any contact with the Lower Diyāla sites, except for comparable pottery found in Lagāš.

From this period, some graves have been excavated in Bani Surmeh and Kalleh Nisar that were dated by Vandenbergh to 2600-2500 BC. The graves yielded monochrome wares, typical Khuzistan assemblage, simple daggers and shafted axes. The Kalleh Nisar graves were constructed by the same time and re-used until the OB Period. Moreover, individual cist graves of Akkadian –Gutian affinities were also found in Kalleh Nisar; they represent a long tradition of graves, examples of which date back to the Late Chalcolithic. The so-called lihaq graves from this region are remarkable. They are large graves, 1.5 m wide and up to 6 m long, with low stone-built chambers accommodating several bodies. The stone gabled roofs, that continued as a tradition until Giyan III and perhaps until the Achaemenid Period (as in the tomb of Cyrus), are the most striking characteristic.

437 Henrickson, Godin III ..., p. 207.
438 Ibid.
439 Ibid.
440 Ibid.
441 Ibid.
444 Potts, Mesopotamia and ..., p. 10.
445 Henrickson, “Šimaški and ...,” p. 105
448 Haenrick and Overlaet, Early Bronze Age Graveyards to the West of the Kabir Kuh (Pusht-i Kuh, Luristan, Luristan Excavation Documents, VIII, p. 5.
449 Goff, op. cit., p. 146; 149.
Godin III: 5 (2300-2100 BC), contemporary with the Akkadian Period architecture, is characterized in Godin by small two- or three-room units, some separated from others by unroofed passageways or small courtyards. In this phase too, carinated pots and jars continued as the most common vessel form of painted pottery (Fig. 27). Its decoration consists of two basic types in the main register: 1) a band of solid or crosshatched diamonds; or 2) paired waterfowl, eagles, “stingrays” or rested diamonds alternating with chevrons.

The pottery of this phase is slightly more widespread and more common than Godin III: 6. It was distributed primarily in the northern half of the Central Western Iran along the High Road and the northern portions of the north-south routes. It has been found in the sites of Mahidasht, and in Baba Jān (level 5) as well. Samples were also found in a grave in Tepe Giyan, where no Godin III: 6 was found.

The stylistic uniformity of this pottery type, without any uniformity with Susa IV B and Fars (Kaftari), presumably indicates some considerable interaction between the territories it covered in the highlands, and that relations with Susa became distant in this phase. Its distribution was concentrated towards the north, probably as a result of the Akkadian military pressure. As this phase coincided with the rise of Akkad’s military power, Mesopotamian material entered the region of Pusht-i-Kūh and is found in the large collective graves. This was a result of Akkadian military and political infiltration into the outer portions of the Highlands.

The Early Bronze Age IV tombs (Contemporary with Akkadian, Post-Akkadian, Ur III and Isin-Larsa Periods of Mesopotamia) excavated in Pusht-i Kuh, Luristan, showed new traditions of construction, although the old ones of the Early Bronze Age I and II were still being used. The new tombs are smaller in general (Fig. 28); the inner size of the chamber is limited; its length varies between 1.10 and 2.20 m. and its width between 0.50 and 0.90 m. The rectangular or horseshoe shaped tombs have three stone walls, two long and one short. The excavators think the fourth short wall contained the entrance and was made of a perishable material with no stones in place. Some were roofed with elongated stone slabs, and others may have been supported by wooden beams, branches or earth and stone.

Conclusion

Since the mid-third millennium BC our region witnessed the appearance of complex societies living in large walled cities, in which rural communities lived on the dry-farming agriculture. These societies were ruled by princes, viziers (badalum) or kings who maintained good relations with each other and with the neighbouring powers of Mesopotamia and western Syria. Yet agriculture was not the only economic activity, for animal husbandry and trade were no less important. This trade was based on the mining of raw materials and the exchange of the finished products. Trade, animal husbandry and agriculture allowed an aristocracy to emerge so that society became crystallized into the classes of slaves, peasants, craftsmen, officials and rulers. The society of the region was compound multi-ethnic and multi-lingual, in which Semites and Hurrians played significant roles. The archaeological
excavations in northern Syria reveal that the region, at least in the excavated areas, was not culturally and politically peripheral. Rather major powers had seized the region that could stand in parity with Akkad and Ebla. Still more fundamental changes were to come. The seizure of power by the Hurrians, to be discussed in subsequent chapters, was accomplished in the following centuries through a difficult process, which coincided with the rise of the Ur III Dynasty.
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CHAPTER THREE

The Gutian Period
The period following the fall of the Akkadian Empire is traditionally seen as a period of darkness and anarchy by historians. While the perceived darkness is due to the rarity of Gutian artefacts and text material, the anarchy is an impression formed by the historians gained from the Sumerian and Babylonian historical and literary compositions describing Gutian rule. In fact these compositions were mostly compiled later than the Gutian period itself. Later in this chapter we shall attempt to answer the question whether the Gutian period was really so dark and fruitless, and to interpret the related evidence.

The Gutian Arrival

Some historical allusions in the texts of the Akkadian period indicate that early on there was Gutian infiltration into Mesopotamian lowlands. One of these allusions is to the probable presence of Gutians as soldiers in the Akkadian army.\(^1\) The archives of Adab from the Akkadian period mention Gutians who received rations,\(^2\) some of them described as ‘travellers’\(^3\) and others as conveyors\(^4\) or generals.\(^5\) There were so many of them, perhaps long

---

\(^1\) According to Kuhrt: “While there is some evidence that Gutians, who had served in the Agade armies, dominated a sector in the eastern region,” cf. Kuhrt, The Ancient Near East, vol. I, p. 56, but unfortunately no reference is given.

\(^2\) A 655, 3, 6, 12; A 919, 2; A 809, 12; A 970, 5. Cf.: Zhi Yang, A Study of the Sargonic Archive from Adab (A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Division of the Humanities, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations), Chicago, 1986, vol. I, part 2; vol. 2, Appendix. 1.

\(^3\) Probably these were royal messengers, since ordinary travellers would not receive rations. Evidence for Gutian messengers comes from Umma, where a text from the time of Šarkališarrī mentions “a Gutian messenger” beside “Gutians” on the same tablet, cf.: Zhi Yang, A Study of the Sargonic ..., vol. I, part 1, p. 110-111 (referring to Foster, Umma in the Sargonic Period, p. 113).

\(^4\) As in A 919, l. 2 ģīr-gen-na gu-ti-um-me, “conveyors to the Gutians,” Zhi Yang, Sargonic Inscriptions from Adab, Changchun, 1989, p. 350, cf. also: Steinkeller, P., “The Old Akkadian Term for Easterner,” RA 74 (1980), p. 7; ģīr-gen-na gu-ti-um A 809, l. 12, Zhi Yang, op. cit. In the archives a messenger of one of the ensi (perhaps the ensi of Adab) is reported to have been killed: Zhi Yang, op. cit., vol. I, part 2, p. 153; Zhi Yang, Y., Sargonic Inscriptions..., p. 127, but further details are not given.
term residents, that the local governor had to use a Gutian interpreter to communicate with them. This early presence surely gave them access to the Mesopotamian institutions and the chance to get acquainted with Mesopotamian practices, particularly with reference to the government, the temple and the culture of the land. They would also have become acquainted with these practices as a consequence of war. The Gutian land was one of the first targeted by the south Mesopotamian rulers, especially the Akkadians, whose campaigns to these regions were noted in the previous chapter. Trade has also certainly played a prominent role. Gutian territory was close to the Mesopotamian lowlands and the Gutians certainly occupied positions close to the land of Akkad, particularly in the region of the Diyāla, where it is believed that they controlled a sector in the eastern region through their service in the Akkadian army.

This acquaintance with Mesopotamian practices as well as other pertinent circumstances helped the Gutians overthrow the Akkadian Dynasty and seize power in the land. One such circumstance was the hard times the Akkadian Empire endured in its last years. Their army was exhausted by continuing revolts on various distant fronts. Internal bitter conflicts between the Akkadian rulers themselves were sometimes bloody and at other times chaotic as they vied for the throne. These conflicts would have stimulated the descent into anarchy that weakened the Akkadian Empire. It is believed that the empire had shrunk under Dudu and Šudurul to a small state confined to the region between the cities of Akkad to Ešnunna and this shows the extent of the decline. Since it is generally assumed that the end of the Akkadian dynasty “has been determined primarily by inside-grown phenomena,” the disintegration and fall of the empire should no longer be wholly attributed to external factors, as cuneiform sources try to do.

There was no attempt at appeasement in Akkadian foreign policy. On the contrary it was aggressive, expansionist and severe towards its neighbours and subjects. It incited the anger

---

5  gir-nita gu-ti-um in A 959, l. 3, Zhi Yang, Sargonic Inscriptions..., p. 360, where a general of Gutium is reported to have travelled from Adab to Uruk, accompanied by a certain ‘Ur-nim,’ the cup-bearer: ū ur-nim saqi unugšē ba-re-[ēš], ibid, l. 4-7.
6  A 1028, 3, Zhi Yang, op. cit., p. 376.
7  Kuhrt, ibid. Earlier contact between the Gutians and South Mesopotamians is also pointed out by Di Ludovico: “Furthermore, some observations based on written texts lead to think that Gutians themselves were not wholly strange to urban peoples living between the Two Rivers,” Di Ludovico, A., “Between Akkad and Ur III: Observations on a "Short Century" from the Point of View of Glyptic,” Proceedings of the 4th International Congress of the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East (29 March-3 April 2004, Freie Universität Berlin), vol. 1: The Reconstruction of Environment, Wiesbaden, 2008, p. 321.
8  For instance, the great revolt against Narām-Sin in which numerous lands (or city-states) took part.
9  Sargon suffered a rebellion of his subjects (or perhaps of the elders of the land) from east and west, cf. Grayson, ABC 19, l. 52-52b; 20, l. 22-23. Other omen texts refer to the violent death of Rimuš, Maništušu and Šarkališarrī: “If a weapon to the right is turned around, blunted and .... and is entangled in filaments, it is an omen. Šarkališarrī whom his servants killed with their seals.” See for these omen texts Hirsch, “Die Inschriften der Könige von Agade,” AJO 20 (1963), 1-82, especially pages 13; 16 and 30. Diakonoff considers it possible that Narām-Sin has been killed in a battle against the Gutians: Diakonoff, CHI, p. 36.
10  The SKL describes the circumstances before the accession of Dudu and Šudurul as “Who was king? Who was not king? Was I[r]gigi king? Was Nanum king? Was Imi king? Was Elulu king? Their tetrad was king?,” [a-ba-ām lu]gal a-ba-ām nu lugal [I/r-gi]-giš lugal [Na-nu-un] lugal [I-mi] lugal [E-lu-lu] lugal [4-bi] lugal, Jacobsen, SKL, p. 112-5; cf. also http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/cgi-bin/etcsl.cgi?text=c.2.1.1&display=Crit&share=geicre#. 1. 284ff.
11  Nissen suggests that these two were rulers of the Akkad region in the time of the Gutian rule, not independent kings of the Akkad dynasty, cf. Nissen, H., The Early History of the Ancient Near East, 9000-2000 BC, Chicago, 1988, p. 185. The absence of bombastic titles like “king of the four quarters of the world” and “king of the universe” from their titles (they use only “the mighty king of Agade”) may support this suggestion. In fact, some others consider that “breaks” have to be inserted between the reign of Šarkališarrī and the reigns of Dudu and Šudurul; cf. Di Ludovico, op. cit., p. 325.
12  Di Ludovico, op. cit., p. 321.
and enmity of those peoples, which resulted in their continual search for the right moment to hit back. It is quite possible that the “national awakening” among the surrounding peoples in this period was a result of this policy, particularly the discrimination exercised by Sargon in using only Akkadians, not natives, to rule foreign lands and cities.

Among the enemies of Akkad the Gutians appear to have been in the best position to step on to the stage and invade Mesopotamia, and the prevailing circumstances paved the way for them to do so. Their relative closeness to Akkadian centres of power, their previous infiltration into Mesopotamian society and their familiarity with the land and its culture were clear advantages, and their probable organizational and military readiness was an essential for a successful attack. The wide-open plain was totally different from the Gutian undulating and mountainous landscape, and more troops and better organization were required. Confronting the experienced Akkadian standing army was a challenge that required a well-planned attack.

The Rule of the South

The Gutians may have infiltrated the land gradually or there may have been a sudden invasion. Archaeologically, there are no data for this phase to suggest any violent subjugation or destruction in the main cities of south Mesopotamia. However, there is evidence that from time to time some Gutians attacked Akkadian domains and pillaged the possessions, as can be seen from the Akkadian letter quoted in the previous chapter. It was sent by a certain Iškun-Dagan to his servant Lugal-ra to encourage him to plough the field and not to pay attention to the nearby Gutians. He was to bring the cattle inside the city should the Gutians attack. This Iškun-Dagan was obviously somehow in charge of Gutian affairs just at this time, for a seal impression was found bearing his name and title as ‘Chief administrator of Gutium (?).’

Whatever the background, the Gutians finally dominated the land of Akkad and “carried off the kingship of Sumer to the mountains/foreign land.” This metaphor clearly implies that the fate of the land and its sovereignty passed into the hands of a foreigner, specifically the great Gutian king. The Gutians were probably supported by other peoples and groups in the

---

13 Elam, for instance, developed a script of its own (Linear Elamite), which was used for a short period of time for official monuments and dedicatory gifts, cf. Potts, The Archaeology of Elam, p. 85 and 125-6. The Hurrian princes in the north and northwest also titled themselves endan, as in the inscription of Tišatul of Urkēš (for the inscription see chapter four). Finally there was the Sumerian renaissance in the Ur III period; cf. Westenholz, Mesopotamien, Akkade-Zeit und Ur III Zeit, OBO, p. 59.

14 According to Westenholz, this awakening was the result of the sudden collapse of the Akkadian Empire. However, in my opinion, it was the result of the Akkadian oppression and harsh policy, especially when Sargon installed “sons of Agade” to rule foreign lands and cities, excluding the sons of their own lands and cities: 79) iš-tum-ma 80) ti-a-am-tim 81) ša-pil-tim 82) DUMU. DUMU 83) a’ka-šu 84) ŠÉN-ku-a-tim 85) [u]-kà-lú, “So that from the Lower Sea <to the Upper Sea> the citizens (lit. sons) of Agade [h]eld the governorships (of the land),” Frayne, RIME 2, p. 11-12 (text E2.11.1).

15 For this cf. Di Ludovico, op. cit., p. 321 with detailed bibliography in note 5; and p. 326.


18 The exact meaning of the metaphor was unclear to Potts, Potts, Mesopotamia and the East, p. 119. This was understandable when one thought that the Gutian kings of Sumer and Akkad were also the kings of all the
region, perhaps even the Sumerians, who looked for liberation from the Akkadian yoke. The neighbouring peoples had together formed an alliance against Narām-Sin years before, and so it would have been natural to do the same this time. Among the probable allies one may expect the Elamites who were always ready to benefit from any weakness of their western neighbour, the Lullubians, the Hurrians and other mountain peoples and groups who had raided Akkadian territories earlier or who had suffered from campaigns of the kings of Agade. It appears that the Gutians did not (or perhaps they were not able to) spread their hegemony over the whole land of Sumer and Akkad. This is suggested by the presence of the influential Second Lagaš Dynasty and the Uruk Dynasty at the end of the period of Gutian rule. The inscriptions of Ur-Namma refer to at least three independent political entities in Sumer at that period: the Uruk city-state with its ruler Utuhegal, Lagaš, and the region under the Gutians. There is a suggestion that the two royal names Dudu and Šudurul, mentioned in the SKL as kings of Agade, were in fact rulers of the region centred on the city of Agade during the Gutian rule. The suggestion is based on the fact that the two of them are separated from the earlier rulers of the dynasty by a one-year hiatus, even though they are descended from the same family. It is also pointed out that their royal titles did not include “King of the four quarters of the world” and “King of the universe.” According to the available source material, we know that the regions of Umma, Kiš and Adab were certainly under (direct) Gutian rule. Textual evidence indicates that Umma was ruled by ensis on behalf of Gutian kings, as in the inscriptions of Namah(a)ni and Lugalannatum and the seal of Elulu that mentions Si’um/Siam, king of Gutium. In this connection, it was in the environs of Adab that the decisive battle that brought the Gutian hegemony to an end took place, according to the text of Utuhegal. If we can rely on the literary text ‘Lament over Sumer and Ur,’ the Gutian control over the Kiš and Adab region appears to have been firm and most probably lasted until the Ur III period. The text says:

Gutians. But if our suggestion about the ‘king of kings’ of the Gutians in the foothills of the Zagros is accepted, the meaning is clearer; see further below: "The Gutian Organization, the Greater king."

19 Potts, Mesopotamia and the East, p. 119.
20 The campaigns of the kings of Akkad to the regions north, northeast and northwest of Mesopotamia, and the revolts of the peoples of these regions against the Akkadian rule, both touched upon in the previous chapter, are good examples. The metal objects found in Western Iran, mainly in the Luristan and Kirmashan regions bearing inscriptions of the Akkadian kings, can be considered the booty of war, pillaged by the peoples of these regions as they attacked Akkad. For these objects and the inscriptions on them, cf. Calmeyer, P., Datierbare Bronzen aus Luristan und Kirmanshah, Berlin, 1969, p. 161ff.
21 Westenholz adds Kiš and Apiak to this small kingdom, cf. Westenholz, OBO, p. 57.
22 Nissen, A History of the Ancient Near East, p. 185.
24 1) Lugal-an-na-tum 2) ensi 3) GIŠ.ÜH⁴ 4) GIŠ.ÜH⁵ 5) ba-ba-a 6) 35 mu 7) zal-la-ba 8) É-PA-GIŠ.ÜH⁹ 9) i-dû (?!) 10) temen-bi 11) ki-i-si-si 12) me-bi sâ-ba 13) si ba-ni-sâ 14) u₃-ba Si-ù-um 15) lugal-Gu-ti-um-kam, “Lugalannatum the ensi of Umma, (after) 35 years had passed since (the territory of) Umma was reduced (or divided up), (he) (re)built the É-PA (=gidru?) of Umma (and) put this deposit document in the foundation-peg, (and) looked after corresponding rituals therein. At that time, Si’um was king of Gutium,” Gelb and Kienast, op. cit., Gutium 3, p. 296-7; cf. also Frayne, RIME 2, p. 268 (text E2.11.13).
25 This name is identical to the reconstructed name of the SKL (see FAOS, p. 293). However, Hallo had earlier declared it did not occur on the list; he compared it with forms such as Si-um-mi and Si-a-um, both attested in texts from the Diyālā Region and Gasur; Hallo, RIA, p. 712 and bibliography.
26 Potts, op. cit., p. 120. The legend of the seal reads I-lu-lu IR Si-a-um, “Ilulu, the servant of Siaum,” cf. Moortgat, A., Vorderasiatische Rollsiegel, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Steinschneidekunst, Berlin, 1940, no. 186.
27 See further below.
Adab, which stretches out along the river, was deprived of water. The serpent of the mountains made his bed there (i.e. in Adab), the rebellious land it is (now). The Gutians multiplied there and brought forth their seed there.  

Based on collation, Hallo has suggested to read Ḥabil-kiṅ, the 12th royal name of the Gutian Dynasty in the SKL as Apil-kiṅ, and consequently suggested a relationship with the dynasties of Mari and Ur. In his new article about the Gutians, he cited new information about this Apil-kiṅ, who was once šakkannak of Mari, actually the seventh in the line, and who was father of Tarām-Ur(i)am, the é-gi4-a (daughter-in-law) of Ur-Namma. Hallo does not entirely exclude that he functioned for a brief time also as king of Gutium. If this is true, it means on the one hand that the Gutian sway had extended to Ur, and perhaps also to Mari. On the other hand it supports our suggestion about the assumed Gutian Great king installing Gutian as well as non-Gutian governors to rule Sumer and Akkad.

The discovery of the mace head of Lā’arab in Sippar raises questions about whether the Gutians actually ruled the city. Hallo pointed out that the provenance of the piece need not imply that this king had ruled the city. At the same time he refers to the late tradition according to which the Gutians removed the statue of Annunitum from Sippar. One might suggest that the mace head was brought to the city as a gift to one of the deities there, spoil of some battle against the Gutian dynasty. However, Sippar was an important cultural centre of Mesopotamia and many significant artifacts were kept there, such as the pieces taken by Šutruk-Nahunte as booty to Susa, including the Stele of Hammurabi. So it would not have been impossible for this mace head to have been kept there with the other pieces. Nevertheless, one should not exclude the possibility that the city was under Gutian control, for it was an important station for peoples coming from the north, northwest and northeast.

---

28 144) Adabki-bu é id-dé lá-ri a-e ba-da-ab-bu(PI) 145) muš kur-ra-ke₄ ki-nú ba-ni-ib-gar ki-bala-šè ba-ab- 

dug₄ 146) Gu-ti-um šà ba-ni-ib-bal-bal numun ba-ni-ib-i, Michalowski, P., The Lamentation over the 

Destruction of Sumer and Ur, Winona Lake, 1989, p. 44; 45, cf. also for the translation: Kramer, S. N., Sumerian 


30 In Hallo, “New Light…,” p. 150, it is dated to 2126-2091 BC by Durand, who suggests he has reigned 35 

years and was evidently a contemporary of Ur-Namma; see Durand, J.-M., “La situation historique des 


31 vii 7) Tā-ra-am-ŠEŠ.AB /₄ am 8) dumu-munus A-pil-ki-in 9) lugal Ma-uri₄-ka 10) é-gi₄-a 11) Ur₄-Namma 12) 


Ur,” AoF 23/1 (1996), p. 24-25, note 6 and the figure on page 38 that shows the relationship between Ur-Namma 

and Apil-Kîn.


33 This is perhaps why some non-Gutian names occur in the list of the Gutian dynasty of the SKL. They were 

considered by some as a sign of Gutian integration in the Mesopotamian society, concerning this integration see 

for instance Veenhof, Geschichte des Alten Orients bis zur Zeit Alexanders des Großen, Grundriss zum Alten 


34 About this suggestion, see below ‘The Gutian Organization, The Great King.’


36 Hallo, ibid.

37 Presenting gifts to the deities from the booty of war was a Mesopotamian tradition, practised, for instance, by 

the kings of Ur III and the kings of Assyria. For Ur III examples cf. Sallaberger, Ur III Zeit, OBO, p. 164 with 

bibliography, concerning offerings to Nanna and Enlil, and deliveries of cattle, said to have been provided from 

the booty of the lands Šašru and Šuruṭhum. The Šulgi hymn D also, speaks of the booty from Gutium, and how 

Šulgi brought home lapis-lazuli packed in bags, “the property of the land,” together with cattle and donkeys, and 

how he offered them to Enlil and Ninlil; cf. Klein, J., The Royal Hymns of Shulgi King of Ur: Man’s Quest for 

Later it became an important centre of the Kassites, who built their capital Dūr-Kurigalzu not too far away, and it was targeted by the Elamites in some of their campaigns.

That the Gutian rulers are listed in the SKL might imply that their control also reached the sacred city of Nippur. The discovery of copies of inscriptions of Erridu-Pizir in the city further supports this idea, but without direct proof this remains far from certain.

The Utuḫegal allusion to Tirigan’s control of both banks of the Tigris has been understood to mean that Gutian control was restricted to the region of the Tigris, rather than as far as the Euphrates. However far Gutian control extended in the western parts of the alluvium this allusion can be explained as propaganda by Uruk against Tirigan rather than a historical statement about the core area of the Gutian power. The idea rests on the fact that the statement occurs in the same narrative of cutting off the ways in the north and depriving the people of the use of the river as a means of transport. So it is in this context that the information should be understood.

The Gutians were thought to have used power and terror to control the land under their sway through widespread raids. As long as the Gutian overlords were smaller in number than the native Sumerians and Akkadians such a policy would have been the best way to keep their rule firm in their hands and it could have been expected, but in fact it conflicts with the archaeological data mentioned above. These impressions arise perhaps from the circumstances described in the literary compositions that speak of the bad conditions under the Gutians. By contrast the stability of the city-state of Lagaš could be attributed not only to the fact that rule was in native hands, for other factors seem also to have been in play. Gudea enjoyed remarkably easy access to mines in Gutian territory or territory under Gutian control, such as the copper mines in mount Kimaš, and this may well indicate some mutual cooperation between the two dynasties.

Outside Sumer and Akkad

In relation to those lands of the Transtigris and Northern Mesopotamia (the names of some of which are known, such as Niqqum, Simurrum, Madga, Assur, Urbilum) and the Habur region, there is no evidence yet of a direct Gutian rule in the area as a whole, except for a few presumed traces in Assur and Nineveh. The situation is more complicated in Brak, ancient Nagar. While some speak of a supposed Gutian destruction of the Akkadian

38 Frayne, RIME 2, p. 284 (text E2.13.6.4). For the Sumerian text, see below.
39 The river Tigris was not used for irrigation in ancient times since its level was lower than the surrounding land. The only useful river for agriculture was the Euphrates with its tributaries and canals. This situation lasted until the Seleucid Period, when hydraulic machines were introduced and first used for irrigation. This is why all important Sumerian cities are located on the Euphrates and its tributaries, not on the Tigris.
40 Nissen, A History of the Ancient Near East, p. 186. However, Potts suggests that this manner of “swift, mobile marauders preying on a richer sedentary population” happened outside the Kiš-Adab region; Potts, Mesopotamia and..., p. 121.
41 For the text of Gudea, cf. Chapter Four.
42 Potts, Mesopotamia and..., p. 119.
43 The level that followed the Akkadian in Assur, especially in the temple of Ištar, that yielded nothing other than hovels, could be, according to Gadd, remnants of the huts of the Gutians who dwelled there; Gadd, “The Dynasty of Agade and the Gutian Invasion,” CAH I, part 2, p. 457-8. However, it is too difficult to link these remnants of houses or other finds with the Gutians or any other ethnicity as discussed by Bär: Bár, J., “Sumerians, Gutians and Hurrians at Ashur? A Re-Examination of Ishtar Temples G and F,” Iraq 65 (2003), p. 148 and 158. According to R. Adams, the larger towns of the Diyâla plains have presumably suffered badly from the invaders: Adams, R., Land Behind Baghdad, p. 45 (after: Hallo, RIA p. 710) and the claim of Nabonidus of restoring a temple in Sippar that had been destroyed by the Gutians: Hallo, RIA p. 717. Yet the damage inflicted on the bronze head of Sargon (or Narâm-Sîn) found in Nineveh was seen as a sign of a Gutian presence and violent revenge. However, it is not impossible that the non-Gutian natives also rejoiced at the fall of Akkad and could have taken such revenge.
occupation in the city resulting in a 300 year gap in the occupation of North Mesopotamia (but slightly later than the Gutian invasion). D. Oates and J. Oates stressed that there is no break found between the Akkadian and post-Akkadian occupations there.

Whatever the case may be, the northern lands mentioned above obviously reverted to local rule immediately after the fall of Akkad if not earlier. However, the discovery of the inscriptions of Erridu-Pizir of Gutium has slightly enriched our knowledge of the situation. Thanks to these inscriptions we know now of campaigns carried out by this king to subdue Simurrum, Urbilum, Lullubum, Madga and several other as yet unidentified GNs. This means that these lands were politically independent or at least had tried to gain independence. It is quite possible that some of them enjoyed some time of independence before the Gutian attempts to annexe them. According to Erridu-Pizir himself, he was successful in his campaigns, but for the moment we cannot be sure for how long he was able to maintain his control over these unruly lands and peoples. If in fact these areas were firmly in Gutian hands, then the Gutian state had become a kind of empire that extended to Sumer and Akkad in the south and at least to Erbil in the north.

The Gutian Organization: the Great King

It appears that the socio-political organization of the Gutians was different from that of Mesopotamia. The Gutian organization seems to have been tribal, centred on the head of the tribe, or probably a tribal committee composed of the elders and sheikhs of the tribe. It is usual in modern tribal organizations, about which much information is known, to be founded on absolute loyalty to the head of the tribe, and he in turn acts as a father for his great family. In such organizations loyalty to one’s own family counts for less than loyalty to the tribe. The absence of allusions to Gutian cities or centres, at least in this early period, could imply they had a non-sedentary lifestyle.

Until a couple of decades ago the head of the Babān and Jāf tribes, in the regions of Shahrazūr and Garmiyān (partly covered by the Diyāla basin) were called ‘kings.’ Similarly, the Gutian and also the Lullubian rulers in that same region were referred to as ‘kings’ by Mesopotamians. In fact they were most probably more like tribal chieftains leading tribal federations that consisted of petty tribes or clans headed by smaller sheikhs.

In tribal organization leadership succession is usually hereditary. But it has been suggested that the Gutian tribal head was elected because of the short terms of the reigns of the Gutian

---

44 Hallo, “New Light …, p. 149.
47 According to Diakonoff, the Gutians were tribesmen with elected chieftains, cf. Diakonoff, “Media,” CHI, p. 37.
49 There is in fact an allusion to “cities” of Gutians in the inscriptions of Tukulti-Ninurta I (MA period) during his campaign on the land of Uqumanu, which he describes as a Gutian kingdom, cf. Grayson, RIMA I, p. 234 (text A.0.78.1); a fact earlier noted in Saggs, H. W. F., The Might that was Assyria, London, 1984, p. 51.
50 The word ‘horde’ to describe the Gutians or their army (as in the SKL, p. 116 and 117, l. 26) is not the precise equivalent of the Sumerian word KI.SU.LU.UB4<.GAR>= uḫnim “army,” “troops,” see also below.
51 Called pa(d)sha in Kurdish, padishah in Persian.
52 In the letters of Shemshāra and Mari numerous instances of “king of the Gutians” and “(numerous) kings of the Lullubeans” (using the Sumerian logogram LUGAL) are recorded; for details and examples cf. Chapters Six and Seven.
kings and the repetition of some of their names in the Sumerian King List (SKL). Diakonoff concluded that in the Gutian regnal system there were no kings, but instead elected tribal chieftains to rule the land periodically for short terms, and they could be re-elected more than once. He found support in the sentence “The Guti horde had no king” in the beginning of version L1 of the SKL. But Jacobsen says this is a secondary variant in a single text of the B branch of texts that all say “a king without a name.” Because the suggestion of Diakonoff is based on one occurrence in a secondary version it is difficult to accept.

Our suggestion is that there was a Great king, a king of kings, of the Gutians, who ruled all the Gutian tribes and resided in the land of Gutium, not in lowland Mesopotamia. The names of such Great kings are not documented because they did not rule Mesopotamia personally. They entrusted rulership to Gutian governors who were sent by the king from his capital. It is the names of these governors that are recorded in the SKL. We should not expect the king of the widespread Gutian tribes to leave his royal seat in the hills to come to lowland Mesopotamia to rule that part of his realm. Instead the land of Sumer and Akkad was ruled by the governors, and it is their names which are recorded in the SKL. These governors, who were not always themselves Gutians, ruled in the name of this putative Great king.

Abdication, substitution and restoration is reflected in the SKL, as in the case of lrar(la)ngab, who was both the ninth and the eleventh king. Such a practice would reflect that of the ensis sent by the Mesopotamian kings to rule the conquered foreign lands while they themselves stayed in their capitals. The Gutians must surely have seen and could easily have imitated the Akkadian example of installing Akkadian citizens to rule foreign lands. Such a system was also in operation in the region under study in the first half of the second millennium. Then Kuwârî, ruler of Šuarrâ, ruled the city and its province on behalf of the Great Turukkean King Pîsendênh, whose capital was Kunšum in the nearby mountains. King Erridu-Pizir, whose inscriptions will be discussed later in this chapter, could very probably have one of those Great kings, for he was not mentioned in the SKL, while the city of Agade was under his direct (or indirect) rule when he campaigned against KA-Nîšba of Simurrum. Another criterion is that the arena of his operations according to his inscriptions was outside Sumer and Akkad, closer to the upper Diyâla and the Transtigris (see his inscription in this chapter). Because few inscriptions attributable to the Gutian kings have been found we must reserve judgement. But the use of the title “king of Gutium, king of the four quarters (of the world)” in the inscriptions of Erridu-Pizir implies that he was Great king

57 Except for two, Erridu-Pizir and his father Enrida-Pizir.
58 For instance, the ensis of the Ur III period.
59 Presumably a Gutian name. The second part of the name occurs also in the name of his father, Enrida-Pizir. A similar form was found in an Ur III text from Umma as Pl-zi-ir: Zadok, R., “Hurrians, as well as Individuals Bearing Hurrian and Strange Names in Sumerian Sources,” in kinattitu ša dârâtî- Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume, ed. A. F. Rainey, Tel Aviv, 1993, p. 235. The first sign can also be read WA or WI.
60 The interpretation presented by Michalowski of why this king was not mentioned in the SKL is that the textual tradition of this section of the SKL was the most garbled in the entire composition: Michalowski, P., “History as Charter, Some Observations on the Sumerian King List,” JAS 103 (1983), apud, Frayne, BiOr, p. 404.
61 The inscription E2.2.1.2 mentions that the army (?) of Erridu-Pizir offered large male goats to the gods in Agade before its march against KA-Nîšba: 14) in A-kâ-da4 15) u-ra-sî 16) ra-bî-å-ti-m 17) <a-nà> 18) <a-àqā-ra-ab, (col. V, l. 14-18), and that the goddess Ištar had stationed troops (probably belonging to him or for him) in Agade: 2) 4INANNA 3) in A-kâ-da4 4) ERÍN-e-am 5) iš-ku-un (E2.2.1.2, col. V, l. 2-5). This refers to some military contribution/ assistance to Erridu-Pizir from his subordinate, the Gutian governor.
of the Gutians in addition to Sumer and Akkad, greater than the kings of Sumer and Akkad who he himself had installed.

The actual title of such a Great king is as yet unknown, but the text KUB 27, 38 (CTH 775), although a historical-mythological text, may give a hint, when it says that the Lullubians once had a “king of kings.” Additional evidence comes later from the time of Tukulti-Ninurta I of Assyria who, in the course of his first military action conducted against the Gutians in Uquma/enu, mentioned “the hordes of princes of Abulê, king of the land of Uqumen.” Although the Akkadian word *malku* means a ‘king’ or ‘foreign ruler,’ this text still points to rulers or minor kings under the leadership of a major king. It is a clear indication that the Gutians in this period were ruled by princes subordinate to a Great king.

If this is true, two questions arise. One is why the SKL calls the Gutian governor of Sumer and Akkad ‘king’, and the other why the name of the Great king is omitted from the list. The answer to the first question is that these governors might have had the same rank as the ‘kings’ of Gutian tribes under the leadership of the ‘Great king,’ and so were called kings. In addition to this, king is the obvious term to denote the ruler of several cities in Sumer and Akkad. As to the second question, the answer may lie in the fact that the Gutian governor known as a king ruled the holy Sumerian and Akkadian cities under the assumed patronage of the deities of those cities and performed their religious duties, for he was the ruler in charge of the land. Thus, it was this governor who was the significant figure for the SKL, not the foreign Great king outside the land. The example given by Ḥat/daniš of Ḥamazi, supports this suggestion. The name of Ḥat/daniš is the only Ḥamazite royal name mentioned in the SKL, as the conqueror of Kiš and probably Nippur, but it neglects other rulers such as Zizi, the contemporary of Irkab-Damu of Ebla, because they did not rule Sumer and Akkad.

Some attempts have been made to identify the “King without name” of the SKL. 65 It is thought that a break in the old manuscript had occurred from which the list of Gutian kings was copied and hence a king without a name is recorded. It remains difficult to accept the identification of Erridu-Pizir as the “King without name.” The difficulty stems from the fact that also the father of Erridu-Pizir, Enrida-Pizir, was a king of Gutium and there is also no mention of his name in the list. If Erridu-Pizir is to be identified with the “King without name,” then his father should also be another “King without name,” but there is only one such epithet on the list. It could be that his father reigned before the Gutian invasion, and hence was not listed in the SKL, but this does not seem to be the case. The Assyrian king list mentions 17 kings who had never been in Assur, but lived in tents. Even so they are included in the Assyrian King List. 66 Of the Kassites, who ruled Babylonia after the fall of the First Dynasty of Babylon, former kings like Gandan are similarly mentioned in the lists. 67


63 III 2) *A-ru-le-e* MAN KUR Ù-qu-me-ni gu-un-ni ma-li-ki-šu, Grayson, RIMA 1, p. 235 (text A.0.78.1). Noteworthy is the translation of the word *gu-un-ni* in this text as “hordes,” while CAD gives “elite troops.” Even Jacobsen in SKL translates ki-su-ub-ur<-gar> =ugnim as “horde,” though it also means “army,” “troops.” The influence the old Mesopotamian propaganda regarding the Gutians (see below) on modern scholars is clear.

64 Cf. *CAD*, vol. M 1, p. 166 ff.


The Gutian Dynasty

We know very little of the Gutian Dynasty from Sumero-Akkadian texts. They are silent on the subject, except for the kings’ names listed in the SKL and a few royal inscriptions by Gutian kings or by their officials. The four versions of the SKL show discrepancies in their lists of Gutian kings, and these discrepancies pose more problems than solutions. The generally accepted list gives 21 or 23 kings including the “king without name.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Imtâ</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Read by Hallo in RIA 3, 711: ni-bi-阿里巴巴 affair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inkišuš</td>
<td>6/7 years</td>
<td>Jacobson’s note to this name is that a break in the last part of the sign TA has resulted in the reading BA, which is the second sign of the name; i.e. im-ta-a has become im-ba-a, cf. Jacobson, SKL, p. 120, note 308.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Šulmê</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Jacobsen’s note to this name is that a break in the last part of the sign TA has resulted in the reading BA, which is the second sign of the name; i.e. im-ta-a has become im-ba-a, cf. Jacobson, SKL, p. 120, note 308.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inimabakeš</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Igeš’a’uš</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Iarlagab</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ibate</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Iarlangab</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ku-ru-um</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ha-bil-kî?-in-Apiškin</td>
<td>3 years.</td>
<td>Possible Semitic; possibly Old Akkadian according to Gelb, op. cit., p. 61.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>La-erabum</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Irarum</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ibranum</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Haššum</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Puzur-Sîn</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Iarlaganda</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Si’u</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tirigan</td>
<td>40 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70 Cf. Hallo, *RIA*, p. 711. As already pointed out, some regard Erridu-Pizir as the king without a name (see above). Their names of some other Gutians, called kings in other texts, were added to the SKL; see for instance Jacobsen, *SKL*, p. 120, note 308.
71 Jacobson’s note to this name is that a break in the last part of the sign TA has resulted in the reading BA, which is the second sign of the name; i.e. im-ta-a has become im-ba-a, cf. Jacobson, *SKL*, p. 118, note 286.
73 The first sign of the name is in fact NAG which has the values ia and zá, so the first element of the name is ambiguous. The sign NI of exemplar WB, can also be either ia or zal.
75 Possibly Old Akkadian according to Gelb, op. cit., p. 61.
76 Cf. Gelb and Kienast, *FAOS*, p. 293; Edzard, D. O., “Königlisten und Chroniken- A. Sumerisch,” *RIA* 6 (1980-83), p. 82-84. UM 29-15-199 adds two otherwise unattested Gutian kings to the list, Duš-ga and i-lu-DINGIR (ii) 3-4; cf. Michalowski, “History as Charter,” p. 246. The name Irarum (the 15th name on the list, WB exemplar) has been attested in a text from Gasur without imitation as I-ra-ra, cf. Meek, *Excavations at Nuzi*, vol. III, Old Akkadian, Sumerian, and Cappadocian Texts from Nuzi, Harvard, 1935, 31: 3; 153 IV 17. As pointed out already, there was a well-known GN in the Trans-Tigris called Irar. Hallo had already called attention to a similar name to Si-u4 (the 21th on the list), presumably attested in the text of Lugalannatum of Umma, in the form Si-ù-um. The name is also attested several times in the texts of Gasur in the form Si-ù-um; cf. Meek, *op. cit.*, 107: 8; 155 IV 6; 155 III 8; 146: 13; 153 II 6; 197: 8; 72 I 3. The sixth name was e-lu-lu-me-eš in Jacobsen,
Inscriptions or seals of officials recording the names of some of the kings listed in the SKL have been found, thus confirming the credibility of the SKL. Among these names are the 19th king Jarlagan, the 14th Lāʿarāḇ and the 20th Siʾaʾu(m). Edzard had removed the first king from the list but inserted another king between Šulme (his no. 4) and Silulumeš (his no. 6) to become the fifth king on the list, but without giving his name. According to Hallo, those kings have ruled 40-50 years only from the end of Šarkališarrī to Ur-Namma. But according to the SKL itself the 21 kings have ruled 125 (var. 124) years and 40 days, or 99 years under 23 kings. The version published by Jacobsen gives 91 years and 40 days for 21 kings.

The Gutian names at the beginning of the list tend to become Akkadianized towards the end, like the names Ibranum, Ḥablum and Puzur-Sîn. As already pointed out, this can be the result of the installation of Akkadians or Akkadian-named individuals to govern the land on behalf of the Gutians, among whom was Apil-Kīn mentioned above.

A Dark Age?

This period has been described as a Dark Age, since the Gutians did not leave any discernible impact on Mesopotamian culture. We cannot distinguish any typically Gutian literature or works of art. All that we possess are a few inscriptions that bear explicit Gutian royal names and titles. This lack of a Gutian material and spiritual culture and the absence of any Gutian version of events contribute to the idea of a Gutian ‘Dark Age.’ This image, based on the presence of strong Sumero-Akkadian propaganda opposed to Gutian silence, though may well have to be changed, but can hardly be changed without further evidence coming to light.

It is hard to understand how so few traces remain of the Gutian period, which lasted at least 91 years in southern Mesopotamia. We have found no sculpture, no architecture, no official or unofficial inscription, none of the basic elements for running a state. What appears to have happened is that the Sumerians, and probably the Akkadians too, have later destroyed everything and anything which evoked any memory of the invaders after the Gutians were...

but according to the collation of Hallo it must now be read as Si-lu-lu-me-eš, cf. Michalowski, “History as Charter,” p. 248, note 66.

77 This name is identified with Jarlaganda of the SKL, cf. Gelb and Kienast, FAOS, p. 293, note to line 19, and with Arlgan, as found on the stone bowl published a few years ago by Hallo, see below.

78 Edzard, Königslisten und Chroniken- A. Sumerisch,” RIA 6, p. 82-84.


81 Hallo, RIA, p. 711.

82 Jacobsen, SKL, p. 116-21. Some find it possible that the Gutian rule in central and southern Mesopotamia could have begun with the death of Narām-Sîn, and also that the last two kings of Akkad ruled the core of the land of Akkad only, centred round the capital Akkad, cf. Veenhof, Geschichte des Alten Orients, p. 72; cf. also the suggestion of Nissen above, that these two kings were rulers of the Akkad region during the Gutian Period.

83 According to Potts, there is no influx of Gutian personal names: Potts, op. cit., p. 121. However, the typical Gutian names listed in the SKL and other relative names in the texts of Nuži and Diyâlî, although few, indicate the contrary. For the discussion of some of these names cf. Hallo, “Gutium,” RIA, p. 712; Speiser, Mesopotamian Origins, p. 97.
expelled. They tried to delete the Gutian interlude from their history. They apparently felt humiliated and scorned when they themselves and their holy cities were ruled by mountainous tribes, tribes that had been a regular source for their slaves in the times before the invasion. This hatred is well reflected in several texts describing the conditions under Gutian rule. The Utuhegal inscription is a good example in this respect:

Gu[tium], the fanged serpent of the mountain, who acted with violence against the gods, who carried the kingship of the land of Sumer to the mountain land, who fil[led] the land of Sumer with wickedness, who took away the wife from the one who had a wife, who took away the child from the one who had a child, who put wickedness and evil in the land (of Sumer).85

It continues:

Tiri[gan], the king of Gutium, ........ He had seized on both banks of the Tigris River. In the south, in Sumer, he had blocked (water from) the fields. In the north, he had closed off the roads (and) caused tall grass to grow up along the highway(s) of the land.86

The Weidner Chronicle shows the disrespectful behaviour of the Gutians towards the gods, the Mesopotamian gods in particular:

Utuhegal, the fisherman, caught a fish as tribute at the edge of the sea; until that fish was offered to the great lord, Marduk, it was not offered to any other god. The Guti, took the cooked fish away from him before it was offered [...].87

The well-known ‘Curse of Agade’ includes a detailed passage concerning the Gutians, which could well be called the “Scorn Chapter”. It depicts life under their rule as stagnated, backward and intolerable, an attitude permeating the whole section. It begins with the description of the Gutians themselves, who looked like humans but were not. They were ugly creatures, cunning with evil intent, and more importantly, they were not part of the civilized world of Mesopotamia, but aliens:

Not classed among people, not reckoned as part of the land/country, Gutium, a people not to bridle, with human instincts, but canine intelligence, and monkeys’ features.88

---

84 Similar cases in the history of the Near East are not unprecedented. In more recent history all works of art and everything bearing symbols of royalty in Egypt after the overthrow of the monarchy in 1952 were destroyed. Similarly, some scholars ascribe the rarity of relics from the Parthian Period in Iran to the hatred of the Sassanian kings towards them expressed by destroying anything bearing their memory.


In order to show the greatness of the sin committed by Narām-Sīn, the image depicted of the invasion and its consequences is horrible. The Gutians are described as hordes intent on destroying any sign of life:

Enlil brought them out of the mountains. Like hordes of locusts they lie over the land; their arms are stretched over the plain for him (Enlil) like a snare for animals; nothing leaves their arms; no one escapes their arms. ⑧⁹

As a result, all aspects of life stagnated. There was civic collapse as administrative work and economic activity ceased:

Messengers no longer travel the highways; the courier’s boat no longer takes to the rivers.⁹⁰

The invaders feared no gods and they dared to plunder temple possessions:

They (the Gutians) drive the trusty goats of Enlil from the fold, and make their herdsmen follow; they drive the cows from the pens, and make their cowherds follow.⁹¹

These uncivilised invaders, as the text wants to show, were the worst administrators the land had ever known. These corrupt criminals left the cities, the homes of the gods and residents, open to ruin by dislodging the gates. The land experienced such devastation that even foreign lands mourned bitterly:

The shackled manned the watch; the brigand occupied the highways; the doors of all the city-gates of the land lay dislodged in the dirt; and all the foreign lands uttered bitter cries from the walls of their cities.⁹²

The crude uncivilized conquerors apparently could not distinguish a city from a village. They abandoned the fields but planted gardens, probably for their own use, in the midst of the cities. Drought, the failure of agriculture and the growth of everything sweet and delicious was due to their policy and their presence:

In the midst of the cities, though not in the widespread exterior plains, they planted gardens (for the first time) since cities were built and founded; the great agricultural tracts produced no grain; the inundated tracts produced no fish; the irrigated orchards produced neither syrup nor juice; the gathered clouds did not rain; the mašgurum did not grow.⁹³

On the individual level the consequences of rising prices were catastrophic:

---

⑨ 162) lú-kin-gi4-a ̃ar-ra-an-na nu-mu-un-g ̃í 163) gišmá ra-gaba íd-da nu-mu-un-dab5-bé, op. cit. 58; 59.
At that time, one shekel’s worth of oil was only one-half quart, one shekel’s worth of grain was only one-half quart, one shekel’s worth of wool was only one-half mina, one shekel’s worth of fish filled only one ban-measure- these sold at such (prices) in the markets of all the cities. He who slept on the roof, died on the roof; he who slept in the house, had no burial; people were flailing at themselves from hunger.

This resulted in the decay of the social texture and the destruction of the moral hierarchy created through centuries of social and cultural evolution:

The honest was changed to a liar; young men lay upon young men; the blood of liars ran upon the blood of honest men.

It culminated with the gods making their sanctuaries and stores smaller and simpler:

At that time Enlil remodelled his great sanctuaries into tiny reed sanctuaries, and from east to west he reduced their stores.

Anyone who did not die of hunger or was not killed could only cry out in despair:

The old women who survived those days, the old men who survived those days, the chief lamentation singer who survived those years, for seven days and seven nights put in place seven balag-instruments, as if they stood at heaven’s base, and played ub, meze, and lilis-drums for him (Enlil) among them (the balags). The old women did not restrain (the cry) “Alas my city!”, the old men did not restrain (the cry) “Alas its people!”, the lamentation singer did not restrain (the cry) “Alas the Ekur!”, its young women did not restrain from tearing their hair, its young men did not restrain their sharp knives.

All these insults, vilifications, and the dark age described here and in other texts reflect the bitter hatred for the Gutians. Such hatred would have given every encouragement for any remnant of any memory of them to be completely destroyed, leaving only these scathing comments. The hatred lived on long afterwards. The Babylonians sustained bitter memories of the Gutian age, as recorded in their literary and historical compositions, and the demonic image they gave to the Gutians became a standard term in their language for the description of any evildoer or invader from the east. When the Persians under Cyrus the Great conquered

---

97 According to T.J.H. Krispin, balags were string instruments, not drums.
99 The badly damaged mace head of Lâ’arâb is evidence of this assumed campaign of destruction. The tablet on which the Erridu-Pizir inscriptions are written, although a later copy, was restored from almost 20 pieces. However, the tablets were seemingly teaching material for scribes. The question arises of whether they had no problem referring to this king, or whether they let pupils study his inscription to get acquainted with the enemy.
Babylon in 539 BC Babylonian inscriptions called them Gutians, and the army of Alexander was similarly called the “army of the Gutians” in Chronicle 10.

Gutian Relics

Although not rich in content, a few surviving inscriptions prove that the Gutians realised the significance of writing and tokens of authority (such as the mace head below). They also made offerings and dedications to the gods whom they worshipped.

The mace head of Ḍārāḇ or Ḍārab (BM 90852) (Fig. 1), is supposed to have been found by H. Rassam in Sippar, since its registration number bears the initials AH (= Abu Habba). The mace head is artistically and orthographically classified as belonging to the early or middle Akkadian Period and bears a lengthy curse formula like those of the Old Akkadian royal inscriptions. Due to its fragmentary state, the expected historical information is lost; even the name of its owner was restored by Jacobsen with the help of Old Akkadian texts from Diyāla. The extant part of the text reads:

Although not rich in content, a few surviving inscriptions prove that the Gutians realised the significance of writing and tokens of authority (such as the mace head below). They also made offerings and dedications to the gods whom they worshipped.

The mace head of Ḍārāḇ or Ḍārab (BM 90852) (Fig. 1), is supposed to have been found by H. Rassam in Sippar, since its registration number bears the initials AH (= Abu Habba). The mace head is artistically and orthographically classified as belonging to the early or middle Akkadian Period and bears a lengthy curse formula like those of the Old Akkadian royal inscriptions. Due to its fragmentary state, the expected historical information is lost; even the name of its owner was restored by Jacobsen with the help of Old Akkadian texts from Diyāla. The extant part of the text reads:

Lā́rāḇ, the mighty, king of Gutium, (lacuna)… fashioned and dedicated (this mace). As for the one who removes this inscription and writes his own name (instead), may the god of Gutium, Aštar and Sīn, tear out his foundations and destroy his progeny. Further, may his campaign not succeed.

Another Gutian royal inscription (Fig. 2) was published late in 2002 by Hallo. The inscription, written on a stone bowl, is quite short:

Arlagan, the mighty, king of Gutium.

Since the bowl bears two inscriptions, one of Šudurul and the other of Arlagan, based on internal evidence Hallo proposed that the Gutian inscription was added at a later date,

---

100 Diakonoff saw that this was due to the fact that the Babylonians in the Neo-Babylonian period were calling new peoples by old names: Diakonoff, I. M., “Last Years of the Urartian Empire,” VDI 36/2 (1951), p. 29-39, after Hallo, “New Light . . .,” p. 155; Chronicle 10 that concerns episodes from the Seleucid Period states: lūummāni ku Gu-ti-i u lūummānūned [ . . . ], “The army of the Guti and the armies of [ . . . ]” Grayson, ABC, p. 117. However, in my view this was purely a political usage of the name in that period. An exact parallel of this phenomenon can be found in the Iraqi political propaganda during the first Gulf war, when the Iranians were called during 8 years of war al-Furs al-Majūs,” The Magi Persians,” while the Iranians actually abandoned the Magi religion more than 15 centuries ago. The terms were simply pejorative and provocative.

101 The Weidner Chronicle is negative in this respect, when it states 56) Qu-tu(!)-ū ša ta-zi-im-te ila pa-la-ḥa la kul-tu-mu 57) par-ši usurāti(gūš,ḥur)kī šu-te-ša-ra la i-du-ū, “The Guti were oppressive people, without instruction in divine worship, they did not know how to properly perform divine rites (and) ordinances,” Grayson, ABC, Chronicle 19, p. 149-150.

102 Gelb pointed to the frequent occurrence of the name Lā́rāḇ in the Old Akkadian tablets from Tell Asmar and has published an Old Akkadian tablet in the Chicago Natural History Museum listing the names of nine persons. One of them is a certain la-á-ra-ab (rev., l. 8), cf. also: FAOS, p. 294-5.

103 Hallo, RIA, p. 711-2; more recently Hallo, “New Light . . .,” p. 151.

104 Hallo, RLA, p. 711-12.


implying that the bowl was re-used. 108 It is interesting that the royal name occurring here is most probably to be identified with Iarlaga(n)da, the 19th Gutian ruler in the SKL.

Two cylinder seals which could be in ‘Gutian style’ from the post-Akkadian period were found in Brak. 109 One shows a row of animals, probably ibexes, together with what seem to be human figures (Fig. 3). According to Diakonoff, the Metropolitan bronze head, that is said to have been found near Hamadan, represents one of the Gutian kings. 110 However, neither the provenance nor the attribution seem to be certain.

The long inscriptions of Erridu-Pizir (Fig. 4) are the exception to what has hitherto been known as meagre survivals of the Gutian kings (see below).

The End of the Gutians in the South

The Gutian domination of Sumer and Akkad was brought to an end by the king of Uruk, Utu-gešal. He ruled the city for seven years 111 and used the title “king of the four quarters of the world,” one that had been used before only by Narām-Sīn and Erridu-Pizir. Utu-gešal appears to have been a mighty ruler who extended his control to the Lagaš region and probably received a commission from the god Enlil in Nippur to move against Tirigan, the last Gutian king of Sumer and Akkad.

The Urukian movement against the Gutians was recorded in a relatively long literary-historical text which is preserved in an OB copy. 112 It begins with enumerating the evil deeds of the Gutians in the land of Sumer, but without mentioning Akkad. This enumeration is a logical beginning with which to justify the war, for this is what had instigated the people’s wrath. It is followed by the commission given by the god Enlil, king of the lands, to rise against the Gutians and restore the kingship to the land of Sumer, not to Akkad. Surprisingly Utu-gešal is called, even before the liberation of the land, king of the four quarters of the world. Then Utu-gešal went to Inanna to request her to be his ally in this war. At this point the text reverts to the atrocities of the Gutians, particularly those of the wicked Tirigan, and how no one had risen against him before this king of Uruk. He then went to the temple of Iskur in his home city Uruk and called out to the people, who followed him as one man. 113 He departed towards the city of Nagsu on the Iturungal Canal, which he reached after a four day march. On the fifth day he captured two Gutian generals, the first with the Sumerian name Ninazu and the second with the Akkadian name Nabi-Enlil, who had been sent by Tirigan as envoys to Sumer. This implies that the Gutians were aware of his advance and were attempting to solve the rebellion peacefully, because these two generals had met Utu-gešal half way or less on his march. 114 From the text it appears that King Tirigan himself was about one or two days away from Nagsu, since the battle took place upstream from Abad after he

---

110 cf. also Chapter Two
111 Frayne, RIME 2, p. 280.
112 Frayne, RIME 2, p. 284. The text was published for the first time by Thureau-Dangin in RA 9 (1912), p. 111-20 and RA 10 (1913), p. 98-100. Since the copies are OB, some consider the inscription a late propaganda text composed for the kings of Uruk. Even so, the text remains in our opinion significant, consisting for the major part of historical facts and real GNs, cf. also Glassner, J. J., Mesopotamian Chronicles, Atlanta, 2004, p. 99, note 8. Scepticism about the reliability of ancient inscriptions has now even reached Sumerian royal correspondence, as in Huber, F., “La correspondance royale d’Ur, un corpus apocryphe,” ZA 91 (2001), p. 169ff.
113 68) lú-aš-gin7, Frayne, RIME 2, p. 286 (text E2.13.6.4).
114 According to the text, Utu-gešal had marched four days when he met the envoys. After two more days marching he reached Karkar and he fought Tirigan upstream from Abad. Another possibility is that the Sumerian army was not on the move on the fifth day, so it was in total a five day march. The meeting with the envoys would have been closer to the battlefield, probably also close to the centre of the Gutian power in the region of Abad.
arrived at Karkar on the sixth day. Nagsu, Muru and Dabrum, mentioned in the inscription, are also mentioned in the economic texts of Umma from the Ur III period and indicate their locations in the province of Umma. Utu-hegal was triumphant in that battle. He defeated the Gutian generals and “Tirigan, king of Gutium, fled alone on foot” to the city of Dabrum. The citizens of that city did not let him go when they knew Utu-hegal was the king of Uruk approved by Enlil. The envoys of Utu-hegal captured Tirigan with his wife and children. They brought him back to the victorious king of Uruk, who smote him to the ground in front of the god Utu and put his foot on his neck, clearly symbolising his submission. An OB omen text alludes to the death of Tirigan on the battlefield: “If a …… is thrown, it is an omen of Tirigan, who died amidst his army.” But there is no mention of killing the Gutian king in the Utu-hegal text, as might have been expected. Probably sparing his life, if true, was a reciprocation for the Gutians sparing the lives of the Akkadian royal family, if the interpretation of the list of gifts from the late mu-iti archive is correct. A tablet from the archive lists gifts presented to the Akkadian royal family during a journey they made to Sumer, to the king, the queen and the prince, who almost certainly constituted the Akkadian and not the Gutian royal family. This list belongs, according to Foster, to the late mu-iti archive and hence very probably comes from the Gutian period. However that may be, the Utu-hegal text ends with the restoration of the kingship to Sumer, again with no reference to Akkad.

It is true that it was the Sumerians who freed the land from the Gutians. The complete omission from the text of the Akkadians, on whose land Gutian control had been concentrated, might be interpreted as the Sumerians subconsciously placing blame for the occupation on the Akkadians. The Akkadians assumed the kingship from the Sumerians under Sargon but could not hold on to it because of their harsh policy towards the peoples and the sins they committed against the gods, according to the Mesopotamian tradition. This had consequently led to the invasion and the loss of kingship to foreign lands, and only then did the Sumerians take action by themselves to restore the Mesopotamian kingship to the land of Sumer, but not to Akkad. The SKL supports this suggestion by stating that Uruk, not Akkad, was smitten with weapons, and that its kingship, not that of Akkad, was carried off by the Gutian horde invading the south.

115 Sauren, H., “Der Feldzug Utu-hegals von Urukgegen Tirigan und das Siedlungsgebiet der Gutäer,” Brève Communications, RA 61 (1967), p. 76. According to him, Nagsu was located to the south of Umma on the Iturungal Canal, while Dabrum was on the northern border of Umma Province, two-days journey by ship from the city Umma itself towards Nippur: Sauren, ibid; see also the map on p. 77.
118 Considering that this text was composed for political propaganda in the first place, one must expect some bias in the narration of what happened. It is not impossible that Utu-hegal wanted to create a perfect image of the powerful and pious hero, who was able to arrest the enemy of the gods and bring him with his own hands to the presence of the god, under whose auspices he fought. This would be more honourable than killing him, probably by the hands of one of his soldiers. This may mean that the true story is the one in the omen.
120 Hallo, “New Light….” p. 153. For this and the discussion of the date of these documents see Foster, B., “Notes on Sargonic Royal Progress,” JANES 12 (1980), p. 32.
121 Unugkā ²²⁰⁴kukul ba-an-sig nam-lugal-bi ki-su-lu-ubē <gar> Gu-tu-um<²²⁰⁴šē> ba-tūm, Jacobsen, SKL, p. 116. According to Kraus, the terms Sumerians and Akkadians were linguistic designations, rather than ethnic, and our criterion for their existence is the language: Kraus, F. R., Sumerer und Akkader, ein Problem der altmesopotamischen Geschichte, Amsterdam, 1970, p. 15. He further says that the old Mesopotamian historical
But this was not the end of the Gutian presence and their incursions into Sumer and Akkad. Ur-Namma went on purging the land from what may have been Gutian pockets of resistance. The adversary he mentioned in a royal inscription was Gutarla, who was “[like] a …dog(?), after he lay at his feet,” who had attempted to gain kingship with the help of troops from Gutium and Zimudar. Sulgi too claimed victories over the Gutians in his hymn E. He seems to have attacked the Gutians because of their collaboration with the Elamites when some of their cities changed their loyalty from Sulgi to the Elamite. Later Ibbi-Sin confronted Gutian attacks from their mountainous bulwark in the east, according to the lamentation over Sumer and Ur.

The Erridu-Pizir Inscriptions

As previously mentioned, these are the longest Gutian royal inscriptions known to date. They are written on a clay tablet from the OB Period, found in Nippur. Their content and their colophons indicate they were copied from texts inscribed on three statues of Erridu-Pizir. The tablet was found at ‘Tablet Hill’ in Nippur during the excavations of Pennsylvania University-fourth season. The discovery of the tablet was first announced by Hilprecht, and had to traditions hardly mention Sumerians and Akkadians, and there is no distinctive art of each of the two peoples, ibid. The Sumerians and Akkadians were no longer a reality or, at least, no longer an interesting reality in the Ur III period: op. cit., p. 90. He did not even succeed to find an indisputable identification of Sumerians and Akkadians, op. cit., p. 99. However, for Sumer as a people cf. Wilcke, C., “Zum Königtum in der Ur III-Zeit,” Le palais et la royauté, RAI 19, Paris, 29 June-2 July, ed. P. Gorelli, Paris, 1974, p. 225-226. To reply to the extreme opinions of Kraus, which need detailed discussion, we must ask what are the criteria for the existence of a certain ethnicity. The most important are, indisputably, language and culture. While Kraus did not deny these two he grossly underestimated them. Pertinent comparisons can be made with the circumstances of the Aramaic population of Southern Mesopotamia after the Arab Muslim invasion in 637 A. D. This Aramaic speaking population, known as ‘Anbāt’, was soon compelled by the new Arab masters to write, and perhaps even speak, in Arabic. No document now attests the existence of the Anbāt in Southern Mesopotamia after the Arab invasion, except for a few scattered allusions. But they did certainly exist. The only Aramaic survivals from that territory are the religious writings of the Sabi’a and Mandaean sects, whose books have survived thanks to the power of religion. That one cannot find an explicit hostile or discriminating passage in the Sumerian records towards the Akkadians is comparable with the situation of the Anbāt, who were certainly not happy with the engulfing of their country with fresh immigrant Arab tribesmen, but not a single hostile passage against the Arabs can be found in the writings of that time. One should not therefore consider only what was written, because written documents were tightly bound to the elite and to the authority of the new masters, and so did not reflect the land’s real ethnic and cultural image.

2°) ur ‘šu-sḫi(? gìn(?)’ 3°) gir a-ba-[x]-nā 4°) Gú-tar-lá dumu gu-tim-um-ma-ra, Civil, “On some Texts Mentioning …,” Orientalia 54 (1985), p. 28. Although the name Gutarla is written gú-TAR-lá in the OB lexical text Nig.gà=makkürü (cf. Civil, M., MSL XIII, Roma, 1071, p. 108), the element –arla in the name is remarkable as a typical element of Gutian names. Zadok called attention to the PN Ì-ar-li-bu in a text from Lagaš from Ur III period that can be attributed to this type of Gutian names, cf. Zadok, R., “Hurrians as well as Individuals …,” p. 234.

9°) n[a]-m-lugal-e 10°) [a] im-ma-‘tu, 11°) [a]gab a-an-‘x-xa-né-eš-[a], “For the kingship he (Gutarla?) took a ritual bath. The crown which they had […]”, Civil, “On Some Texts…,” p. 28.


11°) in the letter to Sulgi, sent presumably by Ahušina, he reports the event; cf. Frayne, The Historical Correlations of…, p. 171-2.


17°) Frayne, RIME 2, p. 220.

be first restored from 20 fragments; later a few smaller fragments were added, as Hilprecht had expected.129 Once it had been restored by Hilprecht it measured 20 by 13.6 cm and consisted of 500 lines in 12 columns on both obverse and reverse. The restored portion constituted almost one-tenth of the original text. The script is “exceptionally sharp and beautiful”130 and, although it is basically Old Akkadian, some Ur III and OB sign forms occur.131 Stylistically and linguistically the inscription shows similarities with the inscriptions of the kings of Akkad and lists the same combinations of gods, the same verbal forms and sibilants,132 besides some Ur III usages.133

Shortly after the tablet had been deposited in the museum it was lost.134 Subsequently it was found and published by Raphael Kutscher.135 But it appeared that by then some fragments had been lost. The tablet consists now of three fragments glued together (BT 2) with an additional fragment (BT 3) that physically cannot be joined with the rest of the tablet.136 However, a comparison between the dimensions given by Hilprecht with those of the current tablet, which measures 11.8 by 13.5 cm (BT 2) and 7.2 by 8.2 cm (BT 3), shows that almost two lines between the two parts are lost.137 Unfortunately, the missing lines appear to have been quite significant, since the context shows they contained the historical sections and important names. The extant parts are “extremely difficult”138 and much room has been taken by the name and titles of the king that have been repeated 11 times, as well as three curse formulae and three colophons.

According to their content and context, the inscriptions were perhaps dedicated to the god Enlil and were intended to be read in sequence.139

The Text:

The following transliteration and translation of the three texts is based on the standard edition of Frayne,140 with consideration for the editions of Kutscher141 and Gelb-Kienast.142 I have also added some extra comments with reference to the transcription (Fig. 4) of the texts.143

129 Hilprecht, The Babylonian..., p. 20.
130 Hilprecht, The Babylonian ..., p. 20.
132 Hilprecht, The Babylonian..., p. 20.
134 Kutscher, The Brockmon Tablets..., p. 49. The evidence for this, as Kutscher says, is that when Poebel stayed in Philadelphia between 1912 and 1914, he could not find the tablet, only two years after Hilprecht’s publication.
135 The tablet is now part of the Brockmon Collection in Haifa.
136 Kutscher, The Brockmon..., p. 49.
137 Kutscher, The Brockmon..., p. 49.
138 Kutscher, The Brockmon..., p. 50.
139 Kutscher, The Brockmon..., p. 51. He concludes that the dedication is inferred from the fact that only Statue I contains an invocation to the gods.
140 In RIME 2, p. 220-228 (text E2.2.1-3).
141 Kutscher, The Brockmon..., p. 49-70.
142 Gelb and Kienast, FAOS, vol. 7, p. 293-316.
143 In certain places the numbering of the lines varies from one editor to another.
Statue 1

Col. i

1) [...-im]¹⁴⁴
2) […] ṭ-x³
3) […] ṭ-x³
4) […] ṭ-x³
5) ṭINANN]A
6) [an-nu-ni-ṭ]um¹⁴⁵
7) [x] x x ‘id-šu¹⁴⁶
8) ū
9) ṭIr-ā-ba₄¹⁴⁷
10) KALAG ū-i-li
11) il-lā-at-šu
12) E-er-ri-du-pi-zi-ir
13) da-nūm
14) LUĞAL
15) Gu-ti-im¹⁴⁸
16) ū
17) ki-ib-ra-tim
18) ar-ba-šim³
19) a-[x]¹⁴⁹
20) u₄-[x x]
21) GI[R][NĪTA-š]u¹⁵¹
22) ‘Ma(?)-[a]d-[ga]⁵
23) […]-BI
24) […]-im
25) […] x

Lacuna of 2 lines

1´) [E-er-ri-du]-Pi-zi-[r]
2´) da-nūm
3´) LUĞAL
4´) Gu-ti-im
5´) ū
6´) ki-ib-ra-tim
7´) ar-ba-im
8´) DA-ī-s-su
9´) ig-ru-uš

¹⁴⁴ Jacobsen’s restoration for this section is [ilā Gu-ti-im], “the two gods of Gutium,” to be compared with the inscription of Lā’arāb; cf. Kutscher, p. 62.
¹⁴⁵ Not read by Gelb-Kienast.
¹⁴⁷ Read ṭA-ba₄ by Gelb-Kienast.
¹⁴⁸ Written without any determinative throughout the three inscriptions.
¹⁴⁹ Jacobsen restored a-[wu] “speak!,” cf. Kutscher, p. 62; but this seems unlikely, particularly in that Madga was not a Semitic territory.
¹⁵⁰ u in Kutscher.
¹⁵¹ This šu is omitted in Kutscher and Gelb-Kienast.
10') ip-la-ah-šú-ša-
11') e-tá-ra-ab
12') ša-du-šu
13') e-sú-ud-šú-ša-
14') ik-mi-šu
15') LUGAL
16') "ū'-ru-a-šu-ma
17') 'tub'-qin-ši-ša-
18') 'E'-er-ri-du-[Pi]-zi-ir

Col. ii

1) da-[núm]
2) 'LUGAL'
3) Gu-ti-im
4) ū
5) ki-ib-ra-tim
6) ar-ba-im
7) in KÁ
8) DINGIR Gu-ti-im
9) im-ši-[154]
10) il-pu-ut-su-ma
11) SAG.GIŠ.RA-ši
12) [LU]GAL (?)
13) en-ma
14) E-er-ri-du-Pi-zi-ir
15) da-núm
16) LUGAL
17) Gu-ti-im
18) [i]
19) [k]i-ib-ra-tim
20) [a]r-ba-im
21) in u-mi-šu
22) DÚL-mi
23) ab-ni-ma
24) in na-pá-ás-ši-šu
25) sa-ab-šu
26) 'iš'-ku-un
27) [...] 'x x' [...]

[152] This sign is read šú14 by Gelb-Kienast and šum6 by Kutscher, but this should be either šum or sum6, cf. Von Soden and Röllig, Das Akkadische Syllabar, no. 90, p. 17 and Labat, Manuel..., no. 126.

[153] The word is read by Frayne as um-ma(-)?-ni-šu. T.J.H. Krispijn suggests um-ba-ni-šu. This is possible if we understand the verb ū-ru-a-šu-ma as a corrupt D-form of the infinitive râšu “to smash, crush,” attested also in a text of Narâm-Sîn: nišši šâr DN GIŠ.LI-šu, “he crushed the people whom Dagan newly (?) gave him,” CAD, vol. R, p. 183 (referring to AF O 20, 74 ii 19). If this is correct, the meaning of the sentence would be “he crushed his army.”

The weak point in the reading tubqin-ni-šu is that the reading q/kin does not occur in this period.

Lacuna of 3 lines

1') [...]"1"
2') 'ašš"155 [...]"155
3') lu-ub-[u(?)-a¬m?]"156
4') ZA.GÌN ša [...]"157
5') la áš-ku-'nu"157
6') a-na
7') "šEn-líl
8') in NIBRU"ki
9') DÚL-šu
10') A.MU.RU
11') ša DUB
12') šuₐ-a
13') u-ša-sà-ku-ni
14') ÜUTU
15') "INANNA

Col. iii

1) [û]
2) Il-a-[ba₄]
3) 'SUHUSH-šu
4) li-sù-hu
5) ù
6) Š[E].NUMUN-šu
7) li-il-qi-tu

Colophon 1

8) mu-sar-ra ki-gal-ba

Caption 1

9) "E-er-ri-du-Pi-zi-ir
10) da-nim
11) LUGAL
12) G[u]-ti-im
13) ù
14) 'ki'-ib-ra-tim
15) [a]rə-[ba²]-i[m]
16) [a-na]
17) [E]n-[lit]
18) in N[I BRU]"ki"

155 Not read by Frayne, but it is clearly visible on the copy.
156 The last two signs are not read by Kutscher.
157 The šu is omitted by both Kutscher and Gelb-Kienast, apparently because only a small portion of the sign is preserved, but the traces on the copy reveal its similarity to the sign NU that occurs in col. iv, 1.
19) A.MU.[RU]

Colophon 2

20) mu-sar-ra x [x x]
21) alam-bi x [x x] i[m-x x]

Caption 2

22) mbbie[...]
23) GIR.[NITA]
24) M[a-ad-ga]k

Lacuna of about 7 lines

Translation

i 1-11) [The god … is his (personal) god], [the goddess Ištata]-[Anunnītum] (is) his …, (and) the god Ištar, the mightiest one of the gods, is his clan (god).
i 12-19) Erridu-Pizir, the mighty, king of Gutium and of the four quarters…
i 20-25) U[…], his gen[eral], Madga …[rebelled?].
lacuna
i 1´-9´) Erridu-Pizir[r], the mighty, king of Gutium and the four quarters, hastened (to confront) him.
i 10´-17´) (Since the ruler of Madga) feared him, he entered (his own) mountain (land), and (Erridu-Pizir) hunted him down, captured him (and) he, the king, led him to his refuse dump (or ‘smashed his army,’ see the note to i, 17”).
i 18´-ii 6) Erridu-[Pi]zir, the mighty, king of Gutium and the four quarters
ii 7-12) took (him) away by force through the gate of the god of Gutium, struck him, and killed him, the king (of Madga).
ii 13-20) Thus (says) Erridu-Pizir, the mighty, king of Gutium [and] of the [f]our [quarters]:
ii 21-27) ‘At that time I fashioned a statue of myself and set a red stone (?) on its neck…
lacuna
ii 1´-10´) …a garment… lapis lazuli, which I did not set, and dedicated a statue of himself158 to the god Enlil in Nippur.
ii 11´- iii 15´) As for the one who removes this inscription, may the gods Šamaš, Aštar, iii 1-3) [and] Ila[ba] tear out his foundations and destroy his [p]rogeny.

Colophon 1

iii 8) Inscription on the base.

Caption 1

Iii 9-19) Erridu-Pizir, the mighty, king of Gutium and the four quarters, dedicate[ed] (this statue) [to the god E]n[lil] in N[ippur].

Colophon 2

iii 20-21) Inscription … its image…

158 Frayne: “myself:” p. 222.
Caption 2

iii 22-24) U-[…], gen[eral] of M[adga].
Lacuna

Statue 2

Col. iii

1') 'E^e[er-ri-du]-Pi-[zi-ir]
2') da-[nûm]
3') 'LUGAL'
4') Gu-ti-im
5') ü
6') ki-ib-ra-tim
7') ar-ba-im
8') in u-mi
9') "KA-ni-iš-ba
10') ni-ku-ur-tám

Col. iv

1) [i š]-ku-nu
2) [a]-bi
3) [E]n-ri-da-Pi-zi-ir
4) da-nim
5) LUGAL
6) Gu-ti-im
7) ü
8) ki-ib-ra-tim
9) ar-ba-im
10) 'ê'-zi-bu
11) Š.A.DÜ-e
12) ü
13) URU.KI.'URU'.KI159
14) u-âš-ba-al-ki-tu
15) ü
16) a-dî-ma
17) KALAM
18) [Lu]-[u]-bi-im"ki
19) [x]-N"ki
20) 'x'-ku"ki160
21) [x]"ki'
22) [(x)] "ki'

159 This line is read by Kutscher and Gelb-Kienast as e-'ul'ki, more like the hand copy, but there are traces of another sign after the supposed UL. However, the collations of Westenholz and Steinkeller support the reading of Frayne in both his review in BiOr and RIME 2. The latter reading may fit better with the context as the text enumerates several GNs following this sentence.
160 This clear KU sign on the hand copy is neglected by Frayne.
Lacuna of about 17 lines

1’) x […]
2’) DA-[is-su]
3’) ig-[ru-úš]
4’) ÍL-[…]
5’) GIS […]\textsuperscript{161}
6’) tí-[…]

Col. v

1) ū
2) dINANNA
3) in A-kà-dè\textsuperscript{ki}
4) ÉRIN-am
5) is-ku-un
6) ip-hur-šum\textsubscript{6}
7) um-ma-núm
8) kà-lù-ša
9) a-na
10) Ši-mu-ur\textsubscript{r}ri-im\textsuperscript{ki}
11) è-ru-úš
12) ŠITA LAM, KUR\textsuperscript{162}
13) è-ru-tub
14) in A-kà-dè\textsuperscript{ki}
15) u-ra-ši
16) ra-bi-à-tim
17) <a-na> i-li
18) ū-gá-ra-ab

Lacuna of about 25 lines until the lower end of the obverse

Col. vi

1) u-šà-a[m]-qi-rít
2) a-ar\textsuperscript{t}bu\textsuperscript{m}-šu-nú\textsuperscript{163}
3) ū
4) ba-al-tù-<tì>-šú-nú
5) NIDBA-šu-nú\textsuperscript{164}
6) il-gá-ù-ní[m]\textsuperscript{165}
7) ANŠE.si-š[t]\textsuperscript{166}

\textsuperscript{161} Jacobsen restored these two lines as il-[e-ma] is-[ba-sú], “he overpowered and seized him,” Kutscher, p. 65.

\textsuperscript{162} The line is not read by Kutscher; only the KUR is read by Gelb-Kienast, and Kutscher has pointed to the KUR in his textual commentary, p. 65.

\textsuperscript{163} This restoration of Gelb-Kienast fits the context better than the reading of Frayne, a-ar-'NAM', based on the collation of Steinkeller.

\textsuperscript{164} These last two signs are read by Kutscher as ka?-am?. He thinks the sentence has something to do with cereal offerings (nim\textsubscript{dabû}) and animal offerings which are mentioned in the next lines, Kutscher, p. 65.

\textsuperscript{165} ni-[m] by Kutscher and Gelb-Kienast.
Lacuna of about 25 lines until the lower end of the obverse
Lacuna of about 25 lines from the beginning of the reverse

Col. vii

1') [...] 'ā[
2') šar-ru-tám
3') a-na
4') dEn-lil
5') GIDRU
6') a-na
7') dINANNA
8') a u-ki-il
9') dNin-hur-sag
10') Ĺ
11') dNin-tu
12') ŠE.NUMUN-šu
13') a-na
14') <ši>-tar-qí-šu
15') li-il-qí-tá
16') DINGIR [...]''
17') 'x' [...]''

Col. viii

The sign ANŠE is treated as a determinative by Frayne, which is quite possible.
Frayne reads śu-'nu' instead of Ĺ. However, there is hardly room for two signs in both this and the following line.
This word is not understandable and it is left without translation by other authors too, cf. also Frayne, p. 225; Gelb-Kienast, p. 61. However, its occurrence twice directly before DINGIR gu-ti-im, here and in col. ix 1, may refer to its being a title of the god of Gutium. The absence of the divine determinative clearly shows it is not the god’s name.
This sign is not read by Kutscher or Gelb-Kienast and is not visible on the hand copy.
This sign is not read by Kutscher or Gelb-Kienast and is not visible on the hand copy.
This sign is not read either by Kutscher or Gelb-Kienast.
Lacuna of about 22 lines from the beginning of column viii
The following seven lines are restored by Gelb-Kienast.\textsuperscript{174}

17) \([E-er-ri-du-Pi-zi-ir]\)
18) \([da-núm]\)
19) \([LUGAL]\)
20) \([Gu-ti-im]\)
21) \([ù]\)
22) \([ki-ib-ra-tim]\)

\begin{itemize}
\item 1\textsuperscript{')} \([ar!-ba-im]\)\textsuperscript{175}
\item 2\textsuperscript{')} \(DUL-\textsuperscript{\dagger}šu\)
\item 3\textsuperscript{')} \(a-na\)
\item 4\textsuperscript{')} \(\text{En-lil}\)
\item 5\textsuperscript{')} \(A.MU.RU\)
\end{itemize}

Colophon

6\textsuperscript{')} \(mu-sar-ra \text{ zà-ga-na}\)
7\textsuperscript{')} \(alam-bi \text{ ugu-kùsib-ba gir-an-ús}\)\textsuperscript{176}

\textbf{Translation}

iii 1\textsuperscript{-7\textsuperscript{')}} \(E[rridu]-P[izir], \text{ the mighty, king of Gutium and the four quarters.}\)
iii 8\textsuperscript{-10\textsuperscript{')}} When \(KA-Niśba \text{ (king of Simurrum) [in]itiated hostilities,}\)
iv 2-10\textsuperscript{')} ignored (the orders of) my \(\text{fa[ther, Enrida-Pizir, the mighty, king of Gutium and the four quarters,}\)
iv 11\textsuperscript{-22\textsuperscript{')}} caused the mountain lands and cities to revolt,
iv 15\textsuperscript{-22\textsuperscript{')}} as far as the land of \([Lu]llubum \text{ (and the lands) ...}\)

\textbf{Lacuna}

iv 1\textsuperscript{-6\textsuperscript{')}} \(...) he has\[tended\] (to confront) [him]...
\textbf{v 1\textsuperscript{-6\textsuperscript{')}}} Further, the goddess Ištar had stationed troops in Agade.
\textbf{v 6\textsuperscript{-11\textsuperscript{')}}} The whole army assembled for him (= \(Erridu-Pizir\)) (and) desired (to go) to Simurrum.
\textbf{v 12\textsuperscript{-18\textsuperscript{')}}} He (= \(Erridu-Pizir\)) entered ... (= ŠITA LAM\textsubscript{KUR}, (while) it (= the army?) was making offerings of large male goats <to> the gods in Agade.
\textbf{Lacuna}
\textbf{vi 1\textsuperscript{')}} He struck down.
\textbf{vi 2\textsuperscript{-6\textsuperscript{')}}} As for fugitives (?) and their \textit{survivors}, their offerings/ gifts they took,
\textbf{vi 7\textsuperscript{-10\textsuperscript{')}}} their horses[es], their oxen, and their sheep...
\textbf{vi 11\textsuperscript{-16\textsuperscript{')}}} ... the god of Gutium and Enrida-Pizir took hold of (them)...

\textbf{Lacuna}

\textsuperscript{174} Gelb-Kienast, \textit{FAOS}.
\textsuperscript{175} This line has been left unread by Frayne and Kutscher, but it is read by Gelb-Kienast, p. 310.
\textsuperscript{176} This line of the colophon is read by Kutscher and Gelb-Kienast as \(alan-bi \text{ sag.dub.ba gir-an-ús, but its translation is incomplete.}\)
... and may he (who shall remove this inscription) not hold the kingship for the god Enlil or the sceptre for the goddess Ištar.

vii 9’-17’) May the goddesses Ninhursag and Nintu destroy his progeny (lit. ‘gather his seed until his disappearance’)...

Lacuna

viii 1’-5’) ... He (= Erri-du-Pizir) dedicated a statue of himself to the god Enlil.

Colophon

viii 6’-7’) Inscription on its shoulder. Its image: (his) foot treading on the...

**Statue 3**

Col. viii

The following 8 lines are restored by Gelb-Kienast.¹⁷⁷

1) [E-er-ri-du-Pi-zi-ir]
2) [da-nûm]
3) [LUGAL[...
4) [Gu-ti-im]
5) [ù]
6) [ki-ib-ra-tim]
7) [ar-ba-im]
8) [in u-mû]

Lacuna of unknown length

8’) KA-ni-iš-ba
9’) LUGAL
10’) Šī-mu-ur-ê-ri-imki
11’) ÙG
12’) Šī-mu-ur-ê-ri-imki
13’) ù
14’) Lu-lu-bi-imki
15’) <<tu>>-uš-ba-al-ki-'it'-ma

Col. ix

1) ’sa-[bî]¹⁷⁸
2) DINGIR Gu-[ti-im]
3) da-[...]
4) mûx-[...]

Lacuna of about 20 lines

1’) x [...]
2’) x [...]
3’) i-n[ù]¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁷ Gelb-Kienast, *FAOS.*
¹⁷⁸ Gelb-Kienast read nothing here; Kutscher reads *ib-*[..].
4) \( mrAm^3[NI]-li \)
5) [\( GR \).NITA]
6) \( S\)\( r\)u(?y)\( 181 \)-[x]-im
7) \( 'x^2-\ldots-Z\)E\( 182 \)
8) [, \( 'x^2 \). KUR\( 183 \)
9) \( u-[na]-ak-[ki]-\)ru(?)-ma\( 184 \)
10) \( \ddot{u} \)
11) \( š\)ar-'x^2-[x]-ma
12) \( e-hu\)\( (?)-x\)-šu\( 185 \)
13) \( E-er-[r]\)i-du-[\( Pi-z\)l]-ir
14) \( [da-n]\)im
15) [LUGAL]
16) [\( Gu-ti-im \)]
17) \( \ddot{u} \)
18) [\( ki-ib-ra-tim \)]
19) [\( ar-ba-im \)]

Col. x

1) DA-iš-šu
2) ig-ru-ūš
3) \( è-ku-uš-ma\)\( 186 \)
4) \( ŠA.DU-e \)
5) Ni-iš-ba\( 187 \)kur
6) in 6 UD
7) Ha-me-me-x-pi-[ir\( 188 \)kur]
8) na-[ra-ab-tám(?)]
9) [SAG.GIŠ.RA]

Lacuna of about 15 lines

1') \( 'x^2-\ldots \)
2') \( na-[\{a\}a[\{b\}]-t\)i-šu
3') è-ru-ub
4') \( 'E\)\( E\)rer-[\( r\)l]-du-[\( Pi\)z]-i-ir
5') \( d[\{a\}]-nim \)
6') \( i-r\)da-šu-\( ma \)
7') Nu-\( u\)h-pi-\( i\)k\( 189 \)kur

\( 179 \) Kutscher reads this line as \( N[i-\)\( i\)š-ba\( 190 \)kap\( (? \)]\), however, the reading i-nu seems more appropriate to begin a narrative.

\( 180 \) Kutscher sees the sign ŠU as also possible.

\( 181 \) Frayne suggests RU; the hand copy shows clearly the beginning of this sign.

\( 182 \) Both Kutscher and Gelb-Kienast see a personal name determinative at the beginning of the sentence. This is visible on the hand copy, but it is not sure whether it is a determinative or the beginning of a different sign. The sign ZE is read by them as AT/D.

\( 183 \) This line is considered by Kutscher and by Gelb-Kienast as part of the preceding sentence in line 7'.

\( 184 \) The numbering of the lines in RIME is mistakenly repeated here, with this line also numbered 8'. Kutscher reads the word as u-ger-ru-\( ma \), while Gelb-Kienast read it 'i\( i\)ger-[\( r\)]-\( u\)ma. The sign RU is clearly visible on the copy.

\( 185 \) HU is restored by Frayne.

\( 186 \) Kutscher tentatively derives it from ak\( ë\)šum “to go,” Kutscher, p. 67.
8') na-ra-ab-tám
9') SAG.GIŠ.RA-am
10') Ĺ
11') Am-NI-li
12') HUR-nam
13') in ra-si-šu
14') u-[ša-a]m-[qi₄-it]
15') x [...] 

Lacuna of 4 lines

Col. xi

1) in 1 UD
2) u-šu-ri-id
3) Ĺ
4) Mu-ma-am₄₃₅₂
5) na-ra-ba-at
6) Ur-bi-lum₄₃₅₂
7) SAG.GIŠ.RA
8) Ĺ
9) Ni-ri-iš-[h]a
10) EN[SÍ]
11) Ur-bi-[lum₄₃₅₂]

Lacuna of about 13 lines

0') [DUL-šu]¹⁸⁷
1') [a-na]
2') [₄₅En-līl]
3') [in NIB]RU₄₅₂
4') [₄₅₅₂A].MU.RU
5') ša DUB
6') šu₄-a
7') u-ša-sa-ku-<ni>
8') [₄₅₅₂₄₅]En-līl
9') Ĺ
10') [₄₅₄₂UTU
11') [₄₅₅₅₂SUHUŠ-šu
12') li-sū-ha

Colophon

13') mu-sar-ra ki-gal-ba

Caption 1

¹⁸⁷ This line is restored by Gelb-Kienast and does not appear in Frayne; however, the restoration seems quite possible.
14’) E-er-ri-du-Pi-zi-ir
15’) da-núm
16’) LUGAL
17’) Gu-ti-im
18’) ù
19’) ki-ib-ra-tim
20’) ar-ba-im
21’) a-na

Col. xii

1) [dEn]-lil
2) [in NI]BRU\(^{ki}\)
3) ‘A’.MU.RU

Colophon 2

4) mu-sar-ra
5) zà-ga-na

Space
Summary colophon (refers to the entire tablet containing the text of E2.2.1.1-3)

6) dub mu-sar-ra
7) 3 alam
8) E-er-ri-du-Pi-zi-ir

Translation

viii 8’-15’) KA-Nišba, king of Simurrum, instigated the people of Simurrum and Lullubum to revolt and
ix 1-4) the … (of?) the god of Gu[tium]…

Lacuna

ix 1’-11’) … whe[n] Amnili, the [gen]eral of … made the land … rebel and…
ix 12’-18’) Er[ru]-[Piz]ir, [the mighty, [king of Gutium and the four quarters]
x 1-2) hastened (to confront) him.
x 3-5) He proceeded (through) the peaks of Mount Nišba.
x 6-9) In six days [he conquered] the pass at [Mount] ›amem-x-pi[r].

Lacuna

x 1’-3’) … en[te]red its pass.
x 4’-6’) Erri-du-[Pizi[r], the m[ighty, pursued him and
x 7’-9’) conquered the pass at Mount Nuhpir.
x 10’-15’) Further, he t[hr]e[w] down [A]mnili, the …, from its summit …

Lacuna

xi 1-7) In a single day he brought … down and conquered the pass of Urbilum at Mount Mumum.
xi 8-11) Further, he [captured] Niriš[hu]a, the go[ver]n[or] of Urbi[llum].

Lacuna

xi 1’-4’) He [ded]icated (this statue) [to the god Enlil in Nipp]ur.
xi 5’-12’) As for the one who removes this inscription, may the gods Enlil and Šamaš tear out his foundations.

Colophon 1
xi 13’) Inscription on the base

Caption 1
xi 14’- xii 3) Erridu-Pizir, the mighty, king of Gutium and of the four quarters, dedicated (this statue) to the god [En]lil [in Nip]pur.

Colophon 2
xii 4-5) Inscriptions on its [sh]oulder.

Summary colophon
xii 6-8) Inscribed tablet with three statue (inscriptions) of Erridu-Pizir.

Comments and Analysis

Statue 1:

The first land against which Erridu-Pizir advanced was Madga (i, 22), which name Jacobsen restored. According to the text, the governor of Madga had abandoned his headquarters and fled to šadu when the troops of Erridu-Pizir approached (i, 8’-12’). The word šadu means mountains, meaning that Madga was located in a plain close to mountains. This fits well with the identification of Madga presented by Frayne, in the region of Kifri, or probably close to the village of Matika near Daqūq. It is also not impossible that the word KUR indicates a hiding place or a refuge. The expression is often used later in the Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions. Another possibility is the east, as the mountains and the best places in which to hide and which to defend lay to the east and north of the supposed location of Madga. The Qaradagh and Sagirma Mountains in particular become more and more sheer when going to the east, close to the Sirwān River.

Frayne’s reading um-ma(?)-ni-šu (i, 17’) is supported by Westenholz and by collation from a photo of the tablet but its position in the sentence leaves the meaning unclear. It could mean that the governor of Madga was led away together with his “army (generals).” Or

---

189 Frayne, “The Zagros Campaigns of Šulgi and Amar-Suena,” SCCNH 10, 1999, p. 157-8. Note his older identification with modern Kifri; bitumen is found nearby in Mount Kumar, as it was concerning Madga in antiquity: Frayne, EDGN, Ancient Oriental Series, vol. 74, New Haven, 1992, p. 54 and 57. Most probably ancient Madga was located in the general area between Daqūq and Kifri. It can be identified with Matiqa in Nuzi texts and Matqia in the annals of Tiglath-Pileser I, cf. Frayne, EDGN, p. 57. Matka in Nuzi texts is located in the same general region of Kifri, Tūz Ḥurmātu and Daqūq; for details cf. Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 176. Heimpel’s recent identification of Madga at Hit (proposing that Madga was another name of Hit) fails to refer to Frayne’s work on the subject and totally neglects the information provided by him, such as the availability of bitumen near Kifri and the closeness of the Sirwān-Diyāla river and its tributaries flowing down from these bitumen sources: Heimpel, W., “The Location of Madga,” JCS 61 (2009), p. 25-61.
190 One of the uses of the word šadu is a place of hiding or refuge, cf. CAD Š I, p. 55, under j. This meaning stems from the fact that refugees seeking hiding places have mostly found their ways to the mountains.
191 Cf.: CAD Š I, p. 59.
192 Speiser pointed to the sheer slopes of the eastern part of the range when he made a flight over the region in the early 1920s: Speiser, E. A., “Southern Kurdistan in the Annals of Assurnasirpal and Today,” AASOR 8 (1926-27), p. 31.
193 Frayne, D., BiOr, 403.
perhaps a word or words in the original inscription was mistakenly omitted when copying the text on to the clay tablet. It is worth mentioning that the sign ma is improperly written and looks more like ba. However, the readings of both Kutscher and Gelb-Kienast fit the context better. They read the word as tubqimmisū “his hole, or his hollow,” indicating an unpleasant place. The meaning given for tubkinnu in CAD is “refuse heap,” which occurs in MB and SB texts.\(^{194}\) On the assumption that an older use of the word meant “fate” it would fit the context very well to translate “the king led him to his fate” (cf. the footnote to the pertinent cuneiform text).

Apparently, the king of Gutium has offered the captured governor of Madga to the god of Gutium, for the text states that he took him away by force through the gate of the god of Gutium, struck him, and killed him (ii, 7-11). After this a word similar to LUGAL occurs, but it neither fits the context nor the grammar. This implies that mistakes occurred when the ancient scribe was copying, or perhaps his exemplar was not free from linguistic mistakes. One possible explanation would be to read en-ma LUGAL, “When the king …” but this remains uncertain.

Then the king, according to the text, fashioned a statue of himself (ii, 22-26) and put something on its neck: in na-pā-āš (written šu)-ti-šu sa-ab-šu is-ku-un. The word sa-ab-šu is not translated by Frayne, but sābu occurs in Standard Babylonian as the name of a red coloured stone,\(^{195}\) hence it is quite fitting to follow Kutscher’s translation “a red stone” or that of Gelb-Kienast “its precious stone.”\(^{196}\) The first person verbal form ab-ni-ma (ii, 23) switches to a third person form íš-ku-un (ii, 26).

Kutscher quoted the suggestion proposed by Jacobsen to read and translate the passage from col. ii 24- ii 5’ as follows:\(^{197}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
24) & \text{in na-pā-aš-ti-šu} \\
25) & ša-(ap₉(DUB)-šu} \\
26) & 'šu-ku-un} \\
27) & [šu-u]m-[š]u} \\
28) & [a-š]i} \\
29) & [šum-ma la]} \\
1') & 'ki-[x-x-x]} \\
2') & aš-k[u-un]} (or aš-k[u-nu]} \\
3') & lu-ub-[ša-am]} \\
4') & uqnim (ZA.GīN) ša [x]} \\
5') & la aš-ku-'un}(or aš-ku-'nu]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“I named it (the statue) ‘Put the (Breath of) Life in its Throat.’ (I swear) I indeed put… (and) I indeed put a garment of lapis lazuli of…”

However, the translations of both Frayne and Gelb-Kienast seem more realistic.

The first sign in ii, 2’\(^{198}\) is clearly aš, perhaps the beginning of a verb with ĕ as initial radical, and šakānu would be a logical choice. The assumed verb has certainly something to do with the garment mentioned in the line 3’ and is also connected to the statue that is mentioned. The garment was made of lapis-lazuli and, since the text has ša la-āš-ku-nu (ii, 4’-5’), it appears that this lapis-lazuli was originally devoted to something or somebody else, but

\(^{194}\) CAD, vol T, p. 446.
\(^{195}\) abnu šikinšu kima dami alpi la bašli NA₄ sa-a-bu, “The stone that looks like unboiled ox-blood is called sābu,” CAD S, p. 5.
\(^{196}\) Hallo proposed “a Sun Disc,” cf. Kutscher, p. 64.
\(^{197}\) Kutscher, p. 64.
\(^{198}\) Left as illegible by Frayne.
the king has put it on the statue out of love for Enlil. The colophon confirms the statue was dedicated to Enlil in Nippur and that the inscription was on its base.

In line 13, the sign ša is written for ša in the word u-ša-sa-ku-ni, this implies that the same sign in the problematic line 25 can be read ša as well.

Statue 2:

This inscription begins with the narration of the rebellion lead by KA-Nišba of Simurrum against Gutium in the time of Erridu-Pizir’s father, Enrida-Pizir. KA-Nišba is called ‘king’ of Simurrum in the inscription and he seemingly enjoyed a great political influence, for he was able to persuade numerous people/lands of the region to join him in the rebellion. Unfortunately, among the names of these people/lands only Lullubum is preserved, though badly damaged (iv, 18: [lu]-[l]-[u]-bi-im¹⁹⁹). From the other names four determinatives KI are preserved followed by a large lacuna. The sign NI can be seen preceding the KI of the first name with preserved determinative. One possibility is the GN U-ru-na mentioned in the LGN²⁰⁰ and attested as U-ra-ni-im and Wa-ra-ne, Û-ra-ne, Wa-ra-nu and U-ru-na-a in the ED and Old Akkadian Periods texts.²⁰¹ It is interesting that the GN Û-ra-ne occurs in a tablet from Ebla together with the GNs Kakmium, Ḥašuwan and Irar.²⁰² This GN was well-known in that period. It was mentioned in a dedicatory text in Mari and had trade relations with Ebla²⁰³ and was perhaps the same Uruña attested in the Geography of Sargon, mentioned as a border of Lullubum.²⁰⁴ Another possibility, though less probable, is Ib-la-nim.²⁰⁵ suggested to have been to the east of modern Sulaimaniya.²⁰⁶ The second name probably ends with KU while the third and fourth are seemingly written with a single logogram. Elam is not impossible since it was close to Simurrum and its name was usually written with the one logogram NIM. The remaining part of the column commences with DA-iš-šu then ig-ru-ūš. If we assume that this part was preceded by about seven lines of the king’s name and titles, there is still room for 3-5 lines. From the transcription it appears that the line preceding DA-iš-šu does not begin with the expected sign ar of ar-ba-im, but with a sign looking like šu.

A palaeographic difference, for which the ancient copyist was responsible, appears clearly in the first sign of iv, 4’, inscribed as šu but this is a later form of the same sign (IL) which appeared in iv, 6 as Ĺ.*šu.

The name KA-ni-iš-ba is still doubtful, because the sign KA has different readings. Among these readings we can exclude INIM because the name is not Sumerian, and QA because this sound was not familiar in the languages of the region.²⁰⁷ Other readings like du₁₁ and pi are possible, but the more likely reading seems to be Ka or Ga, assuming that the sign was used with its primary value in the Akkadian text. Since the sign KA was read in the OAkk. period as ga,²⁰⁸ the name might have been pronounced Ga-Nišba. Nišba was the name

¹⁹⁹ Simurrum is not mentioned by name in this section of the inscription, but we know that KA-nišba was mentioned later in col. v 10 as the king of Simurrum.
²⁰⁰ The Early Dynastic List of Geographical Names.
²⁰¹ Frayne, EDGN, p. 73.
²⁰² Frayne, EDGN, p. 74.
²⁰³ Frayne, EDGN, p. 74; 76.
²⁰⁵ It occurred also as Ḥ-bil-a-nim, Ḥ-ba-nim and Ḥ-ba-nim, cf. Frayne, EDGN, p. 73.
²⁰⁶ Frayne, EDGN, p. 79.
²⁰⁸ For this cf. Hasselbach, Sargonic Akkad, p. 33; Gelb, I. J., Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar, Chicago, 1952, p. 68.
of the national deity of Simurrum, known from the inscriptions of Iddi(n)-Sin (see Chapter Five). There was also a mountain with this name, mentioned by this same Erridu-Pizir in his third inscription (E2.2.1.3 x, 5). The name Nišba is reminiscent of the name of Mount Nišpi, mentioned in the inscriptions of Aššurnasirpal II during his campaigns to Zamua. Identifying these names seems very possible since both were mountain names and both were located in approximately the same area.

It is important to note that the Gutian influence was as unwelcome as the Akkadian influence to the peoples of the Zagros. This can clearly be inferred from this text that speaks of a general rebellion against the Gutians, organized by at least six lands, including Simurrum itself. It might also imply that the Gutians tried to rebuild the empire of Sargon and Narām-Sin as their own, for at the same time that they controlled the Land of Akkad and part of Sumer they subjugated the lands of the Zagros foothills as far as Erbil in the north.

The section that follows the lacuna is about the movement against the rebellion. It is noteworthy that the inscription does not mention any crushing of the rebellion by Enrida-Pizir, and even the lacuna has no room for such a passage. However, the speaker, Erridu-Pizir, was the one who accomplished it. This implies that the rebellion lasted from the reign of his father to his own. Whether this was a short period of almost a year, from the last days of his father to the first days of his own reign, or for a longer period, we cannot answer from the material currently available.

It is significant that troops to crush this ‘northern’ rebellion were mobilized in the ‘south.’ The text (v, 1-11) states that the goddess Ištar had stationed troops in Agade, and according to the next part, the (whole) army was assembled for the king and then went to Simurrum. This means that only part of the army, not all of it, was from the land of Akkad and that the Akkadian troops joined the rest of the army later.

After that, column vi tells of striking down the enemies, using the word a-ar- NAM (vi, 2). If this reading is correct, besides “punishment,” the word also means “sin” and “fault.” Its occurrence with “survivors” and “offerings” is somewhat difficult to understand, unless the survivors of the rebel troops after the battle were punished. However, the restorations and translations of Kutscher and Gelb-Kienast as a-ar-°bu-šu-nu “fugitives,” seem more logical. Then the list of booty follows, among which are horses (si-si-šu-num), oxen and sheep that the Gutian king took off to Gutium, strangely to Enrida-Pizir. Probably this implies he offered this booty to the spirit of his deceased father. As a typical tribal leader, he would have had a great respect for his father after his death. But it is not impossible that Enrida-Pizir was actually alive at this time, for he could have handed over the rule of Gutium to his son Erridu-Pizir before his death. This is interestingly the first Mesopotamian inscription to mention horses.

Following the large lacuna there is the curse formula, the dedication and the colophon in the column viii.

---


210 The sign NAM follows Steinkeller’s collation.

211 Possibly the word is derived from the infinitive erēbum. As parallel in Arabic is the word ادخل, lit. “the one who enters,” from دخل with the same meaning, denoting a person who enters the house or tent (mostly of a sheikh or of a nobleman) asking for protection.

212 The sign šu in the inscription looks like e more than šu.

213 Cf. also Kutscher, p. 65.
Statue 3:

The text of this statue starts with an accusation of KA-Nišba of inciting the people of Simurrum and Lullubum to rebel against Gutium. Reading this makes one feel as if Erridu-Pizir distinguishes the people of Simurrum from their rulers. In other words, he seems to say that without the incitement of KA-Nišba the Simurrians would not have rebelled. This was something new in Mesopotamian inscriptions up to this time and it offered a new political vision.

After another lacuna there is a section recording the name of the governor (or the general) Am-NI-li who had persuaded some lands to rebel. The name of the first land (ix, 6’) is broken; only the first and last signs are preserved and the GN is not accompanied by the determinative KI. Frayne reads the name as šè-°ru(?)-im without any determinative KI, but the hand-copy suggests šu rather than šè. I suggest identifying this GN with Šu-ir-hu-um, a GN attested in an Ur III text. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to think of the GN Šuruthum, known from the Ur III texts, as an alternative, assuming it was written here in an abbreviated form such as *Šu/Šè-ru-hi-im. Šuruthum is located to the north of Simurrum according to the Ur III sources, which supports this suggestion. If correct, it poses the question of a Hurrian presence in the northern Transtigris, since Astour classified the GN Šuruthum as Hurrian. That the ensi of Urbilum bore the Hurrian name Niriš-huha, mentioned in this very text, may be taken as corroborative. The second GN of the text has only ZÉ preserved, and the third has the sign preserved followed by KUR. The determinative KUR is used in these inscriptions to denote mountain names, so it is assumed that the third name is a mountain name that was a centre or bulwark for one of the peoples participating in the rebellion. Erridu-Pizir says he marched to confront Am-NI-li through the peaks of Mount Nišba, the mountain discussed above.

Then the text says that the king could control the pass (?) at Mount Ha-me-me-x-pi-[r]kur after six days of fighting.

The scribal errors introduced by the ancient copyist, the numerous lacunae and the bad state of the tablet all make it more difficult to fully understand the story. Even some words or sections cannot be translated, such as col. Ix, 10'-11'.

After another lacuna, the narrative resumes with the entry into the pass (Fig. 5) and the king pursuing Am-NI-li, controlling the pass of Mount Nu-ú-pi-ir-kur (Fig. 6) and throwing down the general (ŒR-nam) from the mountain top.

In the following section, the text speaks of the control of the pass of Urbilum at Mount Mumum and the capture or defeat of the ensi of Urbilum, a certain Niriš-huha.

To consider the data given here we must pause. Erridu-Pizir has confronted a tough enemy in a mountainous terrain close to his own centre of power. The mountainous terrain close to him was either to the north or to the east, in the region of modern Darband-i-Khān. Because the next place he conquered was Urbilum, and because more than one pass is mentioned in the course of this campaign, we are almost sure that the battlefield for these clashes was to the north, i.e. in the Qaradagh region. This region from ancient times even till now has been well known for its numerous passes (Fig. 7) and as a difficult area for military operations.

---

214 Kutscher: Šu/Šè-°x-[-x]-im.
217 See for instance x, 5.
218 According to Frayne the translation is, “Further, he [st]ru[ck] down [A]mnili, the …, on its summit…,” cf.: RIME 2, p. 227 (text E2.2.1.3), l. x, 10'-15', suggesting that Amnili was struck down on the mountain peak.
219 A clear example would be the Anfāl campaigns, carried out against the Kurdish countryside in the late 1980s. Afterwards all the villages surrounding Sulaimaniya were devastated and the Peshmarga warriors were driven. 155
logical then to expect that an old general would organize his defence in a place most advantageous for himself and most difficult for his enemy, the Gutians, to approach. To have won victory in such a terrain and to have advanced through such a pass after six days of fighting was certainly an occasion for celebration, fitting to be immortalized with a rock relief.

In fact there is a third millennium rock relief in the Qaradagh Mountains that preserves the memory of a military victory. The well known relief of Darband-i-Gawir, attributed for a long time to Narām-Sin, could easily be attributed to Erridu-Pizir. Narām-Sin in his victory stele found at Susa wears a horned helmet, a token of divinity and he puts the deification sign before his name in the inscriptions. On the contrary, Erridu-Pizir did not deify himself in the inscriptions, and this fact is reflected in this relief. The main figure of the Darband-i-Gawir relief, the king, wears a helmet or cap without horns (Fig. 8b). It has no inscription, which is perhaps a typical Gutian trait, and so there is nothing to prove any Akkadian identity. Other details in the costume, beard, ornament and weaponry of the king show differences with those of Narām-Sin, though it does have many OAk. characteristics. Furthermore, exactly as in the inscription of Erridu-Pizir, there are some persons depicted at the feet of the victorious king (Figs. 7c and 7d) falling on their heads. Am-NI-li must be one of them. That inscription did not mention that Erridu-Pizir put his foot on the defeated king, and we see no defeated figure trampled by the triumphant figure on the relief. One may argue that the style is Akkadian and the striking likeness to the Susa stele favours attributing it to Narām-Sin. But other non-Akkadian victory stele that bear much likeness to that of Susa must also be considered, such as the Darband-i-Bēlule relief, the Sar-i-Pul-i-Zahāb (Annubanini) relief and even the much later Darius I relief in Bēštūn (Behestun). These reliefs similarly depict the relatively large proportions of the main person, the king, with the falling enemy at or under his feet. Other defeated enemies are depicted as a row of captives in Sarpul and Bēštūn, with the divine symbols of the national gods or the gods of war, with a bow in one hand and a sword or dagger in the other. Obviously the Susa stele was the model or prototype for all these reliefs. The relief of Erridu-Pizir was the closest to which in time and hence closely resembles it The question why the carving of this relief is not mentioned in the inscription can be answered by reference to the numerous lacunae; together these would add at least 193 lines of text, without counting the lacuna of unknown length.

It is interesting that the element –pir occurred in two of the mountain names: Ḥa-mē-me-x-pi-[iḫ kur] and Nu-ūḫ-pi-iḫ kur (perhaps a Gutian or Elamite type). A look at the narrative of out over the Iraq-Iran border. A little later, but only in very few regions like Qaradagh Region and the Pīra Magrūn Mountain, small numbers of Peshmarga were able to come back and carry out small-scale operations against the Iraqi troops.

220 Meaning “the pass of the Gawir.” Gawir is a Kurdish word to denote everyone and everything related to the pre-Islamic or non-Islamic worlds. The name is inspired by the carved image on the rocky mountain side.


222 For a detailed description and comparison of the relief cf. Boese, op. cit., p. 15 ff.; Strommenger, BaM, p. 84 ff.

223 The Sarpul relief depicts the goddess Ištar in person and the Bēštūn relief shows the symbol of Ahuramazda.

224 However, there is a broken GN from Nuzi that begins with Nu-ūḫ- […] apparently a city, in JEN 724: 5, cf. Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 189.
the campaign suggests that the line of the march was from the south or southeast to the northwest, towards Erbil. If this is true, Mount Nišba was located near Darband-i-Khān, modern Zimmako or Shaho, and the two mountains Ḥameme-x-pir and Nuḫpir were in the Qaradagh-Sagirma chain. The former was on the flanks of, or at, Darband-i-Gawir, and the latter on the way from Darband-i-Gawir to the Shahrazūr Plain in the direction of Mumum, before Erbil. Which mountain is identifiable with Mumum, is difficult to answer.

Another important point in the inscriptions of Erridu-Pizir is the mention of Urbilum in this period, earlier than the previous oldest known occurrence in the Ur III texts. Even if we assume that this reference comes from the end of the Gutian Period, it is still older than the first mention of Urbilum in the date-formulae of Šulgi during his Hurrian wars by at least 63 years. Urbilum had, according to the inscription, an ensi and not a GIR.NITA like other places, and it was located behind a mountain pass that the Gutians should go through to reach it. The text defined the pass as Mount Mumum, a Transtigridian reduplicative name. This GN is reminiscent of the GN Mumum, mentioned together with Alzu, Amadanu, Nihanu, Alaia, Tepurzu, Purulumzu, Papḫu, Katmuḫu and Buššu in the inscriptions of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1244-1208 B.C.) in the course of his campaigns to the north and northwest. However the Mummu of the Assyrian inscriptions seems to have been located behind Erbil to the north, or perhaps the northwest. However, Frayne proposed to identify Mumum of our inscription with mu-i-um(?)-an, mentioned in an inscription of Kutik-Inšušinak from Susa, that commemorates his campaign on Kimaš and Ḫurtum. The name of the ensi of Urbilum, Niriš-huha, is very significant since it can be analyzed as a Hurrian personal name, a clear indication of the Hurrian presence in this region in this period.

The text ends with the dedicatory section and first and second colophon, preceded by a lacuna.

225 Ur-Namma reigned 18 years and Urbilum occurs for the first time in the 45th year of Šulgi.

226 For the inscriptions of Tukulti-Ninurta I cf. Weidner, E., “Die Inschriften Tukulti-Ninurtas I und seiner Nachfolger,” AfO 12 (1970); Grayson, RIMA 1, p. 231ff. These lands were united to form an alliance against Assyria to regain Ḥanigalbat under the leadership of Eḫli-Teššup, king of Alzu (Alshe).

227 Frayne, BiOr, p. 404.

228 For the analysis of this name, cf. Chapter Four.
Figures of Chapter Three

Map 1) The assumed Gutian control area under King Erridu-Pizir.


4a) A hand copy of the inscriptions of Erridu-Pizir. After: Kutscher, R., *The Brockmon Tablets at the University of Haifa- Royal Inscriptions*, Published by the Haifa University Press and the Zinman Institute of Archaeology, Haifa, 1989, p. 120.
4b) A hand copy of the inscriptions of Erridu-Pizir. After: Kutscher, R., *The Brockmon Tablets at the University of Haifa- Royal Inscriptions*, Published by the Haifa University Press and the Zinman Institute of Archaeology, Haifa, 1989., p. 121.
Gutium, Madga and Simurrum in the time of Erridu-Pizir.
5) The pass of Darband-i-Gawir where the relief is located. Photo by the author.

6) The location of the relief at the mountain side, probably Mount Nuhpir. Photo by the author.
7) The series of passes of the Qaradagh mountain range. Photo after Google Earth.
8a) The Darband-i-Gawir rock-relief. Photo by the author.
8b) Detail of the relief of Darband-i-Gawir. Photo by the author.
CHAPTER FOUR

The Age of the Hurrian Expansion
Assuming that the Hurrians\(^1\) 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,\(^2\) 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.\(^3\) 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\(^4\) or from across the Caspian Sea\(^5\) and were present in the mountains north of Urkesh.

\(^1\) 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 kır ‘Hur-ri’ (used for the first time by Ḫattušiliš I); Ugaritic hry; even actual Hurrian (KUR) Hur-ru-u-hê and KUR Hur-ru-u-ê; Egyptian Hu-ru (used for the first time by Thutmos 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 ꜜꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝꜝTahoma, serif; font-size: 10pt; text-align: justify;'>168</span>
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/Dašiatili during one of his campaigns to the northeast. The year-name can be translated: "The ye[ar] Narā[m-S]īn was victorious over the land of Subir at Azuhinum and took prisoner T/Dašiatili." The place-name connected to this Hurrian named ruler also has

---


7 Richter, "Die Ausbreitung der Hurriter …,” p. 273.

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*.


10 Frayne, RIME 2, p. 86, q.

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 -ḫišu 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’aowe, […]-we in addition to Azuḫinum. In the Hamrin region and lower Diyala some PNs from the OAkk. period show a Hurrian presence. Some good examples are Dup-ki-a-šûm (= Ṭupki-ašûm), probably A-ru-um, al-la, Ṣe-eb-du-ur-ug, and probably Zu-uzu from Ḥaḏajī, Ṭul-pi-ip-šē and Wi-(ir-)ri from Tell Suleima. These few PNs, although some of them such as Wi(r)ī 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 former 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 Rīmuš with Talmuš, since the royal name Rīmuš was always written with RI not RI and royal names are used only as parts of compound names.
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 Šehrin-ewri, whose name is doubtless Hurrian. In the description of the garments Hurrian terms also occur: *hišelu=ḫina*, *zime=ḫina* and *'aku=ḫina*.

The Gasur tablets yielded some Hurrian PNs, such as *A-li-a-sar* (185 II 6; 188 III 3), *A-ri/tal/hu-ḫa* (153 VIII 4), *E-wa-ri-ki-ra* (185 II 3), *Ki-ip-tu-ru* (129: 11; 153 IV 31; 199: 5), *Ši-ni-ša-am* (51 I 2; 52 I 3); I would add *Bu-da-īk-ki* (23: 6), perhaps < *puttukki*. Such names have been also detected in Babyloynia, presumably prisoners of war taken from northern Mesopotamia or the Transtigris 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 1 211) 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 Ninḫursag’ 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 “pagentry 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, p. xxviii-xxvii. Gelb was 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-ḫuḫa (adal-ḫuḫ(u+)a) includes the well-known adal with the nominal element huḫu in the esseive case. Ewari-kira (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-ru from turi “man,” functioning here as subject: *ke=i=b=tur(i)=u “the man has put/settled,” Tiru-šaki includes the rare verb tir appearing in OB PNs, such as Tir-šarri, and Ša-ki, found in female PNs, such as Asšum-šaki, Atal-šaki and Elan-šaki.

29 Steinkeller, “The Historical Background…,” p. 90, n. 53. The names are Ú-na-ap-šè-na, A-ri-nin (OSP 1 47 v 3-4); Dup-ki-a-šum (MAD 1 233 iv 11). *’Uš-a-ni ap-[šè-na?] (MAD 4 167:17), and A-ḫu-šè-na (Donbaz-Foster STT 142:2). He lists also the two Hurrian names Tu-pi-in, Šè-eḫ-ri-in-ip/ew-rì (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”.


(Tukrišītum) 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 Tukrišiān 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, in modern Iran. 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 Šamši-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 Ninursag mentioned above: a source of gold and lapis-lazuli.

b) The inscription of Hammurabi from Ur (UES 1 146): mentioning Tukriš with Elam, Gutium, and Subartu.

c) An inscription of Šamši-Adad I: stating that he received the tribute of Tukriš and the Upper Land (mātum ellenum); cf. Grayson, RIMA i, 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-riš-šu-a KU.BABBAR) and 18’ (GAL SAG GUD Tu-skišū[t][uri]-a).

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 Tukriššu, Tukrišša ṣa qa-ti KU.Tuk-riš-šu, Tu-uk-riš-ša.

h) MB documents from Nippur: describing coloured wool, see PBS 2/2 135 44:1 and Aro, Kleidertexte 33.

i) A description of garments in the Amarna letters (EA 22 ii 37; 25 iv 45).

j) Lexical texts: Tuk-riš, Ḥar-gud B V to Ḥǎ XX-XXII 13 (MSL 11 36); ṣa-ad Tu-riš, Ḥǎ XXI 3:14 (MSL 11 13), written ṣa-ad Tu-uk-riš 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.

At that time I received the tribute of the kings of Tukriš and of the king of the Upper Land within my city Assur. I set up my great name and my monumental inscription in the land Lebanon on the shore of the great Sea.\textsuperscript{44}

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 Ḫutūra (near Purušḫandā), Amurrū, Kilāri (mentioned in the texts of Kaneš, but not identified), Kaneš, Ḫatu (Central Anatolia), Lūmme, Gutium, Lullum and Ḫāhūm.\textsuperscript{45} 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.\textsuperscript{46} Guichard further emphasizes a western location for Tukriš based on the sources of gifts labelled ‘Tukrišian’.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{49} Importing it to Mesopotamia would have followed one of the main routes that

\textsuperscript{44} 73) i-nu-mi-šu 74) bi-la-at LUGAL.MEŠ 75) ša Tu-uk-ri-iš 76) u LUGAL ma-a-tim 77) e-li-tim 78) i-na qē-re-eb a-li-ia 79) A-šu 80) lu am-ta-la-ar 81) šu-mi ra-bē-e-em 82) u na-re-ia 83) i-na ma-a-at 84) La-ab-a-an 85) i-na a-ah A.AB.BA 86) ra-bi-i-tim 87) lu-ū aš-šu-an Grayson, RIMA 1, p. 50 (A.0.39.1).

\textsuperscript{45} Cf. Van de Mieroop, M., “Sargon of Agade and his Successors in Anatloia,” SMEA 42/1 (2000), p. 147-8, l. 47-62. According to Guichard, Ḫāhūm and Lullubum were geographically close, \textit{ibid.} However, new textual and archaeological evidence shows that Ḫāhūm was on the Euphrates in the southern part of the Taurus Ranges, probably at Samsat or Lidar Höyük: cf. Van de Mieroop, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 135; Westenholz, \textit{Legends of the Kings of Akkad}, p. 250, note to l. i' 5' and Salvini, M., “Un royaume houïrite en Mésopotamie du Nord à l'époque de Ḫattušil I,” \textit{Subartu} IV/1, Turnhout, 1998, p. 305, but cf. also Chapter Seven. Van de Mieroop tried to interpret the occurrence of the two GNs together, here and in a Mari letter (published as: Kupper, J.-R., \textit{Lettres royales du temps de Zimri-Lim}, ARM 28, Paris, 1998, no. 60, l. 26-30) and in the list of the enemies of Narām-Sīn (cf. Westenholz, \textit{Legends of ...}, p. 250-251, l. 4' 5'), by shedding doubt on whether this Lullum was identical with the traditional Lullubum, because for him, the attestations indicate a common border between the two, cf. \textit{op. cit.} p. 153. In fact, the mention of Gutium in this text dispels any doubt that the text speaks about the same known Lullubum. The sequence of the GNs in this literary text may not have any geographical connotation. Concerning the Mari letter, the second piece of evidence for Van de Mieroop, it refers to “men of Lullum”(LÚ Lu-ul-li-i) in contrast to the preceding E-lu-ša-ut\textsuperscript{50}, cf. Kupper, ARM 28, no. 60: 27, p. 86), thus referring to individual Lullubians in northern Syria rather than to their land.

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 321, note 597.

\textsuperscript{47} For details, cf. Guichard, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 321-3, especially 322.

\textsuperscript{48} Three modern examples come to mind. The mosaic known as \textit{Qašani}, used to decorate façades of buildings all over the Middle East, derives its name from the city of Kashān in Iran. But it is not necessarily produced there now; it has become simply a mark of style. Similarly the name \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{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,” \textit{Iraq} 30 (1968), p. 21 and 28; Herrmann, G. and P. R. S. Moorey, “Lapislazuli,” \textit{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 Marāšians\(^{52}\) from the OAkk. to the Ur III periods is interesting. A list of such names has been compiled by Steinkeller\(^{53}\) and Zadok:\(^{54}\) Hupšum-kibi, \(^{55}\) Ḥavurna-niši, \(^{56}\) Miši-niši, \(^{57}\) Kuš-elli, \(^{58}\) Purašhe, \(^{59}\) Ḥašip-atal, \(^{60}\) Hul(i)ib/par, \(^{61}\) Šimšelah \(^{62}\) 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 Azuḥinum and Simurrum, the organization of a military force, and more significantly giving Hurrian names to regions such as Azuḥinum and Kirašeniwe must have had a previous history, before Narām-Sîn. 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-Sîn.\(^{64}\)

\(^{50}\) 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.\(^{51}\)


\(^{52}\) Komoróczy, ibid.

\(^{53}\) It is even stranger that no Hurrian PNs are found among the Śimaškians (cf. Zadok, “Elamite Onomastics,” p. 228-229), where Hurrians would be expected more than in Marāšiš, since Šimaški is further north and apparently larger.


\(^{56}\) Ħavur(ni) “heaven” and ni-qi 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 ě-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 waur “view.” The form and structure of the name looks very much like the word purameš “slavery” or purme “servant,” Richter, op. cit. p. 308.

\(^{60}\) A frequently attested name consisting of the verbal base ḫaš- “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-se-il-ša-

\(^{63}\) 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-Sîn: 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. 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 skillful 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. 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. Folk etymologies of this GN mean ‘The land of axes’, associated with the abundance of woods widely exploited by cutting, taking Tab(a)rr 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)rr 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
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.

Gelb concluded that northern Syria was originally populated by a people of an unknown ethnic affiliation, later by the West Semites, and subsequently by the Hurrians, cf. Gelb, I. J., “The Early History of the West Semitic Peoples,” JCS 15 (1961), p. 41. These non-Semites were in all probability Subarians. According to Archi, in the Ebla period the northern Syrian region: 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 PN, such as 📆-wa-tu-rī (Urkeš), Śè-ni-za-sa-am (Urkeš), Šu-pa-è (Urkeš), Ú-na-ap-sè-ni (Urkeš), 77 Dal-pu-za-ti-li (Nagar), Tüp-ki-ìš (Urkeš), saʔ/ša-tar-

69 Gelb concluded that northern Syria was originally populated by a people of an unknown ethnic affiliation, later by the West Semites, and subsequently by the Hurrians, cf. Gelb, I. J., “The Early History of the West Semitic Peoples,” JCS 15 (1961), p. 41. These non-Semites were in all probability Subarians. According to Archi, in the Ebla period the northern Syrian region: 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.


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. Catagnoti, A., “The III Millennium Personal Names from the Habur Triangle in the Ebla, Brak and Mozan Texts,” Subartu, IV/2, p. 46 and 62. In fact, Catagnoti 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 PN 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-sa-lib-ri, a messenger of Uršu (BIN III, 221: 35-36).

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

gu-ni and šu-gu-zi (Beydar)\textsuperscript{78} and Ul-tum-ḫu-ḫu, son of the king of Nagar.\textsuperscript{79} They also include Hurrian GNs.\textsuperscript{80} A handful of non-Semitic GNs in the Habur region that appeared in the texts from Nagar and Urkēš were “quite certainly Hurrian.”\textsuperscript{81} Even the name Nagar itself could be Hurrian in origin.\textsuperscript{82} From Urkēš, modern Tell Mozan,\textsuperscript{83} we also have the important discoveries of the inscriptions of Tupkiš, endan of Urkēš, and his wife, Queen Uqniṭum. In the two Akkadian texts found in the 1990 campaign in Mozan, the Hurrian PN Uqnap-šeni\textsuperscript{84} occurs. The king of Urkēš bears on his sealings the title endan, which is somewhat controversial, at least etymologically. Suggestions have been presented to analyze it as consisting of the Hurrian suffix for professions –dan,\textsuperscript{85} preceded by the en, which is either the Sumerian logogram EN “ruler”\textsuperscript{86} or a classical form of the Hurrian eni “god.”\textsuperscript{87} Others associate it with the Akkadian word entu “high priestess.”\textsuperscript{88} However, the recent discoveries in Mozan, especially the collocations “Tupkiš, endan of Urkēš”\textsuperscript{89} and “Uqniṭum, 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 ʿĀ-wa-tu-ri, i.e. ʿĀ-WA-, though not certain, probably comes from the verbal root awu/awu attested in Nuzi and OB names. Its second element is turi “man” (but note that turi in GLH, p. 273 is given as “inferior”). Unaqani is clearly un-a-b-šen(a)=ni meaning “the brother came,” cf. Richter, op. cit., p. 279-280.

\textsuperscript{78} Richter, p. 276 and 279 (referring to Subartu II; Milano, Mozan 2, and Subartu IV/2). He analyzed the name Talpuš-ati-li as talav=ā=ž(i)=adili (by Wilhelm, G., “L’état actuel …,” Amurru, p. 175, note 5), containing the lexeme talawaš “great, big” and atal “strong.” The name Tupkiš (tupki=2) consists of the very common but unexplainable tupki. Salvini thinks it is possibly an abbreviated form of Tupkiš=anni, 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 Urkēš: 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-še-‘en(š)u-li Gu-ma-ra-ši\textsuperscript{85} (RGTC 2, 174) and the above mentioned Dup-ki-ašum from Tutub. For other occurrences of names with the element Tupki(i), cf. Salvini, “Excursus…,” op. cit. p. 85-86. The name S/Satarguni includes šad (“give back”) =ar (iterative/factitive) + gu-ni, a common element in Hurrian PN, as in the OB Mušum-kune/u, a person from Mardam, and Teššu-pu-kuni (AITH *33:10) (Richter, p. 276). As for the name šu-gu-zi, the number “one” forms its first element šog(i), with nizz attached to it and means “To befit one, fitting for one,” cf. Richter, op. cit., p. 276. However, Talon in a study of the PN 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 IV/2, p. 120.


\textsuperscript{80} 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. 


\textsuperscript{82} For the analysis of the name Nagar and its identification with Nawar, see below, under ‘Nawar.’


\textsuperscript{84} Un=a-p=šeni “The brother has come,” cf. Salvini, “The Earliest…,” p. 104.

\textsuperscript{85} Wilhelm, The Hurrians, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{86} 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.”

\textsuperscript{87} The second millennium eni could have been just en in this (classical) period of Hurrian.

\textsuperscript{88} About this see Wilhelm, “Die Inschrift …,” p. 121, and note 22; Collon, D., “The Life and Times of Tehešatal,” RA 84 (1990), p. 134.

Tupkiš\textsuperscript{90} with “Uqniūtum the queen”,\textsuperscript{91} lead to the conclusion that endan means ‘king’\textsuperscript{92} and has nothing to do with Akkadian entu.

For the third quarter of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} 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).\textsuperscript{93}

### Expansion

#### Gutian and Ur III Periods:

The inscriptions of Erridu-Pizir of Gutium mention Niriššuša, the ensi of Urbilum. By analysing this PN as Hurrian,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{96} bears the name and title of the city ruler Talpuš-atili: “Talpuš-atili, the sun of the country of Nagar, son of ….”\textsuperscript{97} From his name, which means in Hurrian “The strong one is great,”\textsuperscript{98} it appears that he was of Hurrian stock, and this is another indication of the range of Hurrian expansion in this

\textsuperscript{90} Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 16.

\textsuperscript{91} Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{92} Salvini, “The earliest…,” p. 104-105. But Salvini, although not sure about the connection, points to the comparable forms $^{94}$entanni ‘(high)priestess,’ and to the epithet enašši of the goddess ḫep̄bat in Hititte-Hurrian texts in the regions of Kizzuwatna, Cilicia and Cappadocia from the 14\textsuperscript{th}-13\textsuperscript{th} 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.

\textsuperscript{93} Richter, “Die Ausbreitung…,” p. 285. For Mari see the discussion on p. 286.

\textsuperscript{94} Steinkeller has listed in his “The Historical Background …” the Hurrian PNs that contain some elements of this name: Ni-iš-u-uš from Nuzi (Gelb et al. \textit{OIP} 57, p. 107); Sargonic A-rī-ḫu-ha (Meek, Old Akkadian, Sumerian, and Cappadocian Texts from Nuzi, \textit{HSS X}, 153 viii 4); the Ur III Šu-bi-iš-hu-ha (of Kakmi) and the OB Ip-hu-ha and Ka-di-iš-hu-ha (Zadok, in Kutscher \textit{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,” \textit{RHA} 36, p. 72, note 16. I would add Ultum-ḫuḫu, son of the king of Nagar, about whom see Biga, “The Marriage of Eblaite Princess Tagriš-Damu …,” \textit{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 nī/er- or nī/īr-, followed by the word ḫuḫu in the essive: nir=i(=)ž-u-uš=a. Richter also refers to Haas, V., \textit{ZA} 79, p. 267 with note 25, and Neu, E., \textit{Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I, Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Ḫatušša}, Wiesbaden, 1996, p. 500 for such a verb. As for the verb nī/er or nī/īr, it might be the same nīri which Wilhelm translates as “good,” cf. Fincke, \textit{RGTC} 10, p. 382.

\textsuperscript{95} Archival texts from the Ur III mention Hurrian PNs associated with the city of Talmuš, e.g. A-ri-ip-ḫu-up-pi lū Tal-muš\textsuperscript{95} (AB 25, 92, 21), cf. Edzard and Farber, \textit{RGTC} 2, p. 157 (under Rīmuš).


\textsuperscript{98} Matthews, D. and J. Eidem, \textit{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, Urkesh and Uršu prove this expansion.  

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.

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

Obviously the Hurrians pushed further westwards across the Euphrates from the middle of the third millennium BC according to onomastic evidence. 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.
102 For the name and inscription cf. Finet, A., “Adalšenni, roi de Burundum,” RA 60 (1966), p. 17f.; Kamenhuber, “Historisch-Geographische Nachrichten…,” p. 165, note 21; Kamenhuber, “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 Kamenhuber, “Die Arier…”.). For this reading compare the PN Anip-šenniš from Tigmunānī (OB). However, Wilhelm confirms that the verbal form ar(i)- is not attested in early Hurrian PNs: Wilhelm, “Die Inschrift des Tišatal von Urkesh,” Urkesh and the Hurrians, p. 120. Therefore the most likely and most accepted reading is Tiš-atal.
103 Wilhelm, 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-Sīn 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-Sīn). 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 (Azuḫinum). 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-ḫ-ḫ-š attested in an Ur III text from the reign of Šu-Sin 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 Himilimma 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, Ḫipilat, Kakmi, Arrapḫum, K/Gumarasi, Sašru(m), Šetirša, 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 Transstigiris, 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 Arrapha 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.

\textbf{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 \textit{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 Hurriten-Frage und eine mögliche Lösung, in \textit{Hurriten und Hurritisch}, ed. V. Haas, Konstanz, 1988, p. 213; Hrouda, B., “Zur Proble 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., 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 \textit{liberate} some territories (Awal, Kismar, Maškan-Sarrum, the lands of Ešnunna, Tutub, Zimudar and Akkad) from Elamite occupation, cf. Frayne, \textit{RIME} 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 (\textit{Gī-tar-lā}), who had been chosen as king, but Ur-Namma declared his kingship false, cf. Frayne, \textit{RIME} 3/2, p. 67 (E3/2.1.130) and Civil, M., “On Some Texts Mentioning Ur-Namma,” \textit{Or} 54 (1985), p. 27ff.


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 Khorāsan 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 balā 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. Kunšī-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-Šu-nir and Bēlat-Teraban, cf. Sallaberger, Ur III Zeit, OBO, p. 160.
125 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 Sī-i-nal-nu! and Sinas of Procopius of Caesarea (said to have been in the region of Amida, modern Diyarbakir) 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-Sīn,” *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 Baḥir 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-Uriam “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 Ipuḫa and a son-in-law called Pūḫi-liši. Since the Sumerian princess has been referred to as the é-gi₄-a (Akkadian kallatu(m) = daughter-in-law) of Pušam’s son Arib-atal, she could have been married to the younger brother Ipuḫa according to Michalowski. However, the text PDT 572, rev. l. 7ff calls her the é-gi₄-a of Arib-atal (dated to ŠS 1, II, 22), and the text Ch. Jean, ŚA LVIII, 35 the é.gi₄-a of Pušam (dated to AS 5, VI, 12). Although the term é.gi₄-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, Ipuḫa. 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 Ḫarši, and it seems that the campaign of the year before had guaranteed clear access to that place. The campaign against Ḫarši 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 princehoods 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 princehoods 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-šag-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. Wilhelm analysed it as Pušš(i?)=a=m “He is like…,” Wilhelm, Hurrians in Kültepe Texts, in Anatolia and the Jazira ..., p. 185.
130 Sallaberger, Ur III Zeit, OBO, p. 161. The names of these two persons are good Hurrian names. The first can be analysed as ari=p=atal “The strong (one) has given.” The second is perhaps i=p=ḫuḫu, of which the second part is known to be attested in other Hurrian PNs, such as Ultum-ḫuḫu and Nirišḫuḫa. There are numerous names from Nuzi that begin with Arip-, cf. NPN, p. 28f.; cf. also Richter for the element ar-, Richter, Ein Ḫurrter wird geboren ... und benannt, in Kulturlandschaft Syrien, Zentrum und Peripherie, Fs. für Jan-Waalke Meyer, ed. J. Becker, R. Hempelmann and E. Rehm, Münster, 2010, p. 510 f.
132 For details, cf. Michalowski, op. cit., p. 717-18; especially 719.
133 Michalowski, op. cit., p. 718.
137 Michalowski, “Königsbriefe,” RIA 6, p. 53.
part of the Hamrin range.\textsuperscript{138} This fortification wall in these letters, according to Michalowski, was undoubtedly the same Bād ma-da constructed by Šulgi.\textsuperscript{139}

Two years after the campaigns against Šašrum, Simurrum and Lullubum for the ninth time (Š 44), and Urbilum, Simurrum, Lullubum and Karšar, “within one day” (Š 45), there were campaigns in the next two years against Kimaš, Ḥuw/murutum and their lands (Š 46-47).\textsuperscript{140} and finally Kimaš, Ḥarši, Ḥuw/murutum and their lands (Š 48). One can assume that the later campaigns against Simurrum (Š 44 and 45), followed by other lands such as Karšar (Š 45), Kimaš (Š 46, 47 and 48), Ḥarši (Š 48) and Ḥuw/murutum (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 Enridapiriz, father of Erridu-piriz. 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 [...].”\textsuperscript{141} A royal inscription alludes to the destruction of Kimaš and Ḥurutum, referring to piled up corpses and digging a moat (perhaps to drain away the blood).\textsuperscript{142} Ḥurutum was probably another spelling of Ḥum/wurutum. It is noteworthy that Urbilum was attacked and probably conquered by Šulgi after Š 45, and then again by Amar-Sin, but no Sumerian governor in that city is attested until Šū-Sin, when Arad-Nanna was governor.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{144} Šulgi attacked it four years later (Š 34-35).\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{146} and Ur-dun. The letters show some of the conditions in the northern or

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

\textsuperscript{139}Michalowski, “Königsbriefe,” RIA 6, p. 53.

\textsuperscript{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 luU.ŠU, “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.

\textsuperscript{141}u4 énsi Ki-šima-akši im-ma-dab-ba’a, and “nam-ra-ak Ki-ma-asxkī ‘Ha’-ar-ši [u …] x1[...].”xk1, cf. (also for bibliography) Steinkeller, “New Light on Šimaški …,” ZA 97, p. 217, note 12; Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 109.

\textsuperscript{142}1) 8u-lu-gi 2) DINGIR ma-ti-su 3) da-nūm 4) LUGAL U.R.1, 5) LUGAL ki-ib-ra-tim 6) ar-ba-im 7) i-mu 8) m-at Ki-ma-ši 9) Ḥu-ur-tim 10) Ḥu-ar-si-na 11) Ḥi-ri-tam 12) iš-ku-un 13) Ḥi-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 Ḥurutum, 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 ducing the streams of blood.


\textsuperscript{144}For this year name cf. Sallaberger, p. 143; 160.

\textsuperscript{145}Steinkeller thinks there were two campaigns undertaken against Anšan, cf. Steinkeller, “New Light on Šimaški …,” p. 226, note 45.

\textsuperscript{146}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-ḡu, 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.\(^{150}\)

---

\(^{147}\) 4) gün ma-da-zu ge-en-ge-nè-dè 5) a-rà ma-da zu-zu-dè 6) ugu A-pi-il-la-ša gal-zu-unken-na-sè 7) ad-gu-gi-
\dè gū-tēš-a si-ge-dè, Michalowski, *Letters from Early Mesopotamia*, p. 63 and 64.

\(^{148}\) 9) kà é-gal-la-sè ġen-a-ḡuò-dè 10) silim-ma lugal-ḡa-ke₂ ñí li-bi-in-tar 11) tuš na-ma-ta-an-zi ki-a nu-ub-za

\(^{149}\) 13) te-ḡe₂t-r-e-da-ḡuò-ne 14) ė kaskal-la-zu ga-rig₂, aká dàlu kū-sig₁₇ kū-babbar 15) nₜ⁴ ugu nₜ⁴ za-gin ḡar-ra-ta a-


---

and R. D. Biggs (eds.), *The Organization of Power - Aspects of Bureaucracy in the Ancient Near East*, Chicago, 1987, p. 35, note 48. Waetzoldt, however, disagrees, supposing three individuals with three different titles. Huber herself, however, thinks they were one and the same person. As for Arad-mu and Ir-mu, she based herself first on a text from Susa (RCU 15 -Suse XII/1, col. ii, li. 32-33-), published by Edzard (referring to Edzard, D. O. (1974), *Textes littéraires de Suse, MDP 57*: 15) that provides a syllabic writing of the name as ur-du-um-gu. For the identification of Urdu-ḡu with Ir-Nanna, she refers to two texts; the one refers to Ir-mu as ugula, responsible for the tribute of the land NI.\(^{148}\) in Ş 48, and in the other text that of Urbilum in ŞS 7. These two texts are, according to her, in perfect agreement with the monumental inscription of Ir-Nanna, dated to the reign of Šu-Sîn, which mentions him as ṣagina of NI.\(^{148}\) and Urbilum, *ibid*. For these reasons, I use here the reading Urdu-ḡu, which is confirmed by the text from Susa.
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.

---


152 27) 2 gud niga 20 udu niga gíbanšur-gú₁₀ lú ma-an-dí 28) nu-kár-kár-da äga-ús lugal-gá-ke₄ gíbanšur-gú₁₀ in-bal-a-sè 29) nì ba-da-te su a-da-zí, Michalowski, ibid.


Another official155 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.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.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,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.159 A certain Taḫiš-atal was a prominent scribe in Puzriš-Dagān,160 and we know of Hurrian Šagina “military governors”161, but we cannot be sure from which category of society they emerged.

---


157 15) kù lugal-gâšer-šum-na ù Ba4-ba4-ti ša14-dub-°ba 16) Zi-mu-dar-ki-ra-ta Si-mu-ur-ri-ru-°um-ki-shè-šé 17) i-re-es-ma 18) ù Bu14-sa14-ba-e-ne-x[...]

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 Sašrum 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 Šaritu from the ensi of Ur 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 Ḥamazi (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 Arraphum, Dūr-maš, Agaz, Lullubum, Ḥamazi, Šuritu, Šuah, Gablaš, Zaqtum and Dūr-Ebla, and also of shipments sent to officials or governors in Lullubum, “destroyed Saššuru,” Arraphum, Kimaš, Awal, Tašil and a royal gift consisting of sheep to the bride of Nanib-atal in Urbilum (AS 7).

Probably under Amar-Sîn a marriage was concluded with Ḥamazi, 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 Ḥamazi. 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 Sariprum, but this seems to be a misread Saritu. 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 (Arraphum); Boson TCSD 140 (Kimaš); Owen 1981 NMW 303276 (Awal and Tašil).
169 Meaning “The sceptre (f.) appeared,” from buūram, thus not Dabur-ḫaṭṭum. I owe this translation to T.J.H. Krispın.
170 This was known from references in texts mentioning her when she was on regular visits to Sumer under Amar-Sîn and Šu-Sîn as follows:
AS 9 (BIN 3 382) e-gi4-a ur-iškur ensi Ḫa-ma-zi
ŠS 2 (TrD, 87) Tâ-bur-ha-tum e-gi4-a U-r-iškur ensi
ŠS 5 Newell 1600 e-gi4-a U-r-iškur ensi Ḫa-ma-zi
ŠS 7 PDT, 454 Tâ-bur-ḫa-tum e-gi4-a U-r-iškur “u₄ Ḫa-ma-zi₄-sé i-ḫen-na-a
171 Michalowski, op. cit., p. 719.
as a sign that this principality in this period was independent of Ur. After 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: ŠŠ 3 against Simanum and ŠŠ 7 against Zabšali. After the daughter of Šū-Sīn had been a daughter-in-law for Simanum for at least 12 years, in ŠŠ 2 a rebellion broke out in Simanum, Ḥabūra and the surrounding lands. The rebels overthrew their ruler Pušam/Arib-atal and chased away his daughter-in-law, who was Kūnš-mātum the daughter of Šū-Sīn. The reaction of Šū-Sīn was swift. He moved against the rebels (ŠŠ 3), conquered the city and its surroundings, reinstated Kūnš-mātum in her residence and put back the dethroned ruler on the throne. He also deported part of the city residents to Sumer, where he settled them in a camp, specially built for them. This camp-city was the very first of its kind built for deportees, 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,” 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. Steinkeller 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 gún 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. Steinkeller, “The Administration and Organization …,” p. 36, note 56.

173 Cf. his date-formulae in Sallaberger, OBO, p. 168. Zabšali was, according to Steinkeller, the largest part of the land of Simaški and it served to describe the whole Šimaškian federation: Steinkeller, P., “More on LU.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) [Sī-ma-nū]num ki 31) [Ha-bu-ra]ki 32) [u ma-da-ma da-bi 33) [lugal-da gū-ér]im 34) [ba-an-da-ab]-gāl, 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) [damu-munu-a]-ni 36) è [ki-tuš-a-ni]-ta 37) ság [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) Sī-ma-nūm ki 30) Ha-bu-ra ki 31) u ma-da-ma da-bi 32) nam-urdu(?)’da-ni-šè 33) sāğ-šè 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-sī-ma-tum é-gi 4-a Ar-ba-tal lugal Ši-ma-nūm, “Kūnš-mātum, daughter-in-law of Arib-atal, king of Šimaški,” 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) sāğ-ér-im-gāl 35) nam-ra-aš-aka-ni 36) En-lil 4Nin-lil-[r]a 37) ki-sur-[r]a 38) Nibrū ki-k[a] (xx) 39) Sī-ma-nū[m] 40) ki-[m[u-ne]-gār 41) […] mu-ne-dū, “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 had been decreed, that a town was established for the sake of Enlil and Ninlil with the people he had captured: 47) u₄-nam-tar-ra-ta 48) lugal-na-me 1) sāg-nam-ra-aš-aka-ni-ta 2) En-lil 4Nin-lil-ra 3) ki-sur-ra 4) Nibrū ki-k[a] 5) i₆ b₆) ki nu-ne-gar, op. cit. col. iv 47- v. 6.

179 Sī-ma-nūm ki nu-ne-gar, Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 299 (E3/2.1.4.1, col. v, l. 11; 22-23).
Edzard and Farber, brother. Additional evidence is that the wife of Šulgi was Šulgi-simtšakkana(kkum) (military governor) of Maškān-šarrī and ensī of Awal.184 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.185 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-šarrī and ensī 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 Ḥaburātum 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’-a-ērim ib-kus, “(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 íb-kud 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: If a Man Builds a Joyful House, E3 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, 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 Abî-simti; see further Sallaberger, OBO, p. 168 and the table on p. 183.
187 Maeda, T., “The Defense Zone during the Rule of the Ur III Dynasty,” ASJ 14 (1992), p. 137. The text lists deliveries from soldiers of Ḥabūra, Talmuš, Ninua and Uruae in addition to ‘ma’-ri-ma-nu-um mar-dū. The frequent mention of Mardaman with Ḥabūra in Ur III texts makes it possible to identify the Marimanum mentioned in this text with Mardaman if we assume the omission of a DA sign and KI determinative (= Ma-ri-
188 Maeda, T., “The Defense Zone during the …,” p. 137.
190 Jacobsen has located it at Jarahīyah, some 40 km northwest of Nineveh, but Kessler located it at modern Gir-e Pan, slightly to the northwest of Jarahīyah; see Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 288; cf. also Edzard et al., RGTC 1, p. 139; Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 158; Groneberg, B., RGTC 3, p. 233; Nashef, Kh., RGTC 5, p. 258 (north of
In SS 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 Šū-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 Ebiḥ 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).

Ninua). Kessler had already thought MA and NA Talmuš/si was not identical with old Talmuš, but it had to be read Rimusa/i, cf. Kessler, K., “Geographische Notizen,” ZA 69 (1979), p. 220.

Michalowski, “Königsbriefe,” p. 54.

Michalowski, The Royal Correspondence…, p. 225; 229, and drafts of the new edition of the letters.

Michalowski, The Royal Correspondence…, p. 225; 229-230, and drafts of the new edition of the letters.
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:

---

195 This is the conclusion of Michalowski from the letter, cf. Miachalowski, “Königsbriefe,” p. 54.
196 Michalowski pointed to a damaged tablet from the OB period found in Nippur (ISET II 117: Ni. 4164, obv. 4’ff.) that bears the opening lines of a letter from Šarrum-bāni to Lu-Nanna: Michalowski, “Königsbriefe,” RIA 6, p. 54..
At that time, Simaški (which comprises) the lands of Zabšali, 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-ar\(^k\)]\(^i\), 'x'\(^i\)-[x-x-a]\(^m\)\(^i\), Si-ig-ri-iš, A-lu-mi-da-tim\(^k\), Ga-ar-ta\(^k\), A-za-ḥa-ar\(^k\), Bu-ul-ma\(^k\), Nu-šu-uš-ma-ar\(^k\), Nu-uš-ga-ne-lum\(^k\), Zi-zi-ir-tum\(^k\), A-ra-ḥi-ir\(^k\), Ša-ti-lu\(^k\) and Ti-ir-mi-um\(^k\).\(^{201}\) 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 Zabšali 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 ensis of these lands together with the names of two kings of Zabšali, Zi-ri-in-gu\(^{203}\) and In-da-su/sû,\(^{204}\) as preserved in the captions of the OB texts copied from the original inscriptions on the statues. The names are:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Ti-ti ensi of Nu-šu-uš-ma-ar\(^k\)
  \item S[a-a]m-ri ensi of [X]-'X'-li-[x]\(^{205}\)
  \item Nu-[x]-li ensi of A-lu-'mi-id-da'-tim
  \item Bu-ni'-ni ensi of [S]i-ig-ri-iš\(^k\)
  \item Ba-ri-hi-za ensi of A-ra(?)-hi-ir\(^k\)
  \item Wa-bur-tum ensi of [L][u(?)-lu-bi-im\(^{205}\)]
  \item Ne-ni-ib-zu ensi of Zi-zi-ir-tum\(^k\)
  \item Ti-ru-'bi'-u ensi of Nu-uš-ga-ne-[l]u-um\(^k\)
  \item 'x'-am-ti ensi of Ga-ar-ta\(^k\)
\end{itemize}

\(^{200}\) 14) u-\(\acute{\text{e}}\)-ba 15) Simaški (LÚ.SU)\(^k\) 16) ma-da-ma-da 17) Za-ab-ša-li\(^k\)-ta 19) a-ab-ba IGI.NIM-ma-šè 20) buru-gin, zi-ga-bi, Frayne, \textit{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:

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1) ̣Gi-ir-na-am-me
  \item 2) Ta-zi-it-ta
  \item 3) E-ba-ar-ti
  \item 4) Ta-zi-it-ta
  \item 5) Lu-'x-x-a-k?-.lu-uḫ-ḫa-an
  \item 6) Ki-in-da-at-ti[b]
  \item 7) I-da-at-ti
  \item 8) Tan-ru-ḫu-at-te-er
  \item 9) E-[ba]-ar-ti
  \item 10) I-da-at-tu
  \item 11) I-da-at-ta-na-pi-ir
  \item 12) I-da-at-ta-te-em-ti
\end{itemize}


\(^{202}\) In text E3/2.1.4.3: \textit{RIME} 3/2, p. 306.

\(^{203}\) In text E3/2.1.4.5: \textit{RIME} 3/2, p. 310, variant on p. 311.

\(^{204}\) Note that Lulubum 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.
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-aššu-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-Šin 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-Šin 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-Šin.

4. Ibbi-Šin

Ibbi-Šin (2028-2004 BC), the last king of the dynasty, campaigned in Simurrum in the early years of his reign (IS 3) and later in Ḥūnhuri (IS 9). Between the two campaigns, he
concluded a dynastic marriage (IS 5), marrying his daughter Tukīn-ḫaṭṭi-migriša to the ensi of Zabšali.\footnote{mu Tu-ki-in-PA-mi-ig-ri-ša dumu-munus-lugal ēnsi Za-ab-ša-li\textsuperscript{b}i ba-an-tuk, “Year Tukīn-ḫaṭṭi-migriša, the king’s daughter, was married by the ensi of Zabšali,” Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 363.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Dealing with the Hurrian Frontier</th>
<th>(B) Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šulgi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24: Karḫar 1  
25: Simurrum 1  
26: Simurrum 2  
27: Ḥarši | «First Hurrian War» |
| 31: Karḫar 2  
32: Simurrum 3  
33: Karḫar 3 | «Second Hurrian War» |
| (37–38: Wall of the land built) | 28–29: High priestess of Eridu  
30: King’s daughter married to Anšan |
| 42: Šašrum 1  
44: Simurrum (and Lullubum) «9»  
45: Urbilum 1 (Lullubum, Simurrum and Karḫar)  
46–47: Kimaš and Ḥumurti  
48: Ḥarši (Kimaš and Ḥumurti) | «Third Hurrian War» |

| Amar-Šîn |
2: Urbilum 2  
6: Šašrum 2 | 1: Amar-Šîn became king  
3–5: various cultic acts  
7: bītim-rāhiium, labrum ..etc.  
8–9: various cultic acts |

| Šū-Šîn |
3: Simanum  
(4–5: Amorite wall built) | 1: Šū-Šîn became king  
2: ship of Enki  
6: stele of Enlil and Ninlil  
7: Zabšali  
8–9: various cultic acts |

| Ibbi-Šîn |
3: Simurrum | 1: Ibbi-Šîn became king  
2: high priest of Inanna of Uruk |

Table of the Ur III campaigns on the Hurrian territories (after Hallo, RHA, p. 82).

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-Šîn, the line reverted to Simurrum, implying that Hurrian
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  
Ḩarši: 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  
Šašrum: 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  
Ḩarši, Kimaš, Ḫu(m/w)rti and their lands (in one day): Š 48

\textbf{Amar-Sîn:}

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

\textsuperscript{219} It is interesting to see this phenomenon also in the archival texts. Steinkeller drew attention to the large number of gùn 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 Šū-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/Ebarti 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.
Šu-Sîn:

Simanum: Š 3
Zabšali: Š 7

Ibbi-Sîn:

Simurrum: Š 3
Hûḫnuri: Š 9

The first attack in the region under study was on Karhar, a strategic city on the Great Khorassân Road, on the Alvand River. Most probably Karhar was in or close to modern Qasr-i-Shirin. 221 The name is first attested as Kâ-kâ-ra-an in the OAkK texts from Tell Sulaimeh. 222 During the Ur III period the governor of Karhar was a certain Ea-ē, known from a text dated to AS 5, from an undated text and from a tablet from ŠS 9. 223 On a cylinder seal 224 we find the name of one of its Hurrian kings, the deified Tiš-atal king of Karhar.225 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.226 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.’227 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 title ‘Sun of his land’ was also borne by Talpuš-atili of Nagar (see below).

The road that now leads to Sar-i-Pul-i-Zahāb passes through Khanaqīn, another city on the Alvand River.228 Khanaqīn is generally identified with ancient Nîqqum,229 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 Ḫalman. It is very possible that this Niqqum is identical with NI-ḤI 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-ḤI.” Frayne noticed that the alternation between the velar stop k and the spirant h occurs elsewhere, such as Karḫar = kakkara(n) and Tikithīnum = probably modern Taqtaq. The suggestion is strengthened by renderings of the name of the goddess Belat-Suḫnīr as Belat-Šuknir, as noticed by Sallaberger. Simurrum will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Little is known about Ḫaršī. 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. Frayne tentatively associated it with Ḫuršītum, mentioned on a brick inscription from the OB period. The inscription states that a certain Puḫiya was king of the land of Ḫuršītum. The brick was reported to have come from a mound on the Awa-Spī tributary close to Tūz-Ḫurmātu, a locality to the south of Kirkuk. This provenance, although uncertain, fits well with the advance of the campaigns of Šulgi. After he destroyed Karḫar, the mighty stronghold, and broke the resistance shown by Simurrum, he would have marched further north, to Ḫaršī/Ḫuršītum, south of modern Kirkuk. An orthographic link between the forms Ḫaršī and Ḫuršītum can be found in sīla-a-ḫa-ar-šī-tum (CT 32, 50: 103409 Rs.9) and u-du-nigax (ŠE)-an-da-tum, south of modern Kirkuk. An orthographic link between the forms Ḫaršī and Ḫuršītum can be found in sīla-a-ḫa-ar-šī-tum (CT 32, 50: 103409 Rs.9) and u-du-nigax (ŠE)-a-ṣi-tum, south of modern Kirkuk. For this cf. Frayne, “Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische …, ZA 10 (1938), p. 68; cf. also Potts, Mesopotamia and ..., p. 107, note 131.

From the archival texts it appears that this land was ruled in the Ur III period by an ensi named Addagina, who was later succeeded by his son Išiwi. The names of other governors of Ḫaršī are known, such as Maḫuni and Ti-[i]b(?)-ti, both described as “the man of Ḫaršī,” and also Abba-uru-me-eṣ, “ensi of Ḫaršī.”

Kimaš was previously confused with the Elamite GN with the same name. However, the mention of this land together with Ḫumurtum and Ḫaršī in the date-formulae of Šulgi

---

237 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 149; 169.
238 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 154-156.
239 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 167; 198.
240 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 167; 198.
241 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 167; 198.
242 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 167; 198.
243 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 167; 198.
244 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 167; 198.
suggests that all these places were in the same general area. Accordin
g the occurrence of NIM-
ki-maški in several texts confirms its association with a highland region, and this is
by the cylinders of Gudea that mention he had mined copper in the mountain of
Kimaš. But it is associated with Ekallātum in OB date-formulae from Išchali as targets of
a king of Ešnumna, which pushes Kimaš further to the north, to the middle Tigris, for
Ekallātum was to the north of Assur. 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 Ḥu-un-Nl.NI or Ḥu-un-ḥi-li, who was also the military governor (šagin) of Madga. This association
strengthens the idea of locating Kimaš in the region proposed above. Noteworthy is the mention of Ra-ši-ši together with this Ḥun-ḥi-li (TCSD 140, 5), an important figure that will
be discussed in the next chapter.

Hu(m/w)urti was also associated with Ḥarši 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 Ḥarši and Hu(m/w)urti in the west. This helps us to

245 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 159.
248 21) KÁ.GAL-a‘i (22) ḫur-sağ Ki-maš-ka 23) uruda mu-ni-ba-al, “In Abullāt, on the mountain range of Kimaš,
he mined copper,” Edzard, D. O., Gudea and his Dynasty, RIME 3/1, Toronto, 1997, p. 34 (E3/1.1.7.StB); 15) ḫur-
sağ uruda-ke, Ki-maš-ta 16) ni-bi mu-na-ab-pā 17) uruda-bi gi-si-a-ba mu-ni-ba-al, “From Kimaš, the copper
mountain range made itself known to him, and he dug its copper into baskets,” Edzard, RIME 3/1, p. 79
(E3.1.1.7. Cyl A).
249 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 160.
250 Cf. Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 100, note also the rendering of the name on the seal as Ḥu-un-i-li;
according to them it has to be read as Ḥu-un-ḥi-li.
251 For the location of Madga in the region between Daqūq, Tūz Ḫurmatu and Kifri, cf. Chapter Three.
252 Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 100.
253 The writing of this GN in cuneiform gives the impression that the name must have been pronounced as
something like /huurt/. The sound /v/, as we know from NA and NB inscriptions, was written either as m or as
w, as in the name of the Median king Ūvāšītra 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 Unmakistar 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 Daryavāus is Dariamūš. (cf. Von Voigtlander, E. N., The Bisitun
Inscription of Darius the Great, Babylonian Version, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part I: Inscriptions of
Ancient Iran, London, 1978, l. 1, p. 11). A parallel element to this virtual /huurt/ may be found in the Hurrian
word ḫavur(ni), “sky,” found in the PN ḪAv(w)uru-na-nigti; for this PN and the meaning of ḫavur(ni) cf. Richter,
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 _HC]arši 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 _HC]arši 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 Arrapha. It could very well be at modern Tüz-Ḥûrmâtu, a town and locality to the south of Kirkuk on the Awa-Šî tributary. The modern name of this town may also be a reflection of the old name, 254 as with many other GNs.

Ḥu(m/w)urti is mentioned in archival texts, one of which refers to the booty of this land.255 Others mention its ensis 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 Ḥišib-rasini, father of Luhšan, king of Awan.257 The reference to NIM-ḫu-ur(r)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 Tüz-Ḥûrmâtu, and travellers easily appreciate the height of the land directly behind the range, with Tüz-Ḥûrmâtu just a few kilometers away.

It is very surprising that there is comparative silence about the two important centres Arrapha and Nuzî. The few occurrences of Arrapha may be understandable, but the total omission of Nuzî, the heir of ancient Gasur, is unexplainable.259 Arrapha 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, Ḩašip-at-tal, in connection with soldiers from Arrapha.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 Nuzî 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 Nuzî/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/Nuzî 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 Nuzî cf. Starr, R. F. S., Nuzî, 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,262 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.263 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.264 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.265 Nagar was famous for its expensive equids in the time of Ebla archives,266 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.267 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, Dahiš-atili. 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 Sallaberger, 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.  

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 Urkeš (see below), Nagar (see below, under Nawar), Simanum, Simurrum and probably Kakmum. The ruler of Urkeš 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,” and he “would therefore have ruled the northern part of Assyria, including the temple town of the Hurrian goddess Šawuška.” The text mentioning Tiš-atal and his unprecedented large number of escorts indicates his importance and status. 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. Collon and Whiting think these names represent the same Hurrian king of Urkeš, while others think the name Tiš-atal was a common PN among the Hurrians in this period. It is tempting to imagine a king of Urkeš exercising his authority on Nineveh, which is geographically connected with the Habur area, and from there exercising authority on the Diŷāla 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 Diŷāla 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 Urkeš can be simply entitled “the man of Nineveh” in the texts mentioned above. The title king of Urkeš 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. Furthermore, we would have expected Tiš-atal of Urkeš 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 Urkeš. Accordingly, it becomes more difficult to identify Tiš-atal of Karḫar with Tiš-atal of Urkeš, since the Diŷāla 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-ušša (=ŪLU)-ša, Ša-u-ša and Ša-u-ša are an Ur III rendering of the goddess Ša(w)ušš(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 Ti’amat-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 Ti’amat-bāštī and the Goddess Ša(w)ušš(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., “Ti’amat-bāštī,” NABU 1990, no. 1. Mars, p. 28 (no. 36).  
273 Salvini, p. 107 and n. 44. Collon thinks that even the scribe Tahsiš-atal of Puzriš-Dagān was the same man of Nineveh, later king of Karḫar and probably the endan of Urkeš, cf. Collon, RA 84 (1990), p. 129f. Matthews and Eidem, and also Frayne, do not exclude the possibility that Tiš-atal of Urkeš 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 Urkeš).
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 Maraš, 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 Eḫië-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 Zibuḫulve. 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 Kanish, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayinlarindan 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 Kanis, 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 Laroché sees it only as a probability, cf. Astour, “Les Hourrites…,” p. 4. A similar name, in the form A-nu=um-He-ir-wa, is attested in a Hitite historical tradition. He was king of [UR]1/Za-al-[wa’ar], a city probably located in the northern Antioch Plain, cf. Astour, “Les Hourrites…,” p. 4-5. The first element of the name that was once understood as the name of the Mesopotamian deity Anum, appears to be the predicate: a verbal form of the 3rd person ergative an=um meaning “He pleases him,” from the verbal root an. If this proves to be correct, the second element must be the theophoric part of the name: Wilhelm, “L’état actuel et …,” Amurrî, I, p. 176, note 15; cf. also Wegner, Einführung ..., p. 23. It is noteworthy that Ḥarbe was known among the Kassites as a deity, whose name formed the theophoric element of two Kassite royal names, the 15th and 30th names, Kadaššan-Ḥarbe I and II. That Ḥarbe was a divine name can be seen by comparing the name Kadaššan-Ḥarbe with the other Kassite royal name Kadaššan-Enli. According to Balkan, the name Kadaššan-Ḥarbe means “Trusted in Ḥarbe,” cf. Balkan, K., Kassitensstudien, 1. Die Sprache der Kassiten, New Haven, 1954, p. 59, the name Meli-Ḥarbe is also attested and means “Slave of Ḥarbe,” op. cit., p. 69.


282 Wilhelm, ibid.


286 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 (-o=g(e)=o/u=li) is attached: Wilhelm, Amurrî, I, p. 176-7.

287 Wegner, Einführung ..., ibid.
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 anthroponyms 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.


291 Güterbock, op. cit., p. 325.

292 Güterbock, op. cit., p. 329.

293 According to M. Kelly Buccellati eight rulers/kings of Urkeš are known from sealings and other textual sources, cf. M. Kelly-Buccellati, “Urkes and the North: Recent Discoveries,” p. 29.

294 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 Nl; for this cf. Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, “The Royal Storehouse...,” p. 16 and note 21.

The domain of these rulers was not restricted to the city of Urkeš, but the city together with the surrounding territories constituted the kingdom of Urkeš. It is thought that the kingdom included Nawar, since the titulary of Atal-šen refers to Nawar as a territory rather than a city.300

The palace of Urkeš (Fig. 1)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 m². 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.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.”303 The palace conforms to a rectilinear layout and includes rooms and courtyards, hearths, ovens (later phase), basins (later phase), drains,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.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.306 Some Hittite religious texts that describe rituals strongly influenced by Hurrian religion “make it possible to communicate with the underworld through pits.”307 Such pits are called ‘offering pits’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.309

An old temple (c. 2400 BC),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...
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 Urkeš 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 Uqnītum. The sealings show scenes from the court in the royal palace in Urkeš. 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 Dukān; 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 Uqnītum. 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 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.
329 Cf. for this M. Kelly-Buccellati, “Urkesh and the north: Recent Discoveries,” p. 31.
330 Kelly-Buccellati, op. cit., p. 33.
331 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.\(^\text{336}\)

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\(^\text{337}\) (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.\(^\text{338}\)

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.\(^\text{339}\) 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.\(^\text{340}\) 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.\(^\text{341}\) Since the tablet is found in the service quarter, it means that apprentice scribes were present within the storehouse.\(^\text{342}\) 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.”\(^\text{343}\)

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.\(^\text{344}\) Furthermore, Urkeš had its own strong and independent glyptic tradition that “helps to identify Urkeš as an autonomous centre of cultural innovation.”\(^\text{345}\) 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.”\(^\text{346}\)

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.\(^\text{347}\) 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

\(^\text{335}\) Hansen, The First Great Empire, p. 226.
\(^\text{336}\) This point will be touched upon in more detail in Chapter Five.
\(^\text{337}\) This seal belongs to the later phase, when Tar’am-Agade was queen of the city.
\(^\text{338}\) Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, “The Seals of the King of Urkesh ...,” *WZKM*, p. 80-81.
\(^\text{339}\) Buccellati, “The Monumental Urban Complex ...,” p. 21. A criterion for judging the Akkadian language of the tablet is the repeated use of the preposition *a-na*.
\(^\text{340}\) Buccellati, *ibid*.
\(^\text{342}\) *Ibid*.
\(^\text{344}\) Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, *WZKM*, p. 81.
\(^\text{345}\) *Ibid*.
\(^\text{346}\) *Op. cit.*, p. 82.
\(^\text{347}\) 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-Sin 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-bēli, 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-Sîn, 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 there 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 Ḥawī’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 Nahur.

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

“To Nerigal, king of Ḥawī’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:

364 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.
365 The name is analysed as śa-u=m-šen. The root śa- 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 (=om) in PNs, cf. Wilhelm, G., in Texte, Sätze, Wörter und Moneme, Festschrift für Klaus Heger zum 65. Geburtstag, ed. S. R. Anschütz, Heidelberg, 1992, p. 667f. As 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.
367 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 [hi]ś 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)-Sin 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 lú Ur-kiški, 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-Ćabdîn) and the locating of Kaḫat “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-Aryan375 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.)
374 J. Harmatta considers the name Nawar to be from ancient Indic *namra-. He treats the other names of the Atal-šen inscription similarly: *A-ri-si-en* (Atal-šen) as *Arisena-, Sá-dar-ma-at as *Sadzharmata-, Sá-um-še-en as
from *nagwar, or even a South Semitic semantic connection with this toponym, comparing Sab. *nār “cultivated land” with the Yemenite place names Nağr, Nağra, Nağran and Nuğyār.

From the Hurrian *itkalzi, “purification of the mouth,” a magical text found in Boğazköy, it appears that Nawar was a Hurrian religious centre. There its name occurs in the form *URU*:Nawari together with the sacred cities of Talmušše, Nineveh and Urkeš (in the form *URU*:Urkin(n)). In a treaty (L 87-1362) between the king of Apum (Tell Leylan) and the king of Kahat (Tell Barri); the domain of Kahat 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. The southern one was located in the southern central portion of the Habur basin, very probably at Nagar (Tell Brak). Eidem also believes that one of the places called Nawar was located to the south of Kahat and the other to the north of it. If the southern one is Tell Brak or very close to it, the northern one must be identified with the GN named in Tell Leylan texts as Nawali and in Mari texts as Nawalu/u. 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. The Hurrian magical text mentioned above associates the cities of Urkeš and Nawar with mountain names. Nawar is associated with Kašijari (HUR.SAG Gašijarri), Tür-Abdin, and Urkeš (in the form Urkini) with the unidentified mountain Napri. 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 Kahat to Till-Abnû of Šeḫnā mentioning “The lady of Somasena,” as referred to by Mayrhofer in Mayrhofer, M., *Die Arier im Vorderen Orient- Ein Mythos?*, Wien, 1974, p. 42 (referring to Harmatta, J., Arisen, Namar királlyának felirata, in Ökori keleti történeti chrestomathia, ed. J. Harmatta, Budapest, 1965). 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.:


378 Whether the GN Nagar can be associated with the so-called Proto-Euphratean professional name NAGAR “carpenter” deserves consideration.
379 ChS I/1, nr. 5 col. I-II, with duplicate nr. 6 col. I; cf. Salvini, *op. cit.*, 110, n. 64.
380 This form is, as Salvini states, the same form in the Hurrian OB tablet from Mari no. 2. (referring to F. Thureau-Dangin, *RdA* 36 (1939), p. 5, no. 2.
382 Cf. for instance Steinkeller, “The Historical Background …,” *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.:


383 Whether the GN Nagar can be associated with the so-called Proto-Euphratean professional name NAGAR “carpenter” deserves consideration.
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.:


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. The Hurrian magical text mentioned above associates the cities of Urkeš and Nawar with mountain names. Nawar is associated with Kašijari (HUR.SAG Gašijarri), Tür-Abdin, and Urkeš (in the form Urkini) with the unidentified mountain Napri. 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 Kahat to Till-Abnû of Šeḫnā mentioning “The lady of Somasena-,” as referred to by Mayrhofer in Mayrhofer, M., *Die Arier im Vorderen Orient- Ein Mythos?*, Wien, 1974, p. 42 (referring to Harmatta, J., Arisen, Namar királlyának felirata, in Ökori keleti történeti chrestomathia, ed. J. Harmatta, Budapest, 1965). But one wonders whether there was any Indo-Aryan influence in third millennium BC Mesopotamia.
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, *RdA* 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 -h-, -a-, -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 Nahur. 393 It is also appropriate to refer to the name Nuhadra to refer to Northern Mesopotamia in the Parthian-Roman Periods, which is reminiscent of Nahur 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, Igrīš-halab, Irkab-damu and Is‘ar-damu. They were roughly contemporary with the three Mari kings Iplul-II, Nī-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-II, king of Mari, and his wife Paba. There the name Nagar 391 occurs in an obscure context. 396 The sentence AMAR.AN dumu ur-4UTU.ŠA […] nagar lī 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-II? Ma-ra-an?), king of Nagar, in a text that can be dated to the reign of Nī-zi of Mari. 398 Nagar occurred also in the texts from Beydar, where references indicate a probable


389 Eidem, “Nagar,” RIA 9, p. 76.


392 Examples of the interchange between these consonants in the Semitic languages, particularly Akkadian, are numerous; for instance Akk. ḫadāru ṣ Akk. adāru; Akk. ēra-Hana ṣ Arab. عاين؛ Akk. ḫarru ṣ Arab. حران؛ Akk. Adad ṣ Ug. Hīd (d); Akk. šēmū(m) ṣ Ass. šmā(u)m ṣ Amorite *samāhu(m) as in the name of Yasmah-Addu ṣ Arab. سم; Akk. alāku ṣ Heb. גורה; Akk. alāku ṣ Heb. גורה.

393 It is thought that Nahur 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., “Nahur,” RIA 9 (1998-2001), p. 86-7.

394 Cf. Frye, R. N., 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 ibid.


dependence of Beyder on Nagar in the time of Ma-ra-AN.399 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.400 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-nīta en Na-gārki: TM.75.G.1250 r. 1), had a Hurrian name and was married to the Eblaite princess Tagriš-Damu (Tag-ri-ি-š-da-mu dumu-mī en: TM.75.G.10157, r. V 2 ff), daughter of Iš’ar-Damu.401 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 Armı 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 Armı for the town of Nl-abhi402, 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].”403 The rich dowry that was given to the princess consisted of expensive garments, jewellery, other personal equipment and a group of personal attendants.404 Another text points to a shipment of 42 jars of wine to Nagar “on the occasion of the marriage of the king of Nagar.”405 That is considered by some to be an allusion to another marriage ceremony at Nagar.406

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,407 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 Marā-An of Nagar, and a treaty was made between the two kings.408 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.409 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.410 The mention of large groups of specialists (20 and 19) from Nagar in the Ebla court, such as ḫūb/ḫūb-ki (Akk. ḫuppum) ‘acrobats’ or ‘horsemen,’ and ‘qualified teachers’ “for groups of some 20 ṭūb 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,” is a clear indication of the cultural importance of Nagar. Ebla officials were frequently sent to Nagar to buy ‘kunga’ equids, male asses, sheep, and ‘wool of Nagar.’

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 A-Šaši, A-bū-i-um, Lulum, and Ša-bar-tim, had rulers entitled en. 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: Ga-ga-ba-an, Da-ti-um, Ba-na-i-lum (var. Ba-na-i-um), Ter-sa-ha-um, A-Šaši, Ša-bar-ti-um, Na-ba-ti-um, and Zuš (SU)-mu-na-ni-um. There are also other place names mentioned as vassals: Ba-sa-hi-um, Du-nu, En-šar (var. EN-šar (NE)), G̲u-zū-wa-ti-um, Hi-la-zi-um, La-dab-bi-um, Šag-gar, Su-du-ma-an, and Zar-‘a-ni-um. 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; Šarhanum was probably located to the east of Brak. Locating Saggar at the junction of the Euphrates and the Lower Habur, as suggested by some, is not the only possibility. From other sources we know about the mountain name KUR Šag-gar (Ebla), with the variants sa-de-em Sa-ga-ar (Mari), and the divine name Šag-gar (Ebla), occurring also in the forms Sa-nu-ga-ru12/ Sa-nu-šar-ga-ar (Ebla), Sa-ga-ar (Mari) (= HARI), Ša-ag-ga-ar (Emar), and Ša-ag-ga-ra (Hatti) and interestingly Sa-an-ga-ra (Hatti). This deity was in all likelihood the deified Jebel Sinjär. 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 Sinjär, according to Eidem. Thus it is probable that Saggar mentioned among the localities subject to the kingdom of Nagar was in fact Mount Saggar.

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 According to Eidem et al., p. 101.
419 For this identification cf. Eidem et al., p. 101.
422 That the GN Šag-gar probably refer to modern Jebel Sinjär is also suggested by Catagnoti and Bonechi: Catagnoti, A. and M. Bonechi, “Le volcan Kawbak, Nagar et problèmes connexes,” NABU 1992, no. 65, p. 53.
424 That the place name Saggaratūm is not located on the junction of the Habur with the Euphrates does not appear to be certain. It has been sited between Qatūnān and Teraq, 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 Šeḫna, 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 Naram-Sin, dedicatory inscriptions of Rimuš and probably seal inscriptions of servants of Naram-Sin. 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 Naram-Sin and Sū-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 Talpuš-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.

425 Eidem et al., p. 102.
426 Eidem et al., p. 101.
427 Partly published by Gadd in 1940, then with additional fragments by Loretz in 1969, Finkel in 1985 and recently by Catagnoti.
428 Eidem et al., p. 102.
429 Ibid.
430 The date is suggested by Boehmer in: Glyptik, p. 34-46 (referred to by Frayne, RIME 2, p. 240).
431 1) It-be-la-'ba' 2) Ens[I] 3) Ga-sur[š], Frayne, RIME 2, p. 241 (E2.5.1.1).
433 This governor has left a dedicatory inscription that runs as follows: 1) I-ti-ti 2) PA 3) DUMU I-nin-la-ba 4) in sa'ur-la-ti 5) Ga-sur[š] (SAG) 6) a-na 7) ANANNA 8) A.MU.RU, “Ititi, supreme judge, son of Inninlaba, dedicated (this object) from the booty of Gasur to the goddess Innin/Ištar,” Grayson, RIMA 1, p. 7 (A.0.1001). For the transcription cf. Schroeder, O., Keilschrifttexte Historischen Inhalts, vol. II, Leipzig, 1922, No. 1.
434 Schwartz and Akkermans, The Archaeology of Syria, p. 282-3; for the discussion of this phenomenon and its scope cf. p. 283 f.
438 Oates and Oates, op. cit., p. 63.
439 Oates and Oates, op. cit., p. 66.
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-ʿAbdīn and had good average rainfall. 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.

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. 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. 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. 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). 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.”

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.

441 For this cf. Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati, “The Seals of the King of Urkesh: Evidence from the Western Wing of the Royal Storehouse AK,” WZKM, p. 82.
446 Ibid.
447 Ibid.
Figures of Chapter Four

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 Tukpiš, 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.


CHAPTER FIVE

Simurrum
The Hurrian kingdoms of the Habur area were lucky, not only because they were not the targets of Ur III aggressive warfare, but also because scientific excavations have recovered some of their material legacy, as for example at Mozan (ancient Urkeš).

The situation is quite different in the eastern part of Hurrian territory, in the Transtigris, which was devastated by the Ur III campaigns and where there has been a lack of proper official excavations. So the history of these kingdoms has been left largely in obscurity, dependent on what is written about them in the records of the neighbouring nations and on chance discoveries.

One of the kingdoms of this region was Simurrum. The name of the land is known from older times, probably as early as the Early Dynastic II Period (c. 2700 BC). The names of some of its kings indicate that the land was later Hurrianized, but it preserved its old name Simurrum and seemingly also its patron god Nišba. Simurrum continued to play a significant political role in the history of the region as late as the age of Hammurabi.

Its name was rendered in different ways in its long history. Akkadian inscriptions write the name with a double ‘r,’ and in later times the initial ‘s’ becomes ‘š.’ A complete view of the different available writings of this GN is found below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Dynastic Period:</td>
<td>Si-mu-ri[^1], Si-mu-ri[^2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkadian Period:</td>
<td>Si-mu-um[^3], Si-mu-ur[^4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutian Period:</td>
<td>Si-mu-ur[^5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur III Period:</td>
<td>Si-mu-ur[^6], Si-mu-ur[^7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Babylonian Period:</td>
<td>URU Si-mu-ur[^8], SI-mu-ur[^9]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1]: Because the identification of its location depends on the data studied in this chapter, the discussion of its location is dealt with at the end rather than the beginning of this chapter.
[^4]: Edzard, Farber and Sollberger, *RGTC* 1, p. 143-4.
[^5]: Frayne, *RIME* 2, p. 224 (Text E2.2.1.2, col. v 10); p. 226 (Text E2.2.1.3, col. viii 10’ and 12’).
[^7]: Groneberg, B., *RGTC* 3, p. 221.
[^9]: In the Bētwate inscriptions. One of the latest occurrences of Simurrum in the OB Period is BIN 2, 80 from the reign of Samsuiluna that concerns a slave girl from Simurrum (wr. URU Si-mu-ur[^10]), cf. Nies, J. B. and C. E.
**The Early Dynastic Period**

If the identification of King Nanne, mentioned in some Sumerian proverbs, with the Early Dynastic II king A-anne-pada of Ur is correct, then the oldest hitherto known mention of Simurrum can be dated to the Early Dynastic II Period. The proverbs, which are copies from the OB period, are about the failures of a king called Nanne (=Na-an-né). In one of the proverbs we read:

He (i.e. Nanne) took Simurrum, but did not carry off its tribute.

Another fragmentary proverb, which appears to be related to the same episode, speaks of the wall or fortress of Simurrum:

He captured Simurrum, but did not [destroy its wall/fortress].

These two excerpts from proverbs belong to the context of a longer series, all concentrating on the numerous and successive failures of King Nanne, who Gurney and Kramer call “the chronic loser.” The complete proverb series runs as follows:

Nanne held his old age in high esteem. He built Enlil’s temple, but did not complete it. He built a wall around Nippur, but ... He built Eanna, but after it had fallen into neglect he carried it away. He captured Simurrum, but did not [destroy] its wall/carry off its tribute/subdue it. He never saw mighty kingship. Thus Nanne was carried away to the netherworld with a depressed heart.

---

11 Del Monte, G. F., *RGTC 6/2*, Wiesbaden, 1992, p. 145. It is attested in the Kumarbi myth and considered to be the same Simurrum.
15 For the meanings of bâd=dâru as wall and fortress cf. *CAD* vol. D, p. 192.
16 Si-mu-ri i-dab5 bâd-e nu-[u]n(-)[gul], or according to a variant, “but did not subdue it,” Alster, *ibid.*, G iv 1-13, 5; Ni 4469, 5.
17 Gurney and Kramer, *ibid.*
This shows that Simurrum was a well-known country to everyone in Mesopotamia and that they understood which country was meant by the “capture of Simurrum.”

The importance of Simurrum made it the subject of another Sumerian proverb, which is somewhat obscure:

Between the basket and the boat (are) the fields of Simurrum.19

According to PSD A20 the proverb can be translated “from the basket to the boat (there is) the region of Simurrum,” with the comment: “denoting a vast area?.”21 This questionable interpretation does not explain why small mobile objects like a basket and a boat are used as boundary markers for Simurrum. If the translation given by PSD proves to be correct, it means that Simurrum was so small a territory that it fitted a tiny space between those two small objects. However, it appears from written sources that Simurrum was a country and a kingdom in the Diyāla/Sirwān region that barricaded the way to the northern Transtigridian territories, so it cannot have been so small. It seems to me that the proverb alludes to the fertility of Simurrum: it shows that the two means of transporting agricultural products, the basket and the boat, are flanking the fertile and fruitful fields of Simurrum. Boats need no explanation, but baskets were and still are the ideal means for the transport of fruits in the gardens and groves of the Transtigris and other mountainous regions.22 The form of the name Simurrum in this proverb with mimation is in contrast to that in the other proverbs mentioned above, where it is written without mimation. Since this was a feature of rendering GNs in the Ur III period,23 one may assume that this latter proverb can be dated to the Ur III period. If this is correct, it makes our interpretation for the meaning of the proverb more likely, associating it with the political sphere in the Ur III period when campaigns, pillaging and looting were conducted against Simurrum many times by the kings of Ur (see Chapter Four).

The Akkadian Period

The first clear reference to Simurrum comes from the time of the Old Akkadian dynasty. One of the latest date-formulae for Sargon found in an archival text from Nippur states that the king24 went there:

The year Sargon went to Simurrum.25

Although it is not explicitly stated what is meant by “went” (Sum. verb gin), the date-formulae of his grandson and later successor give a clear hint to its military connotation when mentioning this land:

In the year Narām-Sīn went on a campaign to Simurrum.26

---

22 It could be, D. Meijer adds in an oral communication, an indication of the contrast between south and north; in the south boats were the main means of transport but in the north it was baskets.
25 MU Šar-um-GI Si-mu-umšē ʾi-gin-ʾna-a, Gelb and Kienast, FAOS, Band 7, p. 49 (Sargon 1); see also Frayne, RIME 2, p. 8 (iv, d).
26 [jr] r1 MU ʾIŠ Na-ra-amEN.ZUʾ a-na KASKAL ʾKIʾ Si-mu-ur-rI-li-ku, Gelb and Kienast, FAOS, p. 51 (Narām-Sīn 5a); Frayne, RIME 2, p. 87 (vii, hh).
Another date-formula of the same king yields significant information, more than expected from a date formula:

In the year Narām-Sīn was victorious over (the yoke?) of Simurrum at Kirašeniwe and captured Baba, ensi of Simurrum, (and) Dubul, ensi of Arame.27

The statement that Narām-Sīn won the war against Simurrum at Kirašeniwe clearly indicates that Kirašeniwe was a city or locality incorporated into the land of Simurrum, as proposed also by Salvini.28 However, there remains a slight possibility that it was a place close to Simurrum, assuming that the Simurrians could have fought the Akkadians on a territory outside their own land. It is important to note the name of the governor of Simurrum, Baba. His name is not Hurrian. It belongs rather to the kind of name typical of the Transtigris region before the arrival of the Hurrians, such as the names found in the texts from Gasur and elsewhere. This same date-formula informs us about a certain Dubul, who was the ensi of Arame. This land was also attacked in the same year and very likely during the same campaign as that against Simurrum.29 In both cases, Arame appears to have been located close to Simurrum and might have been its ally against Narām-Sīn. This location is supported by an Ur III text that mentions troops from Arami (ēren-a-ra-mi(ki)) located between Ašnun and KAŠ-da-dun.30 The Harmal Geographical List puts Arame on the Sîrwan River, south of its outflow through the Hamrin range.31 Variant B of the date-formula adds that Nabi-Ulmaš, the son of king Narām-Sīn, was ruling in a place called Tutu.32

The mention of Simurrum as the main target of the campaign in this date-formula implies its importance even in this early period of the history of the Transtigris. This importance was not only due to its strategic location at the gate to the northern lands, on the major routes that lead to Iran and northern Transtigris and later Assyria, but also to its richness, which is indicated by the quick recovery it showed later in the Ur III period after every campaign. Only a country rich in human and natural resources could resist for such a long time and recover after not less than eleven successive campaigns waged on it by the kings of Ur. If our interpretation of the proverb mentioned above is correct, it adds an extra proof to the richness of this land.

According to Frayne, it is possible that these two date-formulae commemorate two consecutive campaigns undertaken by Narām-Sīn within two years.33 The name of Baba is mentioned also on a piece of alabaster34 from the Akkadian period, found in Sippar and

27 in MU 4Na-ra-am4[N.ZU] Ši-mu-ur-er-ri-[imki] in Ki-ra-še-ni-we iš-ti-a-ra u Ba-ba ŜENI Ši-mu-ur-er-ri-imki Dub-ul ŠENI A-ra-mèki ik-mi-ū, Frayne, RIME 2, p. 87 (vii, ii), cf. also: Walker, The Tigris Frontier from Sargon to Hammurabi, p. 19-20. This date-formula was found in two variants, A and B, the first is written on an archival grain account text, the second variant (B) has three extra lines at the end: 11) Na-hi-ilmaš 12) in Tu-tu13 ib-ri, “… and inspected (his son) Nabi-Ulmaš in the city of Tutu,” Walker, ibid., p. 20.
29 Westenholz considers that the mentioned campaigns may also have been “little more than successful raids,” but without further explanation, cf. Westenholz, Mesopotamien, Akkade- und Ur III-Zeit, OBO, p. 38.
30 Cf. Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 15.
32 Frayne equates Tutu with Tutub in: Frayne, RIME 2, p. 87.
33 Frayne, The Historical Correlations of the Sumerian Royal Hymns (2400-1900 BC), p. 42.
34 Hallo considers this stone fragment part of a stone vessel: Hallo, “Simurrum and …,” RHA, p. 73, however, Frayne thinks it is a stone mace-head: Frayne, “On the Location …,” p. 246 and Frayne, RIME 2, p. 145.
published as early as 1897 by Winckler. The name comes in a fragmentary context, but one can deduce that it is associated with Simurrum:

\[
\text{[Wh]} \text{en [B]} \text{a} [\text{en}][\text{s}i] \text{ of [S]} \text{im} \text{ur} \text{r} \text{um (lacuna).}
\]

Whether or not this inscribed piece of alabaster was dedicated from the booty of Simurrum we do not know for sure. Nevertheless, it is probably this same Baba, who appears on another date-formula from the reign of Našām-Sīn in a different form:

\[
\text{[The year … defe} \text{ated [B]} \text{jibi […]}, \text{and was [v]ic} \text{t} \text{orious in battle in the mountain lands [in] Ḥašimar.}
\]

Mount Ḥašimar is almost certainly the same Ḥašimur of the Neo-Assyrian inscriptions. Shalmaneser III (858-824 BC) crossed the lower Zāb, advanced through the land of Ḥašimur to the land of Namri. From Namri he descended to the lands Messi, the lands of the Medes and Ḥarhar in a northwest-southeast direction. Ḥašimur was identified with the mount and pass of Darband-i-Khan on the upper Sirwān River, at the southern end of the Shahrazūr Plain, where a dam is located nowadays. Although some think that this GN was located further to the south, this appears unlikely, for two reasons. First, Aššurnasirpal II during his campaign against the Lullubians in Zamua mentioned it as the southernmost frontier of the territory under the rulers of Zamua (= Shahrazūr), which was by no means as far as the Hamrin at Diyālā. Second, the same Assyrian king, describing the extent of this part of his realm, indicated already the southern extremity as Tīl-Bāri as opposed to the (Lower) Zāb, but Ḥašimur is mentioned as the eastern (not southern) extremity, as opposed to Babite (Bazīyān) in the west. In other words, he used in his description the north-south axis from the bank of the Zāb to Tīl-Bāri, and the west-east axis from Babite to Ḥašimur, explaining that the territory

---

37 This identification is the suggestion of Frayne in: Frayne, “On the Location of Simurrum,” p. 247.
41 For instance Levine located Ḥašimur at the point where the Sirwān cuts through the Hamrin in: Levine, L., “Geographical Studies in the Neo-Assyrian Zagros I,” Iran 11 (1973), p. 23. Weidner as well, thinks it was the southeastern part of the Hamrin and the pass of Ḥašimur was at the point where the Diyālā cuts through the Hamrin chain: Weidner, E., “Die Feldzüge Šamši-Adads V. gegen Babylonien,” A/O 9 (1933-34), p. 97, and later by Hannoon in the east southeast of Khanaqān.
between the latter two points (Babite to Ḫašmar) comprised the whole land of Zamua. So, there would be no need to mention another point in the south beside Ṭil-Bāri if Ḫašmar was indeed in the south. The location presented by Hannoon and accepted by Frayne, as far to the south as the Darewushke Mountain, between Mandali and Khanaqīn, does not fit its description as a high mountain with a pass. Furthermore, it would be unexpected for Shalmaneser to go south of Khanaqīn then to the north and northwest to reach Namri. Whatever the case may be, Narām-Sīn has campaigned against Ḫašmar, somewhere in the Diyāla/Sirwān basin, near the Darband-i-Khān pass, or most probably slightly further north at the foot of Mount Surēn (see later in this chapter, under ‘The Location of Simurrum’). Because this territory was close to, if not within, the realm of Simurrum there would be a good chance to identify this Bibi with Baba of Simurrum if our location for Ḫašmar proves to be correct.

An interesting letter from Gasur (HSS 10, 5) refers to Simurrians. It implies that there were some Simurrians who received amounts of grain. But one cannot conclude from the letter whether these Simurrians were living in Gasur or not. The letter reads:

Thus (says) Dada, say to NI.NI: He should assign the grain that I had left over for rations as seed grain and give it out. But in case the Simurrains do not receive enough grain (to eat), he should give out some of it as grain rations; I will replace it myself.45

The sender Dada bears a reduplicative name, common in Gasur and the Transtigris. The addressee appears from the letter to have been an intermediary between the sender Dada and somebody else who worked in the field and was in charge of the grain silos and agricultural equipment. One may conclude that this was a group of poor Simurrian peasants working for their master Dada, who probably owned the fields, the seed and even the plough and transport animals.

The Simurrains are also mentioned (LÚ Si-mu-ru-um-me) together with Lullubians at Lagaš in texts from the OAkk. period, “though what they were doing there is not clear.”47

Of importance is the account of the great revolt against Narām-Sīn. The text of this account mentions a king of Simurrum who joined the rebels and who bore the good Hurrian

---

43 See later in this chapter, under ‘The Location of Simurrum’.
name Puttim-atal. This Simurrian king, according to the account of the revolt, was not successful. He was defeated and taken prisoner together with the other rebels to Akkad. 49

Unfortunately, there is no historical document that can support the reliability of this account. Rather, it remains a literary narrative without any chronological context. Nevertheless, one cannot deny its value as a source of information. The events of the account could be a fantasy of the scribes but the names of the lands are real. The names of the rulers as well can very probably be real, though not chronologically correct. By this, I mean that the scribes might have collected the most powerful and famous rulers of those rebel lands from antiquity up to their own time and listed them in the text as the most implacable enemies of the king of Akkad in order to enhance the image of Narām-Sīn as a super-hero. Thus, one can believe in the historicity of Puttim-atal without putting him into an exact chronological setting. As Hallo pointed out, "given the allusions to some of the rebels (Ipḫur-kiš, Lugal-anna of Uruk) in other, in part, much earlier literary texts, the Narām-Sīn legend may preserve genuine historical data." 50 Furthermore, the Epic of Gilgameš and the occurrence of the name of King Gilgameš in the SKL are an indication of how much fact such historical-literary compositions contain. Therefore, if the episode of the great revolt proves to be true, one may assume it has happened after the two or three campaigns of Narām-Sīn against Simurrum. This can be concluded from the Hurrian name of its king, which indicates a later phase after the Hurrians had succeeded in penetrating the land and establishing themselves. They had succeeded in taking power from a local dynasty whose king bore the traditional reduplicated Transtigridian name Baba or Bibi.

**Gutian, Late Lagaš II / Early Ur III Periods**

Frayne listed two other texts from Girsu that point to Simurrians. The texts probably date to the late Lagaš II or the early Ur III period 51 and concern rations for an important group of foreigners in Lagaš, 52 among whom were Ḫuḫnureans, Lullubians and Simurrians. 53 Interestingly, one of these Simurrians is described by his profession as a smith. 54 Frayne calls these foreigners ‘visitors,’ but there is no indication that such a status was assigned to them. Rather, they were perhaps prisoners from the Elamite war waged by Ur-Namma, possibly with the participation and help of Gudea from the Sumerian side and the Simurrians from the Elamite side. 55

The inscriptions of Erridu-Pizir of Gutium (studied in Chapter Three) speak of a general revolt against the Gutian king Enrida-Pizir, father of Erridu-Pizir. Simurrum was not just a part of the rebel coalition but also an influential member, perhaps even the organizer. The inscription says that KA-Nišba, king of Simurrum, had instigated the people of Simurrum and Lullubum to revolt. 56 This proves the power and influence Simurrum enjoyed in this period. Furthermore, Simurrum was apparently the most ardent among the other rebels, due to its territorial overlap with the Gutian territories in the regions to the south and southeast of

49 For bibliography, cf. Chapter Two, p. 87.
50 Hallo, *RHA*, p. 73, adds the evidence provided by the Basitki statue, found to the south of Duhok, as further crediability to the account of the great revolt.
53 Cf. *RTC* 249, I, 8: lú Si-mu-ru-um-me.
54 *RTC* 1, 11'-12': simug Si-mu-ru-um.
56 For the text of the inscription, cf. Chapter Three.
Kirkuk. This must have resulted in an uncomfortable position for Simurrum, especially in the shadow of the growing power of Gutium.

The Ur III Period

The historical data collected from the Ur III date-formulae, touched on in the previous chapter, show that Simurrum was a main target of the army of Ur. This was due to the location of Simurrum on the main road leading to the northern territories, close to the head of the virtual triangle we drew in the Hamrin region (cf. Chapter Four, under the Historical Geography). Thanks to these date-formulae, our information about Simurrum has been increased and set in a better chronological order.

The first time Simurrum was attacked in the Ur III period was in Š 25-26; this was followed by those of the years Š 26, Š 32, Š 44, Š 45, and finally in IS 3 (see the table in Chapter Four). A convincing analysis of the order and dates of these campaigns was presented by Hallo years ago. He concluded that Simurrum was acting as a barricade closing the main routes to the north, and the kings of Ur first had to clear away Simurrum in order to reach territories like Lullubum, Šašrum and Urbilum. He further grouped the campaigns into what he called the three “Hurrian wars.” What is recorded in the date-formulae is clearly not the whole story, for there are only five years named after campaigns against Simurrum, but the date-formula of year Š 44 is “The year Simurrum and Lullubum were destroyed for the 9th time.” It can be calculated from these date-formulae that the number of campaigns undertaken against this land rises to 10 under Šulgi alone, and to at least 11 until Ibbi-Sîn.

The first and second Hurrian wars aimed to crush the resistance of Karḫar and Simurrum, for 6 of the 7 campaigns were directed against these two lands, and 1 against Ḫarši. It appears that the job was accomplished during the second war (to be precise in Š 32) with the capture of Tappan-Daraḫ, king of Simurrum. This was a victory worth celebration, a victory commemorated not only during the age of the Ur III dynasty itself but also in later times. Tappan-Daraḫ, together with his family, was taken prisoner to Sumer. The archival texts from Drehem bear witness of their presence there, listing them as receiving rations. It

---

57 Cf. Hallo, “Simurrum and …,” RHA, p. 72. Hallo thinks that Šulgi bore the title “King of the four quarters” after the destruction of the lands Karḫar (Š 24), Simurrum (Š 25 and Š 26), and Ḫarši (Š 27), disagreeing with Goetze, who believes he bore the title only after the final destruction of Simurrum in Š 44, cf. op. cit. p. 74 and note 35.

58 Cf. Hallo, RHA, appendix II, p. 82.

59 Owen states that the number reflects hyperbole and is not to be taken as fact, Owen, D., “The Royal Gift Seal of Sillûš-Dagan, Governor of Simurrum,” Studi sul Vicino Oriente Antico, dedicati alla memoria di Luigi Cagni, ed. S. Graziani, Napoli, 2000, p. 820, note 29.

60 Whether the name Tappan-Daraḫ is Hurrian or Semitic is not yet settled. According to Gelb and Zadok the name is not Hurrian: Gelb, HS, p. 114. Zadok thinks its first part is the name of the river Tab(b)an, used here as a theophoric component, cf.: Zadok, “Hurrians, as well as Individuals…..,” *kinattûnu ša darrâti: Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume*, p. 224. However, in the Ur III PNs with the name of the river Tab(b)an other signs are used, cf. for instance: Lugal-Ta-ba-an, Lugal-Ta-ba-an (three occurrences), Ṣul-gi-Ta-ba-an, cf. for this: Nashef, Kh., “Der Taban-Fluss,” *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 13 (1982), p. 119. In the OB period, the river name appears mostly with the divinity determinative when occurring as a theophoric component in the PNs, cf. Nashef, op. cit., p. 121. He cites from the OB documents the names [Šu]-Ta-ba-an AS 30: T 402 on a seal legend from Tell Asmar; Šu-Ta-[ba-an] AS 33: 372 (Seal) 4, from Tell Asmar; Šu-[bi]-ba-an: W. G. Lambert, *RA* 74 (1980), 73, 55 from an unknown provenance, but also Ḥi-ba-an-a-bu-um YOS 14, 12, 16 from Tell Harnal. Astour thinks the name consists of the two elements Tappa and Daraḫ; the first comes from Akkadian tappi “companion,” and the second is a divine name; so the name means “Companion of god Daraḫ,” cf.: Astour, M. “Semitic and Hurrians in Northern Transstigris,” *SCCNH* 2, Winona Lake, 1987, p. 41. In this reading, Astour obviously follows Goetze in reading the sign AN in TAB.BA.AN.DA.RA.AH as a divine determinative for Da-raḫ; for Goetze’s transcription cf. Goetze, A., “Historical Allusions in Old Babylonian Omen Texts,” *JCS* 1 (1947), p. 259-60 and below.
seems that the family received rations in Drehem after the year Š 32, though the archival
texts do not mention the names of the wife and the son/daughter of Tappan-Daraḫ. Even
Tappan-Daraḫ himself was simply designated in the texts as “the man of Simurrum” and not
“king” or “ensi.” For Frayne this was enough reason to suggest that this Tappan-Daraḫ was a
man from Simurrum who was someone other than the king. According to Walker, the king
was re-installed on the throne of his own country as a titulary head, though Ur appointed one
of its own men, Śilluš-Dagān, to actually administer the territory. It is necessary to point
out here that the titles used in the archival texts need not necessarily comply with the regular
protocols. A captive king was not always called “the king” in texts written purely for
archival purposes, on small tablets with sentences kept as short as possible. It is also not to be
expected that the victorious Sumerians would give their prisoners their former titles.

The archival texts that refer to the royal family of Simurrum can be summed up as
follows:

Tappan-Daraḫ: Tab-ba-da-ra-aḫ, MAN-ba-an-da-ra-aḫ, in texts dated Š 33; Š 34; Š 36; Š 38; ŠŠ 1; ŠŠ 2; 7 and ŠŠ 8.
Wife of Tappan-Daraḫ: DAM Tab-ba-da-ra-aḫ.

That the victory in Simurrum and taking captive its king with his family was a resounding
success is proved by textual material from later times. OB omen texts and literary
compositions sometimes commemorate it. An OB omen text reads:

If tissue cross the ‘palace gate,’ it is an omen of Šulgi, who took Tappa(n)-Daraḫ prisoner.

---


62 For this cf. Frayne, “On the Location...,” p. 250 and 251, where he points to a governor of Simurrum with the same name installed by Ur.


64 Note that Biggs describes this formula as “the usual way of designating a ruler,” Biggs, “Šulgi in Simurrum,” p. 175.


68 Schneider, N., Die Drehem- und Djohatexte im Kloster Montserrat (Barcelona), Roma, 1932, pl. 16, no. 53, l. 21. However, the fragmentary Šumma bēkallim ši-rum i-bi-ir a-mu-ut Šul-gi ša Tappapa-Da-ra-aḫ ik-mi-ú, (YBT X 22 17), cf. Goetze, A., “Historical Allusions ...,” JCS 1 (1947), p. 259. There are two other omens relating to the same episode: Šumma bēkallim ši-ra-am ú-du-uh a-mu-ut Šul-gi ša Tappa-Da-ra-aḫ ik-mi-ú, “If the ‘palace gate’ is
Another omen can be related to the same triumph, because it attributes the submission of the four quarters of the world to Šulgi:

If the foetus is like a horse, it is an omen of Šulgi, who subdued the four regions.71

Yet another omen text known from a MA copy, dated to the reign of Tiglath-Pileser I (1115-1077 BC),72 although fragmentary, includes the statement:

[...Tab]-ba-gar and Rabsisi, kings of ... [...], he [...] and brother killed brother.73

Frayne has cited in his valuable article another text relating to this episode, a chronicle from the Seleucid period found in Urük:

Šulgi, king of Ur, son of Ur-Namma, exercised [kingship over all the lands, [Tab]bangar and Rabsisi, kings of the land of Subartu, he overpowered.74

Unfortunately, it is not known which brothers are meant by this omen, though the royal families of Tabba(n)gar and Rabsisi are the best candidates. The chronicle says nothing about this, only about the victory over the two kings. It is important that the chronicle states that the two men were kings of Subartu, most probably meaning Simurrum.75 Rabsisi’s realm is not actually mentioned, but the resemblance of his name with a certain Rašiši, attested together with Ḫun-ḫi-li or Ḫu-un-NI.NI, the ensi of Kimaš and ‘šagin’ (military governor) of Madga, in an Ur III archival text (TCSD 140, 5) is noteworthy.76 In this archival text, Rašiši is mentioned as “Ḫu-ḫu-ḫi-li, Ra-ši-ši Ḫu-ki-maški-me,” suggesting that he was in some way related to the administration of Kimaš, if not a member of its ruling family. It seems quite possible to identify Rabsisi of the chronicle with Rašiši of the archival text.

covered over with tissue, it is an omen of Šulgi, who took Tappa-Dara prisoner,” (YBT X 24 35), Goetze, op. cit., p. 260; the other one has a variant for the name of the victim and another verb: [šumma bāb ēkallīm] ši-ra-am u-du-uḫ a-mu-ut Šul-ki ša A-pa-da-ra-aḫ i-ni-ru, “If the ‘palace gate’ is covered over with a tissue, it is an omen of Šulgi who smote Apada-raḫ,” ibid.; and šumma i-na libbi (var. pa-ni) bāb ēkallīm ši-ru-m ku-bu-ut-ma ša-ki-in a-mu-ut Šul-gi ša Tappa-Ša-ra-aḫ iki-mi-ū, “If in the middle (var. in front) of the ‘palace gate’ a heavy mass of tissue is located, it is an omen of Šulgi, who took Tappa-Dara prisoner,” (YBT X 24 40; YBT X 26 31f.), ibid.

71 šumma iz-bu-um ki-ma šīšīm a-mu-ut Šul-gi ša pa-at erbiši i-bi-lu-ū, (YBT X 56 III 10f), cf. Goetze, ibid. An interesting observation is presented by Biggs, who suggests that there was seemingly some special connection between Šulgi, whose name (according to M. Civil) means ‘horse’ or ‘horseman,’ and the horse. In the Šulgi hymn A, he is also described at the end of the section with –me-en as being a horse: Biggs, “Šulgi in Simurrum,” p. 175, note 39.

72 The date was determined by Nougayrol, cf. Frayne, “On the Location…,” p. 250.

73 […] Tab]-ba-gar ū(?) Rab-si-si MAN.MEŠ ša x […] x su-nu-ti-ma ŠEŠ.ŠEŠ-ši GAZ, Frayne, “On the Location…,” p. 250.


75 For the name Subartu, the lands it comprised and the changes taken place along the ages, cf. Chapter Two, under ‘Subartu.’ It appears that by Subartu in this text the author means the non-Sumero-Akkadian lands of the north in general.

76 For the text, cf. Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 100.
In the text known as ‘The Šulgi Prophecy,’ known from some NA fragments, the passage “[I], became lord of the four quarters, from east to west” is found. This is reminiscent of the OB omen texts about the victory of Šulgi over Simurrum and its king Tappan-Dara, in which they gave him the title “king of the four quarters” (cf. the omen above). The badly damaged fragments still preserve the name of Tappan-Dara as Tab-ba-an-... and the name of Simurrum as Ši-mu-ur-ri No. 65: 6. This conclusion is based on the occurrence of his name in texts dated to the reigns of Amar-Sîn and Šû-Sîn, while they are absent in the texts of the time of Šulgi.

After the second Hurrian war, Šulgi initiated work on building the “Wall of the unincorporated lands” in Š 37-38. According to Hallo, this wall was probably built to seal off the frontier from the Tigris to the Hamrin range against Simurrum. In the light of the available data, Simurrum itself does not seem to have been in a state to enable it to threaten Ur. For after the last campaign against it in Š 32, when it was destroyed for the third time, until Simurrum was destroyed for the ninth time in Š 44, it had been attacked six more times within eleven years. It is questionable if a wall was needed to isolate such an easy target as Simurrum in that phase. The name given to the wall that Šulgi built is significant, “The Wall of Unincorporated Lands,” for it means that the territories beyond it, including Simurrum, were not yet under the direct rule of Ur. It was after building this wall that Šašrum was attacked in Š 42, and after the ninth destruction of Simurrum and Lullubum, the northern Hurrian lands in the regions of modern Erbil, Sulaimaniya and the Bitwēn Plain, namely Lullubum, Urbilum, and Šašrum, were also destroyed. As mentioned earlier, this could have been achieved only after clearing the way by destroying Simurrum and Karḫar, the two formidable barricades facing the armies of Ur. Such great news for the kings of Ur was worth recording on a brick inscription of Šulgi found in Susa, where notably the the title “king of the four quarters” occurs.

The evidence for the annexation of Simurrum to the Ur Empire comes both from the mašdari-a offerings from Simurrum in Puzriš-Dagān, which are recorded after Š 40, and from the appointment of a governor to this land in about Š 42 by Ur. Šiššuš-Dagān was perhaps the first to hold this post. Walker thinks it happened after Š 42, while Owen dates it to shortly after the building of Puzriš-Dagan in Š 39. Apart from several texts he is known from

---

79 Gelb considered both elements of the name as Hurrian: Gelb, HS, p. 114, the second is the known word for “weapon,” but the first element is somewhat problematic. According to Gelb, its root is kir and can be a variant of kil or even kel. The last one means “to make good,” “to do well” or “to heal/make sound,” cf. Gelb, Purves and MacRae, NPN, p. 224; 227 and 228.
81 He appears on archival texts dated to AS 8; AS 9; ŠS 1; ŠS 2, for this cf. Biggs, “Šulgi in Simurrum,” p. 173.
82 Hallo, RHA p. 77.
83 For the inscription, cf. Chapter Four.
84 Hallo, RHA, p. 77, referring to TCL 2: 5502 f.
85 Walker, The Tigris Frontier..., p. 223.
87 From the reign of Šulgi: Owen, MViN 3, no. 200l. 2 (t) (30 i) (from Š 44); from the reign of Amar-Sîn: Keiser, BIN 3, no. 627 (-ii) (s) (from AS 6); from the reign of Šû-Sîn: Yildiz and Gomi, PDT 2, nos. 1355 and 1365 (-vi) (s) (from ŠS 3); Schneider, Or 47-49 (1930), no. 38, l. 11-12 (t) (from ŠS 4); Yildiz and Gomi, PDT 2, nos. 1327
impressions of seal legends. The oldest is on a tablet case from Drehem, reconstructed and re-edited by Owen and R. Mayr (Fig. 1a). According to Owen it is the oldest known inaba seal from the Ur III period, to be dated “certainly no later than his (=Šulgi) 42nd year.” It reads:

Šulgi, the mighty man, king of Ur, king of the four quarters, present [ed] (this seal) [to] Š[illuš-Dagan, ensi of] Sim[u]rur[rum], [h]is servant.

Another seal legend (Fig. 1b) is on a tablet case dated to Š 42, which reads:

Šilluš-Dagan, ensi of Simurrum, Ibbi-Adad, the scribe, (is) your servant.

Another, from the reign of Šû-Sîn, is a seal impression of a servant of Šilluš-Dagan, dated to ŠŠ 3 and ŠŠ 5 and found in Nippur:

Šilluš-Dagan, governor of Simurrum, Ilak-šūqir, son of Alu, the chief administrator, (is) your servant.

The theophoric element of the name of this governor is the Amorite deity Dagān. It is not impossible that this person was an Amorite in the service of the kings of Ur. If so, the choice of an Amorite to rule Hurrian Simurrum is significant. That the Amorites and the Simurrians worked together against Ur in the reign of Šû-Sîn (see the letter of Šarrum-bāni in Chapter Four) means that it is possible that they could have done the same even during the reign of Šulgi. In appointing an Amorite collaborator to rule Simurrum Šulgi may have been attempting to split this alliance.

The silence of the sources about this governor after Š 43 is understood as meaning the end of his service in Simurrum. Walker thinks it was probably because of a rebellion in that land against the authority of Ur. The period of dependence on Ur has seemingly lasted until sometime before IS 3, the year when Ibbi-Sîn campaigned against Simurrum.

The letters of Urdu-gû to his king Šulgi, discussed in the previous chapter, are considered a sign that there was calm on the Simurrian front. One passage, in which he says that the king has sent to him to establish the provincial taxes and to get informed about the state of the provinces, clearly alludes to the territories of the Transtigris, particularly to the Sirwân Basin. The reason for this opinion is the combination of the passage above with the allusion to

and 1375 (-vi) (s) (from ŠŠ 5). Hallo referred also to a text that records disbursements for the wedding-feast of Šilluš-Dagan in AS 3, and another one mentioning his sister in TRU 76, cf. Hallo, RHA, p. 77, note 72.


Buchanan suggested AS 6. Hallo considers giving the date AS 6 to the tablet as possible though less likely, cf. Hallo, RHA, p. 78, note 74. A copy of the tablet, with a drawing of the seal impression, is published in: Keiser, Neo-Sumerian Account Texts from Drehem, Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies 3, pl. LXXXIX, no. 627. More recently the complete seal impression is reconstructed in Owen, op. cit., p. 840, fig. 4. Owen now discards the date AS 6, cf. op. cit., p. 816.


Walker, ibid.

Sallaberger, Ur III-Zeit, OBO, p. 158.

cf. Hallo, RHA, p. 78. Hallo even considers Subartu of this letter to mean Simurrum. Ibid.
Subartu in the same letter, and the allusion to Urdu-ğu going to Simurrum in the letter of Ur-

dun to Śulgi (See Chapter Four for this and the letters). Missions to Subartu to discuss the
taxes and sending officials/merchants to the mountains of Subartu to purchase cedar resin
would not have been possible if Simurrum had not yet been subdued but was still hostile.

Under Amar-Sîn, Simurrum was, as was the case with the other territories of the Sirwân
Basin, under the control of Ur. The military garrisons of Ur, stationed in numerous places
along the Zagros foothills (see Chapter Four), proves this fact. This stable situation, which
was comfortable for Ur but undesirable for the Hurrians whose lands were conquered,
continued until the reign of Śû-Sîn. Sometime between ŠS 2-9 Simurrum became active
again.97 A significant letter (UET 6/2, Nr. 183= ISET II 115: Ni. 3083 obv. 1= YBC 4672 =
YBC 714998 mentioned in Chapter Four), from the high commissioner ‘Šarrum-bānî’ to his
king Śû-Sîn, reveals that the balance of power has been changed by that time. The Amorites
began to penetrate the land and Ur decided to strengthen its defences. The ancient wall, built
previously by Śulgi, was rebuilt and given a new name, Mūriq-Tidnim (see Chapter Four). In
the letter, Śarrum-bānî clearly says that the Mardu (= Amorites) have camped between the
two mountains (Ebiḫ) and the Simurrians have come to their aid. A conclusion that can be
drawn from this piece of information is that the western border of Simurrum was in all
probability at Hamrin, ancient Ebiḫ. It is hard to imagine Simurrum offering assistance to the
Amorites in Ebiḫ across the territory of another princedom/kingdom without any mention of
 collaboration (or forced collaboration).

This activity in Simurrum, coupled with the threat the Amorites posed, was a real danger
for Ur. The political and military activities of Simurrum must have continued and even
escalated throughout the reign of Śû-Sîn and the beginning of the reign of Ibbi-Sîn to a
degree that troops again had to be sent to it in IS 3.99 This campaign to Simurrum was the
first launched in the reign of this king and the last in the period of the Ur III Empire. Who
was the king behind this revival of activity in Simurrum? We have a good reason to think that
it was Idd(n)-Sîn who, as Walker proposed, may have declared independence when Ibbi-Sîn
was still in power.100

The Mesopotamian historical sources point to the direct reasons for the fall of Ur and the
end of its dynasty as joint attacks by the Elamites, the Gutian s and the Su people. However,
the empire had been weakened by internal crises, such as shortages of goods, high prices and
the intrigues of Išbi-Er râ that made these incursions easy. Although Hallo suggested that the
Su mainly denotes Hurrians, it is now shown that this was a variant rendering of the name
Šimaški by the scribes of Puzriš-Dağân.101 The final sack of Ur cannot be imagined without
some Hurrian help, particularly from Simurrum which had been the most eager party to hope
for the fall of Ur for many years. Its repeated confrontations, its aid to the Amorites against
Ur and its interest in its fall must have been very good reasons to have a share in the attack.
Furthermore, the long history of military confrontation and warfare with the southern
Mesopotamian powers and the dangerous sphere in which it constantly found itself must
have made it a well-organized and experienced military power, ripe for action in field.

The Šimaškians, as an eastern power, must have used the Great Khorasan Road through
the Halwan Pass. They would thus pass through the domains of the land of Karhar. Thanks
to the royal letters, we knew already that the Amorites for their part were active in the
region close to Hamrin, somewhere between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. Both Karhar

97 Walker, op. cit., p. 110.
98 Michalowski, The Royal Correspondence...., p. 225; 229.
99 For this date formula cf. Sallaberger, Ur III Zeit, OBO, p. 173.
100 Walker, The Tigris Frontier...., p. 225.
and the regions of Amorite activity were neighbours of Simurrum, and Simurrum would never let slip a chance to participate in the attack. It is notable that the attack on Ur was mainly from the north or northeast, from the same area where the kings of the Ur III dynasty had so bitterly fought and expected such threats to arise.

Isin-Larsa Period

Obviously, the peoples of the Transtigris and the Zagros foothills did not wait until the final fall of Ur to announce their independence. Ešnunna stopped dating texts after IS 3 (= 2028 BC), implying independence under Šu-iliya, the son of Ituriya, and Simurrum must have done the same no later and perhaps even earlier than Ešnunna had done. When the empire of Ur was striving for its existence new kingdoms and princedoms emerged on and within its frontiers. The political map of Mesopotamia was changed forever with the Amorite infiltration and the dismemberment of the Ur Empire. Besides the peoples of the region also the Amorites established a series of ruling dynasties in the whole of Mesopotamia and gained the upper hand in many parts. Even Uṣur-awassu of Ešnunna (ca. 1950 BC) was subject to Ušašum, an Amorite chief in the Diyāla Region.

During this phase there were two main fronts in the arena. The one was led by Išbi-Erra of Isin, allied to Nūr-āhum of Ešnunna, Šu-Enlil of Kiš and Puzur-Tutu of Borsippa. The other involved Zin(n)um of Subartu, Nīdugani the sangā-priest of Nippur, Girbubu of Girkal (close to Kazallu) and Puzur-Numuṣda (written Puzur-Šulgi in his letter to Ibbi-Sīn) of Kazallu. Zinnum and Kindattu of Elam attacked Ešnunna and took the city, which seems to have resulted in the murder of Šu-iliya and the flight of Nūr-āhum. Then they marched further to the cities of Kiš and Borsippa in the direction of Isin. Ibbi-Sīn appears to have supported Zinnum, as long as he was attacking the rebel states, enemies of Ur. However, Išbi-Erra was able to drive back the Elamites (IE 12) and he seems to have sent troops to help Nūr-āhum take back his throne from Zin(n)um. What was the attitude of Simurrum in these events and on whose side did it stand? We do not know. What we do know is that it must have been by this time (after IS 3) an independent kingdom ruled by its energetic king Iddi(n)-Sīn. Evidence for its independence is the archival text BIN 9, no. 421 from Isin, dated to the year 19+x of Išbi-Erra, that mentions a “king of Simurrum.” Yet it is strange that in narrating the movements and operations of Subartu against Ešnunna, which must have more or less touched the domains of Simurrum since it is located between the two places, there is no mention of Simurrum. It is even stranger that Puzur-Numuṣda mentions in his letter that Ḥamazi was subdued by Išbi-Erra and formed the northern border of his newly established kingdom. In the light of the available geographical data, this would have been difficult to achieve across the lands of Simurrum, Gutium and probably Lullubum and Karḫar. This

---

103 Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 4. This same Ušašum was the ally and son-in-law of Nūr-āhum (2010-? BC), Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 10. For the dates of Uṣur-awassu and Nūr-āhum, cf. Whiting, *Old Babylonian Letters from Tell Asmar*, p. 22.
104 For this, cf. Wu Yuhong, p. 5-6.
105 Charpin, *OBO*, p. 65; Wu Yuhong, p. 7.
106 Wu Yuhong, p. 6-7.
108 A29) bi-in-dug₄-ga-gin₄-nam … B33) Ḥa-ma-zi₄ nam-ra-aš im-ma-an-ak, “The thing was just as he (Išbi-Erra) said … He has plundered Ḥamazi,” Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 8; cf. also Michalowski, *The Royal Correspondence of Ur*, p. 255, l. 30, 36 and p. 265, l. 30, 36.
claim might have been one element in a psychological warfare against the governor of Kazallu (to whom this was told by the messenger of Išbi-Erra) and his allies.

The exact date of Iddi(n)-Sīn and his son Zabazuna is not yet established. There is inscriptive evidence that they were contemporaries of Išbi-Erra (2017-1985 BC) of Isin. According to Walker, when Iddi(n)-Sīn sat on the throne of Simurrum, Ibbi-Sīn was still king of Ur (See table 1). He further suggests that the campaign of this king to Simurrum in IS 3 was perhaps to check the ambitions of Iddi(n)-Sīn. The fact that Ešnunna declared independence after this campaign (after IS 3) might mean that the campaign against Simurrum was unsuccessful and led to counter effects. The discovery of the seal impression of Zabazuna under the level of Bilalama in Ešnunna seems to indicate that the reign of the former began before that of the latter, during the reigns of Kirikiri or even Nūr-ahum. His father Iddi(n)-Sīn must have ruled the kingdom from the time of Ibbi-Sīn and have been contemporary of Išbi-Erra of Isin, Ituriya, Šu-iliya and perhaps Nūr-ahum of Ešnunna. Unfortunately we have no inscriptive data or archaeological evidence that enable us to determine when his reign ends and his son’s begins. The only possibility is to conjecture. If the campaign of IS 3 was in fact against Iddi(n)-Sīn, in that year (± 2026 BC) he would have been at least in his middle twenties. By the time of the fall of Ur in 2004 he would have been around 45 years old. So he must have died before Išbi-Erra, who ruled until 1985 BC, but it is quite possible that he witnessed the rule of Nūr-ahum, who sat on the throne of Ešnunna in c. 2010 BC. His death must have been sometime during the last part of Nūr-ahum, during the reign of Kirikiri or even Bilalama.

The table below shows the relative synchronisms between the rulers of Ur, Isin, Ešnunna, Simurrum and Dēr.

---

109 Walker, The Tigris Frontier..., p. 177 and 224 and especially 225.
110 For this date, cf. Whiting, Old Babylonian Letters..., p. 22.
112 The table is taken from Walker but includes a few additions.
Table 1: Synchronisms of the rulers of Ur, Isin, Ešnunna, Simurrum and Dēr (after Walker).

Karhār was among the powers that emerged as active in the arena in this period. Its king Zardamu ruled sometime not long after the Ur III period. He appears to have been a powerful king since he claims to be “the mighty king, king of the four quarters of the world.” Regrettably we do not have any further material that may enlighten the darkness surrounding the history and role of Karhār in this period. By contrast, for the king of another rising power, Lullubum, we have an important rock-relief (Fig. 2) with an inscription (Fig 3) in Sarpul that has helped us learn about some aspects of that people. The inscription is of

---

113 According to Wu Yuhong, the capture of Ur and taking Ibbi-Sîn into captivity was in IE 14 on the hands of Idaddu I of Elam: Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 13.
114 For his seal legend, cf. Chapter Four.
historical value also for Simurrum and the chronology of its kings and inscriptions, so a transliteration and translation is presented below.\(^{116}\)

The Annubanini Inscription

Transliteration

Col. i

1) [\textit{An}]-nu-ba-ni-ni\(^{117}\)
2) [\textit{LU}]GAL da-núm
3) [\textit{L}]UGAL Lu-lu-b\(\hat{\textit{s}}\)a-im
4) ša-[\textit{a}-\textit{a}]m-\textit{šu}
5) \(\ddot{u}\) ša-lam \(\ddot{d}\)INANNA
6) \(\ddot{i}\)-na ša-du-im
7) \(\ddot{B}\)a-ti-\textit{ir}
8) [\textit{u}]š-zi(\(\ast\))-\textit{íz}
9) \(\ddot{s}\)a ša-al-mi-in
10) an-ni-in
11) \(\ddot{u}\) tup-pá-am
12) \(\ddot{u}\)-ša-sá-\textit{ku}
13) [\textit{A}]N-nu-\textit{um}
14) \(\ddot{u}\) An-tum
15) \(\ddot{d}\)EN.LÍL
16) \(\ddot{u}\) \(\ddot{d}\)INANNA
17) \(\ddot{d}\)ŠKUR
18) \(\ddot{u}\) \(\ddot{d}\)INANNA
19) \(\ddot{d}\)EN.ZU
20) \(\ddot{u}\) \(\ddot{d}\)UTU
21) \(\ddot{d}\)\[x (?)k\]a(?)-\textit{lum}
22) \(\ddot{t}\)\(\ddot{u}\)\(\ddot{d}\) ...-\textit{at}(?)
23) [...]

Col. ii

1) \(\ddot{d}\)NÈ.IR[\textit{I}, \textit{GAL}]\(^{118}\)
2) \(\ddot{u}\) \(\ddot{d}\)Er[\textit{eš}-\textit{ki}-\textit{ga}]\(\ddot{l}\)
3) \(\ddot{d}\)EN-\[\textit{x}\]
4) \(\ddot{b}\)e-\textit{el} [\textit{x x x}] x [\textit{x (x)}]
5) \(\ddot{i}\)-\textit{lu} [\textit{r}][\textit{a}-\textit{b}][\textit{ú}-\textit{tum}]
6) \(\ddot{u}\) ša-x-[\textit{x (x)}]
7) \(\ddot{e}\)\(\ddot{r}\)-\(\ddot{a}\)-\(\ddot{t}\)\[\textit{a}][\textit{m}]

\(^{116}\) A new examination of the relief performed by Nasrabadi has shown some new signs and corrections to the readings of Edzard and Frayne; for this cf. Nasrabadi, B. M., “Beobachtungen zum Felsrelief Anubaninis,” ZA 94 (2004), p. 291ff.

\(^{117}\) Seidl points out that the name can also be read as \(\ddot{d}\)\textit{Nubanini}, cf. Seidl, U., in Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 50, note 157.

\(^{118}\) Nasrabadi does not exclude the reading \(\ddot{d}\)\textit{Nin-[an]}-\(\ddot{s}\)(\(\ddot{i}\)-\textit{an-na}). However, he points out that there is not enough room for the two signs –\(\ddot{a}\)-\(\ddot{n}\) after the sign which possibly could be read as \(\ddot{s}\)\(\ddot{t}\), Nasrabadi, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 295, note 11.
Translation

i 1-3) [An]nubanini, mighty [k]ing, [k]ing of Lullubum, 4-8) had an im[ag]e of himself and an image of the goddess Ištar set up on mount Batir. 9-12) He who removes these two images and inscription, 13-21) may the gods [A]num and Antum, Enlil and Ninlil, Adad and Ištar, Sin and Šamaš, [x-[k]a(?)-lum and […]-at(?)] 22-23) […] ii 1-6) May the gods Ner[gal] and Er[eskigal], en[…] and the lord of […] x […] the [g]re[at] gods and … 7-11) inflict on him an evil curse. May they destroy his seed. 12-22) The Upp[er] and Lo[wer] Se[a] that … and that may … and … and … and … iii 1-2) May …its name(?) 3-6) … 7) may(?) …8-10) … 11) May it not […] 24-25) may he become detested in front of his people.

119 This could be a wrong spelling of IBILA or perhaps a form of the verb bêlum.
Annubanini emerged as a powerful ruler in this period.\(^{120}\) He seems to have been involved in armed conflicts with Simurrum for the control of the important pass of Sarpul and the main route which passes through there. We do not know yet about the details of this conflict and its exact background. All we do know is that Annubanini in his inscription claims a victory over an enemy whose leader is depicted as a captive walking before the other captives, all bound in fetters. Another important figure has fallen before Annubanini, who tramples on him. The enemy represented and spoken about in the inscription could very probably be Simurrum, although another power like Karḫar should not be ruled out. The reason for this suggestion is that Simurrum has responded to this relief – or that the other relief is a response to this one -\(^{121}\) with a relief in which he claims victory (the Sarpul relief). It is significant that the Sarpul inscription, which was traditionally known as Annubanini II but is now attributed to Iddi(n)-Sin or his son, mentions Lullubum and its king Annubanini (see below under the Sarpul inscription, l. 41-42). The severe damage inflicted on the historical sections – but not on the curse formulae - of both inscriptions must have been the work of the struggling parties themselves, Simurrum and Lullubum. The presence of two other OB reliefs in Sarpul (see map 1), both in a similar style with similar dress and weaponry and gestures, alludes to the long lasting bitter conflict between the powers of the region in this period, among whom Simurrum must have been an essential player.

Surprisingly, more than a century after the first publication of the Annubanini relief, two additional inscribed words have quite recently been noticed: ‘x(?)-baššim-šitt(?’ and ‘im-šú(?’.\(^{122}\) The first is inscribed on the lower arm of the defeated person under the king’s foot. The other is on the arm of the first captive in the lower row. Nasrabadi states that it is an Ancient Near Eastern habit to write the name of the person represented in a relief or statue,\(^{123}\) and so these two words can be considered the names of the two captives. The names are otherwise unknown, though a somewhat similar name, Imi-Šamaš, son of Intalik, is found on a bronze axe from Luristan referred to by Nasrabadi.\(^{124}\) These two newly discovered names are the names of the two leading persons of the enemy rulers in conflict with the power of Lullubum. If our suggestion is correct that the enemy was Simurrum, at least one of them must be the ruler / king of this land. He must have been, in this case, a predecessor of Iddi(n)-Sin, someone whom we otherwise do not know. Is he the author of the Sarpul inscription (see below)? Or does the Sarpul inscription postdate the Annubanini inscription? This cannot be answered with our present state of knowledge.

The mention of Annubanini as the “father” of the kings who formed the coalition against Narām-Sin according to the Cuthaean Legend is chronologically impossible,\(^{125}\) because here we have Annubanini named in the inscriptions of Iddi(n)-Sin as an enemy not as early as the age of Narām-Sin. There is a slight possibility that there was another Annubanini or, as some

---

\(^{120}\) Frayne considers the date of the inscription as uncertain. However, he notes the use of be-el instead of the older form be-al of the Išbi-Erra inscriptions. The form be-el appears in the inscriptions of Išme-Dagān, which suggests to him and Edzard an early Isin-Larsa date: Frayne, *RIME* 4, p. 704.

\(^{121}\) It is also possible that the the Annubanini relief was a response to that of Simurrum.

\(^{122}\) Nasrabadi, *op. cit.*, p. 294.

\(^{123}\) Nasrabadi, *ibid.*

\(^{124}\) Nasrabadi, *ibid.*, note 9. This similarity is valid when, with Nasrabadi, we read the last sign as UTU and assume that the DINGIR sign has been omitted. The inscription reads: ‘im-šú DUMU Im-ta-li, Gelb, I. J. and B. Kienast, *Die altakkadischen Königinschriften des Dritten Jahrtausends v. Chr.*, *FAOS* 7, Stuttgart, 1990, p. 378, Varia, no. 10. Of the name of the father only DU-x-x was read, cf. Calmeyer, P., *Datierbare Bronzen aus Luristan und Kirmanshah*, Berlin, 1969, p. 161. This name from the latter inscription was compared with a PN published in Thureau-Dangin, *RTC* (1903) 95, no. 246, rev. l. 7, dated to the Post-Akkadian period, *ibid.*

\(^{125}\) 38) 360,000 ummānutātšunu 39) Annubanini abiššunu šarru ummaššunu šarratu Melili, “360,000 were their troops, An(n)ubanini was their father, the king; their mother was the queen, Melili,” Westenholz, *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*, p. 310 and 311.
have suggested, that the Narām-Sīn mentioned here was the king of Ešnunna. But on balance the mention of such names here is best seen as a literary fantasy of the author of the composition (see above).

It is of great historical significance that Lullubum extended itself so far outside its traditional homeland as to reach the Sarpul region. We do know from other historical data (see Chapter Two) that their home was Zamua (the Shahrazūr Plain), extending to modern Iranian territories, to the regions of Mariwān, Baneh and probably the region of Lake Urmia. The question is whether there was also a Lullubian ethnic extension in this southerly direction. In any case, their military advance to the south via the normal route along the Sirwān River must have been stopped, or at least made difficult, by the Simurrians and Gutians. So they would have probably used other routes that pass through the neighbouring valleys to the east of the river, behind the Bāmō range.

The subject of the letter AS 22, 2 (1930-T713) from Tell Asmar, published by Whiting, is military conflicts in the eastern mountains, i.e. in the regions of Sarpul (Ḫalman) and Qasr-i-Shīrīn (=Karḫar). Very probably it reflects the events at this stage, when the local powers in the Zagros and the Transtigris foothills were involved in a bitter conflict for mastery over the region. We learn from the letter that Niqqum was taken by Manda and Ḫalman by Dadl[a…], whose titles or functions are not given, but they appear to have been very well-known figures that needed no explanation. Further, we read that 1500 troops of Iddi(n)-Sīn, who seems to be the very Simurrian king we know, were defeated at the hands of a certain DUMU Ḫu(pi)d/tam. This same Manda, the letter states, had explicitly threatened Iddi(n)-Sīn, saying: “I come to you.” Who were Manda, Dadla… and DUMU Ḫu(pi)d/tam? And which of them was king of one of the struggling kingdoms? We do not know. In the light of these data one can imagine how many powers Iddi(n)-Sīn fought, how many troops he defeated and into how many pacts and alliances he entered to build his kingdom.

The Inscriptions of Iddi(n)-Sīn

There are four royal inscriptions attributed to this king: the Bētwate Inscriptions 1, 2, and 3; the Sarpul Inscription, also known as Annubanini II; the Jerusalem Inscription; and the Haladiny Inscription. These inscriptions will now be presented in chronological order of composition. The criteria on which this order depends will be explained following the presentation of the inscriptions themselves.

---

126 cf. Walker, *The Tigris Frontier…*, p. 166 and 167. This despite the fact that Narām-Sīn is addressed in the legend as “son/descendant” of Sargon.


128 The letter reads as follows: 1) [Ma](?)-an-da¿ 2) °a¿-na Ni-qi4-[im†] 3) i-te-ri-[l] 4) ū Da-ad-[a-] 5) a-na Ḫa- al²-ma-an³ 6) [i-]e-ri-[l] 7) um-ma Ma-an-da-ma 8) a-na I-di-²EN.ZU 9) ’x-x-NI-NI’ (?) (Rest of obv. is destroyed, beginning of rev. is destroyed) 1’) ’x’²[-] 2’) a-la-ka-k[um] 3’) iš-pu-ul 4’) ū DUMU-ḫu-dam 5’) sa-ba-am ša I-di-²EN.ZU 6’) li-im Ļ 5 me-at 7’) im-ha-as 8’) [x] qib-ur ma*-x²[-] 9’) (traces of top signs, rest of rev. is destroyed), left edge: [ ]a-[l]-ka u-iš-ur, “… 1-6) Manda has entered Niqqum and Dadl[a-] has entered Ḫalman. 7-8) This is what Manda said to Iddin-Sīn: 9-1’) […] 2’-3’) ‘I will come to you’ he wrote to him. 4’-7’) Furthermore, DUMU-ḫu-dam defeated 1500 troops of Iddin-Sīn. 8’-9’) …, left edge) Protect your city.” Whiting, *Old Babylonian Letters from Tell Asmar*, p. 37-38. About the name DUMU-ḫu-dam, see comment on l. 4’ on p. 38.

129 For a comprehensive list of publications of these inscriptions cf. Frayne, *RIME* 4, p. 708; 712-713.
1. The Sarpul Inscription\textsuperscript{130}

This is a rock-relief (Fig. 4) located on the western side of the northern part of the mountain range that is bisected by the river Alwand (Map 1). The relief is carved almost 25 m above the ground.\textsuperscript{131} It depicts a standing person 1.27 m tall, trampling a defeated enemy under one foot. The standing figure faces a divine symbol on the right, depicted as a combination of the sun and the moon, with bunches of shimmering rays. The scene is carved within a niche, 1.5 m wide and 1.44 m high.\textsuperscript{132} At the base of the relief is the inscription panel, 1.36 cm wide and 35 cm high, but the inscription itself occupies a width of only 1.06 cm.\textsuperscript{133} Herzfeld was the first to discover the inscription, even though the relief had been known earlier. He attributed the relief to the same period as the Annubanini relief but to another king.\textsuperscript{134} The figure is like that of Annubanini, wearing a short tunic consisting of two pieces of cloth stretching to the knees. From the belt down to the lower fringe of the tunic the brocaded fringe of cloth is still clearly visible. His headdress is not clear because of erosion but it appears to be a headband, according to Hrouda.\textsuperscript{135} Behind, the hair (knotted or loose) can be seen.\textsuperscript{136} The footwear, Hrouda thinks, are shoes, not sandals, since they are closed from the sides and have upward pointed toes.\textsuperscript{137} Similar pointed footwear was known in Iran from other arachaeological data (Fig. 5a-c).\textsuperscript{138} The person is depicted as beardless, as in the Jerusalem relief, with eyes and eyebrows carved with deep grooves. Whatever weapons he bore have been eroded away, except for traces of a long sword behind the right leg. The sword appears to be of the same type as the one carried by Annubanini and the goddess Ištar on the Annubanini relief, one with an inverted-B shaped blade. He would have carried a bow\textsuperscript{139} as in all the other reliefs of this type. Although no traces of the bow can be seen Hrouda noted a threefold band on the back of the left hand which can be understood as the remnants of a bracer.\textsuperscript{140} The handle of a dagger under his left hand indicates that a dagger was fitted in his belt. The traces of four lines close to the raised right hand of the fallen figure suggest a beard. The right hand is raised in a gesture pleading for mercy, and the left hand supports his body.\textsuperscript{141} Other traces on the body of the fallen figure could suggest a belt and long hanging hair.\textsuperscript{142} It is relevant to recall that the Lullubians depicted on the Narām-Sīn victory stele also have long hair.

This badly preserved inscription (Fig. 6) consists of a three-column text written in Akkadian. The first column appears to have been inscribed with the name of the king and his titles; the second bears the legible remnants of a long text that certainly contained the

\textsuperscript{130} There are different spellings of the name Sarpul in archaeological literature. The full official name is Sar-i-Pul-i-Zohāb, meaning “(At) the head (= the beginning) of the bridge of Zuhāb/w.” In the local dialect its pronunciation is Sar-Pūl-i-Zahāw. For convenience we use the shorter form Sarpul.
\textsuperscript{131} Hrouda, \textit{Iranische Denkmäler}, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{132} Hrouda, ibid.
\textsuperscript{133} Hrouda, ibid.
\textsuperscript{134} For the history of the discovery and bibliography, cf. Hrouda, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{135} Hrouda, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 5. Herzfeld thought it was a helmet; Herzfeld, \textit{Iranische Felsreliefs}, 1910, p. 193 as referred to by Hrouda, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{136} Hrouda, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{138} Some examples can be seen on objects from Iran, such as a clay figure from Amlash and on a beaker from Deilem; cf. Godard, A., \textit{Die Kunst des Iran}, Berlin, 1964, p. 68, fig. 111 and p. 69, fig. 116a-b. However, the clearest instance is seen in the exaggerated pointed shoes of the copper figure found in western Iran and dates to the proto-Elamite period, cf. Hansen, D. P., Art of the Early City-States, in \textit{Art of the First Cities}, ed. Joan Aruz, New York, 2003, p. 46-8, figs. 15a-b.
\textsuperscript{139} Hrouda, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{140} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{141} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{142} Ibid.
important historical section, continued from the first column; the third column is almost
totally broken away, but preserves three lines of the curse formula. It reads:\[143\]

Transliteration

Col. i
Lacuna of about 21 lines.

22) x x x [x] x
23) x x x x
24) x ZI/GI-TE (?)\[144\]
25) x x x x
26) x x [x]-AM

Lacuna of about 14 lines

40) x x x 'ZI/GI (?)'
41) [An (?)]-nu-ba-ni (?)-[ni (?)]\[145\]
42) [LUG]AL [Lu]-lu-[br]-im[?]\[146\]
43) [x]-te-za-x x x
44) x x x [x-x]
45) x x [x]-a-num
46) x x x
47) x x x
48) [x]-KI/DI (?)-[x] x
49) x x x
50) x x [x] x
51) x x x [x] x
52) [x-x]-kà (?)-ni (?)

Lacuna of about 3 lines

56) [x]-KEŠDA(?) / BÀD(?)-[x]-DUN (?)
57) [x] ŠÀ (?)\[147\] IB (?) 'SU-(x)- 'GUR' (?) / 'NIGIN' (?) / 'ERIN' (?)\[148\]

143 Cf. Frayne, RIME 4, p. 712-14 (text E4.19.1.1001); also Edzard, D. O., “Zwei Inschriften am Felsen von Sar-
i-Pul-i-Zohāb: Anubanini 1 und 2,” AFO 24 (1973); id. in Hrouda, B., Iranische Denkmäler, p. 6. It must be
pointed out that Edzard (both editions) did not publish the first column at all. Frayne gives only the following
reading for col. i:
1) […]
2) […]
3) […]
4) 'x' Za-ba-[zu-na]
5) [DU]MU-[NI]
However, I could not identify these signs from the transcription. Moreover, other signs in col. i shown on the
transcription are strangely not read by either of these editors.

144 Edzard: [I/M]
145 Edzard also has reconstructed this line as the name of Annubanini: Edzard, “Zwei Inschriften…,” p. 77.
146 The restoration is based on parallels, although there is little room for the word Lullubim.
147 Less probably KAM.
148 If the last two signs are ŠU-NIGIN, it would be equivalent to the word ištūniš attested in the inscriptions of
Col. ii

1) [...]  
2) 'ū-[...]'  
3) di (?)-me (?) [...]  
4) 'ū? (?)- [...]  
5) DIŠ GI/ZI NA/BE [x (x)]  
6) x-a (?)-PI-x-[tim] ra-bí-a-tim  
7) A.MU.[R]U  
8) x x MAŠ (?) [x-ki]  
9) i-ne-[er]  
10) qar (?) [x (x)]  
11) ú-ši/e-x-[x]  
12) x x [...]  
13) kà-la-[šu(-nu)-šī(-na)]  
14) ú- [...]  
15) AN [x] x [...]  
16) qar-[dum (?)]  
17) x T[I x (x)] x [...]  
18) [x] KI ŠE 'NE' [x]  
19) ú-kà-ni-i-[š]-sū-[n]u-ti  
20) AL[A]M  
21) i-na š[a (?)-du-im]  
22) [B]a-[ti-t]rki  
23) [u]š-[zf]-[zf]  
24) ša [ALAM]-am  
25) an-[i-am]  
26) ú-[ša-sà-ku]  
27) [a-na šu-mí]  
28) [er-re-ti-sú]  
29) [ša-ni-am]  
30) [ú-ša-ḥa-zu]

---

149 The sign looks also like a badly written ŠU or the beginning of BUR on the transcription, though Frayne and Edzard write Ú without half-brackets.

150 Only di- in Frayne and Edzard.

151 Left unread by Edzard and Frayne.

152 There are more possibilities for the reading of the signs presented by Edzard and Frayne; the GI can also be a ZI and the NA looks also like a BE.

153 According to our reconstruction of the next line as i-ne-er, this line must have contained the name of a land or a people.

154 Typical of the Iddi(n)-Sîn inscriptions is the frequent use of the verb i–ne-er. Edzard and Frayne read only i NE [x (x)].

155 Left unread by Edzard and Frayne.

156 The second sign as seen in the transcription cannot be PI but rather some other sign like ši.

157 Reconstruction of the two signs by Edzard, p. 77.

158 Edzard and Frayne have only qar-[...]. It is plausible to fill the break with –dum. However, the only difficulty is the previous line which begins with AN, which must be here the divinity determinative before a royal name. But there is too little room for either "Iddi(n)-Sîn or "Zabazuna.

159 Edzard: [i-...a].

160 Edzard: ša [tup-pu]-am.

161 Frayne writes šum-mi, but both the Bêtwate and Jerusalem inscriptions have šu-mi.
31) [a-wi-lam]
32) [su-atar]
33) AN
34) ʾ[En-liš]
35) ʾ[En-hur-sag]
36) ʾ[EN.KI]
37) ʾ[EN].ZU
38) ʾ[ESKUR]
39) [h]e-e[l GIŠ.TUKUL]
40) ʾ[UTU]
41) ʾ[En].e[DI.KU3].ʾDA
42) ʾ[INNANNA]
43) [h][e]-la-at [ta]-ʾha-zi-im
44) ʾ[Nin-AN]-si₃-an-na
45) i-li
46) ʾ[N][i-i]š-ba
47) [be-li]
48) er-[ra-tám]
49) le-mu-tám
50) li-ru-ru-uš
51) NU[MUNš]u
52) li-[il-qú-ú-ma]
53) S[UHUŠ-sú]
54) [I]i-[sú-šu]
55) IBI[L]A
56) ū [MU]

Col. iii

1) a i-ḫ[i-n]u-šum
2) [h][a-][a]-tu₃₃
3) [I]u i[ki]-i-[b-šu]

Translation

i 1-21 (lacuna), 22-26) (too broken for translation), 27-40) (lacuna) 40-52) .... [An]ʾnuʾbaʾmiʾni [kin]g of [Lu]ʾ[luʾ][biʾ]im (rest too broken for translation). ii 1-7) .... he has...he has... to the great (gods?)... he dedicated/erected. 8-18) ...he slew/defeated...the he[ro](?)... he has ......ed all of [them](?)...the hero... 19) ... he subjugated them. 20-23) He [s]et up an im[age] on M[ount B]a[iii]. 24-26) He who [removes] th[is image] 27-30) [or on account of this curse

---

162 According to the context and in comparison with the Bêtwate inscriptions, it must be ʾbe-l-e[l DI.KU3].ʾDA’. However the remaining traces of the signs as seen on the transcription do not match the expected text. What we have on the transcription is NA [......] ŠA (?) . The first sign can be understood as faint traces of the sign BE. which the copyist took as NA, but the last sign does not look in any way like the DA sign. This can be a copyist’s mistake.

163 This line, as line 41, is problematic. While [h][e]-la-at [ta]-ʾha-zi-im’ is expected, the space after be-la-at is enough for two signs at the most. These must be TA-ḪA, but the transcription shows the signs IM-ʾBAʾ(?)-NA(?) or IM-ʾBAʾ-[x]-KI/DI. The question arises if these were badly seen and therefore mistakenly transcribed; IM, for instance, could have been mistakenly understood for ZI.

164 Frayne has tum.

Commentary

Unfortunately, the significant historical section of the inscription is broken. We understand only that the king has defeated a group of enemies and has made them bow down. Among them the city of Niqqum must have been listed, since it was difficult for Simurrum to reach Sarpul without passing through the region of Niqqum. Ḥalmans was another major centre in the region, and unless it had been subjugated no victory could have been claimed. The whole inscription might even have been carved to celebrate its capture by Simurrum, an episode mentioned again later in the Haladiny inscription.

The curse formula, the switch from the 3rd to the 1st person, the language and the list of gods, their titles, especially the titles of Nišba and Nin-AN-Sianna, have great similarity with the inscriptions of Bētwate, as will be seen below. Edzard pointed out this similarity in his publication of both the Sarpul inscriptions, although he attributed both to Annubanini. At the time the Jerusalem inscription had not been published, but he became aware of it and something of its content and linguistic aspect through personal communications with Shaffer. The phrases *balatum lū īkkibšu* and “Nin-AN-Sianna is my (personal) god, Nišba is my lord” in both the Sarpul and Jerusalem inscriptions are particularly striking. Where Frayne found the remnants of “Zabazuna DUMU.NI” in col. i is not clear to me. But even if the name is not there it does not greatly weaken the other criteria for attributing the inscription to a Simurrian ruler. The mention of the god “Nišba my lord” is another clear allusion to Simurrum, since Nišba was obviously the patron of that kingdom. There are four completely broken divine names in the inscription of Annubanini in Sarpul (Annubanini I), but no formula seems to have contained “Nin-AN-Sianna is my god, Nišba is my lord,” as in the inscriptions of Iddi(n)-Šîn. To these Shaffer and Wasserman add the phrase *balatum lū īkkibšu*, which, as they state, is found only in the Iddi(n)-Šîn inscriptions.

According to Walker this inscription, carved either by Iddi(n)-Šîn or his son Zabazuna, predates the inscription of Annubanini in Sarpul by at least a century. He further proposes that when Annubanini came to power he deleted this inscription of the king of Simurrum and probably tried to insert his own name instead, in order to claim the other king’s deeds for himself. However, the mention of Annubanini in the Haladiny inscription (see below) proves that Annubanini was either a contemporary or, less probably, older than Iddi(n)-Šîn.

---

165 Compare l. 29ff of this inscription with the Bētwate inscription l. 34-61. Cf. also Walker, p. 179; 182-3.


167 Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 22. However they point to a Sumerian parallel in an inscription of Ur-Namma, *op. cit.* p. 23.

168 Walker, p. 186; 189-90.
2. The Haladiny Inscription (SM 16)

This is an extraordinarily important inscription of King Iddi(n)-Sin, not just because of the rich historical information it provides but also for the long list of GNs, even though they are largely fragmentary. It is a new inscription, not previously published.

The inscription (Fig. 7a-b; 8a-d) is written in two columns on a light grey coloured limestone slab. The slab measures 76 x 37 x 27 cm. As no curse formula is found on the inscription, I would suggest that the inscription originally consisted of two or more slabs bearing a longer text, with the curse formula inscribed on the second slab. No archaeological excavation has yet been undertaken at the spot where the inscription was found to search for other relevant remains. This inscription could have been designed to be displayed horizontally rather than vertically. This suggestion arises from a comparison with the inscriptions of Sarpul and Jerusalem, which are inscribed in long horizontal columns in which the written lines are vertically positioned.

A geological analysis, conducted by Mr. Muhammed Ahmed Raheem from the Geological Survey Service of Sulaimaniya Governorate, showed that the stone is an organic limestone, transformed to dolomite, with a hardness of 3.5 according to Mohs scale. What is extremely important for our purpose is that the stone is one known as a Qamchuqha Formation, typical of the Surdāsh range of which Pīra Magrūn is a part. So it was shaped and inscribed at the place where it was found and as such concerns events that had taken place in that area. At least one of the GNs mentioned in the inscription, perhaps more, should be in the Qarachatān area.

The inscription was found by a ploughman, close to a large berry tree in a field of Mr. Raouf that is located slightly to the south of the village Qarachatān, at the foot of Pīra Magrūn, northwest of Sulaimaniya (Map 2).169

Transliteration (Transcription: Fig. 9)

Col. i

1) [Ē(?)] dNi-[iš-ša]170
2) [x(?)] LUGAL 9 k[u]-[li-šī]
3) kī-nu-[um]
4) ʾdi-EN.'ZU'
5) [LUG]AL da-nūm
6) [LUG]AL Si-mu-ri-imki
7) NUN dINANNA [x(?)]
8) ʾdi-šum-ma

169 The slab was discovered in the early 1980s. At that time the region where the slab was discovered was out of government control, so the discovery remained a secret until a former Pēshmarga warrior, Mr. Ghareeb Haladiny, became aware of it. Mr. Haladiny negotiated with the discoverer of the slab to reach an agreement about keeping it safe. Before they finished their preparations, the village, together with another 4500 villages, was demolished in furtherance of the Anfal operations, started in 1987 by the Iraqi regime of the time against the whole Kurdish countryside. The house where it was being kept was ruined and its owner and his family disappeared. A couple of years later Mr. Haladiny was back in the region with a handful of comrades to prepare for small-scale attacks and raids against the troops of the regime. Secretly he excavated the slab from the rubble of the ruined house and transported it to a safe place until the uprising of 1991 broke out in Kurdistan. Only in 1993, when conditions had calmed, did Mr. Haladiny announce the discovery of the slab and presented it to the Museum of Sulaimaniya.

170 A further examination of the inscription in 2006 revealed the remnants of a sign with a vertical final wedge; for suggested explanations see below under ‘comments.’
9)   Decompiled
10) [be]-el-šu
11) [kak(?)]-kā-am
12) [da]n(?)-na-am
13) [l]e-e-n'ē-ešš
14) [ma]-tā-tim
15) [ma]-at Ša-Šr
16) [ū-ša]-li-šu
17) [......]-x-GA-TI
18) [......]-šu-nu
19) [......]-IZ-[x]-GA
20) [ma-at] Te-ni/li-mu(?)
21) [ū-ša]-li-šu
22) [......]-ta/ša-am
23) [......]-[š]u(?)-nu
24) [i-ne]-er
25) [......]-ar
26) [ū-ša]-li-šu
27) [......]-du-šu
28) [......]-šu-šu
29) [i-ne]-er
30) [......]-na
31) [ū-ša]-li-šu
32) [......]-nām-a-tal
33) [......] [G الصف] GU.ZA
34) [ma-at] Si-mu-ri-im
35) [i-ne]-er
36) [ma-at]̌ř x(?)̌ NE-šum
37) [ma]-a'ť Ša-ri-it-ēu-um
38) [iš]-ba-at
39) [....] Šu-lul(?)-gi/zi-ta-tal
40) [......]-GA/AM(?)-ri-ňr(?)-we
41) [be(?)]-li-šu-šu
42) [......] muš/suh(?)-iš-ti
43) [ma(?)-at(?)] [...(?)]-ti-na-ab-ba-ša-we
44) [ū-ša]-li-šu
45) [......]-li-li
46) [......]-šu-šu
47) [i-ne]-er
48) [ma-at] Hal-ma-an
49) ma-at Be-er
50) [iš]-ba-at
51) [An(?)]-nu-ba-ni-ni
52) [LUGAL Lu-lu-bi]-im

Col. ii

Lacuna of about 5 lines

58) Ti-id-luh-ša-am
59) ù-ḥa-li-iq
60) ma-at Și-ik-ša-am-br'ki
61) ù-ḥa-li-iq
62) ma-at I-te-ra-âš-"we'ki
63) I-tu'ki
64) Ša-un-mi'ki
65) ù ’Hu₂/b'li/’n'e-za-gu'ki
66) a-na še-e[p]
67) ¹Ni-iš-ba
68) ù-kâ-ni-is-sú-nu-ti
69) ma-at Ut-tu-še'ki
70) i-na qâ-ti
71) Kak-mi-im'ki
72) 'ut(?)'ti-ir
73) ma-at Kak-mi-im'ki
74) ù-ḥa-li-[iq]
75) ¹Ma-di/ki-a-[x]
76) ¹Ša-wa/ši/write-[x]
77) ¹Ma-gi-ba'-ni(?)'ii
78) ¹A-ša'-tum'
79) ¹A-wa-la-núm
80) ra-bi-a-nu
81) A-mu-ra-im
82) i-ne-er-šu-nu-ti
83) ù A-mu-ra-am
84) i-na kûl-le'-e(?)-šu
85) it-ru-<<UD>>-us-sú
86) ³Ni-iš-ba
87) be-el-šu
88) a-wa-as-sú
89) 'iš-me-ma
90) ma-tà-tim
91) ù-ḥa³-li-iq
92) A-mu-ra-am
93) 'ù Si-maš-kâ-am'ki
94) i-ne-er
95) ²di'-²EN.ZU
96) gar-dum
97) i-lu-šu-nu-ti
98) a-na še-ep
99) ³Ni-iš-ba
100) be-li'-šu³
101) ù-kâ-ni-is-sú-nu-[i]
102) ma-tà-tum
103) ša i-te-bu 'ši'-na-ti
104) 'E³ ³Ni-iš-ba
105) [LUGAL] '9' 'ku³-[li-ši]
Translation

1) [Temple(?) of the god Niš-ba], 2) [temple(?) of] the king of the nine provinces 3) the firm one. 4) Iddi(n)-Sî’n’, 5) the mighty [king, 6) [king of Simurrum, 7) the prince of Šuška/Istar. 9) Nišba 10) his [lord 8) gave him 12) a [mighty 11) weapon. 13) The [people(s) of 14) the [land of 15) the [land of Šagi 16) [he destroyed, 17) [……]., 18) their [19) [……]., 20) [the land of Ten/limu 21) [he destroyed, 22) [……]., 23) [their [24) [he slew; 25) [the land/city of [……]-ar 26) [he destroyed, 27) [……]., 28) their [……]. [29) [he slew; 30) [The land/city of [……]-na 31) [he destroyed, 32) [……]-num-atal, 33) [the enemy/?/usurper?] of/on (?) the throne 34) of (?) [the land (of)] Simurrum 35) [he slew; 36) [the land]d of [……-NE-šum 37) [the land]d of Șaridhum 38) [he seized, 39) [……] 40) [……] GA/AM-ri-ni(?)-we, 41) [their lords/gods (?) 42) [……] 43) [The land (?) of [……]-tinabbašwe 44) [he destroyed, 45) [……]-liš, 46) [their [……] 47) [he slew; 48) [The land of Ḥalman, 49) the land of Bel 50) [he seized. 51) [An]nubanini, 52) [king of the Lulluḫ]’um’

Lacuna ?

Col. ii:

About 5 lines broken away

58) Tidluḫḫum 59) he destroyed; 60) the land of Šikšambi 61) he destroyed; 62) the land of Iterašwe’, 63) (the city ? of) Itu, 64) (the city ? of) Šaummi, 65) and (the city ? of) ʿHuš-b/nizagu, 68) he subdued (all of) them 66) to the feet of 67) the god Nišba. 69) The land of Utuwe 72) he took back 70) from the hand(s of) 71) Kakhum 73-74) (and afterwards) he destroyed the land of Kakhum. 75) Mad/k/qia-[x], 76) Šawa/i/piya-[x], 77) Magiba-ni(?), 78) Aḥatum, 79) (and) Awilanum 80-81) the Amorite governors/sheikhs, 82) he slew them 83-85) and he turned back the Amorites from his province (i. e. the province of Iddi(n)-Sîn). 86) The god Nišba 87) his lord, 88-89) heard his word(s) 90-91) (and) destroyed the lands 92-94) (and) slew the Amorites and the Simaškians (for him). 95) (In return), Iddi(n)-Sîn, 96) the hero 97-101) overpowered them (and) subdued them at the feet of the god Nišba, ‘his’ lord. 102) The lands 103) that rebelled [he made them build] 104) ‘the temple’ of Nišba, 105) [king of] the 9 pro[vinces]

Lacuna of unknown length.

Commentary

1) [Ē(?)] 4Ni-liš-ba]: The inscription begins with the name of the god Nišba, patron of the kingdom of Simurrum. This could imply that the monument was dedicated to this deity. The beginning of the sentence is essential for understanding the text, but it is unfortunately broken, so the exact context of this divine name is not known. Traces of a vertical wedge were observed in a later re-examination of the inscription, directly before the DINGIR sign. These traces rule out the possibility of a-na 4Ni-liš-ba. Rather I would suggest the remnants of the sign Ė here as well as in l. 104. There is no trace of a line of writing in the space above

Another possibile translation is “subdued their gods to the ..” For this, see the comments below.
line 1 so in all probability what can be read is the first sentence of the text. The name Nišba could also be read as Nišpa, as Shaffer and Wasserman do, a reading associating this divine name with the name of Mount Niš/spi of the NA inscriptions, which is possible as long as Mount Nišpi was one of the steep mountains in the region close to the territory of Simurrum. The god Nišba is known also from other inscriptions of this king (the Bētwate inscriptions and those of Jerusalem and Sarpul), but it is not listed in the famous AN = dA-nu-tum list. As can be seen from be-el-šu in lines 10 and 87 and be-li-šu in line 100, Nišba was a male deity, so should not be identified with the grain goddess Nisaba. Furthermore, for the Hurrians, who seem to have been the basic population of Simurrum since the Akkadian period, the grain god was Kumurwe, a variant of Kumarbi. The Hittite word for “grain” in the Hurro-Hittite god-lists was often substituted for this name. Hitherto the oldest known occurrence of the name Nišba is in the PN KA-Nišba, king of Simurrum, who is recorded as a rebel against Enrida-pizir of Gutium in the inscription of Erridu-pizir. The name Nišba occurs in the same inscription also as a mountain name. Mountain names played a significant role in the (late) Hurrian mythology as Richter states. The Amorite PN Ha-ab-du-Ni-is-pa was the name of a Babylonian man recorded in a Mari letter (ARM 7, 221: 9). However, the name Nišba occurs in these last texts without the divine determinative, perhaps because it indicated a mountain, not a divine name. One last important note about Nišba is that the Hurrian rulers of Simurrum did not replace the non-Hurrian deity - or at least his non-Hurrian name - with a deity from their own pantheon as the country’s patron deity. One may conjecture that the non-Hurrian population of Simurrum may still have had an important influence, or that changing a country’s divine patron was alien to the ideology of this part of the region. If the DN and the mountain name Nišpi/a are to be associated this would add support to the second possibility.

2) [E(?)] LUGAL 9 ku-[li-ši]: The re-examination of the text showed the number 9 instead of what had been previously misread as 8. The meaning of the word kuliši, which appears to be of non-Semitic origin, has become clear after the publication of the Jerusalem inscription. It occurred there twice: û LUGAL 9 ku-li-ši in col. I, line 14' and ku-li-šu-um in col. v, line 1. Shaffer and Wasserman suggest that it denotes “some kind of a political unit such as a district or province (similar perhaps to kalsum in the Mari texts), a geographical designation such as a valley, or even a combined geopolitical entity.” This translation fits well with the context. In the Jerusalem inscription the GN Kulun(n)um alternates with the term kalisum, a fact that supports the above suggestion. This form of giving the number of the provinces ruled by the king or the patron of the kingdom anticipates the later Achaemenid royal inscriptions, especially that of Darius I (521-486 BC) in Behistun. That inscription has Xša[yə]-hiya dahÿ nam, “king of the lands/provinces,” followed by the number of the provinces.

172 For this cf. Chapter Three, note 209.
174 Wilhelm, The Hurrians, p. 52.
175 Cf. Chapter Three. The name KA-Nišba occurs in col. iii 9' and col. viii 8'.
176 Col. ix 3' (according to the reading of Kutscher); col. x 5.
179 According to Richter, the name KA-Nišba is “undoubtedly Hurrian,” Richter, op. cit., p. 301. But the name Nišba is nowhere else attested as a Hurrian deity. If it was Hurrian, it must have been a local deity known only in Simurrum.
180 Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 13. The final š of this word can be seen as the Hurrian š̄ marking a plural.
181 Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 13-14.
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the mighty king, king of the land of Warûm;” two seals of Azuzum; one of Ur-Ninmar; and a fragmentary seal

š

seal of Kirikiri: 1) ƒTi

In the Jerusalem inscriptions, only in the Jerusalem insc ri ption is it written with geminated

r

b

occurrence of the royal name after, not before, this title do not permit any other

interpretation. Further, we have at least some parallels in the seals of Šu-Iliya and Kirikiri of Ešnunna.185 The idea of the god as the actual king of the land was perhaps related to some aspect of the ideology of the Hurrians or the Transtigris region (including Ešnunna) about which we are still ignorant.186

4) Iddi(n)-Sin: No other spelling is given in the inscriptions of this king that could establish an indisputable reading of his name. It could be transcribed Iddin-Sin, “Sin has given,” or Itti-

Sín, “With / besides Sin.” Because the former name is prevalent one assumes that is the correct reading.187 The rendering of the double consonant (for stress) was not compulsory, as for instance in i-ti-šum-ma in l. 8.

5) LUGAL da-núm: This epithet is known also from the inscriptions of Bētwate and Jerusalem. Before Iddi(n)-Sin, this title was borne by Amar-Sin of Ur III;188 earlier Narām-

Sin of Akkad used only the phrase “the mighty,” without LUGAL.189

6) LUGAL Si-mu-ri-im: The name Simurrum is rendered in this inscription and in the

Bētwate inscriptions without gminated r, as in the Ur III inscriptions. Among the Iddi(n)-Sin

inscriptions, only in the Jerusalem inscription is it written with gminated r: Si-mu-ur-ri-im51 i 13’; iv 2?; iv 20.190

7) NUN INANNA: The remnants of the first sign seem to point to the Sumerian logogram NUN, Akkadian rubā’u. Historically, the use of this word in the royal titulary is attested


185 The seal of Šu-Iliya clearly states: 1) 4)Tišpak 2) LUGAL da-núm 3) LUGAL ma-at Wa-ri-im 4) LUGAL 5) [kî]-ib-ra-at 6) ar-ba-im, “Tišpak, mighty king, king of the land Warûm, king of the [jour quarters;” also the seal of Kirikiri: 1) 4)Tišpak, 2) LUGAL da-núm 3) LUGAL ma-at Wa-ri-im, “Tišpak, the mighty king, king of the land Warûm,” and that of Uşurawassu: 1) 4)Tišpak 2) LUGAL da-núm 3) LUGAL ma-at Wa-ri-im, “Tišpak, the mighty king, king of the land of Warûm;” two seals of Azuzum; one of Ur-Ninmar; and a fragmentary seal legend (no. 27). This is true for the god Sataran as well: 1) 4)Sataran 2) da-núm ) [LUGAL Dērim, “Sataran, the mighty, king of Dēr,” Fortkort, H., S. Lloyd and Th. Jacobsen, The Gimmilsin Temple and the Palace of the Rulers of Tell Asmar (OIP 43), Chicago, 1940, p. 143; 145; 147; 148 and 155.

186 Note that Kirikiri and Bilalama are thought to have been Elamites, not Semites as their names probably suggest. For this and a possible etymology of their names, cf. Wu Yuhong, A Political History ..., p. 11-12.

187 Cf. also Hilgert, Akkadisch in der Ur III-Zeit, p. 294f (PNs of the form l-din/di-DN).

188 Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 38.

189 Cf. for instance Frayne, RIME 2, p. 88 (Text E2.1.4.1, l. 2’).

190 For an overview of the different spellings of the name Simurrum, cf. the beginning of this chapter.
under the kings of Ešnunna, by Samsuiluna (YOS 9 35: 147) and Hammurabi in the south, and by Šamiš-Adad I (MARI 3 75, no. 4: 9) in Assyria. Prior to that, the word was used in the archives of the Old Assyrian merchants of Kaneš to denote the governors of the city of Assur and the local kings of Anatolian city-states. If our reading of this sign is correct, it would be the oldest attested use of this epithet. There is room for another sign after INANNA, faint traces of which survive, but no clear signs at all could be seen during the second collation of the inscription. To read INANNA as Hurrian Šauška is not impossible since the kingdom of Simurrum, its king and a large portion of its population were apparently Hurrian.

11-12) [kak(?)-kà-am |da]|n(?)-na-am: The sentence is problematic. Almost the only fitting sign for the remnants of the first (?) sign of line 11 and in the context is the sign KAK. The question is why this word was written syllabically, not, as was the custom in this period, logographically. The reading remains questionable.

The use of “The mighty weapon” in royal inscriptions is not new but is infrequent. It is attested in a Sumerian inscription of Rîm-Sîn of Larsa: “By means of [mighty [weapons] of the god Ninurta.”

13) te-e-ne-eš: This significant word occurs also in the Jerusalem inscription but, as Shaffer and Wasserman noted, it occurs before that as tenistišu only in a Boğazköy text as a variant of the more common tenēštu, “people.” But it occurred as well in Atra-hasîš as te-ni-še, also meaning “people, mankind.” In the Jerusalem inscription it is not inscribed at the beginning of the line, which led to hesitation by both editors of the text whether or not there were other signs preceding it. Its occurrence in our inscription as a complete word confirms the correct reading of Shaffer and Wasserman. Note that the sign TE is incomplete, but there is no room for another sign before it. It is noteworthy that the word has been written with the first vowel lengthened in both the Haladiny and the Jerusalem inscriptions, but it is recorded in the dictionaries with a long second vowel.

15) [ma]-at Ša-gi: This GN appears as the first GN targeted by Simurrum. It is otherwise unknown. A similar GN, Tu-ša-gi, is attested in a Shemshāra text (SH 825) but it does not seem to be identical since here the sign AT preceding the sign ŠA clearly belongs to the word māt. Since this place seems to have been close to Simurrum itself, indicated by its mention in the beginning of the text (see below under ‘The Historical setting’), Šagi can be compared with URU Si-gi-ya attested in texts from Chogha Gavaneh.
20) [ma-at] Te-ni/li-mu(?)\[^{31}\]: Another otherwise unattested GN. If we consider it a Hurrian name it can be Telim(u), a name that contains the Hurrian element talmi- “great,” as in the name of Talmûš. But this is conjectural.

22) [...]-ta/Ša-am: The sign preceding AM can be either TA or ŠA.

24) i-ne-er: < nē/âru or ne’ârum “to kill,” “to strike (enemies)” in addition to its proper meaning “to slay.” It occurs with the meaning to strike enemies in texts from the ÖAkkt. period, as in the OB copy of the ‘Great Revolt against Narâm-Sîn:’ i-ni-ir-ma (G 17)\[^{201}\] or i-ne-er-ma.\[^{202}\]

25) [...]-ar\[^{31}\]: It is difficult to suggest the full name of this GN. It could be any of the GNs which were located in the Transtigris region close to the operations area ending with –ar, such as Zimudar, \[^{203}\] Namar, Ḥaš(ı)mar, \[^{204}\] or Karḫar which was close to Ḥalman, \[^{205}\] also mentioned several lines after this GN.

30) [...]-núm-a-tal: If we assume that the word māt was written before this GN, the room remaining for the name itself is only enough for two or at the most three signs. Little else can be said about this GN. The GN Ḥu-ra-x-na that is attested in some fragmentary contexts in the Nuzi texts \[^{206}\] can be suggested as relevant. According to Frayne, the name Ḥu-ra-x-na is the same as ‘Hur’-a-nûm that is attested in a Narâm-Sîn inscription and the same as Hur-nam of the Erridu-Pizir inscription.\[^{207}\] The faint traces of what can be understood as the remains of two vertical wedges on each other that were noticed in the second examination of the inscription might be the last part of the sign A, probably preceded by ḤUR-RA.

32) [...]-núm-a-tal: This appears to be a PN in relation to the following GN. Since a great part of the inhabitants of the Transtigris in this period was Hurrian we could read the signs A-RI as the Hurrian –a-tal “mighty;” –a-ri could also be Hurrian, though it is less frequent.

33-34) [...]\[^{40}\]/GU.ZA [ma-at] Si-mu-ri-im\[^{31}\]: In the broken space there is room only for two signs. One is GIŠ used here as a determinative, but the other is guesswork. There is also little doubt that another sign existed after the sign ZA because of the space left and the small break in it. This would not affect the meaning so much, because if there was indeed another sign it would be in all probability a phonetic complement of the word kussûm (GU.ZA). Unfortunately we do not know what happened to the throne of Simurrum with this individual. Nevertheless, since the verb of the sentence in line 35 is i-ne-er, the PN [...]-nûm-a-tal must


Grayson and Sollberger, RA 70, p. 111.


Note that Z/Simudar was written in the Ur III sources with –dar not da-ar, cf. Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 166-7.

Although this form of the name is different from the older form Ḥašımar(u), I think it is not possible to guess the exact form and pronunciation of the name in the local speech of the inhabitants, who were perhaps in this period Simurrians. It is not impossible that Ḥašımar(u) was pronounced by its inhabitants as Ḥašimar in this period. The last vowel a might have been changed to ū by vowel harmony, influenced by the Akkadian mimation –um at its end. Support for this suggestion comes from the NA sources that write the name as Ḥašimar, with mimation discarded.

\[^{200}\] Cf. for this location Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 149 and id, RIME 3/2, p. 451; cf. also Chapter Four, note 123.

\[^{201}\] The name occurs as URU Ḥu-ra-x-na! (HSS XV 74: 7) and URU Ḥu-ra-x-na (HSS XV 74: 17): Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 104.

\[^{202}\] Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 184.
be the object of the sentence. He in turn was the person who did something to the royal house of Simurrum. I would suggest that the key to fully understand the sentence lies in the first sign of line 33; here something like ERIM “foe/enemy” or IM.GI “usurper” must have been written, although the space is hardly big enough. The whole sentence then becomes: “(Iddin-Sin) slew [....]num-atal, the enemy/usurper of the throne of Simurrum.”

36) [ma-a]’t’ x(?)-NE-šumki: Since the sign NE has more than one value, the GN can be anything that ends with –ne-šumki, -bi-šumki or -b’iš-sumki.

37) ma-at Ša-ri-it-ḫu-umki: From Ur III sources the name of this land is already known. It occurs as Šu-ru-ut-ḫu-umki, Ša-ri-ḫi-ki and Ša-ri-it-ḫu-umki (exactly as in this inscription).208 The GNs Ša-ri-ip-ḫu-um-ma209 and Ša-ri-ḫ-DU210 can be variants of this name.211 The ruler here in the time of the Shemshāra archives was a certain Kakmum, who turned to be an ally of Šamš-Adad, as appears from a letter of the Assyrian general Etellum to Kuwari.212 Some located this GN in or near the Dukan Gorge, where the Lower Zab flows between the two mountains Haibat Sultān and Sarsir.213 It is based on the mention of niripum Šurutuha, “The pass of Šurutuha,”214 together with Ašuḫaš, Matka, Arrapha, Nuza, Hašmar, Zaba[n] and other places in the inscription of the Elamite Šīṭak-Inšušinak.215 All these GNs are located between the Lower Zab and the Diyāla rivers. In fact, its occurrence with Šašrum earlier in the Ur III documents216 indicates its location in the same general area of the Rāniya Plain. Furthermore, its association with a gorge increases the possibility of its identification with the Ur III documents indicates its location in the same general area of the Rāniya Plain. Moreover, its association with a gorge increases the possibility of its identification with the location pointed out by Astour. There are some hints that may help explaining the meaning of this GN. Frayne thinks the name is Elamite.217 But Astour and Mayer gave a Hurrian etymology, linking it with a Hurrian word that occurs as a loan-word in Akkadian: GIš Šu-ra-ḫu. For the meaning Mayer hesitates between the gall-oak and walnut, while Astour favours walnut.218

39) […]-gi-za-tal: As far as I know, such a PN is not attested in any published text. There is a possibility to read the sign GI as ZI. The last part of the name reminds one of the PN Ku-uẓ-za-rītal of Nuzi.219

40) […]-GA/AM(?)-ri-ni(?)-we: If the restoration of the break in the next line ([be(?)]-li-šu-nu) is correct, this name and the name following it would be understood as the names of rulers or even gods. But traces of a vertical line at the end of the sign make it impossible to read the first sign as BE, unless the vertical line is a scratch. The element –we is the Hurrian genitive suffix, and the –ne before it can be the Hurrian suffix –mi for the formation of adjectives220 or the article –ne.

---

208 Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 177-8; 187.
However, the sign IB in Scheil, RA 24, seems to be a misread sign ID: ।।.
210 Edzard and Farber, op. cit. p. 177-8, referring to: Buccellati, Amorites txt: 22 I 5; Goetze JCS 7, 106 I 5.
211 Astour, “Semites and Hurrians in Northern Transjordania,” SCCNH 1, p. 35, note 249; Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 177-8.
212 4’) IGI Ka-ak-mi-im ša Šu-ru-ut-ḫi-im 5′ a-na be-li’ia is2-sā-ḫu2-tu-ur lu-à hu-de-e[t], “The face of Kakmum of Šurutum has turned to my lord. Rejoice!,” Eidem and Læssøe, The Shemshara Archives, the Letters, p. 104-5 (no. 41).
213 Astour, “Semites and Hurrians …,” p. 36.
214 Astour, ibid. and note 252.
215 Astour, “Semites and Hurrians …,” p. 36.
216 It was mentioned in a date-formula from AS 4, cf. Walker, The Tigris Frontier ...., p. 107.
217 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 174.
218 Astour, op. cit., p. 36-37.
219 For this name cf. Gelb, HS p. 19; Gelb et al., NPN, p. 231 (under Kuzzari).
43) [ma(?)-at(?)] […]-ti-na-ab-ba-ša-weki: Another otherwise unknown Hurrian GN that ends with the Hurrian genitive suffix –we, probably preceded by -ž. If the word māt is written before this name, which is very probable, there is very little chance that any other sign preceded T. In this case, the name Tinabbašawe is complete.

48) [m]a-at Hal-ma-an: The important land of Ḥalman is already known from numerous written sources. As a GN it is attested in different forms, like Arman, Ialman and Ḥalman, until it developed to Ḥalwān in the Middle Ages and Halwān in modern times. The same name has been given to the river Alwand that has obviously developed from the name Ḥalman > Halman > Alman > Alwan (as pronounced now in the local dialect) > Alwan(d). The strategic position of this place in the gorge, through which the Great Khorasān Road passes, was always extremely significant. The Arabic term “Qabat Halwān” of medieval Arab geographers means “The barricade of Halwān” and is reminiscent of the Sumerian “Ḫuḫnuri, the bolt of the land of Elam,” recorded in the IS 9 date-formula, a clear indication of its strategic function.

This Ḥalman cannot be identical with URU Ha-al-ma-ni-(we) of the Nuzi texts, for which another location is suggested.

The mention of Ḥalman in the inscription of Haladiny is very important, for it is incontestable evidence for the extension of Simurrum to the region of Sar pus under his reign. The control of such a strategic pass and main route would have been a crucial factor for the fate of his kingdom. Furthermore, it indicates the surpassing power Simurrum enjoyed when it controlled Ḥalman in the shadow of the other surrounding powers of that time. Taking into account this southerly point of his realm and calculating the northerly point at Bētwate, where his other inscriptions are found, the kingdom of Simurrum extended at least 240 aerial kilometres from south to north.

49) ma-at Be-el: Another otherwise unattested GN. It seems it was located in the area of Ḥalman since it is mentioned directly after it. The Semitic meaning of the word Bēl (= lord) does not necessarily imply that the name is Semitic. It is quite possible that the name belongs to another language with a different meaning.

51-52) [An(?)-nu-ba-ni-ni [LUGAL Lu-lu-bi]-°im: This is one of the very important passages of this inscription because it mentions Annubanini of Lullubum. First, it is important for the establishment of a chronology of both kings, and secondly it alludes to the clash of interests between the two powers. Thanks to this inscription we know that Annubanini did


223 As in the inscriptions of Adad-Nirari II (911-891 BC), see Luckenbill, ARAB I, p. 111, § 360; and also of Šamši-Adad V (888-874 BC), see Luckenbill, ARAB I, p. 258, § 724 (here mentioned as a mountain name).


225 [al-Maqdisi, Anṣan it-Taqāsīm fi Maʿrīf al- Ağālim, Leiden, 1877, p. 53; 115]. al-Maqdisi lived between 945/6-1000 A.D.

226 For the proposed locations of different authors, cf. Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 84.

227 The 350 km. estimation by Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 28 seems too much.
not postdate Iddi(n)-Sin, as Walker suggested. Iddi(n)-Sin was at least a contemporary of Annubanini, or even postdated him. The lack of any other inscription left by Annubanini leaves the other side of the story in darkness. What we are sure of is that the suggestion of Walker, that the inscription of Annubanini in Sarpul is at least a century younger than that of Iddi(n)-Sin in Sarpul, can no longer be regarded as correct. The exact episode that both the Iddi(n)-Sin inscriptions of Sarpul and Haladiny mentioned about Annubanini is not clear. It is regrettable that the Haladiny inscription cannot help to solve the problem, because the following lines on the inscription that must have contained the verb are broken. Nevertheless, the whole inscription is about victories of Simurrum, so we would expect that Iddi(n)-Sin must have claimed a victory over the land, either 
\[\text{uhalilq} (= \text{destroyed}) \text{ or } i\text{sbat} (= \text{took/controlled}).\]
A second option is that the inscription narrates in this passage an older episode, like some hostile act undertaken in the past by Annubanini against Simurrum, and the revenge taken by Iddi(n)-Sin is now being told in this inscription, though that passage is now missing. In this case, Annubanini predates Iddi(n)-Sin.

In any case, this item of information is clear evidence of a struggle between both kingdoms of Simurrum and Lullubum, perhaps to control Ḥalman and the strategic Great Khorasān Road that ended, at least in this phase, in the hands of the former. On the relief of Annubanini in Sarpul a row of prisoners is depicted, led by the goddess Istar to the presence of the triumphant king Annubanini. The prisoners are naked, as in the Old Akkadian victory stelae, but what is noteworthy is that the foremost prisoner in the lower row (which appears to represent the procession of the prisoners before they reach the king) wears a feathered crown (Fig. 10). Such a crown is not so common in the region under study. The only parallels come from clay sealings from Urkeš some 5-6 centuries earlier (Figs. 10, 13 and 18 of Chapter Four), where a seemingly royal figure is depicted with a similar crown. If we assume that such crowns were a characteristic headdress of the Hurrians, as seen in Urkeš, we can say that the defeated enemy of the relief of Annubanini, on which the typical crown is intentionally depicted, was also a Hurrian, very probably from Simurrum.

58) Ti-id-luḫ-ba-am\(\text{ki}\): A GN in the accusative, which means that it was the object of some (military) act. As far as I know, this GN is otherwise unknown. Since the word māt that precedes all the land and country names in this inscription is absent here, Tiḫuḫhūm was probably a city name, as the city of Itu. The location is unknown but its occurrence before Šikšabbum (l. 60) may indicate both places are close to each other. The switch from Ḥalman in the far south to Tiḫuḫhūm and Šikšabbum in the far north is notable. The inscription would narrate the events either in chronological or in geographical order. In the second case there must have been more geographical names listed in the inscription that were located in the region between Ḥalman and Šikšabbum (but see below under ‘The Historical setting’). These can be looked for in the lacuna just before the name Tiḫuḫhūm, which consists of about five lines.

60) ma-at Ši-ik-ša-am-bi\(\text{ki}\): Šikšambi is recorded in the UR III texts in the form Šiš̱abi\(\text{ki}\). The OB sources from Shemshāra render the name in different spellings, such as Ši-ik-ša-ab-bu-um\(\text{ki}\) (sometimes without mimation) as well as Ši-ik-ša-am-bi-im\(\text{ki}\) and Ši-ik-ša-bi-im (without doubled b). In the Shemshāra texts, Šikšabbum is mentioned as the capital of the land of Aḥazum, whereas it is recorded here as a land. It is possible that the land was also

---

229 Walker, The Tigris ..., p. 186 and 189.
230 Walker, ibid.
231 Such a crown became very common under the Achaemenids, and was worn by the noblemen depicted in the reliefs of Persepolis.
233 For these, cf. Groneberg, RGTC 3, p. 221.
234 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 22.
called Šikšabbum because of the fame of its capital city, or that the name of the land of Šikšabbum was changed in a later period to Aḫazum due to ethnic changes in its territories, such as an Amorite infiltration. This suggestion gets support from the name Yašub-Addu, the ruler of Aḫazum, mentioned in the Shemshāra Letters.\textsuperscript{235} It is also possible to identify the otherwise unidentified toponym Agaz, recorded in the Ur III archival texts, with this same Aḫazum of the OB sources. Šikšabbum was, as indicated by the OB sources, an important city that played a prominent role in the power game of that period. From this inscription too it appears that it was a target of the military ambitions of Simurrum, as it was of the Ur III kings.

According to the etymology presented by Astour, the name Šikšabbum is Hurrian, consisting of the two elements S/Šikš-ambi, “pole of ambi-wood.”\textsuperscript{236} What we can add here is that the written form found in this inscription was certainly the correct pronunciation of the name: –am-bi; the form –ab-bi/um with doubled b was the Akkadianized form that assimilated /m/ with /b/.

The location of this GN is not yet firmly established. Some identified it with the Qala Dizeh mound in the plain of Qala Dizeh.\textsuperscript{237} According to Frayne, the name Šikšabbum has something to do with the name of the modern city of Saqlāwa, to the northeast of Erbil. As a result he identifies Šikšabbum with Saqlāwa. His analysis is that the OB Šikšabbum has hypothetically developed to MA *Škilabbum and to modern Śaqlāwā.\textsuperscript{238} However, the data obtained from the Shemshāra archives and the correspondence of Šamši-Adad I and his sons make it almost certain that it was located on the Lower Zāb, downstream from Shemshāra, i.e. to the southwest of Rāniya, near or at Taqtaq.\textsuperscript{239}

It is true that the location of Saqlāwa today, exactly as ancient Šikšabbum, is important, being located on the strategic Hamilton Road and well-defended by steep mountains. But the suggestion of Frayne remains mere conjecture. Furthermore, by the criteria of historical geography it does not seem appropriate to identify Saqlāwa with ancient Šikšabbum for two reasons. First, Šikšabbum was the capital of Aḫazum, and Aḫazum was the name of the country between the Rāniya Plain and Erbil.\textsuperscript{240} Saqlāwa is then too far from the country of Aḫazum. Secondly, the region of operations of Iddi(n)-Šîn, as seen in the Haladiny inscription, was the Rāniya Plain and surroundings, with Bētwate as the northernmost point. Saqlāwa is too far north of this range. It is quite reasonable to think of a location for Šikšabbum on the Lower Zāb region, downstream from the Rāniya Plain, closer to Taqtaq or Pirdē. This location is justified by the activity of Iddi(n)-Šîn in the northern area in this section of the inscription, indicated by his allusion to the land of Utūm below (I. 69), where

\textsuperscript{235} Cf. Letter 1 (SH 809) 4) Ja-šu-ub-šIc 5) LŪ Aḫ-za-a-jišIc, only his name is recorded without reference to his land in 2 (SH 894), 4; 3 (SH 828), 10; 4 (SH 886), 5; 47 (SH 941), 18; cf. Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit. Shaffer and Wasserman think that the omission of Aḫazum in the inscriptions of Iddi(n)-Šîn is because the land was less important during his reign: Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 26. However, in the light of our suggestion, the name Aḫazum was given later than his reign to the land by assumed Amorite newcomers.

\textsuperscript{236} Astour, “Semitic and Hurrians…,” p. 34-35. Astour argues for this etymology with the note that the element ampu, “to judge from its derivations at Nuzi, the Hittite country, and Assyria, had to do with a kind of wood and the tree that produced it.” He cites the derivations that embrace this element like ambašsu, ampanna and ampanānu (referring to CAD A II 44 and 77-78; AHW 42 and 44, to Læssøe (1959), p. 35; NPN, p. 200 and Laroche, GLH, p. 46). The word sš/ziklu denotes, Astour continues, a “lateral pole of the wagon-box,” ibid. However, this remains far from certain.


\textsuperscript{238} Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 180.

\textsuperscript{239} See for details Chapter Six and Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 22-23. With this suggestion, Shaffer and Wasserman agree, p. 18.

\textsuperscript{240} As proposed by Eidem and Læssøe, basing themselves on the data collected from the Shemshāra archives: Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 22.
his march is shown to be from the southeast to the northwest (Ḥalaman → Lullubum), then to the northeast along the Zāb (Šikšabbum → Itu → Utûm). More precisely, Iddi(n)-Sin has marched in this region along the northern bank of the Lower Zāb, from downstream to upstream, as indicated by the mention of Itu (= Satu Qala, see below) → Utuwe. This points to a location of Šikšabbum in or close to Taqtqa. Further, the Amorite influence in Aḥazum pointed out above indicates that Aḥazum = Šikšabbum was not in the heart of the Transtigris, but rather on its periphery, closer to the Plains.

62) ma-at 1-te-ra-āš-we\(^{\text{ki}}\): An otherwise unattested GN that also ends with the Hurrian genitive suffix –we, probably preceded by the plural marker –. It must have been located in the same area, upstream from Šikšabbum and Tidluḫûm. A place name in the Mari archives called Șilluraš\(e\) is said to have been a Turukkean settlement in the Habur Region, a name that echoed a place name in Utûm\(^{242}\) containing the same element –ra+s(<ž)+we that can be seen in Iteraš\(e\).

63) I-tu\(^{\text{ki}}\): Because of the absence of the word mār before this GN, we assume it was a city name. The only GN in this region that could be compared with Itu was a city in the land of Utûm that occurs as U-ta-[im\(^{\text{ki}}\)] (SH 861).\(^{243}\) The letter in which the name occurs concerns troops from this city that deserted and left the city of Šušarrā, where they seem to have been garrisoned as support troops.\(^{244}\) But new light has come from new discoveries that helped in identifying Itu. Since we are now in the region of Šikšabbum and Utum, i.e. between the Rāniya Plain and Pirdē, Itu cannot be anything other than the MA provincial capital Idu, identified most recently at Satu Qala slightly upstream from Taqtqa, where some brick inscriptions are found that bear the name of this city.\(^{245}\)

64-65) Ša-um-mi\(^{\text{ki}}\) ū ‘Hu-it-bũ/n-e-za-gu\(^{\text{ki}}\): Two city names about which we do not know anything except that they might be located in or slightly south of the Rāniya Plain, somewhere between Šikšabbum and Utûm (l. 69). This is derived from the implication in the inscription that the march of Iddi(n)-Sin was from Šikšabbum (= Taqtqa) to Itu (= Satu Qala) to these two GNs, and from there to Utûm. The letter ARM I, 121 from Mari mentions the cities A’innun and Zamiyatum as cities of Qabrā on the Lower Zāb (see Chapter Six). It is tempting to compare Zamiyatum with Šaummi. The name Zami (after removing the Akkadian suffix –ānum) could be another spelling of Šaummi, perhaps from *Zāʾōmi.\(^{246}\) If the reading of the second sign of the second GN is –it- then we may have Ubizagu, the first part of which can tentatively be associated with the first element of the Hurrian PN Hu-š-it-er-we[-we] (HSS XV 128:15) and also the GN URU Hu! (EN)-i-beer-ri-ip-he-na.MEŠ (HSS IX

\(^{241}\) Here one must reconsider the proposed identification of Tikitiḫum with Taqtqa suggested by Frayne. Either Tikitiḫum was not identical with Taqtqa, or the short-lived name Tikitiḫum was changed to Šikšabbum during the Ur III period.


\(^{243}\) The GN Šu-ta in the letter ARM IV 20, which looks like the city name U-ta-[im] of the SH 861, appears to be a misreading; for this cf. Durand, LAPO I, p. 632. I owe this observation to J. Eidem.

\(^{244}\) About the city of U-ta-im\(^{\text{ki}}\), cf. Walker, p. 207-8.

\(^{245}\) Cf. Van Soldt, W. H., “The Location of Idu,” NABU 2008, no. 55, p. 72-74. Although the name Itu seems similar to the Nuzi GN Ittuḫē (written URU Id-du-uh-he’ in EN 9 227: 24 and URU ‘Id-[du]-u-[h]-[h]e in EN 9 220: 3, cf. Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 125), it is unlikely that Itdu and Idduḫē had anything to do with each other, because the Nuzian GN, unlike Itdu, was always written with a reduplicated d (oral communication with J. Fincke), which is analysed as coming from *itt=ri ‘dress,” or “textile” (?) with the Hurrian adj. -ḫē; cf. Fincke, op. cit., 125. Further, Nuzian Ittuḫē was located to the south of Arrapha, in the neighbourhood of Kurrūhān, modern Tell al-Fāhār, as it is associated with the GNs Aršalīpe and Ulūlia; the former was seemingly close to Kurrūhān; cf. Fincke, op. cit., p. 48; 324.

\(^{246}\) J. Eidem wonders whether the form ge-er-ri ša Ku-um-mi\(^{\text{ki}}\) of SH 894, l. 45 and 46 is an error and contains the GN Šaummi (via a personal communication). But this does not seem likely. See about this Chapter Six under ‘Šikšabbum, a Thorn in the Side.’
The land of Kakmu was a very important country in the Transtigris. If the land Itera šwe, including its cities Itu, Šuamm and Ḥuβ/nizagu, were all destroyed. If this is correct, the city of Tidluʾušum as well must have been part of a land of which the name is now broken. The northern bank of the Lower Zāb seems to have consisted of at least three provinces (lands) in this time: X (to which is attached Tidluḫḫum), Šikšabbum and Iterašwe (consisting of Itu, Ḥuβ/nizagu and Šuamm).

The land of Utūm was one of the important lands of the Transtigris. It is attested in the OB sources as Utûm. This land comprised several cities, including Šuṣarrā (For more about this GN see Chapter Six). The form Utûwe in this inscription is obviously the original Hurrian form of the Akkadianized form Utûm. The modern name of Bēṯwatē can very probably be a compound name, consisting of the Semitic (Aramaic) bēṭh, “region / house,” and ‘Wate/a’ which has developed from Utu(we): Utû(m) → Ute → Wute → Wate. Numerous toponyms in the Transtigris begin with the Aramaic element bēṭh in the forms be- and ba-: for example Bitwēn; Bagarmē < Bēṭh Garmai, “The Warm Province,” denoting regions to the south of Kīrkūk; Bazabda; Baʾaḍrē; and Baʾsīqā.

The land of Kakmu was a very important country in the Transtigris. If the Kakmi/e(um) of the Ebla archives is identical with this Kakmu, its oldest attestations go back to the ED period, having trade relations with Ebla (see Chapter Two, under Kakmu). In these texts, there is mention of a king of Kakmu, but without mentioning his name. However, there is mention of a certain Ennaya of the city of Šubugi in the region of Kakmi. This fact shows that Kakmu had satellite cities, indicating its power and position. The same is seen in this later period under present discussion, for both the Haladiny and the Jerusalem inscriptions explicitly mention the hegemony of Kakmu, in the former over the land of Utuwe, and in the latter on Kulunnun (iii 4'-iv 3). Kakmu is reported to have participated also in the Great Revolt against Narām-Sin. Although no campaigns against this land were recorded in the Ur III date-formulae, there is an archival text from Drehem that mentions sheep delivery to four (but Walker says three) Kakmians. According to Walker, the distant

---

249 Cf. Wegner, *Einführung ....*, p. 227 under ḫu(i)-
252 For the meanings of *ina qāṭī ....*, cf. *CAD Q*, p. 192, clause 2‘: a’.
253 The identification of the Kakmu of the Ebla texts with its Transtigridian namesake is still disputed, cf. for instance Bonechi, *RGTC* 12/1, p. 144-5. For occurrences in the Ebla archives, cf. *op. cit.*, 142-44.
255 Grayson and Sollberger, “L’insurrection....,” *RA* 70, p. 115, l. 3’.
256 Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 193, referring to Langdon, *TAD* 67 Obv. 1-7. The text reads as follows: 1) 2 udu Dup-kiš-ne(?i) 2) lū Ḥu-ma-ra-ši 3) 2 udu Ḥi-sa-tal 4) Na-luʾuš 5) Šu-pu-uš-mut 6) 2 udu Duʾ-ug-ra 7) lū Kakmiš-šu-tum, “Two sheep (for) Dupkišen of Gamarasī, two sheep for Ḥiṣatal, Šaluk and Šu-pu-us-mut (and) two sheep for Dugra, men of Kakmu.” The text does not make it clear whether the three preceding men were also from Kakmu, which is perhaps why Röllig pointed only to Dug/kra as the man from that place: Röllig, “Kakmu,” *RIA* 5 (1976-1980), p. 289.
location of Kakmum was the reason why this land escapes mention in the Ur III texts.\textsuperscript{257} However, the mention of far regions like Šašrum, Urbilum, Nineveh, Simanum and even Anšan (Š 34-35) shows that distance is not enough reason for omission. It seems in fact, that Kakmum was so powerful and seemingly in such a well-defendable location that it could resist any campaign or hostile act. The mention of the four persons from this land in the archival text of Drehem does not necessarily mean they were captives in receipt of rations. They could have been messengers or emissaries from that land. The mention of the land Gumaraši in the same archival text, which was also not attacked according to the available data, might support this suggestion. Kakmum was in fact a powerful kingdom, for Sargon of Assyria, some 1400 years later, spoke of “the wicked enemies of the land Kakmi.”\textsuperscript{258} The Jerusalem inscription states that Kakmum, from its earliest days did not carry tribute to anybody (iv 9-16). After the fall of Ur III, or in the few years before its fall, this land apparently appeared as a major power in the Transtigris region, and extended its hegemony over the neighbouring territories. That it confronted Simurrum, which built its own glory at the cost of Kakmum, can be concluded from the inscriptions. Iddi(n)-Sîn took first the land of Utuwe from it, then Kulunnum, and probably other places about which we are still ignorant. Even later Kakmum was effective and remained a prominent figure in the affairs of its own region and those of Babylonia. In the Shemshāra letter SH 809 Kakmum is mentioned among the powers Yašub-Addu of Aḥazum once followed in the course of his constant changing loyalties.\textsuperscript{259} The letter SH 875 mentions looting cattle from the city of Kiğišbi by Muškawê,\textsuperscript{260} governor of Kakmum.\textsuperscript{261} Preparations for an attack on Kakmum itself is recorded in SH 802, 808+815.\textsuperscript{262} There are other events recorded for this land: the 37th year of Hammurabi of Babylonia was named after the victory over “the armies of the Guti, the Turukkians, Kakmum and the land of Šubartum;”\textsuperscript{263} a letter from Mari (ARM 26/2, 489) from the time of Zimri-Lim records that Gurgurrum of Kakmum attacked Qabrā with 500 men and defeated the 2,000 men who were sent against him by Ardigandi of Qabrā;\textsuperscript{264} the capture of two Babylonians to the north of Ekallatum and their detention in the ‘palace of Kakmum’ is reported in an OB letter, in which they ask the GAL.MAR.TU Sîn-Idinnam to buy their release;\textsuperscript{265} a letter from Mari (ARM 6, 79, 17) also refers to a messenger from Kakmum; and texts from Tell al-Rimāh (OBTR 255, 7; 261, 5) mention wine delivered to Kakmians.\textsuperscript{266}

\textsuperscript{257} Walker, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{258} KUR n.AK-mi-\textsuperscript{i} KUR n.EM-ni, Mayer, W., “Sargons Feldzug gegen Urartu- 714 v. Chr., Text und Übersetzung” \textit{MDQG} 115 (1983), p. 72, l. 56.

\textsuperscript{259} Eidem and Læssøe, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 70 (no. 1).

\textsuperscript{260} This is a clear Hurrian name, cf. Eidem and Læssøe, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 24, note 33. In addition, the name of the Kakmian Ḫiš-atal in the above-mentioned Ur III text from Drehem is clearly Hurrian.

\textsuperscript{261} Eidem and Læssøe, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 114-5 (no. 44).

\textsuperscript{262} \textit{Op. cit.}, p 142-3 (no. 69).


\textsuperscript{266} Röllig, “Kakmum,” \textit{ibid.} No. 255, l. 7: 6) 1 DUG GESTIN 7) a-na LÚ Ka-ak-mi-i\textsuperscript{i}; 261, l. 5: 1 ‘DUG GESTIN a’-na LÚ Ka-ak-mi-i\textsuperscript{i}, cf. Dalley et al., \textit{OBTR}, pp. 185 and 188.
The allusion to the capture of the two individuals to the north of Ekalātum and their detention in Kakmum was considered significant for the location of Kakmum by Walker.267 Since it is generally accepted that Ekalātum was located somewhere on the Tigris, south or north of Assur or Nineveh, 268 it means that Kakmum too, according to this detail, was located somewhere on or close to the Tigris. Frayne, on the other hand, proposed modern Koy Sanjaq for its location, basing himself on the morphological similarity of the two names.269 Others put Kakmum between Ekalātum and Erbil, 270 or in the valleys between Sulaimaniya and Chamchamāl.271 All these identifications do not take into consideration two further questions. First, if Kakmum was on or close to the Tigris, how can we explain the involvement of Kakmum in the invasion of the Mannean territories in the days of Sargon II? 272 A kingdom that can seize territories of Manna must have been its neighbour. Furthermore, it would have been impossible for such a powerful enemy of Assyria to exist in its heartland, south or north of Assur, under Sargon. Second, how could Kakmum have escaped the Ur III warfare if it was located in the valleys between Sulaimaniya and Chamchamāl or in Koy Sanjaq, on the way to Urbilum, Šašrum and Šurūthum? Moreover, why was it never mentioned if it was located on the Tigris, on the way that leads to Nineveh and thence to Simanum? The information of the Urartian campaign of Sargon clearly points to a location of Kakmum further north-east. It must have been located in a territory that possessed enough plain terrain to allow the growth of a powerful city and state, away from the main routes and out of reach of military campaigns, but at the same time well-defended by high mountains and narrow passes. The first candidate for this that comes into mind could be the Pishder Plain (= Qala-Dizeh), that is separated from the Rāniya Plain by the pass of Darband-i-Ramkān,

267 Walker, op. cit., p. 194.
269 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 171.
270 Astour, “Semites and Hurrians ....”, p. 8-11. Eidem and Læsøe showed that this location does not fit the information provided by the Shemshārūr tablets, since Kakmum appeared as an enemy of Šamši-Adad after the capture of Erbil and its incorporation in the Assyrian Empire: Eidem and Læsøe, op. cit., p. 23.
272 This is mentioned in the text of the eighth campaign of Sargon II: 51) TA kina Par-su-áš at-tu-maš a-na mi-ši-ia na-gi-ša KUR Ma-an-na-aše aq-te-reb 52) Ul-lu-su-nu a-di UN.MEŠ KUR-si i-na tag-mer-i li-bi ša e-ši-a ar-a-li ša 68) LÚKÚR ši-ir-da-ak-ka bi-r-ti-šu u-aq-ı ger-ri ...55) ... aš-su ur-re gi-mil-li ša il-bi-na ap-pu 56) GIR kina Ka-ak-mi-i 1KUR lem-ni TA qe-reb KUR-su pa-ra-si-im-ma, “From Parsuaş I departed, to Missi, a district of the Mannean country, I drew near. Ullusunu, together with the people of his land, their hearts bent on rendering service, awaited my expedition in Sirdakku, his fortress;” after the passage of presenting gifts and tokens of submission, it goes on: “That I might avenge him (on his foes) he prostrated himself before me, to bar the feet of the people of the land of Kakmi, wicked enemies, from his land,” Mayer, op cit., p. 72/73; Luckenbill, ARAB II, p. 76-7. Another text of Sargon mentions a governor of this land: “Aš-pa-an-ra ša KUR Ka-ak-KAM(sic?)” Röllig, “Kakmum,” p. 289.
defended by the Kāwe Rash Range from the southwest and the huge Ḍandil Range from the north and northeast, but at the same time close to Bētwatē (Kulunnum) and Utuwe (Rāniya). The large tell of Qala Dizeh might hide the ruins of Kakmum. The weak point in this identification is the proximity of Qala Dizeh to Shemshāra as J. Eidem argues (personal communication), although separated by a mountain range. A more possible candidate is Rawandiz, which is a very well defended city, built on the flat top of a mountain and was the capital of the powerful principedom of Sūrān almost one and a half centuries ago. This location also fits the data we possess regarding its closeness to the Rāniya Plain, Bētwate, Qala Dizeh and the Mannean country (accessible via the Keleshūn and Topzāwa passes). The only point that is not in favour of this suggestion is the lack of a plain territory suitable for abundant agricultural production, which was the basic economic activity together with animal husbandry of these old kingdoms. However, one may think of trade and military conquests as economic alternatives (see Chapter Eight). In the Shemshāra letter SH 868 (No. 69) the great Turrikean king Pīndēn asks a certain T[u...] to persuade the kings of Namar, Niqqum and Elam to attack Kakmum. This is taken as evidence that Kakmum must have bordered the lands named. However, undertaking such an attack does not necessarily require shared borders in our view, but it would involve passing through the Lullubian country, which is mentioned a few lines later in a broken context of the same letter. In the Jerusalem and the Bētwate inscriptions, the overtaking of Kulunnum is celebrated. Because Kulunnum is identified in Bētwate or close to it (see below), its removal from the hands of Kakmum must have been very easy for Siddi(Sin), because the way from Qala Dizeh to Bētwate passes through the Rāniya Plain (Utuwe) that he has already captured. The steep and difficult mountain paths that avoid Rāniya seem to have been useless for sending defence troops to Kulunnum. 273

275-81) 1Ma-di/ki-a-[x] 1Ša-wa/wi/pi-a-[x] 1Ma-gi-ba-ḫi(?)/1A-ha-tum/1A-wi-la-nūm-ra-bi-a-nu A-mu-ri-im: Although the second column of the inscription is better preserved than the first, the reading of some of these names remains problematic, especially the final parts of the first two names. As to the first name, there are attestations of the PNs Ma-di-ia, Ma-di-ia-ma and Ma-di-ia-tum that are good parallels. 276 Ma-ki-ia, Ma-ki-ia-tum and Ma-ki-a-nu-um are also recorded as Amorite names, in case we read the name in our inscription as Ma-ki-ia. Amorite names like Ša-wi-lum and Ša-wu-ú-um attested in Mari can also be parallel with the second name, or even the names Ša-bi-DINGIR and Ša-a-bi-è. 277 It is tempting to read the second name as the typical Semitic name Ša Pi-yā, “That of the mouth.” However, this reading is not quite safe since such a name is characteristic of the South Mesopotamian area. 278 The reading of the last sign of the name Ma-giba-ṭi(?)) which was first seen as the beginning of the signs BI, AM or TA, has been now confirmed by the re-examination of the

273 The report from the time of Zimri-Lim that some men were attacked between Arrapha and Kakmum (ARM 26/2, 512) can be a global identification, because the direct neighbours of Arrapha on the north, northeast and east were Qabrā, It/du, Aḥzām and the land of the Lullubum.

274 26) it (ṭ-ru-um šu-[i]-um ma 27 1. e.) i-na-an-na a-na a-bi-im UGULA ra-bi-i-im 28) it Na-ma-ri-im šu Da-as 29) LU.GAL Ni-ki-im šu-pu-ur-ša 30 r.) KU.BABBAR KU.GI ši-aš-la-em 31) da-am qa-am qa bi-ma 32) a-na ma-at Ka-ak-mi-im šu-la-ša-ṭi, “And the plan was as follows: now send words to the "father," the grand-regent, and to Namarum, and to Dāsi, the king of Niqqum, and promise silver, gold and costly things if they will make attacks on the land of Kakmum,” Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 143-44 (no. 69).


276 This applies, of course, if Qala Dizeh is the correct location.


279 For the occurrence of these names, cf. Gelb, Computer-aided ..., p. 193.

inscription in 2006. A parallel Amorite name is not found; Ma-tu-ba-ni,281 does not match this name. The last two names are good Semitic names, derived from the words ašum and awīlum. These persons are labeled “Amorite sheikhs/chieftains”282 in the inscription. For the first time we hear of clashes between the Amorites and the Simurrians who cooperated for a long time against Ur. It is obvious that the Amorites certainly tried to penetrate the territories of Simurrum after the fall of the Ur III Empire, as they did in many other regions of Mesopotamia that were under the authority of Ur. They succeeded in many regions in the south and the north, even in the Transtigris; they seem to have penetrated the land of Šikšabbum, whose ruler in the time of the Shemshāra archives bore the Semitic—most probably Amorite—name Yašub-šAddu (Ia-šu-ub-šISKUR). Nevertheless, their attempt in Simurrum was not successful. Iddi(n)-Sîn triumphantly boasts in this inscription the defeat he accomplished on these five Amorite sheikhs and pushed them back out of his territory. However, the clause i-na kūl-le-ʾe(?)-šu ʾit-ru-<<UD>>-us-sū, “he turned back (the Amorites) from his province” (see below) may indicate that the Amorites actually penetrated Simurrum for a certain time until they were driven back by Iddi(n)-Sîn. What made it more difficult for Simurrum was the joint attack. The Amorites were not alone but rather they collaborated with the Simaškians from the east. In doing this the Amorites seem to have repeated the same scenario they played out against Ur when they joined the Simurrians in that attack.283 In the days of the supremacy of Ur both parties had one enemy and one joint objective. The prospect of the downfall of Ur unified them in one coalition. However, the fall of Ur changed the political interests and the balance of power. Consequently the Amorites became enemies of their former ally and tried to invade its land, leading to the war mentioned here.

83-85) ʾA-mu-ra-am i-na kūl-le-ʾe(?)-šu ʾit-ru-<<UD>>-us-sū: The problem in this sentence is the sign UD in what appears to be a form of the verb ṭarādu. Reading –ut– gives problems with us-sū (from *ud/t-šu), and reading u₄ gives other problems, because a long vowel does not fit this verb. We may think of a scribal error, which was not uncommon in ancient inscriptions. Perhaps the scribe first wrote itrud, a preterite form without a suffix, and–us-sū as an afterthought.

The word kullēšu is likely to be the same as kuliši in lines 2 and 105, but two problems appear. The expected form with genitive stem is kulēši, and the l is inexplicably geminated. Whatever the explanation the sentence clearly means that Iddi(n)-Sîn turned the Amorites out of his territory.

92-94) ʾA-mu-ra-am ʾu’ Si-maš-kā-amki i-ne-er: This is the first time the GN Simaški is mentioned in the inscriptions of this king. The structure of the inscription as a whole gives here emphasis to the two most important and prominent achievements of the king that were crucial to his career, at least up to the time of the writing of the inscription. They were achieved thanks to the god Nišba, who heard his words. One was the defeat of the Simaškians and the other the neutralization of the Amorite danger to his country. Possibly the Simaškians had tried to invade his land earlier and an inscription commemorating the Simurrian victory is waiting to be found. Thanks to this important victory over Simaški Iddi(n)-Sîn received the full blessing of the god of his land, which is stressed here. Another possibility is that the victory over Simaški was mentioned in this inscription, perhaps at the beginning of the second column, in a passage now broken.

282 Different meanings for the word rabiānum are proposed. The most appropriate is sheikh (of a tribe). For more details, cf.: Stol, M., Studies in Old Babylonian History, Leiden, 1976, p. 73-89.
283 For the details of this Simurrian-Amorite coalition against Ur, cf. Chapter Four and this chapter under ‘The Ur III Period.’
As for the location of Simaški, it is thought it was a very large territory in western Iran that comprised several lands including Zabšali. Hinz located it to the north of Susiana, and around Khurramābād in modern Luristan. Stolper shares Hinz’s view, putting it in the north of Khuzistan and/or in the province of Fars. Vallat located it further to the southeast, to the north of Kerman Province. The information in the Haladiny inscription however, is compatible with the suggestion of Zadok for a widespread territory in Western Iran, extending from Fars Province to the Caspian Sea.

95-101) ʾI-dī-EN.ZU qar-dum i-lu-šu-nu-ti a-na še-ep ʾl-lu-iš-šu u-kā-ni-is-sū-nu-t[i]: Iddi(n)-Sin entitles himself here “the hero,” but later, in the Jerusalem inscription, he becomes “the hero among the king(s), the mighty king” (see below, col. i 10’-12’). As for the word i-lu-šu-nu-ti, we have two possibilities. The first is to understand it as “he overpowered them,” from the verb leʾum, as J. G. Dercksen suggests. Then the sentence becomes “Iddi(n)-Sin, the hero, overpowered them (and) subdued them at the feet of Nišba, his lord.” A less probable option is to understand the word as a grammatically mistaken writing of ʾilīšūmu “their gods,” giving “Iddi(n)-Sin, the hero, subdue their gods to the feet of Nišba, his lord.” Theoretically this reading is not impossible. A military victory cannot be accomplished without an ideological one, and the gods of defeated peoples must submit to the god of the victors. Grammatical mistakes of this kind were not infrequent in the Hurrian-speaking sphere, for the scribes were influenced by their mother language, and similar cases in the Akkadian texts from Nuzi were noticed by Speiser. If the second option is correct, we assume that the scribe has written i-lu- for i-li-, and added –ti which is appropriate for a verb but not a noun. One case quoted by Speiser, ipallah-šunuti, is strikingly similar to this case.

102) ma-tá-tum ša i-te-bu-šu-na-ti ʾĒʾ ʾl-lu-iš-ša [LUGAL] ʾ9ʾ ʾku-[il-ši]: What has been done to the temple of the god Nišba by the lands (the word ma-tá-tum is nominative) is unknown because the verb is broken away. It could be something like ba₄ni “to build,” edēšu “to renovate,” šuklulu “to complete/perfect,” madādu “to pay (tribute),” or even ḥalāgu “to destroy.”

3. The Jerusalem Inscription

This inscription, on a stele with reliefs (Fig. 11a-b), was reportedly found together with the three Bētwate inscriptions in the same spot in Bard-i-Sanjān in Bētwate. This town is situated slightly to the northwest of the Rāniya Plain, in a narrow valley but with easy access to the Rāniya Plain. This inscription mysteriously reached the black market in Geneva, where it was sold to a private European collector, and finally arrived in the Israel Museum in Jerusalem in 1971. There it is on display, with the accession number 71.73.248.

The relief (Fig. 12) shows the king standing on the left with a sword in his right hand and a bow in his left. He tramples on a defeated enemy, who appears to be Aurnaḥuš the ruler of Kulunnum, depicted only half as big as the king. On the right the goddess Ištar stands facing the king. It is assumed that a star was originally depicted in the space between the heads of

---
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284 For the names of the lands within Simaški, cf. Chapter Four, under “Šū-Sin;” for the inscription that cites their names and states that “Simaški (which comprises) the lands of Zabšali, whose surge is like (a swarm) of locusts, from the border of Anšan to the Upper Sea” see Frayne, RIME 3/2, p. 303 (text E3/2.1.4.3, vol. ii, l. 14-33).
289 Here I would like to thank J. G. Dercksen for reading the draft of this chapter and offering valuable suggestions.
291 Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 1.
both standing figures.292 The headdress of the king is ornamented with a row of five crescent moons, possibly connected to his name composed with the theophoric element Sin.293 The sword the king holds is similar to the swords depicted on both reliefs of Sarpul discussed above. The king is beardless and without a moustache. The upper part of his body is naked and the muscles on his breast and his arm are shown. He wears a relatively heavy necklace, with a large bean-form pearl in the centre and smaller ones on both sides. He has ring bands round his wrists.294 The dress is generally similar to that of the relief of Sarpul, but it is here clearer and preserves more detail. It is fastened with a wide belt, having two edges, and the space between the two edges is decorated with a grid. The decorated hem marks the high quality material the dress is made of, in a style found in art since the Akkadian Period.295 In contrast to the Sarpul relief the king is here barefoot. The defeated enemy has a moustache and a short beard. His hair is combed and a braid on his neck is clearly shown.296 The hair and short beard of this figure is compared by Seidl to the beard of the captives depicted on the relief of Annubanini in Sarpul.297

The goddess wears the crown with four pairs of horns. Her hair is bound in a large knot that rests on her shoulders, while a long wisp is left loose hanging down to her chest. Her neck is covered with an ornament of five rings. The dress is long and reaches her bare feet. Her right arm is not covered by the long dress but it is not bare, for she also wears a short-sleeved dress shown as round dots. With her right hand she holds what appears to be a sceptre,298 but only the lower part is still preserved. In her left hand she holds a small object which has a double coiled shape at the end.299 Seidl accepts the opinion of Frankfort that it is the uterus of a cow, a symbol used together with mother goddesses. This goddess could similarly be a mother goddess. There is no mention of her name, in contrast to the Annubanini relief in Sarpul. The three female goddesses mentioned in the curse formula are Ningursag, Ištar and Nin-AN-Sianna. Seidl rules out identifying her with Ištar because her iconographic characteristics are not applicable. Nin-AN-Sianna, the personal goddess of this king that would have protected him and stood beside him in battles, is possible. But, as Seidl further states, we do not have any other image of this deity and the texts are not significantly different from those for Ištar.300 This leaves Ningursag, one of the great mother-goddesses.301

Transliteration

\[\begin{align*}
a' & \text{ [AN]} \\
b' & \text{ [\text{EN.LIL}]} \\
c' & \text{ [\text{NIN.HUR.SAG}]} \\
d' & \text{ [\text{EN.KI}]} \\
e' & \text{ [\text{EN.ZU}]} \\
f' & \text{ [\text{ISKUR}]} \\
g' & \text{ [\text{UTU}]} \\
\end{align*}\]

292 Seidl, U., Das Relief, in Shaffer and Wasserman, ZA 93, p. 40.
293 Seidl, p. 42.
294 Seidl, ibid.
295 Seidl, ibid.
296 Seidl, op. cit., p. 43.
297 Seidl, op. cit., p. 45-6.
298 According to Seidl, she might have held the ring and staff or the divine weapon of Ištar, the double-lion club, Seidl, p. 48.
300 Seidl, p. 49.
301 Seidl, ibid.
Col. i

1') [ù ^INANNA?]
2') r^Nin-AN-si-an-na
3') [išu]
4') ù ñiš102
5') 'bešelšu]
6') BALA 'kišnam'
7') lu-bu'iš-[ám]
8') ù nam-ri-ra'am
9') 'a-na
10') 4i-di^EN.ZU
11') [q]ar-dim i-na LUGAL
12') LUGAL da-núm
13') LUGAL Si-mu-ur-ri-im
14') ù LUGAL 9 ku-li-ši

Col. ii

1) i-dišu-šum-m[a]
2) [x] te-ene-ek
3) [x] na-ak-ri-šu
4) [?a? ma]-at Kak-mi-im

Lacuna of about 10 lines

1'-5') (Effaced)
6') x[ub]i-n[en]a-x[x] ich303
7') riši-xi[EN.ZU] ich304
8') [...]
9') 1 Ha-[p/b]-rišu-za/a?ni ki305
10') 1 Šu-šu-teki
11') 1 A/Za-la-ki/gt
12') 1 Ku-ba-an-ni-weki
13') 1 Ti-ri-uk-ki-na-šu-weki
14') i-na mu-ši-im

Col. iii

1) iš-ti-in
2) ú-ša-li-'iŋ3-šu-nu-ti
3) 1Ni/Kak-li-ip

---

302 Shaffer and Wasserman: pú.
303 Shaffer and Wasserman propose two broken signs in the beginning of the sentence (before the assumed UB sign). However, judging by the photos and the transcription, there is room for only one small sign (such as A).
304 Except for DINGIR, nothing legible is shown on the transcription made by Shaffer and Wasserman. This reconstruction seems to have been made based on faint traces that are not shown on the transcription, or are based on older photos of the inscription.
305 The sign ZA, in the reconstructed form of the name given by Shaffer and Wasserman, who suggest the name Ha-[p]-rišu-za-i-ni, is not clear on the transcription. It can also be A.
4) [...]-tim?  
5) [...]-ha?-li?-iq?^{307}  
   (Lacuna of about 20 lines)

a') [sū-üh-ra-am]^{308}  
1') ū ra-bi-a-am  
2') kà-ma-ri-šu  
3') išt-ku-un  
4') 1 Ku-lu-na-am^{ki}

Col. iv

1) Kak-mu-um^{ki}  
2) i-na qá-ti 'Sí?-mu-ur-<ri>-im^{ki}  
3) i-di-šu[m]-ma'  
4) [...]  
5) ìL-di-EN.ZU  
6) da-núm  
7) a-na LÚ ma-ki-im  
8) ū'-ti-ir-šu  
9) ma-at Kak-mi-i[m^{ki}]  
10) ša iš-tu 'UD' pání-šu'?  
11) bi-il-tám  
12) [a?-na?] ma-am-ma-na  
13) [la] ub-lu-ú-na  
14) [x x x AN?-SI?/KU?-BE?  
15) [...]  
16) [...]-ri  
17) [KU?].GI-am  
18) [UDU?] MÁŠ.GAL  
19) [bi-i]-l-tám  
20) [ša? Sí]-mu-ur-ri-im^{ki}  
21) ìL-di.-EN'.ZU  
22) LU[GAL]?  
23) 'da?-núm?] a-[na] še-ep  
24) ìNi-iš-ba  
25) be-li-šu  
26) ū-ká-ni-îs-sú-nu-ti  
27) Ší-ik-ša-am-bu-um^{ki}

Col. v

(Lacuna of about 5 lines)

^{306} Shaffer and Wasserman leave the reading open as NI.
^{307} These two lines (4 and 5) are not shown in the transcription of Shaffer and Wasserman. They have reconstructed them from older photos and the reproduction by al-Fouadi: Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 15.
^{308} Restoration based on its occurrence in col. vii, l. 8.
1') ku-li-šu-um
2') ik-ki-ir-ma
3') 1'a-úr-na-ḫu-uš
4') a-na be-lu-ti-šu
5') il-gé-ma
6') a-la-am ú-ḫa-[i-iq]
7') kà-ma-ar-šu-n[u]
8') iš-ku-šun
9') ʿu a-ʿúr-na-ḫu-uš'

Lacuna of about 2-3 lines

1'') ʿx
2'') x x x [...]
3'') e-ne-er
4'') ALAM-i
5'') i-na Ku-lu-ni-im
6'') uš-zi-iz
7'') ša ALAM-mi
8'') ʿš?[ti-ir-ti
9'') ʿuš[a-s]a-ku-na

Col. vi

1) [ū]
2) a-na šu-mi
3) [x ? x ?] er-re-ti-šu
4) [x ? x ?] ša-ni-a-am
5) [x x] uš-ša-ha-z[u]
6) a-wi-lam šu-a-ti'
7) ʿAN
8) [ʔ]EN.LÍL
9) [ʔ] NIN.ḪUR.SAG
10) ʾEN.KI
11) ʾEN.ZU
12) ʾİŞKUR
13) ʿu ʾINANNA
14) ṙbNin-AN-si4-an-na
15) i-li
16) ʿū ṘNi-iš-ba
17) be-li
18) ʾUTU be-él DI.KU₅
19) ʿu DU Ü
20) DINGIR ra-bí-ū-tum
21) er-re-tám
22) le-mu-tám
23) li-ru-ru-uš
24) NUMUN-šu
25) li-il-qû-tû
26) DU-sú
Col. vii

1) DUMU.NITA
2) ù MU
3) a i-di-nu-šum
4) ba-la-tum
5) lu ik'-kī-ib-šu
6) ki-ma ša-ma?!
7) e-bu-ri-im
8) i-na se-er šu-úḫ-ri-im
9) ù ra-bi-i-im
10) lu ma-ru-uš

Col. viii

1) [x x] 'a-na' DU
2) [x] li GA mi GÜ.UN
3) 1 me-at ŠEŠ še-er-ku₈ 6 KÜŠ
4) MĀŠ.DA.RÌ
5) 1 ŠEŠ U₈ GIŠ.DÛ.A
6) 1 ŠEŠ MĀŠ GIŠ.DÛ.A
7) a-na bi-la-at
8) Ku-lu-nu-um
9) iš-ku-un

Translation

(Lacuna of about 20 lines. Lines a'-f' restored after vi 7-13).

i a'-g') […]An (?), Enlil (?), Niṅhursag (?), Enki (?), Sîn (?), Adad (?), Šamaš
(?)
1'-5') [and Ištar (?)], [Nin-AN-Sianna his god] and Nišba his lord,
6'-8') a firm sceptre, a robe and splendor,
9'-14') to Iddi(n)-Sîn, the heroic among the king(s), mighty king, king of Simurrum
and king of the nine kulišum,

ii 1-4) they gave him so that he may subdue (?)… the population of his enemies [in
the]nd of Kakmum…
1'-5') (effaced)
6') 'x'-x'-ub?₉-na'-x' [x] 'x'
7'-8') Id[di(n)-Sîn], [the mighty],
9'-13') …(the cities of) Ḥapri(z?)ani, Šulute, A/Zailak/gi, Kubanniwe, Tiriukkinašwe,
14') in a single night

iii 1-2) he destroyed them.
3-5) He has destroyed Kak/Ni-lip…
(lacuna of about 20 lines.)
a'-3') [Young] and old, he brought its (i.e. the land’s, or the city’s) defeat.
4') As for Kulunnun,

iv 1-8) Kakmum delivered (it) to the hand of [Sim]urrum, and … Iddi(n)-Sîn, turned
him to a destitute man.

9-16) The land of Kakmum, which from its earliest day(s) did [not] carry tribute [to]
anybody, …

17-26) Iddi(n)-Sin, the mighty king, forced them to prostrate at the feet of Nišba his

27) Šikšamb[um†] (…)
(lacuna of about 5 lines ?)

v 1'-5') The kulišum (i.e. the district ?) rebelled and took Aurnaḫuš for its ruler.

6'-8') Hence, he destroyed the city, brought their defeat.

9'-3'') And as for Aurnaḫuš, [the] en[emy ?] …
(lacuna of about 2-3 lines)
… I/(He?) slew (him).

4''-6'') (On account of all this), I caused to set up my image in Kulun(n)um.

7''-9'') Whoever erases my image [and] my [in]scription,

vi 1-5) [or, because of its […] curse, incites another […] (to do so),

6-23) as for this man, may An, Enlil, Ninḫursag, Enki, Šin, Adad, Ištar, Nin-AN-
Sianna my god, Nišba my lord, Šamaš, the lord of judgement and permanence(?)/ stability(?)/ order(?) (all) the great gods, curse with an evil curse.

24-25) May they not give him an heir and an offspring;

26-27) May they tear out his root;

vii 1-3) May they not give him an heir and an offspring;

4-5) May life be abominable for him;

6-10) Like rain (in the time) of harvest may it be harsh for (his) young and old.

viii 1-2) …. Tribute (?)

3-9) 100 strings of figs, (each) 6 cubits long, offerings- 1 fig (represents? 1)
breeding ewe; 1 fig (represents? 1) breeding he-goat- he established as the
tribute of Kulun(n)um.

Commentary310

a’-f’) These lines are restored by Shaffer and Wasserman after col. vi, l. 7-13.311
i 2’) ṣ[Nin-AN-st-an-na]: The deity ṣ[Nin-AN-st-an-na is attested also in the inscriptions of
Sarpul and Bēwate.

ii 9’) Ha-al[p]-ri‘-za(?)-ni†: As the publishers of the inscription noted, the identification of
the new GNs attested in this inscription would be premature, but that they were close to each
other is deduced from their being destroyed in a single night (ii 14’-iii 2).312 The first element
of this GN could be identical with the first element of the PN Ḥaip-šarr (ha-ip-LUGAL)

309 To Shaffer and Wasserman who translate it as “great goat,” it is not quite clear whether it should be taken
literally. A text of Šu-Sin mentions fashioning a statue of a great goat as a symbol of the tribute of Anšan, cf.
Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 17. It is also interesting that Erridu-Pizir referred to great goat offerings in his
inscription (v 15-18), Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 18. T.J.H. Krispijn prefers to translate UDU as “grass-fed
sheep” and MĂŠ-GAL as “grass-fed full grown he-goat.”

310 Comments will be made only at points that add to or differ from the viewpoint of the editors of the
inscription. Their own valuable comments will not be repeated here.

311 Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 7.

312 Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 26, propose “probably in the district of Bēwate”.279
Support for this comes from the occurrence of Ḫap-zilakku beside Ḥaip-zilakku in WZKM XLIV 183. The element Ḫap- is found also in the GN Ḫapate315 and probably Ḫap/bap/ba316 in the Nuzi texts. The vertical wedges put before the GNs of lines 9'-13', in addition to the KI behind them, probably denote tribal names, names marked both as ethnonyms and toponyms. Writing the name of the Turukkian tribe preceded by LÚ(.MEŠ) and followed by KI in some texts is a good parallel.317

ii 13') 1 Ti-ri-uk-ki-na-dāš-wē³⁴: This GN is attested for the first time in this inscription. It bears clear Hurrian characteristics, seen in the na=až=we suffixes for the pl. marker + gen. suffix. The name that remains is Tiriukki, the name of the famous Tu/irukkû tribe of the Shemshâra letters.318 It is noteworthy that the form Ti... occurs one other time in the Shemsâra letter 1 = SH 809, l. 8 and 9. It could perhaps be possible that the first vowel was u umlaut, Tûrukô.

iii 3) Ni/Kak-li-ip³⁵: It is also possible to read this GN as Kaklip, possibly a variant of Hurrian Kiklip.

vi 18-19) ³⁴UTU be-ēl DI.KU₅ ū DU Ú: The DU Ú is left without any translation by Shaffer and Wasserman. They considered it a divine name, which perhaps formed a divine counterpart to the god Šamas.319 However, the absence of the divine determinative before the DU favours considering it as another word that is coupled with DI.KU₅. The sign DU can be understood thus as a Sumerian logogram, which is followed by the phonetic complement –ū. Then a problem appears about the case of this noun, which should be marked as genitive (with -i), not as nominative (with -u). One may conjecture that the scribe, having written out a series of gods who are all subjects of the sentence and thus in the nominative, has mistakenly written this word too in the nominative. The Akkadian equivalent of the DU can be kūnu < kânu to mean “stability,” “firmness,” or another meaning derived from the verb that fits the context of our text like “[law] establishment,” “putting in order,” “assigning persons to positions/offices,” or “maintaining and preserving the rule, the life of a person or the permanence of a city.”321

Shaffer and Wasserman consider the regions mentioned in the inscription, namely Ḫaprizani, Šulute, Z/Ailaki, Kubanniwe, Tiriukkinašwe and Kulunnum, original parts of the land of Kakmum, not lands conquered and annexed to it.322 This inscription, as the authors noticed, celebrates two main achievements: the defeat of Kakmum (ii 1-iv 27) and the conquest of Kulunnum after it rebelled (v 1′-v 6′′).323 The text shows that the defeat of Kakmum was a great achievement when it stresses that the land “from its earliest day(s) did [not] carry tribute [to] anybody” (iv 10-13). Kulunnum rebelled after its annexation to Simurrum, the fact that necessitated a campaign that resulted in the crushing of the rebellion and destruction of the city. An important piece of information is the name of the ruler that the

---

313 Cf. Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 81. Note that the geographical nomenclature could be based on ethnonyms, for instance the GN 1 Ti-ri-uk-ki-na-dāš-wē³⁴ (ii 13') discussed below. This phenomenon was not uncommon in the ancient Near East. Even today many GNs are deduced from PNs or ethnonyms.

314 Gelb et. al., NPN, p. 213. NPN cites also the Hurrian PN Ḫa-ap-šē-en as an example of the use of this element. According to NPN, the element is formed from the verbal root Ḫai- or Ḫa- that was tentatively translated by Bork as “to mention/ to nominate” or “to give,” cf. NPN, p. 212. But for Wegner the root Ḫa- means “to take,” Wegner, Einführung..., p. 224.

315 Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 92

316 Cf. Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 93.

317 For such occurrences, cf. Groneberg, RGTC 3, p. 240.

318 Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 26, referring to a communication with G. Wilhelm.


320 For the meanings of kūnu cf. CAD K, p. 543.

321 For the different meanings of the verb kânu in this regard, cf. CAD K, p. 166-167.


people of Kulunnum chose for lordship, a certain Aurnašu. He was surely put to death, although the inscription is damaged at this point.

Shaffer and Wasserman think that all the inscriptions of Bētwate (1, 2, 3 and the Jerusalem inscription also found in Bētwate) refer to the same event, the rebellion of Kulunnum. According to them, Zabazuna, son of the king was ruler of the city on behalf of his father Iddi(n)-Sîn and it was he who actually crushed the rebellion, destroyed the city and celebrated the victory in the inscriptions Bētwate 1, 2 and 3. Yet he ordered the making of the Jerusalem inscription and the relief on which only the name of his father as the actual king of the kingdom is mentioned, without any reference to his own name. The available data in the inscriptions allow a further explanation. It is true that Iddi(n)-Sîn was the king of the kingdom and any achievement should be attributed to him. But, on the other hand, there is no reason to totally neglect the mention of his son, the man in the field who accomplished the victory. Furthermore, the style of the inscriptions (the three of Bētwate as one group compared to the Jerusalem inscription), the layout and the orthography are different, and they can hardly have been written by the same scribe or in the same short span of time.

I think the inscriptions refer to two different episodes, two rebellions in Kulunnum, most probably incited by Kakmum. Which one is older is difficult to establish, but I tend to date the Jerusalem inscription before the Bētwate. The former can belong to the first phase of the conquests in the Rāniya Plain and its surroundings, when Iddi(n)-Sîn claimed that he subdued Kakmum to his authority and, after a short time, Kulunnum rebelled. We may imagine that after the crushing of the rebellion and the celebration of his victory by this inscription, he appointed his son to rule the northern districts of his kingdom. A second rebellion in Kulunnum must have broken out. This time it was handled by Zabazuna himself and its success was commemorated by the inscriptions of Bētwate 1, 2 and 3. That Zabazuna was the ruler of Kulunnum, or at least the military commander responsible for the affairs of these regions, is evidenced by the Bētwate inscription, when it states: “Kulunnum rebelled and waged war against Zabazuna” (Bētwate, 4-11), not Iddi(n)-Sîn.

A second option, though less probable, is that the Jerusalem inscription postdates the others, commemorating the victory the king won after he came to aid his son. Nevertheless, in this case, one expects that there would be at least one mention of Zabazuna, for instance stating that the province rebelled against the governor Zabazuna. Hence, it is more probable that the Jerusalem inscription was inscribed in a time when Zabazuna had not yet any official post, at least in relation to the affairs of Kulunnum and Kakmum. Shaffer and Wasserman are correct when they attribute the writing of the Bētwate inscriptions to the son Zabazuna, a fact which reinforces our suggestion that these inscriptions belong to a later phase than his father’s personal involvement in the north. The authors noticed too that the mention of the son of the king in these inscriptions is unique, never having occurred in the inscriptions of lowland Mesopotamia. This phenomenon appears to have been a characteristic of the

324 The first part of the name could be from the Hurrian ewri “lord.”
325 The allusion of Shaffer and Wasserman to the verb e-ne-er in v 3” as reference to putting Aurnašu to death is difficult to accept, because there are 4 lines missing between the name and the verb. The verb inèr can refer to the annihilation or killing any other individual or people or even destruction of any land as in the Haladiny inscription.
326 Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 29-30.
327 Ibid.
328 For a detailed list of differences cf. Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 30, note 103. Sallaberger has pointed out that the Bētwate inscriptions exhibit later scribal features compared with the older scribal habits found in the Jerusalem inscription.
329 Gelb and Kienast believe in a second rebellion in Kulunnum, but without any more precise chronology: Gelb and Kienast, FAOS, p. 379; 381.
330 Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 31-32.
Hurrian royal houses, for we observed the intimate relationship between the royal parents and posterity shown on the seals of Urkeš, as discussed in Chapter Four.

4. The Bētwate Inscriptions (ID 1, 2 and 3)\(^{332}\)

These three almost identical inscriptions (Fig. 13a-c) are each dedicated to a different deity. They have been inscribed to commemorate the victory over the ‘rebel’ city of Kulunnum. The inscriptions begin with the name and title of Iddi(n)-Sin, king of Simurrum, followed by the name of his son, Zabazuna, who appears to have accomplished the task in the field as a military commander by implementing the orders of his father, the king. The inscriptions were found in Bard-i-Sanjān in Bētwate. They are now housed in the Iraq Museum in Baghdad, registered under accession numbers IM 81364 (Text A, or 1); IM 81365 (Text B, or 2) and IM 81366+IM 81367 (Text C, or 3).

Transliteration\(^{333}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text ID 1</th>
<th>Text ID 2</th>
<th>Text ID 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) dden.EN.ZU</td>
<td>1) dden.EN.ZU</td>
<td>1) dI-dî-EN.ZU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) LUGAL da-núm̆</td>
<td>2) LUGAL da-núm̆</td>
<td>2) LUGAL da-núm̆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) LUGAL Si-mu-ri-im(^{\text{ki}})</td>
<td>3) LUGAL Si-mu-ri-im(^{\text{ki}})</td>
<td>3) LUGAL Si-mu-ri-im(^{\text{ki}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) dZa-ba-zu-na</td>
<td>4) dZa-ba-zu-na</td>
<td>4) dZa-ba-zu-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) DUMU-NI</td>
<td>5) DUMU-NI</td>
<td>5) DUMU-NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Ku-lu-un-nu-um(^{\text{ki}})</td>
<td>6) Ku-lu-un-nu-um(^{\text{ki}})</td>
<td>6) Ku-lu-un-nu-um(^{\text{ki}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) ik-ki-ir-ma</td>
<td>7) ik-ki-ir-ma</td>
<td>7) [î]k-ki-ir-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) a-na</td>
<td>8) a-na</td>
<td>8) [a]-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) dZa-ba-zu-na</td>
<td>9) dZa-ba-zu-na</td>
<td>9) [t](^{\text{Za-ba}-})zu-(^{\text{r}})na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) gi-ra-am</td>
<td>10) gi-ra-am</td>
<td>10) [gi](^{\text{ra}})(^{\text{r}})[am]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) i-ta-ba-al</td>
<td>11) i-ta-ba-al</td>
<td>11) [i]-a-ba-al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) ša dZa-ba-zu-na</td>
<td>12) ša dZa-ba-zu-na</td>
<td>12) [š]a dZa-ba-zu-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) a-wa-sú</td>
<td>13) a-wa-sú</td>
<td>13) a-wa-sú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) 5ISKUR</td>
<td>14) 5ISKUR</td>
<td>14) 5ISKUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) 5INANNA</td>
<td>15) 5INANNA</td>
<td>15) 5INANNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) ĻNi-iš-ba</td>
<td>16) ĻNi-iš-ba</td>
<td>16) ĻNi-iš-ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) iš-me-ú-ma</td>
<td>17) iš-me-ú-ma</td>
<td>17) iš-me-ú-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) a-lam u-ha-li-iq-ma</td>
<td>18) a-lam u-ha-li-iq-ma</td>
<td>18) a-lam u-ha-li-iq-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) a-na i-li</td>
<td>19) a-na i-li</td>
<td>19) a-na i-li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) šu-nu-ti</td>
<td>20) šu-nu-ti</td>
<td>20) šu-nu-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) ū-qá-di-iš-sú</td>
<td>21) ū-qá-di-iš-sú</td>
<td>21) ū-qá-di-iš-sú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) GIŠ.BANŠUR-am̆</td>
<td>22) GIŠ.BANŠUR-am̆</td>
<td>22) GIŠ.GU.ZA-am̆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) ša 5INANNA</td>
<td>23) ša 5ISKUR</td>
<td>23) ša 5Ni-iš-ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) be-el-ti-šu</td>
<td>24) be-el-šu</td>
<td>24) be-el-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) iš-ku-un</td>
<td>25) iš-ku-un</td>
<td>25) iš-ku-un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) ša i-pi5-iš-ti</td>
<td>26) ša i-pi5-iš-ti</td>
<td>26) ša i-pi5-iš-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) ū-ša-sà-ku</td>
<td>27) ū-[ša-sà]-ku</td>
<td>27) ū-ša-sà-ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) ū ši-ti-ir-ti(^{\text{334}})</td>
<td>28) ū [ši-ti-ir]-ti</td>
<td>28) ū ši-ti-ir-ti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{332}\) Published as E4.19.1.1-3 in RIME 4.

\(^{333}\) Frayne, RIME 4, p. 708-711.
29) ū-pá-sà-sú
30) a-na šu-mi
31) er-re-ti-šu
32) ša-ni-am
33) ū-ša-ha-zu
34) a-wi-lam
35) šu-a-ti
36) AN
37) ḫEN-LÍL
38) ḫNIN.HUR.SAG
39) ḫEN.KI
40) ḫEN.ZU
41) ḫISKUR
42) be-el GIŠ.TUKUL
43) ḫUTU
44) be-el DI.KU₅.DA
45) ḫINANNA
46) be-la-at ta-ḫa-zi-im
47) ḫNin-AN-si₂-an-na
48) i-li
49) ḫNi-iš-ba
50) be-li
51) er-re-tám
52) le-mu-tám
53) li-ru-ru-uš
54) NUMUN-šu
55) li-il-qú-tù
56) SUHŪŠ-su
57) li-su-ḫu
58) IBILA ū MU
59) a i-di-nu-šum
60) ba-la-ṭum
61) lu ik-ki-ib-šu
62) ki-ma ša ma
63) e-ḫu-ri-im
64) i-na se-er
65) um-ma-ni-su
66) lu ma-ru-us

334 Frayne: šì.
335 By Walker: li-il-qú-tù
336 Walker: DUMU.NITA ū MU.
337 According to Frayne, although what in the text is written MA should be LA. For our reading and interpretation see the commentary below.
338 Frayne has restored pa, but both ID 1 and ID 3 have pà.
Translation

1-3) Iddi(n)-Sîn, mighty king, king of Simurrum, 4-5) Zabazuna is his son. 6-11) Kulunnum rebelled and waged war against Zabazuna. 12-21) The gods Adad, Eštar, and Nišba heard the word of Zabazuna; he destroyed the city (of Kulunnum) and consecrated it to those gods. 22-25) He set up a table of the goddess Eštar, his lady (Text ID 2: He set up a table of the god Adad, his lord; text ID 3: He set up a throne of the god Nišba, his lord). 26-33) He who removes my work, or erases my inscription or because of its curse (from here on, only ID 1) incites another (to do so), 34-53) that man- may the gods Anum, Enlil, Ninšursag, Ea, Sîn, and Adad, lord of the weapon, Šamaš, lord of judgements, Eštar, lady of battle, Ninšianna, my god, (and) the god Nišba, my lord, inflict on him an evil curse. 54-57) May they destroy his seed and rip out his foundation. 58-66) May they not grant him heir or offspring. May life be his taboo. Like the rain of harvest (time), may he become detested in front of his people.

The Orthographic and Textual Variants

l. 21:  ID 1 –iš-
   ID 2 –iš-
   ID 3 –iš-

l. 22:  ID 1 GIŠ.BANŠUR-am
   ID 2 GIŠ.BANŠUR-am
   ID 3 GIŠ.GU.ZA-am

l. 23:  ID 1 ša dINANNA
   ID 2 ša dIŠKUR
   ID 3 ša dNi-iš-ba

l. 24:  ID 1 be-el-ti-šu
   ID 2 be-li-šu
   ID 3 be-li-šu

l. 27:  ID 1 ū-
   ID 2 ū-
   ID 3 ū-

l. 31:  ID 1 -šu
   ID 2 -su (typical Ur III)
   ID 3 šu

Commentary

1-5: According to Walker lines 1-5 do not make clear who the author of the text is, especially since the speaker switches in l. 26 from third to first person. The translation given for the passage is correct. The DUMU-NI is part of the introductory section, and then the text begins with the military deeds of Zabazuna against the rebel city of Kulunnum. The most fitting explanation seems to be that the author was the father Iddi(n)-Sîn, who was king of the whole of Simurrum. His son Zabazuna was the field-commander of the troops and was the one in charge of crushing the rebellion declared by Kulunnum. Walker, on the other hand, thinks this inscription was dedicated to Zabazuna, to be “the first attested instance in which a father dedicates an inscription to an accomplishment of his son.”\(^{339}\) This would be so if we look

\(^{339}\) Walker, The Tigris..., p. 174. He also does not exclude the possibility that the first sentence with the name of Iddi(n)-Sîn is vocative.
from the formal point of view, but in reality the inscription was written by the son, who mentions his father purely as a duty.

The inscription was made and set up there to commemorate this victory. However, perhaps more importantly, it was set up there to function as a symbol of the Simurrian authority in the city of Kulunnum, as an element of psychological warfare. This is valid also for the Jerusalem inscription and relief.

6-11: It clearly appears from the text that Zabazuna was not only the military commander of the troops but also the ruler of the district in which Kulunnum was located (and perhaps of the northern districts of the kingdom) on behalf of his father. This is indicated by the explicit statement that Kulunnum rebelled against Zabazuna (l. 6-11). Farber suggested reading lines 10-11 as zi-ra-am/tim i-ta-pá-al “turned spiteful (towards Zabazuna).” Kulunnum is the name of the rebel city, whose subjugation is the subject of the three inscriptions (Bētwate 1-3 and Jerusalem). The identity of this name is difficult to establish. There is a GN from the Nuzi texts that begins with the element Kulú/a, but it does not help further. What is important for us is the location of the city. Frayne identifies it with the village of Gulān, 4.4 km to the west of Bētwate itself. Further, he identifies Kulunnum and modern Gulān with ancient Gula-an, attested in the OAkk tablets from Tell Sulaimah. Frayne has collected valuable data about this latter GN. He assumes that the GN be-al-GUL-ni and its variant [be]-al-GUL-la-ni that are attested in the OAkk tablets from Tell Sulaimah were used as a GN as well as its literal meaning as a DN (= Lord of Gul(an)). The convincing evidence, Frayne states, is the occurrence of the GN Ú-ta before Be-al-GUL-ni. Ú-ta, attested also as Úš-ta, which is a land in all probability the same as Utīm of the Shemshāra tablets. In addition, he points out to the occurrence of the city Kul-la-an and a certain Sin-abum from Kullān in the archive of Tulūl Haddād (also in Hamrin Region) from the Late OB Period. Two late Neo-Assyrian archival texts (nos. 74 and 76) from Tell Billa mention the city of Kulunnum that could very probably be identical with our city here. If this proves to be correct, the city of Kulunnum was a significant city throughout a long period of history, from the OAkk to the late NA periods. But unfortunately we know nothing else of its history. The important passage in the Jerusalem inscription that says, “(On account of all this) I caused my image to be set up in Kulun(n)um” (Col. v l. 4′′-6′′), followed directly by the curse formula, is clear evidence that he set up the stele and the monumental inscriptions in Kulunnum, where they have been found. In other words, Bard-i-Sanjīn is ancient Kulunnum (Map 3). However, there are two probable alternatives. The stelae might have been moved in antiquity from Kulunnum to their find-spot in Bard-i-Sanjīn. There is also a rumour that the slabs were cut from a building by individuals and transported to Bard-i-Sanjīn to be discovered.

22) GIŠ.BANŠUR-am / GIŠ.GU.ZA-am: It is notable that tables were set up for the gods Adad and Ištar, while Zabazuna set up a throne of the god Nīsha. It is clear that these inscriptions were intended to be built in a monumental building or a shrine. This is indicated by the remnants of calcium carbonate (CaCO₃) (a building material) noticed by Al-Fouadi on the unworked side of inscription ID 1. Support for this comes from the inscription itself,
which indirectly alludes to “my (hand)work” (l. 26-27) and thereafter “my inscription” (l. 28-29). Possibly this “work” refers to the throne he set up for Nišba mentioned in ID 3. It is of interest to point here to a large rock in the Bētwate Citadel, known as Taḥt-i-Ḫuršīdī-Hawar.438 “Throne of the East Sun.” The “East Sun” is the royal title of a legendary king in the local saga. The rock overlooks the whole region from the citadel to the Rāniya Plain. It is shaped like a throne or altar (Fig. 14) and until the end of the 1980s was twice as high as it is now. It is probable that the rock was carved in antiquity for some special purposes, perhaps as a cultic altar/throne for Nišba. Another large flat stone on the citadel might have served as a ceremonial place on which the monument was probably erected (Fig. 15d). The Bētwate Citadel (Fig. 15a-b) itself is a high natural mound in the middle of a narrow valley in the northwestern corner of the Rāniya Plain and overlooks the surrounding area with portions of ancient fortification walls, built of large cyclopean stones in some places (Fig. 16a-b). It is quite possible, then, that the modern citadel represents the high city of Kulunnun, or one of its main positions, where a monumental building of Zabazuna was built with the inscriptions.

26) ša i-pi-š-i-ti: Exactly as in the Sarpul (ii, l. 45) and the Jerusalem (col. v, 4′′-6′′) inscriptions, the 3rd person pronoun switches to the 1st person pronoun. The Erridu-pizir inscription, on the contrary, switches from the 3rd person to the 1st person (ii, l. 26).

62-66: Frayne reads in RIME 4 MA as LA in l. 62, giving ki-ma ša-la e-bu-ri-im i-na se-er um-ma-ni-su lu ma-ru-us, “As (when) there is no harvest, may it be difficult for his people.” Since the same curse formula is repeated in the Jerusalem Inscription with MA, not LA, the reading and translation should be ki-ma ša-ma e-bu-ri-im i-na se-er um-ma-ni-su lu ma-ru-us, “Like the rain of the harvest time, may he become bitter/detested in front of his people.” In an agricultural society such a curse is very well understandable, since rain at harvest time would be a terrible disaster, spoiling the work of the whole year, resulting in the decay of both grain and straw, food and fodder.439 Walker read it as ša-ma, but his translation, “Instead of (fair) summer skies may it (i.e. the weather) be ill for his troops,”440 does not seem fitting.

The Historical Setting as Reflected by the Inscriptions

The extraordinary significance of the inscriptions of Iddi(n)-Sin and his son Zabazuna lies not only in the fact that they present a view, although incomplete, of the events in the northern Transtigris that eventually ended in the building of a large kingdom. Of extra significance is the fact that they are one of the rarest groups of inscriptional material from inside this region that provide first-hand information and provide it from the domestic point of view. This is in contrast to the traditional way of collecting information from the Sumerian, Babylonian and Assyrian sources that sometimes give wrong, incomplete or vague images, or even misleading and hostile views, all according with the intentions of the authors. The inscription of Sarpul is regrettably of little significance in this respect, except for its assumed mention of Annubanini of Lullubum that alludes to synchronism between the two kings. This inscription was probably written in the early phase of the history of the kingdom, because the location of the relief is relatively close to the centre of Simurrum itself (see below under the location of Simurrum). Further, the control of the Great Khorasan Road that passes through this region was seemingly a major factor in the building of the kingdom. In this phase, that most probably began with the disintegration of the empire of Ur under Ibbi-Sin, the Transtigridian powers emerged and began to expand. This has certainly led to clashes between them. In our case Simurrum clashed with Lullubum, the two powers that tried to control the strategic gorge of Sarpul and its important urban centres.

348 Oral statements by the inhabitants of Bētwate and by Mr. Abdul-Raqeeb Yousif.
349 This suggestion agrees with that presented by Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 23.
The Haladiny inscription provides us with several new toponyms in addition to a group of already known ones. These toponyms come from a region least known to historians and Assyriologists, the inner parts of the Transtigris, beyond the line from Nuzi/Arrapha to Erbil. The names of conquered and subdued towns are spread along the whole area from the Sarpul (Halman) up to the Rāniya Plain. We have only clearly identified Halman, and the rest are either generally identified or totally unknown. The inscription lists the lands of Šagi, Ten/lum, [...]jar and [...]na before mentioning Šarīthum. These three GNs give no hints that can help their identification. The GN Šarīthum, probably in the Dukan Pass, might point to a northwesterly direction of the march of Iddi(n)-Sin. However, the mention of Halman some lines after contradicts this assumption. Some of the GNs that follow Halman bear Hurrian characteristics, especially the genitive suffix –we. They appear to be generally located in the northeastern parts of the Transtigris, namely in the Rāniya Plain and its environs. Their location in and around the Rāniya is indicated by the mention of Šikšabbum, Utuwe and Kakmum. After this there is the Amorite episode, followed by the joint Amorite-Simaškian attack.

In general, the inscription seems to have arranged the episodes neither in a perfect chronological or geographical order, but rather in clusters combining the two (see the figure below). The badly damaged column I makes it extremely difficult to find out the exact divisions of the clusters. However, they can be divided as follows: lines 15-31; 32-35; 36-42; 43-52 (southeast and east); 58 (with the preceding lacuna)-68 (north/northwest); 69-74 (northeast); 75-85 (west or southwest ?) (Map. 3). Then what follows seems to be a conclusion, stating that he achieved all what had been mentioned thanks to the god Nišba. He repeats the two major feats, the destruction of the lands (90-91) and the defeat of the joint campaign of the Amorites and the Simaškians. The question about the order in which the clusters are arranged reappears. It is not according to the importance of the events, since the two most important deeds (Amorites and Simaški, according to our view and assuming it was the same in the author’s view too) come at the end. A chronological order remains possible, inasmuch as the clusters mentioned first were fought first and were consequently closer to the centre of Simurrum. In the first stage the lands beginning with Šagi and ending with [...]na were subjugated, then the episode related to the throne of Simurrum occurred. This was probably a reaction to those campaigns or related to a usurper who tried to benefit from the absence of the king, busy for long periods with wars. After this, some territories in the north (Šarīthum) were subjugated. The southern and (north)eastern territories (Halman and Lullubum) were next on his list.351 As we suggested above, the control of the strategically important region of Sarpul appears to have provided Simurrum with resources and the power that enabled it to expand and build such a large kingdom. Following the capture of this region the kingdom extended farther in the north or northwest (Šikšabbum). The last stage of expansion in this inscription is another step farther to the northeast (Utuwe and Kakmum). At this point, the numerous wars waged by Simurrum and the frequent absence of its king appear to have stimulated the greed of the Amorites and the Simaškians to invade his land. This is why the defensive war in the south, in his homeland, was fought (Amorites and Simaški). The conclusion that can be drawn is that his efforts were mostly directed to the north, the direction in which he won most of his territorial gains. The find-spot of this inscription gives a sure and important hint for the direction the expansion of Simurrum took. At least one of the GNs mentioned must be looked for here, at the foot of Mount Pīra Magrūn,352 where in the NA

351 Cf. the OB letter from Tell Asmar discussed above under ‘Isin-Larsa Period- Annubanini Inscription.’
352 There are allusions to urban centres in the plain in front of Mount Pīra Magrūn in the inscriptions of Aššurnasirpal II during his campaign in this region, e.g.: Col. ii 39) TA uš-ma-ni an-ni-te-ma at-tu-muš a-na URU.DIDLI šá EDIN KUR Ni-muš, “Moving on from this camp I marched to the cities in the plain of Mount Nimuš,” Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 204 (text A.0.101.1); cf. also the next two notes.
period Aššurnasirpal II recorded a score of GNs and mentioned some by name like Bunasi,\textsuperscript{353} Larbusa, Dūr-Lullumu, Bunisu and Bāra.\textsuperscript{354} The repeated allusion to the temple of the god Nišba at the beginning and the end of the inscription, and the probable allusion to the building of that temple by “all the lands,” might indicate the presence of this temple there. However, the absence of Kulunnun can mean that the Haladiny inscription was written before the capture of Kulunnun, in the time when only Utuwe was cut off from Kakmum. Nonetheless, the destruction of Kakmum is also claimed here as it is in the Jerusalem inscription. This destruction can be counted as either political propaganda or a figurative destruction, since Kakmum appeared again as a powerful opponent in the Jerusalem inscription. Later on, in the Jerusalem inscription, Iddi(n)-Sin reached the peak of his power, at least according to our present state of knowledge. A new set of toponyms are mentioned in this inscription (ii9′-13′), which were, as Shaffer and Wasserman concluded, territories within the land of Kakmum. In all likelihood these GNs were located in a relatively small area if they could be captured in one night, as the inscription claims (ii 14′-iii 1-2) they were. The real submission of Kakmum—though not necessarily occupied—is told by the Jerusalem inscription: “The land of Kakmum, which from its earliest day(s) did [not] carry tribute [to] anybody, … Iddi(n)-Sin, the mighty king, forced them to prostrate at the feet of Nišba his lord” (iv 9-26). It is clear, as already mentioned, that Simurrum built its own glory at Kakmum’s expense. Kakmum was apparently the other major power of the Transgirs of that time, and the expansion of Simurrum could not be achieved without confrontation with that place. Hence, we see that at first it was the land of Utuwe that was detached (Haladiny inscription), and then Kulunnun (Bētwa and Jerusalem inscriptions), which were territories under Kakmum’s hegemony. In the Haladiny inscription (70-74) we find that he took back the land of Utuwe from the hands of Kakmum. In the Jerusalem inscription (iii 4′-iv 3′) an almost similar clause states that Kakmum delivered Kulunnun to Simurrum. The former might be understood as implying an earlier capture of the land Utuwe by Simurrum, which was taken again by Kakmum and re-captured by Simurrum. The main target the two powers of Simurrum and Kakmum struggled about was Utuwe and this may interpret why the Haladiny inscription does not mention its destruction as it did the others.

The two rebellions of Kulunnun, if our suggestion is correct, may reflect Kulunnian hatred towards the new Simurrian masters of their district. They may have seen the events in a south versus north perspective, even on the internal level within the Hurrian lands. Such a division could have arisen by the geographically different terrains. Kakmum, including Kulunnun, was a mountainous kingdom and was seemingly more engaged with the mountainous regions to the east, inside the Zagros, as indicated by its intervention in Manna in the time of Sargon II. By contrast Simurrum was a piedmont kingdom on the southernmost fringe of the Hurrian lands and, due to its location, had tighter relations with southern Mesopotamia. This is reflected, for instance, in the name occurring in early Sumerian proverbs and the name of its

\textsuperscript{353} Col. ii 34) a-na KUR Ni-muš ša KUR Lu-ul-lu KUR Ki-ni-ba i-qa-bu-šu-ni aq-ḫi-riḫ URU Bu-na-a-ši URU dan-ma-ti-sù-ni 35) ša “Mu-ša-si-ni 30 URU.DIDLI ša li-me-tu-šu ak-šud ERIN.MEŠ ig-du-re KUR-ši mar-šu is-sab-tu, “I approached Mount Nimuš (= Pira Magrān), which the Lullu call Mount Kiniba. I conquered the city Bunāsī, their fortified city, which (was ruled by) Muṣāṣīna, (and) 30 cities in its environs. The troops were frightened (and) took to the rugged mountain,” Grayson, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{354} Col. iii 2) TA uš-ma-ni an-ni-te-ma at-tu-mu asa URU.DIDLI 3) ša EDIN KUR Ni-muš ša a-šar-šu-nu ma-am-ma la-a 4) e-mu-ra a-liš URU La-ar-bu-šu URU dan-ni-ti-ši 5) ša “Ki-ir-te-a-a 8 URU.DIDLI ša li-me-ti-tiši 6) KUR-ud, “Moving from this camp I marched to the cities in the plain of Mount Nimuš which no one had ever seen. I conquered the city Labrusa, the fortified city which (was ruled by) Kiṭearia, (and) eight cities in its environs;” and 15) 1 ME 50 URU.DIDLI 16) ša URU La-ar-bu-ša-a-a URU.BÂD Lu-ul-ma-a-a URU Bu-na-i-sa-a-a 17) URU Bu-ra-a-a … 18) 50 ERIN.MEŠ ša URU Ba-ra-a-a 19) ina ḫu-su ḫa EDIN a-duk, “150 cities belonging to the cities of the Labrusu, Dūr-Lullumu, Bunisu, (and) Bāra… I defeated 50 troops of the Bāra in a skirmish in the plain,” Grayson, \textit{RIMA} 2, p. 245 (text A.0.101.17).
king, Iddi(n)-Sin, which was formed according to a southern Ur III model (compare Ibbi-Sin and Šú-Sin). Such political divisions, stimulated by geographical conditions, are not uncommon in the history and culture of this region. The division of the territories of the region under study into districts and provinces determined by natural barriers, such as mountain chains or rivers, is one of its characteristics. The Avromān parchments from the Parthian Period (141 BC-226 AD) mention the hyparchy Baiseira in which the village Kōpanis was located and where the parchments were written and sealed. The term denotes a territorial division within the greater province. From the Sassanian era onwards, for instance, the terms Garamae “The warm province” and Šyārzūr were used to denote divisions based on geographical features. Even today the divisions Garmiyān (Sassanian Garamae), Qaradāgh, Shahrazūr (Sassanian Šyārzūr), Pishder, Bitwēn, Bālak, Qarāj, Barzān and many others appear to follow the same old tradition of divisions first attested in the Iddi(n)-Sin inscriptions under the term kuliši.

Reverting to the Haladiny inscription, it bears two characteristics not found in this king’s other inscriptions: First, the preserved part does not contain any curse formula, in contrast to the ones that occupy the greater part of the Sarpul and Bētwate inscriptions. Such a formula must have existed, especially since the inscription appears to have been dedicated to the temple of Nišba, and the other inscriptions of this period had long curse formulae. The part on which the curse formula was inscribed was either written on a lost part of this slab, or, more probably, was inscribed on another slab that formed one whole inscription together with the Haladiny inscription. One expects an inscription consisting of two elongated slabs, placed horizontally next to each other underneath a relief (fig. 17), such as those of Sarpul (see fig. 4a and 6). The curse formula must have been very similar, if not identical, to those of the Sarpul and Bētwate inscriptions. A second slab would complete the important gap in the narrative of Iddi(n)-Sin’s march between Simurrum and the Lower Ţāb; in the Haladiny inscription the king departed from Tidluǒnum to Šikšabbum, to Iteraswe and its three cities, all on the Ţāb, to finally reach Utuwe. But there is no hint how he travelled, his route and which lands crossed to reach the Ţāb River axis to attack Utuwe (Map 4). The supposed gap will have contained GNs in the Kirkuk and Aghjalar regions. Secondly, but more importantly, this inscription covers a wider geographical scope than the others. The Jerusalem and Bētwate inscriptions deal with a limited area in which Simurrum was active, namely Kakmum and Kulunnum, while the Haladiny inscription mentions GNs ranging from Sarpul to the Rāniya Plain. It is a more general and comprehensive text that resembles the later NA royal inscriptions in which the kings told the whole story of their deeds.

356 “… who were in Asörestān [and Xūzestān?] in Garamae and Šyārzūr,” Skjærvø, P. O., The Sassanian Inscription of Paikuli, Part 3.1, Wiesbaden, 1983, p. 42-43. The GNs Asörestān and Xūzestān are also names of the provinces Assyria and Elam.
357 Aghjalar is the region to the south of the Lower Ţāb, to the northeast of Kirkuk.
The conquests of Iddin-Siîn in combined chronological-geographical clusters based on the data of the Haladiny Inscription.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sarpul (ID 5)</th>
<th>Haladiny (ID 6)</th>
<th>Jerusalem (ID 4)</th>
<th>Bētwata (ID 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ba-ti-ur</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; ii 22</td>
<td><em>A-mu-ra/i-a/im</em> ii 81, 83, 92</td>
<td><em>A/ZA-i-la-ki/γ&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</em> ii 11’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Be-et</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; i 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ḥal-ma-an</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; i 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hu-bin-eza-ga</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; ii 65</td>
<td><em>Ha-ap/β-ri-(z)aj-nt</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; ii 9’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>I-te-ra-dāš-wē</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; ii 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>I-tu</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; ii 63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kak-mi-im</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; ii 73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lu-lu-bi-im</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; i 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Si-maš-kā-ām</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; ii 93</td>
<td><em>Ni/Kak-li-ip</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; iii 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Si-mu-ri-im</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; i 6; i 34</td>
<td><em>Si-mu-ur-ri-im</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; i 13’; iv 2, 20</td>
<td><em>Si-mu-ri-im</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; A 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ša-gi</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; i 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ša-ri-it-ku-um</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; i 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ša-um-mi</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; ii 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ši-ik-ša-am-bi</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; ii 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Te-ni-li-mu</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; i 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ti-id-lu-ha-am</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; ii 58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ut-su-wē</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; ii 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>x(?)-NE-šum</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; i 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>[..(?)-ti-na-ab-ba-ša-wē</em>&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; i 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>..........-ar&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; i 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>..........-nā&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; i 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The geographical names attested in the Iddi(n)-Sin inscriptions in alphabetical order.<sup>359</sup>

---

<sup>359</sup> Only version A of the Bētwata inscriptions is taken into consideration as the main version.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sarpul (ID 5)</th>
<th>Haladiny (ID 6)</th>
<th>Jerusalem (ID 4)</th>
<th>Bētwata (ID 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x x MAŠ (?) [x³]</td>
<td>Si-mu-ri-im&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Si-mu-ri-im&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Si-mu-ri-im&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba-ti-ir&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>i 6</td>
<td>i 13&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-lu-bi-im&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Si-mu-ri-im&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Si-mu-ri-im&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ku-lu-un-u-nu-um&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 41</td>
<td>i 15</td>
<td>i 4</td>
<td>A 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Te-ni-li-mu&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ha-ap/b-ri-(z)a-n&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i 20</td>
<td>i 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[………]</td>
<td>Šu-lu-te&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>i 10&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i 25</td>
<td>A/Za-l-la-ki/g&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>i 11&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ku-ba-an-ni-we&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>i 12&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ti-ru-uk-ki-na-ás-we&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>i 13&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nl/Kak-li-ip&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>i 3&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ku-lu-na-am&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>i 4&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kak-mi-im &lt;sup&gt;26&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Si-mu-ur&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;-&lt;r&gt;ि&lt;/r&gt;-im&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The geographical names attested in the Iddi(n)-Sîn inscriptions in alphabetical order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sarpul (ID 5)</th>
<th>Haladiny (ID 6)</th>
<th>Jerusalem (ID 4)</th>
<th>Bētwata (ID 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>i 33</td>
<td>AN</td>
<td>A 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dEN.KI</td>
<td>ii 36</td>
<td>dEN.KI</td>
<td>A 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dEN.LIL</td>
<td>ii 34</td>
<td>dEN.LIL</td>
<td>A 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dEN.ZU</td>
<td>ii 37</td>
<td>dEN.ZU</td>
<td>A 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dINANNA</td>
<td>ii 42</td>
<td>dINANNA</td>
<td>i 1; 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dISKUR</td>
<td>ii 38</td>
<td>dISKUR</td>
<td>f; i 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dNin-AN-sir-an-na</td>
<td>ii 44</td>
<td>dNin-AN-sir-an-na</td>
<td>i 1; 2&lt;sup&gt;37&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dNIN.HUR.SAG</td>
<td>ii 35</td>
<td>dNIN.HUR.SAG</td>
<td>c; vi 9&lt;sup&gt;38&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dNi-is-ba</td>
<td>ii 46</td>
<td>dNi-is-ba</td>
<td>i 4&lt;sup&gt;39&lt;/sup&gt;; iv 24; vi 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dUTU</td>
<td>ii 40</td>
<td>dUTU</td>
<td>g; vi 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The divine names attested in the Iddi(n)-Sin inscriptions in alphabetical order.<sup>360</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sarpul (ID 5)</th>
<th>Haladiny (ID 6)</th>
<th>Jerusalem (ID 4)</th>
<th>Bētwata (ID 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>i 33</td>
<td>AN</td>
<td>a&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dEN.LIL</td>
<td>ii 34</td>
<td>dEN.LIL</td>
<td>b&lt;sup&gt;41&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dNIN.HUR.SAG</td>
<td>ii 35</td>
<td>dNIN.HUR.SAG</td>
<td>c&lt;sup&gt;42&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dEN.KI</td>
<td>ii 36</td>
<td>dEN.KI</td>
<td>d&lt;sup&gt;43&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dEN.ZU</td>
<td>ii 37</td>
<td>dEN.ZU</td>
<td>e&lt;sup&gt;44&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dISKUR</td>
<td>ii 38</td>
<td>dISKUR</td>
<td>f&lt;sup&gt;45&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dUTU</td>
<td>ii 40</td>
<td>dUTU</td>
<td>g&lt;sup&gt;46&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dINANNA</td>
<td>ii 42</td>
<td>dINANNA</td>
<td>i 1&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>360</sup> Only version A of the Betwāta inscriptions is taken into consideration as the main version.
The divine names attested in the Iddi(n)-Sin inscriptions in the original order.

**Rabana**

The Haladiny inscription was found, as mentioned above, in a field in the village of Qara Chatān at the foot of Mount Pī-tra Magrūn. This mountain is traditionally known as the old Mesopotamian Nimuš (Formerly Nišir), of the land of the Lullubum,361 which the Lullubians called Kinipa in their own language.362 We have also referred to the likely occurrence of the “temple of Nišba” in this inscription, based on traces of the sign É before the divine name Nišba (see above). The text begins and concludes with the mention of the temple, a fact that shows that the temple was the central topic of the text. This, coupled with the wide range of lands and peoples the text names, forces one to believe that the inscription was part of a monument erected to celebrate the building of the temple. This is why it embraces the names of all those lands and peoples who were subjugated up to that date, and consequently participated in the building of the temple of the god of their lord. If this suggestion proves to be correct, it would be strikingly significant that the temple of the patron of Simurrum was built in a territory outside its national home, like Muṣṣir was to the Urartians, for instance. In this case, Iddi(n)-Sin must have thought of founding a multi-national empire with one god in a central sanctuary for all its peoples in the highest mountain of his realm. Nevertheless, the question that remains is whether there was in fact a temple there.

Behind the village of Qara Chatān, there is a very steep valley in the side of the Mount Pī-tra Magrūn (Fig. 18a). In this valley, the remains of ancient architectural structures are found that are known as Rabana among the local villagers.363 From the beginning of this valley to half way up the mountainside the remains of large walls (Fig. 18b) can be seen. They seem to have served as fortifications and, at the same time, as terraces to reduce the steep slope of its terrain. Behind this, there is a terrace (Terrace no.1) (Fig. 19a-c) that overlooks the plain in front of the mountain to the west. The terrace is rectangular in shape and a huge stone forms

361 For the identification of this mountain with Nimuš, cf. Streck, M. P., “NiŠIR,” RIA 9 (1998-2001), p. 589 (referring also to Liverani); Speiser, “Southern Kurdistan in the Annals of Assurnasirpal and today,” AASOR VIII for 1926-27 (1928), p. 18 and the bibliography given in note 31. I would call attention to some confusion in the contribution of Streck in RIA. There Pir Omar Gudrun and Pir-i Mukurūn are treated as two separate mountains, but in fact they are different spellings of the same name. The former is the original full name, and the latter an abbreviated form transcribed from Arabic, using Mukurūn instead of Magrūn.

362 Cf. the inscription of Aššurnasirpal cited above and below, who recorded this Lullubian name of Nimuš.

363 The site of Rabana is recorded in the register of the Iraqi Directorate General of Antiquities as an archaeological site, but it has been never fully surveyed, studied or excavated. Once in the 1940s its lower part was visited by an official of the Directorate General of Antiquities, who could not reach the temple. There are pottery sherds at the site that belong to different periods and local residents report sporadically finding copper and bronze arrow heads and lance blades.
part of its northeastern angle. Leaving the terrace to the valley, three sides of the wall of another terrace can be seen (Terrace no. 2) (Fig. 20a-b). That terrace seems to have supported a building in antiquity.

Advancing into the steep and narrower part of the valley, spectacular remains of staircases, corridors and the cella of a temple speak for themselves. As a whole these structures form one interrelated complex, of which this part was certainly the most important since it contains the cella. The middle, which I interpret as a temple, has been regrettably damaged by water torrents that stream from the top of the mountain at this point. The remaining parts consist of a narrow corridor (corridor no. 1) 2 m wide that extends in an east-west direction for 16 m. Its floor and northern wall (± 3 m high) are carved in the mountain rock, while its southern side (± 2 m high) is built of large stones (Figs. 21a-b). The southern side ends in the west, the corner leading to another part of the corridor that extends for 6 m to the south (± 2,5 m high).

Above the wall on the northern side there are two staircases (Fig. 22a-b), one leading to the west (staircase no. 1) and the other to the north (staircase no. 2), both carved into the rock. The first consists of 7 steps, each ± 60 cm wide. Only 9 steps remain of the second, each ± 150 cm wide. The corridor’s eastern end is damaged and its northern wall is bisected into two parts, probably by an old exit to the two staircases mentioned. The western part of the northern wall is 10 m long, while the eastern part is 6 m long and is slightly farther from the southern wall, making the corridor a little wider. To the east of the corridor there is a series of staircases and paths (Fig. 23, 29a-c), all except one carved in a south-north direction in the mountain. These staircases stand on a higher level than that of the corridor. The only east-west path (pathway no.1) is carved in the rock like the others and is ± 4 m long, but its full width is not preserved. It leads to a niche in the front wall that contains the headless body of a seated deity on a throne. The niche (Fig. 24a-b) is ± 180 cm high from the ground and measures 67 cm wide, 90 cm high and 37 cm deep. The throne is 32 cm wide, 7 cm high, while the remaining part of the seated deity measures 24 cm width by 30 cm height. The style is simple and shows no details or folds on the dress. According to information provided by the villagers, the head was still there until the 1970s but was then lost. Unfortunately even the hands and shoulders are missing, for the upper torso is also now missing.

Above the niche, there is another path leading in a north-south direction with a slight slope towards the south side (pathway no. 2). Above it is another path (pathway no. 3) leading in the same direction and with the same slope. At the summit of the rock it meets a staircase (staircase no. 3) of 6 steps, the last step of which is partially preserved (Fig. 25). At the upper end of the staircase a vertical shaft has been carved on the left that seems to have been used for the fastening for a door (Fig. 26). The lower end of the staircase begins with the remains of a square space (140 x 140 x 60 cm) (Fig. 27), suggesting it was connected to another path or staircase which is now lost. What remains is a small, smoothed, vertical area to the south (shown on fig. 28 in the square) that indicates the presence of such a path. The two corners of the walls are interesting. In addition to the one just mentioned, another one is to the left, that is also the north, of the niche (Fig. 28 in the rectangle). These corners imply the existence of some extensions of the walls that met the original walls at 90°. The break between these two corners proves the existence of such a wall in antiquity. The remaining north-south path (pathway no. 4) that leads to the niche and measures ± 10 m long and 70-80 cm wide can be the remnants of the floor of a hall or a cella that contained the niche.

Behind the upper staircase a wide path stretches ± 15 m from north to south (pathway no. 5). On its eastern side is a wall carved in the rock (Fig. 23 and 29a-b). This might have been the end of the temple complex, because no traces or remains of other paths or staircases are found.
If there was any symbolic connotation of locating this temple in the heart of the mountain it probably closely related to the assumed association of the god Nišba with the mountain name Nišpi mentioned above (see commentary to line 1 of the Haladiny inscription).

In the light of the available data mentioned above, I propose to identify the remains found in Rabana with the temple of Nišba, mentioned in the Haladiny inscription, the temple about which the inscription says that all the lands participated (?) in building (?) it. About eleven centuries later Aššurnasirpal II (883-859 BC) recorded an account of his campaign against the land of the Lullubians in Zamua. Directly after crossing through the Baiziān Pass (ancient Babite) he went to the capital city of Bunasi in Mount Nimuš “which the Lullubians call Kinipa.” He attacked the city, defeated its troops, captured its governor Musasina and destroyed the city by fire. In another campaign, he captured the city Larbusa in the plain of Mount Nimuš (see above) and mentioned the towns Dūr-Lullumu, Bunisu and Bāra in the same context. These toponyms, if they existed before the NA period, can very probably be counted among the numerous GNs Iddi(n)-Sîn captured and in or close to one of them he built the Rabana temple. That these GNs are not mentioned in the Haladiny inscription can be explained either because the places had different names in the time of Iddi(n)-Sin, or because the names we know have now been broken away from our inscription.

**Cylinders Seals of Simurrum**

Material evidence from the kings of Simurrum and their reigns includes also two cylinder seals and a seal impression. One of the cylinder seals (Fig. 30) was published for the first time by Shaffer and Wasserman. It belongs to the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Jonathan Rosen in New York. The seal is made of a hard, shining stone and bears a legend:

Iddi(n)-Sin, mighty king; dZabazuna (is) his son. Ili-dannu (is) your servant.

The seal depicts a traditional presentation scene in which a goddess presents a person to a seated figure who appears to be the king. The king wears a wide brimmed headdress and a fringed robe seated on a padded stool. The presented person wears a rolled brimmed headdress, a fringed robe and a crescent-like necklace and holds his hands at his waist. The goddess, distinguished by her horned headdress, wears a long striped dress and holds her hands upright. As in the royal seals from Urkeš, the king holds a cup or some small vessel in...
his hand, a posture found in Ur III seals. The moon crescent is shown above the cup. In Urkeš the crescent is also depicted on some seals, for instance the seal that shows the ritual scene. (Fig. 19a-b, Chapter Four).

The mention of sons/ crown princes in the official inscriptions of the kingdoms of the Zagros foothills, presumably sharing titles and responsibilities with their fathers, was seemingly a tradition in that area. The reason for this belief is not only the legend of this seal, but also the Bētwata inscriptions and another royal seal impression. That is one of a certain Pišendēn, king of Itabalhum, found on a fragment from Shemshāra (SH 890), that mentions the son of the king. All support this idea. The seals of Urkeš, on which the royal heir enjoys a prominent position, and the facts just mentioned, imply that the Hurrian traditions and political ideology were different from that of Mesopotamians in relation to the sons/ crown princes.

Another seal, in the British Museum (BM 102055), published by Collon (Fig. 31), is very similar to the one just described. However, its legend does not mention Iddi(n)-Sîn, but only his son Zabazuna. This may imply a later date, probably after the death of Iddi(n)-Sîn and the succession of his son:

d Zabazuna, the strong king. Teheš-atal, the scribe, (is) your servant.

In this seal too, a person is depicted who stands in front of the king. The king is seated on a padded stool and holds a cup or small vessel. As in the former seal, the moon crescent is depicted in the space above the cup. The dress of both persons is similar to those of the former seal. One important difference is the depiction of animals or symbols of animals. On this seal a goose and a scorpion are seen behind the stool of the king, with other symbols above the goose and behind its head. This feature was also present in the seals of Urkeš and later in the Nuzi and Kassite seals. In front of the standing figure is a half-sized person with raised hands as before. It very probably represents a presenting deity, depicted in this way to indicate perspective.

The seal impression, found at Ešnunna, was first published by Jacobsen and later re-examined by Sollberger. The impression, although fragmentary, provided valuable information for it calls Zabazuna “the strong king,” which proves that he succeeded his father on the throne of Simurrum. Equally important is that it was found in situ in the Ituria temple, under the layer dated to the reign of Bilalama of Ešnunna. Thus it can be dated roughly between the end of Ur III period and the reign of Bilalama of Ešnunna, who was a contemporary of Šu-ilišu (1984-1975 BC) of Isin.

---

369 Other seals with the scene of a seated king holding a cup, the crescent and the presentation theme are found in Tell Asmar; for instance seals e, f, g, i and j in fig. 102; a, b, c, h, i, j and probably p in fig. 103 in Frankfort et al., The Gimilsin Temple ..., 216-7.
370 Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 34.
371 For the legend of this seal see Chapter Six under ‘The king and the nuldu(n)um.’
375 Sollberger, op. cit. Sollberger states that the impression is now lost, op. cit., p. 63, note 9.
376 The legend reads as follows: 1) [...]ba-zu-na 2) [...] da-num 3) [...]li ri(?)-ri or [...]li-[a]r-ri, Sollberger, “Two New Seal-Inscriptions,” p. 63.
377 Walker, p. 176; cf. also the table on page 177.
That both Iddi(n)-Sîn and his son Zabazuna are depicted on the seal of the Rosen Collection, in all likelihood both without beard or moustache, deserves special attention. However, this feature is found not only on this seal, for the king is similarly represented on both the Jerusalem relief and the Sarpul relief (see figs. 4a-b and 12). There was some doubt about the identity of the person depicted on the Jerusalem relief, whether it was the king himself or his son Zabazuna, because he is shown beardless and without a moustache. The evidence these two seals present favour the king himself. It is important that both the king and his son appear on one seal (Rosen Collection) without beard or moustache, a fact supporting this conclusion. This was apparently a dynastic tradition of the Simurrian royal house, reminiscent of the Gudea dynasty of Lagaš and Ur III, as noted by Shaffer and Wasserman.

The Location of Simurrum

From this study of Simurrian inscriptions and other pertinent material an attempt can be made to locate Simurrum. The site of this important and politically active country in Mesopotamian history remains a riddle. Of the many different opinions presented one of the earliest was proposed by Meissner as early as 1919. According to him one must look for Simurrum in the region of Kirkuk, near the Lullubian country, since the two were mentioned together in a Sulgi date-formula. Equating Simurrum with Zab(b)an (Si-ur-ru = Zab-ban) in some later texts, especially the lexical and geographical lists, led Meissner to locate it at modern Pirdê (= Aльтûn Kopri), because Zaban at that time was thought to have been located slightly south of the Lower Zāb. Goetze, Billerbeck, Edzard, Diakonoff and Gelb followed Meissner, but Forrer and Weidner did not. They showed that identifying Zab(b)an with Simurrum contradicts inscriptive data. Based on the mention of Simurrum and Zab(b)an in one context in an OB tablet from Sippar, Weidner concluded that the two

---

378 There is no long beard and no curls, but a slight prominence on the sides of the faces of both persons could indicate a thin beard.
379 Al-Fouadi, p. 128; cf. also Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 34.
380 The identity of the two figures as Iddi(n)-Sin and Zabazuna is suggested by Shaffer and Wasserman, and the above conclusion is based on this suggestion. Nevertheless, there remains the possibility of identifying one of them as a third person, an option which is less likely. Even so, it would be a member of the Simurrian royal house without beard or moustache.
381 Shaffer and Wasserman, p. 34. The connections between the Gudea dynasty and the mountainous peoples go back in history, particularly in relation to some linguistic aspects; cf. Speiser, Mesopotamian Origins, p. 99.
383 Meissner, p. 69. Even more recently, Salvini and Wilhelm have located it on the upper reaches of the Lower Zāb: Salvini, “The Earliest Evidence……,” Urkesh and the Hurrians, p. 111; Wilhelm, The Hurrians, p. 7. Wilhelm was apparently inspired by the discovery of the Iddi(n)-Sin inscriptions in Bêtûwata.
384 With another variant from Assur citing the name as Si-ūr-ru^5^, Meissner, op. cit., p. 69, and note 3. The NA text V R 12, no. 6, 44 records: Si-mur-ra^5^ = ŠU = Zab-ban and the text KAV 183, 18: Si-<mu?->-ur-ru^5^ = ŠU = URU Zab-ban, cf. Weidner, ibid.
385 Meissner, p. 70.
386 Billerbeck, ibid.
388 Да有效地, Салиныа, Л. 1585.
389 Gelb, HS, p. 57.
390 Goetze, A., “Jlibar of Duddul,” JNES 12 (1953), p. 120.
391 Forrer, Die Provinzenteilung des assyrischen Reiches, p. 40-41
393 The text is (88-5-12, 712), dated to the fourth year of Apil-Sin (1813-1830 BC) of Babylon, cf. Weidner, op. cit., 78.
GNs referred to distinct toponyms, although linked to each other. He then suggested siting them in the south rather than in the north near the Lower Záb. 394 The inscriptions of Aššurnasirpal II support this. Those inscriptions, when describing the extent of the Assyrian Empire, determine the borders of one of its provinces as starting from the bank of the Lower Záb as far as the city of “Til-Báři, which is above Zabán” as the furthest point. 395 This implies that Zab(b)an was located in the south, far from the Lower Záb. Concerning equating Simurrum with Zab(b)an, Frayne thinks that Simurrum was the ancient name that prevailed in the Akkadian, Ur III and Early Old Babylonian periods until it was replaced by Zab(b)an, maybe under Silliš-Sin and Ilûnâ of Ešnunna. 396 This suggestion was based on the information provided by economic texts of the Mé-Turrān (Tell el-Sîb and Haddâd) archives, in which only Zab(b)an is mentioned. 397 In looking for Simurrum further to the south, Weidner depended on some Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions. Shalmaneser III (858-824 BC) stated that he stopped in Zab(b)an on his way to Mé-Turnat from Assur. 398 Šamš-Adad V (823-811 BC) took almost the same route, passing by Zaban and crossing Mount Ebi (Hamrin) to the city of Mé-Turnat. 399 Weidner collected more references to the city of Zaban in cuneiform sources. 400 The Synchronistic History (Chronicle 21) mentions that Assur-dánan I (1179-1134 BC) “[captured] Zaban, Irriya, Úgarsallu (and . . .)” 401 during his campaign against Babylonia. These data led Weidner to give a location near Hamrin, somewhere on the way between the city of Assur and the Diyâla River, most probably at the point where the River Adhêm breaks out from Hamrin. 402

---

394 Weidner, AJO 15, p. 77-79. He assumes also that Simurrum might have been the name of the land and Zab(b)an its chief city: op. cit., p. 79. According to Astour the equating of Simurrum and Zab(b)an in the lexical texts is due to a scribal error: Astour, “Semitic and Hurrian,” p. 41, note 284.

395 9) TA e-ber-tan ID Za-ba KI.1, TA 10) a-di URU.DU₂-ba-a-ri šá el-la-an KUR Za-ba-an, “From the opposite bank of Lower Záb to the city of Til-Báři, which is upstream from Zaban,” Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 275 (Text A.0.101.23); cf. also Luckenbill, ARAB, vol. I, p. 198, § 551. This is how the text deals with the land of the Lullubians, Zamua: A.0.101.23); cf. also Luckenbill, ARAB, vol. I, p. 198, § 551. This is how the text deals with the land of the Lullubians, Zamua: A.0.101.23).


397 Frayne, ibid.; cf. also: Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 159. Frayne refers to the allusions to Zab(b)an in the texts published by Mustafa in his dissertation, i.e. texts: 3:13; 8:15; 13:7; 24:4; 44:8; 53:8; 87:13; 91:13; 92-9: 93-29; 96:2; 98:4; 111:11; cf. Mustafa, A. A., The Old Babylonian Tablets from Me-Turan (Tell al-Sîb and Tell Haddad), Glasgow, 1983. Another group of texts from Al-Sîb, studied as late as 2002 as a Ph. D. dissertation by Ahmed M. Hameed at the University of Baghdad, also mention only Zab(b)an, without any single reference to Simurrum. References to Zab(b)an occur in: 13:2; 14:3; 18:5; 27:11; 32:5; 33:4; 36: 3: 40-20 (date-formula); 59: col. 1 2; 60: col. 1 2, cf.:

398 Aššurnasirpal II support this. Those inscriptions, when describing the extent of the Assyrian Empire, determine the borders of one of its provinces as starting from the bank of the Lower Záb as far as the city of “Til-Báři, which is above Zabán” as the furthest point. This implies that Zab(b)an was located in the south, far from the Lower Záb. Concerning equating Simurrum with Zab(b)an, Frayne thinks that Simurrum was the ancient name that prevailed in the Akkadian, Ur III and Early Old Babylonian periods until it was replaced by Zab(b)an, maybe under Silliš-Sin and Ilûnâ of Ešnunna. This suggestion was based on the information provided by economic texts of the Mé-Turrān (Tell el-Sîb and Haddâd) archives, in which only Zab(b)an is mentioned. In looking for Simurrum further to the south, Weidner depended on some Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions. Shalmaneser III (858-824 BC) stated that he stopped in Zab(b)an on his way to Mé-Turnat from Assur. Šamš-Adad V (823-811 BC) took almost the same route, passing by Zaban and crossing Mount Ebi (Hamrin) to the city of Mé-Turnat. Weidner collected more references to the city of Zaban in cuneiform sources. The Synchronistic History (Chronicle 21) mentions that Assur-dánan I (1179-1134 BC) “[captured] Zaban, Irriya, Úgarsallu (and . . .)” during his campaign against Babylonia. These data led Weidner to give a location near Hamrin, somewhere on the way between the city of Assur and the Diyâla River, most probably at the point where the River Adhêm breaks out from Hamrin.

399 9) TA e-ber-tan ID Za-ba KI.1, TA 10) a-di URU.DU₂-ba-a-ri šá el-la-an KUR Za-ba-an, “From the opposite bank of Lower Záb to the city of Til-Báři, which is upstream from Zaban,” Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 275 (Text A.0.101.23); cf. also Luckenbill, ARAB, vol. I, p. 198, § 551. This is how the text deals with the land of the Lullubians, Zamua: A.0.101.23); cf. also Luckenbill, ARAB, vol. I, p. 198, § 551. This is how the text deals with the land of the Lullubians, Zamua: A.0.101.23).


401 Frayne, ibid.; cf. also: Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 159. Frayne refers to the allusions to Zab(b)an in the texts published by Mustafa in his dissertation, i.e. texts: 3:13; 8:15; 13:7; 24:4; 44:8; 53:8; 87:13; 91:13; 92-9: 93-29; 96:2; 98:4; 111:11; cf. Mustafa, A. A., The Old Babylonian Tablets from Me-Turan (Tell al-Sîb and Tell Haddad), Glasgow, 1983. Another group of texts from Al-Sîb, studied as late as 2002 as a Ph. D. dissertation by Ahmed M. Hameed at the University of Baghdad, also mention only Zab(b)an, without any single reference to Simurrum. References to Zab(b)an occur in: 13:2; 14:3; 18:5; 27:11; 32:5; 33:4; 36: 3: 40-20 (date-formula); 59: col. 1 2; 60: col. 1 2, cf.: [Hameed, Ahmed Majeed, Old Babylonian Cuneiform Texts in the Iraq Museum (Tell el-Sîb/ Hamrin Basin), Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation submitted to the University of Baghdad, Baghdad, 2002].


According to Nashef, Zab(b)an was located somewhere in the hilly country between modern Kifri and Qara Tepe, based on information from the inscription of Šamš-Adad V.\(^{403}\) He concluded that Zab(b)an was not on the Lower Zāb, so removing Simurrum away from Pirdē. It is supported by the Middle Assyrian archival text (VAT 18000) from Kār-Tukulti-Ninurta and published by Freydank that mentioned “the land (Mount?) of Zab(b)an, on the bank of the Turrān (= the Diyāla).”\(^{404}\)

Frayne, in his detailed study in search of Simurrum, and depending on that same inscription, suggested a location on the River Diyāla,\(^{405}\) not the River Adhēm, as had been suggested by Weidner.\(^{406}\) This location is possible only if this Zab(b)an was identical with Simurrum, which is very probable. The fact that Šilluš-Dagān, the Ur III governor of Simurrum, was responsible for collecting booty from the conquered surrounding lands during the last campaigns of Šulgi was sufficient reason to suggest a location of Simurrum somewhere on the five routes that connected Madga with the Diyāla.\(^{407}\) This seems likely as long as these routes were connecting the surrounding lands with each other. But the question that unavoidably arises is about the location of Madga. According to Frayne, Madga must be located around modern Kifri or Tā'uq (= Daqūq).\(^{408}\) Nevertheless, another explanation for the duty undertaken by Šilluš-Dagān is not because of the location of Simurrum there but because it was the only large urban centre in that region governed by a man installed by Ur.

In short, according to Frayne, locating Simurrum on the Diyāla, at a point where one of the routes from Kifri crosses the river, was more likely. The best spot for him is the modern site of Qalāy Shirwānā, an old fort built on the top of a high ancient tell at the pass formed by the junction of the Pūngla tributary with the Sirwān River,\(^{409}\) “not far from Karhar.”\(^{410}\) He thinks also that the name of the nearby mountain Kushki Zang is derived and developed from the

---

\(^{403}\) Cf. Nashef, Kh., *RGTC* 5, Wiesbaden, 1982, p. 280; also for the bibliography over Zab(b)an on pages 279-280.


\(^{405}\) Frayne, *op. cit.*, 263. In fact, the location he suggests is on the Sirwān River, which is the upper part of the Diyāla itself.

\(^{406}\) Frayne has presented some additional arguments for his suggestion:

1) A year-name of Narām-Sîn of Akkad that commemorates his victory over the two cities of Arame and Simurrum together, suggests that Narām-Sîn has followed the Diyāla route upstream, first to Arame and then to Simurrum.

2) Arame, which is mentioned in the Harmal Geographical list, was located on the Diyāla river, to the south of the point where the river breaks out from Hamrin. Note that this location for Arame on the Diyāla was made by Frayne himself.

3) The troops of Arame were mentioned together with the troops of Ešnunna in an archival text from Ur III, dated to Šulgi 48.

4) Šilluš-Dagān, governor of Simurrum in the Ur III period, was called the leader of the Simurrian troops and the troops of Išṭīm-Šulgi. The latter too, was located in the Diyāla region; cf. Frayne, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

Although the location of Simurrum in this direction is very possible, some points deserve comment. First, defeating two cities within one year does not necessarily imply their being on the same axis or in the same region. They could have been located on two different axes, or even in different directions. Secondly, Šilluš-Dagān could lead the troops of two cities or districts close to each other but on two different axes. Finally, there are other examples of persons holding important posts in cities and regions located in different directions, even far from each other, e.g. Arad-Nanna and Zāriqum in the Ur III period. It seems quite possible to me that such titles were actually an enumeration of the posts and offices held by a person during his career, a kind of *curriculum vitae*.


\(^{408}\) For the location of Madga see Chapter Three, note 189.

\(^{409}\) Sirwān is the upper part of the Diyāla River.

\(^{410}\) Frayne, *SCCNH* 10, p. 148. He identified a location for Karhar near modern Qasr-i-Shīrīn, on the River Alwand and along the Great Khorasān Road.
name of Zam/b(b)an and the names of (Qalāy) Shirwāna and the River Sirwān are reflections of the old name Simurrum: *Sīwurr+ān > Sīwrān.\textsuperscript{411} The fact that even today the main route that leads to the Diyâla Region from Shahrazūr passes by Qalāy Shirwāna is a good reason to believe that this site was important in antiquity, being located on the strategic route that linked the south to the north.\textsuperscript{412} We saw also in the previous chapter that Simurrum was the second target of the Ur III kings after Karḫar. From this we arrived at a location behind the area of influence of Karḫar, which fits Qalāy Shirwāna. Furthermore, that Simurrum was located on or close to a river is shown by the proverb “Between the basket and the boat (are) the fields of Simurrum” cited above. We know now also that Mē-Turnat was in Tell-el-Sib and Tell Haddād, so Zab(b)an was to the north of these two sites. The Harmal Geographical List lists Simurrum between Arraḫa in the north and Niqqum (= Khanaqūn)?\textsuperscript{413} and Meturān in the south,\textsuperscript{414} facts which are compatible with Frayne’s location at Qalāy Shirwāna.

Of special importance is the etymology of the name Simurrum presented by Astour. According to him, the name has an Akkadian origin, namely \textit{s/sīmuɾum}(m), “cumin,” which is attested with the same alternation \textit{s/š} as in the OB variants of the toponym.\textsuperscript{415} More interesting is the other equivalent of “cumin,” \textit{ḥašmūru} or \textit{ḥašī’u}ru, which is used in the Middle Bronze Age and Neo-Assyrian Period to designate a mountainous region as one approaches the Diyâla from the northeast.\textsuperscript{416} In this way, Astour combines linguistically Simurrum with Ḥaš(i)mu/ar in an indirect way. The latter was known in the ancient written sources as an important mountain and pass. The most important and closest pass in this region might be Darband-i-Khān, which controls the route to the southern part of the Shahrazūr Plain and serves as its southern gateway.\textsuperscript{417}

\textsuperscript{411} Frayne, p. 266-7. Although the name Shirwān(a) is a Kurdish name that means ‘The Lion Trainer’ or ‘The man of sword(s)’ (‘šēr’ means ‘lion’ and ‘šīr’ means ‘sword’), the development of the modern name from that ancient name is not impossible through \textit{Volksetymologie}. The name Sirwān, however, has no clear etymology in the local language.

\textsuperscript{412} The routes that linked the south with the north in antiquity, even as late as the Ottoman Period, passed through the Diyâla and Hamrin regions, not along the Tigris; cf. Postgate, N. J., “The Historical Geography of the Hamrin Basin,” \textit{Sumer} 35, no. 1 and 2 (1979), p. 593.

\textsuperscript{413} Frayne, \textit{EDGN}, p. 70.

\textsuperscript{414} Col. III: 74) \textit{A-ra-ap-hu} 75) \textit{Ši-mu-rum} 76) \textit{Gān-DAŠ} 77) \textit{Ni-qum} 78) \textit{Me-tu-ra-an}, Lewy, S., “Harmal Geographical List,” \textit{Sumer} 3, no. 1 (1947), p. 53. In the Nippur List Simurrum is set generally in the following sequence: 99) I(?)-\textit{sim}-(gi) 100) \textit{Sa-su-na-an-na} 101) \textit{Gua-a-ba} 102) \textit{Si-mu-ra-um} 103) An-\textit{sā-n(a) 104) Du-\textit{sī}-\textit{n(a) 105) Bi-ra-\textit{mu}-\textit{mu}(?) 106) Bi-\textit{mu}(?) 107) Di-ni-ik-[\textit{lum}] until it reaches Niq(q)u and Kazallu, cf. Lewy, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 65. Išim-Šulgi was in the Diyâla region (\textit{RGTC} 2, p. 87); Šulgi-nanna is located on the Nahrawān Canal, between Samarra, Tell Asmar and Kūt (\textit{RGTC} 3, p. 227); Guab(b)u was a cultic place to the southeast of the Lagaš region (\textit{RGTC} 2, p. 65), but there is a question whether they were identical; Anšan is Tell i-Maliyān in Fārs Province in southwest Iran; Ibrat in Kūt al-Amārā (\textit{RGTC} 3, p. 104; \textit{RGTC} 2, p. 82) to the south east of Baghdad; Ibla could be the same as Dūr-E/Ubla on the southern shore of lake Zirēbār (Frayne, \textit{EDGN} p. 60 and the map on p. 62) near Mariwān City; and Dinkūn in Tell Muhammed (or: Tell Hurmu?) near Baghdad (\textit{RGTC} 3, p. 54); Frayne, \textit{RIME} 4, p. 682.

\textsuperscript{415} Astour, “Semites and Hurrians …” p. 41. The Akkadian dictionaries give “caraway” as a second possible meaning, cf. Black, J., A. George and N. Postgate, \textit{A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian}, 2nd ed., Wiesbaden, 2000, p. 111. It is notable that this is not the only foreign toponym with an Akkadian meaning; e.g. Kunšum, the capital city of the kingdom of Ḫubalhum in the Zagros, means “ball of wool” in Akkadian; the Elamite city of Madaktu means in Akkadian “(military) camp, expeditionary force.” Such names were not uncommon even within Mesopotamian territory; the birth-place of Sargon of Agade was the city of Azūpirānu, meaning “saffron.”

\textsuperscript{416} Astour, “Semites and …” p. 41; Nashef, \textit{RGTC} 5, p. 122.

Linking the name of Simurrum to a plant name is reminiscent of what the ancient Arab geographer and traveller Miṣʿar bin al-Muhalhal (10th century A.D.) wrote about his visit to Shahrazūr. His narrative is cited in the book of Yaqūt al-Ḥamawī, entitled Muʿjam al Buldān (= Lexicon of the Lands). Al-Muhalhal said, “Shahrazūr is famous for the mountains Shaʿrān and Zalm, on the sides of which some kind of plant grows that is good for manhood and sexuality.” He has identified two criteria relevant to our purpose, the mountain name is similar to (H)ṣīšūrū, and it is known for a particular plant, though we are not in a position to say anything more. Because the name Shaʿrān is not current today an identification is difficult. Nevertheless, its alleged proximity to the ancient capital city Shahrazūr, which is by no means so far to the south as Hamrin and Qalāy Shirwāna, makes us search in the Shahrazūr Plain. The association al-Muhalhal made between Shaʿrān and Zalm is crucial. Zalm is the mountain on the eastern edge of the plain, with the same name and close to Mount Surēn. Surēn is in all probability a development from Shaʿrān from the older form Šīran, a form recorded in a Syriac manuscript concerned with the history of Kirkuk (Kark/bā de-Bēt Selōk). When that manuscript defines the frontiers of the kingdom of Beth Garmai (modern Garmiyān), of which Kirkuk was the capital, it works in a counter-clockwise direction from the Lower Zāb, then to Deklat (the Tigris), then to the river “Atrakon, which they also call Tormara or Tamara,” then to Ladi/ab and Mount Šīran back to the Lower Zāb. A significant allusion made by al-Muhalhal is that the main river of Shahrazūr was called Tama/iurrā, which flows to Khanaqīn. Although he has not given the exact pronunciation of the second vowel the principal elements of t-m-r are recognizable and we have the Syriac form Tormara/ Tamara. If we treat this hydronym by the rules of Akkadian phonology, it becomes possible to take the initial /u/ as having been derived from or developed from Akkadian /s/ or /š/, (compare Akk. štru, “(piece of) writing” > Arab. satru(n) and Akk. šiqlu > Arab. tiqlu(n), and many other examples). The sound /u/ is convertible in Kurdish, which is spoken in the region, to either /a/ or /ā/, as can be heard in the name Tāmā/iurrā. So this name may correspond to the ancient name of S/Simurra/ Simurra/u. This would lend support to the suggestion of Frayne about the name of Simurrum reflected in modern Sirwān, especially when we know that the main river of Shahrazūr that flows southwards to Khanaqīn is Sirwān and the name Tama/iurrā is not known at present. But it is important to know that the Middle Ages geographer al-Mustawfi (14th century AD) mentioned that the River Diyālā

418 Le Strange, The Lands of Eastern Caliphate, p. 190.
419 [al-Hamawī, Muʿjam al Buldān (in Arabic), vol. 5, Cairo, 1906, p. 312-3, under: Shahrazūr]. al-Hamawī has died in 1228 A.D.
420 Ibid.
421 The city of Shahrazūr has not yet been exactly identified, but it seems very probable that it is identical with modern Yasān Tepe, a high and large tell that revealed rich Islamic levels at the upper levels during a short excavation in the 1970s.
422 Another mountain on the eastern side of the Darband-i-Khān, the artificial lake at the southern end of Shahrazūr Plain, is Shamērān, which sounds similar to Shaʿrān, but the association of the latter with Zalm in the passage of al-Muhalhal makes the identification of Šārān with Shamērān unlikely.
423 [Pigulevskaia, N., The Cities of Iran under the Parthians and Sassanians (in Russian, originally published in Russian), Teheran, 1993, p. 68]. Although the manuscript tells the events of the last years of the NA period, it uses terminology and GNs of the time of its composition (the Sassanian Period), such as Beth Garmai. The other GNs mentioned in the text must also be the forms known in Sassanian times.
424 In the light of the Syriac version it could be more probably an a.
425 Kurdish, an Indo-European language, has been present in the region since the beginning of the first millennium BC, when with the Medes came to the region. The grammar and phonology of Kurdish is closely comparable to other neighbouring Indo-European languages, especially in converting the above-mentioned sounds.
was called Nahrawān, coming from the mountains of Kurdistan, consisting of the confluence of the two rivers Širwān (an old form of Sirwān), the lower part of which is called Tāmarrā, and the River Halwān.\footnote{Le Strange, p. 60-61.}

Looking for later or even modern toponyms identifiable with ancient Simurrum leads to a name with a flourishing past, the city of Saimara, which gave its name to the river passing through the district once called Mihrājān Kuţad\footnote{[al-Ĥamawi, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. 5, p. 407, under: Saimarah]; cf. also: Le Strange, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 202 f.} (now in Luristan Minor). This suggestion is more complicated because the city is farther to the southeast, in Iranian territory, to the southeast of Halwān and Sarpul, but it is still worth examining. Also interesting is the presence of another city between Halwān and Saimara called Širwān, the same name as the river discussed above (cf. Map 5).\footnote{The even more similar GN \textit{Samirum} is further to the southeast than Saimara, a distance which makes any identification futile.} Both cities flourished in the Middle Ages and were important centres in the region. While no clear etymology can be presented for these names, they may perhaps be linked phonologically with Simurrum. Both places are not so far away from the area of Simurrarian activity, so there may be some connection between the names. The relief and inscription of a king of Simurrum (Anūbanīnī II= ID) is nearby, and it is the place where Iddy(n)-Sīn fought and subdued Ḫalman. The city name Saimara can be a reflection of the old name Simurrum. But geographically it is difficult to suggest a location of Simurrum of the Ur III and Early OB texts in such a relatively remote place. A reasonable solution would be to suggest the name here reflects the time of a Simurrian extended hegemony, perhaps under Iddy(n)-Sīn.\footnote{Such cases are not uncommon; many city names of the new world are reflections of city names of Europe, from where the new settlers originated. On the other hand the names of Širwān and Saimara are not the only instances of a supposed reflection of an older name. Many examples are known to Assyriologists, particularly in the northern Transtigris and northern Mesopotamia: Śušarrā > Shemshāra; Musasīr > Mujesīs; Azīrā > Azmar; \textit{A/Urbi̇lim} > Arbil and many others. Further, one may add some other ancient toponyms comparable linguistically and geographically with the medieval toponyms mentioned by geographers and travelers of the time, such as Kimās, comparable with Qūmis (var. Kumiš), a large district in western Iran, almost identical with ancient Kimaš. Qūmis or Qumaš is also the name of a village in Maidašt, a locality of Kirmās; for this cf. the note of Rōẕhbayānī to the Arabic version of Sharafhāmeh in: \textit{al-Baladīsī, Shrafkhān, Sharafhāmeh, tr. M. J. Rōẕhbayānī, 3rd edition, Baghdad, 2007, p. 113, note 25 (in Arabic)}; \textit{Ḫašrī and Harsīn (?)} (there is more than one GN Harsīn in the region); Gidānu and (Karḫ) Jadān (?), where Karḫ means “fort, ‘castle’;” Padān and Māsāpādan (?), where Mas can be analysed as the Iranised form of māh, which was used in GNs like Māh of Basra and Māh of Kūfa in the Arabic sources; perhaps it comes from Akkadian \textit{māt}; it is not from the GN Media, OP Māda, as suggested by Edward Brown in \textit{A Literary History of Persia}, vol. I, London, 1951, p. 19. This is not the only case of borrowing. Additional examples are \textcite{ar} \textit{kūrē/} < Sum. KUR and \textit{iqlim/} < Sum. KALAM in Classical Arabic writings to denote “land” and “province.”} Another possibility is that Simurrum could indeed have been in this region of Saimara in its earliest days, but its centre of gravity had moved later to the northwest, to the strategic area around Halwān and the Great Khorasan Road. How the name Simurrum was changed to Zab(b)an is not known, though Zab(b)an could perhaps be somehow associated with Zabazuna.\footnote{In this regard it is tempting to think of Zabazuna as the founder of a new capital in the Diyālī region, named after himself as Zaba(n)zuna, developed or abbreviated to Zab(b)an, assuming Zaban is not identical with Simurrum. Or he might have changed the name of ancient Simurrum to Zaba(n)zuna after he rose to power. This hypothesis fits chronologically with the replacement of the name Simurrum by Zab(b)an in texts dated to Šīlī-Sīn and Iluna of Ešnunna and later of Apīl-Sīn of Babylon.}

426 Le Strange, p. 60-61.

427 It could be that Tāmarrā has its roots in the element Tur(r)ān of the GN Mē-Turān.

428 The even more similar GN \textit{Samirum} is further to the southeast than Saimara, a distance which makes any identification futile.

429 Such cases are not uncommon; many city names of the new world are reflections of city names of Europe, from where the new settlers originated. On the other hand the names of Širwān and Saimara are not the only instances of a supposed reflection of an older name. Many examples are known to Assyriologists, particularly in the northern Transtigris and northern Mesopotamia: Śušarrā > Shemshāra; Musasīr > Mujesīs; Azīrā > Azmar; \textit{A/Urbi̇lim} > Arbil and many others. Further, one may add some other ancient toponyms comparable linguistically and geographically with the medieval toponyms mentioned by geographers and travelers of the time, such as Kimās, comparable with Qūmis (var. Kumiš), a large district in western Iran, almost identical with ancient Kimaš. Qūmis or Qumaš is also the name of a village in Maidašt, a locality of Kirmās; for this cf. the note of Rōẕhbayānī to the Arabic version of Sharafhāmeh in: \textit{al-Baladīsī, Shrafkhān, Sharafhāmeh, tr. M. J. Rōẕhbayānī, 3rd edition, Baghdad, 2007, p. 113, note 25 (in Arabic)}; \textit{Ḫašrī and Harsīn (?)} (there is more than one GN Harsīn in the region); Gidānu and (Karḫ) Jadān (?), where Karḫ means “fort, ‘castle’;” Padān and Māsāpādan (?), where Mas can be analysed as the Iranised form of māh, which was used in GNs like Māh of Basra and Māh of Kūfa in the Arabic sources; perhaps it comes from Akkadian \textit{māt}; it is not from the GN Media, OP Māda, as suggested by Edward Brown in \textit{A Literary History of Persia}, vol. I, London, 1951, p. 19. This is not the only case of borrowing. Additional examples are \textcite{ar} \textit{kūrē/} < Sum. KUR and \textit{iqlim/} < Sum. KALAM in Classical Arabic writings to denote “land” and “province.”}
Figures of Chapter Five

Map 1) The Sarpul pass and the locations of the reliefs. After Hrouda, *Iranische Denkmäler*, Lieferung 7, Reihe II: Iranische Felsreliefs C: Sarpol-i Zohāb, Die Reliefs I-IV, Dietrich Reimer Verlag, Berlin, 1976, pl. 9.b. (The names are modified.)
Map 2) The Transtigris. Names in italic indicate ancient geographical names.

1b) Seal impression of another servant of Silluš-Dagan. After: Owen, op. cit., fig. 4, p. 840.


5a) A silver cup from Deilem in Iran showing shoes with upward pointed tips. After: Godard, *Die Kunst des Iran*, Berlin, 1964. Fig. 116a-b, p. 69.

5b) A pottery figurine from Amlash showing footwear with pointed tips. After: Godard, *op. cit.*, fig. 111, p. 68.

5c) A Proto-Elamite copper figure wearing footwear with pointed tips. After: Hansen, in: *Art of the first Cities*, fig. 15a, p. 46.
7a) The Haladiny inscription in the Sulaimaniya Museum. Photo by the author.
7b) The Haladiny inscription, oblique view. Photo by the author.
8a) Detail of the upper part of the Haladiny inscription. Photo by the author.
8b) Detail of the upper middle part of the Haladiny inscription. Photo by the author.
8c) Detail of the lower middle part of the Haladiny inscription. Photo by the author.
8d) Detail of the lower part of the Haladiny inscription. Photo by the author.
9) The Haladiny inscription; hand copy by the author.

11b) Transcription of the Jerusalem inscription. After: Shaffer and Wasserman, *op. cit.*, fig. 1, p. 4-5.
13c) The Bētwate inscription ID 3 (or C) that consists of two pieces. After: Al-Fouadi, *op. cit.*, fig. 5, p. 124.
15a) The Behistane Citadel from the entrance to Behistane from the Rāniya Plain. Photo by the author.

14) View from the top of the Behistane Citadel. Photo by the author.

15b) The Behistane Citadel from the opposite mountain side. Photo by the author.

15c) The Rāniya Plain seen from the Behistane Citadel. Photo by the author.
15d) The large flat stone on the Bêtwate Citadel between two natural portions that form the citadel. View from the So-called ‘Throne of the East Sun’ rock. Photo by the author.

16a) An old cyclopean stone wall built on a still older portion. The wall is at the foot of the citadel and at present forms one of the walls of a dwelling house in Bêtwate. Photo by the author.

16b) An old stone wall at the hill side of the citadel. Photo by the author.
17) The presumably complete layout of the Haladiny inscription.
Map 3: The Lower Zāb axis through which Iddit(n)-Sin invaded the Rāniya Plain, showing the presumed territorial divisions on the northern bank of the river.

18a) The steep valley in Pīra Magrūn Mountain where Rabana is located. Photo by the author.
Map 3) The conquests of Iddi(n)-Sin and his son Zabazuna.
19c) One of the walls of terrace no. 1, viewed from below. Photo by the author.

19b) The first defense wall in the beginning of Rabana. Photo by the author.

19a) The eastern part of terrace no. 1, viewed from above. The white line runs along the wall. Photo by the author.
20a) Corner of terrace no. 2, viewed from the south. Photo by the author.

20b) Above terrace no. 2, viewed from the north. Photo by the author.

21a) Part of the western carved wall of the lower corridor (Cor. No. 1).

21b) The eastern stone wall of the lower corridor (Cor. No. 1).
22a) The first staircase to the west of the lower passage (Stc. no. 1). Photo by the author.

22b) The second staircase to the west of the lower passage (Stc. no. 2). Photo by the author.
23) The series of staircases and paths in the centre of the complex. Photo by the author.
24a) The niche, which is carved in the mountain rock, with the remains of the statue of a deity. Photo by the author.
25) The upper staircases (Stc. no. 3) that are above the niche. Photo by the author.

24b) The niche with the deity’s statue (scale: 10 cm). Photo by the author.

26) The upper end of the upper staircases and the vertical shaft pointed to by the arrow. Photo by the author.

27) The square space at the beginning of the upper staircases. Photo by the author.
28) The remains of the carved wall connected with the other wall at 90° degree angle (western part). Photo by the author.
29a) The general plan of the Rabana structures. Drawing by the author.
29b) Plan of the temple and surrounding paths and staircases (detail of the upper part of fig. 29a). Drawing by the author.
29c) Front view of the temple. Drawing by the author.

Map 5) Map of medieval western Iran showing the Jibîl Province (Mountains Province) on which both cities of Saimara and Sirwân are shown. Map after: G. Le Strange, opposite page 185.
CHAPTER SIX

Conflict for Survival in the Zagros
The events of the years that followed the period of the military and political successes of Simurrum are shrouded in mystery. No royal inscriptions from inside the region, such as those of Iddi(n)-Sin or Annubanini, are known which could throw light on the events. Here we are obliged to rely on sources from its neighbours, Ešnunna, Assyria, Mari and later Babylon. Some very important light is shed by the Shemshāra archives; they fill a large gap in the history of this period in the 18th century BC from inside the region. Second in importance are the Mari archives; they provide valuable information about the history of the northern Mesopotamian states and sometimes even those of the Zagros, particularly in the period after the Shemshāra archives.

We have only sparse information about Simurrum at this time. In the letter no. 69 = SH 868 that was sent by the great Turukkean king Pišendēn to a certain Tu[...], he addresses him as “brother.” Since no other Turukkean king in the realm of Pišendēn was equal to him, even the influential Talpuš-šarri (see below), this Tu[...] must have been a powerful king outside the Turukkean orbit. In the letter, Pišendēn encourages the addressee to persuade the kings of Elam, Niqqum and Namar to attack Kakmum. This might mean that the addressee had good relations with the rulers of these lands and was most probably their neighbour. So the letter could well have been sent to Simurrum. Eidem and Læssøe base this suggestion, despite the lack of documentation for Simurrum, on evidence that Simurrum had diplomatic relations with Turukkum. Nevertheless, we do not know from other sources who this king was who succeeded Zabazuna directly or indirectly.

The most prominent figure in this period was Šamšī-Adad I (1813-1781 BC) of Assyria. Thanks to him and his conquests the history of the whole region has become better known. Valuable information has been recorded in the letters and reports he, his sons, his officials and his spies exchanged, as we will see in the next pages. These documents come from the archives of Mari and Shemshāra, but other documents from the time of his successors and the time of Zimri-Lim come, in addition to Mari, from the sites of Tell al-Rimāḥ (ancient

---

1 Eidem and Læssøe, The Shemshara Archives 1: The Letters, p. 144, comment on l. 1.
2 Although the French Mari team prefers “North Mesopotamian Kingdom” instead of “Assyria” for the rule of the dynasty of Šamšī-Adad, which is more realistic, for convenience I maintain the traditional terminology and shall use “Assyria” in this work.
Qaṭṭara), Bi’a (Ancient Tuttul), and Leylān (Ancient Šeḥna, later Šubat-Enlil), which were discovered after Mari and Shemšāra. These documents, particularly those of Shemšāra, are extremely important. They provide historical data and also significant information about the culture, language, historical geography and ethnic pattern of the region in this period. In the time of Šamšī-Addad Mari was under the control of Assyria and was ruled by his son Yasma-Addu. The reports his father and sometimes his brother Išme-Dagan sent to him informing him about the developments on the eastern front are, fortunately for us, preserved in Mari. Even in the Post-Assyrian period, when the Shemšāra archives had ceased to exist, Mari remained actively involved in the affairs of northern Mesopotamia. As a result of the involvement of numerous agents and officials of the king of Mari there, reports were sent to the king, documenting the phase that followed the end of the Assyrian domination in Northern Mesopotamia and the emergence of the Turukkeans as a major power.

The Geo-political Scene

A panoramic view of the polities in the region under study shows a series of small kingdoms, princedoms and tribal federations that ruled the whole region, from southern Anatolia to Luristan in the middle Zagros. Every one of these polities had a capital city, and the names of some polities and some capitals are known, such as Kunšum of Itabalḫum that led the Turukkean federation; Qabrā of the land of Qabrā; Šušarrā of Utûm; Simurrum, Kumme, Ahazum, Kamnum and others. Not all were under Hurrian supremacy; there was still room for the non-Hurrians: the Amorites of Qabrā, the Gutians and the Lullubians. These peoples dominated extended areas and were powerful enough to threaten the very existence of some of the Hurrians, as seen in the case of Endušše the Gutian (see below). S/Šubartum is also mentioned several times in the documents of this period, but not apparently to indicate a specific ethnic designation. Rather it served as a collective term for the peoples of ancient Subartu and sometimes for the northern mountainous regions (see also Chapter Two). One important note about Šubartu is that every time the documents refer to its rulers they use a plural formula “the kings of Šubartum.” This suggests that the term covered various independent peoples and polities of the region, and it does not rule out the probability that there were small political entities spread over the areas about which we are ignorant, outside the orbits of the polities we know. To the west there was the growing empire of Assyria under Šamšī-Addad that was centred on the cities of Aššur, Ekallātum and Šubat-Enlil. Ešnunna was a powerful state in the Diyāla region that was politically involved in Northern Mesopotamia and the Transtigris. As will be shown, Ešnunna allied with Assyria to conquer Arrapha and Qabrā. It was more than an ally of Šamšī-Addad’s dynasty, for it acted as its patron. Elam had its own interests in the region and was involved in the power game. It supported the Turukkeans against the Gutians, and later, in the time of Zimri-Lim, it invaded and occupied Northern Mesopotamia for a while. Eidem and Læssøe have grouped the kingdoms and princedoms of the Transtigris of this period as follows:5

I. On the Tigris River: Nurrugum - Ekallātum - Aššur - Ešnunna
II. In the East-Tigris Plain: Urbel/Qabrā - Arrapha - Ešnunna.

---

5 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 21.
III. In the Zagros foothills: Kumme - Ya’ilānum - Aḥazum - Šīmurrum - Namar - Nikki/qqum.⁶

IV. In the inner Zagros: Turukkum - Lullubum - Kaknum - Gutium - Elam.

Some but not all of them have been discussed in previous chapters; Nurrugum, Qabrā, Arrapha, Kumme, Ya’ilānum, Namar and Turukkum still have to be discussed.

Nurrugum appears to have been the region in which Nineveh was located⁷ “perhaps with this city as capital, and perhaps with a king named Kipram.”⁸ Eidem and Læssøe believe it was a short-lived, heavily fortified site in the region of Nineveh, which may now be hard to locate on the ground.⁹ He noticed also that “Nurrugum is only attested in this period and its name almost disappears after Šamšī-Adad’s conquest.”¹⁰ The letter ARM 26, 297 sent to Yasmah-Addu refers to the high quality of Nurruegan alum. Yasmah-Addu asked for it after he had experienced its quality when his father had sent him some.¹¹ “A certain Kipram is the first, and probably the most important, of 9 kings listed in the MEC as defeated by Šamšī-Adad or his sons during the limmu year Aššur-malik, when Nurrugum was conquered. His name is followed by Yašub-Addu (of Aḥazum). Consequently Kipram was quite likely king of Nurrugum.”¹² Listing the name of Kipram as the first of nine kings could imply added significance and power for Nurrugum. This is supported by the number of troops Šamšī-Adad sent with Išme-Dagan to conquer Nurrugum; 60,000 troops¹³ is a huge number for that time when compared with the numbers mentioned elsewhere.¹⁴

The city of Assur was the centre of a city-state on the Tigris. The Assyrian king lists identify a continuous sequence of Assyrian rulers for the city over the centuries, but in fact Assur was at times under the yoke of southern dynasties, such as Akkad and perhaps Ur III.¹⁵ Like other cities in the Zagros foothills, it seems that Assur gained its independence as a result of the end of the Ur III dynasty. With the growth of Šamšī-Adad’s empire Assur was conquered and incorporated in c. 1812 BC.¹⁶ However, the city maintained its prestige and prominence as a religious centre, in contrast to Ekallātum, a political centre. Ziegler confirms

---

⁶ They list Kaknum under this rubric, but according to our identification we situate it in the inner Zagros, not in the foothills. Hence I put it in the following rubric. For this identification, cf. Chapter Five.


⁸ Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 21-22. The royal name is written Kipram (Ki-ip-ra-am, E 10, 19′), which can be the accusative of *Kiprum, but it could also be a name having the same ending -am as the names Nipram, an envoy of Kuwari (see below, letter no. 64 = SH 827), Pušam, king of Simanum (in the same general area of Nurrugum), attested in a Sumerian text from the Ur III period (see Chapter Four), Šennam, king of Uršu, Šup/bram, king of Susā (in the Habur), and Tišnam, a king in the Habur region. These names seem to be original forms, not all in the accusative. It is also noticeable that these PNs ending with –am (all except for Nipram), just like Simanum, come from the Upper and Western Habur.


¹⁰ Ibid.


¹³ Cf. the letter of Šepratu to Kuwari (no. 64 = SH 827) below in this chapter.

¹⁴ Compare for instance the 10,000 Ešnunnian troops Daduša sent to conquer Qabrā (Daduša Stele); the 12,000 Elamite troops Siruk-tuḫuḫ promised to send to support the Turukkenas (no. 64 = SH 827); the contribution of Kusanar(ḫ)um to the Turukkkan alliance was 3,000 troops (no. 63 = SH 812); Kuwari was asked to send 1,000 troops to join Etellum for the conquest of Šikšabbum (no. 14 = SH 917); and the same number to contribute to an action in Kaštappum (no. 9 = SH 882); Kuwari was supported by 600 troops which Šamšī-Adad sent to Šušarrā (no. 19 = SH 861); for more examples, cf. Chapter Seven.

¹⁵ According to a recent study of Michalowski, Zarriqum of Aššur recognized Amar-Sîn of Ur as overlord, but Aššūr was independent from the direct rule of Ur, cf. Michalowski, P., “Aššūr during the Ur III Period,” Here and There, Across the Ancient Near East, Studies in Honour of Krystyna Łyczkowska, ed. O. Drewnowska, Warszawa, 2009, p. 154-5.

that Assur enjoyed precedence over Ekallātum by referring to the letter of Sumiya to Yasma-Addu, who puts Assur before Ekallātum and writes it with the divinity determinative.\(^{17}\) Ešnunna was the power that controlled the Diyāla Basin and parts of the Hamrin Basin. OB tablets from the Hamrin sites are dated with Ešnunna date-formulae.\(^{18}\)

**Erbil,** which is written as Urbel in the texts of this period, reappears this time as the name of the land in which Qabrā was located. It was mentioned for the last time in the date-formulae of the Ur III kings. Now it is again mentioned in unhappy circumstances, when the land of Erbil is said to be occupied by Dadaša and Šamšī-Adad when they conquered the land of Qabrā (see below, the stele of Dadaša) in c. 1782 BC.

Arrapaḥ was apparently an independent city-state. It appears in the written records of this period more often than the few allusions in the Ur III texts.\(^{19}\) Toward the end of the OB period, the city was Hurrianized ethnically and culturally, as indicated by the Nuzi texts. That process certainly began from the OB period or even earlier, but was consolidated as a consequence of the weakness of Assyria and Ešnunna and the rise of the Turukkeans. Its position as a communication junction between Southern and Central Mesopotamia on the one hand and the mountainous regions of the Transtigris and Erbil, Qabrā and Nineveh on the other, gave it a special strategical significance. Arrapaḥ was conquered by Ḫaṭaya of Ešnunna in the eponomy of Dadaya, 4 years after the accession of Šamšī-Adad (c. 1830 BC).\(^{20}\) Afterwards, the city was lost to Ešnunna until it was conquered by Šamšī-Adad I. From the written documents it appears that the city had twin settlements; Āl-ilāni (modern cArafah)\(^{21}\) and Tašenniwe (modern Tīshēn),\(^{22}\) both within the modern city of Kirkuk.\(^{23}\)

Qabrā, written Qa-ab-ra-a\(^{24}\) or Qa-ba-ra-a\(^{24}\), was an important centre, even overshadowing Urbel and Arrapaḥ, judging by the number of times it is mentioned in the texts of this period. Its fame, according to Astour, may have reached Egypt, for Ka-bут of the Medinet Habu texts can be identified with Qab(a)rā.\(^{25}\) It was apparently a large city that gave its name to a whole province.\(^{26}\) Eidem thinks that the land of Qabrā included a large part of the land between the two Žābs, including Urbel.\(^{27}\) We know from the textual material that Qabrā was an extensive territory with numerous cities and towns. In the inscription of Dadaša the cities of Ḫatkmu, Ḫurārā and Kerḥum are named. The Mari letter ARM 1, 121 implies that

---


\(^{18}\) Eidem and Læssøe, *op. cit.,* p. 22.

\(^{19}\) Cf. for instance Edzard and Farber, *RGTC* 2, p. 16; Groneberg, *RGTC* 3, p. 21-22.


\(^{21}\) This is suggested by Hanoon in his dissertation about the historical geography of Northern Iraq in the middle and Neo-Assyrian periods: حبون, ص. 360-363. However, this is in contrast to the older suggestions that identified Arrapaḥ with the citadel of Kirkuk; cf. for instance Boulanger, R., 1966, 699-700 (referred to by Fincke, *RGTC* 10, p. 38).

\(^{22}\) Gelb *et al., NPN,* p. 263.

\(^{23}\) These are the two most common renderings of the name. However, there is at least one case of the use of the sign QA instead of QA (ARM 10, 50:15(7)), cf. Groneberg, *RGTC* 3, p. 187, and the Shemshāra rendering Qa-ba-ra-e (64 = SH 827: 9), Eidem and Læssøe, *op. cit.,* p. 137; cf. also Streck, M. P., “Qab(a)rā,” *RlA* 11 (2006-2008), p. 139.


\(^{25}\) Compare for instance ālim ša Qa-ab-ra-a\(^{24}\) (ARM 4, 49: 6) and māt Qa-ab-ra-a\(^{24}\) (ARM 1, 135: 16; ARM 4, 25: 21; ShT 57, 15) in Groneberg, *RGTC* 3, p. 187.

the cities of A‘innum and Zamiyatum were located on the Záb and would have formed part of the territory of this land (see below). The letter ARM 4, 49 mentions another town, Sarrima. It reports that the inhabitants of Sarrima fled to Qabrā when Šamši-Adad drew near and took the city. Qabrā is rendered in the Nuzi texts as Kapra and it appears that two sites were named Qabrā: Kapra rabû and Kapra sehrū. Qabrā Major and Qabrā Minor. It was located on or slightly to the north of the Lower Záb, near Pirdē (Altûn Köpri), on the way that leads from Kirkuk to Erbil, or at Pirdē itself (the island in the Záb) as Frayne proposed. According to Lewy, Qabrā was located on the northern bank of the Lower Záb at Pirdē, facing Turša on its southern bank, since the river is easily crossed only at this point. However, Deller has located it almost 15-20 km to the northwest of Pirdē, between the routes to Erbil and Dibege-Guwer. Wu Yuhong is of the opinion that it was the name of the citadel of Erbil. At the time of the joint attack on Qabrā by Daduṣa of Ešnunna and Šamši-Adad of Assyria, the king of Qabrā (or the land of Erbil in another account, see below) bore the Semitic name Bunū-Ištar. But later, in the time of Zimri-Lim, the reports mentioned a certain Ardigandi as its ruler (ARMT 26/2 498). This name is very like Berdigendae, the general of Zutlum, mentioned in SH 812, l. 15, who was allied with the other Turukkean kings and planned to attack Arrunum. Berdigendae has the ending –ē, typical of many names in the Shemshāra texts and apparently a characteristic feature of the PNs of this area. Ardigandi might have been a kinsman of Berdigendae and from the same region, not a Semite, which would reflect the change in the political situation in Qabrā after it was liberated from Assyrian rule in the time of Zimri-Lim (see Chapter Seven).

Kumme was the centre for the worship of the Hurrian weather god Teššup. It is first mentioned in a Hurrian ritual text from Mari: Te-šu-ba-am Ku-um-me-ni-en. It is also known in the Hittite texts as Kummiya: “The weather god, the mighty king of Kummiya” (KUB 33, 103 II 6), and “Teššup, the mighty lord of Kumme.” In other Hittite texts it is labelled the abode of the weather god, as Ninevē was to Ištar (KUB 24, 8 IV 15). One of

---

28 According to Durand, the name A‘innum is a dialectical form of inum, “the city of the source,” cf. Durand, LAPO II, p. 122.
29 The letter ARM 1, 121 is discussed below under ‘The Assyrian Domination Phase.’
30 Charpin and Ziegler write this name as Sarri, cf. Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 92 and 96. A city called Sarē is attested in some Neo-Assyrian letters that was located in the same general area as Sarrima. One of these letters describes clearing up the royal road that was being going, according to the authors of the letter, to Mazamua, in the Shahrazūr Plain. The letter reads: r 1) TA ŠÀ-bi URU Sa-re-e 2) a-di URU BĀD-A-ta-na-ī(e) 3) ana-ku û-pa-sa-ak 4) TA URU BĀD-A-ta-na-ī(e) 5) a-di URU BĀD-Ta-li-ti 6) URU Arrap−a-a-a û-pa-sa-ak 7) TA URU BĀD-Ta-li-ti 8) a-di ŠÀ-bi URU A-za-ri 9) [ana-ku-m]a] û-pa-sa-ak, “I remove […] from Sarē to Dur-Atanate, the Arapheans remove […] from Dur-Atanate to Dur-Taliti, [I] remove [the …] again from Dur-Taliti to Azari,” Lanfranchi and Parpola (eds.), The Correspondence of Sargon II, part II, Letters from the Northern and Northeastern Provinces, SA 5, no. 229, p. 166.
31 For this letter too, see under ‘The Assyrian Domination Phase.’
33 Frayne, SCCNH 10, p. 166.
36 Wu Yuhong, A Political History..., p. 182. Charpin, on the other hand, thinks that Qabrā was the capital of Urbel: Charpin, “Chroniques Bibliographiques ….” RA 98 (2004), p. 164.
the few Hurrian texts of Mari from the time of Zimri-Lim mentions “The gods of Kumme.”

42 Kumme was the name of a city and a land. Salvini locates it on the bank of the eastern Habur, which flows into the Tigris. 43 The letters SH 809 and SH 894 from Shemshāra give some clue about its location. The first letter enumerates the stations on the way from Šušarrā to Ḫaburātum, where Šamsī-Adad waited for a certain Kušiya from Šušarrā. 44 The second letter, like the first letter, is addressed to Kuwari, the governor of Šušarrā, and asks him to send the same Kušiya to meet Šamsī-Adad, this time through Kumme. 45 That Kumme was close to Assyria proper is indicated by the strong Assyrian influence there. It was annexed to Assyria shortly after it had twice accepted help from Adad-Nirari II (911-891) to drive back enemies from Ḫabbi. 46 Its association with the lands Mušasir and Gīlzanu in the inscription of Aššurnasirpal II 47 may also attest to its closeness to these lands, which were likewise to the northeast of Assyria. Postgate located Kumme in the region of modern Zaho, in the valley of Iraqi Ḫabar, 48 close to the Iraqi-Turkish border. These facts do not favour locating it in the Habur area close to Urkēš, as Dalley proposed. 49

Since KUR Qu-mē[-n]i in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser III refers to this same Kumme, 50 we could assume that the GN Qumē-ānu or Uqumē-ānu in the inscriptions of Tukulti-Ninurta I has the same element kūm- in Kumme. But these two places were in different locations. The former is mentioned as part of the land of the Gutians, which means a southerly location, not so far north as the northeast of Assyria, as proposed by Radner. 51 So more than one GN had kūm- as a component in this region, particularly if we take into consideration the other GNs with this element in other regions, from Southern Anatolia to Nuzi, enumerated by Wilhelm. 52

The suffixes nu and ni in Uqumē-ānu and Qumē-ānu must be the Hurrian particle -ne/ 53 that was

---

42 *e*–|en|=na Ku–|um|=me=ni=en, Salvini, M., “Un texte Hourrite nonnont Zimrilim,” *RA* 82 (1988), p. 60 and 61. This is a re-edited text, which consists of two fragments and was already published by F. Thureau-Dangin in *RA* 36, p. 20 (see above), and E. Laroche in “Fragment Hourrite provenant de Mari,” *RA* 51 (1957), p. 104-106.

44 Eidem and Lessoe, op. cit., No. 1, p. 70-71.
49 Cf. Dalley et al., *OBTR*, p. 188. They refer also to Hallo, W. W. 188. They refer also to Hallo, W. W. 1964 (1964), p. 70-1, but Hallo did not discuss Kumme on the given pages.
50 Röllig, op. cit., p. 336.
51 For this identification cf. Radner, K., “Qumānu, Qumēnu, Uqumānu,” *RIA* 11 (2007), p. 206. Radner’s description of the land of Qumānu is “mountainous land to the north and east of the plain of Alqoš, part of the Assyrian province *Masemmu*.” However, the inscriptions of Tukulti-Ninurta mention the land of the (U)Qumānu as part of the land of Qutu: *(ina surru(?)) I|UGAL-’u²-ia 15‘ ana’ KUR U-q[u-me-ni lu a-li]k (16) si-hir-ti KUR Qu-ti 17 ki-ma DU₇₆ a-bu-’bi’ [lu ušēmni(?)], “At the beginning of my sovereignty, I marched to the land of Uq[umenu]. The entire land of the Qutu [made (look like) ruin hills (created by) the deluge],” Grayson, *RIMA* 1, p. 234 (text A.0.78.1). In this case, (U)Qumānu must have been more to the southeast, not the northeast. On the other hand, the Qumānu mentioned in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser I indicates a northeasterly position of this land, since it aided the land of Mušri with troops; for instance: 73) um-ma-na-at KUR Qu-ma-nē-e 74) a-na re-ṣa-ṭi KUR Mu-us-ri 75) lu il-li-ku-ni, “The troops of the Qumānu came to the aid of the land Mušri,” Grayson, *RIMA* 2, p. 23 (text A.0.87.1). For the land Mušri and its location in the east Tigris region in Assyria proper, cf. Kessler, K., “Mušri I, Mušri II,” *RIA* 8 (1993-1997), p. 497; Parpola, S. and M. Porter (eds.), *The Helsinki Atlas of the Near East in the Neo-Assyrian Period*, Helsinki, 2001, p. 4.
attached to the name in the Hurrian texts and appears in Urartian inscriptions as -nu-.\textsuperscript{54} The name Kumme itself is formed, according to Wilhelm, from the verbal root kum= meaning (perhaps) some architectonic activity, with the suffix –me that converts verbal roots into nouns.\textsuperscript{55} Some PNs are found compounded with Kumme, such as kumen-anatal (from Mari: RA 36, 78), kumen-ewri (Tikunani Prism I, 17; III, 23),\textsuperscript{56} Paiš-kumme (from Nuzi) and MA Ari(k)-Kumme.\textsuperscript{57}

Ya’ilānum was another power in the Erbil Plain between the two Zābs, perhaps close to Qabrā.\textsuperscript{58} Its name is apparently derived from an Amorite PN or ethnonym. This is why its name is often preceded by the personal determinative. The names Ia-a-il\textsuperscript{59} Ia-i-il\textsuperscript{59} and LŪ Ia-a/i-il\textsuperscript{59} of the Mari texts\textsuperscript{59} show that this name was known in the region of Terqa\textsuperscript{60} as a GN and an ethnonym, in a region that was exclusively populated by Benjāminites (DUMU.MEŠ-ia-mi-na).\textsuperscript{61} It is thus likely that a branch of this Amorite tribe had crossed the Tigris after the fall of the Ur III dynasty and established itself there (see Chapter 5). The ruler of Ya’ilānum in the time of the Shemshā archives bore the Amorite name Bina-Addu, which can also be read in the Akkadian form Mār-Adad.\textsuperscript{62} The cities of Ḥimāra, Dūr-Ya’ilānum\textsuperscript{63} and Tutarrum (Tutarwe)\textsuperscript{64} are associated with its territories.\textsuperscript{65} Tutarru seems to have been close to Qabrā since it was conquered during the campaign of Daduša on Qabrā.\textsuperscript{66} This information contradicts the conclusion of Wu Yuhong, based on the letter ARM 1, 41, that Ya’ilānum was located in the region between Mari and Jebel Sinjār, on the western side of the Tigris. The letter is about an office (būtum) under the authority of Ya’ilānum and Bulmana-Addu, that was claimed by Ḥaṣidanum, the governor of Karanā. Šamši-Adad advised his son Yasmah-Addu to hand over the office to Ḥaṣidanum to avoid his anger.\textsuperscript{67} A solution for this can be that Ya’ilānum, as a polity formed by the immigrant Amorites, might have had extensions in the regions of the West Tigris region, along the path through which they penetrated northern Mesopotamia and the Northern Transtigris. If so, they would still have had interests in the west side of the Tigris.

\textsuperscript{54} Cf. for instance the Hurrian Ku-um-me-ni-en mentioned above and Ku-mi-ni-en in the incantation VS 17, 5, 3: Röllig, RL 6, p. 336; Urartian Qu-me-nu-na-ú-e (UKN 27, 14.55=HChI 10:14.55) and Qu-me-nu-ú-nē (UKN 28 upper side 12 = HChI 16 upper side 16): Röllig, op. cit., p. 337.

\textsuperscript{55} Wilhelm, “Kumme, …,” p. 318.


\textsuperscript{57} For the last two names, cf. Gelb et al., NPN, p. 229; 242.

\textsuperscript{58} Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 23.

\textsuperscript{59} Groneberg, RTGC 3, p. 120-1.

\textsuperscript{60} For this identification cf. ibid.

\textsuperscript{61} Durand, LAPO II, p. 123-4.

\textsuperscript{62} Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 23. However, Durand points to a phonetic rendering of the name Bi-na-IM in ARM 7, 140 f. 19; even though it is the name of a different person it is still a good parallel; cf. Durand, LAPO II, p. 124.

\textsuperscript{63} Dūr-Ya’ilānum/Wilanum was the place from which 200 warriors came out to rob properties of the wife of Išme-Dagan and, in retaliation, the city of Ḥimāra was conquered by Šamši-Adad. Hence, it is possible that the two were identical. For the letters concerning these events, cf. Wu Yuhong, A Political History ..., p. 191; and see further below.

\textsuperscript{64} This city name is recorded in the stele of Daduša among the cities captured during the campaign on Qabrā; see further below under ‘The Assyrian Domination Phase.’

\textsuperscript{65} Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 23.

\textsuperscript{66} Eidem and Læssøe, ibid.; this is according to ARM 1, 131 and the stele of Daduša. The stele reads: 5) a-la-nišu ra-ap-su-tim 6) Tu-ta-ar-ra\textsuperscript{67} Ha-at-kum\textsuperscript{68} 7) Hu-ra-ra-a\textsuperscript{67} Ki-ir-hu-um\textsuperscript{80}; “His extensive cities Tutarra, Ḥatkum, Ḥurarā, Kīrhum,...” Ismail, B. (with collaboration of A. Cavigneaux), “Dādušas Siegesstele IM 95200 aus Ešnunna. Die Inschrift,” Baghdader Mitteilungen 34 (2003), p. 142.

\textsuperscript{67} For the letter, cf. Wu Yuhong, A Political History ..., p. 194; Durand, LAPO II, p. 536-7.
Namar(um) was quite probably located on the Great Khorasân Road, possibly close to modern Khanaqîn or somewhat further to the east, within modern Iran.⁶⁸ It has been attested in Mesopotamian sources since the ED period, in the geographical lists (Na-mar)⁶⁹ and later in an OAkk. text from Tell Sulaima in Hamrin (Na-ma-ri).⁷⁰ Its occurrence in the later inscriptions of the NA period (KUR Nam-ri) together with the Middle Zagros lands, such as Ellipi, Sangibutu and Ḥamban, makes it certainly distinct from Nawar of the Habur area. In letter no. 69 = SH 868, Pišenden (see below) asked a certain Tu[…] to persuade the kings of Elam, Namar(um) and Niqqum to prepare an attack on Kaknum, and this is extra evidence for the location of Namar in this area.

The Habur Region, a region of vital importance in the history of Mesopotamia, must also be mentioned here. References to the struggle to control this area probably began with the movement of Yahdun-Lîm (ca.1810- ca. 1794 BC)⁷¹ of Mari, who went to the region of the Bâlîh in the years b-d, where he fought the Yamin tribes and troops of Yamhad.⁷² After leaving the Bâlîh region he went to the Habur, where Šamšî-Adad was ruling the country from Šubat-Enlil. The years g, h and i witness clashes between the two powers: Yahdun-Lîm took Pahûdar near Tarnip, and probably Talhayum (in the western part of the Habur Triangle),⁷³ burned the harvest of the land of Šamšî-Adad and defeated Šamšî-Adad at the gate of Nagar.⁷⁴ The king of Mari seems to have been successful in his war in the Habur, because he was able to journey the year after to Musû,lûn, Kallaḫu/abra (slightly north of Kahat),⁷⁵ Kahat, Nagar, Subat-Istar,⁷⁶ Tarnip and Šuna (between Šubat-Enlil and Ašnakkum).⁷⁷ A letter from the time of Zimri-Lim refers to the submission of Tigûnûnum to Yahdun-Lîm.⁷⁸ However, Mari did not control the Habur for long. Šamšî-Adad, after he had conquered Mari,⁷⁹ installed his son Yasmâḫ-Addu as governor. The last year name of

---

⁶⁸ This is suggested in Kessler, K., “Namar/Namri,” RIA 9 (1998-2001), p. 92. However, Frayne puts it along the Diyâlîa, somewhere between the Hamrin and Qara Dagh Ranges: Frayne, EDGN, p. 64.

⁶⁹ Frayne, EDGN, p. 64.

⁷⁰ Kessler, RIA 9, p. 91.


⁷³ The control of this GN was reported in a later letter sent by Yawi-ila to Zimri-Lim: [î]-nu-na [î]a-ah-du-un-Li-im a-bi-ka û LÚ Ra-ka-ab-tim an-na-nu-um [“]ika-ku-un-Me-er LÚ,SU,SILA.DU₆,A [IR] Ia-ah-du-un-Li-im ₆a-zi-ia-na-tam [an-na]-nu-um i-pu-uš, “At that time of Yahdun-Lîm, your father, and the ruler Rakabtum here, Yakun-Mer, the cupbearer, [the servant] of Yahdun-Lîm, performed the office of mayor here.” Wu Yuhong, op. cit. p. 105.


⁷⁸ A.1182 (Unpublished): 6′) Ti-gu-na-nim pu-na-nu-um wa-[a]-ki ⁵⁷ Ia-ah-du-[i-im] a-bi-ka il-[Î]-ik, “In the past, the house of Tîgunûnum walked behind Yahdun-Lîm, you father,” Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 50 and note 188.

⁷⁹ Probably the conquest of Mari was a plot the generals of Mari hatched with Šamšî-Adad to overthrow Sumû-Yamûm, the son and successor of Yahdun-Lîm, who ruled only three years. This explains, perhaps, the
Yaḥdun-Lim commemorates a campaign he carried out in Ekallātum, which means that he exercised huge pressure on Šamši-Adad, first in the Habur Region and later in the Transstigris.

The Turukkû

People and Organization

A significant power that appears as active in this period is the Turukkû. These sedentary Hurrian tribes were organized in a series of kingdoms and princeums in the time of the Shemshāra archives. These kingdoms and princeums were, at least in the time of Shemshāra, united in a federation under the leadership of a ‘great king.’ The name Turukkû is mostly written with the determinative LŪ.MEŠ put before Tu-ru-(uk)-ki/u-i/um, followed sometimes by the determinative KI in the Mari and Shemshāra texts. Exceptions to this are Ti-ru-kî-i (no. 1 = SH 809, l. 8 and 9) and Ti-ri-uk-kî-na-âš-we (Jerusalem Inscription of Iddin-Sîn, ii 13”), both with a first vowel i instead of normal u. This does not seem to be a scribal error or Hörfehler since it occurs three times. Instead, it may uniquely represent an umlaut, to be pronounced something like *Türükükû, but this remains hypothetical.

The oldest evidence for Turukkeans comes from the Early Old Babylonian period in the Jerusalem inscription of Iddi(n)-Sîn (ii 13”), as a toponym Ti-ri-uk-kî-na-âš-we”. Then it occurs in the time of Yaḥdun-Lim, some 15 years before the Shemshāra archives, at the time when Yaḥdun-Lim defeated Šamši-Adad in the Habur and sent a costly garment to Tazigi, king of Turukkum.

Durand considers the Turukkeans as being an ethnic mixture and their ruling class as containing an “undeniable” Semitic component. In fact, it is difficult to agree with the idea of a people coming from the inner Zagros having Semitic components. His notion is based on the analysis of Turukkean onomastics, which he mostly understands as Semitic. Of course, if we agree with these analyses such a conclusion would be logical. But the big question is how correct, accurate and convincing is it to understand Zaziya as reflecting Semitic Sasiya (= a hypocoristic for moth), Gutian Zazum as Sasum (= moth), Itabalûm as Ida-palhum (= “flank of the terrible,” parallel with Ida-maras “flank of the difficult”), Lidûya as Lidum (= a hypocoristic of lidum, “offspring”), Utûm as “land of the gatekeeper,” and many other such interpretations. Akkadian, like Arabic, is a rich and pliant language in which one can find an etymology for almost every word, but this does not mean it is always a fact. Further, the evidence from the seal legend of Pišendēn proves that the name Itabalûm is not the Semitic Ida-palhum, because the GN there is written ma-[a]t I-ta-pa-al, without -hi/u(m), occurrence of Išar-Lim among the generals of Šamši-Adad, who was in the service of Sumu-Yamām before; cf. Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 108.

80 For the year names of Yaḥdun-Lim, cf. Wu Yuhong, p. 100-1.
82 Durand, LAPO II, p. 81. According to him, these Semites were among the Amorites who engulfed the far north of the Near East: op. cit., p. 82. But there is no evidence of such an Amorite infiltration as far-flung as the highlands of the Zagros.
83 Heimpel, Letters to the King of Mari, p. 29.
84 Heimpel, op. cit., p. 13.
86 Durand, LAPO II, p. 81.
which was clearly the Hurrian adj. suffix -(h)he, and not part of the suggested Akkadian palhum, “fear.” If the name was from Akkadian palhum the -hi would necessarily have been written in the seal legend. A similar case of omitting the Hurrian suffix -hi by a Hurrian speaker is the rendering of the name Kusananhum as Kusanar(um), without -hi, in letters sent by the native Hurrians Šepratu (no. 63 = SH 812: 7; 12; 19, and once with -hi in l. 5) and Pišendēn (no. 68 = SH 868: 5). The name of the land of Utûm also proves to be of local origin, for before the Amorite infiltration to the east Tigris area it was called Utuwe, in the Haladiny inscription (see Chapter Five). The authors mentioned above give no explanation why Hurrian lands such as Utûm or Itabalhum could have had a Semitic name. We cannot assume that the name was used by the Amorites only, since the name Itaballhum is found on the seal of its native king.

While Eidem and Læssøe consider the Turukkeans “a group of kingdoms in the valleys of the northwestern Zagros, predominantly of Hurrian affiliation,” to Durand, they were just an ethnic mixture (see above). I would add another question about this. From the written sources we possess we have learned about the names of the Hurrians, Subarians, Gutians, Lullubians, Kakmeans and Simurrians who inhabited the Transtigris region. All these ethnic or ethno-geographic groups are mentioned as separate and independent groups in the sources of this period. What, then, are the ethnic components of the Turukkeans? Do we have an ethnic group apart from these to assign to the Turukkean conglomeration? On the contrary! In the light of developments and consequences of the Turukkean revolts at the end of the reign of Šamš-Adad and the beginning of that of Išme-Dagan’s, it seems to me that the name Turukkû became a name for all the Hurrians from the Zagros up to the Habur region. In

It is possible that the name Turukkû is derived from the name of their king Turuktu, who was the father of Pišend/tēn, the great king of the Turukkeans in the time of the Shemshâra archives (see below). Eidem and Læssøe have presented the various views that consider the Turukkeans “very mobile groups waging guerrilla warfare against the cities and kingdoms in the north Mesopotamian plains.” They state that this is principally the image created by the published Mari material, and it is seen in the survey of the material presented by Klengel, which has been followed generally. However, the situation reconstructed from the Shemshâra archives and other related sources alludes to organized political entities with capital cities, that were headed by rulers who styled themselves as kings and nulda(um)s. Eidem and Læssøe go a step further, suggesting that “there is evidence to indicate fairly complex political organization in these polities, with systems of noble lineages sharing territorial power.” These entities were, at least in the time of the Shemshâra archives, united under one leadership to fulfil one strategic goal, to stop the Gutian aggression. These facts do not indicate the nomadic lifestyle of mobile groups, moving easily and leaving their habitations, like the seasonal movements of pastoralists between summer and winter resorts

---

88 Note that in the time when the Amorites made their attempt to invade Simurrum, the Râniya Plain was already known as Utuwe, as in the Haladiny inscription.
89 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 27.
90 Cf. Chapter Seven.
92 Klengel, op. cit., p. 5-22. In his update to this article, Klengel states that according to the published letters, they were not just an element living among the sedentary peoples of the Transtigris dry-farming region, but they possessed their own territory: Klengel, H., “Nochmals zu den Turukkäern und ihrem Auftreten,” AoF 12 (1985), p. 254.
93 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 25.
94 Cf. for instance the letter 63 = SH 812 where both these words occur together.
95 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 27; cf. also Charpin, RA 98, p. 169.
(the *sardsîr* and *garmsîr* in modern terminology). The facts indicate rather a sedentary population of agriculturalists. In a letter from Mari (A.649), a passage from another letter is quoted that was sent by the Turukkeans. There they speak of their houses and bitterness about abandoning them and going to the mountains to live.\(^{96}\) This is a clear indication, as Durand agrees, of their sedentary and not nomadic lifestyle.\(^{97}\)

To the ancient Mesopotamians the Turukkeans were also a peripheral people.\(^{98}\) They were of little interest to them until they could organize themselves into that federation mentioned above and come into contact with Assyria, Mari and Babylon. The federation seems to have consisted of the petty-kings or princehoods headed by Hurrian-named rulers. Each one resided in his own capital but they were allied with each other. A good reference to such an alliance is the one mentioned in no. 63 = SH 812, where allusion is made to a number of Turukkean(?!) kings who took an oath of alliance.\(^{99}\) These rulers or kings were united under the leadership of a ‘great king’ who was no doubt the greatest and most powerful among them. At this time the great king was Pišend/tēn, whose capital was the city of Kunšum. Pišendēn styles himself on his seal legend “king of Itabal(h)um” (see below), showing that Kunšum was the capital of Itaballhum. That he was the king of the Turukkean kings is deduced from the letters in which he is called the “father” of the addressees.\(^{100}\)

In another letter (no. 59 = SH 811), Talpuš-šarri\(^{101}\) is clearly styled the commander of all the lands,\(^{102}\) which means that he too was a prominent figure in the politics of the federation, “since he is seen to participate in a royal summit and could conclude a treaty (no. 63 = SH 812) and lead countries (no. 59 = SH 811) and armies (no. 54 = SH 819).”\(^{103}\) Nevertheless, Talpuš-šarri was a man in second rank to the great king Pišendēn and he was his subject. Eidem and Læssøe deduce this from the letters in which he styles himself ‘brother’ or

\(^{96}\) For the letter cf. Durand, and Charpin, “Le nom antique …,” *RA* 81 (1987), p. 132-4 (translation) and 143-5 (transliteration); cf. also Chapter Seven.


\(^{99}\) 4) “Zu-zu-um ha-ni-za-ru-um 5) ša I-la-la-a\(^{3}\) ša a-na Ku-sa-na-ar-hi-im 6) iš-pu-ru-uš il-li-kam-ma 7) ú it-ti LUGAL ša Ku-sa-na-ri-im 8) it-ra-am a-na A-li-a-a\(^{3}\) 9) ú it-ti-šu Ki-gi-ir-za ú Ta-al-pu-šar-ri 10) in-na-me-er ú ni-iš DINIR.MES ga-am-ra-am 11) i-na bi-ri-ši-šu-nu iš-ku-un, “Zuzum, the hanzarum of Ilalae, who had been sent to Kusanarhum came, and with him he brought the king of Kusanaruum to Aliae, and he had a meeting with Kigirza and Talpuš-šarri, and they swore a comprehensive oath to each other,” Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 134, no. 63 (SH 812).

\(^{100}\) Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 26.

\(^{101}\) His name has been explained as “The God-king is great,” cf. Matthews, R. and J. Eidem, “Tell Brak and Nagar,” *Iraq* 55 (1993), p. 202. This explanation seems convincing since the Hurrian element -šarri occurs often in PNs. According to Gelb, the element is probably a divine epithet. The Hurrian origin of the element is claimed by Weidner and Gustafs (from šar “to order/command,” “to demand”), while Thureau-Dangin, Ungnad and Von Brandenstein support the Akkadian origin from šarrum. To Güterbock, the meaning “king” in a divine sense is the fitting translation. Finally, Ginsberg and Maisler translate it “king” with a Hurrian etymology. For these opinions and bibliography, cf. Gelb et al, *PN*, p. 251. The element appears also in Ugarit as z ѓ r and ѓ r, cf. *ibid*. The PN Tal-Š/pi-Šarri (reading suggested by Gelb instead of Akk. Ku-bi-šarri) has the same name as our Talpuš-šarri.

\(^{102}\) 30) ú šum-ma ma-ta-tum 31) ma-li “Ta-al-pu-šar-ri 32) i-ra-di-a-am i-la-ku-nim 33) ú at-ta i-li-a-am 34) la ta-ka-la, “And if all the countries which Talpuš-šarri commands come, then you too must come up,” Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 130 (no. 59 = SH 811).

\(^{103}\) Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 26.
neutrally when addressing Kuwari, as he does also in the letter his lord Pišendēn sent to Yašub-Addu of Aḥazum; but on his seal (Fig. 1) he styles himself “[…] of Pišendēn”:105

Talpuš-šarri, [son of ……], […… of] Pišen[t/de].106

Talpuš-šarri was not the only high-ranking figure in the federation. Eidem and Læssøe concluded from the formulation of the letters of Shemshāra that he, Kuwari, Šepratu, Ḫulukkadil,107 and Sin-išme’anni were all rulers or officials of equal power and influence under the leadership of Pišendēn.108 All of them enjoyed a great degree of freedom and autonomy. Eidem and Læssøe noted that they were not receiving orders in the way that the subjects of Šamšī-Adad, Yasmaḫ-Addu and Zimri-Lim did. Rather Kuwari, for example, received requests, urges and advice.109 Eidem and Læssøe think these men of the second rank “belonged to a side-branch of the royal line, or perhaps to a closely allied princely dynasty.”110 Talpuš-šarri, when he wrote together with his lord Pišendēn to Yašub-Addu, asked the latter to be true to “this house and the land of Itabalum.”111 In our view this is not concrete evidence that Talpuš-šarri and his colleagues were members of the royal family or even of a side-branch. Any loyal subject or official of the king would have used the same words and expressed those same feelings when urging a hesitant ally to remain loyal to the house that was spiritually the house of all the subjects of the kingdom. Their relationship to the royal house might have been completely different. One interpretation of the word nuldānum,112 if correct, refers more to a spiritual father-son relationship that was not necessarily biological.113

Among these kings and high-ranking officials Sin-išme’anni maintained a special relationship with Kuwari. It seems to have been a deep friendship, not a mere relationship between two colleagues in the service of one lord. The letters of Shemshāra exhibit the warmth of this friendship that tied the two together. In almost all the letters he sent to Kuwari he styles himself “I who love you” and he sometimes styles Kuwari as the one “who loves

---

104 Ibid.
105 For the transliterations and translations of the letters of Shemshāra letters and seal impressions I have quoted from The Shemshara Archives 1 The Letters, by Eidem and Læssøe. On the few occasions when small sections were skipped I have offered here my own translations with appropriate annotation, and some translations have been slightly adapted.
106 1) [Ta-al-]°pu¿-š[ar](+ in field:-r[t]) 2) [DUMU …] ’x x’ [x] 3) [x°]Piš-še-en-[te], Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 160. Unfortunately, the traces in the last line, where the word is expected that determines the relationship to the king are illegible. However, as Eidem and Læssøe state, in a Mesopotamian context one expects IR = wardum, “servant.” In the king’s name there does seem to be space at the end of the line for an additional sign EN, but the name is also written thus in the address of no. 68, Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 160.
107 The first element of this PN can be identified with the first element of the PN Ḫulukkan from Chagar Bazar, labelled as Gutian (cf. also Chapter Two). For the PNs from Chagar Bazar, cf. Loretz, “Texte aus Chagar Bazar,” lišān mitḥurti, p. 244-250; cf. also Gelb, HS, p. 64, note 128.
109 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 27.
110 Ibid.
111 Ibid.
112 It is suggested that the word is derived from the word walādam, “to beget a child,” which is also used in the last line of Pišendēn’s seal legend; cf. Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 27; Eidem, The Shemshāra Archives 2, p. 40, note 36, referring as well to Durand, “Review of ShA 2,” Société de Linguistique, 1996, p. 381f. However, see below under ‘The King and the nuldānum.’
113 For this, cf. Chapter Eight.
114 Charpin is of the opinion that this individual was a diviner, according to his association with oracles or omens on several occasions in the letters of Shemshāra, sometimes using the verbal form epēšum: Charpin, RA 98, p. 177.
me.” Their friendship was so deep that family affairs became involved. Sin-îšme’anni took care of Kuwari’s family in Zulkula, was concerned for their well-being, sent them their news and even took an omen when Šip-šarri, the wife of Kuwari, became ill:

**Sin-îšme’anni to Kuwari (no. 34 = SH 826)**
Secondly, your brother who loves you and I who love you are well, and [your] house [is well]. But Šip-šarri, your maid, was ill, and I took an omen, and lifted the hand of Ištar. Now she has recovered and is well, and the boys, your sons, are well.117

This man was also the last in the phase of Pre-Assyrian domination to send a letter to Kuwari to give him the news and offer his sincere advice about what to do (for his letter, see below). Kuwari even shared with him and a few others an important secret of which we do not know the details. But it has been tentatively suggested that it might have involved a conspiracy to change their allegiance:118

**Kuwari to Sin-îšme’anni (no. 70 = SH 899)**
For this reason I keep sending Šunšiya, saying: “If Sîn-išme’anni is staying there under those conditions, then [confide to him] my secret.” I explained the message of the god.

This raises the question of whether Sin-îšme’anni was a family member of Kuwari, which would explain this intimate relationship. The answer, I think, lies in the letter 65, where he shows his happiness with the greetings sent by a certain Namram-šarur. In the letter he asks the addressee to bring some news of ‘the city of Awal and our family,’ which indicates that Sin-îšme’anni’s family resided far to the south, in the Hamrin Region, not in the country of Kuwari. So he was not related to Kuwari:

**Sin-îšme’anni to Namram-šarur (no. 65 = SH 918)**
Ask for news of Awal and our people and let your retainer who comes bring (it) to me!120

---

115 Cf. for instance the letter 35: 1) a-na ra-i-mì-ia 2) qí-bí-ma 3) um-ma mdEN.ZU-iš-me-an-ni 4) ra-im-ka-a-ma, “Say to the one who loves me: Thus (says) Sîn-išme’anni who loves you,” Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 105-6 (no. 35 = SH 822). The same introduction is found in letter no. 36 = SH 818.

116 amat-ka, “your slave-girl” is written in the text; but there is no mention of a ‘wife’ although sons are mentioned. So it seems likely that Kuwari was married to this slave-girl; Eidem and Læssøe as well take her as his wife; cf. Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 104, 136 and 168.

117 10) ša-ni-ta[m]
11) a-‹u-ka[r-a]-i-im-k[a]
12) ū a-na-ku[r-a]-i-im-[ka]
13) ša-al<<ma
14) ū Ši-ip-[ar-r] a-ma-at-ka 15) im-ra-as-ma te-[e]r-tam 16) e-pu-šša[-ma 17) qa-at EŠi-TAR ū-še-li 18) i-na-an-na i-tu-uḫ 19) ša-al-ma-at ū ši-ḫa-ru 20) ma-ra-ku ša-al-mu, Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 104 (no. 34 = SH 826). The same event was touched upon also in the letter of Šepratu to Kuwari (no. 64 = SH 827); the news of his family, the illness of his wife and, before them, the well-being of “Sîn-išme’anni, who loves you” are all reported at the end of his long and informative letter.

118 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 145.

119 42) [aš]-šum ki-a-am-ma š[u-un-ši-ia] 43) [aš-ta-n]a-ap-pá-ar-[š[u um-ma a-na-ku-ma] 44) ([m]EN.ZU-iš-me-an-ni šum-[m] aš-rā-ri] a-un-mi ki-a-[m]a 45) [w]a-[š]-ib a-wa-at li-iš-bi-[ti a-di-iš-šum] 46) [l]e-[ma-am ša>DINGIR’ ad-[bi]-šu-ub at-[i] [(a) 47] [x (x)]x²-nu-išši-li-li-ip-pu ū a-na-ku 48) [x x]x a-tu-nu a-wa-at 49) [li-iš-bi-i]m a-iš-ši ta-dā-[ba-ub-ba 50) ū a-wa-[a]t li-iš-bi-ia 51) [a-na-k]u a-ša-[š]-ub-[ba,] Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 146 (no. 70 = SH 899).

The King and the nuldānum

The king of Itabalhum in the time of the Shemshāra archives was Pišendēn. A seal impression of him (Fig. 2) was found in Shemshāra that reads as follows:

Piše[ndēn], son of Tukukti, king of the land of Itabal[hum], begetter of Tabitu.121

The name of the father of Pišendēn is Tukukti. Another seal impression naming Turukti, most probably refers to the same Tukukti, father of Pišendēn122 (Fig. 3):

Turukti, son of Uštap-šarri, king of Itabal, conqueror of his enemies, father of AD-…123

The name Turukti “poses the question of a possible connection with the ethnicon Turukk(m), both perhaps based on a presumably Hurrian word turuk.”124 To Eidem and Læssøe it is possible that the political and military exploits of Turukti have led to the emergence of Itabalhum as a dominant kingdom in northwestern Zagros, and “his name for this reason was used in reference to the population there.”125 For comparison they point to Ya’ilānum, which was also an eponymous designation. This seems very possible, especially if we consider the fact that the Turukkeans are not mentioned in texts before the OB period, except for the story of the “Great Revolt” against Narām-Sîn, which is an OB compilation.126 But the reference to “Tazigi, king of the Turukkû” in a text from the time of Yahdun-Lim, some 15 years before the Shemshāra archives (see above) should not be forgotten. Because Tazigi was king before Turuktu we should hesitate to assume that King Turukti was responsible for the ethnicon.127 It has been suggested that Tazigi was most probably a Turukkean king of another polity than Itabalhum.128 This seems quite possible, because the royal line in Itabalhum, as reconstructed from the seal legends, shows two other names before Pišendēn, Tur/kukti and his father Uštap-šarri. This leaves only 15 years for three kings on the throne of Itabalhum before Pišendēn. While the problem of the derivation of the name Turukkû remains unsolved, in our view the ethnicon could be derived from an older predecessor of Turukti, Uštap-šarri and Tazigi, perhaps the founder of the kingdom of Itabalhum or the spiritual father of the federation. The occurrence of Ti-ri-uk-ki-na-āš-weki as early as the time of Iddi(n)-Sîn of Simurru m (Jerusalem inscription) proves this. An alternative would be to derive the name of King Turuktu from the ethnonym or the supposed GN Turukkû, since Hurrian PNs were often derived from or contained GNs.129

122 According to Eidem and Læssøe, the second sign of the name Tukukti in the previous seal impression cannot be RU, even though it is not too clear. They say, “The alternation may be explained as a result of a non-Akkadian phoneme,” as in Še-gi/ri-bu† in letter No. 55, 22; Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 159, note 2. Although the badly preserved impression of the seal of Turuktu makes the reading of the sign RU not quite certain, the parallel PN Turukti in seal impression no. 4 (see below) favours RU.
123 [“]T[ur-]u-k³[-i] [DU][MU] U[š-ša-ri] [LUGAL] [f³]-ta-[a]-al[?][?] [x]-tu a-a-[šu] °a- bi AD-[…….], Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 26 (translation) and 160 (transliteration).
125 Ibid.
126 Cf. Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 25.
128 Ibid.
129 There are, in fact, numerous examples of GNs as components of PNs in the Transtigris region, particularly among the Hurrians. They include Kakmum, governor of Šurutum (letter 41 = SH 925+935+939+942: 4′); Arrap-a-atal; Ḫut-Arraphe; Kipi-Arraphe (NPN, p. 205); Šançara-ḫupi (Šanhar(a) is a city name, probably in Northern Syria), NPN, p. 250; Šarnida (in Shemshāra: no. 8 = SH 887: 32 and no. 16 = SH 883 :9. Šarnida is
Tabiti was a son of Pišendēn and he had very probably previously been the crown prince. He is mentioned in the letter 64 = SH 827 as having been in contact with the king of Elam in relation to the military cooperation with Itabalhum. Here, with the mention of the king’s (first-born) son or crown prince in the king’s official inscription, we are dealing with the same phenomenon seen in the inscriptions of Iddi(n)-Sin, both the Bētwate inscription and his cylinder seal (see Chapter Five). To Eidem and Møller this was to avoid an endless struggle for power after the death of the king. They compare it to measurements taken by Esarhaddon to ensure a peaceful succession, and also with Šamšī-Adad I entrusting two large portions of his kingdom to his two sons. 131 It seems closer to reality to associate it with the royal ideology of the Hurrians, whom we encountered in Urkeš as well (see Chapter Four). The editors of the seal legend are correct in comparing this phenomenon with the Elamite sukkalmah system (as far as we understand it), in which the sukkalmah shared his power with two junior members of the royal line. 132 This system is more comparable with the one we know among the Hurrians, than with the traditional Mesopotamian models.

A seal impression of a servant of Turukti was found in Shemshāra. It is unfortunately very damaged, but the remaining signs read:

[………..] [so]n of [………..], [serva]nt(?) of Turukti. 133

130 This name cannot be linked to any of the other relevant PNs. By contrast, Tabitu, the son of Pišendēn, played a prominent role in the events according to the records (see below, letter no. 64), Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 26.


133 1) […………………] 2) [DUM]U AN ‘x x’ 3) [I]R2 Tu-ru-uk-/ti, Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 161.
The presence of this seal impression among the Shemshāra material posed a problem for the editors of the letters in making a chronological sequence for Turukti and Pišendēn. In search for a solution Eidem and Læssøe asked whether Turukti was still alive when the seal of his servant was used, or did the seal continue to be used by Pišendēn after his death, or was there a complex system of hierarchy of contemporary kings in Itabalhum, similar to that in Elam.134

Later on Lidāya became leader of the Turukkeans. He led the revolt against the Assyrians, but unfortunately no detailed information about him or any seal impression of him is known. We are not even sure whether he was ‘king’ of the Turukkeans or just a leader. Zaziya, on the contrary, is known to have been king of the Turukkeans, as attested several times in the letters of Mari. He is frequently mentioned in the Mari texts which indicates the important role he played in the politics of his time, especially since he was, as Lafont noted, a close contemporary of Zimri-Lim of Mari.135 A seal impression from Mari (Fig. 4) bears an inscription that styles Zaziya nuldānum of Itabalhum:

\[Zazi[ya], \text{son of Tern[anum], nuldānum [o]f Itteba[lihum], [x] of the god […..].}\]136

The iconography of the seal is in the Ur III style and the editors of the seal impression suggest that the seal was probably imported from Mesopotamia and recut locally.137 I would suggest discarding the restored sign HJ in the name of Itabalhum, because the two parallel seal impressions from the kings of the land itself write the name without this suffix (see above). Instead, the determinative KI may be restored.

A problem about the identity of Zaziya of this seal impression occurred when letter M.13039 from Mari was published, a letter which names “Zaziya, son of Akkiya.” For this second Zaziya we have no information about his identity and he is mentioned without titles. But we note that he addresses a certain Ú-qá-ki-El, not Zimri-Lim, as ‘brother,’ reminding him that he himself is the son of Akkiya, and that Uqa-ki-El is the son of Taḥuna, who were likewise brothers (see below).138 Kupper is correct in considering Zaziya on the seal as the king, since he bears the local title nuldān of Itabalhum and in distinguishing him from this Zaziya son of Akkiya.139 Charpin is of the opinion that Zaziya appears to have had a double status after the changes took place in the Turukkēan lands with the Gutian invasion and the disappearance of Pišendēn and his son (see below). According to him he was probably king of Turukkû and nuldānum of Itabalhum,140 which is quite likely to be the case.

However, the problem with Zaziya of the letter remains. It is possible that the one Zaziya was the local nuldānum in Itabalhum and king of the Turukkeans, and that the second one was a Turukkēan ruler or prince somewhere in the Hurrian lands, the sender of the letter. Another possibility is that the name refers to one and the same person, but one of his father’s names indicates a remote ancestor, not his direct biological father, possibly the founder of the dynasty or the legendary head of the tribe. Be it as it may, this letter does provide us with a Turukkēan female PN, who was very probably the mother of Zaziya, son of Akkiya, as the context suggests:

---

137 Beyer and Charpin, op. cit., p. 627-8.
138 Kupper, ARM 28, p. 258 and 261; cf. also Kupper, J.-R., “Zaziya, «prince» d’Ita-Palhum,” NABU 1990, no. 131, p. 108, where the name of the addressee was read as Ū-bi-[x x x].
139 Kupper, ARM 28, p. 258. In his previous note in NABU, Kupper thought it more likely that Zaziya of the seal was not the king, cf. Kupper, NABU, ibid.
140 For this cf. Eidem, NABU, 1990, no. 63, p. 48.
Related to the problem of Zaziya is a text from Mari that mentions a grain ration to a certain Zaziya, dated to month xii of limmu Aššur-malik. Another text probably mentions Zaziya in a broken context in relation to troop assignments associated with the city of Naḥur. While it is not certain one may conjecture that Zaziya the king had been formerly collaborating with Šamš-Adad, receiving allocations and troops, perhaps to contribute to his military actions. However, this cannot be proved at present and it remains possible that more than one Hurrian was named Zaziya.

A few more words need to be said about the controversial title nuldānum. As discussed above, it is thought to be a nupras form, derived from walādum “to beget a child,” a verb that occurs in the last line of Pišendid’s seal legend. The best translation Eidem proposed for the word is “prince” or “duke,” since the position Kuwari had in the land of Utūm was neither inherited nor obtained by career promotion, but awarded through his family connection with the ruling king. This translation fits the contexts in which this word is used. The word ‘king’ is used in apposition to nuldānum in some texts (for instance in the letter 63 = SH 812), which clearly implies something different from ‘king.’ The word does not seem to me to have a Semitic etymology, even though Durand was convinced it did. Rather it was a Hurrian word that had no exact equivalent in Akkadian, and so was left untranslated in the letters and seal legends. The absence of an Akkadian equivalent must have stemmed from the fact that nuldānum belonged to a different system of rulership or was based on a different ideology than those in Sumero-Akkadian culture. It can be compared to Hurrian endan, “ruler” or “king,” in the inscriptions of the kings of Ur keš (see Chapter Four), for it shares the same element –dan, making it in all probability a related word or at least a word of the same type. As a Hurrian term it could by analysed *nul(i)=dan, with Hurrian nuli, a military term for a weapon or a category of soldiers. This would be compatible with Kuwari’s reputation as a warrior, whose military activities are recorded in the Shemshāra letters (see further below). The occurrence of the element nul(i) in the PNs Nu-ul-te-šup and Nu-ul-za-hi (var. Nu-la-za-

---


142) Charpin and Ziegler, Mari et le Proche-Orient …., FM V, p. 109, note 277.
143) 13) 1 me-ša Za-z[ì-ia], “Out of this 100 troops, 100 of Naḥur are for Zaziya.” ARM 23, 594, Ibid.
144) There is, for instance, a certain Zaziya, “man of Kakkulatum” mentioned in M.11787, l. 3-4; cf. Durand, J.-M., Le nomenclature des habites et des textiles dans les textes de Mari, vol. 1, ARM 30, Paris, 2009, p. 211. Another Zaziya appears in the texts of Chagar Bazar. He was one of those responsible for giving out beer and is mentioned in 42 texts: Lacambre, D. and A. Millet Albà, Ménologie et chronologie, in Chagar Bazar (Syrie) III, les trouvailles …, p. 201. This is important because it proves that Zaziya was not a throne name but the king’s birth name. 145) Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 27; Eidem, The Shemshāra Archives 2, p. 40 and note 36 (with reference to Durand, “Review of Sha 2,” Société de Linguistique, 1996, p. 381f.).
148) For the word nul cf. Laroche, GLH, p. 188 under nul.
hi) in the Nuzi texts may support this suggestion. The second element -dan, found also in endan, Wilhelm takes as the Hurrian suffix for professions. Contrary to Durand, who thinks the word is a Hurrian derivation of a Semitic root, we take nuldānum and nuldānutum as Akkadianized Hurrian, with the suffixes –um and –ūtum.

The Land of the Turukkeans

The Turukkeans appear to have inhabited the mountainous regions to the north and northeast of the Rāniya Plain, according to information provided by the Shemshāra tablets. However, the numerous kingdoms and cities referred to in the Shemshāra tablets as Turukkan cannot all have been located in a small mountainous area to the east and northeast of the Rāniya Plain. Room has to be found for the kingdoms of Itabalhum, Zutlum, Kusanar(h)um, Šudamelum, and the cities of Kunšum (capital of Itabalhum), Aliae, Ardamekum, Ilala(e), Sašharšum and Zukula further in the east and northeast. The most suitable place would be the plains and mountain valleys of Iranian Kurdistan, behind the Qandil Range, e.g. the plain that stretches from Sardsht up to Khāneh in the north (Map. 1). Similarly, Eidem and Læssøe think the plains of the Urmia Basin must have formed the core of Turukkan territory. It is important to examine the arguments they have presented to support this suggestion, which can be summarized thus:

1) The use of the verbs elûm “going up” (in 49: 10; 53: 39; 58: 13; 59: 12, 33; 63: 44, 52; 64: 36, 40, 64; 73: 6, 11, 14) and warādum “going down” (56: 39) in the letters, the former when moving from Shemshāra to Kunšum and the latter when returning from Kunšum. This indicates that the city of Kunšum and the Turukkan country around it were in higher territory to the east and northeast.

2) Kuwari’s associates in Kunšum tracked information about Šamšī-Adad’s movements in Arrapḫa and Qabrā through Shemshāra. This means that Shemshāra was located between Kunšum on the one hand and Arrapḫa and Qabrā on the other.

3) GNs associated with the Turukkan land are absent from the Mesopotamian sources outside the Shemshāra material. This indicates that the core region of the Turukkū was far from Mesopotamia. Only two of these GNs seem to form an exception: Arrunum is probably the same city referred to in Kassite period texts as Arnāyu; Kunšum seems to be identical with Kunzu(e)/Kuššu(e) attested in Nuzi texts, and is usually equated with the land of the Kassites. However, the city names associated with Kunzu(e), namely Maškanawe, Utulwe and Ukenna, cannot also be equated with any of the Turukkan GNs recorded in the Shemshāra texts. The Shemshāra texts, moreover, show that Kuwari was not close to base.

4) The route leading from the Rāniya Plain through Qala Dizeh to Sardsht is a main route even now. From Sardsht the other main route that leads to Mahābād is easy to

---

149 Gelb et al., NPN, p. 240; for the bibliography of the names cf. p. 108.
150 For the suffix -dan in endan, cf. Wilhelm, The Hurrians, p. 11, and also Chapter Four for more details on endan.
151 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 28 and 29.
152 Op. cit., p. 28 and note 38. The authors point out to the frequent use of the two verbs in the OA texts that refer to “going up” to Kaniš and “going down” to Assur.
154 Ibid., referring to Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 160ff.. It is interesting that Kunzuḫḫe imported grain and exported a special type of horse, according to the data from Nuzi: Fincke, op. cit., p. 161.
155 Cf. for this Fincke, RGTC, p. 161.
156 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 28.
follow, with just one ford across the River Zāb. “Once having reached Mahābād, the entire Urmia Basin is open to the traveller, with its rich fields and good roads to all parts of Azerbaijan.”

5) The region of the Urmia Basin, forming part of Azerbaijān, is a main population centre in the Zagros, and thus can be seen as the best candidate for the core of the Turukkean lands. Furthermore, “it also seems difficult to suggest a convincing alternative,” because the other areas in Iranian Kurdistan are narrow valleys which are sparsely populated. The regions to the northwest and southeast of the Rāniya Plain were occupied by the kingdoms mentioned and were known in Mesopotamian sources.

6) There is archaeological material from the Urmia Basin that might support the idea of direct contacts with Northern Mesopotamia in a “fairly limited period in the early second millennium BC.” This material consists of a distinctive early second millennium Habur Ware side by side with contemporary local Iranian types of ceramics. The Habur Ware, identified in seven sites, including Hasanlu (level VI) and Dinkha Tepe (level IV), is known to have emanated primarily from Northern Iraq and Syria and circulated from there. Recent studies distinguish four phases of this ceramic. The earliest is pre-Šamsī-Adad; those found in Dinkha Tepe include types which in Mesopotamia belong to the early period for this assemblage, thus fitting the date proposed for those in the Urmia Basin. It is further noticed that Habur Ware of the Urmia Basin is isolated from all directions except to the south and southeast, where no data is available. In the Rāniya Plain, a crucial link, a few specimens were found in Bazmusiān.

I would supplement point four by observing that the territory round Sardasht is level (see map no. 1) and the route upwards to Urmia passes through a narrow strip of plains until it reaches the city of Khānē (= Pirān Shār). There the plains become wider and onwards to Urmia the route is easily accessible. The pass that leads to Sardasht from the Qala Dizeh plain is one of the main crossing points between Iraq and Iran, although not as important as the Haji Omarān-Kēleshin Pass. The only problem when applying these facts to the historical geography is that the route should pass through the Qala Dizeh Plain, which weakens the suggestion of locating Kakmum in Qala Dizeh in favour of the alternative, Rawānīz (see Chapter Five). In case Kakmum was located in Qala Dizeh communications from Kuwari should have passed through the territories of Kakmum. Was Kakmum in this period on good

157 Ibid., quoting Levine, 1974, p. 102.
158 Eidem and Læssøe, ibid.
159 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 28-9.
162 This according to Oguchi, cf. Oguchi, H., “A Reassessment of the Distribution of Khabur Ware: An Approach from an Aspect of its Main Phase,” Al-Rāfidān 18 (1997), p. 205. He has also suggested that Habur Ware was “possibly” introduced at Dinkha in the latter part of this phase: Oguchi, H., “Notes on Khabur Ware from Sites Outside its Main Distribution Zone,” Al-Rāfidān 19 (1998), p. 120 n. 3.
163 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 30.
terms with the Turukkeans? Or was it so weak that it could not prevent others from using its territory? We can find an answer in the letter no. 69 = SH 868, where the great king of the Turukkeans asked another king (most probably the king of Simurrum) to organize a joint campaign with Elam, Niqqum and Namar to attack Kakmum. Apparently this hostile plan against Kakmum stemmed from its location between Turukkû and its dependency Šuṣarrā, which fits also with the location of Kakmum in Rawāndiz. Furthermore, a kingdom like Kakmum could occupy parts of the Turukkane lands if it felt itself powerful, as it did in the time of Sargon II (see Chapter Five, about occupying part of the Mannean country).\(^{166}\)

As to point five, the region of the Urmia Basin and Azerbaijān in general was a densely populated region, not only in the OB period but also through the ages. A good parallel to the Turukkane expansion from that region into northeastern Iraq and north Syria, as pointed out by the authors, is the expansion of the Dizayee tribe about a century ago. This tribe originally stems from the region of Mahabād in the Urmia Basin. They penetrated the Iraqi territories and began raiding the Erbil Plain, occupying the majority of the villages and agricultural lands until they came close to the Tigris, where their advance was checked by the local Arab tribes (see also Chapter Eight). The Turukkane expansion into northern Iraq and Syria must have been a similar episode, but apparently wider in extent and more successful, for they reached Nineveh and Assur and later the Habur region.

The problem that arises with the identification of the Turukkane land with the Urmia Basin is the range of the Gutian warfare. We know from other data that the core of the Gutian country was the regions to the south of the Lower Žāb, with assumed extensions to the region between the two Žābs and the modern Iranian territories (see Chapter Two). So somehow it was a neighbour of the Lullubian country, which was centred on the Shahrazūr Plain. If the suggestion to locate the core of the Turukkane country in the Urmia Basin is correct, it would have been too far away to be attacked by the Gutians. Three possible solutions can be offered:

1) We could imagine a larger Gutian kingdom, that had spread its hegemony over a wider area, from Naw/mar\(^{167}\) in the southeast to the Urmia Basin in northwestern Iran. Such a large state, or federation led by Gutians, could explain the excessive irresistible power of the Gutians under Endušše, surpassing all opponents (see further below).

2) A second solution could be found in the description of Eidem and Læssoe of the Gutian polity, a description which, incidentally, is also applicable to other polities of the region: “Like Turukkum and the Elamite kingdom, Gutium must have been both a rather fluid geo-political term, and certainly composed of several distinct polities.”\(^{168}\) Such terms imply a loose, multi-headed political and military structure, one that is difficult to apply to the image we have of the Gutians in this period.

3) A third but less probable solution is to assume that the events described in the Shemšāra letters are more local, in that they happened within a much smaller area in the immediate neighbouring mountains and intermontane valleys of the Rāniya Plain. But more room is needed in which to fit all those kingdoms, cities, kings and generals named as active in the letters. To assign them such a small area with limited resources is not enough.

With these facts before us, the first solution is the only one viable. It presents a somewhat new view of the range of the Gutian kingdom. Accepting the Urmia Basin as the core of the

\(^{166}\) Only, of course, if we accept the identification of the Turukkane lands with the Urmia Basin.

\(^{167}\) For the Gutian presence in Nawar, cf. the letter of Ibál-pî-El to Zimri-Lim (\textit{ARM} 2, 26) concerning the Nawarite Gutian woman (\textit{nawārītum}), see Chapter Seven under ‘The Elamite Invasion,’ and Chapter Two, under ‘The Gutians.’

\(^{168}\) Eidem and Læssøe, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 32.
Turukkean country results in further conclusions that deserve some comment. The connecting routes between the Urmia region and the regions to the west, i.e. the modern Iraqi side, do not pass only through the Qala Dizeh region. The most popular route between the two regions runs through the Háji Omarān Pass. It was an ancient well-known route, where the Kēleshīn and Topzāwa stelae were erected. Dinkha Tepe, for instance, is closer to this pass than to Qala Dizeh. This means that the communication must have been via Rawāndiz, a very important, naturally fortified town. One and a half centuries ago it was the capital of a powerful princedom that stretched its authority from Mahābaḍ south of Lake Urmia to Sinjār and the outskirts of Mardin in the west, including Erbil, Pirdē, Akrē, Zaḥo, Amēdi and Duhok.169 

Having this parallel and in view of the facts mentioned above, it could be that some of the Turukkean polities that formed the federation were located in the region between the Rāniya Plain and Háji Omarān. If so, one of them must be located at Rawāndiz, if Rawāndiz itself was not Kakmum.170

**Chronology**

Despite the abundance of written documents of this period, particularly from Mari, establishing a precise chronology of the events of the region under study is not easy. This arises from the lack of enough comparable data and the complexity of the various calendars used. Šamšī-Adad, for instance, besides the Ešnunna calendar used the calendars of Tell al-Rimāh and Chagar Bazar, in which either the year began in the winter solstice or the autumn equinox, as Larsen has shown.171 The first month of this calendar, confirmed by M. Gallery, corresponded to the sixth month of the Mari Calendar.172 We distinguish the month numbers of years beginning in the autumn equinox with an asterisk directly following the number.

One of the key sources that helped to establish a chronology of the events of the reign of Šamšī-Adad in particular is the Mari Eponymic Chronicle (MEC). It records important historical events that occurred during the periods of the eponyms. Later another important eponymic text from Kaniš was published by K. R. Veenhof.173 It covers a period of 97 years, from c. 1872-1776 BC, i.e. from the reign of Narām-Sin of Assur to the death of Šamšī-Adad.174 The last part of this text (KEL A) is parallel with the first part of the Mari Eponymic Chronicle (MEC A),175 and thus offers a significantly long list of eponyms.

The series of important events pertinent to our subject we learn from the MEC are:176

**Pre-Šamšī-Adad period:**

**Version A:**

9) Samānum Aminum took Šaduppum.
12) Ennam-Aššur Ipiq-Adad II sat on the throne.
13) Hanna-Nārim Ipiq-Adad was defeated by Aminum.
15) Kapiṭiya Ipiq-Adad was victorious over Aminum.

---

170 For the location of Kakmum at Rawāndiz as a second, more possible, candidate, cf. Chapter Five.
171 Wu Yuhong, A Political History..., p. 153 (referring to Larsen, M. T., The Old Assyrian City-State, p. 193 and 211).
172 Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 154.
174 Veenhof, op. cit., p. 57.
175 Veenhof, The Old Assyrian List..., p. 5.
16) Išme-Aššur Ipiq-Adad took the Ziqqurat.

Version B:

7) Šu-bēli capture of the city of Šuprum(?) by Ila-kabkabi, father of Šamšī-Adad.

The Reign of Šamšī-Adad before the Conquest of Mari:

8) Šarrum-Adad victory of the “man” of Elam over Ipiq-Adad; Šamšī-Adad sat on the throne.
10) Aššur-imitti (II) victory of the Lullû over “the king” (= Šamšī-Adad) at Lazapatum.
11) Dadāya events concerning Mut-Abbiḫ.
12) Dadāya II capture of Arrapha by Ipiq-Adad.
13) Aḫi-šalim conquest of Ga…

Version C:

1) ….. several lands taken by “the king”, including the lands of Šerwunum and Ḥaburātum; mention of the cities of Dûr-… and Dûr-Šamšī-Adad.

After the Conquest of Mari:

Version E:

3) Rīš-Šamaš victory of Išme-Dagan over …
5) Aššur-imitti (III) victory of Šamšī-Adad over … which he restores; Mē-Turan and Daduša are mentioned.
8) Ikûn-pīya a victory of Šamšī-Adad; Mē-Turan and Daduša are mentioned.
9) Asqudum a victory(?) of Šamšī-Adad.
10) Aššur-malik victory of Išme-Dagan over … and taking(?) of Nurrugum by Šamšī-Adad; several (=9?) kings, including Kipram, Yašub-Addu and Yašub-Lim, were captured(?) and handed over(?) to Daduša (= ŠA 29).
11) [Awiliy]a(?) the Turukkû are mentioned; text F (=A.1614), mentioning a victory over the Turukkeans as well as a victory of Yasmah-Addu over the Benjaminites and the submission of the banks of the Euphrates, probably corresponds to this eponymy (= ŠA 30).

Veenhof summed up the results of his study of both the Kaniš and the Mari eponymic texts and showed that the period between the accession of Erišum and the death of Šamšī-Adad is

---

177 The sign GA can be read as qā or kā for the city of Q/Kah/prā, which was taken in the joint expedition of Assyria and Ešnunna. Wu Yuhong reconstructed the name as Gasurum: Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 71, which is also possible, except that we are not sure whether Gasur maintained its old name until this time.

178 This land is mentioned together with Ḥaburātum, which was to the north or northwest of Nineveh, on the eastern Habur. It is logical to think that Šerwunum too was close to it. A good location for Šerwunum would be the region of Šerwan Mazin, “Greater Šerwan,” in the region east of the eastern Habur, north of Duhok.

179 Unfortunately, several lands are said to have been conquered by Šamšī-Adad and Išme-Dagan, but their names are effaced on the tablet.


181 There is room for six more names in lines 18′-21′, cf. Birot, op. cit., p. 232, note 8.

182 The signs ik-x[…] can hardly refer to anything else than the verb ik-mi/mu(-…) < kamû “to capture.”

199 years, from 1974-1776. Level II of Kārum Kaniš ended in c. 1836 BC. The birth of Šamšī-Adad must have been in c. 1850 BC. He occupied the throne in c. 1833 at the age of 18 and died in 1776 at the age of 75. These dates are lowered (= made older) by four years in comparison to the former datings he suggested. Although new data have been proposed in the light of new publications and studies, the data Veenhof suggested in his older study in MARI 4 are cited below for convenience and comparison:

**EPONYM** | **YEAR** | **DATED EVENTS+ MEC** | **DATALBE EVENTS**
--- | --- | --- | ---
Haṣa-malik | 1792? |  | - Conquest of Mari by Šamšī-Adad
Šalim-Asšur son of Šalim-Anum | 1791? |  |  
Šalim-Asšur son of Uṣuranum | 1790? | (place is not certain) |  
Ennam-Asšur | 1789 | (place is not certain) |  
Sin-muballit | 1788 |  |  
Rīš-Šamaš | 1787 |  | - Yasmaḥ-Addu arrived in Mari
Ibn-Addu | 1786 | Conquest of Mardaman, Serwunum and Haburatum | - Conquest of Šinamum
Aššur-imitti | 1785 | Events concerning Me-Turan and Daduša (MEC) | - Conquest of Mankisum
Ili-tillati =Ahiyaya? | 1784 |  |  
Rigmanum | 1783 | 9/i*: Messengers of Haššum and Karkemiš in Tuttul (KTT 80), where Yasmaḥ-Addu is sitting (KTT 79) |  
Ikuppiya | 1782 |  |  

---

184 Veenhof, *The Old Assyrian...,* p. 57-8.
186 This list and the dates of the eponyms are made by Charpin and Ziegler, who add the related texts and events in detail in Charpin and Ziegler, Mari et le Proche-Orient …., FM V, p. 145ff.

The eponyms used to date the events of the kingdom of Šamšī-Adad are charted below. They were sorted by Charpin and Ziegler from data in letters, royal inscriptions and administrative texts. It is clear that the data in this chart do not always correspond to that of the MEC, which makes it impossible to combine all in one chart. The months of the Šamšī-Adad Calendar are asterisked and only events relevant to the subject of this and the next chapter are mentioned:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Asqudum  | 1781 | Šamš-Adad went to Akkad and concluded peace with Ešnunna; he remained there until 20 (/ii*?), then went back to Aššur.  
   - viii*: Conquest of Arrapa (Stele of Louvre)  
   - 20/vii*: Šamš-Adad crossed the Lower Zāb and invaded the land of Qabrā  
   - ix*: Conquest of the fortified cities of the land of Erbil by Šamš-Adad (Stele of the Louvre)  
   - ix: Išme-Dagan lays siege to Nineveh  
   - Yasmaḫ-Addu in Razama  
   - x*: Conquest of Ninēt and Šibanum (M.8898: On 2/x* Išme-Dagan left Ninēt)  
   - 15/xii*: War on Ya’ilānum  
   - Yasmaḫ-Addu killed the Ya’ilānumite hostages (ARM 1, 8) |
| Aššur-malik | 1780 |  
   - i*-iii*: 1000 boats are made during these three months; Mašum received 1216 lances “for the expedition of Qabrā”  
   - 3/i*: Conquest of Kirhum by Išme-Dagan (A.4413); only Qabrā itself remains (ARM 1, 135)  
   - 5/i*: Yasmaḫ-Addu passed by Ekallatum before joining Išme-Dagan for the siege of Qabrā  
   - Yasmaḫ-Addu participated in the siege of Qabrā for more than 20 days (A.2745+)  
   - ii*: Conquest of Qabrā in collaboration with Ešnunna and division of its booty (Stele of Daduša)  
   - vi*: Victory of Išme-Dagan in Ikkalnum.  
   - vii*: Conquest of Nurrugum by Išar-Lim (ARM 10, 107)  
   - Before 10/vii*: Victory over Aḥazum  
   - 10/vii*: Šamš-Adad in Šaikšābbum, capital of Aḥazum (A.2302)  
   - x*-xi*: Išme-Dagan and Išar-Lim confront the Turukkean revolt lead by Lidaya  
   - 8/xi*: End of Lidaya’s revolt  
   - 30/xi*: The troops of Išme-Dagan demobilized for taking provisions (ARM 2, 8) |
| Awiliya   | 1779 |  
   - i*: Išme-Dagan to Amursakkum to confront the Turukkean revolt  
   - 3/ii*: Šamš-Adad decided to attack Turukkeans before treating the situation in Zalmaqum (ARM 1, 53+)  
   - ii*-iii*: Turukkeans leave Amursakkum to Tigorānum and revolt in the region of Šubat-Enlil  
   - ii*-vi*: Daduša of Ešnunna died  
   - iv*-v*: Yasmaḫ-Addu resides in Šubat- |
Eidem for his part has successfully divided this period in Shemshāra into three phases: the Pre-Assyrian phase, the Assyrian domination phase and the Post-Assyrian phase. These are the divisions we will follow in this chapter. According to their contents the letters of Shemshāra can be categorized into two main phases. The early phase involves internal correspondence between the Zagros chieftains and Kuwari, and appears to have been a short period of a few spring months, although a few older letters are included. The later phase is the time when Šušarrā was subordinate to Šamšī-Adad. It seems to have begun in the limmu of Asqudom or Aššur-malik (around 1780 BC) and lasted longer. The events occur in the 28th and 29th and perhaps part of the 30th years of Šamšī-Adad.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Nimer-Sin & 1778 \\
\hline
Nimer-Sin & \textit{wariki} \\
\hline
Addu-bani & 1777 \\
\hline
& - 30/vi*: Grain for the families of the Lullubians (\textit{KTT} 138,, cf. also \textit{KTT} 321) \\
\hline
& - The official census in the kingdom of Šamšī-Adad started \\
\hline
& - 12/vii*: Negotiations of Šamšī-Adad with Ešnunna continued in Aššur and proved to be difficult \\
\hline
Warki Addu-bani & \textit{wariki} \\
\hline
Tab-silli-Aššur & 1776 \\
\hline
& - 2/x*: Šamšī-Adad heads the negotiations with the Ešnunnean messengers in Ekallātum, bearing a proposal for peace \\
& - xii*: Šamšī-Adad dies \\
& - xii*: Išme-Dagan buys peace with Ešnunna. The problems made by the Turukkeans ended \\
\hline
Warki & Tab-silli-Aššur \\
\hline
& - vi*: Zimri-Lim’s reign began \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textit{In the Light of the Shemshāra Archives}

The Shemshāra archives shed a very important spot of light, though small and brief, on the history of the inner Zagros. Their importance is not restricted to historical events but they also provide valuable data about the ethnic and linguistic texture of the region in that period as well as valuable hints for the historical geography of the area.

\textsuperscript{188}Eidem and Læssøe, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 34. \\
\textsuperscript{189}Eidem and Læssøe have 1781 BC, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 16 and 34. However, note the older dating of 1785 BC in Eidem, \textit{The Shemshāra Archives} 2, p. 16. \\
\textsuperscript{190}Eidem and Læssøe, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 34; Eidem, \textit{The Shemshāra Archives} 2, p. 16.}
The Pre-Assyrian Domination Phase

The scene

As pointed out above, the first phase perhaps involves just a few spring months of correspondence between the chieftains of the Zagros. Then the political scene consisted of Turukkean princedoms or kingdoms, united under the leadership of Pišendēn, the king of one of these kingdoms, Itabalhām. This Turukkean alliance controlled Šušarrā in the Rāniya Plain and had installed Kuwari as its ruler. At the same time the Gutians threatened the Turukkeans, and probably this threat was the motive for their alliance. The Gutians, under Endušše (var. Indaššu and Indušše) were exercising a huge pressure by a merciless siege that resulted in a severe shortage of supplies, fundamentally grain. The troops of Endušše were bent on destroying the harvest of Kunšum, the capital of Itabalhām every year. We know from the letters that this was done at least for three or four successive years. Turukkum was forced to ask its vassal Kuwari and other vassals for grain supplies for themselves and the troops of the alliance, and also for wool and tin for the manufacture of weapons. Politically the Turukkeans succeeded in the broadening of their alliance by the introduction of new allies. But these allies never offered any help when needed and the Gutians won the war easily. On the western front Šamšī-Adad was harvesting the victories of his campaigns and getting closer and closer to the Turukkean domains. The Turukkeans were also worried about this threat, and these matters formed the main issues of the correspondence in this phase. The motive for the Gutian aggression towards the Turukkeans is not clear. Perhaps it is too simple to say it was expansionism. What we do know is that Gutium in this period was a formidable power that was able to smash all its opponents independently.

Turukkum and Šušarrā

The Turukkeans held the land of Utûm192 under their hegemony. It is not known when this began, but it was an essential asset, particularly in this hard time, because Utûm seems to have been the only part of the kingdom that could supply grain after Endušše had deprived them of this.

The eastern border of Utûm must have been the mountain ranges of Kēwa Rash, Pashkēw and Kurkur, that separate the Rāniya Plain from Qala Dizeh (Map 2). From the north and northwest its borders faded into the mountainous territory of the supposed Kakmean and

---

191 This is explicitly stated in the letters SH 818 (no. 36) and SH 812 (no. 63), see below.
192 The name Utûm is understood as Semitic by Eidem, which according to him means “(the land of) the gate-keeper,” referring to its location close to the gorge between the Rāniya and Qala Dizeh Plains: Eidem, *The Shemshāra Archives 2*, p. 17 and 41. However, its occurrence in the Haladiny inscription as Utuwe (see Chapter Five) more than a century earlier, thus earlier than the Amorite infiltration to the East-Tigris region, is in favour of a local language etymology, perhaps Hurrian. Even if we assume that the Amorites had begun their infiltration so early, their presence is not attested in a territory as deep in the Zagros as the Rāniya Plain. Utûm is an Akkadianized form (Utum), and Utuwe a Hurrianized form (Utuwe), if Utu is not itself a Hurrian name. One does not expect in fact a Semitic name for such a region in the Zagros, predominantly populated by Hurrians and other non-Semitic peoples like Gutians, Lullubians and Subarians as the texts reflect. The trend to interpret every name or term as Semitic, which was the case with Itabalhām and muldānum too, regardless of its geographical location and ethnic and linguistic textures, is risky; see further above, under ‘The Turukkû: People and Organization.’
thereafter Turukkean territories. The southern and southeastern borders cannot have extended much further than the eastern bank of the Lower Zāb, towards the Qara Sird and Sara chains, the border of the Lullubian country. To the west Utûm was limited by the Haibt Sultân Chain, behind which the lands of Qabrā and Ahazum were located. That Qabrā was next to or close to Utûm can be seen in a letter of Šepratu to Kuwari, who was eager to know what would be the next step of Šamšî-Adad after the capture of Qabrā:

**Šepratu to Kuwari (no. 63 = SH 812)**

And you must investigate the intentions of Samsî-Addu. If he has directed his attention elsewhere, and there is no anxiety for the country of Utûm, then take your best troops under your own command, and come up here.193

Šušarrā194 was the capital of the land of Utûm. This is deduced from the letter SH 827:

**Šepratu to Kuwari (no. 64 = SH 827)**

Do this so that they will be friendly towards the country of Utûm, the town of Šušarrā, and the campaign.195

Utûm comprised, or exercised control over, several other cities; the letters of Shemshāra provide evidence that the cities of Ḫiššinaśwe and probably Šegibbum were satellites of Šušarrā. Letter 31 from the Assyrian domination phase bears a request of Kurašānum196 to Kuwari to release the family of a man who had all been sent three years previously to the city of Ḫiššinaśwe. That Kuwari had the authority to release people restrained in that city is clear evidence that it was under his control:

**Kurašānum to Kuwari (no. 31 = SH 916)**

Say to Kuwari: Thus (says) Kurašānum: Listen to the case of the bearer of this letter. He sent his brother and his people three years ago to the town of Ḫiššinaśwe,'
but now his brother has died, and his people have been detained. Now release his people and his maids. 197

From the Pre-Assyrian domination phase, Talpuš-šarrī advised Kuwārī to let a certain Ḥabur-atal go to the city Šegibbūm, where he was popular:

Talpuš-šarrī to Kuwārī (no. 55 = SH 884)
Say to Kuwārī: Thus (says) Talpuš-šarrī, your brother: As for Ḥabur-atal, about whom you wrote to me as follows: “They want him in Šegibbūm. Send him there, and let him stay!” Hereby I have sent him to you. Do as you see fit. The Lulleans will perhaps … 198 the country of Šegibbūm, and his brothers need him. Send him (there), and for us there will later be a good reputation. The people of Šegibbūm love him. 199

This city, called also ‘the country,’ appears to have been located to the south or southeast of Šušarrā since the Lulleans are somehow involved in its affairs. 200

The land of Ištānum was close to Šušarrā, but whether or not it was subordinate to the latter is uncertain. That the name Ištānum is a generic term meaning ‘the northern country’ has been tentatively suggested. 201 If so, Ištānum was located to the north of Šušarrā. That it was close to Šušarrā is obvious from a letter of Išme-Dagan to Kuwārī, in which he talks about a previous report of Kuwārī that contained some news of Ištānum:

Išme-Dagan to Kuwārī (no. 26 = SH 856)
With regard to the report about the country of Ištānum, about which you wrote to me, I have written. They will investigate the matter. 202

The same topic occurs in another letter sent by Kurašānum to Kuwārī. From the letter it appears that Išme-Dagan had asked Kurašānum to make an investigation about the cities of this land, but Kurašānum had no idea about its background:

Kurašānum to Kuwārī (no. 29 = SH 921)
You have sent a letter about investigating the towns of Ištānum to my lord Išme-Dagan, and my Lord wrote thus to me: “Send words to the towns of Ištānum, and have them investigate the situation for you, and write back to me quickly!” This is what my Lord wrote to me. How can I write to these towns [ … ] you did not write to me, and I do not know the matter. Now, as soon as you hear this letter of mine, send me quickly a complete briefing on the towns of Ištānum so that I

200 For the meaning and interpretation of the unclear clause after the city-country name, cf. Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 125, comment on lines 14f.
201 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 51 and 98, comment on l. 4.
Kuwari

The ruler appointed for Utûm was Kuwari, and he enjoyed a considerable degree of independence and power. The texts designate his position as nulûnum. Kuwari was a descendant of a noble family, for according to the letter SH 812 he himself and his father and his grandfather all held the position of nulûnum inasmuch as they exercised nulûnutûm. But it does not say they were all in Utûm:

Šêpratu to Kuwari (no. 63 = SH 812)
He (= Kuwari) whose father and grandfather exercised nulûnutûm.205

As noted by the editors of the Shemshâra tablets, Kuwari was not a citizen of the city Šušarrâ, and probably not even of the land Utûm. The letter SH 882 clearly indicates this:

Sin-îšme’anni to Kuwari (no. 35 = SH 882)
The king is well. The city of Kunšum, your brother, your estate, your wife and your sons and I who love you are well. You cannot say to us: “You are living there, and yet you do not look after my estate.” I entered your estate and questioned the daughter-in-law206 and Tidduri: “Has the harvest work started? You must do the harvest! Have you started the grazing (season) or not?”207

The fact that his house/estate, wife, son and cattle were not in Šušarrâ, but rather in a place called Zigulû (SH 811, 16) or Zukula (SH 882, 31), clearly means that he was in Šušarrâ for the sake of his function.208 In a letter from his son Tenduri we read:

---


204) The name Kuwari is Hurrian; it appears in the texts of Nuzi in the forms Ku-a-ri, Ku-ù-a-ri and in some cases a female name as ‘Ku-ù-a-ri, Ku-ù-a-ri; in Chagar Bazar as ‘Ku-wi-ri (Gelb et al., p. 228); and in Tell Haddad (OB) as Ku-wa-ram (Muhammed, A. K., Old Babylonian Cuneiform Texts from the Hamrin Basin, Tell Haddad, London, 1992, 24:13; , p. 53); and in Tell Mizyad (Ur III) texts as Ku-wa-ri (18 iv: 6; v: 33; vii: 40-26 I: 10-30 I: 18); cf.

205) 56) ša a-bu-šu ū a-bi a-bi-šu nu-ul-da-nu-tam 57) i-pu-šu, Eide-m and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 135 (no. 63 = SH 812).

206) According to Charpin, the word kallatum should be translated as “wife” or “spouse,” cf. Charpin, RA 98, p. 174, but compare Ar. دَخْلَةً, “daughter-in-law.”


208) Cf. also letter 59 = SH 811 below.
A letter from Ḫulukkadil points out clearly that his cattle were in a place called Šašharšum:

**Ḫulukkadil to Kuwari (no. 50 = SH 813)**

Talpuš-šarri went to Šašharšum and inspected your flocks and took away 10 Šubarian sheep. Note that they are with the shepherd Ḫizutta. Do not worry!210

After the beginning of the Assyrian domination, which followed the Gutian victory over the Turukkean alliance, his wife Šip-šarri (SH 826, 14; SH 827, 66), and probably also his son Tenduri and daughter-in-law, were moved to Šušarrā. This too means that Žīgulā was located in the area targeted by the Gutian warfare, and thus in Turukkean territory, if not close to the city of Kunšum.

By contrast, the prominent Turukkean figures had economic investments in the rich land of Utûm. This was the case with Talpuš-šarri, who had an estate there and had special people who were in charge of running it, as we understand from an interesting letter to Kuwari:

**Talpuš-šarri to Kuwari (no. 53 = SH 810)**

Say to Kuwari: Thus (says) Talpuš-šarri, your brother: Imdiya came to me and (said): "Your estate in Šušarrā is not being looked after." I explained these things to you. Did I not say this to you concerning this estate of mine: "Kuwari do not be negligent with regard to this estate! Do not depend on the steward! When you arrive you must inspect my estate, and if the steward living (there) manages the estate well, then let him stay. If not so, then you yourself appoint a steward of your choice!"

Now why is this estate being ruined, and you do nothing? Now have the grain of my estate checked and guarded!211

Charpin is against associating the ownership of estates in a feudal pattern with the Hurrian mountain kingdoms similar to the pattern found later in Nuzi and Alalaḫ as noticed by Eidem. Charpin finds this to be a common practice of the polities of the period, referring to the estates of Yasmaḫ-Addu in the region of Ekalātum and Šubat-Enlil and that of Zimri-Lim in Alalḫūm in the kingdom of Yamḥad.212

---

209 Charpin, RA 98, p. 169.
211 Charpin, RA 98, p. 169.
The Gutian Siege

Letters 63 = SH 812 and 36 = SH 818 state explicitly that the Gutians were blockading the core of the Turukkean country at the capital Kunšum for three or four years and destroying the harvest. Under these circumstances, one of the main tasks of Kuwari was to supply his lords with grain and to entertain good relations with the Lullubians to ensure the flow of grain to them. This indicates that the Lullubians were either the suppliers of grain or that the routes to Kunšum were (partly) passing through their territory. Šepratu, the writer of the first letter, reminds Kuwari that he will be reproached in case he remains negligent over their requests:

Šepratu to Kuwari (no. 63 = SH 812)
Now his (= Kuwari’s) lord has been under siege for three years, but he did not come.213

In the second letter Šin-išme’anni writes to Kuwari:

Šin-išme’anni to Kuwari (no. 36= SH 818)
Indušše has come looting and […] he has destroyed the harvest of the town of Kunšum together with the harvest of Ir(…)iašum, [You indeed] know that for three years it has not been possible to bring in the harvest. And now he has destroyed the harvest of the country and…215

Letter 36 seems to be later than Letter 63, since there the harvest had already been destroyed for three years; “now he has destroyed the harvest” (no 36) means in all probability a fourth time.

Grain Supply

Thus, one of the main tasks Kuwari was asked to perform by his lords was to provide and to deliver grain to his lords. This is reflected in several letters sent by more than one person. In one of them Šin-išme’anni writes:

Šin-išme’anni to Kuwari (no. 34 = SH 826)
Say to Kuwari: thus (says) Šin-išme’anni, who loves you: Have barley for the palace transported quickly, so that your lord and the country will be pleased with you, [and your good name] will be established forever, and I too will be pleased….. thirdly: You know yourself that they have no barley. (Some of) my retainers are staying with you. Load their donkeys with barley, and send them quickly to me by a safe route! They have no [barley].216

---

214 Charpin prefers “invading” instead of “looting:” Charpin, RA 98, p. 174. This is possible since the verb abātu also means “to move across, to make an incursion or a razzia into enemy territory;” cf. CAD ḫ, p. 12, ḫabātu D; for the verb abātu in general and its meanings cf. also Kraus, F. R., “Akkadische Wörter und Ausdrücke, IX,” RA 69 (1975), p. 31-40.
216 1) a-na Ku-wa-ra 2) qa-bi-ma 3) [u]m-ma ḪEN.ZU-iš-me-an-ni 4) [r]a-im-ka-a-ma 5) še-am ar-hi-iš a-na É.GAL 6) šu-[š]-ši-am-ma ū be-ʾel-ka 7) [u] m[a-tum li-ih-da-ni-kum] 8) šu-[š]-um-k[a] a-na ka-li-iš 9) lu ša-[k]-i-[n] 10) t₂ [a-na-ku 10) tu-uh-du….. 21) ša-ni-tam at-ta-a-ma 22) it-de ki-ma 23) še-am la i-šu-ii 24) ši-ša-ru-ia  mieszka-cost-ka
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In another letter, he reports the effect of the circumstances on the household of Kuwari himself, and urges him to save his own household at least:

**Sin-išme’anni to Kuwari (no. 35= SH 822)**

They (Kuwari’s son Tenduri, and daughter-in-law) answered as follows: "There is no grain available." ….. If you arrange transport of the grain of the palace, then send 20 (measures) of flour with the grain for the palace, the harvest may not be delayed. If you do not arrange transport of the grain of the palace, then at least send 20 (measures) of flour to Zukula, so that your estate will prosper.

Nevertheless, Kuwari’s compliance to these requests was not swift. In letter 54 = SH 819, Talpuš-šarri reminds him for the third time that he should send the barley. More importantly, the letter makes a clear allusion to the alliance arranged by the Turukkeans, so that the armies of several countries were heading to defend Kunšum. But because they still had the problem of provisions there was urgent demand for barley:

**Talpuš-šarri to Kuwari (no. 54= SH 819)**

Say to Kuwari: Thus (says) Talpuš-šarri: (Both) once and twice I have written to you to have the grain delivered, but you have not delivered the grain. Now the countries which march to our assistance have drawn near, and I command the army in Zutulum. Now, before the troops come, have grain brought quickly! You know indeed that (even) the inner palace is empty, and that there is not (even) a litre of chick peas available. Do not be idle with regard to the grain! Have it brought quickly!

We learn from this letter that the situation at home was catastrophic. There was no grain to feed themselves let alone the troops that were coming to give military help. The promised grain from Utûm was seemingly their only hope, but it was not sent. That even the inner palace was empty, which probably alludes to carefully stored strategic reserves, shows how effective and damaging the Gutian siege was. Zutlum was thus a city in the orbit of Kunšum. Nevertheless, even the importance of Zutlum could not ensure the promised shipment of grain:

---


217) "The harvest may not be delayed" is accidentally omitted in Eidem and Læssøe.

218) "[a litre of] chick peas available. Do not be idle with regard to the grain! Have it brought quickly!"

219) We learn from this letter that the situation at home was catastrophic. There was no grain to feed themselves let alone the troops that were coming to give military help. The promised grain from Utûm was seemingly their only hope, but it was not sent. That even the inner palace was empty, which probably alludes to carefully stored strategic reserves, shows how effective and damaging the Gutian siege was. Zutlum was thus a city in the orbit of Kunšum, perhaps close to it. The fact that Talpuš-šarri, who appears from the letters to have been second in command to the great king, was in charge of the defence there shows its strategic significance. Nevertheless, even the importance of Zutlum could not ensure the promised shipment of grain:
Tenduri to Kuwari (no. 59 = SH 811)
The grain that Talpuš-šarri promised, Ulukkadil did not deliver. Do not count on this grain! Now they have detained a caravan to Zutlum. Those who will not (even) give straw will not give to Zutlum like before.220

Talpuš-šarri, it appears from the letter, had already promised to provide this city, which he was in charge of its defence, with grain (see also letter no. 54). But he was unable to fulfil his commitment.

The impression the letters give is that Kuwari was negligent about the frequent requests from his lords because, it can be supposed, he was unable to fulfil all of them. Nevertheless, a letter of Sin-îšme’anni states that the safety of communications may have stopped the grain being sent in time. He writes with pleasure that the grain can finally be sent with the troops:

Sin-îšme’anni to Kuwari (no. 37 = SH 829)
Send the barley that I have written to you about both once and twice with these troops! And I shall keep praying for you before Šamaš.221

The troops were apparently those sent by Talpuš-šarri, which are mentioned in his letter to Kuwari. The situation in the Turukkean heartland was so miserable that soldiers and servants could desert the service of their lords:

Talpuš-šarri to Kuwari (no. 56 = SH 829)
Hereby I have sent men to you to transport the grain. Hopefully these men do not scatter in the land. Post guards so that these men return to the country. And you yourself must provide the soldiers who are coming to you with food and beer and oil and send them (back) to me quickly! ……. And this measure should be 4 (times) larger than the previous measure- and send as much wine as you can with the barley. It is ready here, and it is ready elsewhere. So collect tin, (and) send (it) to me!222

It is noteworthy that not only the capital Kunšum needed grain supplies, but other places, such as Zutlum, were waiting for barley urgently. A letter to Kuwari from Ulukkadil is probably about one such case, if the final destination of the barley mentioned was not Kunšum:

Ulukkadil to Kuwari (no. 52 = SH 820)
Also I hope you will gain renown concerning the tribute. The country looks to you. Have the barley transported here, and in future we shall have renown!223


223 27) ša-ni-tam aš-sum GŪ mi-de 28) šum-[k[a] ta-ša-ak-ka-an 29) ma-tum i-na-ta-la-ak-kum 30) še-am šu-ūš-ši-a-am-ma 31) ū i-na wa-ar-ka-at 32) ū-ri-mi-li šu-nu-um, Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 121-2 (no. 52 = SH 820). The same issue of grain is once more touched upon in the badly preserved letter no. 51 = SH 805, sent by Ḫulukkadil to Kuwari.
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The Rāniya Plain was always one of the main agricultural areas of the region that produced large amounts of grain. So it is strange why making peace with the Lullubians was essential for grain. If it was not just because the transport routes passed through the Lullubian land, we may assume that grain from their land was also needed. This could be due to the extra demand for grain, for more than could be produced in Rāniya. The region as a whole may have been smitten by a periodic drought, as often happened and still happens from time to time. Or the Lullubians may have been controlling part of the Rāniya Plain at this time and only a peaceful agreement could keep open the routes. The letter of Śîn-išme’änni to Kuwari rules out the possibility of drought. From this letter we learn that the problem, at least in and around the city of Kunšum, was the Gutian siege that had every year destroyed the harvest. Making peace with the “numerous kings of the Lulleans” is emphasized in the letter of Šepratu to Kuwari (no. 63 = SH 812, see below). From the tone of the text and the context it appears that the Turukkeans badly needed this peace; it was essential to fetch grain for the success of the whole campaign. It shows that the Lullubians were the obstacle for bringing grain to Šušarrā. The command “seize their best terms and accept their peace, you know indeed that the stores are empty” followed by “Now make a firm peace with the Lulleans, and do what is needed for the transport of grain and flour” make this clear. The Lulleans, we conclude, collaborated with the Gutians in the blockade probably willingly, not out of fear, because they were able to offer peace with Kuwari independently, as the letter shows. It appears that they played a game with both sides to get as much advantage as possible. The grain was, then (partly) imported to Šušarrā and from there to the Turukkan lands, since the land of Utûm was seemingly unable to provide the large quantities asked for. The Lullubians for their part found this a good opportunity to put pressure on Kuwari and his lords to get benefit for themselves. It is worth noting that there were some Lulleans who were already allied to, or perhaps hired by, Kuwari, since he could keep “some reliable Lulleans” in Šušarrā until he could leave to join the campaign.

Not only grain but other items were requested from Kuwari, such as wool:

**Hulukkadil to Kuwari (no. 50 = SH 813)**
And you must send much wool from your stock for the king’s wool supply.

**Hulukkadil to Kuwari (no. 52 = SH 820)**
You know indeed, that there is no wool in the palace….. when you come bring [wool]
for the king’s wool supply.

---

224 Cf. also letter 64 = SH 827 also from Šepratu: 22) ‘u a-na Lu-ul-li-im LUGAL.MEŠ 23) ša it-ti-[k]a na-ak-ru šu-pu-ar-ma 24) it-ti-ka li-ši-li-mu la ta-na-ki-ir 25) sa-li-im-šu-nu le-qé ki-ma a-na ma-at Û-te-em 26) ū URU181 Š[u-š]ar-ree182 ū a-na KASKAL 27) i-tà-bu an-ni-tam e-pu-uš, “Send words to the Lullean kings who are hostile to you, that they should make peace with you! Do not continue hostilities! Accept their peace! Do this so that they will be friendly towards the country of Utûm, the town of Šušarrā, and the campaign!” Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 137-8 (no. 64 = SH 827).

225 Similar information and instructions were cited also in letter 64 = SH 827: 44) it-ti Lu-ul-li-im si-li-im-ma 45) še-am ar-hi-išt šu-ši-a-am, “Make peace with the Lulleans and have the barley transported quickly!” Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 137-8.

226 The mention of gifts to LUGAL ša Lulli, “the king of Lulli” (SH 116, 3; 128, 4; 133, 12; 145, 2; 146, 4) in the administrative archives of Shemshāra may refer to the king of this allied group of Lullubians or to one of the kings who made peace with Kuwari; for these texts, cf. Eidem, The Shemshāra Archives 2.


228 10) at-ta-a-ma ti-di ki-i-ma 11) i-na li-bi Ê.KÁL SIG ū-ul l?-ba-aš-ši-a……. 14) ki-ma ta-li-k[am?] SIG a-na lu-bu-uš-ti ‘LUGAL’.….., Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 121 (no. 52 = SH 820); SIG has been accidentally written in l. 11.
Tin, copper and other items were requested from the vassals and others. Pišendēn asked personally his “son” Šu-Enlil for a shipment of tin for the manufacture of lance blades. He reports that he has already received 5,000 shafts from Kusanarhum for the lances and what he needs is the tin. The smooth language with which the king addresses Šu-Enlil and the high appreciation of the service he expects is noteworthy:

Pišendēn to Šu-Enlil (no. 68= SH 868)
Say to Šu-Enlil: Thus (says) Pišente, your father: I requested lance(s) from the king (of) Kusanarhum, and he accordingly sent me 5,000 lances. I am having the blades of the lance(s) made, but I have no tin available. My son must not deny (me) the tin which I request, and the tin which my son gives (/sells?) me, will give me success like 20,000 soldiers! Be forever generous to your father, and all the tin I request, will my son please send it to me quickly so that I can have the lance(s) made.  

In another letter to Yašub-Addu of Aḥazum, apparently in the time when he was allied to the Turukkeans, Pišendēn asks him for copper, tin and other items:

Pišendēn to Yašub-Addu (no. 67= SH 816)
All [I] want […] in Kunšum [deliver …] 200 […], red stone, […] [cloaks, 20 …, 14 minas of] pure metal, 10 minas of kurbianum, and […] sweet oil […] … If you are in truth my son, these goods must not be lost. I need the copper and the tin (for the manufacture of) weapons. Have them delivered with all dispatch. These goods must not be lost!  

It appears that the need for metals, particularly tin, was so urgent that it surpassed the need for grain, because they were ready to pay barley in exchange for tin:

Talpuš-šarri to Kuwari (no. 57= SH 824)
Say to Kuwari: Thus (says) Talpuš-šarri, your brother: Enter my estate, and check all the grain available. If 500 (measures) are ready, then seal [300 (measures)], and [turn] 200 (measures) over to Im-di-la, and let him [make purchases of] tin.  

This letter, however, could be from the earlier phase of the correspondence, before the conditions had become as bad as they became in the later phase, shortly before the campaign. This is suggested because Talpuš-šarri was still in a mood to take care of his estate in Šušarrā, asking Kuwari in the same letter to recruit a new guard. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that the correspondence of this whole phase (= the Pre-Assyrian phase) took a couple of
months, they must have felt the crisis beginning. The shortage would certainly have been predictable.

Diplomacy

In order to keep their kingdom strong and united, the Turukkeans had to practise diplomacy. There were seemingly some vassals and friends who were hesitating, and to keep them loyal, the king himself or his retainers sent persuasive letters and perhaps also envoys. In the same letter of Pišendēn to Yašub-Addu quoted above he reminds him of the long-established brotherhood between their fathers and grandfathers. This also implies an old Amorite presence in Aḫazum represented by the ruling family of Yašub-Addu:

Pišendēn to Yašub-Addu (no. 67 = SH 816)

Have you yourself not heard that my father and my grandfather made an alliance of brotherhood with your father and your grandfather. Now you [... ] must not leave, and Kunšum must not divide [...].232

Talpuš-šarri too sent a letter to Yašub-Addu bearing the same message, perhaps simultaneously with the letter of his lord Pišendēn.233 Yašub-Addu had apparently made his calculations and had realized that he would lose if he decided to stay on the Turukkean side, which is why he did not send his envoys to his lord:

Talpuš-šarri to Yašub-Addu (no. 66 = SH 896)

Why do you not send your envoy to your father Pišendēn? Like previously your father and your grandfather conferred with this House and the country of Itabalhum. You should now confer (with it) in the same manner234

Another small kingdom or city-state that was closer to Šušarrā than to the Turukkean lands235 was urged to stay loyal, exactly as Kuwari had done, and to be ready when asked to “go up” and join the campaign. The message had to be delivered by Kuwari himself:

Talpuš-šarri to Kuwari (no. 58 = SH 801)

Say [to] Kuwari: [Thus] (says) Talpu-[šarri], your [brother]: [The en]voy [……..] …….. and let him indeed hear (this) and let him say thus: "You, like Kuwari loves his lord, and he sent him grain, flour, and what his lord needs, you likewise must not neglect the country and the town of Šušarrā. Until your lord sends for you and you go up you should stay there! When the armies from elsewhere are coming I will write to you to come."236

232 4) ’aš-hu-[k][a-]ma 5) at-ta ’ù-ul” ta-aš-me-e <<x>>-ma 6) a-bi <ù> a-bi a-bi-i-a [i]t-ti ’aš-bi-[k][a] 7) ú a-bi a-bi-ka ’at-šu-tam i-pu-šu 8) i-na-an-na at-ta […………………] 9) la ta-[a]-[l]-ta-ak-ma ’ku-unšu-[um] 10) la i-pa-ra-š[…………………], Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 140-1 (no. 67 = SH 816).

233 Since both letters were found in Šušarrā, one concludes that the letters did not reach their destination in Šaikšabbum. This also proves that both letters were sent to Yašub-Addu together, or at least within a very short time span.

234 4) ’a-[n]a mi-ni-im a’-na se-er½ 5) [a-bi]-ka m’Pi-še-en-de-en 6) [DUMU] ši-ip-ri-ka la t[a-š]a-ap-pa-[ar] 7) [kí]-m[a] u-uš-ši-uš-um […] 8) [a-bi]-ka ú a-bi a-bi-ka 9) [i]t-ti É-tim an-ni-im 10) ’uš ma-tim ša I-ta-ba-al-ši-im½ 11) [i]d-[š]-hu-[š]-i i-na-an-na 12) [a]-ta [k]i-a-a-[m]-ma 13) [d]u-hu-[š]-ub, Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 140 (no. 66 = SH 896).

235 Since the kingdom is urged to be loyal to Šušarrā, it means that it was closer to the latter city. It was probably a city-state in Utûm or within its orbit.

236 1) [a-ná] Ku-wa-[š]-i bi-[k][a-]ma 2) [um-ma] Ta-al-pu-[šar-rí] 3) [a-hu-k]a-a-[m]-ma 4) [DUMU ši-š]-p-ri […………………] …….. and let him indeed hear (this) and let him say thus: "You, like Kuwari loves his lord, and he sent him grain, flour, and what his lord needs, you likewise must not neglect the country and the town of Šušarrā. Until your lord sends for you and you go up you should stay there! When the armies from elsewhere are coming I will write to you to come."
Shortly before the campaign, Kuwari received envoys from Šamsi-Adad, Ya‘ilānum and Šimurrum. This is reported in the same letter of Šepratu to Kuwari in which he asks him to investigate whether it is true that Šamsi-Adad has become hostile to Ya‘ilānum. We assume that the Turukkeans did their utmost to build a broad coalition against the Gutians or, at least, to neutralize those who were not ready to enter the alliance. On the other hand, it appears that those powers, like Šimurrum, Ya‘ilānum and Assyria, had their reasons to prevent any single power, let alone the Gutians, from controlling the whole Transtigris region. We understand from the letter that the Turukkean kings, represented by Šepratu, wanted to go further into details with the envoys of these three powers together with the agents/envoys of Kuwari who brought him the news, Nipram, Kubiya and Ullam-Tašni. In addition, we conclude that the envoys were anxious about the Lulleans who were in Šušarrā. The reason for this anxiety is not clear, but one can assume that they were suspected of having ties with the Gutians and did not want the news of their communications with the Turukkeans to reach Endušše:

Šepratu to Kuwari (no. 64 = SH 827)

Let Nipram, Kubiya and Ullam-tašni come up here together with the envoys of Šamsi-Addu, Ya‘ilānum and Šimurrum, and seize all the important Lulleans and keep them under your control. Do this so that the envoys of these kings can come with a light heart and we will not get trouble.

At about the same time as this letter was sent, perhaps shortly afterwards, Talpuš-šarrī sent a letter to Kuwari telling him that it was not necessary to meet the envoy of Šamsi-Adad, but to meet the envoy of Ya‘ilānum who had brought tin. He describes the message of that envoy as “dated,” a reference to old arguments that he would not believe any more. Does this behaviour have something to do with an unfulfilled promise of the Assyrians to provide the Turukkeans with tin? If so, the Assyrians might not have faithfully kept faith with the Turukkeans, but rather followed a policy of maintaining the power balance. The fragile trust between the parties is reflected in the same letter, when Talpuš-šarrī asks Kuwari not to send the retainers of the envoys together with them when they come to the meeting, but rather to send them alone:

Talpuš-šarrī to Kuwari (no. 73 = SH 804)

The envoy of Šamsi-Addu, who is staying before you, his message is dated. Why should he come up here? You can give him instructions and send him off, but the envoy of Ya‘ilānum, who brought tin, let him come with one of your retainers, and have them indeed bring up the tin with him. When the envoys of Šamsi-Addu and Ya‘ilānum [who (are)] there who … want to come up, do not detain them, [but] their
The fragmentary state of the section in which the Lulleans are mentioned means what was said about them is not known. But we can guess that it was one of the points stressed in other letters, to make peace with them or to hide the news of these communications from them.

**Formation of the Alliance and Assembling Troops**

It is true that the Turukkeans were preparing for a campaign against the Gutians, but this was only a desperate attempt to break the siege. It would not have been reasonable to wage war while the people and the army were starving, when the stores and silos were empty, the soldiers or servants were seeking a chance to desert (see above, letter no. 56), and the king was asking his vassals for barley, tin and even wooden shafts for lances (see above). The preparations, apart from diplomacy and ensuring supplies, comprised the formation of an alliance of Turukkean and probably some non-Turukkean kingdoms and city-states. This occurs in several letters from Shemšāra. The most important was sent by Šepratu to Kuwari:

**Šepratu to Kuwari (no. 63 = SH 812)**

Zuzum, the *hamizurum* of Ilalae, who had been sent to Kusanaṛum, came and with him he brought the king of Kusanaṛum to Aliac; and he had a meeting with Kigirza and Talpuš-šarrī, and they swore a comprehensive oath to each other. The king of Kusanaṛum, Naššumar, and (his) sons, Tarugur (and) Šurti, will come with 3,000 troops; and Berdigendae, the general of Zutlum, will come to Kunšum with his army; and Kigirza with his own troops from Kusanaṛum and Šudāmelum have marched off to besiege Arrumum. Inside the town, there is someone who says, "Come! I will give the town to you!"

Now if the numerous kings of the Lulleans who were hostile to you are ready for peace and (accept) the comprehensive treaty you have offered them, then seize their best terms and accept their peace. You know indeed that the stores are empty and that there is no grain for these troops who are coming. Now make a firm peace with the Lulleans and do what is needed for the transport of grain and flour, so that your lord and the land will rejoice and you will gain eternal renown.

Also get me 500 slings!

And you must investigate the intentions of Samsī-Addu. If he has directed his attention elsewhere and there is no anxiety for the country of Utûm, then take your best troops under your own command and come up here and have some reliable Lulleans kept inside Šušarrā until you come up. If you have investigated the matter and there is (reason to) fear for the country of Utûm, then leave the troops to protect the country of Utûm and the town of Šušarrā; but you yourself come up with your retainers and the country will not reproach you.241

---


240 Since many Hurrian PNs were composed partly of GNs (see above), this name may be compared with the land Nususmar, which formed part of the lands of Šimaški; for Šimaški and its different parts, cf. Potts, D. T., *The Archaeology of Elam*, Cambridge, 1999, p. 141.

After urging Kuwari to join the campaign, a matter touched upon also by his own son Tenduri.\textsuperscript{242} Again he is asked for grain because the arrival of the army is imminent:

\textit{Šepratu to Kuwari (no. 63 = SH 812)}

But have the grain brought in advance! Please (make) haste! Do not tarry! (The arrival of) the army is imminent!\textsuperscript{243}

This letter, the major part of which is cited above, is extremely important. It outlines the political map of the Turukkean alliance and the conditions under which the alliance was formed. The alliance, according to this and other letters, involved the following powers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kingdom/City-State</th>
<th>Capital city</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Itabalum</td>
<td>Kunšum</td>
<td>Pišendēn</td>
<td>king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utûm</td>
<td>Šušarrā</td>
<td>Kuwari</td>
<td>nuldān(um)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilalae</td>
<td>Zuzu</td>
<td></td>
<td>hānizar(um)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusanarāhum</td>
<td>Naššumar</td>
<td>Tarurgur Šurti</td>
<td>king son of the king son of the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šudamelum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>subordinate to Kusanarhum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zutum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kigirza Berdigendae</td>
<td>king? general (GAL.&lt;MAR.&gt;TU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aļazum</td>
<td>Šikšabbum</td>
<td>Yašub-Adddu</td>
<td>Commander-in-chief of the troops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A small kingdom in the orbit of Utûm, cf. letter 58 = SH 801)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kingdom/City-State</th>
<th>Capital city</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šudamelum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a city in which the meeting for the treaty was held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sušar-šarri</td>
<td>Šuruḥtuḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šimurrum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Šu[...]?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The etymology of the title \textit{hanizarum} has been disputed, whether it is Semitic or Hurrian. Læssøe discussed it in detail years ago and suggested a possible Akkadianized form of the


\textsuperscript{242} In his letter Tenduri speaks to his father as follows: 30) ú šum-ma ma-ta-tum 31) ma-li "Ta-al-pu-šar-ri 32) i-ra-di-a-am i-la-ku-nim 33) ú at-ta i-li-a-am 34) la ta-ka-la, “And if all the countries which Talpuš-šarri commands come, then you too must come up,” Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 130 (no. 59 = SH 811). Šepratu, in another letter asks Kuwari to “…take your best troops under your own command and come up here!,” (for the transliteration see above under Turukkum and Šušarrā).

Hurrian word *ha-ni-za-ra-a-e*, attested in *KUB* 12, 44, ii 20. He did not rule out a Semitic origin of the word, comparing Semitic *hnzr* group attested in Ugaritic, related to the Semitic word for 'pig, boar.' Goetze suggested a Hurrian etymology, from *ʔinzur*, 'girl, lassie.' *Hanizarum* is known to be a title, most probably military or administrative, or a profession, parallel to *glm* '(male) servant.' In a text from Ugarit *hnzr*, 'officer(s)' occurs in the same context as 'servants.' If the word is originally Semitic it would be directly comparable to the title of some generals centuries later in Sassanian Iran, such as Hurmuz-warāz, “Boar of Hurmuz (the king),” Warāz-Pirūz, Šapur-warāz (governor of Azerbijān in the time of Narseh), or Warāz-Šapur. The seal of king Khusraw II includes the title Šahrwarāz, “Boar of the empire.” Perhaps a Semitic term has survived in the tradition there for millennia. It is also possible that *hanizarum* may have been used only among the few close friends Kuwari, Šeprat u and Šin-īšme’anni, as a disparaging nickname for Zuzum, who appears to have been a powerful but troublesome figure. This is concluded from letter 35 that alludes to a certain Zuzum who was troubling Utūm:

**Sin-īšme’anni to Kuwari (no. 35 = SH 822)**

Another matter: I keep hearing that Zuzum is up to no good. He troubles the land of Utūm and takes away the sheep (of) its (people). Perhaps no one will tell you (about it); since your retainers are afraid of him, no one will tell you (about it).

Yašub-Addu was an untrustworthy vassal of Itabalhum, so one hesitates to list his name with the allies, for we do not know whether he had changed his mind by this time. Šamši-Adad said that he had followed Ya’ilānum after the abandonment of the Turukkeans.

The name of the small kingdom alluded to in letter 58 is unfortunately not preserved, but it may have been the land of Ištānum, that was also in the realm of Šušarrā, about which Kuwari wrote a report to Išme-Dagan later in the Assyrian domination phase. Yet, another city under the control of Kuwari was Ḥišhinašwe, mentioned in letter no. 31 = SH 916. It

---

244 Læssøe, *The Shemshāra Tablets*, p. 83.
245 Ibid.
246 Ibid.
252 Another individual also named Zuzum is recorded in a letter from Mari. According to the letter, this Zuzum was a peasant and his wife, Qabisatum, was sent back from Qabrā after she was found hiding in a straw silo, cf. Joannès, F., “La femmes sous la paille,” *FM* I, Paris, 1991, p. 82-83.
254 Cf. letters 26 = SH 856 and 29 = SH 921.
could also be identified with the polity mentioned in letter 58, but if not, we still have two satellite polities assisting the military enterprises of Kuwari, and through that Turukkum.

The same could be said for Talpuš-šarri and Kigirza. It is possible that they, particularly Talpuš-šarri, were rulers of polities beside their functions in the Turukkean alliance. Otherwise, they may have been high officials and not rulers of polities. A letter from Shemshāra (no. 59 = SH 811) said that Talpuš-šarri was leading all the lands which means that he functioned as commander-in-chief of the alliance troops. Eidem and Læssøe consider it possible that Kigirza was the ruler of Zutlum.²⁵⁵ This would be true if Berdigendae was only a military general of that polity under its ruler, not a ruling general on behalf of Pišendēn.

Eidem and Læssøe compare the meeting and the diplomatic procedure reported in this letter with the meeting of leaders of two Northern Mesopotamian kingdoms in the time of Zimri-Lim. According to ARMT 26, 404,²⁵⁶ Atamrum of Andarig sent an official to Aškur-Addu of Karanā and invited him to a meeting to conlclude a treaty in a small town on the border of the two kingdoms. It is also reported that Aškur-Addu sent an official to Andarig to fetch Atamrum with his troops and vassals, followed by the meeting of the two kings.²⁵⁷ At the same time, there is no clue in our letter whether the city of Aliae was one of the city-states that entered the treaty or was a city within one of the mentioned kingdoms. However, taking into account that the summit of Andarig and Karanā is a parallel to this meeting, we can say that Aliae was also a city on the border of Kusanarhum and Zutlum.

Since both Kusanarhum and Šudamelum are attested only in this letter in the same context, the latter might have been a subordinate territory to the former, but this remains conjectural in our present state of knowledge.

As discussed above, making peace with the “numerous kings of the Lulleans” was vital to the Turukkeans and their alliance, seeing that they could obstruct or allow, wholly or partly, the passage of goods. However, some letters show that some Lulleans were allied to Kuwari and were residing in the city of Šušarrā (no. 63 = SH 812).

In those same hard times Šamšī-Adad was moving on their western front, which made the situation extra-critical for the Turukkeans. They were afraid of the loss of Utûm, their ‘bread basket,’ should the Assyrians decide to turn to Šušarrā after the capture of Qabrā and Arrapha. This worry is reflected in a passage in which Kuwari is asked to investigate the intentions of Šamšī-Adad so that he could decide whether to take his troops or leave them in the city to protect it.

An important ally was Elam. Letter 64 = SH 827 refers to a message which Širuk-tuḫ (written Šuruḫtuḫ)²⁵⁸ of Elam sent to Tabitu, whom we know as the son of Pišendēn, thanks to the seal legend of the latter. In his message, Širuk-tuḫ asks why no envoys of Itabalhum have been sent to him. The information that a large army of 12,000 troops is assembled to march against the Gutians must have reached Šepratu from Tabitu, who obtained the information from Širuk-tuḫ:

Šepratu to Kuwari (no. 64 = SH 827)
Another matter, Šuruḫtuḫ, the king of Elam, sent the following message to Tabitu:
"Why does the land of Itabalhum not send envoys to me?" The armies are

²⁵⁵ Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 136.
²⁵⁶ For this letter, cf. Chapter Seven.
²⁵⁷ Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 136.
²⁵⁸ Širuk-tuḫ was a sukkalmah of Elam in the period called ‘The sukkalmahs period,’ cf. Potts, The Archaeology of Elam, p. 160ff., 164 and 168.
The question raised here is why the king of Elam addressed Tabitu, not king Pišendēn, father of Tabitu. There is no related information in the texts that can give any hint, but we may conjecture that this son was, as the crown-prince, the ruler of a vassal kingdom of Itabalhum that was nearer to Elam than Itabalhum itself or was located between them. The seal legend of Pišendēn states that this son had a special status: “Pišendēn …… the begetter of Tabiti” (see above). Eidem and Møller do not rule out that by this time he may have succeeded his father on the throne of Itabalhum. But, they add, the very close date of this letter with that of his father does not make this likely.260

Letter no. 64 is a reply to a letter that Kuwari sent in answer to the questions Šepratu asked in the previous letter, so it can be dated directly after letter no. 63. Among the significant information Kuwari sent in his reply was that Šamš-Adad had moved towards Qabrā after Arrapā and had sent his son to conquer Nurrugum, so there was no fear for Utūm in that short phase. However, Šepratu, as an experienced politician, still had doubts. He would not rely on the reports and asks Kuwari to pay attention to the news and to investigate whether it is true that Šamš-Adad is in hostilities with Ya’ilānum. He also asks Kuwari to hide his doubts from the envoy of Šamš-Adad and to act as if they feel comfortable:

Šepratu to Kuwari (no. 64 = SH 827)

I have heard the letter you sent me (where you wrote) as follows: 'Nipram came back from Šamš-Addu and said: ‘All that Šamš-Addu gave me in reply is very good news; and having conquered the city of Arrapūm, it is towards Qabrā Šamš-Addu has proceeded, and he has sent his son Išme-Dagan with 60,000 troops to besiege Nurrugum.’ This is what you wrote in the letter you sent to me. Pay close attention to this news. Hopefully the man will not conquer the whole country, and we shall not have to worry. Keep this news from the envoy of Šamš-Addu, and let your words be pleasing to him.”

"Another matter, the news about Šamš-Addu that runs as follows: 'He has become hostile to Ya’ilānum." Investigate whether the substance of the news is correct or not and send me a letter quickly.262

The clue to dating this letter is the mention of the capture of Arrapā and the plans to capture Qabrā and Nurrugum. Šamš-Adad captured Arrapā in VIII* of limmu Asqudum (1781 BC),263 crossed the Žāb to the land of Qabrā in 20th of VIII*, and captured the fortified

---

262 Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 146; but in Charpin, OBO, p. 166, he has 1780.
cities of the plain of Erbil in IX\(^*\) of the same year.\(^{264}\) This letter, then, was sent sometime between months VIII\(^*\) and IX of limmu Asqudum (1781 or 1780).

Letter 69 = SH 802, 808+815 has already been discussed. We suggested, following Eidem and Læssøe, that it was sent to the king of Šimurrum, although only a part of the first sign of his name is preserved. In his letter, Pišendēn reminds the addressee of the traditional good relations between the two dynasties. But his main message was to get this king to persuade the kings of Elam, Niqqum and Namar to undertake a joint campaign against the kingdom of Kakmum. Pišendēn reminds Tu-[…] that those kings received gold and silver from him (?) to attack his enemy, but they are silent. We have unfortunately no details about why Kakmum was on the list of adversaries. Furthermore, we have no precise date for the letter. All we can conjecture is that Kakmum, as a major power in the area, has found the Turukkean expansion to Utûm unacceptable and therefore has made trouble for them. It is conceivable that Kakmum saw this expansion to Utûm as an incursion into its traditional domain, remembering that Utûm was under its control in the time of Iddi(n)-Sîn. Pišendēn has certainly tried to breathe life into the old feud between the two kingdoms of Simurrum and Kakmum that went back to the time of Iddi(n)-Sîn and probably even earlier. The question that we cannot answer is why Pišendēn asked those kingdoms to attack Kakmum. Had Kakmum’s power surpassed that of Turukkum, or was Turukkum unable to fight Kakmum because of its preoccupation on other fronts of conflict? One more problem is the distance between Kakmum and those kingdoms that could campaign against it. The way to Kakmum would pass through the terrains of Gutium or Lullubum to reach its suggested location in Rawândiz. The fragmentary state of the letter is frustrating in this regard. Nevertheless, the land of Lullubum is probably mentioned a few lines later, a place which might have afforded a passage for the troops to Kakmum:

\begin{verbatim}
Pišendēn to Tu[..] (no. 69 = SH 802, 808+815)

Say to Tu[..]: Thus (says) Pišen[dēn], your brother: Your envoy [..... brought me] your greetings. I questioned him and [he told me your news]. I was as pleased as if I and [you had (actually) met]. As for [..... why] are you silent? My slave\(^{265}\) [..... like/as if\(^{266}\) [.....] established brotherhood and friendship, and the previous kings established brotherhood and friendship. Like/as [.....]\(^{267}\), no[w why why....] [you] are silent?\(^{268}\) Like\(^{269}\) [......][..(break)......]. [......] I/he honoured your [......]. Was it not his [.....] who honoured him? And the plan was as follows: "Now send words to the "father," the grand-regent,\(^{270}\) and to Namarum, and to Dâsi, the king of Nikum, and promise silver, gold, and costly things if they will make attacks on the land of Kakmum" Why did our fathers get silver (and) gold, either 2 or 3 talents, for this promise? Keep the kings on our side (for the rest of) this year. Now look sharp and your troops \[will defeat\] the enemy and the hostile [.....] to the Lu[lean(?)...(break)].\(^{271}\)
\end{verbatim}

\(^{264}\) These dates are according to the Stele of Mardin; cf. Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 146-7 and the table above under ‘Chronology.’

\(^{265}\) This IR-di was left untranslated by the editors.

\(^{266}\) ki-ma was also left untranslated.

\(^{267}\) Also left untranslated.

\(^{268}\) Also left untranslated.

\(^{269}\) Also left untranslated.

\(^{270}\) Eidem and Læssøe are of the opinion that the waklum rabûm “must be a local variant of the title used for the king of Elam, sukkal-ma – or possibly its Akkadian version;” Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 145, comment on lines 27ff.

\(^{271}\) 1) a-na T[u............] 2) qi-bî{ma} 3) um-ma Pi-še-e{n-de-en} 4) a-hu-ka-a-[ma] 5) ma-ru ši-ip-pi-k[a ..........] 6) šu-lu-um <<x x>>-ka [ub-la-am] 7) a-sa-al-sù~-ù~ma [lesem-ka ig·bé-em] 8) ki-ma ša a-na-ku [ui at-ta ni-na-am-rî] 9) ma-di-is ah-du a-na mi-[ni-ma] (.....)] 10) ši-ip-p[a-]t[a [ša al ’x’ [................] 11) IR-di [..............................][12] ki-ma [........................] 13) ’u’ ka’a at ’x’ [......................] 14) at-hu-[tam ù ra-i-mu]-tan 15) i-pušu ù LUGAL.ME[S]-tam 16) pa-nu-tu[m a]-t-[h][u-ta][m ù ra-i-mu-tam 17) i-p[uršu .............]’x’ ka ’x’
Finally, the Turukkeans launched their attack on the Gutians. However, their attempt to break through the siege was not only futile, but it also had adverse results: Endušše was victorious, the allies did not fight faithfully and the country suffered more than 20 days of Gutian devastation and pillage. This is reported in a sad letter of Kuwari’s sincere friend, Sin-išme’anni. He tells Kuwari about the coming of Endušše and the destruction of the harvest of Kunšum and other surrounding cities (see above, under ‘The Gutian Siege’), and continues:

Sin-išme’anni to Kuwari (no. 36 = SH 818)

… And Kusana(r)hum and Zatulum, the allies who keep hearing (about it), nobody came to (help) us. Now Indušše has roamed the countryside for 20 + x days, and we have not confronted him in open battle, and the soldier of our secret depot and the guards have absented themselves. 272 A brother does not trust his (own) brother! 273

That the news of the front reached Kuwari through a friend may very possibly mean that he had not “gone up” with his troops to join the campaign. In justification he certainly argued that the city of Šušarrā would not be safe so he would not leave it but stay where he was. This was a very good excuse that was supported by the similar advice he had received in the administrative texts,274 but there is no mention of Pišendēn and Sin-išme’anni. Perhaps they had fled deeper into Turukkean territory, or were killed in the battle, or just faded away from being active and so were not mentioned in the correspondence between Kuwari and his new lord Šamšā-Adad. The omen that the sender would take for the fate of Kunšum perhaps means that the city had not yet fallen into the hands of Endušše. If so, we could expect Pišendēn still to be residing there. But the omen


272 Eidem and Læssøe explain that their translation of this passage is tentative; they point to the suggestion of Durand in ARM 26/1, p. 345, note 37: “The small peasants too who smuggle and the (customs) guards stay inactive …” cf. Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 107, comment on lines 22f.


274 Cf. Eidem, ShA 2.
may also have been taken to foretell the fate of the city under the Gutians. Both suggestions are speculative.

The letter of Sin-išme’anni to Kuwari states that Endušše destroyed the harvest, which can hardly mean anything else than setting fire to the ripe grain, a custom occasionally recorded in the royal inscriptions. The letters often specify that the grain was barley, which ripens earlier than wheat, in May. So we conclude that the war broke out around this month or slightly later, taking into account that the Turukkene lands on a higher elevation were cooler. Endušše would have been in a hurry to destroy it as early as possible in order not to give any chance to his enemies to harvest it. The timing of the destruction of the harvest by Endušše could not have been worse, for it was in the same year when Šamš-Adad destroyed the harvest of the land of Qabrā, according to his own statement in the Mardin stele.275

Sin-išme’anni did not forget to give Kuwari his last advice coupled with requests. He expected that Endušše would head on to Šušarrā. So he asked Kuwari to reinforce his stores and to be friendly to the Lulleans, probably to let them be neutral in the war:

Sin-išme’anni to Kuwari (no. 36 = SH 818)
You must not let (us) down there! (Act) like a (noble)man! Reinforce the defence of your stores! Come a propitious day and I will take omens for the fate of Kunšum and [write down] and convey the results to you. [……] Be friendly to the kings you control, and be friendly to the Lulleans! And [in order that] they will not destroy the harvest (there) and it will be well for Kunšum and with …….. do not be negligent, but alert the countryside!276

Sin-išme’anni had seemingly the time to write another letter to a certain Namram-šarur during this same war. Apparently, the letter did not reach its destination but instead found its way to the palace of Šušarrā. The reason is easy to guess, for the routes were blocked or were too dangerous to follow because of the Gutians or (or together with) their Lullean allies. This becomes understandable if we read that the letter was sent to the city of Awal in the Hamrin Basin, and would have to pass through the enemy territories. In that letter, the sender refers clearly to the current war:

Sin-išme’anni to Namram-šarur (no. 65 = SH 918)
[….Here] there is war and I cannot send you any of my retainers.277

The Aftermath

Thus, the bitter defeat reported in the letter of Sin-išme’anni resulted in a great change in the political situation. No mention of Pišendēn is made from now on and years later other Turukkene kings, such as Lidāya and Zaziya, are named instead. This points to profound changes, not only on the political level, but also on the social and ideological levels in the Zagros. Ideological changes include the transition that took place in Turukkene life, from being an isolated inner-Zagros kingdom to one in direct contact with the Mesopotamian

275 For the inscription of the stele see below. The chronology of these episodes is discussed below ‘The Assyrian Domination Phase.’


277 17) [an-na-nu-u]m nu-ku-[u]m-ma 18) ma-am-ma-[a]n i-na šu-ḫa-ri-ia 19) a-[n]a še-ri-ka 20) [u-ul a]-ša-’pa-[ar], Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 139 (no. 65 = SH 918).
powers and developing an expansionist ideology towards the territories to the west of the Tigris and the Habur region.

As a direct result of the Gutian triumph the lords of Kuwari became powerless. Many of those lords, governors, high officials, and perhaps a large number of other officials and ordinary people, all became refugees in Šušarrā.278 Šušarrā itself was threatened by the Gutians, as shown in the letter of Šīn-išme’anni (no. 36, see above). The scale of devastation and looting the Gutians brought about was huge, and Kuwari remained without any protective cover after the collapse of the Turukkean front. The pressure was now considerable: large numbers of refugees caused problems from within, and there was an impending military invasion from without. Under such circumstances, Kuwari had few if any choices. He had to offer himself as vassal to the ambitious king of Assyria, who clung to every chance to expand his realm. Their two aims coincided perfectly. With this, a new phase in the history of Šušarrā and of the northern Transtigris begins, to be called the phase of Assyrian Domination.

The Assyrian Domination Phase

In Šušarrā this phase begins with Kuwari’s offer of allegiance to Šamšī-Adad. But more importantly there are a set of significant episodes which had taken place before this. In the limmu of Asqudum both Šamšī-Adad and Daduša of Ešnunnā279 were victorious in a joint expedition against Arrapha in VIII* Asqudum (1780 BC),280 against Nineveh in X*,281 and against Qabrā.282 As a result, a large part of the plains of the east side of the Tigris were

278 A list of individuals, mostly bearing Hurrian names, are mentioned in letter no. 8 = SH 887, sent by Šamšī-Adad to Kuwari asking for their release. Seven of these individuals are named “PN, with his men” or “PN, with his people,” which means that they had been influential persons with a retinue, such as former governors or city-rulers. The only exception to this might be Uštap-tukpi, who is designated as “the cook.” This could have been just a title, or he really was a cook with (political ?) influence with a large family or followers; for the letter, cf. Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 78-81 (no. 8 = SH 887).

279 The alliance of Ešnunna and Assyria lasted until late in the reign of Išme-Dagan. That it was more than a mere political alliance between two royal houses is clear from the roots of Šamšī-Adad’s family in the south. His father Ila-kakbābu was ruler in the Diylla region, and his grandfather Yas/dkur-El was governor of Zaralulu (modern Tell Dhibā’ī). Even Šamšī-Adad describes himself as “King of Agade” in one of his royal inscriptions and both Šamšī-Adad and Išme-Dagan chose Babylonia as a refuge during hard times; cf. Birot, “Les chroniques ....” MARI 4, p. 222-3, for the relations between the ancestors of Šamšī-Adad with the Diyalla region; Wu Yuhong, A Political ..., p. 62-3, for Yadkur-El and his identification with Yaskur-El, the grandfather of Šamšī-Adad; Durand, LAPO II, p. 108-9 who suggests Agade as the cradle of the dynasty of Šamšī-Adad and that the latter was once a vassal of Ešnunna (p. 108), Charpin, OBO, p. 149; Charpin, D., “Mari und die Assyrer,” 2000 v. Chr., Politische, Wirtschaftliche und Kulturelle Entwicklung im Zeichen einer Jahrtausend, Internationale Colloquium der Orient-Gesellschaft 4-7. April 2000, Saarbrücken, 2004, p. 372f.

280 The letter M.8898 relates that Išme-Dagan left Ninēt (=Nineveh) on the second day of X* after its capture; cf. Charpin, OBO, p. 167 and note 785.

281 Since the conquest of Aḥazum and Nurrugum (limmu Aššur-malik, cf. MEC) must have chronologically followed the conquest of Qabrā, the conquest of the latter should have taken place in the limmu Asqudum that records a victory(?) of Šamšī-Adad; cf. also Charpin and Durand, “La prise du pouvoi par Zimri-Lim,” MARI 4, Paris, 1985, p. 315; and Eidem, who considers month VIII* of Asqudum and perhaps month I* of Aššur-malik: Eidem, ShA 2, p. 17. However, Charpin, in his later article in RA dates this joint campaign to the beginning of month II* of limmu Aššur-malik, i.e. in the autumn of that year (1779): Charpin, RA 98, p. 170 (referring also to Charpin, D. and N. Ziegler, Mari et le Proche-Orient..., FM V, p. 95) and OBO, p. 168. I note that in the limmu Aššur-malik there is mention of victory over Yašub-Addu of Aḥazum. We know from the correspondence of Šamšī-Adad with Kuwari that the former planned to conquer Šikšabbum, the capital of Yašub-Addu, but winter was the obstacle (see below), so he waited until spring. This spring must have been within the limmu Aššur-malik. Since the capture of Šikšabbum and Nurrugum postdates the capture of Qabrā, the joint campaign of Šamšī-Adad and Daduša on Qabrā can hardly have taken place in the autumn (of Aššur-malik) as Charpin suggests. This is based on the fact that, in autumn there is no harvest to burn or to destroy, as told by the stele of
subjugated and the Assyrian power came into direct contact with the inner Zagros region and its political affairs. These operations shook the political structure of the region, and this accordingly resulted in demographic changes that will be shown later in this study.

The Conquest of Qabrā

Qabrā must have been a large, powerful and well-fortified city in the region. This is supported first by the elaborate preparations for its capture, when the surrounding towns and villages were captured to cut off supplies and support. Second, both Ešnunna and Assyria joined forces to attack it. Šamšī-Adad himself with both his sons personally led the troops. The details of this campaign are recorded in two important royal inscriptions as well as several letters from Mari. The first royal inscription is the stele of Daduša, found accidentally in 1983 in the Diyālā region (now in the Iraq Museum) while digging a well.283 The second is the stele of Šamšī-Adad, purchased in Mosul and said to have come from Sinjār or Mardin. It is now in the Louvre and known as the Mardin Stele.284 The historical section of the Daduša stele runs as follows:

Qabrā - none of the previous princes285 who ruled in Ešnunna and none of the kings of the whole land who are (today?) had ever dared to proceed to its siege - this land, that disdained me and did not bow down in respect on hearing my great name - I sent against it 10,000 of my elite troops. With the powerful weapon of Tišpak, the hero, and Adad, my god, I marched through its territory like a furious scythe. Nobody among its allies (and) its warriors could stop me. Its main cities, Tutarra, Ḫatīkum, Ḫurarā, Kirhum and its large settlements I conquered with my mighty weapons within a twinkle. I transported its gods (statues), its booty286 (that I spoiled) and its best kept possessions to Ešnunna, my royal city. After that I plundered the surrounding territory and extensively devastated the whole country. I approached Mardin. To be compatible with the statement of the stele we must date it in May-June of limmu Asqudum and suggest that the capture of Nineveh was after, not before Qabrā. It needs no explanation that the correspondence of Šamšī-Adad with Kuwari was of course after the submission of the latter to the former, which took place after the capture of Qabrā. The suggestion of Charpin cannot be based on the fact that the Assyrian calendar, also in the time of Šamšī-Adad, began in the late autumn (cf. Hunger, H., “Kalender,” RIA 5, Berlin, 1976-1980, p. 299 and 301), because Šamšī-Adad, judging by the mention of the month magrānum in his stele, used the Ešnunna calendar, which was different from the OA calendar, (for the OA calendar, cf. Hunger, op. cit, p. 301). In the Ešnunna calendar, magrānum (attested as such in Harmal = Šaduppum, and as magrātum in Ešnunna) was the second month, approximately May.


284 Grayson, RIMA I, p. 63. The name of Šamšī-Adad is not preserved on the stele, but there is a strong probability for attributing it to him and this is supported by Von Soden, Lassøe, Charpin and Durand; cf. Grayson, RIMA 1, p. 63; Charpin, RA 98, p. 162 and bibliography. A criterion used by Charpin and Durand is the occurrence of the month names Addarum and Magrānum, which they say were not included in the calendar of Ešnunna: Charpin and Durand, “La prise du pouvoir …,” MARI 4, p. 315, n. 98. They are correct insofar as addarum and magrānum were the months used by Šamšī-Adad. But they are not correct to assume that magrānum was not used in Ešnunna, when it is attested there also as the second month; cf. Hunger, RIA 5, p. 301; see also above; for addarum and magrānum in the calendar of Šamšī-Adad, cf. Wu Yuhong, A Political History…, p. 155.

285 Ismail translates the word rubē as “kings,” cf. BM, p. 143.

286 Or, according to Charpin “captives,” cf. Charpin, D., “Chroniques bibliographiques……,” RA 98 (2004), p. 154 and his note on p. 156. He argues that the word šallatu(m) means anything taken as booty of war; people and property alike, and since property is mentioned separately, the word here should be restricted to people taken captive.
The inscription, as a traditional royal inscription, is the narrative of a military action. It begins by showing the might of the enemy, mentioning that it had never been conquered by an Ešnunnean nor another king of the land. To justify the campaign, Daduša says that Qabrā

287 Ismail has “Marktstad,” however, the words rebitišu was already been explained by Charpin as “centre” in a note in NABU (NABU 1991, no. 112), cf. Charpin, “Chroniques bibliographiques….” RA 98, p. 156.


289 Ismail adds tentatively “(ihn persönlich?)” after “head” in her translation. This seems unlikely because, as Charpin also says, it was a common practice in that period to decapitate enemies; cf. Charpin, D., “Une décollation mystérieuse,” RA 98, no. 59, p. 51-2.


291 The inscription, as a traditional royal inscription, is the narrative of a military action. It begins by showing the might of the enemy, mentioning that it had never been conquered by an Ešnunnean nor another king of the land. To justify the campaign, Daduša says that Qabrā vigorously Qabrā, its capital city. By laying siege to the encircling wall, hearing up against the wall, breaching, sweeping attack(s) and my great power, I captured that city in ten days. Its king, Bunu-Ištar, I overwhelmed in a twinkle with the strike of my mighty weapon and sent his (decapitated) head immediately to Ešnunna. (Thus) I smashed the bond of the kings who fought for him and (the) precious stones, expensive items, everything this land had, to my royal city Ešnunna, and I showed (all) the people of the upper and lower lands, big and small. Everything else in that land, that city, its widespread land/territory and its presentations, I presented as a gift to Samši-Addu (=Šamši-Addad), the king of Ekkalātu. In the north (lit. height), in the land of Šubartum, from the land of Burunda and the land of Eluhut to Mount Dilubu and Mount (of) Lullûm, those land(s) I subjugated with my mighty arms without mercy. (Thus) I made the king(s) of the whole land(s) praise me forever. In that same year, I built Dûr-Daduša, (to become) my border city on the bank of the Tigris, (by which) I made a good name for the days to come. 293
disdained him and did not show any respect. Charpin noted that Daduša, while saying nothing about his own allies, alludes to the regular soldiers (na-ap-ḫar qar-ra-di-šu, vii 3) as well as to the auxiliaries (sa-bi ti-il-la-ti-šu, vii 2), who supported his opponent Bunu-Ištar. The king, realizing the conquest of the city will need a siege, began his campaign with the control and destruction of the towns, villages and settlements of the land to deprive Qabra of supplies and support. None of the towns mentioned in the inscription, namely Tutarrā, Ḥatkum, Ḥurārā and Kirjum, has been precisely located, except that their general location was in the fertile plain to the north of the Zāb. The second step, laying siege to the fortified capital itself (Fig. 5), took 10 days, during which every available siege technique was utilised. Charpin is correct when he says that Daduša would not have been able to reach Qabrā without the conquest of Arraḫa by Šamšī-Adad and supposes that Daduša has followed the route of the Adhēm Valley, although no itinerary is given. However, we think that the fragmentary section of the MEC, that mentions the city of Mē-Turan and Daduša in the limmu Ikūn-pīya, directly before the limmu Asqudum (see above under Chronology), has certainly something to do with the preparations and opening up the ways leading to Arraḫa and Qabrā. The inscription implies a pact between Daduša and Šamšī-Adad to divide the spoils of Qabrā; Ešnunna takes the moveable possessions and Assyria takes the land. This suggests that Šamšī-Adad received Qabrā emptied of its inhabitants.

Another side to the story comes from the stele of Šamšī-Adad (the Mardin Stele):

...[I th]ought. [By] the command of [the god] Enlil and [... thanks to the vigour of] my attack [I broke into the fortress of Arraḫa [within] seven days and I sacrificed [to DN...[lacuna of about 4 lines]...]. I entered his fortress. I kissed the feet of the god Adad, my lord, and reorganized the land. I installed my governors everywhere and in Arraḫa itself I sacrificed at the Festival of Heat within seven days and I made a razzia in the land of Qabrā. I destroyed (lit. struck down) the harvest of that land and in the month of Magrānum (IX*) (lit. Threshing-Floor) I captured all the fortified cities of the land of Urbēl (= Urbilum/Arbela). I established my garrisons everywhere. On[ly] Qabrā

294 Charpin, RA 98, p. 164.
296 Charpin, RA 98, p. 164. To Charpin, they were in the plain between the two Zābs, but we are not sure if Qabrā controlled the whole region up to the Upper Zāb, since we know of other polities in the region, such as Aḥazum, Ya’ilānum and perhaps even Nurrugum.
297 Charpin, RA 98, p. 165.
298 Mē-Turan was a key centre on the way from Ešnunna to Arraḫa. It was associated with Daduša three years before as well, in the limmu Aššur-imitti (III); cf. MEC.
300 Grayson, RIMA 1: [x x-d]a(?)-al-ma.
301 For ṣepû cf. CAD H, p. 170f.
302 Grayson, RIMA 1: ina.
303 Grayson, RIMA 1. Charpin leaves it as “humtum festival.”
304 Charpin and Durand are correct in their suggestion to read these two DNs in Hurrian: Charpin, D. and J.-M. Durand, “La prise du pouvoir …,” MARI 4, p. 315, note 99 (referred to by Grayson, RIMA 1, p. 64, note to ii’ 9), because we expect Hurrian deities in the temple of the by-that-time Hurrianized city as also the city name indicates.
305 This is month I of the ŠA calendar; cf. the concordance in Wu Yuhong, op. cit. p. 155.
306 This river name is written in the same way in his letters he sent to Kuwari, for instance no. 1 = SH 809: 21 and no. 9 = SH 882: 11; for transference see below.
307 Month II of the ŠA calendar.
Šamš-Adad here says nothing about booty or prisoners, as Daduša had done. Instead, he speaks about reorganization and consolidation of his authority by installing garrisons and governors everywhere. The pact between the two kings seems to have been a long-term one, since in the following year, in the *limmu* Aššur-malik, several lands were conquered and 9 kings were captured, all of them handed over(?) to Daduša, according to the MEC (see above). This pact is reminiscent of the alliance between the Neo-Babylonians and the Medes who jointly attacked Assyria. Then it seems that the Babylonians took the spoils and the Medes inherited the Assyrian territories. Daduša is not honest when he ignores every allusion in his stele to the cooperation of the troops of Šamš-Adad. Eidem collected a group of letters from Mari that concern this campaign. From the letters we learn that the troops were led by Išme-Dagan, who actively took part in the conquest of all the cities of Qabrā. The letter *ARM 1*, 138 reports:

**Išme-Dagan to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 1, 138)**

I have reached Ḥatka. Within one single day I conquered it and took it. Rejoice!

In another letter, Išme-Dagan reports more successes and repeats the old one:

**Išme-Dagan to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 1, 138)**

As soon as I conquered Tutarrum, Ḥatka and Šunḫūm, I went to attack Ḫurraš. I laid siege to this town, I set up siege tower(s) and battering ram(s) (towards its walls). I took it within seven days. Rejoice!

After taking these towns, Išme-Dagan, of course together with Ešnunnaan troops, went on to take Kerhum:

---

308 i’ 1) [ašš]-al-ma 2) [ina] qi-be-it 3) [E][N]L[I].-ma 4) [x x] x i-ti-la’m 5) [x x x] i-hi-ia 6) [ina Ar-ra-a]p-hi-im 7) [ina] ’U‘. 7) KAM.8) [lu-ši-ši]pi-ma 9) [ana DN lu a]i.qi 10) [x x x x] sa’m 11) (lacuna of 4 lines...) ii’ 1) ana ke’er-hi-si e-ru-ub 2) še-pa’ IM be-li-ia 3) ašš-iq-ma 4) ma’a-a-tam ša’a-ti 5) ū-[u]-ki-in 6) ša-ak-2ni-ia 7) ašš-ta(?)-ka-ma 8) i-si-in ša-um-[tim] 9) an a-šTU ša IM 10) i-ana Ar-ra-ap-hi-im 11) lu-ši ap-qī 12) ITI šE.KIN.KU 13) i-ana U 14) KAM.šu 14) (I)za-i-ba-am 15) [lu] e-bi-ir-ma ii’ 1) a-na ma-a-at 2) Qa-ab-ra-a 3) aš-ha-bi-im-ma 4) ma-a-tam ša-a-ti 5) e-bi-ur-sa 6) am-ha-ay-ma 7) a-la-nī ša-an-na-ti 8) ša ma-a-at Ur bi-e-el 9) ka-la-shu-ma 10) i-ana ITI ma-ag-ra-nim 11) ū-ša-bi-it-ma 12) bi-ra-i-i 13) lu-ši aš-ta-ak-ka-an 14) Qa-ab-ra-a 15) e-di-[išši-šu] 2) lu-ši e-zi-ib 3) i-ana [x x x] 4) e-BU[... 5) ID x [...] 6) a-lum šu-[ša ša 7) i-ana ITI :1o.KAM 8) la iš-ša-[... 9) a-ša ma-[a-ti 10) i-ana I [TI ki-nu-nim] 11) i-[a ka ak-k[i-a] 12) da-[lan-nu-tim], Charpin, RA 98, 162-3, with references to restorations; cf. also Grayson, RIMA 1, p. 64-65.


Eidem, *The Shemshâra Archives*, 2, p. 16f.


Išme-Dagan to Yasmaḥ-Addu (ARM 1, 135)
When I arrived at the city of Kerhum, I set up a (siege) tower and demolished its wall by means of a breach. Within 8 days, I took the city of Kerhum. Rejoice! All the fortified towns of the land of Qabrā have been taken, only Qabrā itself has remained. The same event was reported by Šamši-Addad to his son Yasmaḥ-Addu:

Šamši-Addad to Yasmaḥ-Addu (A.4413)
your brother has conquered Kerhum. Rejoice!314

According to the texts A.4413 and A.2745+, Yasmaḥ-Addu was residing in Razama but moved with his troops to Qabrā, passing by Ekallātum, to join his brother for the siege of Qabrā.315 There he remained at least 20 days:

Yasmaḥ-Addu to Šamši-Addad (A.2745+)
... Now only Qabrā has remained... We, Išme-Dagan and 'Iš, have been laying siege to Razama for 20 days.316

The information provided by the letter ARM 4, 49 proves that the king himself was commanding other troops, also in the same region of Qabrā, since he is reported to have approached the town of Sarri(ma). As a result of this approach the inhabitants of the city fled to Qabrā. This perhaps indicates that Qabrā was better fortified, or was the only place remaining:

Išme-Dagan to Yasmaḥ-Addu (ARM 4, 49)
When the king with massive troops marched to Sarrima, a city of Qabrā, the city of Sarrima was abandoned before the king and they entered Qabrā. Now the king has stayed in Sarrima.317

The last phase of the campaign had now been reached. After this Šamši-Addad took A’innum and Zamiyatūm on the bank of the Lower Zāb and began to march towards Qabrā:

Išme-Dagan to Yasmaḥ-Addu (ARM 1, 121)
The king took A’innum and Zamiyatūm which stand on the bank of the Zāb and which are the cities of Qabrā. Rejoice! After the king had taken these cities, he directly marched to Qabrā.318

314) [a]-hu-ka [Ki]-ir-ḫa-[am] is-sa-ba-at [l]u-ii ḫa-de-e-et, after: Eidem, ShA 2, p. 17.
315) Charpin and Zieglar, FM V, p. 94.
316) Charpin and Zieglar, FM V, p. 94, note 159.
317) LUGAL a-[n]a S[a-ar-ri-ma] 6) a-lim ša Qa-ab-ra-a 7) qa-du-um ka-bi-it-ti sa-bi-[f]m 8) [i]-ḫe-ma a-lum Sa-ar-ri-ma 9) [a-n]a pa-an LUGAL 10) (i-na) di-ma a-na Qa-ab-ra-a 11) (i-te-[r]u-ub ū LUGAL 12) (i-na) Sa-ar-ri-ma 13) (w)a-si-ib, Dossin, ARM 4, 49; the breaks in lines 10 and 11 are partly restored by Durand, LAPO II, p. 122; cf. also Wu Yuhong, A Political ... p. 184.
318) LUGAL A-i-in-na-am 6) ū Za-mi-ia-tam 7) ša i-na a-ah 8) Za-i-bi-im ša-ak-nu a-la-nu šu-nu 8) ša Qa-ab-[r]a-[a] LUGAL is-ba-as-si-nu-[t] if 9) lu-ii ḫa-de-[e]t iš-tu a-la-né-e šu-mu-ti 10) LUGAL is-ba-tu a-na Qa-ab-ra-a 11) [r]š-te-se-er, Dossin, ARM 1, 121, Wu Yuhong, A Political ... p. 184.
It was at this moment that Yašub-Addu of Aḥazum seems to have gone to meet Šamš-Adad to swear an oath of allegiance for the second time (no. 1 = SH 809, see below), most likely after the capture of Aʾīnum. Why did he go for a second time and why to Aʾīnum? Probably it was a town in the eastern part of the land of Qabrā, close to Aḥazum, between Šikšabbum, the capital of Aḥazum, and Qabrā. We can imagine Yašub-Addu went to the king out of fear and tried to avoid suffering the same fate of Aʾīnum.

Like Dadaša, Šamš-Adad attacked Qabrā from the south, for he points to crossing the Zāb, implying he had made his preparations in Arrapḫa. Charpin and Durand find it very probable that he had attacked Arrapḫa also from the south. This must have been the time when Yašub-Addu for the first time swore an oath of allegiance to Šamš-Adad in the temple of Adad in Arrapḫa, as mentioned in the letter 1 = SH 809 (see below). Such an allegiance procedure could be counted as part of the reorganization Šamš-Adad undertook (see above, the Mardin Stele). It is important to note that Bunu-Ištar, king of Qabrā, mentioned in the inscription of Dadaša, is styled later in the same inscription (col. xii, l. 12) as king of the land of Urbēl. The royal family of Qabrā seems to have been deported to Ešnunna as part of the spoils. The cylinder seal of a certain Eki-Teššup was found in Ešnunna, and from the legend it appears that he was in the service of Bunu-Ištar. Shortly after their deportation, Šamš-Adad demanded the delivery of the members of the royal family as stated in one of his letters to his son Yasmaš-Addu. From it we learn that Šamš-Adad had earlier wanted to have the members of that family, but he waited until Dadaša had taken over Malgium. On that happy moment he would ask for them. The letter states:

Šamš-Adad to Yasmaš-Addu (ARM I, 27)

…. Now since my brother’s heart became happy (with the take over of Malgium), honour (him) and ask for your desire, the sons of the king who were taken from Qabrā, and say, "What are these sons of the king? They are dogs. Give me these men and gladden the heart of your brother!" Write [this] to Ešnunna.

Qabrā was a territory with southern limits beginning on the northern shore of the Lower Zāb, to the north of which Erbil was also located. So it is no surprise that these two names have been switched when referring to approximately the same territory (as in the stele of Dadaša). The name of Qabrā as the dominant power of this period prevailed, but the ancient name of Erbil, despite its dwindled political role, re-emerged from time to time thanks to its glorious past. It is not known why Erbil is attested so infrequently in the records of the OB period, the period with the richest written sources up to that time. Erbil was close to where Šamš-Adad and his son were operating but it is never mentioned in their correspondence. The Ur III campaigns were much fewer than those against a land like Simurrum, so they cannot be

320 Charpin explains this as a possible mistake committed by the scribe when copying from an exemplar written by another scribe: Charpin, RA 98, p. 164. This does not seem to be likely. Other cases of mistakes in transmission involve one sign, component(s) of a sign, or haplography or dittography of a sign; they do not involve a whole name, as here Ûr-bē-ellä.
322 Durand describes this as a ‘manoeuvre;’ by making his request on such a happy moment it cannot be refused; cf. Durand, LAPO I, p. 500.
held responsible for any presumed destruction. What is more, Simurrum reappeared as a major power while Erbil faded out. The fact that Qabrā overshadowed Erbil can hardly be enough reason for such silence. The answer suggested by Eidem is that the ‘traditional’ large cities of Assur, Nineveh and Erbil were abandoned by the Amorite sheikhs, who preferred to live in newly built fortified cities, or military bases some distance away from those ancient cities. According to him, this was to avoid problems from the urban elites of those ancient centres, who would have resisted these Amorite usurpers. That is why Ekallātum, Nurrugum and Qabrā were founded as capitals. Later parallels reinforce this suggestion: the Arab conquerors of the 7th century AD did not reside in the major cities and urban centres of Mesopotamia, such as Ctesophon, Hīra, Nu-Ardashīr (= Mosul) or many others. Instead they first built military bases at Kūfā and Baṣra, which soon became cities when the warriors brought their families to live there. Later, in the Umayyad Period, they moved from a small camp city, not to an urban centre, but to the newly founded Baghdad. The old Sassanian capital, consisted of a conglomeration of seven towns, and Hīra diminished gradually. A similar fate must have happened to Erbil.

**Ya’ilānum Faces the Fate of Qabrā**

Only five days after the capture of Qabrā, Šamšī-Adad campaigned against Ya’ilānum. The direct reason for this was a raid by 200 men from Ya’ilānum on Ekallātum to rob the emmer of Lamassi-Aṣṣur, the wife of Išme-Dagan, as reported in a letter of Tarim-šakim to Yasmah-Addu. The letters *ARM* 1, 8 (dated to 15 of Tīrum), *ARM* 1, 92 and *ARM* 4, 33 deal with the war on Ya’ilānum. The first letter bears a terrible message to Yasmah-Addu. He is ordered to kill the relatives (perhaps of the king of Ya’ilānum) who were resident with him. They would be kept as hostages if the peace plan with Ya’ilānum was successful, but since this was not the case, they should die, their possessions be confiscated and their concubines be sent to Šamšī-Adad himself. From this letter we understand that there had already been serious problems between Šamšī-Adad and Ya’ilānum, and this raid was only the final straw. The stèle of Daduša mentions Tutarrā among the cities of Qabrā that he had captured with Šamšī-Adad. Nevertheless, Tutarrā (written Tutarwa/yu or probably Tutarwe) is again mentioned in the letter *ARM* 4, 33 as the capital of Ya’ilānum that was decisively conquered. This makes Tutarra a city of Ya’ilānum, not Qabrā. The joint campaign of Daduša and Šamšī-Adad had traversed Qabrā to the territories of Ya’ilānum, which had started hatred and enmity. The reaction of the king appears in the following message:

**Šamšī-Adad to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 1, 8)**

As to the sons of Wilanum who are at your side, when it seemed there would be peace later, I ordered to hold them as hostages. Now, there is no peace with Wilanum at all. I am talking about seizing it. Give orders that all the Wilaneans who are

---

324 Charpin concluded that Qabrā was the capital of the land Erbil: Charpin, RA 98, p. 164; but both land of Urbēl and land of Qabrā are mentioned simultaneously.

325 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 22. The question is whether we can count Nurrugum as a city founded by the Amorites, since the name of its king, Kipram, occurring in the correspondence is not Amorite. Note that Wu Yuhong suggests that Qabrā may have been the name of the citadel of Erbil city: Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 182; this is impossible.

326 In Egypt too, a new city was founded which later became Cairo.


329 This seems to be the Hurrian form of the name *Tutar+we* (genitive suffix).

330 Wu Yuhong has “him,” p. 192. However, I think the king means seizing the land of Wilanum = Ya’ilānum.
before you must die in the night. There must be no rite, wake and grief. Let tombs be made for them and let them die and be buried in the tombs! [Let men bury (?)] Sammetar, his blood (relative). You must not hold his concubines. [Send them] to me [with] two asses of tribute and p[er] an attendant wi[th them]! In the hands of the concubines of Sammetar there is one mina of gold and two minas of silver. Mananna the subordinate should not say improper things. Do not trust him! Escort [them to me]! Mananna, the subordinate must not approach [the concubines]. Let men pull off what are on their veils and their garments, and (you), take their gold and silver but send these women to me! There are left two girl singers of Nawirašarur.331 and all their other women. Keep these women at your side! However, send the concubines of Sammetar to me! On the 15th of the month of Tirum, I am sending this tablet of mine to you.332

The campaign was successful and the king conquered the city of Ḫimarā, which is possibly identical with Dūr-Wilanum mentioned in the letter of Tarim-šakīm.333 The letter ARM 1, 92 mentions the capture of the city of Ḫimarā, which was ruled by the son of the king/sheikh of Ya’lānum:

Šamš-Adad to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 1, 92)

After I defeated the ruler of Qabrā, just five days later I defeated Wilanum. I have taken the city Ḫimarā.334 I conquered his 300 troops, the garrison and his son335 in that city. Rejoice!336

However, putting an end to the power of Ya’lānum necessitated a battle against its gathered troops. This time too the victory was decisive:

331 Wu Yuhong noted that this name is attested also in Shemshāra letter no. 65 = SH 918, a letter from Sinšme’anni to Kuwari:Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 193.
334 Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 191.
335 According to Durand, the city could have been related to the city of E/Imār, as long as ḪI could be converted to ‘ in the Mari texts: Durand, LAPO II, p. 125. He further suggests that according to the phenomenon of toponyms in the mirror of the Amorite period, the name of Ḫimarā in this way would mean “Country with asses” as long as the city of Imār (OB/Emār (MB) means “City of the ass” or “Market with asses,” op. cit., p. 126.
336 Durand in LAPO II, p. 125 and Dossin in ARM 1 read 1 DUMU instead of 2 DUMU, as in Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 193.
337 Wu Yuhong noted that this name is attested also in Shemshāra letter no. 65 = SH 918, a letter from Sinšme’anni to Kuwari: Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 193.
The Allegiance of Utûm to Šamš-Adad

A letter in the archives of Shemshāra mentions a meeting in which the elders of the land of Utûm together with Kuwari assembled must have been related to the procedure of taking an oath and concluding a treaty between them and the Assyrians. However, the ceremony seems to have taken place later, because the sender of the letter in which this is mentioned addressed himself as “your lord,” not as “Šamš-Adad,” as in the early letter no. 1.340 The letter reads as follows:

Šamš-Adad to Kuwari (no. 18 = SH 878)

I have heard the letter you sent me. If before this letter reaches you, you have already made haste to leave Šušarr to come to me, don’t bring the elders of the land and many troops with you. Just come to me yourself with your retainers. 15 days after I have sent this letter to you, towards the end of next month, you will meet me in Šubat-Enlil. If this is not so, and this letter has reached you there, and you have not yet left to come to me, do not come until I write to you. Stay there. I shall arrive in Qabrā and write to you, and you shall lead the elders of the land with you, and come with all your forces.341

This annexation of Utûm to Assyria, or at least the declaration of its allegiance, took place in the limmu Asqudum (c. 1781 BC), after the capture of Qabrā and before the year in which Šamš-Adad conquered Nurrugum. We know this from the letters from Šamš-Adad and Etellum to Kuwari that make allusions to the coming conquest of Nurrugum (see below). The
capture of Nurrugum is recorded in the limmu Aššur-malik, which was the 29th year of Šamš-Adad, c. 1780 BC. 342 (see above under Chronology).

Šikšabbum, a Thorn in the Side

The dominant theme of the correspondence of this phase was the city of Šikšabbum, the capital of Aḥazum. Šamš-Adad was terribly upset about the city and its ruler Yašub-Addu. He expressed himself to Kuwari more than once and attributed this feeling to the changing loyalties of Yašub-Addu and his unstable character:

Šamš-Adad to Kuwari (no. 1 = SH 809)

Surely you have heard about the enmity of Yašub-Addu, the Aḥazean. Previously he followed the ruler of Šimurrum. He left the ruler of Šimurrum, and followed the ruler of the Tirukkeans. He left the ruler of the Tirukkeans, and followed Yaʾi-lānum. He left Yaʾi-lānum, and followed me. He left me and now follows the ruler of Kakmum. And to all these kings he has sworn an oath. Within just three years he made alliances with these kings and broke them. When he made an alliance with me he swore an oath to me in the temple of Teššup in Arrapḫum; (and) again he swore an oath to me on the bank of the Zāb River in Aʾinnnum; and I swore an oath to him. Twice he swore an oath to me, and from the day he seized the hem of my garment I never collected any silver, oxen or grain in his land. I did not seize a single town in his land. Now he has broken relations with me and follows the ruler of Kakmum. He makes an alliance with one king and swears an oath. He makes an alliance with (another) king and swears an oath, but breaks off relations with the first king with whom he made an alliance, and with the (new) king with whom he made an alliance; his alliance and his enmity [change] within (just) 2[+x]343 months. [He had an alliance] with me for 1[+x] months, and then he turned hostile again.344

342 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 34. It is interesting that the capture of Nurrugum was fixed by Šamš-Adad as a landmark in his history and the Emene shrine in the Ištar temple complex of Nineveh. He says in his inscription: 14) bi-tam sa ʾiš-šu 15) šu-lum A-kâ-da2 16) a-di šar-ru-ti-ia 17) a-di sa-ba-at Nu-ur-ru-šum 18) 7 da-a-ru i-ti qa-qi-ma 19) i-na LUGAL.MEŠ 20) a-li ku-ut pu-₇₃₄₅ na₇₃₄₅ ma₂₂ 21) ša pu-šu-₇₃₄₅ ma₇₃₄₅ …… “The temple which none of the kings who preceded me, from the fall of Akkad until my sovereignty, until the capture of Nurrugu- seven generations have passed- had rebuilt and …(lacuna)……”, Grayson, A. K., RIMA 1, p. 53 (text A.0.39.2).

343 Here two numerals are Definitely written; the editors propose 2-3 months; cf. Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 72, comment on l. 43f.

The same complaint is recorded in another letter to Kuwari that appears to have been sent later than letter no. 1. However, there is a slight difference. Yašub-Addu has gone first to Šamšī-Adad, who has counted him with the ruler of Ya’ilānum, who appears to have been allied to Šamšī-Adad at that time. But later, Yašub-Addu allied himself to Šamšī-Adad directly. This might be understood as one change, not two. Another point of interest is the clear allusion that Kuwari was a Turukkean, when “you” in this letter replaces “the Turukkeans” of the previous letter:

Šamšī-Adad to Kuwari (no. 2 = SH 894)

[I have heard] the letter you sent to me. As for the news of Yašub-Addu which you wrote to me, this cheater!; having followed the ruler of Šimurrum for two years, he left the ruler of Šimurrum and [followed you]. He left you and came to me. I counted him with Ya’ilānum, and for this reason he left Ya’ilānum and came to me. [Now] he has left me and follows the ruler of [Kakmum].

Apparently, Kuwari agreed with the feelings of Šamšī-Adad towards Yašub-Addu and added more to what his lord knew about him. This other letter to Kuwari shows an extreme resentment:

Šamšī-Adad to Kuwari (no. 4 = SH 886)

I have heard the letter you sent me. All the things you wrote me are correct. The word of Yašub-Addu is mad. The hand of the god is on him, and his statement is false. He does not know his own words, and he does not know the oath he swears. As if he swears an oath in his dream, he disregards (it). He is a madman, and his statement is false. A king who ……never existed!

But this change of loyalty may not have been sufficient reason or even the only reason to arouse such anger. However annoying it was to have such an untrustworthy ally, it seems to me that the geopolitical position of the kingdom of Aḥazum, particularly its capital Šikšabbum, would have played a role in understanding the situation. In the previous chapter, an attempt was made to identify the location of this city. The available data and criteria pointed to (or somewhere close to) Taqtaq on the Lower Zāb, downstream from Šušarrā (see Chapter Five). This means that Šikšabbum, now allied to the enemy of Šamšī-Adad, was barricading his way to reach his newly gained land of Utûm, a road already known as dangerous for Assyrian messengers and envoys. A clear allusion to this is made in letter no. 2:

Šamšī-Adad to Kuwari (no. 2 = SH 894)

And [with your work] I am much pleased, but your reward for this service you have rendered me I cannot send. The roads are dangerous, and envoys must travel in...
The Assyrian troops and messengers would have to take the difficult tracks that went through the mountains that became blocked by winter snowfall, as pointed out in letter no. 1. This is exactly why Šamš-Adad asks Kuwari to send the messenger back to him before the winter. The normal route along the Zāb would rarely be blocked by snow, unlike the mountain tracks. Šamš-Adad obviously had good knowledge about the local topography so that he was able to find safe routes avoiding Šiškabbum. A sidetrack like this is suggested in letter no.1:

Šamš-Adad to Kuwari (no. 1 = SH 809)

(As for) Kušiya, why is he staying there? Give him the instructions, and send him to me before the …-th of this month. Send him to me before the mountains and roads become snowbound: from Šalam to Šegibbu; from Šegibbu to Šikum; from Šikum to Uraš; from Uraš to Luṭpiš; from Luṭpiš to the land of Ḥaburātum. If too late (lit. if not so), and the mountains and roads have become snowbound (and) he cannot go, let him stay with you. It will be your responsibility, and you must provide him and his retainers with bread and beer.348

A route along the inner mountain territory but parallel to the route along the plain that passed through the GNs mentioned is conceivable. Among these GNs only Šalam and Ḥaburātum can be approximately identified. The former was on the Lower Zāb, downstream from Šušarrā, according to other data from Shemshārah.349 It cannot have been too far from Šušarrā because it was located before Šiškabbum, which we locate at Taqtaq.350 Ḥaburātum was to the north of Nineveh, probably close to the eastern Habur (=Pēššhabur) close to the Iraq-Turkey border.351 While we know that Šegibbu was within the local sphere of the


349) Eidem and Læssøe locate it below Dukān: Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 72, comment on lines 54ff.


351) Joannès and Ziegler, “Une attestation de Kumme…,” NABU 1995, no. 19, p. 17. Ḥaburātum seems to have been a region populated with Hurrians. In the time of Zimi-Lim its king had the Hurrian name Nanip-šauri, and a messenger of this king also had a good Hurrian name, Ehlip-atal; for the attestation of these names cf. Durand, J.-M., ARM 26/1, p. 294; Lacambre, D., “Ehlip-atal, messager de Ḥaburātum,” NABU 2004, no. 91. Durand points to its occurrence in the texts of Rimāh and other Mari texts, which group male and female weavers of Ḥaburātum together with those from Karāma, Razama and Burullum. For him this implies that they were close to each other and formed one homogenous group (basing himself on information in letter ARM 5, 67). Similar evidence is deduced from reports about a pact between Andarig and Razama to smite Mardaman, which was to the west of Ḥaburātum and north of Razama and Andarig: Durand, ibid. According to Charpin, the name Ḥaburātum no doubt elicits the name of the Habur River, which is the Eastern Habur in this case: Charpin, “Une campagne de Yahdun-Lim en Haute-Mésopotamie,” FM II, p. 180-1, note 30. For the name Nanip-šauri, compare Nanip-Sarru from Nuzi, where the first element is nani-, and the second is common in the Hurrian names; cf. Gelb et. al., NPN, p. 237-8.
Shemshāra letters its precise location is unknown. It is reasonable to think of a location to the west or northwest of Zaslum, where the sidetrack could turn to the northwest. Ura’u was, according to Astour, close to MA Šibaniba (modern Tell Billa), basing himself on data from Ur III, MA and NA periods. 352 Eidem and Læssøe agree with Astour in that the route “traversed the plain of Köy Sanjaq, followed the Bastöre River all the way to Gird Mamik, crossed the Great Zāb, and continued, via the otherwise unknown Lutpiš, to a terminal in the land of Ḥaburātum.” 353 However, the plain of Köy Sanjaq seems to me unlikely for two reasons. First, from the Köy Sanjaq plain to the region of Bastöre in the Erbil plain there is no mountainous terrain which could be snowbound in the winter. Secondly, the Köy Sanjaq plain forms one geographically integrated territory with Taqtaq, where we assumed Šikšabbum was located. Thus it is quite difficult to imagine this plain to be out of the reach of Yašub-Addu. The best alternative route would have followed partly the river Basalam, a tributary of the Lower Zāb, and then passed through the valley between Makōk-Harfīr and Safin Ranges up to Shaqlāwā (Map 2). From Shaqlāwā, a tributary of the Upper Zāb leads to the plains east of the region of Nineveh, south of ʿAqra and west of Jebel Maqlūb, in the territory of Musṣrī, as identified by Astour. Both Šegibbum and Zikum must have been located between a point downstream from Shemshāra (= Zaslum) and south of ʿAqra on the Upper Zāb (= Ura’um). Shaqlāwā could well be Zikum.

Šamšī-Adad did not leave Yašub-Addu in peace. He planned to crush him and thought of every possible way to do it. But Yašub-Addu proved to be no easy target. First of all, his timing was perfect. He declared his revolt at a time when military action against him was no longer possible. Šamšī-Adad expressed this explicitly in his letter:

Šamšī-Adad to Kuwari (no. 1 = SH 809)
Now for the next [x+]1 months it is winter, and I cannot lay hands on him; but as soon as the weather becomes milder you will hear all I shall do in his land!354

The is repeated in the letter no. 3:

Šamšī-Adad to Kuwari (no. 3 = SH 828)
It is winter, and for the next two months it will stay cold. I cannot lay hands on him. […] ……, [and on the very] first day the weather becomes milder I shall come up with a complete army and bring him to account.355

Another letter, apparently later than letter no. 1, was sent to Kuwari with the same message, to bring Yašub-Addu to account. This time Šamšī-Adad asked Kuwari to move against his enemy. Obviously the king was loosing patience:

Šamšī-Adad to Kuwari (no. 2 = SH 894)
… and bringing him to account is not […]. Either you go out, and bring him to account, and do me a (great) service. If you do not go out, and do not bring him to

352 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 72; Astour, “Semitic and Hurrian in the Northern Transtigris,” SCCNH 2, p. 45. Astour further explains that Ura of the NA period belonged to the land of Musṣrī according to the annals of Tiglath-Pileser III. Musṣrī, in turn, was located in the area between the ranges of Jebel Maqlūb and Jebel Zirga Bardarash in the southwest and Jebel ʿAqrah (Ākrē) in the northeast, the greater Zāb in the east, and a line east of Bavian in the west. The letter ABL 490 of Sargon II also refers to a location of Ura downstream from Kumme and Ukkû on the same river, ibid.

353 Astour, op. cit., p. 46; Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 72.

account [(ca. 3 lines are broken) …] I will come up there with the complete armies and bring him to account.

It is noteworthy that Šamši-Adad repeats in this letter his request to send Kušiya to him, but this time via Kumme, which "is now safe." This alludes undoubtedly to a change in the situation in Kumme; most probably it had been subdued by Šamši-Adad or his sons:

Šamši-Adad to Kuwari (no. 2 = SH 894)

Secondly, why do you detain my servant Kušiya? Send him to me! The road via Kumme is now safe. Send him to me by the way of Kumme! 357

Kuwari had seemingly suggested other methods than war to punish Yašub-Addu. His reticence to obey on this occasion, and the case of his not participating in the campaign against the Gutians with the Turukkeans, and (as we shall see) his repeated staying behind when Etellum went to attack Šikšabbum, despite requests and encouragements, all lead us to conclude that Kuwari was a man who avoided wars as much as he could. The reply of Šamši-Adad outlines his plans:

Šamši-Adad to Kuwari (no. 3 = SH 882)

As for catching Yašub-Addu, which you wrote to me about, may the god guide you! Catch him! Do me this favour, and for this single favour which you do me, I shall do you 10 favours (in return). As for bringing his land in a state of unrest, which you wrote to me about, ally yourself with the Lullean, and bring his land in turmoil! 358

Finally, Kušiya reached Šamši-Adad, probably after the winter cold months had passed. The oral message he brought from Kuwari was not compatible with the written letter and did not give him the information he should give; probably he had forgotten many details. The king is upset and asks Kuwari to meet him in person when he comes to the war against Aḥazum. The rendezvous would be "the upper (part) of Aḥazum." This letter must be later than letters 1 and 2:

Šamši-Adad to Kuwari (no. 5 = SH 880)

I have read the letter you sent me. Kušiya conveyed nothing of this message of yours. He is a liar! He pretended to take it, but he did not put your message before me. Now I shall send for you to come to the upper (part) of the land of Aḥazum, and you will come to me and meet with me and I shall give you a complete briefing. 359

---

356 26) ū ša-al-š[u] 'ú-ul te'[………] 27) ū-lu a-ta bu-ma [š]a-al-š[u] 28) 'u' du-um-mi- qa-am šum-ma at-[a] 29) [la ta-ba-ma la ta-ša-š[al-š[u]] (ca. 3 lines broken) 33) [a-na-ku i-ti k[a]-bi-[l][i]-t[e] um-m[a]-na]-[ti]m '34) 'a-[ša-ri-[š] e-š(u)-š(u)-š(u), Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 73 (no. 2 = SH 894).

357 43) ša-ni-tam Kušiš=34=ia IR-di am-m[i]-n[i]['m 'ka-le'e[l[t 44) tú-ur-da-aš-šu ge-er-'ri' 45) ša Ku-um-mišiš te-es-ru 46) ge-er-ri ša Ku-um-mišiš ma 47) tú-ur-da-aš-šu, Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 73 (no. 2 = SH 884). J. Eidem (in a personal communication) wonders if Kumme of this letter corresponds to the GN Šaummi of the Haladiny inscription, or if there is a scribal error in one of the texts. Since this form is written twice in this letter (l. 45 and 46) a scribal error is ruled out and the occurrence of girri ša GN in other texts may support this. For such occurrences, cf. CAD vol. G, p. 90. Further, it would be too difficult in this case to think of Šaummi, which was on the Lower Šab and closer to Šikšabbum, as an alternative route, because it could be more dangerous for the messenger Kušiya. See Chapter Five for the location of Šaummi.


Slightly before or after this letter, letter no. 4 discussed the provisions Kuwari should provide for the army of Šamši-Adad when he comes to beat Aḥazum:

**Šamši-Adad to Kuwari (no. 4 = SH 886)**

Now if you can manage what you wrote to me, then place your barley which they are stockling at the disposal of the king, and return the land to its fortress(es). If (the land?) does not starve, .... will be available there in one month as field supplies. Together with the armies I will come up to that land. He will come and join me, and you will bring the retainer with you.\(^{360}\)

Before taking action against Šikšabbum Šamši-Adad wanted first to conquer Nurrugum, which seems to have been important for securing his expansion in the north. In the meantime, the Turukkean chieftain Lidāya was staying with Šamši-Adad, whom the king wanted to keep with himself until the conquest of Nurrugum. This is evidence that the Gutian victory over the Turukkeans was before limmu Aššur-malik, i.e. before 1780 BC.\(^{361}\) This evidence is reported in the short letter no. 7, in which the king asks Kuwari to bring the siege engines downstream to Zaslum to be ready for the campaign. This, as well, is a clear allusion to the fact that Zaslum was to the south of Šušarrā and was located between Šušarrā and Šikšabbum:

**Šamši-Adad to Kuwari (no. 7 = SH 915)**

I have heard the letters you sent me. Lidāya came here and had a meeting with me. Until the conquest of Nurrugum he stays before me. When Nurrugum has been conquered, he will come with the army to the country of Aḥazum. And siege towers must be brought downstream to Zaslum, so that they are ready for the army. At that time when [Nurrugum has been conquered ....(break)....].\(^{362}\)

At this same time, Šamši-Adad sent an army to mount attacks on Aḥazum. He probably wanted to weaken it or prevent it from getting stronger by receiving assistance, because Šamši-Adad emphasized in his letters his coming to conquer Šikšabbum. This army was under the command of a general called Etellum. Letter no. 14 reports this and bears a request from Šamši-Adad to join Etellum with 1,000 troops to conquer Šikšabbum, the capital of Aḥazum. From the tone of the letter it appears it was the first letter in the series of repeated requests that followed:

---

\(^{360}\) i-na-an-na šum<<x x>>ma 16) ki-ma ša ta-āš-pu-ra-a[m] 17) ’e aşk-le-I 18) [ṣe-e]m-[k]a ša i-ma-al-lu’u’ 19) ’a’-na LUGAL šu-ku-un-na 20) ma-a-tam a-na b[i]-ri-[t]-ša te-er 21) šum-ma la b[ē]-r-i 22) [x]-ni-tam a-na ʾŠE’ a’di ITI.1.KAM 23) a-ša’-ri’-iš’ a-na i-me-ru-tim 24) ib-ba-aš-sa-ū qa-du-un um-ma-[n]-a-tim 25) ’a’-na-ma-tim ša-a-ti 26) ’e-el-ﬂ-e-em a[-]-ta 27) a-na pa-ni-i a ’a-la-kam-ma 28) it-ti-ka L.U. TUR 29) ta-ra-de-em, Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 75-6 (no. 5 = SH 880). Note that the numbering of the last line in Eidem and Læssøe should be 19 not 20.

\(^{361}\) This evidence is reported in the short letter no. 7, in which the king asks Kuwari to bring the siege engines downstream to Zaslum to be ready for the campaign. This, as well, is a clear allusion to the fact that Zaslum was to the south of Šušarrā and was located between Šušarrā and Šikšabbum.

---

\(^{362}\) As we have explained already in this chapter the conquest of Aḥazum and Nurrugum was in the limmu Aššur-malik according to the MEC. Now we learn from letter 7 that Lidāya, who was one of the fleeing Turukkean chieftains after their defeat on the hands of the Gutians, was staying with Šamši-Adad until the conquest of Nurrugum, which means a time before Aššur-malik.

---

\(^{363}\) From the tone of the letter it appears it was the first letter in the series of repeated requests that followed:
It seems that Šamš-Adad was too optimistic about the military contribution of Kuwari. As we will see, this became later the subject of many letters sent to Kuwari by both Etellum and Šamš-Adad.

Etellum’s Hopeless Calls for Help

Apparently the request for support from Kuwari was not only a matter for a moral contribution. Victory would have been impossible without it. Etellum, as well as his king, frequently asked Kuwari for help. The fact is that he was unable to conquer the city alone, and the reasons for that are stated in letter no. 42. It is important to note that some towns of the land of Alahzum had already been conquered and Assyrian garrisons were stationed inside them:

Etellum to Kuwari (no. 39 = SH 913)

Šikkabbum is your enemy! It is a menace to both you and me. Let us prepare to besiege Šikkabbum. As soon as you hear this letter muster all your troops and (take) the Lullean with you and march off! Let us quickly besiege Šikšabbum. As soon as you hear this letter muster all your troops and (take) the Lullean with you and march off! Let us quickly besiege Šikšabbum and gain renown before our lord! I am now staying on the border of Tarum. I wait (for you). The date of letter no. 39 is approximately close to that of letter no. 7. It is important to note that some towns of the land of Alahzum had already been conquered and Assyrian garrisons were stationed inside them:

Etellum to Kuwari (no. 42 = SH 859+881)

I have no troops available. The troops have been left in four (sections) in walled towns in the land of Alahzum and cannot leave the town(s), (since) they hold the towns and the rest of my troops are with the king. I have no troops available. You must gather troops and muster the Lulleans with you and come to Zaslum and take up position against him. Then send words that the whole land becomes hostile to him. When he leaves you attack him and cut him off.

From his numerous letters to Kuwari we learn that Kuwari never took any serious step to comply in this case. The date of letter no. 39 is approximately close to that of letter no. 7. It reports that Nurrugum will be conquered within 3 or 4 days, unless this is an exaggeration by Etellum. But letter no. 7 mentions an impending attack on that same land. Letter 39 also instigates anger against Šikšabbum:

Etellum to Kuwari (no. 39 = SH 913)

Šikkabbum is your enemy! It is a menace to both you and me. Let us prepare to besiege Šikkabbum. As soon as you hear this letter muster all your troops and (take) the Lullean with you and march off! Let us quickly besiege Šikšabbum and gain renown before our lord! I am now staying on the border of Tarum. I wait (for you). The date of letter no. 39 is approximately close to that of letter no. 7. It reports that Nurrugum will be conquered within 3 or 4 days, unless this is an exaggeration by Etellum. But letter no. 7 mentions an impending attack on that same land. Letter 39 also instigates anger against Šikšabbum:

Etellum to Kuwari (no. 42 = SH 859+881)

I have no troops available. The troops have been left in four (sections) in walled towns in the land of Alahzum and cannot leave the town(s), (since) they hold the towns and the rest of my troops are with the king. I have no troops available. You must gather troops and muster the Lulleans with you and come to Zaslum and take up position against him. Then send words that the whole land becomes hostile to him. When he leaves you attack him and cut him off.

---

363) a-nu-um ma ša-ba-am <<x>> 5) it-ti E-te-el-lim 6) a-na la-we-e <<x>> 7) at-â-ru-ad <<x>> 8) (erased)
365) 4) Ši-ik-ša-ab-bu-am 5) a-ka-šu-um i a-ia-ši-im ma-ra-us 6) ša Ši-ik-ša-ab-bi-im 7) <<x>> la-we-e-em i ni-pu <<x>>-aš-ši 8) tâ-pi-an-né-em i-na še-me-e-em 9) ’go-ba-ša-ar-ti 10) ša-bi-ka u Lu Lu-ul-li-im 11) it-ti-ka <<U> DÅ’ 12) lu-pu-ut-[m[a] 13) a at-la-ka-am 14) ar-hi-š 15) Ši-ik-ša-ab-ba-am 16) i ni-il-še u šu-ma-am IGI be-li-ni 17) ni-il-sh 18) an-na a-na-ku i-na pu-at Ta-ri-im 19) w[a-ša-ba-k]u u qa-QA ar-hi-š 20) [al-ka]-am <<x>> 21) [i]ši-[k]-ša-ab-bi-am 22) [i ni-š][a]-al la-ma LUGAL i-ka-aš-ša-dim 23) [a]-dit U 3 KAM U 4 KAM Nu-ru-ga-am LUGAL 24) [i]-ša-ab-bi-at 25) [u] LUGAL it-ti um-ma-na-tim 26) [a-n[a] Ši-ik-ša-ab-bi-im 27) i-
After this letter was sent Etellum waited seven days for Kuwari, but Kuwari did not come. Then Etellum sent him the following letter to inform him about his plan to leave Tarum to the city Ikkalnum, which seems to have been the capital or central city of Tarum:

**Etellum to Kuwari (no. 41 = SH 925+942)**

I waited for you 7 days but you did not come, and the whole country [together] has turned [against me]. You should not [come... (rest of obv. is lost)...].

... you gave your promise to the king. Now do what is needed to destroy this ferry! The face of Kakmum of Šuruthum has turned to my lord. Rejoice! Let him come to your lord's side.

Another matter: I will go to Ikkalnum. This town [...] I will leave a garrison and [go] to Arraphum; and you must hold your own land and be available in Zaslum to support Ikkalnum. Perhaps something will happen, and you must come as relief from there and I will come as relief from here, and then the interior of the land will become quiet.

Another matter: in seven days the king will come to Arraphum. Be aware of this and send your greetings to Arraphum to the king.

The ferry that Kuwari was asked to destroy was perhaps used for bringing the siege towers from Šušarrā to Zaslum. As we learn from other letters (see below no. 47 = SH 941 for instance), its destruction was necessary to avoid its being used by enemy troops bringing provisions to support Šikšabbum. However, Kuwari did not destroy the ferry. We are not sure whether Kuwari was just negligent or playing the game of balancing the rival powers for his own interests. Etellum would not have insisted on his requests for support if there were real threats against Šušarrā.

The next letter, in addition to reminding Kuwari of the danger and enmity of Šikšabbum, refers to the ferry again:

**Etellum to Kuwari (no. 42 = SH 859+881)**

About the ferry, you spoke thus to the king: "I will destroy this ferry for the king!" but you did not destroy (it).

We may suppose that Etellum, seeing Kuwari was doing nothing for the destruction of the ferry, asked Yadinum to write a letter to Kuwari with the same message. In addition, he gave Kuwari a sign of danger, that there were Gutian troops ready to cross the river to enter Šikšabbum:

**Yadinum to Kuwari (no. 47 = SH 941)**

---

[op. cit., p. 110-11 (no. 41 = SH 925+942).]

The allusion to the Gutians who are ready to cross the river to enter Šikšabbum is evidence of the location of this city on the northern bank of the Zāb, not on the southern bank where the Gutians would be coming from, from the centre of their country. One may infer that Yašub-Addu had by now allied himself to the Gutians, so another power can be added to the list of Šamšī-Adad (letters no. 1 and 2).

After Etellum gave up hope of assistance from Kuwari he left Tarum to enter the city of Ikkalnum. There he met its elders and the rulers of two other places. His request for help from Kuwari this time was linked to the condition that there was no threat against Šušarrā:

**Etellum to Kuwari (no. 40 = SH 877)**

I departed from the border of Tarum. I have entered Ikkalnum. There the ruler of Ḥanbat and the ruler of Zappan and the country is gathered. Make a forced march all night and come here! If you have not arrived tomorrow I shall break camp and march off and withdraw. If you have not arrived tomorrow, do not come. Hold your own country and stay close to Zaslum. Be ready to assist the troops I left behind in the garrisons.

Three important observations arise from these two letters. First, Tarum with its city Ikkalnum was close to both Zaslum and Šikšabbum. Secondly, Ikkalnum was one night’s march away from Zaslum, where Kuwari seems to have camped. Thirdly, the letter indicates that the reason Kuwari stayed behind was that his land was also under threat, possibly from Kakmum and the Gutians. In letter no. 44, there is news from Etellum that Muškawe, king of Kakmum, has attacked and looted the city of Kigibiši. Kuwari is asked to launch a counter-attack to divert Muškawe and force him to retreat:

**Etellum to Kuwari (no. 44 = SH 875)**

The ruler of Kakmum, Muškawe, made an attack into Kigibiši and took 100 sheep, 10 cows, (and x) men, (and) its inhabitants reacted; (and since) the town of Kigibiši [……….. to] besiege the town [……(break)…] ‘those’ [men]… and you… the man staying ‘before me’… and one man in …not… attack his land, [and] with its [dead] your Lord [you will please] and [you will gain] renown [for yourself…(break)…..]

Now do what you will according to your own wish. But if not, send me words whether this or that. When you attack his country then you will make him retreat your Lord [you will please] and [you will gain] renown [for yourself…(break)…..]

Now do what you will according to your own wish. But if not, send me words whether this or that. When you attack his country then you will make him retreat your Lord [you will please] and [you will gain] renown [for yourself…(break)…..]

---
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Upset Enduše Strikes

It is true that Kakmum was an old warlike enemy of Utûm, but there was another enemy on the scene. Enduše was still the greatest enemy against whom they would have had much apprehension. It was because Kakmum formed a tripartite axis with Gutium and Aḫazum against Kuwari and the Assyrians that it attacked Kiğibiš. From the letter it appears that the city was within, or at least close to, the domain of Kuwari. By such an action Kakmum could reduce the pressure on Šiḫabbum. During the correspondence between Kuwari and Etellum on the one hand, and between Kuwari and Šamš-Adad on the other, Šamš-Adad sent an envoy to the Gutians. The envoy came back with terrible news:

Šamš-Adad to Kuwari (no. 8 = SH 887)
Warad-šarrim arrived here from before Indušše, and reported to me. Indušše is dead set against you; he will not leave you in peace. In case he marches against you, you must be prepared; and do not spread your garrisons! If the garrisons are small and the townspeople many, will (the latter) not be in control and hand (them) over to the enemy? Do not spread your garrisons! Let all your troops be gathered in Šušarrā itself and be ready! You must be prepared. As on the very same day the enemy approaches you, thus you shall be prepared.372

In another letter, Šamš-Adad tells Kuwari how Enduše is angry about Šamš-Adad because of the protection the latter offered Kuwari. The message was brought back by the same envoy of the king, Warad-šarrim, who had been sent to Enduše three months earlier. It is strange that when Šamš-Adad expresses his anger about the Gutian in this letter, he says he looks forward to the time when his land will starve. This could mean that Šamš-Adad was helping him with food supplies, and the protest of the people to Enduše that the barley was finished would reproach him for his hostile reaction to Šamš-Adad that led to that aid being stopped:

Šamš-Adad to Kuwari (no. 20 = SH 905)
Three months ago I sent Warad-šarrim to Endaššu, but he did not receive an official brief or an escort, and his words are hostile to us. He gave him the following message: "I am his son, who does his [……] and his bidding. Kuwari my (official) brief or an escort, and his words are hostile to us. He gave him the following message: "I am his son, who does his [……] and his bidding. Kuwari my father a-bi-it [……] to [……]."
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To approach their target the Gutians supported the enemy of Kuwari and his lord. So they began to send messengers and troops to Šikšabbum. Now we understand why the king and his general Etellum insisted on the destruction of the ferry, for directly after the question why Kuwari did not destroy the ferry, Etellum states:

Etellum to Kuwari (no. 42 = SH 859+881)
Messengers and troops from Indušše keep crossing (the river), now 200 Gutian troops. And they keep attacking the land, and you gave no respite to this land. Now why do you do nothing?
Do this service to your Lord! ........ So if Šikšabbum becomes stronger, will it not be bad for you as well as for me? Why do you do nothing? Apart from Šikšabbum who is your enemy? Apart from it you have no enemy! Stop doing nothing about it!

It is worth noting that Kuwari, as said in the letter, was formerly a major enemy of Šikšabbum, but now he does nothing against it. We suspect he withheld his contribution the capture the city in order not to give Šamši-Adad an absolute upper hand in the region. However, it is also likely that he did not move against it because of the constant threat of the Gutians and Kakmeans on Šušarrā. Another significant point is that the previous enmity between Utûn and Ahažum did not change, though they had both been vassals of Pišendet shortly after the Assyrian domination, a vassaldom indicated in letters no. 66 and 67 (see above).

---

Another letter, that seems to have been written after no. 42, reproaches Kuwari for doing nothing. This letter shows that Šamš-Adad too was waiting for some action by Kuwari and entertaining the hope that he together with his general would conquer the city:

**Etellum to Kuwari (no. 43 = SH 857)**

Now what are you doing? Why do you not come here? The king keeps writing from there: "Has Kuwari still not turned up?" As soon as you hear this letter of mine, make haste and march all night to join me! 

---

**Internal Troubles in Utūm: Refugees, Citizens and the Case of Ḫazip-Teššup**

In the same letter of Šamš-Adad to Kuwari no. 8 the king says that he has given a full briefing about Nurrugum. But we do not know whether the land was taken or not because the text gives no details of the briefing. What we do learn are facts about the conditions inside Šušarrā. The Turukkean refugee chieftains were making troubles for Kuwari, and Kuwari for his part may have been afraid of his position or annoyed about them. He put some of them in jail, killed others (Ḫazip-Teššup), and asked Šamš-Adad himself to settle others. In several letters Kuwari was asked to release people or send them to Šamš-Adad. Letter no. 8 bears a clear message with a list of names of people Kuwari should release:

**Šamši-Adad to Kuwari (no. 8 = SH 887)**

Why have you detained countrymen under Ḫazip-Teššup and incite public opinion against yourself? Release these men!

Eidem and Læssøe noticed that Ḫazip-Teššup was not a refugee from the Turukkean land, but rather a local nobleman who enjoyed a significant influence. This they understood from letter 16, which states that he attempted to instigate a rebellion in “his town.” It appears that he tried to assume power from Kuwari and to sit on his throne. Kuwari saw killing him as the best solution and asked his lord for such permission. But his lord, though afraid of public opinion, finally gave him permission, on condition that he do it secretly:

**Šamš-Adad to Kuwari (no. 16 = SH 883)**

An idea occurred to me concerning Ḫazip-Teššup, about whose execution you wrote to me. Since you want to kill him, let him die! Why should he live? Let him die in the workshop! He keeps writing to his town and tries to turn your [country] against you. [And if] his brothers who are (staying) with me [ask] me, [I shall pretend] that he is alive and [say]: "He is alive, he is alive! [And …] we are indeed his brothers!"

So they will assume that he is (still) alive and staying in the workshop.

---


Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 47.

Charpin does not agree with the translation “workshop” for nēparum; rather he finds that it denotes the exterior part of the palaces: Charpin, RA 98, p. 174 (referring to Durand, LAPO III, p. 106).

Charpin, RA 98, p. 174 (referring to Durand, LAPO III, p. 106).

Charpin, RA 98, p. 174 (referring to Durand, LAPO III, p. 106).

Charpin, RA 98, p. 174 (referring to Durand, LAPO III, p. 106).

Charpin, RA 98, p. 174 (referring to Durand, LAPO III, p. 106).
Charpin thinks that this Ḥazip-Teššup is to be identified with Ḥazip-Teššup, ruler of Ḥaburatum under Yahdun-Lim, who fled and sought refuge in Šuṣarrā. 381 This is not impossible but should not be taken as certain. Statements of Šamš-Adad that his brothers were before him and that he kept writing to his town to instigate a rebellion should not necessarily be understood as support for this opinion. The brothers of Ḥazip-Teššup were before the king certainly to put pressure on Kuwari to release their brother. But it does not necessarily mean that they were natives of Ḥaburatum, and “his town” can be any town in the realm of Kuwari or the Turukkanean country. Any troubles in a town in Kuwari’s domain would concern Šamš-Adad as troubles in the domain of the king himself, evoking the same reaction as for instigating a rebellion. Furthermore, if a former governor of Ḥaburatum now tries to instigate them to rebel that means a rebellion against Šamš-Adad, since Ḥaburatum had been conquered and ruled by Šamš-Adad himself. Šamš-Adad would not have tolerated such an act and received him in the honorific way recorded in no. 17 (see below). The name Ḥazip-Teššup, on the other hand, seems to have been a common name among the Hurrians, as, for instance, Tiš-atal, which was the name of three contemporary rulers in the Ur III period (see Chapter Four).

Kuwari was not popular in Šuṣarrā, perhaps because of the oppression he exerted and the numerous people he detained, as documented in the letters of his lord (see above, letter no. 8). That was why it was easy for an influential nobleman like Ḥazip-Teššup to call the people to rebel. Before his detention Ḥazip-Teššup once visited Šamš-Adad. During that visit the king showed him high esteem and respect by offering him a garment and a golden ring, even though Kuwari had asked the king to rid him of the man:

**Šamš-Adad to Kuwari (no. 17 = SH 906 + 909A + 923A + 927 + 928 + 929 + 932 + 933)**

Concerning Ḥazip-Teššup you wrote thus to me: "My lord must not send him to me. And why did my lord put a gold ring on him, and dress him in a garment? He must not return and come to me." This you wrote to me with Šuma-Adad. You did not (however) send Ḥazip-Teššup to me to be executed. You sent him to me to be calmed and returned to you. [And] I asked your retainer, who escorted Ḥazip-Teššup [(to me)] saying as follows: "Shall I keep Ḥazip-Teššup here forever, or return him to Kuwari?" [Thus] I spoke to your retainer, and your retainer answered me thus: 'He must not be detained. Let him calm down and return him. This is what I was instructed (by) Kuwari: 'Let him return and let him stay with me.'" This your retainer said to me, and for this reason I put a gold ring on him and dressed him in a garment, and calmed him, and said as follows to him: "Does a father not stand by a son? And your father stands by you. He has brought you to account according to your case. Do not worry!" These things I told him, and I calmed him saying: "Let him rest 2 or 3 days. Then I will send him to Kuwari." 382

381 Charpin, RA 98, p. 174. Similarly, Joannès and Ziegler find it possible to identify the two Ḥazip-Teššups, but strangely assume that he was smitten by the Gutians and consequently fled to Šuṣarrā; cf. Joannès and Ziegler, “Une attestation de Kumme…,” NABU 1995, no. 19, p. 17. If he was indeed the same king of Ḥaburatum, it would be impossible to blame the Gutians for his flight. This is because of the distance between Ḥaburatum and the Gutian land, and the absence of Gutian activity in that region, at least at this time. And finally, if he was indeed the king of Ḥaburatum, Šamš-Adad would have restored him to his throne as a vassal, at least because it was the Gutians, the enemy of the Šamš-Adad, who had overthrown him. Needless to say, Ḥaburatum was at this time under the control of Šamš-Adad.

From this, we learn that Ḥazīp-Teššup and Kuwari were on bad terms and that there were problems between them, not only about the inciting of rebellion, that led the latter to get furious. It is true that Kuwari had sent him to Šamš-Adad in the hope that he would not see him again, but his lord treated him with respect, perhaps to keep him for the day he would need him to oppose Kuwari.

Ḥazīp-Teššup was not the only figure that posed danger for the position of Kuwari. On another occasion Kuwari asked Šamš-Adad where to settle Lidāya, seemingly to keep him away, but the king preferred Lidāya to remain until the conquest of Šikšabbūm:

Šamš-Adad to Kuwari (no. 10 = SH 943)

I have heard the letters you sent me. You wrote as follows about Lidāya: "My lord should write to me where to settle (him)." This you wrote to me. […] who [enter(s)] Šikšabbūm ([5 lines broken]). Until the plan for Šikšabbūm has been carried out, [let him stay] in that land.383

This letter must be later than no. 7 that informed Kuwari that Lidāya should stay before Šamš-Adad until the conquest of Nurrugum (see above). We understand from the two letters that Lidāya had visited and met Šamš-Adad at least twice. Letter 24 also mentions sending Lidāya to Šamš-Adad, but it is unfortunately too broken to say more:

Šamši-Adad to Kuwari (no. 24 = SH 852)

For my god's sake, if […] Lidāya […] perhaps […(rest of obv. broken)[…]] […] send him to me, and before me […] and I seized Nabi-Ištar, his retainer. The matter stands thus. Send him to me.384

We learn from letter no. 19 that the people of the country of Utûm also disliked Kuwari and his authority. This was exemplified by Šušarr-ād where their elders had already expressed their allegiance to him in Sarrima in the land of Šamš-ī. According to Eidem and Læssøe, this approach of the elders of Utûm took place during the campaign against Qabrā.385 This section of the letter reads as follows:

Šamši-Adad to Kuwari (no. 19 = SH 861)

The citizens of Utûm hate the town of Šušarrā, and you, you citizens of Kunšum who left Kunšum, they hate you. They are villainous and rebellious. Previously, when I have heard the letters you sent me. You wrote as follows about Lidāya: "My lord should write to me where to settle (him)." This you wrote to me. […] who [enter(s)] Šikšabbūm ([5 lines broken]). Until the plan for Šikšabbūm has been carried out, [let him stay] in that land.383

We learn from letter no. 19 that the people of the country of Utûm also disliked Kuwari and his authority. This was exemplified by Šušarr-ād where their elders had already expressed their allegiance to him in Sarrima in the land of Šamš-ī. According to Eidem and Læssøe, this approach of the elders of Utûm took place during the campaign against Qabrā.385 This section of the letter reads as follows:

Šamši-Adad to Kuwari (no. 19 = SH 861)

The citizens of Utûm hate the town of Šušarrā, and you, you citizens of Kunšum who left Kunšum, they hate you. They are villainous and rebellious. Previously, when I have heard the letters you sent me. You wrote as follows about Lidāya: "My lord should write to me where to settle (him)." This you wrote to me. […] who [enter(s)] Šikšabbūm ([5 lines broken]). Until the plan for Šikšabbūm has been carried out, [let him stay] in that land.383

We learn from letter no. 19 that the people of the country of Utûm also disliked Kuwari and his authority. This was exemplified by Šušarr-ād where their elders had already expressed their allegiance to him in Sarrima in the land of Šamš-ī. According to Eidem and Læssøe, this approach of the elders of Utûm took place during the campaign against Qabrā.385 This section of the letter reads as follows:

Šamši-Adad to Kuwari (no. 19 = SH 861)

The citizens of Utûm hate the town of Šušarrā, and you, you citizens of Kunšum who left Kunšum, they hate you. They are villainous and rebellious. Previously, when I have heard the letters you sent me. You wrote as follows about Lidāya: "My lord should write to me where to settle (him)." This you wrote to me. […] who [enter(s)] Šikšabbūm ([5 lines broken]). Until the plan for Šikšabbūm has been carried out, [let him stay] in that land.383
In this same letter military support from Šamši-Adad for Kuwari is mentioned, so it seems very probable that it aimed to protect Kuwari from internal perils, such as Ḥazip-Teššûp. This support was one of the fruits Kuwari gained from the treaty he had concluded with the Assyrian king, and according to the letter he received 600 Assyrian troops:

**Šamši-Adad to Kuwari (no. 19 = SH 861)**

Hereby I have sent you 600 troops to protect Šušarrā. Let these troops enter Šušarrā itself, and you yourself come to me.\footnote{387}

Letter 12 seems to follow letter 19 chronologically because it is about details of a meeting between Šamši-Adad and Kuwari. This meeting could be the one his lord asked for in letter 19. In the letter, that predates the conquest of Šikšabbum, Kuwari was asked again to send troops to contribute to the conquest of that city:

**Šamši-Adad to Kuwari (no. 12 = SH 888)**

Before you left I gave you a decision. I instructed you thus: “If Šikšabbum is conquered, then come to me in Arrahphum. If Šikšabbum has not been conquered, let the garrison troops enter the environs of Šikšabbum and you, according to your own judgement, go to Šušarrā and instruct a commander of Šušarrā, and take the troops of the district of Šušarrā with you and come to me!” This I instructed you. The instruction was thus. (Now) act in accordance with the instruction I gave you! If Šikšabbum is conquered, and you go to the country of Šušarrā, then until you return to me you must keep writing to me any information you learn. [If not] and you stay there, let [the commander] of Šušarrā send the troops of the upper land to me; [and you] must continue writing to me so that I am informed.\footnote{388}

**Plot or Tactic?**

With regard to the Gutians, who had decided to help the enemy of Kuwari and Šamši-Adad by supporting Šikšabbum, we note an interesting letter sent to Kuwari to inform him about a deal with them. Endušše promised Šamši-Adad not to attack the land of Utûm as long as it was under the control of his “father,” the title he uses for Šamši-Adad. Such a father-son style is also found in letter no. 20, where Endušše states “I am his son.” Was this deal reached after the punitive act of Šamši-Adad not to attack the land of Utûm as long as it was under the control of his father’s land? This question at present cannot be answered. What is noteworthy is

---

\footnote{386} 9) L.Ü.MEŠ DUMU.MEŠ Ū-ta-im\(^{11}\) a-lam Šu-šar-ra-a\(^{10}\) i-zi-ir-ru ū ku-nu-ti DUMU.MEŠ Ku-un-ši-im\(^{11}\) ša ša-tu Ku-un-ši-im\(^{11}\) tu-si-e [(……)] 12) i-zi-ir-ru-ku-nu-ti 13) sa-ar-ru mu-ut-ta-ab-la-ka-tu 14) i-na pa-ni-tim i-na ma i-na Ša-a[r]-r[ı]ma\(^{15}\) 15 i-na ma-a-at Qa-ab-ra-a\(^{3}\) ū-[ba-ku] 16) ši-bu-tu-šu-ru a-na se-ri-[a] 17) [][li-ku-nim 18) [um-nu]-a-mi lu-u IR-[u]-ka n[i-mu], Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 93 (no. 19 = SH 861).


\footnote{388} 4) i-na pa-an wa-si-e-ka pu-ru-us-sa-am 5) ad-di-na-kum ki-a-am ū-wa-e-er-ka 6) um-ma a-na-ku-ma šum-ma Ši-ik-ša-ab-bu-um\(^{10}\) 7) it-ta-'aš芭[-ba-at a-na Ar-ra-ap-hi-im\(^{10}\) a-na pa-ni-ia al-kam 9) šum-[m]a Ši-ik-ša-ab-bu-um\(^{10}\) la 1a-sa-bi-t\(^{10}\) 10) sa-ba-am bi-ir-tam a-na i-ta-at Ši-ik-ša-ab-bi-im\(^{10}\) 11) li-ru-ab-ma at-ta ki-ma pu-ni-ka-ma a-na 12) Šu-ša-[r]-a[-d]\(^{11}\) a-li-ka MU mu-ki-t\(^{11}\) Šu-ša-[r]-a[-d]\(^{11}\) 13) wu-e-[e]-ma ša-ab ha<<al-\(\ll\)-la-as Šu-ša-ša-ra-a\(^{10}\) 14) it-ti-ku ra-um-ma a-na se-ri-ia al-kam 15) a[n]-i-tam ū-wa-e-er-ka wu-u-ur-tum ši-[m]\(^{a}a\) 16) ša-pi wu-u-ar-tim ša ū-wa-e-ru-ka e-p[u-[a]-u] 17) 'šum-ma-[Ši]-[š]a-am-bu-um\(^{10}\) it-ta-[a]-šu-[a]-a\(^{11}\) 'a[-n] [m]a-[a]l-Šu-ša-ša-ra-a\(^{10}\) ta-at-ta-la-ak 19) a-[n]-i-tam ū-wa-e-er-ka wu-u-ur-tum ši-[m]\(^{a}a\) 20) [te-[e]-ma]-m\(^{a}a\) ma-la ta-ta-am-ma-du 21) [a-na se]-ri-ia ši-ta-ap-pa-ra-[a]+n\(^{2}\) 22) [sum-ma]-l[a]-ki-a-ma [a-n]-[ki]-a-am wa-as-ba-at 23) [LÜ mu-ki-t]\([\Šu-ša-ša-ra-a\(^{10}\)] sa ба-am ša ma-tim e-l\(\ll\)-ti-\(<<X>>\) 24) [a-na se]-ri-ia i-[š]-a-[p]-[a]-r[a]-a-am-ma\(^{2}\) 25) [u at-ta] 'a[-n]-a[a]-e-[r]-i[n]-a ši[-]-tap-pa-ra-am-ma 26) [lu-ul] i-di, Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 84-5 (no. 12 = SH 888).
that the same Warad-šarrim was the envoy involved in the negotiations and discussions with Endušše in all three letters. He was perhaps the envoy specializing in Gutian affairs and most probably able to speak Gutian.\(^{389}\) A second confirmation of the agreement reached Šamši-Adad through a Gutian envoy:

**Šamši-Adad to Kuwari (no. 11 = SH 920)**

An envoy of the Gutians who are staying in Šikšabbum came to me and said this to me: "The ruler of Gutium, Endušše, said this to me: 'If the army of Šamši-Adad, my father, should approach Šikšabbum, do not do battle! I shall never sin against my father. If he orders you to march off, (then) march off! If he orders you to stay, (then) stay!'" This is what he said. Who knows whether their words are true or not? Perhaps they have seen the prospects of the town and concocted this themselves. Or they have been instructed from outside. Who knows? So I questioned him, and he gave me indications about the retinue of Warad-šarrim. A *hullum* ring which I gave to Mutušu, the envoy, he told me as an indication, and the colleague of Mutušu, Etellini, was ill in Arraphum, and he told me about the illness of this man. And he gave me all these indications, so that I trusted his message. And I questioned him about the news of Warad-šarrim, and he (said), "His message Indušše received (and replied)\(^{390}\) as follows: 'To the border of Šušarrā in the land which my father controls, I will not draw near!'" This he told me. Warad-šarrim brings good news. Be aware of this!\(^{391}\)

Why did Šamši-Adad send this letter to Kuwari and show him the double confirmation of the agreement he had concluded with the Gutians? Apart from the exchange of information between allies, it must have aimed to give him the message that there will be no Gutian threat to Šušarrā, so Kuwari could no longer use that argument to withhold his military support for the campaign against Šikšabbum.

We have already questioned whether Kuwari was negligent towards his lord or whether he was deliberately playing a game of power balancing when we discussed the letters of Etellum and Šamši-Adad to him. The following letter that relates a plot that was hatched between his lord Šamši-Adad and his enemy Endušše, of which Kuwari would be the victim, sheds more light on this question. Whether the plot was actually made or was a subterfuge to break off the alliance between Šamši-Adad and Kuwari we are not sure, but the report was a reply to a letter Kuwari had sent earlier. Whatever the case may be, the report must have had a damaging effect on Kuwari and his confidence towards his lord. The sender’s name is

\(^{389}\) His name in the Shemshāra letters was always written in Sumerian logograms, so it is not completely certain whether we can read his name as the Akkadian Warad-šarrim. He could have been a local citizen in the service of the Assyrians with an indigenous name written logographically.

\(^{390}\) The translation of Eidem and Læssøe needs to be supplemented with "(and replied)," because what follows must be the answer of Endušše. Without this it would seem as if it was Warad-šarrim’s answer. The Akkadian text lacks any indication to Endušše (see the transliteration below).

It is possible to date this letter to the short phase after the collapse of the Turukkean front and before the vassaldom of Kuwari to Šamš-Adad. In this case the Turukkean kings, who were not happy with the loss of their former province to the Assyrians, might have sent a report such as this to Kuwari to prevent him from going to Šamš-Adad. Note, particularly, that the letter uses the form Samš-Addu, just as Šepratu did (no. 63 and 64). However, this form of the name cannot be taken as conclusive. Instead another aspect in the letter calls for attention. Šamš-Adad styled Endušše “brother” in contrast to the father-son terminology found in the two letters discussed above (twice in no. 11 and once in 20). In both instances it is Endušše who styles himself son of the king, while nothing like that is recorded by Šamš-Adad himself. Is it possible, then, that Šamš-Adad considered him a peer because he needed his alliance, and Endušše, on his part, felt flattered because he needed his aid? At any rate, the more likely date of the letter is the time after the vassaldom of Kuwari, because there were many more reasons in this phase to send such a report, particularly by the numerous enemies of both parties. These enemies would have been eager to see the alliance of Kuwari with Šamš-Adad broken, and keen to poison that relationship by inserting such a report into the correspondence. At this time the alliance of Gutium with Aḥazum and Kakmum formed a powerful axis, as noted by Eidem and Læssøe, so, it is also quite possible that Šamš-Adad had thus tried to break off this alliance. Whether Šamš-Adad was serious in this offer or made it just as a manoeuvre is a matter for speculation.

Other Turukkeans Help Šikšabbum

It was not only the Gutians who helped the Aḥazians. Many Turukkeans who were fleeing from Šuṣarrā or who had been sent by Kuwari to Šamš-Adad entered Šikšabbum. This worried Šamš-Adad seriously:

Šamš-Adad to Kuwari (no. 13 = SH 919+924)

Concerning the Turukkeans who you sent to me together with their people: [as] many Turukkeans with their people as you sent me—they do not correspond to […… I asked them for an explanation] and they told me this: "At [night and in] secrecy [our feet] are sore, and the men who stole away and entered Šikšabbum are as many as we are." This
they told me, and you said thus to me: "They slander me to my Lord." How do they slander you? Previously I wrote thus to you: "Those Turukkeans whose maintenance you cannot manage, send them to me, and I shall take charge of them here." This I wrote to you. Now all [the Turukkean]s you send to me come at night and in secrecy, and the land in front of them they claim, and they keep entering Šikšabbum. Is it right that we should make the enemy stronger, and my armies greater. I am worried about this. Now assemble the country, and tell them thus: "He who wants to can stay here; he who does not want to stay here can go to my lord!" Tell them this, and all the Turukkeans you send to me, must not come at night and in secrecy. Let one of your retainers take charge of them, and [lead] them [safely] to [……]. Since [………..] let them lead them. [………..] Take precautions so that [the land in front of them] they do not claim, and they do not enter [Šikšabbum], and we do not make our enemy stronger and do not make his army greater? All the Turukkeans you send to me, should first be listed on a tablet.

The letter makes it clear why many Turukkeans were sent to Šamš-Adad. Kuwari wished to get dozens of Turukkeans out of his domain because he claimed he was unable to maintain them due to his limited resources. By doing so, he was imposing a kind of exile on troublesome Turukkeans who threatened his authority by participating in or organizing rebellions. But why did those Turukkeans choose for Yašub-Addu and not for Šamš-Adad? Was it to take revenge on Kuwari? Or did they find the authority of Šamšī-Adad rebellions. But why did those Turukkeans choose for Yašub-Addu and not for Šamš-Adad? Was it to take revenge on Kuwari? Or did they find the authority of Šamš-Adad no better than that of Kuwari? Or did they find the regions in the Habur area where they were destined to settle too far away and too much like exile? Or did the Gutian-Kakmean-Āhazian alliance offer them better conditions? A letter to Kuwari that was sent before letter 13 hints that some of them were kidnapped en route and forced to enter Šikšabbum. How the others ended there is not yet known. In that letter Šamš-Adad says he had already given Kuwari the instruction to send retainers with them, but Kuwari, perhaps on purpose, apparently neglected the order:

**Šamš-Adad to Kuwari (no. 15 = SH 911+922)**

When you stayed before me I instructed you as follows: "The Turukkeans who are coming in from outside, those you cannot manage to provide for, you shall keep with you; and in force they will protect this land. These things I decided. Now keep the troops you can manage to provide for with you, should stay there, and [lead] them [safely] to [……]. Since [………….. let them lead] them. Now assemble the country, and tell them thus: "He who wants to can stay here; he who

---

395 Lit.: “make his lance stronger,” Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 87; Charpin, RA 98, p. 174.

a retainer of yours. They sneak away themselves en route, or midway [they] kidnap them. [Those] who cannot stay there, and are not conducted safely here in one group by your retainer, will disappear [en route, or] they will force them [into Šikšabbum. [……] joyful, [and there] they will hold the country. You shall send them in a single group. Let one of your retainers lead them, and conduct them safely to me, and they will not disappear en route. If not so, we will frighten them. And then will they not turn their faces elsewhere?397

Whatever the reasons, this transfer marked the beginning of the Turukkean presence in the Habur area and the surrounding regions. Later from there they were to play a crucial role in the Turukkean expansion into Assyria and west of the Tigris.

The End of Šikšabbum

In the end Šamš-Adad sent a huge army under his son Išme-Dagan and managed to conquer Šikšabbum. This could be done only after the conquest of Nurrugum, which was such an important episode that it was mentioned as a dating event in a royal inscription of Šamš-Adad.398 Fugitives from Nurrugum reached Mari and are mentioned there in texts of the time of Zimri-Lim.399 They were in all probability victims of this campaign. In a letter to Yasmah-Addu, Išme-Dagan allows his brother to keep those he wants and send them those he do not want:

Išme-Dagan to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 26, 269)

About the fugitives who fled from Nurrugum, concerning whom you wrote to me, dispatch to me a secretary (from among them)! ‘Keep’ the physician with ‘you’! And from the fugitives keep whom you want to keep and have the ‘remainder’ of them conducted to me! And from now on keep those of the fugitive that come to you that you want to keep, and have conducted to me any that you do not keep, and I shall assign them where they can be assigned.400

Since the king of Šikšabbum was captured and delivered to Daduša, as the MEC states, Ešnunna must have contributed to the campaign. Šaššaranum, who played a prominent role

---


398 14) bi-tam ša iš-tu 15) Ši-lu mum A-kà-dè 16) a-dí sa-rú-tri-i 17) a-di sa-ba-at Nu-ur-ru-giši... “The temple (which none of the kings who preceded me) from the fall of Akkad until my sovereignty, until the capture of Nurrugum.”

399 For the texts mentioning them, cf. Charpin and Ziegler, FMV, p. 99, note 198.

in the capture of both Qabrā and Nurrugum, was rewarded with the governorship of Nurrugum. The main battle in Aḥazum took place in Ikkalnum, where Etellum had stationed a garrison. According to a letter from Mari, this must have taken place prior to the 10th of Addarum (late March). The city of Šikšabbum itself was conquered after a short siege on 10th of VIII* of Aššur-malik and a new king for Aḥazum was installed whose name was Ḥalun-pi-ūmu. The letter ARM 1, 69+M.7538 gives some valuable details concerning this campaign. One of the points worth mentioning is the strategic significance of Qabrā as a communications hub for assembling troops. The Aḥazians seem to have taken the initiative by coming to Ikkalnum, apparently downstream (= west) from Šikšabbum, to do battle where Etellum was stationed with his garrison in the hope of saving their capital:

Šamši-Adad to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 1, 69+M.7538)

When the troops gathered in Qabrā, I dispatched Išme-Dagan with the troops to the land of Aḥazum and I have come to the city (= Ekkalatum). While the troops were gathering in Qabrā, the land of Aḥazum heard of the gathering of the troops in Qabrā and took action. The troops of all that land and the Turukkeans with them were gathered and were stationed in the city of Ikkalnum (= Ikkalnum) of the land of Aḥazum against Išme-Dagan. Išme-Dagan made up his mind to go against that city and, at a distance of 300 (cubits?) away from it, the troops of all that land and the Turukkeans gathering with them to do battle, they [raised] weapons in the face of Išme-Dagan to do battle; […] the people of that land and the Turukkeans with them he captured them (all). No one escaped and on that day, he took all the land of Aḥazum. That victory is great for the land. Rejoice! The Turukkeans who fought side by side with the Aḥazians and were defeated by Išme-Dagan, as the letter relates, must have been those who were entering Šikšabbum in secrecy or that had been kidnapped during their transfer to Šamši-Adad from Kuwari.

The conquest of Aḥazum was very important and vital for the king; he saw it as a great and perfect triumph, giving him a great reputation to follow, and addresses his son accordingly:

---

401 Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 99.
402 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 51.
403 Charpin, RA 98, p. 171.
404 Charpin, RA 98, p. 171. This date is fixed thanks to an unpublished text that mentions the presence of Šamši-Adad in Šikšabbum, dated on the 10th of VIII*; cf. Charpin, OBO, p. 171, note 802.
405 Charpin, OBO, p. 171; Charpin and Ziegler, FM VI, p. 100.
407 Charpin and Ziegler, FM VI, p. 99.
Kaštappum, Ištanum, Abšeniwe and others

After this there was another mission waiting for the Assyrian troops as well as for those of Kuwari. He received a letter from Šamšī-Adad asking him to send 1,000 troops to Kaštappum, where his lord had arrived. The plan seemed to be that they would meet there with the troops of Išme-Dagan and the king of Ešnunna, who had just crossed the Žāb. Before the conquest of Šikšabbum, it would have been too difficult to send troops to Kaštappum along the Žāb, so this must have been after the conquest of Šikšabbum. That makes a statement of Charpin, that the request came first to Kuwari to send troops to Kaštappum but a little later the request was changed to send them to Šikšabbum, seem unlikely. The letter reads as follows:

Šamšī-Adad to Kuwari (no. 9 = SH 882)
The army which is with Išme-Dagan has arrived. The day I sent you this letter the whole army which is with Išme-Dagan and the army from Ešnunna have crossed the Žāb and I have arrived in Kaštappum. The day you hear this letter, on the third day, let 1,000 of your troops descend to me to Kaštappum, and let one of your generals come with the troops.

Most probably related to this mission is letter no. 30, sent by Kurašānum, a high official of Šamšī-Adad. The letter gives Kuwari the sign that he can send his garrison troops that were stationed in a town called Ḥallulwife to receive their rations. This town is attested within the orbit of Nuzi, and from information in this letter it seems to have been a local centre for Šamšī-Adad’s administration of the Transtigridian provinces. The presence of troops and issue of rations in a centre close to Nuzi indicates that the troops of Kuwari were still far from home. They were most probably occupied with the duty referred to in letter no. 9. Kurašānum wrote to Kuwari:

Kurašānum to Kuwari and Šamaš-našir (no. 30 = SH 879)
I went to Ekallatum to meet with the king, but before I went to the king you wrote to me about issuing the grain rations for the garrison troops stationed there in Ḥallulwife. When you hear this letter of mine, send the garrison troops to receive their grain rations in Ḥallulwife, and let them receive their grain rations. I have now

408 For his statement, cf. Charpin, RA 98, p. 171.
409 For his statement, cf. Fincke, RGTC 10, p. 85-6. Grain supplies were sent from this GN to Nuzi (HSS XIII 367). ibid.
410 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 102.
Eidem and Læssøe suggest that the victory reported in this same letter of Kurašānum was a victory of Išme-Dagan over the cities of Ištānum (= “The Northern Country”), a subject mentioned in letters 26 and 29.\(^{414}\) However, we consider that it does not refer to Ištānum but to a country in or around Kaštappum itself. This is based on three reasons. First, the information gathered from letters 26 and especially from 29 implies that the country of Ištānum was closer to Šušarrā, not to Ekallānum, where Kurašānum was placed. Note that in letter 29 it is Kuwari who was asked to send his report about the cities of the land of Ištānum to Kurašānum. Secondly, since Kurašānum was placed in Ekallānum, we would not expect him to send news of a country to Kuwari that was nearer to the addressee than to the sender. Finally, if our suggestion proves to be correct that the content of the first part of this letter is related to the joint mission of Ešnumna, Assyria and the province of Kuwari, then the victory reported in its second part must be the one they fought for together. Thus, the letter can be seen as one interrelated report.

It is quite possible that letters 26 and 29, that concern the affairs of the country of Ištānum and discussed already, belong to this time, after the conquest of Šikšabbūm, \(^{415}\) particularly since the ‘lord’ mentioned in these letters was Išme-Dagan, who seems to have resided in a city close to the region, in Qabrā or Arrapha.

Kuwari, beside his duties towards his lord Šamši-Adad, was deeply involved in internal affairs of his realm and its citizens. We know this from letters about some military activities, such as the conquest of a city called Zu’l(??)zulā (\(Zu^l <ul^l> -zu-la-a^k\)), about which Šamši-Adad expressed his pleasure in letter no. 16. Several letters deal with requests for the release of detained people (nos. 8; 32; 38 and 46) or other legal disputes (no. 33) or other affairs (nos. 38 and 42). In letter no. 62, a certain Wanni/a was asked by Kuwari to release three individuals and send them back to him, but Wanni refused, although he was somehow a vassal of Kuwari. \(^{416}\) Instead his reply was that the three together with a fourth person will be executed. It is worth noting that Kuwari and this Wanni were on good terms. Kuwari had once advised Wanni to go to his lord (meaning most probably Šamši-Adad) to become his vassal, as he himself did:

**Wanni to Kuwari (no. 60 = SH 874)**

I paid much attention to the words my father wrote to me, and these words are good. Like you went to my lord and kissed my lord’s feet, I shall now go to my lord and kiss the feet of my lord. The noblemen of the country will come with me, (and kiss) the feet of my lord, and hear the word(s) of my lord’s lip.\(^{417}\)

---

\(^{413}\) 5) a-na ŠE.BA sa-bi-im bi-ir-tim 9) ša as-ra-nu-am wa-as-bu 10) i-na Ḥa-lu-ul-li-še-er LUGAL. 8) a-li-ku aš-šūm ŠE.BA sa-bi-im bi-ir-tim 9) ša as-ra-nu-am wa-as-bu 10) i-na Ḥa-ğu-ul-li-ši-er LUGAL.


\(^{417}\) 414 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 102.

\(^{418}\) Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 101. However, Charpin and Ziegler do not rule out that the campaign on Ištānum took place before the fall of Šikšabbūm, suggesting that Išme-Dagan left Aḫazu in the capture of Ikkalhum to deal with the troubles of Ištānum: Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 99, note 201.

\(^{419}\) In the letters 60 and 62 Wanni styles himself as “your son.”


418
Wanni in turn warned Kuwari about troubles in a town called Abšeniwe in two letters. The town, the letters imply, was under the control of Kuwari and was under threat from an enemy whose name is unfortunately not written:

**Wanni to Kuwari (no. 60 = SH 874)**

Do not be idle about the town Abšeniwe and the campaign. My lord’s attention is extensive. I hope my father will not neglect to gather for the country. Install yourself in Abšeniwe and the campaign will be dissolved.\(^{418}\)

**Wanni to Kuwari (no. 61 = SH 900)**

… The guard is staying with Yaqqim-Addu and you should stay in the town of the Abšum. Send words so that reinforcements do not reach him and his envoys cannot pass through, and […] and we shall bring him to account! […] write to me whether this or that is the case!\(^{419}\)

Letter no. 60 makes a distinction between “my father” and “my lord.” By the former he means Kuwari, by the latter the lord of Kuwari, to whom he would go. It should be noted that Wanni, the sender, warns Kuwari, his father, about the intentions \(^{420}\) of the lord. The context distinguishes ‘father’ from ‘lord.’ The campaign mentioned was led by the lord, the target was the town Abšeniwe, and Kuwari was asked “to gather” the country to confront the campaign that would be dissolved. It is most natural to assume that this ‘lord’ was the same ‘lord’ in the first paragraph of the same letter. The most fitting interpretation is that Wanni, as a subordinate of Kuwari, or even as an independent but less powerful friend of Kuwari, was the ruler of a small country. If Wanni was a subordinate his country would have been part of the realm of Kuwari. The town Abšeniwe was within the domain of Wanni, but Wanni had not yet sworn an oath of allegiance to Šamšī-Adad. Therefore, his domain was under the threat of the Assyrian troops, which appear to have been led by Yaqqim-Addu (see letter no. 61). Although Wanni and Kuwari (perhaps his lord) tried to save the town from plunder and destruction, from the letter it seemed to them hopeless to hold on to it any longer. So Kuwari suggested to Wanni to become a vassal of Šamšī-Adad. Wanni, having accepted the suggestion, would become an ally of or would tighten the alliance with Kuwari, secured by accepting a daughter in marriage mentioned in letter 60:

**Wanni to Kuwari (no. 60 = SH 874)**

And as for your daughter whom you talked to me about saying: "Either give me your daughter or let me give you my daughter!” Now give me your daughter for my son and may the family ties between us not be dissolved.\(^{421}\)

The name *Wa-an-ni* in letter no. 61 is written *Pa-an-ni*; the sign PA may indicate that the initial W/P was in fact pronounced /f/ or /v/.

\(^{418}\) a-na a-li-im ša Ab-šē-₄i-we\(^{420}\) ṣu ge-er-ri-im 22) la-a te-eg-gi 23) pa-ni be-li-ia ra-ap-šu 24) as-sū-ur-ri pa-ha-ra-am 25) a-na ma-₃a₃-tim a-bi la i-gi 26) i-na Ab-šē-ni-we\(^{420}\) 27) ta-ṣa-ab-ma 28) u ge-er-ru-um li-ip-pa-ri-iš, Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 131 (no. 60 = SH 874).

\(^{419}\) 1) [qa-d]u-im la-a-[q]i-[i]m 2') bē-eh-ram wa-ši-i₃ 3) ū a-ta i-na URU ša Ab-šē-im 4') lu wa-aš-ba-at 5') aš-sum sa-ha-un te-er-di-[i](im 6') la-a i-ra-hu-su-am 7') u ma-ru ši-ip-ru-šu 8') [l]a-a i-ri-qši 9') [a-ta ša]-up-ra-am-ma 10') [...] u ma-ar-ti-ka lu-ud-di-na-ak-kum [...]

\(^{420}\) I prefer to translate the word *panu* here as ‘intention, plan or wish’ rather than ‘attention,’ as Eidem and Læssøe do, to fit the context better.

If the interpretation we have presented is correct, we can conclude further that the country of Wanni was located either to the west of the Rāniya Plain or somewhere downstream from Šušarrā and thus subject to the threat from Assyria. It also shows that Kuwari was not acting sincerely towards his lord Šamšī-Adad; his allegiance was just bitter fruit under Gutian pressure. The date of these three letters and their sequence within the letters of the Assyrian domination phase remains unknown.

Chart showing the pattern of relations between the powers of the Transtigris as documented by the Shemshāra letters in the Pre-Assyrian and Assyrian Domination Phases.
Figures of Chapter Six


5) The fortifications of Qabrā with the destroyed city gate in the middle. Drawing by the author from the original stele in the Iraq Museum.
Map 1) The plains of Iranian Kurdistan up to Urmia compared to those of Rāniya and Qala Dizeh. Detail of map no.1 in: *Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 1, ed. W. B. Fisher.
Map 2) The Rāniya Plain and surroundings.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Towards the Empire
In the previous chapter, we saw the Hurrians fighting for their survival in the Zagros. They, represented by the Turukkeans and the kingdom of Kuwari, did their best to survive the bitter conflict with the Gutians, the Kakmeans and even the Assyrians. Their conflict did not involve only fighting but they also used diplomacy and a complex pattern of alliances.

The period from the end of Ur III until the vassaldom of Utûm to Assyria can be counted as the period of Amorite expansion into Mesopotamia and the Transtigris. We have seen already how they penetrated the territories to the east of the Tigris as early as the time of Iddi(n)-Sîn of Simurrum. They settled and consolidated their authority in the Diyāla Region (the Kingdom of Ešnunna), and in the north we find the polities of Ya’ilānum, Aḥazum and Qabrā, all in the Transtigris. The Amorite names of the rulers of these polities, such as Bunu-Eštar of Qabrā, Yašub-Addu of Aḥazum and Bina-Addu of Ya’ilānum, in addition to the name Ya’ilānum itself, all point to an Amorite domination in the region. They were more successful here than in Simurrum, where Iddi(n)-Sîn succeeded in holding them at bay, at least for a certain time. As Eidem and Læssøe have suggested, these Amorite rulers, who usurped control of this region in the early second millennium BC, did not reside in ancient prestigious cities like Nineveh and Erbil. Instead, they built new military capitals for their polities, such as Ekallātum and Qabrā. The reason for this was to avoid any dangerous resistance from strong urban-based elites.

By comparing later models, especially those of the 7th century A. D. (see Chapter Eight), we can assume that the Amorites formed the ruling class of the population in this above mentioned region, while the substratum largely remained non-Amorite. Šamšī-Adad began to conquer the region in the last five years of his reign in co-operation with Ešnunna. He put an end to the rule of these different Amorite polities and incorporated them in his empire. Towards the end of his empire, during the reign of his sons Yasmah-Addu and Išme-Dagan and the rise of Turukkean power under Zaziya, the situation was reversed. Then it was the Turukkeans/Hurrians who began a new phase of expansion into the plains east of the Tigris and west of the Tigris up to the Habur. They settled in these lands, controlled its cities and consolidated their presence, establishing kingdoms such as Tig/kunānī. This favourable position of the Hurrians seems to have continued for a couple of centuries until the formation of the Mittanni Empire, which, in fact, had resulted from these developments. The events from the Hurrian revolt until the end of the OB period will be the subject of this chapter.
The Post-Assyrian Phase

The Turukkean Revolt

Not only the land of Utûm but also the whole Transtigris was in turmoil, according to the Shemshāra correspondence. Turukkean chieftains such as Lidāya and Zaziya were busy organizing a revolt against Kuwari and his Assyrian overlords. Some information concerning these movements can be gleaned from the texts. Lidāya was under the authority of Kuwari, but it is not sure whether he was detained as the other Turukkean chieftains were; Zaziya, Ziliya, Ḥazip-Teššup, Tirwen-šēnni and others (see letter no. 8=SH 887). What we do know is that he was summoned to a meeting by Šamšī-Adad and that was successful (no. 7=SH 915).

Kuwari seems to have asked his lord to send Lidāya back to him, perhaps to put him to death, as he had done with Ḥazip-Teššup. But Šamšī-Adad kept him back until the conquest of Nurrugum, according to the same letter. Šamšī-Adad went on to say that, after the conquest of Nurrugum, Lidāya would come with the army to Aḥazum (l. 10-14), indicating that Lidāya personally participated in the siege of Šikšabbum. We also know that he was installed in the city of Burullum, and seemingly endowed with some position there to keep him away from Kuwari. This city of Burullum seems to be identical with Burulliwe of the administrative texts of Shemshāra, according to Eidem and Læssøe, and is less probably the Burullum in the northwest, to the north of Jebel Sinjār. We suggest this because it was from this city that Lidāya declared his revolt against both Kuwari and his lord Šamšī-Adad, and it was impossible to revolt against Kuwari and Šamšī-Adad from a city so close to the heart of Šamšī-Adad’s empire and far from his Turukkean subordinates. It seems that the revolt broke out shortly after letter 20 = SH 905 was sent to Kuwari, in which Šamšī-Adad informed Kuwari about his decision to cut off relations with (and presumably his aid for) the Gutians. Letter ARM 4, 25, from Išme-Dagan to his brother Yasmah-Addu, found in Mari reports the revolt. This letter can be counted among the earliest letters of this phase, since Išme-Dagan still mentions “the king,” pointing to his father, meaning that Šamšī-Adad was still alive when the revolt broke out. The letter relates that Lidāya and the Turukkeans who are with him have turned hostile. The designation “The …. who are with him” is the same designation used to denote that part of the Lullubians who were allied to Kuwari. In the same way, this letter alludes to the ‘part’ of the Turukkeans who have joined the revolt. Specifically it is to those who were the ones living in Utûm as refugees; the rest of them with part of the citizens of Utûm probably remained loyal, or at least neutral, to Assyria. This is why Išme-Dagan decided to resettle them somewhere close to Arrapḫa and Qabrā. Evidence for this comes from letter A.562: “The people of Utûm who have been deported to Qabrā and Arrapḫa, have revolted.” A tablet from Mari, dated to some years after these events, also mentions an Utûm near the Tigris. In the Habur region there were settlements called Nakabbinwe and

---

1 The verb in line 7 of the letter is broken; only li- is preserved. So, the line was restored as a-n[a] šu-šu-bi-im be-li i-[i-ru-da-šu] by Læssøe and Jacobsen in Læssøe, J. and Th. Jacobsen, “Šikšabbum Again,” JCS 42/2 (1990), p. 172; but as a-šar’ šu-šu-b[i]-i[m be-li i]-iš-pu-ra-am by Eidem and Læssøe in Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 82.
4 For this identification, cf. Chapter Six.
5 For a discussion of the date of the rebellion, see below.
7 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 52.
Išme-Dagan reasoned from the situation that the land could no longer be kept under control. This was a correct conclusion, as can be seen from an important fact mentioned in the letter, that the Turukkeans retreated to the mountains when Išme-Dagan marched on. This is a clear example of what became (and had most likely been before) the most effective military tactic to fight larger and mightier armies in the mountainous lands, with quick raids and retreats.

At the sack on Šušarrā and the destruction of its palace the archive unfortunately stops. We must now rely for information on those letters from Mari that give news of the Transtigris. We have letters sent by Šamšī-Adad and Išme-Dagan to Yasmah-Addu, and later letters that the ambassadors, the officials and spies sent to Zimri-Lim, the king of Mari, who regained the throne of his father from the Assyrians.

The reaction to the revolt that was touched upon in letter ARM 1, 5 (from Šamšī-Adad to Yasmah-Addu) seems likely to be the same action of Išme-Dagan that he reported to his brother in ARM 4, 25. However, in this letter more details are given. It is also stated in the letter that the king plans to take the command of the army by himself. Other letters show that Yasmah-Addu needed troops to fight the Bina-Yamina tribe at this same time and his father could not send him the troops because of their business in Utûm. Eidem and Læssøe established the sequence of three letters related to this matter; Šamšī-Adad sent the letter ARM 1, 67 on the 6th of Ābum to Yasmah-Addu telling him that Uṣur-pi-šarrim will explain why the troops he repeatedly asked for had not yet been sent. Two days later Šamšī-Adad received the latest news about the situation in Utûm, and so he sent an update on the 8th of Ābum. He seemed to think that the troubles of the land were ended. Therefore, he determined the date for his departure with his troops to be the middle of the next month. However, when bad news came, such as that in letter ARM 4, 25, Šamšī-Adad delayed; the letter ARM 2, 8, sent on the 30th of Ābum, promised that the troops would arrive on the 15th of Tirū. These
events could be dated to the limmu Awilîya of the MEC, which mentions a defeat of the Turukkû and a victory of Yasmah-Addû over the Bina-Yamina, as tentatively proposed by Eidem and Læssøe\(^\text{11}\) (see also the eponymic chronicle, under Chronology). The last part of letter ARM 1, 5, dated on the 8th of Aûbûm and sent from Šubat-Enilî, reports:

**Šamšî-Addad to Yasmah-Addû (ARM 1, 5)**

Concerning the report that Usur-pî-sarrîm will give you, the enemy positioned with Lîdîâya before Išme-Dâgan heard the din of the armies gathering around Išme-Dâgan, and gave up their town, pulled out and left. Išme-Dâgan seized their town Burullûm. He has calmed and subjugated the whole land of Utûm. He has placed it under a single command. The troops have marched home. They will rest two or three days in their houses and reassemble to me. I shall take command of the troops, and by the middle of next month, I will reach my destination there. Be aware of this! Until I come up, just keep the troops ready!\(^\text{12}\)

This letter too confirms the use of guerrilla tactics by the Turukkeans. The rebels retreated to the mountains and left their city to the approaching army of the Assyrians. Išme-Dâgan, thinking he was victorious and putting an end to the revolt, has withdrawn from the land, after reorganizing its administration and putting it under one command. Unfortunately, the identity of this commander is not given.

**The Revolt Expands**

Eidem and Læssøe are correct in assuming that, with the return of the troops of Išme-Dâgan from the campaign on Lîdîâya, the news of the revolt would have spread across the whole of northern Mesopotamia with obvious consequences.\(^\text{13}\) The many Turukkeans who had been resettled in different parts of Northern Mesopotamia, as noted already, must have heard about the revolt. Such news as the failure of Išme-Dâgan to crush the revolt and capture Lîdîâya must have been a great encouragement for all the Turukkeans to start a great revolt, including those who had been resettled in the plains of Qabrár, Arrâpîh (see above, letter A.562) and the Habûr.\(^\text{14}\) Of course, the Turukkeans too knew that the country of Utûm could no longer be held by the Assyrians, a fact admitted by Išme-Dâgan in his letter to his brother. A very important point is that also those Turukkeans participated in the revolt who had been transferred by Išme-Dâgan. Those Turukkeans were transferred, as we understand from the texts, in order to protect them from the consequences of the revolt because of their assumed loyalty to Assyria. So, what pushed these loyal groups then to join a rebellion against their lords? It seems reasonable to doubt that they were transferred of their own free

---

\(^{11}\) Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 53.


\(^{13}\) Eidem and Læssøe, *op. cit.*, p. 54. This assumes the date of the revolt in the Habûr was after the revolt in Utûm; Villard, followed by Wu Yuhong (see below) suggest it was after that revolt.

\(^{14}\) Charpin thinks that the revolt was coupled with the revolt of the army that Išme-Dâgan sent to Šûnû and Aparha, cf. Charpin, *OBO*, p. 177.
will. But there are two texts that indicate they were not forced. The first is the letter of Išme-Dagan (ARM 1, 25) that gives the impression that they were displaced because they were counted as loyal citizens. The second is the important Shemshāra letter no. 13, in which Šamšī-Adad orders Kuwari concerning the Turukkeans as follows: “Now assemble the country, and tell them thus: "He who wants to can stay here; he who does not want to stay here can go to my Lord!" Tell them this” (l. 33-38) (see above). The unpublished letter of Išar-Lim (M.5659) reports the same incident, but still does not help to explain whether this transfer was voluntary or compulsory. The related section of the letter reports:

**Išar-Lim to ?? ?? (M.5659)**

I deported them [together]er with their oxen and th[eir] sheep, and settled half of them in the land of Arrapha and half of them in the land of Qabrā.15

Be that as it may, the participation of the Turukkeans of the homeland and of what we may call their diaspora can be considered as a reflection of a common consciousness, based on blood ties within the tribe and strict compliance to the tribal chiefs. It is also worth discussing whether the revolt was staged only by the transferred Turukkeans. For Eidem it was the transferred Turukkeans who launched the revolt, not an “invasion” of nomadic tribesmen of the Habur region in the time of Šamšī-Adad.16 Charpin, contrary to Eidem, is of the opinion that the situation had more to do with an invasion.17 This seems likely because the range and strength of the military operations that threatened the Assyrian Empire in its core area, close to the capital Šubat-Enlil, cannot have been the work of hundreds or even thousands of transferred Turukkeans. These transferred groups consisted of families where only the adult males were warriors, so the number of fighters would be less than the total of the transferred Turukkeans. We know that there were 10,000 troops which Išme-Dagan commanded to rescue the Tillā region that was under Turukkean threat (letter A.863, see below), which means that only there the Turukkeans were at least half of that number.18 The revolt of Lidāya certainly opened the door to thousands more Turukkeans to invade the plains to the east of the Tigris, from Arrapha up to Nineveh, and later further to the west of the Tigris. Another problem arises here, in that there is no allusion to such a mass migration of Turukkeans to the Habur region in the texts. In this regard we should not forget the Hurrian population of the Habur area who were organized in kingdoms, such as Nawar and Urkeš, in the periods before the emergence of the Šamšī-Adad dynasty, in addition to the Hurrians of the southern Anatolian mountain lands, who were geographically and ethnically connected with the Hurrians of the Habur area. This huge Hurrian population must have joined the Turukkeans to put an end to the Assyrian rule.19 The more likely possibility is that the name Turukkean may have been applied by the Assyrians to all the Hurrians involved in the revolt, perhaps due to the Turukkean leadership of the revolt or just because of their common ethnic

---

15) [i-i] GU₄.HĂ-šu-mu 16) û UDU.HĂ-š[u-mu] 17) na-na-hu-um-ma 18) mu-at-ta-tam i-na ma-at Ar-ra₁-₈ apa-h₂-₈-im₁₈ 19) û mu-at-ta-tam i-na ma-at 20) Qa-ab-ra-a₁₉ š-


18 A rule in the military science is that an attacking force must be two to three times larger than a defending force, and we assume that this was the same in antiquity.

19 Support for this view comes from the statement of Charpin and Ziegler, who find that the Turukkean revolt was not the only problem the kingdom faced in its core area. In addition it faced resistance from the local population of the Habur area against the dynasty: Charpin and Ziegler, *FM V*, p. 16-7. The letter A.315 (see below) is a good example for this.
background. Another look at the revolt, from an ethnic point of view, reveals that the revolt can also be seen as a revolt of the Hurrian substratum against the Amorite immigrants, who formed the superstratum in this phase. Hatred of the Amorite dynasty of Šamš-Adad is not to be assumed only in the Hurrian lands. In the inscription of Puzur-Sin of Assyria, who ruled after the overthrow of the Šamš-Adad dynasty, he explicitly expresses his hatred:

**Puzur-Sin**

When Puzur-Sin, vice-regent of the god Aššur, son of Aššur-bēl-samē, destroyed the evil of Asinnum, offspring of Šamš-Adad,20 who was ... of the city Aššur, (at that time) [I (= Puzur-Sin) removed] ... A foreign plague, not of the flesh of the city Aššur. The god Aššur justly ... [with] his pure hands and I, by the command of Aššur himself my lord, destroyed that improper thing which he had worked on, (namely) the wall and palace of Šamš-Adad, his grandfather, (who) was a foreign plague, not of the flesh of the city Aššur, and who had destroyed the shrines of the city Aššur.21

---

**Further Expansion; into the Habur Region**

According to the reconstruction of the events presented by Eidem and Læssøe, the great revolt began a few months after its start in Utûm.22 Some Mari letters provide valuable information about these developments and the spread of the revolt to areas as far as the Habur area. One of the hot-spots of the conflict was in and around Amursakkum. Išme-Dagan was residing in Šuna at the beginning of the month, and on hearing of the revolt he hastened to Amursakkum.23 Letter ARM 1, 90 gives important information concerning Amursakkum:

**Šamš-Adad to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 1, 90)**

In Amursakkum, where (the) Turukkeans are staying, Dādanum with 2,000 Nurrueans is stationed alone on one flank in the siege lines. In order to break through the blockade(?)24 the enemy (chose) to approach Dādanum to fight with an auxiliary force,25 and they killed him, and they also killed 5 soldiers with him. Later they drove a herd26 back and 50 enemies were killed. Išar-Lim stayed with him, (but) Išar-Lim is safe; the troops are safe. Both flanks27 are secured; the armies are safe.28

---

20 He may have been one of the members of Šamš-Adad’s royal house.
21 1) [i]-nu-me 2) [P]u-ziur-EN.ZU 3) [Ē]NSI 4) [A]-šur 4) [DUM]U(? 5) [A]-šur-be-el-AN-e 5) [l-e-mu-ta] A-si-nim 6) [pa-r]a-a 7) [UTU]-ši-ŠI-ŠI 8) [M] 7) [ša x pu]‘[x s]a UR.[U] Aš-[ši 8) [ši-na-ap-[pi]-lu x 9) [k x] x [k x] re-d:i-am 10) [a]- [na UR]’-Aš-šur ([lu]) u-š[u]‘([pi]-šu) 11) x x u-a-ši MU-[šu] 12) [ši-bi]-š(u)’ la ši-ir 13) [UR]’ [b]a-[šu] 14) [...] x 15) [ši] Aš-[ši]-ši I-di-[šu 16) KŪ.[M]EŠ]-ti 17) i-na ‘ki-na-te-šu 18) u-ši-ZA(? 19) u-da-[šu]-ma 19) la dam-qa‘am šu-a-ti 20) ‘t-i-na ‘qi-ši it [b]a-šur-ma 21) [b]e-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[š]-[sh]
It is clear from the letter that the Turukkeans had been entrenched in the city in the face of the Assyrians laying siege to them. This seems to have taken place in the autumn of 1779 BC (end of month I* of the limmu Awilîya).²⁹ Auxiliaries from Nurrugum under the command of Dádanum,³⁰ who was a high-ranking general, helped the Assyrians, but the Turukkeans, realizing that auxiliaries are a weak part of an army,³¹ attacked the Nurrugeans and killed Dádanum. At this point letter M.8145+ that was sent by Išme-Dagan to his brother, mentions Dádanum, and after a lacuna he tries to calm the fear of Yasma ūm-ma and [took?/looted?] provisions (enough for) 4 days. He said (also): "I have deserted the army."³³

In the other letter Išme-Dagan writes to his brother how he has prevented the Turukkeans getting provisions, a method Durand describes as the first recorded instance of following a scorched earth policy.³⁴

---

²⁹ Charpin, OBO, p. 177. Note that Charpin and Ziegler point out the absence of any text dated to month I* of Awilîya; they attribute this to a delay in the nomination of the new limmu after the end of Aššur-malik due to the restriction imposed on the movement of messengers when the revolt broke out. They cite the letter of Išhi-Addu in which he reminds Yasmah-Addu of holding his and their envoys from going to Išhi-Addu as evidence for this: Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 115.

³⁰ Durand derives the name from dādum, "paternal uncle;" Durand, LAPO II, p. 89. It is worth noting, as Charpin and Ziegler do, that 15 months after its capture Nurrugum provided troops for its conqueror; cf. Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 109, note 277.

³¹ Eidem, ShA 2, p. 19. Eidem has corrected the translation Durand offered for this letter, cf. ibid, note 22.

³² Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 115, note 334.


³⁴ Durand, LAPO II, p. 91.

Letter ARM 4, 53 shows that the Assyrians have communicated with the Turukkeans by sending a message through a prisoner, but we do not know whether this was to negotiate or to send warnings to them:

**Išme-Dagan to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 4, 53)**

The king has sent me the following message: "Write to Yasmah-Addu to send you one of the two prisoners that Tāb-ēl-ummanātī-šu brought to you and send him to Amursakki." Now, send me a prisoner who is capable of handling the affairs so that he enters Amursakku.36

The siege of Amursakki ended when it was abandoned by the Turukkeans, despite the approach of the winter. They had to endure the rain and suffered from casualties inflicted by the pursuing troops of Išme-Dagan. As the Turukkeans fled, in order to save their injured comrades from being taken prisoner, they killed 100 of them with their own hands and left behind many chariots.37 They then stationed in an empty town near Nitḫum to the north of Amaz,38 on the route from Kaḥat, in order to raid the land of Tillā. This is recorded in letter A.863, and gives an approximate idea of where Amursakki was located. The GN is found in some OB tablets from the lower town at Leylān (ancient Šubat-Enlil) indicating it was near there, somewhere in the Habur Basin.39 According to Charpin, Amursakki was located in the region of Nuṣaybin, to the northwest of Šubat-Enlil.40

Šamš-Adad’s response to the new move of the rebels was a reorganization of the defence by sending Išme-Dagan at the head of 10,000 troops to Marêtum. He sent other troops to Sabbanum and Eluḥut41 to cut off the Turukkeans if they decided to flee in front of Išme-Dagan.42 The letter A.863 reports as follows:

? to ? (A.863)

Another matter: a tablet from Išme-Dagan has reached me (edited) in the following terms: "The enemy has left Amursakki in force and established himself in Tillā43 on the route from Kaḥat with the intention of raiding the land of Tillā, taking the

---

36 5) LUGAL ki-a-am iš-pu-ra-am 6) um-ma-mi i-na 2 a-si-ri 7) ša Tā-ab-el-um-ma-ni-šu 8) ū-ša-ri-em 9) [a-n]a se-er 10) [i]a-[š]-ma-ah-IM 11) 1 a-si-ra-am 12) li-ir-ru-ni-kum-ma 13) a-[n]a A-mu-ur-a-sa-ki 14) šu-p[a]-ur-šu 16) i-na-an-na 1 a-si-ra-am 17) ša a-wa-tim ku-ul-la-am 18) i-ša-ri-im-ma 19) a-na A-mu-ur-a-sa-ki 20) li-ru-ub Dossin, ARM 4, p. 78-9; Durand, LAPO I, p. 185-6. It seems that Durand agrees with Sasson in the assumption that the prisoner was destined to fill a position in the city (Durand, ibid. and Sasson, J., The Military Establishments at Mari, 1969, p. 48), while to Eidem it was to make him bear a message (Eidem, ShA 2, p. 19), which seems the more likely suggestion.
37 Charpin, OBO, p. 177; Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 116.
38 Charpin, OBO, p. 177.
39 Eidem, ShA 2, p. 20.
40 Charpin, OBO, p. 177. This is the location proposed by Kessler: Kessler, K., Untersuchungen zur historischen Topographie Nordmesopotamiens nach keilschriftlichen Quellen des I. Jahrtausends v. Chr., Wiesbaden, 1980, p. 209. Durand identifies it with the MA Amasakku (a dependency of Ḫanigalbat) and NA Masakku, which neighboured Sudduḫum, Tā’idum, Ḫurrā and Kaḥat, and formed a large part of the region of Nuṣaybin, probably in Tell Muhammed; cf. for this Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 115, note 331; Durand, LAPO I, p. 185. A probable etymology of this name is tentatively proposed by Durand as ṣu-μu-asakī “I have noticed/seen my taboo” in Durand, LAPO I, p. 185 a, and, in contrast to this, he adds that the name is without doubt non-Semitic. It is noted that it has the same suffixes as the names Ašlakkā and Ašnak(um). For the proposed etymology Volksetymologie needs to be considered. There are examples of giving Amorite/Semitic names to some GNs that were phonetically similar to the older original non-Semitic names, such as Erbil: A/I/Urbil → Arba-il(tum).
41 Possibly Eluḥut had already suffered from Turukkean devastation according to Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 116.
42 Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 116.
43 Charpin translated Til-la-a as “in a tell,” while the GN Tillā is most likely; cf. Wu Yuhong, “The Extent of Turukkean Raids during the Reign of Šamš-Adad I,” JAC 8 (1993), p. 121, note to l. 5′.
During the winter, while Šamši-Adad was staying in Andarig, the two brothers, Išme-Dagan and Yasmah-Addu, stayed in the Habur area and secured a number of regions, such as Kaḥat, Tilla, Ḥassikkunum Ḫurāṣum, and exchanged several letters. From one of them we learn that the local population of the region, or at least those of the land of Kaḥat, supported and encouraged the Turukkian revolt:

Šamši-Adad to Yasmah-Addu (A.315+M.8103)
… he said to me [this]: "[The men of the] land of Kaḥat wrote to [the Turukk]ians as follows: '[It is out of fear that you] haste to make peace. [Do not make peace!'"]

This is what he said to me.

For this, the garrisons round Kaḥat, in the three towns of Nilibšunnum, Kallaḫubra and Kabittum, were each reinforced with 100 troops. Yasmah-Addu seemingly left for Mari afterwards, for he was there on 21 V* Awilīya; his troops may have gone back gradually. The troops which were under Aššur-tūllassu reached Mari on 4 VI* Awilīya, while a contingent from Mari seems to have been kept by Išme-Dagan. This is indicated in a letter of Mašiya to Yasmah-Addu (A.562, dated around VII* Awilīya) in which he explains why his personal guard is not back: they had gone with Išme-Dagan to pursue the Turukkians in the mountains. Probably these operations pushed the Turukkians to the north and northeast, towards Tigunānum. The hot-spot has now moved there.

From other letters we learn that the revolt did not restrict itself to the regions round Šubat-tum, for he was there on 21 V* Awilīya; his troops may have gone back gradually. The troops which were under Aššur-tūllassu reached Mari on 4 VI* Awilīya, while a contingent from Mari seems to have been kept by Išme-Dagan. This is indicated in a letter of Mašiya to Yasmah-Addu (A.562, dated around VII* Awilīya) in which he explains why his personal guard is not back: they had gone with Išme-Dagan to pursue the Turukkians in the mountains. Probably these operations pushed the Turukkians to the north and northeast, towards Tigunānum. The hot-spot has now moved there.

For this, the garrisons round Kaḥat, in the three towns of Nilibšunnum, Kallaḫubra and Kabittum, were each reinforced with 100 troops. Yasmah-Addu seemingly left for Mari afterwards, for he was there on 21 V* Awilīya; his troops may have gone back gradually. The troops which were under Aššur-tūllassu reached Mari on 4 VI* Awilīya, while a contingent from Mari seems to have been kept by Išme-Dagan. This is indicated in a letter of Mašiya to Yasmah-Addu (A.562, dated around VII* Awilīya) in which he explains why his personal guard is not back: they had gone with Išme-Dagan to pursue the Turukkians in the mountains. Probably these operations pushed the Turukkians to the north and northeast, towards Tigunānum. The hot-spot has now moved there.

From other letters we learn that the revolt did not restrict itself to the regions round Šubat-tum, for he was there on 21 V* Awilīya; his troops may have gone back gradually. The troops which were under Aššur-tūllassu reached Mari on 4 VI* Awilīya, while a contingent from Mari seems to have been kept by Išme-Dagan. This is indicated in a letter of Mašiya to Yasmah-Addu (A.562, dated around VII* Awilīya) in which he explains why his personal guard is not back: they had gone with Išme-Dagan to pursue the Turukkians in the mountains. Probably these operations pushed the Turukkians to the north and northeast, towards Tigunānum. The hot-spot has now moved there.

For this, the garrisons round Kaḥat, in the three towns of Nilibšunnum, Kallaḫubra and Kabittum, were each reinforced with 100 troops. Yasmah-Addu seemingly left for Mari afterwards, for he was there on 21 V* Awilīya; his troops may have gone back gradually. The troops which were under Aššur-tūllassu reached Mari on 4 VI* Awilīya, while a contingent from Mari seems to have been kept by Išme-Dagan. This is indicated in a letter of Mašiya to Yasmah-Addu (A.562, dated around VII* Awilīya) in which he explains why his personal guard is not back: they had gone with Išme-Dagan to pursue the Turukkians in the mountains. Probably these operations pushed the Turukkians to the north and northeast, towards Tigunānum. The hot-spot has now moved there.

From other letters we learn that the revolt did not restrict itself to the regions round Šubat-tum, for he was there on 21 V* Awilīya; his troops may have gone back gradually. The troops which were under Aššur-tūllassu reached Mari on 4 VI* Awilīya, while a contingent from Mari seems to have been kept by Išme-Dagan. This is indicated in a letter of Mašiya to Yasmah-Addu (A.562, dated around VII* Awilīya) in which he explains why his personal guard is not back: they had gone with Išme-Dagan to pursue the Turukkians in the mountains. Probably these operations pushed the Turukkians to the north and northeast, towards Tigunānum. The hot-spot has now moved there.

From other letters we learn that the revolt did not restrict itself to the regions round Šubat-tum, for he was there on 21 V* Awilīya; his troops may have gone back gradually. The troops which were under Aššur-tūllassu reached Mari on 4 VI* Awilīya, while a contingent from Mari seems to have been kept by Išme-Dagan. This is indicated in a letter of Mašiya to Yasmah-Addu (A.562, dated around VII* Awilīya) in which he explains why his personal guard is not back: they had gone with Išme-Dagan to pursue the Turukkians in the mountains. Probably these operations pushed the Turukkians to the north and northeast, towards Tigunānum. The hot-spot has now moved there.
That somebody from Talmuš brought the news of the enemy’s advance (that of the Turukkeans) means that Ašal\(^{53}\) was closer to Talmuš than to Karanā and Qaṭṭara (= Rimāh), where Ḥasidum was governor. Both Durand and Wu Yuhong identify Apqum as modern Abu Mariya\(^{54}\) and Zanipa to the southeast of it, while Sanduwatum was northwest of Assur.\(^{55}\)

Another letter from the same governor to Yasmāh-Addu shows that the approaching Turukkeans threatened the regions of Karanā and Qaṭṭara:

**Hasidanum to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 5, 37)**

There are no oxen and sheep in the land at all. They have moved away from the steppe. The donkeys of my lord [……….]. Let those near Karanā enter Karanā! Let those near Qaṭṭara enter Qaṭṭara! And let those near Appaya enter Appaya! All the land has been collected into the fortresses. May my lord not be worried!\(^{56}\)

Wu Yuhong is correct in concluding that the whole region from Jebel Sinjār to the Tigris was under Turukkan threat: the cities Sadu watum and Assur to Zanipa and Apqum, including Karanā and Qaṭṭara.\(^{57}\) This is confirmed by a letter from Sumiya to his lord Yasmāh-Addu, in which he writes:

**Sumiya to Yasmah-Addu (A.4197)**

When Sušum on the Euphrates rebelled my lord wrote repeatedly for troops; but the land (here) also rebelled, and all the troops at our disposal were deployed here, and for this reason we could not send troops to our lord.\(^{58}\)

The letter points to the calmness that prevailed in the regions of Nurrugum (round Nineveh), Razama, Azuhinum (both in the Sinjār region), Šudā, and Šubat-Enlil (in the Habur) after the revolt ended. It shows also that Adal-šenni could go back to Burundum in the north. These regions practically cover the majority of Northern Mesopotamia.\(^{59}\)

The need for grain reported in the letters in relation to Amursakkum has become a priority in Tīgūnānum.\(^{60}\) Some letters that touch upon the circumstances there speak of a more urgent

---

\(^{53}\) According to Wu Yuhong, Ašal was a city of the Turukkeans: Wu Yuhong, *JAC* 8, p. 114. However, a city close to Talmuš is hardly Turukkan. Rather it was a city in the region of Nineveh, like Talmuš itself, which was not a Turukkan region but most likely Hurrian. This description would be correct only if our suggestion to identify the Turukkeans of the correspondence of Išme-Dagan and Šamšu-Adad with the Hurrians is true (see above). To Durand, Ašal was located to the northeast of Rimāh: Durand, *LAPO* II, p. 120 a. For the Hurrian name and identity of Talmuš, cf. Chapter Four.

\(^{54}\) Durand refers to Hallo, *JCS* 18 (1964), p. 73.

\(^{55}\) Wu Yuhong, *JAC* 8, p. 115; Durand, *LAPO* II, p. 120 d and f; Durand makes an allusion to the location of Sanduwatum on the route from Assur to Kaniš, as referred to by Garelli in Garelli, P., *Les Assyriens en Cappadoce*, p. 85-85, XXVI 527. Therefore, it was in the eastern part of Upper Mesopotamia. He prefers a location in the east southeast of Sinjār: Durand, *LAPO* II, p. 120 f.

\(^{56}\) Durand, *LAPO* II, p. 120 f.

\(^{57}\) Wu Yuhong, *JAC* 8, p. 115; Durand, *LAPO* II, p. 120 d and f; Durand makes an allusion to the location of Sanduwatum on the route from Assur to Kaniš, as referred to by Garelli in Garelli, P., *Les Assyriens en Cappadoce*, p. 85-85, XXVI 527. Therefore, it was in the eastern part of Upper Mesopotamia. He prefers a location in the east southeast of Sinjār: Durand, *LAPO* II, p. 120 f.


\(^{59}\) Wu Yuhong, *JAC* 8, p. 115.


\(^{61}\) Eidem and Læssøe, *op. cit.,* p. 54; Van Koppen, *ibid.*

\(^{62}\) Durand located Tīgūnānum on the left bank of the Tigris, to the east of modern Diyarbakir, on the route that joins Amuda-Mardin at the course of the Tigris: Durand, *LAPO* II, p. 81; Durand, *LAPO* I, p. 130. Charpin and Ziegler, *FM* V, p. 50-51 and 117, note 353, almost agree with Durand, putting it on the left bank of the Upper Tigris, but some 50 km downstream from Diyarbakir, perhaps close to modern Bismil. This identification is
situation under the Turukkeans. The letters say that they were starving and therefore raiding neighbouring territory, such as Ḫirbaẓānum. The report that they were going back to think of going back to their “own” country is important in this respect. Letters ARM 4, 23; 24 and 76 (dated month VIII*) deal with the circumstances in this place. In the first letter Išme-Dagan relates that he pursued the Turukkeans who crossed the river and entered the land of Tigunānum. The Turukkeans benefited from the river in flood which hindered the pursuit of the troops of Išme-Dagan:

Išme-Dagan to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 4, 23)
You have written to me about the Turukkeans. Since the Turukkeans went out, I have been in trouble so that I did not write to you the news about the Turukkeans. I kept driving them without a truce. I killed many troops. When the (enemy) arrived on the bank of the river they stayed there. Since the river was in flood they could not cross. However, I made a squad cross and dispatched it to the land of Tigunānum. After the squad (crossed), when the river was lower, the Turukkeans crossed over in the night. After they (crossed) the river flooded again so that I could not cross. Now the Turukkeans have entered the land of Tigunānum. I was told that they will depart for their land.

This letter was very likely the reply to the letter ARM 4, 87 by Yasmah-Addu to Išme-Dagan, in which he expressed his worry about the news of the “going out” of the Turukkeans, but no more news was sent to him.

Another letter from Išme-Dagan (ARM 4, 76) again says that the Turukkeans still intend to go back to their land. However, a very important clue the letter provides is the date of the events in Tigunānum. The first part of the letter preserves a quotation from a previous letter of Yasmah-Addu to Išme-Dagan, in which he tells his brother about the journey he made to Tuttul. The journey of Yasmah-Addu to Tuttul was preceded by raids of Sumu-Epu of Yamḥad on that city some months before (month VII*) (ARM 4, 10). There is also a report about this Sumu-Epu, that he had spread the news that he had twice supported the Turukkeans to rebel and had helped them to raid the territory of Šamš-Adad (ARM 5, 17+ A.1882; for this letter see below). The death of Sumu-Epu was announced in the letter ARM 1, 91+, sent by Šamš-Adad to Yasmah-Addu when

based also on information from letter A.1182, (cf. for this op. cit., p. 50-1 and notes 188 and 189). However, Salvini pinpoints Tigunānum in the east, at the ford located immediately to the south of Cizre. He bases his proposal on: A) there is mention of crossing a river by the Turukkeans, and the ford here is the most fitting place to cross, being shallow and the current slow; B) seasonal flooding makes crossing impossible there, as mentioned in ARM 4, 23; C) it is the last passage before the mountains, cf. Salvini, “Un royaume hourrite en Mésopotamie du nord …,” Subartu, IV/1, p. 306.

Eidem, ShA 2, p. 20.

Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 117, note 353.


According to Ziegler, this letter was sent after the letter A.562 in which Mašiya at the end of the month Mana (VI*) sends a report to Yasmah-Addu to inform him about the pursuit of the Turukkeans by Išme-Dagan (after Durand, ibid).

For the letter, cf. Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 222-3; Durand, LAPO II, p. 87-88.

This journey of Yasmah-Addu is dated by Wu Yuhong 21st VIII* limmu Aššur-malik: Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 134 and 222. This means that it must have taken place before the departure of Išme-Dagan to Qābrā to gather troops for the campaign on Šikṣābānum. If this dating proves to be correct, then the Turukkean revolt in the Habur region must have broken out before the revolt of Lidāya, and the revolt of Lidāya was instigated by that of the Habur, not vice versa. Nevertheless, this seems not to be the case (see further the discussion below).
the latter was in Tuttul. In this same letter, Šamšî-Adad asks his son to recruit a certain Zimrânum to raid Yamḫad, the territory of Sumu-Epuḫ. This may indicate that Yasmah-Addu’s presence in Tuttul was the same occasion when he went there to protect Tuttul from Sumu-Epuḫ’s raids. Villard, followed by Wu Yuhong, has put these events in the limmu Aššur-malik in the following sequence: in VII* Yasmah-Addu reported the raids by Sumu-Epuḫ and Išši-Addu wrote to him about the news of Sumu-Epuḫ dispensing help to the Turukkeans; 15 VII* Šamšî-Adad ordered Yasmah-Addu to go to Tuttul; 21 VIII* Išme-Dagan mentioned the journey of Yasmah-Addu to Tuttul and the raid of the Turukkeans in Tigonānum. However, according to the reconstruction of the events round Amursakkum and Tigonānum presented later by Charpin and Ziegler, the limmu Awīliya should be the correct date; Eidem proposed a later date, after the limmu Adad-bānī.

Without going too deep into this complicated issue, which has been touched upon several times, I would call attention to an important point to support the date given by Charpin. The Turukkan revolt broke out in the core of the kingdom, close to the capital Šubat-Enlil and posed a serious threat to the very existence of the kingdom. If this was in the limmu Aššur-malik – especially the events in Tigonānum, dated by Wu Yuhong to month VIII* of that limmu –, how could it be that Išme-Dagan, under such urgent circumstances demanding the fullest priority attention, gathered troops in Qabrā on the other side of the kingdom to attack Šikšabbum, also in the spring months of Aššur-malik? When Šikšabbum was conquered Kuwari was still in power and Lidāya had not yet risen up and destroyed the two cities in Utûm. This means that it is impossible to date the revolt in the Habur before that of Utûm. Thus, it cannot be dated to early or middle Aššur-malik. Late autumn or early winter is indicated for the events round Amursakkum because of the rain mentioned in the letter (see Charpin, OBO, p. 177), later than the events in Qabrā and Šikšabbum. So the revolt began at the end of Aššur-malik, certainly after the conquest of Šikšabbum, and lasted until Awīliya.

The letter (ARM 4, 76) mentioned above reads:

---

67 Charpin, OBO, p. 177; but note that Charpin dates it to the end of month I* of this limmu, thus the beginning of the revolt might have begun at the end of Aššur-malik.
68 Charpin, D. and N. Ziegler, FMV, p. 112 and 114f.
70 Cf. for instance Eidem, Akkadiana 81, p. 23ff; Villard, MARI 6, op. cit.; Villard, “La mort de Šûmu-Epuḫ et …,” NABU 1993, no. 119; Eidem, J., “Šûmu-Epuḫ- A Stretcher-case?,” NABU 1994, no. 10; and for the reign of Yasmah-Addu, the death of Sumu-Epuḫ, and the end of reign of Šamšî-Adad in general, cf. R. Whiting, M. Anbar, D. Charpin & J.-M. Durand, and M. de Jong Ellis (for these bibliographical references cf. Eidem, Akkadica, p. 27). One of the problems with the chronology discussed in the above literature is letter A.1314, in which Yarim-Lim claimed to have saved Dèr and Babylon 15 years earlier and Diniktum some 12 years earlier. This has been taken as a chronological marker for the events before and after. It has caused confusion about the date of his accession, the death of his father, the length of the reign of Yasmah-Addu and the related issues. To resolve the problems raised by this, some (such as Sasson in Sasson, J., “Yarim-Lim’s War Declaration,” Miscellanea Babylonica, mélanges offerts a Maurice Birot, Paris, 1985, p. 237-55) have argued that the letter is fictitious. However, a simpler solution can be found: Yarim-Lim could have done what he claims in the letter when he was still crown-prince not necessarily king. We know that crown-princes were in charge of important missions, campaigns and duties, and that they were installed as provincial governors, firstly to consolidate their position, and secondly to train them to become capable kings. In this case we would have two different dates: we are no longer compelled to combine the dates he claims for his accomplishments and the date of his accession.
Išme-Dagan to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 4, 76)

[1 listen to] your tablet you sent to me. You wrote to me: "In the beginning71 of [m]a[grânum (=[IX*])72 I ca[me from] Mari [to] fortify Tu[ttul]." You wrote [this] to me.

Then, after 24 lines, the letter resumes:

Days ago, Asdi-Takim intended to go to Ḥamša to you so I dispatched the army with Amur-Âšur and Iṣar-Lim to him. Three74 days before the army could cross over the Tigris, Asdi-Takim heard of it and retreated to his land. The (surviving) Turukkeans are staying in the land of Tigan-num. The refugees who fled to me tell me: "They are starving and intend to depart for their land. When they collect their travel provision, they will depart for their land." The refugees tell [me] that I am well. The army is well. On the 21st of Addarum (VIII*) on the day I have Mašiya bring this tablet of mine to you.75

Letter ARM 4, 76 seems to be earlier than ARM 4, 24; the former reports the looting of a village by the Turukkeans in the region of Tigan-num, while in the latter they waited to prepare provisions for the journey back home. Since they themselves did not have the necessary provisions they decided to loot the village:

Išme-Dagan to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 4, 24)

As for the news of the Turukkeans about which you wrote to me, the Turukkeans stay in the land of Tigan-num. Formerly they starved and went to the land of Hirbazân-num.76 The village of Talzur77 made peace with them but they killed a noble of that village.78 They took his people and property. That was a mountainous village without resources.79 The Turukkeans hardly took the food of five80 days from that village. After that village had made peace with them, they took it. That land which

71 Durand does not rule out reading this line as a-na re-eš IT[I-m]a a [n^i-ni-im], “in the end of this month;” he notes that rēš warhim means the beginning or the end of a month: Durand, LAPO I, p. 130.
74 Or 2 according to Durand, op. cit., p. 129.
76 Hirbazân-num is also mentioned in a text from Leylân that lists booty. It is identified with Ḥuršân, close to Ealuht and Tigan-num, somewhere north-northwest of the Habur Basin, by Eidem in ŠA 2, p. 20. According to Durand, in the correspondence of Ḣal-Addu (XXVIII, 57) as Ḥirmasnûm implies that its original name was Ḥirm/ban/zzânûm: Durand, LAPO II, p. 100 a. He further conjectures that the name can be in some way related to Ḥurmiš (land or city) and Ḥirmash (river?) and that Ḥi/urmi- or Ḥi/urb was the basic root in the formation of the name of the western part of Ṭīr-Abdân; cf. ibid.
77 This village’s name was left as [x]Åš-zu-ri-yâki by Dossin in ARM 4; Wu Yuhong restored it as [U]Åš-zu-ri-yâki: Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 225. But Durand reads Ta-‘alÅš-zu-ri-yâki: ARM II, p. 99 and 100 b; he thinks it was the name of a village or a province (valley?) of HirbazânNUM.
78 Durand translates, “they killed (no less) than every male of this village,” cf. Durand, LAPO II, p. 99.
79 This is Durand’s restoration and translation; Wu Yuhong has: “That village was robbed […],” ibid. Durand’s translation of ṣadatâwâ as “mountainous,” is based on the equation of the word with Sumerian Lû/HUR.SAG in the OB series Lû (in MSZ 12, p. 186: 32); cf. Durand, LAPO II, p. 100 d.
80 Dossin has 4 days in ARM 4, p. 24, 42.
had turned its attention to them has become tough. It has come into conflict with them. The Turukkeans are still starving. They have no food. They are staying in the land of Tigunûnum.\footnote{Durand translates mākalūm “place where one finds food” instead of just “food,” cf. Durand, LAPO II, p. 100 and 101 f.}

The Turukkean Revolt Calms

With the end of the winter Sumu-Epu\footnote{To Durand these Nuz\u00e6ši were individuals hired out their service to the king, like many such groups, who wandering throughout the Near East with their families and were hired as needed by other kings and rulers. He thinks that this group, with certain skills in warfare or artisanship, later gave its name to the city of Gasur in the thirteenth century.} succeeded in conquering two border territories of Šamš-Adad, Dûr-Addu and Dûr-Samsi-Addu, separating the two kingdoms on the Euphrates some 20 km to the north of Emar.\footnote{However, his unexpected death gave the advantage to Šamš-Adad, because it seems that the Turukkeans lost the support they had had from YamHad, of which Sumu-Epu had boasted. That support for the Turukkeans is mentioned in a letter sent by Išhi-Addad, the king of Qatna, to Yasma\u00e6š-Addu:}

Išhi-Addu to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 5, 17+A.1882) Sumu-Epu\u2013keeps sending the Nuzu\u2013men and messengers to all the land, saying: "I gathered the Turukkeans and sent the troops into Turukkum. I defeated Šamš-Adad and plundered his land." He keeps sending this message.

Previously, when the Turukkean rebelled in the land, you (pl.) would hold your (pl.) envoys and my envoys there. You (pl.) would not allow merchants to come up to here.

What is the matter? Why can I not know about your success or failure?\footnote{3) [a]-ša-an-ni li-ib-bi ma-tim aš-ra-nu um ma-tim ka-la-ad di-na …… 21) [s]a a-na se-ri-šu nu 22) ú-su-an-sa ta-ar-ra-at 23) iš-ti-ni-in it-ti-šu-nu it-ta-ki-ir 24) ù LÜ-MES Tu-ru-ku-u 25) bi-te-ru-à ma-ka-lam ú-il i-šu-à 26) i-na ma-a-at Ti-gu-nu-nim\u2013ma 27) wa-as-bu, Dossin, ARM 4, p. 42; Wu Yuhong, op. cit., p. 225 (restorations/corrections in l. 10 and 17 follow Wu Yuhong); restorations of l. 14 and 16 follow Durand in Durand, LAPO II, no. 506, p. 99-100.}

It is important to call attention to several points; Sumu-Epu\u2013was one of the main instigators of the Turukkean revolt and he had supported them with troops. The addition of these troops to the Turukkeans themselves and the assumed local groups that joined the revolt would greatly have enhanced the power and danger of the revolt. But no mention of YamHadite troops is found in the letters sent to Yasmah-Addu from the front. If the claim of Sumu-Epu\u2013were true, he must have sent a small contingent that was not worth mentioning. The Turukkeans for their part benefited from the conflict between the two powerful kingdoms, but the death of Sumu-Epu\u2013(VIII\u2013Awilleya)\footnote{Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 112.} must have been a catastrophe for them. Further, the benefit Sumu-Epu\u2013gained from his support was more than mere revenge.

\footnotemark[81]Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 112.
\footnotemark[82]Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 118. Whether it is correct to attribute the name of a place to the king, like many such groups, who wandering throughout the Near East with their families and were hired as needed by other kings and rulers. He thinks that this group, with certain skills in warfare or artisanship, later gave its name to the city of Gasur in the thirteenth century.\footnote{Durand translates mākalūm “place where one finds food” instead of just “food,” cf. Durand, LAPO II, p. 100 and 101 f.}
or acquiring advantage points; he harvested the two border fortresses of Šamši-Adad’s kingdom on the Euphrates, most likely the same two where building was reported in fragment C of MEC in *limmu* Ibni-Adad (II).\footnote{According to the restoration of Durand, in this year Šamši-Adad built the two border fortresses Dūr-Adad and Dūr-Šamši-Adad in the territory of Yamhad and defeated [Sumu-Epîh’]: 5′) BĀD,\textsuperscript{4} [IM\textsuperscript{5}] 6′) Š BĀD,\textsuperscript{6} [UTU]-ši-\textsuperscript{7} [IM\textsuperscript{5}] 7′) i-na da-ad-mi ib-[a-ni] 8′) da-awda-am š[a Šu-mu-e-pu-uḫ] 9′) i-na ta-ri-š[u i-du-uk], Durand, J.-M., “Documents pour l’histoire du royaume de Haute-Mésopotamie II*,” \textit{MARI} 6, p. 274.} The last point to be noted is the mention of the previous revolt of the Turukkeans \textit{ina lībbī mātim}. This implies that even the first revolt broke out in the Habur area, and has nothing to do with the defeat of those Turukkeans who joined Yašub-Addu of Aḫazum.

Another “going out” of the Turukkeans is reported in letter \textit{ARM} 4, 21, when they went to get salt but also took cattle and captives by sending raiders into the land:

**Išme-Dagan to Yasmah-Addu (\textit{ARM} 4, 21)**

The enemy, the Turukkeans, went out and arrived at the country here. They took salt\footnote{According to Durand, this salt was taken from the south of Sinjānā.} and then sent the raiding squads into the land and they took cattle and captives. During this invasion nothing was too big and they took away (everything) indeed. They began to leave. I will investigate and write news to you.\footnote{Another “going out” of the Turukkeans is reported in letter \textit{ARM} 4, 21, when they went to get salt but also took cattle and captives by sending raiders into the land:}

The phrase “they began to leave” hardly means leaving for their country. Rather Išme-Dagan seems to mean leaving the territory they had just invaded. Another letter makes an important allusion to negotiations between the two parties for peace. The Turukkeans asked for hostages but Išme-Dagan refused:

**Išme-Dagan to Yasmah-Addu (\textit{ARM} 4, 22)**

As to the news of the Turukkean for which you wrote to me, their news keeps changing so that until now I cannot write true information to [you]. Their terms that were taken for peace have become troublesome. They want Yantakim, Lu...
the conclusion drawn by Eidem, that the revolt was put to an end depending on ARM 1, 53+M.7346 which relates that iṣem Turukki is performed and the campaign against Zalmaqum could begin,\textsuperscript{91} must be revised. The letter does not explicitly state that the affair of the Turukkens has been brought to an end; rather, according to the translation Durand gives, Šamši-Adad says that his foremost aim is to bring the affair to an end, and then he will move towards Zalmaqum.\textsuperscript{92} This clearly means that he expected a quick end to the troubles. Though he seems to have failed in that, danger was at least reduced, as Charpin and Durand suggest.\textsuperscript{93}

\textbf{Šamši-Adad to Yasmah-Addu (ARM 1, 53+M.7346)}

About the army which is with you,\textsuperscript{94} I have once written to you to dispatch it to me. Dispatch that army to me immediately! You, stay in Mammagira\textsuperscript{95} with the rest of that army which you keep with you! Neither your stay in <Ša> Pănäzum, nor in Talhāuyum please (me). Mammagira is best for your stay. Another thing, I have written to withdraw\textsuperscript{96} my army staying in Babylon and that army has been withdrawn. With that army there is a 3,000-man Ešnunnean army with Ištar (goddesses). This army and those that have reached me and those troops will join with the army here. The force(s), these and those, are gathering and the affair of the Turukkens will soon be settled. After the affair of the Turukkens has been settled I will lead troops and come up to Zalmaqum. However, we are going to settle the affair of the Turukkens and then the expedition to the upper land will be executed. May you know this! On the 3rd of Kinunum (II*) I am sending this tablet of mine to you.\textsuperscript{97}

Thus, the revolt was brought to an end, or in fact calmed, not by the arms of Išme-Dagan but by those of an old enemy, the Gutians. The Gutians offered a priceless gift to Išme-Dagan and Šamši-Adad when they troubled the Turukkens again in the Zagros and forced them to retreat from the Habur and the surroundings, as we learn from letter A.4197.\textsuperscript{98} Did the Gutians move without any intention of serving Šamši-Adad, or were they perhaps prompted

\textsuperscript{91}Eidem, \textit{ShA} 2, p. 21.

\textsuperscript{92}The translation of Durand is “As soon as that is done, I will take the lead of the armies and go up to Zalmaqum. For now, we will arrange the affair of the Turukkens, then the expedition to the Upper Land.” cf. Durand, \textit{LAPO} II, p. 58.


\textsuperscript{94}Wu Yuhong has “the army under you,” \textit{op. cit.}, p. 255; however, Durand has “the army which is released from your command,” according to his own restoration of the last word of l. 4 as w[a-əš-su-r]u; cf. \textit{LAPO} II, p. 58 and note 128.

\textsuperscript{95}For the location of this GN in the northwest, close to Nusybin (Finet, \textit{ARM} 15, 135), or in the springs at the source of the Habur, opposite Ra’s al-‘Ain (Hallo, \textit{JCS} 18, 75b), cf. Gronenberg, \textit{RGTC} 3, p. 157.

\textsuperscript{96}The Akkadian verb \textit{supturu} (l. 14) is translated by Durand as “release” and by Wu Yuhong as “withdraw.” Both translations are admissible, but the most fitting meaning in this context is “to relieve from work assignment (here, “duty”),” cf. \textit{CAD}, vol. P, p. 301. The troops with Yasmah-Addu were of course as those in Babylon, and Šamši-Adad asked to be relieved from the duty and get a new one.


\textsuperscript{98}Van Koppen, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 426 and 427; Eidem and Laessöe, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 55.
by him, as Eidem and Læssøe tentatively suggest? Whatever the case may have been, letter A.4197 points to the calm that settled in the regions of Šubat-Enlil, Razama, Azuḫinum, Šudā and Nurrugum, and the return of Adal-šenni to Burundu in the north. This can be dated to the end of limmu Adad-bānī or the beginning of Nīmer-Sīn, when the campaign against Zalmaqum could begin. The phrase “returned back to Burundu,” after the departure of the Turukkeans mentioned above, must be understood to mean that Adal-šenni was cooperating with the Turukkeans in their revolt. When the revolt had calmed his work was finished, or rather was postponed and he returned to his capital. This king fought Išme-Dagan and his father Šamšī-Adad side by side with the Turukkeans, and this made him an ideal ally of Zimri-Lim and even of the kingdom of Šamšī-Adad.

More can now be said about Adal-šenni and his kingdom. He was one of the Hurrian kings, who ruled the Hurrian kingdom of Burundum in western Šubartum. The location of Burundu(m) is not precisely known, but the available data point to a location to the north of Talhayum, on the route that leads to Kaniš, before and close to Ḥaḥḥum. Since the governor of Ašnakkum (Chagar Bazar) was his vassal, it is thought that Burundum was to the northwest of Ida-maraš, on its periphery and bordering Eluḫut (indicated by the war between them), not far from Zalmaqum.

In a letter of Adal-šenni to the king of the Lullu (ARM 28, 43), who was in Burundum with his troops in the first year of Zimri-Lim, he spoke about the new king of Mari (Zimri-Lim) as equal to him. However, later in the two letters of Zakura-abum, the terms father and son replace the terms indicating parity. The presence of the Lullu troops in Burundum was very likely after the departure of the Turukkeans and lasted until the first year(s) of Zimri-Lim’s reign, as the letter indicates. The kingdom of Burundum was seemingly powerful and important in Ida-maraš, on one occasion being able to mobilize 8,000 troops. Adal-šenni’s influence is seen in his imposition of vassaldom on the governor of Ašnakkum, which he conquered in ZL 1. The vassaldom of the city to Burundum is clearly indicated in the letter of Zakura-abum to Zimri-Lim: “Yaḫmus-El, the governor of Ašnakkum, [servant] of Adal-šenni wrote me as follows…..” Although it was Adal-šenni who laid siege to the city and conquered it, most probably aided by the Turukkeans, Zimri-Lim, as lord of Burundum, claimed the victory for himself in a later text. There is also a report about war between Burundum and Eluḫut in the second half of the reign of Zimri-Lim. The circumstance that led to this war was a power vacuum in both Šinamum and Tušhum, which came under the influence of Eluḫut. However, the two cities were instigated to revolt by Itūr-Asdu, a Mari

---

99 Eidem and Læssøe, ibid.
100 Van Koppen, op. cit., p. 426.
103 Guichard, op. cit., p. 149.
104 Barjamovic, A Historical Geography of Anatolia in the Old Assyrian Colony Period, p. 97; 103.
105 Ibid.
106 Guichard, op. cit., p. 150-1. This is also the case in a late letter by Ibāl-Addu (ARM 28, 60), who describes the king of Burundum as the “son” of Zimri-Lim, cf. op. cit., p. 151 and note 125.
107 This according to the unpublished text A.851, cf. Guichard, op. cit., p. 150 and note 120.
110 Not only Ašnakkum, but also the conquests of Qirdašt, and Kaḥat were all claimed by the army of Zimri-Lim, cf. Guichard, op. cit., p. 151.
high official, and as a consequence of the destabilization of the region, under circumstances of which the details are still unknown, the two kingdoms of Burundum and Eluhut engaged in a military clash that turned out favourably for Eluhut. Letter A.2436 records the request of Adal-senni for troops:

Zakura-ahum to Zimri-Lim (FM VI, 7=A.2436)
Adal-senni wrote to me as follows: "the E[lu]butean,[111] the Numhean and the Yammutealan have made preparations to do battle with me. Entrust to me, I, 1,000 Ḥāneans (= pastoralists) to sit before me." Like the complaint that Adal-senni made to me, Ḥaduna-Addu of Ḥanżat has written the same to me. And Tarim-natiku from Subat-Enlil has written to me similarly.[112]

It is noted that Šubat-Enlil was in the hands of a governor with a Hurrian name at this time, shortly after the time when Išme-Dagan was expelled from the city. As a result of the defeat of Adal-senni he withdrew from Ida-maras, and the country was shared between Qarni-Lim and Zimri-Lim. Guichard notes that after ZL 2 few allusions to Burundum and its king are found in the Mari texts, as a consequence of its withdrawal from Ida-maras. However, a plan to capture Ahunu with an army of Zalmaqum before the fall of Mari is reported by an informant of Mari.[113]

Liqtum, the queen of Burundum, was the sister of Zimri-Lim, known from letter M.8161, which she had sent to her brother Zimri-Lim. In the letter, she expresses her absolute satisfaction about Adal-senni:

Liqtum to Zimri-Lim (M.8161)
Say to Zimri-Lim, thus (says) Liqtum, your sister. I am well. Adal-senni, my lord is well. He has entrusted me his large palace. He has given me much satisfaction. 200 women, singers, weavers (and) stewards, they come and go in my service. They execute my orders and [my directives]. This is [the gift that] Adal-senni, my lord, [has told] me....(lacuna) Further, the daughter of Išme-Dagan and the daughter of Bina-Addu of Ya'il are in my service.[114]

It is of historical importance to notice the presence of the daughter of Išme-Dagan and the daughter of Bina-Addu of Ya'il in the palace of Burundum, in the harem serving the sister of Zimri-Lim. This is a sign that Burundum contributed to putting an end to the reign of the kingdom of Išme-Dagan in Northern Mesopotamia, by helping Zimri-Lim to restore his rule over Mari. As a reward for this, and to ensure a perpetual alliance with Burundum, Zimri-Lim gave Adal-senni his sister in marriage.[115]

---

[114] 1) [a-n]a Zi-im-ri-Li-im 2) [q]i-bi-ma 3) um-ma 4') Li-iq-tum a-ha-at-[ka] 4) ša-al-ma-a-ku 5) A-dal-še-ni be-li ša-sa-li 6) è-kul-ša ra-bè-em a-na qa-ti-li 7) ip-qī-da-am i-ša-ri-i 8) i-pu-la-an-ni 2 ME MUNUS.MEŠ 9) lu MUNUS NAR.MEŠ lu MUNUS UŠ.BAR.[MEŠ] 10) lu MUNUS.AGRIG.MEŠ a-na qa-ti-[a] 11) i-ta-ka ša pi-ia ū ‘e’[pë-ša-pi-ia] 12) i-ip-pi-ša a-na zi-ik-[ri-ia] 13) ŠMA‘A-d[a]-š[e]-n[i] bu-li-ma 14) [lu-šu] iz-ku-r[a-an-[ni... 4’) ša-ni-tam DUMU.MUNUS ša-me-[‘I₂]-g[a]n 5’) ū DUMU.MUNUS.ŠMA‘IM DUMU 1a-ša-la-[nim] 6’) ma-ah-rii ia wa-aš-b[a], Marello, “Liqtum, reine du Burundum,” p. 455-6. According to Guichard’s restoration of the broken lines 19’-24’, the two daughters were in Kahat before Yarim-Addu, and after the “liberation” in the words of Liqtum, Yarim-Addu has given them to serve as priestesses. However, Adal-senni gave them permanently to her; Guichard, op. cit., p. 152.
After Adal-šenni was killed or captured by Šarraya, king of Eluḫut, Edip-ḫuḫ succeeded him to rule Burundum. The name Edip-ḫuḫ may consist of the two elements ed and ḫuḫ(u). The first is attested in Nuzi PNs, and the second at the end of several Hurrian names discussed in Chapter Four. Edip-ḫuḫ is known from a letter that mentions his ambassador and explicitly styles him king of Burundum: “Tuḫna-adal, the messenger/ambassador of Edip-ḫuḫ, king of Burundi.” The Lulleans who were in Burundum seem to have left the kingdom after Adal-šenni and joined Šadum-adal of Ašlakkā; they are attested there in ZL 3.

Išme-Dagan Loses, Zimri-Lim Wins!

The simultaneous revolts of the Turukkeans and the pastoralists in Suḫum and elsewhere must have weakened the empire of Šamši-Adad. The power and influence of the empire cannot have been the same as before the revolts. After the death of Šamši-Adad in XII* limmu Ṭaḫ-sili-Aššur, his son Išme-Dagan assumed the throne. The conditions were far from favourable: his brother Yasmaḫ-Addu was expelled from Mari; the capital Šubat-Enlil was sacked and plundered. Zimri-Lim, the new king of Mari, who replaced Yasmaḫ-Addu, tried to gain control of the city-states of Ida-maras, whose kings had already been chased off before by Šamši-Adad. Zimri-Lim sent a circular to its kings and asked them to open the doors of their cities before him. We learn this from a letter (one still sealed and so not actually sent) to the Hurrian-named king of Mardaman, Tiš-ulme. In it he asks for a quick response, after telling him that “everyone entered upon the throne of the house of his father” and all the land had “returned” to his side.

Tigunānum was one of the lands which replied positively to Zimri-Lim, as related in a letter stating that its king, Nagatmiš, sent him a letter for which he was reproached by the Eluḫutanes. Negative responses led to a military campaign in the region: Zimri-Lim laid siege to some of the cities and so needed more troops. He requested them from Ibāl-pī-El II (1778-1765 BC) of Ešnunna in a letter styling him as “father (of Zimri-Lim).” One of the cities Zimri-Lim succeeded to conquer was Kaḥat, a victory celebrated by the year-name “The year Zimri-Lim seized Kaḥat.”

---

117 Cf. Gelb et al., NPN, p. 211.
119 Some find the term Bedouin unfitting to designate these groups, since they were not really Bedouin moving elsewhere must have weakened the empire of Šamši-Adad. The power and influence of the empire cannot have been the same as before the revolts. After the death of Šamši-Adad in XI\* limmu Ṭaḫ-sili-Aššur, his son Išme-Dagan assumed the throne. The conditions were far from favourable: his brother Yasmaḫ-Addu was expelled from Mari; the capital Šubat-Enlil was sacked and plundered. Zimri-Lim, the new king of Mari, who replaced Yasmaḫ-Addu, tried to gain control of the city-states of Ida-maras, whose kings had already been chased off before by Šamši-Adad. Zimri-Lim sent a circular to its kings and asked them to open the doors of their cities before him. We learn this from a letter (one still sealed and so not actually sent) to the Hurrian-named king of Mardaman, Tiš-ulme. In it he asks for a quick response, after telling him that “everyone entered upon the throne of the house of his father” and all the land had “returned” to his side. Tigunānum was one of the lands which replied positively to Zimri-Lim, as related in a letter stating that its king, Nagatmiš, sent him a letter for which he was reproached by the Eluḫutanes. Negative responses led to a military campaign in the region: Zimri-Lim laid siege to some of the cities and so needed more troops. He requested them from Ibāl-pī-El II (1778-1765 BC) of Ešnunna in a letter styling him as “father (of Zimri-Lim).” One of the cities Zimri-Lim succeeded to conquer was Kaḥat, a victory celebrated by the year-name “The year Zimri-Lim seized Kaḥat.”

118 The Lulleans who were in Burundum seem to have left the kingdom after Adal-šenni and joined Šadum-adal of Ašlakkā; they are attested there in ZL 3.
119 Some find the term Bedouin unfitting to designate these groups, since they were not really Bedouin moving
120 The unpublished letter A.1182 refers also to the time of Yaḫdun-Lim, when Tigunānum was a vassal of Mari: 3’) i-na-an-[na] a-nu-[m]a da-as-ma ša Na-غا-at-mi-is 4’) [a-n]a se-er be-li-ia it-ta-al-[k]am 5’) b[e]-li i-ša-ri-iš 6’) Ti-غا-나-nim pa-na-na-um wa-[a]-r[i]-ki 7’) “ša-ah-<du>-a ni-li-im a-bi-ka il-[li]-ik 8’) u ki-ma be-li a-na ma-a-tim i-lu-i 9’) u Na-غا-at-mi-is a-na se-er be-li-i-la 10’) iš-pu-ul-ma DUMU ši-ip-ri-su lu 11’) LU.MEŠ E-לו-u-ta-yu₅ 12’) i-mu-ru-šu-ma u LU.MEŠ E-לו-u-ta-yu₅ 13’) ki-a-am tiq-bu-šu um-ma-a-[m]i-[nim] 14’) a-na se-er Zi-[m]-r[i]-[l][i]-[im] 15’) Ta-[aš] pu-ul u q[i]-iš-ta-[šu] 16’) uš-te-lu-ii, “Now, is it a deception that Nagatmiš has come to my lord? Let my lord give him satisfaction! The house of Tigunānum, formerly walked behind Yaḥdun-Lim, your father. And now, when my lord came up to the country, Nagatmiš sent him his messenger. The Eluḫutanes saw his message and said to him: Why have you sent a message to Zimri-Lim and he has been offered a gift?”, Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 50 and note 188.
121 Heimpel, op. cit., p. 43.
122 Heimpel, ibid.
The Rise of Zaziya

During the period of recession which the kingdom of Šamši-Adad and his sons were experiencing, the Turukkeans organized themselves to establish a kingdom with Zaziya at its head. Some 15 years after their revolt in the Habur region and in Utûm, they appeared again as one of the main powers of Northern Mesopotamia and played an undeniably important role. According to the complicated patterns of alliances and declarations of hostilities that mark this period of North Mesopotamian history, they had good relations with some powers and were hostile towards others. An important letter from Ašqudum to his lord Zimri-Lim refers to an occasion in the past when Zimri-Lim carried silver and gold to Zaziya to conciliate him, but Zaziya was still not satisfied. Now, when the letter was written in the end of ZL 2', the relations were good. Unfortunately, we do not know how much earlier that event had occurred, but it shows that the Turukkeans with Zaziya at their head were a considerable power. Even Zimri-Lim, when he had regained control of Mari compared his throne to that of Itabalḫum. He was said to have a throne loftier than that of Itabalḫum, where Zaziya most probably was king. The related section of the letter of Ašqudum is as follows:

Ašqudum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 27)

And about the issue of Zaziya […] , my lord understands that Dagan had taken the lead of [the troops]. And he handed the land, all of it, over to my lord. ‘Zaziya’, to ‘whom’ my lord carried silver and gold in the past, and who was ‘not’ agreeable; now ‘Dagan’ has placed ‘good’ words between my lord and Zaziya.128

When the relations between Mari and Ešnunna became hostile in ZL 2’, Zaziya sent a letter to Sammetar, the governor of Terqa, to warn him about the march of 3,000 Ešnunnean troops towards Rapiqum. The information he gave was a reply to a question of Sammetar:

Zaziya to Sammetar (ARM 28, 178)

You have written to me about information concerning the troops of Ešnunna. 3,000 men of the troops of Ešnunna with Ahi-Takim […] (lacuna) "… on way back, the Ešnunnean took (the route) until […] and continued towards Rapiqum." This is the information I am told. Now, write to your lord, so that he takes his decision. Let him not be negligent about this and that.130

125 According to Kupper, the reason why Zaziya contact ed Sammetar, not the king, is that Sammetar was in charge of the administration in the palace of Mari, having replaced his lord Zimri-Lim at this time. Zimri-Lim himself was absent from his capital for most of the year 3; cf. Kupper, ARM 28, p. 257.
128 According to Kupper, the reason why Zaziya contacted Sammetar, not the king, is that Sammetar was in charge of the administration in the palace of Mari, having replaced his lord Zimri-Lim at this time. Zimri-Lim himself was absent from his capital for most of the year 3; cf. Kupper, ARM 28, p. 257.
129 For the date of this letter, cf. Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 196, note 214.
130 Lafont alludes to economic and administrative texts from Mari that concern the exchange of gifts and indicate mutual friendly relations between Mari and Turukkkum under Zaziya, but none of these texts is dated. He assumes they were on good terms from ZL 2′ onwards: Lafont, B., “La correspondance d’Iddiyatum,” ARM 26/2, p. 470, note 47.

126 Lafont alludes to economic and administrative texts from Mari that concern the exchange of gifts and indicate mutual friendly relations between Mari and Turukkkum under Zaziya, but none of these texts is dated. He assumes they were on good terms from ZL 2′ onwards: Lafont, B., “La correspondance d’Iddiyatum,” ARM 26/2, p. 470, note 47.
127 This is referred to in the unpublished fragment M.13034; ŠIŠ.GU.ZA-ŠU e-li ŠIŠ.GU.ZA ša I-ta-pa-al-ḫi-im e-le-e-ē-et, “his throne is loftier than the throne of Itapalḫum,” cf. Charpin, p. 63, note 94 (referring to a communication by Durand).
129 For the date of this letter, cf. Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 196, note 214.
130 Lafont alludes to economic and administrative texts from Mari that concern the exchange of gifts and indicate mutual friendly relations between Mari and Turukkkum under Zaziya, but none of these texts is dated. He assumes they were on good terms from ZL 2′ onwards: Lafont, B., “La correspondance d’Iddiyatum,” ARM 26/2, p. 470, note 47.
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Zaziya intervened in the political game with the struggling powers in an attempt to gain a foothold in the region west of the Tigris and replace Zimri-Lim. He did this by messages to the kings Bunu-Eštar of Kûrdâ, Ḫâdu-rabi of Qaṭṭara, Šarrum-kîma-kâli-ma of Razama of Yamutbal, Zîrimiya of Surra and others. We learn this from an extraordinarily long and well-preserved letter sent to Zimri-Lim by his general Yassi-Dâgan. The letter gives an overview of the situation. The kings mentioned above were allied to Zimri-Lim, but Zimri-Lim himself was busy with the pastoralists far from his allies. Thus, he was unable to help these allies against the aggression of Ešnunna. The allies were desperate and doubtful towards their lord. What made the situation worse was the disclosure of a secret message their lord had sent with a shepherd to Qârni-Lim of Andârig, an ally of Ešnunna, asking him to perform for him quickly the secret service they know about. A secret mission with the ally of their enemy gave the allies of Zimri-Lim the impression that their lord was making peace with Ešnunna behind their backs. The whole country became afraid according to the letter, and the kings began to resent Zimri-Lim. At that moment, Zaziya, who appears to have had an effective intelligence service and knew every detail of the intrigue, found a great opportunity to split the alliance of Zimri-Lim. In the letter, Yassi-Dâgan says:

**Yassi-Dâgan to Zimri-Lim (A.1025)**

Zaziya prowls around Ḫâdu-rabi and his land to destroy it.\(^{12}\)

The general quotes what Zaziya told the kings:

**Yassi-Dâgan to Zimri-Lim (A.1025)**

“So, where is Zimri-Lim whom you(pl.) looked for to be your(pl.) father? And you were walking behind him when he let himself been conveyed in a litter. Why, now, has he not come to save you?” These are the words of Zaziya to Bunu-Eštar, Ḫâdu-rabi, Šarrum-kîma-kâli-ma, Zîrimiya and (other) kings.\(^{13}\)

All the kings Zaziya approached (at least those whose names are recorded) controlled regions to the west of Nineveh, across the Tigris. If this is significant it suggests an attempt to spread his influence there, and thus safeguard a wide corridor to reach the Habur area, to contact his fellowmen, the Hurrians/Turukkeans of the Habur. That would have been possible only if the territories and cities on the eastern side of the Tigris were secured. The relative absence of cities like Nineveh, Nurrugum, and Kâwallum in the letters of this phase as military targets may indicate that they were already in Turukkean hands, removed from any struggle for controlling them. Letter ARM 26, 517 gives a hint that supports this suggestion, mentioning that Zaziya stayed in Ninêt (= Nineveh), although for how long is not known.\(^{134}\) This intervention of Zaziya can be counted as the prelude to his long series of military and political involvements in the lands across the Tigris (see below).

In the letter of Yassi-Dâgan he also tells that the kings believed Zaziya and had begun to slander their lord Zimri-Lim, while Zaziya himself had a non-aggression pact with Ešnunna:

\(^{131}\) Heimpel, *op. cit.*, p. 50.


Yassi-Dagan to Zimri-Lim (A.1025)
But those do not realize the intentions of this man (= Zaziya). One would say he speaks to them with sincerity, while these are only (evil) plots. They began to slander my lord to Zaziya without realizing that he is telling them lies and he (= Zaziya) has a pact of non-aggression with the prince of Eṣunnna.135

He also informs Zimri-Lim about the situation among the kings, his allies, after his secret letter to Qarni-Lim became known. When Zaziya received them, together with all the chiefs of divisions/captains136 and Yassi-Dagan himself, he aroused their doubts more and widened the gulf between them and Zimri-Lim by saying:

Yassi-Dagan to Zimri-Lim (A.1025)
"What are these things that Zimri-Lim has in mind? Last year he ‘came up’ to the interior of the land. The kings adopted him as their father and leader and he gave troops to Ḫadnu-rabi. He (= Ḫadnu-rabi) took my cities, attacked my sheep, and committed massacres in the heart of my land.137 Afterwards the Eṣunnane came up, and Zimri-Lim rose and departed for his land. He did not save you. Now he came up a second time, took the oath with Qarni-Lim and the Eṣunnane, and departed for his land." This is, among other things, what Zaziya told (them) and they bear resentment against my lord. They asked him to go with them to Karanā, but he refused, saying:

"He has allied himself to Ḫadnu-rabi, a typical aggressor, so I will fight but I am not going to Karanā. Here I will take an omen. If it will be good, I will fight Eṣunnana; otherwise, if the omen I will get is too bad, I will not fight. Instead, I will send a letter to Hammurabi. Reinforcement troops will come up from Babylon; then Zimri-Lim will come and we will fight." These are the plans of the man, but all that he says is deception. He has a pact of non-aggression with Eṣunnana.138

It is unclear why Zimri-Lim supported Ḫadnu-rabi of Ḫattara against Zaziya, for we would have expected good relations as long as both parties had Išme-Dagan as a common enemy. Can we assume that the increasing influence of Zaziya in the Hilly Arc made Zimri-Lim feel concerned about his own influence there? It is possible that Išme-Dagan was

136 41) 60 A.AN GAL.KUD.MEŠ ša ma-tim; Durand has “et des chefs de sections du Pays,” cf. Durand, LAPO II, p. 147; Kupper, the first author of the text, has “et 60 capitaines de tout le pays...” cf. Kupper, MARI, 6, p. 340.
137 Heimpel has “and he kept setting snares for me,” cf. Heimpel, op. cit., p. 50.
contained at this time and he could not pose a serious danger. Danger threatened from the new rising power that had set its face towards the west, the kingdom of Turukkum. Whatever the case may be, the words of Zaziya worked, for Yassi-Dagan admits:

Yassi-Dagan to Zimri-Lim (A.1025)
Now, the kings and the whole country are inflamed (with rage) against my lord. Also Bunu-Eštar rose to tell Zaziya: "Zimri-Lim kept his elite troops and sent to us limp people. With them, we shall die!"139

Zaziya cleverly used these kings against Zimri-Lim and showed them that he too was hostile towards their enemy Ešnunna while he had a pact with it. When he promised them to fight Ešnunna, the pact was already in force. That is why he did not make any move, using the pretext of taking a favourable omen.

From Zaziya we learn that Ešnunna advanced a second time, after Zimri-Lim had left the region, but it is not said what exactly happened. Probably Ešnunna conquered or peacefully incorporated Aššur and Ekallātum in ZL 2', an event reported in the letter of Meptum to his lord A.2459:

Meptum to Zimri-Lim (A.2459)
After Aššur, Ekallātum and Ešnunna have now become one house.140

Whatever the political and tactical intentions of Zaziya’s speech to the allies of Zimri-Lim, he was not too far from truth. The next year Ešnunnean troops marched to the northwest, defeated Šarraya141 of Razama of Yussan and two other neighbouring kingdoms. Kurdā and Qaṭṭara leaned towards Ešnunna (ARM 14, 106), although Kurdā refused in the end the peace offer of Ešnunna. After a siege (ARM 27, 19) Kurdā could resist the Ešnunneans and chase them all the way to Andarig (ARM 27, 16), the ally of Ešnunna.142 Mari reacted by sending only 200 Ḥanean troops for the support of Kurdā (A.2821), and these arrived only after the victory of Kurdā over the Ešnunneans. The Ešnunneans felt sufficiently free in the region to advance towards Šubat-Enlil as well as Qarni-Lim, where Ešnunna took its share of the household of Šamšī-Adad. After this, the Ešnunneans returned home and celebrated their campaigns by calling the 10th year of Ibāl-pi-El the year of the defeat of Šubartum (referring to Šarraya) and Ḥana.143 In ZL 4', Ešnunna moved again towards the northwest in order to conquer “the land of Šubartum, all of it,” according to letter A.2119.144 However, this time Ešnunna lacked an important ally, Qarni-Lim of Andarig, who had switched loyalty to Mari. Mari successfully formed a wide coalition against Ešnunna, including the kingdoms of the Hilly Arc (Andarig, Qaṭṭara, Allahād, Kurdā and others). It included as well the kings of Idamarā and even Zaziya.145 Apparently it was because of this coalition that Zimri-Lim could come and save Andarig. The difficult mission of building such a coalition was entrusted to

141) Written also Šarriya; cf. for example letter ARM 26, 128 in Durand, ARM 26/1, p. 293; see also Heimpel, p. 558.
145) Ibid.
Sammetar, who reconciled the kings Zaziya, Bunu-Eštar, Ḫadnu-rabi and Šarraya with Qarni-Lim in ZL 3.\(^{146}\)

The Elamite Invasion

After a few years of calm Zimri-Lim decided to support Elam against Ešnunna in ZL 7'.\(^{147}\) Once Ešnunna was conquered the way was open for Elam. In ZL 8', while Zimri-Lim was visiting his father-in-law, Yarim-Lim of Yamḫad, he went with Yarim-Lim, their families and retinue on a journey to the shores of the Mediterranean. At this time Elam mustered its troops and penetrated Babylonia and the northwestern territories up to the Habur region.\(^{148}\)

Around this time, Išme-Dagan became gravely ill and resided for a while in Babylon. He left his son Mut-Asqur\(^{149}\) behind in Ekallatu. Atamrum of Allahad\(^{150}\) (since ZL 10' also of Andarig)\(^{151}\) plotted against Išme-Dagan, “tied up” Mut-Asqur and put a certain Ḥammurat in his place. Išme-Dagan went to Hammurabi and then to the Vizier, the king of Elam, who was still in Ešnunna, to get help. Afterwards he seems to have presented him valuable gifts. His going to the king of Elam was perhaps because Atamrum was a vassal of Elam, and he hoped with this that the latter would order Atamrum to reverse the coup.\(^{152}\) In ZL 9' the Elamite and Ešnunnean troops, led by the Elamite general Kunnum, entered Šubat-Enlil\(^{153}\) and most of the kings of Ida-marā showed their allegiance to the Elamite. The kings of Šubartum, the mountainous regions to the north and northwest of Assyria, also apparently showed their allegiance to the Elamite, perhaps from hatred of Išme-Dagan. The first thing they did was to denounce Išme-Dagan to the king of Elam. This we learn from letter ARM 26, 384, sent to Zimri-Lim, which relates that Hammurabi made Išme-Dagan address the kings of Šubartum “his brothers” and Zimri-Lim “his father,” something humiliating for him:

??? to Zimri-Lim? (ARM 26, 384)

… This he said to them; and, given that, we entered the palace together, and they (= the Babylonians) greeted them (= the Ekallateans), and they (= the Ekallateans) delivered their message as follows: “Your servant Išme-Dagan (says): ‘I made myself sick for the hardship of my lord. When the Elamite was the enemy of my lord, the kings of the land of Šubartum denounced me to the Vizier (= the king) of Elam and conducted me to Ešnunna, and the Vizier of Elam scolded me, and I had to be helped out. And when the Elamite besieged the city of Ḥiritum, my lord knows the good things I did for him. I was worried sick about the hardship of my lord. Now I dread the glory of my lord. Zaziya, the Turukkean, ‘made incursions’ into my land and captured 3, 4 of my cities. He was encroaching on my land. And I wrote to you for troops, but you did not give me troops. And you gave troops to another place.’”

Hammurabi spoke to the messengers ‘of’ [Išme-Dagan] as follows, he (said): “The kings of Šubartum have pointed the finger at your lord, and I wrote to him (= Išme-Dagan) as follows: ‘To those kings that write to me as sons you [write] as brother.

\(^{146}\) Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 199 and notes 251 and 252.

\(^{147}\) This has happened in ZL 7' but appears as a date-formula of ZL 8', cf. Heimpel, op. cit., p. 57.


\(^{149}\) According to Durand, this PN should be read Mut-asqur. He derives the name Asqur from zaqārum, “to be high,” and it was also a divine name: Durand, J.-M., “L’emploi des toponymes dans l’onomastique d’époque Amorrite (I) les noms en Mut-,” SEL 8 (1991), p. 88.

\(^{150}\) Allahad was a city somewhere between Andarig and Karana, cf. Heimpel, op. cit., p. 114.

\(^{151}\) Cf. Heimpel, op. cit., p. 114-5.

\(^{152}\) For details, cf. Heimpel, op. cit., p. 64.

To Zimri-Lim who writes to me as brother you write as son. Is what I wrote to him wrong? This Hammurabi answered them.\textsuperscript{154}

Perhaps from ZL 2 on Zaziya was enjoying a good relationship with Hammurabi of Babylon. This we learn from the letter of Yassi-Dagan cited above, in which it is said that Zaziya told the kings he would ask for troops from Hammurabi to hold back the Ešnunneans if necessary. This good relationship was maintained. Now the letter \textit{ARM 27}, 162 provides evidence that a messenger of Zaziya was in the palace of Hammurabi and that the relationship was not one of parity, because Zaziya styles himself as son of Hammurabi:

\textbf{Zimri-Addu to Zimri-Lim (\textit{ARM 27, 162})}

A Turukkan messenger came, and he had the following instructions for Hammurabi (of Babylon): "Since I have written to you as son, now then I shall see who among the kings of the land of Šubartum does not write to 'you' as son." This Zaziya [wrote] Hammurabi.\textsuperscript{155}

Does this passage indicate that Zaziya was acting as chief of the kings of Šubartum when checking who is not calling Hammurabi "father"? Or was he pretending to have authority over them in front of Hammurabi to guarantee his support? We do not know.

It is worth mention that there was a Gutian contingent within the Elamite troops invading Šubat-Enlil. They appear in the administrative tablets of Leylân\textsuperscript{156} and are also mentioned in several letters of Mari.\textsuperscript{157} In the same year ZL 9 an Elamite military encounter with the Gutians is recorded.\textsuperscript{158} According to a letter of Ibâl-pî-El (\textit{ARM 2, 26}), when the Elamite troops returned from the land of the Gutians two different rumours circulated about the outcome:

\cite{Heimpel1987}
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\textsuperscript{154} for instance, Heimpel, p. 452.

\textsuperscript{155} Does this passage indicate that Zaziya was acting as chief of the kings of Šubartum when checking who is not calling Hammurabi “father”? Or was he pretending to have authority over them in front of Hammurabi to guarantee his support? We do not know.

\textsuperscript{156} According to Heimpel, this encounter seems to have taken place between the 5th and the 8th month of that year, cf. Heimpel, p. 101.
The Elamite troops who went to the land of Qutum have returned to Ešnunna. And I heard the following from those around me: "(Qutean) troops’ drew up in battle formation against them (= the Elamites), and they 'accepted' their (offer of) peace." And half (of those around me) are saying the following: "The Nawarite (woman) (= Nawaritum) - her general bound her and gave her up." 159 This I heard from those around me. 160

It is interesting to hear of an influential Gutian woman who appears to have been a princess or governor of the city of Nawar in the east Tigris region. She cannot have been queen of the Gutians since, as Heimpel points out, Zazum is mentioned as king of the Gutians before (A.649) and after (ARM 26, 491) this incident. 161 Durand’s identification of Nawar with Nawar of the Habur region 162 is impossible because western Nawar was never a Gutian populated city and is nowhere said to be ruled by the Gutians. Further, letter ARM 6, 27 from Mari reports that she sent 10,000 troops against Larsa 163 the year after Elam withdrew from Babylonia. This indicates that she was involved more in southern Mesopotamian affairs than those of the north. Thus it is the eastern Nawar, later Namri, that should be identified with the GN after which she was named. The letter was sent by Bahdî-Lim to Zimri-Lim; he says:

Bahdî-Lim to Zimri-Lim (ARM 6, 27)

And thus (they told me): "Troops of 10,000 Gutians of the queen of Nawar have departed just before the feast of 7 (days) of the year and headed to Larsa. And the Babylonians have left Malgium; they rustled the sheep of the Elamites and Hammurabi is in Sippar." This is the news they brought to me. 164

The information in this letter indicates that Nawaritum was either soon released, or that her arrest and deliverance to the Elamites was a false rumour, as she was able to lead an army to Larsa in the following year. It is possible that Nawaritum was arrested by the Gutian general who was allied to the Elamites, because she attacked at a time when the Elamites and that part of the Gutians undertook their joint invasion of the Habur.

Kunnam, the Elamite general who led the troops to the Habur, wished at first to establish good relations with Zimri-Lim. He styled himself as ‘your son,’ 165 even though he was actually occupying his territory, 166 and Zimri-Lim did his best to form an alliance against the

---

159 Durand has restored the verb ik-]/u-ši-ma as ik-ši-ši-ma, Durand, LAPO II, p. 230, note 461.
161 Heimpel, op. cit., p. 478.
162 Durand, LAPO II, p. 231, b.
163 Durand, LAPO I, Paris, 1997, p. 618. Bahdî-Lim, the writer of this letter, unfortunately did not give further details about whether these troops were destined to support Larsa or to attack it.
166 The letter of Bahdî-Lim to his lord Zimri-Lim makes a clear allusion to the fact that Ida-maras was in this time under Zimri-Lim’s authority: 1) [a-na] be-li-ia gi-bi-m[a] 2) [um-ma] Ba-ah-di-Li-im IR-ka-a-ma 3) [ai]i-aš-su-šu-ma-šu a-na mal-a-at 4) [zil-ti]-LI-im a-na ni-[l]-bi 1)I-da-ma-ra-as 7) [il]-em-ma ma-am-ma-an ša ma-a-at I-da-ma-ra-as 8) iš-se-ez-ze-ši-šu ša-be-aš-[a], “Say to my Lord, thus says your servant Bahdî-Lim. Haya-sümü wrote to me as follows: ‘The Elamite and Ešnunnean troops have come up in masses towards the land of Zimri-Lim, into the interior of Ida-maras, and there is nobody to save the land of Ida-maras,” Dossin, ARM 6, 66, p. 94-6; Charpin,
Elamite presence. After he had brought on to his side Qarni-Lim of Andarig, Atumram of Allahad, the Upper Land, the land of Šubartum and Išme-Dagan, he tried the same with Zaziya and the Qabrāeans. Letter ARM 26, 489 mentions the dispatch of two messengers, one to Qabrā and the other to Kawilhum:

Ibál-pi-El and Buqaqum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 489)
We dispatched Napsi-Eraḥ to Qabrā and Šamaš-Lamassašu to Kawilhum.168

Qabrā was at this time ruled by a certain Ardigandi. The name Ardigandi, as we have noted already, is of the same type as the Shemshāra name Berdigendae, the general of Zutlum (see Chapter Six). This, and the words of Išme-Dagan in this letter that the ruler of Qabrā will turn to Zimri-Lim after his defeat (see below), mean that the city was no longer ruled by Išme-Dagan. Rather the authority had seemingly passed to other groups related to those living in the eastern mountains, specifically the Turukkēanes, as the name Ardigandi indicates. The attack of Išme-Dagan on Qabrā in ZL 9’ confirms this as fact. The unpublished letter A.2137+, sent by Ḫaqba-ahum to his lord, contains a quotation from a letter of Zaziya to Hammurabi. Išme-Dagan had won some victories:

Ḫaqba-ahum to Zimri-Lim (A.2137+)
Secondly, Zaziya wrote as follows to Hammurabi: "Išme-Dagan, since he came up, has begun acting like his father constantly. He contests the lord of Qabrā in his land. He disputed with Qabrā and made war. [Išme]-Dagan has defeated Qabrā."

Išme-Dagan sent his son and his army to dig the canal of Nurda and the lord of Qabrā rushed with the whole of his army. He blocked the way saying: "You will not come up!" They seized then each other and fought. The son of Išme-[Dagan] was victorious over Qabrā. The army of Išme-Dagan took back the city of Nurda, Abnā and the plain of Zamurā from the lord of Qabrā.170

Kawilhum also seems very likely to have been under Zaziya’s control, since when Išme-Dagan negotiated for peace with Zaziya he could place (or keep) his barges in Kawa’ilhum to receive grain (see below, letter ARM 26/2, 491) as a result of the negotiations. The rest of the letter of Ibál-pi-El and Buqaqum concerning the Kakmean attack on Qabrā and related matters continues:
Išbī-šelik and Buqaqum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 489)

We [arrived]‘in’ [the city of] Asšur at bedtime and [heard] the following word from those around us: "Kaknum defeated ‘Aragina’, the [king of] ‘Qabrā’." This we heard from those around us. We arrived [in Ekaṭṭatum] and Išme-Dagan [spoke to us] as follows, he (said): "500 troops of Gurgurrum attacked [the land] of Aragina and looted [its villages]. 2,000 troops of Aragina ‘went out’ to the rescue and fought, and Kaknum went ahead and defeated Aragina. And his (= Aragina’s) high-ranking servants were ‘running about’ aimlessly. Now that man, because of having been defeated, [will ...]. And he will pay attention to your lord (Zimri-Lim). And he will ... His cities." This [news] Išme-Dagan told me. ‘Išme-Dagan’ is very sick. And according to the instructions of our lord, [we ...] and then [...], and Mut-Āškur and Lu-Nanna ‘will come up’ to take his (= Išme-Dagan’s) lead and to go to our lord. Based on everything we saw, Išme-Dagan ‘is not able to go’. He is very sick. Concerning a message (from Išme-Dagan) about the Qutean, for which our lord sent Ḥabdul-malik to Lu-Nanna, he (= Ḥabdul-malik) did not reach Lu-Nanna and gave us (the message with our lord’s instructions) instead. We told Lu-Nanna that message. And once we had arrived (in Ekaṭṭatum), we placed that ‘message’ before Išme-Dagan, and Išme-Dagan ‘spoke’ to us as follows: "[Lu-Nanna] told me that message before your arrival. The Qutean did ‘not’ come up all. And I did not address to your lord that message." This he answered us, and we addressed Lu-Nanna ‘before’ him [and] (said): ‘Did not Ḥabdi-Erah tell our lord that message?’ With these (words) we addressed Lu-Nanna, and he confirmed their truth (saying): ‘They (= the words) are true. Ḥabdi-Erah told (Zimri-Lim) that message.’ ‘Perhaps’ because our lord ‘did not address’ him with the right words he (= Išme-Dagan) contradicts us, (saying): ‘The Qutean did not come up at all.’ And perhaps he is telling ‘the truth’. Who would know? Besides, we have not heard anything on the Quteans from those around us.

This is not the whole story of letter ARM 26, 489. In addition to the mention of the Kakman sack of Qabrā it relates that the gravely sick Išme-Dagan denied sending a message to Zimri-Lim about the “coming up” of the Gutian. Whether by “the Gutian” one individual, (i.e. Zazum) is meant, or whether it is a collective term for the Gutians and their...
troops, is not clear. Nevertheless, we understand from the letter that the Gutians were somehow involved in the affairs, but it is not stated whether they were for or against Išme-Dagan in this matter. The letter gives the impression that the coming up of the Gutians was a warlike action against the kingdom of Išme-Dagan, who had warned Zimri-Lim about it but then denied sending such a message. The key to solving the riddles of this letter is found in letter A.649 that refers to a Gutian offensive on Qabrā and on Turukkean territory, that forced the Turukkeans to retreat from Qattara, where they had gone to the rescue. Worse than these was the involvement of Išme-Dagan himself, whose men guided the Gutians to Qabrā. Perhaps this is why he denied sending the message to Zimri-Lim about their “coming up.”

Haqba-ahum to Zimri-Lim (A.649)

The Turukkeans came to Qattara to the aid of Ḫadnu-rabi, because the land of Qattara began to ask with insistence for the restoration of Ḫadnu-rabi to his throne. But on the fifth day, the Turukkeans began to leave the land of Qattara because the news concerning the Gutti arrived, and Hammurabi (of Kurdā), very worried, told me the following: "When I rose to set off, news arrived from the region downstream (of the Tigris) that Zazum king of the Gutians approached with his troops (and) the retainers of Išme-Dagan guided them; (and that) they have reached the land of Qabrā and occupied the city (of Qabrā); and (on the other hand) Išme-Dagan has arrived from Babylon to Makilân, which was his objective; and from Makilan the messengers of Išme-Dagan continued their route to Atamrum (bearing the following message): 'I am well. I have arrived.'".

On the other hand, the Turukkeans sent me this message: "The Gutians threaten us; yes; we are ourselves certainly in a position of weakness now. Facing the Gutians, are we going to abandon our homes? The Gutians arrive now indeed. Shall we be driven out of everywhere we currently hold? Shall we reach the mountains? Shall we look for ground to live there? And you indeed, Will you abandon your homes and your towns and leave in front of the Gutians? Pay close attention to what has happened. Join your troops with ours to drive out the Gutians." This is what the Turukkeans sent me. Therefore, the Turukkeans on hearing the threat of war of the Gutians, rose and left the land of Qattara to their own interest.

Perhaps this was the same time that the king of Elam ordered his general in Šubat-Enlil, Kunnam, to negotiate with Zaziya, to get support against the coalition Zimri-Lim was building against them. Zaziya refused to cooperate and left Kunnam helpless to confront the coalition on the one hand, and a conflict broke out between his Elamite and Ešnunnean garrison troops in Šubat-Enlil on the other. Letter A.910 records this Elamite approach:


Yamsum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 310= A. 910)

Kunnam drunk beer and said to Ibni-Addu: “My lord wrote to me: ‘Right now Zimri-Lim will go against you and he will trouble the land. Write to the Turukkan so that the Turukkan comes to your side. Do (pl.) battle against Zimri-Lim!’ He (= Kunnam) wrote to the Turukkan but they did not come to him.”

It is not known why Zaziya refused to cooperate with the Elamites. It is true that an old alliance between Elam and the Turukkan kingdom of Itabalhum in the time of Pišēndēn says nothing in a period full of changing loyalties and shifting alliances like this, but Zaziya was an adversary of Zimri-Lim. He had tried to replace him in the Hilly Arc and the Habur region. Zaziya was also the enemy of Išme-Dagan, whose kingdom was between Elam and the Habur region, so an alliance with Elam could be fruitful for him. Zaziya, on the other hand, as Yassi-Dagan stated, had a non-aggression pact with Ešnunna, now a vassal of Elam. Thus, this offer suited Zaziya best and it could be a chance for him to destroy his enemies and take over their domains. The only explanation that can be given for his refusal is that the Turukkans were at this time dominating large areas and cities in the east Tigris plains, such as Nineveh and Kawalḫum, and were present in the Habur region following the revolt there. Thus, Zaziya seems to have been concerned about the fate of the domain he controlled at that time and the larger domain he was planning to control. He would have reckoned that overthrowing the petty polities of the region fighting with each other, including the exhausted kingdom of Išme-Dagan, was a much easier aim than regaining those territories from a great power like Elam.

This and other developments forced the Elamites to leave Northern Mesopotamia. Kunnam left Šubat-Enlil with his troops in late ZL 9′ and handed over the city to the Elamite-named lieutenant Simat-Huluriš. After the Elamite withdrawal from Babylonia in early ZL 10′, the city of Šubat-Enlil too was abandoned and Atamrum entered it as its new master. Letter ARM 2, 49 suggests that Išme-Dagan tried to control the city, but Ibāl-pī-El was recommended by one of his retainers to let Atamrum seize the city before Išme-Dagan did.

Turukkû Resumes War

An independent Qabrā collaborated with Zaziya against Išme-Dagan, as shown by a letter from Iddiyātum to his lord:

Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 510)

I and Belum-kima-Iliya entered the palace for instructions and Aškur-Addu told us: “2,000 Turukkans, 2,000 Qabreans and 1,000 Ya‘urrum attacked a work detail that was working on a river of Išme-Dagan. Išme-Dagan came to the rescue, and they defeated him.”

This posed a real danger that Išme-Dagan was not able to confront alone. Therefore, he asked for help from Babylon. We do not have a letter that documents his request for help from Babylon but the letter of Yarim-Addu to his lord says enough:

177 Heimpel, op. cit., p. 84, and the letter ARM 2, 49 on p. 480.
Yarim-Addu to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 373)

And I heard from those around me the following: "6,000 Babylonian troops are going up to Išme-Dagan." And rumours keep circulating that they are headed for another place. I found out these matters: the troops 'set out' because of Zaziya and the king of Qabrā. They are strong. They will go up to Išme-Dagan. I have confirmed the truth of this matter. They will go up to Išme-Dagan in the coming month.180

However, we have a letter that preserves a complaint of Išme-Dagan’s retainers before Hammurabi of Babylon. They complained about Hammurabi withholding troops from Išme-Dagan when the Turukkeans attacked Išme-Dagan’s land and took three or four cities (see above, letter ARM 26, 384). This letter can be chronologically placed here and these Turukkean attacks must have taken place during or shortly after the Elamite invasion.

It was perhaps at this time that Zimri-Lim counted Qabrā among his friends, as long as it was hostile to Išme-Dagan. It is very possible that Zimri-Lim came to Qabrā, since litter-carriers are reported to have been killed between Arrapā and Kakmum, while the litter itself was either robbed or annihilated. That Zimri-Lim had the habit of having himself carried in a litter was already touched upon by Zaziya with disgust (see above, the letter of Yassi-Dagan, A.1025). The letter of Iddiyātum is presented here:

Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 512)

A messenger of my lord arrived from 'Qabrā' and spoke to me as follows: "[I] have' [no] companion." Further, (he said): "[They 'attacked'] Yadurum and the men who were with him carrying the litter between Arraphum [and] Kakmum [and] killed them. And they [...] 'the litter'.181

There is an unclear passage at the end of this letter, where Išme-Dagan and the lord of Ešnunna, Aššur, and setting sight for Arrapā are all mentioned.182 No fuller interpretation of this passage can be given. It is important that Arrapā, like Qabrā, seems to have liberated itself a long time before from the rule of Išme-Dagan. Its liberation cannot have been later than that of Qabrā because Qabrā is almost halfway between Arrapha and Ekkallātum. Letter ARM 26, 523 makes it clear that Arrapā was out of reach of Išme-Dagan, because messengers were sent to go via Arrapā to Ešnunna to avoid arrest by the lord of Ekkallātum:

Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 523)

They released the two Ešnunnean messengers who had been detained 'here'. But they have not yet departed. (Aškur-Addu said): "'[I] cannot give' you companions. [Take] the route to Arrapā [and reach] Ešnunna (that way) I am afraid [Išme-Dagan] will detain my messengers because I am detaining [his] messengers."183

---

180 34) ù i-na a-di-ti-i-a ki-a-am es-me um-ma-a-ma 35) li-mi sa-bu-um LÚ KÁ.DINGIR.RA ki a-na še-er Iš-me-4Da-gan 36) i-il-le ù tu-uk-ka-šu a-šar ša-ni-im-ma 37) i-ta-na-ad-du-ù a-wa-a-tim ši-na-ti ū-pa-al-li-iš-ma 38) aš-šu-ma Za-zi-ša-ù LUGAL ša Qa-ba-ra-a 39) sa-ba-um it-[ň]i-dan-nu 40) a-na se-er Iš-me-4Da-gan i-il-le 41) a-wa-tam an-ni-tam uk-ti-in 42) Iš-me-4Da-gan i-il-le, Charpin, "Les représentants de Mari à Babylone (I)," ARM 26/2, p. 183; Heimpel, p. 327.


182 9') ša-ni-[i-am 10') ši-me-4Da-gan ū LÚ ŠE-nu-nu 10') [i-na x x x] wa-aš-šu Aš-su-ar 11') ù a-na'[ x x] x-x-[i]-mu-ti a-na Ar-ra-ap-hi-im 12') pa-[n]-a ši-su/an-ma a-wa-tam 13') [a-na 14') ši-me-4Da-gan ū-šé-su-ma, "Further, Išme-Dagan and the Ešnunnean are staying in […] Aššur […] set 'sight' on […] for Arraphum, and they let the word go out [to] Išme-Dagan, and […]]," Lafont, ARM 26/2, p. 490; Heimpel, p. 399.

183 35) 2 [D]UMU.ŠIŠ ši-ip-ri ŠU ŠE-nu-nu 36) [a-an]-a-ni um ka-šu ū-ta-as-še₂₃,ru <<>> 37) ù a-di-ni ù-šu it-ta-al-ku 38) um-ma-a-mi a-li-ik i-di-[m] ū-ul a-n/a[a-d]-i-na-ku-nu-ši-im 39) gi-ir-ri Ar-ra-ap-[i]-im le-gê-
The Influence of Zaziya across the Tigris and the Hurrian Presence

The range of Zaziya’s influence reached the territories to the west of the Tigris. Apart from his political influence there - as reflected in the long letter of Yassi-Dagan (see above) -, he exercised some kind of authority over Hammurabi of Kurdā, as the letter of Yassîm-El (ARM 26, 405) indicates. When Atamrum laid siege to the city of Ašīhum, Yassîm-El, as a general of Zimri-Lim, who was an ally of Atamrum, found himself compelled to contribute to the siege. The city was defended well by the 1,000 troops under Saggar-abum, the general of Hammurabi of Kurdā. The two parties negotiated a peaceful exit, with a suggestion of exchanging one or more cities. It is important that Hammurabi of Kurdā attaches the condition of Zaziya’s approval to the agreement. Although Heimpel thinks that Hammurabi of Kurdā was overstating the rank of Zaziya as a manoeuvre to oppose Atamrum, who had Hammurabi of Babylon and Zimri-Lim as suzerains, the letter shows that Zaziya’s name was something to be reckoned with. Further, it is undeniable that the Turukkeans were powerfully present in the region:

Yassi-El to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 405)

.... [These things and] more I wrote him. [...] that man came out and [...] and answered me as follows: "[I will cede (to you)] the city of 'Ḫarbe' [on] 'command' of the Turukkean [and release to you that which] I took [from] that city." 'Atamrum answered him as follows: '[If you (= Hammurabi) cede] [that city on] command of the Turukkean, [I will]... on command of the Babylonian or else on 'command' [of Zimri-Lim]. After you [increased (the number of)] cities (to be ceded) on command of the Turukkean, I will increase by as much (the number) of cities (to be ceded) to you. While [we wait for] 'Zimri-Lim', the elder brother and strong ally, who is it that 'splits' reed in my reed hut?" These things and many more his (= Hammurabi’s) messenger answered; and Arrap-ādallaya, king of Širwunum, together with [his troops], and with him 2,000 Lullu troops, his allies, 'will come down', [and] he will lay siege to [the city of] 'Adallaya' on command of Atamrum. May my lord know.161

Še/irwunum,185 which was already conquered by Šamši-Adad, appears now again with a king with a good Hurrian name, Arrap-ādallaya. He too was an ally or vassal of Atamrum, or at least, what he did was good for Atamrum. To be a vassal or ally of an ally of Zimri-Lim, i.e. Atamrum, means that Šerwunum was no more under Išme-Dagan’s authority; it had joined
Qabārā and Arrapha in their independence from Assyria. The location of Adallaya is not precisely known. However, since it was contested between Kurdā (as here in ARM 26, 405) and Andarig (ARM 26, 421), one may speculate that it was somewhere close to a limit of their range of influence. As for Ašihum, it is identified in the region north of Jebel Sinjar. Its former Hurrian-named king Ḥazip-ulme may indicate a Hurrian (= Turukkean?) population in this period. This and its closeness to the territories controlled by Zaziya can explain why the latter should approve its hand-over.

Two other letters from Mari provide significant information concerning the Turukkean presence in the northern Habur region. The first is ARM 26, 128, sent to the king by Išhi-Addu, probably a high-official of Zimri-Lim. The subject of the letter is about Mardaman, and how Qarni-Lim king of Andarig and Šarraya king of Razama entered that place and took numerous prisoners, but later the Turukkeans laid an ambush for them. This clearly indicates a Turukkean presence there and perhaps means that the inhabitants of Mardaman were Turukkeans as well. This is not surprising as Mardaman was known since the 3rd millennium B.C.E., and was rather located somewhere to the west of modern Mardin.194 However, it appears now that it was not so far to the west and north, and was rather located somewhere to the west of Ḥaburūm, north of Andarig and Razama,195 i.e. to the north of the Hilly Arc. Apparently, the reason for this belief is a report

Išhi-Addu to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 128)

Qarni-Lim and Šarraya entered Mardaman. Before Qarni-Lim entered, Šarraya entered' prior to him, 'and Šarraya [captured?] 300 men and [...] women, [and took them to] Ḥadnum. 'Later, when Qarni-Lim' had arrived (in Mardaman), they took (another) 1,000 'prisoners' and shared the 1,000 prisoners between them. Qarni-Lim took 500, and Šarraya took 500. And [...] (2 lines...) and 'the city' [of Mardaman (?)] (he/they) is/are not 'staying'. And 2,000 'Turukkeans' laid an ambush for them. This my lord may know.192

Mardaman, the oldest mention of which is in the OAkk. Period,196 was formerly identified with modern Mardin.197 However, it appears now that it was not so far to the west and north, and was rather located somewhere to the west of Ḥaburūm, north of Andarig and Razama,198 i.e. to the north of the Hilly Arc. Apparently, the reason for this belief is a report

186 According to Heimpel, it was a city of Kurdā: Heimpel, op. cit., p. 118.

187 Heimpel, op. cit., map on p. xxii.

188 Cf. Birot, M., Correspondance des gouverneurs de Qaṭṭūnān, ARM 27, Paris, 1993, p. 144, no. 72-bis, l. 35'-36'. He is mentioned together with another Hurrian-named king of Alilamu (A-li-la-ni-mu), namely Masum-atal (Ma-su-um-a-tal), op. cit. l. 34'-35'.


190 Cf. Heimpel, p. 642.

191 Durand, ARM 26/1, p. 294.

192 Edzard and Farber, RGTC 2, p. 118 with bibliography; Groneberg, RGTC 3, p. 160; but note that both Finet and Birot have put it in the Transtigris region, cf. RGTC 3, ibid. with bibliography.

193 Edzard, D. O., “Mardaman,” RGTC 2, p. 118 with bibliography; Groneberg, RGTC 3, p. 160; but note that both Finet and Birot have put it in the Transtigris region, cf. RGTC 3, ibid. with bibliography.
concerning an attack on this GN by the kings of Razama and Andarig, which indicates its closeness to them. 196 Furthermore, people travelling from Mardaman to Mari passed through Karanā. 197 Some texts associate Mardaman with Ḫaburātūm, which was close to the eastern Habur: A.474 clearly indicates that the two lands could have been involved in the war directly. 198 A.2986 speaks of a peace proposal between Mardaman and the king of Ḫaburātūm, Nanib-šauri. 199

If the restoration of the break is correct, letter ARM 26, 129, gives more significant information by mentioning Turukkean cities in the same region, implying a Turukkean population in the area:

Išhi-Addu to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 129)

My lord ‘instructed’ [me] to thoroughly learn the news of the land. I kept ‘writing’ (to my lord) the news of the land. ‘According to’ what my lord himself perceived of them, [the kings (of Ida-mara)] did not act like enemies and [the agreement] has been established between them. [And] Ḫaya-sumu keeps writing to them all the time as follows: “Since you did not dispatch your troops to Zaziya, enlist your troops now (and) come to me, and we shall go either against the army or else against the cities of [the Turukkean], and ‘together’ we shall ring the border area (with defences).” This Ḫaya-sumu ‘keeps writing to them. And they are not in agreement (with him). This my lord may know.” 200

I have doubts about the restoration of “the Turukkean” (l. 20) because of the fact that Ḫaya-sumu offered here alternative options: 1. “if you do not send troops to A;” 2. “let us then attack the army or cities of B instead.” So fighting the army of Zaziya (A) as the first option would be the same army in the second option (B); there would have been no need to offer this as a second option. The two options should be different targets, not the same. Further, it is not quite certain that “dispatching” troops to Zaziya (as the first option) necessarily means fighting him, for it could be to support him. But even then, Ḫaya-sumu would not attack the cities or the army of the one he intended to support.

There were other rulers (or kings) of cities in the region to the west of the Tigris at this time who bore Hurrian names. In many cases we can assume that their subject citizens were also Hurrians, particularly those to the north, northeast and northwest of Jebel Sinjār, since there was a Hurrian presence there in the periods before the Amorite immigrations. Kupper has compiled a list of Hurrians mentioned in the texts of Mari, most of them in the Hilly Arc and the Habur region. He pointed to the importance of the list as it indicates that “in the time of Zimri-Lim, a relatively large number of the small states of Northern Mesopotamia were governed by Hurrian princes.” 201 Such kingdoms, were scattered across the region from Jebel Sinjār (Ḥaburātūm and Arriyuk’s kingdom) 202 to the cities of Ḥaššum and Ursu in the west,

196 Durand, ibid.
197 Durand, ibid.
199 Durand, ibid.
202 For Arriyuk and his kingdom, see below.
i.e. from the Tigris to the Euphrates, with a special density to the north. Charpin and Ziegler also compiled a list of all the rulers of the Near East in the time of the Mari archives. I have combined both lists, and added information from later literature to include the Hurrian rulers (or those with Hurrian names) attested in Mari texts:

### In the Upper and Western Habur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role/Location</th>
<th>Time/Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aniš-ḫurpi</td>
<td>king of Ḫaššum (Gaziantep)</td>
<td>and Zarwar (north of Samsat and northeast of Adiyaman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iniš-ulme</td>
<td>(capital unknown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirip-adal</td>
<td>(capital unknown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuzukka</td>
<td>king of Šinamum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šadum-adal</td>
<td>Ašlakka in western Ida-marāš</td>
<td>ZL 0-2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šakru-Teššup</td>
<td>Eluḫût (Mardin)</td>
<td>ZL 11’-12’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šennam</td>
<td>Uršu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šepraru (?)</td>
<td>(Capital unknown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šupram</td>
<td>king of Susā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tišnam (?)</td>
<td>(capital unknown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turum-natki</td>
<td>Šubat-Enlil (Apum)</td>
<td>ZL ?-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamarzi</td>
<td>Tarmani in Ida-marāš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takka (?)</td>
<td>Tilla</td>
<td>ca. ZL 4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terru (?)</td>
<td>Urkeš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In the Northeast of Sinjār

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role/Location</th>
<th>Time/Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arriyuk</td>
<td>Probably Kala-a (see below)</td>
<td>ZL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

203 Kupper, *ibid.*


205 Names of those who were not certainly kings or rulers and are listed by Kupper are omitted here; cf. Kupper, “Les Hourrites …,” *RHA* 36, p. 123.

206 The name Aniš-ḫurpi is equivalent to Anum-ḫirbi, the king of Mama, whose famous letter was found in Kaniš. The two names refer to the same person; cf. Miller, J. L., “Annum-ḫirbi and his kingdom,” *AoF* 28 (2001), p. 93-4 (with bibliographical references).

207 According to Sasson, it was within the sphere of influence of Eluḫût: Sasson, *op. cit.*, p. 396.


211 His name seems to be a derivative of the Hurrian verb ar(r)i- “to give,” meaning “given (by the god)” or “Theodorus” according to Durand: Durand, J.-M., *De l’époque amorrite à la Bible: le cas d’Arriyuk,* in
It can be concluded that the Hurrians settled over almost the whole region to the east of the Tigris, to the north of the Hilly Arc (north of Jebel Sinjār), to the Habur, and further to the west to the Euphrates and beyond. One of the westernmost points they reached was Apišal, a kingdom with a capital perhaps at Tilmen Höyük in the Islahiye region, where one of its kings bore the Hurrian name Nawar-atal. It is also noted that the Hurrians were not the only ethnic group in the Habur; Semites were there also. This mixed character of the Habur region seems to have continued through the ages, a characteristic of the area still today. In this respect it is interesting that Kupper discovered that the line that separated Hurrians from Amorites in the early second millennium BC is “fairly close to the limit which today separates Kurdish from Arabic speakers.”

Memoriae Igor M. Diakonoff, Babel und Bibel 2, eds. Kogan, L., N. Koslova, S. Loesov, and S. Tishchenko, Winona Lake, 2005, p. 59. However, Charpin and Ziegler label him “an Elamite lieutenant,” cf. Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 226. According to them, he accompanied the Elamites during their invasion of Ešnunna and Northern Mesopotamia and could seize that part of the territory for himself. However, when the Elamites invaded the region he was already king of his realm. Moreover, it is difficult to imagine an Elamite officer reigning over a territory that his overlords (the Elamite king and his troops) could not hold. Compare the elements aw and kir and the related forms in Nuzi PNs: NPN, p. 208 and 228. Kupper reads Awi-kiriš, ibid.

Kupper, ibid. with bibliography in note 39.

Another king of Ḫuršanum was a certain Zinnugan (ZL ?-5′), whose name is similar to Zinnum, the king of Subartum, who carried out an attack on Ešnunna at the end of the Ur III period (see Chapter Five, Isin-Larsa). It is probable that the two names were philologically related and were both Subarian. Note that the name of the GN where Zinnugan was ruling means “Highland” (< Sum. Ḫur.sag), a name that could be the Akkadian/Amorite designation for (part of) Subartu.

Cf. the name Pūhiya (Pu-ḫi-ia/ Pu-ḫi-a) in Nuzi: NPN, p. 246.

The end of the name is of the same type of Arriyuk; furthermore, Širwunum was a Hurrian populated area.

Although of a slightly later date, a letter from Alalaš (level VII = 17th century BC) relates the dynastic marriage of Ammiqatum of Alalaš with the son of king Nawar-atal of Apišal, cf. Chambon, op. cit., p. 235-6. For his identification of Apišal with Tilmen Höyük, cf. p. 237-8. For the date of Alalaš VII, cf. Von Dassow, E., State and Society in the Late Bronze Age: Alalaš under the Mittani Empire, SCCNH 17, Bethesda, 2008, p. XVI. It is important to note that archaeological excavations showed that by the middle of the Middle Bronze Age Tilmen became an important city, perhaps even a capital city, with its grand palace, temple and other principal buildings; cf. Duru, R., A Forgotten Capital City, Tilmen, Istanbul, 2003, p. 74.

Today there are Kurds, Arabs, Nestorians and smaller ethnic minorities in the region.

From now on a new phase of Turukkean expansion begins. After Zaziya had taken control on the east of the Tigris, he started incursions to control the west of the Tigris and add it to the Turukkean kingdom. The numerous attacks, sieges and raids were one of his methods of exhausting the economy and consequently weakening the political and military structures of the kingdoms there. Once the Turukkeans had captured and dominated some parts of these territories, they could become new bases for further actions. The attack on the city of Asna, only “two and a half double hours” (i.e. 2.4 km or 1.5 miles)\textsuperscript{223} from Ninēt, might be the earliest raid across the Tigris, for it was so close to Ninēt:

Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim (\textit{ARM} 26, 518 = \textit{ARM} 2, 42)

On the 25\textsuperscript{th} day of the month Abum (IV), the 'Turukkean' crossed the Tigris to 'the land' [of...]. And he laid siege to the city of Asna. And 'the city of' [Asna lies at a distance of] 2 and 'a half' double-hours (= bērum) toward (lit. to) 'Ninēt. After' he laid siege to 'the city' he offered it 'peace' but kept [his troops] in place. And he requested (the surrender\textsuperscript{224} of) its king. They did not give to him what he asked for. He (=Zaziya) returned.\textsuperscript{225}

Sometime in late ZL 10\textsuperscript{226} Turukkean troops penetrated as deep as Karanā. Fear of such an attack on the city is expressed by Aškur-Addu:

Zimri-Addu to Zimri-Lim (\textit{ARM} 27, 154)

Now Aškur-Addu spoke as follows: "We both go? As long as I meet with my father (=ZL), 'Haqba-Ḥammu' must hold the land. I [am] afraid the Turukkean 'will make an incursion' and encroach on the land."\textsuperscript{227}

Also in late ZL 10\textsuperscript{228} Ešnunnean troops entered Razama and from there they marched on, but it was not known to the sender of letter \textit{ARM} 26, 390 whether they intended to head to Karanā or to Andarīg. Letter \textit{ARM} 27, 18 reports that 30,000 troops are heading for Andarig, which can very probably relate to the same episode of \textit{ARM} 26, 390. In \textit{ARM} 27, 18 there is evidence of contact between Zaziya and Zimri-Lim, which seemingly concerned the developments around Andarig:

\textsuperscript{223} Compare both Durand, \textit{LAPO} II, p. 259 and 260, and Heimpel, p. 399.
\textsuperscript{224} Durand: “asked for the king (as hostage),” \textit{op. cit.}, p. 259.
\textsuperscript{225} 4) ITI a-bi-im U:25.KAM L[U Tu-r]a-a[k-kum'] 5) i-l-d[i]-i-g-l-a-at i-bi-ir a-na ma-[a-at ... il-li-ik] 6) ū a-lam [?]–As-na-a[k] il-wi ū a-[lum, (=LAM As-na-a[k] A.ŞA] 7) a-na N[ī-z[–nē]-etb bé-ra-am ū zu-z[–a-am ru-uq'] 8) iš-[i] ū a-[lum] ša-a-tu il-wu-š al-li-[ma-a]m iš-šu-sm-ma 9) [sa-ba-am] ū-š-e š-ih ū LUGAL-šu i-ri-iš 10) [ki-ma ša i-r]i–šu la id-di-nu-šu T U-tu-rur-ma, Lafont, \textit{ARM} 26/2, p. 489; Heimpel, p. 399; Durand has [ki-ma ša i-r]i–šu in l. 10 instead of [ku-ma ša i-r-š-š]i–šu, cf. Durand, \textit{LAPO} II, p. 259. After a lacuna of about 17 lines, with references to an enemy and troops at the disposal of the author of the letter, there is a passage about the capture of a city. But it is not certain whether it is the same city Zaziya besieged or not. Durand has “he proposed again a peace treaty” instead of “he (= Zaziya) returned,” cf. Durand, \textit{ibid}.
\textsuperscript{226} For the date of the letter \textit{ARM} 27, 154, cf. Heimpel, p. 649.
\textsuperscript{228} Cf. the letter in Heimpel, p. 336.
In the month II of ZL 11′ a treaty between Atamrum of Andarig and Aškur-Addu of Karanā was concluded. This was an important event aimed against Kurdā and its allies. On the one side were Andarig and Karanā, supported by Mari, and on the other, Kurdā and Ekallātum, supported by Ešnunna. In the negotiations that preceded the conclusion of this treaty many important personalities and kings were involved, in addition to the representatives of the major powers of Mari, Babylon, and Ešnunna. They were invited to observe and probably to witness its ratification. Heimpel considers that the presence of Ešnunnean and Turukkēan representatives was tolerated because the two were enemies of neither Andarig, nor Karanā at that time. He does not agree with Lafont, who thinks that Andarig and Karanā were part of the Mari-Babylon-Andarig-Karanā alliance, because the treaty between Babylon and Ešnunna was not yet concluded. A long and detailed report concerning this event was written and sent to Zimri-Lim by Yasîm-El. What is remarkable in the report is that Turukkû was present, but no mention of Ekallātum is made. If we take into account the growing power and influence Zaziya had in the West-Tigris region, Turukkû’s presence will not surprise us. The section in relation to the treaty is as follows:

_Yasîm-El to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 404)_

…… in Siqdim they all congregated and started talking of the matters between them and […]. Before killing the stallion, while they were talking, [Atamrum] proceeded and, facing the Babylonian (messenger), the Ešnunnean (messenger), the ‘Turukkēan’ (messenger), the seven kings who were present before him and the troops of the alliance, all of them, spoke the following words…..

Zaziya’s presence in the meeting did not hinder his plans for the region. At the end of the same long letter comes the news of the Turukkēans, who had crossed the Tigris to lay siege to Razama:

_Yasîm-El to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 404)_

Zuzuni, a servant of Aškur-Addu, ‘….’ with Yantin-erah. And he spoke ‘a word’ to Yantin-erah as follows: "The Turukkēan crossed. Inîš-kîbal is heading [to] lay siege to the city of Razama.”

This news is also reported in another short letter, which seems to have been written at precisely the same time as this letter of Yasîm-El:

_Habdul-malik to Šu-nuhrâ-halu (ARM 26, 395)_

‘Further’: After I sealed the tablet for the king, news broke. Turukkēan troops have crossed. Inform the king.

---

229 17′) ʿ a-nu-um-ma tup-pi 18′) ʿZA-zî-ia tup-pi 19′) ʿŠar-ra-ia 20′) ʿ Zi-im-ri-ia 21′) [a]-na še-er be-li-ia, Biot, ARM 27, p. 66; Heimpel, p. 418.
230 Heimpel, p. 135.
233 86) [m] Zu-zu-ni ʾR Aš-kur-ʾIM it-ti Ia-an-ti-[in- x x šu]da-a[m] 87) [i] a-na Ia-an-tî-in-e-ra-arih 88) [a-wa]-tam ki-a-am iq-bi um-ma-a-mi 89) [LÜ T]la-ru-ku-am i-bi-ra-am 90) [a-na] Ia-wî a-lîm10 Ra-za-ma10 91) I-ni-iš-ki-ba-al pa-na-am ša-ki-in, (erasure)<<<šu>>>., Joannès, ARM 26/2, p. 261; Heimpel, p. 345.
Razama was not the only target of Zaziya across the Tigris. There are other reports about cities being attacked, besieged and captured, and even about the rustling of sheep by the Turukkeans. We saw in letter ARM 26, 518 how Asna was besieged and later other cities and territories, such as Karanā, Adē, Razama and Ekkāllum, followed. From letter ARM 28, 155 we learn that Azuḫinnūm too was among the cities Zaziya attacked. The letter was sent by Arriyuk to his lord Zimri-Lim, in which he defends himself against the “slander” of Šadu-šarri, king of Azuḫinnūm, who accused Arriyuk of cooperation with the Turukkeans when they attacked his city:

**Arriyuk to Zimri-Lim (ARM 28, 155)**

Say to my father Zimri-Lim: Thus (says) Arriyuk, your son. I heard the tablet my father sent me. Concerning the news of the Turukkeans and the people of Ḫivilāt, about which my father wrote to me as follows: “You have let these people cross (the river) and they pillaged my sheep.” This is what my father wrote to me. Certainly, on five occasions they put insulting (reports) about me in front of my father, and my father listens, while there is no confirmation. As to what Šadu-šarri said: “The troops of Arriyuk went with the Turukkeans,” now, may my father ask (about that)!

I learned about the build up of the Turukkean (troops) one month before. I wrote to Azuḫinnūm, to the land of Burullum, and to Aqba-ḫammū about the necessity of moving the sheep (and) I gave strict orders to Kibšunatar and Yadašūnum, the shepherds (whom) I sent.

He was not only accused of collaboration with the Turukkeans, but also with the Elamites when they invaded the region. According to the restorations of letter ARM 28, 153 made by Durand, he defends himself for not sending his messengers to the Elamite:

**Arriyuk to Zimri-Lim (ARM 28, 153):**

I have not sent my messengers to the Elamite as before. Before, the Elamite took out my messengers to kill them.

Arriyuk was a vassal of Zimri-Lim and owed his position as ruler of a city to him. This is apparent from the repetition of the formula “(you are) my father... (I am) your son” in his letters to Zimri-Lim (see letters ARM 28, 153-157). Unfortunately, no mention of his kingdom or capital city is made in these letters, but according to Sasson, it must have been located in the region of Karanā and Razama. Kupper too located it in the region of Jebel Sinjār, to its northeast, in the neighbourhood of Azuḫinnūm and Burullum; both Charpin and Ziegler agree. Durand thinks that Arriyuk resided in Kalḫu, arguing that the GN Ka-la-a[ù],

---


mentioned in letter ARM 28, 155, as a departure point of a group of people, is one of the different spellings (such as Kawkhum) the Assyrians used to render the name of Kalhu. In this letter Arriyuk complained to his lord Zimri-Lim that a group of people were taken to Mari when they were on their way from Ka-la-ā[ki] and he is now afraid that they may be sold later. To Durand, the passage “There are people of mine in large numbers (that I[?]) made depart from Kal’a to Mari” makes sense only if Kal’a is the place where these people departed from. This is possible, although we are not sure whether Arriyuk resided in Kal’a itself or in a second city with authority over Kal’a which enabled him to send people from there. It is more important that we have the modern place Kalak on the Upper Zāb, exactly halfway between Erbil and Mosul, that forms the main crossing point on the river that leads from the region of Erbil to the western territories, which is still in the region of Kalhu. I would prefer to identify Kalak with Kal’a instead of Kalhu, provided the reading Ka-la-ā[ki] of Durand is correct. Kalak presumably was also a crossing point in ancient times and perhaps its name today maintains the essence of its old name Kal’a(k). In the letter there is a clear reference to its importance as a crossing point, when Arriyuk is accused of helping Turukkcean troops to cross “the river” without identifying which river. In the spring of 2010 an inscribed brick of Shalmaneser I was found in the tell of Kalak that identified it with the city of Kilizi.

It seems that the rulers of the petty kingdoms of the region found themselves stuck between Mari on the one hand and the rising power of Zaziya on the other. They, or many of them, were somehow politically bound to Zimri-Lim, but were not able to resist the demands of Zaziya, and this explains why Arriyuk was accused of collaboration with the Turukkceans, an accusation that seemingly had every reason to be believed.

The texts ARM 28, 153 and 154 date events from ZL 3′-4′, and ARM 28, 155 and 156 indicate events from ZL 10′-11′, according to Kupper. However, Kupper based himself on the mention of the affairs of Ešnunna and the Elamite intervention in Northern Mesopotamia when dating the events to ZL 3′-4′, but the date of the Elamite invasion was later, in ZL 8′ (see above). Among other events the letters of Arriyuk mention that Zaziya was three times victorious in the region of Mardaman, and now needs military assistance to secure the land:

**Arriyuk to Zimri-Lim (ARM 28, 156)**

Previously, [Zaziya], the Turukkean, went [to the land] of Mardaman and was victorious [for the second time]; then he crossed [the mountain], he fought for the third time in Šišūm and he triumphed. Now may my father send me Aškur-Addu so that we can safeguard the land.

It is possible that one of these victories was the one in ZL 7′ or 8′, discussed above.

---

240 Note that the reading of this word as a GN is Durand’s suggestion against the reading ka-al <uš-mi-im> of Kupper.
242 Durand, ibid.; cf. also Kupper, ARM 28, 155, p. 226.
243 Durand, op. cit., p. 62.
244 The finite k is a common Iranian suffix attached to substantives.
245 This according to an oral communication from Mr. Dilshad Zamua and Mr. Qusay Mansoor, both lecturers in the Archaeology Department of the University of Salahaddin-Erbil. One wonders whether there is any link between the names Kala’a and Kilizi.
246 Kupper, ARM 28, p. 221.
Shortly after the conclusion of the treaty mentioned above, presumably in the same month of ZL 11', Isme-Dagan carried out an attack on Nusar, a dependency of Karanā. Later he linked with Hammurabi of Kurdu and attacked Šurra. Around the same time Hammurabi of Kurdu and Isme-Dagan attacked Purattum and Ašan. These events called for Zimri-Lim to react. He moved to Šurra and was there on the 29th of III of 11'; before his arrival Isme-Dagan and Hammurabi seem to have withdrawn. On the 5th of VI of ZL 11' Ekallātean and Ešnunnean troops entered Razama and it became known that they intended to march further to Ḥašarum. This we learn from a letter that Iddiyātum sent to Zimri-Lim. Iddiyātum was right when he reported that the lack of grain was the motive behind the Ekallātean aggression:

Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 513)
I wrote my lord once, twice. I (said) "Isme-Dagan will look for an ally. Now that man 'needs(?)' grain and he will look for an ally for (that) reason alone. He will not quit."

This is an important turning point in the history of Isme-Dagan’s kingdom. From now on, his star began to fade; most of his next movements aim at obtaining grain or rustling cattle. Ironically the kingdom of Isme-Dagan suffered from the same hardship that the Turukkean lands had suffered from in the past, which resulted in their collapse and all the consequent grain shortages. In the month VI of the same year, he conquered the city of Kiyatan and transported its grain to Razama. However, the caravan was attacked by Ḥaqaṭ-Ḥammū and the accompanying troops of Isme-Dagan were forced to flee into Razama without weapons, food or grain. The Turukkeans, forgetting their previous attempt to stir up the allies of Zimri-Lim against their lord, seem now to have helped the Mari-Andarig-Karanā alliance, as long as it was against Isme-Dagan. There are reports of the march of the Turukkeans against Isme-Dagan; the first relates that 4,000 Turukkean troops had crossed the Tigris towards Ekallātām:

Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 522)
And I heard from those around me: "4000 Turukkeans crossed (the Tigris), and 'their sight is set' on Ekallātām." Possibly because of these things, Isme-Dagan [returned].

It is very possible, as Heimpel suggests, that the 300 Turukkeans who were reported to have “arrived inside” the camp of Rakna were part of those 4,000 troops. Rakna was the

---

249 According to Lafont, Nusar was located between Razama and Karanā, but closer to the latter. An unpublished letter (A.1180) too states that it was three steps distance from Qattara (Tell al-Rimāh), on the way that leads from Qattara to Ekallātām; cf. Lafont, ARM 26/2, p. 476; cf. also Ziegler, according to whom it was to the south or southeast of Qattara: Ziegler, “Le royaume d’Ekallatum…, FM VI, p. 268.

250 Cf. Heimpel, p. 139.

251 Heimpel, p. 139.

252 19) 1-šu 3-su a-na be-li-ia aš-pu-ra(a)-am 20) um-ma –an-ku-ma Iš-me-Ša-ga[an] ú-ta-la-al 21) ina-an-na LÚ šu-ú še-em ‘i-sù’-ma 22) i-dam iš-ti-tu in ú-ta-al-la-al 23) ú-ul i-pa-at-ša-ar, Lafont, La correspondance d’Iddiyātām, ARM 26/2, p. 483; Heimpel, p. 397. The restoration of ‘i-sù’-ma of l. 21 is understood as ‘i-ku-ul’a-ma by Durand; however, the alternative of Heimpel to restore the verb ūšašīh, “to need/lack” fits the context better; cf. Heimpel, p. 397, note 380.

253 Cf. the letter ARM 2, 50. Ḥaqaṭ-Ḥammū attacked the troops, but it is not sure whether it was also who deprived Isme-Dagan of grain, because the donkeys bearing the grain were not lost; cf. Heimpel, p. 143.

254 10’) ú i-na a-hi-ta-ia ki-a-am eš-me um-ma-mi 11’) 4 li-mi Tu-ra-uk-kum i-bi-ra-am-m[ar] 12’) ú i-na Ė-kál-la-t[um] 13’) [o]p[a]-nu-[š]u-[nu]-ša-[l]-[nu] 13’) mi-id-de aš-sum an-né-tim [Iš-me-2Da-gan]…, Lafont, ARM 26/2, p. 496; Heimpel, p. 401. The restoration “[returned]" is by Heimpel.

255 Heimpel, p. 143.
camp Aškur-Addu set up near Razama after he left the camp near Kiyatan. The arrival of those troops was announced in the letter ARM 28, 171. This informative letter gives more valuable hints about the situation; it shows that Šubat-Enlil, like Andarig and Allahad, was counted among the domains of Zimri-Lim. Further, it reports that Išme-Dagan left his camp in front of Kiyatan and entered Razama, because of a lack of troops, especially after he realized that Ešnunna had refused his request for more troops. The reason for the refusal was worse than the refusal itself: Ešnunna had made peace with Babylon:

**Himidiya to Zimri-Lim (ARM 28, 171)**

The cities of Andarig, Allahad, ‘Šubat-Enlil’, the land and the troops are well. Four days ago the enemy (= Išme-Dagan) rose from his camp 'in front of' the city of Kiyatan, and he is staying (now) inside the city of Razama. The Babylonian troops, the troops of my lord and the troops of Aškur-Addu-, we are staying in front of the enemy in Rakna, a border city of Aškur-Addu. The day I sent this tablet of mine to my lord, ‘the next day’, 300 troops of Zaziya arrived inside our camp. From the bivouac of the troops of my lord we will block (the trespass on) the fringe of the land of Karanā ‘until’ the intention of the enemy is understood. We sent men of the field campaign to capture an informer, and they captured two ‘men by’ the gate of Assur. We asked ‘them’, and they spoke to us as follows: "Mut-Aškur, son of ‘Išme-Dagan’, brought a visitation gift to Ešnunna. He went to bring up additional troops. They did not accept his visitation gift. And they did not give him one man. They pushed him aside and they dispatched him. Four days ago he arrived in Ekkallātum. The Ešnunnean and Babylonian made peace between them."

This news they told, and I wrote my lord the news I heard.

The information in this letter is confirmed by ARM 26, 523, sent by Iddiyātum, in particular the journey of Mut-Aškur to Ešnunna, the refusal of his request and gifts. It adds also that a high-ranking Ešnunnean envoy accompanied Mut-Aškur to Ekkallātum to organize the return of their military contingent. The same letter relates that Šubatum on the bank of the Tigris was attacked, and that 40 men and women and 100 heads of cattle were captured; but the writer is not sure whether it was the Hadaneans who did it or the Turukkeans. Letter ARM 26, 341 explains why Išme-Dagan needed extra troops from Ešnunna; he heard about the return of Atamrum from Babylon to Andarig. According to Heimpel, he was afraid of the possibility (or knew indeed of the certainty) that he may bring Babylonian troops against him:

---

256 Lafont puts Rakna on the border of the Aškur-Addu’s kingdom: Lafont, ARM 26/2, p. 476.

257 ARM 26, 523, sent by Iddiyātum, in particular the journey of Mut-Aškur to Ešnunna, the refusal of his request and gifts. It adds also that a high-ranking Ešnunnean envoy accompanied Mut-Aškur to Ekkallātum to organize the return of their military contingent. The same letter relates that Šubatum on the bank of the Tigris was attacked, and that 40 men and women and 100 heads of cattle were captured; but the writer is not sure whether it was the Hadaneans who did it or the Turukkeans. Letter ARM 26, 341 explains why Išme-Dagan needed extra troops from Ešnunna; he heard about the return of Atamrum from Babylon to Andarig. According to Heimpel, he was afraid of the possibility (or knew indeed of the certainty) that he may bring Babylonian troops against him:
Yamsun to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 341)
Three fugitives from Ekalattum fled here and told the full story to me, (saying):
"They (= the Ekalattuans) heard about the coming of Atamrum and dispatched Mut-Aškur to bring up Ešnunnean troops."261

The new king of Ešnunna, Śilli-Sin, who was put on the throne in the beginning of ZL 10’,262 decided to break off the alliance with Išme-Dagan in ZL 11’.263 The rupture of the alliance was because of a new alliance Ešnunna had concluded with Hammurabi of Babylon after the latter’s victory over Larsa.264 The timing could not be worse; all other lands were hostile to Išme-Dagan, and his territory had shrunk to only Ekallātu.265 The timing could not be worse; all other lands were hostile to Išme-Dagan, and his territory had shrunk to only Ekallātu.266

The new king of Ešnunna, Illi-Sîn, who was put on the throne in the beginning of ZL 10’262, decided to break off the alliance with Išme-Dagan in ZL 11’.263 The rupture of the alliance was because of a new alliance Ešnunna had concluded with Hammurabi of Babylon after the latter’s victory over Larsa.264 The timing could not be worse; all other lands were hostile to Išme-Dagan, and his territory had shrunk to only Ekallātu.265 The timing could not be worse; all other lands were hostile to Išme-Dagan, and his territory had shrunk to only Ekallātu.266

For this date, cf. Charpin, FM V, p. 232 and 236; Charpin, op. cit., p. 172, note 98, referring also to Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 232 and 236; Charpin, op. cit., p. 172, note 98, referring also to Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 232 and 236; Charpin, op. cit., p. 142, for the letter cf. p. 390.267 Lipit-Sîn, also called Lipissa, was leader of the Ešnunnean contingent in the kingdom of Ekallātu.268


Llipit-Sîn was a division commander, enthroned by the Ešnunnean army to fill up the power vacuum after the Elamites retreated from Ešnunna; cf. Heimpel, op. cit., p. 108 and 647.270

Llipit-Sîn was a division commander, enthroned by the Ešnunnean army to fill up the power vacuum after the Elamites retreated from Ešnunna; cf. Heimpel, op. cit., p. 108 and 647.270

This for this date, cf. Charpin, RA 98, p. 172; also Charpin, op. cit., p. 172, note 98, referring also to Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 232 and 236.271

Charpin, op. cit., p. 172, note 98, referring also to Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 232 and 236; Charpin, OBO, p. 325.

By the expression “blind snake” Išme-Dagan means incompetent and cowardly Ešnunnean troops: Heimpel, p. 549.272

The verb used in the letter is ikkalū; Eidem and Læssøe translate it as “they stayed,” op. cit., p. 55; Heimpel prefers “detained.” Heimpel, op. cit., p. 389. However, in the light of the content of letters ARM 26, 491, 524 and 525, it seems more likely that Lipit-Sîn agreed to let the 500 troops stay until Išme-Dagan could find a solution for the dangers menacing him personally. Išme-Dagan perhaps asked him to wait until peace with Zaziya was concluded. In this case “stayed” fits the context better. Išme-Dagan, on the other hand, cannot have been in a state to be able to detain 500 Ešnunneans. Moreover, what would be the military value for him of 500 soldiers kept by force, perhaps even in prison as the word “detained” suggests?

Another letter from Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26/2, 525) tells exactly the same story, using the same words, which shows how accurate and strict the messengers and spies were in writing reports and choosing words when they transported news. They were passing on exactly what they had heard.

The Ešnunnean troops had been stationed in Razama before the alliance was terminated and it was thanks to these troops that Išme-Dagan was able to keep control over the city. Letter ARM 26, 524 gives valuable details:

**Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 524)**

Haqba-Hammu came from the troops and spoke to me as follows: "Three fugitives 'fled' from Razama in the middle of the night and spoke to Aškur-Addu as follows: 'When we departed (to get) here, Išme-Dagan, together with his troops, started out in the middle of the night for Ekalātu. And the grain that Išme-Dagan transported on his donkeys from the *namaššum* of Aškur-Addu did not arrive in Razama. And his donkeys returned without their load to Ekalātu.' They (say): 'Išme-Dagan is hungry. There is no grain whatsoever in his land'. Further: those fugitives spoke to Aškur-Addu as follows: 'When the Ešnunnean 'messenger', a rider of donkeys, who came up with the son of 'Išme-Dagan' to dismiss the Ešnunnean, arrived in Razama, they (the people) saw him in Razama, and the prison rose up in that city. And Išme-Dagan addressed that messenger as follows: "The 500 Ešnunnean troops must stay behind to guard me! If not, my land will kill me after you (depart). They will not let me live."' Herewith I have written my lord what I heard."

The letters show a desperate Išme-Dagan, terrified by the idea of being abandoned by the supporting troops of Ešnunna. He even prefers to leave his capital city and go with them to Ešnunna (ARM 26, 491) to exile. He told the Ešnunneans that he was not on good terms with his land and, therefore, he is afraid for his life (ARM 26, 524). The only choice he had was to approach his arch-enemy Zaziya, who had besieged a city of Išme-Dagan three months before and captured it, had cut off the head of its ruler and had sent it to Išme-Dagan. This is reported in a letter of Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim.
Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 511)
And the Turukkean seized the city that he had besieged. And its king, he cut off his head and sent it to Išme-Dagan, (saying): "Herewith the head of one who relied on you." 273

Zaziya for his part replied positively to Išme-Dagan’s call for peace and concluded a treaty with him, but it proved it was without a single benefit for Išme-Dagan (see below). The Turukkean found an alliance with the Gutians more advantageous. The same letter states that Zaziya went to Zazum, the new king of the Gutians who had succeeded his father Endušše,274 taking with him his sons as hostages. As a sign of good intentions Zaziya also took with him a valuable gift, the king of Šimurrum, who had been detained by the Gutians but had fled and sought refuge with the Turukkeans. Zaziya in this way was delivering the refugee to his enemy:

Buqaqum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 491)
Zaziya took his sons and had (them) conducted as hostages to Zazum the Gutian. And he carried tribute (to him). The king of Šimurrum, who stayed with Zazum the Gutian in the past and (then) fled to Zaziya, Zaziya gave him up to Zazum the Gutian.275

Zaziya’s reply to Išme-Dagan’s call for peace is preserved in another letter, sent to Zimri-Lim:

Yasîm-El to Zimri-Lim (ARM 2, 40)
Išme-Dagan has concluded an alliance with the Turukkeans. He will receive a daughter of Zaziya for his son Mut-Aškur. Silver and gold for the bride price Išme-Dagan sent to Zaziya.276

Nonetheless, the Turukkean does not appear to have been serious in his alliance with Išme-Dagan, who was as good as a dead horse for him; the treaty lasted for a very short time, if at all. It is surprising that the following letter reports an alliance of Zaziya with Kurdā and with Išme-Dagan, but at the same time relates the heavy raid Zaziya launched on the territory of Išme-Dagan:

Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 526)
The Ekalāitean messenger Isharum, who was detained in Karanā, and Assyrian merchants came and told me the following: "Zaziya made peace with 'Išme-Dagan' in (the form of) a binding agreement. And the gods of Išme-Dagan are staying with Zaziya for (the purpose of) declaring a sacred oath. And his (= ID's) boats remain in Kawalšum. Later, after Zaziya had made a binding agreement with Išme-Dagan, Zaziya dispatched 3,000 troops up to the gate of Ekalātum, and they beat 100 troops (and) <took> [...] 100 men and women prisoners of war. They (= the troops) attacked their (= the Ekalāiteans’) cities (all the way) up to Kurdiššatum. They

273 56) ü Tu-ru-u[k]-kum [a-lam ša il-wa-ú is-ba-at ü LUGAL-šu 57) 'qa₂ qa₂-as-su [i[k]-ki-is-ma a-na Iš-me-Dagan üša-bi-il; 58) [u]m-ma-mi a-nu-um-ma qa₂ qa₂ mu-ta-ki-li-ka, Lafont, ARM 26/2, p. 480; Heimpel, p. 396.
274 An unpublished text from Mari mentions Zazum as the son of Endušše; cf. Charpin and Ziegler, FM V, p. 268.
News of this event was sent to Zimri-Lim by another retainer of his, who had heard it from Iddiyātum, the author of ARM 26, 526, where more details are given:

Yasim-El to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 425)

Iddiyātum wrote to me as follows: "The Turukkeans raided the land of Ekallatum on the other side of the river and went (all the way) to Kurdišatam. They took the sheep of Išme-Dagan, all of them. There was nothing (left) for miles. They carried off (the inhabitants of) four of his cities and beat 500 troops of his." I have written to my lord the news that Iddiyātum wrote me.278

Heimpel takes this attack as the same as the one reported in letters ARM 26, 522 and ARM 28, 171; these letters mention the march of 4,000 Turukkeans to Ekallatum,279 and 300 of them entering the camp of Rakna (see above). However, this does not seem to be the case. First, the figures differ (3,000 in ARM 26, 526 instead of 4,000 troops), and in the light of the accurate reports of the messengers of Zimri-Lim this difference cannot be a simple miscalculation. Secondly, at the time of the attack by 4,000 Turukkeans, Išme-Dagan was still in Razama waging war on Kiyatan for grain and asking for more troops from Ešnunna; the attack of the 3,000 Turukkeans coincided with the time when Ešnunna had already repatriated its troops and Išme-Dagan was in his worst position, approaching Zaziya for peace. Thirdly, the attack of the 4,000 troops was at the time of Išme-Dagan’s conquest of

Kiyatan, which is dated to VI of ZL 11’, while the 4,000 attackers moved in at the end of ZL 11’.280

Was the offer of hostages by Zaziya to Zazum and the delivery of the unnamed king of Šimurrum intended to ensure a firm alliance with the Gutians? Or was it a sign of weakness among the Turukkeans, as Charpin states?281 We cannot answer this question with certainty, but the image of Zaziya as attacker and raider in the heart of Išme-Dagan’s kingdom (cf. for instance ARM 26, 526 and ARM 26, 522) is not compatible with the image of a king in a time of weakness. By the alliance with Zazum, Zaziya seems instead to have planned to encircle Išme-Dagan with a broad alliance, his Turukkeans, the Gutians, and the kingdom of Kuršā his ally. We notice that Zaziya concentrated his efforts on the kingdom of Išme-Dagan: first at Razama (Zaziya’s siege ARM 26, 404); later he deprived Ekallātum of its old ally, Kuršā, by his new alliance with Hammurabi of Kuršā. Furthermore, letter A.649 of Ḥaqqa-aḫum to Zimri-Lim (see above) sheds light on the sombreness of this situation; we learn from that letter that Zazum attacked the Turukkean land and marched to Qabrā and in that march, Išme-Dagan’s men guided his troops. This cooperation between the Gutians and Išme-Dagan was quite alarming. With their backs unprotected, the Turukkeans could not continue on their mission in Qaṭṭara and felt weak (which is explicitly said in the letter). The first thing they did was to retreat to their own land; then they broke the alliance between Išme-Dagan and Zazum by the alliance Zaziya offered to Zazum, accompanied by offering precious gifts that could not be resisted. The peace with the Gutians was very important in the history of the Turukkeans and the region. Only after this treaty could the Turukkeans proceed. Without it, the usual pattern of exhausting warlike conflicts would have been continuing and would have impeded any state-formation process.

From the sequence of the events, we can conclude that the Gutians, trusting in their power, built a widespread state in the OB period. First, they conquered Simurrum, as the presence of its dethroned king before Zaziya indicates. Then they turned their faces towards the north and northeast, where the Turukkean kingdoms of the Urmia Basin were ruling.282 They were powerfully present in the region of Namar and Diyiša, and even intervened in Babylonian affairs when the Nawarite Gutian queen led an army of 10,000 soldiers against Larsa (ARM 6, 27). Even in the time of Zaziya they attacked the Turukkean domains and Qabrā, most probably to enlarge their own domain at the expense of the Turukkeans. It is noteworthy that the Gutians were able to change the power balance of the region so many times with such irresistible power, but never played a commensurate political role. This is, at least, a feeling that emerges when surveying the Mari material and comparing the Gutian role with that of the Turukkeans. An explanation could be that their activity may have been concentrated on those parts of the Zagros that form modern Iranian Kurdistan.

Now, with his rear front secured, Zaziya could attack Ekalētān territory. Lafont is probably correct in assuming that Zaziya took the opportunity of Išme-Dagan’s absence; he was occupied with bringing grain from Kawalḥum in accordance with his new alliance.283 Even so, Zaziya inflicted heavy damage in the regions round Ekallātum, but not in the city itself, which gives the impression that he may have exploited a legal gap in the text of the

280 For these dates, cf. the schedule of the prominent events and related texts given in Heimpel, p. 651-2.
281 Charpin finds that Zaziya was so weak at this time that the powerful Zazum forced Zaziya to deliver his sons as hostages, and to carry a tribute to him etc., cf. Charpin, RA 98, p. 172; similarly, Durand labelled these gifts as “tribute,” cf. Durand, LAPO II, p. 81.
282 See Chapter Six, The Turukkean Land.
283 Lafont, ARM 26/2, p. 471. He also considers this attack the last fatal blow to the ambitions of Išme-Dagan to control the region, ibid.
alliance and interpreted as protection only for the city of Ekallātum.\textsuperscript{284} Another explanation would be that Ekallātum was well defended by battlements and troops, and so to be avoided.

The context in which Išme-Dagan sought peace with Zaziya and placed barges in Kawalūm to receive grain in letter $ARM$ 26/2, 491 directly links peace with the Turukkleans and obtaining grain. Kawalūm, identified with Kalḫu of the NA period,\textsuperscript{285} seems to have been controlled by the Turukkleans, or was at least in the range of their influence, and so peace with them was a prerequisite for obtaining grain.\textsuperscript{286} That the Turukkleans controlled these areas can be deduced from other letters that point to the stay of Zaziya in Ninêt (= Nineveh) ($ARM$ 26, 517) and their raids across the Tigris in the regions west of the river (see below). Raids in the territories west of the Tigris would not be possible until the eastern side was secured and firmly controlled. The image one can deduce from the available data is that the Turukkleans had the upper hand in the regions to the east of the Tigris, with pockets controlled by Qabrā and perhaps Arrapha. The rest of the mountainous regions was under the Gutian, Kakmean and Lullubian hegemony, the last mentioned being the least powerful according to the image deduced from texts. The Turukkleans were present not only in their traditional lands in the Zagros and in the Rāmiya Plain but also in the plains between the Tigris and the Zagros Mountains, i.e. the plains of Ėrbil and Nineveh. The grain shortage in the kingdom of Išme-Dagan must have largely been due to the loss of control over these fertile plains, even today among the best dry-farming grain producing lands in Northern Mesopotamia. The Turukkleans were present, or at least had influence, in the regions to the north and northwest of Nineveh as well, for we learn from letter $ARM$ 26, 405 that Zaziya could permit Hammurabi of Kūrdā to cede the city of Ḥarbe to Atamu. The city of Ḥarbe became a matter of exchange during the struggle for Ašiḫūm, which was located to the north of Jebel Sinjār.\textsuperscript{287}

In the light of these facts, the more likely conclusion would be that the Turukkleans were not driven back to their own land after their revolt in the Habur region. Their revolt was seemingly not completely crushed, but rather they may have remained, controlling a territory and continually enlarging it at the expense of Išme-Dagan. This territory they made the domain of their kingdom that played a significant role in the politics of the time of Zimri-Lim.

The place from which the Turukklean troops crossed close to Nineveh is mentioned as Adē, in the same letter that points to the staying of Zaziya in Ninêt:

\textit{Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim ($ARM$ 26, 517)}

\textit{.… To Zaziya […] of the Turukklean I [asked them?]. The Turukklean army crossed at Adē, [and] Zaziya [is staying] in Ninêt. (They say), "The troops crossed. We did not witness the crossing of Zaziya." I wrote my lord the news that I heard.}\textsuperscript{288}

The range of raids reached the territories of Karanā:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{284} Since the text of the treaty is not preserved one must speculate that Ekallātum was written without māt, "the land of…," and could be interpreted as the city, not the land of Ekallātum, but this remains conjectural.
\item \textsuperscript{286} The assumption of Lafont (cf. Lafont, B., $ARM$ 26/2, p. 471) that the grain from Kawalūm was brought to Ekallātum to be given to Zaziya because his land needed it does not seem likely, because the kingdom of Išme-Dagan, not Zaziya suffered around this same time from a severe grain shortage, as can be seen in letter $ARM$ 26/2 494.
\item \textsuperscript{287} Cf. map no. 3 on p. xxii in Heimpel, op. cit.

\begin{verbatim}
1) a-na [a 'se-er' Za-zi-ia [x x x x x] 2') 'sa Tu-ra'-uk-k[ri]-m aš-[q(a-l-šu-nu-ti?] 3') um-ma-nu-am LŪ Tu-ra-ak-kum[1] 4') i-na A[d(e]-bi-ri-a-m] 5') [i] Za-zi-ia i-na Ni-nē-e[r]6) [w[a-ša-i-dh?] 6') [um]-ma-mi ša-bu-am i-bi-ra-um 7') e-bē-er Za-zi-ia 8') ū-ur ni-ha-tam 9') [e-r-m]a-am ša eš-mu-ū 10') [a-na] be-li-ia aš-tap-ra-am, Lafont, ARM 26/2, 517, p. 489; Heimpel, p. 398.
\end{verbatim}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Yamsun to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 339)

Further, about the sheep and their shepherds, those of Suratan, whom the Turukkeans carried off, a messenger of Aššur-Addu went with Suratan to the Turukkean king Zaziya, and he [...] them as follows: 289 "Just as I have [carried off sheep] from the district [of Karanā] (rest broken)." 290

Another letter by the same writer, to a certain Šu-nuḫra-ḫalu (ARM 26, 340), repeats almost exactly the report of the negotiation with Zaziya, and preserves part of Zaziya’s reply: he warned that he may repeat what he did the first time. 291 This reply underlines how superior the Turukkeans were west of the Tigris in this phase.

It is perhaps noteworthy that the first letter clearly mentions the “king” Zaziya, while the second refers to the “army” of the Turukkeans, two designations not frequently used in relation to the Turukkeans.

Even in the last days of Išme-Dagan Zaziya did not stop raiding his cities:

Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 519)

Further, 500 Turukkeans made a raid below Eklālātum and Aššur and reached Razama. They captured 100 persons and 50 cattle. And nobody stood up to them. 292

Išme-Dagan was ill and his weakened kingdom had lost its prestige. He himself was consequently treated with disdain, according to the same letter:

Iddiyātum to Zimri-Lim (ARM 26, 519)

Išme-Dagan spoke to the Sapheans as follows: "How is it that of all (people) the little Aššur-Addu commands you?" And they answered him: "Should you, a cripple, command us!" The two men who answered him with these words – he set their dwellings on fire. And he carried off 15 men who approached him. 293

We learn from other sources that he had sought refuge in Babylon. He is known to have been in Sippar in month I of the ZL 12th (the 13th year of ZL’s reign) and was probably installed in Tutub. 294

Shortly after, Išme-Dagan died and the rumours of his death reached his former capital; he warned that he may repeat what he did the first time. 295 This reply underlines how superior the Turukkeans were west of the Tigris in this phase.

Further, 500 Turukkeans made a raid below Ekallātum and Aššur and reached Razama. They captured 100 persons and 50 cattle. And nobody stood up to them. 292

We learn from other sources that he had sought refuge in Babylon. He is known to have been in Sippar in month I of the ZL 12th (the 13th year of ZL’s reign) and was probably installed in Tutub. 294

Shortly after, Išme-Dagan died and the rumours of his death reached his former capital; letter ARM 26, 493 reports the outbreak of the rumour, but the letter of Buqaqum gives the details:

289 Thus far following Heimpel’s translation.
The death of Išme-Dagan must have marked the actual end of the kingdom of Ekkallūm, and a main beneficiary from this was certainly Zazziya. The kingdom of Ekkallūm was an old enemy of Zazziya and a barrier preventing him from extending further to the west. There remained the minor kingdoms of the Hilly Arc, who were vassals of the major powers of Mari, Ešnunna and Babylon. When Išme-Dagan was in Sippar, the news of the death of Atamrum (late ZL 11ᵗʰ) reached him. Hammurabi of Babylon took care of the succession; he divided his kingdom, putting Ḥulȃm on the throne of Allahad and let Ḥimdiya keep control of Subat-Enlil, which Išme-Dagan had lost long ago. By dividing the kingdom into two and consequently weakening it Hammurabi seems to have unintentionally served the future plans of Zazziya to further spread and consolidate his authority in the Habur Region.

The Years after Išme-Dagan

It seems that the alliance of Zazziya with Hammurabi of Kurda continued after the death of Išme-Dagan, but now they became part of a larger alliance that incorporated Zimriya of Zurrā (= Šurra) and Hammurabi of Babylon. Babylon was among the powers Zazziya established relations with, to whom he sent and most probably from whom he received messengers. We learn this from a letter stating that the Turukkean messengers who were going to Babylon were held up by Meptum, the pasture-chief of Suḫum. Letter ARM 28, 179 from Zazziya reports:

Zazziya to Meptum (ARM 28, 179)

Your lord and you, you constantly commit malicious acts towards me. You (pl.) have held up my messengers whom I sent to Babylon. Now, the road to Babylon is open towards Arrāpi since I have the steppe under my control (lit. my eyes). It seems that the alliance of Zazziya with Hammurabi of Kurda continued after the death of Išme-Dagan, but now they became part of a larger alliance that incorporated Zimriya of Zurrā (= Šurra) and Hammurabi of Babylon. Babylon was among the powers Zazziya established relations with, to whom he sent and most probably from whom he received messengers. We learn this from a letter stating that the Turukkean messengers who were going to Babylon were held up by Meptum, the pasture-chief of Suḫum. Letter ARM 28, 179 from Zazziya reports:

Zazziya to Meptum (ARM 28, 179)

Your lord and you, you constantly commit malicious acts towards me. You (pl.) have held up my messengers whom I sent to Babylon. Now, the road to Babylon is open towards Arrāpi since I have the steppe under my control (lit. my eyes).
Meptum is reported to have seized messengers of Kurdā, Ekallātūm and also Ešnunna and to have sent them to Mari; such an act against Zaziya was no exception.²⁹⁹ In spite of this Zaziya succeeded in sending his envoys to Hammurabi in Babylon, as letter ARM 6, 33 indicates; it reports requests of Hammurabi for all three allies. His statement in letter ARM 28, 179 that the road to Babylon is open towards Arrapha since he controls the steppe means that Arrapha had come under his control. Letter ARM 6, 33 reports:

**Bahdi-Lim to Zimri-Lim (ARM 6, 33)**

I have asked Abumēkīm about the messages of Hammurabi of Babylon to Hammurabi of Kurda, for Zaziya and Zimriya of Zurrā.

….. And he has sent the following message to Zaziya: "Secure your positions and send your troops (according to the) alliance. Several days ago I asked you about (them) and this is what you answered me: 'I will depart.' But I have neither seen you moving nor crossing yet. Now, let your troops together with that of …. quickly reach me."³⁰⁰

This letter is of historical significance in that it proves the existence of political relations between the Turukkeans and Hammurabi of Babylon in this phase; the date of the letter is 16th XII ZL 12.³⁰¹ The alliance Hammurabi speaks about is the one Babylon concluded with Kurda, Zurrā and the Turukkeans during the final confrontation between Babylon and Ešnunna (Hammurabi 31 = 1762 BC).³⁰² Thus, the river that had to be crossed according to the letter would be the Lower Zāb.³⁰³ Letter ARM 28, 179 provides further interesting information and gives a clue about the range of Turukkean domains in this time. Zaziya struggled for the control of the steppe that stretched as far as Šītullum, which was on the Tigris, upstream from Mankisum;³⁰⁴ more precisely it is identified with Tikrit by Ziegler.³⁰⁵ One may assume that after the death of Išme-Dagan and the capture of Ešnunna in H 31, Zaziya had a free hand in this region and he could expand his territory further. But instead of the kingdoms of Išme-Dagan and Ešnunna, Zaziya was now confronted by the nomads, who had succeeded in crossing the middle Tigris and formed a threat for both Zaziya and Hammurabi of Babylon, according to Durand.³⁰⁶ The term kašūm used to designate the steppe in this letter is understood by Kupper as the Jazīreh, taking the letters of Buqaqum as parallel.³⁰⁷ In the letter Zaziya offers two alternatives. Either one of them would control the steppe, and in case the other side takes it he demands 1,000 *gukallu* sheep in

---

²⁹⁹ Cf. letter ARM 6, 27 in Heimpel, op. cit., p. 484-5.
³⁰¹ While Kupper dates the letter to ZL 9 in: ARM 27, p. 257 and note 291, basing himself on the date given by Lackenbacher in ARM 26/2, p. 376-7, Durand dates it to the end of ZL 12. This seems to me to fit the context of the events it treats better. For the dating of Durand, cf. Durand, LAPO I, p. 532.
³⁰³ Durand, *ibid.*
³⁰⁴ Kupper, ARM 28, p. 258.
³⁰⁸ Kupper translates it as “big/fat-tailed sheep," cf. ARM 28, p. 261.
compensation. Or he is ready to use his military force in case the other party decides to fight, showing his power and determination. This letter indicates that Zaziya’s range of power reached large areas of the steppe:

Zaziya to Meptum (ARM 28, 179)

If you desire to take the whole steppe and the pastures of the steppe, speak with your lord and your commoners. Take 1,000 big-tailed sheep - 500 male big-tailed sheep and 500 tailed ewes - and bring them to me! If you do not bring me 1,000 big-tailed sheep I shall not leave the whole steppe down to Štitullum for you and I shall not let your sheep go to pasture. Otherwise, our forces are in position; you would say: “The Hanneans, another one and (even) a third will join (us) and we will fight (him = Zaziya).” Either you (pl.) take the steppe or I will take the steppe. Perhaps you say: “He attempted a shot then calmed down, the army (of Zaziya) does not have the provisions for a day with it.” It is true that (the provisions of the army) are not abundant, (but) for sure, I would be able to go out in the middle of the steppe for one (whole) month. I am afraid you say as follows: “Zaziya has not gone (there).” I swear (it) by Adad. I went in person. Send me a reply to my tablet, (either) this or that.\footnote{14}  

It is true that the defeat (H 32) and destruction (H 34) of Mari by Hammurabi of Babylon put both lands, together with their vassal states, under one authority, but this unification was not without cost. Moving the centre of power to Babylon in the south, far from Mari and Ekallātum, offered another good chance for Zaziya.

Hammurabi of Babylon became a major power for, after the capture of Larsa in ZL 11’ = H 30 (= 1763 BC),\footnote{10} he pushed further to the northeast and northwest. In his 31\textsuperscript{st} regnal year he conquered Ešnunna and in the 32\textsuperscript{nd} and 34\textsuperscript{th} he fought and captured Mari. The 33\textsuperscript{rd} year of Hammurabi was known as the year in which “He overthrew in battle the army of Mari and Malgium; subdued Mari and its villages. And the many cities (of the mountain land) of Šubartum, (Ekallātum, (all of) Burundum and the land of Zalmaqum, on the bank of the Tigris to the Euphrates); and he caused <them> them to dwell at his command in friendship.”\footnote{31} This formula does not refer to the Transstigridian territories that were under Zaziya’s control; Hammurabi’s newly gained domain was between the two rivers. Charpin’s suggestion is that Hammurabi’s northernmost point in this campaign was the outflow of the Balih into the Euphrates.\footnote{32} Even if he was further in the north he was not yet in the Habur, where we think Zaziya now had the upper hand.
The year H 37 is significant; he claimed to have defeated “the army of the Gutians, Kakmum, and the land of Šubartum.” Although there is evidence of such a campaign to these regions, seen in Hurrian-named individuals in Dilbat some years later, it is hard to believe that his victories resulted in a sustained occupation. Parallels from the past reveal the difficulty of keeping control over these mountain lands. Two years later, i.e. in H 39, he had to campaign against Šubartum again, this time without any mention of Kakmum, Gutium or Turukkum. Their omission cannot be attributed to their being under the firm control of Hammurabi, but rather more likely to their liberation. Support for this suggestion may be the enumeration of the 26 cities Hammurabi listed in the prologue of his Code toward the end of his reign. In the list, from which Charpin says to be able to draw a map of the empire, only Nineveh among the northern centres is listed. There is no mention of, for instance, Qabrā, Erbil, Arrapha, or the centres of the Habur region. The conquest of Nineveh, if true, might be considered a brief relapse in the Turukkian expansion. It is easy to conclude that the East-Tigris region and at least some large parts of the Habur were under Turukkian hegemony by this time. We should not forget to say that the campaign of H 37 might mark the end of the peaceful relations between Babylon and Turukkum, since the latter was included in the list of Hammurabi’s targets. With the disappearance of minor, and even major, polities from the scene as a result of Hammurabi’s conquests, the buffer between the kingdoms of Babylon and Turukkum disappeared. The conflict, struggle for power and expansion between the two became inevitable.

The years after the death of Hammurabi of Babylon are not so well documented as those in his lifetime. A significant episode during the reign of Samsu-iluna was the movement of the Kassites. When the king was busy with the revolt of south Babylonia, the Kassites made their first appearance in Mesopotamian history as a power: they launched an attack on the kingdom of Babylon. The alleged victory of Samsu-iluna over them is celebrated with the name of the 9th year of his reign:

Samsu-iluna, the king, tore out the foundations of the army of the Kassites at Kikalla.

This may mark the beginning of the rise of the other mountainous peoples, following the period during which the tide of Amorite immigrations ebbed and the wave of their progress dissipated. The Hurrians, the Kassites and the Hittites built large empires that overshadowed the Amorite kingdoms.

313 Charpin, OBO, p. 332. For the versions of this year-name and related problems, cf. Stol, Studies in OB..., p. 38. According to Stol, the submission of the cities of Assur and Šitullum to Hammurabi must have taken place between the regnal years 29-32, while Nineveh was mentioned in the final edition of his Code, sometime after H 38, op. cit., p. 39. For the presumable identification of Šitullum with modern Tikrit, see above.


315 Charpin, OBO, p. 332.

316 A prominent Kakmean was mentioned in two texts from Rimāh (OBTR 255 and 261), who received wine. The date of the texts is after the conquest of Mari by Hammurbi and probably indicate a Kakmean role in this region at that time, of which we have no further details. For the texts cf. Dalley, OBTR, p. 185 and 188.

317 For these city names and the order in which they are arranged, cf. Charpin, OBO, p. 333-4.

Samsu-iluna invaded the Habur region in 1728 (Samsu-iluna 22, the year 23 bears the formula) and destroyed the land of Apum, according to the year name:

The year: Samsu-iluna, the king, by force of power which Enlil gave him, destroyed Ša-na (sic.), the capital city of (the land of) Apum, Zarḫum, Putra Šuša, ….-lažia(?) <and> …. Yakunašar ….Yakun-X.319

His victory is also reflected in his royal inscriptions:

The king who subjugated the land of Ida-maras from the border of Gutium to the border of Elam with his mighty weapon.320

Sometime after 1750 BC a certain Mutiya ruled Še-na321 (formerly Šubat-Enlil). He concluded a treaty with Ḥāzīp-Teššub, the king of Razama of Yussan, which was to the north of Jebel Sinai.322 Razama of Yussan was in the time of Zimri-Lim a vassal of Zimri-Lim323 and was perhaps ruled by Amorites like Šarraya.324 By this time, the situation seems to have reversed; the Hurrian Ḥāzīp-Teššub was its ruler and this may indicate that the Hurrian expansion to the west and slightly to the south was still in progress.

Hurrian presence in the Habur region towards the end of the OB period is confirmed by textual evidence. At this time, almost one and a half centuries after the Mari period, Tigúnum appears in the form Tiktunun. Its Hurrian-named king Ttin-Teššub325 became known to us from a few documents, including the well-know prism, familiarly called the Ḥābiru Prism, and the important letter Ḥattušili I of Ḥatti sent to him. In that letter, Ḥattušili (= Labarna LUGAL.GAL) addressed the king as his servant and uses the hypocoristic form of his name, Tuniya.326 The letter is about plans for an attack on the city of Ḥāḫnum327 by

---

319 mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal.e usu gir.ra 4En.lil.le mu.un.na.an.sum.ma.ta Ša-ḫa na.ai urú sag ma.da <A>.pu.um.ma Za.ar.ha.mu.umki Pu.ut.ru Su.ša.ai (ma) .. x la? si-a? Mi.bi.bul.gul.gu.la m Ia-ku-un-a-šar ... Ia-ku-un-x ... Horsnell, op. cit., p. 211-12; cf. also Charpin, OBO, p. 348.

320 3) [LUGAL] ša ma-at 4) [/d]a-ma-ra-at 5) iš-šu pa-at [G]u-ti-um[56] 6) [a-d]i pa-at [NI]M[57]-tim 7) in ka-ak-ki-šu da-nim 8) [a]-ka-[a]ni-ni-tš[6] (Akkadian version), Frayne, RIME 4, p. 389-90 (text no. E4.3.7.8). With the identification of the region “from the border of Gutium to the border of Elam” he appears to mean the Diyāla region, which he subdued before his attack on the Habur. Nevertheless, the formulation of the sentence here is strange; it gives the impression that by Ida-maras he means the lands between the border of Gutium and the border of Elam. If so, this is Ida-maras in the east Tigris region; cf. Chapter Two, under Gutium: Location.

321 For this date, cf. Charpin, OBO, p. 349.

322 Charpin, OBO, p. 305.

323 Cf. for instance letters ARM 27 and 71, where the alliance of Zimri-Lim with its king Šarraya is reported: Heimpel, p. 434. ARM 14, 104+ was sent to Zimri-Lim by Yaqṣim-Addu and relates that the people of the city said that the city of Razama is Zimri-Lim’s: 20) ki-a-um i-pu-lu-šu um-ma-a-mi a-lum3 kir Zi-im-ri-Li-im, “They answered as follows, thus (they said): ‘The city (= Razama) is Zimri-Lim’s,'” Charpin, D., “Données nouvelles sur la poliorcétique à l’époque Paléo-Babylonienne,” MARI 7, Paris, 1993; Heimpel, p. 496; in letters ARM 6, 51 and 52 it is expected that Zimri-Lim will march towards the city to save it from the siege mounted by Atamrum, the ally of Elam in this time; for the letters, cf. Heimpel, op. cit., p. 488.

324 This name was probably a hypocoristic form of Šarrum-kiš, cf. Heimpel, p. 558.

325 According to Wilhelme the name is "tumun=t=b-Teššob, presumably “Teššup has enabled(?)”, Wilhelm, Hurrians in Külepe, Anatolia and the Jazira..., p. 187, note 34. To Richter the name means “Teššup provided (a child):” Richter, Th., Ein Ḥurrīter wird geboren ... und benannt, p. 522.

326 Salvini, “Un royaume hourrite en Mésopotamie du nord …,” Subartu IV/1, p. 305.

327 Not to be confused with Ḥāḥum(?) of the Hittite texts, which was further north; cf. Liverani, M., “The Fire of Ḥāḥum,” OA 27 (1988), p. 165-6. Our Ḥāḥum was located in all probability on the Upper Euphrates, identifiable with modern Samsat (M. Falkner) or Lidor Hüyük; cf. Liverani, op. cit., p. 168; Van de Mieroop, “Sargon of Agade and …,” SMEA 42/1 (2000), p. 135; Westenholz, Legends of ..., p. 250, note to l. i’ S’ and Salvini, M., “Un royaume hourrite …,” Subartu IV/1, Turhout, 1998, p. 305. A recent study has shown it to be located on a high altitude, perhaps on a mountainside, and close to an important river crossing point that must be the Euphrates, but its location whether on the eastern or western bank of the river is not settled; cf. Barjamovic,
both Ḫattušili and Tunip-Teššup, the attack that is recorded in the 6th regnal year of Ḫattušili. From the content and the wording of the letter, one understands that Tikunani was a vassal city of the Hittites. The letter is important also because of the chronology it establishes for Tunip-Teššup; it proves that he was a contemporary of Ḫattušili I, who was, in turn, a contemporary of Ammi-šaduqa (1646-1625 BC) of Babylon.

The prism records a large number of male individuals (438 persons) labelled ÉRIN.MEŠ Ḥabiri (Col. I, 1), “Ḥabiru soldiers/ workers”. The editor of the text noted that the names are predominantly Hurrian, the rest are Semitic and names of unknown origin with one Kassite name, providing a valuable hint to the ethnic texture of the region of Tikunani in this time. Salvini thinks it is possible to count Tikunani among the political entities of northern Mesopotamia, which later was incorporated with the kingdom of Mittanni.

A large proportion of names of slaves from Babylonia in the 17th century were Hurrian. Charpin feels these came from different regions of Upper Mesopotamia, where the Hurrian population seems to have immigrated from the mountains of Tūr-Abdān and exercised pressure on the southern piedmonts.

---

328 Salvini, Subartu, p. 305.
329 Ibid.
333 Charpin, OBO, p. 375.
The kingdom of Turukkû under Zaziya with unknown extensions in the north and east.
CHAPTER EIGHT

A Comparative and Anthropological Overview
The previous chapters showed that the region under study had long been an area of human occupation and where communities became organized into socio-political units. These units were small at first, but developed into one of the earliest complex social systems. The neolithic village communities are among the earliest known complex social systems and socio-political groupings.¹ From then on social classes began to crystallise; specialization had now appeared and consequently the first kinds of hierarchy followed. The forms of organization in these village communities were based on family and kin relationships and must have been similar to the small-scale communities found in Polynesia. There the leaders of communities consisting of a few hundred individuals exercised modest forms of leadership with only a few tasks.² Significantly, family and kin relationships and their involvement in the various functions of production, distribution and legal arrangements were a characteristic of the organization of local communities and remained in one way or another in later states.³

Economic growth and the accumulation of surplus production, a result of technological developments and population growth, led to an expansion of these units in size and complexity.⁴ Indicators of a complex socio-political organization, as listed by Schwartz, are the appearance of urban-sized settlements, monumental architecture, and

---

² Claessen, H. J. M., Was the State Inevitable?, in The Early State, its Alternatives and Analogues, eds. L. E. Grinin, R. L. Carneiro, D. M. Bondarenko and A. V. Korotayev, Volgograd, 2004, p. 76-7. Needless to say, the socio-political organization of Polynesia is diverse; there are small-scale local societies, large, well-organized chiefdoms and early states; cf. Claessen, op. cit., p. 76. The comparison here is made with the small-scale communities.
⁴ According to anthropologists, the ‘evolution’ of communities to statehood developed from ‘bands,’ to ‘tribes,’ to ‘chiefdoms’ and ultimately to the ‘state,’ cf. Yoffee, op. cit., p. 18f. But Yoffee himself and other anthropologists and archaeologists disagree with this model, considering it to have fallen out of use and “an illusion of history,” cf. Yoffee, op. cit., p. 231. They propose instead that social evolution did not inevitably pass through a sequence of stages from simple to complex, pre-state to state, but rather that they were more diverse; cf. Bolger, D. and L. C. Maguire, “Introduction: The Development of Pre-State Communities in the Ancient Near East,” in Development of Pre-State Communities in the Ancient Near East, ed. D. Bolger and L. C. Maguire, Oxford, 2010, p. 1 and 2.
new administrative tools such as cylinder seals and writing. Expanding socio-political units led to the emergence of a new type of political organization, the chiefdom, in which the indicators just mentioned feature. According to some, not only these developments but also competing strategies of different social groups created an opportunity for chiefly lines to be promoted. In this new type of organization local communities are integrated within a single polity, presided over by a paramount chief and an accompanying ruling aristocracy. A chiefdom is known to have a more transparent hierarchy, with simple and acceptable principles of heredity or election for recruitment to offices. It also maintains its characteristics of centralization, hereditary ranking, and differential control of productive resources.

By applying the criteria presented for chiefdoms we consider the socio-political organization of the chalcolithic communities of Ninevite V make them chiefdoms. In his study of these communities in Northern Mesopotamia Schwartz showed how these polities organized themselves into a complex series of rival chiefdoms. Their elites derived their authority and power through the control of local surpluses produced by dry-farming agriculture. The archaeological data Schwartz examined date to the Ninevite V culture from Northern Syria and Northern Mesopotamia. He found that most of the data indicates “social systems of decidedly limited socio-political complexity,” and that the urban centres of this culture were relatively small and usually unfortified. Food surpluses came only from the lands in the immediate vicinities of the large centres and not from the smaller centres. Graves and their contents show a social differentiation, but one that is distinct from that of Southern Mesopotamia. A similar simplicity can be seen in the architecture: no monumental buildings such as palaces or temples are found. Only towards the end of Ninevite V does the situation change into a state organization. Then food surpluses were extracted also from the smaller centres, contrasts in social stratification increased, and monumental buildings appeared.

6 Wright, H. T., Prestate Political Formations, in Chiefdoms and Early States in the Near East, p. 81; cf. also the editor’s introduction on p. 67. Note also Schwartz’s statement that our knowledge about the Southern Mesopotamian activities of the Uruk period and the local socio-political development is still too fragmentary to allow a persuasive evaluation of the transition from Late Uruk complex societies to third millennium chiefdoms: Schwartz, op. cit., p. 164.
8 Chabal, P., G. Feinman and P. Skalník, Beyond States and Empires: Chiefdoms and Informal Polities, in The Early State, its Alternatives and Analogues, p. 58.
9 Schwartz, op. cit., p. 155.
10 Although some of the elements mentioned as criteria are also found in the preceding Ubaid and even Halaf communities, as seen in Tepe Gawra and Arpachiyah for instance (see Chapter One), the lack of one or more elements, especially the urban-sized communities, prevents these communities from being counted among the complex societies.
12 Schwartz, op. cit., p. 156.
It is interesting here, however, to call attention to the significant finds of Tepe Gawra, where monumental buildings, represented by a series of temples, were uncovered. A clear social stratification is indicated by different types of tombs, some of which were even monumental, and different types of private houses, some of which look like palaces. One should also add the municipal services that point to a central authority. These are almost exactly the features of spatial organization by which Wright identifies not only a chiefdom but also a complex chiefdom society. He groups these features into three categories, A) Settlement hierarchy; B) Residential segregation and C) Mortuary segregation. While only further archaeological investigations and excavations can prove the fact that Tepe Gawra was the largest and architecturally more elaborate of the surrounding chiefly seats, the residential houses show a clear segregation, in which high-ranking domestic units of noble elites (for instance the large round house of level XI) are easily distinguishable from other low-ranking domestic houses. The mortuary segregations in Tepe Gawra constitute the clearest examples, with three types of burial (see Chapter One). Furthermore, there are architectural sectors specifically for administration or military purposes, for grain storage, for crafts, for religious usage and for residence.

An even more important point is that these cultural remains are older than those discussed by Schwartz, coming from the Uruk period, not Ninevite V. This may imply that the region of Tepe Gawra was organized in a complex socio-political polity centuries before the Habur region. Such differences in the developmental level and social complexity in different places and in different periods is observable also in other regions. Archaeologists and anthropologists widely acknowledge now that “social change among early societies such as those of the ancient Near East is likely to have been recursive and disruptive rather than unilinear.” There are others, however, who chose ‘multilinear’ models of social change to interpret the variable paths to complexity shown by the archaeological record.

The greatest part of the region under study was covered by the Halaf, Ubaid and Uruk cultures (see Chapter One). Ninevite V was no less widespread, since its pottery is found in regions from Urmia in the east to the Habur sites in the west, through Eski Mosul and Sinjār, and in the Hamrin Basin in the south through the Rāniya and Shahrazūr Plains (see Chapter One). This implies that the whole region under study was organized along those periods in simple or complex chiefdoms. In view of the archaeological data mentioned above, and by applying the theoretical criteria discussed, we can safely say that the societies which produced these cultures were stratified and were ruled by chiefly lines that collected and redistributed the local agricultural surpluses.

The conclusion reached by Schwartz, that the societies of Syria and Northern Mesopotamia were not organized into states until at least the very end of the Ninevite V period, is based on the absence of several pertinent elements and institutions. Among these were the absence of evidence of monumental architecture (palaces and temples),

---

16 For details, cf. Chapter One.
17 Wright, Prestate Political Formations, in Chiefdoms and Early States in the Near East, p. 68.
19 Bolger and Maguire, ibid. with bibliographical references.
writing, urbanization before the middle of the third millennium BC, and the relatively small scale of social stratification and settlement pattern hierarchies.  

The situation changed sometime later. From after the middle of the third millennium these chiefdoms were transformed into urban states. The agricultural intensification, controlled by the elites, probably played a prominent role in this transformation, as Schwartz suggests. As proof for this intensification he points out specialized grain storage emplacements found in many sites of this period. Thanks to the abundant archaeological data from the latter part of Ninevite V, the transformation from chiefdoms to city-states in Northern Mesopotamia is better documented, in contrast to the poor documentation for the transformation to chiefdoms. By the middle of the third millennium, or slightly earlier, the dry-farming areas of Northern Mesopotamia were covered by large, walled, occupied cities and the existing urban centres witnessed great expansion. A city like Leylān, for example, expanded from 15 hectares to 90 hectares, and it was surrounded by a city-wall in around 2500 BC. Similar walled cities appeared in this period in the plains of Sinjār and the Habur, and at Mozān, Hamoukar, Khoshi, Hadhail, Taya, and probably Nineveh.

Harvey Weiss advances the hypothesis that the development of organizational technology to overcome transport difficulties allowed for the mobilization of agricultural surpluses to support endogenous urban and state systems. The urban expansion in the region took place almost two centuries before the Akkadian dynasty, even before that in the Ebāla region. Therefore, Weiss uses this data from Tell Leylān to “disprove one of Childe’s hypotheses concerning the military imposition of urbanism in Northern Mesopotamia, as well as Wheatley’s explanation of northern urbanism as ‘primary diffusion associated with the extension of empire’.”

Although many different definitions for ‘state’ have been presented, most of them represent the background from which, or for which, the definition is made. Economists have an economic definition, which is different from that of sociologists, and so on. However, for our topic, we can simply define a state as “a certain form of organization that exercises power within a determined region, the territory. It is the manner according to which the society has organized its administration.” To further explain this simple abbreviated definition one should add that this form of organization is an independent

21 Schwartz, op. cit., p. 159-62. He excludes Mari from this conclusion.
25 Weiss, op. cit., p. 83.
26 Ibid.
28 Weiss, op. cit., p. 87.
30 For a comprehensive overview of the definitions of the ‘state’ and the different views that see the state as a positive achievement or as wrong and despicable, cf. Claessen, H. J. M., Verdwenen Koninkrijken en Verloren Beschavingen, Assen/Maastricht, 1991, p. 9-18.
31 Claessen, Verdwenen ..., p. 19; cf. also Claessen, Was the State Inevitable?, p. 73.
socio-political one that exercises authority over a bounded territory from a centre of government. The exercise of authority needs legitimacy to be imposed by power. 32 Legitimacy is a concept Max Weber introduced into the social sciences. 33 Such a state must have an economy, be it agricultural or, in some cases, pastoral or mixed. Trade and a market system with taxes form a supplementary source of income beside the main source (agriculture or pastoralism). The society is stratified into at least two classes, with the ruler at its head, followed on the hierarchical ladder by his retinue, officials, administrators, generals, possibly governors, priests and craftsmen down to the lowest strata, the peasants, servants, and tenants. Sometimes a clear distinction between the rulers and the ruled can be made, but more often the transitions and boundaries between the various strata are flexible, dynamic and determined by context. 34 Thus, several requirements have to be fulfilled to establish a(n early) state, what Claessen calls the ‘necessary conditions:’

- There must be a sufficient number of people to form a complex stratified society.
- The society must control a specified territory.
- There must be a system of production yielding a surplus to maintain the specialists and the privileged categories.
- There must exist an ideology, which explains and justifies a hierarchical administrative organization and socio-political inequality. 35

Only with a sufficient number of people can one have a complex stratified society of at least two classes: rulers and ruled. A specified territory in which a state comes into existence may not necessarily be sufficient for the maintenance of the population, so states with small territories may live from trade or conquest. 36 A system of production that yields a surplus is necessary to feed the rulers and the other specialists, such as officials, soldiers (for a standing army), merchants, priests, scribes and craftsmen and the like. In fact, in this system a rich and powerful minority rules a poor and powerless majority.

The importance of ideology in (early) states, lies in the fact that there must exist an ideology “that makes it possible for the less fortunate to understand and to accept their modest position.” 37 But this matter is more complicated; “a readily adaptable ideological background, be it religious, juridical or related to kinship, is a necessary condition for the emergence of the state.” 38 Its role lies in the fact that ideology induces the moods and motivations which induce people to construct states and to give precedence to the central values of their ideological systems over their own interests. Their own interests are subjected to the interests of the state, “and people tend to accept that situation and even to approve of it. People do make sacrifices for the sake of ideological values and they may
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32 Cf. Claessen, Verdwenen..., p. 17.
35 Claessen, Was the State Inevitable?, p 77-9; Claessen and Oosten, Ideology and ..., p. 5.
36 Claessen and Oosten, op. cit., p. 5.
37 Claessen, Was the State Inevitable?, p 79.
even sacrifice their own life in war if necessary. Ideology was of crucial importance not only in the formation but also in the fall of early states. Since ancient times people have believed that some individuals had better relationships with the gods, spirits or deceased ancestors than others had. Thanks to this, these individuals were placed in higher positions to function as intermediaries between the people and the gods or whatever supernatural forces were responsible for fertility, prosperity and protection. A reciprocal relation emerged between these individuals, who became the rulers, and the people. The people offered goods and paid tax and the rulers guaranteed prosperity, fertility and protection through their contacts. This ideologically based position that legitimized the rulers makes them the pivot of the early state.

The religious functionaries, for their part, usually supported the state ideology.

It is important to note that the existence of these elements alone would not necessarily lead to a complex socio-political organization and consequently state formation. These elements should reinforce each other. “When the strength of the factors varied greatly there is every reason to believe that some other type of socio-political organization would emerge—a big-man structure, a heterarchy. If, as often happened, the factors contradicted or hampered each other, stagnation (negative feedback) ensued, and an early state would not emerge.”

Although the ‘necessary conditions’ mentioned above are the elements without which the formation of a state would be impossible, there remains yet another factor to complete the process. Claessen describes this as “the cause that triggers the developments,” that may be considered as the fifth of the four necessary conditions mentioned above. Such a cause varies from case to case; it could be an impending danger, a need to develop irrigation or to protect trade routes that demand a strong leadership, a shortage of food and goods, or the introduction of new ideas and beliefs. Since the factors vary, the duration of the process varies as well. There are cases, such as the Betsileo State, where the formation of an early state was accomplished within 50 years. In other cases, such as the African Mbundu, where all the necessary conditions were fulfilled but a state never emerged. Complex stateless societies are not exceptional; there are societies that culturally and socially are not inferior to early state societies with respect to their territory, population, socio-cultural and/or political complexity. Such complex stateless societies, which are larger than simple chiefdoms and are in some cases at the same level of socio-political development as the early state societies, are called by some Early State Analogues.
According to the discussion above, the socio-political organizations that emerged in the Habur region towards the end of the Ninevite V period were early states: a large stratified population, territory, a productive economy and an ideology that must have been strictly bound with religion. A similar, though not identical, situation seems to have prevailed in the other parts of the region, the Transtigris and Zagros Mountains. The differences may be in the subsistence resulting from contrasting landscape and climate, but the economy of both regions was a combination of agriculture, animal husbandry and pastoralism (the latter by the non-sedentary groups). The early states of the Zagros region were distributed, as in the Habur, on the dry-farming zone of the Zagros piedmonts or on the plains between the mountain ranges. Examples are the kingdoms of Simurrum, Gutium, Lullubum, Turukkum (in the plains of the Urmia Basin) and probably Kakmum (if it was located in the Qala Dizeh Plain). There was a magician in Ḥamazi, who was so prized that he entered the service of the king of Aratta after his home city was devastated. This may indicate a stratified society in Ḥamazi as early as the Early Dynastic Period, in which assumed specialists such as this magician came to the fore. There are numerous allusions to kings, princes and sometimes to generals in the Mesopotamian texts in relation to the region under study, whose names are mentioned in the previous chapters. These different titles stem from the categorized nature of the political organization. Perhaps the Mesopotamian terminology used to describe the rulers of this region mean they were fulfilling the minimum Mesopotamian criteria for a king or a prince. It could be that it was those rulers who could not fulfill these criteria that were generally called “The man of … GN” (Sumerian LÚ … GN). A clear example of such a distinction in a Mesopotamian text is in “The Great Revolt against Narām-Sīn,” where a list of rebels includes the appellatives “King of …” as well as “Man of …”

The allusions to “kings of Šubartum,” and “the (numerous) kings of Lullu” (Shemshāra letters) or “princes of Lullu” (inscriptions of Aššūnasirpal), the “kings of Šimaški” (inscription of Kutik-Inšušināk), indicate multi-leader socio-political organizations. These were political entities known to outsiders as one entity and under one comprehensive name, but ruled by multiple rulers, which can be understood as federal political organizations, perhaps based on tribal kinships. Similar federal organizations appeared in Elam as well. The case of Elam is discussed by Stolper, who thinks that after, and as a result of, the Ur III imperialistic policies political changes took place in the region.
place in Elam. Such policies led to the coalescence of alliances among highland states into larger political units, increasing and consolidating the existing regional and dynastic ties among the constituent widespread lands of later Elam. This resulted eventually in a confederate multicentric state with ranked members of a ruling family controlling individual regional centres.\(^{53}\) J. Eidem is of the opinion that the Turukkan federation is a similar case, involving the same southern forces, but probably in more rudimentary forms.\(^{54}\)

This kind of organization does not seem to be that kind of socio-political organization known by early-state anthropologists as heterarchy. That word applies when the strength of the state formation factors discussed above varies greatly, instead of reinforcing each other, and as a result they produce complex stateless societies in which power and leadership is divided over several groups of persons.\(^{55}\) Federations in the region under study were usually formed to confront threats, mostly external threats. The best example to be drawn here might be the Median federation formed in the NA period to confront the subsequent Assyrian campaigns. In their case, the Medes had only two choices: either “existence under the banner of unity” or “possible disappearance under a foreign yoke.”\(^{56}\) They chose the second option, formed a federation of widespread tribes and small political entities, which later became the Median kingdom, and still later an empire. In a similar way we see that the Turukkan political entities were united in a federation, probably since the Ur III campaigns, as Eidem proposes, but that federation was still needed in the time of the Shemshāra archives, to confront the Gutian aggression. The Lullubian federation too is attested in the period that follows the Ur III period. We assume that the Lullubians were organized in a federation because when Kuwari was instructed to make peace with them and accept their terms for peace, the texts treat them as one political body. Aššurnasirpal II says nothing about federation during his third campaign on Zamua (eponymy of Miqti-adur), when he fought the Lullubian kings Ameka and Araštua. Perhaps his scribes were not interested in mentioning it, or probably the Assyrian campaign was a surprise that left no time for such an organization to come into existence. But it was surely expected after they had withheld the tribute and the corvée due to Assyria. The inscription says:

> On the first day of the month Sivan I mustered (my army) for a third time against the land Zamua. Without waiting for the advance of (my) numerous chariotry and troops I moved on from the city Kalzi, crossed the Lower Zab, (and) entered the passes of Mount Babitu.\(^{57}\)

By contrast the Lullubians were organized in an alliance in the previous campaign (eponymy of Aššur-iddin), as mentioned explicitly in the annals:


\(^{55}\) Cf. Claessen, “Was the State Inevitable?,” p. 72 and 81.


\(^{57}\) col. iii 30) ina ITL.SIG4 UD 1.KAM 3-te-ṣa ᵄ-na 31) KUR Zu-mu-a-a ᵃš-ku-na di-ku-tu pa-an GIŠ.GIḪ.R.MEŠ ma-a-’te 32) ū ERIN.Ḫ.LA MEŠ-a la-a ad-gul TA URU Kâl-zi at-tu-muš 33) ID Za-ba KI.TA e-te-bir ina nê-reb ša KUR ba-bi-te 34) e-tar-ba, Grayson, *RIMA* 2, p. 246 (text A.0.101.17).
Nūr-Adad, the sheikh of the land Dagara, had rebelled; (the inhabitants of) the entire land Zamua had banded together; they had built a wall in the pass of the city Babitu.  

As to the OAkk. period, we have unfortunately not enough data to judge whether there was a Lullubian federation in the Akkadian period to confront the Akkadian aggression, especially in the time of Narām-Sīn. But one expects such an organization to have existed, similar to the one this king faced in Subartu. The latter incident is recorded in the Basitki inscription, where the defeat of nine kings of the cedar-tree region in Subartu is reported.

The situation in Šubartum was, in the same way, similar to the rest of the region. It was ruled by numerous kings and rulers with one probable exception. Since the term Š/Subartu was at certain times used to designate a widespread geographical region, regardless of the ethnic and cultural differences, it may have comprised more than one ethnic group. For instance, the “kings of Šubartum” mentioned in some Mari letters designate a group of rulers from the region of the Upper Jazirah and the mountainous territory to the north and northeast of the Habur (Tūr-Abdīn). That territory does not seem to have been wholly Hurrianized by this time. Rather one expects other ethnic groups still to be living there, such as Subarians. In the MA and NA periods, the Assyrian royal inscriptions mention the “lands of Nairi,” and their numerous kings. Tukulti-Ninurta I mentions in some of his inscriptions the defeat of forty kings of Nairi lands:

Forty kings of the lands of Nairi fiercely took up a position for armed conflict.

He brought them in fetters into the presence of the god Assur:

I did battle with forty kings of the lands Nairi (and) brought about the defeat of their army. (Thus) I became lord of all their lands. I fastened bronze clasps to the necks of those kings of the lands Nairi (and) brought them to Ekur, the great mountain, the temple of my support, into the presence of the god Aššur, my lord.

There were also occasions when these federations installed a king or a king of kings, probably to perform special tasks that necessitated a strong centralized and firm
leadership. The leadership of Pišendēn of Itabalium is a clear example (see Chapter Six). There is also the Subarian Zinnum, who attacked Ešnunna in the last years of Ibbi-Sīn’s reign (Chapter Five). He appears to have been the king who led a cluster of Subarian kingdoms or princedoms, since the text mentions only Zinnum as king, without other Subarian rulers. The allusion to Immaškuš, the Lullubian king of kings mentioned in the Hittite text, is also a good example, assuming the narrative is historically reliable. In the MA period too the Hurrian kingdoms of Northern Mesopotamia in Nairi and Šubartu allied together under the command of Eḫli-Teššup, the king of Alzi to confront Tukulti-Ninurta I:

All the land of the Šubaru, the entirety of Mount Kašiyari as far as the land Alzu, which previously, during the reign of Salmaneser (I), king of the universe, my father, had rebelled and withheld tribute, had united itself under one command. I prayed to the god Aššur and the great gods, my lords, and marched up to Mount Kašiyari. (As) with a bridle I controlled the land of the Šubartu, the land Alzu, and their allied kings. I conquered the great cult centre of the land Purulimzu. I burnt them (the inhabitants) alive (and) the remnants of [their] army I took as captives. I conquered four strong capitals of Eḫli-Teššup, king of the land Alzu, (and) six rebellious cities of the land Amadanu.64

These instances are reminiscent of the Roman office of dictator, when leaders were temporarily endowed with an extraordinary magistracy to deal with military (and later domestic) crises.65

Why did the prevailing socio-political pattern in the mountainous regions consist of numerous small entities, even within the same territory and the same ethnicity, while the model presented by kingdoms like Simurrum or Gutium does not suggest such a pattern? The numerous small entities pattern covered the whole region from Subartum and Nairi down to Šimaški, but was restricted to the mountainous territories of the Taurus and Zagros,66 except for Lullubum. The core area of the latter was the Plain of Shahrazūr, but we should not forget that their land had extensions into the mountainous territories to the east (to the regions of modern Mariwān67 in Iran and perhaps further) and to the north and northwest, where Aššurnasirpal fought Lullubian kingdoms in mountainous lands.68

---


66 Later, in the same region of Tūr-Abdīn, Tiglath-Pileser I fought five Mušku kings in the Kašiyari Mountains, cf. Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 14 (text A.0.87.1).

67 Salmaneser III mentions “the sea” of inner Zamua in his annals, a sea identified with Lake Zirēbâr near Mariwān, or Lake Urmia; cf. Chapter Two.

68 For details, cf. the annals of Aššurnasirpal II in Grayson, RIMA 2.
The water sources in this region are basically springs, which can support limited communities and limited irrigated cultivation, as happens nowadays.69 The springs themselves are quite numerous but small in size and the quantity of water they supply is limited. The agricultural lands as well are restricted to the foothills and narrow strips of plain lands between the mountain ranges. Elsewhere there are either bushes (that need much labour to make the land suitable for cultivation) or it is rocky terrain that cannot be cultivated. These two factors, especially water resources, have imposed a pattern of settlements that is marked by small sized, scattered and isolated units with self-sufficient communities. Furthermore, the rugged landscape, intersected by endless mountain chains and water courses, has increased the isolation and independence of these communities. The positive side of this pattern is that it guarantees the survival of the population thanks to four factors: a) self-sufficiency: agriculture and animal husbandry of a small settlement and the natural wild products of its surroundings can produce and provide almost everything it needs to feed its population, a characteristic of the Kurdish villages even now; b) the natural defence the mountainous territory offers: for comparison, the demolition of the city walls of Southern Mesopotamia by Sargon of Agade, to prevent them from revolt again by depriving them of their defences, was impossible in these regions; c) casualties caused by natural disasters remain limited in number and range because the population lives in small groups and is scattered over a wide area, in contrast to a similar disaster in a large urban centre; d) in the same way, an attacking enemy can kill or capture only a limited number of the population; in addition scattered groups can warn other neighbouring settlements to flee before the arrival of enemy troops. The modern village communities of the region are tied with each other in a web of social relations70 and family relations, which seems a good parallel to the situation in antiquity. If this is correct, the ancient villagers would have been more eager and serious about warning each other in times of impending danger.

Nonetheless, this has also negative sides. Such a pattern cannot build a powerful united kingdom based on centralized administration. The self-sufficiency and independent life-style weakens centralization trends and undermines any attempt at unification. The difficulty of communications and interruptions because of the ruggedness of landscape and severity of climate, be it winter snow or spring-time fast-flowing currents,71 hinder the emergence of any effective central administration on the one hand, and ease the dismemberment of a state on the other, should one or more elements decide to separate. Another negative side is that small scattered communities do not have the same chances as large communities have to grow into more complex institutionalised societies comparable to those known in the large urban centres. Here, less complex societies with less specialization appear. The result of these negative sides is a politically passive socio-political pattern that is not taking part in the power games

69 In the mountainous regions small fields of vegetables are irrigated by spring waters gathered in cisterns specially built for that purpose. These fields, which have to be below the level of the spring and the cistern, are called barāw, “below-water.” They are much more expensive than dry-farming fields because they are limited.

70 Barth, F., Principles of Social Organization in Southern Kurdistan, Oslo, 1953, p. 16.

71 Both cases are attested in, for instance, the Shemshāra letters. The first by the retainer Kušiya of Šamšī-Adad, who could not reach his lord when the routes from Šušarrā to Šubat-Enlil were snowbound. The second by Išme-Dagan, who could not pursue the Turukkeans further because the river flooded. For the texts and translations, cf. Chapters Six (1 = SH 809) and Seven (ARM 4, 23).
the communities of the plains play, unless there is a catastrophe that pushes them towards
the plains, such as famine, drought, earthquake or an outbreak of an epidemic. In some
cases, these regions were a strategic extension of plain polities. The relationship of Urkeš
with the north is one of these.\textsuperscript{72} The material culture of Urkeš shows a culture whose
cradle was in the old rural Hurrian communities of the northern highlands, in northern
and eastern Anatolia. This is likely evidence that the Hurrians of Urkeš came from these
highlands and have kept their ties with their kinsmen there. It seem that the Turukkeans
had similar ties later in the OB period with the eastern and northeastern mountains. When
the Gutians attacked them from the rear, while the Turukkean troops were on duty in Qaṭṭara, they were compelled to withdraw. In a letter to Ḫaqba-ahum, they wondered
whether they should leave the lands they currently held and go to the mountains. The idea
of going to the mountains to live when their current holdings were lost can very probably
be a reflection of the association the Turukkeans felt with their ‘original homeland’ in the
Zagros Mountains. In the letter they said:

The Gutians threaten us, yes; we are ourselves for sure in a position of
weakness now. Facing the Gutians, are we going to abandon our homes? The
Gutians arrive now indeed. Shall we be driven out of everywhere we currently
hold? Shall we reach the mountains? Shall we look for a soil to live on? And
you, that is it?\textsuperscript{73}

The absence of allusions to the pattern of small scattered polities in relation to
Simurrum and Gutium can be taken as a sign of their being what can be called one-unit
states. This is quite possible in fact inasmuch as their lands were not mountainous; rather
they were located in the plains of modern Garmiyān. Although still largely a dry-farming
zone, Simurrum was a state centred on a central city located at the junction of a river with
its tributary (see Chapter Five). The plain landscape and the rivers were ideal for
effective communications needed for the administration of a state\textsuperscript{74} and, as H. Weiss
stated, important for the nucleation of population and settlements.\textsuperscript{75} The same must be
valid for other states we know little about, such as Karhar and probably Ḫumurtum,
assuming the latter was an independent polity. As to Gutium, the case is somewhat
complicated. The Gutians lived in a region to the north of Simurrum up to the Lower Zāb,
probably including Arrapha and Gasur, but they seem also to have had extensions in
relatively large parts of modern Iran, as far as Luristan to the south of Kirmashān (see
Chapter Two). This extension to Iran is assumed from OB period evidence, from
incursions made into the Turukkean core land, presumably into the Urmia Basin (Chapter
Six), and also from the Gutian Queen Nawarītum, who fought the Elamites and once led
an army of 10,000 troops towards Larsa (see Chapters Two and Seven). Unfortunately no
Gutian cities are known to us except for an allusion in the MA royal inscriptions to
“cities” in the land of Uquma/enu, a Gutian kingdom in that period (see Chapter Three).

\textsuperscript{72} Touched upon by M. Kelly-Buccellati in Kelly-Buccellati, M., “Urkesh and the North…,” \textit{SCCNH} 15

\textsuperscript{73} For the transliteration and bibliographical reference, cf. Chapter Seven.

\textsuperscript{74} The use of the river in Simurrum for communication is pointed to in the Sumerian proverb “Between the
basket and the boat (are) the fields of Simurrum,” cf. the discussion on this in Chapter Five.

\textsuperscript{75} Weiss, H., “Civilizing” the Habur Plains: Mid-Third Millennium State Formation at Tell Leilan,”
\textit{Resurrecting the Past, A Joint Tribute to Adnan Bounni}, eds. P. Matthiae, M. Van Loon and H. Weiss,
This absence is more probably a reference to the non-sedentary life-style of the Gutians,\textsuperscript{76} as the modern Jâf tribes were until a century ago.\textsuperscript{77} Although there is no explicit textual reference to plurality of kings among the Gutians, we have already suggested in Chapter Three that there was a great Gutian king who was king of a number of minor kings or tribal chiefs. This kind of hierarchy was, we think, not due to a direct geographical factor in this case, but more probably was due to the semi-nomadic lifestyle of the Gutians. Yet the absence of any mention of plurality may indicate that the geographical conditions in their land had helped this great king to strengthen his administration and consolidate his authority to a degree that he overshadowed the junior kings under him; hence they were not mentioned. That a nomadic people formed a powerful state that was able to conquer other countries should not surprise us, for there are numerous other examples in history, as Kradin states: “nomads have many times united into political formations and created great empires which have after time disintegrated.”\textsuperscript{78}

The situation is reversed in the Gutian kingdom of Uqumenu. Tukulti-Ninurta I campaigned against this kingdom in his first regnal year. Since the territory of this kingdom was mountainous, as the text clearly states, it has left its effect on the socio-political organization. The text speaks here of a federation of numerous princes led by the king Abulê. The geographical conditions seem to have changed even the lifestyle of the Gutians of this kingdom, from a non-sedentary people to a sedentary one with fortified cities. For convenience and exactness, the text is cited below:

\textit{[At the beginning of] my sovereignty I marched to the land of the Uq[umenu]. The entire land of the Qu[utu] [I made (look) like] ruin hills (created by) the deluge (and) I surrounded their army with a circle of sandstorms. At that time they \textit{banded together} against my army in rugged (and) very mountainous terrain. They fiercely took up position for armed conflict. Trusting in Aššur and the great gods, my lords, I struck (and) brought about their defeat. I filled the caves and ravines of the mountains with their corpses. I made heaps of their corpses \textit{[like grain piles]} beside their gates. Their cities I destroyed, ravaged, (and) turned into hills. （…） (Thus) I became lord of the extensive land of the Qu[utu]. With joy and excellence I stood over them. The hordes of princes of Abulê, king of the land of Uqumenu, I captured (and) brought them bound to my city, Aššur. I made them swear by the great gods of heaven (and) underworld… The land of the distant Qu[utu], the paths to which are extremely difficult and the terrain of which \textit{[is unsuitable]} for the movement of my army …}\textsuperscript{79}
That the Gutian territory at this time extended to mountainous regions in the north is indicated by the inscription of Šalmaneser I, who claims to have destroyed their land from the border of Urua ri (= later Urartu) to Kutmuḫu (see Chapter Two).

Eidem and Læssøe noted that Kuwari did not receive orders from his overlord, King Pišendēn, as was the case with the subjects of Šamšī-Adad and Zimri-Lim for instance. Instead he received requests, imprecations and words of advice. 80 Now that we have discussed the socio-political situation in the Zagros Mountains, we can understand this contrast. In a region where political unity and social integrity were fragile, a flexible and soft policy was the ideal means to maintain alliances and cordial relations between groups. This certainly contributed to the formation of the socio-political mentality in this region, as is reflected in the diplomatic language used in the Shemshāra letters of the Pre-Assyrian domination phase. There one notes, for instance, the parity relationship not only in the traditional addressing of each other as “brother,” but also in the sequence of persons. The sender always mentions the addressee before himself. Moreover, the word brother, symbolizing parity and equality, had a special position in these letters and in the Hurrian society in general, for so many Hurrian PNs have the component šen, ‘brother.’ Examples can be found in the introductions of the Shemshāra letters. The letter no. 34 = SH 826 from Šin-īšme’anni begins first of all with news of the brother of Kuwari, then with his own news, followed by referring to the house and wife: “Secondly: your brother who loves you, and I who love you are well, and [your] house [is well], but Šipšarri, your maid ….” Note here that “I” follows “he,” in contrast to the letters sent by Assyrians. Letter 35 = SH 822 similarly states, “The king is well. The city of Kunšum, your brother, your estate, your wife, and your sons, and I who love you, are well.” 81 The sequence shows brother directly after the king and the capital, before the estate and even before the sons, and “I” comes in the very end.

The patterns discussed above lead to the conclusion that there were three types of socio-political organization in the region: the small scattered polities, the one-unit polity, and a nomadic type of polity. According to parallels from later times, the nomadic type must have consisted of groups and sub-sections bound by kinship that moved between winter and summer resorts on fixed tracks. These resorts can be as much as 250 km apart; 82 for example the winter resorts of a section of the Jāf are located in Qizil-Ribāt near Khanaqīn and the summer resorts round Halabja. 83 Another Jāf section, the Mika’ili, had the habit of moving between Sangāw and Bāneh in modern Iranian Kurdistan. 84 Such movements must have caused confusion for ancient Mesopotamians in determining the homelands of these nomads. Such nomadic and semi-nomadic movements were, and still are today, the cause of considerable overlap and interference of tribal domains, and consequently the names of lands were mostly derived from ethnonyms.

8) KUR Qu-ti-i né-su-ti ša ar-ḫu-šu-nu šu-ḫu-qa-ma a-na me-te-eq um-ma-ni-ia 9) [lā 新闻网], Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 234-5 (text A.0.78.1).
80 Eidem and Læssøe, op. cit., p. 27.
81 For the transliterations of both letters, cf. Chapter Six.
82 Barth, op. cit., p. 35.
84 Edmonds, C. J., Kurds, Turks and Arabs, Oxford, 1957, p. 147.
One concludes, then, that the conditions in the region under study, particularly
the mountainous regions, would have remained as small scattered polities or petty-states if
there was no influence or threat from the southern powers. The conditions there would
not necessitate a larger and more complex system than those small units, but the threat
from the major powers compelled them to organize themselves in confederations and
state conglomerations that developed into larger far-flung states. Some of these large
unified kingdoms, like the Gutian, Simurrian and Turukkian kingdoms, covered large
areas, almost the whole region under study, as with Turukkum. Under other
circumstances, the organization of the northern communities would have remained as
small-scale socio-political polities, best suited to dispersed populations in mountainous
regions. As discussed above, the dependence of the population of the region on rain for
cultivation and springs for personal use and small-scale irrigated agriculture meant the
population had to live in small scattered communities. This is true with the exception of
some relatively large communities in the urban centres of the Habur and Erbil-Kirkuk
Plains. Harvey Weiss is correct when he notices that the absence of enough navigable
rivers in the region as a whole has made them dependent on inefficient land transport,
which constrained the nucleation of populations and settlements.

There existed, of course, peaceful relations between the highlands and the plains of the
region. There is textual evidence of, for example, Lullubeans doing business in Gasur,
Arrapha and Nuzi (see Chapter Two), and of commoners from Qattunan going to
Subartum in search of work and food in some Mari letters (ARM 27, 26 and ARM 27,
80). This was not always by individuals but happened in large groups as well. The
Turukkian migration from their assumed land in the Urmia Basin and the Azerbijan
region to the plains of Erbil and Kirkuk and later to the Habur is a good example (see
Chapter Seven). A good parallel to this episode may be the expansion of the Kurdish
Dizayee tribe around one and a half centuries ago. According to oral traditions, they
originate from the same region. They began to penetrate the Iraqi side of Kurdistan to the
Erbil Plain, taking the villages and lands as far as those close to the Tigris banks, where
they were checked back by the Arab tribes. The Turukkian expansion into Northern
Transstiris and Northern Mesopotamia (including Northern Syria) must have been a
similar episode, but it was apparently wider ranging and more successful; they reached
Nineveh and then the Habur cities. The Gutian insistence on crushing the Turukkian
power as recorded in the Shemshira and the Mari letters must have been a reaction to the
Hurrian (= Turukkian) penetration into the Gutian territories in the plains of modern
Kirkuk. The later Hurrianized cities of Nuzi, Arrapha, Kurruhani and others indicate that
the Hurrians won the struggle in the end.

The Urmia Basin and the Azerbijan region had always been densely populated places
(including in the OB period), for they were agriculturally rich and productive. The factor
that pushed the Turukkians out of their land into the regions of Raniya and further west

85 Or ‘micro-states’ as Yoffee calls the early, territorially small states, cf. op. cit. p. 17.
86 For this, cf. Weiss, “‘Civilizing’ the Habur Plains.....”, p. 387 (with bibliography). Weiss’s statement is
about the Habur, but it is also true for the whole region under study in general.
87 For these letters, cf. Heimpel, Letters to the King of Mari, p. 420 and 438.
88 Cf. also:
[al-^Azzawi, A., Tribes of Iraq, vol. 2: Kurdish Tribes, p. 336 (in Arabic; online PDF version: www.al-
mostafa.com)], who points only to their Iranian origin.
seems to have been the Gutian warfare against their kingdoms and its consequences, as documented in the Shemshāra letters.⁸⁹ In these events, the Rāniya Plain played a crucial role: it was the source of foodstuff for the lords of the Turukkean kingdom,⁹⁰ the destination of the refugees and, most importantly, the place where the spark of the Turukkean uprising was lit.⁹¹

Although we think that the name Turukkeans was applied in the documents of this period to the Hurrians in general, not exclusively to the refugees and deportees from Utūm (see Chapter Seven), those who were refugees and deportees must have played an important role in the cultural exchange. One expects, as Eidem and Læssøe do,⁹² that they have maintained contacts with the other Turukkeans who remained in the Zagros or the Urmia Region, and through this mutual relationship many cultural elements must have been exchanged between the two regions, the homeland and the new land they settled, in other words, between Northwestern Iran and Northern Mesopotamia. It is important to note in this regard that with the considerable expansion of the Turukkeans to the west under Zaziya, Itabalḫum still was a prestigious name; Zaziya bore the title ‘nuldaḫ of Itabalḫum’ on his seal, the impression of which is found in Mari (see Chapter Six). This further proves the close relations they maintained with their homeland.

The widespread kingdom the Turukkeans built in the Mari period under the leadership of Zaziya must have played a significant cultural role in addition to its political role. The kingdom that stretched from the Habur region across the Hilly Arc and the mountains to the north of it, to the east Tigris Plains probably as far as the Turukkean homeland in Urmia Region (with certain enclaves for other non-Turukkeans), was a unifying factor. Such a kingdom, that provided a political framework for the whole region mentioned must have facilitated the transport and exchange of cultural elements as well as goods and products. However, it is difficult to imagine that the unification of the different Turukkean tribes and clans which resulted in such an extensive state was achieved by war alone. Domestically the Turukkeans could have reached some kind of agreement, with reconciliation where necessary, to achieve a unity. Here it is appropriate to cite the example of the Hasanwaihi state, centuries later in the Eastern Zagros region, and to offer an overview of its comparable features.

The Hasanwaihi state was founded by two generals, Wandād and Ghānim, sons of Ahmed, in the 10th century AD; it lasted until the beginning of the 11th century.⁹³ These were generals of troops mobilized from Barzikāni Kurds who succeeded in the conquest of large parts of western Iran, including the regions of Dīnawar, Hamadān, Nihāwand, Şamghān, districts in Azerbaijan as far as Shahrazūr for a period of some 50 years.⁹⁴ After the death of the two brothers (Wandād in 349 AH / AD 960 and Ghānim in 350 AH / AD 961), their nephew, Hasanwaih bin al-Hussain al-Kurdi, replaced them and ruled the

---

⁸⁹ Eidem and Laessoe, The Shemshāra Archives I., p. 28.
⁹⁰ This does not contradict the fact that the Urmia Basin was rich and fertile if we remember that the region was under Gutian threat and their grain, the Shemshāra letters state, was set on fire on three or four successive years.
⁹¹ The spark for the general Kurdish uprising against the former Iraqi regime in 1991 was also lit in Rāniya, which is a striking similarity.
⁹² Eidem and Læssøe, ibid.
kingdom until 369 AH / AD 979. When Hasanwaih extended his sway westwards to Shahrazūr, the Buwaihids under Muʿiz ad-Dawla felt worried about his ambitions and sent troops to Shahrazūr under the command of Yanal Kush to push him back to the east. Hasanwaih, however, defeated this army by cutting off its way to the west of Erbil. Although the Buwaihid sultan sent another army against him and succeeded in plundering and burning the city of Dinawar, he was finally compelled to make peace with Hasanwaih. In 356 AH / AD 967, the war broke out again between Hasanwaih and the Buwaihid sultan Bakhtyar, son of Muʿiz ad-Dawla, but the victory of Hasanwaih was soon followed by peace in the year after. As a result of this peace, and at the demand of Hasanwaih, both parties undertook a successful attack on the Hmadānids of Northern Syria to take over their territories up to the Upper Zāb by Hasanwaih. In 359 AH / AD 970, Rukn-ad-Dawla, the Buwaihid sultan, ordered his vizier Ibn al-ʿAmīd, to march against Hasanwaih, but Ibn al-ʿAmīd died in Hamadān, so his son made peace with Hasanwaih. The war broke out again in 377 AH / AD 987, the Buwaihid sultan Sharaf ad-Dawla sent his troops against Badr, but the latter inflicted a bitter defeat upon the army of the sultan. As a result of this victory he expanded his kingdom by controlling the jibāl (= mountains) province and became stronger. Later, in 388 AH / AD 998, he was endowed the title nāṣir al-dīn wad-dawla (protector/aid of religion and state) by the Abbasid Caliph Al-Qādir, which was a highly esteemed and prestigious title. Badr remained a powerful influential king until he was killed by some of his soldiers in 405 AH / AD 1014 during the siege of Kusjad. Towards the end of his reign, the kingdom comprised Sābūr Khwāst, Dīnawar, Burūjird, Nihāwand, Asadābad, Qarmīsīn (= Kirmashān), several districts of Ahwāz, in addition occasionally to Shahrazūr.

---


[al-Hashimi, op. cit., p. 735].

[ Ibn al-Athīr, op. cit. p. 319].

[ Ibn al-Athīr, op. cit., p. 83].


[ Ibn al-Athīr, op. cit., p. 388].

[ Ibn al-Athīr, op. cit., p. 430].

[ Ibn Kathīr, op. cit., vol. 15, p. 478 and 557].

[ Ibn al-Athīr, op. cit., vol. 8, p. 83].

Or Kusjad, according to Sharfkhān: ibid.
The history of this kingdom is interesting. Its founders were military generals. If our interpretation of the word *nuldān(um)* as a military title held by the Turukkeans is correct (see Chapter Six; the use of *hanīzārum* is probably another military title), it would offer a good parallel to the military positions the Turukkean chiefs occupied. The Hasanwaihi state is also a good example of a state that could cover such a vast territory, from Susiana (= Ahwāz) to Azerbaijān and Shahrazūr up to the Upper Zāb, including rugged mountainous regions. However, one important note is that the centre of power of this kingdom was not in a mountainous region, rather in the plains of Hamadān and Kirmāshān. Similarly, the capital of the Turukkeans must have been located somewhere in the plains of Urmia region. More important is that the lands round the Hasanwaihi kingdom were also populated by the Barzikāni Kurds, the same tribe of the ruling family, as indicated for instance by the mention of the revolt of the Barzikāni chieftain, whose domain was near Qumm.\textsuperscript{104} This fact points to the ethnic extension of these tribes to regions as far north as modern Tehran, providing a strategic ethnic depth for the state. From the west, towards Qarmīšīn and Hulwān, another Kurdish tribe, the Shadhinjān, particularly the c\textsuperscript{Annāzīd}\textsuperscript{105} family, had been rivals of the Hasanwaihids for as long as anyone could remember.\textsuperscript{106} One may assume that the rivalry with the Shadhinjāns to their west was one of the reasons why the Hasanwaihids remained inside the Eastern Zagros, except for Shahrazūr and the Upper Zāb in the north. Had they been able to bring the Shadhinjāns to their side they would probably have extended their rule to most of the western Zagros. The Turukkeans on their part seem to have crossed this obstacle, either by warfare or by peaceful means or simply thanks to more ethnic homogeneity of their region of influence.

A good example of a powerful extensive state in the same region under study is the Sorān princedom. This princedom was founded sometime in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century AD, but reached its zenith under Prince Muhammed Rawāndīzī, who ruled from AD 1808 or 1813 until 1836.\textsuperscript{107} Thanks to his political, organizational and military abilities, he became within a few years “the most prominent prince in Kurdistan”\textsuperscript{108} and his princedom was the most powerful one at that time.\textsuperscript{109} He commenced by conquering the small principalities to the north of Rawāndiz: Bradōst (1816), Lītan and Shirwān.\textsuperscript{110} Then he conquered Margawar, Mahābād, Lahījān and probably Shinō (= Ushnawiyeh)\textsuperscript{111} on the Iranian side. Afterwards he conquered Erbīl and Pīrdē (= Altun Koprić), probably in 1824,\textsuperscript{112} and took the districts of Hārīr, Rāniya and Köy Sanjaq, which were under the rule of the Babān princedom. By now he had reached the Lower Zāb. In 1833 he began his campaign on Behdīnān princedom and its capital Amēdī. First he took Akrē (c\textsuperscript{Aqrāh}) by force, a decisive victory that made Amēdī surrender without a fight.\textsuperscript{113} This victory ended the rule of the Behdīnān princedom, and Prince Muhammed marched towards

\textsuperscript{104} Cahen, *ibid.*
\textsuperscript{105} Or c\textsuperscript{Ayyārid}, according to others.
\textsuperscript{106} Cahen, *ibid.*
\textsuperscript{107} Nebes, *Die Kurdische Fürst ....*, p. 46 and 73 (Arabic version).
\textsuperscript{109} Nebes, *op. cit.*, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{110} Nebes, p. 126.
\textsuperscript{111} Only one report lists Shinō among the conquered cities, Nebes, p. 127-8.
\textsuperscript{112} *Op. cit.*, p. 133.
\textsuperscript{113} *Op. cit.*, 136.
Duhōk, Zakhō and Sinjār and took them. These victories encouraged the prince to attack the princedom of Botān, with its central city Jazīra (modern Cizre), and approached both Mardin and Nusaibin.¹¹⁴

Prince Muhammed’s capital, the city of Rawāndiz, located in a naturally well-defended position and at the intersection of the communications of the region, was an important advantage that helped the princedom to reach such a position. The city is located on the routes that link Mosul and Erbil with Mahabād in the Urmia Basin.¹¹⁵ Furthermore, Prince Muhammed was aware of the key elements needed to build a powerful princedom, among which were good administration, a well-organized army and the capability of manufacturing weapons, all of which he did successfully.¹¹⁶

This princedom was located in a rugged mountainous terrain but could become a major power of the region, even though only for a short time. Its economy was the traditional self-efficient dry-farming agriculture and animal husbandry,¹¹⁷ but what appears to have helped him in financing his campaigns were war spoils and the conquest of the fertile plains of Erbil, and further west he had the control of the important trade routes mentioned above. Similarly, the conquest of the Erbil Plains by Zaziya was a great support for the Turukkean kingdom, and a fatal blow for the kingdom of Išme-Dagan. After this his kingdom suffered from grain shortages and his army began to starve. This shortage was not caused by drought, since grain was available in Kawaljum, as stated in the letter ARM 26, 491 (cf. Chapter Seven).

Sorān provides a clear example of a mountainous state that can expand and unify a vast area without having rich irrigated arable plains or major navigable rivers that help the nucleation of population. The circumstances and historical events of this princedom bear the characteristics of ancient Kakmum. The range of influence of Sorān in the south, in Râniya and Köy Sanjaq, being out of reach of the centre of Kakmum itself, and its attack on Pîrdê, close to ancient Qabrâ, are all parallels to ancient Kakmum. If Kakmum was in Rawāndiz (the second, most probable, option discussed in Chapter Six), Sorān can be considered a late reflection of Kakmum.

Both the polities of Hasanwaihi and Sorān show how it is possible for a state to expand over a vast rugged area within a few years. In this regard, it should not be surprising that the Gutians may have reached the Urmia Basin to the core land of the Turukkeans as assumed in Chapter Six.

In discussing the history of the region under study, the Amorites are unavoidably important. Their immigrations to Mesopotamia as a whole changed its shape and history. They infiltrated the Habur region to form an additional Semitic element to the ancient Semites who are attested there from the third millennium BC and probably earlier. They also penetrated the west and east Tigris plains. The presence of Hurrian elements to the north of the Hilly Arc together with Amorites, as the PNs indicate, means that this part was not wholly dominated by the newcomers, but rather the Hurrians; other probable indigenous elements could maintain their positions. The same is valid for the east Tigris

¹¹⁵ Nikitine, ibid.
¹¹⁶ Cf. for details Nebes, op. cit., p. 75-7; 117.
¹¹⁷ Nebes, op. cit., p. 119-22. He refers also to the reports of Dr. Roos, who had personally visited the princedom and the city of Rawāndiz.
plains, where few Hurrian PNs appear in the texts which show an Amorite majority (for example see Chapters Six and Seven). However, the small number of non-Amorites here, as the records show, should not be taken as an indicator to their scarcity. The written documents concern the ruling elites and their affairs, the Amorites, and do not necessarily reflect the overall ethnic pattern. A similar case was discussed in Chapter Two, the case of Gasur. In Gasur, a large proportion of the PNs recorded in the documents were Akkadian, which was taken by some as a sign of a dominant Semitic population in Gasur at that time. Nevertheless, we tried to show that the archive must have concerned a group of people, most probably Akkadians, who lived in the city and did business with the local population, causing the frequent attestation of Akkadian names. The PN proportions from Gasur, then, should not be taken as an indicator of the ethnic background of the city population as a whole, for everyone was not necessarily involved in the business activities. The same must be true for the indigenous population of the East Tigris plains, who have by this time formed the substratum of the Amorite kingdoms of the region and were not directly and actively involved in the political affairs of the new masters.

It is important to note that some of these Amorites have infiltrated deep into regions close to the foothills, but not into the mountains and mountain valleys themselves. One example is the kingdom of Aḥazum, of which the centre was at modern Taqtaq. It appears to have controlled a large surrounding area up to the Köy Sanjaq Plain. The eastern border of Aḥazum reached the Dūkān gorge, which was the beginning of the land Utūm, the modern Rāniya Plain. Although these Amorites were newcomers, who would have been seen as invaders by the locals, we saw that the Hurrians (Turukkeans) had good relations with some of them. In some cases, such relations lasted for more than one generation, as indicated by the letter of Pišendēn to Yašub-Addu (see Chapter Six, letter 67 = SH 816), in which he points to the old alliance between their kingdoms since the times of their fathers and grandfathers. At the same time we saw the deep hatred Puzur-Šīn, the ‘Assyrian,’ expressed towards Šamšī-Adad I in his inscription from Assur, describing him as a foreign plague, not of the flesh of (the city of) Aššur (see Chapter Seven). The Nurrueans, shortly after the conquest of their land by Šamšī-Adad, contributed to the siege of Turukkeans in Amursakkum (ARM I, 90), who were supposedly their blood relatives. The numerous changing alliances discussed in the two previous chapters (Chapters Six and Seven) were concluded or broken off regardless of the ethnic backgrounds of the parties. This was not only on the political, but also on the individual level. The Turukkean chieftain Lidāya, for instance, had a retainer that bore the Semitic name Nabi-Ištar (see letter 24 = SH 852 A in Chapter Six), probably implying he was a Semite. Bunu-Ištar, king of Qabrā, had a Hurrian in his service called Eki-Teššup, as his seal legend indicates (see Chapter Six). A better example is the famous Șîn-išme’anni of the Shemshāra letters, a prominent figure in the politics of the Pre-Assyrian domination phase. Although his Semitic name alone does not prove he was a Semite, the content of letter 65 = SH 918 gives valuable hints to support the idea. Letter 65, discussed in Chapter Six, was meant to reach the family of Șîn-išme’anni in Awal in the Hamrin Region, and we concluded that he most probably had his roots there. But the question here is how he could reach such a high position in the Turukkean kingdom if he was a foreigner, a Semite from the Hamrin Region.

For this one may look for parallels in later history which can provide interesting hints. In the middle Ages the Abbasid caliphs began to use foreign slaves in the army, and later
in the special guards of the caliph himself. These slaves, who were mostly Turks, gained more and more power and influence; their chiefs ascended to the highest military ranks so that in later days they were able to kill the caliph and install the one they wanted. The history of the Muslim states often refers to slaves occupying high-ranking positions, used to performing important tasks for their masters. Still later the Ottomans were organizing campaigns to hunt slaves or buy them, particularly male boys to be educated under strict discipline and subject to harsh military training; they were called mamālīk (pl. of mamlūk, ‘slave’), and from them they mobilised the inkishārī troops. These inkishāris then became a powerful class in the Ottoman army and later reached political posts, such as governors of provinces. The Baghdad province, for instance, was ruled for centuries by mamālīk, mostly Georgian in origin. In Egypt, they even founded a ruling dynasty known as al-Mamālīk. In the light of such parallels one may conjecture that Sīn-išme’anni was perhaps such a slave, one who had reached the high status he occupied thanks to his qualifications. The suggestion of foreign slaves from Middle or Southern Mesopotamia in the highland societies of the Zagros should not be taken as odd, strange or unexpected. The only side of the image coming from South Mesopotamia referring to slaves from the highlands is not the complete image; one should think of southerners as slaves in the northern societies too, although perhaps in smaller numbers.

In returning to the Amorite immigrations, in Chapter Seven we pointed to the times when they were advancing to occupy new territories and seize power; this began in the Ur III period and lasted until the rise of Zaziya. During this period, the Amorite tribes are attested in most of ancient Mesopotamia, they infiltrated into its territories, settled themselves and established ruling dynasties, as seen in Sumer, Babylonia, Diyāla Region, Erbil Plains, the Habur Region and Mari. The Haladiny inscription of Iddi(n)-Sīn provides good evidence of their attempt to infiltrate his territories in the modern Garmiyān region (southeast of Kirkūk), but he was able to turn them back and kill their five chieftains (see Chapter Five). Other Amorites, such as the Ya’lānians and the Ahazians, were more successful in the north, where they could enter the land and establish kingdoms such as Qabrā, Ahazum, Ya’lānum and perhaps others. In doing so, they formed a superstratum of a population of which the substratum was still a majority of Hurrians and other aboriginal ethnic groups. This was the case in the Upper Habur too. The success of the Amorites in the Transtigris was certainly thanks to the absence of powerful kingdoms there similar to Simurrum. Nevertheless, as soon as these kingdoms were established and the tribes settled, they began with endless disputes and bitter struggles for power and influence. The age of Mari, as reflected in the letters of its archives, is a story of perpetual fighting, peacemaking, alliances made and broken, and changing allegiances. Small kingdoms had to seek powerful patrons, ally themselves to others, and fight each other on behalf of major powers.

118 The process was begun in 220 AH / AD 835 by Caliph Al-Mu’tasim. He brought large numbers (about 18,000) Turkish slaves to Baghdad from Transoxiana and modern Turkestan; cf. [Amīn, Ahmed, Dhuhr el-Islām (Midday of Islam), vol. 1, Beirut, 1969, p. 3 (in Arabic)].

On the other side, the mountain peoples could benefit from these struggles; they organized themselves and united the different tribes to form powerful kingdoms, such as those of Turukkum and Gutium. With the weakness of the Amorite kingdoms, especially the kingdom of Šamšī-Adad and his sons, with large parts of territory in the Transtigris and the Habur Region, these mountainous powers regained control. But it took somewhat longer in the Habur because of the influence there of Mari. With the appearance of the Kassites in the arena, a time begins when the Amorites recede and the mountainous peoples rise. It ended with the emergence of the Mittani, Kassite and Hittite Empires who came to hold the upper hand in the region.

This situation looks very much like the age of the Arab conquests, when the Arabs fought and defeated the ancient empires and established their own kingdom. But as soon as this kingdom was established and the numerous bedouin Arabs settled in the new founded cities, endless disputes and merciless fighting with each other started. Each group was striving for sovereignty over the whole population and the whole kingdom, claiming an exclusive right, that of pure and correct Islam. As a result the kingdom was fragmented into petty-kingsdoms and the defeated peoples of Persia, part of Anatolia, and Kurdistan recovered from the defeats and built again their states, which sometimes developed into empires.

As mentioned above, ideology is the fourth ‘necessary condition’ for the formation of states. As for the Arabs, they brought a new religion, which became the ideology of their new kingdom through which they legitimised their conquests and occupation of land. Their old local paganism was not able to promote and control the extensive empire they built. The new religion provided the new believers with all the ideological means necessary for conquest. They gave the name fath (lit. “opening”) instead of “occupation” or “invasion,” to these conquests, claiming the performance of a divine mission by bringing God’s religion to other infidel peoples. This new religion united the different Arab tribes that were raiding and plundering each other before Muhammed, and directed their efforts against the outsiders; instead of raiding each other, they were permitted to pillage and take booty and told they would be rewarded in paradise. Almost the same phenomenon was repeated in Arabia in the 18th century AD, although on a smaller scale. A new radical trend of Islam (Wahābīsm) was introduced to the Arab tribes by Muhammed bin Abdulwahāb al-Najdī, who convinced the tribesmen that only they bear the correct Islam, and other Muslims who disagreed with his teachings were outside the pale of Islam altogether. Therefore they could fight and plunder those in other, non Wahābi, streams of Islam to make them comply. This resulted in the opening of an era of Wahābī raids on Mesopotamian cities (from AD 1790) during which numerous urban centres on the Euphrates from south of Baghdad were pillaged, burned and
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121 See for example:
For Wahabi movement in general cf. Commins, *op. cit.*
[Longrigg, *op. cit.*., p. 256].
devastated, while the centres under Wahābi control were engulfed with fortune. These two instances clearly show how ideology can stimulate, organize and legitimise incursions, conquests and migrations.

We do not know whether the Amorites brought their own ideology to the newly conquered lands, but they most probably had an ideology. As for their religion, we know some names of Amorite gods, but there is no evidence of them imposing their beliefs on the conquered people, as the Arab Muslims did. Perhaps it was because their ideology was based on other principles or perhaps their religion had much in common with the existing Mesopotamian religion, more than Islam had with Christian, Zoroastrian and other minor religions of their conquered lands. In contrast to the Arab Muslims, it seems that some of the Amorites adapted themselves to the existing Mesopotamian culture and religion, as was the case with Šamši-Adad I, who adapted his Amorite name Šamš-Addu, including the theophoric element, to a Mesopotamian form Šamš-Adad, which is found in some of his royal inscriptions. One ideological contrast with the Mesopotamian traditions of that time is that the OB kings, who were mostly Amorites, did not adopt a notion of divinity, except in certain contexts. Whatever Amorite ideology was, it was neither able to unify the Amorite tribes nor to establish political stability; on the contrary, they spent centuries in wars against each other. For comparison, the ancient Iranians believed that among the numerous Iranian tribes, there were seven noble tribes, but only one of them had royal blood. The kings came from this tribe, and the high ranking officials and generals from the other six. Such an ideology guarantees stability from the viewpoint that others do not think of taking kingship by force unless they possess royal blood. The famous myth “Kāwa and Zohāk” confirms and consolidates this belief. When the blacksmith Kāwa revolted and killed the usurper, the tyrant Zohāk, after a reign of a thousand years he freed the people; he did not rule for himself, which he could have done, but instead brought back the legitimate king Fereidūn, who was “of the seed of Kayān,” and restored him to the throne. Such an ideology plays a unifying role by the idea that all the tribes need each other for prosperity and stability of society and to keep alive their socio-political organization.

One may tentatively assume that a similar ideology existed among the Hurrians, particularly those of the Zagros. Letter 63 = SH 812 from Shemshāra clearly states that not only Kuwari but also his ancestors were nuldānums. This can be understood as a hereditary post held by certain noble families among the Turukkeans, not a post taken by force or granted by the king.

The times after Išme-Dagan and Zimri-Lim are not so well-documented. However, we learn from little reports that the Hurrians kept the lands they controlled after the overthrow of the dynasties of Šamši-Adad and Zimri-Lim (see Chapter Seven). Tigunānum became the centre of a Hurrian kingdom, rendered in this period as Tikunani. According to Salvini, Tikunani was probably “one of the Hurro-Akkadian political entities of North Mesopotamia, which later were incorporated with the Kingdom of
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124 Christensen, L’Iran sous les Sassanides, p. 15-6.
125 Or Dahāk, from Azhi Dahākā, which later has become Azhdahāk.
Mittani.127 Of course there were more Hurrian polities that were unified and likewise incorporated with Mittani. There were still small and medium-sized Hurrian polities such as Uršu, Ḥaḥhum and Ḥaššum in Northern Syria and the Taurus, ruled by “kings,”128 and it was these polities that were probably designated as the “Hurrian foe,” (seemingly a collective term) in the annals of Ḥattušili I.129 This “Hurrian foe,” the annals relate, invaded the realm of Ḥattušili, into Anatolia, in the year after the expansionist conquests of this king in northern Syria. “Hurrian troops” were also among the allies of Uršu during the Hittite siege of this city, according to a Hittite literary text (KBo I 11).130 This alludes to the existence of a powerful Hurrian state to the east of the Euphrates at this time that supported the North Syrian states against the Hittites.131 Another literary text mentions the names of four “kings of the Hurrian troops,”132 who rescued a member of an anti-Hittite coalition. These allusions clearly show the political situation of the Hurrians in this phase, which was still consisting of small kingdoms, that could sometimes form coalitions and threaten the Hittite kingdom or any other power. Here again we have an alliance formed by small polities to resist a foreign enemy, in this case the Hittite State.

Yet the formation of the Mittani empire needed more effort and internal developments. This was done after the contacts had taken place between the Hurrians and the Indo-Aryans. The Mittani PNs and technical terms of Indo-Aryan origin found in the texts point to a clear Indo-Aryan contribution in the formation of the Mittani Empire, and to the Indo-Aryan background of its ruling dynasty.133 Such contacts, although still unclear, must have led to profound developments among the Hurrians. W. von Soden is of the opinion that the Indo-Aryans first came from Eastern Iran to Mesopotamia in about 1500 BC, but there were contacts with the Hurrians, according to Klinger, before that time.134 These Indo-Aryans unified the numerous Hurrian (as well as some Amorite) polities of the region between the bend of the Euphrates and the Upper Tigris, forming the state of Mittani.135 This unification was seemingly prompted by the threat the Hittite expansion to North Syria posed to the Hurrian polities and Hurrian populated regions there. It bound them first, Kühne thinks, by “treaties of loyalty that stipulated Mittani’s position of superior strength, which automatically led to suzerainty.”136
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127 Salvini, The Habiru Prism ..., p. 13. Salvini emphasizes the ethnic diversity of the kingdoms of Northern Mesopotamia that formed the Mittani Empire: Salvini, “Un royaume hourrite en Mésopotamie du Nord…,” Subartu IV/1, p. 310. This fact, however, needs more precision. It is true that other ethnicities inhabited the core region of Mittani, but one has to take into consideration the predominance of the Hurrian element that gave Mittani its Hurrian identity. Saying “...et assez variée d’un point de vue ethnique...” and “...aït eu une composition multi-ethnique” (ibid.) gives the impression that the founders of Mittani and its citizens were from different ethnic backgrounds in equal proportions, which was not the case.


133 Wilhelm, op. cit., p. 292-3.


Because the capital of Mittani remains unexcavated and its state archives unrecovered, the history of the Mittani empire, particularly its early phase, is still poorly known. Its history depends on external sources, mainly what is recorded by its enemies. There remain questions to be answered about the process of Mittani state formation that took place in Northern Mesopotamia in the period between the Mari period and the reign of king Parrattarna. Questions Wilhelm asked include the numbers of immigrants or warlike invasions from the neighbouring mountains; the role these groups played; the source of the Indo-Aryan linguistic remains in the Mittani Empire; whether the battles of Ḫatušiliš I and Muršili I against the Hurrians were battles against Mittani but without mentioning that; perhaps Parrattarna, attested as “King of the people of Ḫurri,” was a king of Mittani, or perhaps the state of Mittani coexisted with that of Ḫurri; and connections between the emergence of the Mittani empire and the Hyksos rule in Egypt. Kühne suggested answers to some of these questions in his ‘Imperial Mittani’ cited above, in which he showed that the designations “Hurrians,” “Hurrian enemy,” and “Hurrian country,” as used by the Hittites, seem to have meant Mittani. Thus it was not a separate polity, since “Hurrian country,” was also used by Mittanians themselves, and the title “King of the Hurrian troops/people” is attested at different times and places to denote later kings of Mittani. It is also noted that the language of the Mittani chancellery in the 14th century was different from the Hurrian of the Pre-Mittani period. Thus “it seems possible that the "Hurrian troops" meant in our annalistic texts were drawn from a recent wave of Hurrian invaders who had descended from the mountainous flanks of northwestern Iran and superseded the older Hurrian ethnic layers.” The new wave of the Hurrians seems to have established itself by force; their military elites became powerful landowners by exploiting the lands and subjecting the surviving settlements to a framework of a quasi-feudal system. Regarding these ‘Hurrian invaders,’ Kühne suggests that the Indo-Aryans, after they had settled for a while among the Hurrians, may have played a leading role in the military and political successes the Hurrians achieved. They may even have been behind their emigration (or invasion) in search of better homesteads. There remains the question whether these Indo-Aryans emigrated along with the Hurrians to Southern Anatolia and Northern Syria; or whether the borrowed linguistic features were derived from earlier encounters between the two groups in the Trans-Caucasus during their migrations to Iran and India. Wilhelm discussed this point saying that the latter possibility can be confirmed if Hurrian or (proto-) Urartian borrowings were found in India, but this has not so far been demonstrated. He further adds that the flow of influence would have been one-way only, from Indo-Aryan into
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137 The capital city of Waššukanni has according to Anthony an Indo-Aryan name, composed of *vasu-khani*, meaning “wealth-mine,” Anthony, D. W., *The Horse, the Wheel and Language*, Princeton, 2007, p. 49.
139 Wilhelm, *RLA* 8, p. 291.
142 Wilhelm, *The Hurrians*, p. 16.
144 For this question and the controversy about it, cf. Wilhelm, *The Hurrians*, p. 17.
145 Wilhelm, *ibid.*
Hurrian. In fact, if no Hurrian or (proto-) Urartian linguistic borrowings existed in India, it would mean that the contacts took place with that group of Indo-Aryans that did not migrate to India, which also means that the contacts were after the split of the Indo-Aryans. Those who did not migrate to India must have remained in the areas populated at the same time by the Hurrians, and groups of them might have accompanied the Hurrian new wave of migrations to northern Syria. However, the most likely possibility seems to have been the one Wilhelm considers the “easy” one: “Indo-Aryan splinter groups from the main stream of migration through Iran to India, who along with Hurrians ended up in the amalgam of the Fertile Crescent.” The few Indo-Aryan elements found in the Kassite DNs in this period must have been related to a similar process of contacts with Indo-Aryan groups in Iran.

The suggestion of an Indo-Aryan leading role seems to be quite possible for several reasons: 1) the Mittani kings bore Indo-Aryan names or throne-names; 2) swearing by the Indo-Aryan deities in a state treaty means that they were deities of the ruling elite; and the ruling elite was thus of Indo-Aryan stock; 3) the technical terms in relation to horse training (found in Boğazköy and Nuzi) and for combat wagons
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146 Ibid.
147 Ibid.
149 For example, Artatama > rtā-dhāman- (nominative: rtā-dhāmā), “whose domain/dwelling place is Rta,” Mayrhofer, op. cit., p. 23. Rta (written also rtāḥ) means “true, right; divine law; truth,” cf. Hess, *op. cit.*., p. 224; cf. also Kammenhuber, A., *Die Arier im Vorderen Orient*, Heidelberg, 1968, p. 80: a central concept in the Indo-Aryan and Iranian religions; for the names Tu笋atta and Śattiwaza see below. Although the names Sauš(sa)tat(t)ar, his father Pār/Bar/Maš-sa-ta-tar and Pa-ra-ta-na (var. Bar/Pār-ra-at-ta-na) are Indo-Aryan, no plausible etymologies for them are found: Kammenhuber, *Die Arier...*, p. 79; Mayrhofer, *Die Arier...*, p. 25. Wilhelm assumes that the tradition of giving Indo-Aryan royal names to the kings of Mittani “was established under the influence of Indo-Aryan settlers in Transcaucasia and that this accompanied the ruling class more than 500 kilometres southwest to northern Mesopotamia.” Wilhelm, *op. cit.*, p. 17. It is interesting that this tradition was practised even by city-rulers in regions of Syro-Palestine that were not under Mittanian rule and it continued after the collapse of the Mittani Empire in Hanigalbat, as seen with some of their kings, cf. Mayrhofer, *Die Arier...*, p. 17 and note 32; p. 18 and 27-8.
150 The treaty was between the Hittites (under Šuppiluliuma) and Mittani (under Śattiwaza). The deities are: DINGİR.MEŠ Mi-it-ra-aš-ši-il DINGİR.MEŠ Ū-ru-wa-na-aš-ši-el DINGİR.MEŠ Mi-it-ra-aš-ši-il DINGİR.MEŠ A-ru-na-aš-ši-il
*In-da-rar* or *In-da-ra* DINGİR.MEŠ Na-ša-a[t-ti-ia-a]n-na
*In-da-ra* DINGİR.MEŠ NA-ša-at-ti-ia-an-na

151 Also to Wilhelm, the worship of these deities may have been restricted to dynastic circles, *op. cit.*, p. 18-19.
152 This is strengthened by the notion that when a Hurrian entered the circle of the Mittanian kings he had to choose an Indo-Aryan throne name. We have at least one such occurrence: Śattiwaza’s birth name was Kili-Teššup, cf. Mayrhofer, *Die Arier...*, p. 17, note 30; Kammenhuber, *Die Arier...*, p. 82.

153 This is the well-known Kikkuli tablet, who was “a horse trainer, stable master, from the land of Mittani,” Mayrhofer, *ibid.*. The text provides the following Indo-Aryan words: aika-wartanna (< ēka- < *aika- “one” + Vedic varṭana “way, path, track”) “one-fold race-track,” tōra-wartanna (< ṛtri- “three”) “three-fold race-track,” panza-wartanna (< pānca- “five”) “five-fold race-track,” šatta-wartanna (< saptā-
were Indo-Aryan. So, one may speculate that the profession of horsemanship and its techniques were Indo-Aryan inspired. The Indo-Aryan contribution to the rise of Mittani by horsemanship and horse breeding was coupled with (though not necessarily Indo-Aryan) the use of the composite bow, the “Hurrian (type) battering ram”\(^{155}\) and the combination of horses with the two-wheeled chariot in warfare, which were altogether essential for the expansion of the empire.\(^{156}\) The chariot-drivers were the military elite of the Mittani Empire and were called in Mittani and Syria-Palestine marianni-na.\(^{157}\) The Indo-Aryan names of some of the kings of Mittani carry connotations in relation to warfare, which may refer to the military role this royal family played: Tušratta < tvešā-ratha-, “who pushes forward the impetuosity of the (two-wheeled) war-chariot;”\(^{158}\) Šattiwaza < *sāti-vāja-, “obtaining fighting gear,”\(^{159}\) and Šuttarna < satvar, “warrior.”\(^{160}\) The same could be said about the name of the city ruler Bi-ri-ia-aš-šu-wa (from Alalah) < Oir. Friyāspa-, Indo-Aryan Priyāśva-, “having dear/beloved horses.”\(^{161}\)

For such a leading role to be played by a foreign minority ethnic group is not unique. Some later examples are good parallels with Indo-Aryans among the Hurrians. In the late Abbasid Period, the Kurdish family of Saladin formed the ruling dynasty of a widespread state that ruled Egypt, Muslim Syro-Palestine (including Lebanon), most of Upper Mesopotamia and Yemen.\(^{162}\) The population of this state was mainly Arab (or Arabised peoples) beside other minor ethnic groups like the Turkomens. The Indo-European Kurds formed only a thin layer over a huge body of Semites. The substantial political and military role the Kurds played in the Ayyubid State (AD 1171-1250) is comparable to the role the Indo-Aryans played in the Mittani state. In the Ayyubid State, in addition to the king, there were governors and other important officials, numerous army cavalrymen and
generals, and several leaders who were Kurds.\textsuperscript{163} In Mittani the kings, even if they were Hurrian, took Indo-Aryan throne names, and in the army, the Indo-Aryan mariyanni warrior class formed an important component. As in Mittani, where there were Indo-Aryan words in the Hurrian of Mittani, so also there were and still are numerous Kurdish words, especially technical terms, in the Arabic of the lands of former Ayyubid state; which is another point of comparison.

Ideology played a significant role in the ascent of the Ayyubid family to power. Under the slogan of liberating Muslim territories from the Crusaders, supported by Islamic ideology, the Ayyubids succeeded in a persistent ascent to power through their service as generals and fortress holders under the Turkomen Zangīs, a branch of the Seljūqs, since 1138 A.D. After the seizure of the highest post in the state, they unified by different means the peoples and incorporated the polities of the whole region mentioned above into one state. But what ideology enabled these Indo-Aryan groups to reach that status is still unknown. Their deities were worshipped side by side with those of the Hurrians, so there is no evidence for imposing a new religious ideology. But because the throne names and the deities by whom the kings swore were Indo-Aryan, their religion must have had the virtue of being the religion of the ‘Upper Class.’ The case of the Ayyubids was quite different; the religion of their subjects was prevailing and so their throne names and titles were of an Arabic-Islamic background. One may conjecture that the Indo-Aryans may have reached high military positions thanks to their horsemen and their swift war chariots mounted by the maryanni warriors, and through their high military posts they gained political influence. This is no wonder if we again note that the Ayyubids followed almost the same path.\textsuperscript{164} The fact that márya-, “young man,” refers to the heavenly war-band assembled around the god Indra in the Rig Veda\textsuperscript{165} and was employed by the Mittanian warriors (if the derivation is true) may shed light on the ideological side of the Indo-Aryan contribution. Perhaps they have presented themselves as warriors of the god Indra, fulfilling earthly tasks based on heavenly orders. Whatever the reasons, the ascent of Indo-Aryans to power seemingly coincided with the Hurrian will to expand their kingdoms, to confront the Hittites and to fill the vacuum that followed the decline and later the fall of the first dynasty of Babylon and the murder of Muršili I.

The oldest as yet known mention of Mittani\textsuperscript{166} is on the tomb of the Egyptian official Amenemhet (Imn-m-h3.t) from Thebes. He was in the service of the pharaohs from Ahmose, founder of the 18th dynasty until Thutmose I (1494-1482).\textsuperscript{167} On his tomb is written “… a land, one calls it Mittani. The enemy….,” which proves that Mittani already

\textsuperscript{163} For this, cf.:


\textsuperscript{164} The Albanian family of Muhammed Ali Pasha of Egypt is another example. Muhammed Ali Pasha was installed by the Ottomans as governor of Egypt. Thanks to his reforms and the modernization of the country, Egypt became powerful and, trusting in his power, he declared independence. His Albanian, Turkish speaking family continued to rule Egypt until 1952, when monarchy was overthrown by a coup.

\textsuperscript{165} Anthony, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 50.

\textsuperscript{166} For other names designating Mittani, cf. Kühne, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 204-6.

\textsuperscript{167} Klinger, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 28-9.
existed before 1500 BC, perhaps since 1550 BC. According to Wilhelm, Mittani had perhaps existed since the first half of the 16th century BC (or the middle of the 17th century BC according to the middle chronology). Another early record, probably contemporary to Amenemhet’s tomb, of Mittani is the seal impression found in later dynastic use that reads “Suttarna, son of Kirta, king of Mittani,” and seemingly belongs to Suttarna I. Other data, such as the Idrimi inscription, which speaks of a treaty between his forerunners and Parattarna, and another treaty between Ḥalab and Mittani, in addition to the Indo-Aryan traditions seen in the throne-names of the king of the latter, all clearly date the emergence of Mittani before 1530 BC, or almost 100 years earlier than what was previously known. So, it seems that Mittani goes back to the period following the death of Hammurabi of Babylon, and then started to fill the power vacuum in Northern Mesopotamia created by his death. Supported by the Hurrian population already inhabiting Northern Syria, it expanded its supremacy there, where it came into armed conflict with the Hittites, who tried to control Northern Syria and the Upper Habur regions, but were resisted by the Hurrians, as shown above. These battles recorded in the Hittite historical and literary texts represent the early, if not the formative, stages of Mittani’s statehood, as Kühne describes. If the identification of Parattarna of the Terqa texts with Parattarna of Mittani mentioned on the statue of Idrimi, according to its excavator O. Rouault proves to be correct, it proves that Mittani under Parattarna extended further south than had been thought.

However, the best times for Mittani to build its power and become an unchallenged polity in Northern Mesopotamia was after the assassination of Muršili I. This brought a period of weakness in the Hittite state, during which it could neither pose a danger for Mittani nor compete with it. Just before the murder of Muršili I, he overthrew the first dynasty of Babylon; in doing so, he opened the way for the Kassites to invade Babylonia. Yet, before the overthrow of Babylon, Muršili campaigned against Northern Syria and conquered Ḥalab, thus weakening another power which was in the range of Mittanian activity. The Mittanians were not standing silent, waiting to see what the Hittites would
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168 Klinger, op. cit., p. 28-9, also with arguments for this dating. Wilhelm makes the oldest mention 1500 BC, cf. Wilhelm, RIA 8, p. 292.
170 Wilhelm, RIA 8, p. 192; cf. also Wilhelm, “l’état actuel…,” Amurru I, p. 179.
172 It seems to be this same Parattarna who is mentioned in texts from Terqa (see below), Wilhelm, “l’état actuel…,” p. 179 and note 56.
174 Cf. Klinger, p. 37. But note that there are chronological problems concerning the Mittani Empire. These are because the reconstructed chronology is based on the Assyrian eponym lists and king lists which do not cover the 15th century BC and so cannot be connected with the OB chronology. The history of Mittani Empire before the Amarna Period does not show any synchronism with Hittite or Babylonian history; for further details on these, cf. Wilhelm, RIA 8, p. 291; Kühne, op. cit., p. 203 and note 1.
175 Klinger, op. cit., p. 35.
176 Ibid.
177 Kühne, op. cit., p. 208.
179 Wilhelm, ibid.
180 Klinger, op. cit., p. 37.
181 Kühne, op. cit., p. 211.
do. They appear to have fought Muršili I after his retreat from Babylon. The texts of Terqa mentioned above, refer to a victory over the troops of the Hittites, those who were very possibly under Muršili I. 182 The reduction of pressure from both the south and the northwest was ideal for Mittani to expand and fill the vacuum. 183 Mittani then easily advanced through Western Syria and southwards along the Orontes River into Southern Canaan. 184 The emergence of Mittani owes much to Muršili, both alive, by the sacking of Babylon and Ḥalab, and murdered, by the ensuing weakness. The Hurrians appeared as a powerful opponent of the Hittites in Northern Syria and Upper Mesopotamia in the 16th century, 185 and the high position the Indo-Aryans enjoyed in the state of Mittani must be a result of the great role they played in the Hurrian successes.

It is significant to note that the core region of Mittani was not the Transtigris or the Zagros Mountains. Rather it was the plains of the Habur, where its principal cities of Waššukkanni, Taidi and Kaḥat were located. 186 Although Mittani soon extended its sway to Nuzi and the Arrapha region in the east and to Alalah in the west, as early as the reign of Parattarna, 187 the question remains why Mittani did not emerge in the East Tigris plains. One may suggest that the new wave of Hurrian immigrants, together with the Indo-Aryan groups, was perhaps directed to the Upper Habur, not the Transtigris, a wave that came from the eastern mountains via the Taurus, the same track of the Urkeš-north communications. The Hittite expansionist policy, in the Upper Habur and Northern Syria, was seemingly another factor that unified the Hurrian polities there and made them ready to become a powerful unified state as soon as the Hittites weakened. Similar factors and conditions were perhaps absent in the Transtigris at this time. A quick look at the scene gives the impression that there was a gap between Zaziya’s state and the emergence of Mittani, but the birth of Mittani, in fact, was somehow achieved by the grace of a leader like Zaziya. Without the great efforts of Zaziya, who unified the Hurrians, crossed the Tigris with his troops, established a widespread state in the Transtigris and large parts of the Habur, and overthrew the rival Kingdom of Išme-Dagan, the coming into being of Mittani would have been very difficult, if not impossible.

183 To these, Klengel adds the control of North Mesopotamian trade routes by Mittani and the weak rule of Assyrian kings, cf. Klengel, op. cit., p. 107.
184 Kühne, op. cit., p. 211-2. He states also that the appearance of the Hyksos in Egypt was probably because the Hurrian penetration into southern Canaan “even before there is evidence for Mittani’s existence,” Kühne, p. 212 and note 58 for different views.
185 Wilhelm, op. cit., p. 292.
186 Wilhelm, op. cit., p. 291.
187 See for this Kühne, op. cit., p. 214.
A- Pertinent to the subject of the dissertation:
1) The geographical conditions imposed a pattern of settlements that is marked by small size, scattered and isolated units with self-sufficient communities. It also increased the isolation and independency of the socio-political organizations which appeared in ancient Kurdistan. These were chiefdoms in the Ninevite V period, but developed into early states after the middle of the third millennium BC.
2) There were in the historical periods three types of socio-political organization in the region: the small scattered polities, the one-unit polity, and a nomadic polity. According to parallels from later times, the latter type must have consisted of groups and sub-sections bound by kinship that moved between winter and summer resorts on fixed tracks.
3) The Gutians, also during their rule of lowland Mesopotamia, were ruled by a Great King of kings/tribal chiefs exercising a central authority in the land of Gutium, not in lowland Mesopotamia. They entrusted the rulership of the south to governors subordinate to the great king. It is the names of these governors that are recorded in the SKL. King Eriru-Pizir could very probably have been one of those Great Kings.
4) The peace the Turukkeans concluded with the Gutians was very important in the history of the Turukkeans and the region. Only after this treaty did they proceed further to the west of the Tigris. Without it, the usual pattern of exhausting warlike conflicts would have continued and would have impeded any state-formation process.
5) The control of the fertile East Tigris plains by the Turukkeans was a key factor in the fall of the kingdom of Išme-Dagan and, by contrast, essentially contributed to the power and extension of the Turukkean kingdom.
6) The Gutian victory over the Turukkeans that brought them out to the Transtigris and the Habur Plains, the great efforts of Zaziya and the deeds of the Hittite king Muršili I were crucial factors that paved the way for the formation of Mittani.
7) The title nuldān(um), more or less meaning ‘king,’ does not seem to have any Semitic etymology. Rather it was a Hurrian word, sharing the suffix –dan with the other Hurrian title endan.
8) ‘The Turukkeans’ in the Mari correspondence was a name applied to all the Hurrians of the Habur region and Southern Anatolia.
9) The Hurrians of the Transtigris, unlike those of the Northern Mesopotamia, were targeted by Ur III warfare because their region, especially in the Sirwān-Diyāla basin, geo-politically and militarily posed a danger to Ur.
10) Itu (MA Idu, modern Satu Qala) of the Haladiny inscription formed together with Šaummi and Ḫubi/nezagu parts of the land Iterašwe that was located on the northern bank of the Lower Žāb, directly upstream from Šikšabbum, at, or close to, modern Taqtaq.
11) Iddi(n)-Šīn seems to have been around 45 years old in 2004 BC. He probably died before Išbi-Erra and was a contemporary of Annubanini of Lullubum. He extended Simurrum from Sarpul to Bētwate, at least 240 aerial kilometres from south to north.
12) The Amorites, in collaboration with the Simaškians, penetrated the territories of Simurrum as invaders, but were driven back by Iddi(n)-Šīn. But because of the
absence of such a powerful kingdom in the north the Amorite kingdoms of Aḥazum and Ya’īlānum could be established between the two Zābs.

13) The central topic of the Haladiny inscription is the temple of Niṣba, which seems to have been in Mount Pīra Maqrūn. All the conquered lands participated in its construction to be the central temple of the national god of the kingdom, located outside Simurrian territory.

B- Pertinent to the field of the subject of the dissertation:

14) The chronological problems raised by letter A.1314, in which Yarim-Lim claimed to have saved Dēr and Babylon 15 years earlier and Diniktum 12 years earlier, can be solved by assuming that he acted when he was still the crown-prince, not necessarily the king. So we are no longer compelled to identify the date of his action with the date of his accession.

15) The stability of the city-state of Lagaš could be attributed not only to the fact that rule was in native hands but also to the apparent existence of some mutual cooperation between this dynasty and the Gutian dynasty.

16) The Sumerians seem to have placed the blame of the conquest of Sumer by the Gutians on the Akkadians. Hence there is no mention of them in the text of Utuḫeḡal. After the victory over the Gutians they restored the kingship to Sumer not to Akkad. The SKL too states that the kingship of Uruk, not Akkad, was taken to the mountains by the Gutians.

17) The events of the account of the great rebellion against Narām-Sīn could be a fantasy of the scribes but the names of the lands are real. The names of the rulers as well can very probably be real, though not chronologically correct.

C. A Personal Proposition:

18) Numerous new projects for building dams in Iraqi Kurdistan will endanger the cultural heritage of large areas. This calls for special attention from archaeologists and research institutes to undertake surveys and salvage excavations in those areas.
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[al-Ḥasanī, Aḥsan it-Taqāsīm fi Maʾrifat il-Aqālim (= The Best Divisions in the knowledge of Provinces), Leiden, 1877 (in Arabic)].

[Longrigg, S. H., *Four Centuries of Modern Iraq*, Baghdad, 1968 (Published in English in 1925) (in Arabic)].
Summary

In this work the early history of Kurdistan is studied, the territories of which are nowadays located in north and northeastern Iraq, southeastern Turkey, north and northeastern Syria and northwestern Iran. The study of this region was chosen because of the absence of a comprehensive study of its history and culture in those early periods, and because it often formed a uniform political and cultural area in the past. It was more realistic to study the region as a whole than study it as separate parts belonging to the other larger cultural areas of Iraq, Iran, Syria and Turkey. The modern name Kurdistan was chosen as it best fits the studied regions, although it is not an official name applied to the entire region.

The study focuses on the early states which emerged in ancient Kurdistan, the peoples who founded it, the ethnic changes that took place and the later appearance of socio-political units larger than early states. A large number of written materials have been consulted and cited in addition to archaeological data, either as supplementary evidence or as primary source material when inscriptions are absent. One of these documents is an important royal inscription of the king of one of these early states, which for the first time is published and edited in this thesis.

After an introduction that comprises a short geographical description of the region, the study begins with a study of the history of the region in the periods before 2500 BC, i.e. before the age of written history. It has been shown that ancient Kurdistan was an important cultural area in prehistory, where the first cultures developed from the Neolithic village communities and many basic cultural inventions originated there. Most importantly, the region formed one cultural area during the Halaf, Ubaid, Uruk and Ninevite V cultures. These were prototypes of the later cultures and socio-political formations which appeared in the region in the historic periods and which covered at some times the majority of the region. They are studied in some detail.

Chapter Two touches upon the ancient peoples of the region, their ethnic affinities, languages, attestations in the written sources and the roles they played. Afterwards the history of the region up to the end of the Old Akkadian period is studied. Since some parts of the region under study had not yet come in contact with the Mesopotamians and were outside the orbit covered by written material, the last part of the chapter tries to fill this gap from the archaeological material available.

The third chapter is devoted to the Gutian rule in Mesopotamia. The problematic list of Gutian rulers in the south, the political organization of the Gutians and whether the Gutian period was really so dark as the Mesopotamian sources claim. It has been suggested that the Gutians had a great king of kings, who ruled over the whole Gutian lands in addition to their colonies that once included the land of Akkad and (part of) Sumer. So the list of the Gutian rulers recorded in the Sumerian King List was actually a list of the Gutian governors who ruled the south on behalf of the great Gutian king. King Erridu-pizir, wrongly identified by some with the “king without name” of the Sumerian King List, was one of these great kings, not a governor of the south. The last part of the chapter is an update edition of the inscriptions of this king followed by a historical study of his deeds in the light of these inscriptions.

In Chapter Four the coming of the Hurrians to the region is studied. The first appearance of Hurrian groups based on Hurrian personal names is traced from the written sources. After this, the history of the region in this period is studied, the age of the Hurrian expansion, which mainly coincides with the Ur III period. It has been noticed that the Hurrian lands can be divided into two parts. The one, in the east Tigris region, was subject to severe warlike actions by the kings of Ur. The other, to the west of the Tigris and northern Syria, had peaceful relations with Ur, sometimes supported by marriages of political convenience. The reason for
this difference was the fact that the Hurrians of the Transtigris, especially those of the Sirwan-Diyāla basin, were close to the domains of the Ur III Empire, and any move southwards was a real threat to the existence of that empire.

Simurrum, the important Transtigridian early state, dominates Chapter Five. Its oldest attestations up to the times dealt with by the study, its history, population, role in the history, and the inscriptions of its king Iddi(n)-Sīn are all studied in detail. It is here that the new royal inscription known as Haladiny is presented, its context, comments and a general historical study based on the inscriptions of this king. The site of Rabana is also studied, together with photographs and drawings made by the author and tentatively attributed to the temple of Nišba, the patron of Simurrum. The temple of Nišba was built by this king and is mentioned in the Haladiny inscription. Finally two cylinder seals of Simurrum and the location of Simurrum are studied.

Chapter Six is the history of the region in the light of the Shemshāra archives and some Mari letters. The complex pattern of political relations and the ethnic texture of the region have been explained from evidence in the letters and an attempt to synchronize the chronology of the letters and related episodes is made. Some ideas about the Turukkeans have been discussed and alternatives for some controversial ones are suggested.

Another significant subject, the Turukkea revolt and its consequences on the fate of the kingdom of Šamšī-Adad I, is discussed in Chapter Seven. The related topics included here are: the rise of Zaziya, king of the Turukkeans, and his efforts to bring to an end the kingdom of Šamšī-Adad and of his son Išme-Dagan; expanding the kingdom of the Turukkeans to the west of the Tigris and the Habur region to join the other Hurrians there; and the formation of a widespread Hurrian kingdom in the whole Upper Mesopotamia. It has been shown how the control of the east Tigris plains was essential in the weakening and downfall of the Assyrian kingdom and, at the same time, essential in the strengthening of the Turukkan kingdom. With the appearance of Babylon as the most powerful kingdom in Mesopotamia under its king Hammurabi, the Hurrian kingdom of the Turukkū was at its peak and controlled the regions from the Urmia Lake in the east until the Habur and beyond in the west and to the regions of Kirkuk as far as Tikrit in the south. It has also been shown that the Hurrian expansion continued even in the period that followed the fall of the Assyrian kingdom, where the texts record Hurrian personal names associated with places that were formerly Amorite.

The last chapter, the eighth, is dedicated to an anthropological approach of the material discussed in the earlier chapters. The terms chiefdom and early state and the criteria of calling a given socio-political formation a state are evaluated. Then these criteria have been applied to the formations which appeared in ancient Kurdistan, especially those of Uruk and Ninevite V Cultures. It seems that the formation of the Ninevite V Culture can be described as chiefdoms, but developed into early states after the middle of the third millennium BC. Yet the geographical conditions imposed some differences in the socio-political structures that appeared there. Three types are identified: the small scattered polities, the one-unit polity, and a nomadic polity. Two state models from Kurdistan in the Middle Ages are summarily outlined for comparison with the older models. This shows that it was not impossible for widespread kingdoms to emerge despite the rugged terrain that can restrict communications and nucleation of population in large urban centres. At the same time, it is suggested that these geographical conditions influenced not only the political situation but also the mentality of its populations, as reflected in Hurrian personal names and the style, wording and formulation of the letters they exchanged. Finally, the rise to power of the Indo-Aryan groups in the Mittani kingdom is mentioned. How a small group could climb to the highest positions within another larger ethnic group is shown from a later similar model, the dynasty of the Ayyubids among the Arab majority.

The dissertation is closed with conclusions and bibliography.