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 Harrân 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 Shalmanesar 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 tells 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, stele 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

¹ Cf. my overview on the periods of scientific interest in historical geography in our discipline in “Historical Geography – Past and Present,” in: M. Liverani (ed.), Neo-As-
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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-Katlimmu 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” 2 DeZ 2521 which was published 12 years ago. 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 Ḥabūr triangle is most probable. M. Wäfler has restressed the possibility of an identification with Tall Ḥamidiya, where he undertook excavations, but is unable to offer proof for his proposal. The just-published royal inscriptions from this place show that Tukulti-Ninurta II built there – but nothing else.

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

Naprasi remains unidentified, but is definitely to be found on the banks of the Ḥabūr. The same holds true for Latepi, which may be identified with Tall Saddāda, a place not far from Tall ‘Āgāqa which certainly bears the ruins of ‘Āgāqa which certainly bears the ruins of Ṣādikanni,7 a well-known seat of a provincial governor in Neo-Assyrian times, named as ‘Āgāqa in four docu-


ments from Dūr-Katlimmu, once written ša-di-k[a]-ni.

Qatun is named not only here but together with Sadikanni also in DeZ 3309, a document concerning the delivery of barley. It has often been connected with Qatṭunān in the Mari Archives and appears as Qatni in the Neo-Assyrian itineraries from Tukulti-Ninurta II on, earlier as a nisbat uru-qat-na-a-ia in a text of Aššur-bēl-kali besides the land Māri, which will be discussed later. An identification with one of the tells on the lower Ḥābūr, namely Tall Fadgami or Tall Ašamsāni, is not yet possible.

The identification of Dūr-Katlimmu with Tall Ṣeh Ḥamad is indisputable. As noted before, the continuation of settlement from Middle to Neo-Assyrian times in the Ḥābūr 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

387 ANŠU 6 BĀN ŠE  
29 [ANŠU] 5 BĀN  
9 [ANŠU] 6 BĀN  
2 ANŠU 6 BĀN  
5 6 ANŠU 6 BĀN  
2 ANŠU 3 BĀN  
1 ANŠU 4 BĀN  
3 ANŠU 3 BĀN  
3 ANŠU

5 6 ANŠU 6 BĀN  
2 ANŠU 3 BĀN  
1 ANŠU 4 BĀN  
3 ANŠU 3 BĀN  
3 ANŠU

DeZ 3281

This document records in the summary “133 homers and 7 sutu barley according to the sutu measure of the hiburnu Ninuajā'u has imposed on the town Šaluša.” 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.0.89.2 II 6.  
I have no doubt that they belong to Ḫēr-Marduk, a well-known bēl paḥete, and Sin-mudammeq, also a high official in the administration of the MA empire, probably a sukallu 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 Patti-Āššur constructed with the noun patti “channel,” which is known from another text from Dūr-Katlimmu.** Therefore no proposal for an identification is possible.

**Dunni-Āššur,** “stronghold of Aššur,” is well-known from two letters, sent by Sin-mudammeq to the sukallu rabu Assur-iddin. In the letter BATSH No. 4:2 troops have been commanded to hold back soldiers from Karkemīsh and these troops took post at Dunni-Āššur, which is named “my (i.e. Sin-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 Bālib river. For good reasons Eva Cancik concluded that the last-named river must be taken into consideration, where tells such as Tall Sabi Abyad, Tall Gīdlā, Tall Shāfān and Tall Hammām show MA occupation levels. But Tall Sabi Abyad is to...
be excluded because the MA texts from this place hint that Dunni-Assur belonged to its district (pafiutu) - 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, Tuttul and Gilma are mentioned, all places on the Balih. That Tuttul is the famous Tuttul ša Bāliha seems undoubtedly sure. Another letter, BATSH 4 N° 4 Rev. 11 refers to Dunni-Assur and connects it with a place named Sahlalu. This is a well-known place, mentioned as Sa-ah-la-la in the famous OB itinerary between Apqu ša Bāliha and Zalpaḥ, both to be sought on the Balih. It was identified by G. Dossin in 1974 with T. Sahlan. For these reasons, the series of tails available for Dunni-Assur may be reduced to Tall Gidle and Tall Hammām.

Huziranu, 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 Balih valley. Its Neo-Assyrian existence is well documented.

Harrānu, the modern Altınbaşak, 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.

Ayya is doubtful. The reading here is sure, but the identification poses some problems. In a MA letter from Dūr-Katlimmu it is reported that merchants, coming from Karkemiš, crossed the Euphrates below the city of Kumāḫu (ṣaplan ṣu Kumāḫi) and proceeded to Ḥuzirāni, ṣu A-ya-a-ni and Harrāni, 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 *Ajjalānu and identification with NA Yalu-na, a place which is named several times in wine texts from Kalaḥ, but normally it is mentioned there together with the region of Nineveh 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 ṣu A-na-ta-a besides ṣu Bālihu, 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 Altınbaşak and Akçakale (Tall Abyad) a series of ruins of ancient settlements (tails) can be seen which have not yet been identified.

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...
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 Tiglath-pileser I which was repeated by Assur-bēl-kala in his inscription on the so-called Broken Obelisk. Tiglath-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 kūḫa-at- te)”;27 Aššur-bēl-kala uses the same text but adds after “before the land Hatti” the words “and at the foot of Mount Lebanon (ū ina šēp kūlab-na- nī).”28 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 (ḫu-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 Gebel Ḥādir al-Arda29 is absolutely excluded.

If we take into consideration the other texts from Dūr-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 Harrānu 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 rēš uru-raz-i-[qī] besides an otherwise unknown Ešpirua and later on a town uru-ri-na ša šadē(kūr);30 all places where Sutians can be found and – possibly – defeated. Kumaḫa/Kumaḫi, on the other hand, is well-known from Hittite sources.31 It is the place of a battle between the king Suppiluliuma I and Karanni, king of Ḫašaša.32 Other references in the so-called evocations name it besides the lands of Alzija, Papanha and Ḫašaša; 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,33 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.
29 A.R. Stucky, cf. Kh. Nashef, RGTC 5 (1982) 36 with references. Further references are DeZ 3439 (= BATSH 4 N° 2):45 and D. Arnaud, AuOr. 5 (1986) 21ff T.13:13. It seems possible – following an idea of Marta Luciaini – to offer a suggestion for the identification of this place: During a first campaign of excavations at Tall Shioukh Foqāni in the area of the Tišrin Dam project on the Euphrates, F.M. Fales unearthed an Aramaic document with the place name br mṛn, certainly to be connected with the uru-ri-na in Ād-Adini of Shalmaneser III (see NAT p. 95) (private communication). This fits quite well with the Marina of MA times.
32 Cf. for example J. Garstang/O.R. Gurney, The Geography of the Hittite 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 Kumaḥa should be sought either far to the northeast of Karkamish 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 Aḥmar) which is situated 20 km south of the capital on the left bank of the river. D. Hawkins identified this place with Hit-tite Mazuwati, a town in Astata, but from the Middle Assyrian sources comes no support for this identification. Therefore I think that the merchants took their route from Tall Aḥmar to the northeast around the Kara Dağ and behind the Cudi Dağ to Ḥuzirina/Sultantepe, Ayyani and Ḥarrānu. This corresponds mostly with the route of the ḥarrān šarrī in NA times. With respect to the location of Araziqiu, a prominent place at the southern border of the Saruḡ plain such as Tall Karuṣ is a possible candidate, but it seems as if it has Neo-Assyrian levels only. That the name Araziqiu is no longer present in NA times is immaterial; the settlement may have survived under a different name.

Busaya’u 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 Busaya’u 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 Katmuḥi and Mumme of Alzi. Because Katmuḥi 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.

Nihria 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 ešartum 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 Ḥurupša and Šinariḫum, 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 Māri texts refer several times to the city and the people coming from there. Administrative documents record presents given to men from (in this sequence): Apum - Andariq - Kurda - Nihria - Sudā - Ašnakkm; or a little bit

---

36 See the report about a survey conducted by the German Archaeological Institute by B. Einwag, Damaszener Mitteilungen 7 (1993) 39f, map Abb. 4 N° 8.
37 Cf. Kh. Nashef, RGTC 5 (1982) 76 and note that a writing KUR biša-ye-e for this mountain exists (A 68:3, unpubl.).
42 ARM 7 211.
different – from Kurda - Ḫanżat - Niḥri; or – again different and as ethnica – Eluḥtāy - Azuḥiyā'u - Niḥrāy - Imaru. Once also a close connection to Ḫarrānum is reported. Beyond that, the famous letter of Šamsī-Adad to Yasmah-Adad testifies to the responsibility of the young viceroy of Mari for a campaign from Niḥri to Šudā. This campaign is to be postponed because of an unnamed enemy which may be identified with the Ḫaneans named later on. The place name Šudā, which is also well-known from MA documents, is of particular interest here and will be referred to again later. Another Mari letter points to the fact that it was possible to walk from Niḥri to Admum, 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 Rimāh/Karakānā concerning food “of the huradu-troops” ša urNiḥri ša ilkan ištu aḫḫašu isšu “of Niḥriš who do their service together with the brothers(?))” it seems sure that during the eponymate of a certain Qibi-Āššur the town lay within the Assyrian sphere of influence. But Qibi-Āššur is not only – as supposed for example by C. Wilcke – 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, one of them was eponym close to Ina-Āššur-Šumi-asbat, the eponym of the dates in most of the letters from Dūr-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 1 (1225/1223 or 1222/1217 BC). In these letters Niḥriš is named twice. In the letter BATSH 4, N° 3:10ff, 1500 enemies are assembled in the Ḫṣûme mountains, a region southeast of Ḫarrān, well-known from OB and NA sources (Shalmaneser III), and the correspondent Sin-mudammīq – also named at the top of our document – reports that there are no specific plans for the case that those troops invade the town Niḥriš, the land Ḫan or the banks of the Ḫābūr. If the itinerary follows a line from west to east Niḥriš should be sought somewhere in or not far from the Ḫarrān 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: Šubriu – that they grew hostile to Niḥriš and plundered in the environs of this town, destroyed(?) the hay of Niḥriš and another town, Pa-nu-aš, which is not mentioned in other texts from the Dūr-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, Niḥriš 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 AR 7 164.
44 AR 12 747.
45 AR 14 231.
47 ARM 1 103-9.
48 TR 3005:5 = J. N. Postgate, Iraq 30 (1968) 179, pl. LVIII.
50 Qibi-Āššur mār Ṣilišši-ilu DeZ 3410, 3415, 3826; VAT 19554, 19668, 19673; cf. C. Saporetti, EMA p. 55; H. Freydank, Beiträge zur mittelassyrischen Chronologie und Geschichte (1991) 162-64.
sure that the events, described in the famous letter found at Ugarit53 and analysed by I. Singer54 took place earlier, possibly during the reign of Shalmaneser I or at the beginning of the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I. It seems beyond dispute that the battle of Ninhria between the Hittite king Tudhaliya IV and an unidentified Assyrian king had as a consequence the loss of the city by the Hittite and, in the time thereafter, an Assyrian predominance in this region east of the Euphrates. All this points to a location of Ninhria not too far from Harran. Following a nice suggestion of James Mellaart55, "the copious springs at Urfa could very well elicit a town name Ninhria" so that this town - the modern Sanli-Urfa - constituted the very northwestern point on the map of the empire of Tukulti-Ninurta I.

The place named as Sūdu in Māri56 and as Sūdu or Sūdu in MA documents57 is now also mentioned in Assur texts.58 Possibly but not certainly it may be connected with Sūduḫi,59 a paḫutu once mentioned in Dūr-Katlimmu under the responsibility of the sukkallu ṛabi Submānu-mušabšī.60 Its location in the central part of the Habur-triangle is evidenced by the many connections with Ḥurra, Nabula and Uṣšukannu in historical inscriptions of Adad-nārāri I.61

The next entry, ḫa-nu an.ta, bears as a surprise the qualifying epithet an.ta, the "upper Hanu (or Ḥana)." There will be no doubt that this designates the opposite position to another, the "lower" Ḥana. The well-known Old Babylonian, Middle Assyrian (and later) māt Ḥana 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 Ḫa-an i between Ninhria and šiddi Ḥābūrī, i.e. in the upper part of northern Syria. Another letter discusses some military actions and mentions "strongholds in the Land of Harran and at the feet of the Kašiyari-mountains"63 and refers in the same context to hostile troops "which committed a robbery in front of the city of the land Ḥanu."

Afterwards they hid their stolen animals at a watering place in the desert (?) and proceeded to another gasn at the bank of an unnamed river, maybe the Hābūr or one of its tributaries. All this points to a location of this Ḥana-land in northwestern Syria, maybe at the feet of the Kašiyari or the

57 MARV 2 21:3 (between Katmuḫu and Ta'idu); 32:9-9 (written ṣu-di-[i]), cf. H. Freydank, AOF 19 (1992) 312f.
58 Cf. Kh. Našef, RGTC 5 (1982) 251, where the possibility of an interconnection of the two lemmata 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 ṣa-di-ḫi-im besides ṣa-Sūda, see RGTC 3 226 and D. Charpin, MARI 7 (1993) 169-71 (also to the "kings" of Šudūḫuṭum). Nevertheless it could be the well-known human adjective-formation in -hi-he, often to be found in the onomatopoeic and in the toponymy of Nuzi and MA for example in Ḥabbi, Ḥalaḫa, Ḥarnaphi, Ḥuzuḫi (DeZ 2500:15), Kiliḫi, Kiliḫi(naš), Kumaḫi, Kummuḫi(?), Nagabbilḫi, Nigimḫi, Māt Paphi( ?), Tarbaše.
64 ša i-na pi-[i] i bi-ru na Ḫa-an i iḫ-bu-tu-ni 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 Hana.

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-lêšir during the excavations of Peter Pfälzner at Tall Bderi on the Hâbûr. As Stefan Maul showed in his publication of these inscriptions,65 during the time of Tiglath-pilesîr I this “king” ruled a land which bears the name of the famous Old Babylonian capital Mârî 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 Hâbûr. It seems as if the country and its name existed there already during the reign of Tukultî-Ninurta I. In one of his inscriptions66 he reports that in a campaign at the beginning of his reign he conquered the lands of Mârî, Hana and Rapiqu – in this sequence, which corresponds to an advance from the Hâbûr 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 Mârî/Tell Ḥarîrî and with the intention of renewing the glorious history of this town.

The situation for Hana may have been different. The Old Babylonian Mârî documents mention groups of the Hana tribes living and rambling not only in the surroundings of Mârî itself but also far in the northwest,67 just in the region where the uru kur Ḥâni of the Dur-Katlimmu documents are to be found.68 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 Kašiyyâri mountains – and further to the west and in the Middle Babylonian period in Alalah.69 As a consequence it should be questioned if the famous place where the statue of Mar-duk had been deposited by Mûrsâli I after his raid on Babylon and if the kingdom of Tukulti-Mer is to be located on the Middle Euphrates.

Hûmnaḫûṣa again is otherwise unknown. The name seems to be of Hurrian origin, cf. Šumella, Šumpuršu in Nuzi-texts.70 After the summimg-up of our document

67 Independently, D. Charpin states in NABU 1995 N° 23: “que soit abandonnée la thèse traditionnelle, qui voulait que mât Hâna désigne la région de Terqa à l’époque des archives de Mari; les rois qui ont repris l’épithète de «roi de Hana», entendaient sans doute encore par la mêmes les lions de la région du Moyen-Euphrate et du Habur, non sur la région autour de Terqa.” It is a mere fact that Hâna in the Mari documents refer to the nomadic population groups in the area of influence of the Mari kings; cf. also the title šar Mari (Tuttul) u mât Hâna used by Yahdun-Lîm, RIME 4 (1990) E4.6.8.1:3-5, 2:19, and Zimri-Lîm, 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/Beduinische Bevölkerungsgruppen als Forschungsproblem und Forschungsgegenstand in der Gegenwart,” in: F. Scholz et al., Beduinen im Zeichen des Erdöls, TAVO Beih. B 45 (1981) 1-53.
68 Hana-people are gathered in Ha-[ši]-imê sa me-em-bi-da... aššînum gâblît mātin “there in the middle of the country” ARM 1 37:32f; cf. MARI 4, 37; RGTC 3, 94, in Idamaras (ARM 5 51) in Kirdahat (Tell Šâgâr Bâzâr) and Nahîr at the springs of the Hâbûr; cf. J.-R. Kupper, Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari (1957) 28 and M. Anbars, Les tribus armurîtes de Mari, OBO 108 (1991) 102ff with references.
69 J.-R. Kupper, Lc. 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 Dûr-Katlimmu texts,⁷¹ most of them from the same eponymate, namely Aššur-zēra-iddina, who took his office shortly before Ina-Aššur-šumi-ašbat. Because Šaluša appears several times in the neighbourhood of Šadikanni it must have been in the Ḥabûr 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 Mari-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 Šadikanni as an obligation of a delivery by Aššur-iddin); 3309+:15 (140 homers of barley from the palace of Šadikanni 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>Naprași</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latți</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-Katlimmu</td>
<td>Dūr-aduklim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patu[...]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunni-Aššur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saḥlala</td>
<td>Saḥlala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥuzirānu</td>
<td>Ḥuzirina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḣarrānu</td>
<td>Ḣarrānu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayya(ni)</td>
<td>Ayyanatā(?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥabayatu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araziqū</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buṣayā'ū</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niḥria</td>
<td>Niḥria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[KUR (H)asam]</td>
<td>[KUR Ḥasume]</td>
<td>[KUR Ḥasumu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Šuduḫi]</td>
<td>[Šuduḫi]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Šudā/Sudā]</td>
<td>[Šudu/Sudu]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ūunu KUR Ḥani AN.TA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šaluṣa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>