

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/19095> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Ahmed, Kozad Mohamed

**Title:** The beginnings of ancient Kurdistan (c. 2500-1500 BC) : a historical and cultural synthesis

**Date:** 2012-06-19

# Stellingen

Behorende bij het proefschrift van Kozad Mohamed Ahmed  
*The Beginnings of Ancient Kurdistan (c. 2500-1500 BC)*  
*A Historical and Cultural Synthesis*

## 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 Erridu-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 Zāb, directly upstream from Šikšabbum, at, or close to, modern Taqtaq.
- 11) Iddi(n)-Sîn 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 Bētuate, 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)-Sîn. But because of the

absence of such a powerful kingdom in the north the Amorite kingdoms of Aḫazum and Ya'ilānum could be established between the two Zābs.

- 13) The central topic of the Haladiny inscription is the temple of Nišba, which seems to have been in Mount Pīra Magrūn. 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 the apparent existence of some mutual cooperation between this dynaty 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 Utuḫēgal. 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-Sîn 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.