

On the Location of the Towns of Ur-Zababa and Dimat-Enlil and on the Course of the Arahtum*

Piotr Steinkeller (Boston, MA)

The town of Ur-Zababa, which is plausibly named after a legendary king of Kiš,¹ is documented exclusively in the Ur III period.² Among the attestations of Ur-Zababa, especially informative is *JCS* 52 (2000) 46 no. 61 (ASM 12080),³ almost certainly from Puzriš-Dagan (see Appendix Text 1). This tablet (henceforth Text 1) calculates the rental cost of a boat hired to transport cargo from Ur-Zababa to Puzriš-Dagan (here described by its alternative name of Esagdana).⁴ Very importantly, the total distance between the

* Few cuneiformists living today are as deserving the honor of *Festschrift* as is Gernot Wilhelm. Therefore, I am proud and happy to be part of this worthy undertaking, which recognizes a truly great scholar. Although the topic of my contribution falls beyond the scope of Gernot's usual preoccupations, I hope that my old and dependable friend will find it of at least passing interest.

Robert McC. Adams, Andrea Seri, and Benjamin Studevent-Hickman read the preliminary versions of this paper and offered comments and suggestions. I am grateful to them for this contribution. Needless to say, I alone am responsible for the final product and the views expressed in it.

¹ The third ruler of the Fourth Dynasty of Kiš in the "Sumerian King List" and the adversary of Sargon in the composition "Sargon and Ur-Zababa." It needs to be stressed that there is no independent evidence that Ur-Zababa was a historical figure. Although his name figures already in the Ur III version of the "Sumerian King List" (Steinkeller in *Literatur, Politik und Recht in Mesopotamien: Festschrift für Claus Wilcke*, ed. by W. Sallaberger et al. [Wiesbaden, 2003], 271 iii 4-5), a synchronism with Sargon is most unlikely, since, in that source (as in the later versions), Ur-Zababa is followed by five other kings of Kiš (before the transfer of kingship to Uruk and, eventually, to Sargon). The only Ur-^dZa-ba₄-ba₄ who is documented before the Ur III period is the one of Adab (Ur-^dZa-ba₄-ba₄ Adab^{ki}), who is found in the Names and Professions List from Abu Salabikh and Ebla (OIP 99, 65 lines 89-90; MEE 3, 126 no. 43 v 2). This list, which, as suggested by G. Marchesi in N. Marchetti, *La statuaria regale nella Mesopotamia protodinastica* (Rome, 2006), 225, may have originated as a tally of actual officials of the kingdom of Kiš, dates considerably earlier than Sargon.

² The only other mention of this toponym (spelled Ur-^dZa-ba₄-ba₄^{ki}) comes from an Old Babylonian geographical list (MSL 11, 58 line 131, 59 line 196); note that at least two other sites are named twice in that source: Apsan (lines 64 and 132) and Ešnuna (lines 57 and 86).

³ Originally published in transliteration by P. Michalowski, *OA* 16 (1977) 292-93.

⁴ See Steinkeller, *ZA* 91 (2001) 57-65.

two localities is given, which is fourteen double-hours (da-na), i. e., roughly 150 km.⁵ From this we learn, accordingly, that Ur-Zababa was situated ca. 150 km from Puzriš-Dagan, and that it could be reached by a waterway.

But in which direction from Puzriš-Dagan, and where specifically, did Ur-Zababa lay? The answer to these questions is provided by two Nippur tablets (BE 3 83 and 84). Though excavated at Nippur, these documents may not actually have been written there, since they, together with a group of related Nippur texts, use a mixture of Umma and *Reichskalender* month-names and are concerned with economic activity in various northern Babylonian localities.⁶ BE 3 83 and 84 are closely connected, since both of them are balanced accounts of a certain Ur-Lugalbanda, and date to the same year and month (Šulgi 48/vi = é-iti-6). The former text records Ur-Lugalbanda's labor expenditures (the upkeep of the UN-il personnel and hired workers) to cultivate the fields of Ur-Zababa (nig-ŠID-ak a-šag₄ Ur-Za-ba-ba Ur-^dLugal-bànda^{da}-ke₄ i-dab₅). The other text too is a tally of agricultural expenses, which, in this instance, were incurred by Ur-Lugalbanda in connection with the cultivation of other fields, those of Dimat-Enlil.⁷ Another, equally important topographical information is added in the

middle of the text (iii 1-9), namely, that some of those works focused on the inlet of the Arahtum waterway: ú se₁₂(SIG₇)-a / 13 1/3 sar kin-ka / kun-zi-da / 30 sar kin-ka / mu kin íd ka A-ra-ah-tum-ma-ka-šè / Hé-ti ba-na-a / á guruš 260 ud 1-kam / á 1 guruš 1 ud-a 5 sila-ta / še-bi 4.1.3 še gur, "the removal of weeds, the work being 13 1/3 sar, (and the work on) the dam, the work being 30 sar, in connection with the canal work on the inlet of the Arahtum; (this work) was done⁸ by Heti for him (i. e., for Ur-Lugalbanda); (it required) 260 man-days; at the rate of six quarts per man-day, the barley was 1290⁹ liters."

Since both texts concern the same official and share the same date, it necessarily follows that Ur-Zababa and Dimat-Enlil were situated in close proximity of each other. Moreover, Dimat-Enlil — and therefore Ur-Zababa as well — was located near (or possibly even immediately at) the beginning of the Arahtum, which, during the Old Babylonian period and later times, was one of the main branches of the Euphrates. This is an exceedingly important datum, not only for the locations of Ur-Zababa and Dimat-Enlil, but also for the course of the Arahtum, since, conversely, the Puzriš-Dagan tablet studied earlier establishes the rough distance between Puzriš-Dagan and the starting point of the Arahtum. But, before I consider these issues in detail, we need first to review other data on Ur-Zababa.

Another Ur III attestation of Ur-Zababa comes from Sigrist Ontario 1 168:1-6,¹⁰ a Puzriš-Dagan tablet dating to Amar-Suen 5/iv (kisig-Ninazu). This text records an expenditure of 346 bushels of barley, which was made, in Ur-Zababa, by the major-domo Adallal¹¹ to a certain Dayyan-ili. The barley in question is said to have originated at Maškan-Amar-Suen. The latter place, which is otherwise undocumented, probably

⁵ 1 da-na, written also damma[KASKAL.BU], Akk. *bēru* = 10,692 m.

⁶ For these sources, see R. M. Whiting, *ZA* 69 (1979) 29, 31 and n. 58-59. Of particular interest among them are BE 3 59, 100, 103, and 104, which record deliveries of large quantities of cereals from Upi (in the area of the confluence of the Diyala and the Tigris) and Der (modern Tall 'Aqar near Badra), and involve an official named Ur-nigingar. BE 3 59 (Šulgi 29/iti ^dDumu-zi) lists a total of 1,126 bushels and 97 liters (1126.3.1 + 7 sila) of barley, emmer, and wheat, which was delivered from Upi, from Lu-Šara, via Ur-nigingar. BE 3 100 (Šulgi 31, 34, 35, iti še-KIN-kud, iti še-sag-kud, iti ezen-mah) is concerned with barley, emmer, and wheat, from Upi and a-šag₄ Dim₈(DIN)-at-4-ta, most of it coming from Ur-nigingar, and destined for Ur. BE 3 103 (Šulgi 29) records barley, emmer, and wheat, which was loaded on boats (še má si-ga) and shipped to Ur, Nippur and NAGsu (in the Umma province). Finally, BE 3 104 (Šulgi 28-29, iti ezen-mah, iti ^dŠul-gi) is a record of the deliveries of barley, emmer, wheat, and "large pulses" (gú-gal-gal) from Der (šag₄ Uru-BĀD.AN^{ki}-ta, i 17) and from Upi (ii 10, 18) to Nippur, made mainly by Ur-nigingar. Although a Nippur origin of these texts cannot completely be excluded, a more likely solution is that all of them were written elsewhere, and then transferred to Nippur in ancient times. Be that as it may, this entire group of sources (including BE 3 83 and 84 discussed earlier, and those cited by Whiting, op. cit.) is evidence of large-scale agricultural activity that the central government conducted on the northern fringes of the Ur III state. Apart from the employment of Umma month-names, another peculiarity of these sources is the appearance in them of individuals bearing typical Umma personal names, such as Lu-Šara (BE 3 104 ii 11), Ur-^dUr-bar-tab (BE 3 104 ii 5), and Ur-nigingar (passim). In this connection, one should also mention two sale documents (Steinkeller, *Sale Documents of the Ur III Period*, FAOS 17 [Stuttgart, 1989], 319-22 nos. 121 and 122), with *Reichskalender* month-names, which, based on the information given in no. 122, can be localized in Upi and the hamlet of Nigingar-kidug on the bank of the Durul (modern Diyala). Several of the individuals listed in these documents too have Umma names: Lu-Šara, Puzur-Šara, Šara-mulDU, Gududu, and Ur-nigingar. This possibly indicates that a considerable number of the state officials at Upi stemmed from the Umma province. One could even envision that, sometime early in Šulgi's reign, a whole contingent of Umma administrators had been brought from Umma to Upi, and installed there in charge of the local administration. For a possible identification of Upi with the site of Tulūl-Mujaili', see D. R. Frayne, *The Early Dynastic List of Geographical Names*, AOS 74 (New Haven, 1992), 46.

⁷ šu-nigin 75.3.4 še gur zi-ga-ām 9.2.0 še gur tuš² še i-dub gur₇ ki Ur-^dLugal-bànda^{da}-ka gál-la nig-ŠID-ak Ur-^dLugal-bànda^{da}-ka a-šag₄ Ti-ma-at-^dEn-líl (iv 1-2). BE 3 84 records

specifically the yearly wages of the lú-hun-gá and other personnel employed in the fields of Dimat-Enlil. The fields of Dimat-Enlil are also named in ii end: lú-hun-gá a-šag₄ Ti-ma-at-^dEn-líl-[lá-ka]; and in i end: lú²-[hun-gá² a-šag₄] Ti-ma-a[t]-^dEn-líl-lá-ka.

⁸ I assume that ba-na-a stands for ba-na-ak.

⁹ Since the expected figure is 1300 liters, the total needs to be emended to 4.1.4 še.

¹⁰ 346.0.0 gur še lugal / še Maš-gán-^dAmar-^dSuen^{ki} / ki A-da-lál sabra-ta / DLKUD-i-lí / šu ba-ti / šag₄ Ur-^dZa-ba₄-ba₄.

¹¹ Adallal was an important royal official, apparently stationed at Puzriš-Dagan, who supervised deliveries and distribution of agricultural products. Related documents are: Nikolski 2 518 (Šulgi 46/ii), issues of cereals as part of Adallal's bala; Sigrist Ontario 1 169 (Amar-Suen 8/x), 120 bushels of barley, a loan from the merchant Guli-šag to Adallal; Sauren New York Library 1 (Šu-Suen 2/iv), 60 bushels of barley from Adallal to Duššumum; MVN 15 343 (Šu-Suen 6/iv), "large pulses," various flours, salt, and reeds (as fuel), for the palace, from Adallal, as part of his bala; PDT 1144 (Šu-Suen 6/vi), 14.2.0 bushels of barley from the *hazannum* Nur-ili to Adallal; Sigrist SAT 3 1845 (Šu-Suen 7/xii), 324 bushels of barley from Adallal to Duššumum, distributed on the bank of the Tumul canal (gú íd-Tum-ma-al, line 18, collated; for the Tumul canal, see Steinkeller, *ZA* 91, 67-70). It appears that, in the beginning of his career, Adallal was concerned specifically with the cultivation of royal land in the town of Gišgigal, which was situated in the province of Umma. See *RT* 37 (1915) 136 (Šulgi 43/vi), seed-grain to seed 108 iku of land, from Adallal to Puzur-u'a, a-šag₄ Giš-gi-gal^{ki}; Legrain TRU 377 (Šulgi 46/vi), seed-grain and animal fodder, from Adallal to the farmer Lala'a, šag₄ Giš-gi-gal^{ki}. And compare also Contenau Umma 87 (Šulgi 45/iii), copper (for tools?), from Adallal to Lu-Nana, a supervisor of plow-teams (nu-bànda-gud), a-šag₄ ma-da Umma^{ki}.

was a small agricultural settlement in the vicinity of Ur-Zababa. The huge quantity of barley involved corroborates the testimony of BE 3 83 and 84 that the region of Ur-Zababa was an important agricultural area.

Even more significant is the information that Ur-Zababa had an extensive population of military settlers. We learn this from an undated tablet from Puzriš-Dagan (MVN 11 181:1-7, collated), which records a delivery of animals as the *gún ma-da* tax¹² from the various members of Ur-Zababa's military organization:

1)	[1] gud niga 10 udu Ur-dNin-giš-zi- ¹ da ¹	[1] barley-fed ox (and) 10 sheep: (from) Ur-Ningišzida;
2)	1 gud 10 udu Za-la	1 ox (and) 10 sheep: (from) Zala;
3)	18 udu ugula-géš-da-me	18 sheep: from the officers in charge of 60 (men each);
4)	3 ¹ udu ² ugula-géš-da-me	3 sheep?: from the officers in charge of 60 (men each);
5)	ugula La-la-a (space)	under the command of Lala'a;
6)	lú <Ur->dZa-ba ₄ -ba ₄ ^{ki} -me	the men of <Ur->Zababa;
7)	ugula I-gi ₄ <-ru-mah>	under the supreme command of Igi<rumah>. ¹³

On the basis of the *gún ma-da* rates given in other Puzriš-Dagan sources,¹⁴ Ur-Ningišzida and Zala, the two top payers of the tax, may be identified as "colonels" (*nu-bànda*). In addition, we learn that Ur-Zababa had at least two "officers in charge of 60 (men each)." Finally, Lala'a, who commanded the entire unit, is plausibly to be identified as a "general" (*šagina*).¹⁵ Thus the number of Ur-Zababa's military settlers must have been in the hundreds. That Ur-Zababa had "colonels" is additionally confirmed by the mention of a NN *nu-bànda* Ur-dZa-ba₄-ba₄^{ki}, who appears in a Puzriš-Dagan tablet from Šulgi 33/iv (MVN 3 136:4).

The fact that Ur-Zababa paid the *gún ma-da* tax is significant, since this duty was characteristic of — and actually restricted to — the periphery of the Ur III state.¹⁶ Accordingly, Ur-Zababa must have lain outside the state's core area, i. e., the system of provinces, governed by *ensis*.

We turn our attention now to the town of Dimat-Enlil, which, as I suggested earlier, was a relative neighbor of Ur-Zababa. Although commonly thought by scholars

to have been situated near Nippur,¹⁷ Dimat-Enlil clearly was a northern Babylonian site (see in detail below). Documented during the Ur III and Old Babylonian periods, and possibly also in Middle Babylonian times,¹⁸ Dimat-Enlil was an important strategic point. This is demonstrated by the fact that, in the second half of Šu-Suen's reign, it was one of the localities directly controlled by the chancellor Arad-Nanna (aka Aradmu).¹⁹ The military organization of Dimat-Enlil is otherwise documented; a tablet from Girsu/Lagaš records an expenditure of 9 bushels of barley to ninety soldier-workers (*éren*) of Dimat-Enlil.²⁰ It is also known that there were some Amorites living there.²¹

Dimat-Enlil's strategic importance persisted into the Old Babylonian period, since it was one of the six fortresses that had been built by Sumu-la-el of Babylon, and

¹⁷ See, e. g., RGTC 2, 31; 3, 52-53; A. R. George, *Babylonian Topographical Texts*, OLA 40 (Leuven, 1992), 447. This idea, which seems to derive from the fact that BE 3 84 was found at Nippur, can be traced to A. Falkenstein, *Gerichtsurkunden* 1, 37 n. 5. A toponym Dimat-Enlil (which may or may not be identical with the Dimat-Enlil of Ur III and OB sources) is mentioned in the Middle Babylonian texts from Nippur (RGTC 5, 81), but even in this case a connection with Nippur is highly uncertain (if not doubtful). That Dimat-Enlil belonged to northern Babylonia had been concluded already by E. Unger, RLA 2 (1938), 227a.

¹⁸ See the preceding note. Note, further, that Dimat-Enlil is named in several OB geographical lists (MSL 11, 59 line 168, 105 line 295, 131 iv 12).

¹⁹ See D. R. Frayne, RIME 3/2, 323-24 Šu-Sin 13, Arad-Nanna's inscription commemorating the construction of Šu-Suen's temple in Girsu. This source, which must have been written after the pacification of the Šimaškan lands in the year Šu-Suen 7 (or Šu-Suen 6), contains a detailed enumeration of Arad-Nanna's ensiships and generalships. Those fall into distinctive groupings, in reflection of their geographic distribution: 1) the *ensi* of Lagaš, the *šagina* of Ušar-GARšana (in the Umma province); 2) the *šagina* of Pašime (on the coast of the ancient Persian Gulf, near modern Amarah); 3) the *énsi* of Sabum (in northwestern Khusistan) and of the land of Gutium (in Luristan south of Kermanshah); 4) the *šagina* of Dimat-Enlil, the *énsi* of Al-Šu-Suen; 5) the *šagina* of Urbilum (modern Arbil), the *énsi* of Hamazi (north of Assur, possibly Tall Haikal on the Tigris) and of Karahar (to the east? of Hamazi), the *šagina* of NI-hi (probably near Hamazi and Karahar); 6) the *šagina* of Šimaški and of the land of Karta (in Iranian Kurdistan; to the east of Lullubum = region of Sulaymaniyah). The consolidation of so many, strategically important posts under Arad-Nanna undoubtedly was a desperate, last-ditch effort to shore up the defenses of the weakening Ur III state.

On the internal logic of this listing, it would appear that Dimat-Enlil and Al-Šu-Suen were relative neighbors. The latter toponym is almost certainly identical with Al(URU)-Šu-Suen-re'i-nišišu, which is mentioned in MVN 4 1, a record of the land held by the military organization in and around that town. See Steinkeller in *Studies Presented to Robert D. Biggs*, ed. by M. T. Roth et al., AS 27 (Chicago, 2007), 219.

For the location of Hamazi, see Steinkeller in *Urkes and the Hurrians: Studies in Honor of Lloyd Cotsen*, ed. by G. Buccellati and M. Kelly-Buccellati, BiMes 26 (Malibu, 1998), 84-85. For NI-hi, see Jean ŠA XXXVI:1c lines 1-3 (Šulgi 48/viii), which lists the *gún ma-da* tax from the military settlers (*éren*) of NI-hi^{ki}, under the command (*ugula*) of Aradmu. The fact that NI-hi was controlled by Aradmu/Arad-Nanna is a strong reason to think that it was situated in the general area of Hamazi and Karahar. Cf. Steinkeller in *Organization of Power*, 35 n. 48. For the location of the Šimaškan lands, see Steinkeller, ZA 97 (2007) 216-17, 219 fig. 1.

²⁰ ITT 9962, description of content only: "Paiement: 90 hommes à 30 qa, l'orge est de 9 gurru, éren Ti-ma-at-dEn-lil-lá." Seal of A-bu-tā-ab, son of Í-lí-ki-ib-[r], servant of Ibbi-Suen.

²¹ See Or. 47-49 38:1-4 (Puzriš-Dagan, Šu-Suen 4/vi): 1 har kug-babbar 7 *gín-ta* / [l]ú? 4 ù Ama-ak-nu-um [MAR].TU Ti-ma-at-dEn-lil-lá^{ki} / [ud] kur MAR.TU-ta / ¹im-gin-na-a / Arad-dNanna suka¹-mah maškim, "1 coil of silver (weighing) 7 shekels per each (person): four [me]n? and Amaknum, the Amorite of Dimat-Enlil, [when] he came from the Amorite land; the requisitioner (was) Arad-Nanna, the chancellor."

¹² See Steinkeller in *The Organization of Power: Aspects of Bureaucracy in the Ancient Near East*, ed. by McG. Gibson and R. D. Biggs, SAOC 46 (Chicago, 1987), 30-39.

¹³ In all probability, we find here the general I-gi₄-ru-mah, who is documented as a *šagina* in AUCT 2 384:9 (Šulgi 47/v).

¹⁴ See Steinkeller in *Organization of Power*, 31-35.

¹⁵ He is possibly identical with La-la-a-a *šagina*, who appears in an Umma tablet from Amar-Suen 5/ix/16 (UT 1 3 1987:10). There was also a "colonel" (*nu-bànda*) La-la-a (Sauren New York Library 236:7).

¹⁶ See Steinkeller in *Organization of Power*, 36-37.

were later restored by Samsu-iluna.²² Those fortresses, which appear to have formed Babylon's main defense line, were, apart from Dimat-Enlil, Pada, Lagaba, Yabušum, Kulaba, and Uši-ana-Erra. Although none of these six toponyms can be located precisely,²³ it is certain that all of them belonged to northern Babylonia.²⁴

For the location of Dimat-Enlil specifically, it is significant that its name appears in the Old Babylonian texts from Sippar.²⁵ Among those attestations, of particular interest is the legal document CT 48 59, from the reign of Apil-Sin, in which a Sippar *nadītu* wills to her adoptive daughter a field in Dimat-Enlil.²⁶ Another Sippar text (CT 48 7), talks of a slave woman that had been sent, apparently from Sippar, to Dimat-Enlil, and placed in a household there.²⁷ And finally, a letter-order from the reign of Hammurabi (VAS 9 141 = R. Frankena, AbB 6, 150-51 no. 221) groups together individuals from Dimat-Enlil with those living (along) the Tigris of Yahrurum, where Yahrurum undoubtedly stands for Sippar-Yahrurum, i. e., Abu Habbah.²⁸ These data argue strongly that Dimat-Enlil's location was not too far from Sippar.

This finding takes us back to the Ur III text BE 3 84, which, as I noted earlier, places Dimat-Enlil near the inlet of the Arahtum. The question of the Arahtum was studied most recently by S.W. Cole and H. Gasche,²⁹ with a conclusion that, in the beginning of the Old Babylonian period, the hydronym Arahtum described a lower section

the Kiš branch of the Euphrates, which departed "32 km north of Babylon, at the point where the latter waterway turned toward Kish" (p. 26). At the same time these scholars acknowledged that, at least since the reign of Abi-ešuh of Babylon, Arahtum's name also applied to the uppermost section of the Kiš branch, which took off from the "main" branch of the Euphrates some 20 km northwest of Sippar. This particular part of the Kiš branch appears to have been called "the Upper Arahtum."³⁰

The combined evidence of Text 1, BE 3 83, and BE 3 84 has important bearing on this question. The figure of fourteen *da-na*, which is given in Text 1 as the distance between Puzriš-Dagan and Ur-Zababa, translates into 149.68 km. Assuming that this distance was also broadly representative of Dimat-Enlil and the beginning of the Arahtum, Ur-Zababa's putative neighbors, one might now juxtapose this figure with the distance between Puzriš-Dagan (modern Dreheim) and Sippar (modern Abu Habbah). The direct (as a crow flies) distance between these two sites is 148.31 km³¹; if one allows for the distortions of the waterways, the figure increases to ca. 164 km.³² On this evidence, therefore, the starting point of the Arahtum was ca. 15 km south of Sippar.

When compared with the reconstruction of the Arahtum's course by Cole and Gasche, our findings agree best with their conclusion that this waterway began 32 km north of Babylon (and thus some 27 km south of Sippar). A possibility that the Arahtum of BE 3 84 describes the upper section of the Kiš branch (the so called "Upper Arahtum"), which separated from the "main" branch of the Euphrates some 20 km northwest of Sippar — while not entirely impossible — is considerably less likely.

The safest conclusion, therefore, appears to be that the towns of Dimat-Enlil and Ur-Zababa are to be sought roughly half-way between Babylon and Sippar. This finding agrees with the testimony of Old Babylonian sources, according to which Dimat-Enlil was near Sippar.

Another settlement located in the same general area, apparently, was Maškan-Amar-Suen, which is mentioned together with Ur-Zababa in Sigris Toronto 1 168. Still another likely candidate for this general area is Al-Šu-Suen, which is paired with Dimat-Enlil in the inscription of the chancellor Arad-Nanna.³³

It appears that this group of settlements was situated along the right (western) bank of the Arahtum.³⁴ This is indicated by the fact that Ur-Zababa and Dimat-Enlil

²² See D. Frayne, RIME 4, 380-83 Samsu-iluna 5 lines 33-62 (Sumerian) = lines 31-58 (Akkadian).

²³ The location of these fortresses was discussed by Frayne, *Geographical List*, 93-95, 96 Map 13. Frayne too thought that "these forts formed a protective ring around Babylon," but his specific identifications lack conviction. As argued by O. Tammuz, "The Location of Lagaba," *RA* 90 (1996) 19-25, Lagaba probably lay on a watercourse between Babylon and Kutha. For the northern Babylonian Kulaba, which appears to have been originally a satellite of Babylon, and later, one of Babylon's districts, see Steinkeller, *Vicino Oriente* 6 (1986) 40 and n. 64; Frayne, *Geographical List*, 9; George, *Topographical Texts*, 18-19.

²⁴ For this conclusion, sufficient alone is the fact that Babylon's political influence under Sumu-la-el was still limited to northern Babylonia. See D. Charpin in *Mesopotamien: Die altbabylonische Zeit*, ed. by P. Attinger et al., OBO 160/4 (Fribourg, 2004), 95, who traces the extent of Sumu-la-el's territorial possessions from Marad, in the south, to Sippar, in the north.

²⁵ R. Harris, *Ancient Sippar* (Leiden, 1975), 382; RGTC 3, 52-53.

²⁶ 2(BÜR) 3(IKU) GÁNA A.ŠAG₄ *i-na* Di-ma-at-^dEn-lil (line 6, restored after the case). Although RGTC 3, 53, analyzes this occurrence as *Di-ma-at-^dŠin*(EN.ZU), the last sign is almost certainly LÍL/É, and not ZU.

²⁷ [E-tel]-^dpi-^dNa-bi-um a-na AN.ZA.GÁR-^dEn-lil^{kil} / ub-^dla'-aš-ši-ma / i-na É E-te-ia-tum DUMU Ša-li-ia-tum / ù E-ri-iš-tum aš-ša-ti-šu / c-mi-iq-ti-šu ú-šc-ši-bu-ši / Ak-ša-ia ù ^dMarduk-na-ši-ir / a-na AN.ZA.GÁR-^dEn-lil^{kil} i-li-ku-nim-ma / a-na E-te-ia-tum ù E-ri-iš-tum / aš-ša-ti-šu ki-a-am iq-bu-ú / [u]m-ma šu-nu-ma 1 SAG. GÉME [...] "[Etel]-pi-Nabi-um brought her (i. e., the slave woman) to Dimat-Enlil, and they placed her in the household of Eteyatum, son of Saliyatum, and Erišum, his wife, as his (i. e., of Eteyatum) servant. (Subsequently) Akšaya and Marduk-našir came to Dimat-Enlil and thus said to Eteyatum and Erišum, his wife: 'One slave woman' [...]" (lines 3'-12', rest broken off).

²⁸ PN₁ PN₂ LÚ AN.ZA.GÁR-^dEn-lil PN₃ PN₄ ù PN₅ LÚ ÍD.IDIGNA Ia-aš-ru-ru-um ni-pa-ti-šu-nu wu-uš-šc-cr, "(concerning those five individuals) release their distresses!" (lines 1-10).

²⁹ *Changing Watercourses in Babylonia: Towards a Reconstruction of Ancient Environment in Lower Mesopotamia*, Mesopotamian History and Environment Series II: Memoirs V/1 (Ghent, 1998), 26-27. Cf. also H. Gasche, M. Tanret, S. W. Cole, and K. Verhoeven, "Fleuves du temps et de la vie: Permanence et stabilité du réseau fluvial babylonien entre 2400 et 1500 avant notre ère," *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 57 (2002) 538-39.

³⁰ N. b. Cole and Gasche, *Changing Watercourses*, 26 n. 125, were aware of the mention of the Arahtum in BE 3 84, but thought that "the interpretation of the passage is problematic." In this they followed an earlier, inconclusive discussion of this attestation by F. Carroué in *ASJ* 13 (1991) 26-28.

³¹ This figure is based on the latitude/longitude coordinates of these two sites, as given in RGTC 2, 156, 169.

³² I owe this calculation to Elizabeth C. Stone. Similar information on the length of boat-trips is provided by Texts 2 and 3 (see Appendix at the end of this article), which concern trips between an unknown locale and Umma, and between Nippur and Ur, respectively.

³³ See above n. 19.

³⁴ Any speculation as to how far to the west of the Arahtum these settlements were located depends on the maximum westward extent of the cultivation zone in this region during the period under consideration (Ur III-Old Babylonian). In the absence of fully comprehensive archaeological surveys of the western reaches of northern Babylonia (see below n. 39), this question cannot be answered at this time.

enjoyed a somewhat peripheral status in Ur III times. This is especially clear in the case of Ur-Zababa, which paid the *gún ma-da* tax. Furthermore, there is the fact that both of them (and the same was true of Al-Šu-Suen as well) were directly governed by the crown — and therefore they remained outside the provincial system (in this case, the ensiships of Babylon and Sippar).

There is every reason to think that Ur-Zababa, Dimat-Enlil, and Maškan-Amar-Suen (and probably Al-Šu-Suen as well) were all part of a completely new settlement project. This project, which must have begun already under Šulgi³⁵ (or perhaps even under Ur-Namma), appears to have been made possible by the fact that the Arahtum had become (probably at the very beginning of the Ur III period) a major waterway. As is generally recognized, a direct consequence of this development was the rise of Babylon, Borsippa, and Dilbat, as well as other Arahtian settlements, to economic and political prominence.³⁶ Concomitantly, there began a slow decline of the settlements along the lower section of the Kiš branch (from the city of Kiš all the way down to Uruk), since, due to the Arahtum diversion, considerably less water was reaching this channel.³⁷ These two parallel processes were already at work in Ur III times — as evidenced, most palpably, in Babylon having become an ensidom. But their full logical outcome came only with the reign of Sumu-la-el, when Babylon established hegemony over northern Babylonia.

The project through which Ur-Zababa and the related settlements came into being undoubtedly was a planned, state-run undertaking. As the examples of similar projects in the core area of Babylonia — and in the periphery of the Ur III state as well — indicate, new settlers were brought in from the outside, provided with land allotments, and put under the control of central military organization. Since, as their names indicate, the sites of Maškan-Amar-Suen and Al-Šu-Suen were founded under Amar-Suen and Šu-Suen respectively, this was an ongoing process, lasting most of the Ur III period.³⁸

³⁵ Note that the earliest attestation of Ur-Zababa dates to Šulgi 33 (see MVN 3 136, cited above p. 372).

³⁶ See, e. g., Cole and Gasche, "Courses," 27; Gasche et al., *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 57, 539.

³⁷ It is characteristic that, in Ur III times, the river traffic south of Nippur was conducted predominantly over the Tigris, via the link at KA-sahar. See Steinkeller, ZA 91, 41-84. This fact indicates that the Euphrates levels below Nippur usually were too low to allow large-boat navigation. The beginnings of this situation can be traced as far back as the reign of Utu-hegal, since, already at that time, Uruk had depended on the Tigris for its irrigation needs (which were satisfied through the Iturungal canal), the supplies of the Euphrates having apparently been insufficient for that purpose. Hence the conflict with the Gutian rulers of Adab, who, shortly earlier, had assumed control over the Tigris and its canal systems. Still further evidence of the diminished water-flow in the Kiš branch is the reliance, in post-Ur III times, of the kingdom of Larsa on the Tigris for its water requirements.

³⁸ Such state-sponsored settlements are documented in other parts of northern Babylonia as well. Examples here are the towns of Hibaritum and Šarru-laba, which, according to the so-called "Cadaster of Ur-Namma," were situated within the general area of the cities of Urum, Puš, and Sippar. See Steinkeller, JCS 32 (1980) 26-27; Cole and Gasche, *Changing Watercourses*, 19-21. For Šarru-laba, which is also attested, as a military settlement, in Old Babylonian times, see further K. De Graef, *AuOr* 20 (2002) 74-76, 93. Hibaritum and Šarru-laba are linked together in AUCT 1 390 (ŠS 2/ii — Umma month-name), which lists *siskur* offerings for (a-šag₄ šag₄) Hi-ba-ri-tum^{ki} (lines 8 and 12) and a-šag₄ šag₄ Sar-ru-[la]-ba^{ki}

As shown by our data, this new settlement developed into a major cereal-producing area. We have seen that its produce was brought directly to Puzriš-Dagan, where it entered the coffers of the crown. No less important, this settlement formed an important link in the chain of Ur III defenses, as it protected the critical junction of the Euphrates and the Tigris water systems, and, at the same time, served as a buffer against Amorite intrusions. The strategic importance of this region is demonstrated by the fact that Dimat-Enlil was maintained as a fortress by the rulers of Babylon from the time of Sumu-la-el into the reign of Samsu-iluna, i. e., for some 150 years. Since Samsu-iluna names it first among the fortresses he rebuilt, Dimat-Enlil may even have been Babylon's premier defense facility.

Unfortunately, the area where Dimat-Enlil and its neighbors are to be sought has not been covered systematically by the exiting archaeological surveys.³⁹ Accordingly, a physical identification of these sites will have to wait until the exploration of Iraq's alluvial plain, in particular, of its outer reaches, will again become possible.

APPENDIX

Text 1 (JCS 52 [2000] 46 no. 61 — Amar-Suen 2; Puzriš-Dagan?)

- 1) 1 má 20.0.0 gur da-na 1(gur) gur 1 sila-ta
- 2) kaskal-bi da-na 14-àm
- 3) še-bi 0.4.4 [gur]
- rev. 4) PAD má bappir gú-gal-ga[l] gú-tur-tur ù imgaga₃(ZÍZ.AN)
- 5) Ur-Za-ba₄-ba₄ki-ta
- 6) É-sag-da-na-šè gar-ra
- 7) mu dAmar-dSuen lugal-e Ur-bí-lum^{ki} mu-hul
- 1) One boat of the capacity of twenty bushels, (its hire rate per one) double-hour is one liter (of barley) per one bushel (of cargo).

(line 6). A related tablet (AUCT 1 723, -/ii — Umma month-name) names a *siskur* offering for a-šag₄ šag₄ Sar-ru-sar^{ki}. It is known that Hibaritum supplied large quantities of cereals to the central government. See MVN 9 93 (Š 32 /ii *Reichskalender* month-name), which records a delivery of 102 bushels of barley and over 41 bushels of emmer from the field of Hibaritum (mu-DU a-šag₄ Hi-ba-r[i]-tum^{ki}-ta). A similar (probably military) settlement may have been Šarrum-ṭab. See Sauren New York Library 77 (AS 7/vii), from Puzriš-Dagan, listing a receipt of 177 bushels of barley, 2 bushels of "large pulses," and 120 liters of cumin in Šarrum-ṭab (šag₄ Sar-ru-um-DÜG).

³⁹ The surface-survey on northern Babylonia conducted by R. McC. Adams, apud McG. Gibson, *The City of and Area of Kish* (Coconut Grove, FL, 1972), 182-208, Maps 1-9 following p. 316, focused primarily on the territories extending to the east of the (presumed) course of the Arahtum. See in particular, *ibid.*, Map 1c. In response to my query as to the extent of that survey, R. McC. Adams wrote back to me as follows: "My own involvement with the western courses of the Euphrates came to an end of the Akkad Survey more than half-century (!) ago, and I don't believe anyone else took up that interesting corner of the Mesopotamian plain later. And the Gasche maps are too generalized and small-scale to look for details on the ancient watercourses themselves" (e-mail letter, March 16, 2008).

- 2) Its trip is fourteen double-hours.
- 3) Its barley is 280 liters.
- 4) (This is) the rental fee of a boat loaded with “beer-bread,” large pulses,
small pulses, and emmer,
- 5) (traveling) from Ur-Zababa
- 6) to Esagdana.
- 7) Year Amar-Suen 2.

The purpose of this document is somewhat unclear. On the one hand, the fact that the text omits the official(s) in charge of this operation and the month, suggests that we find here a theoretical exercise. On the other hand, however, the description of the cargo appears to be too specific for such an interpretation. The most likely solution, therefore, is that it is an estimate, written in preparation for a forthcoming shipment.

Lines 1-3. The rental rate of one quart of barley per each bushel (gur) of cargo transported over the distance of one double-hour is documented in two other Ur III sources (see Texts 2 and 3 below).

Line 4. Owen, *JCS* 52, 14, reads the first sign as níg (i. e., GAR), but, as copied by him, it is unquestionably PAD. Note that Michalowski, *OA* 16, 292, without hesitation read the sign in question as šuku. My own original transliteration of this text, which was made based on a cast that was available in the seventies at Chicago’s Oriental Institute, also shows unequivocal PAD. The context suggests that PAD is here a term for rental fee. If so, one might consider that PAD is an abbreviation for addir, written PAD. DUG.SI+GIŠ in ED Lagaš sources. For other early spellings of addir, see Zhi Yang, “A Study of the Sargonic Archive from Adab” (unpubl. PhD dissertation, Chicago, 1986), 248-49. Note also the possibility that addir may be abbreviated as SI in the Ur III texts from Nippur (see Steinkeller, *ZA* 91, 70 n. 206). Otherwise, addir is exceedingly rare in Ur III sources. I know of only one (and not completely certain at that) Ur III attestation of it: 5 gín kug-babbar kug má PAD.SIA Pa-šim-^re’, “5 shekels of silver, the cost of a rented boat (to travel to) Pašime” (Or. 47-49 221:1-2 + Waetzoldt *OA* 17 [1978] 43; Umma). Cf. also še PAD.SIA-ta è-a in BE 3 100 iii 13, iv 7’, 14’, which, however, may equally well stand for pad/šuku diríg, “leftover/extra food allotment.”

Text 2 (AUCT 2 307 — Šu-Suen 7/iii; Puzriš-Dagan)

- 1) 12.2.3 še gu[r]
- 2) á má hun-g[á] še 150.0.0 gur
- 3) 0.5.0? GA AR SAR M[A?]
- 4) é-amar é-dŠá-ra-ki-še
- 5) kaskal-bi 25 da-na
- 6) da-na-a á še 1.0.0 gur 1 sila-ta
- rev. 7) ki Lú-dingir-ra-ta ba-z[i]
- 8) iti šeš-da-k[ú]

- 9) mu dŠu-dSuen [luga]l Úrim-ki-ma-k[e₄]
- 10) ma-da Za-ab-ša-li-ki mu-hu[l]
- 1) Twelve bushels and 150 liters of barley
- 2) (is) the rental fee of a hired boat (carrying) 150 bushels of barley,
- 3) ...
- 4) (traveling) to the cattle (fattening) establishment of the temple of Šara;
- 5) (the distance is) twenty-five double-hours (= 267.3 km);
- 6) at the rate of one liter (of barley) per one bushel (transported over one)
double-hour).
- 7) Expended from Lu-dingira.
- 8) Month III.
- 9-10) Year Šu-Suen 7.

Line 3. The entire line is very obscure. One expects to find here the name of the site from which the grain was sent. A possible, but highly tentative, reading would Ú-ga-ar-sar-r[u-um^{ki}-ta]. The tablet needs to be collated.

Line 4. É-dŠá-ra-ki is an alternative designation of Umma. See RGTC 2, 48. Since the tablet dates to Šu-Suen 7, this delivery of barley was probably part of the supplies that the central government contributed toward the construction of Šara’s temple at Umma. For this national project, which began as early as Šu-Suen 2, and was completed in Šu-Suen 9, see Steinkeller, “The Employment of Labor on Public (National) Projects in the Ur III Period” (an unpublished paper, presently revised for publication).

Line 5. Assuming that the shipment came from the north, and that the boat traveled to Umma via Nippur, the point of issue would have been some 170 km north of Nippur, and thus on the outer fringes of northern Babylonia (the Diyala region?). This is based on the estimated Nippur-Umma distance of 80.45 km (as a crow flies) or 100 km (over the waterways, via the KA-sahar connection, for which see Steinkeller, *ZA* 91, 56-61).

Line 7. This Lu-dingira is almost certainly identical with the general Lu-dingira, who supervised the construction of Šara’s temple in Umma. See Steinkeller, “Employment of Labor.”

Text 3 (AUCT 1 386 — Amar-Suen 9/xiii; Puzriš-Dagan)

- 1) 4.4.0 še gur
- 2) á má hun-gá še 80.1.0 gur é dEn-líl-lá-ta
- 3) še 36.0.0 gur ki Ur-dBa-ú-ta
- 4) Nibru-ki-ta
- 5) Úrim-ki-še
- 6) kaskal-bi 15 da-na
- 7) 1.1.4 še gur
- 8) á má hun-gá še 20.0.0 gu[r]

- 9) 'x-x-LUM'[ki-ta]
(rest broken off)
rev. (beg. broken off)
- 1') kaskal-bi [x da]-na
2') da-na-a 'á' [še 1.0.0 1] sila-t[a]
3') iti ezen-d[Nin-a-z]u-ta
4') iti dirig-še-KIN-kud-šè
5') iti 9-kam
(space)
6') šu-nigin 16.2.0 2 sila še gur
7') á má hun-gá še zi-ga
8') ki Ur-šu-ga-lam-ma-ta ba-zi
9') mu en dNanna Kar-zi-da ba-hun
- 1) 1,440 liters of barley
2) (is) the rental fee of a hired boat (carrying) 80 bushels and 60 liters of
barley from the temple-household of Enlil,
3) (and of) 36 bushels of barley (coming) from Ur-Bau;
4) from Nippur
5) to Ur
6) the distance is fifteen double-hours.

Lines 1-6. The numbers do not add up. The problem may be resolved in two different ways: (1) if one emends the rental fee in line 1 to 5.4.0 = 1,740 liters, then this figure agrees with the cargo of 116.0.0 (lines 2-3), transported over a distance of 15 da-na, at the rate of 1 liter per 1 bushel over 1 da-na; this solution ignores the extra 60 liters in line 2; (2) if one emends 80.1.0 in line 2 to 60.0.0, then the total of the cargo so obtained, i. e., 96.0.0, agrees with the rental fee of 4.4.0 = 1,440 liters. The second solution may be favored, since it removes the problem of the outstanding 60 liters, as fractions of bushel (gur) are unlikely in this context.

Lines 4-6. 15 da-na = 160.38 km. The distance between Nippur and Ur as a crow flies is 154.91 km; over the waterways — 161 km (the calculation is courtesy of E. C. Stone).

15 double-hours are given as the distance between Nippur and Ur also in "Šulgi A" lines 39-78.⁴⁰ This famous passage describes how Šulgi ran from Nippur to Ur and back during one day (from dusk to dusk, i. e., twenty-four hours), covering 15 double-hours each way in the process, and how he was able to perform, on the very same day, the eššešu festival both in Nippur and at Ur.⁴¹ See, especially, the following key lines:

Nibruki-ta sig₄ Ūrimki-ma-šè / danna l-gim šu-nigin-ta šag₄-mu

⁴⁰ See J. Klein, *Three Šulgi Hymns: Sumerian Royal Hymns Glorifying King Šulgi of Ur* (Ramat-Gan, 1981), 167-217.

ha-ma-ab-dug₄ ... dUtu á-dam-ma ud dagal-la / É-kiš-nu-gál-šè ha-ba-ku₄-re-en ... dNin-ninna₂mušen sūr-dùmušen-gim ha-ba-zi-ge-en / Nibruki-šè a-la-gá ha-ba-gur-re-en ... dUtu é-a-ni-šè igi i-ğa-gá-dè / kaskal 15 danna-àm šu hu-mu-nigin / sag-ur-sag-mu-ne igi hu-mu-un-du₈-uš-àm / ud l-a Nibruki Ūrimki-ma èš-èš-bi hu-mu-ak, "my heart prompted me to make a round-trip between Nippur and the brick-work of Ur as if it were one double-hour ... (by the time) Utu spread daylight over the habitations (i. e., in the early morning⁴²), I entered into the Ekišnugal ... (then) I rose like an owl, like a hawk, and returned to Nippur in my joy ... before Utu set his face toward his (netherworld) house, I covered the distance of 15 double-hours back and forth; my top warriors looked at me (with astonishment); in Nippur and at Ur, in one day, I indeed celebrated the eššešu festival!" (lines 40-41, 49-50, 60-61, 75-78).⁴³

Importantly, the immediately preceding lines offer a detailed description of how Šulgi built new roads and established along them a network of traveling lodges and road-houses:

gīr hu-mu-gur kaskal kalam-ma-ke₄ si hé-em-sá-sá / danna hu-mu-gi é gal-la hé-bí-dù / zag-ba gīškirig hé-bí-gub (hé-bí-íb-dù) ki ní dúb-bu hé-bí-gar / ki-bé lú zu-a hé-em-mi-tuš / sig-ta du igi-nim-ta du-e / á šed₁₀-bi-šè hé-eb-ši-te-en-te-en / nita har-ra-an-na du kaskal-e gi₆ ba-an-da-sá / uru dù-a-gim zi-ni ha-ba-ši-in-tum, "I strengthened⁴⁴ the roads, put in order the highways of the land, determined the double-hour (distances), built big caravansarais, planted orchards at their sides, established resting places, installed in those places experienced personnel, (so that) the one coming from the north, and the one coming from the south, may refresh himself within their cool sides; the way-farer, who travels by night, may find haven there as in a well-built town" (lines 28-35).⁴⁵

⁴¹ This event is also commemorated in "Šulgi V" lines 13-29 (M.-Ch. Ludwig, *Untersuchungen zu den Hymnen des Išme-dagan von Isin* [Wiesbaden, 1990], 86-89).

⁴² Cf. "Šulgi V" lines 23-25: Nibruki ki-ur-ta na-ka₄ èš Ūrimki É-temen-ni-gūru-šè dNanna ūnu kin-nim bur nun sūg-ga-né sá ul nam-mi-in-du₄, "he ran from Nippur, from Ki'ur, to the shrine of Ur, Etemenniguru, where he provided the princely bowls of Nanna, set-up for breakfast in the dining-hall, with perfect offerings."

⁴³ For šu ... nigin (or simply nigin), "to turn around, to make one's rounds, to make a round trip" (Akk. šadu, saḫāru), see Klein, op. cit., 215; Steinkeller, ZA 91, 58 and n. 58. For sag-ur-sag, "top/best warrior" (here certainly not assinnu, as thought by Klein, op. cit., 215, and ETCSL), see sag-ur-sag = qar-ra-du (Sag B 13 = MSL SS1, 28).

⁴⁴ I assume that the verb gur in line 21 is gur₄ = kubburu, "to make strong, thick, to fortify." See na-na lu-a ... ūr É-ninnu-ka mu-na-ni-gur, "he fortified the foundations of Eninnu with innumerable boulders" (Gudea Statue B vi 60-63), and the use of kubburu in reference to the construction of thick brick walls (CAD K, 5b).

There is every reason to think that Šulgi's "run" was a historical event, since it is also commemorated in the formula of his seventh regnal year: *mu Šul-gi lugal-e Ūrimki-ta Nibruki-še šu in/i-nigin*, "made a round-trip between Ur and Nippur" (RTC 276, 277, 278; BE 1 125:3). And, echoing "Šulgi A," the formula of Šulgi's previous year deals with his road-building program: *mu gīr Nibruki[-ta Ūrimki-še? si bí-sa?]* (BE 1 125:2).⁴⁵ Thus, the two events were clearly connected,⁴⁷ with the "run" having been a direct consequence of the road-building project. In all likelihood, therefore, the reality behind Šulgi's "run" was an official inauguration of the completed highway network (particularly, the Nippur-Ur route, which probably constituted the main highway within the core area of the Ur III state), and a test-run of the courier service. Quite likely, the specific purpose of that test was to demonstrate that messages could be carried on foot from Nippur to Ur and back within one day.

We can be sure that Šulgi did not run himself (although he may have jogged for a while at the beginning and at end of the trip), the actual running having been done by the professional runners (*lú-kas₄*). A distance of 150 km could easily be covered by relay runners within twelve hours (at a very reasonable rate of between 10 and 15 km per hour); the Inka road-runners (*chaski*) could traverse (in the mountains!) up to 240 km daily.⁴⁸ One might even envision that the runners carried Šulgi in a palanquin on this trip. Assuming that the trip began at dusk (the starting point of the Babylonian day), Šulgi may have actually traveled from Nippur to Ur and back within one twenty-four hour period, and participated in two separate festivals: a morning one at Ur and an evening one at Nippur!

⁴⁵ These claims are confirmed by the testimony of economic sources, which attest to the presence, in Ur III Babylonia, of an elaborate network of rest houses and messenger posts, called *é-danna*, "double-hour house," and *é-kas₄*, "runners' house," respectively. The former, for which see Steinkeller, ZA 91, 63 n. 170, appear to have been distributed at one double-hour intervals. The *é-kas₄*, which are documented at Umma, Apišal, Girsu, Gu'abba, Kinunir, and Hurum — as well as in the periphery (note the *é-kas₄ gaba Ba-šim-e-ki*, "runners' house at the border/seacoast of Pašime") — provided lodgings, travels provisions, and logistical support to royal messengers, members of the military organization, and other individuals traveling on official business. See in detail W. Heimpel, RA 88 (1994) 1-31; W. Sallaberger in *Mesopotamien: Akkade-Zeit und Ur III-Zeit*, ed. by P. Attinger and M. Wäfler, OBO 160/3 (Freiburg, 1999), 306-15; N. Veldhuis, ZA 91 (2001) 85-100; F. D'Agostino and J. Politi, NISABA 16, 14.

⁴⁶ Note, however, that the autonomous status of the formula Šulgi 6 was questioned by C. Wilcke, Or NS 54 (1985) 301.

⁴⁷ So already Sallaberger, *Akkade-Zeit und Ur III-Zeit*, 307.

⁴⁸ According to colonial accounts, there were 1,500 *chaski* on duty along the Cusco-Quito road (the main route of the Inca empire). See John Hyslop, *The Inka Road System* (Orlando, 1984). These runners were stationed at 12.5 league (ca. 8 km.) intervals. A characteristic feature of the Inka road-system were "inns" (*tampu*), which lodged individuals traveling on state business. Distributed at intervals of between 10 and 40 km (mostly within a range of 15 to 25 km), these resting facilities were equipped with stores for food, fodder and firewood, and corrals for the llamas. There were also smaller, more rudimentary messenger posts, called *chaskiwasi*, which were intended specifically for the runners. The latter were separated by an average range of about 3.3 or 6.7 km, "depending on whether there were two or four *chaski* to a post" (op. cit., 307).