



Ursu and #aššum

Sidney Smith

Anatolian Studies, Vol. 6, Special Number in Honour and in Memory of Professor John Garstang.
(1956), pp. 35-43.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0066-1546%281956%296%3C35%3AUAH%3E2.0.CO%3B2-F>

Anatolian Studies is currently published by British Institute at Ankara.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/biaa.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

URSU AND HAŠŠUM

By SIDNEY SMITH

PROFESSOR GARSTANG, WHOSE excavations and geographical studies have so notably increased sources of information about, and our knowledge of, eastern Cilicia in early times, will have watched with interest, and perhaps with amusement, the way in which, in modern studies of texts, locations proposed for Ursu have jumped about over a considerable area, in which physical features might be expected to restrict the possibilities. As the story of Ursu in the second millennium ends just before that of Qizzuwadana begins, so far as our present information goes, it may not be inappropriate to dedicate a brief account of the development of evidence about, and the changes of opinion concerning, the situation of the city and the land to the friend who has often discussed Qizzuwadana with me during the last thirty years ; the course taken is not without its lessons for criticism, which should be a form of intellectual discipline.

The reason for believing that Ursu was a city in the mountainous region Ibla was an inscription of GU.DE.A, that for identifying Ibla with part of the Amanus was based on texts concerning Naram-Sin. The argument seemed simple and logical enough for Peter Jensen ¹ to identify Ursu with Arsuz, by which, probably, he understood no more than a location on the coastal strip west of the Bailan Pass. When the texts about Naram-Sin were subjected to criticism based on the assumption that such documents were not the product of the temple schools, but by individual authors engaged in inventing fictions about history after their own taste,² Ursu was located at or near Edessa, Orrha, Urfah ; in judging what was to be accepted as probable, even the provenance of the stele of Naram-Sin found at Pir Hussain was discredited.³ A further assumption, that all places visited by merchants from Kültepe south of that town were on a straight route to the city of Ashur, came to be adduced as proof that Ursu, which is frequently mentioned, must lie on this route.⁴ Traders are not couriers (the markets they went to involved zig-zag journeys), the insertion of Ursu into other routes unjustifiable,⁵ but this point led to no reconsideration. In an edition of the text describing the siege of Ursu by Hattusilis I the acceptance of the location at Urfah ⁶ had the consequence that his operation was not recognized as part of the war on the "great kingship" of Aleppo, and the significance of the attitude of Carchemish

¹ If the identification was proposed by someone before Jensen I have failed to trace it.

² This kind of criticism can find in a simple colophon, that for the document giving a recipe for lead glaze, a deliberate falsification of history, *JCS.*, VIII, 68-9, Anm. 174 d.

³ B. Landsberger in *ZA.* (NF), I, 236.

⁴ The primary text was no. 18 in Dr. G. Contenau, *Tablettes cappadociennes*, I.

⁵ *Mélanges syriens offerts à M. R. Dussaud*, I, 31, addendum. See further, p. 41 (note 4 and note 6).

⁶ H. G. Güterbock in *ZA.* (NF), X, 136-7.

and Aleppo did not appear.¹ When Hattusilis, shortly before his death, was arranging for the succession of Mursilis, a minor, under the regency of Pimpiras,² he had in mind the prosecution of that war ; it was later said of him that he “ caused (the days of) the great kingship ” of Aleppo to be “ full ”,³ that is he began, but did not accomplish, its fall.⁴ The nuance of meaning in this idiom is clear from its use in Hebrew.⁵ If Ursu was near the Amanus the siege was the first step in this process, one which seems to have been the direct cause of the death of Hattusilis.

Evidence about Ursu was increased by letters in the Ma’er archives⁶ ; one of them might have been thought decisive. Mašum, a senior officer in the service of Yašmaḥ-Ada(d), the son and sub-king of Shamshi-Adad I, sent a report of a campaign in which he failed.⁷ He had been summoned to Šubat-Šamši by Sin-tiri, one of several officers of Shamshi-Adad at that place, which was administered directly from Assyria, not through a sub-king. Documents from the provincial capital Çager Bazar show that Sin-tiri was in command, with others, there, authorizing routine issues of rations.⁸ Mašum himself was not infrequently at Çager Bazar, drawing rations due to Yašmaḥ-Ada(d), for his seal is found on lists of rations and the like issued, obliterating the text,⁹ a sort of quittance kept for the records. The practical certainty is that Çager Bazar was Šubat-Šamši, a name used only during this time for the place ; it was pointed out at the time when the texts were described in a catalogue that the documents which mention Šubat-Enlil mention other places as well to which supplies were to be sent, for example Kaḥad,¹⁰ and that it cannot therefore be the name of Çager Bazar, though this has been proposed simply because the name occurs.¹¹ While Mašum was at Çager Bazar news came that Yapaḥ(a)-Ada(d), with 2,000 Ḫapiru, had fortified Šallul “ on this bank ”¹² beside the Euphrates. Mašum marched against Yapaḥ(a)-Ada(d) and fortified a town¹³ 30 “ fields ” distant. When he saw these reinforcements for the

¹ *JRAS.*, 1942, 64-6.

² That Pimpiras did act as regent, and that Mursilis was therefore a minor during his early years, follows from the texts concerning ritual cults of royal ancestors.

³ *Alalakh and Chronology*, 12.

⁴ B. Landsberger in *JCS.*, VIII, 53, Anm. 89, quoting the reference in note 6, translated “ er setzte dem Königtum ein Ende ”, pointing out the error of fact ; but that is in the translation, not the text.

⁵ e.g. Nahum, I, 10 : “ stubble full dry ” but not yet dead is compared to the haters of the Lord, about to be destroyed, but still in existence.

⁶ Exhaustive references in *ARM.*, XV ; use of this with regard to persons and places removes any necessity for more than indications here.

⁷ C.-F. Jean’s edition, *ARM.*, II, no. 131.

⁸ Listed in *Iraq*, VII, 41 sub Sin-tiri.

⁹ A 921, 924, 945, 953, 956, 962, 972, 981.

¹⁰ Listed in *Iraq*, VII, 43 c ; rations for the household of Šubat-Enlil. References to Šubat-Enlil in the Ma’er letters show that skilled men, ploughs, etc., had to be sent to this palace, built in an uncultivated area. The new site cannot therefore be the city of Ashur.

¹¹ B. Landsberger in *Belleten*, II, 252, and again *JCS.*, VIII, 56, Anm. 31.

¹² *ARM.*, XV, 184, “ ce point de passage ”, as if apposition ; adverbial.

¹³ ḪI-mu-uš, possibly Tamuš for Talmuš ?

“land”, that is for the Assyrian territory, Yapaḥ(a)-Ada(d) raised a beacon-fire, and all the townsmen, *alanū*, of the bank of the land Ursu accepted it, that is the signal. Mašum did not attack; the troops brought across, *naburum*, were numerous and stood to the casements, and he feared lest they might smash (with missiles) his own troops. The officer suffered for his failure, his household was attainted.¹ “This bank” for the Assyrian could only be the east bank, which was Assyrian territory; the bank of the land of Ursu must therefore be the west bank. The view expressed in a discussion of the references to Ursu in the Ma’er letters that this report could be reconciled with the location at Urfah² was always a paradox.

This attack on the Assyrians was the beginning of the end of their domination at that time in Mesopotamia. Some years earlier Shamshi-Adad had been the recognized suzerain of the ruler of the Rabbaya, of the ruler of Carchemish, of the ruler of Ḥaššum and of the ruler of Ursu, and had made a plan for an attack on one Sumu-epuḥ, should he send a hostile answer to some proposition made to him; this plan was communicated to the sub-king of Qatanum, almost certainly the hill region between the lower Khabur and the Balikh, with an invitation to join in the expedition since he had complained about raids by Sumu-epuḥ.³ The western rulers were to “shake the hand (free)” from Sumu-epuḥ in Shamshi-Adad’s presence.⁴ The troops of Ḥaššum had already joined those of Shamshi-Adad, more Assyrian troops than had been asked for were to be sent to Ursu, and had already been posted for the expedition. In a letter which contains instructions for this campaign addressed to Yašmaḥ-Ada(d) he was told to go to Tuttul, on the Euphrates bend south of Carchemish⁵; Sumu-epuḥ on hearing news of the ukase, *tuqqu*, for this march would retire, the “sons of Yamina”, men of the right bank, were to be reassured and the harvest gathered.⁶ There was, then, to be a three-fold, possibly a four-fold, attack, by the troops of Shamshi-Adad and Ḥaššum on the north side, east of the Euphrates, by Carchemish and Ursu from the west bank (the reason why Ursu was reinforced and not ordered to join the main column), by Yašmaḥ-Ada(d) who was to cover the south, and possibly by a column from Qatanum. There is no doubt that the campaign planned

¹ *ARM.*, IV, 5/5-9. A Turukku was to be withdrawn from the general levy to be sent to Babylon; he had been serving with Mašum, but the administration had sent Mašum’s household away, *bit Mašim ekallum irdi*, so Yašmaḥ-Ada(d) is to have the Turukku found. *ARM.*, V, 46, a plea for the release of the wife of Mašum from servitude.

² J.-R. Kupper in *RA.*, XLIII, 80, 83.

³ *ARM.*, I, 24.

⁴ *qatam napasu*; the nuance is to be understood from the use of the same root in the same idiom in Syriac, “to have nothing to do with someone or something.”

⁵ It was the police post for river traffic on the Euphrates at the border between Carchemish and Ma’er, *ARM.*, V, 9. This precludes a location at the mouth of the Balikh, a marshy delta, unless on the south Euphrates bank. *JCS.*, VII, 53, col. iii, 3-5 [*pa-al-gi ba-at-tum . . . Tuttul . . . Ahuna* conforms to other indications, see *JRAS.*, 1928, 874. Battum is Abattum, *Syria*, XXXII, 7, iii, 8.

⁶ *ARM.*, I, 43.

was carried out ; later, word was sent to Yašmaḥ-Ada(d) that Sumu-epuḥ was dead.¹

Yaḥdun-Lim, the hereditary enemy of Shamshi-Adad, had conquered the whole of Palmyrene and parts of Mesopotamia before Shamshi-Adad seized the throne at Ashur. He defeated Sumu-epuḥ of Yamḥad, and was the acknowledged suzerain of kings of Zalmakum, the marshy region between the Euphrates and the lower Balikh. When Shamshi-Adad was effecting his own extension of power to the western Euphrates one of these kings, Abi-samar, wrote to his suzerain in Ma'er asking aid ; he had not lost cities when the rulers of Ḥaššum and Ursu, the rulers of Carchemish and Yamḥad, were at war with him, cities had subsequently been lost in the war with Shamshi-Adad.² The phraseology does not absolutely necessitate, but it does suggest, the inference that all the four rulers mentioned had been allied in a single war against Abi-samar, probably after he himself had accepted the suzerainty of Yaḥdun-Lim and they themselves were still at war with the king of Ma'er.³ The king of Yamḥad at that time can only have been Sumu-epuḥ. In the later Assyrian war against a Sumu-epuḥ Ḥaššum participated and had therefore a common border with that king's territory, in the war against Abi-samar Ḥaššum joined Sumu-epuḥ in a war against a kingdom in Zalmakum. There is no discrepancy from the inference drawn from the disposition of troops by Shamshi-Adad, provided that some territory east of the Euphrates was in the hands of Sumu-epuḥ of Yamḥad ; it is in fact clear that Irrid, certainly on the east bank or further east, was in the hands of a king of Yamḥad.⁴

In the discussion of the location of Ursu based on these letters it was rightly stated that Shamshi-Adad had no control over Yamḥad.⁵ That "great kingdom" acknowledged Zimri-Lim after his flight from Ma'er on the assassination of his father, when he went up to Aleppo and was acknowledged as king there ; the state god accepted a dedication by him.⁶ But the borders of Yamḥad must have varied considerably during these years ; sometimes Carchemish and Ursu acted as sub-kingdoms, sometimes they were forced to acknowledge Assyrian suzerainty and act against

¹ ARM., I, 91.

² ARM., I, 1.

³ *ina nikurti . . . ul ihliqu, ina nikurti . . . ihtalqu* ; the apposition is best rendered "in one war . . . in another war" ; the I 2 form in the second clause has its usual force of an aspect, an action or state secondary to some previous action, or having a secondary effect.

⁴ D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets*, no. 1. At the beginning of line 4 read (*al*)*Irridi KI GUB.BA-ma*. The alignment of this tablet cannot be adequately represented in a copy and has not been described by Mr. Wiseman ; his transliteration needs correction, for *ša-ab-šu ik-šu-ud* is an over-run, cf. over-runs in 6 and 9. I copied this tablet several times.

⁵ J.-R. Kupper in *RA.*, XLIII, 81-2.

⁶ Date formulae. The 32 formulae include five of the "year after" type. Zimri-Lim was not in Ma'er till the 16th year of Ḥammu-rabi of Babylon and ruled there at most 17 years. Ten date formulae belong to his kingship in exile. The chronology depends on the unquestionable evidence of a date formula, not a figure, which proves that an oath by Shamshi-Adad was sworn in the 10th year of Ḥammu-rabi. Otherwise A. Parrot, *Archéologie mésopotamienne*, II, 345, note 23.

Yamḥad. It is then unsound to argue that the land of Ursu could not extend to the west bank of the Euphrates north of Carchemish because Yamḥad at times extended its authority that far. The position of the city of Ursu is not decided by the extension of its territory, beyond the inference that the city lay within the land and therefore west of the river. It would seem that the land Ursu could also be called Ibla KI ; a sub-king of Alalaḥ, the son of the Yarim-Lim who became king of Yamḥad, asked the king of Ibla for his daughter as bride to his own son, an indication that this was a sub-kingdom of Yamḥad, while Uriš in the Alalaḥ documents, named only later, was kept as a designation of the city.

The leader of the attack on Assyrian territory, Yapaḥ(a)-Ada(d), who summoned the townsmen of the land Ursu to his assistance, bore the same name as an envoy sent to Ari-šenni, the kinglet of Naḥur and Burundu, when that person had espoused the cause of Zimri-Lim, before the Assyrians were driven from Mesopotamia ; the embassy finished, he returned to Yarim-Lim of Yamḥad and Apla-Ḥanda of Carchemish.¹ A wife of a Yapaḥ-Ada(d) impressed her seal on a document² summarizing a case about property belonging to a branch of the royal family³ brought before Niqmi-epuḥ, the son⁴ of Yarim-Lim of Yamḥad⁵ and successor⁶ of

¹ Text edited by C.-F. Jean in *Semitica*, I, p. 22.

² D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets*, no. 7.

³ Abba-il son of Ammu-rabi in this text cannot be Abba-il of Yamḥad son of Ḥammu-rabi and father of Yarim-Lim of Yamḥad, seal impressions 444 *a* and *b*. Abba-il the suzerain after a revolt of sub-kings called "brothers" gave Alalaḥ to Yarim-Lim in exchange for Irrid, east of the Euphrates, no. 1, a charter like the land charters. His *akil tamkare* Irpa-Ada(d), at a time when Yarim-Lim was his "brother" at Alalaḥ, no. 56, was the father of Samšu-Ada(d) *akil tamkare* in the reign of Niqmi-epuḥ, who began his service in the reign of Yarim-Lim. Nos. 76 and 77 belong to the reign of the suzerain. Abba-il the *mar šarri* of no. 346 is probably the son of Ammi-taqu to whom a not unimportant town was assigned as an inheritance share, *zillu*, provided he made no further claim, no. 86 ; he is not the Abba-il of no. 7, and not the suzerain. For the name used for private persons cf. the bowman of no. 206 or the goldsmith of no. 348. The same name is written Ab-be-li-im-ma, which is to be compared with Abba-DINGIR.MEŠ ; the crasis shows that the fashionable *Abban* is erroneous.

⁴ Seal impression *e* of no. 7. Ir-Kabtum *mar šarri* witnessed no. 96, dated "year Niqmi-epuḥ became king (the event of the previous year) ; year there was plague in the land," not a proof that Ir-Kabtum was king at Alalaḥ in that reign, as stated on p. 3 of the publication. Text no. 52 is dated in the next or a subsequent year, "year of the plague ; 2nd time," not the same year, as stated p. 4. The witness on the envelope of no. 61, an act of Ammi-taqu, dated in the 1st year of Yarim-Lim, could, but need not, be the future king ; the *akil ride* of no. 54 cannot be, any more than the man of Ippa, cited in the index under Niqmepa king of Yamḥad, no. 142 (a Level IV text), or the son of Ešbi-Ada(d) of no. 8, also listed as the king.

⁵ The father of Ammi-taqu, the king of Alalaḥ, was named Yarim-Lim, seal impression 443 *b*, and he assigned his kingdom and possessions to Ammi-taqu in his lifetime, as Ammi-taqu did to his son Ḥammu-rabi who died before him, no. 6/9-10. When this assignment was the subject of a claim Yarim-Lim the king renewed it ; Ammi-taqu was king of Alalaḥ in the first year of Yarim-Lim of Yamḥaḥ. A unique endowment for burial rites to be carried out by Nakkušše, no. 126, contains in the first lines a denial that Yarim-Lim committed sin against the "brother-man", a direct reference to no. 1. All these references could be to the same person. Yarim-Lim the *mar šarri* in the time of Ammi-taqu, ration issues 247, 249, 255, 258, 272, who had in his service *amele* BA.ZI, *nasiḥu* (men called up with the general levy and then removed from their district for special employment), became king of Alalaḥ in the reign of

Ḥammu-rabi of Yamḥad.¹ The reigns of the kings of Yamḥad in the Alalah archive, though four generations are attested, cover a comparatively short space of time,² as is shown by the names of members of the family and of officials. By the time of the earliest document, the charter of Yarim-Lim and his descendants at Alalah, a city east of the Euphrates was already possessed by Yamḥad. "The land of Ursu," though that is mentioned to the exclusion of Ibla in the Ma'er letters, does not occur in the Alalah archive, but Ibla does; when the sub-king of Alalah sought a wife for his son Ir-Kabtum, that is towards the end of his reign, he approached the king of Ibla, almost certainly then a member of the Yamḥad confederation.³ An area called by two different names in two different sets of documents might possibly prove that the documents are not contemporary, but it does not necessarily do so; Ibla was the old geographical name, Ursu was the city which became the capital of an enlarged city state.

If it were really necessary to distinguish the Sumu-epuḥ of Yamḥad defeated by Yaḥdun-Lim from the Sumu-epuḥ killed in the war with

Niqmi-epuḥ, no. 52, and Nakkušše made a claim against him based on his father's assignment, nos. 9, 10, probably an allusion to no. 126. He was still king of Alalah in the first year of Ir-Kabtum, 38/8. As Ammi-taqu remained king till the reign of Ir-Kabtum, Yarim-Lim II of Alalah was presumably co-regent with his father. The tables in the publication, p. 3, and *JCS.*, VIII, 51-2, are not reliable.

⁶ Ammi-taqu was man or king of Alalah in the reigns of (a) Yarim-Lim, nos. 61, 79 (which mentions the right of the suzerain to examine resale of a royal property); (b) of Ḥammu-rabi, nos. 21, 22; (c) of Niqmi-epuḥ, no. 55, and (d) of Ir-Kabtum, no. 54, where Ir-Kabtum the son of Ammi-taqu cannot be Ir-Kabtum of the date formula, the suzerain. The father of the suzerain was Niqmi-epuḥ, since Mr. Wiseman's restoration is surely correct, seal impression 443 a. Since Ammi-taqu was confirmed in his succession in the first year of Yarim-Lim of Yamḥad, there should be no question of Ḥammu-rabi the suzerain in the time of Ammi-taqu being the predecessor of Yarim-Lim, as in the table in the publication. But Niqmi-epuḥ and Ir-Kabtum must be later than Ḥammu-rabi.

¹ In no. 1/8-9 the proposed restoration "Yarim-Lim son of Ḥammu-rabi" is based on the assumption that Yarim-Lim who was given Alalah was the blood brother of Abba-il, and that the Ḥammu-rabi mentioned is Ḥammu-rabi the father of Abba-il of Yamḥad; it is supposed to be supported by the identification with Abba-il the son of Ammu-rabi of no. 7, in the reign of Niqmi-epuḥ, an impossibility. The use of "brother" in these texts for the relation of suzerain and sub-king is parallel to the use of "father" and "son" in the Ma'er texts for the relation of suzerain and client king; a different type of confederation is indicated. The restoration of *KUB.*, XXXI, no. 5/2, is not historical evidence for the relationship of Ḥammu-rabi to Yarim-Lim, though the text almost certainly refers to the kings mentioned in the Ma'er archive. The Ammu-rabi of no. 7 is probably the Ḥammu-rabi who was assigned the whole inheritance of Ammi-taqu, and died before the reign of Niqmi-epuḥ, when Yarim-Lim was co-regent.

² Yarim-Lim took Arazik on the Euphrates, probably in the war against the Assyrians for Zimri-Lim; he defeated Ešnunna in battle, almost certainly in the war of Zimri-Lim and Ḥammu-rabi of Babylon against Ibal-pi-EI II, the *sukkallu* of Elam and Atamrum of Andariq, after the 16th year of Ḥammu-rabi of Babylon; Niqmi-epuḥ returned from Isin, and his visit there is to be connected with the greater favour shown to envoys from Yamḥad than to envoys from Zimri-Lim. The alliance of Babylon and Yamḥad would explain the otherwise inexplicable victories of Ḥammu-rabi over an alliance of powers individually as strong as he.

³ Text 35, an advance to Ir-Kabtum *mar šarri*, "in the year of Ammi-taqu the king (LUGAL.E) when he sued for the daughter of the man of Ibla KI for his son," almost certainly giving the occasion for the advance. The theory that this is a date formula proving that Ammi-taqu assumed independence arises from the failure to distinguish the suzerain Ir-Kabtum from Ir-Kabtum son of Ammi-taqu, the *šangu*, text 55/15.

Shamshi-Adad, or the Yarim-Lim of Yamḥad in the Ma'er archive from the Yarim-Lim of the Alalah archive, or the Yapaḥ(a)-Ada(d) who invaded Assyrian territory from the envoy of Yarim-Lim of Yamḥad, or both from Yapaḥ-Ada(d) whose wife was a priestess of the state goddess of Yamḥad, it would have to be granted that this is a most remarkable series of homonyms. Homonyms are of course frequent,¹ homonyms with the same title rare, a series of such very rare indeed. Historical reconstructions that rely on the possibility of a very rare chance should be grounded on a historical basis, such as is not provided by a theory about what personal names were used in Syria in the time of Ḥammu-rabi of Babylon, because there is no sound evidence as to what the personal names in Syria were in the 18th century.² It cannot be argued that the story that seems to result from the two archives of Ma'er and Alalah presents incompatibilities; the details form a perfectly coherent series of events that give an account of a developing political struggle.

Though the consideration of the references in the Ma'er letters to the land of Ursu did not lead, as it might have done, to abandonment of the location at Urfah, a new proposal arose from further study of the place names in the Kültepe tablets,³ namely north of the Euphrates. In a later discussion⁴ it was stated that from the city Ursu to Mama was an alternative route for that by Ḥaḥḥu and Timelkia, supposed to be a straight route from Šimala to Kaneš; Ursu was said to be north of the Euphrates where it flows roughly from east to west between Samsat and Birijik. This, it was argued, accounted for the attitude of Aleppo and Carchemish during the siege by Hattusilis I; but no evidence was adduced to show that at the time of that king either Aleppo or Carchemish had borders so far north, well within territory normally Hittite. The position under Hattusilis generally assumed⁵ does not permit the conclusion.

Doubtless it was this consideration, combined with the Ma'er letters, that led to the tacit withdrawal of former identifications with Urfah and north of the Euphrates in favour of a location of both Ḥaššum and Ursu west of the river, with Carchemish and Aleppo,⁶ though no precise reason was given. The compass has thus been nearly, but not quite, boxed, for

¹ For example, Paratarna in Alalakh text no. 3, not called king, is a homonym of a king who died at Nuzi, when a piece of cloth issued for the burial was burnt. As Paratarna in no. 3 swore an oath with king Idri-mi, of Mukišhe, he must be the envoy of the other party to the treaty, Pillia of Qizzuwadana(?); suzerains do not swear oaths to abide by treaties between sub-kings. But Zukraši (?) who has the same title as a Zukraši (?) in an unpublished text from Boğazköi, *JCS.*, VIII, 52, is much less likely to be a homonym; in which case the date of the Boğazköi text which is said to be connected with *KUB.*, XXXI, 5, depends on the date of the Alalah archive.

² How misleading theories of this kind can be is illustrated by the classification of a set of names as East Canaanite, with the consequence that most of these East Canaanites are now found in the west.

³ Bilgiç in *AfO.*, XV, 24-5.

⁴ A. Goetze in *JCS.*, VII, 69-70.

⁵ O. R. Gurney, *The Hittites*, 22-3.

⁶ B. Landsberger in *JCS.*, VIII, 64, col. ii. The location shows that the original argument from the Kültepe tablets was erroneous, see above (p. 35, note 5).

west of the Euphrates in this connexion can only mean west of the reach between Birijik and Carchemish, the location of Ursu that was practically certain from the start. Unfortunately Ḫaššum has now been dragged to the wrong side of the river through collocation with Ursu.

The extension of the land Ursu to the west bank of the Euphrates does not fix the site of the city, except generally. References to cities which suddenly became kingdoms, then relapsed again, are confused by the failure of the texts to distinguish clearly between a city and the kingdom ruled by a city state, though a sort of distinction occurs irregularly, through the prefixed *mat*, or the post-fixed KI. The boundaries of these kingdoms did not conform to neat shapes that can be drawn on a small scale map ; even contour maps can be delusive. The point that may interest Professor Garstang, who knows the terrain so well, is that the land Ursu, extending from the Amanus to the Euphrates north of Carchemish, covered the approach to Syria. Throughout the 18th century it acted in agreement with Carchemish, first as an ally of the Assyrians against Sumu-epuḫ, then as an ally of Zimri-Lim against the Assyrians, at the time of the attack on Šallul, when both Carchemish and Ursu were probably under the control of Yamḫad. By the time of Suna-assura, about 1380, Ursu was a city in Qizzuwadana, Urussa, and it was almost certainly included in that land in the time of Telepinus, when Ispuṭ-aḫsu was "great king", for that title generally implies sub-kingdoms. In the 15th century archive from Alalah Ursu appears as Uriš, Urešši, without mention of Qizzuwadana, but it was obviously still an important trade centre, almost certainly because it was a market for the log trade, as in the time of GU.DE.A. The political change west of the Euphrates, south of the Taurus, was, then, considerable between the time of Mursilis I and that of Telepinus.

Telepinus destroyed the city Ḫassuwa, which is associated in his decree with Zizzilippa, and quite clearly dissociated from Lawazantia.¹ He had a treaty with Qizzuwadana, which therefore no longer shared the political attitude of Ḫaššum, if Ḫassuwa is the Hittite name of the capital of that land. One change in the political situation was, then, that the Hittites had an ally in the power ruling the approach to northern Syria west of the Euphrates, but an enemy just south of the Taurus east of the Euphrates. The political formations of the 18th century in Mesopotamia broke up during the rise of the kingdoms of the Ḫurri confederation under dynasts with Indo-Aryan names ; the Amorite dynasts in northern Syria and along the Euphrates valley down to Babylon were swept away in the time of Hattusilis I and Mursilis I. The change from the conditions in the time

¹ J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*, II, 59, lines 16–19. The text *KUB.*, XXVI, no. 41, transliterated and translated in A. Goetze, *Kizzuwatna*, 64–6, is an adjuration of the Hittite king Arnuwandas to the men, that is the military nobles, of Ismirikka, allocating individuals to new posts in two provinces of the Hittite Empire. This hardly proves the thesis advanced by Goetze. Qizzuwadana ceased to exist as an independent state after the death of Suna-assura, the appointment of Telepinus the younger as priest of the state goddess meant that it was reduced to a province. The Hittite king should be Arnuwandas IV, as Sayce thought. This is the last occurrence of Urussa.

of Mursilis I to those of the time of Telepinus had not destroyed Hittite influence in Ibla and Ursu, in Qizzuwadana, but east of the Euphrates the resistance of Ḫassuwa must have been due to support from the Ḫurri kingdoms. The struggle for the northern Euphrates valley up to Isuwa was beginning ; the sequel can be found in the wars of Suppiluliu-ma. The details are of course completely obscure.