

## SIMURRUM AND THE HURRIAN FRONTIER<sup>1</sup>

William W. HALLO

The first attested area of Hurrian settlement and political domination is the kingdom of «Urkiš and Nawar» of the late Sargonic period (ca. 22nd century B.C.)<sup>2</sup>. It stretched for more than 500 km. from Urkiš in the Habur triangle<sup>3</sup> southeastward to Nawar east of the Jebel Hamrin<sup>4</sup>. When united, it posed a massive barrier to the north-Iranian trade routes leading to such sought-after raw materials as tin<sup>5</sup>, lapis lazuli<sup>6</sup> and perhaps chlorite<sup>7</sup>. It was therefore a prime target of Mesopotamian military activity by both Sargonic and Ur III kings, who referred to it, it appears, as Subir (Subartu)<sup>8</sup>, and conceived of it as extending to the shores of Lakes Van and Urmia<sup>9</sup>. In ecological terms, it constitutes the major portion of that zone of fertile brown soil in the piedmont and fairly rich arable in the plains<sup>10</sup> which lies above the isohyet of 400 mm. rainfall per annum. It remains to this day the «region of the main concentration of rainfall agriculture» in Iraq, «a region in which rain agriculture is normally free of risk», where irrigation is not essential, where steppe nomadism is a minor factor, where settlement is permanent even *between* the river valleys; it is, in

1. Presented to the 24<sup>e</sup> Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Paris, July 4, 1977. The text is given here as delivered; the notes incorporate some subsequent publications.

2. See simply Hallo and Simpson *The Ancient Near East : A History* (ANEH) (1971) p. 67, but note that the table contains an error (Atal-shen, not Dish-atal, is ruler of the double kingdom). For Atal-shen (or Arišen) in the «Hurrian King List» see A. Kammenhuber, «Historisch-geographische Nachrichten...», *apud* J. Harmatta and G. Komoróczy, eds., *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im alten Vorderasien* (1976) 167.

3. For this localization, see simply Hallo, «The road to Emar», JCS 18 (1964) 83 and n. 18.

4. For this localization, see most recently R. Borger, AfO 23 (1970) 9; Kammenhuber, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 2) 164. Others place it higher up the Zagros, assuming not only that Nawar/Namar equals neo-Assyrian Namri but that its location remained the same; cf. T. C. Young, Iran 5 (1967) 15, n. 39 (Lake Merivan basin); W. Schramm, Or. 38 (1969) 126 f.

5. J. D. Muhly, *Copper and Tin* (1973) 288 f.

6. G. Hermann, «Lapis lazuli : the early phases of its trade», Iraq 30 (1968) 21-57.

7. Philip L. Kohl, «Long-Range trade in Southwestern Asia», unpublished lecture (Yale), April 8, 1977; *idem*, «Carved chlorite vessels», Expedition 18 (1975) 18-31.

8. I. J. Gelb, *Hurrians and Subarians* (= SAOC 22, 1944) 34-40; A. Goetze, «Hulibar of Tuttul», JNES 12 (1953) 118-121; W. H. Ph. Römer, WO 4 (1967) 15-20.

9. M. Civil, «Šu-Sîn's historical inscriptions : Collection B», JCS 21 (1967) 37 f.

10. M. A. Beek, *Atlas van het Tweestromenland* (1960) p. 48 fig. 5.



short, the area lying exactly along the outer frontier of what Rowton calls the dimorphic zone (see Map) <sup>11</sup>. Its geographical midpoint was Urbilum, but in late Sargonic times its political centers seem to have been located in its north-western and southeastern extremities, to judge by native royal inscriptions. Not only was the title «king of Urkiš and Nawar» affected by Atal-šen (or Ari-šen), perhaps in the sense of king of East and West, i.e. of the world <sup>12</sup>, but a certain Diš-atal was variously known as *endan* of Urkeš <sup>13</sup> and king of Karahar <sup>14</sup>. The northwestern half of the kingdom included the cities or districts of Mardaman, Šimanum and Šerši, all in the vicinity of Urkiš, and Rimuš on the Tigris; its southeastern half included the cities or districts of Gumaraši, Šašrum, Šetirša and Hibilat, all on or near the Lower Zab, and Simurru at its southernmost end. All these places were presently represented (in the Ur III records) by men bearing Hurrian names as demonstrated by Gelb in 1944 <sup>15</sup> in a survey so thorough that even today, more than thirty years later, few additions can be made <sup>16</sup>.

The exact location of Simurru remains in dispute <sup>17</sup>. But it clearly represented the gateway to Hurrian territory from the Mesopotamian point of view — or its «bolt» if we may use the figure of speech later used of Huhunuri with respect to Anšan (or Elam) <sup>18</sup>. As such it appears first and most often of all

11. M. B. Rowton, «Dimorphic structure and topology», *Oriens Antiquus* 15 (1976) 17-31, esp. p. 20 and n. 13.

12. A. Parrot and J. Nougayrol, «Un document de fondation Hurrite», *RA* 42 (1948) 19. However, it is unlikely that the usage was borrowed from Mesopotamia where the nearest analogy, the title «king of Sumer and Akkad», was introduced only by Ur-Nammu. More likely, the foreign title inspired the Mesopotamian usage, as in a number of other examples. See also E. Sollberger and J.-R. Kupper, *IRSA* (1971) 128 (II H 1a).

13. Parrot and Nougayrol, *ibid.*, 1-20; Gelb, «New Light on Hurrians and Subarians», *Studi... Levi della Vida* 1 (1956) 381.

14. Sollberger and Kupper, *IRSA* 169 (III H 1a), prefer the reading Ankiš-atal and propose an Ur III date for this inscription. R. M. Whiting, «Tiš-atal of Nineveh ...», *JCS* 28 (1976) 173-182, weighs an Ur III date for both inscriptions (p. 174).

15. *Hurrians and Subarians*, pp. 112-114.

16. Note the following from D. O. Edzard and G. Farber, *Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes* 2 (1974) : Neriš-atal of Mardaman, Hiliš of Rimuš, and Kit-atal of Urbilum. Edzard himself adds Uršu and perhaps Harši to this list in *RLA* 4 (1975) 509 (6), but if the latter is based on the next published by me in *HUCA* 29 : 75 : 4, I would now rather read there (rev. 1-3) : «for Marhuni and the troops that came with him (erīn mu-da-a-re-e-ša-a-šē) — they being men of Harši». Cf. Genouillac, *Tr Dr* 83 : 10 and 85 : 5 (u<sub>4</sub> ... ī-im-e-re-ēš-ša-a), cited by Sollberger, *JCS* 10 (1956) 23 note 42 and by J. Krecher, «Die pluralischen Verba für "gehen" und "stehen" im Sumerischen», *WO* 4 (1967) 5 (6). H. Limet, «L'étranger dans la société sumérienne», *RAI* 18 (1972) 135-137, provides another resume from which Tišan-tahe of Šimanum may be added. For Šersi cf. perhaps the Nuzi scribal name Šeršiya : *JEN* 2 : 124. With Kip-atal of Urbilum, one is tempted to compare the Kiklip-atalin of Tukriš in the «Hurrian Kinglist» (above, note 2; Gelb, *Hurrians and Subarians*, 55). For Tiš-atal of Nineveh (Ni-nu-a<sup>ki</sup>) see above, note 14. Finally, note the uku-uš lú-li-ik-ri<sup>ki</sup>-me-ēš under (ugula) Tahiš-atal in YBC (unpublished).

17. E. Weidner, «Simurru and Zaban», *AfO* 15 (1945-61) 75-80, regarded it as the name of a land, not a city, and placed it east of the Jebel Hamrin between the Adhem and Diyala rivers.

18. Ibbi-Suen year 9; cf. Edzard and Farber, *Répertoire Géographique*, 77.

the targets on the Hurrian frontier. Were we to credit the proverb recently revealed by Gurney and Kramer <sup>19</sup>, we could argue that it was already the object of Mesopotamian military attentions as early as the Second Early Dynastic period, when the legendary Aenepada of Ur captured it but was unable to choke (?) it [1] <sup>20</sup>. More believable is a reference to Simurru (or rather its people) in an Old Akkadian letter [2] from Gasur, the later Nuzi <sup>21</sup>. And one of the few known «date formulas» of Sargon of Akkad recalls his «going to Simurru» <sup>22</sup> — though for what purpose is not clear [3]. Naram-Sin is (as usual) more explicit. In what is clearly a real date formula, newly identified in the Yale Babylonian Collection by Mark Cohen <sup>23</sup>, the great king commemorates an expedition against Simurru [4]; in another date formula, known from two Tutub (Khafaje) texts, he records that he defeated Simurru and captured its ruler (*ensī*) [5] who bears the not very revealing name of Ba-ba <sup>24</sup>. It is just possible that this same Ba-ba *ensī* of Simurru inscribed a fragmentary vase of Sargonic date which is otherwise almost completely destroyed <sup>25</sup>.

The Old Babylonian legend of Naram-Sin first published by Boissier <sup>26</sup> and more recently reedited by Grayson and Sollberger <sup>27</sup> lists the kings of Simurru and the land of Namar at the head of a coalition of rebels who rallied to the banner of Iphur-Kiš and (presumably) were crushed by Naram-Sin. Mardaman and its king figure in the coalition as well [6]. Given the allusions to some of the rebels (Iphur-Kiš, Lugal-anna of Uruk) in other, in part much earlier literary texts <sup>28</sup>, the Naran-Sin legend may preserve genuine historical data <sup>29</sup>. It is therefore worth noting that it attributes to the king of Simurru a name (Pu-ut-ti-ma-da-al) which can be explained in Hurrian terms (Puttum-atal) <sup>30</sup>.

19. *OECT* 5 (1976) pp. 38 f.

20. References in brackets are to the citations in Appendix I.

21. *HSS* 10 : 5.

22. *TMH* 5 : 151, edited by A. Westenholz, *Early Cuneiform Texts in Jena* (1975) p. 76 (photo : pl. XXI); *idem*, *OSP* 1 : 145. Cf. Hans Hirsch, «Die Inschriften der Könige von Agade», *AfO* 20 (1963) 5 (c).

23. *JCS* 28 (1976) 227-232.

24. Hirsch, *AfO* 20 (1963) 22 (c 6).

25. H. Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 1 (1897) 545 n° 3.

26. A. Boissier, «Inscription de Narām-Sin», *RA* 16 (1919) 157-164 and 206; cf. G. A. Barton, *RISA* 138-141. See next note for the previously unpublished duplicate from Mari cited by G. Dossin, *Syria* 20 (1939) 99. Cf. in general Hirsch, *AfO* 20 (1963) 25 (3) and note 268.

27. A. K. Grayson and E. Sollberger, «L'insurrection générale contre Narām-Suen», *RA* 70 (1976) 103-128.

28. Hallo and Van Dijk, *The Exaltation of Inanna* (= *YNER* 3, 1968) 9 and n. 59. Cf. already C. J. Gadd, *Teachers and Students in the Oldest Schools* (1956) 11 n. 1.

29. The newly-found statue inscribed by Naram-Sin lends further credibility to the literary traditions about his triumphs in what is now northernmost Iraq, since it is unlikely that so heavy a monument would have been found far from its ancient location. See A. H. Ayish, «Bassetki statue with an Old Akkadian inscription», *Sumer* 32 (1976) 63-75 and 2 pls.; Tariq Madhloom, «Studies on Akkadian bronze statues», *ibid.* (Arabic part) 41-48; Fawzi Reshid, «Preliminary studies ...», *ibid.* 49-58, both with numerous plates.

30. Gelb, *Hurrians and Subarians*, 55.



If it is also correct in suggesting separate kings for Simurru and Mardaman, then this situation must have changed by late Sargonic times when, as we have seen, a united kingdom emerged which stretched from Urkiš to Nawar and almost certainly extended to Mardaman and Simurru as well. Such a development would explain the focal role which Simurru played in the military policy of the Ur III empire (21st century), particularly in what may be called its Hurrian strategy.

That strategy can be read off clearly from the date formula of the Ur III dynasty (see Appendix II) <sup>31</sup>, and is further illuminated by other sources — canonical, archival and monumental. According to the date formulas, the neo-Sumerian campaign against the Hurrian realm began midway through the long 48-year reign of Šulgi. Bearing in mind that the events in question fell into the preceding year, we note that Šulgi began his military operations with an attack on Karahar for which he named his 24th year <sup>32</sup>. This is the first campaign to figure in an Ur III date formula <sup>33</sup>. Years 25 and 26 were named for the first and second campaigns against Simurru, and year 27 for one against Harši. It was at this time, apparently, that Šulgi reclaimed, at least in its Akkadian form, the Old Akkadian title «king of the four quarters», implying that to the central lands (ki) of the amphictyonic league of Sumer and Akkad he had now added the foreign lands (kur) of Subartu and Martu <sup>34</sup>. The Old Babylonian omen tradition may allude to the change of titles when it speaks of «the omen of Šulgi, who subdued the four regions» <sup>35</sup>.

But the jubilation proved premature. After a four-year respite, there began what may be described as Šulgi's Second Hurrian War: years 31-33 commemorated two more campaigns against Karahar and the third campaign against Simurru. This third defeat of Simurru may have involved Šulgi's crowning military achievement, to judge by the Old Babylonian omen tradition. For apart from the one reference to Šulgi already mentioned, its sole interest in that king is his capture of Tabban-Darah — the subject of no less than three different omens [7] <sup>36</sup>. And a Tab-ba-Da-ra-ah already appears in a Puzriš-Dagan (Drehem)

31. Cf. the convenient summary by Edzard, «Neue Inschriften zur Geschichte von Ur III unter Šusuen», AfO 19 (1959-60) ff.

32. Except for the variant date formulas from Isin recording the destruction of Der in or after his 21st year; cf. Edzard and C. Wilcke *apud* B. Hrouda, *Isin* 1 (1977) 87.

33. With the possible exception of «Ur-Nammu j», for which see E. Sollberger, «Sur la chronologie ...», AfO 17 (1954-56) 13. (And see previous note.)

34. Hallo, *Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles* (= AOS 43, 1957) 53 and n. 4. Cf. also Civil, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 9) for *kur-šubur-ra*. N. Schneider, *Die Zeitbestimmungen der Wirtschaftsurkunden von Ur III* (An.Or. 13, 1936) 15 mistakenly lists the year in question under «Šulgi 24» (i.e. Šulgi 26); it is rather a variant of «Šulgi 25» (27). See also next note, and cf. Wilcke, RAI 19 (1974) 178 f.

35. Goetze, «Historical allusions in Old Babylonian omen texts», JCS 1 (1948) 259 f. (24); *idem*, JCS 17 (1963) 14 and n. 37. I cannot agree with Goetze that Šulgi assumed the new title only after his final destruction of Simurru (year 44).

36. *Ibid.* (25-27).

document dated the following year (Šulgi 34) <sup>37</sup> and his son even in the same year (Šulgi 33) <sup>38</sup>. His wife turns up at Puzriš-Dagan a few years later (Šulgi 38) <sup>39</sup>, and he himself recurs there in tablets dated to the reign of Šu-Sin, with <sup>40</sup> or without <sup>41</sup> the designation «man of Simurru». In the Šu-Sin texts, his name is written Tab<sub>x</sub>(MAN)-ba-an-da-ra-ah, but the graphic principle involved (MAN for TAB) was already adequately explained in 1957 <sup>42</sup>; the hesitations expressed more recently on this point are unnecessary <sup>43</sup>. Moreover, as long ago as 1948, Goetze had drawn the connection between the Drehem account texts and the Old Babylonian omens <sup>44</sup>, and it is clear that, as correctly stated by four of the five versions of the three omens, the king was captured and not, as in one variant, killed.

Until recently, it appeared that this great triumph of Šulgi had vanished from the historical tradition *after* Old Babylonian times, along with most other memories of the king and, indeed, his entire dynasty <sup>45</sup>. True, there were allusions to him and his father Ur-Nammu in the Weidner Chronicle and the Chronicle of Early Kings <sup>46</sup>. But these only referred in general to his rule over all countries, or to his sins. Now, however, we suddenly have no less than three specific references to his Subarian campaigns in late literary texts. The oldest of these is a fragmentary omen published by Walker in 1972 <sup>47</sup> and dated by Nougayrol to the time (and the library) of Tiglat-pileser I <sup>48</sup>. The *apodosis* reads (in part): «[...] -ba-gar and (!) Rab-si-si, Kings of X [...], he [...] them and brother killed brother» [8]. Next is the Šulgi-prophecy reconstructed by Borger from seven neo-Assyrian fragments into one large Nineveh tablet of six columns, with a small duplicate from Assur <sup>49</sup>. Here the beginning of column ii still preserves traces of the names of the kings whom Šulgi overpowered, and goes on to tell that Šulgi «<ruled> <sup>50</sup> the four quarters from east to west» [9]. Finally, Hunger has just

37. TLB 3: 15.

38. An. Or. 7: 53.

39. *Ibid.* 40 (written Tab-ba-da-ra).

40. Edzard and Farber, *Répertoire Géographique* 167 s.v. Man-ba-an-da-ra-ah.

41. An. Or. 7: 44 (Šu-Sin 7). Delivery of the territorial tax (gú-ma-da), the overseer (ugula) being Šilluš-Dagan; cf. on this text Goetze, JCS 17 (1963) 6 (29); Michalowski, ZA 68 (1978) 45, note 37.

42. Hallo, Bi. Or. 14 (1957) 231 n. 15 and *apud* BIN 3 (1971) p. 9 n. 18; Gelb, MAD 22 (1961) 67 (N. 90), 118 (N. 324) *et passim*.

43. Edzard and Farber, *Répertoire ...*, 167 f.; cf. M. A. Dupret, Or. 43 (1974) 342.

44. *Loc. cit.* (above, notes 35 f.).

45. In the meantime, Ivan Starr has identified three duplicates of a neo-Assyrian omen of Amar-Suen with links to the Old Babylonian tradition; see JCS 29 (1977) 160-162.

46. See the latest editions of both by A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (TCS 5, 1975) *sub* Chronicle 19 and 20 respectively.

47. CT 51: 152 rev. 12-15.

48. RA 67 (1973) 191.

49. Borger, «Gott Marduk und Gott-König Šulgi als Propheten: zwei prophetische Texte», Bi. Or. 28 (1971) 3-24.

50. The verb is missing; I take *ibel* to belong to the preceding clause.



published a chronicle text from Seleucid Uruk<sup>51</sup> which reports that «Šulgi, king of Ur, son of Ur-Nammu, exercised kingship (?) over all lands, overpowered [...b]an-ga-ár<sup>52</sup> and Rab-si-si, kings of the land of Subartu, took the booty of the hostile country» and so forth [10]. The connection between the omen and the chronicle had already been drawn by Hunger in 1973<sup>53</sup>, though in his new commentary he regards the context of the omen as lost<sup>54</sup>. But the next entry in the omen-text deals with Utu-hegal, as was seen independently by Nougayrol<sup>55</sup> and Reiner<sup>56</sup>, and the entry after that with Ib-bi-Sin. And just as the Middle Assyrian Utu-hegal omen (and its parallels in KAR 422 and 433)<sup>57</sup> are faithfully mirrored in the neo-Assyrian Weidner Chronicle<sup>58</sup>, so, it is now clear, the Šulgi omen is mirrored in the Uruk Chronicle. Moreover, the Middle Assyrian Ib-bi-Sin omen preserves in somewhat garbled form the most popular Old Babylonian omen about that king<sup>59</sup>, so it seems only reasonable to suppose that the late Šulgi tradition likewise preserves the most popular of the Old Babylonian omens about him, albeit somewhat imperfectly. I would therefore restore the name of the first of his royal victims as [Tab]-ba-gar in the omen and [Tab-b]an-ga-ár or [Tab-b]an-garaš in the Chronicle. The traces in the prophecy are reconcilable with a restoration [Rab]-[si-si] x [?] <sup>60</sup>. These forms are not too far from an original Tab-ba-an-da-ra-ah and Ra-ši-ši, the second name familiar from a Dreheim text as «man of Kimaš»<sup>61</sup>. The name of their realm is effectively lost in the omen<sup>62</sup> and the prophecy<sup>63</sup>; in the Chronicle it is KUR.SU. BIR4.KI.

So much for Šulgi's Second Hurrian War. A seven-year respite followed on this frontier, to judge by the date formulas. It was occupied with a campaign against Anšan far to the south (Šulgi 34-35)<sup>64</sup>, with the building of the «wall

51. H. Hunger, *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk* 1 (1976) 2 : 3 ff.

52. A reading ...-b]an-garaš is also conceivable.

53. ZA 63 (1973) 317 ad CT 51 : 152. The connection with the prophecy is proposed here for the first time, and is less certain.

54. STU p. 20 ad line 5.

55. RA 67 (1973) 191.

56. *Apud* Grayson, TCS 5 (1975) 285 ad Chronicle 19 : 62.

57. Nougayrol, *loc. cit.* (above, note 55).

58. Grayson, TCS 5 N. 19 : 62.

59. Note only that it writes the royal name differently (\*I-bi[BÍL].d30 for (\*I-bi.dEN. ZU) and that, having presumably substituted the logogram \*NÍG.HA.LAM.MA for (ša) šahluqtim, it then apparently misinterpreted the logogram as a geographical name (ša HA. LAM.KI).

60. For the autograph, see Winckler, *Sammlung von Keilschrifttexten* 2 (1893-4) 73 where the traces are :



61. Boson, TCS 140 : 5.

62. S[i-mu-ur-ru-um<sup>KI</sup>] is conceivable.

63. See above, note 60.

64. For its identification with Tell Malyan, see now E. Reiner, «The location of Anšan», RA 67 (1973) 57-62.

of the unincorporated territories» (ma-da), probably sealing off the frontier against Simurru from the Tigris to the Hamrin mountain (Šulgi 37-38), and the construction of Puzriš-Dagan (Dreheim) — or perhaps we should say its dedication as a royal cattle-yard (Šulgi 39-41). For texts from this site begin to appear with some regularity at least seven or eight years earlier (Šulgi 31 or 32)<sup>65</sup>, and to provide valuable allusions to the provisioning of envoys from the Hurrian lands.

The Third Hurrian War occupied the last seven years of Šulgi's reign, and reached ever deeper into Subartu, as well as the adjacent lands of the Lullubi<sup>66</sup>. Šašrum on the Lesser Zab<sup>67</sup> was attacked first (Šulgi 42) and Urbilum three years later (Šulgi 45), followed by Kimaš and Humurti (Šulgi 46-47)<sup>68</sup>. This last triumph is memorialized in a recently published brick from Susa inscribed in Akkadian by Šulgi<sup>69</sup>, whose monumental texts are otherwise singularly silent about his military exploits<sup>70</sup>. As we have seen, the later literary tradition also seems to recall Šulgi's triumph over Kimaš, even though the earlier tradition, so far as now known, remembered only Simurru. Simurru itself had been reduced for the last (literally the «ninth») time two years before the attack on Kimaš (Šulgi 44) and it is probably around this time that it was turned into a province. Already in Šulgi 40, *maš-da-ri-a* offerings from Simurru are recorded at Puzriš-Dagan<sup>71</sup> and within two years at the most, a governor was appointed by the Ur III king. His name, Šilluš-Dagan, occurs frequently in Puzriš-Dagan texts, in the company of other dignitaries<sup>72</sup>. His title is known from two seal impressions. One is fragmentary but what remains suggests it was his own seal, inscribed in the form reserved for high officials on whom the king

65. T. Fish, MCS 5 (1955) 93. But note that the first six (or even eight) texts listed there are almost certainly misdated either by Fish or by the ancient scribes. For Dreheim (or Ur ??) texts dated Šulgi 29 and 30, see TLB 3 : 12 and 92 f.

66. H. Klengel, «Lullubum. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der altvorderasiatischen Gebirgs-völker», MIO 11 (1966) 349-371.

67. Šašrum is here equated with Shemshara following J. Laessøe, *The Shemshāra Tablets* (1959) 70. Despite A. Falkenstein's reservations in his review of the book (ZA 54, 1961, 287), the evidence of the pattern of Šulgi's campaigns seems to bear out Laessøe. Cf. also below, note 88.

68. Or. Inst. A 5080 (unpubl.) records offerings of a large and small cattle to Enlil and Ninlil «on the day that the ruler (ensi) of Kimaš was captured» (Šulgi 46/IV or V); see Hallo, *Ensi's of the Ur III Dynasty* (1953) 25.

69. E. V. Schuler, BJV 7 (1967) 293-295 and pl. 3. For translation see Sollberger and Kupper, IRSA III A 2 p.

70. With the exception of the late copies of Šun-Sin and Ib-bi-Sin, the Ur III royal inscriptions in fact rarely employ the «when ... (then) clause»; see Hallo, «The royal inscriptions of Ur : a typology», HUCA 33 (1962) 22 n. 193 where Ur-Nammu 28 and Šu-Sin 9 (and Ib-bi-Sin 9 and 10) are listed.

71. TCL 2 : 5502 f., dated *mu-mín(a)-kam-ús é ba-dù*.

72. See the survey by Goetze, JCS 17 (1963) 13 f. An unpublished text (transliteration court. Brian Lewis) records disbursements for the wedding-feast of Šilluš-Dagan (*mu-kaš-dé-a nam-mí-ús-sá Š.šé*) in Amar-Suen 3/III/18. His sister (not wife as Goetze held) figures earlier in TRU 76.



himself bestowed the seal<sup>73</sup>. The other, on a tablet dated Šulgi 42, is dedicated to him by one of his own retainers; its remarkable seal design includes «the only clear example of a winged deity in the (Ur III) period» and has been dealt with in detail by Buchanan<sup>74</sup>. It is tempting to see in this Šilluš-Dagan the former owner of Puzriš-Dagan who was thus compensated for the loss of his former holdings to the state, for this would explain the confusion that surrounded the renamed site in an early example of the date-formula recording its rebuilding or recommissioning as a royal cattle-yard, as already suggested by Sollberger<sup>75</sup> and Edzard<sup>76</sup>.

The pacification of Simurru is also documented in the Royal Correspondence of Ur, a canonical source recently edited in a Yale dissertation by Piotr Michalowski. The very first letter in the corpus, from Aradmu (Ir-Nanna) to Šulgi, begins (in Michalowski's translation)<sup>77</sup> : «You have instructed me to take the road to Subir, in order to put in order the taxes on the unincorporated territories (i.e. gú-un ma-da), to discern the state of the provinces (a-rá ma-da), etc.». That Subir here includes or even in effect means Simurru is clear from the fourth item in the corpus, another letter from Aradmu to Šulgi<sup>78</sup> which begins : «Oh my king, you have given me instructions about everything from the sea of the country of Dilmun, to (variant : from) the bitter waters at the slopes (gaba) of the country (or mountain : kur) of the Amorites, to (var. : from) the border (da?) of Simurru, the border (of) Subir» [11]. Related to this correspondence by numerous personal names is the letter of the merchant Ur-dun to the king (presumably Šulgi)<sup>79</sup> which recalls that «Aradmu, your servant, and Babati, the šā<sub>x</sub>-dub-ba, had gone from Zimudar to Simurru».

When Amar-Suen followed Šulgi to the throne, the Hurrian strategy continued without significant change, while previous gains were consolidated. We may note first that the Middle Tigris was now firmly incorporated into the empire, as demonstrated by the career of Zariquim, the military governor of Assur<sup>80</sup>. With the southeastern end of the Hurrian territory presumably secured, Assur now served as a military base for operations against its center and as a diplomatic intermediary for negotiations with its far northwestern end. Urbilum was attacked almost at once (Amar-Suen 2) and Šašrum halfway through the new king's

73. V. Scheil, RA 23 (1926) 36 f.; cf. Hallo, HUCA 33 (1962) 42, sub Anonymous 14, and Sollberger, JCS 19 (1965) 29 n. 11, and now also J. A. Frank, BM 6 (1977) 61 and n. 4.

74. BIN 3 : 627; cf. B. Buchanan, «A snake goddess and her companions», *Iraq* 33 (1971) 1-18 and pls. I-II, esp. p. 3. The date of Amar-Sin 6 proposed by Buchanan (p. 17) is also possible but less likely.

75. AfO 21 (1966) 91 n. 4.

76. «Puzriš-Dagān-Šilluš-Dagān», ZA 63 (1974) 288-294.

77. Cf. also S. N. Kramer, *The Sumerians* (1963) 331.

78. ISET 2 : 112 Rev. III and four unpublished duplicates.

79. YBC 5011, unpubl.; cf. Hallo, JAOS 88 (= AOS 53, 1968) 88.

80. Hallo, «Zariquim», JNES 15 (1956) 220-225. Note that Lutz, STR II 36 (p. 223, top) is entered in the Sammeltafel published by G. Buccellati, *Amorites of the Ur III Period* (1966) pls. VII f. col. v 10' f. and that Za-rí-iq lú AŠ.LALxRIN.KI recurs in VI 9'.

reign (Amar-Suen 6). Šimanum, in the far northwest<sup>81</sup>, was too distant to be subjected militarily. It apparently retained its own Hurrian ruler, a certain Pušam, while diplomatic ties were pursued through his messenger called, interestingly enough, Puzur-Assur (Amar-Suen 7)<sup>82</sup>. The immediate object was a dynastic marriage; specifically a daughter of the crown-prince Šu-Sin was sent as daughter-in-law to Šimanum, intended for one of Pušam's two sons, Arib-atal or Iphuha. What happened when Šu-Sin himself succeeded to the throne can best be seen from the Old Babylonian copies of his «triumphal» inscriptions<sup>83</sup>. According to these, it appears that an internal revolt deposed both Pušam and Šu-Sin's daughter (Kunši-matum). Šu-Sin therefore marched against Šimanum, an event commemorated in the name of his third year, and restored both the native dynasts (now perhaps as dependent governors) and his daughter<sup>84</sup>.

This marked the highpoint of neo-Sumerian successes against the Hurrians. Immediately following the defeat of Šimanum, Šu-Sin was forced to rebuild Šulgi's «wall of the territories» (Šu-Sin 4-5), a defensive move to judge by the new name he gave it : «the wall of the Amorites for keeping Tidnum at bay». The construction of this wall was memorialized in building inscriptions from Umma<sup>85</sup> and is also the main theme of the royal correspondence between Šu-Sin and Šarrum-bani<sup>86</sup>. Here we read, i.e., : «As a result of my building activities the wall is (now) 26 *danna* long. When I sent for word (to the area) between the two mountains, it was brought to my attention that the Mardu were camped in the mountain(s). Simurru had come to their aid. (Therefore) I proceeded to (the area) "between" the mountain range(s) of Ebih in order to do battle» [12]<sup>87</sup>.

Clearly the tide had turned. When Ibbi-Sin succeeded to the throne of Ur, his first recorded campaign was against Simurru (Ibbi-Sin 3), implying that the more distant Hurrian lands had already slipped from his control. And it is probable that the Su-people who contributed to his downfall and to the des-

81. For the localization, see Civil, JCS 31 (1967) 36.

82. H. de Genouillac, *Trouvailles de Dréhem* n° 84. For the reading of the name, see already Hallo, JNES 15 (1956) 225.

83. On this genre (pro and contra), see J.-R. Kupper, «Les inscriptions triomphales akkadiennes», *Oriens Antiquus* 10 (1971) 91-106; G. Van Driel, «On "standard" and "triumphal" inscriptions», *Symbolae ... Böhl* (1973) 99-106.

84. P. Michalowski, «The bride of Simanum», JAOS 95 (1975) 716-719. For captives from this campaign, see Gelb, «Prisoners of war in early Mesopotamia», JNES 32 (1973) 76 f. For a possible «state visit» by Tiš-atal of Ninua to Ešnunna in the following year, see Whiting, JCS 28 (1976) 177 f.

85. Hallo, HUCA 33 (1962) 38 sub Šu-Sin 9, to which add now O. H. Dodson, *Archaeology* 22 (1969) 102 = University of Illinois 1779. For translation see Sollberger and Kupper, IRSA III A 4 d.

86. See for now S. Lieberman, «An Ur III text from Dreheim recording "booty from the land of Mardu"», JCS 22 (1968-69) 53-62 esp. nn. 68, 62 and 83, and C. Wilcke, «Drei Phasen des Niedergangs des Reiches von Ur III», ZA 60 (1970) 54-69.

87. Translation by Michalowski; based on UET 6/2 : 183 : 10-15 and unpublished Yale duplicates.



truction of Ur were the very same Hurrian<sup>88</sup>. Thus more than two hundred years of Mesopotamian campaigns into Subartu ultimately failed in their objective. The trade routes to the North fell into Assyrian hands after the sack of Ur, and the «Cappadocian Road» skirted the Hurrian areas on the south, for the Hurrians were not dislodged from their ancestral realm. On the contrary, they were firmly entrenched around Šašrum in the time of Šamši-Adad I, in the area then probably known as Utūm<sup>89</sup>. Despite some setbacks under Hammurabi<sup>90</sup>, the Hurrians were ready for an even greater role around Nuzi in the middle of the second millennium<sup>91</sup>.

#### APPENDIX I

- [1] Na-an-né ... si-mu-ru(or : ur<sub>4</sub>?)ki i-dib gú(var. : bàd)-bi nu-mu-un-da-gíd  
 [2] ù šum-ma si-mu-ur<sub>4</sub>-rí-ùKI a-ti da-ni-iš ŠE la i-ma-ha-ru  
 [3] mu Sar-um-GI si-mur-umKI-šè i-gen-na-a  
 [4] in I MU [d]Na-ra-am-[dEN.ZU] a-na KASKAL.KI Si-mu-ur<sub>4</sub>-rí-imKI i-li-ku  
 [5] in I MU dNa-ra-am-dEN.ZU RÉC 169 si-mu-ur<sub>4</sub>-ri-[imKI]  
 in ? KI.RA.ŠE.NI.PI.K[I]? iš<sub>x</sub>-a-ru ù Ba-ba ENSÍ  
 si-mu-ur<sub>4</sub>-ri-imKI ...ik-mi-ù...  
 [6] 'Pu-ut-ti-ma-da-al LUGAL ši-mu-ur-ri-im  
 'In-ZAB LUGAL ma-at na-ma-arKI ...  
 'Du-uh-su-su LUGAL mar-da-ma-anKI  
 [7] a-mu-ut dŠul-gi ša Tap-pa-(an)-da-ra-ah ik-mu-ú (var. : i-ni-ru)  
 [8] ...]-ba-gar ù(!) Rab-si-si MAN.MEŠ šá s[i? - ...]  
 ...]-su-nu-ti-ma ŠEŠ ŠEŠ-šú GAZ  
 [9] ... e-bé-el UB.DA LÍMMU.BA iš-tu dUTU.È a-di dUTU.ŠÚ.A  
 [10] [... dŠul-gi LUGAL ŠEŠ.UNU.KI A 'Ur-dNammu

88. For arguments for and against the equation of these Su-people and the Subarians see Edzard, AfO 19 (1959-60) 16-18; *idem*, RLA 4 (1975) 508 f.

89. Laessle, JAOS 88 (= AOS 53, 1968) 120-122. For Simurrum in the Old Babylonian period, cf. J. J. Finkelstein, JCS 9 (1955) 6.

90. Assuming that Subartu in his date formulas refers to the «Hurrian belt» and not to Assur. On the other hand, one may doubt the existence of a woman or queen of Nawar (MUNUS Na-wa-ri-tim) commanding 10,000 Gutians (ARM 6 : 27; cf. Kupper, RA 42, 1948, 43-46, rev. 9) and involved in the wars of this period (ARM 2 : 26 : 5-10; cf. Kupper, *ib.* 50 and n. 2; B. Landsberger *apud* A. L. Oppenheim, JNES 11, 1952, 135 f.); more likely the reference is simply to an «excellent (slave)-girl» (cf. E. A. Speiser, Or. 23, 1954, 235 f.; Gelb, JNES 20, 1961, 194-196).

91. For ethnic or ethnolinguistic patterns of settlement in the second millennium, see now in detail Carol Kramer, «Pots and Peoples», *Bibliotheca Mesopotamica* 7 (1977) 91-112. This article suggests interesting parallels not only to the situation in the third millennium but also in present-day Iraq, where the approximate border between the heaviest concentrations of Arabic and Kurdish-speaking populations still seems to follow the 400 mm isohyet.

- [šar]?-ru-tu KUR.KUR ka-la-ši-na i-pu-uš  
 [...]ban-ga-ár u 'Rab-si-si LUGAL.MEŠ šá KUR.SU.BIR<sub>4</sub>.KI i-be-el  
 [11] lugal-mu níg-na-me-šè á-šè mu-e-da-(a)-ág  
 a-ab-ba kur dilmun(KI)-na-ta  
 a šeš gaba kur mar-dú-šè (var. : -ta)  
 da? si-mu-ur-ru-um da su-bir<sub>4</sub>KI-šè (var. : -ta)  
 [12] bàd-bi 26 danna-àm (var. : -kam) dím-e-da-mu-dè  
 dal-ba-na hur-sag min-a-bi inim di-di-da-mu-dè  
 dím-(m)e-mu-šè mar-dú hur-sag-gá-ka (i)-íb-tuš-a geštú mu-ši-in-ak  
 si-mu-ur<sub>4</sub>KI nam-tab-ba-ni-šè im-ma-da-[gin]  
 dal-ba-na hur-sag ebih<sup>ki</sup>-ke<sub>4</sub> gištukul sìg-ge-dè im-ma-ši-gin

## Appendix II

## Date Formulas of the Ur III Dynasty

	(A) Dealing with the Hurrian Frontier		(B) Others
Sulgi	24 : Karahar 1 25 : Simurru 1 26 : Simurru 2 27 : Harši	«First Hurrian War»	
			28-29 : high priestess of Eridu 30 : king's daughter married to Anšan
	31 : Karahar 2 32 : Simurru 3 33 : Karahar 3	Second Hurrian War»	
	(37-38 : wall of the land built)		34-35 : Anšan 36 : Nanna of Karzida to his temple 39-41 : Puzriš-Dagan «built»
	42 : Šašrum 1 44 : Simurru (and Lullubum) «9» 45 : Urbilum 1 (Lullubum, Simurru and Karahar) 46-47 : Kimaš and Humurti 48 : Harši (Kimaš and Humurti)	«Third Hurrian War»	43 : high-priestess of Nanna
Amar-Sin	2 : Urbilum (2) 6 : Šašrum 2		1 : Amar-Sin became king 3-5 : various cultic acts 7 : Bitum-rabium, labrum, etc. 8-9 : various cultic acts
Šu-Sin	3 : Simanum (4-5 : Amorite wall built)		1 : Šu-Sin became king 2 : ship of Enki 6 : stele of Enlil and Ninlil 7 : Zabšali 8-9 : various cultic acts
Ibbi-Sin	3 : Simurru		1 : Ibbi-Sin became king 2 : high-priest of Inanna of Uruk

