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Aspects of the Historical Geography of Northeastern Syria from Middle Assyrian to Neo-Assyrian Times

Surveys, excavations and historical investigations during the last three decennia have considerably changed our picture of the historical and historical-geographic setting of northeastern Syria during the time of Assyrian occupation. If at the beginning of this century the source material was limited to the annals of Neo-Assyrian kings and documents such as the famous Harrán Census, we now possess a wealth of documents reaching over the centuries from the 14th up to the 6th century BC. Nevertheless our knowledge of the historical geography of northern Syria during this time is limited for various reasons.

1. The available source material is not equally distributed within the time-frame. On the contrary: We possess rich source material from specific periods, for example the reigns of Tukulti-Ninurta I or Shalmaneser III, but nothing or only very scant textual or archaeological evidence from some of the other periods. This unequal distribution of the sources has historical-political reasons on the one hand and the accidental tradition on the other. It depends, too, on the state of research in specific periods, i.e. the interest of the scholarly world in questions of historical geography.¹

2. The available source material is not equally distributed in space, i.e. we know quite a lot about the capitals and some provincial centres due to continuous excavations in Aššur, Nimrud and Nineveh. In other regions and places however there have been far fewer systematic investigations, and only random finds have been made. For this reason a well-investigated and documented place may be overestimated; its importance seems overwhelming – although nothing in the primary sources points to such a unique situation. On the other hand, archaeological excavations were carried out and the importance of a place demonstrated – but the lack or scarcity of written material precludes its identification and the historical situation cannot be shown. In the extensive and varied landscape which constitutes northern Syria hundreds of tellas are known but only a limited number have been excavated and thus remarkable places may remain unidentified.

3. The available source material is not uniform. There are “official” texts such as royal historical inscriptions – often in the fashion of a building inscription with a historical introduction – or building inscriptions, steleae etc. in places which have been captured and integrated into the administrative system of the Assyrian empire. But there are also the administrative documents of the local or of the central bureaucracy, which show us something about the geographical situation at a certain place.

4. The available source material is not yet published in full and the published texts and archaeological results are not yet fully examined with respect to their contributions to historical geography. This is a well-known and deplorable situation. Happily, the important project of our friends here in

Helsinki is trying to change this situation. We are on the way to a better reconstruction of the geographical and historical features of this region although many problems remain unsolved.

The main concern of my paper today will be the stability and instability of settlements and political or ethnic units, the continuation of habitations or the breaking off of a tradition or of a settlement at specific places. I have tried to find out where long-lasting traditions existed and natural, commercial or political reasons led to continuous habitation at a specific place.

At the moment I propose to proceed from texts from the archive of Tall Šēh Ḥamad/Dūr-Ḫatlimmu² and to discuss first some topographical problems which are posed by several of the places and rivers named in these texts. Later on I shall discuss more general questions arising from the comparison of Middle Assyrian and Neo-Assyrian historical geography.

I will start with the so-called “itinerary” DeZ 2521 which was published 12 years ago.³ Most of my identifications have been accepted by scholars; some are under discussion. The topographical features mentioned in this document are:

Ta’idu, certainly identical with Hittite Ta’ita and Neo-Assyrian Tabite,⁴ has not yet been identified. Its situation in the northeastern part of the Hābur triangle is most probable. M. Wäfler has restressed the possibility of an identification with Tall Ḥāmidiya, where he undertook excavations, but is unable to offer proof for his proposal. The just-published royal inscriptions from this place⁵ show that Tukulti-Ninurta II built there – but nothing else.

The river Marīte has no counterpart in other inscriptions and therefore is left unidentified. I proposed an identification with the Gağā or an affluent of this river⁶ which received its name from the extreme salinity of its water. Makrisi, in later texts Magaris, has been identified with modern Hassaka. Although this identification cannot be confirmed by textual or archaeologica1 evidence – the ancient tall is occupied by a part of the modern town and the French barracks – it seems appropriate.

Naปราsī remains unidentified, but is definitely to be found on the banks of the Hābur. The same holds true for Latibi, which may be identified with Tall Šaddāda, a place not far from Tall ‘Ağā which certainly bears the ruins of Šadikanni,⁷ a well-known seat of a provincial governor in Neo-Assyrian times, named as Šadikani in four docu-

² For the excavations at this place and the Middle Assyrian tablets found there, cf., i.a., H. Kühne, AFO 26 (1978/79) 166-68; 31 (1984) 166-78; W. Röllig, Orien
³ W. Röllig, “Ein Itinerar aus Dūr-Ḫatlimmu,” Damas
tener Mitteilungen 1 (1983) 279-84.
⁴ K. Kessler, Untersuchungen zur historischen Topogra
ments from Dûr-Katlimmu, once written ša-di-k[a]-ni.\(^9\)

Qat\(\)an is named not only here but together with Šadikanni also in DeZ 3309, a document concerning the delivery of barley. It has often been connected with Qat\(\)tunân in the Mari Archives\(^10\) and appears as Qat\(\)nî in the Neo-Assyrian itineraries from Tukulti-Ninurta II on,\(^11\) earlier as a nisbat \(^{\text{11}}\)gat-na-a-ia\(^{\text{11}}\)mes in a text of AŠur-bêl-kala\(^12\) besides the land Mârî, which will be discussed later. An identification with one of the towns on the lower Hâbûr, namely Tall Fâdğami or Tall Ašam-\(\)sâni, is not yet possible.\(^13\)

The identification of Dûr-Katlimmu with Tall Šêh Ťamad is indisputable. As noted before, the continuation of settlement from Middle to Neo-Assyrian times in the Hâbûr valley has been proved for most of these towns.

Another text in the TSH archive can also be used in a certain sense as an itinerary. It bears the museum number DeZ 3281 and lists a number of cities or places, which are partially known from other texts from the same archive and also from contemporary or later texts.

DeZ 3281

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38(^8)</td>
<td>ANŠU 6 BÁN ŠE 1(^4)KAR-[(^4)AMAR,UTU] DUMU a-[bu-SI]Gš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ANŠU 5 BÁN 1(^4)XXX-m[u-SI]Gš [ ]x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ANŠU 6 BÁN a-ra-[a-tu-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ANŠU 6 BÁN a-[du-an-ni]-a-š[ur]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ANŠU 6 BÁN a-[hu]-zi-ra-ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ANŠU 6 BÁN a-[KASKAL]-ra-()-()-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ANŠU 3 BÁN a-[a]-ia-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ANŠU 4 BÁN a-[ha]-ba-ja-tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ANŠU 3 BÁN a-[a]-ra-zi-qu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ANŠU 7 BÁN a-[bu]-ša-ia-ú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ANŠU 1 BÁN a-[ni]-ih-()-ri-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ANŠU 8 BÁN a-[KUR]-ha-()-nu ()A.N.TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ANŠU a-[hu]-um-na-()-()-()-()-sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ANŠU 2 BÁN 1(^{\text{14}})tukul-ti-()-me-er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ANŠU 1(^{\text{14}})a-[šur]-ke-ta-[li]-()šer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠU.NIGIN 1 ME 33 ANŠU 7 BÁN ŠE i-na GIŠ.BÁN ()hi-bur-()-ni a-[()]a-[ša]-()-lu-[()]a-[n]-nu-o-ia-ú e-te-me-di</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 KÁM li-mu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1(^4)EN.I.LI.-SUM-IBILA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This document records in the summary “133 homers and 7 suatu barley according to the suatu measure of the hiburnu Ninuajâ'u has imposed on the town Šalušâa.” At the beginning and at the end of the list we find personal names. They are not complete, but

\(^8\) DeZ 2524, 3304, 3309, 3845.
\(^9\) DeZ 3317:3.
\(^12\) RIMA 2 (1991) A.0.89.II 6.
I have no doubt that they belong to Eṭir-Marduk, a well-known bel pahete, and Sîn-mudammeq, also a high official in the administration of the MA empire, probably a sukkallu with residence at Aṣšukanni. Each of these officials receives a considerable amount of barley – possibly on behalf of their districts. The following place names are mostly well-known from other texts, but there are some exceptions.

**Patu[...]** of line 3 is otherwise unknown and according to its orthography it is not necessarily connected with the place name Pâti-Aṣšur constructed with the noun pattu “channel,” which is known from another text from Dûr-Katlimmu. Therefore no proposal for an identification is possible.

**Dunnî-Aṣšur,** “stronghold of Aṣšur,” is well-known from two letters, sent by Sîn-mudammeq to the sukkallu rabû Aṣšur-iddin. In the letter BATSH No. 4:2 troops have been commanded to hold back soldiers from Karkemiš and these troops took post at Dunnî-Aṣšur, which is named “my (i.e. Sîn-mudammeq’s) stronghold” (dunni-ja). Because during this action the bank of a river is occupied it seems convincing that the fortress was situated on the Euphrates or the Balih river. For good reasons Eva Cancik concluded that the last-named river must be taken into consideration, where tell such as Tall Sabi Abyad, Tall Jîdle, Tall Şahlân and Tall Hammâm show MA occupation levels. But Tall Sabi Abyad is to

---

14 Eṭir-Marduk is mentioned as bel pahete in DeZ 2215, 2523, 3395 and 4022; further in DeZ 2522, 2532, 3272, 3309, 3325 and 3393 during the eponymats of Aṣšur-beł-ilâni, Muṣallim-Adad, Abî-ili, Etel-pî-Aṣšur and Ina-Aṣšur-šuna-aṣbat, i.e. during the first third of the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I. At the same time – except in the eponymate of Abî-îli – the sukkallu was Aṣšur-iddin.

Eṭir-Marduk was the son of Abu-da'aq and had a son named Marduk-ṭala-ṭeres (cf. DeZ 3325).


16 Pattî-pa-ti-a-ṣur DeZ 3389:11. It deals with a receipt for the transfer of a four-year-old ox as a replacement for an animal that died in P. Date: 5.Belâš-ekallim, Eponym Libur-zanîn-Aṣšur. Besides this reference, only river names with the element pattî- are known; cf. Kh. Nashef. RGTC 5 (1982) 312.

17 DeZ 3396+3837 = BATSH 4 No. 4 and DeZ 3439 = ibid. No. 2.
be excluded because the MA texts from this place hint that Dunni-Aššur belonged to its district (puḫatu) — but is not identical with the place itself. It should be mentioned that in the same context of the letter further places such as Dunni-Dagal, Sirda, Tuttol and Gilma are mentioned, all places on the Balīḥ. That Tuttol is the famous Tuttol ša Balīṭa\textsuperscript{19} seems undoubtedly sure. Another letter, BATSH 4 N° 4 Rev. 11 refers to Dunni-Aššur and connects it with a place named Sahḫālu. This is a well-known place, mentioned as Sa-ḫḫ-ša-la-la in the famous OB itinerary between Apqq ša Balīṭa and Zal-paḫ\textsuperscript{20}, both to be sought on the Balīḥ. It was identified by G. Dossin in 1974 with T. Sahlān.\textsuperscript{21} For these reasons, the series of tallis available for Dunni-Aššur may be reduced to Tall Gišil and Tall Hammām.

\textbf{Huzirānu}, which is mentioned in line 5 and in the letter DeZ 3320 (= BATSH 4 N° 6), is undoubtedly to be identified with the NA Huzirina which K. Deller many years ago found at Sultantepe in the Upper Balīḥ valley.\textsuperscript{22} Its Neo-Assyrian existence is well documented.

\textbf{Harrānu}, the modern Altünbaşak, needs no comment besides the fact that this town in this part of the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I belonged to the region with stabilized Assyrian presence.\textsuperscript{23}

\textbf{Ayya} is doubtful. The reading here is sure, but the identification poses some problems. In a MA letter from Dūr-Katlimmu\textsuperscript{24} it is reported that merchants, coming from Karkemiš, crossed the Euphrates below the city of Kumāḫu (šaplan `Kumaḫi) and proceeded to Ḥuzirāni,`ʿA-ya-a-ni and Ḥarrāni, i.e. the same constellation of settlements is to be found as in our record about the delivery of barley. E. Cancik proposed in her PhD thesis an emendation to Ḥayalānū and identification with NA Yalūna, a place which is named several times in wine texts from Kalaḥ, but normally it is mentioned there together with the region of Niniveh\textsuperscript{25} and should be located there and not as far in the west as our Ayya(ni). On the other hand we learn from the Harrān Census (4 III 18) of a (little ?) town `ʿA-na-ta-a besides `ʿBalīḫu,\textsuperscript{26} which is conventionally identified with the modern Tall Abyad; this could be a candidate for the new MA place, because in the plain between the modern Altünbaşak and Akçakale (Tall Abyad) a series of ruins of ancient settlements (talls) can be seen which have not yet been identified.

\textbf{Habayatu} has not yet been found in other sources and its location is absolutely unknown. Despite the fact that it cannot be demonstrated that our list of place names

\textsuperscript{18} These documents have been brought to our attention by F.A.M. Wiggermann who is in charge of the publication of the textual material from Tall Sabi Abyad. Cf. provisionally his paper delivered at the 41st RAI in Berlin. "The Middle Assyrian Texts from Tell Sabi Abyad."

\textsuperscript{19} For the identification with Tall Bi’a cf. B. Groneberg, RGTC 3 (1980) 242 and M. Krebnerž, MDOG 125 (1993) 52; here also the identification of Sirda/Serda with Tall as-Sedda on the Balīḥ.


\textsuperscript{21} G. Dossin, RA 68 (1974) 26 n. 4.


\textsuperscript{24} DeZ 3320 = BATSH 4 N° 6.


\textsuperscript{26} See F.M. Fales, Censimenti e catasti di epoca Neo-Assiria (1973) 34 N° 4 (= SAA 11 213) III 18.
proceeds in a strict geographical order – as is the rule in the “itinerary” DeZ 2421 – I think that places are mentioned which are close together or at least not in absolutely opposite directions. So this place should be looked for in northwestern Syria, too.

On the other hand, there are references to Araziqu in other sources. There is the well-known hunting report in the annals of Tiglat-pileser I which was repeated by Assur-bél-kala in his inscription on the so-called Broken Obelisk. Tiglat-pileser is hunting “extraordinarily strong wild virile bulls in the desert, in the land Mittani, and at the city Araziqu which is before the land Hatti (ša ina pan ur-ba-at-te)”; Assur-bél-kala uses the same text but adds after “before the land Hatti” the words “and at the foot of Mount Lebanon (ù ina šep ur-lab-na-ni).” This phrase cannot imply that this town has to be sought “at the foot of Mount Lebanon” but that this hunting expedition, if it really took place, extended in this direction. Nevertheless, the description by Tiglath-pileser gives a clear picture of the situation: he proceeded from the steppe region (ḫur-ribte) of the land Mittani, i.e. the plain of northern and northwestern Syria, to Araziqu, which is not in the land Hatti, but “before” this region. As far as we are informed, at this time the region of Hatti had its eastern frontier at the Euphrates. Therefore Araziqu, too, should be located somewhere in the region east of the river. The arrival of the town onto our list supports this position strongly. No place seems to be mentioned which is far in the west and beyond the Euphrates, and the proposed identification of Araziqu with Tall al-Ḥagg near Ḥebel Aruda is absolutely excluded.

If we take into consideration the other texts from Dür-Katlimmu it is a fact that only a single place is mentioned several times as having a position on the Euphrates, namely Karkamiš. The just cited letter BATSH 4 N° 6 reports on the merchants on their way from Karkamiš to Ḥuzirānu and Ḥarrānu and the crossing of this river at Kumaḫu. The same city Kumaḫu is named in letter N° 2 which further on, in an undecided context with Karkamiš, cites the reš ur-a-ra-zi-[qi] besides an otherwise unknown Ešpirua and later on a town ur-ma-rina ša šade(kur); all places where Sutians can be found and – possibly – defeated. Kumaḫa/Kumaḫi, on the other hand, is well-known from Hititite sources. It is the place of a battle between the king Suppiluliuma I and Karannī, king of Ḥajaša. Other references in the so-called evocations name it besides the lands of Alžia, Papanhā and Ḥajaša; in the region of Kumaḫa are forests and the landscape seems to be mountainous.

In the light of the new textual evidence it is sure that the – based on apparent consonance – proposed identification with modern Kemah is precluded. The town has to be located further to the south, not far but upstream or downstream from Karkamiš/Cerablus. We should take into consideration that it seems practical to cross the Euphrates at a ford and not to travel through

27 A.K. Grayson, RIMA 2 (1991) A.0.87.1 VI 61-69.
28 ibid. A.0.89.7 IV 4f.
30 It seems possible – following an idea of Marta Lucia-ni – to offer a suggestion for the identification of this place: During a first campaign of excavations at Tall Shiouk Foqāni in the area of the Tišrin Dam project on the Euphrates, F.M. Fales unearthed an Aramaic document with the name br mnn, certainly to be connected with the “bur-mar-ti-na in Bêt-Adini of Shamanser III (see NAT p. 95) (private communication). This fits quite well with the Marina of MA times.
33 Cf. for example J. Garstang/O.R. Gurney, The Geography of the Hititite Empire (1959) 35.
an extremely mountainous region. In the region of the upper Euphrates four direct fords of significance are reported: At Kemah (which here is not relevant), Malatya, Samsat and Birecik. Therefore Kumah should be sought either far to the northeast of Karkamiš at Birecik or further south at the place where until the beginning of this century the Mossul-Aleppo caravan route crossed the Euphrates, namely at Til Barsip (Tall Âhmar) which is situated 20 km south of the capital on the left bank of the river. D. Hawkins identified this place with Hitite Mazuwati, a town in Aštata, but from the Middle Assyrian sources comes no support for this identification. Therefore I think that the merchants took their route from Tall Âhmar to the northeast around the Kara Dağ and behind the Cudi Dağı to Huźrina/Sultantepe, Ayyani and Herrânu. This corresponds mostly with the route of the harrân šarrī in NA times. With respect to the location of Araziqu, a prominent place at the southern border of the Saruğ plain such as Tall Karus is a possible candidate, but it seems as if it has Neo-Assyrian levels only. That the name Araziqu is no longer present in NA times is immaterial; the settlement may have survived under a different name.

Buṣâyû as the name of a settlement is otherwise unknown. If the quantity of grain delivered to each place according to our document is an indication of the importance of the respective settlements then Buṣayû was extremely small, probably only a village. But it should be remembered that a mountain or a mountain range named Bušše existed which is mentioned as lying between Katmuhi and Mumme of Alzi. Because Katmuhi is to be sought in the eastern part of the Kaššiyari mountains, Bušše may have been somewhere in its western regions. The place name of our document can be connected with this area if the village was founded by settlers from the Bušše mountains.

Nihdrîa poses special problems. It is well-known from other sources and has been intensively disputed in many publications during recent decades. Nevertheless, the problem of its localisation is unsolved. Let me repeat in brief what is known about this important city: In Old Assyrian documents it is well-known as the seat of a kārum, with administration through an esartum and a kaššum official. Subsequently, a palace is reported in this town, which – according to one document only – possibly played a role in a series of route-stations between Ħurupša and Sinariḫum, both unidentified.

From the context of other documents it seems sure that its position is not far from Zalmaqum and therefore somewhere in northern Syria. The Mārī texts refer several times to the city and the people coming from there. Administrative documents record presents given to men from (in this sequence): Apûm - Andariq - Kurda - Niḥria - Sudâ - Ašnakkum; or a little bit

---

36 See the report about a survey conducted by the German Archaeological Institute by B. Einwag, Damaszener Mitteilungen 7 (1993) 39 ff, map Abb. 4 No. 8.
37 Cf. Kh. Nâshef, RGTC 5 (1982) 76 and note that a writing kûr ba-sa-ye-e for this mountain exists (A 68:3, unpubl.).
42 ARM 7 211.
different – from Kurda - Hanzat - Nihría,\(^{43}\) or – again different and as ethnica – Eluhtâyû - Azubiyâ'tu - Nihrâyû - Imaru.\(^{44}\) Once also a close connection to Harrân is reported.\(^{45}\) Beyond that, the famous letter of Šamši-Adad to Yasmah-Adad\(^{46}\) testifies to the responsibility of the young viceroy of Mari for a campaign from Nihría to Sudá. This campaign is to be postponed because of an unnamed enemy which may be identified with the Haneans named later on. The place name Sudá, which is also well-known from MA documents, is of particular interest here and will be referred to again later. Another Mari letter\(^{47}\) points to the fact that it was possible to walk from Nihría to Adnum, but nothing is said about the distance or about the direction of the march.

MA sources for N. up to now have been scarce. In a receipt from Tall Rimâh/Karaná\(^{48}\) concerning food “of the huradu-troops” ša ursNihría ša ikam ištu aḥhe₃₃₅₄₃₅ ilîkînî “of Nihría who do their service together with the brothers(?)” it seems sure that during the eponymate of a certain Qibi-Āšur the town lay within the Assyrian sphere of influence. But Qibi-Āšur is not only – as supposed for example by C. Wilcke\(^{49}\) – the name of the eponym of the second year of Tukulti-Ninurta; we know of 3 eponyms with this name and a different father’s name,\(^{50}\) one of them was eponym close to Ina-Āšur-šuqti-āšbat, the eponym of the dates in most of the letters from Dûr-Katlimmu who held his office in the middle of the reign of his king, i.e. in the 18th or – following another chronology – in the 12th year of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1225/1223 or 1222/1217 BC).\(^{51}\) In these letters Nihría is named twice. In the letter BATSH 4, N° 3:10ff, 1500 enemies are assembled in the Hasûme mountains, a region southeast of Harrân, well-known from OB and NA sources (Shalmaneser III),\(^{52}\) and the corresponding Sin-mudammiq – also named at the top of our document – reports that there are no specific plans for the case that those troops invade the town Nihría, the land Hanu or the banks of the Habûr. If the itinerary follows a line from west to east Nihría should be sought somewhere in or not far from the Harrân plain. Another letter (BATSH 4, N° 8:54ff), which is fragmentary, undated and provides no information as to either sender or addressee, belongs to the same correspondence and is therefore certainly contemporary. It tells us about Hurrians – in the terminology of this time: šubriâ – that they grew hostile to Nihría and plundered in the environs of this town, destroyed(?) the hay of Nihría and another town, Pa-nu-a, which is not mentioned in other texts from the Dûr-Katlimmu archive or from other places. Both references confirm that at this time, namely around the fifteenth year of the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I, Nihría was the property of the Assyrians and that it constituted part of the provincial administration – but in a dangerous frontier position. Therefore it seems quite

\(^{43}\) ARM 7 164.
\(^{44}\) ARM 12 747.
\(^{45}\) ARM 23 241.
\(^{47}\) ARM 1 103-9.
\(^{48}\) TR 3005.5 = J.N. Postgate, IRAQ 30 (1968) 179, pl. LVIII
\(^{49}\) C. Wilcke, ZA 66 (1976) 231f.
\(^{50}\) Qibi-Āšur mär ībāṭī-iliu DeZ 3410, 3415, 3826; VAT 19554, 19668, 19673; cf. C. Saporetti, EMA p. 55; H. Freydk, Beitritte zur mittelassyrischen Chronologie und Geschichte (1991) 162-64.
sure that the events, described in the famous letter found at Ugarit\(^{53}\) and analysed by I. Singer\(^{54}\) took place earlier, possibly during the reign of Shalmanesar I or at the beginning of the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I. It seems beyond dispute that the battle of Nišriya between the Hitite king Tudhaliya IV and an unidentified Assyrian king had as a consequence the loss of the city by the Hitite and, in the time thereafter, an Assyrian predominance in this region east of the Euphrates. All this points to a location of Nišria not too far from Ḫarrān. Following a nice suggestion of James Mellaart\(^{55}\) “the copious springs at Urfa could very well elicit a town name Nišriya” so that this town—modern Şanlı-Urfa—constituted the very northwestern point on the map of the empire of Tukulti-Ninurta I.

The name placed as Śudā in Māri\(^{56}\) and as Šadu or Śudu in MA documents\(^{57}\) is now also mentioned in Assur texts.\(^{58}\) Possibly but not certainly it may be connected with Šuduḫi,\(^{59}\) a pāḫutu once mentioned in Dūr-Katlimmu under the responsibility of the sukkallu rabā Śulmānu-mušabû.\(^{60}\) Its location in the central part of the Hābû-triangle is evidenced by the many connections with Ḫurra, Nabula and Ušukkannya in historical inscriptions of Adad-narāri I.\(^{51}\)

The next entry, \(^{\text{us}}\)KUR Ḫa-nu AN-\text{TA}, bears as a surprise the qualifying epithet AN-\text{TA}, the “upper Ḫanu (or Ḫana).” There will be no doubt that this designates the opposite position to another, the “lower” Ḫana. The well-known Old Babylonian, Middle Assyrian (and later) māt Ḫanu is the region of the Middle Euphrates, bordering in the north on Suḫi, in the south on Māri, with its center Terqa.\(^{62}\) But our document, together with two letters from Dūr-Katlimmu, all point in another direction. The just cited letter BATSH 4 N° 3 mentions \(^{\text{us}}\)KUR Ḫa-\text{a-ni} between Nišria and šiddi Ḫābûrī, i.e. in the upper part of northern Syria. Another letter discusses some military actions and mentions “strongholds in the Land of Ḫarrān and at the feet of the Kašiṣari-mountains”\(^{63}\) and refers in the same context to hostile troops “which committed a robbery in front of the city of the land Ḫanu.”\(^{64}\) Afterwards they hid their stolen animals at a watering place in the desert (?) and proceeded to another gazān at the bank of an unnamed river, maybe the Ḫābûr or one of its tributaries. All this points to a location of this Ḫana-land in northwestern Syria, maybe at the feet of the Kašiṣari or the

---


\(^{56}\) B. Groneberg, RGTC 3 (1980) 226.


\(^{58}\) MARV 2 21:3 (between Kattuḫu and Ta'ādu); 3 29:9 (written \(^{\text{us}}\)Šš-šu-ī, cf. H. Freydenk, AOF 19 (1992) 312f).

\(^{59}\) Cf. Kh. Nashef, RGTC 5 (1982) 251, where the possibility of an interconnection of the two šemātu is considered, and J.N. Postgate, AFO 32 (1985) 98a. But the differentiation according to different time-levels seems unfounded, because Mari texts already know Šš-du-šš-im besides Šš-Sudā, see RGTC 3 226 and D. Charpin, MARI 7 (1993) 169-71 (also to the “kings” of Šudāhun). Nevertheless it could be the well-known human adjective-forming in -hi/he, often to be found in the onomasticon and in the toponymy of Nuzi and MA for example in Ḫabbi, Ḫalāḫi, Ḫarnāpi, Ḫuzuḫu (Dez 2500:15), Kiššiḫu, Kulišiḫu-naši, Kūmaḫi, Kummāšiḫu (?), Nagabīḫi, Niğnimbi, Matt Paphl (?), Tarbašē.


\(^{63}\) bēli(šu) ṣa-Šš di-kur-e Ka-ši-ta-ra ši-ši-pu-ur BATSH 4 N° 7 Rv. 9-11.

\(^{64}\) Ša i-na pu-šu khu Ḫa-ni iš-ša-pu-Šš iš-ši ibid. Rv. 17f.
Hasûme mountains. I think that later references to this country’s name have to be discussed bearing in mind the possibility of a second Hanā.

Here we are confronted with a more general problem and a phenomenon not so seldom in the course of the history of the Ancient Near East, namely that the name of a place or a region may have changed or been transferred to another place or region. In this respect I also refer to the famous discovery of the cylinder inscription of a certain Aššur-ketti-lēṣî during the excavations of Peter Pfälzner at Tall Bderi on the Ḥabûr. As Stefan Maul showed in his publication of these inscriptions, during the time of Tiglath-pîleser I this “king” ruled a land which bears the name of the famous Old Babylonian capital Māri on the Euphrates, but which is nevertheless situated far away from the Middle Euphrates, namely in the region of Tabête near the modern town Hassaka on the Ḥabûr. It seems as if the country and its name existed there already during the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I. In one of his inscriptions he reports that in a campaign at the beginning of his reign he conquered the lands of Māri, Hanā and Rapiq – in this sequence, which corresponds to an advance from the Ḥabûr region to the Euphrates and the frontier of Babylonia. The problem which remains to be solved is to decide whether this name was chosen independently or in memory of the former state and city of Māri/Tell Ḥarīrī and with the intention of renewing the glorious history of this town.

The situation for Hanā may have been different. The Old Babylonian Māri documents mention groups of the Hanā tribes living and rambling not only in the surroundings of Māri itself but also far in the northwest, just in the region where the Ħāni of the Dûr-Katlimmu documents are to be found. Therefore the name of this population group was used not only in the Terqa region on the Euphrates but also at the piedmont of the Hasûme and Kašiyari mountains – and further to the west and in the Middle Babylonian period in Alalah.

As a consequence it should be questioned if the famous place where the statue of Marduk had been deposited by Muršili I after his raid on Babylon and if the kingdom of Tukulti-Mer is to be located on the Middle Euphrates.

Humnaḫuṣa again is otherwise unknown. The name seems to be of Hurrian origin, cf. Humella, Humpuruš in Nuṣi-texts.

After the summing-up of our document

---

66 A.K. Grayson, RIMA 1 (1987) A.0.78.22.69.
67 Independently, D. Charpin states in NABU 1995 Nr 23: “que soit abandonnée la thèse traditionnelle, qui voulait que môt Hanâ désigne la région de Terqa à l’époque des archives de Mari; les rois qui ont repris l’épithète de «roi de Hanâ», entendaient sans doute encore par là affirmer leur domination sur les bédouins de la région du Moyen-Euphrate et du Habûr, non sur la région autour de Terqa.” It is a mere fact that “Hanâ in the Mari documents refer to the nomadic population groups in the area of influence of the Mari kings; cf. also the title sar Mari (Tutul) u môt Hanâ used by Yahdun-Lim, RIME 4 (1990) E4.6.8.1:3-5, 2:19, and Zimri-Lim, ibid. E4.6.12:3:3f; 4:6f; 5:4f; 6:4f and see D. Charpin,J.-M. Durand, RA 80 (1986) 141-83. Therefore the designation “bedouin” generally used by D. Charpin and J.-M. Durand is well founded – with the restraint that in my opinion “bedouin” is a nomadic life-condition based on camel breeding and therefore the possibility of crossing wide distances. In contrast “nomads” are sheep and goat breeding people with donkeys for transport and riding, constrained to a daily use of watering-places and therefore with a limited radius for travelling. Cf. for example Fred Scholz, “Nomadische/Beduinen: Bevölkerungsgruppen als Forschungsproblem und Forschungsgegenstand in der Gegenwart,” in: F. Scholz et al., Beduinen im Zeichen des Erdöl, TAVO Beh. B 45 (1981) 1-53.
68 Hanâ-people are gathered in Ha-[šî]-lm[i]-mîtu “there in the middle of the country” ARM 1 37:32f; cf. MAR14, 37; RGTC 3, 94, in Idamaras (ARM 5 51) in Kirdaḫat (Tall Ṣâgar Bazar) and Nahur at the springs of the Ḥabûr; cf. J.-R. Kupper, Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mâri (1957) 28 and M. Anbar, Les tribus amurrites de Mâri, OBO 108 (1991) 102ft with references.
69 J.-R. Kupper, l.c., 44f; RIA 4 (1972/75) 76.
70 J. Fincke, RGTC 10 (1993) 103f.
the city of Šaluša is mentioned, an otherwise unknown place, to which there are some references in the Dūr-Katlimma texts, most of them from the same eponymate, namely Aššur-zēra-iddina, who took his office shortly before Ina-Aššur-šumishbat. Because Šaluša appears several times in the neighbourhood of Šadikanni it must have been in the Ḥabūr region too. But no proposal for its location is possible.

If we look back on the tradition of the place-names referred to in these documents in comparison to their appearance in earlier and later periods, the picture is far from convincing (see the table on p. 292). From the 23 geographical terms named in the Middle Assyrian documents, only 7 are reported from the Old Babylonian tradition and 9 survive until the Neo-Assyrian period — but not every equation is assured. The reason for the changes may be sought in different circumstances. First of all: The settlements did not continue in history, have been destroyed by hostile actions, by fire or other natural catastrophes, or they have been abandoned by their population for economic reasons – climatic changes, drying up of wells, alteration of commercial routes etc. Sometimes it may have occurred that the name of a place changed and therefore the identification is impossible for us. Often also our source material is so scanty from the periods and places under discussion that a mere lack of written texts causes an abnormal picture. Therefore it is highly to be welcomed that with the project of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus on the one side, with the discovery of new Middle Assyrian and Māri-material on the other, the textual basis of our research is widened and much better founded, so that the picture of the historical geography of Assyria has been enriched in recent years and promises to continue to improve also in the future.

71 DeZ 2524:12 (30 homers of barley from Šuadikanni as an obligation of a delivery by Aššur-iddin); 3309+15 (140 homers of barley from the palace of Šuadikanni has been brought to Š.); 3831:8 (105 homers from Š, to a certain Adad-šamši) and 3818 (= BATSH 4 N° 3):33 (with troops [of workers?] from Š.).
## Correspondence of place names from the Old Babylonian to the Neo-Assyrian period
(Names not mentioned in DeZ 2521 and 3281 are in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OB</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ta'īdu/Ta'īta</td>
<td>Tabite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marirte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makrisi</td>
<td>Magarisi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napraşi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latîhi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šuadikanni</td>
<td>Šadikanni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatun</td>
<td>Qatni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūr-Yagidlim(?)</td>
<td>Dūr-Katlimmu</td>
<td>Dūr-aduklim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patu[…]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunni-Aṣṣur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahšlala</td>
<td>Sahšlala</td>
<td>Saḥlala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huzirānu</td>
<td>Huzirīna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥarrānu</td>
<td>Harrānu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayya(ni)</td>
<td>Ayyanatā(?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habayatu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araziqu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bušayā’u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niḥriya</td>
<td>Niḥria</td>
<td>[KUR Ḫasam]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[KUR (Ḫ)asam]</td>
<td>[KUR Ḫasume]</td>
<td>[KUR Ḫasumu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Šuduḫi]</td>
<td>[Šuduḫi]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Šudā/Sudā]</td>
<td>[Šūdu/Sūdu]</td>
<td>Ḫūmnahuša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(KUR) Ḫanā(56)</td>
<td><strong>KUR Ḫani AN.TA</strong></td>
<td>Šaluša</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Lokalisierte Ortsnamen in den mittelassyrischen Briefen aus Tall Šēh Hamad/Dūr-Katlimmu und spätbronzezeitliche Fundorte

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ortsname</th>
<th>Bedeutung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altinbaşak</td>
<td>Fundorte der Spätbronzezeit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nibria</td>
<td>Antike Orte unsicherer Lokalisierung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥarrānu</td>
<td>Lokalisierte Orte der Dūr-Katlimmu-Briefe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūbri</td>
<td>Landesnamen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purattu</td>
<td>Ethnien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(modern Name)</td>
<td>Flußnamen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Assyrien kontrolliertes Gebiet im Eponymat des Ina-Assur-Sumiskīt-ābat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routen durch die Steppe (vermutet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entwurf: H. Köhne, E. Cansak-Kirschbaum 1995  
Ausführung: G. Müller

Northeastern Syria in Middle Assyrian times according to texts from Tall Šēh Hamad/Dūr Katlimmu