Subartu

Editorial Board

Sultan Muhesen, Joachim Bretschneider, Marc Lebeau,
Lucio Milano, Philippe Talon, Karel Van Lerberghe.

With the support of the following institutions:
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Università di Venezia Ca' Foscari, Université Libre de Bruxelles,
Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster.

Subartu is edited by the European Centre for Upper Mesopotamian Studies.

Manuscripts are to be submitted to:
Marc Lebeau, ECUMS-Brussels, 41, Boulevard A. Reyers, B-1030 Brussels, Belgium (or to)
Karel Van Lerberghe, ECUMS-Leuven, Departement Oosterse Studies, KUL, Blijde Inkomststraat 21, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium.

Order forms to be mailed to:
Brepols Publishers, Begijnhof 67, B-2300 Turnhout, Belgium.

This publication is integrated in a research program supported by:

Direction Générale des Antiquités et des Musées de Syrie - Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft -
Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique (Belgique) - Förderverein Tell Beydar e.V. und seine Sponsoren -

- Interuniversity Pole of Attraction 34 (Belgian State, Science policy programming) -
Med-Campus 95 (European Union) - Nationaal Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (België) - Onderzoeksaad
K. U. Leuven - Nationale Loterij - Société Générale de Belgique - Université Libre de Bruxelles (Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres & Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales)
& a great number of private sponsors.
Textes réunis par
Olivier ROUAULT et Markus WÄFLER

LA DJÉZIRÉ ET L’EUPHRATE SYRIENS
DE LA PROTOHISTOIRE À LA FIN DU IIᵉ MILLÉNAIRE AV. J.-C.
TENDANCES DANS L’INTERPRÉTATION HISTORIQUE
DES DONNÉES NOUVELLES

BREPOLS
(2000)
Table des matières

Olivier ROUAULT & Markus WÄFLER: Avant-propos i
Olivier ROUAULT & Markus WÄFLER: Introduction aux recherches sur l’histoire de la Djéziré et de l’Euphrate syrien 1
Ali ABOU ASSAF: Discoveries in Euphrates Valleys and Syrian Jezireh 5
Sultan MUHESEN: Les racines préhistoriques des premières civilisations à écriture en Syrie 9
Frank HOLE: The Prehistory of the Khabur 17
Andrew M.T. MOORE: Abu Hayra and the Beginning of Agriculture and Village Life in the Euphrates 29
Peter M.M.G. AKKERMANS: Old and New Perspectives on the Origins of the Halaf Culture 43
Catherine BRENQUIET: De Bouqras à Tell es-Sawwan. Les premiers avatars des plans tripartites du nord mésopotamien 55
Ingolf THUESSEN: Ubaid Expansion in the Khabur. New Evidence from Tell Mashnaqa 71
André FINET: Les avatars du tell Kannâs 81
David & Joan OATES: Recent Excavations at Tell Brak 91
Jean-Claude MARGUERON: Mari et le Khabur 99
Michel FORTIN: Économie et société dans la moyenne vallée du Khabour durant la période de Ninive 5 111
Tom L. McCLELLAN, Rodger GRAYSON and Cliff OGLEBY: Bronze Age Water Harvesting in North Syria 137
Marc LEBEAU: Les voies de communication en Haute Mésopotamie au IIIe millénaire avant notre ère 157
Glenn M. SCHWARTZ: Perspectives on Rural Ideologies: the Tell Al-Raq‘a’i “Temple” 163
Edgar PELTENBURG: From Nucleation to Dispersal. Late Third Millennium BC Settlement Transformation in The Near East and Aegean 183
Harvey WEISS: Causality and Chance Late Third Millennium Collapse in Southwest Asia 207
Diederik J.W. MEIJER: State and Trade. Toward a Case Study for Northern Syria 219
Bertille LYONNET: Méthodes et résultats préliminaires d’une prospection archéologique dans la partie occidentale du Haut-Khabur, depuis le Néolithique jusqu’à la fin du IIe millénaire avant notre ère 241
Jesper EIDEM: Northern Jezira in the 18th Century BC. Aspects of Geo-Political Patterns 255
Olivier ROUAULT: Quelques remarques sur la société de Terqa 265
Hartmut KÜHNE: Dür-kaštimmu and the Middle-Assyrian Empire 271
René LEBRUN: Le Hatti et la Djéziré 281
Mirjo SALVINI: Les Hourrites dans la Djéziré syrienne 287
Guy BUNNENS: Géographie historique de la région du barrage de Tishrin 299


Markus WÄFLER: Historische Geographie. Theoretische Perspektiven 317

Jean-Daniel FOREST: De l’usage de “modèles” en archéologie 335

Pierre MATARASSO: Éléments de méthode pour une reconstitution des rapports hommes-techniques-environnement dans le domaine de l’archéologie 339

Index 353
Dür-katlimmu and the Middle-Assyrian Empire

Hartmut Kühne

1. Scope

The aim of this paper is to deal with the geopolitical position and significance of Dür-katlimmu in the middle-Assyrian empire of the 13th century BC with an outlook on the 12th and the 11th century. It may be remembered that the cuneiform sources mentioning and dealing with Dür-katlimmu in the 13th cent. BC are supplied by Dür-katlimmu itself and not - as could be expected - by Aššur. Most recently Dür-katlimmu is also mentioned in the middle-Assyrian archive of Tall Ḫuwēra (pers. com. by W. Orthmann and C. Kühne). The oldest text outside of this framework dealing with Dür-katlimmu is the ‘broken obelisk’ from Niniveh which is to be dated to the end of the middle-Assyrian empire, to the time of Aššur-bēl-kala.

The tablets were discovered in modern Tall Šēḫ Hamad and allowed this site to be identified with Dür-katlimmu (Kühne 1974-77; Röllig 1978). The archive consists of about 550 units, mostly lists of goods and animals, receipts, contracts and the like (Röllig 1984), all dated by numerous limus to the kings Tukulti-Ninurta I. and Salmanassar I (Freydank 1991: 40-43). Historically most elucidating are a group of about 35 letters which have been dealt with by Eva Canev (1994) in a PhD-dissertation.

The findspot of the archive, room A in building P (fig. 1) is to be identified most probably with a wing of the middle-Assyrian palace mentioned in the tablets as the residence of a governor, a bel pahētē. Thus, Dür-katlimmu has been the center of a larger administrative unit, a pahētu. Other pahētu called units of the middle-Assyrian empire are Amasakku, Naḫur, Šuduḫu and Taʾiḏu (Nashef 1982, 1983; Postgate 1985). A bit doubtful and in any case belonging to the late middle-Assyrian empire of the 12th to the 11th cent. BC are Šadikanni and Qatni (Millard 1970).

In addition to this basic information, the letters provide an idea of a more central function of Dür-katlimmu. One of them is a royal letter, sent by the king Tukulti-Ninurta I and addressed to a certain Aššur-iddin. In other texts of the archive this man’s title is mentioned: he is called a sukallu rabū. As an addressee of a number of letters by officials of the western empire, he must have resided in Dür-katlimmu at least for a certain period of time. Another sukallu rabū recorded in the archive is Šulmanu-mušābši, but he does not seem to have resided in Dür-katlimmu. This man is now reported in the middle-Assyrian archive of Tall Ḫuwēra, too, which can be identified with the ancient town of Ḥarbē, also mentioned in the archive of Dür-katlimmu (pers. com. W. Orthmann / C. Kühne).

2. Some geographical considerations

The heartland of Assyria (fig. 2) is but a small entity. To the southeast, towards Babylonia, two natural barriers, the Ḫāmrin mountain chain and the lower Zab, and to the north and the northeast another natural barrier, the Zagros mountains, mark its borders. From the Babylonian point of view, Aššur was the gateway to the north, to Subartu or to the land of Aššur (Hallo 1971: 114). To the west, the heartland of Assyria is flanking the flat tableland of the steppe or Ḥāzira, and in the northwest it is touching the slopes of the Sinjar mountains.

Thus the heartland of Assyria is receiving the shape of a heart, its point being the capital Aššur. It is perhaps of some significance that its western borderline is about matching the line of the dry-farming-belt. However, the steppe like landscape of the western heartland continues to the west, the first natural barrier in the west being the perennial stream of the Ḫabar, more exactly the lower part of it.

From a geographical point of view, the Ḥāzira is a uniform landscape extending from the Tigris in the east to the Euphrates in the west and south. In the north it is ultimately limited by the rising slopes of the Taurus mountains but already undulated by the low mountain chains of the Šalμal Sinjar and the Šalμal ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz. This tableland is divided by two perennial streams, the Ḫabar and the Bâlîḥ, into three sections, the eastern one, the middle one between the two tributaries, and the western one. Further more, the dry-farming-belt is cutting the region into two parts, one in the north and the other one in the south. The dividing line is the 200 mm isohyet which is usually associated with the dry-farming-belt. This line is extending south of the Šalμal Sinjar and the Šalμal ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz. The northern part is receiving enough precipitation to allow dry-farming and is thereby favouring a sedentary way of life. The southern part is
getting less than 200 mm per annum and is allowing only stockbreeding, thus favouring a nomadic or transhumant way of life. In reality the dividing line is a broad strip of risky economic conditions for dry farming depending on the right moment of rainfall when the crops are needing it. Therefore, irrigation is a major device even in dry-farming-areas to guarantee a harvest (Ergenzinger et al. 1988; Ergenzinger - Kühne 1991).

The capital Aššur is the only one of the four Assyrian capitals situated on the west bank of the Tigris; it is also by far the smallest, covering only 70 hectares. Leaving aside the old-Assyrian residence of Šamši-Adad I. in Šubat Enlil, modern Tall Leilan, the new capitals and residences were all founded on the eastern bank of the Tigris, beginning in middle-Assyrian times with the foundation of Kalhu/Nimrud and Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta. This policy continued in neo-Assyrian times with the refoundation of Kalhu, the new foundation of Dūr-Šarrukin and the refoundation of Niniveh (Kühne 1994).

The explanations for this development have been various, ranging from the excentricism of Tukulti-Ninurta I to Aššurnasipal II’s passion for splendour and expression of his ideology of kingship. On the whole, they do not satisfy. An ecological argument has rarely been discussed: the water supplies and the problem of subsistence of the old capital of Aššur.

The geo-climatical position of Aššur quite clearly is a critical one. Its hinterland is consisting of a small area at the edge of the dry-farming-belt, being part of the risky zone described above. For an urban population to subsist upon its harvests alone would be more than hazardous. This may explain why provincial centers like Dūr-kaššiumu were liable to grainrates, which were devoted to the god of Aššur but needed for subsistence. It seems that water was difficult to be drained off the Tigris for irrigation purposes - no canal system was as yet discovered. Further more, since the city of Aššur was situated on a natural spur, water had to be lifted to be used in the city; in lack of any more sophisticated lifting devices, this means that it had to be carried to the palaces, temples, and houses. In contrast to these unfavourable conditions, the other capitals were well situated in the dry-farming-zone, and water was drained off from the Zagros mountains and was lead, following the rules of gravitation, right into the palaces, temples, and houses. As is well known, Sanherib is boasting of having irrigated and created the gardens of Niniveh, and he is best known of all of the Assyrian kings to have supported water engineering. But it seems that the Assyrian kings were concerned seriously about this problem ever since the middle-Assyrian period (Simonet 1977; Ergenzinger - Kühne 1991).

One may ask why Aššur was founded on this unfavourable geographical spot. Originally, it did have a significant position controlling the trade route to and from Anatolia and Babylonia. “By nature, Aššur was an exposed road station ...” as David Oates put it in 1972: 802. Once the Assyrians tried to extend to a territorial power, starting as early as the old-Assyrian period, Aššur lost this significance, but was not able to meet the needs of a capital. But since it was the germ cell of the Assyrians no king dared to deprive it of its traditional rights. Thus it became part of the ideology of the empire, sanctifying and glorifying the provenance of the Assyrians, it became a sacred city (Lambert 1983: 85-86).

Finally, it is important to evaluate the relation of the Assyrian capitals and the steppe. Aššur, being the only capital situated on the west bank of the Tigris, is by far the most exposed one. Its natural hinterland was the worst part of the steppe with little farming, little water, and frequented by not always peaceful nomads. Yet, it had a rich vegetation of dwarf-shrublands of the type Artemisietea herbae-albae mesopotamica providing the habitat for an equally rich fauna of lions, elephants, and numerous gazelles (Frey - Kürschner 1991, Becker 1991). As mentioned above, the first natural barrier limiting this hinterland was the lower Ḥabar, about 230 kilometers west of Aššur. The other capitals were situated east of the Tigris in rain fed agriculture land, so that they did not have any immediate contact to the Gázira-steppe. Their geo-political flank were the Zagros mountains, they were threatened by any enemy living there. History shows that it was this region where the final enemy came from to sack the Assyrian capitals.

3. Dūr-kaššiumu and Aššur

Dūr-kaššiumu and Aššur are commonly situated on about the same latitude (fig. 2). The geo-climatical situation of Dūr-kaššiumu is definitely worse than that of Aššur. Dūr-kaššiumu is situated almost 100 kilometers south of the dry-farming-belt. Its subsistence is entirely relying on irrigation. Even considering the oscillating conditions of the climate, Dūr-kaššiumu would never move into the range of the dry-farming-belt and never has done so in the late Holocene (Gremmen - Botema 1991).

Similar to Aššur, Dūr-kaššiumu is situated alongside a perennial stream. But in contrast to Aššur, there is no major traffic or trade route, which could have been the subject of control or of levying taxes, nor does the geographical position offer any obvious strategic advantage. What then were the reasons for the middle-Assyrian kings to upgrade Dūr-kaššiumu to a provincial center with the seat of a bel paḫete?
First, it seems to be of some relevance, that the middle-Assyrian kings were still residing in Aššur. The conditions and problems of the Gázira-steppe must have been a matter of major concern to them. From this geo-political position it seems natural, that any thought of expansion was directed westward - the east-Tigris-land was more remote for them. But to erect territorial control over this vast nomad’s- and no man’s-land was a major problem and required more than just military campaigning. It necessitated the establishment of permanence, administration, traffic routes, subsistence means, and to enact all this, funds had to be available and the central government had to be powerful.

There is no notification in the middle-Assyrian cuneiform sources that such a program of ‘colonization’ was laid out as a conscious political act towards the territorial control of the Gázira. The question is however, whether expecting such an act is not asking in a wrong direction. In view of the above explained geo-climatic situation of Aššur, I suggest that it is to be understood rather and basically as a strategy of survival, if the policy of Aššur turns towards the west, and only later it becomes a conscious political act of expansion, then to be called Assyrian policy. The only answer to be expected from the texts may be an explanation of the administrative system which would allow certain conclusions on the intensity of the territorial coverage of it. However, the understanding of the administrative system is still creating problems, we are far from knowing what the exact status of a bēl paḫēte in the administrative hierarchy was and how large a territorium a paḫētu could cover, how many of them there were in the 13th cent. BC, or - to bring it to the point - what the provincial system of the middle-Assyrian empire was like (Machinist 1982; Postgate 1992).

It seems though, that new archaeological evidence may shed some light on this problem by evaluating the relationship between the capital Aššur and the provincial center of Dūr-katlimmu. The steps taken by the central government to strengthen the position of Dūr-katlimmu significantly were the following:

1. Dūr-katlimmu became the center of a paḫētu (Röllig 1978: 428).
2. Dūr-katlimmu became - at least temporarily - the center of far ranging political activities (Cancik 1994).
3. The economical situation of Dūr-katlimmu was stabilized considerably by the construction of a regional canal on the east bank of the Ḫabur (Ergenzinger - Kühne 1991).
4. Dūr-katlimmu was connected to the capital by a steppe route and by regular road stations (Pflälzner in Bernbeck 1994).

The archaeological evidence to be discussed here is the steppe route (fig. 2). Normally it is difficult to verify and to date traffic routes archaeologically (Wilkinson 1993). In the region of concern little archaeological activity can be mentioned. More over, scholars have been prejudice as to whether the steppe was penetrable, due to the lack of water and other supplies and the danger of wild animals. Consequently, historians rarely coped with the steppe south of the dry-farming-belt as an area of any political, economic or cultural significance more than being nomad’s land. A recently published map (Roaf 1991: 140) is cutting out the area of concern from any political control by the middle-Assyrians thus implying that no direct connection could have existed between Aššur and Dūr-katlimmu.

One major archaeological activity to be mentioned here is the archaeological survey of the Wadi ‘Ağīq on Syrian territory. This was a joint venture of the mission of Tall Ṣeh Ḥamad and the Tübiner Atlas des Vorderen Orientis in 1983-84. A preliminary report was published by Peter Pflälzner (1984), the final publication by Reinhard Bernbeck (1994) has just appeared.

During this survey a middle-Assyrian site, Tall Umm ‘Aqrēbe (fig. 3), was discovered, situated alongside the Wadi Umm ‘Aqrēbe, a tributary of the Wadi ‘Ağīq, about 45 kilometers east of Tall Ṣeh Ḥamad, next to the Syrian/Iraqi border. A low tall of one quarter of a hectar is controlling - like a small citadel - a flat settlement of considerable dimensions of about 13 hectares. The pottery is adding functionally to the middle-Assyrian pottery from the archive building in Dūr-katlimmu so well that there must have been a dependency between the two sites (Pflälzner in Bernbeck 1993: 89 ff.). The significance of this site becomes obvious if its occupation area is compared with the administrative center of Dūr-katlimmu which was covering about 15 to 20 hectars then.

Of the 42 sites surveyed in the region, Tall Umm ‘Aqrēbe is the only one occupied in the middle-Assyrian period. It is therefore definitely not functioning as a central place because no settlement system is connected with it. But being a permanent settlement in the middle of what is today virtually nothing it must have had a special function. Looking at the map, it becomes obvious that Tall Umm ‘Aqrēbe is situated on a direct line between Dūr-katlimmu and Aššur. It ought to have functioned as a road station then!

Following a line which was laid out for a different period (Kühne 1983) Pflälzner (in Bernbeck 1993: 92 ff.) has now elaborated this suggestion for the middle-Assyrian period. By mapping wells and waterholes during the survey and using all the informations available from Iraqi maps he is able to
demonstrate that even today wells are lined up in a regular distance of about 40 kilometers which would confirm a reconstruction of a route connecting Dūr-kašîšumu and Aššur. During the survey, the staff members were relying partially on this water; it is clean and clear, many times bitter in taste but in rare instances also sweet.

The historical geography is more difficult to deal with. Of the overall distance of 230 kilometers between Aššur and Dūr-kašîšumu, the first étape to Tall Umm ‘Aqrebe, 45 km, is almost exactly one fifth of it. On the other end, the distance between Aššur and Hatra is about the same, 45 kilometers. Some texts of the 14th century from Aššur are indicating that the area of Hatra was occupied during this period (Nissen 1967: 116). As was mentioned above there is little archaeological evidence on the Iranian side of the region. The only settlement of the late Bronze Age listed by the archaeological survey of Iraq in this region, Ḥîrbat Dibîšiya, is situated exactly at the end of the next fifth, or the next étape. The other two road stations are missing, possibly due to the lack of surveying, but wells are indicating their hypothetical positions.

There can be little doubt that such a traffic axis existed during the 13th century BC. If so, this would explain why Dūr-kašîšumu became so important for the central government and why - on the other hand - its position had to be strengthened. Dūr-kašîšumu was situated at the nearest point of the next natural barrier in the west of the capital Aššur, at Ḥabar. A direct route connecting both places, with large stations alongside the road, gave territorial control to Aššur over the eastern third of the steppe. At the same time Dūr-kašîšumu was supplying control over the lower Ḥabar which was elaborated by the construction of the canal, for the maintenance of which more centers in regular distance were necessary. Thus, Dūr-kašîšumu became a strategic center, guarding the southern flank of the steppe towards the Euphrates, the population of which always has defended its independence and was difficult to control, and at the same time guarding the lower Ḥabar. The pahḫūtu of Dūr-kašîšumu in the 13th cent. BC may have comprised much the same territory as the later province of Rašappa, that is the steppe area between the southern flanks of the Sinjâr mountains in the north, the Euphrates in the south, and the Ḥabar in the west.

It is tempting to summarize the evidence of the localization of the other known pahḫūtu which formed the middle-Assyrian empire in the 13th cent. BC (fig. 2; for a different arrangement see the maps by Postgate 1985: 97 and 1992: 249). It seems at the moment that the pahḫūtu of Dūr-kašîšumu controlled most of the lower Ḥabar bordering in the north on the pahḫūtu of Amassakku, Ta’īdu, Suduḫu, and Naḥur. The localization of these units has been disputed by Nashef (1982; 1983) and by Postgate (1985). Postgate has suggested that Ta’īdu should be the southernmost pahḫūtu. It would therefore border the pahḫūtu of Dūr-kašîšumu if the above made assumption is correct. The itinerary of Dūr-kašîšumu (Röllig 1983) is placing the city Ta’īdu two marches away from Makriš and on the bank of the Marītu. I have argued (Kühne 1980) that Makriš should be identified with Tall Ḥasaka; if - as Röllig suggests - the river Marītu should be identified with the neo-Assyrian ḤAR,MĪŠ and modern Gaqqaq, Ta’īdu could be equated with Tall Ḥamidiya, as was suggested by Wäfler (1992). In any case, Tall Brak would be too close to be identified with Ta’īdu, as was suggested by Oates (1985: 169-172). Since Tall Hamidiya is situated on the east bank of the Gaqqaq - as is Tall Barri/Kaḫat - I would suggest that the pahḫūtu of Ta’īdu is comprising most of the eastern most part of the Ḥabar triangle, the Gaqqaq possibly being its western border. Thus, the pahḫūtu of Amassakku may extend from Hassaka to Nusaibin, including Tall Barri/Kaḫat (Postgate 1985: 98), covering an area between the Gaqqaq and about the Wadi Auwil, possibly including Marītu in the south and Kulüšiniš, the north. The pahḫūtu of Suduḫu would have to be looked for west of it, since it is mentioned between Hurra and Waššukan in the famous inscription of Adad-nirari I (Grayson 1987: 131). West of it, the pahḫūtu of Naḥur has to be located since it is still associated with Waššukan (Nashef 1982: 201). This is implying that Tall Fahariya should be identified with Waššukan or Uššukan, as it is called in the texts from Dūr-kašîšumu. The position of the newly discovered middle-Assyrian settlement of Tall Ḥuwēra/Ḫarbe is important for two reasons: it could indicate another pahḫūtu west of Naḥur, and it may be situated on an east-west route comparable to the neo-Assyrian Ḥarrān šarrī (Kessler 1980, 235).

The situation is changing after the death of Tukulti-Ninurta I, that is in the 12th cent. BC. The central government was weakened, according to the pottery (Příházner in Bernbeck 1993: 80) the settlement of Tall Umm ‘Aqrebe and consequently the direct traffic route between Dūr-kašîšumu and Aššur still functioned, but apparently lost its significance during the 12th century. It is suggested that only then other pahḫūtu along the lower Ḥabar, north of Dūr-kašîšumu, came into existence, the ones in Qatni and in Šadiškani (Millard 1970: 172-173). It seems that by the end of the 12th century the governors had become rather independent local rulers, calling themselves ‘kings’, as is demonstrated in the texts from Tall Bderi (Maul 1992), and that the reerection of the middle-Assyrian empire under Tiglat-pilesar I was only a short interlude in reassessing local potenates to their original functions (Postgate 1985: 100-101). However, it seems to be evident also, that these local rulers continued to regard themselves as vassals of the Assyrian central government throughout these centuries (Kühne in press).
4. Dūr-katlimmu and the western part of the middle-Assyrian empire

As was mentioned above, Dūr-katlimmu was - temporarily - the seat of a sukallu rabû, called Aššur-idin, who is receiving letters and reports from most of the western part of the empire, including names like Tuttul, Carcemiš and Waššukanni. The details are discussed by E. Cancik (1994). It seems that it was some special event that made him stay here for some time. Apart of the actual occasion, the implication is that Dūr-katlimmu was a place fairly well accessible also from other parts of the empire.

The first direction would be from the north. Following the lower Ḫabar upstream, the lava fields of the vulcan Kaukab are requesting a decision whether to continue to the northeast or to the northwest. The northeastern route is confirmed by the middle-Assyrian itinerary from Dūr-katlimmu (Röllig 1983). A northwestern route is now indicated by the affinities which seem to emerge from the middle-Assyrian texts from Tall Ḫuwrēa/Ḫarbe in comparison to the texts from Dūr-katlimmu.

A western route from Dūr-katlimmu would imply the continuation of the steppe route from Aššur. There are two indications that this reconstruction may be of some relevance. The first is the site of Tall Malḥat ed-Deřû (Kühne 1983), which is situated within the distance of a road station from Dūr-katlimmu. The site had a major occupation in the Early Bronze Age and belongs to the type of the “Kranzhügel”. However, in contrast to other sites of this type, the occupation did not cease completely but apparently lingered on throughout the whole second millennium. The evidence for the Late Bronze Age is meager (Kühne 1983: 303 Abb. 3m) and needs to be reconfirmed, and nothing can be said about the size or type of a possible occupation. Additional evidence is the water, which is recorded even nowadays as being present in wells and sources.

The second indication is the middle-Assyrian archive of the 13th century BC which was found recently in Tall Sabi Abyad on the east bank of the Balîḫ (Akkermans 1993; pers. com. by P. Akkermans). This Assyrian settlement was a small center with depending hamlets like Hirbat aš-Šanaf (Bartl 1990) surrounding it. It was situated near the large east-west route, the later ḫarran Sarri (Kessler 1980: 235). It could also have been one of the destinations of a steppe route itself. This steppe route would have to be reconstructed along the water resources. Leaving Tall Malḥat ed-Deřû to the west, three wells are situated within a distance of less than 50 kilometers (map 1945): ‘Bir Fannaţina’, turning northwest ‘Bir Boutmane’, and continuing that direction and crossing the undulating hills of the Tual ‘Abba, ‘Bir Qantari’. From there, the distance to Tall Sabi Abyad is about 25 kilometers. It may be of some interest that I have travelled this route in 1981 and saw the wells still functioning.

Somewhere west beyond the Balîḫ, the distribution of middle-Assyrian material culture ceased, as the pottery is demonstrating clearly. The Euphrates valley proper is characterized by a different material culture (Pfälzner in preparation). The middle-Assyrian sites of Tall Sabi Abyad and Hirbat aš-Šanaf are probably marking the western periphery of the territorial extension of the middle-Assyrian empire in the 13th century BC.

The middle-Assyrian empire was to a greater extent ‘steppe bound’ than historians so far realized. Since larger areas of it were unoccupied, it was to be controlled only by a well functioning communication system. The archaeological investigations of the Wadi ‘Aqîq region does seem to offer the first evidence of such a system, consisting of large road stations. On first glance, this seems to prove materially Liverani’s (1988) idea of a ‘network-empire’. But giving it a second thought, the idea of colonization and territorial occupation may have gained some ground already in sites like Tall Umm ‘Aqrebe and Tall Sabi Abyad. Within this system, Dūr-katlimmu was an important center of communication and at the same time it was guarding the southern flank of the middle-Assyrian empire.
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Fig. 1: Building P.
Fig. 2: General map.

Fig. 3: Umm 'Aqrèbe.