

and measuring stones, teaches us that the people of Anatolia were trying to conform to Mesopotamian fashion. However we can not say that the development within this style is exclusively the result of foreign influences. As the evolution sufficiently demonstrates the existence of a solid artistic base in Anatolia itself.

You will present the best examples of these during the Rencontre.

The research and study of the establishments of the ancient civilisations is not an end but simply a means. During the breathtaking speed of the technological advances of today, it is our duty to show to the younger generation the contribution of the past to where we are today and let them understand the significance of the past for a better future.

As a science and as a field of study research Assyriology, Hittitology and archaeology in Turkey owes its emergence, development and establishment to Atatürk, I am very happy to see my teacher Prof. Dr. H.G. Güterbock here with us today, a scholar who was invited from Germany to teach us in those early days.

I heartily greet Prof. Dr. Kraus and Mrs. Muazzez Çığ who both contributed significantly to the present advanced organisation of the cuneiform tablet archives in Istanbul Museums, making them easily accessible to the scholars.

As much pleasure as it gives to me to address you here with this speech, it further brings joy in me to see the old Istanbul'ian Prof. N.S. Kramer and Mrs. Kramer here today; I extend my gratitudes to them.

I am grateful to professor P. Garelli who devoted himself to the success of the Rencontre Assyriologique International. He made so many contributions to the development of the Old Assyrian Trading Interprise in Anatolia.

I wish a successful Congress and also wish that your expectations from Turkey will be realized by seeing the most of these sites and museums.

Your patience and attention which reveal your nobility are very much appreciated and I would also like to express my respects and sincere sentiments for you.

RELATIONS BETWEEN MESOPOTAMIA AND ANATOLIA IN THE AGE OF THE SARGONIC KINGS

JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ*

From the highlands of Anatolia to the lowlands of Mesopotamia stretch 3000 kilometers of mountains, rivers, steppe, and marshes. The question of the existence of direct communication between these two distant culture areas in the later part of the third millennium B.C. is not amenable to easy solution. It has long been maintained that the strongest and only positive evidence for close relations between Mesopotamia and Anatolia in this time period comes from the literary narratives concerning the historical kings of Akkade: Sargon and Naram-Sin. The pivotal event is Sargon's championship of the Akkadian merchants in Purušhanda, the seat of an early Anatolian ruler, a *rubā'um rabium*, until the advent of Anitta.¹ In a lecture presented to the American Oriental Society Meeting in Seattle in 1984, this writer proposed that Sargon of Akkade could have gone to the aid of the merchants of Purušhanda in Anatolia. The historicity of this event had been attacked on two fronts: (1) the event itself did not occur since it was mentioned neither in the royal inscriptions nor in the date formulae and thus, was a fabrication of a later age; and (2) the event was accepted as historical but attributed to later kings of the same name. On the basis of long-distance commodity exchange patterns and source and distribution analysis in the third millennium, an attempt was made to locate and compare the trade routes of the third and second millennia in order to prove that Sargon's expedition could only have happened in the period in question.

In the last three years, however, scholarly opinion has remained stagnant as to the question of whether any relations existed between Mesopotamia and Anatolia in the third millennium. Extreme skepticism is voiced by the assyriologists while positive credence is given by the archeologists and metallurgists. The following three statements clearly demonstrate the

* Joan Goodnick WESTENHOLZ, Peterson 5, 93109 Jerusalem/ISRAEL

¹ For the latest short synopsis of the history of the city of Purušhanda, see Kempinski and Kořak, "CTH 13: The Extensive Annals of Hattuřili I(?)," *Tel Aviv* 9 (1982) 95, 99f.

various positions: (1) "Traditional scholarship, however, fascinated by event rather than by structure, has tended to invent and overestimate certain historical moments. One such case is the role of the Sargonic kings ... We put too much emphasis on the raids which Sargon and Naram-Sin effected in the north and north-west of Mesopotamia. In fact, it is a great credit to the ancient propagandists of the Sargonic kings, and their later successors, how well modern scholarship has been affected by the fruits of their labors... The data we have, however, do not suggest any empires or large states in [the] third millennium... the presence of Naram-Sin's garrison at Tell Brak and possibly in a few other towns in the region, a few victory cartoons, and scribal bombast notwithstanding..."² (2) "These large urban settlements (e.g., Karahöyük-Konya) and the fact that trade contacts between central Anatolia/Cilicia and north Syria/Mesopotamia substantially increased following the ED IIIA period, should prompt us to re-evaluate our scepticism regarding the authenticity of the legendary claims by the Akkadian kings Sargon and Naram-Sin about their military campaigns against Anatolian kings and princes."³ (3) "Preliminary research supports the idea that much of the movement of luxury goods in South-west Asia during the third millennium B.C. was generated in response to the specific and unique demands of Sumerian society, and that such commercial enterprises continued under the Akkadian rulers."⁴

Consequently, it is incumbent upon us to review the evidence to which the above scholars were alluding: First, the written and pictorial descriptions of military campaigns transmitted to us through the auspices of the Sargonic kings and their successors and second, the archeological data concerning the existence of garrisons, large city-states governed by royal leaders in Anatolia, and the trail of destruction left by the Sargonic kings on their military expeditions. In the limited space of this paper, an appraisal of the reliability of the historical tradition will be not attempted.

Sargon, the founder of the Akkadian dynasty faced opposition from the Sumerians in the south, the Elamites and other states on the eastern periphery, the Hurrians straddling the northern areas and the North Syr-

² P. Michalowski, "Third Millennium Contacts: Observations on the Relationships between Mari and Ebla," *JAOS* 105 (1985) 301.

³ J. Yakar, *The Late Prehistory of Anatolia. The Late Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age* ["B.A.R." International Series no. 268; Oxford, 1985] vol. 1, p. 218.

⁴ Stech and Pigott, "The Metals Trade in Southwest Asia in the Third Millennium B.C.," *Iraq* 48 (1986) 39.

ian city-states to the west. Under Sargon, we see the first thrusts both north and west. In reference to the northern territories, one yeardate, mu Sar-um-GI Si-mur-um^{ki}-še ḫl-gen-ina-a¹,⁵ commemorates Sargon's conquest of Simurru, the gateway to the Hurrian territory⁶ which opened the northern road to Anatolia.⁷ Two Old Babylonian literary sources refer to this event⁸ and one of the narratives also depicts a march on Mardaman to be located either in the Upper Khabur basin or in the upper Tigris valley⁹ on the northern road to Anatolia. The memory of Sargon's penetration into the Hurrian territories is preserved in certain Hurrian rituals.¹⁰ In one text (KUB XXXI 3 rev. 6,8) Sargon, lord of Akkade, is found but in another he is listed as a deified king (KUB XXVII 38 col.

⁵ A. Westenholz, *OSP I* p. 115.

⁶ For Simurru, the gateway to the Hurrian territory, but whose exact location is unknown, see RGTC 1 143f. Hallo, "Simurru and the Hurrian Frontier," *RHA* 36 (1978) 71-83, and the discussion of year dates concerning Simurru by M. Cohen, "A New Naram-Sin Date Formula," *JCS* 28 (1976) 227-232. Note the references to Sargon's conquest of Simurru in the Louvre and Harmal texts (see footnote 8). On the basis of the Old Babylonian royal inscriptions from Simurru, its location must be placed east of the Tigris between the Lower Zab and the Diyala.

⁷ The northern road went up from the Mesopotamian plain from Akkade at the confluence of the Tigris and Diyala following the Diyala through the Jebel Hamri (Ebiḫ) through the territory of Simurru northwards passing Gasur. It then turned eastward to the Assyrian plateau recrossing the Tigris above Assur going behind the Jebel Singa to the Khabur headwaters dominated by Tell Brak which is the natural focus of routes in the eastern sector of the basin. The road then goes northward through the Tur Abdin to the Upper Tigris valley. From Diyarbekir in the valley, various routes cross the eastern Taurus. One route, in particular, crosses to the Keban valley (Elaziḡ area) where the port of trade is apparently Norşuntepe and continues across the Euphrates near Malatya/Arsilantepe and then further inland to the Elbistan plain to arrive at Kültepe/Kaneš and perhaps on to Puruşanda/Acemhöyük in the Konya Plain.

⁸ For the present see the editions of J. Nougayrol, "Un chef d'oeuvre inédit de la littérature babylonienne," *RA* 45 (1951) 169-83, 1.68 and J. van Dijk, "Textes du Musée de Bagdad," *Sumer* 13 (1957) 66, pls. 16-19, republished in TIM IX 48 iii 15 [henceforth referred to as Harmal]. This author is preparing a complete edition of these texts in her forthcoming book, *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*.

⁹ For Mardaman, known in a Naram-Sin yeardate (see below (b)), see RGTC 1 118. On the location of Mardaman, which most commentators place somewhere in the Upper Tigris region of northern Mesopotamia, see most recently K. Kessler, *Untersuchungen zur historischen Topographie Mesopotamiens* [TAVO Beiheft Reihe B, No. 26] Wiesbaden, 1980, p. 64 and notes.

¹⁰ For a thorough reexamination of this problem, see A. Kammenhuber, "Neue Ergebnisse zur hurrischen und altnesopotamischen Überlieferung in Boğazköy," *Orientalia* 45 (1976) 130-146.

iii 19). However, the historical source for the northernmost point that Sargon reached is found in the bilingual annals of the Hittite king Hattušili I of the Old Kingdom: "No-one had crossed the Mala (Purattu) but I, the Great King Tabarna, crossed it [on foot] and my army crossed it [after me(?)] on foot. Sarg[on (also) crossed it]; he defeated the troops of [Ḫaḫḫa] [but] did nothing to Ḫaḫḫa and did [not burn] it down."¹¹ The text records the extraordinary achievement of Sargon - his crossing of that great river, the Euphrates. How far north could Sargon have forded the river? It has been stated that after the confluence of Kara Su and Murat Su, the river cannot be forded. That leaves a long stretch between Birecik and Malatya where it would be possible for Sargon to have crossed into Anatolia. It is in connection with this expedition that the epic *šar tamḫāri* is alluding when Nur-dagan, lord of Puruṣḫanda, boasts that Sargon will not be able to reach his realm because among other things the river bank and the flood will prevent him from coming. Note that in the Hittite version, Sargon crosses the Aranzah, identified with the Murat Su as well as the upper Tigris.¹² Thus, in short, is the evidence for Sargon's reaching southeastern Anatolia. This expedition may be attested archeologically. The destruction of phase 6 of area CH, Tell Brak in the Upper Khabur triangle has been attributed to Sargon.¹³

In reference to the western territories, a yeardate, mu Ma-ri^{ki} «-a» hul-a¹⁴, commemorates Sargon's destruction of Mari. According to his royal inscriptions, he pushed the border to the west from Mari on the Khabur, to Tuttul on the Balikh, to Yarmuti, Ebla up to the Cedar Forest and the Silver mountains along the southern route to Anatolia.¹⁵ Later literary sources recount Sargon's crossing the Amanus.¹⁶ At Mari, the destruction of the ED temples and palace have been attributed to this campaign as well as the foundation of the *šakkanakku* dynasty from probably

¹¹ H. G. Güterbock, "Sargon of Akkad mentioned by Hattušili I of Hatti," *JCS* 18 (1964) 1-6.

¹² H. G. Güterbock, "Ein neues Bruchstück der Sargon-Erzählung «König der Schlacht»," *MDOG* 101 (1969) 19:1.16

¹³ J. Oates, "Tell Brak and Chronology: The Third Millennium," *M.A.R.I.* 4 (1985) 137-144.

¹⁴ A. Westenholz, *OSPI* p. 115.

¹⁵ CBS 13972 = A. Poebel PBS 5 pl.xx No. 34 v 23-31 (Sum.), vi 27-38 (Akk.) and passim in inscriptions of Sargon.

¹⁶ Harmal col.i 11'-12'

the military governor appointed by Sargon or his successors.¹⁷ His political policy is succinctly stated. In his royal inscriptions, Sargon declares that the civil authority, the ensi-ships, were entrusted to Akkadians.¹⁸ In the later traditions, it is told that he stationed his court officials at five double hours and thus ruled in unity all the lands.¹⁹ In the same traditions, he is also known for setting up pictorial representations. We possess pieces of at least three reliefs which date to Sargon giving a visual presentation of his military prowess. The most complete is the four sided victory stele which appears to be pre-Sargonic but Sargon is named on it. It announces clearly his military policy: the order of battle, the mobilization, the battle array, the campaign, the bloodshed, and the battlefield left to the birds of prey/carrion birds.²⁰

Of Rimuš, Sargon's successor we hear of no campaigns to the west whether that is because he was too embroiled in the fighting in the Sumerian heartland and in the east to have time to undertake any expedition to the west or whether there was no necessity to go west. He does claim that Enlil gave him the upper and lower seas and all the mountains. Nevertheless, there are no sources that mention any connection between Rimuš and Anatolia - it is significant that his name is the only one missing from the Hurrian sources. On the other hand, vases bearing his inscription appear far and wide - the farthest north from Tell Brak.²¹ His cruel policies towards prisoners of war - of incarceration in prison camps - are well known. The only possible depiction is contained in the stele which has been reconstructed and reinterpreted by Prof. B. Foster as reflecting the campaigns in Sumer in the early phase of his reign.²²

While the exploits of Rimuš were concentrated in the homeland areas and among the neighbors to the east, his elder brother Maništušu went farther afield to the south and to the north. To the north, he is the famed

¹⁷ J.-M. Durand, "La situation historique des Šakkanakku: 3. Examen des Listes Dynastiques," *M.A.R.I.* 4 (1985) 152-159.

¹⁸ CBS 13972 = PBS 5 pl. xx No. 34 ix 6-9.

¹⁹ K. Grayson, ABC p. 153 Chronicle 20:7

²⁰ Louvre Sb 1 = P. Amiet, *L'art d'Agadé au Musée du Louvre* (Paris, 1976) 8-10, no. 1.

²¹ BM 127340 = F. 1152, see Mallowan *Iraq* 9 197 pl. lx no. 4. Loretz *AOAT* 3/1 no. 83, cf. I. Finkel, "Inscriptions from Tell Brak 1984," *Iraq* 47 (1985) 201. For the inscription, see Sollberger *IRSA* II A 2a.

²² B. Foster, "The Sargonic Victory Stele from Telloh," *Iraq* 47 (1985) 15-30, pls. III-IV.

builder of the Ishtar Temple in Assur,²³ from whence a votive inscription for his life was found.²⁴ Probably, in the same area, is to be located the city named after him.²⁵ From the Khabur triangle, from Qamišliyyah in Syria, across from the Turkish city of Nusaybin comes a copper bowl bearing his name and title.²⁶ From the king list embedded in the Old Hurrian ritual (KUB XXVII 38) comes the listing of king *Ma-an-na-mi-iš-du-un*, *ewerne* [L]UGAL-GI-*ewe talawaše pudk[i]* eldest son of Sargon. From this record, we may deduce that Maništušu continued the strong Akkadian presence initiated by his father Sargon in the northern Hurrian territories. Evidence for a campaign to the west comes from one of Maništušu's many statues. Under his feet, lay the enemies and one is inscribed as [Ur]-^d[Nun]-tag (or [I]-šum) ensi of Nirrab in northern Syria.²⁷ Unfortunately, no other topographic name inscribed on the enemy figures can be deciphered.

When we study the career of Naram-Sin, the grandson of Sargon, we have many documents at our disposal, contemporary and traditional concerning his foreign campaigns to north and west. There are seven year-dates that allude to his northern campaigns:

(a) mu Na-ra-am-^dEN.ZU / [] igi-nim-še / [i-g]en-na-a the year when Naram-Sin went on campaign against the north (PBS IX 15 + 110, Hirsch 3, Nippur, Sumerian)

(b) mu ^dNa-ra-am-^dEN.ZU-e / Ma-ri-da-ba-an^{ki} / mu-ḥul-a the year when Naram-Sin destroyed Mardaman (Naab-Unger, *IAMN* XII p.47 pl.V Ni 2541, N 207 (unpub.), Hirsch 4, Nippur, Sumerian)

(c) in 1 MU / [^dNa-ra-am-^dEN.ZU] / a-na KASKAL. [KI] / Si-mu-ur₄-ri-im^{ki} / i-li-ku in the year that Naram-Sin went on a campaign to Simurru (M. Cohen, *JCS* 28 (1976) 227ff. NBC 10920, Diyala, Akkadian)

²³ K. Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia B.C.* (To 1115 B.C.) ["RIMA", Vol. I, Toronto, 1987] pp. 51ff. A.O.39.2

²⁴ Assur 21340 = VA 8300, copper spear point, see *ibid.* p.8: A.O.1002.

²⁵ Cf. the two references listed in RGTC I 114, note that the Adab reference is not to be so read.

²⁶ W. Nagel, "Eine Kupferschale mit Inschrift des Königs Manistusu," *Acta Praehistorica et Archaeologica* 1 (1970) 195.

²⁷ Louvre Sb 48 = Amiet *L'art d'Agadé* no. 15, cf. Amiet, "Les Statues de Manishtusu, Roi de Agadé," *RA* 66 (1972) p. 105, fig. 7. For the identification of Nirrab, see RGTC I 133f. but note that the identification and reading are doubtful.

(d) in 1 MU / [^dNa-ra-am-^dE]N.ZU / *RÉC.* 169 *Si-mu-ur₄-ri-[im^{ki}] / in?* *Ki-ra-še-ni-we^{ki}?* / *iš₁₁-a-ru ù Ba-ba* / PA.TE.SI *Si-mu-ur₄-ri-im^{ki} / [x]* x PA.TE.SI / *A-ra-me^{ki} / ik-mi-ù* in the year that Naram-Sin was victorious in battle against Simurru at Kirašeniwe and captured Baba, the ensi of Simurru and [PN] the ensi of Arame (MAD I 217 and 220, Hirsch 6, Khafajah, Akkadian)

(e) in 1 M[U] / [^dNa-ra-am-^dE]N.ZU / KASKAL.*RÉC.* 169 SUBIR^{ki} / in *A-zu-ḫi-nim^{ki} / i-ša-ru / Da-ḫi-ša-ti-lī / ik-mi-ù* in the year Naram-Sin was victorious in battle with Subartu in Azuḫinnum (and) captured Da-ḫi-š-atal (B. Foster, *Acta Sumerologica* 4 (1982) 42 no.8, Umm-el-Jir, Akkadian)

(f) in 1 MU / [^dNa-ra-am-^dEN.ZU] / *na-gab Idiglat ID / ù UD.KIB.NUN ID / ik-su-tu / ù RÉC.* 169 / *Še-nam-in-da-d^{ki} / eš-a-ru* in the year Naram-Sin reached the source of the Tigris and of the Euphrates and was victorious in battle with Šenaminda (MAD I 231 and 236, Hirsch 7, Khafajah, Akkadian)

(g) [in 1 MU] / [^dNa-ra-am-^dEN.ZU] / []-at^{ki} / [KÁ.G]AL-at^{ki} / [*iš₁₁-a-ru / [ù su₄-ma]?* in [KUR *La-a*]b-na-an / [GIŠ]. EREN / *ib-du-kam* in the year Naram-Sin conquered GN and Abullāt and he himself felled cedars in Mount Lebanon (Aa. Westenholz, *OSP* II, 16, Nippur, Akkadian)

Of the above, one date (a) commemorates in general his going north while four (b,c,d,e) concern his campaigns against specific Hurrian city-states. Of the two last, one (f) describes his penetration into Anatolia and one (g) his advance west to the Lebanon. In relation to his expedition to Anatolia, the toponym Šenaminda is mentioned. According to a Lagash text, this area was incorporated into the Akkadian administrative economic system: 1 pisan sag-gub-[ba] Še-nam-in-da-[(a)^{ki}] 1 basket: men on duty in Šenaminda ITT II 4690 iii 1'.²⁸ Records for this file include L. 4470 and 4701a. In the latter file, the toponym Šenaminda is linked with the toponym kà-kà-ni-šum^{ki}, which despite linguistic difficulties, sounds suspiciously like the Kārum of Kaniš. In his royal inscriptions, Naram-Sin describes his conquest of the territory of Subartu up to the cedar forests.²⁹

²⁸ B. Foster, "Archives and Record-Keeping in Sargonic Mesopotamia," *ZA* 72 (1982) 15.

²⁹ AO 5474 rev. iii = Thureau-Dangin *RA* 9 (1912) 34, cf. Hirsch *A/O* 20 (1963) 22, U 7725 = UET I 274 i 12-16.

In this context, the cedar forests are probably to be located in the eastern Taurus. His relief at Pir Hüseyin, at Diyarbekir attests to his passage through the eastern Taurus.³⁰ He claims to have directed his march to Talhat, a station known to be on the road to Kaniš.³¹ At this juncture in his campaign, it is Inanna who gave him no opponent so that the ensi's of Subartu and the en's of the Upper Lands bring nidba offerings. In this reference Subartu, the land of the Hurrians, is contrasted with the Upper Lands. The latter is a well known expression for the Anatolian highlands in the Hittite period.³² The same term is reflected in the Sumerian *ma-da-igi-nim* of Ur III³³ and in the Akkadian *mātum elūtum* found in inscriptions of Šamši-Adad I.³⁴ There exists a recently published Sargonic royal inscription(s) which may be attributed to Naram-Sin on the basis of the titulary.³⁵ It not only records the conquest of Hurrian city-states but also lists Anatolian city-states. Text fragments N. 3580 (+) UM 29-13-559 begin with [KALAM].KI-su / *Ha-hu-un^{ki}* / *ù* / *a-ti-ma* / 'KALAM'^{1?ki} (break). In the following preserved sections are toponyms of apparent Hurrian, Anatolian, and unknown origin. Of the Hurrian toponyms, one is Azuḫinnum mentioned in yeardate (e) above. Of the Anatolian toponyms, the most obvious after Haḫhun is probably IR-an-da, another Anatolian toponym similar to Šenaminda, exhibiting the -nda suffix.³⁶ The last extant lines echo yeardate (f): [*ù* KALAM. KI]-su [*a-ti*]i-ma [KALAM ?]. KI [*ù*?] URU.KI.URU.KI [*a-bar-ti*] [I]DIGNA.ÍD up to the territory and the cities on the other side of the Tigris. The other side of the Tigris is not to the east of Mesopotamia but to the north. The evidence from the yeardates and from the royal inscriptions supports the thesis of a strong Akkadian presence in Anatolia under Naram-Sin. Archaeologically, it has been discovered that Kaniš EB III levels 11b and 12 exhibit foreign influ-

³⁰ Istanbul, Altorientalisches Museum 1027 — V. Scheil *RT* 15 (1893) 62ff. — BE 1 120 and photo pl.xxii no. 64 — Naab-Unger, *Die Entdeckung der Stele des Naramsin in Pir Hüseyin* ["IAMN", vol. XII, Istanbul, 1934] 39ff.

³¹ RGTC 1 156.

³² RGTC 6 293f.

³³ RGTC 2 83.

³⁴ Grayson, *RIMA* 1, op. cit., p. 50:76f.

³⁵ P. Michalowski, "The Earliest Hurrian Toponymy: A New Sargonic Inscription," *ZA* 76 (1986) 4-11, cf. his discussion in "Mental Maps and Ideology: Reflections on Subartu," *The Origins of Cities in Dry-Farming Syria and Mesopotamia in the Third Millennium B.C.*, ed., H. Weiss, Gilford: Four Quarters, 1986 on pp. 136-140.

³⁶ E. Laroche, "Études de Toponymie asianique," *RHA* 69 (1961) 57-98, where he analyzes it as Indo-European.

ences in architecture and many imported objects alongside items of local manufacture, many traceable to Mesopotamia. According to the excavator, Prof. Tahsin Özgüç, the discoveries at Kültepe demonstrate the position of Kaneš in the trade network between Anatolia and Mesopotamia already in the third millennium B.C. and reflect an Akkadian presence in the area.³⁷

Information concerning Naram-Sin's expedition(s) to the west is transmitted in his yeardates and royal inscriptions. The yeardate (g) above refers to the destruction of two cities and felling cedars in the Lebanon. His royal inscriptions refer to the defeat of the town of Ḥaršamat and the au-rochs hunt on Mount Tibar, previously located in the Amanus region and now located at Jebel Abd el Aziz³⁸ as well as the Siege of Armanum.³⁹ The latter states that it was Nergal who opened the way for Naram-Sin to destroy Armanum and Ebla as well as the Amanus, the cedar mountain, and the Upper Sea. The text continues with the account of Naram-Sin's conquest of Armanum and Ebla with the aid of the weapon of Dagan and the subjugation of the people of Dagan who dwelled in the territories stretching from the bank of the Euphrates until Ulušum. Armanum is located between Ebla and the Amanus crossing. A possible crossing seems to be the pass of Arslanlı Bel, the northeastern pass which affords a natural and easy route from northeastern Syria and Mesopotamia to Cilicia. In the same royal inscription, Naram-Sin claims to have brought the Amanus, the mountain of the cedar under his control. A survey of this area revealed many of the settlements date back to the third millennium B.C.⁴⁰ At Tilmen Höyük a bulla was found in level IIIe (dating to EB III) with repeated impressions of a cylinder seal, an intrusive Mesopotamian administrative element in the predominant Anatolian stamp seal culture. On the other side of the Amanus range, lies Cilicia. Pictorial representation of such a campaign is illustrated by an alabaster stele two fragments of which were allegedly discovered in Nasiriya in

³⁷ T. Özgüç, "New Observations on the Relationship of Kültepe with Southeast Anatolia and North Syria during the Third Millennium B.C.," *Ancient Anatolia, Aspects of Change and Cultural Development, Essays in Honor of Machteld J. Mellink*, Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1986: 31-47.

³⁸ M. Stol, *On Trees, Mountains, and Millstones in the Ancient Near East* (Leiden, 1979) 25ff.

³⁹ B. Foster, "The Siege of Armanum," *JANES* 14 (1982) 27-36.

⁴⁰ U. B. Alkim, "The Amanus Region in Turkey," *Archaeology* 22 (1969) 280-289.

southern Iraq.⁴¹ Prof. M. Mellink has argued for attributing the scenes to an illustration of captives and booty from Cilicia⁴². She pointed out specific features exhibiting parallels to Cilician evidence: the accoutrements of the prisoners of war and the features of the spoils, the dagger and two-handled goblet, carried off by the victors. The captured soldiers have hair styles and cheek straps, features which indicate that they are from regions in Anatolia or Syria. Mellink identified the dagger form as being of Anatolian or Syrian origin and closest to that found in Troy II. The goblet, a two-handled tankard, is a relative of the *depas amphikypellon*, typical of the Western Anatolian culture, and an important hallmark of third millennium EB III sites in Turkey as far west as the plain of Islahiye and most characteristic of Troy and Cilicia.⁴³ The specific form of the tankard as portrayed on the relief is a shorter, wider variant more typical of examples from Tarsus in Cilicia, thus prompting the attribution of the Akkadian campaign to this area. Although the date of this stele has been variously assessed by different art historians on artistic grounds,⁴⁴ it would seem on historical grounds to belong the glorious period of Naram-Sin.

Catalogues of Kings

BM 79987

KBo III 13

2. [^{1d}Gu-la-AN LUGAL G]u-tu-um.KIg'. ^dMa-na-i-la LUGAL KUR.URU.GÚ.ŠÚ.A

3. []-el LUGAL Ka-ak-mi-im.KI

'Bu-na-na-[i-la] LUGAL KUR.URU.Pa-ak-k[i ...]

4. []-a-el LUGAL Lu-ul-lu-im.KI

10'. 'La-pa-na-i-la LUGAL KUR.URU *Lu-ul-li-u-i

⁴¹ For the most recent assessment of this stele and its various fragments, see J. Börker-Klähn, *Alt Vorderasiatische Bildstelen und Vergleichbare Felsreliefs* (Mainz, 1982) nos. 22, 23, 24 and the references collected there.

⁴² M. Mellink, "An Akkadian Illustration of a Campaign in Cilicia?" *Anatolia* VII (1963) 101-115.

⁴³ P. Spanos, *Untersuchungen über den bei Homer *depas amphikypellon* genannten Gefäßstypus* ["Ist.Mitt." Bh. 6, Tübingen, 1972] 81f. Note the more recent finds in Kültepe level 12 (fig. 3-31) and a similar two-handled tankard found at Acemhöyük in a pot grave, discussed in Özgüç, op. cit., p. 41. He traces them from the same workshop in western Anatolia.

⁴⁴ Sargon: Parrot - Maništuš: Amiet, Moortgat - Naram-Sin: Basmachi, McKeon - Reichsakkadisch II/III: Stromenger.

5. [...-a]n-da LUGAL Ḫa-aḫ-ḫi-i.KI

'[...-i]n-ni-pa-i-la LUGAL KU[R. URU. ...]

6. []i-i-AN LUGAL Tu-ru-uk-ku-um.KI

IÍ. ¹pa-am-ba LUGAL KUR.URU. Ḫa-at-ti

7. []-ḫa-AN LÚ Ka-ni-šum.KI

'Zi-pa-ni L[UGAL.K]UR.URU.Ka-ni-eš
'Nu-u[r...]

8. []-du-AN LÚ MAR.TU.KI

12', ¹Ḫu-wa-a-ru-wa-aš LUGAL KUR.URU A-mur-ri

9. []-me-e-AN LÚ BĀD.AN.KI

10. []-bu-na-AN LÚ A-ra-ar-ru-ú.KI

11. []-i]t-lu-uḫ LÚ Ka-aš-šu-ú.KI

12. []-ib-ra LÚ Me-luḫ-ḫa.KI

13. []-d]u-na LÚ SU.KUR.RU.KI

14. []-en LUGAL Mar-ḫa-ši

'Ti-iš-š[i]-en-ki LUGAL KUR.URU.Pa-ra-ši

15. []-s]ar LUGAL ki-iš-ša-at NIM.MA.KI

[...]

16. []-bur-an LUGAL KUR GIŠ.GI.KI

19. []-ge-e LUGAL KUR 50.KI

20. ['Ma-d]a-gi-na LUGAL Ar-ma-nim.KI

13'. 'Ma-da-ki-na LUGAL.URU Ar-ma-ni

21. []LUGAL KUR Ḫa-na.KI

'Is-qip-p[u] LUGAL. ḪUR.SAG ERIN

'Ti-eš-š[i...]

14'. 'Ur-La-ra-ak LUGAL KUR.URU La-ra-ak

'Ur-[b]a(?) -an-da LUGAL KUR.URU Ni-ik-ki-[...]

15'. 'Il-šu-na-i-il LUGAL URU Túr-ki

'Ti-[i]š-bi-in-ki LUGAL KUR.URU Ku-ur-ša-ú-ra

Such is the contemporary written and archeological data for the presence of Naram-Sin in Anatolia. From later traditions, of which there are several, I would like to select an Old Babylonian narrative, the so-called London text of the Insurrection against Naram-Sin.⁴⁵ This text relates most closely not to the other Insurrection texts but to the Hittite tale of the seventeen kings who confronted Naram-Sin.⁴⁶ This comparison has already been pointed out by Grayson and Sollberger. Judging by its original accession number, i.e., 89-10-14, 537, the Old Babylonian text comes from Sippar (confirmed by E. Leichty) and the second text is a New Hittite text retaining old Hittite archaisms (communication of C. Watkins) and thus, whose written originals are to be postulated for the Old Hittite period.⁴⁷ Thus, both texts were written at approximately the same time and must reflect an even older oral or literary tradition. Unfortunately, both texts are fragmentary and in particular, open with a break. More survives of the beginning in the Hittite text than in the Akkadian - it speaks of a conflict with an unknown king and then the building of the temple of Enlil. Then the Hittite tale introduces its account of the rebellion with the statement "at that time, all the lands together rose up in arms against me" - a typical Naram-Sin introduction. Then, follows a catalogue of 17 kings while in the Akkadian there are 18 kings. Although there is not total identity of the lists, there is a significant correspondence not only one-to-one as to personal and topographical names but in the same exact order. Both the lists seem to go back to Old Akkadian sources from which each has added and subtracted. Some additions reflect the period of time of its written redaction: the Old Babylonian reflects the conquests of Hammurabi (especially year 37) in its inclusion of Kakmum and Turukkû, the latter appears as Hatti in the Hittite recension. It is impossible to ascertain what geographical unit was originally in that position in the catalogue. As can be seen in the accompanying chart, the list does

⁴⁵ In general, see Grayson and Sollberger, "L'Insurrection Générale Contre Naram-Suen," *RA* 70 (1976) 103-128. For a further treatment of this text and a reappraisal of all the geographical terms, see my forthcoming book legends of the Kings of Akkade.

⁴⁶ CTH 311.1 = KBo III 13 = BoTu 3, see Güterbock *ZA* 44 (1983) 67ff.

⁴⁷ Note that G. Beckman suggests that this Naram-Sin legend belongs to traditions whose originals are to be postulated for the Old Hittite period (*JCS* 35 (1983) 100ff. On the other hand, A. Kammenhuber would prefer to see this legend as part of the written Hurrian transmission introduced into the Hittite traditions in the empire period (*Orakelpraxis, Träume und Vorzeichenschau bei Hethitern* ["Texte der Hethiter" Heft. 7, Heidelberg, 1976] 94 and passim in her various articles.

reflect all the foreign territories of the Old Akkadian realm. Eleven out of the 18 countries, states, or peoples listed in this composition are known already from Old Akkadian documents, see Gutium (RGTC 1 65f.), Lulubum (RGTC 1 111), Ḫahḫum (RGTC 1 68), Amurru (RGTC 1 14, also Mardu 115f.), Dēr (RGTC 1 22), Meluḫḫa (RGTC 1 121), Aratta (RGTC 1 17), Marḫaši (RGTC 1 116f.), Elam (RGTC 1 42ff.), Gišgi (a place with the same name in the heartland is RGTC 1 59), and Armanum (RGTC 1 18). It is interesting to note that the Hittite preserves the akkadian pronunciation of the land of Marḫaši - Baraḫšum (Paraḫšum) while the Babylonian preserves the Sumerian. These lands do not seem to be in any exact geographical order but seem to be generally in order according to certain geographic areas: (a) the northern geographic area, the piedmont uplands, spanning the Hurrian territories surrounding the Mesopotamian heartland, 2'-11', (b) the eastern geographic area, both the mountains, Iranian plateau, and the coastal plains, 12'-18'⁴⁸, and (c) the western geographic area, 19'-21'. At the end of the list the Hittite text added 5 names not on the Akkadian list which except for the last are not particularly Hittite but rather reflect Mesopotamian onomastics. These two traditional lists may contain a large element of historicity, despite poetic liberties. The catalogue of rebel kings resembles catalogues in other heroic poetry, such as the Catalogue of Ships in the Iliad, or the Catalogue of the Kings in Widsith which are usually accorded a high historical value. The catalogue of kings of various countries and peoples who rose in rebellion against Naram-Sin not only demonstrates the influence of the Akkadian traditions in Anatolia, but it also preserves the memory of the historical confrontation in southeastern Anatolia. The Hittite text mentions Naram-Sin's confrontation with the Hurrians without giving the location but the Akkadian text states that the en-

⁴⁸ As pointed out by Grayson and Sollberger, lines 17-18 are inadvertently repeated at the beginning of the reverse of the tablet. One possible reading of l.15 is *qi-iš-ša-at* from *qistu* 'forest' with doubling of the š in the fem.pl. Then, lines 15-16 would refer to the forested highlands of Iran and the lower marshlands on the coast - the linkage of GIŠ.TIR/*qistu* and GIŠ.GI/*apu* is very common in Akkadian literature. Nevertheless, it is more likely that the word is *kiššatu* 'totality' referring to the confederate character of the Elamite state, on which cf. F. Vallat, *Suse et l'Elam* ["Ed. recherches sur les civilisations", *Mémoire* 1, Paris, 1980]. Consequently, we must look farther afield for the location of KUR.GIŠ.GI. It has recently been proposed to connect it with the land of Apum in the Upper Khabur basin, on the Old Assyrian route to Cappadocia (D. Charpin, "Šubat-Enlil et Le Pays d'Apum", *M.A.R.I.* 5 (1987) p. 138 n. 45) which would place this toponym with section (c) the western group.

counter with Gula-AN of Gutium took place at Ḫa-wa-an-nim KUR GIŠ.ERIN in the Amanus, the mountain of cedar.⁴⁹ There exists additional evidence for Naram-Sin's presence in Anatolia passed down in Hittite incantations⁵⁰ and Hurrian rituals.⁵¹ On the basis of the contemporary and traditional evidence reviewed above, we can propose that Naram-Sin exerted some political hegemony over the Anatolian city-states of Ḫaḫḫum and Kaniš to the north and Armanum and the Amanus as far as Cilicia to the west.

With the demise of Naram-Sin, the Akkadian empire does not collapse. During the reign of his son Šar-kali-šarri come the first historical mention of the two peoples who will bring down the kingdom - the Amorites from the west and the Gutians from the east. Despite these incursions, he states in his royal inscriptions that he reached Ḫa-ḫal-la-āš at the source of the Tigris and Ni-u-x at the source of the Euphrates. He also mentions cutting down cedars in the Amanus for the temple of Inanna in Zabalam.⁵² However, this Amanus reference may refer to the eastern Taurus since the Mesopotamians may not have been as geographically conscious as we are today of the difference in the mountain chains. Knowledge of Šar-kali-šarri's dominion in the north became part of that Hurrian kinglist (KUB XXVII 38 iv 24). From this data, we may deduce that of all parts of the empire it was the northern, southeastern Anatolia, which was held as an Akkadian province in comparison to the western and eastern quarters of the empire.

After Šar-kali-šarri, there is a short interregnum followed by two kings - Dudu and his son Šu-Durul. The last evidence of the old Akkadian presence in Anatolia was discovered in the Urfa district on a lower branch of the northern road was: a weight inscribed with the name of an official of Šu-durul.

This weight is an example of the controlling mechanisms used by the Old Akkadian kings to unify their realm. The standardized weight - the

⁴⁹ BM 79987 ii 18. For the Amanus as the cedar forest mountain, cf. Amanam GIŠ.ERIN UET 1 225-27 (Naram-Sin royal inscription); uštētiq ummānšu Ḫamanam qīšat erinim ikšud qāssu Harmal i 1 f-12.

⁵⁰ Bo 2134, see Güterbock ZA 44 Bof.

⁵¹ KUB XXVII 38 iii 18 as a deified king.

⁵² D. R. Frayne, "Notes on a New Inscription of Šar-kali-šarri," Annual Review of the Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Project 2 (1984) 23-27. The attribution of this text to Šar-kali-šarri is not above doubt, despite the fact that he is mentioned twice. Everything else in this text, including the king's titulary reflect Naram-Sin.

gur.Agade and gur.lugal is the measure found in all economic documents of the Akkadian empire. On the other hand, there was no strict political structure. It was a mixture of local rulers, foreign garrison leaders of sometimes equal status, and Akkadian governors. The evidence is ambiguous and a thorough study of the provincial administration of the Old Akkadian period is yet to be made. Peaceful occupation in large prosperous towns seems to be characteristic of these years. Rich tomb deposits of the wealthy citizens are found in most of the western and northern towns. Inscribed objects for the life of the Akkadian kings abound. Naram-Sin's daughters, Simat-ulmaš and Šumšani left two bowls in Mari (Maison Rouge)⁵³ and Mesuni, the daughter of the sanga of BĀD.KI left a bowl in Tell Munbāqa on the Middle Euphrates.⁵⁴

In Anatolia, as yet, have been no finds of tangible objects bearing inscriptions of the Akkadian kings but there are the written traditions and the scribal orthography which originate in the Old Akkadian period.⁵⁵ Memories of Akkadian battles are preserved as part of their own military history as described above and in literary narratives such as the tale of Gurparanzaḫu.⁵⁶

This paper has concentrated on the philological side of the problem of the relations between Mesopotamia and Anatolia, because for the present the weight of the evidence relies on the philological material. The archeological evidence in its current state can only add corroboration since its finds are as yet nebulous. The archeological approach depends on clear definitions of the contemporary Akkadian and Anatolian assemblages. Without an Akkadian type site in southern Mesopotamia, we are lacking the essential condition for such a definition. The testing of the nature of a foreign relationship lies in the detection and definition of recognizable imported objects. It is generally assumed that an import manifests itself in an archeological context as being atypical or rare with respect to

⁵³ A. Parrot, "Les fouilles de Mari, dixième campagne (automne, 1954," Syria 32 (1955) pl.xvi nos.1 and 2.

⁵⁴ M. Wäfler, "Der Becher MBQ 26/35-62 (=71 MBQ 59)," MDOG 112 (1980) 9-11; P. Steinkeller, "Old Akkadian miscellanea, 1. The Toponym BĀD^{ki} in Sargonic Times," RA 78 (1984) 83f.

⁵⁵ G. Beckman, "Mesopotamians at Ḫattuša," JCS 35 (1983) 100.

⁵⁶ For an assessment of the latter as historiography see H.A. Hoffner, "Histories and historians of the Ancient Near East: The Hittites," Orientalia 49 (1980) 318ff.

the rest of the cultural assemblage.⁵⁷ The chronology of the critical import index fossils for the mid third millennium cultures is still being investigated. Likewise, the recognition and attribution of imports depend on our ability to determine the origin of the allegedly alien artifacts found in excavated contexts. Past work on import fossils have concentrated on certain categories of objects. They are: ceramics, metal objektes, and glyptics. Of the ceramic indices, one of the most important wares is the Metallic ware whose origin, distribution, and dating are far from certain.⁵⁸ Not only the wares, but certain shapes such as the carinated shoulder jar with one ridge at the shoulder or certain decorations such as the snake appliqué or impressed circles are thought to be typical of the Akkadian assemblage.⁵⁹ The differences and similarities between Akkadian metallurgy and Anatolian metallurgy make it difficult to ascertain the mutual influences. It is too early to speak about the actual metals trade because at the moment it is speculation built upon hypothesis. Until the present metallurgical analysis of ores and objects is finished,⁶⁰ we can hardly make any serious statement. As far as glyptic is concerned, there are Mesopotamian traditional seal designs such as the geometric seals which are produced longer on the periphery and are not evidence of any contacts with Mesopotamia. Specifically Akkadian seals and sealings are found rarely.⁶¹ Their importance lies in their function in the Akkadian economic system - one of symbolic communication involving administrative regulation which attached to a shipment could be interpreted as a mark of ownership authority, acknowledgement, or obligation. Note that the seal inscrip-

⁵⁷ A. Yener, *Third Millennium B.C. Interregional Exchange in Southwest Asia with Special Reference to the Keban Region of Turkey* [unpub. Ph.D Diss., Columbia University 1980] 101.

⁵⁸ H. Kühne, *Die Keramik von Tell Chuera und ihre Beziehungen zu Funden aus Syrien-Palästina, der Türkei und dem Iraq* (Berlin, 1976); G.M. Schwartz, "The Ninevite V Period and Current Research, *Paléorient* 11 (1985) 58ff.

⁵⁹ Mc. Gibson, "A Re-evaluation of the akkad Period in the Diyala Region on the Basis of Recent Excavations at Nippur and in the Hamrin", *AJA* 86 (1982) 531-538.

⁶⁰ For the source analysis, see A. Yener, "The Production, Exchange, and Utilization of Silver and Lead Metals in Ancient Anatolia: A Source Identification Project", *Anatolica X* (1983) 1-15; "The Archeometry of Silver in Anatolia: The Bolkardağ Mining district", *AJA* 90 (1986) 469-472; "Tin in the Turkish Taurus mountains: the Bolkardağ mining district", *Antiquity* 61 (1987) 220-6; and cf. her article in this volume. For the analysis of objects, see P.R.S. Moorey, *Materials and Manufacture in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Evidence of Archeology and Art* ["B.A.R." International Series no. 237, Oxford, 1985] while we await the findings of the Sumerian Metals Project of the University Museum, University of Pennsylvania.

⁶¹ Yener diss., op.cit., 123-136.

tion became more common in the Akkadian period, perhaps because of the increase in trade.

There are two other worthwhile avenues of approach - the settlement pattern and the destruction pattern. As to the first, it is clear that urbanization first appears to the north of Mesopotamia in the mid third millennium B.C. The building of fortified cities could be a defensive reaction to any threat whether from Akkadian armies or Hurrian hordes or Indo-European migrations or any other force that was coming down from the Caucasus.⁶² On the other hand, analysis of the pattern of the sites along trade routes especially at intersections of those routes yield significant information as to relationships. The type of settlement pattern among settlements and the distribution of building types within settlements bear upon the issue of comparative relations. The relocation of villages to areas close to trade routes and mineral resources in the mid and late third millennium could be explained in terms of socio-economic reorganization. The large public buildings which seem to function as great storehouses seem to be a positive response to a large trade flow. The best example from the Keban area is: Norşuntepe. On the highly elaborate citadel building system on the summit is the monumental building called the Pithos Gebäude on the basis of the 100 storage jars with a capacity of 160 liters that were found in it.⁶³

The second approach that of regarding the destruction layers has been examined in archeological literature - i.e., the correlation of Akkadian military expansion with certain destruction levels as that of the last of the ED temples at Mari together with that of the ED palace. Likewise, at Tell Brak the two destruction levels - phase 6 is attributed to Sargon and phase 7 to Naram-Sin. However, the complexities of this approach are typified by the questions raised in the assigning of the destruction of Mari BII-1. This approach is only useful in the Mesopotamian area since as soon as one approaches Anatolia, there are several ethnic movements and periodic destructions during the same period. The consecutive population shifts which continued throughout the third millennium were com-

⁶² For a discussion of urbanization in the Khabur triangle, see H. Weiss "Excavations at Tell Leilan and the Origins of North Mesopotamian Cities in the Third Millennium B.C.", *Paléorient* 9 (1983) 39-52 where he attributes the development to the formation of Hurrian dynasties.

⁶³ Yener diss., op.cit., 87f.

posed of groups arriving from the west, the east and the north with different ethno-cultural backgrounds - differences in rural architecture, metallurgical traditions and burial habits. Moreover, not all destructions were wrought by enemy or even human hands.

Thus, from archeology alone it is difficult to establish either the socio-economic or the political relationship between Anatolia and Mesopotamia in the age of the Sargonic kings. From the written evidence alone, there is sufficient information to establish short periods of political hegemony of the Akkadian kings in southeastern and southern Anatolia. On the other hand, there is little we can say concerning the socio-economic relationships.

VON DER BEFESTIGTEN SIEDLUNG ZUR TEMPELZITADELLE

Der vor-und fröhdynastische Hügel B von Halawa,
Nordsyrien

FRIEDRICH LUTH*

Tafeln 1-11

Der Fundplatz Halawa liegt am mittleren Euphrat, im Gebiete des Assad-Stausees (Abb. 1). Im Zuge der allgemeinen Rettungsgrabungen entdeckt, werden seit dem Jahre 1977 systematische Ausgrabungen auf dem Tell A und seit 1979 auf dem Tell B** durch die Universität Saarbrücken unter der Leitung von Prof. Dr. W. Orthmann durchgeführt¹.

Bereits während der ersten Kampagne gelang eine relativchronologische Einordnung der Funde des Tell B im Verhältnis zu den benachbarten Hügeln dieser Siedlungskammer: Daraus ergab sich, daß die Siedlungsreste des Tell B aus einer älteren Zeit stammen mußten als die übrigen, bis dahin bekannten frühbronzezeitlichen Fundstellen des Stausee-Gebietes, dagegen jünger zu sein schienen, als die benachbarten, wesentlich bekannteren Fundplätze Habuba Kabira, Tell Qannas und Djebel Arouda.

Die dritte Kampagne förderte dann im Zentrum des Hügels Reste eines Heiligtums zutage, worüber bereits in einem Vorberichte informiert worden ist². Die Aufgaben der folgenden Kampagnen bestanden zum einen in der Erforschung der Baustrukturen³, zum anderen in der exakten relativchronologischen Einordnung dieser, für die Rekonstruktion siedlungshistorischer Prozesse in diesem Raume wichtigen Funde.

* Dr. Friedrich LUTH, Friedensalle 13 2000 Hamburg 50. GERMANY

** Ich danke Herrn Prof. Dr. W. Orthmann (Saarbrücken) dafür, mir innerhalb des Gesamtprojektes die Grabungen auf dem Tell B sowie die Auswertung von Befunden und Funden übertragen zu haben.

¹ W. Orthmann, Halawa 1977-79. Vorläufiger Bericht über die 1. bis 3. Grabungskampagne. Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 31 (1981).

² F. Lüth, Grabungen auf dem Tell B, in W. Orthmann (wie Anm. 1), 39-48.

³ Kurze Zusammenfassungen über die Kampagnen nach 1979 in AFO 28 (1982), 223-226, AFO 31 (1984), 142-146, AFO Beiheft 19 (1982), 237-243.