

## Traveling in Ancient Anatolia: Two New Sources from Karum Kanesh

KLAAS R. VEENHOF\*

### Özet

Anadolu'nun en erken tarihsel dönemlerinin anlaşılması bakımından Kaniş'in aşağı kentinde yaşamış olan Eski Assur tüccarlarına ait arşivlerin hayati bir önemi bulunmaktadır. Söz konusu tüccarlar, yerel Anadolu egemenleri veya insanlarıyla olan politik, ticari ya da kişisel temelde çeşitli ilişkilerini belgelemiştir. Sözleşmeler ve mektuplar Anadolu maddi kültürünün geçim kaynakları, yerel adetleri ve dinsel inanışları gibi çeşitli konuları hakkında bilgilendirmektedir. Unvanlar ve ya meslekler Anadolu'lular ve Assurlular arasındaki anlaşmazlıklar, görüşmeler, ortak kararlar ve anlaşmaların metinlerde belgelenmiş olması, idari yapının işleyişini kavramamıza yardımcı olmaktadır. Çok sayıda Anadolu'lu şahıslara ait isimlerin varlığı ile metinlerde Assurluların geçtikleri, ticaret yaptıkları ya da yaşadıkları belirtilen kent ve yerleşimlere ait düzinelerce isim ise yerel halkın bileşimine ışık tutmaktadır.

For the reconstruction of the earliest history of Anatolia the archives of the Old Assyrian traders, settled in the lower city of Kanesh, are of vital importance. They document a variety of contacts with the local Anatolian authorities and populations, both on a political, a commercial and on a more personal level. Contracts and letters acquaint us with aspects of Anatolian material culture, local economies, legal customs, and religion. Titles and professional designations and texts recording conflicts, negotiations, agreements and treaties between Anatolians and Assyrians provide us with insights into the administrative structures. The great number of Anatolian personal names shed light on the composition of the population and the texts mention dozens of cities and towns where Assyrians had settled, traded, or which they had passed during their many trips.

All these aspects have been studied in the past, but many questions remain, because most texts reflect Assyrian interests and were not meant to tell their readers more on ancient Anatolia than what was of immediate commercial interest. Moreover, the information they provide, apart from that in a small number of official letters, diplomatic documents, and a few texts discovered in the palace of Kanesh, is usually short, laconic or accidental. It only became more specific when events interfered with the trade and the recipients of letters had to be informed in order to prevent or repair problems. But our knowledge keeps growing, thanks to the publication of new texts, in particular of the archives excavated since 1948 and kept in the Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi at Ankara, which started in 1990. This asks for an updating and revision of much of what was written in the past, but it has to be done with care, because of the nature of the sources, which also become known only piecemeal. There is a risk of a too fast and optimistic combination and interpretation of scattered data, which derive from many

different archives, refer to various cities and areas, and frequently cannot be accurately dated.

One of the areas where progress is needed is that of ancient Anatolian geography, vital for understanding the patterns of the trade and the expansion of Assyrian commercial presence in Anatolia, which is now attested in ca. forty different towns, harbouring Assyrian "colonies" (*kārum*) or "trading stations" (*wabartum*). The new sources allow an update of K. Nashef's *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der altassyrischen Zeit* of 1991, and a better reconstruction of the topography to discover the location and role of the main trading cities and routes used by the Assyrian caravans. Much is still uncertain due to the absence of descriptive texts and real itineraries, and because Kanesh, Hattuša and Amkuwa still are the only cities identified by excavation. Most other identifications are at best probabilities, based on a combination of textual data (including those provided by the growing number of Hittite sources), topographic facts (relations to other towns, roads, rivers, river crossings, mountains, and passes), and archaeological observations. Many are disputed as the study of some recent maps of ancient Anatolia and of the different proposals for locating important cities such as Purušhattum and Turhumit<sup>1</sup> shows.

My lack of archaeological expertise and familiarity with the landscape do not allow me to offer geographical reconstructions, which in due time will be proposed in a dissertation which is being prepared by Gojko Barjamovic, a Ph.D. student of Copenhagen. The aim of this article is more modest: making known to researchers of Anatolia's history, as the jubilarian to whom this volume is dedicated, some new geographical data, culled from the archives excavated in 1991 and the beginning of 1992 (bearing kt 91/k and kt 92/k),<sup>2</sup> whose publication has been kindly entrusted to me by the director of the Kanesh-Kültepe excavations, Professor Tahsin Özgüç.

Many of the geographical data they contain are additional references to well-known towns with Assyrian commercial settlements or visited by their caravans. But we also meet new towns or villages, such as Hanigga (kt 91/k 437: 6), Kutia (kt 92/k 3: 18), Tahadizina (kt 91/437: 21), Tapaggaš (kt 91/k 437: 19), Tarkua (kt 91/k 424: 7), Tipurzia (kt 91/k 108: rev.2'), Tumelia (kt 91/k 345: 19), and Wazina (kt 91/k 437: 9). The new texts also show that Kuburnat (kt 91/k 176: 21f.), Šinahuttum (kt 92/k 194: 18), Tišmurna (kt 92/k 200: 5), Ušpukatum (kt 91/k 424: 12), and Zimišhuna (kt 91k 202: 19f.) had a *wabartum*, and Tawinia during the level II period a *kārum* (kt 92/k 96:20), facts not yet recorded in Nashef 1991.<sup>3</sup> Anatolian rulers mentioned (by means of nisbe formations) are those of Hattuš (kt 92/k 194: 43f.), Wahšušana (kt 92/k 234: 4f.), Tipurzia (kt 92/108: 2'), and we meet men from Ubra (*ub-ra-e-im*, kt 91/k 546: 6), Ebla (kt 91/k 338: 2; owes silver for wool), and copper of Tapašata (*ta-pá-ša-ta-i-am*; kt 91/k 390: 6).<sup>4</sup>

Of special importance for a reconstruction of the geography are sources where a number of towns and topographical features occur in a sequence or combination which offers insight into their relationship. Kt 91/k 416, in connection with a caravan loaded with tin, which arrives from Hahhum (probably the site of Samsat on the Euphrates), states

### 1. Kt 91/k 437 (inv. 1-290-91)

1 1/2 GÍN AN.NA *i-na a-al Bu-ut-/n]a-tim*  
*a-É wa-áb-ri a-dí-in*  
6 GÍN AN.NA *i-na pá-tí ša*  
*Ha-na-ak-na-ak a-šar ni-IS-GA-/ru*  
*a-na É ub-ri a-dí-in*  
3 GÍN AN.NA *i-na Ha-ni-ga*  
*wa-sa-i-ni a-na É ub-ri*  
*a-dí-in* 3 GÍN AN.NA *i-na*  
*Wa-zi-da a-na É ub-ri a-dí-in*  
6 GÍN AN.NA *a-na ni-is-ha-tim*  
*ša TÚG.HI.A i-na Ha-na-ak-na-ak*  
*a-dí-in* 14 GÍN KÜ.BABBAR  
*ši-im < > áš-qúl* 3 GÍN AN.NA  
*iš-tù Ha-na-ak-na-ak*  
*i-<wa>-sa-i-a a-na É ub-ri-'ni*  
*a-dí hu-lu-qá-e ni-iš-e-ú*  
*a-dí-in* 3 GÍN AN.<NA> *i-na a-al*  
*Ku-pi-il<sub>5</sub>-ša-an a-dí-in* 1 1/2 GÍN  
*i-na Ta-pá-ga-áš a-kà-ši-im*  
*a-dí-in hi-dam* AN.NA *a-na*  
*a-lá-hi-nim ša Ta-ha-dí-zi-na*  
*1/2 ma-na URUDU a-né-bar-tim*  
*i-ša Tur<sub>4</sub>-hu-mi-it a-dí-in*  
3 *ma-na URUDU SIG<sub>5</sub> ni-is-ha-/tim*  
*i-na Tur<sub>4</sub>-hu-mi-it a-kà-/ši-im*  
*a-dí-in* 5 *ma-na URUDU*  
*SIG<sub>5</sub> i-nu-mi a-na Wa-ah-šu-ša-na*  
*'ur~ -ki TÚG.HI.A i-li-ku a-qá-tí*  
*l<sub>1</sub>-li-ús-ra-ni a-dí-in*  
10 *ma-na URUDU ši-kam lu a-É ub-ri*  
*lu gám-ri i-na Wa-ah-šu-ša-na*

that it should not be shipped on "beyond Šalahšuwa" (*ebar Š.*, lines 16f.), but, for reasons of safety, "beyond Timilkia to Turhumit" (lines 20f.). Kt 91/k 345 mentions the sale of textiles for silver in Purušhattum (line 4) and continues by listing how this silver was spent in Kaniš, Tumelia, Wahšušana, Ullama and Purušhattum. The memorandum Kt 92/k 111 lists travel expenses subsequently met in Wahšušana, Kaniš, Huruma (for Hurama), Timilkia, Hahhum, Burullum, before arriving in Assur. Kt 91/k 424, already used by Dercksen in his study of the geography of the copper trade.<sup>5</sup> Registers expenses in Šalatuwar, Tarkua, Purušhattum, Ušpukatum, Purušhattum, Šalatuwar, Wahšušana, Turhumit, Kaniš and again Wahšusana. These records, though mentioning a few new towns, in general cover fairly familiar ground, the trip from Assur to Kaniš and journeys to the west of Kaniš, beyond the Kızılırmak, until Purušhattum.

In what follows I present two other such records, which deal with trips in the area north of Hurama and Kanish and across the Kızılırmak to or in what was called "the land of Hattum" and in Hittite sources "The Upper Land". They mention a number of new and less well-known towns, visited during what seems to have been in each case one single journey.

1 1/2 shekel of tin in the town of Butnātum  
I gave to the caravanserai.  
6 shekels of tin in the area of  
Hanaknak, where we .....,  
5 I gave to the caravanserai.  
3 shekels of tin, when we left  
Hanigga, I gave to the caravanserai.  
3 shekels of tin I gave in Wazida  
to the caravanserai.  
10 6 shekels of tin I gave in Hanaknak  
l. e. as import tax on the textiles.  
14 shekels of silver as price  
<of .....> I paid. 3 shekels of tin,  
rev. when I left Hanaknak I gave to our  
15 caravanserai, while we had  
searched for goods lost.  
3 shekels of tin I gave in the town  
of Kupilšan. 1 1/2 shekel I gave  
in Tapaggaš to the chief.  
20 A *hiddu*-bead of tin for the  
"steward" of Tahadizina.  
1/2 pound of copper I gave for the  
crossing in the area of Turhumit.  
3 pounds of refined copper, import tax,  
25 in Turhumit I gave to the chief.  
u. e. 5 pounds of refined copper  
I put at the disposal of Ili-usranni,  
when he went to Wahšušana  
le. e. in pursuit of my textiles.  
30 10 pounds of *šikku*-copper for the caravanserai and expenses in Wahšušana.

Notes on the text

1. I take *butnātum* as “pistachio trees/nuts”, a word not yet attested in Old Assyrian. While its occurrence in Anatolia is not surprising, the use of an Assyrian name is, since Assyrians normally use native Anatolian town names. Did the writer translate an Anatolian name or did he call the village in question -whose name he did not know- after a prominent feature, its trees? The latter might explain why it is not a real place name, but a designation of the type “the town of...” (*āl* ...). This type of place-name is attested with “the town of” followed by a personal name, a divine name, a gentilic, or a noun referring to a specific local feature. Cf. *āl Kupišan* (our text lines 17f.), *āl I-a-ša* (Ka 1113: 4, contracted to *A-li-a-ša* in CCT 2, 39: 26), *al ZI-ZI-im*, “the town of .....”,<sup>6</sup> *āl<sup>d</sup>UTU*, “the town of the sungod”,<sup>7</sup> *āl issurātīm*, “the town of the birds” (kt 92/k 237: 3), *āl ti-im-ni-e*, “the town of .....” (kt 92/k 251: 18 and 252: 16). The latter is perhaps a gentilic, comparable to *ālūm ša Hatti’ē* (KTS 1, 8a: 41), and especially

to *āl Kà-ni-ši-e/i*, “the town of the Kaneshites”, now attested in kt 92/k 103: 14f. and 108: 6. This town is not identical to Kanesh, but must be a settlement or colony in the south-east, beyond the plain of Elbistan, perhaps not far from the Euphrates. It occurs in two records of expenses in towns visited on the caravan journey from Assur to Kanesh, listed in the order: (Assur) - Qattarā- Hamisānum - Burallum - *Bird/tu’um* - “the town of the Kaneshites” - Timilkia - Hurrama - Luhusaddia - Kanesh.

4. *ni-IS-GA-ru* cannot be a verb, also because the writer only uses the first pers. sing., and a reading *l.GIŠ*, “oil”, yielding “where oil .....”, is unlikely and leaves *GA-ru* unexplained.

13. *šim*, “price paid for .....”, with omission of the word for the item bought.

30. *šikku*-copper is “a primary smelting product containing many impurities”, whose value was usually half or one-third of that of fine quality copper.<sup>8</sup>

2. kt 92/k 3 (inv. 1-53-93)

1 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR <i>i-na</i> <i>Hu-ra-ma a-na É</i> <i>ub-ri a-dī-in</i> <i>pá-zu-ur-tí TÚG.HI.A</i> <i>i-na Lu-hu-sà-dī-a</i> <i>a-na I-ku-pi-a DUMU Da-a-a</i> <i>a-dī-in</i> 3 GÍN AN.NA [x x x] HI.A <i>wa-bar-šu</i> ‘x’ [x x x x] <i>a-dī-in</i> [x x x x] ‘i’- <i>tí-tù-ri-im</i> [x x x x AN].NA <i>a-na É</i> [ <i>wa</i> ]- <i>áb-ri i-na</i> <i>Ša-mu-ha a-dī-in</i> 1 1/2 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR <i>a-na ig-ri ša bi<sub>4</sub>-il<sub>5</sub>-tim</i> <i>a-dī Ša-mu-ha a-dī-in</i> 3 GÍN AN.NA <i>i-na Ha-ti-pi<sup>2</sup>-it-ra</i> <i>a-dī-in</i> 1 1/2 GÍN AN.NA <i>i-na Ku-tí-a a-Ha-sà-nim / a-dī-in</i> 12 GÍN AN.NA <i>i-na</i> <i>Kà-ra-ah-na a-na GAL sí-ki-/tim</i> <i>a-dī-in iš-tù Kà-ra-/ah-na</i> <i>a-dī Ku-bu-ur-na-cat</i> 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR <i>ša bi<sub>4</sub>-lá-tim</i> <i>ik-šu-ud</i> 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR <i>ni-is-ha-tim a-BA-DÍ-GA</i> [x (x)] <i>a-dī-in</i> : 2 GÍN AN.NA <i>a-na É</i> [ <i>ub-ri</i> ] <i>a-dī-in</i>	One shekel of silver in Hurama I gave to the caravanserai. (The costs of) smuggling textiles I gave in Luhusaddia to Ikuppia, son of Dāya. Three shekels of tin [for .....] his lodging ... [x shekels of tin] I gave [to/for .....] at the bridge. rev. [x shekels of t]in I gave to the to the caravanserai in Šamuha. I gave 1 1/2 shekel of silver as wages of a porter until Šamuha. 3 shekels of tin I gave in Hatipitra. 1 1/2 shekel of tin I gave in Kutia to Hasānum. 12 shekels of tin I gave in Karahna to the commander. From Karahna until Kuburnat the costs of porters amounted to 3 shekels of silver. Six shekels of silver import-tax to/for ..... I gave. Two shekels of tin I gave to the caravanserai.
--	--

Notes on the text

4-6. See for such payments, usually to Assyrian transporters, K. R. Veenhof 1972, 314-6. The Assyrian mentioned in line 6 is known from CCT 4, 6f.: 5 (as transporter) and kt 91/k 141: 49. Smuggling could take place in various regions, but apparently rather often to get merchandise from the plain of Elbistan across the Kızılırmak, to the north, bypassing Kanesh. But the claim by H. Lewy<sup>9</sup> of a special smuggler’s road “from Akçadağ via Darende and Gürün straight to the river

Halys and on to the region of Alisar and Boğazköy”, is not justified.

8-9. HI.A could be the determinative of a missing plural noun, or the end of an Anatolian name. “His lodging” must refer to “money” the smuggler received for such expenses.

10. There are several references to bridges, most probably only for smaller rivers.<sup>10</sup> They are mentioned both as a topographical landmark (KTP 26: 2ff., wages paid to a transporter “until the bridge”; kt m/k 127: 5f., an escort

“which went until the bridge”) and as a facility for the use of which a fee had to be paid, registered as a payment “for” (*ana*, kt n/k 1582: 8), “at” (*ina*, kt t/k 25: 10), or “for the costs of” (*ana ša*, kt m/k 127: 8) the bridge. Bridges of course also made ideal tolls, hence in AKT 3, 34: 7, “they levied a toll of 20 shekels (of copper) per donkey at the bridge” (*ina titurrim ... issuhū*).

16. Cf. for the form the place-name Kapitra. I write *pi<sup>2</sup>*, because the sign looks more like GA than BI.

20. “Commander”, assuming that the well-known *rabi sikkitim* had a military function.

25. A reading *pāti Ka[niš]*, “the area of Kanesh”, is very unlikely, because the traveller is far to the north of that city. Moreover, a payment of taxes “to/for the area of ...” is strange, since one pays “in the area of ...” (cf. text 1: 3). This also seems to rule out a reading *pāti Ka[rahna]*, apart from the fact that in line 22 we are already in Kuburnat. Perhaps we have to restore an Anatolian name or title of the person to whom the payment is made.

Comments

Using texts like nos. 1 and 2 for geographical reconstructions is not without problems. They render account of expenses and places where nothing was paid therefore are absent and they also do not mention how many days the trip or its stages took. Further questions are whether the sequence of towns faithfully reflects the itinerary of a journey and, if so, whether it was a straight one, from the town first mentioned to the last one, or (also) comprised smaller trips from one or more “central places” to smaller towns in their neighbourhood, where merchandise was sold or bought.

Payment of expenses in silver, tin or copper may offer a clue, because in different areas, depending on the composition and provenience of the caravan, different types of “money” were used. Payments for lodging (*bēt ubrim/wabrim*, “caravanserai” or perhaps simply “inn”), for porters, and gifts to local dignitaries may occur anywhere, but those for “crossing” a river (*nēbartum*, 1: 23) or the use of a bridge (*titurrim*, 2: 10) are more informative. Payment of taxes due to the local authorities (*nishatum*) is also important, since this usually happened in more important towns passed en route, where some business was done. At times also the size of the payments (even though such records do not tell us how big the caravan was) may give a hint and that for “lodging” may indicate how many days one stayed somewhere. Unfortunately we do not know what was bought for the biggest amount, 14 shekels of silver, mentioned in 1: 12f., because the scribe forgot to mention what was paid for; perhaps a dead donkey had to be replaced.

Text 1

No point of departure is mentioned in text 1 and the first place for which expenses are listed, “Pistachio town”, is unknown. The caravan may have set out from the south, but also from Hattuš; we note that during the first stage of the trip expenses were paid in tin.

The first important town is Hanaknak. The writer travels “in the area of Hanaknak” (line 3f.), pays for lodging there (lines 15ff.), and is charged a small *nishatu*-tax for his textiles (line 10f.). Some information on what he did in Hanaknak may be derived from the amounts of tin paid for lodging. In “Pistachio town” 1 1/2 shekel, in Hanaknak 3 shekels, in the area of Hanaknak 6 shekels, in the town of Kupišan 3 shekels, and in Hanigga 3 shekels. If the fee for one day (cf. line 1) was 1 1/2 shekels, the traveller may have stayed in all 10 to 12 days in the area of Hanaknak, from where he made trips to the otherwise unknown towns of Hanigga (perhaps to be connected with Hittite Haniqqawa, attested in texts from Maşathöyük) and Wazida. Line 15f. mention the search for lost goods, which may have delayed his departure.

Hanaknak harboured an Assyrian trading settlement (*wabartum*),<sup>11</sup> and kt 89/k 230: 5-7 (courtesy Y. Kawasaki) surprises us by the information that the town had a “*kārum*-house”.<sup>12</sup> Kt 87/k 393: 12f. (courtesy K. Hecker) mentions an Assyrian “who lived in Hanaknak”, the writers of KTS 1, 37b and ICK 1, 31c // 33a ask their addressees to come or to send messages to them in Hanakanak, and that of CCT 6, 45c must have kept a box with silver there, which his addressee had opened. Kt 94/k 437 (courtesy Larsen) mentions the possibility of a demand for textiles in Kuburnat, Hanaknak or Turhumit.

The location of Hanaknak is unknown and it has been looked for to the north-east or east of Boğazköy.<sup>13</sup> The most recent proposal by Forlanini, which takes into account the geographical data of the Maşathöyük texts, where it occurs as Hanannaka,<sup>14</sup> is a location north of the Buzluk Dağ, on the Çekerek Irmak, ca. 35 km north-east of Şapinuwa (Ortaköy) and ca. 35 km north-west of Maşathöyük.<sup>15</sup>

Leaving Hanaknak the caravan reached Turhumit -where import tax was paid in copper, line 24ff.- via three thus far unattested towns or villages (lines 17-21), for which only small gifts to local dignitaries are booked, but no expenses for lodging, which means that it was not necessarily a trip of three days. The three towns are that of Kupišan, *Ta-pá-ga-áš*, and Tahadizina. The first may have been named after a person, and the name of the third, whose “steward” receives a bead of tin, contains the element Taha-, well-known from a few dozen Hittite topographical names. The third, whose chief (*kaššum*) receives a modest gift, might be identical to Hittite Tapig(g)a, the ancient name of Maşathöyük (attested some four centuries later); the different second vowel need not be a problem, cf. Hittite Taptaga alongside Taptiga. If this identification is correct, it would yield a fixed point and might be important for the location of Turhumit (Hittite Turmita), which (in this case) would have been reached from Hanaknak via Tapigga, hence by travelling (first) to the east. This is rather surprising, since Turhumit is generally looked for a few hundred kilometres further to the south-west. M. Forlanini’s last suggestion, also based on Hittite evidence on the province or land of Turmitta, is on the bank of the Kızılırmak, downstream of (“unterhalb”) Nenašša,<sup>16</sup> while J. G. Dercksen<sup>17</sup> suggests a location on the left bank, further upstream, north-east of the northern tip of

the Tuz gölü. In this connection it is interesting to learn from our line 22 that a small payment had to be made in the area of this town “for crossing”.

If we accept the equation Tapaggaš = Tapigga, our text seems to suggest a location of Turhumit more to the north-east, which fits some new evidence. The official *kārum*-letter kt 92/k 200, which deals with the collection of taxes, is addressed to the *wabartums* of Kuburnat, Hanaknak and Tišmurna,<sup>18</sup> and a related record (kt 92/k 194: 3ff.) lists taxes collected in Kuburnat, Hanaknak and Turhumit. Kt 94/k 442: 16f. (courtesy Larsen) mentions the possible sale of textiles in Kuburnat, Hanaknak or Turhumit, while in kt k/k 87: 5ff. (courtesy Hecker) a trader travelling to Kuburnat is asked to re-direct his shipment to Hanaknak. These data may imply that one could travel from Kuburnat via Hanaknak to Turhumit, whereby Kuburnat may have been the most (north-)easterly town of the three. Upon arrival in Turhumit (lines 23ff.) expenses are paid in copper, which is not surprising since Turhumit was the main copper market, and the caravan must have obtained it there in exchange for tin or textiles. This market function, however, also implies that it was not too far from the area where copper was found, for which there are again two options: the area north-east of Tokat and that stretching between Çankırı and Çorum, as shown on the map of J. G. Dercksen.<sup>19</sup> The latter might support a location of Turhumit in the north-east, somewhere between Çorum and Amasya.

Lines 26ff. finally mention that some expenses were paid in Wahšušana. A laconic statement suggests that one member of the caravan personnel had been sent off to follow the track of a lot of textiles, who was paid (his expenses or wages) when the caravan finally arrived in Wahšušana. There also additional small payments (i.e. for lodging) were made. If Wahšusana, usually located somewhere near the northern tip of the Tuz gölü, was indeed the final destination of the caravan (which may have taken along tin acquired in Turhumit), it might support J. G. Dercksen's location of Turhumit. It one opts for a location more to the north-east, it is surprising that no travel expenses are booked for the caravan trip from Turhumit to Wahšušana.

Text 2

Text 2 seems to deal with one single journey from the south to the north. It started in Hurama, usually located in or near the plain of Elbistan, to arrive by way of Luhusaddia, and perhaps

another town, mentioned in the damaged part of lines 8-10, in Šamuha, after crossing a river by means of a bridge (line 10). From there it went via the otherwise unknown towns of Hatipitra and Kutia to Karahna, to end in Kuburnat. The sequence of place-names in our text suggests that Luhusaddia (Hittite La[hu]wazantija, apparently not on the main road from Hahhum to Kanesh) was north of Hurama, perhaps somewhere in the region of Darende or Gürün, or south of Šarišša. Leaving Luhusaddia the caravan, apparently (if we may use this negative evidence) without passing the more easterly towns of Kuššara and Tegarama, headed to the north-west, for Šamuha. The location of this town is somewhat disputed,<sup>20</sup> but is usually located on the lower course of the Kızılırmak, near Sivas or ca. 40 km more to the west, at Kayalıpınar (M. Forlanini). This would fit the information that a river was crossed to reach it, but the existence of a bridge over the Kızılırmak is problematic. Karahna, an important Hittite cult centre, attested in texts from Boğazköy and Maşathöyük, would have been reached ca. two days after leaving Šamuha. The most probable location of Karahna, according to M. Forlanini,<sup>21</sup> seems to be Sulusaray on the Çekerek Irmak, ca. 35 km west of Šaduppa (located at Aktepe/Bolus). This would mean that the trip continued from Šamuha in a north-westerly direction.

The final destination was Kuburnat, also a *wabartum*,<sup>22</sup> (perhaps identical to Kapurnanta, attested once in Hittite sources), which occurs ca. twenty times in texts from *kārum* Kanish as a town where Assyrians travelled to do business or stayed. Above I presented some evidence on this city and its mention alongside Hanaknak and Turhumit. The letter TCL 14, 27 seems to indicate that it was situated in what was called (the land) Hattum, but all this unfortunately is rather vague.<sup>23</sup> The town is usually located somewhere to the north-east of Hattum, and the map of Larsen 2002, frontispiece, places it within the bend of the Yeşilirmak, but this must be too far to the north-east.

These new, in a way fairly informative texts, unfortunately do not answer our questions nor fix the location of important towns like Kuburnat and Turhumit. Nevertheless, the contexts in which they appear and especially the identification of Tapagaš with Tapigga, if correct, has again narrowed down the possibilities and indicated in which directions we have to look. With more such texts and especially with the help of more archaeological data we will in due time be able to recover the truth.

verdicts of this *wabartum*; courtesy K. Hecker) and by kt a/k 1258: 34f.  
12 When two Assyrians “entered the town of Hanaknak one seized them in the *kārum*-house”. This, in my opinion, does not mean that Assyrian settlement there had the status of *kārum*, but it must have been the Assyrian designation of the local trading facility, also used by the Assyrians.  
13 See Nashef 1991, 49 (“eine gewisse Beziehung zu Hattuš”, assuming a possible identification with Hittite Hanhana). Di Nocera and Forlanini 1992, 17 with Tav. X, mentioning its identification with Hittite Hananagga, propose a location in the basin of the Yeşilirmak, a little to the east of the Hittite “Upper Land”.  
14 See Del Monte 1992, 24.  
15 Forlanini 2002, with map p. 276.  
16 Forlanini 1992, 179.  
17 Dercksen 1996, 14, 154, 254 map A.. Same location in Di Nocera and

Forlanini 1992, Tav. X.  
18 See Çeçen 1997, 227. A parallel letter is sent to the *kārums* of Turhumit, Hattuš, Tamnia an Tuhpia, presumably the area more to the west of the *wabartums* just mentioned. The location of Tišmurna is still unclear.  
19 Dercksen 1996, 255, map B.  
20 See Wilhelm 2002, who indicates that even a location near the upper course of the Euphrates, hence north of Kuşaklı/Şarišša, is not impossible.  
21 Forlanini 2002, with map on p. 276.  
22 Not yet recorded in Nashef 1991, 72, but attested in kt a/k 403: 17f., 465: 18f.; 513: 14f.; kt 91/k 176: 21f., and kt 92/k 200  
23 This damaged letter RA 81 (1987) 20 no. 9, reports that Kasuwa, whose activities were the subject of TCL 14, 27, was not caught in Kuburnat, because “he is (now) staying in the land of [.....]rua”; he subsequently left this land and [travelled on] to Hurama.š

Bibliography

Bayram, S. 1998. “New and Some Rare Geographical Names in the Kültepe Texts.” H. Ertem, M. Ç. Şahin, A. Süel, F. Öktem ve S. Bayram (eds.), *Emin Bilgiç Anı Kitabı. Archivum Anatolicum/Anadolu Arşivleri* 3: 41-66.  
Çeçen, S. 1997. “Kaniš Kārum’unun Diğer Kārum ve Wabartumlar’a “K”.AN” (*amutum*) İle İlgili Önemli Talimatları.” *Belleten* 61/231: 219-32.  
Del Monte, G. F. 1992. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte Supplement*. Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 6/2. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.  
Dercksen, J. G. 1996. *The Old Assyrian Copper Trade in Anatolia*. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul.  
Di Nocera, G. M. and M. Forlanini. 1992. *Anatolia. La prima metà del II millennio A.C.* Atlante Storico del Vicino Oriente Antico 4/2. Roma: Università Degli Studi di Roma, (La Sapienza).  
Forlanini, M. 1992. “Am Mittleren Kızılırmak.” H. Otten, E. Akurgal, H. Ertem ve A. Süel (eds.), *Sedat Alp’a Armağan. Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern. Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp*, 171-9. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Forlanini, M. 2002. “Tapikka: una marca di frontiera. Note sulla struttura territoriale ed economica.” S. Martino and F. P. Daddi (eds.), *Anatolica Antiquae. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati I*, 255-77. Firenze: LoGisma.  
Lewy, H. 1963. “Neša.” *JCS* 17: 103-4.  
Michel, C. 1991. “Durhumid, son commerce et ses marchands.” D. Charpin and F. Joannès (eds.), *Marchands, diplomates et empereurs. Etudes sur la civilisation mésopotamienne offertes à Paul Garelli*, 253-74. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.  
Michel, C. 2003. *Old Assyrian Bibliography*. Old Assyrian Archives, Studies 1. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.  
Nashef, K. 1991. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der altassyrischen Zeit*. Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 4. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.  
Veenhof, K. R. 1972. *Aspects of Old Assyrian Trade and its Terminology*. Studia et Documenta ad Iura Orientis Antiqui Pertinentia 10. Leiden: Brill.  
Wilhelm, G. 2002. “Noch einmal zur Lage von Šamuha.” S. de Martino and F. P. Daddi (eds.), *Anatolica Antiquae. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati II*, 885-90. Firenze: LoGisma.

Footnotes

\* Klaas R. Veenhof, Professor Emeritus of Assyriology in Leiden and British Academy Visiting Professor. Schubertlaan 50, 2102 EM, Heemstede, Netherlands.  
1 See for the importance of this town, Michel, 1991.  
2 See for the sigla of the cuneiform tablets excavated at *kārum* Kanish and for the abbreviations of the text editions, Michel 2003, 145-53.  
3 See for additional data on new or rare geographical names also Bayram 1997.  
4 See for this town, a source of copper, equated with Hittite Tappaššanda, Dercksen 1996, 15, who proposes a location north or north-west of

Boğazköy.  
5 Dercksen 1996, 12 n. 32.  
6 Nashef 1991, 7, with discussion.  
7 Nashef 1991, 7.  
8 Dercksen 1996, 42.  
9 Lewy 1963, 104, who proposed to locate Neša, which she did not identify with Kanish, at or near one of the three Turkish towns mentioned.  
10 See Dercksen 1996, 13.  
11 The single reference for a *wabartum* of Hanaknak, recorded in Nashef 1991, 49, can now be supplemented by kt k/k 70: 21f. and 91: 29 (both