

THE MEANING OF THE IDEOGRAM ⁴KASKAL.KUR = "UNDERGROUND WATER-COURSE" AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR BRONZE AGE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

EDMUND I. GORDON

Jersey City, N.J., U.S.A.

The most characteristic feature of the entire region of Central Anatolia, namely those parts lying outside of the basins of the Kızıl Irmak, the Sakarya, and the Büyük Menderes, and reaching ultimately as far as the watershed line of the streams emptying into the Mediterranean Sea, is its *interior drainage*. This region includes both closed drainage systems emptying into *salt lakes*, the largest of which is the Tuz Gölü, as well as *karstic*¹ systems with *underground drainage*, particularly frequent in the predominantly limestone country of the Central Taurus mountains, in the Konya and Ereğli Plains, and in the Lake Region westward from Konya to Denizli. These karstic

1. The geographical terms "Karst" and "karstic", which are derived from the name of the Karst limestone district in the Dinaric Alps near the Adriatic coast of Yugoslavia, are applied generally to all limestone regions in which most or all of the drainage is by underground channels. Since the calcium carbonate in the limestone is highly soluble in water, and especially in rain-water charged with carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, the water seeps through rock, forming caverns and channels beneath the surface. Since the type region in Yugoslavia has been well-studied, much of the terminology used internationally (*polje*, *doline* / *dolina*, *ponor*, etc.) is of Serbo-Croatian origin. *Dolines* or *dolinas* are closed hollows in such regions, formed by solution of limestone near the surface, are often rounded or elliptical in shape, and sometimes have *sink-holes* or *ponors* into which surface water flows. *Poljes*, similar to *dolines* but larger, are usually flat-bottomed and several miles in length. After heavy rains they may temporarily become lakes. They have been usually formed primarily by solution of limestone, but sometimes there has originally been some tectonic activity involved. They commonly have a covering of soil, making cultivation possible. For general definitions, cf. W. G. Moore, *A Dictionary of Geography* (Penguin Reference Books) [Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, 3rd edition, 1963], under the respective terms. The newly published *Les Guides Nagel: Turquie* [Genève, Suisse, 1967], edited and prepared entirely by scholarly specialists of several European countries, is particularly rich in data pertaining to the physical geography of the various regions of Turkey, and this particular subject is briefly but well treated (French edition, p. 24, pp. 489 f., and *passim*).

areas are characterized by: (1) copious springs either gushing forth from the ground or rushing forth from caverns; (2) natural bridges or tunnels, under or through which streams briefly flow; and (3) *poljes* or blind valleys, and *ponors* (Turkish *düden* / classical *katabothron*, *barathron*, or *chasma*), into which surface-flowing streams suddenly disappear completely underground.² These latter may take the form of simple *sink-holes* in the floors of depressions into which the waters flow down vertically, or they may be small or large cavern entrances into which the waters flow off horizontally or obliquely downhill. When the volume of water is greater than the capacity of the *düden*, or when the latter have become partially blocked in the course of time by silt, stones and brush, there have come into existence marshes and even lakes of varying degrees of permanence. There exist both literary evidence from classical Greece and Anatolia, as well as folklore traditions in modern Anatolia to the effect that in ancient times these *düdenler* had had to be cleaned out from time to time when they were blocked, and also that they were sometimes wilfully blocked, causing the formation of permanent lakes with sweet water but of variable volume. It is the aim of the present study to show that a hitherto misunderstood ideogram used in Hittite historical and religious contexts refers in fact to the *katabothron*, a natural phenomenon which classical sources indicate had played a considerable rôle in mythology and cult (usually in connection with descents to and ascents from the Netherworld, or as the lairs of mythical monsters, or else for purposes of necromancy) both in Greece and Anatolia,³ and it may well be

2. Cf. also W. M. Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, vol. I [Oxford 1895], p. 211, note 1: "*Düden* (like *κατάβητος*) denotes either end of the underground channel of a river, where the river either disappears or reappears, and it also denotes the underground channel as a whole."

3. Cf. especially Ganschinietz in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissen-*

that these have similarly played an as yet unrecognized rôle in the mythology both of Mesopotamia and of Anatolia in pre-classical times.

Hitherto read "ILLAD" or "AN.ILLAD" (like its homograph without the divine determinative, equated to Akkadian *illatum*, with meanings ranging from "caravan" to "family-group"^{3a}), the ideogram in question, which the writer proposes to read analytically as ⁴KASKAL.KUR, occurs nine times in Hittite contexts, most of them already having been collected by Laroche in his "Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites" (*RHA* VII/46 [1946-1947], pp. 94-95, *sub voce* "ILLAD"). Three of these represent landmarks delineating frontiers in Hittite treaties, three others are included in lists of divine beings or sacred topographical features invoked either in treaties or in prayers, while the final three instances consist of somewhat obscure ritual contexts, one of the latter being in a text with obvious Hurrian connections, and the remaining two having associations with the oracle-priest (LÜ.ĪAL). The passages involved are the following:

(1) Treaty of Mursilis II with Kubanda-Kurundas⁴ of Mirā (KBo IV 7 ii 10 = KBo V 13 i 30 = KUB VI 41 ii 7), in a passage delineating the frontier between Mirā - Kuwaliya and the Hittite state (cf. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge* I, pp. 114 f. §9):

ke-e-ez-ma-at-ta ŠA URU Wi₃-ya-na-wa-an-da
⁴KASKAL.KUR.ĪIA ZAG-aš e-eš-tù nu-kán
 I-NA URU A-ù-ra pa-ri-ya-an le-e za-a-it-ti

schaft, vol. X/2 [1919], article "Katabasis (B. Eingänge zur Unterwelt, §§ 1-2)", cols. 2377-2387, and particularly cols. 2379 f.; considerable data on this subject are to be found in both Strabo and Pausanias, some references from which will be given by the present writer in his subsequent publication.

3a. Cf. *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. 7 (I-J), pp. 82-85 (*illatum*).

4. i.e., Kubanda-⁴KAL-aš; the present writer accepts fully the reasoning of Ph. H. J. Houwink Ten Cate, *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period* (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqua X) [Leiden 1961], pp. 128 ff., and particularly p. 130, note 3, to which further evidence will be added here in Excursus A at the end of the present article. The writer admits, however, the reservation resulting from the several apparent instances of a phonetic complement -ya- in this very same name presumed to occur in the "Indictment of Mattuwattas" (KUB XIV 1), all of them occurring in passages partially restored by Goetze in his edition (*MVAeG* XXXII/1 [1928]), where the -ya- may in several instances be an-

(variants: Wi₃-ya-na-wa-an-da; ⁴KASKAL.KUR.-MEŠ; pa-ri-ya; za-a-[i]-it-ti)

"On this side furthermore the ⁴KASKAL.KUR.ĪIA at the city of Wiyanawanda shall be (included in) your frontier, but you shall not cross over (or: go beyond them)⁵ into (the territory of) the city of Aura."

(2) Treaty of Hattusilis III⁶ with Ulmi-Tešub

alysable rather as the conjunction -a / -ya, the major difficulty arising in Obverse line 55 where -ya-ya-ká[n] seems to exist unless it be a simple case of accidental dittography.

5. For the use of the verb *zai-* with reference to bodies of water not only in the sense of "to cross over" (= Akkadian *ebērum*), but also in the meaning "to go beyond, to bypass" (= Akkadian *etēqum*), cf. the "Bilingual Annals of Hattusilis I": KBo X 2 ii 17-18, (ĪD Pu-u-ru-n[a-an] zi-iḫ-bu-[un]) = KBo X 1 obv. 34 (ĪD Pu-ra-an i-te-ti-iq), in contrast to KBo X 2 iii 29-32 = KBo X 1 rev. 18-20, where four occurrences of *zai-* are rendered in the Akkadian by forms of *ebērum*. The writer intends to discuss this problem more fully in his larger study on Bronze Age Historical Geography now in preparation, together with a new interpretation of the Mari letter ARM II 113 (hitherto misinterpreted on several counts), where the correct rendering of ĪD Ḫa-bu-ur^{KI} i-ti-iq-ma in lines 9-10 (in addition to the recognition that Ta-ar-ni-ib^{KI} in line 13 is not a personal name but a place-name already known from a date-formula of Narām-Sin of Ešnunna) make the text of especially great importance for the correct localization of the city of Naḫur much further to the north than has until now been realized, with important implications for the entire geography of Upper Mesopotamia. It has already been pointed out that the Hittite verb *zai-* was also used occasionally as the equivalent of the Akkadian *nabalkutum* "to cross over (the top of)" (Turkish *aşmak* in contrast to *geçmek*) in connection with both mountains and walls; cf. Goetze, *Hattusilis* (*MVAeG* XXIX/3 [1924]), pp. 78 f., note to ii 6, and p. 79, note 1.

6. The writer, though formerly inclined to accept the analysis of Laroche (*RHA* 48 [1948], pp. 40-48) that this text in its present form in KBo IV 10 belongs to Tudḡaliyas IV(?) son of Hattusilis III, feels that internal evidence in the treaty itself demands that the Hittite king involved is always Hattusilis III himself, admittedly towards the very end of his reign (so that the list of officials appearing as witnesses may still correspond closely to those in the "vakfiye" for Sahurunu- was issued by the newly-enthroned Tudḡaliyas IV(?) [KUB XXVI 43 = KUB XXVI 50]). The present writer's main concern is that throughout the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub (KBo IV 10), even with its beginning missing, there are too many historical "back-flashes" to the earlier treaty establishing Kurundās (mi⁴ KAL-aš) on the throne at Tarḡundassas (as a concession to Muwatallis's primary intention, as Hattusilis himself half admits in his so-called "Apology", which at the same time provides the evidence for the earlier treaty's date

of Targundassa⁷ (KBo IV 10 obv. 19'), in a passage delineating the frontier between the Hūlaya River-Land and the Land of Pedassa⁸ (§4):

IŠ-TU ZAG KUR.URU Pé-daš_x(š)-ša-ma-aš-ši KASKAL.KUR.MEŠ URU A-ri-im-

to the very beginning of Hattusilis III's reign after driving out Urhi-Tesub), at the same time without a single reference to any of these passages as being acts of "my father," which would surely be expected had in fact the later treaty been composed by Tudḡaliyas. It goes without saying, therefore, that the writer does not find himself inclined to agree with the suggestion of Güterbock that "m KAL-aš" and Ulmi-Tesub might be double names of the same ruler (*JNES* XX [1961], p. 86, note 3); rather he considers that perhaps Kurundās never recovered from the incurable disease with which he was afflicted according to two of Rameses II's letters to Hattusilis (KUB III 27 + [?] 25, and KUB III 67), and after dying will have been succeeded by Ulmi-Tesub, either his son or his nephew, who, if the writer has succeeded in his attempt to understand the text of KUB XXI 37, had originally been partisan to Urhi-Tesub in his quarrel with Hattusilis, and although not himself a ruler as yet, had first been removed from Hattusilis's good graces, only to be later amnestied, this amnesty being the main purpose of KUB XXI 37. Further details on this matter must naturally be reserved for a future publication.

7. See *Excursus A* appended to the end of the present article.

8. This name is to be normalized *Pedassa* (and not "*Petassa*") on the following grounds: (1) in Hittite cuneiform sources, the intervocalic dental stop is never written doubled, and therefore, according to the principles of Sturtevant's Law, indicates a voiced stop *d* (and not a voiceless *t*); (2) the Egyptian transcription (which unambiguously distinguishes syllables beginning with *d* from those beginning with *t*) gives this very name, in both the prose and poetic versions of Rameses II's account of the "Preliminary Phase of the Battle of Qadesh", as *Pi-da-ša* (cf. most recently Wolfgang Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* [Wiesbaden 1962], p. 205). The present writer is furthermore convinced that the *Pedassos* cited in the Iliad among the Anatolian allies of the Trojans is in fact a reference to the very same nation, and that the occurrence of the name in the southern part of the Troad in much later times represents merely a *post facto* transference of this name to that region on the part of the Aeolians who later settled there, much as they are known to have assigned other archaic names to new sites. The more reliable traditions reported by both Herodotos and Strabo relating places called *Pedasa* and a people called *Pedaseis* to various parts of south-west Anatolia from the region of Halikarnassos all the way to Pisidia, and the association in some of these passages (and in the Iliad as well) of this people with the even more obscure *Leleges* (cf. especially Strabo XIII i 50 and XIII i 59) may be compared, moreover,

ma-at-la ZAG-aš URU A-ri-im-ma-at-la-aš-ma-kán A-NA KUR.URU Pé-daš_x-ša a-aš-ša-an-za

"In the direction of the frontier-march⁹ of the Land of Pedassa, the KASKAL.KUR.MEŠ (of) the city of Arimmatta shall be (included

with the tradition cited by Strabo that the mountaineers of Pisidia were mixed in ancient times with nomadic *Leleges* who settled down among them (Strabo XII vii 3). [Cf. for the classical tradition as a whole on these peoples, the articles by W. Ruge, "Pedasa" and "Pedasos (4)", in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* XIX/1 [1937], cols. 26-29 and 29-30 respectively.]

9. The expression IŠ-TU ZAG KUR.URU Pé-daš_x-ša cannot mean simply "in the direction of the boundary of the Land of Pedassa" (cf., for example, most recently, the translation in Garstang and Gurney, *The Geography of the Hittite Empire* [London 1959], p. 66), since in the sequel that boundary is further described. Moreover there must certainly be some further distinction between this phrase and that in the preceding paragraph, IŠ-TU KUR.URU Pé-daš_x-ša, besides the obvious one that the phrase in the preceding paragraph is suffixed by -at-la (i.e., the enclitic dative 2nd person singular -ta, indicating the passage to belong to the new treaty with Ulmi-Tesub, to which all of the 2nd person singular passages explicitly belong) whereas the present passage is suffixed by -ma-aš-ši (i.e., the conjunction -ma- plus the enclitic dative 3rd person singular -si, apparently earmarking this passage as deriving from the older treaty with Kurundās). The writer would suggest that the Land of Pedassa itself (as indicated in the paragraph which precedes the one under discussion) lay primarily on the far side of the mountain-range called Mt. Hāwas, whereas the ZAG of the Land of Pedassa will be perhaps a *cismontane region belonging to the Land of Pedassa* (cf. the classical Greek term *peraia* generally referring to exclaves separated from their main home-territory by a river or by the sea). Cogent for this interpretation is not only the use of ZAG in literary Sumerian (as in the reference to the ZAG of Anšan along the route from Uruk to Aratta in the Sumerian epic-tale "Lugalbanda and Enmerkar"; see for the present, Kramer, *BASOR* 96 [1944], p. 26, and E. I. Gordon, *BiOr* XVII [1960], p. 132, note 63 — the writer may add that since writing the last-mentioned note he has studied the Eighth Campaign of Sargon II in greater detail, with the help of modern topographical maps, and come to the conclusion that the two rivers *Rappā* and *Arattā* are actually the Āb-e-Sirwān and another one of the headwaters of the Diyala, with *Arattā* falling somewhere in the Sanandaj area, and *Anšan* at or near Kermānshāh), but also the fact that ZAG in Sumerian basically means "shoulder", the other meanings being secondary semantic developments from it (for a parallel, one might compare the use of "shoulder" in English for the "edge of a highway", and the use of "flank" generally). Perhaps also worth mentioning in this matter is the apparent

in) his frontier, but the city of Arimmatta (itself) lies within¹⁰ the Land of Pedassa."

(3) *ibid.*, obv. 28', in a passage delineating the frontier between the Hūlaya River-Land and the Hittite state itself (§4):

URU *Za-ar-wi₅-ša-za-ma-aš-ši* HUR.SAG Šar-la-im-mi-iš ⁴KASKAL.KUR.HIA wa-a-dar_x(TAR) (Glossenkeil) *Hi-in-na-ru-u(!)-wa-aš* ZAG-aš <.....^{lacuna (?)}>¹¹

"And in the direction of the city of Zarwisa, Mt. Sarlaimmis (and) the ⁴KASKAL.KUR.-HIA (and) the Waters of Hinnarūwas shall be (included in) his frontier <.....^{lacuna (?)}>."

(4) Treaty of Muwatallis with Alaksandus of Uilusa (KUB XXI 1 iv 28), in a list of deities belonging to the Land of Uilusa, following the deities of the Hittite Land, invoked as witnesses to the treaty-oaths:

⁴KASKAL.KUR ŠA KUR.URU Ū-i-[lu-ša]

relationship between Hittite *arha-* / *irha-* ("boundary", "frontier-district") and *arha* ("out", "away"), *arahza* ("outside, roundabout"), *arahzena* ("outer, outside, etc."), etc., although whether this resemblance is merely superficial or involves real cognates remains to be determined (an objection may be raised in that the vocalic Ablaut form *irha* does not seem to occur for any of the second group of words). In any case, it needs to be emphasized that in general in antiquity (cf. the usages of *pāṭum* in Akkadian, and of *ṭəḥūm* in Biblical Hebrew), frontiers did not consist of lines, but rather of lists of places, each with their own demarcated limits, which fell either to one or the other side of the frontiers. This principle was apparently excepted only in the case of high mountains and permanent bodies of water forming impassable frontiers, but this entire subject needs considerable further investigation.

10. Literally "remaining to"; interestingly one may compare the modern Turkish idiom with *kalmak* when referring to places falling to one or another side of a modern frontier [the writer first became aware of this Turkish idiom when he was told that when the present frontier was drawn between Turkey and Syria after the First World War, "all the important *hüyüks* had remained (*kaldılar*) on the Syrian side of the frontier", a point which the writer hopes in his major geographical study now in preparation to demonstrate as being in error].

11. The writer suspects here a lacuna in the text, this being the only section of the entire boundary description in this treaty which ends with the list of places which were ZAG-aš, but omits to say which places "remain" to which side. In the case of the sacred mountain Mt. Sarlaimmis, and most likely also in the case of the remaining landmark(s), we are probably *not* here dealing with an impassable part of the frontier (cf. the discussion at the very end of note 9 above).

(5) Plague-Prayer no. 1 of Mursilis II (KUB XIV 14 + KUB XIX 1 obv. 5), at the end of a list of deities and sacred topographical features invoked to hear the prayer (cf. Goetze, *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* I [1930], p. 165):

HUR.SAG.MEŠ ID.MEŠ TÚL.MEŠ
⁴KASKAL.KUR.MEŠ-ya

"(O) Mountains, Rivers, Springs, and
⁴KASKAL.KUR.MEŠ"

(6) Fragmentary treaty of [Mursilis II(?)] with [.....(?)] of Hayasa (KUB XXVI 39 rev. iv 23-25), in a list of sacred topographical features following the list of deities of the Hittite Land, and preceding the list of deities of the Land of Hayasa, invoked as witnesses to the treaty-oaths (cf. E. Forrer, *Caucasica* XI [1931], pp. 6 ff.; cf. Laroche, *Cat.*, no. 39):

[DINGIR.MEŠ.L]Ū.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ.-MUNUS.MEŠ *hu-u-ma-an-te-eš* Š[A KUR.-URU] HA-AT-TI {*hu-u-ma-an-te-eš*}
ne-bi-iš te-gán HUR.SAG.MEŠ¹ ID.MEŠ
TÚL.MEŠ ⁴KASKAL.KUR.MEŠ *hu-u-ma-an-te-eš šal-li-iš a-r[u-n]a-aš*

"All the gods and goddesses of the Hittite Land, {all of them,} the Sky, the Earth, all the Mountains, the Rivers, the Springs, (and) the ⁴KASKAL.KUR.MEŠ, (and) the Great Sea," ¹²

12. It should be noted that this treaty fragment is the only one to have been turned up thus far containing this expression ⁴KASKAL.KUR.MEŠ, although it is well possible that the *treaty of Suppiluliumas I with Hukkanas of Hayasa* may also have had it in the break which begins in the midst of the usual sequence; Friedrich, *Staatsverträge* II, pp. 112 f., line 58, had restored here [UR-PI.M]EŠ, but this is not compelling in view of its position in the sequence. The *treaty of Suppiluliumas I with Kurtiwaza of Mittanni* (first version) has HUR.SAG.MEŠ ū ID.MEŠ, omitting even TÚL.MEŠ, but then apparently continues with "River [Tigris(?) and River Euphrates]" before going on to "Heaven and Earth, Winds (and) Clouds"; the second version of this treaty is mostly broken away, but the preserved end seems to indicate that it was similar to the first version. The *treaties of Suppiluliumas I with Telle of Nuğasse and with Azira of Amurru*, and the *treaty of Mursilis II with Tuppi-Tešub of Amurru* are all alike in the passage under discussion in their having HUR.-SAG.MEŠ ID.MEŠ TÚL.MEŠ followed immediately by A.AB.BA GAL ("the Great Sea"), after which come "Heaven and Earth, Winds (and) Clouds". The *treaty of Mursilis II with Manaba-Tarḫundas of the Sēha River-Land* seems to have had [HUR.SAG.MEŠ ID].MEŠ TÚL.MEŠ followed immediately by *šal-li-iš a-ru-na-aš*, after which appear to have come "[Heaven and Earth],

with Alaksandus, was treated by Friedrich (*Staatsverträge* II, pp. 80f., lines 28–29) as the name(!) of a deity. It is conceivable that Forrer in rendering "Heerscharen" had attempted to find a meaning harmonizing with those of the well-attested ideogram ILLAD (= KASKAL.KUR) = Akkadian *illatum/ellatum* ranging from "caravan" to "group, family-group".¹⁴ It is difficult, however, to see what logic might have underlain the translation "military post", unless it were perhaps merely an attempt to force a concrete meaning with topographical significance out of the idea of "Heerscharen", although this is to be sure nowhere stated. But in no case did any of the scholars in question attempt to confront the two apparently distinct usages of the ideogram.

The present writer in fact had at one time — then aware only of the usage as a topographical landmark in the frontier descriptions — tried, in a similar *ad hoc* manner, to derive a meaning "caravansaray" for the ideogram, assuming a direct connection with the common Old Assyrian usage of ILLAD (= KASKAL.KUR) = *illatum*. He found it impossible, however, to explain the initial component DINGIR / AN of the ideogram used in Hittite; the adduceable parallel of EDIN and AN.EDIN in Sumerian literary usage did not seem sufficiently cogent. It was the writer's learning of the instances where the ideogram occurred among the natural features appended to lists of invoked deities that forced him to investigate the possibility that (1) this ideogram was to be kept distinct from its apparent homograph ILLAD = *illatum*, that (2) it should therefore be transcribed analytically either "KASKAL.KUR" or AN.KASKAL.KUR, and that (3) it might well represent a sacred (or even deified) natural topographical feature just like the others in the same contexts.

Following up this line of thinking, it was evident that in contexts 5 and 6 above, "KASKAL.KUR" most likely stands for such a sacred topographical feature, a meaning which is also reasonable in context 4; in none of these is either a meaning "military post, frontier-post, military garrison" or "caravansaray" particularly suitable. Moreover, a natural topographical feature is more likely in the frontier delineations of contexts 1, 2, and 3, than a man-made feature. In context 5, the position in the sequence after "rivers" and "springs", and in context 6, after

"rivers and springs" on one hand and before "the Great Sea" on the other, in addition to the separation from "mountains" in both contexts 5 and 6 by the "rivers and springs", all point to the term "KASKAL.KUR" as likely to stand for a *hydrological* geographical feature. This conclusion is enhanced both by the association with *wa-a-dar*_x(TAR) (Glossenkeil) *Hi-in-na-ru-u(!)-wa-aš* in context 3, as well as the occurrence with the expression *pa-ri-ya(-an) le-e za-a(-i)-it-ti* in context 1.

In the light of this deduction, the writer next attempted an analysis of the components of the ideogram "KASKAL.KUR", with interesting results. The first element KASKAL is the normal Sumerian word, as well as the normal equivalent from very early times of the Akkadian *ḥarrānum*, both of which mean not only "road, track, route", but also "journey" and "(military) campaign". The form of the sign, from the earliest Uruk period pictographic script onwards, was a picture of two tracks crossing, a carrefours, a crossroads. The sign was also used from very early times, at least as early as the Early Old Babylonian Period, as an ideogram for the name of the city of Ḥarrānum (later Ḥarrān, modern Harran), the major carrefours in the western part of Upper Mesopotamia, as is now quite clear from the Old Babylonian Itinerary.¹⁵

The second element KUR offers a number of possibilities which are chronologically delimitable:

(1) KUR = "foreign land", the primary meaning in Sumerian generally, from Early Dynastic times through the Early Old Babylonian Period;

(2) KUR = "netherworld", the most common secondary meaning in literary Sumerian from the Early Dynastic period through the Old Babylonian Period;

(3) KUR = "mountain, highland", in Sumerian texts only very rarely used in this meaning in the Old Babylonian Period or earlier, the idea being normally expressed rather by ḤUR.SAG; in Akkadian already used to write *šadūm* in the Early Old Babylonian Period, both in the Mari

15. Cf. Goetze, *JCS* VII [1953], pp. 51–72, for the edition of the first known texts, the tablets UIOM 2134 and UIOM 2370 at the Oriental Museum of the University of Illinois at Urbana, Illinois. Cf. W. Hallo, *JCS* XVIII [1964], pp. 59–64, for the edition of the third tablet to all intents and purposes completing the sequence of the text, YBC 4499 at the Yale Babylonian Collection. Cf. also Goetze, *JCS* XVIII [1964], pp. 114–119, for further commentary on this text in light of the new find.

14. See footnote 3a above.

texts and in the Old Babylonian Itinerary, preceding the names of mountains, where it was meant to be read, not merely used as a graphic determinative; very rare in Hittite usage as a variant¹⁶ for *ḪUR.SAG* which is normally used preceding the names of mountains; regularly used in place of *ḪUR.SAG* in later Akkadian from the Middle Assyrian and Middle Babylonian times onwards;

(4) *KUR* = "east", a very rare secondary meaning both in Sumerian and Akkadian of the Old Babylonian Period, and derived from the fact that the nearest mountains were to the east of Sumer and Akkad; in later periods more commonly used in compound ideograms;

(5) *KUR* = "land" in general, never so used in Sumerian of the Early Dynastic through the Old Babylonian periods; in Akkadian as the equivalent of *matum*, never so used either in Old Akkadian (where *KALAM* is used rarely alongside of phonetically written *ma-ta*) or in Old Assyrian or Old Babylonian (where the construct form *ma-at* before names of countries is *always*(!) written out phonetically); normal usage in Hittite,

16. Examples of the rare instances of the use of *KUR* for "Mountain" in Hittite have been pointed out by Von Brandenstein, *Bildbeschreibungen*, p. 45: *KUR Ištarunuwas* (*op.cit.*, text no. 1 = KUB XXXVIII 2 iii 18'; cf. also L. Rost, *MIO* VIII, pp. 174 f.) and *ḪUR.SAG Ḫalälaziba* (Bo. 2316, now KUB XXXVIII 26 obv. 23' and rev. 15') parallel to *KUR Ḫalälaziba* (Bo. 2316 = KUB XXXVIII 26 rev. 22; cf. L. Rost, *MIO* IX, pp. 182 ff.). The case of *Mt. Ḫalälaziba* is absolutely clear; moreover, the fact that the same festival ritual and cult-inventory text continues in rev. 25 with a reference to [*ḫa-aš-ša-ra-aš*], the chief Hittite goddess revered at the city of *Tüwanuwa*, classical *Tyana*, and apparently mentions *KUR.URU Tu-ú[-wa-nu-wa]* in the same line as well, gives a strong temptation to connect this mountain with the classical town of *Halala*, which in Roman times was renamed *Faustinopolis*, and whose location at *Başmakçı* on the *Kırkeçit Deresi* 25 km. southeast of *Kemerhisar* (*Tyana*, *Tüwanuwa*) and 29 km. northwest of *Pozantı* (classical *Podandos*, preserving the name of Hittite and Iron Age *Paduwanda* although the exact site of the latter has yet to be identified) has only recently been confirmed (cf. M. Ballance, "Derbe and Faustinopolis", *Anat. Stud.* XIV [1964], pp. 139-145); if this supposition be true, it is perhaps likely that the Hittite *Mt. Ḫalälaziba* be the mountain-ridge separating *Kemerhisar* from *Başmakçı*, along the road between which a Hittite relief was discovered at or near the village of *Gökbez* in the summer of 1963 by the late *Kadri Erdil*, then director of the *Nigde Museum*, when in the company of Mr. Richard Harper of the British Archaeological Institute in Ankara, who men-

as well as in Akkadian from the Middle Assyrian and Middle Babylonian periods onwards.

The combination of these various possible meanings for *KUR* with the meaning of *KASKAL* leads to the following conceivable possibilities:

(1) "road" + "foreign land" = "caravan" (explanation for *ILLAD* = *illatum* without explaining any of the meanings of Akkadian *illatum*); no meaning adduceable for a hydrological term;

(2) "road" + "netherworld" = "tunnel", and as a hydrological term, "underground water-course";

(3) "road" + "mountain" = "mountain-pass", and as a hydrological term, "canyon, gorge";

(4) "road" + "east" — no readily apparent special meaning;

(5) "road" + "land" in general = "high-way(?)"; no meaning adduceable for a hydrological term.

It is evident that if the logic here followed be correct, only hypotheses 2 and 3 remain open for consideration.

It was at this stage of analysing the elements of this ideogram that the writer in the spring of 1964, then newly returned from an extensive

tioned it casually (thinking it already known) to the writer in the spring of 1964, after the latter had returned from his Anatolian trip without learning about it while in *Nigde* because of the recent death of its discoverer. As for *Mt. Ištarunuwas*, it is quite reasonable to accept this as the name of a mountain (cf. the numerous other mountain names also ending coincidentally in *-nuwa*) near to the city of *Ištahara*, which was clearly located in the same region as the other towns mentioned in the same context as the mountain. Additional instances of *KUR* as a variant for *ḪUR.SAG* are the occurrences of *KUR Ḫaḫarwa* three and possibly four times in KUB V 1 (i 3, ii 74, iv 3, and possibly also iv 11), and the occurrence once of the strange conflate error *KUR.SAG Ḫa-ḫar-wa* on the very same tablet (KUB V 1 iv 65 — collated on the original tablet by the present writer), as against thirty-five instances again on this same tablet of the normal *ḪUR.SAG Ḫa-ḫar-wa*. There are also some seven names with *KUR* that are likely to be mountains likewise, in the cult-inventory text KUB XXXVIII 6 and its duplicate KUB XXXVIII 10, these being: *KUR Lawada* (6 i 30'), *KUR Siwanda* (6 iv 8'), *KUR Warwalya* and *KUR Tarmaimis* (6 iv 18' = 10 iv 4'), *KUR Tunmas* and *KUR Saluwandiyas* (10 iii 15'), and *KUR Mammanandas* (10 iii 16'); with the *KUR Saluwandiyas* occurring here compare *ḪUR.SAG Saluwanda* (KBo II 1 iii 13 and 16, as well as KUB II 1 i 45 and iii 38).

journey through most of the districts of seventeen vilayets in Central and Southern Anatolia, and beginning anew the philological side of his geographical researches, suddenly recalled (while discussing the matter with Professor Sedat Alp of Ankara University) two important occurrences in Akkadian and Sumerian of the signs ⁴KASKAL.KUR having considerable bearing for finding the solution to this problem:

(1) *The name of the Baliḫ / Belih River* in western Upper Mesopotamia, is written both ideographically and phonetically in the Old Babylonian Itinerary dating from the Early Old Babylonian Period:

(a) [A]p-qum ša ⁴KASKAL.KUR in UIOM 2134 rev. iii 7 (Goetze, *JCS* VII [1953], pp. 53 f.);

(b) Ap-qū-ú ša Ba-li-ḫa-a in YBC 4499 rev. 33 (Halla, *JCS* XVIII [1964], pp. 58-64).

Cf. also the Proto- *diri* = *watrum* text from the 1952 Nippur excavations in which this equation is confirmed, according to Landsberger *apud* Goetze, *op. cit.*, p. 61; one may note also the writing *Ba-li-ih* clearly referring to this river in a text from Mari (cf. the "order of Zimri-Lim" excerpted by Dossin in "Benjaminites", *Mélanges Dussaud* II, pp. 989-990).

The river Baliḫ's name is also written both phonetically and ideographically (with a variant ideogram) in the early Neo-Assyrian inscriptions of Shalmaneser III (859-826 B.C.) in the course of the campaign of the 6th *palū* (853 B.C.):

(a) ⁴ID KASKAL.KUR.A in the Kerh-i-Diele ("Kurkh") Monolith (*III R* 8 ii 79);

(b) ⁴ID Ba-li-ḫi, in Marble Plaque IM 55644 ii 14 (Ernst Michel, text no. 32, *WO* II/1 [1954], p. 32), Black Obelisk line 54 (id., text no. 33, *WO* II/2 [1955], p. 148), and in the Fort Shalmaneser Statue (context broken in J. Laessle's preliminary edition in *IRAQ* XXI [1959], p. 150, but complete in P. Hulin's new edition [in preparation]);

(c) ⁴ID Ba-li-ḫi, in Clay Tablet IM 54669 ii 20 (Ernst Michel, text no. 31, *WO* I/6 [1953], p. 464).

(2) *The name of Waliḫ or Baliḫ, the son and successor of Etana of the First Dynasty of Kish in the "Sumerian King List"* (cf. Thorkild Jacobsen, *Assyriological Studies* no. 11 [Chicago 1939], pp. 80 f., column ii 20 ff., with note 76

on p. 81) is written both phonetically and ideographically:

(a) *Wa-li-ih* in text P₂ (CBS 13981 = Poebel, *PBS* V 2), datable by its summary to the 4th year of Enlil-bani of the First Dynasty of Isin;

(b) *Ba-li-ih* in texts W-B (the Weld-Blundell cylinder, Ashmolean Mus. 1923.444 = Langdon, *OECT* II, pls. i-iv) and Su₁ (a text from Susa published by Scheil, *RA* XXXI [1934], pp. 150 f.), both datable to the middle of the First Dynasty of Babylon, as well as in text P₃ (CBS 19797 = Poebel, *PBS* V 5), datable to the 2nd half of the First Dynasty of Babylon;

(c) ⁴KASKAL.KUR in text K (a Neo-Assyrian copy from Kuyunjik, K.8532 + K.8533 + K.8534 = L. King, *Chronicles Concerning Early Babylonian Kings*, vol. II, pp. 143-145; cf. also E. A. Speiser, *Mesopotamian Origins* [Philadelphia 1930], p. 151); though this is only a late copy, there is a reasonable chance that the ideographic orthography faithfully reproduces at least an Old Babylonian original, an idea enhanced by the existence of this very same ideographic orthography for the name of the River Baliḫ in one of the texts of the Old Babylonian Itinerary (see above).

The fact that this ideogram ⁴KASKAL.KUR was used to write the name of the River Baliḫ (and at that already in the Early Old Babylonian Period) tended to confirm the present writer's basic premise that the ideogram ⁴KASKAL.KUR in Hittite sources stood for a *hydrological term*, and lead him to make the further deduction that this term *should correspond to some special characteristic of the River Baliḫ par excellence!* The occurrence of the component KASKAL in the compound ideogram could, to be sure, have been due merely to the association of the River Baliḫ with the city Harrānum (which was written simply KASKAL in one text of the Old Babylonian Itinerary, and URU.ŠĀ.KASKAL in the other).¹⁷ On the other hand, the use of the element KUR in this ideogram already in the Early Old Babylonian period tends to weaken the possibilities of the

17. For the city of Harrānum written simply KASKAL, see UIOM 2134 iii 8 (Goetze, *JCS* VII [1953], p. 54, and copy on p. 53); for the orthography URU.ŠĀ.KASKAL, see YBC 4499 rev. 32 (Halla, *JCS* XVIII [1964], p. 64, with copy on p. 60, and photograph on p. 58).

hypothetical meaning "road + mountain" = "canyon, gorge" for the compound ideogram ⁴KASKAL.KUR, and to increase the probability of the meaning "road + netherworld" = "underground water-course".

Moreover, in fact, neither the River Baliḥ itself, nor either of the two branches of its major tributary, the now largely dry Colap (Jullāb), flows at any point in its course through a canyon or even through mountainous terrain. Rather they flow through a broad plain, at times with "braided" courses, and even have some tributaries of the "Yazoo River" type.¹⁸ Thus the case for establishing a meaning "canyon" or "gorge" for the ideogram ⁴KASKAL.KUR was manifestly fruitless. Not so, it developed later, was the brief for the other postulated meaning, "underground water-course".

Although the writer had not (and to date has not) visited the region of Urfa and Harran in Turkey, and the valley of the Baliḥ in Syria, he was most fortunate in being able to obtain clues both by interrogating persons who had, and by combing the literature. The first likely clue was the existence at Urfa itself of the great sacred fish-pond, the Birket İbrahim, and the canal-like streets of that city,¹⁹ all fed from a great spring at Direkli, some 5 kilometres west-northwest of Urfa, the excess waters from which flow around the outside of the city wall through a rock-cut canal known as the Kara Koyun.²⁰ Turning to other parts of the region, great springs break out just north of Akçakale (some 19 km. south-southwest of Harran) to feed two pools near the railway line forming the modern boundary between Turkey and Syria. Then there is the copious spring just south of Tel-Abyaḍ on the

Syrian side of the border, known as Ra's-al-'Ain-al-'Arūs ("the Fountainhead of the Betrothed") or alternatively as Ra's-al-'Ain-al-Ḥalīl ("the Fountainhead of [Abraham,] the Friend [of God]"), forming a small lake which is the main source of the River Baliḥ today, and which was evidently the *Apqum ša Baliḥa* of antiquity. Since most of the low mountains both to the west and east of the valleys of the Baliḥ and the Colap consist in fact of limestone, it is manifest that we are dealing in this region with *karstic formations*. This conclusion is enhanced by the existence of what appears, to judge from the modern topographical maps, to be an extensive *polje* in the vicinity of Ağvīran and Millisaray villages some 35 km. north-northwest of Urfa and some 18 km. east of Samsat. All of this evidence gives credence not only to the traditions about an underground connection between the Ra's-al-'Ain-al-'Arūs and the Birket İbrahim at Urfa,²¹ but also to the opinions expressed by Seton Lloyd and William Brice that quantities of water "must drain off by underground seepage" from the upper valley of the Colap in the Urfa region to account for the waterlessness of the Harran region today,²² as well as to their suspicion that the old rivalry in classical and mediaeval times between Urfa and Harran had led to a complete "piracy" on the part of Urfa of the water-supply of Harran after the sack of the latter city by the Mongols under Hulagu in 1259 A.D.,²³ just as the same rivalry also led to Urfa's usurping from Harran the traditions about Abraham (to be sure, aided by the superficial resemblance in name between *Ur* and both *Urfa* and its Syriac precursor, *Orhai*).

One must moreover reckon with the fact that in pre-Islamic times the waters of the western branch of the Colap River must also have been shared, not only by Urfa and Harran, but also by the city at the intervening site of Sultantepe (the city *Ḥaziri* of the Old Babylonian Itinerary and the *Ḥuzirina* / *Ḥuzirna* of the Neo-Assyrian period, as well as the *Hostra* of Roman times according to the Tabula Peutingeriana, which locates the latter city at distances from both Edessa and Harran exactly equivalent to the respective distances of Sultantepe from Urfa and Harran).²⁴

In view, moreover, of the picture given by the

18. The term "Yazoo River" is applied by physical geographers to tributaries which are prevented from joining the main river because the latter has built up high natural levees of sediment. They therefore run parallel to the main river for quite a distance, eventually joining it much farther downstream. The name is derived from the Yazoo River, a tributary of the Mississippi River, the classic example of this type of stream. (Definition taken almost verbatim from W. G. Moore, *A Dictionary of Geography* (Penguin Reference Books) [Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, 3rd edition, 1963], p. 194.)

19. Cf. *Baedekers Autoreiseführer Türkei* [Stuttgart, 1965-1966], p. 249.

20. Cf. Seton Lloyd and William Brice, "Harran", *Anat. Stud.* I [1951], p. 83.

21. *ibid.*, p. 95. 22. *ibid.*, p. 83. 23. *ibid.*, p. 84.

24. See *Excursus B* appended to the end of the present article.

10th century writer Jahšiyārī cited by Yāqūt, as well as by the 13th century Arab writer Ibn-Šaddād, of a permanently-flowing River Jullāb (Colap), some of whose waters had been led by means of a canal into Harraṇ,²⁵ the present writer postulated in 1965 the following two alternative hypotheses:

(1) The presence of *an underground river in the region, whose outflow of water through a second great karstic spring in the near vicinity of Urfa* will have in antiquity been a major source of the Colap-Baliḥ, but the outlet of which will have been blocked off by the people of Urfa after the Mongol destruction of Harraṇ to prevent the restoration of their ancient rival.

(2) The existence of *a düden in the immediate vicinity of Urfa, into which most of the headwaters of the western branch of the Colap will have originally flowed in prehistoric times*, but which will have been kept blocked in the interest of the city of Harraṇ and the waters diverted into the plain since earliest historical times, but which the vengeful people of Urfa will have reopened after the 1259 A.D. destruction of Harraṇ, allowing the major part of the waters to escape once more naturally into this underground "drainpipe", thereby sealing the fate of their rival city downstream.

In principle, though not in detail, the writer's deductions about the underground drainage in the Urfa-Harraṇ area has been happily confirmed by a news item which appeared in the Turkish press in August 1966, following several months of heated pressure upon all political parties during the 1965 parliamentary elections and afterwards by the people of the city of Urfa (itself now a growing modern city with a population over 70,000 and severely pressed for water to meet its 20th century needs) and of the Harraṇ Ovası. The following is a translation of the news-report which appeared in the newspaper *Yeni Gazete* of Istanbul on 18 August 1966 (page 3):

**"URFA IS AT LAST BEING RESCUED
FROM ITS WATERLESSNESS"**

"ANKARA (Haber Ajansı) — Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel has taken in hand the water problem suffered by Urfa for many long years. He has given orders to the relevant

authorities for bringing water to the city, and has demanded that this problem be resolved within one year."

"Upon the issuing of the Prime Minister's order, the General Director of the Provinces' Bank (İller Bankası), Vedat Önsel, immediately prepared a plan, had it approved by the Ministry of Development and Settlement, and began work on the securing of water within one year from *an underground river (bir yer altı nehrinden)* located at a distance of four kilometres from Urfa. From this underground river Urfa will be provided with *265 litres of water per second*. Of this, 200 litres will be utilized for the city's needs, while 65 litres will serve for irrigation purposes."

The present writer had hoped, prior to his writing the present article, to have the opportunity of visiting the Urfa area in order to investigate the exact nature of this underground river's opening, and in particular to learn also whether or not there is a *düden* either directly associated with it or located elsewhere in the vicinity of Urfa, or even within the walls of the 13th Century city itself, possibly in the neighbourhood of the run-off from the Birket İbrahim.

It is nevertheless reasonable to state with more assuredness than ever before that *in all likelihood the tales of an underground connection between the Birket İbrahim and the Ra's-al-'Ain-al-'Arūs have a basis in fact*. This new piece of evidence also makes it much more safe to state with much less hesitation that the waters which now flow in an underground course near Urfa had in antiquity most likely been permitted (if not caused by man) to flow above ground, providing a constant flow of water for the western branch of the Colap-Jullāb arm of the Baliḥ River, along whose course had been situated the two major cities of Haziri-Huzirina-Hostrā (Sultantepe) and Harraṇ, in addition to a number of smaller sites. It therefore becomes readily understandable why the name of the Baliḥ River should have been written with the ideogram "KASKAL.KUR!"

On the other hand, the reason for the homonymy and homography of the River Baliḥ with Baliḥ/Waliḥ, the son and successor of Etana, and what connection, if any, either Etana or Baliḥ/Waliḥ, as rulers of Kish in southern Mesopotamia in the earliest phase of the Early Dynastic Period (if not still earlier during the Jemdet

25. Cf. D. S. Rice, "Mediaeval Harraṇ", *Anat. Stud.* II [1952], p. 37, §5, and p. 40, commentary to §5.

Nasr Period), may have had with the region of the Balih River remains for the time being shrouded in mystery. It is conceivable that Balih/Walih himself figured in an as yet undiscovered epic-poem in which he descended to the Netherworld in this region, much as his father Etana had ascended to Heaven in quest of the "plant-of-birth" in order to help his barren wife to bear a child, and succeeded in bringing "Kingship" down from Heaven where it had been kept since the Deluge. Alternatively, and perhaps even more likely, the missing end of the Etana Epic itself²⁶ may well have involved Etana's having been informed by the gods in Heaven that the "plant-of-birth" was not to be found in Heaven, but rather at a Netherworld-Entrance²⁷ in the region of modern Urfa and the Balih River, and his being given "Kingship" as a sort of "consolation-prize" in compensation for his daring to ascend to Heaven astride the eagle; so that only after a further adventure by Etana will his child have been born and given his name from the river in the vicinity of (or at the source of) which Etana will have obtained the sought-for plant.

26. Cf. E. A. Speiser in J. B. Pritchard, *ANET* [2nd edition, Princeton 1955], p. 114 (introductory comment on the epic of Etana) and pp. 118 f. (note 50). It may be added that the fragmentary contents of column iv of the reverse of K. 8563 (= *Babyloniaca* XII, pl. IX and p. 52) contain nothing tending either to confirm or refute the present writer's proposals about the possible conclusion of the epic.

27. The writer's suggestion here about the possible ending of the "Etana Epic", it should be noted, assumes the presence of the common folklore motif of the "quest with a 'happy ending' after an unexpected delay", in contrast to the motif of the "unsuccessful quest of the impossible, softened by the award of a 'consolation prize'" exemplified by Gilgamesh's search for immortality, and receiving knowledge from Utanapištim about the "plant-of-rejuvenation". The "plant-of-birth" which Etana sought, and probably obtained finally, may well have been the same as the *dūdā'im* of Genesis 30: 14-16. Whether or not these latter really were "mandrakes", the traditional fertility-promoting drug (and/or aphrodisiac) used by women in the classical world, and even more so among the Semitic peoples in the Near East and elsewhere down to modern times and the advent of the use of hormones, the episode in Genesis 30: 14-16 between Rachel and Leah is one that took place while they were still living in Haran! It may be noted also that one species of mandrake, the *mörion* (*Mandragoras microcarpa* Bert.; Turkish *adamotu* and *kankurutan*), grows in shady places and in caves. Cf. Steier in Pauly-

Once it has been assumed that the correct basic meaning of the ideogram ⁴KASKAL.KUR is "ponor, *düden*, *katabothron*", it becomes evident that several new and important concrete topographical constants can be adduced in the analysis of the landmarks delineating the frontiers of, or marking the routes on the approaches to, the Hittite sub-kingdom of the Hūlaya River-Land and Tarğundassa, and similarly the vassal Land of Mirā and Kuwaliya, as well as for limiting the possibilities for locating the vassal Land of Uilusa. For, however important the identifications of mountain ranges, mountain peaks or rivers might be as constants in the attempt to trace on the modern map of Anatolia the frontiers of and the approaches to these ancient political units, the well-nigh ubiquity of mountains and rivers in the west and southwest of Anatolia permits an almost infinite number of combinations with little conclusiveness possible in the identification of the ancient mountains or rivers named in the texts with their modern counterparts. On the other hand, despite the great number of *düdenler* encountered in the west and southwest of Anatolia, by far the heaviest concentration of these is to be found in the area of Antalya and the hinterland of Pamphylia where archaeologically there is no sign of Bronze Age remains with Hittite connections, while the occurrences of *düdenler* and related karstic phenomena in the interior of western Anatolia to the north of the Taurus Mountains are both sufficiently distinctive and scattered to be impor-

Wissowa-Kroll, *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* XIV/1, article "Mandragoras", cols. 1028-1037, and especially col. 1031. The occurrence of important drug-plants in caverns or *katabothra* at the same time associated with myths has in fact two important parallels mentioned in classical literature: (1) the connection of the myth of Herakles and Kerberos, localized at the *Cavern of Akherousia* near Hērakleia Pontikē (one of the three caves on the Baba-Burnu just northwest of modern Ereğli on the Black Sea), with the plant aconite or wolfsbane (Turkish *kurtboğan*), for which cf. Wagler in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* I/1 [1893], article "Ἀκόνιτον", cols. 1178-1183; and (2) the association of the *crocus* (Turkish *çiğdem* or *ıboğan*) with two karstic avens, famed as the *Grottoes of Kōrykos* and known today as *Cennet-Cehennem* ("Heaven and Hell"), where part of the myth of Typhōn and Zeus was localized (cf. Strabo XIV v 5, and see now Baedekers *Autoreiseführer Türkei* [Stuttgart 1965/1966], p. 204).

tant as landmarks identifiable with their ancient counterparts, particularly when combined with the mountains and streams associated with them, and even more so when the evidence of archaeological sites are brought into the picture.

With these factors in mind, the present writer has collected a considerable body of data (both personally in the course of his travels in Anatolia, as well as by fine-combing the written literature, in addition to the making of detailed analyses of modern topographical maps) relevant to the locations and descriptive qualifications of all the known *düdenler* and other related phenomena, such as karstic springs, lakes originating from flooded *poljes*,²⁸ and the like, in the relevant parts of Anatolia, together with such information as is known either from local traditions current today or cited by authors of the classical period and later. These data form the backbone of a second larger study already partially prepared for publication by the writer, in which he trusts he will have presented conclusive arguments to definitively establish, *inter alia*, that (1) the *Hūlaya River* was the today nameless *Irmak* (called simply that by the villagers along its banks²⁹) flowing southeastward from the Beyşehir

28. For the present, cf. the relevant sections of Erwin Lahn (Emin İlhan), *Türkiye Göllerinin Jeolojisi ve Jeomorfolojisi Hakkında bir Etüt / Contribution de l'étude géologique et géomorphologique des lacs de la Turquie* (Maden Tetkik ve Arama Enstitüsü Yayınlarından / Publications de l'Institut d'études et de recherches minières en Turquie, Seri B, No. 12) [Ankara, 1948].

29. Although this stream is known to the townsfolk at Beyşehir itself (many of whom imagine that its natural and well-eroded river valley had not existed at all before it was developed into an irrigation canal at the turn of the present century) as the "*Kanal*", the peasants and villagers all admit that it had always been a river, and most of them see nothing surprising in the fact that they have no other name for it than simply "The River" par excellence. At the large village of *Yalı Hüyük* (once apparently known as "Eski Saraylar" according to the tradition) on the shore of the former Soğla Lake, the writer was quite unexpectedly informed by the elders of a traditional name "*Hūlu Irmağı*". The first vowel of this traditional name is long, and the first consonant is a strongly articulated velar spirant, most interestingly a phoneme that does not exist at all in the local dialect today and cannot be pronounced by the younger men who, knowing that they are mispronouncing it to the ridicule of the elders, say "*Kālu*" with a pronunciation that approaches that of the Turkish word *kuşulu* ("having swans", although this bird has admittedly never been seen in the area). The latter is

Lake to be carried eventually through the gorges of the Çarşamba Çayı to water the Konya Plain, with the city of *Tarğundassa* to be found either at, or in the immediate neighbourhood of, *Karaman*,³⁰ and the city of *Purushanda/Parshunta* at a great site called *Homat* near the village of Belceğiz in the district of Şarki Karaağaç near the northwest corner of the Beyşehir Lake itself; that (2) the ⁴KASKAL.KUR of URU *Wiyana-wanda* was the underground river said to be situ-

also the official name of a great gushing spring near the village of *Taşafıl*, the *Kuşulu Pınar* which today provides the entire water-supply of the town of Seydişehir, to which it is pumped via a pipe-line. The elders insist that this was the "*Hūlu Pınarı*" according to the traditions learnt from their "grandfathers", and claim that it had been the main source of the river of the same name, and moreover that this source had always produced "twice as much water as the Irmak coming from Beyşehir"!

30. A not insurmountable problem is raised by the Hittite stele found at *Çağdın* between Gaziantep and Ni- zip, and now in the Adana Museum (no. 1982). Whether the deity to whom the stele was originally dedicated in its hieroglyphic inscription consisting of four signs is to be read "*Storm-god of the Storm-god City*" (cf. Güterbock in *Halil Edhem Hâtıra Kitabı* [Ankara, 1947], pp. 55 f. [Turkish] and 66 f. [German]) or "*God Tarğunds of Tarğundassa City*" (cf. Bossert in *Anadolu Araştırmaları / JKF II/1* [1951], pp. 107-108) or as "*Storm-god of Hattusa City*" (cf. Laroche, *Les hiéroglyphes hittites*, vol. I [Paris 1960], pp. 106 and 109), the site at which the stele was discovered in 1931 cannot under any circumstances be considered as evidence for the location of the city of *Tarğundassa* (any more than as a pointer to the location of the city of *Hattusa*), since it is clearly within (or very close to) the frontiers of the sub-kingdom of Kargamis. One may consider two possible explanations of its presence at *Çağdın*: (1) Just as there were cults for the deities of Halab (Aleppo) and of Samuha at the Hittite imperial capital of *Hattusa* (Boğazköy), there might well have been a cult for either the storm-god of *Hattusa* or the god *Tarğunds* of *Tarğundassa* in the area of Kargamis; (2) If the stele had originally been dedicated to *Tarğunds* at *Tarğundassa* itself, it is conceivable that it might have been carried off to Kargamis at some time after the breakup of the Hittite Empire, by refugees from the city of *Tarğundassa* (about whose later history and fall we know as yet absolutely nothing) coming to Kargamis, or perhaps might have even been carried off by some ruler of Kargamis in the early Post-Imperial period as the result of a war against one of the later rulers of *Tarğundassa*, or even against the enemies who might have taken over the kingdom of *Tarğundassa* after its fall. One has but to compare the similar actions of Hattusilis I in his wars, or even the famous transfer of the "Black-Goddess" from Kizzuwatna to Samuha by one of the early rulers named Tudḡaliyas.

ated in the proximity of the *Source of the Sakarya River* near the town of Çifteler, with the city of *Mirā* to be identified with the classical and Byzantine city of *Miros*, located either (as hitherto maintained) at the site called *Malatya* southeast of Kütahya, or as the present writer believes, in the Hittite levels of the so-called "*Midas City*," the "*Phrygian Yazılıkaya*"; and that (3) the capital-city of the *Land of Uilusa* can with great likelihood be identified with the great double site of *Ilıcapiınar* and *Haclaritepe* south of the modern town of Orhangazi to the west of İznik Lake.³¹

Having given this brief foretaste of some of his conclusions to be presented with full evidence and arguments in the very near future, the writer would like to bring the present article to a close with a piece of evidence which may possibly provide the Hittite reading of the ideogram ⁴KASKAL.KUR in a passage which partially parallels the list of sacred topographical features invoked in the treaties and plague-prayer passages quoted in the earlier part of this article. The passage in question is KUB II 1 iv 31-35 (in the midst of the famous list of ⁴KAL and ⁴A.A-la-aš / ⁴Muwalas³² patently dating from the Middle Hittite period of the great ruler Tudḡaliyas, but perhaps even going back originally to the Old Kingdom because of the repeated references to Labarnas), and reads as follows:

HUR.SAG.MEŠ-aš hu-u-ma(-an)-la-aš [⁴A.A-l]a-aš

İD.MEŠ-aš hu-u-ma-an-ta-aš [⁴A.A-l]a-aš

tù-wa-du-na⁷(?)(-aš) hu(-u)-ma-an-ta-aš
[⁴]⁷A⁷.A-la-aš

šu-up-pi-ya-an-t[(-aš)] hu-u-ma-an-ta-aš ⁴A.A-la-aš

"The ⁴A.A-las — deities of all the Mountains,

The ⁴A.A-las — deities of all the Rivers,

The ⁴A.A-las — deities of all the *tuwaduna*(?),

The ⁴A.A-las — deities of all the Springs(!)³²
....."

31. Cf. sites no. 6 and no. 7 in the survey of prehistoric sites in Northwest Anatolia by David H. French to be published in *Anat. Stud.* XVII [1967]; the writer wishes to thank David C. Biernoff for the information that these two sites (which according to French's data appear to be complementary to one another) should actually be considered a single large settlement, since Mr. Biernoff himself collected materials of all the periods involved on both sites.

32. The word *suppiyant-* occurs elsewhere only with

If one should grant that *suppiyant-* here does in fact mean "sacred spring, clear pool" (and in the context it is not likely to mean anything else), and that this is also the correct reading of TÛL-an-za in KBo X 45 ii 23, it may then be reasonable to make the admittedly very tenuous assumption that the apparent hapax *tuwaduna*(??) may correspond to the ideogram ⁴KASKAL.KUR "ponor, *düden*, *katabothron*", despite the fact that the sequence in our passage is not the same as that in the invocations. Finally, if it should really turn out that this very tentative and possibly even presumptuous deduction be correct, one may perhaps dare even to dare to suggest (naturally with an infinity of reservations) that it is not inconceivable that the Anatolian Turkish word *düden* itself, a word that has no evident etymology in Turkish, and is apparently in common use only in the western, southwestern, and west-central parts of Anatolia,³³ might have been derived ultimately from our Hittite word *tuwaduna*.

EXCURSUS A. URU Targundassa (not URU "Tattassa / Dattassa")

As already implied above in note 4, the writer subscribes fully to the conclusions of Houwink

the adjectival meaning "sacred, pure", as the 'ergative' form of the adjective *suppi-* with the same meaning (cf. Laroche, "Un 'ergatif' en indo-européen d'Asie Mineure", *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* LVII [1962], pp. 23-24). The substantival use in the present passage in parallel to topographical terms, when confronted with the fact that *suppi-* is used in combination with the noun *luli-* "pool, pond, small lake" in both the toponym *Suppiluliyama* and in the personal name *Suppiluliuma* / *Suppiluliyama*, leads to the conclusion that the "sacred place" par excellence for the Hittites was the spring sanctuary, the pool which was at once clear, pure, and sacred. The fact that the personal name *Suppiluliuma* was written ideographically (both in cuneiform and in the hieroglyphic scripts) with the combination of ideograms KUG and TÛL, in which KUG is the normal and expected ideogram for *suppi-* and TÛL the expected correspondence for *luli-*, is another pointer in the same direction. The writer would therefore propose that the substantival "ergative" form TÛL-an-za, which appears in KBo X 45 ii 23 in coordination with *uidenanza* "waters", may perhaps be normalized *suppiyanza* in accordance with the present passage rather than **wattaruwanza* as proposed by Laroche (*op. cit.*, pp. 25 f. under "*wetenant-*" and "*wattaruwant-*").

33. Although the word *düden* is used in the vocabulary

Ten Cate (*loc. cit.*) that URU ^dU-aš-ša and URU ^dU-dā-aš-ša are to be read URU *Tarḡundassa*. At the same time the writer would point out that not only does the nature of Rameses II's interest in the health of the king in question tend to indicate a personage comparable in station to the King of Kargamis (as explicitly specified in the Ulmi-Tešub treaty, KBo IV 10 obv. 37'), but also the commercial and political importance of Tarḡundassa and its king is pointed to by a dossier found at Ugarit. From the two texts RŠ 17.158 and RŠ 17.42 (cf. Nougayrol, *PRU* IV, pp. 169-172) dating from the time of Ini-Tešub king of Kargamis (who himself had been one of the witnesses to the Ulmi-Tešub treaty), we learn that a "merchant of the King of Tarḡu(n)dassa" (LÜ.DAM.KÂR ša LUGAL KUR *Tar-ḡu-da-aš-ši*) had been killed at Ugarit by citizens of Ugarit, and that consequently claims were brought against the citizens of Ugarit by a fellow-merchant of the murdered man, one Ari-Šimiga, "merchant, servant of the King of Tarḡu(n)dassa" (LÜ.DAM.KÂR ARAD₂ ša LUGAL KUR *Tar-ḡu-da-aš-ši*), the case being then adjudicated by Ini-Tešub, King of Kargamis, in his rôle of suzerain over Ugarit vis-à-vis the Hittite Empire itself or vis-à-vis the Empire's other viceroyships comparable in status to that of Kargamis itself, such as apparently both Tarḡundassa and Isuwa were during this period.

It should be noted that, although Laroche has expressed the opinion that the name of this city could in principle be read "Tarḡuntassa" as well as "Dattassa" (implicitly in *Dictionnaire louvite*, pp. 127-128 under "*Tarḡund-* / ^dIM / ^dU", and explicitly in *op. cit.*, p. 128 under "*Datta*", then again with more emphasis in *RHA* XVI/63 [1958], pp. 88-89, and even more specifically in

pp. 91-96 of the last-mentioned article), this alternative having already been reckoned "a possibility not to be excluded" long ago by Sommer and Ehelolf in *Bo.St.* X, p. 49 with note 1, the present writer would now go a step further and insist that *there no longer exists any evidence whatsoever* either for a reading "^dTatta" or "^dDatta" for the Storm-god ^dIM / ^dU, or for assuming a connection between the city-names URU ^dU(-dā)-aš-ša and either URU *Tā-at-tā-aš-ši-iš* (KBo IV 10 obv. 30') or URU *Ta-at-ta-aš-ša-za* (KBo II 11 rev. 20). Careful checking by the writer of *all* the "references" cited and arguments given by Goetze (*Kleinasien zur Helthüterzeit* [1924], pp. 17 f., note 3, and *Kleinasien* [1933 edition], p. 127), by Forrer (*MDOG* LXI, p. 39, and *ZDMG* 76 /n.f. I [1922], p. 219 with note 8, as well as *Forschungen* I/1 [1926], p. 11, note 2, and pp. 32-33), by Sommer (*Ahhijawa Urkunden*, pp. 35 and 76), by Sommer and Ehelolf (*Bo.St.* X, p. 49 with note 1), and by Laroche (*RHA* VII/46 [1946-1947], pp. 89-90), has made it absolutely clear that the "evidence" for a Storm-god, Luwian or other, named either "Tatta" or "Datta" has never been anything but circumstantial or based upon erroneous citations!

Most recently Laroche (*Les Noms des hittites* [Paris 1966], pp. 40 [no. 138] and 291) has finally combed all of the "evidence" and reduced it to two points: (a) the existence of personal names such as *Tatta*, *Tattamaru*, and *Tattiya*; and (b) the occurrence of a slave with the purportedly Luwian name "*Ar-ma-da-ta-aš*" in an Old Babylonian text from Dūr-Rimuš (Iščali) in the Diyala region (Lutz, *UCP* X/1, no. 27) on the basis of a proposed emendation of Lutz's copy (without a collation of the tablet itself) by Von Soden (*ZA* 45 /n.f. 11 [1939], pp. 76 f.), who objected to the "orthographically unbeautiful" sequence *Ar-ma-da-AL-aš* as the name appeared in both Lutz's copy and transcription (*op. cit.*, p. 10). Recognizing finally that the Hittite name ^mAr-ma-^dU-aš / ^mAr-ma-^dU-da-aš in fact never (sic!) appears in an orthography such as "^mAr-ma-DA-at-ta-aš", Laroche now proposed that, if Von Soden's suggestion should be correct, this Old Babylonian "occurrence" might be considered an important piece of circumstantial evidence (along with the Achaemenian period Lycian

of geographical instruction in Turkey today generally, it is apparently not known by the general population except in that part of Anatolia west of a line drawn roughly from Silifke (on the Mediterranean coast) to Ereğli (northwest of the Cilician Gates), and thence to the northwest corner of the Tuz Gölü. Strangely the true *düdenler* which are found in the two grottoes known in antiquity as the "*Grottoes of Kōrykos*" and today as "*Cennet-Cehennem*" ("Heaven and Hell") are locally called simply *dere* "brook, creek"; the same term *dere* was used by informants from the region of Sivas questioned by the writer, these informants not being familiar at all with the word *düden*, although such phenomena occur in their home-province.

name *Ermadatēs*) as to the reading of the Hittite or Luwian name in question.

At last, convinced that (1) the Hittite personal names *Tatta*, *Tattamaru*, and *Tattiya* could all be explained as based either upon the name of the sacred mountain HUR.SAG *Ta-at-ta* (localized in the central Hittite area near the city of Hattarina according to the Cult-Centre List in the "Prayer of Muwatallis", KUB VI 45 i 54-56 = KUB VI 46 i 22-23) or of a more obscure deity *Ta-at-ta-aš* (see now KUB XXXVIII 16 obv. 14', and cf. Laroche, *loc. cit.*), and that (2) the existence of Achaemenian period Lycian names like *Ermadatēs* is not cogent so long as the same milieu includes Hellenized Persian names like *Mithradatēs*, the present writer, in the interest of resolving this problem once and for all, sought from Prof. Jørgen Laessøe (who was at Berkeley, California, during the spring of 1967) a collation of the Išāli tablet in question. As a result, the tablet was in fact collated not only by Prof. Laessøe but also by Dr. Anne Draffkorn Kilmer, both of whom were agreed as to their conclusions, which were communicated to the writer by Prof. Laessøe, as follows:

"... the Lutz text's museum number here is 9-2412 ... I am confident that the fourth sign of the first line is certainly not a TA; Lutz's copy is in fact fairly accurate with the exception that he has over-accentuated the two small vertical flicks and somewhat misplaced them with regard to their place in the overall ductus of the sign. Nor has Lutz indicated that there is in fact a break above the sign; it is certain, however, that the upper horizontal wedge, unlike the lower one, does not continue into a downwards slanted wedge. The top of the final vertical wedge is lost in the break, and this vertical wedge, by the way, is very faint below the break. The final sign of the line is definitely an AŠ; although the line runs around the right edge and continues on to the reverse, with AŠ appearing there under the signs *-we-di*, I have ascertained that AŠ is definitely not part of the signs of the reverse. I am enclosing a copy of the two signs involved as I see them, and have indicated the break as faithfully as I can. With regard to the second sign of the name, it is MA beyond any doubt

[Prof. Laessøe's copy of the two signs involved appears in fig. 1.]

The writer himself is in accord with Prof. Laessøe and Dr. Kilmer that these two questioned signs are certainly not *-ta-aš*, but he feels equally that what is seen in Prof. Laessøe's copy does not represent the signs *-AL-aš*. He would like to note that he has never encountered an instance of the Old Babylonian sign AL having not even a single long vertical wedge in the middle, although at times the diagonal wedge or the "Winkelhaken" to its right may have been missing; to be sure, the head of the missing vertical may, in this particular instance, have been present in the break at the top of the sign, and its tail may have been even fainter than the tail of the final vertical apparently is, according to Prof. Laessøe's detailed description quoted above. For the time being, the writer has no other proposal to offer for reading the name, since *-ra-aš* seems equally unlikely in the light of the copies both of Lutz and Prof. Laessøe. In any case, we are not entitled to read this name as "*Ar-ma-da-ta-aš*" and to see a "Luwian" in the Diyala region during the



FIG. 1

time of Hammurapi, even as a slave! If the name should be *Ar-ma-da-al(!)-aš*, we might be dealing with a Hurrian name in *-adal*, but the final *-aš* is then anomalous.

Having eliminated this "proof" for a Luwian or Hittite Storm-god named "*Tatta(s)*" or "*Datta(s)*", we may, the writer feels, safely deal the coup-de-grâce once and for all to the readings "*Arma-Dattas*" and "*Manaba-Dattas*", and read these names as should be expected: *Arma-Tarḡundas* / *Arma-Tarḡunas* and *Manaba-Tarḡundas* / *Manaba-Tarḡunas* respectively!

Turning next to the problem of URU *Tattassis* (KBo IV 10 obv. 30') and of URU *Tattassaza* (KBo II 11 rev. 20), the writer not only agrees completely with Güterbock's simple explanation that URU *Tattassis* be considered as one of the places which were *ubadi* ("dependencies") of URU *Walwaras* (cf. Güterbock, *JNES* XX [1961], p. 86, note 3), but must confess that he himself, unaware of Güterbock's note on the subject, thought of this solution independently and told it to Prof. Güterbock in 1964, who kindly drew his attention to the reference. As for

URU *Tattassaza*, the fact that this place name is followed by the damaged verbal form *ma-ni-ah-ḫu*¹ [...] in an otherwise broken context tends nevertheless to carry within it the seeds for destroying the superficially obvious but grammatically impossible interpretation. One may restore either *ma-ni-ah-ḫu* [Preterite 1 sing.] or *ma-ni-ah-ḫu* [wa-an-zi] (Infinitive I), but one does not have the right to translate either "I was ruling from Tattassa" or "to rule from Tattassa", since the verb *maniyahḫ*- in the sense of "to rule, administer, govern" demands an accusative of the country administered, while at the same time the Hittite idiom expressing the centre of administration would be expected to be a *locative* ("in Tattassa"), not an *ablative* (which, though it makes good sense in both English and French, would be anomalous in Hittite); moreover the final syllable *-za* here must stand for the ablative, and cannot be a reflexive *-za*, since *maniyahḫ*- would not take a reflexive in any case! Possibly the meaning may be "I handed over from Tattassa" or "to hand over from Tattassa", with the direct object of *maniyahḫ*- in this sense separated from the verb by the ablative phrase, but as long as the context is broken, little can be decided. (The writer is most grateful to Prof. E. Laroche for his kind advice on the problems involved in this particular passage.) The place name has above been written "*Tattassa*" as though it were a different place from the *Tattassis* of the previously discussed passage; it is quite possible, however, that *Tattassaza* is in fact the ablative of the name *Tattassis* (cf. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* I [2nd edition, 1960], p. 48, §67 b), and that the two references are to one and the same place, but in any case they have nothing to do with URU ⁴U(-da)-aš-ša, i.e., *Tarḡundassa*, except for being situated on the "arahzena-frontier" of the Ḫūlaya River-Land, of which the city of *Tarḡundassa* was the capital.

In concluding this Excursus, the writer wishes to justify his normalization of this name as *Tarḡundassa* (with the voiced velar spirant Ḡ like the Semitic *ghain*, and with the voiced dental stop D) rather than "*Tarḡuntassa*"; it is based quite simply upon the following two alphabetic transcriptions: (1) TRḠDŠ at Ugarit, representing the Hittite personal name *Tarḡu(n)dissa*, occurring in the two texts RS 4.475, line 5 (cf. A. Herdner, *Corpus de tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques* [Mission de Ras Shamra X, Paris 1963],

pp. 142 f., no. 53 = C. Gordon no. 54; cf. also Albright, *BASOR* 54 [1934], p. 26, and *BASOR* 82 [1941], pp. 46-49), and RS 11.857, line 27 (cf. Herdner, *op. cit.*, p. 169, no. 81 = C. Gordon no. 119); (2) TR'NZ in the Aramaic transcription PYTR'NZ of the theophoric personal name of a Cilician in Egypt (Driver, *Aramaic Documents* V 4; cf. Goetze, *JCS* XVI [1962], p. 56, no. 7, and Laroche, *Les Noms des hittites* [Paris 1966], p. 142, no. 987,³⁴ both of whom misinterpret the name as "*Piya-Tarḡunazi*", an anomalous and unexpected name form),³⁵ representing unquestionably, in the present writer's opinion, the Hittite-Luwian name *Piya-Tarḡunda* or *Piya-Tarḡunz* (for *Piya-Tarḡunds*),³⁶ so far occurring only in Hieroglyphic Luwian on a seal in Berlin in the writing *Pi-a-w-tá* (cf. Laroche, *op. cit.*, p. 142, no. 988).

EXCURSUS B. URU Ḫuzir(i)na = Sultantepe (Roman period Hostra)

The occurrence of the name of the city URU *Ḫu-zir-na* in the colophons of two of the literary tablets from Sultantepe (*STT* I 64 and 71), as well as in connection with the title of one of the witnesses to a slave-sale document from that same site (S.U. 51/36, published by J. J. Finkelstein, *Anat. Stud.* VII [1957], pp. 138 ff.) has most recently been treated by Finkelstein (*op. cit.*, p. 137 with note 6), who briefly discusses the possibility of its relation to the city URU *Ḫu-zir-na* known both from Assyrian historical texts from the time of Adad-nērārī II to the time of Šamšī-Adad V, and from an eponym stele found at Assur and dating from the time of the last-

34. Laroche erroneously cites this alphabetically written name as "PYTRḠNZ".

35. If this name were in fact to be read "*Piya-Tarḡunazi*" as proposed by both Goetze and Laroche, it would be the only instance in the entire "Hittite" onomastic (from the Old Assyrian period down through the Post-Hittite period) of a personal name containing a second personal name in a construction analogous to theophoric names.

36. Cf. both the personal name ^m ⁴U-za, to be normalized either *Tarḡunza* or *Tarḡuanza* or *Tarḡuza* (see Laroche, *op. cit.*, p. 287), and the personal name *Zidanda* with the variant form *Zidanza*, concerning which Laroche (*op. cit.*, p. 329) notes as follows: "La variante pour le même personnage historique suggère l'idée que le suffixe *-anza* inconnu de la grammaire anatolienne serait une altération phonétique de *-anda-* / *-anta-*, mais on ignore les conditions précises de cette assimilation."

named ruler. Reiterating the opinion voiced by Gurney in *Anat. Stud.* II [1952(!)], pp. 30 f., and in *STT* I, p. 6, Finkelstein also maintains the view that "there is no clear indication from the Sultantepe tablets concerning the name of the site in [Neo-]Assyrian times", and that "Sultantepe, situated about 15 miles north of Harran, could not be identical with the city of *Huzirina*, familiar from the Assyrian royal annals, which was situated at a distance of not more than one day's march to the west of *Našibina* (Nisibis); in other words, some 130 miles to the east of Sultantepe". Finkelstein nevertheless admits the possibility that the city URU *Hu-zi-ri-na* mentioned in the Sultantepe documents might be a homonym of the well-known URU *Hu-zi-ri-na*, and even the likelihood that it is the same place as the city *Ha-zi-ri* of the Old Babylonian Itinerary.

The viewpoint that *Huzirina* was but one day's journey from *Našibina* is founded on an assumption first made by Scheil in his publication of the Annals of Tukulti-Ninurta II, namely, that the campaign of 885 B.C. as related in those annals is complete and unabridged, and that therefore there are no omitted passages. It should however be clear to anyone who has made even superficial comparative studies of the various versions of the Annals of Assur-našir-apal II or of Shalmaneser III (to speak merely of the well-attested texts of the two immediate successors of Tukulti-Ninurta II) that whole passages, even in the midst of itinerary sequences, are regularly omitted, often even in the episodes of the latest year of a given edition of the annals.

A case in point, since it is one of the texts which are important for the localization of *Huzirina* quite a bit further to the west than the vicinity of *Našibina* (modern Nüsaybin), and one having an absolutely certain indication of such a lacuna, is the account of the campaign of 866 B.C. of Assur-našir-apal II (Budge and King, *AKA* I, pp. 374 ff.):

"On the 20th day of the month of Ayyār, I set out from Kalḫu. I crossed the River Tigris. (LACUNA!!!) I went down (sic! = *attarad*) into the Land of Qipani (*a-na* KUR *Qi-pa-ni*). I received the tribute of the city-rulers of the Land of Qipani in URU *Hu-zi-ri-na*. While I was staying in URU *Hu-zi-ri-na*, I received the tribute of 'It-ti' of the Land of Zalla (and the tribute) of 'Gi-ri-da-di of the Land of Ašša (KUR *Áš-šá-a-ya*), (namely)

silver, gold, cattle, and sheep. At that time also I received the tribute of 'Qa-ta-zi-li of the Land of Kumuh (KUR *Ku-mu-ḫa-a-ya*), (namely) logs of cedar-wood, silver, and gold I set out from URU *Hu-zi-ri-na*. I marched upstream along the River Euphrates (*ši-di* *ÍD Pu-rat-te a-na e-le-ni ašbat/DAB*¹). I crossed over the top of Mt. Kuppu (KUR *Ku-up-pu*). I came down into the midst of the towns of the Land of Ašša (KUR *A-áš-šá*), a *Ḫabḫi*-Land facing the Hittite-Land (KUR *Ḫab-ḫi šá pa-an KUR Ḫat-te*). . . ."

That there is a lacuna immediately following the Tigris crossing is clear because of the descent into the Land of Qipani, which must have originally been preceded by a passage relating the crossing over a mountain-region, most likely the KUR *Kašiyari*. The city of *Huzirina* is here clearly stated to be situated *in, or at least on the fringe of, the Land of Qipani*. Moreover it is while still there that Assur-našir-apal II receives the tribute both of the immediately neighbouring peoples (including those to the north) on the east bank of the Euphrates, as well as from the Hittite ruler of the Land of *Ku(m)muḫ* across the Euphrates in the area of Samsat and Adiyaman. Furthermore it is *from the city of Huzirina that he departs to head upstream along the Euphrates*, which can only mean a march from the Urfa region north-northwestward to the Hilvan-Karacurun area, and then northward to end up in the region of Çermik and Ergani (KUR *Ar-qa-ni-a*) before heading eastward across the divide to the Tigris valley in the area of *Amede* (later Amida, modern Diyarbakır).

With this account of Assur-našir-apal II one may compare the earlier conquest of URU *Hu-zi-ri-na* by Adad-nērārī II in 899 B.C. as reported in the clearly abridged "Nineteenth Year Annals" of that ruler (KAH II 84 obv. 45-48), where, after recounting the capture of the city of *Huzirina* and the re-bricking(?) of its wall, along with the submission of towns at the foot of Mt. Kašiyari which had previously been seized by 'Mamli of the Land of Temanna, and Adad-nērārī's taking over for himself the latter's "palaces" (public institutions in general, to be sure!), there follows in the text immediately the following passage:

"At that time I received large *pa-gu-ta* and small *pa-gu-ta*, a 'contribution' (*še-bu-ul-tu*) of the Land of *Bêt-Adini* (KUR DUMU

A-di-ni) which is situated on the bank of the River Euphrates".

To be sure, a lacuna may have been involved here; but, if not, the 'contributions' of *Bêl-Adini* on the *Euphrates* (capital: *Til-Barsaib* = modern Tell-Ahmar) are received in URU *Huzirina*, exactly as thirty-three years later the tribute from *Ku(m)muh* across the *Euphrates* was explicitly received at URU *Huzirina* prior to a departure from that city for the march upstream along the Euphrates. The combination of these two passages alone points to the area of Urfa and Sultantepe as the meeting-place of the natural roads pointing northwest to Samsat and southwest to Tell-Ahmar.

In the light of these two passages, moreover, re-examination of that section of the Annals of Tukulti-Ninurta II dealing with the campaign of 885 B.C. subsequent to the arrival at and departure from URU *Ta-bi-te* makes quite obvious the fact that it is full of lacunae, and not merely in the sequel to the arrival at URU *Hu-zi-ri-na* (which seems to have taken the Assyrian army far to the north). To begin with the departure from URU *Ta-bi-te*, one may even question whether URU *Našibina* belongs here at all, for reasons that revolve about the problematic boundary between the "Province of the *Turtānu*" (as known from the eponym stele of Bēlu-baliṭ, 814 B.C.) and the "Province of *Našibina*" (as seen from the eponym stele of Šarru-pati-bēli, 831 and 815 B.C.). In view of the recent discovery of the exact site of the city of *Kaḫat* at Tell-Barri on the Jaghjagh River due south of Nūsaybin, and of the likelihood that the city hitherto read as "URU *Ū-rak-ka*" should be read simply URU *Ū-šal-ka* (and identified with the older city of *Ašlakkā* / *Ašnakkum*, situated to the west or northwest of 'Amouda), it is altogether difficult to imagine how an URU *Ta-bi-te* belonging to the "Province of the *Turtānu*" (with all of its other cities and districts centering about the Baliḫ and Colap rivers) could possibly have been situated between URU *Ṭābete* (= older *Ṭābatum*, firmly located at the site of Tell-Abu-Bekr just across from Hassette at the bend of the *Ḫabur*) and URU *Našibina* (Nūsaybin), and particularly on the Jaghjagh River, where it has been placed both by Scheil and Forrer (*Provinzeinteilung*), a location which would fall between the two firmly located cities of *Kaḫat* and *Našibina*,

both of which belonged to the "Province of *Našibina*".

These and other related problems will all be taken up with considerably greater detail in the writer's fuller study of Bronze and Iron Age Historical Geography now in the process of preparation. Leaving to that study the question of how many places named URU *Ta-bi-te* had existed, and where it or they may have been located, one must note for the time being that the sequence of three of the cities listed in the eponym stele of Bēlu-baliṭ (Assur stele no. 44), the *turtānu* in 814 B.C., namely: URU KASKAL³⁷ (= *Harrāni*), URU *Hu-zi-ri-na*, and URU BĀD-KUR.*Qi(!)-pá-ni* (= *Dūr-Qipāni* or *Dūr-Mat-Qipāni*; for this now corrected reading, cf. the penetrating study by the late Margarete Falkner in *Afo* XVIII [1957-1958], p. 15), are more than temptingly identifiable, if they do not in fact demand identification, with *Harran*, *Sultantepe*, and *Anaz Hüyük*,³⁷ running from south to north. This trio corresponds roughly with the trio from the Roman period comprising *Karrhai* (Carrhae), *Hostra*, and *Edessa*, as recorded on the "Tabula Peutingeriana". Quite typical of its easternmost sectors, the Tabula shows *Karrhai-Harrān* three separate times in three different orthographies: (a) "*Tharrana*" (for *Charrana*; Ravennas similarly has "*Tarana*"), (b) "*Charra*" (Ravennas gives the variants "*Chara*" and "*Cara*"), and (c) "*Charris*" (again Ravennas has the variants "*Carris*" and "*Tarris*"), and indicates for *Hostra* a position 18 Roman miles from "*Tharrana*" and 12 Roman miles from *Edessa* (= modern Urfa), these being roughly the exact distances and proportions between Harran and Sultantepe on the one hand, and between Sultantepe and Urfa on the other! It is moreover especially noteworthy that the three periods most heavily represented in the archaeological remains at Sultantepe are exactly as might be expected: (1) *Old Babylonian*, largely deduced from the height of the mound beneath the Neo-Assyrian levels reached in the sondages, and

37. *Anaz Hüyük*, situated on the east bank of the eastern branch of the Colap River, some 20 km. due east of Urfa, has long been recognized to have been the site of the city called simply URU BĀD (*Dūru*) in the Stele of Mušēzib-Šamaš discovered by Pognon at Anaz; cf. E. Forrer, *Die Provinzeinteilung des Assyrischen Reiches* [Berlin 1921], pp. 22 and pp. 108-109, in addition to E. Unger, article "Anaz" in *RLA* I, p. 106, and Taf. 14.

corresponding to the *Ha-zi-ri* of the "Old Babylonian Itinerary"; (2) *Neo-Assyrian*, representing the URU *Hu-zi-ri-na* of the Assyrian historical texts from 899 B.C. down to 814 B.C., and the URU *Hu-zir-na* of the later literary-text colophons and of the one economic text from Sultan-tepe mentioning the city by name; and (3) Roman (corresponding to *Hostra* of the Peutinger Table). Cf. *Anat. Stud.* II [1952], pp. 13-15, and *Anat. Stud.* III [1953], pp. 27-51, for the reasonably detailed reports of the all too insufficient excavation by Seton Lloyd and the late Nuri Gökçe of this exceedingly important city, which has proved so productive of textual material in just a few sondages. The continuity in the site is beautifully demonstrated by its name through-

out antiquity: the Latin form *Hostra* evidently reflects a Syriac **Hoṣrā* or **Hoṣrā* (cf. Latin *Bostra* alongside Hebrew and Arabic *Boṣrā*), which in turn would go back to the Neo-Assyrian *Huzir(na)* / *Huziri(na)*, and this again a development from the Old Babylonian form *Haziri*.³⁸

38. There is a strong possibility that the final *-na* of *Huzirina* / *Huzirna* is the Hurrian plural "article". It may be added that the great height of the mound underlying the Neo-Assyrian levels most likely indicates not only an historical level contemporary with the Old Babylonian period, but certainly also a Late Bronze Level contemporary with the periods of the Hurrian Confederation and the Mittanni Kingdom; the city does not appear, however, in any Hittite or Middle Assyrian source dealing with this area, indicating most likely that it was overshadowed completely by its neighbour Harran during this period.