

# ALTORIENTALISCHE FORSCHUNGEN

Band 28 · 2001

Herausgeber: VOLKERT HAAS

in Verbindung mit MANFRED BIETAK  
HELMUT FREYDANK  
KARL JANSEN-WINKELN  
HORST KLENGEL  
JÖRG KLINGER  
JOHANNES RENGER  
WERNER SUNDERMANN



Akademie Verlag

JARED L. MILLER

## Anum-Ḫirbi and His Kingdom

### Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Anum-Ḫirbi<sup>2</sup> is the only monarch mentioned concurrently in the cuneiform texts from Old Assyrian Kültepe in central Anatolia, Old Babylonian Mari on the middle Euphrates, Old Kingdom historico-legendary texts from Boğazköy and neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions. Moreover, his name is inscribed on arrowheads, reportedly found near Maraş, in the Gaziantep museum. Indeed it is difficult to recall an ancient ruler from any place or period who appears in texts from such geographically and chronologically divergent sources. Compared to this relative ubiquity, however, rather little is known about him and his kingdom, as none of

<sup>1</sup> I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Prof. Drs. Nadav Na'aman, Itamar Singer and Gernot Wilhelm and to Dr. Guido Kryszat for their helpful comments and criticism regarding this article. Abbreviations follow the standards of the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, the *Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, R. Borger's *Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur* and the annual indices in the journals *Orientalia* and *Archiv für Orientforschung*. Further abbreviations: Expeditions = J. L. Miller, *The Expeditions of Ḫattušili I to the Eastern Frontiers*. Unpub. MA Thesis, Tel Aviv Univ. (1999); Imdilum = M. Ichisar, *Les archives cappado-ciennes du marchand Imdilum*, Paris (1981) (Recherche sur les grandes civilisations. Cahier n°. 3); Innāya = C. Michel, *Innāya dans les tablettes paléo-assyriennes II: Editions des textes*, Paris (1991); QGS 5 = M. Liverani, ed., *Neo-Assyrian Geography*, Rome (1995) (Quaderni di Geografia Storica 5).

<sup>2</sup> The name of our protagonist, normalised Anum-Ḫirbi in this study, is the victim of a wide variety of spellings in the cuneiform sources: <sup>m</sup>A-nu-um-ḫé-ir-wa<sub>a</sub> (KBo XII 3) at Boğazköy; A-nu-ha-ar-wi (ARM XXII 151), A-ni-iš-ḫu-ur-pí (M.7536; ARM XXV 14 and 25; H. Limet transliterates a-ni-ip-hu-ur-pí in ARM XXV 14, while M. Guichard, NABU [1993] 54, lists A-ni-iš\*-hu-ur-pí), [A-nu]-[ḫa-ar-wi] (A.1264+M.12643+ARM XXI 252) and A-ni-iš-ḫu-ul-pí (M.11397) at Mari; A-nu-um-ḫi-ir-bi (g/t 35 = Letter of Anum-Ḫirbi) at Ma'ama itself; A-num-ḫi-ir-wi (Gzt. 31.23.92; Gzt. 1.3.93 = Gaziantep Museum arrowheads) in the northern part of his realm near Ma'ama; and <sup>m</sup>AN-ḫir-be (RIMA A.0.102.3), <sup>m</sup>AN-ḫi-ir-be (RIMA A.0.102.5, 28, 29 and 34) and AN-ḫi-ir-bi (RIMA A.0.102.2) by the neo-Assyrian scribes. Note the interesting, if slight, variation between the spelling of the name in the three inscriptions for which Anum-Ḫirbi himself would have been responsible, i.e. the Letter and the two spearheads.

the texts come from excavations of his realm, and those extant are usually fragmentary, oblique and refer to him and his kingdom from distant perspectives. The two exceptions are the arrowheads, which reportedly come from an area which must have been included in the northern portion of his realm, and the well-preserved text known as the *Letter of Anum-Ḫirbi*. K. Balkan's publication of the letter still serves as the foundation for our understanding concerning Anum-Ḫirbi and his kingdom, and the information in it will not be gratuitously repeated. While the letter and several other documents have been well known for decades, a number of newly published texts make a re-examination of Anum-Ḫirbi and his realm a worthwhile exercise.

### The Sources

The primary document which concerns our subject is still the Letter of Anum-Ḫirbi, written in Old Assyrian, found in the large palatial structure on the höyük of Kültepe (K. Balkan, *Letter* (1957); P. Garelli, *Assyriens* (1963), 207–221; L. L. Orlin, *Assyrian Colonies* (1970), 97–101). A recently published Mari letter (M.7536; see S. Maul, *Gs. Birot* (1994), 29–31) is the first text from that site to offer hints about Zalwar and Anum-Ḫirbi apart from cursory occurrences in account texts. A further text (A.1215; see I. Guillot, *Gs. Barrelet* (1997), 276), while not unequivocally datable to the reign of Anum-Ḫirbi, shows the relationship between the dynasty of Zalwar, during either his rule or that of his predecessor, and Šamši-Adad's realm. The account texts (see M. Guichard, *NABU* [1993] 54) provide the only concrete dates for Anum-Ḫirbi which can be linked to the Mesopotamian chronologies, as well as information on the political and trade relations between Mari and the kingdom of Zalwar and Ḫaššu. From Boğazköy come KBo XII 3 and KUB XXXVI 99 (W. Helck, *Fs. Bittel* (1983)), which might be called historico-legendary texts, the fragmentary condition of which allows only a brief glimpse at our protagonist. In the neo-Assyrian annals of Shalmaneser III, an inscription and (carved) image of AN-ḫirbi is said to have been found in the mountains of northern Syria (RIMA A.0.102.2:10; 3:91; 5:3; 28:23; 29:25; 34:9). Finally, two spear- or arrowheads from the collection of the Gaziantep Museum (Gzt. 31.23.92; Gzt. 1.3.93), said to have been found at or near the village of Hasancık, c. 40–45 km north-west of Maraş (see V. Donbaz, *AoF* 25 [1998] 178–181), provide interesting hard evidence, but essentially add little to the overall picture. Numerous other documents from Kültepe, Mari, Boğazköy and Alalaḫ enable the localisation of the toponyms of Anum-Ḫirbi's realm with a fair degree of certainty, if not pin-point precision, and add to the general picture of his kingdom.

### The Chronology of Anum-Ḫirbi's Reign

Anum-Ḫirbi is found in Mari documents dated to the reign of Zimri-Lim, and is the author of a letter to King Waršama of Kaniš. He can thus be solidly linked

to the Mesopotamian chronologies, of which the Middle Chronology will be conventionally employed in this study, and to the first rulers of Kültepe Ib. Anum-Ḫirbi is attested in dated Mari documents which show he was alive and active from 12/vii/ZL 4' to 21/i/ZL 9', including one text from ZL 5' and one from ZL 7' (M. Guichard, NABU [1993] 54). According to the latest studies of Mari and Kültepe Ib period chronology, which are based largely on the eponym lists from Mari, Kültepe and other north-Mesopotamian and Anatolian sites, ZL 4'-9' should be *c.* 1776-1771 ± 8 BCE<sup>3</sup> (R. M. Whiting, OBO Series Archaeologica 6 (1990), 210; K. R. Veenhof, MARI 4 (1985), 207, 214). These five documents are indeed the only dated documents that attest Anum-Ḫirbi. All other texts regarding Anum-Ḫirbi and his kingdom must be relatively dated based on their content, a rather difficult and speculative task in some cases. It can reasonably be assumed that he had a fairly long reign, perhaps three decades or more, since he left a lasting impression on his region. Since Anum-Ḫirbi was contemporary with the first rulers of Kültepe Ib (i.e. Waršama and perhaps Inar; see below), and since the city of that level likely received its regenerative impetus from Šamši-Adad's Assyrian state structure (R. M. Whiting, OBO Series Archaeologica 6 (1990), 213; M. Forlanini, StMed 9 [1995], 126; K. R. Veenhof, in J. Sasson, ed. *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, Vol. II, New York (1995), 865), or more neutrally, some time toward the end of the third or beginning of the fourth decade of Šamši-Adad's nearly six decade career (some 33± years of which he ruled in Aššur) (R. M. Whiting, OBO, Series Archaeologica 6 (1990), 214; K. R. Veenhof, RAI 34 (1998), 429)<sup>4</sup>, it might be proposed that most of Anum-Ḫirbi's reign occurred prior to the accession to the throne of Zimri-Lim. Tentatively placing Anum-Ḫirbi's death slightly after the fall of Mari conforms to the negative evidence that nowhere in the Mari archives does one learn of his passing, nor is a successor to Anum-Ḫirbi on the throne(s) of Zalwar or, later, Ḫaššu attested. Hence, Anum-Ḫirbi's reign in this study will be contingently assigned the dates *c.* 1795-1765 BCE.

<sup>3</sup> R. M. Whiting, OBO Series Archaeologica 6 (1990), 214, points out that the dates for Zimri-Lim depend on how the death of Šamši-Adad is linked to the rule of Hammurabi. Šamši-Adad is positively attested as alive during Hammurabi 10, while Zimri-Lim is likely to have ascended the throne of Mari, following the death of Šamši-Adad, in Hammurabi 18. Hence, the ± 8 (cf. K. R. Veenhof, MARI 4 (1985), 207-209). Utilising D. Charpin and J.-M. Durand's proposal that Šamši-Adad died in Hammurabi 17, and assuming no gap between his death and the accession of Zimri-Lim, ZL 4'-9' would be *c.* 1771-1766.

<sup>4</sup> There is, of course, a tendency to reduce the number of years of Šamši-Adad's 'full' reign from R. M. Whiting's suggested 57. See, e.g. J.-M. Durand, MARI 6 (1990), esp. pg. 275. Such a reduction would not significantly affect the reconstruction presented here. It should also be noted that Kültepe Ib is now generally understood to have continued for a significant period following the death of Šamši-Adad, which would allow for the several kings of Kültepe Ib who probably followed Waršama, e.g. Piṭhana, Anitta and Zuzzu (see M. Forlanini, StMed 9 [1995]; K. R. Veenhof, RAI 34 (1998), 440 ff.).

## The Geography of Anum-Ḫirbi's Realm

Four toponyms are relevant to the kingdom of Anum-Ḫirbi. He is witnessed as the King of Ma'ama in the Letter of Anum-Ḫirbi and as the King of Zalwar and later Ḫaššu in the Mari documents. He is also reported in Shalmaneser III's annals to have left an inscription and an image on Mount Atalur. Locating these toponyms will enable an outline of the kingdom over which he must have ruled.

### The Location of Ma'ama

It is known from the letter of Anum-Ḫirbi, King of Ma'ama, to Waršama, King of Kaniš, that the two kingdoms bordered one another, while between them lay at least several smaller intervening towns, each with their own vassal rulers, including Taišama in the land of Kaniš and Sibuḫa in the land of Ma'ama. It is also known that Anum-Ḫirbi had the ability to cut off the trade route that went through his land/city toward Kaniš (K. Balkan, Letter (1957), 30).<sup>5</sup> While the text offers invaluable relative information about the geography of the two countries, the border between the two will only be determined once the position of Ma'ama and the magnitude of the two lands are known.

The principal Old Assyrian trade text defining the location of Ma'ama is TCL IV 18, which describes a splitting of the Old Assyrian trade route to Kaniš. In the letter, Aššur-Iddin writes to his son, Aššur-nādā, explaining that if the latter feared travelling through Ḫaḫḫum, he should proceed by way of Uršu and Ma'ama.<sup>6</sup> From this passage it can be surmised that Uršu lay on an alternative route to the one through Ḫaḫḫum, and that Ma'ama lay farther than Uršu on the same route. The Letter of Anum-Ḫirbi corroborates the picture that Ma'ama must lay closer to Kaniš than such power centres as Uršu, since Ma'ama and Kaniš clearly bordered one another.

It is also known that Ma'ama is to be located in the mountains, according to CCT II 11 a.<sup>7</sup> This valuable information lends Ma'ama little geographic specificity, and does not allow one to assume, with P. Garelli, *Assyriens* (1963), 108, that the loss of the goods was due to the difficulty of the mountain passage. One could

<sup>5</sup> For a recent convenient summary of the situation touched on in the letter, see T. Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, Oxford (1998), 33-36.

<sup>6</sup> 'Wenn du bezüglich Ḫaḫḫum Furcht hegst, reise nach Uršu! (Reise) dringend, dringend! Reise allein! Mit der Karawane gehe nicht nach Ma'ama (hinein)! Auch (beachte folgendes:) genau nach der Weisung der Stadt soll die Karawane deines Bruders in drei Teile geteilt werden: der erste Trupp soll aus Ma'ama aufbrechen, und (erst) sowie er das Land Kaniš erreicht hat, soll der zweite Trupp aus Uršu aufbrechen. Auch der dritte Trupp soll in gleicher Weise aufbrechen' (TCL IV 18:32-46; trans. in E. Bilgiç, *AfO* 15 [1945-51] 24-25).

<sup>7</sup> '36 pièces d'étoffes *kutānū* de la caravane d'Aššur-ēmuqī qu'Aššur-ṭāb avait expédiées, se sont perdues dans la montagne de Mamma' (CCT II 11 a:15-18; trans. in P. Garelli, *Assyriens* (1963) 108; see now M. Ichisar, *Imdilum* (1981) 225ff. for full transliteration and trans.).

as easily assume (as is often the case attested elsewhere) that the goods were lost to bandits. Hence, P. Garelli's placement between Maraş and Göksun, predicated on the difficulty of the mountain passage, though otherwise likely, is not necessitated.

Likewise, BIN IV 219 indicates a relationship between Unibgum, Uršu and Ma'ama.<sup>8</sup> M. Forlanini, *Hethitica* 6 [1985] 54, states the case most fittingly, describing this second route to Kaniš as, 'La route de Uršum qui, en passant par Unipkum et Mama, atteignait par le montages le pays de Kaniš,' a description which avoids a firm commitment to the order of Unibgum and Ma'ama, which cannot be ascertained from the text. Unfortunately, Unibgum is not localisable, and therefore lends little to the discussion of Ma'ama.

Finally, the Old Assyrian trade route order Kaniš-Tegarama<sup>9</sup>-Ma'ama can be established from Kt 90/k 110a<sup>10</sup>, as well as from CCT 5 30a (see K. Nashef, *TAVO*, Reihe B, Nr. 83 (1987), 31-32), placing at least one station worth mentioning between them, cautioning against locating Ma'ama 'too close' to Kaniš, a very relative note at best.<sup>11</sup>

K. Balkan, *Letter* (1957), 33, would place Ma'ama either in the area of Elbistan or Göksun, K. Nashef, *RGTC* IV:83 between Maraş and Göksun, K. Hecker, *RIA* 7 (1987-90), 192, in the area of Göksun, while M. Forlanini and M. Marazzi, *ASVOA* 4.3 (1986), Tav. XVI, would place a unified Ғaššu/Ma'ama at Maraş (concerning the latter, see below). The discovery of the spear- or arrowheads inscribed

<sup>8</sup> 'There is no honey here! We shall dispatch a message to Uršu in order that honey is sent up. We stayed at Unnibgum for a whole day on behalf of the boys so that the son of Ғamḫam[um] came up to Māma before our arrival. Thus we did not reach him' (BIN IV 219:3-13; trans. in J. Lewy, *OrNs* 21 [1952] 289 n. 4; see now C. Michel, *Innāya* (1991) 82-83 for full transliteration and trans.).

<sup>9</sup> Tegarama is often placed at Gürün, due primarily to the assumed identity of the attested toponyms Tegarama = Til-garama = Gauraena = Gürün (e.g. P. Garelli, *Assyriens* (1963) 117). This northerly location, in turn, was seen to fit the Hittite references which vaguely associate Tegarama with Išuwa, Azzi and Šamuḫa, as well as the assumption that the Old Assyrian trade routes would have come through this area from Malatya to the east. B. J. Beitzel, in G. D. Young, ed. *Mari in Retrospect*, Winona Lake, Indiana (1992), however, has shown convincingly that the Old Assyrian routes did not come through Malatya, but further south through the upper Baliḫ and the Euphrates bend in the Samsat area. At present, the location of Tegarama seems to be floating freely within a rather large region.

<sup>10</sup> 'Dis à Aššur-ennam: ainsi (parle) Šallim-Aššur. "Sur les 114 étoffes que tu m'as confiées dans Aššur, 2 étoffes de qualité ordinaire manquaient. Là-dessus, j'ai laissé 16 étoffes dans Māma, dans la maison de Merali, fils d'Aššur-imittī. Là-dessus, j'ai (également) laissé 6 étoffes de bonne qualité et 30 étoffes dans Tegarama, dans la maison de Šallim-Aššur, fils d'Illi-bāni. Je n'ai rien pris pour mes frais, et je ne les ai pas fait entrer à Kaniš'" (Kt 90/k 110a 1-12; trans. in C. Michel and P. Garelli, *Tablettes paleo-assyriennes de Kültepe I* (Kt 90/k), Paris (1997)).

<sup>11</sup> Ma'ama also appears now in an unpublished Old Assyrian text from Tell Leilan; see M. Forlanini, *StMed* 9 [1995] 125.

with the name of Anum-Hirwi (see V. Donbaz, *AoF* 25 [1998] 173–185), assuming that this must be the northern area of his realm, indicates that these suggestions are not ill directed. The arrow-/spearheads are said to have been found at the village of Hasancık, located some 45 km. north-west of Maraş. If one assumes that these finds probably indicate the region of Ma'ama, then they provide the first archaeological correlation, if presently unverifiable, for a location of that northern seat of Anum-Hirbi's power.<sup>12</sup> At present, there is no evidence which allows one to decide conclusively between the options. Archaeological survey data from the region suggested is almost non-existent, which is a remarkable lacunae considering the ubiquity of proposals that Ma'ama be located in the region. A location between Göksun and Maraş will, for the sake of argument, tentatively be accepted in this study.

## The Location of Zalwar

### Introduction

The search for the location of Zalwar is complicated by the fact that at least three cities with very similar names are found in the cuneiform sources. While the northern Hittite Zalpa/Zalpuwa can with some confidence be located to the north of Ḫattuša<sup>13</sup>, and the Zalpaḫ of the Mari archives and the Old Babylonian Itinerary can be located with a great degree of specificity on or near the Baliḫ River<sup>14,15</sup>, there remain significant difficulties to be addressed regarding what

<sup>12</sup> The present author cannot agree with all the historical and geographical inferences drawn by V. Donbaz, *AoF* 25 [1998] 173–185.

<sup>13</sup> The principal textual sources relating to the northern Zalpa have been covered by H. Otten, *StBoT* 17 (1973); V. Haas, *MDOG* 109 [1977] 15–26; U. B. Alkim, H. Alkim and Ö. Bilgiç, *Ikiztepe I. The First and Second Seasons' Excavations (1974–1975)*, Ankara (1988), 195–196; and G. Steiner, *Fs. N. Özgüç* (1993).

<sup>14</sup> Voluminous scholarly material has dealt with Zalpaḫ. The following are the essential studies and select recently published textual sources: J.-M. Durand, *LAPO* 17 (1998), 171, 448–449; *idem.*, *Mélanges Garelli* (1991), 53; T. J. Wilkinson, *Subartu* IV/1 (1998); M. Guichard, *Gs. Barrelet* (1997), 197–198; C. Michel and P. Garelli, *Tablettes paleo-assyriennes de Kültepe I (Kt 90/k)*, Paris (1997), 65–67; B. J. Beitzel, in G. D. Young, ed. *Mari in Retrospect*, Winona Lake, Indiana (1992); *idem.*, *Fs. LaSor* (1978); C. Michel, *Innāya* (1991), 84–85; J. M. Córdoba, *AoF* 17 [1990] 360–378; M. N. van Loon and D. Meijer, *Hamam et-Turkman I*, Istanbul (1988); K. Nashef, *TAVO, Reihe B, Nr. 83* (1987); P. Villard, *MARI* 5 (1987), 591–596; M. Ichisar, *Imdilum* (1981), 409–410; G. Dossin, *RA* 68 [1974] 25–34; A. Goetze, *JCS* 7 [1953] 51–72.

<sup>15</sup> The *Sal-ba/Sal-ba-ù* of the Ebla archives (RGTC XII/1:287–288) has also been equated with Zalpaḫ by V. Davidović, *Acta Sumerologica* 11 [1989] 1–26; M. C. Astour, *HSAO* 2 (1988), 154; A. Tånberg, *Der geographische Horizont der Texte aus Ebla*, St. Otilien (1994) (*Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament* 42) 55. Since the equivalence is conjectural, though not unlikely (H. Klengel, in K. van Lerberghe and A. Schoors, eds. *Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East*, Leuven (1995) (*Orientalia Lovanien-*

must be a third city, Zalwar, a principal city of Anum-Ḫirbi. It is not always transparent which Zalpa of the three is mentioned in any particular text.<sup>16</sup>

#### The Attribution of the Occurrences of Zalpa, Zalpaḫ and Zalwar

The varied orthography of the three Zalpa's witnessed in the texts, initially confusing, may actually be of some use in solving the puzzle of which occurrences should be assigned to which city:

- All cases of Zalpa in the Old Assyrian texts, regardless whether they refer to the northern Anatolian Zalpa or a Syrian Zalpa, are written *Za-al-pá* (RGTC IV; see also newer material cited below)<sup>17</sup>, except, perhaps, one occurrence of *A-ru-a-ar* in KUG 29 (see also H. Klengel, Fs. T. Özgüç (1989), 266–267).
- All Mari references and that in the Old Babylonian Itinerary are written *Za-al-pa-aḫ* (see RGTC III and newer material cited below), except: *Za-ar-wa-ar* in G. Dossin, Syria 20 [1939] 109; *Za-al/ar-wa-ar* in ARM XXII 151 and XXV 25, respectively (M. Guichard, NABU [1993] 54; H. Limet, MARI 3 (1984), 193), each of which is explicitly associated with Anum-Ḫirbi; *Za-al-pá* in M.7536, also clearly associated with A[niš-ḫ]urpi (S. Maul, Gs. Birot (1994), 29–31); and *Za-al-wa-ar* four times in A.1215 and once in ARM XXVI 547, both of which clearly refer to Zalwar west of the Euphrates (see below).
- In the Hittite texts the picture is less clear:<sup>18</sup> It is spelled *Za-al-pa* (Hittite) and *Za-al-ba-ar* (Akkadian) in the Annals of Ḫattušili I (CTH 4); *Za'-ru-a-ar* (or *A-ru-a-ar*; see W. F. Albright, BASOR 78 [1940] 28 n. 28; H. Klengel, Fs. T. Özgüç (1989), 266–67; G. Beckman, JCS 47 [1995] 30) in the Siege of Uršu Text (CTH 7); *Za-al-pa/i* in KUB XXXVI 99 (CTH 2; W. Helck, Fs. Bittel (1983), 272–276; P. Meriggi, Fs. Otten (1973), 203), in which Anum-Ḫirbi appears, assuring its attribution to Zalwar near the Amanus (see below for this proposed location); *Za-al-pa* in KBo III 27 (CTH 5; see S. de Martino, AoF 18 [1991] 54–66) and KBo XXII 4 + KUB XL 5 (CTH 14; see C. Kühne, ZA 62 [1972] 236–261; H. Otten, StBoT 17 (1973), 60); *Za-al-pa* in HL § 54 (see H. A. Hoffner, DMOA 23 (1997); B. J. Collins, OrNs 56 [1987] 136); as well as *Za-al-pu-wa* and *Za-a-al-pu/a* and variants thereof, especially, it seems, in reference to the northern Anatolian

sia Analecta 65) 129, e.g. suggests an identification with Hittite Zulabi), and the location of the Ebla toponym based entirely on the later material, the question will be followed no further in this study.

<sup>16</sup> In this study the northern Anatolian city will be normalised as Zalpa, the Baliḫ city as Zalpaḫ, and the city of Anum-Ḫirbi as Zalwar.

<sup>17</sup> The fact can probably be explained by the suggestion that the Assyrian traders assumed that the northern Zalpa bore the same name as the Baliḫ Zalpaḫ, which might have been more familiar to them.

<sup>18</sup> G. Steiner, Fs. N. Özgüç (1993), 584, would attribute the occurrences of Zalpa in KBo X 1 and 2; HL § 54; KBo III 27 + KBo III 41; KBo XII 3 and KUB XXXVI 99; and KUB XL 5 + KBo XXII 4 and KBo XII 13 to his south-eastern Zalpa, purely on his method of toponym grouping.



city (CTH 3; H. Otten, StBoT 17 (1973); W. Röllig, Fs. Dörner (1978); RGTC VI); and finally, *Za-al-pa-ar* in the Tikunani Letter (see M. Salvini, SMEA 34 [1994] 63–80; 1996).

- It is spelled *Za-al-wa-ar*<sup>19</sup> in the lone document from Alalakh witnessing the name (ALT \*204 (obv. 5)).

The Old Assyrian material cannot help one decide, on the basis of its orthography alone, to which of the Zalpa's a particular text refers. The attestations from Kültepe must be assigned according to other criteria. The Hittite material, while not unequivocal, attests only the north-Syrian Zalwar, as far as can be otherwise ascertained, with a final consonant (*Za'-ru-a-ar*, *Za-al-pa/ba-ar*), while it attests both the northern Anatolian and the Syrian city as simply Zalpa/i. The Mari material, on the other hand, seems to maintain a rather clear distinction between Zalpaḥ on the Baliḥ and Zalwar west of the Euphrates. In *all* cases that the latter toponym appears with its king, Anum-Ḫirbi, it is spelled radically differently than the oft-attested and consistent spelling (i.e. with final *-ḫ*) of the Baliḥ toponym (Zalpaḥ). The occurrence in M.7536, which lacks the final *-r* of other Mari attestations of the north Syrian city, provides not an exception to this rule, as it too is spelled divergently from Zalpaḥ on the Baliḥ, but suggests perhaps that the name of the city was particularly difficult, phonetically, for the scribes of all relevant regions and periods to master.<sup>20</sup> It seems that the Mari orthographic evidence provides strong support for the supposition that there were indeed two nearly homonymous Syrian cities. The Alalakh occurrence provides nice corroborative evidence and hints that the third of the three, Zalwar, should be located somewhere within its rather narrow sphere of interests (see below).

At least four points, inconclusive individually, but yielding a strong case in tandem, point to an identification of Zalwar with the Zalpa/Zalbar<sup>21</sup> that

<sup>19</sup> D. J. Wiseman, Alalakh (1953), 75, records only a transcription, '(al) Zalwar (KI)'; idem, JCS 18 [1954] 14.

<sup>20</sup> Since it was authored by a servant of Zimri-Lim, Yasīm-Sūmū, stationed at Karkemiš, perhaps the orthographic divergence (i.e. generally Zal/rwar at Mari; here Zalpa) might be explained by suggesting that Yasīm-Sūmū employed a scribe of Karkemiš to record his missive, a scribe who might have developed in the north-Syrian cuneiform scribal tradition, versus the Old Babylonian tradition evidenced at Mari; hence, the rendering of the toponym in a manner similar to the Hittite attestations.

<sup>21</sup> It is also true, of course, as recently reiterated by M. C. Astour, UF 29 [1997] 19, that a Zaruar, commonly equated with Zalwar, was active against the Hittites during the Siege of Uršu, which, if equated with the campaign against Uršu in the Annals of Ḫattušili, would come *after* Zalpa/Zalbar was destroyed in the second of the six campaign seasons enumerated there. Hence, according to M. C. Astour, Zalpa/Zalbar in the Annals and Zaruar in the Siege of Uršu could not have been the same entity. He asserts, *ibid.* 14, 18–19, incorrectly according to the understanding in this study, that it must be the north-Anatolian Zalpa mentioned by Ḫattušili in the Edict (KBo III 27) and in the Tikunani Letter, and that the Zaruar in the Siege of Uršu text should be identified, correctly it

Ḫattušili destroyed in his Annals, and suggest that the city lay in Syria rather than in northern Anatolia: 1) the intentional parallel regarding Zalpa in KBo III 27 with the north-Syrian cities of Ḫaššu and Aleppo<sup>22</sup> (e.g. H. Klengel, HdO I/34 (1999), 45–46 and n. 58). It must surely be assumed that the Zalpa mentioned in the Edict of Ḫattušili is the same as the Zalpar which he claims to have humbled in the Tikunani Letter, since the statements are nearly identical and are employed for similar purposes; 2) the greater likelihood that King Tuniya of Tikunani (and, via the grape vine, the king of Ḫaḫḫum?) would be made more keenly aware of the reality of Ḫattušili's power through the mention of the destruction of a north-Syrian city than that of a north-Anatolian centre; 3) the fact that the Akkadian version of Ḫattušili I's Annals records Zalbar, which, despite the inconsistency with which Hittite scribes record the name of the nearly homonymous cities, is never used, as far as can be ascertained, to apply to the north-Anatolian Zalpa, which is always written Zalpa/Zalpuwa; 4) It would be especially difficult to understand the north-Anatolian Zalpa as the city to which Tuniya was to send Ḫattušili's servant, Bulliṭadi, as well as one of his own servants, as the theatre of action in the Tikunani Letter is exclusively a north-Syrian/north-Mesopotamian one. In sum, it seems that Zalwar by the Amanus should be the city considered to have been pillaged in the Annals and the Edict, and now, in the Tikunani Letter. As long claimed by numerous scholars, this Zalwar should likely be identified with the Zaruar in the Siege of Uršu

seems, with Zalwar by the Amanus. Indeed, in order to maintain that the Zalpa/Zalbar Ḫattušili claims to have destroyed (in KBo III 27, the Annals and the Tikunani Letter) was a Syrian Zalpa, one must claim either: 1) that the action against Uršu in the Siege text should not be associated with the attacks against Uršu mentioned in the Annals; 2) that the damage to Zalpa/Zalbar in the Annals was insufficient to prevent its quick recovery and its functioning against the Hittites during the campaign against Uršu (e.g. M. Forlanini, *Hethitica* 6 [1985] 55); 3) that the chronological order of the Annals is unreliable; 4) that the occurrence in the Siege Text, habitually corrected to Zaruar, refers to a different city altogether and should be equated with Aruar of KUG 29. W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 78 [1940] 28 n. 28, wrote that collation of photographs 'show that the reading *Zar-ru-a-ar* is quite as possible as *A-ru-a-ar*'. Cf. H. Klengel, *Fs. T. Özgüç* (1989), 266 n. 35, referring to Aruar in KUG 29: 'Die Lesung *A* statt des (nach Kollation des Originals) nicht unmöglichen *Za-* in KBo I 11 wird durch den Kültepe-Beleg jetzt bekräftigt.' It is to avoid these exigencies that M. C. Astour, and others, assume that it must have been the northern Zalpa destroyed in the Annals, the destruction of which Ḫattušili boasts of in the Edict. However, it surely cannot be simplistically maintained, with M. C. Astour, *UF* 29 [1997] 18, that 'The final proof is provided by the recently published letter from Ḫattušili I to Tunia (Tunip-Teššup), king of Tikunanu.' M. C. Astour badly confuses the chronology of the Tikunani Letter and Ḫattušili's Syrian campaigns. That Ḫattušili refers to the destruction of Zalwar in the Tikunani Letter presents no contradiction, contra M. C. Astour, when compared with the chronology of the Annals (see J. L. Miller, *Expeditions* (1999), 54–55).

<sup>22</sup> 'The man of Zalpa spurned the father's word; look at Zalpa now! The man of Ḫaššu spurned the father's word; look at Ḫaššu now! And the man of Ḫalpa has also spurned the father's word; Ḫalpa will also be destroyed!' (KBo III 27:28'–31').

text. The mentions in the Tikunani Letter, the Siege of Uršu, the Annals and the Edict probably refer to Zalwar by the Amanus.

Zalwar/Zaruar of the Mari texts should be identified with Zalpa of KUB XXXVI 99<sup>23</sup>, as Aniš-Ḥurbi, King of Ḥaššum in the Mari archives is also attested in those same archives as the King of Zalwar/Zaruar (M. Guichard, NABU [1993] 54; M. Forlanini, Hethitica 6 [1985] 45–67; M. C. Astour, RHA 36 [1978] 4–5), while Anum-Ḥirbi, King of Maʿama in the Kültepe texts (K. Balkan, Letter (1957); P. Garelli, Assyriens (1963), 210–211), is also attested as the King of Zalpa in the Hittite texts KBo XII 3 and KUB XXXVI 99.<sup>24</sup>

### The Location of the north-Syrian Zalwar

Perhaps the most significant of the new Mari documents is A.1215, in which Bunû-Eštar, the ‘legitimate’ heir to the throne of Kurdâ exiled in Zalwar during the Interregnum of Šamši-Adad, reports his discontent over Zimri-Lim’s support for the pretender, Simaḥ-ilanê.<sup>25</sup> Since Šamši-Adad’s control extended from Šubat-Enlil to Mari, the Baliḥ and the Euphrates, A.1215 clearly places Zalwar outside of Šamši-Adad’s sphere of control, to where a ‘legitimate’ king deposed by his Interregnum might flee into exile, firmly placing Zalwar west of the Euphrates, though providing no more specific details.

<sup>23</sup> V. Haas, MDOG 109 [1977] 17, with H. Otten, StBoT 17 (1973), would associate the Zalpa of KBo XII 3 with that which he places on the Black Sea, creating a vast sphere of influence and/or military activity for Anum-Ḥirbi, one that reached from Ḥaššum and the Amanus in Syria to Maʿama, perhaps somewhere between Göksun and Maraş, through the later Hittite heartland to the north of Ḥattuša. Such a claim, which would entail great repercussions, is unwarranted on present evidence, and the association of the Zalpa of KBo XII 3 with a southern one, i.e. that with which Anum-Ḥirbi is associated in the Mari archives, is much to be preferred.

<sup>24</sup> The texts that can safely be utilised, then, in the search for Zalwar are: Mari texts ARM XXII 151; ARM XXV 25; M.7536; A.1215; and ARM XXVI 547, on the basis of the spelling attested in them and/or the association of the city with Anum-Ḥirbi; KUB XXXVI 99, due to the mention of Anum-Ḥirbi and the association with Uršu; The Annals of Ḥattušili (CTH 4), KBo III 27 and the Tikunani Letter (see below); CTH 7, CTH 14 and HL § 54 due to their clear north-Syrian contexts; and ALT \*204, due to the limited sphere of Alalah’s archives.

<sup>25</sup> ‘Bunû-Eštar m’a fait astucieusement dicter cette tablette à mon égard et me l’a envoyée. Voici ce qu’il y avait écrit: “Parle à Yassi-Dagan; voici ce que dit ton frère: ‘Précédemment, lorsque je résidais à Zalwar, alors Samsi-Addu avait écrit au roi de Zalwar de m’amener. Par astuce, le roi de Zalwar a donné à ma place un homme sans importance et qu’on avait apprêté, disant: “Amène-le.” Alors Amînum a amené cet homme comme s’il s’agissait de moi-même et Samsi-Addu a mis à mort cet homme. Moi-même, le roi de Zalwar m’a sauvé. Or je suis venu de Zalwar et je me trouve à Kurdâ. Maintenant, est-ce joli ce qu’a fait Zimri-Lim? Quelqu’un qui n’y avait pas de part est entré sur le trône paternel et moi je suis un errant! Fais pression sur le *merʾûm* et les grands dignitaires qu’ils me fassent revenir sur le trône de mon père!” Voilà le message que Bunû-Eštar a imaginé et m’a fait porter’ (A.1215; trans. in I. Guillot, Gs. Barrelet (1997), 276).

In another recently published Mari text, M.7536, Yasīm-Sūmû reports to Zimri-Lim that he had consulted with Aplaḥanda, King of Karkemiš, concerning one Qaqqadānum's travels to Ḥaššum, which had apparently been inhibited.<sup>26</sup> Aplaḥanda responded by writing to A[niš-ḥ]urpi about the matter. Further, Yasīm-Sūmû reports about one Abdu-e[rah], who had come to Karkemiš from Zalpa, only to be recalled by the king of Uršum, who then filled his wine ship and provided him with an escort. Upon his arrival at Karkemiš, Yasīm-Sūmû advised him to return to Uršum, before which he was detained in Karkemiš by the king of Zalpa, who was apparently resident there (S. Maul, *Gs. Birot* (1994), 29–31). Again, M.7536 does little more than place Zalwar (such is the attestation understood here, due to the spelling, i.e. not Zalpaḥ, and the mention of A[niš-ḥ]urpi) within the general trade sphere of north-western Syria, hinting at a position west of the Euphrates. The picture of tight commercial and complex political interaction among Zalwar, Ḥaššu, Uršu and Karkemiš thus conforms well with the location of Zalwar suggested in this study.

Similarly, the passage in the Siege of Uršu indicates no more than the general area west of the great bend of the Euphrates (cf., e.g. M. Forlanini, *Hethitica* 6 [1985] 55, who ekes too much specificity from the vague hint in the text). Zaruar is mentioned twice in the text, once in the context of the Hittite king ordering his commanders to guard against the enemy's projected movements<sup>27</sup>, and once in the context of one of the king's commanders informing his sovereign that the enemy indeed is acting with impunity.<sup>28</sup> The text provides the association of Zaruar (= Zalwar) with Uršu, Aleppo and Karkemiš, but alas, little more specificity can be gained from it than can from the Mari texts cited above.

Likewise, the fragmentary text KUB XXXVI 99 (W. Helck, *Fs. Bittel* (1983), 273) places Zalwar vaguely in connection with Uršu, the location of which at or in the area of Samsat owns a fair degree of certainty (see J. L. Miller, *Expeditions* (1999), 59–66). The destruction of Zalpa/Zalbar, listed in the Annals of Ḥattušili

<sup>26</sup> 'Zu meinem Herrn sprich: "Folgendermaßen (spricht) Iasīm-Sūmû, dein Diener. "Wegen der Durchreise des Qaqqadānum (auf seiner Reise) nach Ḥaššu(m) habe ich mit Aplaḥanda gesprochen. Aplaḥanda hat eine Tafel an A[niš-ḥ]urpi gesch[ickt, nämlich folgenden (Wortlautes)]: "Wegen [...des Qaqqadānum (...)] Dies habe ich geh[ört ...] Etwas anderes: Abdu-e[rah] kam [her] aus Ṣalpa, [jedoch] dann hielt ihn der König von Ursu(m) zurück mit folgenden (Worten): "Das Weinschiff will ich dir beladen, und ich will dir auch eine Eskorte geben aber dann geh!" Er kam her zu mir nach Karkamis und traf sich mit mir. Ich aber habe ihn nach Ursum zurückgeschickt, indem ich folgende (Worte an ihn richtete): "Geh und eile und [...] ihn?." Der Mann von Ṣa[lpa] hält sich nämlich (gerade) in Ka[rkamis] [auf]"' (M.7536; trans. in S. Maul, *Gs. Birot* (1994) 30).

<sup>27</sup> 'Guard the roads! Keep watch on those who would enter the city and those who would leave the city! No (one) shall go over to the enemies, to Zaruar, to Aleppo, to the Hurrian army, or to Zuppa' (KBo I 11 rev. 23–25; trans. in G. Beckman, *JCS* 47 [1995] 26).

<sup>28</sup> 'The servant of the man of Aleppo has entered five times; the servant of Zuppa is present in the city; the men of Zaruar come and go; the servant of the Son of the Storm-god, my lord, goes back and forth' (KBo I 11 rev. 28–30; trans. in G. Beckman, *JCS* 47 [1995] 27).

in isolated context, is later recalled in the Edict, where it is paralleled by the destruction of Ḥaššu and the prophecy of the destruction of Aleppo. Once again, the passage confirms the vague association of Zalwar with Ḥaššu and Aleppo, which suggests a location somewhere west of the Euphrates, south of the Taurus and north of Aleppo.

The single occurrence from Alalakh (ALT \*204) should not be neglected, as, considering the largely provincial nature of the text in particular and the Alalakh archive in general, as well as the spelling of the toponym, it seems far more reasonable to assume that this Zalwar is neither the north-Anatolian city nor the Baliḥ site, but that associated with Anum-Ḥirbi. It is an account of archers and their bows and arrows, including that of a scribe of Zalwar, who receives one bow, accounting matters which surely would not be found in the Alalakh archives if Zalwar were a great distance from Alalakh. Hence, one can conclude that Zalwar should most likely be sought, taking into account the general picture attained above, along the river valleys not far to the north or north-east of Alalakh.

The inscriptions of Shalmaneser III confirm this interpretation, though never mentioning Zalwar. That neo-Assyrian king claims to have erected a monument to himself 'before the source of the River Saluara at the foot of the Amanus range' (RIMA A.0.102. Z: i 50–51), from where he departed, crossing the Orontes. The area described is clearly the mountains and valleys to the north and north-east of the U-turn of the Orontes (see also below). M. C. Astour, UF 29 [1997] 12, has recently summarised the argument, made long ago, of seeing in the phonological similarity between the name of the river, Saluara, and the name of the city, Zalwar, confirmation of the location suggested in the Shalmaneser inscription, and hence, identifies the Saluara with the modern Karasu.<sup>29</sup>

With M. C. Astour, then, the Saluara River should be identified with one of the rivers at the foot of the Amanus, most likely the Karasu, and Zalwar should very probably be associated with the Saluara. Hence, Zalwar should be sought first along the Karasu. Indeed, these do seem the best available clues for the location

<sup>29</sup> M. C. Astour's, UF 29 [1997] 13, further claim, however, that 'Since Zalwar and Ḥaššu formed, in the late eighteenth century, a dual kingdom under Aniš-Ḥirbi, one may presume that the two political units bordered on each other within the same sharply delimited geographical region', does not square with what is known of the extent of Anum-Ḥirbi's realm. This is no reason to place Ḥaššu and Zalwar in the same valley, as M. C. Astour does. Only three pages earlier, M. C. Astour himself writes that Anum-Ḥirbi of Ma'ama must be considered the same ruler as the king of Ḥaššu and Zalwar, yet he locates, plausibly, Ma'ama at Göksun. Why then, would the political unit ruled by Anum-Ḥirbi have to be contained within tightly defined geographical parameters? His realm, even as described by M. C. Astour (*ibid.* 16), ranges widely over some of the roughest terrain in the entire region. M. C. Astour does raise the possibility that Anum-Ḥirbi moved his kingdom wholesale (or was moved?) across the Taurus, a suggestion which, without the substantial evidence that would be necessary to support it, seems rather far fetched.

of Zalwar, especially since they confirm the picture drawn through a study of the other available material.<sup>30</sup>

With M. Forlanini and M. Marazzi, ASVOA 4.3 (1986), Tav. XVI, then, it seems that a likely candidate for Zalwar would be Tilmen Höyük.<sup>31</sup> The archaeological evidence uncovered there fits the paradigm constructed from the philological very neatly (for preliminary excavation report, see U. B. Alkım, *Archaeology* 22 [1969] 280–289; for summary and references, M. C. Astour, *UF* 29 [1997] 14–15). Its location toward the northern end of the Karasu Valley is preferable when one tries to imagine the realm governed by Anum-Ḫirbi<sup>32</sup>, considering the location of Ḫaššum in the area around Gaziantep (see below), and accepting, for the sake of argument, a location for Ma'ama between Göksun and Maraş.

### The Location of Ḫaššum<sup>33</sup>

#### The Evidence from the Mari Archives

Again, the first task when utilising the Mari material is to ascertain which occurrences should be assigned to the north-Syrian Ḫaššum west of the Euphrates, and which, if any, should be assigned to Ḫe/iššum, wherever it might be located.

<sup>30</sup> Other elements of M. C. Astour's, *UF* 29 [1997] 14, argument are less convincing, i.e.: 1) the assumption that Ḫaššu and Zalwar must occupy the two principle tells of the Karasu Valley, which would be Tilmen Hüyük in the north (M. C. Astour's Ḫaššu) and Koyuncu Hüyük in the south (his Zalwar; *ibid.*: 13; *idem.*, *Hittite History and Absolute Chronology of the Bronze Age*, Partille (1989), 89 n 104); 2) the placement of Zalwar at the southern option and Ḫaššu at the northern due to the Siege of Uršu text, which, he claims, shows that Ḫaššu and the Ḫaššu-Uršu road were already under Hittite control. The fact that the Hittite king orders a Hurrian battering ram from the mountains of Ḫaššu hardly necessitates that Ḫaššu was under Hittite control. Indeed, Ḫaššu is only reduced *after* the action against Uršu in the Annals. It should be remembered that M. C. Astour uses the argument that Zalpa/Zalbar of the Annals is reduced before the action against Uršu in the Annals to indicate that it could not be the city Zaruar which appears in the Siege text. One cannot argue from the same text in one direction at one juncture and in the opposite at the next.

<sup>31</sup> Such studies as the present one, it must be noted, often tend to naively choose the best-known tell which falls into the region established by a study of the textual evidence, necessarily ignoring those tells which are less well or completely unknown. There are, for example, quite a number of tells in the Karasu Valley which would perhaps fit the bill for Zalwar (e.g. U. B. Alkım, *Archaeology* 22 [1969] 280–289), but are archaeologically unknown.

<sup>32</sup> His inscription on Mount Adalur, then, might be understood either as a southern border marker, or, more likely, as graffiti engraved during a timber cutting expedition, which finds a later echo in Shalmaneser's campaign of similar purpose.

<sup>33</sup> Ḫazuwan of the Ebla texts has been almost unanimously identified with Ḫaššu of the Hittite and Mari texts (e.g. P. Fronzaroli, *Orientalia Suecana* 33–35 [1984–86] 143; M. Bonechi and A. Catagnoli, *NABU* [1990] 30; cf. justifiable caution of P. Michalowski, *ZA* 76 [1986] 10 n. 15). P. Fronzaroli, *SEB* 3 [1980] 48–49; *Orientalia Suecana* 33–35

W. Yuhong, NABU [1994] 67, has recently shown that the reference in ARM I 37, previously read *Ḫa-š[i]ʿi-im<sup>ki</sup> ša Me-em-bi-da*, should be read, *Ḫa-[b]a-im<sup>ki</sup> ša Me-em-bi-da*.<sup>34</sup> Indeed Ḫab(b)aʿum is associated with Membida in several texts (e.g. ARM XXII 160; M.10687; M.6684). All other occurrences of Ḫe/iššum indeed seem to suggest a location on the Baliḫ or toward the western Ḫabur (ARM I 1 = LAPO 17, 475; ARM I 2 and 10; IV 28).<sup>35</sup> M. Falkner, AfO 18 [1957–58] 12 – vs. A. Finet, in ARM XV (1954), 125 n. 2, who left open the possibility that Ḫaššum and Ḫeššum were the same, plausibly maintained only when Ḫaššu(wa) of the Hittite texts was considered to be east of the Euphrates – is of the opinion that, ‘Auf Grund der Mari-Briefe sind Ḫaššum und Ḫeššum jedoch unbedingt zu trennen. Während Ḫaššum eng mit Ursum und Karkemiš verbunden ist, liegt

[1984–86] 143, notes that the variant writing *Ḫa-su-wa-an<sup>ki</sup>* may indicate a locale different from Ḫaššum, to be identified with Ḫašuʿanum of the Old Akkadian and Ur III texts, in the eastern Ḫabur region. A. Archi, Aof 19 [1992] 24, understands the famous Ebla text (TM.75.G.2367) to indicate Mari’s steady territorial expansion west and north up the Euphrates, culminating in Iblul-Il’s generation in the conquest of Ḫaššuwan, ‘on the right bank of the Euphrates, at the height of the Amanus’ (see also M. Bonechi, NABU [1996] 92; cf. radically different conclusions of G. Pettinato, *The Archives of Ebla. An Empire Inscribed in Clay*, Garden City, NY (1981), 99–102; M. C. Astour, SCCNH 2 [1987] 11–14). This would agree well with the assumed location of the Old Babylonian Ḫaššum somewhere north of Karkemiš. Clearly, research on the Ebla toponymy is not at a stage which can greatly contribute to the location of Ḫaššu. Hence, the present study will begin essentially with the Mari data. If, however, it is ascertained at some point that A. Archi’s proposals are correct, his location of Ḫaššuwan might accord well with the location for the OB Ḫaššu suggested here.

<sup>34</sup> D. Charpin and J.-M. Durand, MARI 4 (1985), 318 (see also J.-M. Durand, LAPO 17 (1998) 49 n. b) note that Yasmaḫ-Addu appears in a number of texts from Chagar Bazar during the period of 5-ix to 15-ix. They argue that since Yasmaḫ-Addu is attested (ARM I 37, dated 12-viii) journeying to Ḫa/eššum to conduct a census of the Ḫaneans, he would have been there some days/weeks after this letter. In ARM VII 7 (dated 26-ix) Yasmaḫ-Addu is already in Emar. Since he is attested in the Chagar Bazar texts from the 5<sup>th</sup> of ix, this would fit well the time slot in which he said he was going to Ḫa/eššum. In consideration of W. Yuhong, NABU [1994] 67, however, it is Ḫab(b)aʿum, not Ḫeššum, which might plausibly be identified with Chagar Bazar (for a summary of the issue of the identification of Chagar Bazar, see now P. Talon, *Akkadica Supplementum* 10 (1997), 4–7).

<sup>35</sup> ARM VII 113 might indicate a distinction between two cities with phonologically similar names, though it is not clear that they should be equated with the likely division between Ḫaššum and Ḫe/iššum. The tablet details silver deliveries to, *inter alia*, [Eḫ]ip-Atal of the city of *Ḫa-š[e]-e[m<sup>ki</sup>]*; followed significantly by a Taguzza, of the city of Ḫaššum. The scribe clearly has two cities in mind, for elsewhere in the text, when several individuals hail from the same city, he lists the individuals first, then notes their provenience in one line of summation. Further, it is unlikely that the scribe would have spelled the same city differently, and significantly so (cf. *Ḫa-š[e]-e[m<sup>ki</sup>]* with *Ḫa-aš-ši-im<sup>ki</sup>*), in two adjacent lines, though such scribal variance is neither unimaginable nor unattested. I. Singer (pers. comm.) wonders if this occurrence might also be restored *Ḫa-b[a]-i[m<sup>ki</sup>]*, in light of the improved reading of *Ḫa-[b]a-im<sup>ki</sup> ša Me-em-bi-da* in ARM I 37 (see above). Collation of the original would probably be necessary to settle the question.

Ḫeššum zweifellos östlich von Šubat-Šamaš, und zwar ungefähr im selben Gebiet wie Šuda, Mammagirā und Šapānazum.' Indeed, this neat division between the two toponyms is appealing even today with the addition of a considerable amount of evidence, and will be maintained in this study.

If the evidence of ARM I 1:4'-7'<sup>36</sup> and 24:3'-8', 12'-14'<sup>37</sup> can be taken to indicate a geographical grouping, as seems likely, it would support a localisation of Ḫaššum roughly between Uršu and Karkemiš.<sup>38</sup> Likewise, M.7536 (see above) attests the strong commercial and political ties among Karkemiš, Ḫaššu, Uršu and Zalpa (= Zalwar), suggesting its location in the region defined by those toponyms with which it appears, i.e. between Aleppo and the Taurus. Among further recently published (i.e. post-RGTC III) Old Babylonian material mentioning Ḫaššu can be counted: Abb 12, 51, in which an Awīl-ilim leaves his collection of textiles in Emar and continues on to Ḫaššum to receive silver; ARM XXVI 547, in which Šidqum-Lanasi writes to Zimri-Lim regarding, *inter alia*, 'Le pays de Ḫaḫḫum, Ḫaššum, [...], Zalwar, [...]'; and ARM XXI 257, in which material(s) from Ḫaššu and Yamḫad are warehoused. Each text confirms the location defined above, though none is able to further clarify it.

In summary, the Mari material would seem to be explained most easily by the proposal of two cities with similar names, i.e. a Ḫaššu(m) located to the west of the Euphrates, probably between Karkamiš and Uršu, and a Ḫeššu(m) located to its east, perhaps along the Balih.

### The Hittite Sources

H. G. Güterbock, RIA 4 (1972-75), 137, notes that Ḫaššu(wa) appears in the Hittite sources only during the Old Kingdom; indeed no occurrences of the toponym occur anywhere in the cuneiform literature after the Old Kingdom sources. At the most general level, it may be mentioned that Ḫaššu is often seen in the Hittite texts as acting in tandem with Aleppo, and is associated with Uršu, Zalwar and other cities of northern Syria west of the Euphrates (e.g. KBo III 27 [CTH 5]; KUB XXXI 5, KBo XIX 91 [CTH 14.1]; KBo VII 14 + KUB XXXVI 100 [CTH 15]). The fact suggests no more than the conclusions already reached through the analysis of the Mari material.

<sup>36</sup> 'De par l'hostilité du seigneur de Ḫaš[im], (de celui) de Ursum, de celui de Cark[émiš] et (de celui) de Iamḫad, ces villes n'avaient pas été perdues ...'.

<sup>37</sup> '... le seigneur de Ḫaššim, le seigneur de Ursim [et le seigneur de Carkémiš] qui ... ont é[crit.] Déjà auparavant, j'ai réuni le seigneur de Ḫaššim, le seigneur de Ur[sim] et le seigneur de Carkémiš et je leur ai parlé dans les termes suivants ...; ... le seigneur de Ḫaššim, le seigneur de Ursim et le seigneur de Carkémiš en ma présence contre Sumu-Ebuḫ feront alliance.'

<sup>38</sup> The degree of detail that S. Smith, RSO 32 [1957] 167 n. 3, sees in these documents is greatly exaggerated.



In the Telipinu Proclamation (CTH 19), that king claims, ‘When I, Telipinu, had sat upon the throne of my father, I marched on campaign to Ḫaššuwa, and destroyed Ḫaššuwa. My troops were also in Zizzilippa, and in Zizzilippa a battle took place. When I, the King, went to Lawazzantiya, Laha was hostile to me and stirred Lawazzantiya to rebellion’ (§ 24–25; trans. in T.R. Bryce, *MHT* (1983)) Again, the relationships between the cities mentioned are so vague that little geographical information can be elicited from them, as has been done in past studies (e.g. A. Goetze, *Kizzuwatna* (1940), 72). The paragraph containing the references to Ḫaššuwa and Zizzilippa is in a section preceding, but separate from, that in which Lawazzantiya is found, leaving the relation between the two paragraphs undefined. Moreover, the order of events and the relationship between the cities cannot be relied upon, as KBo XII 8 shows the same (or related?) events of Telipinu’s campaigns, reversing the order of the rebellion of Laḫḫa and the campaign against Ḫaššu (E. Laroche, *OLZ* 59 [1964] 563).

Likewise, E. Bilgiç, *AfO* 15 [1945–51] 27 n. 193, astutely wrote, ‘Wir verzichten darauf, die ebd. verwertete Assoziation von Ḫurma mit Ḫaššuwa ..., weil hier lediglich von einem in Ḫaššuwa wohnenden Mann aus Ḫurma die Rede ist, wodurch benachbarte Lage nicht gegeben ist.’ He refers, of course, to previous unwarranted use (e.g. W.F. Albright, *BASOR* 78 [1940] 28) of the Palace Chronicles (CTH 8). The Palace Chronicles actually provide no geographical information on Ḫaššu, since they relate a series of anecdotes from various areas of the Old Kingdom, the connections between which are not always clear.

The location of Ḫaššu(wa) in the Annals of Ḫattušili depends largely on the identification of the Puran River, which appears in the same paragraph. It is assumed here, with V. Haas, *HdO* I/15 (1994), 14 n. 43, that the Puran River should probably be identified with the Afrin (see detailed discussion in J. L. Miller, *Expeditions* (1999) 67–69).<sup>39</sup> Hence, the city of Ḫaššu, according to the testimony of the Annals<sup>40</sup>, which show clearly that Ḫaššu(wa) should be located ‘within days’ of a crossing of the Puran River, should likely be sought to the east of the Afrin: perhaps roughly north of the Syria-Turkey border (to avoid placing it too

<sup>39</sup> There was once a debate about whether the Puran should be identified with the Euphrates (see H.G. Güterbock, *JCS* 18 [1964] 1–6; O.R. Gurney, *CAH*<sup>3</sup> 2/1 (1973) 228–255; cf. A. Goetze, *JCS* 16 [1962] 24–30), but this is no longer tenable in the face of much more satisfactory prospects.

<sup>40</sup> ‘In the following year I marched against Zarunti, and I destroyed Zarunti. I marched against Ḫaššu, and it stood against him, and with it, troops from Ḫalap. At Mount Adalur I delivered them a blow. Within days the Great King crossed the bank of the Puran River like a lion. He cuffed Ḫaššuwa with his paws like a lion. He heaped dust upon it and filled Ḫatti with its possessions’ (KBo X 1 obv. 31–36; Hittite version omits Mt. Adalur).

close to Aleppo<sup>41</sup>), outside of a radius centred at Karkemiš and sweeping from the Sacir Suyu in the south-west toward the north (to avoid placing it too close to Karkemiš); and south of the Karasu (to avoid placing it too close to Uršu, probably Samsat). Within this region, A. Archi, P.E. Pecorella and M. Salvini, *Gaziantep e la sua Regione*, Rome (1971) briefly describe 13 large mounds<sup>42</sup> (by 'large', I intend a rather arbitrarily delimited diameter of 100+ m.). While they mention that several (Arkik, Burç Hüyüğü, Çıraz, Oylum, Tilbeşar and Vasılı) yielded Bronze Age material, the data in the publication simply are not precise enough to enable one to suggest a particular mound for the location of Ḫaššu. Ceramic material from some sites is mentioned, but not from others, and that listed is recorded as Bronze Age, yielding an insufficient site profile for comparison to the textual attestations of Ḫaššu; i.e. especially the Middle Bronze Age (Mari, Hittite), perhaps the Early Bronze (Ebla), but probably not the Late Bronze (no mentions in Hittite texts after Tudḫaliya).

Ḫaššu, then, should probably be sought in close proximity to Gaziantep, perhaps at one of the larger sites witnessing Bronze Age material listed in A. Archi, P.E. Pecorella and M. Salvini. Further survey data and more accurate site profiles would be needed in order to attempt a more specific correlation between the textual and archaeological information.

#### Against the Identification of Ma'ama with Ḫaššu

Here must be addressed M. Forlanini's (*Hethitica* 6 [1985] 54–55; *StMed* 9 [1995] 125) interesting suggestion that Ḫaššum is to be equated with Ma'ama. He bases his argument on the fact that Ma'ama does not appear in the archives of Mari, Alalah or Boğazköy, 'comme on pourrait s'y attendre pour des raisons géographiques ou historiques', while Ḫaššum, well attested in the Mari and Boğazköy archives, 'n'est pratiquement jamais nommée dans les documents cappadociens' (*Hethitica* 6 [1985] 54; in n. 89 he recognises kt k/k 4, in which Ḫaššum does appear). He further notes that both cities gave their names to a mountain in the region (CCT 2 11 a:17–18; KBo I 11 col. i 16'), and that both are attested as ruled by Anum-Ḫirbi. Indeed these facts present an intriguing set of homonyms and coincidences which cannot be ignored.

Simpler and no less satisfying explanations can be offered, however. M. C. Astour, *HSAO* 2 (1988), 144 and n. 39, suggests a plausible explanation for the paucity of

<sup>41</sup> M. C. Astour, *UF* 29 [1997] 9, objects to V. Haas' suggestion on similar grounds, stating, 'that 'Ain Dāra could not be a state capital in the Middle Bronze Age. It stands near towns which, according to Alalah VII records, belonged to the direct royal domain of Yamḫad'. Further, the fact that 'Ain Dara was an important, apparently Hittite, site in the 13<sup>th</sup>/12<sup>th</sup> centuries (H. Klengel, *HdO* I/34 (1999), 50 n. 85) militates against the identification, since the city is nowhere mentioned in Hittite sources after Tudḫaliya.

<sup>42</sup> Arkik, Burç Hüyüğü, Ceğde, Çıraz, Delhemi, Dokurcun, Gaziantep, Gücege, Lohan, Oylum, Suboğazi, Tilbeşar and Vasılı.

information in the Alalah VII and IV archives concerning the area north of Lake Antioch and east along the Amanus chain, which would apply to Ḥaššu and Ma'ama: the area would have belonged to the MB and (early) LB kingdom(s) of Zalwar (mentioned once; see above) and Ḥaššu, allowing the scribes of Alalah little opportunity to record the names of its towns. Simpler explanations for Ma'ama's absence from the Mari and Boğazköy archives might be suggested as well. In the case of the former, perhaps a Ma'ama located across the Taurus<sup>43</sup> would not be expected to find its way into the archives at Mari, as Mari's sphere of interests are all but terminated by that mountain range. In the case of the latter, one might propose that Ma'ama lost its importance during the violent transition from the Old Assyrian to the Old Kingdom period, and that it was no longer a major player in the region, if it existed at all. Indeed, it does not appear in any sources after the Old Assyrian period. Moreover, the extremely few and fragmentary Old Kingdom texts which do reflect this former age, or the transition from it, can hardly be taken as a statistically reliable sample; hence Ma'ama's absence from them can not be understood as indicative.

M. Forlanini himself notes (Hethitica 6 [1985] 65 n. 89; StMed 9 [1995] 125) that Ḥaššum appears in Kültepe tablet k/k 4<sup>44</sup>, which, while militating against his argument, is not actually fatal to it, as M. C. Astour imagines.<sup>45</sup> Again, it seems there is a simpler explanation for the rarity of Ḥaššum's appearance in the Kültepe tablets: if it was located very near Gaziantep, as suggested in this study, it would have lain largely off the established Old Assyrian trade routes.<sup>46</sup> Kültepe text k/k 4's unique Syrian characteristics (see K. Hecker, SCCNH 8 (1996), 291–303) might indeed suit the suggestion that Ḥaššum is to be located to the south-west of the 'beaten track'.

Further, there is a chronological distinction in the Mari letters; through ZL 5', Anum-Ḥirbi is attested only as the King of Zal/rwar, while beginning with ZL 7' he is attested as the King of Ḥaššum. Therefore, not only did Anum-Ḥirbi likely conquer Ḥaššum, he may well have moved his capital from Zal/rwar to the more prestigious seat of Ḥaššum (M. Guichard, NABU [1993] 54). M. Guichard explains the adoption of the name of the conquered city-state as the result, not

<sup>43</sup> Ma'ama is traditionally located in the area of Göksun. If located at Maraş, with M. Forlanini, then this explanation would lose much of its force.

<sup>44</sup> It also appears in one other unpublished Kültepe text, mentioned in M. Forlanini, StMed 9 [1995] 125.

<sup>45</sup> M. C. Astour, UF 29 [1997] 9, apparently failing to read M. Forlanini's footnotes, which refer to k/k 4, or his plausible later defence (StMed 9 [1995] 125), writes, referring to exactly this text, 'The equation of Ḥaššu with Mama, never very plausible, was eliminated by the discovery that Ḥaššu appears under its own name in an Old Assyrian tablet from Kültepe ...', as though this were a new revelation that M. Forlanini could not have considered.

<sup>46</sup> The great city of Aleppo is also absent from the Kültepe records (RGTC IV), except for a single *nisbe*, but one would hardly propose that it should have another name in the Assyrian records based on the fact.

unknown in the Old Babylonian period, of the desire of the ruler to henceforth be associated with the wealth and prestige which the conquered city had known; indeed, as M. Guichard illustrates, the Ḫaššum of the Mari archives must have been considered a wealthy city. Since Anum-Ḫirbi was first king of Zalwar and later captured Ḫaššu, it would seem strange, if not impossible, that Anum-Ḫirbi and his royal line would have such long-standing relation with Waršama and Waršama's father, Inar, as are implied in the Letter of Anum-Ḫirbi. The Letter shows that Anum-Ḫirbi (and likely his predecessor(s)) were long-standing rulers of Ma'ama. If Anum-Ḫirbi had recently conquered Ma'ama/Ḫaššu from his base at Zalwar, surely Ma'ama/Ḫaššu's relationship with Kaniš would have been different. One might rather have expected Kaniš to have confronted rather steadfastly, perhaps belligerently, such an aggressive thrust from northern Syria across the Taurus into Cappadocia. Rather, normal relation, including a previous treaty regarding road passage, as well as disputes over it, seem to have obtained. Further, to solve the difficulties which had arisen between Ma'ama and Kaniš, Waršama had proposed a treaty agreement, to which Anum-Ḫirbi replied that the old one was still valid, so there was no need to draw up a new one. Though it is impossible to judge how old the treaty was, it implies again a long-standing relationship between Ma'ama and Kaniš and their respective dynasties at least during the reigns of Waršama and his predecessor Inar, which probably takes us to the beginning of Kültepe Ib - not what one might expect had Anum-Ḫirbi recently expanded from his base in Zalwar, conquering Ma'ama/Ḫaššu. Further, Anum-Ḫirbi speaks of a time when he had struggled with an apparently serious adversary, at which opportunity a vassal ruler of Waršama's made an incursion over the border into the land of Ma'ama, raiding 12 of its towns and collecting booty. Anum-Ḫirbi, or his dynasty, is known to have ruled in Ma'ama for at least 9 years (the period of time Inar besieged Harsamna), plus some further period of time (Anum-Ḫirbi's reverses against an enemy and Waršama's vassal's taking advantage of it), a situation which Anum-Ḫirbi's *land* (i.e. not himself, hence likely his predecessor; see M. Forlanini, *StMed* 9 [1995] 125 n. 14), so he claims, refrained from exploiting. In sum, it seems more reasonable to propose that Anum-Ḫirbi and his dynasty expanded from a long-established base at Ma'ama first to Zalwar, then Ḫaššu, or alternatively, had long included Ma'ama and Zalwar, and expanded toward Ḫaššu.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>47</sup> The possibility exists, of course, that Anum-Ḫirbi did not conquer Ḫaššu from his base at Zalwar, with M. Guichard, but contrariwise, was until some time between ZL 5' and ZL 7' the king of a united Zalwar and Ḫaššu, during which time he was referred to at Mari as the King of Zalwar, following which he was forced from Zalwar, and was referred to thereafter as the King of Ḫaššu, i.e. the remnant of his kingdom. If this alternate interpretation is correct, the serious arguments against M. Forlanini's equation of Ma'ama with Ḫaššu in this paragraph (and *only* this paragraph; the others stand) would be rendered untenable (nowhere does M. Forlanini suggest this necessary reversal of M. Guichard's suggestion; on the contrary M. Forlanini, [e.g. *StMed* 9 [1995] 125-126, 130],

The suggested locations of Ḥaššu, Maʿama and Zalwar in this study, i.e. near Gaziantep, between Göksun and Maraş, and on the upper Karasu, respectively, would present a reasonable entity over which Anum-Ḥirbi would have ruled. The paradigm seems to fit well all the textual evidence available.

### The Location of Mount Adalur

The location of Mount Adalur is also important for an understanding of Anum-Ḥirbi's kingdom, since Shalmaneser III reports (very nearly 1,000 years later!) in his annalistic inscriptions that he discovered there an inscription and an image of <sup>m</sup>AN-ḥīr-be. There are three texts, or text complexes, which provide information on the location of Mount Adalur:<sup>48</sup> the annalistic inscriptions of Shalmaneser III, the Annals of Ḥattušili I and, of secondary importance, KBo XV 44. The former two are hotly debated, and no consensus has been reached concerning what these texts suggest concerning the location of Adalur.

accepts M. Guichard's claim; M. C. Astour, UF 29 [1997] 15, doubts M. Guichard's conclusion, suggesting that Anum-Ḥirbi conquered from his base at Maʿama first Ḥaššu, due to the geographical necessity of his reconstruction, then Zalwar). Anum-Ḥirbi and his dynasty might still have had a long-standing relationship with the Kaniš dynasty, as implied in the Letter from Anum-Ḥirbi, during the loss of Zalwar on its southern front. A belligerent reaction on the part of Kaniš to the conquest of Ḥaššu would hence not be a question. Indeed, the time referred to in the Letter when Anum-Ḥirbi's land was invaded by a powerful enemy might be equated with the loss of Zalwar, which would then be reflected in the Mari archives. Depending on the location of Maʿama, an argument against this alternative paradigm might run as follows: If Anum-Ḥirbi lost Zalwar between ZL 5' and 7', and retreated to Maʿama/Ḥaššu located in the area of Göksun, with most scholars, it would indeed be strange that the bulk of the Mari attestations refer to Anum-Ḥirbi at Ḥaššu, which would hardly be included in the Mari sphere of interests. However, if located at Maraş, with M. Forlanini, Maʿama/Ḥaššu might still find its way into the Mari archives. A further argument against might be the fact that Ḥaššu is seen as a very rich trading and exchange partner during the time Anum-Ḥirbi ruled there, which would hardly suggest a Ḥaššu forced to abandon half its territory and confine itself to the mountain fringes. While it seems somehow more likely that Anum-Ḥirbi subsumed Ḥaššu from his base(s) at Zalwar (and Maʿama), there seems to be no way to conclusively decide between the two paradigms at present.

<sup>48</sup> The *lipšur* litany places <sup>KUR</sup>A-dil-ūr following the geographical entities Amanu, Ḥabur, Ḥašur, Sirara and Labnanu and preceding Arandu, Dilur and Dibar, while the <sup>HAR</sup>.RA=*hubullu* list places <sup>KUR</sup>A-da-lu-ūr following the same entities, with minor variations, and before Zilhuš, Gasar and Dibar (see E. Reiner, JNES 15 [1956] 131-133, 146-147; W. F. Lee-mans, Trade (1960), 5-8 and n. 1). M. C. Astour, HSAO 2 (1988), 153, equates *Da-lu-ri*<sup>ki</sup> of ARET VIII 541 § 23 with Adalur. While these texts support a location along the northern Levant, they do not help further locate Mount Adalur.

## KBo XV 44

The fragment KBo XV 44 (CTH 215) lists Mount Ammana, Mount Atallur ..., the cities of Aštata and Kinza (i.e. Qadesh on the Orontes) ..., and the (Mediterranean) Sea, which M. C. Astour, UF 29 [1997] 4, suggests defines the borders of Hittite Empire Syria. The text does not disagree with Astour's location for Mount Adalur at the southern part of the Amanus Range, but, especially considering the several lacunae, can hardly be said to exclude other possibilities in northern Syria, e.g. the Kurt Dağ proposed by N. Na'aman, Tel Aviv 3 [1976] 96, and seconded by J. D. Hawkins, QGS 5 (1995), 95, or even the Amanus Range west of İslahiya, as suggested by M. Forlanini and M. Marazzi, ASVOA 4.3 (1986), Tav. XVI. Moreover, it would seem strange that the text would name essentially the same place twice (i.e. Atallur and the Amanus) if, with M. C. Astour, it were defining the extent of Hittite Syria.

## Mount Adalur in The Annals of Hattušili I (CTH 4)

The location of Mount Adalur, as well as Ḫaššu and Zaruna included in the same paragraph (see note 40), depends on the identity of the Puran River. While evidence is available which might plausibly identify the Puran with the modern Ceyhan, an identity with the Afrin River is tentatively accepted in this study, largely on the strength of the Annals, the evidence of which can hardly be reconciled with an identity of the Puran with the Ceyhan.<sup>49</sup> Assuming the identity of the Puran with the Afrin, Zaruna and Mount Adalur should be located to the river's west, while Ḫaššu should be located to its east. On this evidence, and in light of the Shalmaneser inscriptions, Adalur could be located either in the southern Amanus range (e.g. M. C. Astour, UF 29 [1997]), or alternatively, in the southern Kara Dağ (also called Kartal Daği) between the Karasu and Afrin rivers (e.g. N. Na'aman, Tel Aviv 3 [1976]; J. D. Hawkins, QGS 5 (1995)).

There seems to be no evidence to decisively prove one rather than the other. Two arguments might be said to favour an identification of Mount Adalur with one of the peaks of the southern Amanus, probably immediately south of the Belen Pass: 1) the negative evidence that Shalmaneser records no details between his cutting trees in the Amanus and his activity at Mount Adalur; e.g. a crossing of the Karasu, or confrontations with or acceptance of tribute from the cities in the Karasu Valley, through which he must have marched toward Adalur if that mountain is to be placed in the southern Kara Dağ; 2) The Ḫaššu-Aleppo alliance might have waited in ambush of Hattušili's forces near the Belen Pass, a

<sup>49</sup> The only alternative, it seems, is to propose that the Annals here are badly defective, which might find mild support in the fact that Adalur appears as the site of the initial confrontation with the armies of Ḫaššuwa in the Akkadian version only, while it appears as the name of a deity in the list of spoils from the campaign in both versions.

strategic focal point, and the point where Ḫattušili likely crossed into northern Syria on his earlier campaign, when he sacked Alalah.

However, Zaruna can very likely be located on the west bank of the Afrin, probably between the modern Turkish border and the river's sharp turn westward (J. L. Miller, *Expeditions* (1999), 69–72), which seems to argue in favour of a location for Mount Adalur in the southern Kara Dağ, which J. D. Hawkins, QGS 5 (1995), it will be remembered, feels can be derived from the evidence of Shalmaneser III's inscriptions alone. After Ḫattušili's attack on Zaruna, it seems reasonable to imagine that the Ḫaššu-Ḫalab coalition responded immediately by engaging him at or near the city of Zaruna itself, which would be located near the foot of the Kara Dağ. It is not inconceivable, of course, that Ḫattušili, upon seeing, or hearing word of, the approaching coalition, retreated to the southern Amanus, where he made a successful stand on the field of his choice, perhaps near the Belen Pass, then, following his victory, retraced his steps toward Zaruna, crossed the Afrin and continued on to Ḫaššu. It seems more likely, however, that after destroying Zaruna on the west bank of the Afrin, Ḫattušili faced the coalition at the foot of nearby Mount Adalur, the southern reach of the Kara Dağ, and 'within a few days' crossed the river and marched for Ḫaššu.

### The Inscriptions of Shalmaneser III

Shalmaneser III records much more detailed, but also much more inconsistent and contradictory, information in the various versions of his annals (Table 1). The testimony of Year 858 found on the Kurkh Monolith is the most detailed.<sup>50</sup> K. Balkan, *Letter* (1957), 36, wrote, 'we doubt whether we can trust its correctness throughout and dismiss the deviating account of the later inscriptions.' He doubted its veracity because of what seemed like two incompatible seas in

<sup>50</sup> 'Moving on from the city of Gurgum I approached the city of Lutibu, the fortified city of Ḫaiiānu, the Samʿalite. Ḫaiiānu, the Samʿalite, Sapalulme, the Patinean, Aḫunu, the man of Bīt-Adini, (and) Sangara, the Carchemishite, put their trust in each other and prepared for war' (RIMA A.0.102.2 i 41–43). After recounting his devastating defeat of the coalition, Shalmaneser continues, 'At that time I praised the greatness of the great gods ..., by creating a colossal royal statue of myself. ... I erected (it) before the source of the River Saluara, at the foot of the Amanus range. Moving on from the Amanus range I crossed the Orontes River (and) approached the city of Ališir (or Alimuš), the fortified city of Sapalulme, the Patinean' (ibid.: 49–52). Again, Shalmaneser defeats a north-Syrian coalition and continues, 'I captured the great cities of the Patinean. I overwhelmed [the cities on the shore of the] upper [sea] and the land of Amurru, also called the western sea ... I marched about by right of victory in the extensive area of the seashore. I made an image of my lordship which establishes my fame (lit. "name") for eternity (and) erected (it) by the sea. I ascended the Amanus range (and) cut down beams of cedar (and) juniper. I marched to Mount Atalur, where the image of Anum-ḫirbe stands, (and) erected my image with his image. *Moving away* from the sea I captured the cities Taiia, Ḫazazu, Nulia, (and) Butāmu, which belong to the Patinean' (ibid.: ii 5–10).

Col. ii line 5, and the unlikely *ultu tâmdi attar[da]* at the end of ii 10<sup>51</sup>, which indeed depicts Shalmaneser erecting his image at Mount Adalur, then immediately descending from the sea where he had been only two lines before. K. Balkan (ibid.) admits that if the Kurkh data is to be taken at face value, 'This would lead to an identification of the Atalur mountain with the southern continuation of the Amanus ...'. The starting point for K. Balkan's suspicions (ibid.: 37) about the Kurkh Monolith's accuracy stems from this very conclusion: 'But how can this rather insignificant southern spur of one of the most impressive and compact mountain chains be known in the schools of Sum.-Akk. scribes? This seems hardly possible.'<sup>52</sup> K. Balkan therefore gives preference to the sequence found in the Balawat inscription, concluding that, 'the Atalur-Lallar mountain was reached before Shalmaneser descended to the sea and went up to the Amanus' (ibid.: 38), and that, 'Perhaps the variant *Lallar* of later recensions represents the real name of this mountain, as heard by the scribes preparing the itineraries from which the historical inscriptions were composed, and the identification with the historical Atalur (= Taurus?) is already a scholarly adjustment?' (ibid.: 37). Finally, he places Lallar, where he felt the image of Anum-Ḫirbi must have stood, 'not far from Ḫattena (modern Turkish province of Hatay) and not far from (but not directly on) the coast of the Mediterranean' (ibid.: 38), hence slightly to the south-west of the location in M. Forlanini and M. Marazzi, ASVOA 4.3 (1986), Tav. XVI.

N. Na'aman, Tel Aviv 3 [1976] 89–106, following and expanding upon K. Balkan's suggestion, radically emended the text of the Kurkh Monolith.<sup>53</sup> Instead of K. Balkan's relatively minor emendation, N. Na'aman suggested moving the entire

<sup>51</sup> K. Balkan, Letter (1957), 36, proposes the emendation *ultu šadê attar[da]*. Cf. A. K. Grayson's more acceptable restoration (RIMA A.0.102.2).

<sup>52</sup> The issue of whether the average neo-Assyrian scribe would be acquainted with the southern reaches of the Amanus is irrelevant, as Shalmaneser would have taken a scribe or scribes with him on his campaigns, partly for the express purpose of recording the place names of his conquests. Further, I must agree with M. C. Astour, UF 29 [1997] 4 n. 22, when he writes, 'Archi-Pecorella-Salvini 1971:43 claimed that the Amanus is a compact chain and would not carry diverse names. But this is precisely the case.'

<sup>53</sup> While N. Na'aman, Tel Aviv 3 [1976] 91, is, of course, correct in noting the significant number of scribal errors in the Kurkh Monolith, it does not necessarily seem that its 'poor execution suggests the direction in which we should seek an explanation for the anomalies'. For one thing, N. Na'aman (ibid.) notes the 'additional difficulty' of the absence of a 'building inscription'. Due largely to this fact, as well as the errors just mentioned, he proposes that 'the Monolith text was carved by a provincial scribe dwelling in Tušhan (Kurkh), who was insufficiently skilled in his profession'. But the absence of building inscriptions and closing formulas is by no means exceptional in Shalmaneser's annals. N. Na'aman notes that *Assurnasirpal II's* inscription, also found at Kurkh, lacks these closing paragraphs. More relevant is the fact that so do *Shalmaneser's* Fort Shalmaneser inscription (RIMA A.0.102.1), the Kurkh Monolith currently under discussion (RIMA A.0.102.2), the Nabu Temple inscription (RIMA A.0.102.3), the slab from Til-Barsip (RIMA A.0.102.4), the Balawat Gates inscription (RIMA A.0.102.5), the clay tablet copies of the annals inscriptions (RIMA A.0.102.6), the Black Obelisk (RIMA A.0.102.14), the statue



Table 1: Summary of Events Connected with Mount Adalur in Shalmaneser III's Annals

<i>Kurkh Monolith</i> (A.0.102.2)	<i>Balawat Gates</i> (A.0.102.3)	<i>Nabu Temple</i> (A.0.102.5)
	Overwhelms N. Mesopotamia	
	Population transfers and annexations in Mesopotamia and Syria (Ḫatti)	
Gurgum → Lutibu of Sam'al <sup>54</sup>		Gurgum → Lutibu of Sam'al
Defeats N. Syrian coalition <sup>55</sup> and collects booty		Defeats N. Syrian coalition and collects booty
Erects statue at source of Saluara River, at foot of Amanus Range		Erects statue at source of Saluara River, at foot of Amanus Range
Amanus Range → crosses Orontes River → Ališir/Alimuš <sup>56</sup> of Patina		Amanus Range → crosses Orontes River → Ališir/Alimuš of Patina
Defeats second N. Syrian coalition <sup>57</sup> and collects booty	Defeats second N. Syrian	coalition and collects booty
Conquers cities of Patina		Ališir/Alimuš → western sea
Conquers cities of upper sea of Land of Amurru, the western sea.		
Erects colossal image by the sea		Erects colossal image by the sea
Ascends Amanus Range, cutting cedar and juniper		<i>Returning from sea,</i> ascends Amanus Range, cutting cedar and juniper
Goes to Mount Adalur and erects statue by that of ᵐAN-ḫirbe	<i>Upon passing the sea,</i> erects colossal image by that of ᵐAN-ḫirbe	Goes to Mount Adalur and erects statue by that of ᵐAN-ḫirbe
<i>Leaves the sea</i> and captures cities of Patina <sup>58</sup>	Destroys cities along his way; receives tribute of [...].	<i>(With no mention of leaving the sea),</i> captures cities of Patina
	Goes down to the great sea. Receives tribute from kings by the sea	
	Erects colossal image by the sea Destroys from Enzite to Daiēnu (in Urartu!)	

account of Shalmaneser's climbing of the Amanus, his cutting of cedars and junipers, his movement to Mount Adalur and the erection of his image beside that of Anum-Ḫirbi from its place in Col. ii 9-10 and inserting it wholesale after the first clause of Col. i 51. In this case, a healthy scepticism toward such radical tampering with original sources seems to have been justified, for little could N. Na'aman have known in 1976 that in 1986 a text would be found that provides an almost ready made solution that avoids major surgery.

The Nabu Temple Inscription<sup>59</sup> is especially interesting, as its narrative ends with this campaign of Year 858, leading Grayson to suggest that it is likely the 'first in a series of slabs inscribed with a version of the annals' (RIMA III, p. 24).<sup>60</sup> It was likely inscribed then, only months after the events took place in northern Syria (which Shalmaneser, of course, calls Ḫatti), lending it priority and validating the Kurkh Monolith inscription, which it parallels almost exactly. It also provides an 'emendation' to the Kurkh inscription. A.0.102.3:87-93 is the key:

from Calah (RIMA A.0.102.16), a slab from Fort Shalmaneser (RIMA A.0.102.29), and a door sill from Fort Shalmaneser (RIMA A.0.102.34), to mention only a few. Whatever the explanation for and significance of this lack in Shalmaneser's annalistic inscriptions, it can hardly be attributed to the provincial scribe at Tušḫan.

<sup>54</sup> Sam'al was the well-known city-state centred at modern Zincirli. Gurgum was the northern neighbour of Sam'al (J. D. Hawkins, QGS 5 (1995), 94; TAVO B IV 8; note that TAVO B IV 8 reflects the situation of c. 700 BCE, a century and half after Shalmaneser III's campaigns discussed here).

<sup>55</sup> This Syrian coalition consisted of elements from Sam'al, Patina, Bīt-Adini and Karkemiš. Patina is the alternate name of the city-state of Unqi, which included the modern Amuq and the Amanus Range, and the corresponding Mediterranean coast. Bīt-Adini was the southern neighbour of Karkemiš, the eastern neighbour of Patina (TAVO B IV 8; J. D. Hawkins, QGS 5 (1995)).

<sup>56</sup> Ališir/Alimuš should be placed near Antakya, on the southern side of the Orontes (J. D. Hawkins, QGS 5 (1995), 95).

<sup>57</sup> This second Syrian coalition consisted of elements from Patina, Bīt-Adini, Karkemiš, Sam'al, Que (Cilicia), Ḫiluke, Iasbuqe and Iaḫane. Ḫiluke/Ḫilakku was the western neighbour of Que in Cilicia (J. D. Hawkins, QGS 5 (1995), 94; TAVO B IV 8). Iaḫane was apparently an eastern neighbour of 'Aziz (see J. D. Hawkins, RIA 5 (1976-80), 238-239; idem., QGS 5 (1995), 96).

<sup>58</sup> The cities of Patina listed are Taiia, Ḫazazu, Nulia and Butāmu. Ḫazazu is probably modern 'Aziz (see J. D. Hawkins, RIA 4 (1972-75), 240; idem., QGS 5 (1995), 95-96).

<sup>59</sup> Through line RIMA A.0.102.3 85b (dupl. RIMA A.0.102.2 ii 5b) the text is nearly identical to the Kurkh Monolith inscription. Instead of continuing with the conquest of the cities of Patina and the cities of upper sea of the Land of Amurru, however, the Nabu Temple inscription substitutes, 'Moving on from the city Ališir (or Alimuš) I went down to the western sea. ... I made a colossal lordly statute of myself. ... I erected (the statue) by the sea. On my return from the sea I ascended the Amanus range (and) cut down beams of cedar (and) juniper. I ascended Mount Adalur (and) proceeded to the place where the image of Anum-ḫirbe stands. I erected my image with his image. I captured Taiia (and) Ḫazazu, great cities which belonged to the Patinean' (RIMA A.0.102.3 85-89).

<sup>60</sup> On p. 7, however, in the introductory text to the Fort Shalmaneser inscription, A. K. Grayson writes, 'This text ... is the earliest known version of the annals.'

- 87-89. ... *ša-lam* EN-*ti-a* ... *ina* UGU *tam-ti ú-še-ziz ina ta-ia-ar-ti-a*  
 ... a statue of my lordship ... I erected by the sea. On my return
90. *ša tam-ti a-na* KUR-*e* KUR *ha-ma-ni e-li* GIŠ.ÜR.MEŠ GIŠ *e-re-ni* GIŠ *bu-ra-ši ak-kis*  
 from the sea, I ascended the Amanus Range (and) cut down beams of cedar (and)  
 juniper.
91. *a-na* KUR-*e* KUR *a-ta-lu-ur e-li a-šar šal-mu šá* <sup>m</sup>AN-*hír-be* *zaq-pu a-lik*  
 I ascended Mount Atalur (and) proceeded to the place where the image of Anum-  
 hírbe stands.
92. *šal-mi it-ti šal-mi-šu ú-še-ziz* URU *ta-ia-a* URU *ha-za-zu ma-ha-zi*  
 I erected my image with his image. The city of Taiia and the city of Hazazu,
93. GAL.MEŠ-*ti ša* KUR *pa-ti-na-a-a ak-šud* ...  
 great cities which belong to the Patinean, I captured.

A.0.102.2 ii 8-10 (Kurkh Monolith) reads:

8. ... *ša-lam* EN-*ti-ia mu-kín* MU-*ia a-na da-ra-a-ti* DÛ-*uš ina* UGU *tam-di* [ú]-[šēziz]  
 I made an image of my lordship which establishes my name for eternity (and)  
 erected (it) by the sea.
9. *a-na* KUR-*e* KUR *ha-ma-ni e-li* GIŠ *ga-šu-ri* GIŠ *e-re-ni* GIŠ *bu-ra-šir*<sup>1</sup> *a-kis a-na* KUR-*e*  
 I ascended the Amanus Range (and) cut down beams of cedar (and) juniper. To  
 Mount
10. KUR *a-ta-lu-ur a-šar* NU *ša AN-hi-ir-bi* *zaq-pu a-lik* NU KI NU-šú *ú-še-ziz* TA *tam-di*  
*at*<sup>2</sup>-[*tumus*<sup>2</sup>?]  
 Atalur, where the image of Anum-hírbe stands, I marched, (and) I erected my  
 image with his image. *Moving away* from the sea ...

But with a much less radical emendation than N. Na'aman's, A.0.102.2 ii 8-10  
 might read:

8. ... *ša-lam* EN-*ti-ia mu-kín* MU-*ia a-na da-ra-a-ti* DÛ-*uš ina* UGU *tam-di* [ú]-[šēziz]  
 <TA *tam-di at-tu-muš*>  
 I made an image of my lordship which establishes my name for eternity (and)  
 erected (it) by the sea. <*Moving away* from the sea ...>
9. *a-na* KUR-*e* KUR *ha-ma-ni e-li* GIŠ *ga-šu-ri* GIŠ *e-re-ni* GIŠ *bu-ra-šir*<sup>1</sup> *a-kis a-na*  
 KUR-*e*  
 I ascended the Amanus Range (and) cut down beams of cedar (and) juniper. To  
 Mount
10. KUR *a-ta-lu-ur a-šar* NU *ša AN-hi-ir-bi* *zaq-pu a-lik* NU KI NU-šú *ú-še-ziz* {TA *tam-*  
*di at*<sup>2</sup>-[*tumus*<sup>2</sup>?]}  
 Atalur, where the image of Anum-hírbe stands, I marched, (and) I erected my  
 image with his image.

The emendation is especially attractive, since both lines 8 and 10 otherwise end  
 with *ú-še-ziz*; hence the scribe could very easily, due to some slight distraction,  
 have added TA *tam-di at-tu-muš* to the end of 10 instead of the end of 8, where  
 it likely should have been. The emendation solves the difficulties with the text as  
 efficiently as the more radical one, if not better, and at the same time reconciles  
 the Kurkh Monolith with the Nabu Temple inscription.<sup>61</sup>

The Balawat Gates inscription<sup>62</sup>, of course, only summarises, or selects from, the early campaigns. It is perhaps not a matter, then, of whether it should be preferred to the Kurkh and now, the Nabu inscriptions – since it simply omits much of the detail which concerns us here – but of a presentation of a different message with different devices. It cuts momentous portions of previous editions of the annals and pastes them into a narrative which tells a story of its own<sup>63</sup>, while omitting other important events.<sup>64</sup> But the few details which are included in this sweeping summary surely should not be taken to override the much more detailed and explicit testimony found in the Nabu Temple and Kurkh inscriptions, the former of which was probably written only months after the events themselves.

In addition to the attempts to reconcile the various versions of Shalmaneser's annals by textual emendation, there have been a number of attempts to manipulate the geographical picture according to the data as they stand.<sup>65</sup> M. Forlanini,

<sup>61</sup> J. D. Hawkins, QGS 5 (1995), 95, has recently suggested that the Nabu Temple evidence 'supplements, restores and clarifies' the Kurkh account, 'pointing more clearly than before to the location of the long sought Mount Atalur ... in the southern part of the Kurt Dağ range.' While it certainly does clarify the Kurkh account, I fail to understand how it might lend significant support for the southern Kurt Dağ as opposed to the southern Amanus. No intervening details are inserted between the Amanus events and those at Atalur which might suggest a division between them (see above). On the contrary, the wording, 'On my return from the sea I ascended the Amanus range (and) cut down beams of cedar (and) juniper. I ascended Mount Atalur (and) proceeded to the place where the image of Anum-ḥirbe stands' (RIMA A.0.102.3:89–91) seems, if anything, to militate against any significant interval between the Amanus and Atalur. Nevertheless, as was seen above, N. Na'aman's and J. D. Hawkin's identification with the Kara Dağ is indeed corroborated by the evidence of the Annals of Ḥattušili I.

<sup>62</sup> 'I overwhelmed like the Deluge (lit. "tells of the Deluge") the entire (territory stretching) [from] the sea of the land of Nairi, the sea of the interior of the land of Zamua and the great western sea of the land Ḥatti. I uprooted 44,400 of their troops (*with*) their officers (and) regarded (them) as people of my land. ... Upon my passing by the sea I created a colossal image of my lordship (and) erected (it) where the image of Anum-ḥirbe (stands). I razed, destroyed, (and) burned the cities along my way (and) [received] the tribute of [...]. I went down to the great [sea] ..., I received the tribute of all the kings by the sea. I created a colossal image of my lordship. ... I erected (it) by the sea. I conquered, razed, destroyed, (and) burned from the land Enzite to the land Daiēnu ...' (RIMA A.0.102.5 i 3–ii 5).

<sup>63</sup> Note, for example, that Shalmaneser razes, destroys and burns the lands of Enzite and Daiēnu, of Urartu, immediately after (in the very same line!) setting up his image by the Mediterranean in the Balawat inscription, with no mention of a later campaign or the utilisation of any chronologically indicative device.

<sup>64</sup> It omits, e.g. the Euphrates crossings, which play a pivotal role in the rest of the inscriptions; see S. Yamada, JCS 50 [1998] 87, n. 1.

<sup>65</sup> In addition to those discussed here, J. Börker-Klähn, *Alt Vorderasiatische Bildstelen und vergleichbare Felsreliefs*, Mainz am Rhein (1982), 87–88, places Mount Atalur in the Birecik area, east of the Euphrates, confusing several issues and relying on obsolete studies.

Fs. Meriggi (1979), 172, for example, placed Mount Adalur in the mountains near Kadirli. Later, apparently realising the difficulties such a location would present for the Annals of Hattušili I and of Shalmaneser III, M. Forlanini (*Hethitica* 6 [1985] 55 and n. 96; M. Forlanini and M. Marazzi, *ASVOA* 4.3 (1986), Tav. XVI) located it in the northern Amanus, at the Bahçe Pass. Though perhaps conceivable, M. C. Astour, *UF* 29 [1997] 12, has correctly pointed out that this location also requires a stretch of the imagination, as it would place the mountain in neo-Hittite Sam'al, whereas the campaigns immediately before and after Shalmaneser's climb of Atalur were against cities of Patina, to the south of Sam'al.

As if these divergent versions of Shalmaneser's annals caused insufficient difficulty for the modern student, Mount Adalur is replaced with Mount Lallar<sup>66</sup> in the same context in five other Shalmaneser inscriptions (A.0.102.14:31; 16:11; 28:23; 29:24; and 34:9). In the latter three, Shalmaneser specifies that he erected his image on Mount Lallar by that of Anum-Hirbi, so it can hardly be argued that this event was a separate one from that on Mount Atalur. Two points concerning the texts in which Mount Lallar occurs should be made clear: 1) they are *late* versions<sup>67</sup> of the annals; and 2) they are *summaries of and selections* of the annals. Conversely, it should be noted that the inscriptions in which Atalur occurs are: 1) much *earlier* versions<sup>68</sup> of the annals; and 2) are generally more *detailed and inclusive* versions. In the light of this distribution of the occurrences of Atalur and Lallar, it seems reasonable to assume, even disregarding extraneous evidence for the moment, that Atalur would be the more reliable designation, and that Lallar might be: 1) a late scribal error which was often reduplicated; 2) a secondary name of Mount Atalur; 3) the range or sub-range to which Atalur belonged (or vice versa); or 4) the current usage at the time of the later inscriptions, perhaps due to the ethnic and/or linguistic changes in northern Syria, brought about in part by Shalmaneser's disruption of its city-state structure; hence, the scribes would indeed have been up to date on north-Syrian geography. The simplest and most efficient solution seems to be that Lallar was an oft-copied scribal error, indeed, a solution proposed, along with a plausible phonetic explanation, nearly a hundred years ago (M. Streck, *OLZ* 6 [1906] 344–345).

<sup>66</sup> See W. Röllig, *RIA* 6 (1980–83), 438, for brief summary and references regarding Lallar.

<sup>67</sup> Black Obelisk (*RIMA* A.0.102.14) in 828; statue from Calah (*RIMA* A.0.102.16) in 828/7; slab and door sill from Fort Shalmaneser (*RIMA* A.0.102.29 and 34) in 844; base from Fort Shalmaneser (*RIMA* A.0.102.8) in 846 (see Introductions to respective texts in *RIMA*, with refs.). Hence, Lallar makes it into the annals only 12 years+ after the events of 858 in the Amanus.

<sup>68</sup> Kurkh Monolith (*RIMA* A.0.102.2) in 853/2; and the Nabu Temple inscription (*RIMA* A.0.102.3) in 858/7<sup>2</sup>. Hence, the texts in which Atalur occur were written in the year of the events themselves (or the year immediately following), or, at the latest, some 5–6 years after the events.

Mount Adalur, then, can likely be located in the southern Kara Dağ. Such a location fits well the routes that Ḫattušili I and Shalmaneser III must have taken, and is within the area which might likely have been included in the territory of Zalwar and/or Ḫaššu, two of Anum-Ḫirbi's principal cities.

### The Person of Anum-Ḫirbi and the Setting of His Kingdom

#### The Name Anum-Ḫirbi

It must first be noted that K. Balkan's identification of Aniš-ḫurpi with Anu(m)-ḫarwi<sup>69</sup> is surely correct (see already W.F. Albright, BASOR 78 [1940] 27–28), especially considering the addition of A.1264+ to the corpus (M. Guichard, NABU [1993] 54), whereby it is seen that both primary variants of this king's name are applied to the king of Zalwar and to that of Ḫaššum.<sup>70</sup> There seems to be no evidence that might suggest that Anum-Ḫirbi was the name of more than one individual, though neither can the possibility be categorically excluded. All the sources which mention him can be dated independently to Kültepe Ib, or at least the Old Assyrian period, or to the beginning of Zimri-Lim's reign, except the neo-Assyrian inscriptions, which reflect roughly a second millennium context. Further, all documents originate in northern Syria or the Maraş region or report on events in those regions. Finally, the name itself is so rare in the onomasticon that it must be considered very unlikely to have been borne by any but a minimal number of individuals.

K. Balkan, Letter (1957), 34, considered *aniš* the Hurrianized form of *anum* and *-ḫurbi/ḫirbi* as dialectical variants. E. Laroche, Les Noms des Hittites [1966] 346, placed in doubt the assumption that the name was to be considered a Hurrian one, proposing instead that Anum was simply the name of the Sumerian-Akkadian god. G. Wilhelm, Amurru I (1996), 176 and n. 15 (with refs. to previous discussions), has recently discussed the issue in light of the Hurrian-Hittite bilinguals from Boğazköy and the most up-to-date knowledge of Hurrian. He claims that, 'Il est vrai que le caractère hurrite de cet anthroponyme (i.e. specifically Anum-Ḫirbi) n'a pas été strictement prouvé jusqu'à maintenant, mais il semble possible d'obtenir désormais plus d'assurance.' In short, *anum*

<sup>69</sup> It appears that even in 1957 K. Balkan would have liked to equate the names in the Kültepe and Mari archives, anticipating by several decades the studies that gradually closed the gap between the *royaume de haute-Mésopotamie* and Kültepe Ib (e.g. K.R. Veenhof, MARI 4 (1985), 191–218; R.M. Whiting, OBO Series Archaeologica 6 (1990)), for he states (Letter (1957), 34), 'The two royal names *Anum-ḫirbi* and *Aniš-ḫurbi* were not invented or given independently, but we refrain from historical conclusions as long as the date of our letter (in relation to the Mari period) is not exactly established.'

<sup>70</sup> E.g. *A-nu-ha-ar-wi* lugal *Za-al-wa-ar*<sup>ki</sup> (ARM XXII 151:29–30); *A-ni-iš-hu-ur-pi* lugal *Za-ar-wa-ar*<sup>ki</sup> (ARM XXV 25:3–4); *A-ni-iš-hu-ur-pi* lugal *Ha-aš-ši-im*<sup>ki</sup> (ARM XXV 14:3–4) and [*A-nu*]-[*ha-ar-wi*]<sup>l</sup>[*lugal*]<sup>l</sup> *Ha-aš-ši-im*<sup>ki</sup> (A.1264 + M.12643 + XXI 252:2'–3').

(*an=o=m*) can be explained as a finite third person ergative verb form meaning, 'il le réjouit'. The variant *aniš*, however, must apparently be analysed as a verbal stem ending in *-i*, with the enclitic suffix *-š*, well attested in Syrian homonymy.<sup>71,72</sup> The two forms, then, do not seem to be easily reconcilable, which appears at first to constitute a serious obstacle to the proposal that there was only one King Anum-Ḫirbi. However, all the attestations of the forms Aniš- and Anu- originate from Mari (see notes 2 and 70), suggesting that perhaps it was particularly the scribes at Mari which had a difficult time with this Hurrian element, Anum-, and (only) sometimes emended it to a form more familiar to them.<sup>73</sup> The scribes from Ma'ama, Kültepe and Ḫattuša, who were perhaps more familiar with such Hurrian names, consistently spell the name Anum-. The inscription on Mount Adalur must also have been spelled Anum-, since the Assyrian scribe who copied from it, and who would have known no Hurrian whatsoever, confidently associated Anum- with one of the great gods of his pantheon, An, which he hardly would have done had the inscription read Aniš-.

#### Two New Mari Texts

As mentioned above, A.1215 reports the discontent of Bunû-Eštar (see note 25) – Bunû-Eštar, it will be remembered, was the legitimate heir at Kurdâ who was exiled in Zalwar during the Assyrian Interregnum of Šamši-Adad – over Zimri-Lim's support for the pretender, Simaḫ-ilanê. A.1215 clearly places Zalwar outside of Šamši-Adad's sphere of control and presents its sovereign as partial to and actively supportive of Šamši-Adad's antagonists. While A.1215 itself can be fairly precisely dated to ZL 2' or 3' (I. Guillot, Gs. Barrelet (1997), 274–276), the timeframe of Bunû-Eštar's historical sketch is more difficult to establish. Kurdâ must have fallen into the hands of Šamši-Adad around the time that he took Šubat-Enlil, hence around 20–25 years before the end of his reign and the advent of Zimri-Lim. The flight of Bunû-Eštar and his family, then, might possibly have taken place during the reign of Anum-Ḫirbi, or perhaps equally likely, during that of his predecessor. At this time the north Syrian states of Karkemiš, Uršu, Ḫaššu and likely Zalwar were antagonistic toward Šamši-Adad (see e.g. H. Klengel, *Syria 3000 to 300 B.C.*, Berlin (1992), 52 ff.) and suffered his belligerence.

<sup>71</sup> See now an *mA-ni-iš-gi-bé-el* in the Habiru Prism IV 23 (M. Salvini, *The Habiru Prism of King Tunip-Teššup of Tikunani*, Rome (1996), (Documenta Asiana 3); idem. *Subartu IV/1* [1998] 309 and ns. 48, 51).

<sup>72</sup> *-ḫirbi* can be explained as a theophoric element; see G. Wilhelm, *Amurru I* (1996), 176, n. 15.

<sup>73</sup> For the elements of the name at Mari, see J. M. Sasson, *UF 6* [1974] 357, 378, 383, with refs. to Nuzi names.

It is unlikely, then, that Šamši-Adad would have requested Bunû-Eštar's extradition from the King of Zalwar immediately after his taking of Kurdâ, but rather at some later date, when the situation had de-escalated to some degree, and at a time when it seems even more likely that it was Anum-Hirbi who sat on the throne of Zalwar. Of course, a number of northern and central Syrian states, including Karkemiš, Uršu, Haššu and Qatna, are known to have entered into an alliance with Šamši-Adad against Yamḥad, apparently soon after the midpoint of the little more than two decades during which Šamši-Adad controlled Mari.<sup>74</sup> The relationship of the ruler of Zalwar to the *royaume de haute-Mésopotamie* at the time is not clear-cut. He certainly felt compelled by Šamši-Adad's extradition order to comply. He was clearly not bold enough to merely scoff at the order. Perhaps this may be interpreted as the realisation that Šamši-Adad was in league with powerful allies to the west of the Euphrates, which he could surely induce to cause serious trouble for Zalwar, rather than as an indication that Šamši-Adad exercised direct control over Zalwar. Alternatively, perhaps the point at which Šamši-Adad demanded of the king of Zalwar the extradition of Bunû-Eštar might be interpreted as indicating that it was at this time that Šamši-Adad was allied with Karkemiš, Uršu, Haššu, Qatna, and perhaps, by implication, Zalwar, against Yamḥad. This would explain better the fact that Šamši-Adad apparently wrote to the king of Zalwar as if there were some treaty agreement between them, which likely would have included an extradition clause. If indeed this demand for extradition indicates the period during which Šamši-Adad maintained ally status with these Syrian kingdoms, it apparently dates at least the event to which Bunû-Eštar refers, i.e. Šamši-Adad's extradition demand, to within the last decade of Šamši-Adad's reign, making it quite likely that it was indeed Anum-Hirbi who ruled Zalwar at the time (see above).

Hence, it was quite possibly Anum-Hirbi himself who provided refuge to Bunû-Eštar. The trick played upon Šamši-Adad, both ingenious and ruthless, may give some insight into the character of the individual who was able to carve a significant kingdom from the north-Syrian/south-east-Anatolian network of city-states. The King of Zalwar did not feel free to ignore the order, but neither did he respond as a loyal ally and friend of the *royaume de haute-Mésopotamie*. Sending a 'man of little worth' to his death in the place of Bunû-Eštar is an obvious indication that the King of Zalwar favoured Bunû-Eštar's cause against Šamši-Adad's demand, despite the likelihood that he was a nominal ally of Šamši-Adad, and that he was prepared to undertake considerable risk, though

<sup>74</sup> See generally H. Klengel, *Syria 3000 to 300 B.C.*, Berlin (1992), 52 ff. M. Anbar, *Mélanges Finet* (1989), 7–8, opts for Year Ikūn-pīya, i.e. 1782–1781. J.-M. Durand, *LAPO* 17 (1998), 68, suggests Ibni-Addu = Hammurabi 6. For the complex considerations regarding the chronology of Šamši-Adad's reign, see, *inter alia*: R. M. Whiting, *OBO Series Archaeologica* 6 (1990); M. Anbar, *Mélanges Finet* (1989); K. R. Veenhof, *RAI* 34 (1998) (lecture from 1987); D. Charpin and J.-M. Durand, *MARI* 4 (1985), 293–343; K. R. Veenhof, *MARI* 4 (1985), 191–218; M. Anbar, *IOS* 3 [1973] 1–33.



only furtively, to hedge his bets against the *royaume de haute-Mésopotamie*. The King of Zalwar's willingness and ability to do so, not to mention Bunû-Eštar's choice to flee to him for protection, seems to indicate that already at this stage, the kingdom of Zalwar was no insignificant entity and must have been one of the power centres west of the Euphrates, along with Yamḥad, Karkemiš and Uršu. Its precise magnitude compared to them, however, is impossible to judge.

Mari text M.7536, discussed briefly above (see note 26), consists of Yasīm-Sūmû's report to Zimri-Lim, in which he relates that he had consulted with Aplaḥanda, King of Karkemiš, concerning Qaqqadānum's travels to Ḥaššum, which had been inhibited. Aplaḥanda wrote to A[niš-ḥ]urpi about the matter. Concerning a further matter, Yasīm-Sūmû reports about one Abdu-e[raḥ], who had come to Karkemiš from Zalpa, only to be recalled by the king of Uršum. Upon finally arriving at Karkemiš, he was advised by Yasīm-Sūmû to return to Uršum, before which he was detained in Karkemiš by the 'Man' of Zalpa, who was apparently resident there (S. Maul, Gs. Birot (1994), 29–31). Yasīm-Sūmû was active throughout the reign of Zimri-Lim (S. Maul, MARI 8 (1997), 756–757), and it is not currently possible to affix undated texts such as M.7536 to a chronology of his activities. The text should probably be dated to some time after ZL 5', since only thereafter was Anum-Ḥirbi called King of Ḥaššu (M. Guichard, NABU [1993] 54), in which role he appears in this text. The picture of the tight commercial and complex political interaction among Zalwar, Ḥaššu, Uršu and Karkemiš certainly places A[niš-ḥ]urpi in the thick of the north-Syrian scene. Unfortunately, the conclusion of Yasīm-Sūmû's report of the affair concerning Aplaḥanda's interaction with A[niš-ḥ]urpi is not preserved. Likewise, the second matter of the tablet, Abdu-e[raḥ]'s struggle to accomplish his aims, leaves several open questions. Who was the 'Man' of Zalpa (l. 12') who detained Abdu-e[raḥ] in Karkemiš, and why did he do so? If this was the king of Zalpa, why was he not called either Aniš-ḥurpi, as in line 7, or lugal Zalpa, as the king of Uršu is called lugal *ša* Uršu in line 4? In the six Mari attestations assembled by M. Guichard, NABU [1993] 54, Anum-Ḥirbi is called lugal in five and lú in only one. K. Balkan, Letter (1957), 25–30 (see also P. Garelli, Assyriens (1963), 207–209) noted that the distribution of the terms *šarrum* and *rubā'um* seem to be reversed in the Letter from Anum-Ḥirbi, i.e. *šarrum* is employed for vassal princes and *rubā'um* is applied to the kings Anum-Ḥirbi and Waršama. Though *šarrum* is almost non-existent in other Kültepe tablets, replaced nearly completely by *rubā'um*, the epithet of the Assyrian king, in the few other examples from Kültepe, *šarrum* applies to the king, and *rubā'um* is reserved for subordinate princes, following, albeit inconsistently, Old Babylonian usage. In any case, Yasīm-Sūmû advises Abdu-e[raḥ] to consult with this 'Man' of Zalpa, who may perhaps, despite the open questions, be identified with king Anum-Ḥirbi, concerning his complaints about the king of Uršu's actions.

It does not necessarily, however, with S. Maul, indicate that Anum-Ḥirbi was a dependent of Aplaḥanda, or that the king of Uršu was a vassal of the king

of Zalpa/Zalwar, assumptions that would bear significant import for the understanding of the west bank of the Euphrates. This would relegate Šennam, the King of Uršu (if this is indeed the unnamed king, as is likely), to a third-rung vassal, which would seem very unlikely when one considers what is known of this ruler and his important city-state. Even apart from what is known of Šennam, however, S. Maul's deduction can be shown to be unwarranted. He makes his assumptions based on the fact that Yasīm-Sūmû turns to Aplaḫanda, rather than directly to Anum-Ḫirbi, in the former case, and the possibility that Abdu-Eraḫ was advised to complain to the king of Zalpa regarding the behaviour of the King of Uršu in the latter (ibid.: 31 ns. b and g). However, it could well be that Yasīm-Sūmû turned to Aplaḫanda simply because he was in Karkemiš and had not the authority himself to address Anum-Ḫirbi. Satran-našir, for example, likewise an official of Zimri-Lim residing at the Karkemiš court, is known to have requested that Aplaḫanda write to Yamḫad, Qatna and Zalmaqum for troops in support of Mari (H. Klengel, *Syria 3000 to 300 B.C.*, Berlin 1992, 72); but it hardly need be supposed that these three cities were subject to Karkemiš. Further, Yasīm-Sūmû may have advised Abdu-e[raḫ] to council with the king of Zalpa for more practical reasons, e.g. about the possibility of transferring his trade interests to Zalwar and Ḫaššu, rather than keeping them with the disagreeable king of Uršu, as opposed to an exclusively political explanation, i.e. that Abdu-e[raḫ] would have to discuss the matter with Šennam's overlord. It seems, based on the picture provided by this document alone, that perhaps Karkemiš was the leading player on this north-Syrian stage, while Zalwar, Ḫaššu and Uršu may well have been vassals, or perhaps lesser confederates, of Aplaḫanda.

### Hints in Fragmentary Hittite Legends

KBo XII 3<sup>75</sup> and KUB XXXVI 99<sup>76</sup> were treated recently by W. Helck, Fs. Bittel (1983), whose conclusions need to be reconsidered in light of the ensuing publication of a number of Kültepe documents. First, W. Helck's chronological

<sup>75</sup> A transliteration of KBo XII 3 ii 2–23, based upon W. Helck's, minus what seem to be a couple far-fetched restorations, is presented here for the reader's ease of reference: <sup>x+2</sup>[...ḫa]r-ni-ik<sup>1</sup>[ta a-pa-a-aš-ša<sup>(2)</sup>]/ <sup>3</sup>[nam-ma e-ša-ti<sup>(2)</sup>] [a-pa-a-aš-ša-an n[am-ma ḫar-ni-ik-ta<sup>(2)</sup>]/ <sup>4</sup>a-pa-a-aš-ša<sup>1</sup> nam-ma e-ša-ti a-pa-a-aš-ša-an nam-ma]/ <sup>5</sup>ḫar-ni-ik-ta 3-ŠU ḫar-ni-ik-ta ma-[a-an...]/ <sup>6</sup>tu-[pí]ʔ-iz-zi wa-at-ta-ru-i tu[u]-[ri-iz-zi<sup>(2)</sup>]/ <sup>7</sup>ERÍN<sup>MES</sup>.[ŠU] Ū<sup>GIS</sup>GIGIR<sup>MES</sup>.ŠU URU Za-al-[pa...]/ <sup>8</sup><sup>m</sup>A-nu-um-ḫé-ir-wa<sub>a</sub>-aš-ša DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> ḫé-in-[kat-ta]/ <sup>9</sup>pa-id-du-wa ERÍN<sup>MES</sup> Ū<sup>GIS</sup>GIGIR ḫu-[ma-an-te-eš<sup>(2)</sup>]/ <sup>10</sup>e-eš-[a]-a-ni-ia-ir ERÍN<sup>MES</sup>.ŠU [Ū] [<sup>GIS</sup>GIGIR<sup>MES</sup>.ŠU<sup>(2)</sup>]/ <sup>11</sup>[URU Za-a]pí ḫu-ul-li-e-ir [...]/ <sup>12</sup>ap-pa-an an-da-pát IŠBAT<sup>m</sup>A-nu-[um]-[ḫé-ir-wa<sub>a</sub>-aš-ša]/ <sup>13</sup>[ka]r<sup>2</sup>-pí-e-eš-zi nu ḫar-ša-a[n wa-la-aḫ-ta<sup>(2)</sup>]/ <sup>14</sup>nu GUŠKIN-aš ḫa-lu-wa-na-aš [GEŠTIN-it<sup>(2)</sup>]/ <sup>15</sup>šu-un-na-aš an-da-an-na [...]/ <sup>16</sup>ta-at e-ku-ut-ta t[a<sup>2</sup> ...]/ <sup>17</sup>Ū ER[ÍN<sup>M</sup>ES URU Za-al]-pa [...]/ <sup>18</sup><sup>GIS</sup>[TIR]ʔ-na-aš na-[...]/ <sup>19</sup>nu [SAG].DU-SU [...]/ <sup>20</sup>nu-uš ta-ma-a-[iš...]/ <sup>21</sup>ma-a-an-ma-w[a ...]/ <sup>22</sup>šu-uš k[a...]/wa-an-n[a...]. Regarding l. 6: E. Neu's tu-[pí]ʔ-iz-zi, meaning uncertain (see HEG T,D/3 453), is vastly preferable to W. Helck's

scheme is no longer tenable. He proposes, based on K. Balkan's study, that 'Waršama durch Piṭhana, Vater des Anitta, gestürzt worden ist. Anum-herwe war also Zeitgenosse des Anitta' (ibid.: 276). He also suggests that the *Hirtenjunge* would be a grandson of Anitta (the bastard son of a slavewoman and a young prince), and that the *Hirtenjunge* founded the dynasty at Ḫattuša<sup>77</sup>, an event reflected in the related fragment KUB XXXVI 99 7, which he translates, '[...], die Verwandtschaft (?) seines Bruders (?) [führte er nach] Ha[ttusa weg]' (ibid.: 273).

This schema, however, can no longer be supported, since Piṭhana and Anitta must have been active only toward the end of Kültepe Ib, whereas Inar and Waršama would have ruled toward the very beginning of that c. 100-year period (V. Donbaz, Fs. T. Özgüç (1989); idem., Fs. N. Özgüç (1993); M. Forlanini, StMed 9 [1995]). Anum-Ḫirbi is best placed some four generations before Anitta, not contemporary with him. As seen above, this is corroborated by the Mari documentation, which shows Anum-Ḫirbi to be contemporary with Šamši-Adad and Zimri-Lim, and hence, that Inar and Waršama should also be placed contemporary with Šamši-Adad, and in the latter case, perhaps also with Zimri-Lim - certainly far too early for Anitta. Hence, the appearance of Anitta and Anum-Ḫirbi in the same tablet, KBo XII 3, shows that it was indeed a *Sammeltafel*.

Moreover, why restore URU *Ha-[at-tu-ši u-da-a-aš]*<sup>78</sup> in this legend of exclusively north-Syrian context, when Anum-Ḫirbi is clearly associated in it with Zalpa, and URU *Ha-[aš-ši...]* would fit the context far better? Hence, this text might very well reflect Anum-Ḫirbi's struggle for Ḫaššu, which finds contemporary documentation in the Mari archives. It has already been shown that the first portion of KBo XII 3 should be separated from the second by some four generations, so one should not necessarily connect the occurrence of Anitta - who was not a ruler at Ḫattuša, in any case, but at Kaniš and Kuššar; indeed he was the destroyer of Ḫattuša, not the founder of a dynasty there - and the *Hirtenjunge* with the legend in the second portion, which deals with Anum-Ḫirbi. This second portion mentions the Syrian toponyms Ur[šu and Zalpa and clearly reflects the Mari-era struggles in northern Syria west of the Euphrates. As O. Soy-

*tu-[ri]-iz-zi*. The traces are easily recognisable as a *pi* (less likely *ga*). W. Helck, Fs. Bittel (1983), 275, himself admits that, 'nach Publ. das zweite Zeichen des ersten Wortes zerstört; die angegebenen Spuren passen nicht zu der hier gegebenen Ergänzung ...'

<sup>76</sup> Again, a transliteration of KUB XXXVI 99 1-10, based upon W. Helck's, with a few omissions and changes: <sup>x+1</sup> [...]-uš<sup>URUP</sup> [...] / <sup>2</sup> [...-a]š LÚ<sup>URU</sup> U[r-šu(?)...] // <sup>3</sup> [...an]-[da]pāt IŠBAT ša-a[n?]... / <sup>4</sup> na-an nam-ma hu-ul-li-it wa-[...] / <sup>5</sup> ša-an tu-ut-tu-ut a-aš-šu-uš-še-ī[t da-a-aš(?)...] / <sup>6</sup> [k]u-it-ki ū-e-mi-it x-[...] / <sup>7</sup> [...]MÁŠ<sup>2</sup> ŠEŠ<sup>2</sup>-ŠU<sup>URU</sup> Ha-a[š-ši...] // <sup>8</sup> [ERÍN<sup>MES</sup>(?) URUZ]a-al-pa ū-it nu<sup>URU</sup> [...] / <sup>9</sup> [m]A-nu-um-h[é<sup>2</sup>-ir-ua<sub>a</sub>-ša pa-it [...] / <sup>10</sup> [...]i a<sup>2</sup>-x-[]

<sup>77</sup> H. Otten, StBoT 17 (1973), 65, suggested rather that the legendary tale reflected the founding of the city of Zalpa.

<sup>78</sup> W. Helck, Fs. Bittel (1983), 275, claims, 'daß dieser "Hirtenjunge" in Hattusa seine Herrschaft errichtet hat, denn der charakteristische Satz KUB XXXVI 99 Vs (!), 7 läßt doch mit dem erhaltenen URU *Ha...* als Ziel der weggeführten Beute keine andere Ergänzung zu.'

sal has recently pointed out (Hethitica 7 [1987] 173–253; Vicino Oriente 7 [1988] 107–128), not all Old Kingdom texts found at Boğazköy describe events directly related to the dynasty at Ḫattuša (e.g. the Puḫanu Chronicles [CTH 12] and the so-called Cannibals Text [CTH 17]). It appears that KBo XXXVI 99 and the second portion of KBo XII 3 may well reflect legendary events from surrounding areas, the relationship of which to the Hittite dynasty at Ḫattuša are at present indiscernible.

What can be gained from the text is unfortunately meagre. The context is clearly one of an intense battle at Zalpa, which should be understood as the Syrian Zalwar. Not unequivocal, however, is Anum-Ḫirbi's position in the battle as defender, or alternatively, would-be conqueror. Anum-Ḫirbi, who is definitely presented as unhappy with the outcome of the events, is not necessarily the principal protagonist in the tale. Whether the texts reflect actions whereby Anum-Ḫirbi gained control of Zalwar from his base at Ma'ama is conjectural, but seems not unlikely, since it is known from the Mari material that he indeed was king there at some stage. That the text relates a point when Anum-Ḫirbi lost control of Zalwar is also possible, but seems less likely, since one would probably have to propose an extremely eventful reign full of successes and reverses, i.e. expansion from Ma'ama to Zalwar, expansion from Ma'ama and Zalwar to Ḫaššu, and finally the loss of Zalwar. While such a string of events is not impossible, it seems wiser at this point to stay with a minimal reconstruction based on what evidence is available, rather than reconstructing additional events which as yet find no witness in the sources.

Finally, I would hesitate very much to restore, with W. Helck, Fs. Bittel (1983), who follows P. Meriggi, Fs. Otten (1973), 203, the suicide by poisoning of Anum-Ḫirbi.<sup>79</sup> Both operative elements of the event ('poison' and 'he died') are fully restored. It seems that such a radical restoration which 'creates' history rather than interpreting and understanding it should be avoided. The context is probably a ritual one, in which Anum-Ḫirbi petitions the gods for support, but the operative words of the event are lost, as is the ensuing context.

#### Notes on the Nature of Anum-Ḫirbi's Kingdom

The nature of the kingdom of Ma'ama/Ḫaššu and Zalwar involves a multitude of questions, apart from the geo-political and chronological addressed above, the answers to which can be glimpsed only most opaquely through the documents regarding Anum-Ḫirbi's realm. The rest must be inferred through comparison with comparable entities in the same region, an endeavour which is obviously

<sup>79</sup> W. Helck restores: *šu-un-na-aš an-da-an-na [IM-TU šu-uḫ-ḫa-aš]/ ta-at e-ku-ut-ta t[a BA.ŪŠ]* (KBo XII 3 ii 15–16).

beyond the scope of this short paper.<sup>80</sup> It might only be noted that Anum-Ḫirbi seems to have been a true chameleon, taking part simultaneously in the north-Syrian city-state structure, seen most clearly in the archives at Mari, while he was equally at home in the Anatolian world beyond the Taurus, a world otherwise linked less to northern Syria than to the distant entity of Aššur and its merchant communities. As M. Guichard, *NABU* [1993] 54, notes, Anum-Ḫirbi's kingdom must have been a wealthy one, judging from the bilateral trade in prestige items – items of gold, silver, bronze, iron, tin, lapis lazuli, crystal, as well as textiles – witnessed with Mari in the latter's archives. Such wealth must have been generated from the Old Assyrian merchant activity, which wound its way through the *wabārtum* of Ma'ama not long before reaching the hub of the Anatolian market at Kaniš. The kingdom would also have accessed the agricultural fertility of the north-Syrian valleys, perhaps earning profits from exports of surplus grain and olive oil, such as are witnessed in texts from the period and are grown there today.

The ethnic composition of the northern portion of the conglomerate must have been similar to that of Kaniš, i.e. primarily native Anatolian with a lesser admixture of Hurrian and Indo-European elements (O.R. Gurney, *CAH*<sup>3</sup> 2/1 (1973), 228–255), ranging in its south toward that found in Alalah VII, i.e. predominantly Semitic with a strong admixture of Hurrian (A. Draffkorn, *Hurrians and Hurrian at Alalah*, Unpub. Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Pennsylvania 1959). Its demographic distribution and social structure likewise would mirror that of its neighbours. An interesting question for future archaeological study, especially if archives are at some point involved, would be how the unification of the kingdom affected its respective Syrian and Anatolian constituent states. Was there an ensuing ethnic integration of the northern and southern peoples, or did the Taurus continue to function as a social and demographic barrier, despite its failure to remain a political one? Finally, it should be asked, who and what might the precursors<sup>81</sup> of Anum-Ḫirbi's remarkable reign have been, and what impact did his rule have on his successors? M. Forlanini, *StMed* 9 [1995] 130–131, was thinking along the same lines when he wrote:

<sup>80</sup> Such studies exist in K. Balkan, *Letter* (1957); P. Garelli, *Assyriens* (1963); L. L. Orlin, *Assyrian Colonies* (1970); K. R. Veenhof, *Aspects* (1972); and M. T. Larsen, *The Old Assyrian City-State and its Colonies*, Copenhagen (1976), from the Old Assyrian colony standpoint, which should be complemented by parallel reference to research on the north-Syrian city-states, e.g. G. Buccellati, *Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria*, Rome (1967) (*Studi Semitici* 26).

<sup>81</sup> That Ḫurmeli was a predecessor of Anum-Ḫirbi was recently claimed by V. Donbaz, *Fs. T. Özgüç* (1989), 75–77, 87–90, but rejected by M. Forlanini, *StMed* 9 [1995] 124. At present there seems to be no way to conclusively decide between the options.

Elements of the ancient Babylonian cultural tradition and contacts with the Amorrite kingdom of Yamḥad are already perceivable at the end of K(ültepe) Ib and will become dominant in the following century with the interruption of the Assyrian commercial network, but they could go back to the time of Anum-ḫerwa and of his empire connecting the two worlds, northern Syria and Central Anatolia. For that reason the first historical traditions of the Hittite state are related to Anum-ḫerwa and to the Kuššar Dynasty, who went to power immediately after him.

### Conclusion

It can be hoped that a major centre of Anum-Ḫirbi's realm will one day be excavated and that it will reveal cuneiform archives, from which scholars will be able to reconstruct the details of his reign as well as the lives of his kingdom's populace. At present, a steadily augmenting corpus relevant to Anum-Ḫirbi and his kingdom is emerging from the archives of a number of other Syrian and Anatolian sites. This remarkable ruler's reign can be roughly dated to the first third of the 18<sup>th</sup> century BCE, and his realm can be geographically circumscribed with some degree of confidence, if not, as yet, great precision. Data is also available that serves to provide a general picture of what his kingdom must have been like, though no texts from its centres are available.