

PIHANS. UITGAVEN VAN HET
NEDERLANDS INSTITUUT VOOR HET NABIJE OOSTEN TE LEIDEN

voorheen Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul

onder redactie van
J.G. DERCKSEN, J. EIDEM, K. van der TOORN en K.R. VEENHOF

CXVII

THE ROYAL ARCHIVES FROM TELL LEILAN

OLD BABYLONIAN LETTERS AND TREATIES
FROM THE LOWER TOWN PALACE EAST

THE ROYAL ARCHIVES FROM TELL LEILAN

OLD BABYLONIAN LETTERS AND TREATIES FROM THE LOWER TOWN PALACE EAST

by

Jesper Eidem

with an introduction by
Lauren Ristvet and Harvey Weiss



Published in Cooperation with
the Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums of the Syrian Arab Republic

NEDERLANDS INSTITUUT VOOR HET NABIJE OOSTEN
LEIDEN

2011

Copyright 2011 by
Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten
Witte Singel 25
Postbus 9515
2300 RA Leiden, Nederland
NinoPublications@hum.leidenuniv.nl
www.nino-leiden.nl

*All rights reserved, including the rights to translate or
to reproduce this book or parts thereof in any form*

Cover image: View of the Lower Town Palace East, October 1987. In the background,
to the right, excavation of tablets proceeds in rooms 17 and 22.

The Royal Archives from Tell Leilan. Old Babylonian Letters and Treaties from the Lower Town
Palace East / by Jesper Eidem. — Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

PIHANS = Uitgaven van het Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten te Leiden
(ISSN 1571-5728; 117)

*(voorheen Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul
= Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul)*

ISBN 978-90-6258-328-7

Printed in Belgium

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE..... XIII

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTRODUCTION

Micro- and Macro-Contexts of the Tell Leilan Eastern Lower Town Palace Archives..	XVII
The Eastern Lower Town Palace	XIX
Building Level 4.....	XXII
Building Level 3.....	XXII
Building Level 2.....	XXVII
Building Level 1.....	XXX
An Archaeological Analysis of the Eastern Lower Town Palace Archives.....	XXXI
Northern Mesopotamian Palaces during the Mari Age.....	XXXIII
The Two Palaces of Tell Leilan	XXXIV
Palaces and Royal Households.....	XXXV
Šeḫnā and the Land of Apum.....	XXXVII
Amorite Sedentarization and Inter-regional Conflict.....	XXXIX
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	XLII
<i>Works Cited</i>	XLIX

PART I. THE LETTERS

1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

<i>1.1. Chronological and Historical Context</i>	1
1.1.1. Historical Background	1
1.1.2. Evidence from the Lower Town Palace	4
1.1.3. The Leilan Kings.....	5
1.1.4. The Leilan <i>limmus</i>	10
1.1.5. Archival Context of the Tablets	12
<i>1.2. Synchronic Survey</i>	16
1.2.1. The International Horizon.....	16
1.2.2. Trade through Leilan.....	18
1.2.3. The <i>habbātum</i>	18
1.2.4. A Note on Historical Geography	22
1.2.5. The Jezira Kings and Kingdoms	27
1.2.6. The Kingdom of Apum and its servants	38
<i>1.3. Diachronic Patterns</i>	44
1.3.1. Basic Premises	44
1.3.2. The Reign of Mutija: War against Andarig and Razamā	46
1.3.3. The Transition Mutija – Till-Abnû	49
1.3.4. The Reign of Till-Abnû.....	53
<i>1.4. Summary and Perspectives</i>	56
Appendix 1. Selection of information in L.87 dated administrative tablets	60

2. THE TEXTS

<i>2.1. Introductory Remarks</i>	66
<i>2.2. Classification</i>	68
I. Letters to Mutija (1-22)	70
II. Letters to Till-Abnû (23-123)	94
III. Letter to Jakûn-Ašar (124)	198
IV. Letters to <i>bēlum</i> (125-163)	199
V. Miscellaneous Letters (164-174)	237
VI. Letters where Name of Addressee lost (175-178)	248
VII. Letters/Fragments with both Names in Address lost (179-219)	252
Appendix 2.1. Physical Characteristics of the Tablets	274
Appendix 2.2. The Envelope Fragments from the Lower Town Palace	279
Introduction	279
The Inscriptions	281
Appendix 2.3. Two Additional Letters to Leilan Kings	287
INDICES TO THE LETTERS	
<i>A. Geographical Names</i>	290
<i>B. Personal Names</i>	295
<i>C. Divine Names</i>	302
<i>D. Selected Vocabulary</i>	302

PART II. THE TREATIES**1. INTRODUCTION**

<i>1.1. General Introduction</i>	310
<i>1.2. Précis of Old Babylonian Treaty Procedures</i>	311
1.2.1. The Basic Procedure	311
1.2.2. The <i>lipit napištim</i>	317
1.2.3. Treaties and Tablets	321
<i>1.3. Historical Context of the Leilan Treaties</i>	324
1.3.1. L.T.-1 to L.T.-5	324
1.3.2. Other Treaties in Leilan Evidence	327
<i>1.4. Format and Contents of the Treaties</i>	328
1.4.1. General Observations	328
1.4.2. Adjuration	329
1.4.3. Clauses	331
1.4.4. Curses	344
1.4.5. Subscript	345

2. THE TEXTS

<i>L.T.-1: Treaty between Hāja-abum of Apum and Qarni-Lim of Andarig and king(?) of Sûmum</i>	346
Material Reconstruction.....	346
Transcription.....	346
Translation.....	358
Notes.....	366
<i>L.T.-2: Treaty between Mutija (Mutu-Abih) of Apum and Hazip-Teššub of Razamā</i>	368
Material Reconstruction.....	368
Transcription.....	368
Translation.....	378
Notes.....	385
<i>L.T.-3: Treaty between Till-Abnû of Apum and Jamši-Hatnû of Kahat</i>	387
Material Reconstruction.....	387
Transcription.....	387
Translation.....	397
Notes.....	405
<i>L.T.-4: Treaty between Till-Abnû and Jamši-Hatnû(?)</i>	407
Material Reconstruction.....	407
Transcription.....	407
Translation.....	414
Notes.....	416
<i>L.T.-5: Treaty between Till-Abnû and Assur</i>	417
Transcription.....	417
Translation.....	422
<i>L.T.-6: Miscellaneous Treaty Fragments</i>	427
<i>L.T.-7: Treaty Bullae(?)</i>	431

INDICES TO THE TREATIES

<i>A. Geographical Names</i>	434
<i>B. Personal Names</i>	435
<i>C. Deities</i>	436
<i>D. Selected Vocabulary</i>	437

BIBLIOGRAPHY	439
---------------------------	------------

TABLES

Table 1. L.87-Letters listed according to publication numbers	451
Table 2. L.87-Letters listed according to field numbers	457
Table 3. L.87-Letters listed according to find spot.....	463
Table 4. L.87-Treaties listed according to published sigla and field numbers	469

PLATES

Plate I. Map of the Habur region with sites discussed indicated	471
The Letters. Hand copies	
Plate II. Letters 1 and 2	472
Plate III. Letters 5 and 6.....	473
Plate IV. Letter 7.....	474
Plate V. Letter 8, obv.	475
Plate VI. Letter 8, rev.	476
Plate VII. Letters 9 and 10	477
Plate VIII. Letters 11 and 12.....	478
Plate IX. Letters 13 and 14	479
Plate X. Letters 15 and 16.....	480
Plate XI. Letter 18, obv.	481
Plate XII. Letter 18, rev.	482
Plate XIII. Letter 19	483
Plate XIV. Letter 20.....	484
Plate XV. Letters 22 and 23	485
Plate XVI. Letters 24, 25, and 26.....	486
Plate XVII. Letter 28.....	487
Plate XVIII. Letters 29, 30, and 32	488
Plate XIX. Letters 33 and 34.....	489
Plate XX. Letters 35 and 36	490
Plate XXI. Letter 37.....	491
Plate XXII. Letters 38 and 39	492
Plate XXIII. Letters 40 and 41	493
Plate XXIV. Letter 42	494
Plate XXV. Letter 43	495
Plate XXVI. Letter 44	496
Plate XXVII. Letters 45 and 46	497
Plate XXVIII. Letters 47 and 48	498
Plate XXIX. Letters 52 and 54.....	499

Plate XXX. Letters 55, 56, and 57	500
Plate XXXI. Letter 58, obv.	501
Plate XXXII. Letter 58, rev.	502
Plate XXXIII. Letters 59 and 61	503
Plate XXXIV. Letters 60 and 62	504
Plate XXXV. Letters 63 and 65	505
Plate XXXVI. Letters 64 and 66	506
Plate XXXVII. Letters 67 and 68	507
Plate XXXVIII. Letters 70 and 71	508
Plate XXXIX. Letters 72 and 74	509
Plate XL. Letter 75	510
Plate XLI. Letters 76 and 77	511
Plate XLII. Letters 78 and 79	512
Plate XLIII. Letters 80 and 81	513
Plate XLIV. Letter 82	514
Plate XLV. Letter 83	515
Plate XLVI. Letter 84	516
Plate XLVII. Letter 85	517
Plate XLVIII. Letters 86 and 87	518
Plate XLIX. Letters 88 and 89, obv.	519
Plate L. Letter 89, rev.	520
Plate LI. Letters 90 and 91	521
Plate LII. Letter 92	522
Plate LIII. Letter 93	523
Plate LIV. Letter 94	524
Plate LV. Letter 95	525
Plate LVI. Letter 97	526
Plate LVII. Letters 98 and 99	527
Plate LVIII. Letters 100 and 101	528
Plate LIX. Letters 102 and 103	529
Plate LX. Letters 104 and 105	530
Plate LXI. Letters 106 and 107	531
Plate LXII. Letters 108 and 110	532
Plate LXIII. Letter 111	533
Plate LXIV. Letter 112	534
Plate LXV. Letters 114 and 115	535
Plate LXVI. Letter 116	536
Plate LXVII. Letter 117	537
Plate LXVIII. Letters 118 and 119	538

Plate LXIX. Letters 121 and 122	539
Plate LXX. Letter 125	540
Plate LXXI. Letter 126	541
Plate LXXII. Letter 127	542
Plate LXXIII. Letters 128 and 129	543
Plate LXXIV. Letters 130 and 131	544
Plate LXXV. Letters 132 and 134	545
Plate LXXVI. Letters 135 and 136	546
Plate LXXVII. Letter 137	547
Plate LXXVIII. Letter 138	548
Plate LXXIX. Letter 139	549
Plate LXXX. Letters 140 and 141	550
Plate LXXXI. Letters 142 and 143	551
Plate LXXXII. Letters 144, 145, and 146	552
Plate LXXXIII. Letter 147	553
Plate LXXXIV. Letter 148	554
Plate LXXXV. Letter 149	555
Plate LXXXVI. Letters 150 and 152	556
Plate LXXXVII. Letter 153	557
Plate LXXXVIII. Letter 155	558
Plate LXXXIX. Letter 156, obv.	559
Plate XC. Letter 156, rev.	560
Plate XCI. Letter 157	561
Plate XCII. Letters 164 and 165	562
Plate XCIII. Letters 166 and 167	563
Plate XCIV. Letters 168 and 169	564
Plate XCV. Letters 170 and 171	565
Plate XCVI. Letter 173	566
Plate XCVII. Letters 174 and 176	567
Plate XCVIII. Letter 175	568
Plate XCIX. Letters 178 and 180	569
Plate C. Letters 179 and 182	570
Plate CI. Letters 185 and 186	571
Plate CII. Letters 187 and 188	572
Plate CIII. Letters 191 and 197	573
Plate CIV. Letters 201, 207, and 210	574
The Letters. Photographic plates	
Plate CV. Letter 28	575
Plate CVI. Letter 63	576

The Treaties. Hand copies

Plate CVII. Treaty L.T.-1 (1)	577
Plate CVIII. Treaty L.T.-1 (2)	578
Plate CIX. Treaty L.T.-1 (3)	579
Plate CX. Treaty L.T.-1 (4)	580
Plate CXI. Treaty L.T.-1 (5)	581
Plate CXII. Treaty L.T.-1 (6)	582
Plate CXIII. Treaty L.T.-1 (7)	583
Plate CXIV. Treaty L.T.-1 (8)	584
Plate CXV. Treaty L.T.-1 (9)	585
Plate CXVI. Treaty L.T.-2 (1)	586
Plate CXVII. Treaty LT-2 (2)	587
Plate CXVIII. Treaty LT-2 (3)	588
Plate CXIX. Treaty LT-2 (4)	589
Plate CXX. Treaty LT-2 (5)	590
Plate CXXI. Treaty LT-2 (6)	591
Plate CXXII. Treaty LT-2 (7)	592
Plate CXXIII. Treaty LT-2 (8)	593
Plate CXXIV. Treaty L.T.-3 (1)	594
Plate CXXV. Treaty L.T.-3 (2)	595
Plate CXXVI. Treaty L.T.-3 (3)	596
Plate CXXVII. Treaty L.T.-3 (4)	597
Plate CXXVIII. Treaty L.T.-3 (5)	598
Plate CXXIX. Treaty L.T.-3 (6)	599
Plate CXXX. Treaty L.T.-4 (1)	600
Plate CXXXI. Treaty L.T.-4 (2)	601
Plate CXXXII. Treaty L.T.-4 (3)	602
Plate CXXXIII. Treaty L.T.-4 (4)	603
Plate CXXXIV. Treaty L.T.-5 (1)	604
Plate CXXXV. Treaty L.T.-5 (2)	605
Plate CXXXVI. Treaty L.T.-5 (3)	606
Plate CXXXVII. Treaty L.T.-5 (4)	607
Plate CXXXVIII. Treaty L.T.-5 (5)	608
Plate CXXXIX. Treaty L.T.-5 (6)	609
Plate CXL. Treaty L.T.-6	610
Plate CXLI. Treaty L.T.-7	611

The Treaties. Photographic plates

Plate CXLII. Treaty L.T.-1, obv.	613
Plate CXLIII. Treaty L.T.-1, rev.	614

Plate CXLIV. Treaty L.T.-1, obv. of 1456	615
Plate CXLV. Treaty L.T.-2, obv.	616
Plate CXLVI. Treaty L.T.-2, rev.	617
Plate CXLVII. Treaty L.T.-3, obv.	618
Plate CXLVIII. Treaty L.T.-3, rev.	619
Plate CXLIX. Treaty L.T.-3, obv. of 1362+1363	620
Plate CL. Treaty L.T.-3, rev. of 1362+1363	621
Plate CLI. Treaty L.T.-4, obv.	622
Plate CLII. Treaty L.T.-4, rev.	623
Plate CLIII. Treaty L.T.-4, obv. of 924a.....	624
Plate CLIV. Treaty L.T.-7.....	625

٣	تمهيد
٩	مقدمة
٥٠	شكر و امتنان

Photo and illustration credits

Cover image: Photograph by the author.

Pages XVII-XLIX (Archaeological Introduction): All photographs, drawings and tables were provided by Lauren Ristvet and Harvey Weiss.

Plate I: The map was drafted by the author and drawn by Aase Ghazemi.

Plates II-CIV and CVII-CXLI: All hand copies of tablets were drafted and inked by the author.

Plates CV-CVI: Photographs of tablets (letters) by R. Taylor Andreasen.

Plates CXLII-CLIV: Photographs of tablets (treaties) by the author. Please note that the photographs of treaties do not include all fragments listed in this edition.

PREFACE

This volume is the *editio princeps* of the Old Babylonian letters and treaties found in 1987 in the “Lower Town Palace East” (Operation 3) at Tell Leilan in northeastern Syria. These tablets, with a few possible exceptions, formed parts of archives belonging to the kings Mutija and Till-Abnû, who reigned at Leilan ca. 1755-45 B.C. (middle chronology). Most of the letters and treaties were found mixed with hundreds of administrative records in the same two small rooms of the palace.¹ Convergent archaeological and archival evidence indicates that this “archive” is a composite group of texts, formed in antiquity through a process of selection and deselection of older and partly redundant documents. This observation of course has little impact on our modern interest in the evidence, evolving from its indisputable importance as the first major group of historical sources found on the Habur Plains, and indeed as the only historical sources from northern Mesopotamia in this period.

The Habur Plains in northeastern Syria have in recent decades become a major focus for archaeological and historical research. Long neglected after the pioneering efforts of Max Mallowan, the resumption of excavations at Tell Brak, and the inception of the Yale University excavations at Tell Leilan in the 1970s, inaugurated a new and intense phase of exploration. Many important projects of survey, excavation, and textual studies are in progress, and it seems realistic to expect the future appearance of comprehensive historical vistas of the region in all its syn- and diachronic configurations.² In this perspective the present volume enters the virtual maelstrom of a rapidly increasing scholarly literature, incorporating some recent research results, but itself primarily a new important component in the data base from which more mature historical analyses should eventually emerge. It must also be noted that the present volume presents only part of the corpus of epigraphic evidence from the Lower Town Palace excavations in 1987. Preliminary editions with most of the administrative texts have been completed, but cannot be fully exploited in the formats currently available, and this whole material still awaits final elaboration.³

The efforts in this volume have therefore been deliberately concentrated on the empirical presentation of the tablets themselves. The actual texts, the letters and the treaties, are edited in formal manner in separate sections to allow easy reference, and ready access for what analytical reappraisal may become necessary or desirable in the

¹ The tablets also included fragments from a version of the Sumerian King List. See Vincente 1990 and 1995.

² For a history of archaeological research in the region see the contribution by D. Warburton in the first volume of the Tall al-Hamīdīya publications. Both that volume (Eichler et al. 1985) and the second in the series (Eichler et al. 1990) contain numerous articles on Habur archaeology and history. For full bibliographies see Anastasio 1995, specifically for Tell Leilan p. 214. Collections of recent studies of the region may be found in Lebeau (ed.) 1998, and Rouault and Wäfler (eds.) 2000.

³ See Vincente 1991; Ismail 1991. Tablets from these two editions are referred to as CV + No. and FI + No. Other epigraphic finds from Leilan are referred to with their L(eilan).87-field Nos.

future. The introductory chapters, on the other hand, contain background material, summaries, and analyses based on my own comprehension, which, readers should be warned, at times is quite tentative. I believe, however, that the sometimes severe problems attached to historical analysis of these sources are no excuse for avoiding such analysis, and not presenting the most advanced reconstructions possible.

Behind the preparation of the present volume stands a host of initiating, inspiring, financing, and generally generous and helpful individuals and institutions which it is a great pleasure to be able to thank.

Foremost I must express my gratitude to my colleagues in the Yale University Tell Leilan Project. To the project director Harvey Weiss who entrusted his tablets to me, and to Robert M. Whiting, whose work on the early finds from the Lower Town Palace immediately put this in historical perspective, and who gave me a fine introduction to the epigraphic work at Leilan in 1987.

Later a small team was formed to undertake the post-excavation processing of the epigraphic material in the National Museum, Deir ez-Zor (Syria), where the tablets are housed. My closest collaborators in this team were Claudine Vincente (Yale University) and Farouk Ismail (Universität Tübingen, now University of Aleppo), who prepared editions of the administrative documents from Leilan. Their professional help and good company during several long sojourns in Deir ez-Zor, as well as subsequent cooperation, was much and sincerely appreciated. Equally pleasant to recall are the somewhat briefer visits to Deir ez-Zor by the other members of our team, the conservators Ulla Kasten (Yale Babylonian Collection) and Rise Taylor-Andreasen (Tromsø Museum, Norway), who expertly baked and restored Leilan tablets.

The work in Syria, extending over three longer stays 1988-1989 with shorter visits in 1990, 1992, and 1994, could not have been completed so quickly and smoothly were it not for the cooperation, hospitality and efficiency of the Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums of the Syrian Arab Republic, especially as represented by the National Museum in Deir ez-Zor, whose director A. Mahmoud and his staff proved continuously welcoming and helpful. They are most warmly thanked.

In a wider perspective help with analysis of the Leilan material has come from several quarters. Especially from Harvey Weiss, Peter Akkermans, and Dominique Parayre, who provided information on the archaeological context as well as many insightful suggestions. A most valuable help has come from Klaas Veenhof, who has given us much advice on the problems concerning the Leilan *limmus*. In a general as well as more specific ways my thinking about the history and geography of the northern Jezira has benefited much from discussions with numerous scholars, like foremost David and Joan Oates, Markus Wäfler, David Warburton, Jean-Marie Durand, Dominique Charpin, Marco Bonechi, and Marc Lebeau. Last, but not least, the Carsten Niebuhr Institute of Near Eastern Studies at the University of Copenhagen, where the manuscript was prepared, provided as always a friendly and inspiring atmosphere, and supported the work throughout in many ways.

All the above efforts, however, might have been of little avail, were it not for the generous financial support which enabled the author to undertake this work. A research grant from the University of Copenhagen 1988-1990 formed the basis, while travel grants

from The Carlsberg Foundation, The Martin Levy Memorial Grant (both Copenhagen), The Danish Research Council for the Humanities, and support from the Yale University Tell Leilan Project provided the necessary funds for the work in Syria.

There finally remains a very personal note: namely my wish to dedicate this volume to the memory of my teacher and friend, Jørgen Læssøe (1924-1993), formerly professor of Assyriology at the University of Copenhagen. Jørgen had of course himself experience with newly discovered Old Babylonian tablets from northern Mesopotamia (from Tell Shemshāra), and although his health prevented him taking any active part in my studies of the Leilan tablets, he shared my enthusiasm over the new finds. I entertain the vain hope that his scholarly and inspiring spirit – always so generously communicated to his students – finds some reflection in the following pages.

Copenhagen, in March 1998

Additional Note

The present volume unfortunately appears with some considerable delay, and since 1998 a number of new publications of relevance for the texts presented here have appeared. Foremost the long-awaited volume with the “royal letters” from Mari: J.-R. Kupper, *Letters royales du temps de Zimri-Lim. Archives royales de Mari XXVIII*. Paris: ERC 1998 (= ARM XXVIII), and the trilogy by J.-M. Durand, *Documents épistolaires du palais de Mari I-III*. Paris: Les éditions du cerf 1997-2000 (=DEPM). Since little in these and other recent publications has substantial impact on results and conclusions in the present volume, no complete revision of the text has been attempted, but comments and bibliography have been updated where this seemed important. It should finally be noted that the volume J.-M. Durand and D. Charpin (eds.), *Amurru II*. Paris: ERC 2001, which contains a long study of Mari period international relations and diplomacy by B. Lafont, had not yet reached me prior to submission of the final manuscript.

Copenhagen, in September 2002

Final Note

After another long and ultimately inexplicable delay this volume has finally come close to actual publication, and therefore subject to final updates, not least following the publication of the Kültepe Eponym List (KEL) G (Günbattı 2008), and a number of new publications of Mari texts. Again no complete revision has been attempted, but in view of the detailed summary of the Leilan sources which has appeared in OBO 160/5 (Eidem 2008b) the introductory chapters to Part I have been somewhat shortened. The introduction to Part II, on the other hand, has been only slightly updated. The author sincerely regrets that this volume has taken so long to appear, and would like to thank the

institutions which finally made the publication possible. Foremost I must record my gratitude to the Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums of the Syrian Arab Republic for its cooperation and permission to have this volume appear in PIHANS, and the editors of that series for accepting the manuscript. It is to be hoped that at least some of the readers will conclude that the material presented here was, after all, worth the waiting!

Leiden, in December 2010

PART I. THE LETTERS

1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1. Chronological and Historical Context

1.1.1. Historical Background

Recent publications on both archaeological and documentary evidence from Tell Leilan itself and from other sites have produced detailed discussions of the site and its place in the history of Northern Mesopotamia in the late 3rd to early 2nd millennium B.C., so that a few remarks on the historical background for the material presented here will suffice.⁴

First of all it may be useful to reiterate that the identification of Tell Leilan with ancient Šehnā/Šubat-Enlil can be considered definitely established. Any possible doubts left by the analyses by Charpin (1987a) and Whiting (1990b) are removed by the 1987 evidence.⁵ On the other hand the problems concerning the relationship between Apum/*māt Apim* and Šehnā/Šubat-Enlil remain unresolved, and the new evidence provides no firm conclusions on this issue. All that can be said is that Apum, in the texts presented here, refers to areas near the capital Šehnā/Šubat-Enlil.⁶

⁴ The following brief remarks summarise information and discussion found especially in publications by Weiss (see Bibliography), Whiting 1990a and 1990b (for the Leilan evidence); Charpin 1986 and 1987a, Charpin, ARMT XXVI/2, pp. 31 ff., and Charpin and Ziegler 2003, *passim* (for the Mari evidence). A more detailed summary is available in Eidem 2008b, 271-273.

⁵ This follows not so much from any single piece of evidence, but from the cumulative weight of corroborative data. To mention but two aspects: numerous adm. documents record transactions as taking place “in Šehnā”, and in all seven cases where Šubat-Enlil is mentioned in the letters (see index) the logical contextual implication is that the letter was received by someone residing in this town.

⁶ As correctly pointed out by Charpin (1987a, 137ff.; and Charpin 1990b, 117 with notes 4-5; for a different etymology of the name Apum see Cohen 1993, 260) extant OB references (including those from the new Leilan material) provide a clear distinction between Apum as the area or country around Leilan and Šehnā/Šubat-Enlil as the actual ancient city, but some problems persist. First of all that the Old Assyrian references, exclusively to Apum, should be to a town (in parallel with other localities along the Old Assyrian routes), and secondly divine compounds like Bēlet-Apim usually involve the name of a town rather than a land. Unfortunately the new evidence does not solve this problem, and we can only refer to some tentative suggestions:

Charpin has identified a town Apû, located in the Sinjar region, and which he suggests housed the *kārum* mentioned in OA sources (Charpin 2003, 10 n. 68). This would of course solve the problem, but it seems to me unlikely that this can be correct. The OA evidence in one instance provides the stations: Qaṭṭarā – Daragum – Apum (Nashef 1987), and since Daragum probably

The name Šubat-Enlil for Leilan, sparingly used in the texts published here, was almost certainly applied to the town by the mighty Šamši-Adad 1. (ca. 1833-1776 B.C.), whose association with the Habur Plains goes back almost to the beginning of his reign. This evolves clearly from the Mari Eponym Chronicle (Biro 1985), where the annotation for the 3rd regnal year of Šamši-Adad mentions that he was defeated by the Lulleans, i.e. local hill population, at Lazapāt(um), a town located in the region south of Leilan (see I.1.2.4). Šamši-Adad presumably conquered the town from an earlier ruler, but the name of this ruler, or indeed the name of any other pre-Šamši-Adad ruler of Leilan, is still unknown. The archives from Mari and Chagar Bazar provide us with the names of a number of officials active in Šubat-Enlil (Villard 2001, 107f.), but otherwise give few details about the town. From Leilan itself there is some evidence from this period, primarily from the buildings excavated on the Acropolis in 1985 (Whiting 1990a and 1990b), but also from the Lower Town Palace, where several rooms have yielded sealing fragments bearing legends of Šamši-Adad, Išme-Dagan, and some of their officials.⁷

When Šamši-Adad died in 1776 B.C. his empire quickly disintegrated. Jasmah-Addu disappeared, and Išme-Dagan was left with the core of the kingdom around Ekallātum (Charpin and Ziegler 2003, 186). In the Habur area the official Samija held Šubat-Enlil for some years, and the rather complex situation in this period includes a struggle between Samija and a certain Turum-natki, who may have had old claims on

should be located on the east edge of the Habur area (cf. ARMT XXVIII, 132), an Apum in the Sinjar region would mean that the OA caravan moved in circles!

Another suggestion made by this author (Eidem 2008b, 269f.) is based on the evidence in [101] where the king of Šunā, located somewhere fairly due west of Leilan, reports that he has prepared the defense of “the town of Šunā and the *hallaš* of the country of Apum”, and at the end of the letter states that “the town of Šunā and the country of Apum is well” (cf. also [102], 26f.). This seems to indicate that Šunā, a vassal kingdom of Leilan, was actually *within* the territory of Apum, and if so it could be speculated that a town Apum perhaps was located west of Leilan, where Tell Aid could be a candidate.

Yet another solution might be that Apum and Šehnā (for an etymology “Hot (Springs)” see Bonechi 1998, 221f.) originally referred to two different aspects of the Leilan settlement, its extensive lower town and the ancient core represented by the citadel. These two realities are of course termed respectively *adaššum* and *kerhum* in Old Babylonian northern texts, and this “double” nature of major tells, which dates back into the 3rd millennium B.C., could have created different names for parts of the same settlement (cf. the situation at Ebla where a special designation (sa-za^{ki}) was used for the citadel). Since the *kārum* merchant quarter in Leilan was located in the lower town the Assyrians would then have used the name Apum rather than Šehnā.

None of all this, however, is very convincing on present evidence, and we must conclude that the problem cannot yet be solved in any definitive way.

⁷ For the 1987 material cf. the example published here in Appendix 2.2, no. 7 (Šamši-Adad). Other figures attested in such evidence include Kani-PI, son of Hatni-Addu, servant of Išme-Dagan [L.87-1281]; Samija, servant of Šamši-Adad [L.87-1279]; Lîter-šarrûssu, servant of Šamši-Adad (cf. Parayre 1991b, 138 no. 14; a bulla with the seal of this official has also been found at Acemhöyük, see Tunca 1989, 483). Samija and Lîter-šarrûssu (see Whiting 1990a and 1990b; also for Lîter-šarrûssu see D. Charpin, ARMT XXVI/2, p. 29 c), are well-known figures in this phase of Leilan history, and both are known to have been stationed at Šubat-Enlil towards the end of the period, while finally Kaniwe(?) is not to my knowledge attested previously.

Apum. When Ešnunna invaded the region in ZL 4, Samija disappeared, and Turum-natki died. Qarni-Lim of Andarig, an ally of Ešnunna, then placed one of Turum-natki's sons on the throne of Apum. This son may have been a certain Zūzu, but in any case his reign was brief, and he was soon followed by his brother Haja-abum, whom L.T.-1 now reveals also was a son of Turum-natki. Until mid-ZL 10 Hāja-abum remained king of Apum, although under some control by Andarig, as also revealed by L.T.-1, and the archive from the Leilan Lower Town Palace North (Van De Mierop 1993). In ZL 10 Elamite troops and their allies invaded the Habur, and Haja-abum was killed. An Elamite general, Kunnam, resided for a time at Šubat-Enlil, and controlled a large sector of the Habur Basin, but later the same year the Elamites and their allies were defeated. Qarni-Lim came to a bad end (cf. Heimpel 1996a), and his place was taken by a certain Atamrum, ruler of the Sinjar town Allahad, who now controlled both Andarig and also Šubat-Enlil, where a certain Šupram (also king of the town Susā) was installed as governor. During the following years Atamrum, and simultaneously and subsequently from ZL 12 his successor, Himdija, were in control of Leilan.

The 1987 excavations in the Lower Town Palace produced only a few inscriptions from this whole period. Neither Turum-natki or Zūzu are attested, but a few sealings have the legend of a certain Bēlī-emūqī, servant of Hāja-abum. Atamrum of Andarig and his governor (*šāpiṭum*) Šupram are not attested, but Himdija, Atamrum's successor, is represented by a few sealing fragments, and two tablets.⁸

After 1761 B.C., when Hammurabi of Babylon brought an end to the power of Mari, documentation for the history of northern Mesopotamia comes to an end for a very long time, although not completely so. Texts from Tell al-Rimah in the Sinjar Plain (ancient Qaṭṭarā; see Charpin and Durand 1987; also Eidem 1989a) provide some information on a few years within the decennium 1760-50 B.C., and show that Hammurabi of Babylon now was in control of northern Mesopotamia,⁹ while texts from Tell Asharah (ancient Terqa) on the middle Euphrates document developments under the so-called Hana dynasty (Rouault 1984 and 1992). Most recently a small group of Old Babylonian tablets excavated at Tell Ṭaban have shown that the Terqa kings controlled the Middle Euphrates and Lower Habur up to and including Tell Ṭaban, ancient Ṭabātum, where a local noble (*sugāgum?*), Jasim-Mahar, was subordinated the kings of Terqa (Yamada 2010 with further references).

When the first rooms of the Lower Town Palace at Leilan were excavated in 1985 tablets and sealings appeared bearing names of new kings, and evidently dating to a period later than that documented at Mari. Several of the new tablets were administrative texts dated with the otherwise unknown *limmu* Išme-El and *warki* Išme-El, and sealed with the seal of Jakūn-Ašar, son of Dari-Epuh and king of Apum. This royal name provided a welcome chronological link with southern Mesopotamia where the year-formula for the 23rd regnal year of the Babylonian king Samsu-iluna states: "... the king, by the fierce power which Enlil gave him, destroyed Šahnā, the capital city of the land of Apum,

⁸ The envelope fragments from Room 2 (see Appendix 2.2, no. 1) are especially interesting since they carry the full legend of Himdija's seal. The two tablets are a legal document sealed by a servant of Himdija and dated with the *limmu ha-ab-d[u(?)]-...* found in Room 22, and a single letter [L.87-887] addressed to Himdija, from Room 5. The latter text, which contains interesting new information, will be published separately by Prof. F. Ismail.

⁹ For some remarks on the order and extent of this control see below I.1.2.1.

Zarhanum, Putra, Šusā, ...-lazia(?) «and» ... Jakūn-Ašar Jakūn ...” (Horsnell 1999, Vol. 2, 211-213). Thus the year Samsu-iluna 22, which equals 1728 B.C., could be considered a terminal date for the king Jakūn-Ašar. The Babylonian year-formula is the latest extant reference to Leilan, where at least major occupation came to an end at this time.

1.1.2. Evidence from the Lower Town Palace

The material excavated in the Lower Town in 1985 has been dealt with in some detail by Whiting (1990a and 1990b) and need only be briefly summarized here. It was mainly found in the two partially excavated rooms numbered 2 and 5, and it included 16 administrative texts dated with the following *limmu* eponyms: Adad-bāni (1 text), Aššur-taklāku (1), Išme-El (7), *warki* Išme-El (1), and Niwer-Kūbi (6). All of these texts came from Room 2 except the one dated to Adad-bani, which was found in Room 5.

In addition to this was found half a dozen undated or fragmentary administrative texts and a single letter addressed to Samija. The sealings found had inscriptions relating to the kings Šamšī-Adad, Himdija, Till-Abnū, Mutija, and Jakūn-Ašar. The seal of Jakūn-Ašar himself was also found impressed on all the administrative tablets dated with the *limmu* Išme-El (including the one dated *warki* I.-E.).

From this rather limited material Whiting was able to define the main premises for the chronological situation. As mentioned above Jakūn-Ašar can be connected with the 22nd regnal year of Samsu-iluna, which provides a date *ante quem* for the material, while the lower floors of the building obviously dated back to the time of Šamšī-Adad. The intervening period Whiting could define as follows: “a) any time that Dari-Epuh, Yakun-Ašar’s father, may have ruled; b) any time that other unknown predecessors of Yakun-Ašar (such as possibly Mutija [the attestation of Till-Abnū only became clear with corroborative evidence from 1987. JE] may have ruled; c) the length of Yakun-Ašar’s reign prior to the limus attested in the archive.” (Whiting 1990b, 572 n. 106).

During the 1987 season the rooms 2 and 5, which produced the majority of the tablets found in 1985, were completely exposed, and in addition a large new area of the palace was excavated. The epigraphic finds from this season were recorded with 1068 field-nos., but since subsequent study has separated fragments recorded as one field-no. and joined others recorded separately this figure is only a rough guide to the number of separate items found. Leaving aside the ca. 250 sealing and envelope fragments, for which absolute figures are less meaningful, the material can be summed up as follows:

- 219 letters or letter fragments published in this volume. Although a few theoretical joins among the sometimes very small fragments may have passed unnoticed this material can safely be said to represent at least 200 different texts.

- some 80 fragments from at least 5 larger tablets containing the texts of political treaties and a version of the Sumerian King List.

- 344 administrative texts or fragments with preserved (or reconstructable) *limmu* date representing this approximate number of individual tablets.

- some 125 administrative texts or fragments without preserved date.

- some 140 smaller fragments, either of administrative texts or insignificant or worthless pieces.

As reported by the excavators (Akkermans and Weiss 1991) most of these tablets and fragments were found in two main groups, in Room 2 and Rooms 17/22/23 respectively.

The first group consists of administrative texts, many dated to the *limmu* year Išme-El, firmly associated with the ruler Jakūn-Ašar. The texts predominantly concern wine, and seem to be part of a smaller, specialized archive, and probably the latest texts found in the palace.

The much larger second group, scattered in three different rooms, consists of both administrative texts, letters, and fragments from political treaties. Most of the texts presented in this volume belong to this group.¹⁰ With very few exceptions the material belongs to the latest phase of Leilan history, i.e. the period ca. 1755-28 B.C.. Apart from Himdija, who may have continued to be in control of Leilan some time after the Mari archives come to an end in 1761 B.C., three different kings, Mutija, Till-Abnû, and Jakūn-Ašar, are attested for this phase, their names occurring in seal legends, letters, and as contracting partners in treaties.

1.1.3. The Leilan Kings

The sequence of the three latest Leilan kings presents no immediate problem. The basis for a reconstruction is provided by two synchronisms with material from Babylonia. The first is the Samsu-iluna year formula already referred to, and which shows that Jakūn-Ašar was king in 1728 B.C., a year which no doubt was the last of his reign. The second synchronism is provided by the *limmu* Habil-kēnu, firmly associated with the reign of Mutija, and which is also found in tablets from Sippar. From the Sippar material the *limmu* can be dated to a year either very late in the reign of Hammurabi or very early in the reign of his successor Samsu-iluna, i.e. approximately 1750 B.C. (see Veenhof 1989; cf. Charpin 1990d), and this has now found confirmation in KEL G, where Habil-kēnu occurs as No. 110, which can be dated ca. 1749 B.C. (Günbatt 2008). Finally the Leilan material itself provides ample evidence that Till-Abnû directly succeeded Mutija, who is referred to retrospectively and in very specific terms in several letters sent to Till-Abnû.

Mutija

The name Mutija is a hypocoristicon of Mutu-Abih¹¹, but it is exclusively the short form which is used in the letters. The complete form is attested in the seal legend of Mutija found impressed on 16 administrative texts dated in the *limmu* Habil-kēnu:

mu-tu-a-bi-ih, dumu ha-lu-un-pi-mu, na-ra-am ^dim, ù ^dnin-a-pi-im

“Mutu-Abih, son of Halun-pî-(ju)mu¹², beloved of Adad and Bēlet-Apim”

¹⁰ Exceptions are: 2 letters from Room 12: a fragmentary letter exchanged between two palace officials [168], and a small fragment from a letter sent to Mutija from an unidentified writer [21]; a letter fragment found in Room 2 [160].

¹¹ For this name meaning “Man of Ebih” (Jebel Hamrin) see Durand 1991c, 85. It could of course be speculated that this name has a bearing on the history of the family to which Mutija belonged.

¹² This follows writings like *ha-lu-(un/m-)pi-PI-mu* in texts from Mari (ARMT XVI/1, 97), and here L.T.-2 iii 5’ *ha-lu-pi-ú-mu*. The same name is carried by an earlier king of Ahazum (Charpin and Ziegler 2003, 100 and 107).

In this inscription Mutija is not given any title, but this is found in L.T.-2 where he is repeatedly referred to as lugal *māt Apim* – “king of the land Apum”.

Till-Abnû

Although Till-Abnû¹³ is the current form of the name, the hypocoristicon Tillāja is found once, in the address of [23] sent from Hammurabi of Halab (also possibly in the address of [27] sent from Bin-Dammu, the Halab general).

A number of administrative tablets are sealed with seals of servants of Till-Abnû or with his own seal. The two first lines in the legend invariably read: Till-Abnû, dumu Dari-Epuh – “Till-Abnû, son of Dari-Epuh”, but the third line is often not visible on the tablet, since it has been erased by repeated impression of the seal legend onto the tablet.

On a total of seven tablets, however, the third line appears as: *ir ša* “[.....]” – “servant of the god[.....]”. Six of these texts are dated in the *limmu* Amer-Ištar (months iii, iv, v, x, xi), and one in a *limmu* [...]-Ištar (month iii), which almost certainly is identical with Amer-Ištar.

On one single tablet (dated Amer-Ištar, vii.15) the third line appears as: lugal *ma-a-at* [*a-pi-im*^(ki)] – “king of the land Apum”, and this is the title found in several of the treaties, e.g. L.T.-3 which is dated to the *limmu* Amer-Ištar.

Jakûn-Ašar

Again the full version is the most current form, but a hypocoristicon, Jakûja (*ia-ku-ia*) is found in several seal legends belonging to servants of the king. The legend of his own seal is found on numerous tablets from Room 2 (all dated in *limmu* Išme-El and in 2 cases *warki* I.-E.):

ia-ku-un-a-šar, dumu *da-ri-e-pu-uh*, lugal *ma-a-at a-pi-im*

“Jakûn-Ašar, son of Dari-Epuh, king of the land Apum”.

(see Parayre in Weiss et al. 1990, 564 fig. 34)

The Dynasty

While a sequence Mutija – Till-Abnû – Jakûn-Ašar seems secure there remains a number of problems concerning these kings, their origin and relationship to each other, and their periods of rule.

It is clear that Till-Abnû and Jakûn-Ašar, both sons of Dari-Epuh, were brothers, and possibly other members of the family are attested.¹⁴

¹³ For this name and its possible etymologies cf. Durand 1987g. The current spelling is *ti-la-ab-nu-ú*, but we also find: *til-la-ab-nu-[ú]* ([55] from Halu-rabi), *ti-í[l-la-a]b-nu-ú* ([89] from Šukrum-Teššup), *til-ab¹-nu-ú¹* ([89], 29), *til-na₄* ([105] from Mehilum and [128] from Bahdi-Lim), *ti-í-l[í-a]b-nu* ([113] from Sumu-Ditana), *ti-la-ab-ni* ([118] from Ahušina, and probably [122] from [...]), also in two letters from Kuzuzzu [137] and [139]); for variations in spelling of -Abnû: *ab-nu/ab-nu-ú/ab-ni* in letters from Aja-abu of Šunā see below ad [93]. These variations fit Durand’s observations and justify the normalization Till-Abnû used also in this volume. Again it could be speculated whether the name – if formed from the town Till-Abnā (cf. Charpin 2003, 30) – has a bearing on the history of the family.

Since Mutija, and Till-Abnû and Jakûn-Ašar had different fathers it might seem that two different dynasties were involved, but apparently the situation is not that simple. A diachronic view of our material shows that men named Till-Abnû and Jakûn-Ašar were actively supporting Mutija during his reign, and the evidence suggests a geo-political construction where Mutija as king of Apum and based in Šehnā was supported by two sub- or junior kings on the borders of Apum.

Till-Abnû – in contrast to Jakûn-Ašar – is not attested as correspondent of Mutija, but the letter [110] (Ewri to “his lord” Till-Abnû) can with confidence be dated to the reign of Mutija. Till-Abnû is further mentioned in two letters from the official Kuzuzzu [137] and [139] almost certainly sent to Mutija (for the historical context of all three letters see I.1.3.2). The implication of this evidence is that Till-Abnû supported Mutija and must have been an ally, vassal, or governor of Apum.

This observation may be connected with information in administrative texts dated to the *limmu* Habil-kēnu:

The first is CV 112 (19.v) which lists a delivery of wine from [ti]-la-ab-nu-ú lú Šurnat. An individual named Till-Abnû is also mentioned in CV 55 (11.ix) and CV 66 (25.ix), but in these instances in uncertain context. At the same time we have evidence for another lú Šurnat, a certain Kuzzuri:

CV 84 (25.viii Habil-kēnu) lists a garment given to Kuzzuri lu Šurnat

CV 111 (7.viii a Habil-kēnu; same entry in CV 117 with same date) is a note of 4 jars of wine brought by Kuzzuri lú Šurnat “when he came to meet with the king” (*inūma itti lugal ana nanmurim illikam*)

While the ever-present possibility of homonymy precludes definite proof it is a reasonable theory that Till-Abnû, for a time at least, was based at Šurnat prior to his accession, and that possibly he was assisted or succeeded by Kuzzuri.¹⁵

The town Šurnat, apart from references in the Leilan texts, is mentioned in a number of Mari texts which provide some evidence for its location, and it has been suggested that it should be sought northeast of the Jebel Sinjar (see ARMT XXVI/2, p. 83 sub e). ARMT XXVI/2, 422 provides interesting information showing that Šurnat must have been a fairly large walled town: (Hammurabi of Kurda) “sent 2000 soldiers and they attacked the town Šurnat which belongs to Zû-Hatni, and captured as much of its *salhum*,

¹⁴ Two sealing fragments are relevant in this context. The first is [L.87-151] where the fragmentary 3 line legend reads: [x x]^d[.....], [dumu d]a-ri-[.....], [x t]i-la-[.....]. If Dari-Epuh and Till-Abnû are involved here we must have a figure related to, but presumably subordinated Till-Abnû.

The second is [L.87-152], again with only part of the legend preserved: [x x]^rx¹.^rd¹ [.....], [dumu ia-k]u-un-a-[šar], [ir² ti-la-a]b-nu-^rú¹. In this case it could be speculated that a nephew of Till-Abnû is involved, and hence that Till-Abnû was fairly aged – or considerably younger than his brother Jakûn-Ašar.

¹⁵ The Kuzzuri mentioned in CV 92 (27.x Habil-kēnu), a section leader, could be a homonym. A man Kuzzuri is mentioned twice in letters, but no good links with a lú Šurnat can be established: as sender of [17] (reading, however, not completely certain) to his “father” Mutija, hence this figure was presumably a “king”. The letter is just a fragment, but the town Amaz – far from Šurnat – is mentioned. The other reference in [179] (address not preserved) is to an individual facing a trial.

its cows and sheep, and people, as they could get hold of, but the townspeople mounted to the citadel, and saved themselves in the citadel.” (ll. 25-31). Charpin (1990b, 118f.) has shown that Šurnat probably belonged to Apum, and it can tentatively be suggested that Šurnat should be identified with Tell Qal’at al Hādī on the wadi Rumeilan southeast of Leilan (see I.1.2.6, s.v. Ewri; and analysis of the historical events in I.1.3.2).¹⁶

In the extant material Jakūn-Ašar appears as king of Apum on sealing fragments, and in the sealed tablets dated to the *limmu* Išme-El and its *warki* year, found exclusively in Room 2. A man named Jakūn-Ašar occurs also, however, in the letters found in Rooms 17/22:

- Sender of 1 letter to Mutija, his “father”;
- Sender of 3 letters to Till-Abnû, his “brother”;
- Receiver of 1 letter from Halu-rabi;
- Mentioned as “brother” of addressee in a letter sent to *bēlum* (here probably Till-Abnû);
- Also mentioned in letters sent from Sangara of Tillā to *bēlum*.

Finally a single-entry administrative text, dated to the otherwise unattested *limmu* Aššur-kāšid, mentions an issue to Kazikuk, lû-tur Jakūn-Ašar, lû Ilān-šurā (FI 104).

Again granted the possibility of homonymy we can assume that Jakūn-Ašar, prior to his accession to the Apum throne, was based in Ilān-šurā. Since obviously Jakūn-Ašar may have retained a position as viceroy through the reign of Till-Abnû, the evidence for his activities and sphere of action is more extensive, and provides some support for a location in Ilān-šurā. This important town can unfortunately not yet be located very accurately, but was placed west of Leilan (see I.1.2.4).

What emerges then is the likely theory that Mutija had placed Till-Abnû and Jakūn-Ašar as viceroys in respectively Šurnat and Ilān-šurā, and it is important to note that these two towns marked major border points for the country of Apum. In the time of Zimri-Lim Ilān-šurā appears to be an outpost for the territory controlled by Mari and areas in the eastern part of the Habur, and in ARMT XXVI/2, 301 this is explicitly stated by the Mari envoy Jamšûm, who refers to the town as the *āl pāti ša bēlīja*. Similarly Šurnat’s position may have been useful for protecting the southeastern border of Apum.

Whether this geo-political reconstruction is strictly correct or not, we have so many corroborative pieces of evidence in the texts that the basic situation of the brothers Till-Abnû and Jakūn-Ašar supporting Mutija hardly can be doubted. This of course raises the question of the exact relationship between the three men. Himdiya’s reign and control of Leilan beyond the last year of the Mari archives, 1761 B.C., is unknown, but presumably of short duration, and the year of the *limmu* Habil-kēnu which may be the last regnal year of Mutija, can be dated to ca. 1750 B.C. Consequently we need to fill a ca. 10 year gap in the history of Leilan.

¹⁶ Šurnat is not attested outside the Old Babylonian sources referred to here. If identical with Qal’at al Hādī the town may have changed its name since there is evidence for later occupation on the site (see Meijer 1986, 19).

No kings other than Mutija are so far attested directly, but it seems possible that Dari-Epuh, the father of Till-Abnû and Jakûn-Ašar, once ruled Leilan. Some evidence to this effect can be found in [28] where Ea-malik states that Till-Abnû has ascended his “father’s” throne, and in [149] where Takê writes to his lord: “This is the advice which your father gave me: If you write to Till-Abnû, he shall come to you(r aid) like one man, and if he calls on you(r help), go to him at once!” Assuming that the “father” in question really was Dari-Epuh, and that he once ruled Leilan, it might obviously be thought that Mutija was an outsider who had usurped the throne after the death of Dari-Epuh. In [28] Ea-malik says that Mutija ascended “his” throne and Till-Abnû the throne of his “father”, but this difference is hardly of any consequence.

It seems likely that Mutija died a natural death (cf. [128]), but the circumstances of Till-Abnû’s accession are not revealed, and it cannot be excluded that it involved some crisis. In [127] Abbuttānum, referring perhaps to the time of Till-Abnû’s accession, writes: “When the elders of [Apu]m went to Kahat [to] my lord [.....]”, a statement which could be interpreted to mean that Till-Abnû, having being deprived of his rights by a usurper Mutija, had sought refuge in Kahat. At the same time we have a hint that Till-Abnû’s accession may have been disputed in certain quarters since Hammurabi of Halab in [24] finds it necessary to affirm his kingship.

However that may be the best theory which can be offered at present is perhaps that Till-Abnû and Jakûn-Ašar were nephews of Mutija. It could also be suggested that some of the problems concerning the accession of Till-Abnû just referred to relate to a competition between Till-Abnû and Jakûn-Ašar for the succession, rather than any crisis between Till-Abnû and Mutija. Although again there is no direct evidence for enmity between the two brothers (cf., however, [48]) the likely brevity of Till-Abnû’s reign makes it entirely possible that he could have been ousted by a malcontent brother.

Finally another question concerning these three kings can be raised. Where did they come from, did they have any connection with older rulers of Leilan, and how did they come to power? The answer is that we simply do not know. Neither Dari-Epuh, Mutija, nor his father Halun-pî-(ju)mu are known from other sources, and our texts reveal nothing about their origins (excluding the doubtful evidence from the names Mutu-Abih and Till-Abnû). The same names occur in texts from Mari, but in contexts which render it unlikely that the same individuals are involved. Both the family of Turum-natki (see I.1.1.1) and(?) that of Mutija and(?) Dari-Epuh could have been related to the dynasty which ruled Leilan before Šamši-Adad conquered Apum.

The foregoing discussion shows clearly how fragmentary and ambiguous present evidence is, and it can only be hoped that future discoveries will serve to fill in some of the serious documentary gaps and reveal clearer patterns. Meanwhile we have presented the outlines for an operational understanding of the texts published here: three members of possibly the same family ruling Apum, with Mutija as king assisted by his juniors Till-Abnû and Jakûn-Ašar. Subsequently the triad dwindled when first Mutija died and was succeeded by Till-Abnû, who in turn was followed on the throne by Jakûn-Ašar.

1.1.4. The Leilan *limmus*

In order to date the reigns of the last Leilan kings more accurately we turn next to the 12 *limmus* identified in the dated administrative texts.¹⁷ Although a number of problems persist, the fresh evidence from the Kültepe Eponym Lists (KEL A-G; Veenhof 2003, Günbatti 2008), combined with the Mari Eponym Chronicle (MEC; Birot 1985) now provides a sequence of almost all *limmus* from ca. 1975 B.C. down to ca. 1712 B.C. Since others will soon publish a comprehensive study of the new sequence (Larsen et alii, n. d.) we will here only discuss the part which pertains to the Leilan evidence. It is certainly reassuring to see that the core sequence Habil-kēnu – Amer-Ištar – Ipiq-Ištar is confirmed by KEL G, while for other aspects it raises some questions.

First a table which provides an overview of the *limmu* dated texts found in 1985/87.¹⁸

<i>limmu</i> /month	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii	<i>viii</i> a	ix	x	xi	xii
Habd[u [?] -...] 1											1		
Habil-kēnu 178 ¹⁹					17	24	24	31	17	19	14	14	1
Amer-Ištar 61 ²⁰	2	11	9	7	8	4	3			4	6	2	1
Ipiq-Ištar 17		1	3	2			3	5 ²¹		1		1	1
Išme-El 58	1		2		1	1	12	9		5	9	8	3
<i>warki</i> Išme-El 2	2												
Adad-bāni 3			1			2							
Aššur-kāšid 1													1
Aššur-taklāku 3			1				2						
Azzubija 1						1							
Nimer-Kūbi 17		1		1	1	2	4	7					
Pilah-Sîn 1										1			
Šu-bēlī 1		1											

The name of *limmus* are followed by total number of texts including tablets where the evidence for month is lost. Month *viii*a, which is only attested for Habil-kēnu, is the intercalary *niggallum*. Figures in bold face include sealed tablet(s) with evidence for royal name.

¹⁷ For this evidence see also provisionally the editions by Vincente 1991; and Ismail 1991.

¹⁸ For the names and the sequence of months (so-called “Šamši-Adad calender”) see Charpin 1985, Cohen 1993, 255ff., and Charpin and Ziegler 2003, 155f.

¹⁹ To this number may be added the text (month vii) published in Waetzoldt 2003.

²⁰ To this number may be added a single text (month iii) from the Brussels tablets (cf. below Appendix 3).

²¹ One of these, FI 138, is dated to the intercalary *niggallum* by the editor, but the sign min may be remains of a sign from the broken obv. If the reading should prove correct, however, it would seem unlikely that this *limmu* year is only 2 years removed from Habil-kēnu.

All texts dated with Aššur-taklāku, Išme-El/*warki* Išme-El come from Room 2, where also 16 of the tablets dated with Nim/wer-kubi were found. With the exception of a few texts from isolated contexts, all the other dated texts were found in Rooms 17, 22, and 23.

Seal legends help to date the most prolific *limmu*s to reigns of different Leilan kings:

Habd[u(?)-.....] is associated with the seal of a servant of Himdija (It should be noted that Habdu-Ištar (*limmu* earlier reported from the Leilan Acropolis) has proved not to be an eponym (see Whiting 1990b, 573).

Habil-kēnu texts are associated with seals of Mutija or his servants.

Amer-Ištar texts are associated with seals of Till-Abnû or his servants. A single text from month iv, however, is sealed with the seal of a Mutija servant, making it likely that this was the first regnal year of Till-Abnû.

A single Ipiq-Ištar text is sealed with the seal of a servant of Till-Abnû.

Išme-El/*warki* I.-E. texts are associated with the seal of Jakûn-Ašar.

For the remaining *limmu*s, however, we may now turn to the evidence from KEL G, a section of which is summarised in the following table, giving also number of attestations at Leilan:

KEL G	<i>limmu</i>	ca. B.C.	Leilan	other sites
100	Ataja	1759/58		Rimah
101	Aja	1758/57		Rimah
102	Azzubija	1757/56	1	Rimah
103	Kurkudanum	1756/55		
104	Sabrum	1755/54		Rimah
105	Hadiu	1754/53		
106	Dadija	1753/52		
107	Aja	1752/51		
108	Zizaja	1751/50		
109	Adad-bāni	1750/49	3	
110	Habil-kēnu	1749/48	178	
111	Amur-Ištar	1748/47	61	
112	Ipqu-Ištar	1747/46	17	
break	1746-1736		
123	1736/35		
124	Puzur-Nirah	1735/34		
125	Šumu-.....	1734/33		
126	Qišti-ili	1733/32		
127	Pilah-Sîn	1732/31	1	
128	Nimar-Kûbi	1731/30	17	Q. al-Hādī
129	Aššur-taklāku	1730/29	3	
130	Buzuja	1729/28		
131	Ušur-ša-Aššur	1728/27		

Thus the KEL G helps to fit 8 of the 12 Leilan *limmus* into specific time slots, but unfortunately leaves 4 more to be accounted for. The most vexing problem is the apparent absence of Išme-El, which *should* have been the last *limmu*, according to previous and quite reasonable assumptions (cf. Eidem 2008b, 282). Possibly this *limmu* hides in the break at beginning of col. IV of the KEL, but would then not be the last year attested. KEL G, however, omits quite a number of *limmus* known from other sources (Günbattu 2008, 116f.), and until further analysis of the text, and possibly the appearance of fresh sources, caution is warranted when the KEL apparently contradicts other evidence. The *limmu* Habd[u- ...], associated with the reign of Himdija, is also difficult to account for, and not apparent in KEL G, where one would expect it somewhere between Nos. 95-109.

Two other eponyms not attested in the KEL, Aššur-kāšid and Šu-Bēlī, are less problematic and quite likely hide in the break in KEL G, IV, since they are both associated with information which shows they must belong to this general time range. The single text dated Aššur-kāšid is the one which mentions Jakūn-Ašar lú Ilān-šurā (cf. I.1.1.3), and if this is the same individual as the later king of Leilan, the text should date before his accession to the throne in Apum. A *limmu* Aššur-kāšid is attested in Kültepe, son of ZI-lā-mu (see Veenhof 1998, no. 8). Šu-Bēlī is known from the MEC (= KEL G 30) for the year before Šamšī-Adad's accession, but this definitely seems too early for our *limmu*. The relevant text mentions the official Bajjānu, who can be firmly associated with the reign of Till-Abnū, and although his activity of course may cover a long period, it can hardly be stretched back that far.

1.1.5. Archival Context of the Tablets

Having presented an overview of the chronological situation we may briefly focus attention specifically on the archival context of the texts published here, which were virtually all found in Room 22. The tablets from this room together with much smaller groups from the two adjacent rooms 17 and 23 form one group as is evident from the facts that joins can be made with fragments between rooms, like the letter [9] and several of the treaties. It is apparent that this archive consists of several different groups or “sub-archives”. On a synchronic level there is a mixture of letters and administrative texts similar to that observed in other smaller palace archives like the Iltani archive at Rimah and the Kuwari archive at Shemshāra. This can be fairly easily explained by the kind of administrative texts involved at all three sites, in the main documents pertaining to expensive items like metals, garments, expensive food products (or, especially at Rimah, documents pertaining to the household of the archive owner),²² and demanding presumably closer control by the archive “owner”, or the top level administrators, whose seals at Leilan have been applied to many of the texts. Other administrative documents concerning typically agriculture and circulation of agricultural products were kept

²² The complete analysis of 189 administrative texts undertaken by Vincente shows three dominant groups: silver/metal: 36.5 percent; foodstuffs: 30.1 percent; garments etc.: 18.5 percent (Vincente 1991).

separately elsewhere, and one example of this is found at Shemshāra (cf. Eidem 1992, 33ff.). Also accounts for the circulation of wine and beer could be kept completely separate, perhaps close to the actual “cellars”. Apart from the group of such texts excavated in the Rimah palace, the small archive from Leilan found in Room 2 of the palace is a good example (see Whiting 1990a; also Ismail 1991). Finally the inclusion of treaty texts in royal archives is not surprising.

On a diachronic level the archive represents several separate archives and we can, for present purposes, distinguish two main groups:

A. Texts relating to Mutija:

- 22 letters addressed to Mutija (+ X letters sent to him as *bēlum*)
- 178 administrative documents dated with *limmu* Habil-kēnu (= last regnal year)
- 1 political treaty

B. Texts relating to Till-Abnû:

- 99 letters addressed to Till-Abnû (+ X letters sent to him as *bēlum*)
- 61 administrative documents dated with *limmu* Amer-Ištar (=1st regnal year)
- 17 administrative documents dated with *limmu* Ipiq-Ištar (= 2nd regnal year)
- 3 political treaties

These groups constitute the core of the archive and should provide a key to its composition. Turning again to a comparison with the archives from Rimah (Iltani archive and related texts) and Shemshāra, which in contrast to our archive cover only single administrations, we note that both have a roughly similar composition: letters covering a few years and administrative documents heavily concentrated in a single year. This distribution can be explained as a tendency to keep letters longer while periodically deselecting the older administrative texts which were summarized on larger tablets, recycled or simply discarded. Charpin has discussed such procedures specifically for the Mari archives and introduced a significant distinction between “living” and “dead” archives, the latter type being exemplified, for instance, by the groups of small administrative notes found as fill in benches in the Mari palace (Charpin 1985, 253ff.). Adding to Charpin’s typology we might introduce an intermediate category, namely that of an “inactive” archive – not discarded, but no longer a current working body of material.²³ A good example of this category would be the letters found at Mari from the time of Jasmah-Addu; no longer part of any “active” archive, but still kept for reference – for any number of reasons (cf. Eidem 2004).

These observations have obvious relevance for the Leilan material. Knowing as we do that Till-Abnû succeeded Mutija it can be assumed that the tablets in group A were regarded as an “inactive” archive during the reign of Till-Abnû. Since we also know that

²³ I owe this idea to MacGuire Gibson.

Jakūn-Ašar succeeded Till-Abnû, and is hardly in evidence in the tablets from Rooms 17/22/23, we may further assume that group B prior to 1728 B.C. (when presumably the reign of Jakūn-Ašar ended) also came to be regarded as an “inactive” archive. This means in the first instance that the main “active” archive of Jakūn-Ašar, if preserved, is located elsewhere in the palace.

The fact that we are dealing with a composite “inactive” archive, however, leads to a complex situation since perhaps several levels of selection or deselection must be reconstructed in order to clarify the composition of the extant material. The complexity involved is illustrated by the fact that in contrast to the situations obtaining at Rimah and Shemshāra, where the administrative documents cluster in a single, presumably final year, we are here faced with the exact reverse, namely a marked diachronic *decrease* in the number of administrative texts.

Rather than review the whole range of possible reorganisations which could be theorized as a framework for the archival composition we shall instead set out what seems the most reasonable solution, anticipating also some information and some conclusions evolving from the discussion in the following chapters. This solution supposes two main stages in the formation of the archive:

Stage 1

Till-Abnû on his accession selected from the archives of Mutija series of letters and administrative texts to be kept.

The small number, the limited range of correspondents, and the narrowly circumscribed vista of subject matter in the letters sent to Mutija, makes it unlikely that the corpus is in any way complete. As will be shown below (I.1.3.2) these letters mostly deal with events which occurred shortly before Mutija’s death, and the texts may have been kept as still relevant.

The very compact and perhaps near complete series of administrative texts from months v-xii of the year Habil-kēnu clearly constitutes the result of a deliberate selection. Till-Abnû on his accession, which occurred at end of this year or shortly into the next (Amer-Ištar), may have wanted to keep a fairly complete set of accounts dating some months back for easy reference and checking.

All of these texts were presumably kept with the main archive of Till-Abnû through his reign, which may in fact only have lasted the ca. two years for which we have explicit evidence.

Stage 2

After Till-Abnû’s disappearance, Jakūn-Ašar “inherited” the archive of his predecessor, and decided to deselect most of it while keeping probably selected letters, and no doubt some administrative documents from the time of Till-Abnû – in *increasing* numbers relative to a diachronic scheme.

Placing these stages in a wider framework we can posit three different groups of texts from the period of the last three Leilan kings:

A. “Dead archives” (*if still preserved likely to be found in secondary deposits*)

- Mutija texts deselected by Mutija and by Till-Abnû
- Till-Abnû texts deselected by Till-Abnû (primarily administrative texts)

B. “Inactive archives” = *the texts found in Rooms 17/22/23*

- Mutija texts selected by Till-Abnû
- Till-Abnû texts deselected by Jakûn-Ašar

C. “Active archives” (*Texts yet to be found – if preserved*).

- Till-Abnû texts selected by Jakûn-Ašar
- Jakûn-Ašar texts.

It might be assumed that traces of the original arrangement of the many tablets found in Rooms 17/22/23 can be revealed by their spatial distribution. In theory analysis of this problem is possible, since the debris containing the tablets were divided into a number of excavation units (*lots*), and all objects further given sequential numbers as excavation proceeded. Obviously the units defined archaeologically would hardly correspond exactly to possible archival units, but in spite of overlaps some clusters might still be visible. Especially one could look for possible divisions according to genre, date, subject-matter, and in the case of the letters according to receivers or senders. In order to illustrate the possibilities of such analysis a few examples can be given:

Area 8, Lot 37, which contained 89 epigraphic objects, equals debris from a well-defined space in the northeastern corner of Room 22. The tablets found include 30 letters of which 9 are addressed to Till-Abnû, 5 to Mutija, and 2 to *bēlum*. The rest includes 10 fragments, some specimens with partly broken address, and the single letter to Jakûn-Ašar from the archive. Among the 20 *limmu* dated texts are 11 dated to Habil-kēnu, 7 to Amer-Ištar, and 2 to Ipiq-Ištar.

This example is not encouraging since the material statistically seems to be a virtual microcosm of the entire archive.

The letters addressed to Mutija (by name) were found in 5 different lots, and in no apparent cluster. One interesting observation, however, is the fact that all 4 letters sent from Hammurabi of Halab came from a single lot, namely no. 37 just discussed.

Turning to the series of letters sent to Till-Abnû from different correspondents we find that the letters from Aja-abu were found in 4 different lots, those of Jamši-Hatnû in 7 lots, and those from Buriia in 3 lots.

This must suffice in the present context, but readers may themselves pursue further examples through the catalogue tables appended in this volume. Further analysis of this level may well provide some interesting conclusions, but should await the possibility of confronting the complete epigraphic evidence with the detailed archaeological evidence. In provisional terms, however, it seems unlikely that such analysis will significantly alter

the conclusions drawn here concerning the archival composition of the tablets. Considering both the “inactive” status of the archive, the confusion resulting from the collapse of the building, and subsequent disturbances, it is not surprising if the tablets have become so mixed that only smaller segments of an original archival arrangement have survived.

The observations made here on the composition of the archive have important implications for analysis of the texts, as well as considerable intrinsic interest. We shall return to some of these questions below (cf. I.1.3.1).

1.2. *Synchronic Survey*

1.2.1. The International Horizon

The kingdom of Jamhad centered on Halab (modern Aleppo) in northwestern Syria,²⁴ appears as the decisive political power in the northern Jezira at the time of the Leilan archives. Hammurabi of Halab ascended the throne in ZL 10, and was followed by his son Abban sometime into the reign of Samsu-iluna of Babylon. We know that Hammurabi was still king sometime into the reign of Till-Abnû, but as yet he is not attested in association with the reign of Jakûn-Ašar. All which can be said at present is that the reigns of Samsu-iluna and Abban overlapped, and more speculatively that the raid by Samsu-iluna deep into the Habur Basin in his 22nd regnal year (1728 B.C.), destroying a number of towns, and probably deposing (and perhaps killing) Jakûn-Ašar, could have been prompted by the opportunities offered by the death of Hammurabi and a temporary weakening of Jamhad.

The letters sent from Hammurabi to Mutija [1]-[4] are unfortunately all short or very badly preserved, and yield almost no information. An administrative text (CV 53) lists presents sent from Leilan to the court in Halab, and mentions Jahdun-Lim, Abbā, son of the king, Nūr-ahhīšu, and Kilimani, his vizier (*šukkallum*). Jahdun-Lim may be the king of Karkemish (cf. Charpin and Ziegler 2003, 264), who was supposed to receive a present en route, while Abbā surely is identical with Abban, and prince select, while Nūr-ahhīšu would seem to be a younger son of Hammurabi.

More revealing are the two letters sent to Till-Abnû [23]-[24], and which seem to date shortly after his accession. In [23] Hammurabi recalls that he earlier sent his special envoy and general Bin-Dammu to “you” (plural – a reference to the trio of “rulers” in Apum – or simply to Till-Abnû and his allies and vassals). Hammurabi urges Till-Abnû to come to him together with Bin-Dammu, and also asks for the release of Halab servants detained in the Habur town Amursakkum. This letter would fit a time shortly after the reestablishment of good relations with Halab after the war against Andarig and Razamā, during which there is evidence for a severe strain on mutual relations and perhaps an actual breach (see [8] and discussion of this war in I.1.3.2). [24] is poorly preserved, but

²⁴ For a survey of the evidence outside Leilan see Klengel 1992, 44ff.. Particularly relevant for our material is the letter from Samsu-iluna to Abban, AbB 7, 1, and the letter AbB 4, 24, which also concern relations between Halab and Babylon. The texts from Alalah (level VII) generally concern a slightly later period than the Leilan material (see Zeeb 1991).

the writer, who is almost certainly Hammurabi, states that: “[..... I heard that] you had entered your father’s [house] (i.e. ascended the throne), but I was busy [(and) therefore have not written] to you until now this town is your town and this country is your country!” This affirmation, apart from showing the real or putative political leadership exercised by Halab, also indicates some problems for Till-Abnû’s kingship.

Also from Till-Abnû’s reign we have two letters from the ruler Halu-rabi who is making himself instrumental for a treaty between Halab and Till-Abnû [54]-[55]. Here as in a number of other texts the king of Halab is simply referred to as “the king” (lugal), another clear indication of Halab’s political importance.²⁵

The Halab agent Bin-Dammu occurs repeatedly in the administrative texts as shown by the charts supplied in Appendix 1. His long stays at Leilan towards the end of the year Habi-kēnu relate to protracted negotiations involving other Habur and Sinjar kings, and marked the reestablishment of order prevailing prior to the war late in Mutija’s reign. He is mentioned also in administrative texts dating to the years Amer-Ištar and Ipiq-Ištar and in letters, including those he himself sent to Till-Abnû [26]-[27]. Unfortunately his activities are only well-charted for the latter part of the *limmu* Habi-kēnu, but there can be little doubt about his role as chief envoy of Halab touring the region, presumably accompanied by a military command, and his title in an administrative text (CV 15) is given as sag-gal-mar-tu-meš i.e. “field marshal”. The figure of Bin-Dammu in fact provides a striking parallel to a Babylonian agent in this region, Mutu-Hadkim, attested in the slightly earlier texts from Rimah.²⁶

Another Halab agent in the region seems to have been the *šāpiṭum* Takē mentioned in [8], where the indignant Aštamar-Adad suggests that he be dismissed in disgrace from Apum. Whether this happened is unknown but apart from his probable occurrence in [24] he seems to disappear from record, and all the extant letters sent from a certain Takē seem to concern a different individual.

Important, but unfortunately rather enigmatic, is the evidence in [41]. The deployment of 10,000 Halab troops for two years in Andarig shows more clearly than any other evidence the power and influence of Hammurabi in this region. The hint of a Babylonian campaign northwards in the direction of Karkemish and a consequent danger for Andarig seems to be the background for this, but the poor preservation of the text renders a precise evaluation difficult. Since the letter mentions envoys from Andarig en route to Halab being turned away at Kubšum, it seems possible to assume that the Upper

²⁵ The king Halu-rabi would seem to have had particular ties with Halab at this time. The letter [20] sent to Mutija from Ea-malik reports on a situation where Bin-Dammu, Halu-rabi, and other “kings” are concluding an alliance in Zarhānum. On the other hand, Halu-rabi later complains that Burija slanders him to Hammurabi (because he has made a treaty with Apum?) [56]. The letter [125] which he sent to Jakūn-Ašar stating: “I have arrived in the midst of the armies and [seized?] the hand of Bin-Dammu for “your” (plural) sake!” should also be mentioned. A connection with the events in [20] seems likely.

²⁶ Mutu-Hadkim was originally a Šamši-Adad official, but later joined Babylonian service (Durand and Charpin 1986, 171). The texts from Rimah show that he had influence in a wide area of the north, and he could, e.g., decide transfer of personnel from Šubat-Enlil (see OBTR 136), and dispose over war booty (OBTR 160). Cf. the remarks in Eidem 1989, 70 n. 15.

Euphrates country, including the important kingdom of Karkemish,²⁷ was trying to assert its independence from Halab. Such a theory could provide a logical explanation for a Babylonian campaign taking advantage of the situation. The deployment of Halab troops in Andarig, if meant to anticipate the Babylonian troops, indicates that these latter were expected to follow a route up the Tigris and across the Upper Jezira rather than the route along the Euphrates, which for any number of political or other reasons may have been impractical.

Otherwise Babylon or Babylonians are rarely referred to in the Leilan texts. Administrative documents do mention envoys and other people from there, but not in very revealing contexts. Such references seem to increase for the year Išme-El, i.e. during the reign of Jakūn-Ašar, but since we have as yet no further information for this period, which is only documented in the wine texts from Room 2, it is evidently too early to attempt an analysis of the events related to the campaign by Samsu-iluna in 1728 B.C.

1.2.2. Trade through Leilan

The evidence for the continuing Assyrian trade through the Habur Basin, with an important relay station at Leilan, has been discussed elsewhere in connection with the publication of L.T.-5 concluded between the city of Assur and Till-Abnû (Eidem 1991b), and very recently in other presentations (Eidem 2008a and 2008b), and need only be briefly mentioned here. The city of Leilan housed merchant establishments not only from Assur, but also from Sippar in Babylonia, and from local Habur towns like Kahat, Šunā, and Amursakkum. It seems likely that these establishments were inside the city walls, possibly in a special quarter of the lower town, as yet unidentified. They were overseen by a *wakīl kārī*, a certain Iši-ahu, possibly a royal official. Unfortunately the letters published in this volume provide no evidence for the activities of this man and the Leilan *kārī*, but we may perhaps look forward to extremely interesting documentation if and when the merchant houses are identified and excavated.

1.2.3. The *habbātum*²⁸

Repeatedly in these texts we meet large groups of so-called *habbātum*. The evidence falls logically into two groups. The first date to the time of the war between the two coalitions of Habur and Sinjar city-states which occurred late in the reign of Mutija (see I.1.3.2). Apparently Mutija and his allies held the upper hand and are said to have looted in the territory of their enemies [8]. Then suddenly the situation is reversed and the enemy penetrates their own territory. The explanation for this is also given implicitly: the enemy kings have secured the support of a large army of so-called *habbātum* – variously said to number 6,000 and 10,000 men. An important piece of evidence is provided by a letter which reports that the *habbātum* have returned from across a river and now plunder in the region of the Sinjar mountains. This probably means that these particular *habbātum* arrived from the country east of the Tigris, from present-day northern Iraq [18].

²⁷ For a recent survey of the history of Karkemish see Kupper 1992.

²⁸ The following section essentially reproduces the text of Eidem 1996b.

Several letters portray the ensuing panic and fear of the *habbātum*, who in one instance are reported to have looted in a particular area and said to have “eaten the land clean”. Unfortunately our evidence is not sufficient to reconstruct in detail what happened next, but it seems that the attack of the enemy and the supporting *habbātum* was halted, and we have a letter which reports that Jakūn-Ašar has won a victory over the enemy. The same letter then reports how *habbātum* who belong to the enemy send a message to Jakūn-Ašar as follows: “Either let us go free or take command of us and lead us where you please”! [126]. Thus it seems that at least some *habbātum* were now enrolled on the side of Mutija and his allies and an echo of this may be found in an administrative text which belongs to this time and records an issue to a *habbātum* who is said to have “barred the enemy passage to the land” (CV 106).

The second group of references to the *habbātum* are slightly later and date to the reign of Till-Abnū, where both his brother Jakūn-Ašar [60] and the king of Kahat [62], [65] write to Till-Abnū about people who have been bought from the *habbātum*, i.e. individuals whom the *habbātum* captured during the recent hostilities and subsequently were ransomed. Also probably from the reign of Till-Abnū comes a letter sent to him by the king of Šunā who writes: “It is said that the *habbātum* soldiers have returned. If these soldiers have returned please send me 150 soldiers to help protect the town of Šunā” [93].

These references show fairly clearly who the *habbātum* were, and there can be little doubt that they must be regarded as professional mercenaries ready to offer their services to any king or state with enough silver to pay them. The Old Babylonian administrative tablet accidentally found on the surface of Tell Qal’at al Hādī southeast of Leilan, and which can be dated to the time of the Leilan archives, records division of nearly 30 kilos of silver into 3,500 pieces as payment to probably the same number of *habbātum*, so that we here have direct evidence for the *habbātum* acting as paid hands (cf. Eidem 1988).

What is particularly interesting about the *habbātum* is the fact that they seem to be a basically new phenomenon. From the slightly older texts found at Mari we have many examples of kings using foreign troops, but such troops were usually sent as auxiliaries by foreign allies. A significant exception are the smaller groups of soldiers labelled “Gutians” or similar and apparently kept as a kind of “Swiss” guards by many kings, and similar groups also occur in the Leilan texts. The *habbātum*, on the other hand, are apparently independent groups of professional soldiers who seem basically detached from any fixed political control. On two separate occasions they are said to return – in one case apparently from the country east of the river Tigris. This indicates that the arrival of the *habbātum* in the Habur and Sinjar areas may have been seasonal and related to the conventional periods for conducting war.

The new evidence from Leilan also helps to improve understanding of some previous references to groups called *habbātum* in texts from Syria and Iraq. First of all we have evidence from Alalah for *habbātum* in northwestern Syria. A certain Muzun-Addu and his *habbātum* assisted rebels against Abban of Halab, and a seal inscription refers to Muzun-Addu’s general Tahe-Addu, who is also called a *habbātum* (Dietrich and Loretz 1969). From Tell al-Rimah southeast of Leilan we have a list which mentions a section-leader of *habbātum* (OBTR 267). This text is only slightly older than the Leilan evidence. Finally we have also from southern Mesopotamia evidence for *habbātum*

soldiers in organized groups during the reign of Samsu-iluna.²⁹ It can therefore be concluded that the *habbātum* did not belong exclusively in northeastern Syria, but in fact are found in the entire Mesopotamian area in this period. Further confirmation of this is provided by an Old Assyrian text from Kaneš (Level Ib), which refers to *habbātum* in Anatolia (Dercksen and Donbaz 2001).

The few personal names belonging to *habbātum* which occur in all of these texts show the same mixture of Akkadian, Amorite, and Hurrian which was current across northern Mesopotamia, and it seems certain that the *habbātum* did not constitute a new or different ethno-linguistic group, but basically must have been made up of local Mesopotamians or Syrians.³⁰

Why then do we in this particular period, i.e. around 1750 B.C., have the occurrence of large groups of professional mercenaries, fundamentally outside state control, and apparently able to influence political events in a fairly decisive manner? The answer to this question seems fairly simple. The immediately preceding period in the history of Mesopotamia, extremely well-documented by the Mari archives, was characterized by a pattern where a number of strong city-states together with their respective following of smaller vassal states had struggled for power. The end of this period is marked by a severe reduction in the number of such major city-states. After the elimination of Larsa, Ešnunna, and Mari, Babylon appeared preeminent in the south, and in the north Jamhad could reach out for the northern portion of a political vacuum left by now eclipsed city-states.

Viewed in this perspective the appearance of large groups of redundant soldiers in the countryside is hardly surprising. The new international situation did not result in a solid formation of two superpowers, Babylon and Jamhad, but in a much more fluid situation where these two states remained as major powers with extended control and influence, but without the ability to occupy and integrate firmly the space around them.

It is in this space we have to seek the origin of the *habbātum*, but the actual formation of the *habbātum* mercenaries may have been a complex process involving a

²⁹ Cf. the letter AbB 7, 116 (ref. courtesy of K. R. Veenhof) written by Sîn-nadin-šumi to the ugula *ha-ba-ti*. The writer, who is identified with a governor of Sippar attested during the latter years of Samsu-iluna, has complained that his *dunnum* has been looted (*habātum*) while his house staff was absent to fetch wood. The ugula *h.* has written back offering to replace the stolen goods, and Sîn-nadin-šumi now provides a list of these (clothes, tools, food-stuff). In the words of F. R. Kraus: “Dieser bisher nicht belegte Titel eines Beamten beweist die Richtigkeit der Annahme einer irgendwie der geordneten altbabylonischen Gesellschaft angehörigen Gruppe, deren Mitglieder *habbātum* hiessen” (AbB 7, p. 95 ad 116 a).

In the slightly earlier texts from Mari we find only a few relevant references: A.3552 (= DEPM I, 456) where lú *ha-ab-ba-tum* are mentioned with lú *ke-na-ah-núm-meš* (Cana’aneans) staying in Raḥiṣum in Western Syria; ARMT XXIII, 307 is a note of a sheep issued to the lú-meš *ha-ba-ti* in Mari (*habbātum* is here translated “bédouins-*habbātu*”); further ARMT XXVI 24, XXVII 1, XXVIII 40, ARMT XVIII 55 (iii 5’ and iv 1’). The relative dearth of such references can hardly be accidental in view of the abundant Mari evidence already published (cf. Durand 1992, 106 w. n. 71), and it seems definitely that the *habbātum*, at least under this name, only take on major significance in the second half of the 18th century.

³⁰ Administrative texts from Leilan contain a small handful of such names.

range of different developments of which we have as yet little knowledge. Similarly it remains difficult to determine exactly what impact the *habbātum* would have made on contemporary Mesopotamian society, but in the Habur and Sinjar regions we note how the *habbātum* constituted a dangerously uncertain element which could be turned from side to side in the inter-state struggles, and on a long term basis their existence must clearly have constituted a destabilizing factor. One aspect of this may have been economic, since probably *habbātum* were more expensive than normal auxiliary troops.

Turning finally to the linguistic aspect it can be concluded that a translation of *habbātum* as “robber” or “bandit” is not correct in these texts. The noun *habbātum* stems from a semantically complex root HBT which can mean “move cross-country”, “hire/hire out”, and “rob/steal” (Kraus 1975). It is easy to see how these different meanings all in some way convey information about the *habbātum*: highly mobile, employed as paid hands – and of course an unstable and unreliable social element. In other contexts the noun *habbātum* is certainly used as a designation for “robbers” or common outlaws, but at Leilan covers a different notion for which the best translation seems to be “mercenary”. Interestingly the verb *habātum* in the meaning “rob” is used frequently in the Leilan texts, not about the *habbātum*, but about common outlaws. When *habbātum* are said to have plundered the verbs *ṣabātum* or *leqūm* are used, whereas the individual “robbers” connected with the verb *habātum* are described as *sarrārum* “outlaws” or with a special noun *hābitānum* and its abstract *hābitānūtum* [78], 17).³¹ This latter nominal formation from the verb *habātum* is not to my knowledge attested elsewhere, and its use at Leilan shows that a special noun was needed to avoid confusion with the distinct category *habbātum*.

Evidently semantic analysis of social terms has to be closely related to a contextual analysis since use of such terms easily underwent syn- and diachronic variation. This problem is again illustrated when considering another aspect concerning the *habbātum*, namely their relationship to the much more famous *hābirū*. In some text groups the *hābirū* seem to play a somewhat similar role as the *habbātum*, and there can be little doubt that the two terms could be virtually synonymous and describe phenomena of the same order. That this was not always the case, however, is neatly demonstrated by the new Leilan texts since they also include evidence for *hābirū*, not organized groups like the *habbātum*, but individuals functioning outside their original social context.³² In [43] the king of Andarig complains that a certain individual coming from Andarig, but now resident as a *hābiru* – i.e. an emigrant, in a town closer to Leilan has collected *sarrārum* “outlaws” and started to “kidnap” (*habātum*) men from Andarig in order to sell them as slaves.

³¹ See index for references to these words. The noun *sarrārum* is translated “robber, criminal” by CAD S, 178, while Durand (1987b, 198; cf. also Durand 1991b, 64) has argued plausibly for a more precise understanding of these people as those not having sworn allegiance to the king and hence outside the administrative and political control of the city-states. This conclusion seems also valid for our texts.

³² This conclusion is the exact opposite of that reached in a detailed discussion of the *hābiru/habbātum* (Bottéro 1981) where the latter are seen as the individual brigands, but this of course seemed a reasonable view prior to the new Leilan discoveries.

At the time of the Leilan archives the complexity of the social reality prompted a clearer distinction between *hābiru* and *habbātum* (and *hābitānum*) because *habbātum* as organized groups of professional mercenaries were a new element. As in the slightly earlier texts from Mari the *hābirū* were people who, often for political reasons, had left their original home; they were emigrants and often acted as rebels against the authority they had escaped (see Durand 1991b, 24). Later in the 2nd millennium B.C. the *habbātum* seem to gradually disappear again except as a term for common robbers, while the *hābirū* of course are well-attested in a number of text groups from Amarna, Ugarit, Nuzi, and from Anatolia (see Bottéro 1971, and 1981).

The Old Babylonian sources are fortunately numerous and highly informative, and they allow a fair degree of precision when analysing social labels which in other contexts may appear wholly opaque. This fact, however, should not veil the ever present fluidity of the social landscape: clearly many social labels are just *ad hoc* contextual designations which stress one particular aspect of individual or group behaviour which is the focus of current interest. The *habbātum*, although fairly briefly, stand out as a more definite and clear occupational category which seems to have had considerable social and political impact.

1.2.4. A Note on Historical Geography

The historical geography of the Habur Plains and adjacent areas is of crucial importance for an understanding of the information contained in the Leilan letters. The letters were sent from kings and officials in many different localities as shown not only by the actual texts, but also by the many variations in tablet type (see Appendix 2.1), and they concern events in wide areas within and beyond the land of Apum and its capital Leilan. While the texts provide interesting new evidence for well-known toponyms as well as supplying a fair number of entirely new ones, a comprehensive or detailed discussion of the historical geography would be premature and beyond the scope of the present volume. To ease understanding of the evidence presented, however, and to state explicitly some assumptions underlying analysis of the material, some general remarks must be made.

In this respect we may conveniently draw on the overview provided by Joannès (1996), and in general refer to the summary list provided by Charpin and Ziegler (2003, 272-276). The Habur Plains were basically divided into the western Ida-Maraš (i.e. “the land flanking the Maraš” – “the difficult” = the Tūr ‘Abdīn), and the eastern Apum centered on Leilan. Within Ida-Maraš were a number of city-states, notably Ašlakkā, Ašnakkum, Ilān-šurā, Kahat, Susā, and Šunā. Areas on the upper Habur were known as Japṭur with the capital Talhājum, while the area to the east of the Habur Plains was called Jassān with Razamā (distinct from a second, southern Razamā) as capital. To the south of the three major ranges of the Jebel Sinjar, from west to east named Murdi, Saggar, and Zara, were the areas known as Numha and Jamutbal, and more or less west-east were located the important city-states of Andarig, Kurdā, and Karanā/Qaṭṭarā. Last, but not least, it evolves clearly from the Mari texts that the region between the Jebel Sinjar and the Habur Basin, in modern times very sparsely populated, was more prosperous in the early 2nd millennium B.C., and that larger tells here, still poorly known archaeologically, are candidates for fairly important towns like Alilānum, Azuhinnum, and Šuḥpad.

Such is the general framework within which some of the more detailed discussions that follow in the next chapters and in the notes to the edition of the texts must be placed,³³ but it must at the same time be stressed that our knowledge of the historical geography of the northern Jezira, when it comes to finer details, is still sketchy, and likely to remain so for some time to come. In spite of much scattered information in the texts, which aid relative locations for many major settlements, the indications are generally too vague to allow precise identification. This is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that already in 1957 M. Falkner, working from a much smaller corpus of relevant sources, was able to present a comprehensive historical map of the region based on relative locations, but that her conclusions, with some notable exceptions, have not been drastically improved as the bulk of published sources has grown.³⁴ The recent rapid development in publication and analysis of the Mari archives has improved the situation, but the exact extent of the change is not entirely clear, since a number of claims for identifications, as yet unsubstantiated by published evidence, and sometimes conflicting, have been made, and it seems also that fresh evidence in some cases have added to the confusion rather than helped to narrow down the margin of error for older, relative locations. More recently M. Wäfler (2001) has attempted to establish the identity of major sites by the aid of mathematical distance and gravity calculations, but the results do not seem entirely convincing.³⁵

Thus the problem remains that the indications in the texts are too vague given the proximity of tells on the ground which constitute candidates for the ancient settlements. Archaeological surface surveys have covered much of the region, most intensively the eastern part of the Habur Plains (Meijer 1986 and 1990; Eidem and Warburton 1996; Wright et alii 2006-7), the Leilan hinterland (see Akkermans and Weiss 1990; Weiss and Ristvet 2005), the Tell Beydar area (Wilkinson 2002), and the area around Tell al-Hawa east of the Habur Basin (Wilkinson 1990). The survey conducted by a French team intending to investigate all major tells in the Habur region may fill in some important gaps and provide an overview of settlement in the early 2nd millennium B.C. (see Lyonnet 1996), although surface material is often difficult to date with the small-scale accuracy demanded by the historian. Nevertheless the combination of fresh sources, comprehensive survey results and excavations may eventually allow us to plot most major ancient settlements on a map with a fair degree of precision.

³³ The accompanying map (Plate I) is provided to ease general orientation, but does not generally reflect any definitive or authoritative statement on the historical geography. Note that Chagar Bazar now is plausibly identified with ancient Ašnakkum. Till-šannim, however, should be sought in the vicinity of Chagar Bazar.

³⁴ This statement is of course not intended to slight the many valuable studies on north Jezira historical geography which have appeared since Falkner's seminal work, like the excellent *répertoires* Groneberg 1980, and Kupper in ARMT XVI/1, or studies like Hallo 1964, and Kessler 1980, but only to stress that the original obstacles remain.

³⁵ Although some of the concrete identifications suggested may prove correct, the basic scheme (like compact cluster of all major Idamaraš sites in NE corner of Syria, assumption of regular territorial units, and the at present unlikely identification of Nagar with Tell Arbid) seems questionable, but detailed discussion must be deferred to another occasion. See now Chambon 2009.

One very important point which does emerge clearly from the Mari evidence, is that we may still fail to grasp organising principles behind the geo-political landscape of the region. We have tended to think in fairly fixed dimensions for the various polities mentioned in our texts, but several examples show that beyond the core areas of the various city-states and their walled capitals could exist a wide network of affiliated towns and areas, sometimes linked in intricate ways to several different kingdoms, like the interesting example of Amaz studied by Joannès (1990). This means that toponyms mentioned together in particular texts will often not have been adjacent – something which previous research has more or less explicitly assumed. It is further clear that the search for precise identifications of the major sites in the region, tempted of course by the nature of the evidence, which holds out a promise of eventual success, is far from being an idle game, but an issue of great importance for a better understanding of ancient economic, social, and political patterns.

To ease orientation it may be convenient to collect here some of the basic information on the geography of the Habur Plains.

First of all we have some certain or near-certain identifications: Šubat-Enlil = Leilan, Nagar = Tell Brak, Urkiš = Tell Mozan (Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 1996), Kahat = Tell Barri, Tādum = Tell Hamīdiya (for the two latter identifications see Wäfler 1995).

Secondly we have some less certain, but plausible identifications: Ašnakkum = Chagar Bazar (Lacambre and Alba 2008, 143-154), and Amaz = Tell Arbid (see provisionally Eidem 2008a, 40).

An important letter from Mari (A.1053), recently edited by D. Charpin (2009), provides a list of settlements on the Habur, from Qaṭṭunān to somewhere near modern Ras al-‘Ain: Qaṭṭunān (= Tell Fadghami?) – Latihum – Makrisa – Zahatum – Qirdahat (= Hassake?) – Yahasan – Apparum – Tarnip – Zalluhān (at confluence of Wadi Jirjib?).

Next we have some “itineraries” listing stations in or close to the Habur Plains:

A) (Qaṭṭarā (= Tell al-Rimah)-Darakum) – Apum (Leilan area) – Amaz (Tell Arbid?) – Nahur

(Old Assyrian “route”; see Nashef 1987)

B) Šubat-Enlil (Leilan) – Šunā – Ašnakkum (Chagar Bazar?)

(part of Old Babylonian “Road to Emar”; see Hallo 1964)

C) Šehnā (Leilan) – Šunā – Amaz (Tell Arbid?)

(march route for army in ARMT XXVI/2, 313)

These three sequences all describe a somewhat similar line, more or less due west from Leilan, and A) leads to a point perhaps near Tell Ailun (Nahur?), close to the border between Syria and Turkey. We may supplement with some points on a route from Leilan to Nahur found in the administrative list FI 135:

D) (Šubat-Enlil-)Tehhi-Šuttannum-Šinah-Jarbinazu-Ašnakkum ... Nahur
and add to this:

E) Šinah-Urkiš-Šunā

(route followed by Zimri-Lim in ARM X, 121 (= DEPM, 1141))

D) probably does not describe a straight route; E) seems to be a route west-east.

The Eastern Part of the Habur

This is essentially the area known as the land of Apum. Charpin (1990b, 118ff.) has conveniently listed the towns attested:

- Azamhul – tentatively identified with Tell Mohammed Diyab (southeast of Leilan) by Charpin, but perhaps located further east (cf. Eidem 2008b, 270 w. n. 7)

- Hidar – on wadi Jarrah south of Leilan

- Lazapātum – the unpubl. Mari text A.2503 gives route of Hammurabi of Kurda as Kasapā – Lazapātum – Kudimmar – Šubat-Enlil; hence Lazapātum and Kudimmar must be sought south of Leilan

- Kudimmar

- Kumulhum – located between ŠE and Kahat, i.e. west of Leilan

- Nihru

- x-wa-ar-du – no doubt identical with na-wa-ar-di in ARMT XXII, 15r II 3' (see Eidem, 1996a)

- Saphum – located on border of Jassān east of Leilan

- Šurnat – tentatively identified here with Qal'at al-Hādī southeast of Leilan

For this region especially the administrative texts from Leilan provide much information which, however, cannot be dealt with here. Of the above towns Azamhul and Šurnat occur in the letters, and they were probably major centers.

The Central Habur

A large and poorly defined area west of Leilan where a number of important towns must be sought. There exists as yet no detailed survey for this region, and the difficulty of locating ancient towns correctly emerges clearly from Max Mallowan's remarks: "From the top of the mound [Tell Arbid] one can see along the horizon no less than 110 mounds, all of which represent ancient occupations of the Habur and remind us of the prosperity of the region in antiquity." (Mallowan 1937, 117).

A central problem, very much relevant for both the Mari and the Leilan texts, is the location of Ilān-šurā, an important kingdom in the time of Zimri-Lim, and in our texts presumably the place of residence for Jakūn-Ašar prior to his accession to the Apum throne. J.-M. Durand has suggested that the town should be sought in the central part of the Basin and has mentioned Chagar Bazar and Tell Arbid (ca. 10 km due east of Chagar

Bazar) as likely candidates (Durand 1990a), but both of these sites are now plausibly suggested as Ašnakkum and Amaz, respectively. A more recent proposal by Guichard (1994) to place Ilān-šurā at Tell Sharisi southwest of Leilan seems effectively ruled out by the archaeological evidence adduced by Wäfler (1995), who instead suggests Tell Farfara, located some 20 kms southwest of Leilan. Let us now review the evidence in our material:

Ilān-šurā is mentioned only three times in the Leilan letters. The isolated reference in [141] is not helpful, but the two other references both occur in connection with the troubles caused by the king Halu-rabi and his allies (see I.1.3.3):

In [112] Sangara, probably based in Tillā, writes to Till-Abnû and refers to the enmity of Halu-rabi directed at Ida-Maraš and Ilān-šurā, and we find a similar report in [116] sent by Zimri-[...] to Till-Abnû: the writer is on a mission to Sabbānum, and mentions news of Halu-rabi and Ilān-šurā. Sangara also sent [143] and [144] which pertain to the same situation. In [143] he states that Halu-rabi has reached Irbinazu (= Jarbinazu), and that he has received news from Jaššib-Hatnû in Urkiš(?) to the effect that Jakûn-Ašar is trying to muster allies presumably near Irbinazu to meet Halu-rabi. In [144] Sangara relates how Jakûn-Ašar has sent for help to Jaššib-Hatnû and the king of Ašnakkum(?).

The action here clearly takes place somewhere south or southwest of Urkiš/Mozan (compare D) and E) above), and the threat to Šunā also posed by Halu-rabi's march (cf. I.1.3.3) points in the same direction. Sangara and Jakûn-Ašar were not necessarily in either Tillā or Ilān-šurā, their presumed bases, at this time, but if Halu-rabi intended to reach Ilān-šurā we must conclude that this town presumably should be sought further west than suggested by either Guichard or Wäfler. Some slight further evidence to the same effect is found in [60], where Jakûn-Ašar himself writes on behalf of a man from Till-šannim, a place presumably fairly close to Chagar Bazar. It is further worth noting that Tillā easily could be a short form of Till-šannim.³⁶ The relative proximity of Ilān-šurā and Tillā is fairly clear in the available evidence from Mari, as well as that from Leilan just discussed.

In sum our evidence favours a location of Ilān-šurā as suggested by Durand, in the central part of the Habur, but I can point to no specific new site as candidate for this town. As will appear from the following chapters and the notes to individual texts, quite a number of settlements are tentatively placed in the "central" Habur, which in effect just means that they should be sought within the Basin to the west of Leilan. The ancient geography of the far western portion of the Habur Plains is still poorly known. Observations made by a number of visitors to this region seem to indicate that occupation of the early 2nd millennium B.C. is relatively sparse (see Lyonnet 1996, and Wilkinson 2002), but more work and actual excavations here seem needed.

³⁶ For Till-šannim see the note to letter [60]. The location of Tillā is complicated by the 1st millennium references to a place Tillē, which seems better located further east, but there is no proof that the two entities are the same, and the generic name "Tell" could easily have been applied to different places through time.

1.2.5. The Jezira Kings and Kingdoms

This chapter lists alphabetically figures attested in the Leilan letters who may be assumed to have functioned as rulers of towns or city-states in the northern Jezira. The list includes all correspondents with Mutija and Till-Abnû who identify themselves as “brothers” or “sons” on the assumption that these forms of address were used only by other rulers. A second, less certain category, are correspondents who identify themselves as “servants”, but otherwise seem likely to have been rulers. In keeping with the formal classification used also in the text edition all “servants”, however, whether officials or kings, are discussed in the next chapter. A few individuals who are not attested as correspondents, but from contextual evidence would appear to function in a leading political and military capacity are added although some of them may not necessarily have had the status of “king”. On the other hand it must be noted that the list cannot be exhaustive since other individuals mentioned in the texts could also have been kings.

Unfortunately the evidence is often less specific than could be desired, and as will appear below the capitals of even quite important rulers like Šepallu and Halu-rabi cannot be identified at present. The administrative texts, moreover, are not particularly helpful here. Many of the rulers attested in the letters are not mentioned in the administrative texts at all, and possible new rulers are difficult to identify because of the frequent use of the opaque lú GN “man of GN”, which may refer to rulers as well as other citizens. For the kings of Leilan, who are not included here, see I.1.1.3.

Ahušina

Sender of [118] to Till-Abnû, probably as “brother” or “son”, but this part of the address is broken. The letter is the (negative) answer to a request from Till-Abnû about the capture of AŠKI-Addu, and seems to have issued from a figure with status as ruler.

No namesakes are attested in the administrative texts.

Aja-abu of Šunā

Administrative texts dated with the *limmu* Habil-kēnu mention a delivery of wine from Aja-abu, the king of Šunā (both texts, CV 108, where Aja-abu is called lugal and CV 117, where he is called lú, probably list the same shipment). This king is clearly identical with the “son” of Till-Abnû by this name, from whom we have 10 letters [93]-[102].

A prominent visitor to Leilan named Aja-abu is attested in administrative texts which date to the reign of Jakūn-Ašar (FI 24 and FI 72). No title or GN is given, but it seems likely that Aja-abu of Šunā is involved, and that consequently his reign continued until the end of our documentation.

The town of Šunā must be located west of Leilan, probably on or near the upper course of the wadi Jaghjagh (see I.1.2.4, and cf. Eidem 2008a). Aja-abu appears as a vassal of the king of Leilan, referring back to him also on apparently minor matters, and stating blankly that the town of Šunā is “your town” [93]. In one instance Aja-abu co-authors a letter with a certain Šibila [101], who is also mentioned in an administrative text as Šibilāni lú Šunā (CV 107), and presumably a high official (*šukkallum*?) of Šunā. Also [102] is co-authored, this time with the “elders” (*šībūtum*) of Šunā.

Aja-abu mar Jamutbalim

This man, referred to by name in [42] and [45], is not identical with the king of Šunā, but an “emigrant” (*hābirum*), and an “outlaw” (*sarrārum*) (cf. I.1.2.3). Aja-abu, who is characterized as a Jamutbalean, presumably originated in the territory of Andarig or at least south of the Habur Basin. The town Šunā on the other hand was specifically associated with the clan Jabassum (ARMT XXVIII 95: cf. Durand 2004, 146f.).

Aplahanda

A man with this name writes once to Till-Abnû as “brother”, a short letter with general offers of friendship [35], and this evidence is not sufficient to identify Aplahanda’s geopolitical context. Very tentatively it could be suggested that he was king of Karkemish, where a king by the name of Aplahanda is attested for a slightly earlier period (Charpin and Ziegler 2003, 264). This Aplahanda is known to have died in ZL 11, and was replaced first by his son Jatar-amī and later, in ZL 13, by another son, Jahdun-Lim, who perhaps is mentioned in a text dated Habil-kēnu (CV 53). So Jahdun-Lim of Karkemish must have disappeared shortly afterwards for our Aplahanda to be a successor, but it seems entirely possible that the name was used again by later Karkemish kings, like a grandson of the “old” Aplahanda.

The *ap-la-h[a-an-da]* mentioned in [48] may be the same individual.

Asdi-[....]

Attested only as writer of letter [12] to his “father” Mutija. He reports that Hazip-Teššup of Razamā with 10,000 *habbātum* troops has stayed the night in the town Šurum (*šu-ri-im*), and it is therefore possible that Asdi-[...]’s place of residence should be sought not far from this locality. We shall not discuss other evidence for towns named Šura, Šur’u/i etc. (cf. Kessler 1980, 57ff.), but just note that an administrative text from Leilan (FI 129) provides a relative location of a town *šu-ri* near Kahat. This means that our man may belong somewhere in the central part of the Habur Basin.

The administrative text FI 135 records a certain Asdi-Ištar lú Ašlakkā, but it is not clear whether this man was the ruler of Ašlakkā. The question of possible identity with Asdi-[...] must remain open.

AŠKI-Addu

In seven different letters we find probably the same important figure, but the correct reading of his name poses problems. It is variously written ÁŠ-KI-*e*^dim, ÁŠ-KI-*d*^dim, and twice apparently AB-KI-*e*^dim (see index for references). The first form is found in [101] and [102] sent from Šunā, and the first sign is almost, but not entirely certain to be ÁŠ since its shape is unusual, and the sign does not occur otherwise in the same text group in more secure sequence.

The name does seem to be Semitic, and the -*e* is perhaps a sandhi writing for ... e+Addu = Eddu, but the first element is not clear, and seems unparalleled. One might consider a derivation from the verb *šaḳûm* “to pour water, libate”, or whatever verb is

involved in a number of 3rd millennium PNs with an element išgi- (see Bonechi 1997, 493f.), but the form here seems to be 1st person sing., which hardly makes sense.

In any case AŠKI-Addu was clearly an enemy of Apum. In [101] and [102] Aja-abu of Šunā reports how he has taken command of troops deserted from Halu-rabi, and plunders a town called Gurdabahhum, while he has sent 1,000 soldiers from Eluhut against Sabbānum. These events are related to the troubles on the northwestern “front”, near the vassal kingdom of Šunā, which are discussed in I.1.3.3, but the exact role or status of AŠKI-Addu or the outcome of the situation described in the letters from Aja-abu is unknown. It can be seen, however, that Till-Abnû asked others to remove AŠKI-Addu [118], and that eventually an unknown writer reported that he had been successful in this respect [121].

Aštamar-Adad of Kurdā

This king is attested as sender of letters [5]-[8] to Mutija and [36]-[40] to Till-Abnû, both addressed as “brothers”, and he is also frequently mentioned by other correspondents. Although he is nowhere explicitly referred to as king of Kurdā, this identification emerges clearly from his association with both the town itself, with Kasapā, another important town in this kingdom, and with its tribal designation Numhum/Numahum (see index for references). Aštamar-Adad appears as a firm ally of Apum throughout the correspondence. He is allied with Mutija and Šepallu against Andarig and Razamā, and his letters to Till-Abnû discuss the arrangements of a political treaty.

The central area of Kurdā must clearly be sought south of the Jebel Sinjar and the latest suggestion for a location of the capital itself is Balad Sinjar (Joannès, ARMT XXVI/2, p. 235). Interestingly there is evidence for a pre-Šamšī-Adad ruler Aštamar-Adad of Kurdā, which reveals a conscious and perhaps factual link between that dynasty and the king in our texts (see Lafont 1994, 214).

Burija of Andarig

Burija is attested as sender of letters [41]-[50] to his “brother” Till-Abnû, and both cumulative and quite specific evidence, in e.g. [41], makes it certain that he was king of the important and powerful kingdom of Andarig, located in the region south of the Jebel Sinjar, and possibly identical with Tell Khoshi (cf. Ziegler 2002, 257).

Halu-rabi

This man, no doubt an important king, is a central figure in the archive. He sends letters to his “brothers” Mutija [9], and Till-Abnû [51]-[56], and as “neutral” to Jakūn-Ašar [125], and is further mentioned in numerous other letters.

Some caution with these references is warranted since the name Halu-rabi is not rare, and the possibility of homonymy is present. Thus an administrative text FI 85 refers to a certain Halu-rabi and his two colleagueaues (*tappūšu*), which means that also an official or envoy by this name was active in the region. In [2] Hammurabi (of Halab) mentions two envoys sent to Mutija, and the name of the first should perhaps be read [*ha-lu-ra-bi*] (l. 4). It is therefore possible that Halu-rabi in FI 85 and in other instances should be identified with an envoy from Halab, and not with a Jezira ruler. All the

“brother” letters from a man named Halu-rabi, however, may safely be assumed to have issued from the same local ruler, and a text like [150] (see immediately below) shows clearly that such a ruler existed. The paramount Halab agent in the region appears throughout to be Bin-Dammu, and as far as preservation and context allow the letters (except [2]) seem exclusively to refer to Halu-rabi, the ruler, and not a Halab agent.

In the time of Mutija Halu-rabi writes and suggests a joint campaign [9], but the context of this event does not evolve clearly from the badly preserved letter. Otherwise much of the evidence for Halu-rabi belongs to a situation which started shortly before Mutija’s death, and continued into the early part of Till-Abnû’s reign, and which is studied below in I.1.3.3.

Later during the reign of Till-Abnû Halu-rabi writes in very friendly terms offering assistance in negotiations for a treaty with Hammurabi of Halab [54]-[55], and seeking apparently Till-Abnû’s support when Burija slanders him to Hammurabi [56].

Halu-rabi’s background is unfortunately never stated explicitly in our texts. The letter [112] reports that Halu-rabi will march against Ida-Maraš, which suggests that he belongs outside the Habur Basin. Further we learn in [150] that an army from Halab marching to Andarig via the straight “steppe” route (*kašāmma*), where the Haneans graze their sheep, sends envoys to successively Halu-rabi, Kahat, and Apum. This suggests that Halu-rabi’s capital should be sought west or south of Kahat. Finally in [51] Halu-rabi asks Till-Abnû to send envoys for a meeting in Ṭabātum, identical with Tell Ṭābān on the Habur river below modern Hassake. The only theory which can be offered at present is that this was Halu-rabi’s own seat of kingship. In fact a glance at the Mari evidence for Ṭabātum reveals some close parallels with Halu-rabi’s situation: a diviner is sent to Ṭabātum to take omens about the Haneans and the border (ARMT XXVI/1, 141), and a route from Ṭabātum across steppe to Andarig via Rapšum is given in ARMT XXVII, 65.

A further implication of the Mari evidence is of course that Ṭabātum was controlled by the Mari kings and therefore played no independent political role in this earlier period. As for the Old Babylonian tablets recently found at Tell Ṭābān, showing that this was under control from Terqa (Yamada 2010), it would seem that they are slightly later than the bulk of the texts edited in this volume, and date to the reign of Jakūn-Ašar.

Hawur(ni)-atal of Nawali

Hawur-atal is attested as sender of [119] to Till-Abnû. The letter is not well preserved, but connects the writer with activity near Šunā and Kiduhhum. This neatly fits the second attestation of Hawur-atal in [97], where Aja-abu of Šunā complains to Till-Abnû that Hawur-atal recruits troops from Eluhut and frightens the citizens of Šunā, while in [102] he reports that Eluhut troops have entered Nawali. It is therefore possible to identify Hawur-atal securely with a certain Hawurni-atal lú Nawali mentioned in several administrative texts.

At the moment then it seems most likely that Hawur-atal was ruler of Nawali, and a certain Ukku lú Nawali sending *šūbultum* of wine to Leilan (cf. FI 12 and CV 176) was probably an official.

Nawali is mentioned fairly often in the administrative texts, and appears to have been an important religious center. In the letters Nawali is mentioned, apart from [102],

in connection with the temple for Adad/Teššup of Nawali [6], and as one of four towns where Šepallu is offered grazing for his sheep [10]. Excavations at Girnavaṣ, a large mound ca. 5 km north of Qamishli, has produced Neo-Assyrian tablets whose contents strengthen an earlier theory that the town Nawalā/u/Nabula, surely identical with our Nawali, should be located here (see Donbaz 1988, 5, and cf. below sub Jamsi-Hatnû). The remarks by Erkanal (1988, 139) about the modern religious importance of this place (“Heute gilt dieser Hügel für alle Religionen und ethnischen Gruppen in der Umgebung als Dämonenzentrum”) are particularly interesting in view of the ancient evidence, which apart from the references noted above, includes mention of Adad/Teššup of Nawali in godlists in the treaties, evidently showing that Nawali was one of the major religious centers of the region in Old Babylonian times.

Hazip-Teššup of Razamā

A fragment belonging to L.T.-2 provides the explicit information that a king of Razamā contemporary with Mutija was named Hazip-Teššup. In spite of this treaty and the parallel evidence from administrative texts dated to Habil-kēnu (cf. II.1.3.1) Hazip-Teššup mostly appear as an enemy of Apum in these letters, which also explains why we have no letters sent from him – with the possible exception of [57]. In [8] Mutija and his allies are waging war on the lands of Jassān and Jamutbalum, often associated with respectively (the northern) Razamā (see, e.g., Lafont, ARMT XXVI/2, p. 477) and Andarig, and indeed the text makes it clear that Mutija’s opponents were precisely Burija and Hazip-Teššup. Again in [157] Hazip-Teššup is connected with the land of Jassān (lú Jassānum) and with Razamā.

It must be noted that administrative texts mention no less than two homonyms. The first is Hazip-Teššup lú Hurāšā in CV 32 (*limmu* Habil-kēnu), who may be identified with a probable namesake in [8], 20, where he occurs probably in region of Hurāšā (see I.1.3.2) and where the king of Razamā is elsewhere (cf. I. 28). The second is a Hazip-Teššup lú Nilibšinni in [L.87-698+718](undated). Finally an envelope fragment is sealed with the seal of a certain [*ha-zi*]-*ip-te-šu-up* (Appendix 2.2, no. 4).

For the possible location of Razamā of Jassān in the plain east of the Habur Basin see Durand 1990a, 12. The few Old Babylonian tablets found at Tell al-Hawa unfortunately yield no conclusive evidence (see George 1990, 41f., and George 1992; Eidem 1993b).

Ila-Hatnû

Attested only as sender of [58] to his “brother” Till-Abnû. The letter discusses the case of some Apum citizens captured by Ila-Hatnû’s troops while these were operating with troops of his “brother” Burija, the king of Andarig. This may be a reference to the war between Apum and Andarig and Razamā, where Ila-Hatnû then was an ally of Andarig.

Since Ila-Hatnû styles himself “brother” of both Till-Abnû and Burija, he must himself have been a fairly powerful king. As for the name and location of his kingdom present evidence allows no specific suggestions, but his alliance with – or at least assistance to Andarig points in a direction south of the Jebel Sinjar, and the presence of just a single reference to him, perhaps to a fairly distant location.

Jamši-Hatnû and Ea-malik of Kahat

Jamši-Hatnû can be securely identified as king of Kahat since he is so described in L.T.-3, which also provides the name of his father, a certain Asdi-nehim. The same treaty places Ea-malik, without title or filiation, as party to the proceedings together with the king.

The treaty provides other interesting information on Kahat. In several passages towns and citizens of Kahat are described with the strange designations *ši-al-PI-ri* and *nu-ha-ši*. The two terms must clearly designate main ethnic, social, or geographical components of the kingdom of Kahat, but a more precise understanding does not seem possible. *ši'aljeri seems likely to be a Hurrian term and is perhaps related to Hurrian *ši-ya-l* – “(dis)poser, installer, mettre en pile” (see Catsanicos 1996, 282, for such forms as *ši-ya-le-e-ri* “qui (dis)posa” etc.), and *nuha(š)šu (root NHŠ “to prosper”?), while hardly with any direct historical connection, seems likely to be the same word as the name of the land Nuhašše in western Syria known from the later 2nd millennium (cf. Klengel 1992, *passim*). Since both towns and citizens could be so designated the two terms should have served to describe a main geographical or social division in the land of Kahat other than settled-nomad.

Another problem is the definition of the territory of the kingdom as “from Nawar to Nawar” (*ištu Nawar adi Nawar^{ki}*) in several passages of the treaty. Kahat itself is presumably to be located at Tell Barri on the wadi Jaghjagh, and one of the two points referred to as Nawar can be identified with Nagar (in the Mitanni period spelled Nawar) to the south, surely identical with Tell Brak. Nagar with its cult of the goddess Bēlet-Nagar has been the subject of studies by Guichard, who has published several pertinent texts from the Mari archives, among them a letter which shows how the statue or emblem of this deity was taken on ceremonial tours in the region. The ruler of Hazzikannum, Huziri, writes to Zimri-Lim: “Here Bēlet-Nagar, who protects the life of my lord and grants my lord long life is passing through the lands. I will receive her in Iluna-ahi, and Haja-Sumu will receive her in Miškillum, and I will receive her (again) from Hāja-abum and perform her sacrifices in Hazzakannum” (A.221, 5-14; Guichard 1994, 237ff.). A similar tour of the goddess is attested here in [28], and Bēlet-Nagar is also included in the godlist in L.T.-3.

We have previously suggested that the second Nawar mentioned in the treaty could be another, northern Nawar, tentatively identified with Nawali (see Matthews and Eidem 1993, and cf. above sub Hawur-atal). If correct there seems to be a clear logic in defining the kingdom by these two outer points of the wadi, both important religious centers. Guichard (1997) has published a text which mentions dedication of a girl *a-na^dna-wa-ar i-na na-ga-ar^{ki}*, and suggested that Nawar was the local pronunciation versus the Semitic Nagar. In any case the new text clearly lays to rest the doubts expressed (most recently by Wilhelm 1996, 178 n. 38) about the identification of Nagar with Nawar. Guichard in the same article suggested that the phrase in our treaty referred, not to two different localities, but to a “round-trip” Nagar-Nagar made by the goddess. This is an interesting idea, which may yet prove correct, but at present remains speculation. It should be noted that the treaty phrase consistently places the determinative only after the second Nawar, and although this may not have any real significance, it could also be

thought that it was done to differentiate the compounded divine geographical entity Nawar (= Nagar) and a mere locality Nawar.

The history of Kahat in the time of the Mari archives has been summarized by Charpin (1990a; cf. also Charpin and Ziegler 2003, 266) and need not be discussed here, but it should be mentioned that from this period we have evidence for three kings, Akin-Amar, Kabija, and Asdi-Lim, none of whom can be related to Jamsi-Hatnû or Asdinehim on present evidence. Turning to the evidence from the Leilan texts we note first of all that although Jamsi-Hatnû is sender of no less than 15 letters to Till-Abnû [62]-[76], he is never mentioned by other correspondents. Ea-malik, on the other hand, himself sender of 4 letters to Till-Abnû [28]-[32], is mentioned by several other correspondents. Ea-malik may have been a son or brother of the king, but in any case he appears more “executive” than the actual king.

This distribution of the evidence is slightly curious as is also the fact that virtually all the letters from Kahat concern routine affairs. The kingdom of Kahat seems almost aloof to the dramatic events reflected in other parts of the documentation although some of these evolve very close to its territory. Tentatively it could be suggested that Kahat, itself the center for a famous cult of Adad/Teššup (included of course in L.T.-3 as ^dim *bēl* Kahat; for the temple of this cult see Charpin 1982), and claiming nominal control over perhaps two other important cult-centers, had a special status among the Habur kingdoms, and that this explains both the peculiar role of Ea-malik and the apparent low-tune political and military activity. In fact a similar “quiet” situation is reflected in the letters from Kabija published in ARMT XXVIII (nos. 123-133).

Jasmah-Addu

This man is attested exclusively as sender of [14] to his “father” Mutija whom he asks about the rumours of approaching *habbātum* troops. Presumably a king of minor importance the evidence allows no further conclusions about his background.

Janši[b-....]

Sender of [33] to Till-Abnû as “neutral”. The contents of the letter provide no background information about the writer. It mentions two men, Zimri-Addu and Tarim-Šakim, who are sent to Šehnā, but these names are not attested elsewhere. It seems likely, however, that Janši[b-....] is identical with the next figure discussed.

Jaššib-Hatnû of Urkiš(?)

Mentioned in three letters to *bēlum*, from Sangara [143] and [144], and from Takē [150]. The information in [143] is explicit as to Jaššib-Hatnû’s background since he is reported to have written: “I have evacuated (my territory) to Urgina”. In [144] it is further reported that a messenger has gone to Jaššib-Hatnû and the king of Aš-KA-kum to get help against Halu-rabi (for the historical context of these letters see I.1.3.3). On the assumption that the two towns here are identical with respectively Urkiš and Ašnakum this information would support the theory that Jaššib-Hatnû was king or governor of Urkiš. ARMT XXVIII 69 documents an important official of Urkiš named Janšib-Hadnu, who might well be the same as our figure. In the time of the Mari archives Urkiš was

under some order of control from Ašnakkum (see Durand 1990a, 10f.), and does not appear politically important

Recent excavations have made it virtually certain that Urkiš is identical with Tell Mozān near modern Amouda (see, e. g., Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 1996).

Kanisānu

Kanisānu is attested as sender of two letters to his “father” Mutija [15]-[16], and of [178] to an unknown addressee. He is apparently a minor ruler, but the evidence about his background is not clear.

[15] can be connected with the war against Andarig and Razamā. This context and the mention of a town Anamaš points to the central sector of the Habur Basin.

[16] concerns a man called a “servant of this house” a certain Hazip-Šimegi, possibly identical with a namesake lú Puṭrim^{ki} mentioned in an administrative text FI 135 (month iv Ipiq-Ištar). The mention of both Puṭrum and Šuttannum indicates again the central sector of the Basin.

ARMT XXVIII 111 documents a high-ranking official Kanisānu in Ašlakkā, and identity with our figure seems *possible*.

Kirija

This man is not attested as sender of any letters, but is mentioned by other correspondents. In [7] he is involved in military operations south of the Jebel Sinjar (between Sanduwātum and Tupham; cf. notes to text), and in [147]-[148] the Apum general Šupram is apparently attached to him. In [147] Šupram quotes a warning from Kirija, who says that Šupram’s lord (presumably Mutija) should let the enemy reach his city gate, but not engage in open battle with him. It seems likely that these letters all refer to the same events, and that they can be dated to the time of the war against Andarig and Razamā late in Mutija’s reign.

On this evidence Kirija would seem to belong in the region between the Habur Basin and the Jebel Sinjar, and he could be identical with the Girija, lú Jassān, who is preparing to assist Hazip-Teššup of Razamā in [157].

Kuzzuri

See above I.1.2.1 n. 14.

Masum-atal of Alilānum

This king, a “son” of Till-Abnû, is only attested in our material as sender of two short and rather uninformative notes to Till-Abnû [103]-[104]. It seems very likely that he is identical with a namesake known as king of Alilānum from a few Mari texts, several of which concern a visit to Mari planned by Šarrāja of Razamā, who will be accompanied by two other kings, Hazip-Ulme of Ašihum and Masum-atal of Alilānum (see Birot, ARMT XXVII, pp. 23f.). Since the three kingdoms of Razamā (ša Jassān, cf. above s.v. Hazip-Teššup), Ašihum, and Alilānum thus would seem to have been closely connected, and both Razamā and Ašihum (cf. ARMT XXVI/2, p. 258) can be placed in the region

between the Habur and Sinjar plains, it follows that also Alilānum must be sought in this general area, and this is supported by the reference made to the town in [138] where it is stated that *habbātum* troops have entered Alilānum and continued towards Razamā.

Mašum

Attested as sender of [18] to his “father” Mutija, and of [77]-[81] to his “brother” Till-Abnû. Unfortunately his place of residence is not named, but a general location is provided by [18], where Mašum states that his town is “your” (sing.) town and that he is guarding the frontier of “your” (plural) land – “from the crest of mount Saggar hither to the land of Jassān”. This places Mašum firmly south-southeast of Apum in the land of Jassān(um), where a number of towns are known (see above s.v. Masum-atal and cf. also Joannès in ARMT XXVI/2, 235ff., where other towns in this area are discussed). Among these Razamā and Alilānum are excluded, and the same must apply to Azuhinnum from the way it is referred to in [18], 14.

The letters sent from Mašum to Till-Abnû mostly concern routine affairs and are not easily datable. The only text with clear historical implications is [81] where Mašum, who himself has made peace with Burija, advises Till-Abnû to evacuate the countryside of his land. This information would seem to fit a context towards the end of the war against Andarig, i.e. late in the reign of Mutija, and it is therefore possible that this particular letter was sent to Till-Abnû prior to his accession when he perhaps was stationed as viceroy at Šurnat. Since Mašum consistently address Till-Abnû “brother”, it further seems possible that all his letters belong to this period. Such a theory might be supported also by the relative proximity which can be assumed between the capital of Mašum and Šurnat, but must remain a theory only.

Mehilum

This man is attested as sender of 2 letters to Till-Abnû, his *rā'imum* [105], and his “father” [106]. The former text is short and not very informative: Kahat is mentioned and Mehilum seems willing and able to provide auxiliaries. [106], where the change of style in address could reflect a difference before and after Till-Abnû's accession, is more interesting. Mehilum is staying with Halu-rabi, who is displeased with Till-Abnû who does not pay him a visit and apparently is expected to provide troops. Mehilum has interceded on Till-Abnû's behalf, and now urges him to do as desired.

The background of Mehilum is better established through other references. In [149] we hear of a Mehili lú Japṭur whose retainer together with a dignitary (*qaqqadum*) of Qirdahat has been sent to Till-Abnû, and the designation lú Japṭur for Mehili is also attested in CV 79. The association of Mehilum with Qirdahat is likewise found in [128] from Bahdi-Lim (probably resident there, see I.1.2.6) who reports that Mehilum has stayed 5 days in Qirdahat without meeting envoys of *bēlum* (Till-Abnû).

What emerges from this evidence is that Mehilum was lord of the land Japṭur and also had control over Qirdahat, where he occasionally resided. According to Charpin (2009, 41) Qirdahat should be placed in the area of modern Hassake, while Japṭur is a designation for areas further northwest (see Durand 1988, and 2004, 123f.). From Mari we have evidence for a certain Šubram as king of Qirdahat (ARMT XXVII 20).

Muti-Addu

This figure is attested only as sender of [82], where he asks Till-Abnû for troops and states: "...and since your route is near, I shall come up to a town, so that you and I can meet, and establish brotherhood between us". This seems to place Muti-Addu's town somewhere south in relation to a route of march or travel planned by Till-Abnû, but no more exact location can be given.

Niqmi-Adad

Sender of letter [19] as "son" to Mutija, and of [83]-[84] as "neutral", and [85]-[86] as "small brother (*ahum šihrum*)" – all to Till-Abnû, in the two latter texts addressed "big brother" (*ahīja gal*). This man, apparently a figure of minor political importance, could in view of the fairly rare style of address have been an actual younger brother of Till-Abnû and Jakûn-Ašar, but this cannot be proved. His letters deal with routine affairs like herding of sheep [85] or legal cases. The geographical information in the texts, which mention towns like Kuzzaja, Ahanda, Puṭrum, and Nilibšinnu, points generally to a location somewhere in the central part of the Habur Basin.

Sumu-Hadû

Only attested as sender of [34] writing as "neutral" to Till-Abnû to establish friendly relations, apparently shortly after he succeeded to the Apum throne. The letter mentions a certain Šamaš-na-š[ir²] who is sent to Till-Abnû, and although homonymy is very likely involved, it should be noted that an administrative text (CV 116) refers to a merchant Šamaš-našir from Amursakkum, and this is the only possible clue to Sumu-Hadû's location.

Šepallu

Sender of [10]-[11] to "brother" Mutija, [87]-[88] to "brother" Till-Abnû, [166] to Aštamar-Adad, and finally [175]-[176] to "brothers" whose names are not preserved, but most likely were Mutija or Till-Abnû. Šepallu must have been an important king as shown clearly by the affairs related to the war against Andarig and Razamā late in the reign of Mutija (see I.1.3.2), where he was an ally of Apum and Kurdā. Unfortunately the evidence for his seat of kingship is not clear, but points to a location south of the Habur Basin. This evolves first of all from the texts relating to the war against Andarig and Razamā, and where towns like Zannānum and Sabum [11], and Hurāšā [137]-[138] seem to belong to his land, which was invaded by the enemy [139]. Other evidence is less clear. In [176] Šepallu invites probably Mutija or Till-Abnû to come from Šubat-Enlil to a particular town, whose name is almost completely broken on the tablet. None of this is very conclusive, but since Zannānum and Sabum may be identical with towns located not too far from the Rimah area (cf. notes to [11]) one could tentatively think that Šepallu was king of Karanā/Qaṭṭarā, where we seem to lack a king. This important kingdom (cf. Charpin and Durand 1987 and Eidem 1989a) is not mentioned in the texts from 1987, but a single reference is found in L.85-490 dated in the *limmu* Adad-bani, which lists a certain Warad-Šamaš lú Karanā (Whiting 1990b, 569; a man with this name is also

mentioned as recipient of a garment in CV 100), but he may well have been an envoy or similar.

Šukrum-Teššup of Eluhut

That this man was king of Eluhut is explicit in the letters he sent to Till-Abnû [89]-[91]. From Mari we know of two different kings of Eluhut, the earlier Šarrāja and the later Šukrum-Teššup, who must be identical with our king, and thus one of the very few surviving figures from the time covered by the Mari archives.

The most informative of the letters sent from Šukrum-Teššup is [89] where it is indicated that relations between Apum and Eluhut have been strained, but a meeting and the conclusion of a treaty is still anticipated. Apparently Šukrum-Teššup wants a “house” (i.e. an estate) in Šubat-Enlil and he offers Till-Abnû not only a “house” in Eluhut, but a(ny) town he wishes (from Eluhut domain).

Eluhut cannot be located with much precision, but must be sought in the mountains across the Turkish frontier (cf. Nashef 1982, 104).

Zigē of Amaz

Zigē occurs only as sender of [107] to his “father” Till-Abnû. The letter treats routine affairs and reveals no details about Zigē’s background. Most likely, however, Zigē is identical with the namesake referred to as lú Amaz in several administrative texts. References in texts from Mari to namesakes (e. g. from Ilān-šurā in ARM VII, 210, 11) are surely homonyms, and show that the name was current in the Habur region.

The town of Amaz is well-attested in older sources. In Old Assyrian texts it appears as an intermediate station between Apum (Leilan) and Nahur, hence west of Leilan, and the recent find of an Old Assyrian envelope fragment at Tell Arbid provides a tentative candidate for the site of Amaz (Eidem 2008a, 40). Apart from a king Zambug(a) known from the early part of Zimri-Lim’s reign (see ARMT XXVI/2, p.121 d), the most detailed information about Amaz is found in the series of letters from late Zimri-Lim published and discussed by F. Joannès in ARMT XXVI/2 (and conveniently summarized also in Joannès 1990). It shows that Amaz was a typical walled town with citadel and lower town, and that it was contested between various neighbouring kingdoms like Susā, Eluhut, Šunā, and Šubat-Enlil (which was part of the kingdom of Atamrum of Andarig). Although Amaz also at this time had its own king, a certain Hišrija, it clearly did not belong to the more powerful Habur states.

This information is well in accordance with the situation in our texts, where the ruler of Amaz appears to be subordinate to Leilan, and the town is mentioned in relative proximity to Sabbānum [116] and Japṭur [130]. For the Apum(?) governor or general Hammi-Epuh stationed in Amaz see next section.

Concordance

Concordance between selected GNs and PN (PNs underlined are firmly associated with the GN, while those in parentheses only tentatively so).

Alilānum	<u>Masum-atal</u>
Amaz	<u>Zigē</u>

Andarig	<u>Burija</u>
Ašnakkum	cf. Jaššib-Hatnû
Eluhut	<u>Šukrum-Teššup</u>
Hurāšā	cf. Hazip-Teššup
Japṭur	<u>Mehilum</u>
Kahat	<u>Jamši-Hatnû</u>
Karanā/Qaṭṭarā	(Šepallu)
Karkemish	(Aplahanda)
Kurdā	<u>Aštamar-Adad</u>
Nawali	<u>Hawurni-atal</u>
Nawar	cf. Jamši-Hatnû
Qirdahat	cf. Mehilum
Razamā	<u>Hazip-Teššup</u>
Šunā	<u>Aja-abu</u>
Ṭabātum	(Halu-rabi)
Urkiš	<u>Jassib-Hatnû</u>

1.2.6. The Kingdom of Apum and its servants

The kings of Apum have already been discussed, but a brief review should be made of the most important “servants” (*wardum*) occurring in the letters. It must be stressed, however, that this category probably includes “kings”, foreign officials, and officials of the kings of Apum, and that any precise distinction between these categories often is difficult to make without more explicit evidence. It may be assumed, for instance, that several towns, especially in Apum, had both resident officials of the king, as well as local “princes”. Examples of this could be Šurnat (cf. I.1.1.3 and below s. v. Ewri), Amaz (below s. v. Hammi-Epuh), and Azamhul (below s. v. Inganum). The evidence is complex in this respect, and further evaluation is better left pending appearance of the final editions of the administrative texts.

For obvious reasons the officials relevant for the letters are mostly those who permanently or occasionally functioned outside Leilan. For the officials having primarily functions in Leilan itself or in the Lower Town Palace, the evidence from the administrative texts and the sealings (also on tablets) is of course of primary importance, but will only be occasionally referred to here.

Abbuttān(um)

Sender of [127] to *bēlum* (from internal criteria certainly Till-Abnû). Abbuttānu is on a campaign and claims that he can conquer town(s?) and defeat(?) kings if he is given quick reinforcement. The only other extant reference to Abbuttānu (including the administrative texts) is in [94] where Aja-abu writes: “Previously when I sent you letters from Abbuttān, my “father” wrote back in accordance with these letters. Now the son of Abbuttān came to me”. Not least in view of the rarity of this name we are allowed to assume that both texts refer to the same individual.

The phrasing in [94] perhaps indicates that Abbuttān was dead, and if correct this might explain why he is not mentioned more often since he must evidently have been an important figure. In the first part of [127] he seems to anticipate some backbiting from other officials and writes: “Let Takē, Bajjānu, and Tišwen-atal stand before my lord and hear this letter of mine. They must not say anything against me who is (indeed) a servant of my lord Till-Abnû. (It is) I who made all the kings bend to my lord’s feet. When the elders of the country of Apum went to my lord to Kahat, I held”

This is extremely interesting if somewhat obscure (cf. I.1.1.3), but underlines that Abbuttānu must have been an important official who had supported Till-Abnû on his accession to the throne. Judging from [94] he may have functioned as governor or agent west of Leilan sending reports concerning affairs near Šunā to the king.

Ahī-maraš

Sender of [126] to *bēlum* reporting on Jakūn-Ašar’s victory and subsequent developments concerning the *habbātum*, and of [167] to Inganum (*rā’imum*) about quarrel they will solve when there is peace in the country. Ahī-maraš is further mentioned in [171] as being able on request to give Ewri further information about the *habbātum*.

All three references may well belong to the same historical context, namely the war against Andarig and Razamā late in Mutija’s reign, in which case all our evidence pertains to a single participation in a campaign lead by Jakūn-Ašar, but in poorly defined capacity. The administrative texts furnish no firm evidence for this individual.

Bajjānu

This man was an important palace official. He is mentioned in at least 4 administrative texts, and sealing fragments impressed with his seal were found in Room 5 (legend: *ba-a-ia-nu*, dumu *ha-ka-mu*, ır *ti-la-ab-nu* [L.87-894]; see Parayre 1991b, 128 no. 11). He is mentioned in 3 letters, and his high position is especially evident in [127]: “Let Takē, Bajjānu, and Tišwen-atal stand before my lord and hear this letter of mine” (ll. 3-5). So far Bajjānu is not attested in texts relating to the reign of Mutija, but this may of course be accidental.

Bahdi-Lim

Sender of [128] to *bēlum* referring to the death of Mutija and offering congratulations on *bēlum*’s accession to “the golden throne”. Bahdi-Lim is not mentioned elsewhere, but his lonely letter provides some clues to his background (see I.1.2.5, s.v. Mehilum) and it seems likely that he was stationed in Qirdahat, but whether as an official or “king” is difficult to decide on present evidence.

Ewri

Only attested as sender of two letters sent simultaneously to Till-Abnû his lord [110], and Takē [171]. An important figure with this name is also attested in the Old Babylonian tablet, contemporary with the Leilan texts, found at Tell Qal’at al-Hādī southeast of Leilan (see Durand 1987a; Whiting 1990a, 216; Eidem 1988; and cf. I.1.1.4). Since the

diachronic analysis of the letters in the next chapter shows that our Ewri was placed in this corner of the region, there can be little doubt that the two men are identical. Since further Till-Abnû seems to have resided in Šurnat prior to his accession, and Šurnat is known as a town in or near Apum territory, it can be suggested that the ancient name of Qal'at al-Hādī was Šurnat.

However that may be it is not easy to define Ewri's position and it seems that he could have been either a local nobleman or an Apum official. Unfortunately the administrative texts provide no relevant information.

Hammi-Epuh

Sender of [129]-[130] to his lord, and mentioned in [116]. All three references seem to concern the same series of events taking place in the northwest part of the Habur Basin (in region of Sabbānum, Amaz, and Jap̄tur) and with a connection to the troubles with Halu-rabi (see I.1.3.3).

Administrative texts supply references to:

- Hammi-Epuh, a physician (CV 176, *limmu* Habil-kēnu)
- Hammu-Epuh lú Amaz (CV 165, *limmu* Habil-kēnu)

There can be little doubt that our man is identical with the latter individual, while the former should be a homonym. Since Zigē seems to have the king of Amaz, Hammi-Epuh is best considered an Apum general or governor.

Hawilija

Sender of [111] to his lord Till-Abnû about release of various people. The text implies that Till-Abnû is in Šubat-Enlil and writer resident elsewhere. The only other reference to Hawilija is in [145] where Sangara reports that "Hawilija sent me to Irpapā. After the arrival of my messenger I shall arrive in Ibnahi." Both of the toponyms in this passage are otherwise unattested and the context therefore difficult to elucidate (cf. below sub Sangara).

Ilī-Epuh

Sender of [131], where he writes to *bēlum* about routine matters, but with the implication that Ilī-Epuh was stationed elsewhere. A namesake is mentioned in [149] where he intercepts(?) a man who (secretly?) had carried information to Mutija about Jap̄tur and Qirdahat. Unfortunately the details of the affair are not clear, but this Ilī-Epuh would seem to be an official(?) of Mehilum, the lord of Jap̄tur.

Inganum

Sender of [132]-[135] to *bēlum*, [169] to Šupram (Apum general), and receiver of [167] from Ahī-maraš.

Among the letters to *bēlum* [133]-[135] form a small series concerning troubles in Apum related to the events discussed in I.1.3.3. In [133] it is reported that someone has "taken" Nihru, and Inganum sends off a relief force. In [134] auxiliaries of Halu-rabi

have entered Nihru, and Inganum adds: “The outlaws who enter this town have increased in number! My lord must not stay silent, but do all he can!”. In [135] he reports that he has gathered the “district” (*halšum*) in Azamhul at harvest time as ordered, guards are posted and he himself present. Further he fears for the safety of the town Šathura.

Azamhul was an important town in Apum, possibly to be identified with Tell Mhm. Diyab southeast of Leilan (Charpin 1990b, but cf. Eidem 2008b, 270 w. n. 7). It is possible that Inganum could have functioned as governor of this town or at least in this general sector of Apum, but administrative texts also refer more explicitly to a fairly prominent man Samsu-malik lú Azamhul. Another theory could make him an official stationed at Leilan itself, sending reports to the king while he was absent.

Jašub-...

Sender of [136] to *bēlum*, but the short and badly preserved text provides no real information.

Kuzuzzu

Only attested as sender of [137]-[141] to his lord. [137], 10-16 implies that he was resident in Šehnā, but [137]-[139] were written while he was on a diplomatic mission with Šepallu (during reign of Mutija; see I.1.3.2). In [140] he conveys complaints from auxiliaries under a certain Šanigi’s command. Finally the fragmentary [141] concerns an isolated affair about a man from Ilān-šurā.

Qarrādu

Sender of [142] to *bēlum*. The letter concerns the apprehension of a refugee reported to be in Šehnā. Probably Qarrādu resided outside Šehnā; he may or may not be identical with a certain Qarradu lú NaDBim mentioned in FI 6. A town or country NaDBum is not known from elsewhere.

Sangara

Only attested as sender of letters to *bēlum*, in [112] explicitly Till-Abnû, and for [143]-[144] from context perhaps Mutija. He is probably identical with the namesake Sangara lú Tillā mentioned in an undated administrative list of officials (and vassals?) CV 176. For the location of Tillā see I.1.2.4. From the Mari archives we have the names of two different kings of the town, successively Takka and Samsi-Erah (Guichard 1994, 252).

Šin-tukultī

This man, attested as official in CV 176, is no doubt the same as the sender of letter [165] (concerning garments) to the woman Ahatani.

Sumu-ditana

Sender of [113] to his lord Til-Abnû and reporting on a treaty concluded between the towns Ahanda and Kiduhhum and AŠKI-Addu, information which provides a link to the

troubles with this latter figure (see I.1.3.3). Especially the clay of the letter is very similar to the distinct type used for letters sent from Šunā (see Appendix 2.1) which may indicate that the letter, which indeed concern events in this region, was sent from this town or nearby.³⁷

Šupram

A man with this name is mentioned in administrative texts with the title “general” (*gal-mar-tu*), and very likely this is the same man sending letters to his lord [147]-[148] while on military mission to Kirija (see I.1.2.5, s.v.), and receiving letters from Inganum (governor in or near Azamhul) with short greetings [169], and from his “brother” Samum (otherwise unattested) with requests for oil [170].

Takē

The evidence for this man is complicated and may involve at least one homonym.

In [8] and possibly [24] a man named Takē who is a Halab “governor” (*šāpīṭum*) occurs, but he may have been dismissed by Mutija (see [8]).

Letters to both Mutija [6] and Till-Abnû [44] refer to a man Takē who seems to be resident in Apum. He is called Till-Abnû’s “servant” [87], and seems to have been one of the highest officials [127].

A number of letters were sent by Takē: [114] and [115] to his lord Till-Abnû, and [148]-[151] addressed to *bēlum*, and Takē himself received an important report on the movements of the *habbātum* from Ewri [171]. The material evidence (cf. Appendix 2.1) shows that all the letters sent by Takē issued from the same man. Particularly interesting is the allusion to Till-Abnû’s father who imposed a “contract” of reciprocal assistance between Takē and his Till-Abnû [115], something which shows that Takē must have had his own base outside Leilan. Also in [114] the impression is certainly that he was stationed outside Šehnā. In both [150] and [151] he reports the arrival of important envoys which he sends on to his lord, but is this because these had passed Takē’s place of residence en route to Leilan or because Takē had received them in the capital when the king was absent?

In view of the important status of this man it seems strange that the administrative texts furnish virtually no evidence (a single text dated Išme-El, FI 48, mentions a certain *ta-ge* visiting the king). Also for this reason it seems to me doubtful that the Takē who sent the letters discussed above should be identical with the Halab governor and the best solution may be to assume that he was a local nobleman in Apum, who also functioned as a high official in the capital, and that all the other references except [8] (and [24]?) are to this individual.

Tišwen-atal

Tišwen-atal is mentioned frequently in the administrative texts (especially those dated to the reign of Jakūn-Ašar from Room 2) as a “general” (*gal-mar-tu*); he appears twice in

³⁷ It is somewhat unexpected to find the rare name Sumu-ditana, also carried by a son of Hammurabi of Babylon (see Lion 1994), in this context.

the letters: in company with other high officials in [127], and as sender of the rather enigmatic [152], sent to his lord from Kahat (and in Kahat “style”, cf. Appendix 2.1).

Warad-[...] / Warad-Ištar

The evidence listed below is not clear, but it seems possible to distinguish at least two different individuals: Warad-[.....] who sent [155] and who may have been a small-scale governor or similar stationed outside Leilan, and a fairly important palace official named Warad-Ištar:

Warad-[...]

Sender of [155] where he reports that he is harassed by enemies “left and right” and asks his lord to send soldiers. This tablet is of unique type with very large writing.

Receiver of [173] from a certain Jakūn-A[r-...], an otherwise unattested figure who lives in Kasapā (in Kurdā), and needs furnishings for his house.

Warad-Ištar

Sender of [153] to *bēlum*. Writer is on apparently successful mission to unnamed king to effect ransom of unnamed person. In [164] Warad-Ištar writes to Aham-arši and gives instructions about issues of food stuff to Bajjānu (a Šehnā palace official).

Sender of [168] to a certain Ṭābīja, attested as palace official in administrative texts. This tablet is of a distinctive type (shape, writing). It was found in Room 12.

The fragment [154] could have issued from the same man, but this cannot be definitively established.

Receiver of [172] from his “brother” [...-a]n-zali about release of certain women, and of [174] from Awīl-Amurrim and Hi-[.....], who have disobeyed the king and ask Warad-Ištar to intercede.

Zimri-[...]

Sender of [116] with clear connections to the “war” against Halu-rabi and to letters sent by Hammi-Epuh. Writer reports that he “went up” to Sabbānum and that some troops under Hammi-Epuh deserted in Amaz, and he also asks his lord to send fresh soldiers to guard “the palace and me”. Tentatively this information would indicate that Zimri-[...] was resident south of Sabbānum and Amaz, towns located in the central part of the Habur Basin.

Names beginning with Zimri- are of course very common, and we can suggest no firm link between our figure and others attested in the texts, although geographical context could make someone like Zimri-Addu sent to Till-Abnû from Janši[p-...] (cf. I.1.2.5, s.v.) a possible candidate.

[.....]-a (?)

The two letters [156] and [157] are of a very special physical type, deal with the same events, and were most likely sent from the same man, whose name has unfortunately not survived in either text. The contents are interesting, if somewhat enigmatic.

In [157] sender quotes letter from the brother of a certain Kabizzari lú [...]urnim. This man appears to have encountered troops of Hazip-Teššup under the command of Giritja and asked them where they were going. The answer was “We are going to Dīr!”, but this is apparently a lie and it is affirmed that they are really heading towards Šathuri!

In [156] writer quotes a report from a certain Ilī-asī who was asked by a *sugāgum* official where he was going. At the answer “to Hazip-Teššup!” the *sugāgum* protests that this man is plotting evil. 500 men from Numha have joined him in the town Li-[...] so that his full force marching to Razamā is now 1.500. It is reported that he intends to go to Šathuri. The writer (of [156]) is afraid that this will cause panic in the country and mentions security measures like fire signals and evacuation of the countryside.

Leaving aside some unclear details of this situation it can be concluded that the writer is giving his lord two different reports on the same matter: Hazip-Teššup, the king of Razamā, is gathering troops for an attack against the town Šathuri. This town, which is not attested outside the Leilan texts, occurs also in a letter sent from Inganum [135], where there is also fear for its safety. There can be little doubt that the geographical context for the situation is somewhere on the southeastern borders of Apum.

1.3. Diachronic Patterns

1.3.1. Basic Premises

Unfortunately dated administrative texts provide very few links to events mentioned in the letters, an important exception being the evidence for diplomatic activity and treaty-making found in texts from the *limmu*-year Habil-kēnu (see II.1.3.1). In this situation attempts to place the evidence in diachronic perspective must rely on other observations, both external and internal. Given the various difficulties already outlined, like the archival composition of the material, and the briefness or very general nature of many texts, diachronic analyses must necessarily be tentative and sketchy for the time being, and we shall not attempt any exhaustive study here, but merely try to establish a basic historical framework for the evidence. This will involve presentation and discussion of both reasonable assumptions, as well as deliberate speculation which may help solve some problems.

A most important premise for a diachronic scheme is provided by the theories about the archival composition of the texts presented above (I.1.1.5). If these are correct it can be assumed that the letters are basically contemporary with the administrative texts, and mostly date within the three consecutive *limmu* years Habil-kēnu, Amer-Ištar, and Ipiq-Ištar. It can further be assumed that the number of administrative texts from each of these years within the archive should be roughly indicative for the number of letters from each year within the archive. This means that most of the letters should belong to the period late Habil-kēnu to mid-Amer-Ištar. Evidently it is impossible to prove such a scheme for all individual texts, but it does seem to have some basic validity, and in spite of the rather kaleidoscopic impression which the letters may give, there are so many obvious links between events and individuals mentioned that a limited time frame in any case seems a necessary conclusion.

Mere mechanical prosopographic observation shows within the material three major groups of texts which concern three different political situations. The first is the war between two coalitions: Mutija, Aštamar-Adad of Kurdā, and Šepallu of Karanā(?) against Burija of Andarig and Hazip-Teššup of Razamā. This situation clearly belongs to the end of Mutija's reign, but involves also letters sent to Till-Abnû. The second situation is the transition between the two reigns of Mutija and Till-Abnû, reflected in a number of letters which explicitly refer to the change of rule. Finally a third group consists of the many texts which concern troubles on the marches of Apum caused by the king Halu-rabi or his allies. Since this latter series of events is not mentioned explicitly in any of the letters addressed to Mutija by name, it could be thought to belong entirely to the reign of Till-Abnû, but this, given the number of texts in the series, would run counter to our basic premise.

This brings us to a fundamental problem. All the letters sent to Mutija as named addressee must of course belong to a period before his death and the accession of Till-Abnû, which can be placed sometime in late Habil-kēnu or early Amer-Ištar. For the letters addressed to an anonymous *bēlum* "lord", however, only internal evidence can show whether Mutija or Till-Abnû – or someone else for that matter – was the addressee. A similar difficulty applies to the letters sent to Till-Abnû, a few of which clearly date to a time when Mutija was still king, while most belong after his accession. Evidently these two difficulties cannot be entirely eliminated, and must be kept in mind throughout, but it seems possible to make considerable progress with a correct division of the texts. Apart from explicit internal evidence in some letters the address formulae can provide some indications.

One such indication may be derived from the correspondents who address their letters to *bēlum*, but add the name of Till-Abnû. Lafont (ARMT XXVI/2, 512; cf. also Charpin ARMT XXVI/2, p. 130 + n. 5) has suggested that this mode of address was used when writing to a "foreign" lord, while the plain *ana bēlīja* was the current address used by officials to their "own" lord. This distinction indicates that the seven people who used the address *ana bēlīja* PN to Till-Abnû were not his own officials or vassals, but considered either Mutija or some third king their proper "lord". Two of these, Sangara and Takē, also employ the simpler form, and we may here have a criterion for separating some letters sent to Till-Abnû before and after his accession. [110] from Ewri to "my lord Till-Abnû" is one certain example of such a letter which predates the death of Mutija. If the same applies to other letters with this mode of address it is a crucial point, since information in some of these letters can be related to the troubles caused by Halu-rabi and his allies, which are not mentioned explicitly in letters addressed to Mutija.

Another observation is that the evidence from Mari shows how the same king could style Zimri-Lim both "father" and "brother" according to circumstances (cf. Lafont 1994), and in our texts it can be noted that Jakūn-Ašar, Mašum, and Niqmi-Adad all call Mutija their "father", but refer to Till-Abnû as "brother". Since Jakūn-Ašar was actually a brother of Till-Abnû his case is easy to explain, while for the others the date and political context of the letters may be the reason. The absence of any "status" marker (neutral) found in a number of letters must probably be viewed as a deliberate avoidance of the status issue. People like Bin-Dammu (Halab general) and Ea-malik (Kahat "prince") probably used this style because they did not belong to any of the distinct status

slots indicated by “brother” and “son”. In other cases it seems that writers may have left the issue pending establishment of regular relations with Till-Abnû. Halu-rabi, Niqmi-Adad, and Šukrum-Teššup all write both as “neutral” and as “brother”, and it could be thought that the “neutral” letters are the earliest.

In sum the address formulae may assist the division of the material, but it is of course evidence of a fairly inconclusive nature, and should only be brought to bear if it fits a coherent pattern. In our case it seems that a theory which places a good deal of the letters sent to Till-Abnû *before* his accession would fit the evidence from the archival composition admirably, and place the bulk of the letters squarely in the period between late Habil-kēnu and early Amer-Ištar. How letters to Till-Abnû sent prior to his accession would have ended up at Leilan poses no real problem. The tablets may have been transferred at the accession, and it is also possible that a transfer of Till-Abnû from Šurnat(?) happened before Mutija died (cf. I.1.1.3).

The general problem of the location of the correspondents, however, must also be kept in mind since the letters were certainly not always sent from – or received at the normal address of the correspondents. A more temporary location occasionally evolves from the contents of individual texts or the physical features of the tablets (cf. Appendix 2.1), and from the administrative texts we know, for instance, that Till-Abnû, during the year Amer-Ištar, went travelling on several occasions (cf. chart of this evidence in Appendix 1). On the other hand we have no evidence for Mutija’s place or places of residence when receiving the letters addressed to him, and it should be stressed that these problems of geography and residence and locations of individuals can give rise to considerable uncertainty or confusion.

1.3.2. The Reign of Mutija: War against Andarig and Razamā

A total of 22 letters are addressed to Mutija by name, but to these can be added some from the group addressed to *bēlum*. The point of departure for a diachronic analysis must be the first category, which in turn may help to show which texts from the second category are involved. Several of the letters addressed to Mutija are fragmentary or short or contain only references to general or isolated subjects, and cannot at the moment be placed in diachronic context. As indicated above, however, archival considerations, not least the very small size of the group, leads to the suspicion that these letters may cover only a restricted period of time, and hence that some coherence of subject matter may be detected. In the following we shall therefore attempt a systematic analysis of these texts.

The letter yielding by far the most coherent information is [8] from Aštamar-Adad of Kurdā. He relates that envoys of Mutija, presumably en route to Leilan, have arrived from Hammurabi of Halab, who complains that Mutija, Aštamar-Adad, and Šepallu are “destroying” the lands of Jassān and Jamutbalum with troops from Kakmum. As shown by the latter part of the text the geo-political implication is that the alliance is ranged against the city-states Andarig and Razamā with their respective kings Burija and Hazip-Teššup, and Hammurabi complains that the conflict alineates these territories from his group of client kingdoms. There follows a less clear part, but apparently Aštamar-Adad is angry and instructs Mutija to send off a Halab “governor” (*šāpīṭum*) Takē in disgrace. He then states that Burija is massing his army in Hubšalum (close to the Jebel Sinjar) waiting

for the arrival of Hazip-Teššup, and Aštamar-Adad will not go “there” until “his intentions have been investigated”. Aštamar-Adad further relates that Šepallu has arrived together with two named individuals, a certain HaZip-...., who cannot be securely identified, and Hazip-Teššup, who cannot be the king of Razamā, but probably is identical with a homonym “man of Hurašā” (see I.1.2.5, s. v. Hazip-Teššup). Aštamar-Adad will send these men to fetch reinforcement from the Kakmum troops, presumably mercenaries supplied by the kingdom of Kakmum.

Proceeding from this situation we note that Aštamar-Adad and Šepallu also occur together in [139] where the sender, Kuzuzzu, reports to *bēlum* that Šepallu has complained to himself (Kuzuzzu) and Hazipna-El that the allies do not arrive although the enemy is ravaging his country. Fortunately [139] is the last text in a series of three consecutive letters sent from Kuzuzzu. The first is [137]: Kuzuzzu is on a mission accompanied by a *behrum* (elite) corps and affirms that he sends only trusted messengers to his lord. He then states: “The troops of the enemy are confronting Till-Abni, [and the day I sent] this letter of mine to my lord Aštamar-Adad will arrive in Hurašā.”

The second letter is [138] where Kuzuzzu states that “we” left Hurašā and went to Agā.³⁸ [138] further contains a number of informative statements:

- A messenger arrived from Kurdā reporting that Burija is raiding the country towards Kurdā;

- *habbātum* troops have entered Alilānum and will continue towards Razamā;

- Aštamar-Adad has gone to Kasapā;

- It is rumoured that Burija will march to Razamā, leave his main force and raid the interior of the land.

Finally in [139] Kuzuzzu reports that Šepallu complains about the missing help from his allies: “Why will my brothers not come? Aštamar-Adad came, but left again. Now what is this? Since days the enemy is settled in the midst of my country. He carries away grain and destroys my towns!”.....”Let them come here and I shall march out, and Till-Abni will know who is coming!”

From these texts it can be established that Šepallu’s land is invaded by the enemy; that Till-Abnû is with troops in the same area, and that also Aštamar-Adad is present, but hastily leaves for his own country when it is reported that Burija has attacked Kurdā. The initial situation may be echoed in [11] where Šepallu writes to Mutija that he has attacked enemy troops laying siege to his own town Zannānum near the Jebel Sinjar and asks for help. It may have been somewhat later that the letter [8] was written: Mutija perhaps sent Till-Abnû to assist Šepallu, and also Aštamar-Addu arrived. Together they survey the situation staying in Hurašā and await the next move by the enemy.

Subsequently the *habbātum* arrived on the scene and were presumably recruited by the enemy. This event seems to be reported by Mašum in [18] who states that the *habbātum* “have returned from across the river”, and that they are raiding in Numha. He

³⁸ It must here be noted that both this tablet and that of [139] are completely different from the other Kuzuzzu tablets, and it can be concluded with certainty that this is because Kuzuzzu had moved from Hurašā, and obviously was served by a different scribe (cf. Appendix 2.1); an observation which confirms that the sequence in the series is correct.

asks for troops from Mutija, Aštamar-Adad, and Šepallu, and gives advice about guarding of the sheep. From the Kuzuzzu letters we learnt that the *habbātum* moved into Alilānum (southeast of the Habur Basin), and that Burija intended to march in the same direction and attack the interior of the land from Razamā.

The ensuing panic in Apum is mirrored in two letters from Ewri. In [110] he reports to his lord Till-Abnû that Burija with *habbātum* troops is raiding in the country of Numhum, a virtual echo of the information transmitted by Kuzuzzu in [138]. He states also that Till-Abnû can expect no help from his brother(s?) and asks whether, in view of this situation, the countryside should be evacuated. At the same time Ewri also wrote to Takē [171] giving the same basic information, but with more details. The number of *habbātum* is given as 6,000, and they are staying in the otherwise unattested town Šuprum in Numhum. He adds also that Aštamar-Adad has gone back to Kurdā (cf. [138]) and discusses the evacuation of the countryside. Since we have evidence showing that Till-Abnû may have resided in the town Šurnat before his accession, and evidence for a high official named Ewri placed at Qal’at al-Hādī southeast of Leilan, there is a good chance that this site should be identified with ancient Šurnat. Ewri is writing to get instructions from his immediate superior (see also I.1.2.6, s.v. Ewri), and it seems reasonable that projected raids by Burija from Razamā southeast of Leilan into “the interior of the land” (cf. [138]) should create panic in this particular corner of Apum.

Thus the action, with the arrival of the *habbātum*, shifts from the land of Šepallu to the land of Aštamar-Adad which was now under attack, while another enemy push into the southeast of Apum is expected. In [8] we heard that Burija was waiting in Hubšalum for Hazip-Teššup, who may have been the enemy raiding the land of Šepallu, but next we see Burija, having received support from an arriving army of 6,000 *habbātum*, make a raid into Kurdā thereby splitting the enemy forces.

Subsequently, however, the action shifts once again. The next move was directed not at the southeast, but the southwest corners of Apum. This seems clear from two letters sent from this region. The first is [12] sent by Asdi-[.....] to his “father” Mutija: “The same day I sent you this letter, Hazip-Teššup with 10,000 *habbātum* has made halt for the night in Šurum. My father should devise his course of action [(.....)]”. The second text is [15] from Kanisānu to his “father” Mutija and reports that Hazip-Teššup has made halt for the night in Anamaš. Since the geographical information in both letters can be associated with the central sector of the Basin (cf. I.1.2.5, s. v. Asdi-[....]; and Kanisānu), it may be concluded that Hazip-Teššup of Razamā, with a large force of *habbātum* is attacking into the (south) central part of the Basin. Particularly interesting in this connection is the letter [147] sent from Šupram to *bēlum*: “News of the *habbātum* arrived, and Kirija spoke to us like this: “Send words to your lord!”; we (said): “This is your decision, and you yourself must tell us (what to write)!”. He (said): “You should not give battle! Let them advance to your city gate, but do not give battle!” – Also, in my previous letter I wrote to my lord (about) 6,000 troops, (but) now (it is) 10,000 troops; my lord should not worry”

Our imperfect understanding of the historical geography obviously makes it difficult to ascertain the details of these events which apparently mostly took place in the intermediate zone between the Habur Basin and the Jebel Sinjar, and area which would allow quick moves and countermoves with quite large forces and rapid shifts in strategy

with the military emphasis focused on the land of Šepallu, then Aštamar-Adad's Kurdā, and finally the borders of Apum. This less populous, but certainly not deserted region, no doubt functioned as a buffer-zone between the Habur and Sinjar kingdoms, and both the new Leilan texts as well as the Mari texts indicate that it may have been far more important than hitherto suspected.

What happened next is somewhat harder to establish, but quite possibly the letter [126] sent from Ahī-maraš to *bēlum* (said to be brother of Jakūn-Ašar, hence probably Till-Abnū) provides a sequel. The writer reports that Jakūn-Ašar has defeated an enemy and that the *habbātum* subsequently gathered and sent him a message of submission: "Either let (us) go free, or take command of us and lead us where you please!" Thus the threat against the interior of Apum may have been halted, and this could be connected with an administrative text dated 6.viii Habil-kēnu which lists an issue to a certain *habbātum* who "barred the enemy passage to the land". Here we suddenly find *habbātum* on the side of Mutija and his allies, but this turn of events can be neatly explained by the evidence in [126] where the *habbātum* offer their service to Jakūn-Ašar. Thus it seems that the scenario envisaged in [147], namely the *habbātum* reaching the gates of Šubat-Enlil, never materialized.

Instead the hostilities seem to have ended and given way to a succession of diplomatic initiatives. These are not documented in the letters, and it is therefore necessary to turn to some information from the administrative texts from the year Habil-kēnu. The first observation is that some sworn agreement was concluded between the king of Apum and Hazip-Teššup of Razamā: on 10.vii the king swears to envoys from Razamā (CV 2), and 10 days later the palace records silver received by Apum envoys in Razamā (CV 52), presumably the envoys sent to receive the oath of Hazip-Teššup. This evidence may be connected with L.T.-2, which records a general agreement of peace and alliance to be sworn by Hazip-Teššup to Mutija. It does not contain specific reference to the recent hostilities, but we can perhaps suppose that it was accompanied by an oral codicil concerning the conditions and logistics of the actual cease-fire.

The next major diplomatic event took place during the intercalary month viiib when the Halab "field marshal" Bin-Dammu arrived and held a summit with the king of Apum and with Burija of Andarig (CV 131). This event should mark the final settlement of the hostilities and a reestablishment of the control exercised by Halab. The administrative texts do not reveal the name of the Apum king at this time, but it may be assumed that Mutija was still alive, and it must be noted that two of the letters sent to Mutija indicate that he was still reigning *after* the hostilities had ended. Both [19] from Niqmi-Adad and [22] from Šinurhi refer retrospectively to an invasion of *habbātum*, the first in the area of Kahat and the second in "the midst of the country", and this of course fits the final phase of the events discussed here very well.

1.3.3. The Transition Mutija – Till-Abnū

On present evidence Mutija's reign can only be connected with a single year, that named after the *limmu* Habil-kēnu. Although nearly 200 administrative texts dated to this year have been found, archival reorganisation has left us only texts from month v of the eponymy year onwards. The latest text sealed with the seal of Mutija himself is dated

20(+x).ix Habil-kēnu (CV 10), while the treaty tablet L.T.-3, where Till-Abnû is king of Apum, is dated 1.iii Amer-Ištar. It is within the intervening 5 months that we must place the death of Mutija and the accession of Till-Abnû. That the years Habil-kēnu and Amer-Ištar followed each other directly is supported by a text dated 6.iv Amer-Ištar (FI 116), sealed with the seal of a Mutija “servant”. Since this specimen is isolated by numerous texts with Till-Abnû related sealings it must reflect use of a seal not yet brought *au fait* with the dynastic change.

If we are correct in assuming that the diplomatic activity documented for months vii-ix Habil-kēnu marked the end of the hostilities discussed in I.1.3.2, a next question is what happened subsequently in the months(?) preceeding Mutija’s demise. The various bits of information provided by the administrative texts unfortunately provide little help. Assuming, however, that some of the letters addressed to Till-Abnû as “my lord Till-Abnû”, like clearly [110], date before his accession, we may turn to [112] sent from Sangara, who reports that “[the campaign] of Halu-rabi against Ida-Maraš and Ilān-šur is ordered for the end of this month”. The last very badly preserved part of the letter mention *habbātum* and Ilān-šur(a). This “campaign” of Halu-rabi is referred to in many other letters, and it would have begun while Mutija was still alive, judging from *Brussels* 1 (Appendix 2.3), where Niqmi-Adad has obtained information about the plans of Halu-rabi: he has mustered the kings of Japṭur with their troops to probably Šunā, and his intentions are uncertain.

Two more letters from Sangara, but addressed to “my lord”, refer to the same scenario, and in contrast to [112] they have the introductory “May all be well for the town and district of my lord”:

[143] Sangara reports that Janšip-atnû in Urgina (= Urkiš?) has written to him. Halu-rabi has reached the town Irbinazu and Jakūn-Ašar is trying to muster his allies.

[144] Sangara writes: “Yesterday Zūni went to Janšip-atnû and the king of Ašnakkum: “Come here and I shall make a sortie with you; alone I cannot make a sortie!” This message Jakūn-Ašar wrote to them, (and) my lord should know about it.”

These letters must be later than [112] and sent at a time when Halu-rabi has started his “campaign” and approaches the central part of the Habur Plains (cf. I.1.2.4).

It may be to this time that the letter [20] belongs. It was sent to Mutija from a certain Ea-malik who reports that Bin-Dammū, Halu-rabi, and “the kings” have met in Zar’ānum, but the outcome of the meeting and their intentions are not clear. The sender of this letter may or may not be identical with the homonym prince of Kahat, but it should be noted that the shape and clay of the tablet and the writing is completely different from the letters issued from Kahat (see Appendix 2.1). The style of the letter is very similar, however, to that of the only letter we have addressed to Jakūn-Ašar [125], from Halu-rabi, who writes: “I have reached the midst of the armies, and [*seized*] the hand of Bin-Dammū for your sake”.

If these letters belong here it would seem that Halu-rabi’s march, in spite of the apprehensions it provoked, was not a military campaign directed against Apum, but had some other purpose which unfortunately does not emerge at all clearly from the available evidence. The story can be followed through other letters which will be discussed presently, but it should first be noted how this whole affair seems to overlap the reigns of

Mutija and Till-Abnû, and tentatively we would suggest that it was during these events that Till-Abnû succeeded to the Apum throne. This theory cannot be proved on present evidence, but it seems fairly certain that the letters which relate to the aftermath of the situation with Halu-rabi's march must belong to the reign of Till-Abnû.

First we may review a series of letters sent from Aja-abu, the king of Šunā, to Till-Abnû:

[93] Aja-abu complains that some of the lances which Till-Abnû sent have been left in Šahana. Aja-abu has heard that the *habbātum* have returned. If true he wants Till-Abnû to send 50 soldiers to protect Šunā – “Is this town not your town?”

[94] Aja-abu relates that a son of Abbuttān arrived reporting that Halu-rabi has evil intentions towards Aja-abu, who now asks Till-Abnû for instructions: “Now if these people come here, shall I send them to you and my “father” will answer them, and these people, when they arrive, shall I let them into the interior of the town or not?”

[95] Aja-abu has received a letter from Till-Abnû who asks for a trusted messenger who will be given a full briefing, and it is implied that Aja-abu by this letter supplies this. Halu-rabi is drawing near and Aja-abu asks whether he should go out (*wašûm*) or not.

[97] Aja-abu complains that Hawur-atal (of Nawali) collects troops from Eluhut and intimidates the people of Šunā. If Till-Abnû will not put an end to his, Aja-abu must take strong measures.

When parting in Šahana Till-Abnû told Aja-abu to send a trusted envoy 5 days later, and Aja-abu now sends Aja-aham.

[98] Aja-abu refers to Aja-aham whom he sent to Till-Abnû.

[101] Aja-abu and Šibila relate how diri-ga “auxiliaries” of Halu-rabi joined AŠKI-Addu who has marched on Gurdabahhum, and sent 1,000 Eluhut soldiers against Sabbānum. They ask Till-Abnû to send 150 soldiers to protect Šunā and the country of Apum.

[102] Aja-abu and the elders report that the troops of AŠKI-Addu (1,300 men) have entered the *adaššum* (lower town) of Gurdabahhum. It is further reported that Eluhut troops have entered Nawali (cf. [97]).

Aja-abu is clearly disturbed by three different elements:

Halu-rabi is threatening, but not evidently hostile, and Aja-abu is uncertain how to react.

Hawur-atal of Nawali recruits troops from Eluhut in the north and menaces Šunā. The exact position of Hawur-atal is not very clear, however, since in [119] he states that some of his troops are in Šunā, and he asks Till-Abnû to send troops to Kuzāja or Kiduhhum.

AŠKI-Addu seems to act on his own initiative. Apart from Šunā itself there is a direct threat against Gurdabahhum and Sabbānum. In [113] Sumu-ditana reports on a treaty concluded between AŠKI-Addu and the towns of Ahanda and Kiduhhum. Unfortunately the text is broken and difficult to interpret, but it seems that the main theme of the treaty concerns stipulations about allies or compatriots in a number of towns adjacent to Ahanda and Kiduhhum. All of the towns involved can be located not too far from Šunā, and this places the action somewhere in the central portion of the Habur. In

sum there can be little doubt that this letter pertains to the same events as those reported by Aja-abu of Šunā.

A sequel to this affair is provided by [118] from Aḥušina who regrets to inform Till-Abnû that he cannot apprehend AŠKI-Addu since he fears it will turn the whole country against him. In [121], however, a writer whose name is lost reports – presumably to Till-Abnû: “You wrote to me both once and twice about AŠKI-Addu. This man is in my hand(s), and I will not depart from your instruction. Just like Mutija and I had good relations, you and I – let us have good relations. Concerning this man [i.e. AŠKI-Addu] your heart should rejoice!”

Simultaneously reports from other writers refer to the same events: In [116] Zimri-^d[...] reports to “his lord Till-Abnû”, that he “went up” to Sabbānum. He discusses an affair concerning some soldiers under command of Hammi-Epuh who have run away to *hālaš* Japṭur from Amaz. He asks his lord to send soldiers to protect “the palace and myself”, and in sadly broken passage refers to a report concerning “auxiliary” troops of Halu-rabi, to Ilān-šurā, and to Aja-abu, a clear link with the letters from Aja-abu and Sangara. Hammi-Epuh is no doubt identical with a certain lú Amaz mentioned in an administrative text (see I.1.2.5) and the man who sent the letters [129]-[130]. In [129] he asks his lord to watch out for his fire-signals since he expects trouble, and in [130] he refers to men who must be transferred from Sabbānum to Amaz.

Last we turn to the four letters from Inganum, perhaps governor of Azamhul, sent to *bēlum*. They are both short, badly preserved, and generally not easy to understand, but one of them [134] clearly describes how mercenaries from Šimurru, apparently dissatisfied with their service in Halu-rabi’s forces, have entered the town Nihru, and two other letters seem closely connected with this text. In [133] it is stated that the town Nihru “has been taken”, and in [135] Inganum reports that he has gathered the district in Azamhul as instructed and that guards have been placed – a clear indication of a critical situation.

What is particularly interesting here is the fact that troops of Halu-rabi are also troubling the area of Apum itself, no doubt somewhere on its southwestern borders where we would tentatively place Azamhul and Nihru.

Evidently we face with this evidence a complicated and no doubt in real life confused series of events. As stated above we can only guess at the original purpose or purposes of Halu-rabi, but it seems that his strategy somehow collapsed and that regiments of auxiliaries from his army, dissatisfied with the whole affair, went off in different directions to start their own little wars. Some attached themselves to AŠKI-Addu, who also had troops from Eluhut under his command, and attacked towns in the northern part of the Habur, while troops recruited from Šimurru harassed towns in Apum itself. The result was a rather chaotic situation which caused a number of Apum governors, officials and allied kings to write more or less agitated letters to Till-Abnû, who himself is not seen to have taken any action.

1.3.4. The Reign of Till-Abnû

With the end of the troubles caused by Halu-rabi and his allies we are probably already some months or so into the reign of Till-Abnû, possibly in the first month of Amer-Ištar. In any case it may be noted that dated administrative texts sealed with the seal of Till-Abnû or his servants are recorded for the minimum period of 18.iii to month xi of the year Amer-Ištar. The smaller text group from Ipiq-Ištar covers, although unevenly, the whole year from minimum 16.ii to 23.xii, and the single sealed text (FI 106, dated 15/vii) pertains to Till-Abnû. Thus the reign of Till-Abnû should have ended at the earliest in month vii of Ipiq-Ištar. A number of the letters sent to Till-Abnû has more or less direct references to his accession, occasionally combined with retrospective mention of his predecessor Mutija:

[24] Hammurabi of Halab mentions Till-Abnû's accession and confirms his position.

[28] Ea-malik of Kahat refers to Mutija's relationship with the goddess Bēlet-Nagar and states: "Now it is you the goddess has touched with her finger and you have ascended the throne of your father's house".

[34] Sumu-Hadû writes: "Previously Mutija had good relations with me, (but) now since Mutija went to his fate, you have never sent your greetings to me!"

[87] Šepallu here probably refers retrospectively to Mutija.

[128] Bahdi-Lim (writing to *bēlum*, who must here be Till-Abnû) refers to the death of Mutija, and states that his lord has been placed on the "golden throne" by the gods Šamaš and Bēlet-Apim.

Other texts like [180], [149] and [121] also refer retrospectively to Mutija, but without specific indication that the text dates to time of Till-Abnû's accession.

Unfortunately the administrative texts provide very little information on events mentioned in the letters. The texts from the first months of Amer-Ištar show Bin-Dammu still in evidence. Possibly the visit to Kahat may be connected with the conclusion of L.T.-3 (see II.1.3.1). One notes the sudden emergence of enemies before the gates of Šubat-Enlil in month viii of Amer-Ištar, but the name of the enemy is not revealed, and nothing more is heard of this. The most interesting events for the year Ipiq-Ištar are the two journeys to Kudimmar (iii) and Nahur (iv). Kudimmar was a town in Apum, while Nahur was an important cult-centre in the northwest (cf. I.1.2.4).

Since the remainder of Till-Abnû's letters contains no major themes which may bring letters from different correspondents together we shall instead briefly review the evidence from series of letters sent by the most important kings in the region.

Aštamar-Adad

Starting with the king of Kurdā the letter [36] is of particular interest: "Yesterday I had a meeting with Burija and Hazip-Teššup, and we swore to brotherhood and an oath by the gods. Rejoice!" This of course signifies the end of the hostilities as far as Kurdā is concerned, and the text may well belong to a time prior to Till-Abnû's accession. The rest of the correspondence includes, apart from a letter of introduction [38] and an invitation to a festival [39], two interesting texts which may both concern the conclusion

of a treaty between the two kings and their countries and reflect two different stages in the proceedings: the overtures [37] and the transmission of divine statues or symbols for the actual ceremony of oath taking (direction Leilan-Kurdā) [40]. This treaty was but a renewal of the friendship between the two states documented for the reign of Mutija and its conclusion can be dated early in Till-Abnû's reign. The treaty, perhaps in its preparatory phase, is referred to in a letter from Burija, who writes: "Your retainer told me himself that you have meetings with Aštamar-Adad. May the god place his agreement between you!" [46]. Aštamar-Adad is further mentioned in three other texts, but unfortunately in broken or very general context.

In conclusion it seems that these letters fit well into a period not too long after Till-Abnû's accession, and that apparently nothing disturbed the continuing good relations between Kurdā and Apum.

Šepallu

Šepallu, the second major ally of Mutija, seems to fade somewhat into the background. The two preserved letters he sent to Till-Abnû provide no chronological or historical information (the same is true for the two letters from Šepallu where the name of addressee is lost), and he is only mentioned by other correspondents a few times, never as taking active part in major events. Of some interest is the letter he sent to Aštamar-Adad [166] where the two kings seem to agree that Till-Abnû will be able to assert his power: "For now Till-Abnû is holding out, and in future he will steadily grow big". Such a statement may fit a context shortly after Till-Abnû's accession, and it seems possible that Aštamar-Adad could have sent it on to Till-Abnû. On the whole it tends to confirm the impression that peaceful, although perhaps not very close, relations with Šepallu continued into the reign of Till-Abnû.

Mašum

From another old ally, Mašum, who wrote to Mutija as "son", we have 5 letters to Till-Abnû addressed as "brother". One of these [81], which was discussed above and could date prior to Till-Abnû's accession, shows that he had made peace with Burija before Till-Abnû (Mutija). The remaining texts concern routine matters and reveal nothing but regular friendly relations reflected, for instance, in the invitation to a festival [79]. The same Mašum is not mentioned by other correspondents (a homonym is attested as official in the Leilan palace), and with the possible exception of [81] we cannot date his letters with any precision.

Burija

Turning next to Mutija's old enemies it has already been noted that peaceful relations with Burija were (re)established in the year Habil-kēnu, and they seem to have continued as far as our evidence reaches. Among the letters from Burija to Till-Abnû are some of the longest and most interesting texts in the whole archive, providing occasionally information of wider significance.

The best example is undoubtedly [41] where Burija recalls that "we" sent envoys to Halab, and relates that Hammurabi has dispatched 10,000 troops commanded by a certain

Abi-Dabah. These troops are to stay in Andarig for 2 years and assist Burija, and although the text is broken it would seem that the movement of troops is connected with an expected offensive from Babylon against Andarig and ultimately Karkemish. The letter can be linked securely with [150] sent from Takē to *bēlum*. This evidence has already been discussed above (see I.1.2.1). Both [41] and [150] were probably sent to Till-Abnû, although his name is not preserved or mentioned in the addresses.

Some of the other letters from Burija, however, fit more easily into a diachronic scheme. In [43] Burija writes: “You wrote to me that Hazip-Teššup came, and that you went out and met him, and that you talked to him about the towns which he holds, and that he said: On my return I will release them.” Burija then warns Till-Abnû that Hazip-Teššup apparently is less good than his word. Another subject raised in the same letter allows us to connect it with a number of the other letters from Burija:

[42] Burija relates how the Jamutbalean Aja-abu, staying as *hābirum* in Zurra, caught people from Jamutbalum after peace was established in the land. He was denied access to Zurra, but took his prisoners to Kašpatum in Ida-Maraš. Burija wants his party intercepted, and has also written to Kahat and to Šepallu.

[43] “I wrote to you about the Jamutbalum people who were captured in the mountains, and you stood up before my retainer (swearing): “So help me Sîn, the lord of Jamutbalum, and Nergal, the king of Hubšalum, I shall return (them)!” Since you have not seized these men and their captors, let the crime against these people rest with their captors; since they have long disappeared – what can we do to them?”

[44] “I have written to you both once and twice about searching for the people who are kidnappers, but you do not seize these people. Now (still) there are people who kidnap citizens of Jamutbalum and sell them there for silver.”

[45] “Concerning Aja-abum who previously stole eight people in the mountains: I sent Kabi-Larim and Uqadam to my brother about this man; now word has reached me that this man is staying there ...”

The series, sent approximately in this order, cannot cover a very long period, and the statement in [42] places the beginning of this period not long after the establishment of peace between Burija and Apum. The town Zurra should evidently be considered a border point between Apum and Andarig territory, and Burija is complaining that the town functions as a base for raids into his realm, a problem echoed in, e.g., letters sent from Jamsi-Hatnû of Kahat. The remaining letters from Burija are of general content and cannot be placed in any diachronic scheme. Tentatively the letter which mentions the army from Halab [41] and the related situation could be placed after the series just considered.

Hazip-Teššup

The letter from Burija [43] seems to show that relations between Apum and Razamā, in spite of the treaty concluded late in the reign of Mutija, were not the best during the reign of Till-Abnû. Unfortunately it is not clear what the exact context of the situation described in [43] was. Did Hazip-Teššup arrive in peaceful manner to discuss a settlement or did he arrive with an army? The question is of some importance since the

latter possibility could allow a connection with the “enemy” reaching the gates of Leilan in month viii Amer-Ištar. The phrasing of the text does rather suggest that Hazip-Teššup did not arrive as a friend being allowed into the town, wined and dined since Till-Abnû leaves Leilan (*wašûm*) and meets him outside, an situation known from numerous other instances in this period. Since [43] can be placed early in the series of Burija letters, which begins not long after peace was established, we may here have an important synchronism. It could be speculated that Hazip-Teššup had not fulfilled the obligations attached to his treaty with Mutija, and still held towns in Apum occupied, which he had originally promised Mutija to evacuate.

In any case it seems clear that Hazip-Teššup did not develop very cordial relations with Till-Abnû, and the two letters [156]-[157] which both concern unfriendly activity by Hazip-Teššup may well belong to the reign of Till-Abnû (see for these texts I.1.2.6, s.v.a(?)). Only a single letter is preserved which Hazip-Teššup may have sent to Till-Abnû. This is [57] sent by the “brother” *ha-zi-i[p-.....]* who refers to a legal case, but also invites his “brother” to a festival for Adad. Since the sender must be a king of equal status to Till-Abnû, he can be fairly safely identified as Hazip-Teššup of Razamā.

1.4. Summary and Perspectives

Recent research on the letter archives from Mari, Rimah, and Shemshāra have shown the importance of diachronic analysis,³⁹ and demonstrated that neglect of this aspect may result in very misleading conclusions if evidence from several, succeeding time levels is conflated into a single horizontal masterplan. Evidently the means for such analysis may not be available in a particular group of material, and it must be admitted that the letters published in this volume do not place us in a very favourable position. The relative lack of corroborative evidence from elsewhere and the cursive nature of the letters themselves constitute severe obstacles, while on the other hand the rapid succession of the Apum kings and the related structures of archival composition provide some basic help to establish the outlines of a diachronic sequence for the material.

The basic division is between the reigns of Mutija and Till-Abnû, and the evidence is clearly focused on the transition between these two kings. The final phase of Mutija’s reign witnessed a major military confrontation between Mutija and his allies, and Andarig and Razamā to the south and east of Apum. Peace was reestablished, but new troubles soon clouded the political scene in the shape of troubles with Halu-rabi and his auxiliaries in the west. It was presumably during this period that Mutija died and was succeeded by Till-Abnû. The new king would not seem to have enjoyed a long reign, but circumstances surrounding his disappearance do not evolve clearly from the evidence. This is no doubt due to archival reorganisation which removed the latest and most important texts from Till-Abnû’s reign from the archive found in Rooms 17/22/23.

³⁹ For the vast evidence from Mari the publication of *MARI 4* marks an important turning point in this respect, not least through the articles there by Birot, Charpin, and Charpin and Durand (all 1985). The material from Tell Shemshāra is of course exceptionally well suited to such analysis, which has yielded results in excess of the modest sample of texts found (Eidem and Læssøe 2001).

Some of the reconstructions presented in the preceding chapters may certainly seem rather bold. The succession of the three kings Mutija, Till-Abnû, and Jakûn-Ašar can be considered certain, but otherwise the relationship between these three figures is not clear. The theory that Till-Abnû and Jakûn-Ašar acted as “junior-kings” placed in respectively Šurnat and Ilān-šurā is built on rather slim evidence, which may be due to homonymy. The potential problem of homonymy may obviously also apply in other cases, and information on some namesakes may have been erroneously conflated. Yet another problem is to establish the status, title and function of many important individuals mentioned in the texts, since this information often does not appear at all clearly from the evidence. Finally it is evident that a diachronic reconstruction is open to critique. While it is certain that the main group of texts represents a composite “archive” with large gaps, our theory of the archival formation of the group may not be correct. This is a serious problem since it could be argued, for instance, that many of the letters sent to Till-Abnû could date considerably later, and the total represent bits and pieces from his correspondence over a number of years. While this remains possible, I believe that the individual series of letters sent from the same writers, the relative coherence in subject matters, and the fact that so many texts refer back to the time of Mutija are fairly decisive arguments against such a theory.

We can only hope that further work at Leilan will one day reveal the presumably substantial archives of Jakûn-Ašar, which may solve many of the problems in our texts, and perhaps provide more information on the latter year(s) of his brother Till-Abnû, on his own reign, and on the international events leading up to the Babylonian raid in 1728 B.C.

Meanwhile with a basic interpretational schema for the evidence established, we may turn to a few observations on how it fits the wider perspective of north Syrian history in the early 2nd millennium B.C. A first impression of our material is certainly that very little seems to have changed since the slightly earlier period documented in the Mari archives. We find the same city-states competing for power and political control in patterns similar to those recorded earlier. We find the same major cult centers still in place, and the Old Assyrian trade on Anatolia still in operation. A complete analysis of the onomastic material in the Leilan texts is not yet available, but will hardly show noticeable differences from the image of ethno-linguistic patterns in the region already provided by the evidence from Chagar Bazar and Mari.

But the later date and the local nature of our texts provide some new perspectives. Examples include the possible occurrence of the fairly powerful king Halu-rabi in Ṭabātum(?) on the upper reaches of the Lower Habur river, in an area which previously formed an integral part of the Mari realm. Next the rather surprising dearth of references in the extant Mari texts to the important town and cult-center Nawali, probably a function of the difference in perspective rather than any change. Another overt difference is of course that, except Šukrum-Teššup and Masum-atal of Alilānum, none of the kings in the region attested in the Mari archives survived into the years documented in our texts. Leilan itself seems once again to have been the capital of a fairly important city-state at this time, in contrast to the situation in evidence from the Mari archives where Leilan was controlled by neighbouring city-states like Andarig.

The international situation of course changed considerably during the 18th century B.C.. In the time of Šamšī-Adad an attempt was made to unite the whole Habur region and adjacent areas under a single administration, a system seen in operation in the tablets from Chagar Bazar. Later, during the period contemporary with the reign of Zimri-Lim, a more complicated series of strategies were employed to gain control with the region. Finally with the disappearance of Mari from the political scene, Babylon and later, in the time of the Leilan archives, Halab came to control the Habur Plains in a looser manner with a series of vassal treaties and a system of resident agents and army commanders. The long-term effect of these and earlier phases of outside interference and control may eventually have served to break down the local structures, and in the Leilan texts the apparently new phenomenon of the *habbātum* may be one important factor in this development. As viewed from the Leilan archives, however, Jezira society still seems to exhibit a good deal of resilience and adherence to heterogenous traditions.

An important part of these traditions was no doubt a complicated system of balance between the interests of many local city-states and population groups with different languages and modes of subsistence, which must have been a basic factor in the region back into the early 3rd millennium B.C. As mentioned above (I.1.2.4) the major Jezira kingdoms of the early 2nd millennium B.C. must be viewed in several dimensions. First the walled capital within a core territorial unit, constituting ultimately a legacy of a previous period, as evidenced by the fact that a good number of important cities found in mid-to late third millennium texts recur in our period. Secondly a complicated network of affiliated lesser towns and territories – and *not* necessarily in proximity to the capital. In the Leilan texts this is demonstrated several times. Mutija and later Till-Abnû apparently controlled a good number of places astride the kingdom of Kahat in the central Habur, probably Ilān-šurā and Tillā, and further away we find agents or governors resident in perhaps Qirdahat (see I.1.2.6 s. v. Bahdi-Lim), and close to Sabbānum and Amaz (see I.1.2.6, s. v. Hammi-Epuh and Zimri-...). In [28] it seems that the goddess Bēlet-Nagar claims a town (Alā) within Apum territory, while in [89] Šukrum-Teššup of Eluhut offers Till-Abnû one of his towns. A similar pattern is found in the slightly earlier texts from Mari. We have already referred to the interesting example of Amaz (I.1.2.4), and may in passing note a text like ARM II, 62 (DEPM I, no. 307) where Haja-Sumu of Ilān-šurā lays claim to Nahur, far away from his own capital. Numerous other examples from the Mari archives could be produced, but since each example must be evaluated in proper geographical and chronological context, we shall leave this for future study. The main point is, however, that many of the disputes over towns in the Habur are not border disputes, but simply competition for control over domains well outside the core areas of the city-states.

Another important issue concerns the different nature of the various city-states which may have had long-standing individual traditions. Some of the towns in the region appear as preminent cult centers, foremost Nagar, Nahur, and Nawali, and such status must have rested on already ancient traditions. On the other hand our evidence shows how several of these towns had changed status politically. Tell Brak, for instance, was the capital for a region called *māt* Nagar “the land of Nagar” in the late 3rd millennium (cf. Matthews and Eidem 1993), but in the early 2nd millennium it was presumably under the control of Kahat. As new evidence is retrieved and published it should eventually be

possible to write real individual histories of some of these Habur city-states. The French Mari scholars have already supplied some preliminary “portraits” of northern towns like Kahat (Charpin 1990a), Talhājum (Durand 1988), Qatṭara (Charpin and Durand 1987), Hazzikkannum (Guichard 1994), Nahur (Guichard 2008), and Šuduhum (Guichard 2009), and we may expect many new details to appear as more texts from Mari are published.

One of the important tasks for future research must be to study these problems more closely, and investigate the peculiar balance which could after all be achieved between so many divergent interests in a fairly small region with few natural borders. In general our texts reflect a remarkably well-ordered society, and it is important to stress this since the strong scholarly interest in references to nomads and tribes in this period easily confuses the issue. Indeed a superficial, “conflated” view of the texts presented here might well give the impression that the region was in a state of almost permanent anarchy. A very large number of texts could be cited in support of such a perspective since a recurrent theme is the havoc caused by the large numbers of *habbātum* “robbers” roaming the region, the constant complaints and litigations over people being “stolen” “taken”, “detained”, and sold as slaves or held for ransom. Through the analysis in the foregoing chapters emerges, however, not a region in a state of anarchy, but a relatively well-ordered world, occasionally disrupted by the ever-present disintegrating forces in complex, pre-modern society. The movements, if not the composition or origin, of the notorious *habbātum* mercenaries can be fairly accurately plotted on political-military maps and calendars. The phases of readjustment encompassing ransom and extradition of captives, border regulations, and treaty-making succeeding major sequences of hostilities are all elements of a highly integrated, if intricate and heterogenous pattern. The large number of letters exchanged between the local kings concerned with the settlement of small individual disputes is indeed remarkable, and evolves naturally from the traditional role of the king as the “shepherd” of his people and the “fountain of justice” in the land. A letter from Mari quoting popular feeling about Zimri-Lim in Nahur states the ideal very clearly: “Finally we have a strong shepherd, and finally we can begin to pursue our private business!” (ARMT XXVI/2, 346; quoted below ad [59]).

This urge for stability obviously went deep. The peaceful, prosperous pursuit of business was sought by most elements of society: the kings claiming control and exploitation of lands crisscrossing the core territories of the city-states, the merchants operating in or through the *kārum* “harbours” attached to major towns, the people doing business in the *mahīrum* “markets” of even moderately sized towns, the farmers, the shepherds, from paid hand to full-scale nomad. Even the *habbātum*, on the eve of defeat, immediately sought a new employment [126].

In this perspective the contents of the Leilan treaties, edited in part II of this volume, with their normative rules of international conduct, but fairly paranoid fear of treachery and treason, match the world reflected in the epistolary and other evidence very well.

APPENDIX 1. SELECTION OF INFORMATION IN L.87 DATED ADMINISTRATIVE TABLETS

YEAR Habil-kēnu

V

- 6: Wine shipments for *elunnum*-festival (CV 115)
- 9: Silver for diviner Bina-Addu (CV 50); silver tax from Šupram (CV 66)
- 10: Silver from ... when Lawila-Addu of Šuppā became king (CV 63)
- 14: Silver objects sent for *elunnum*-festival (CV 57, with duplicate 62)
- 15: Summary of items sent for *elunnum*-festival (CV 70)
- 16: Food issues for *elunnum*-festival (CV 133)
- 17: Wine shipments for *elunnum*-festival (CV 109)
- 19: Wine from Till-Abnû of Šurnat (CV 112)
- 25: Ransom of woman by man from Urgina (= Urkiš?) (CV 27)

VI

- 7: Ransom of people sold in Kurdā (CV 33); ransom of man from Tappišu (CV 39)
- 11: Wine from Samsu-malik of Azamhul (CV 119)
- 14: Wine from Šamaš-nāšir, merchant of Amursakkum (CV 116)
- 15: Wine from Aja-abu, king of Šunā (CV 108), honey for Bēlet-Apim (CV 127)
- 22: Shoes for general Šupram (CV 86)
- 24: 1 mina of silver from House of the “servant of Aššur” (CV 64)
- 27: Ransom of man from House of the “servant of Aššur” by man of Hizhizzi (CV 31); ransom of woman from same place by man from Lazapatum (CV 35)

VII

- 5: Wine from Šibilani of Šunā (CV 107)
- 10: Issues to “retainers” of Bin-Dammu and Hazip-Teššup “when they made the king swear” (CV 9, with duplicate 2); issues to same “envoys” of Bin-Dammu “when the king swore” (CV 7)
- 11: Issue to man arriving from Babylon (CV 93)
- 20: Issue to messenger from Kakmum (CV 83); silver for men when they stayed in Razamā (CV 52)
- 21: Wine from elders of Tehhi (CV 110)

VIII

- (day lost): Silver to retainers of Bin-Dammu and to Bin-Dammu “field marshal” (sag-gal-mar-tu-meš) when he swore (CV 15)
- 5: Silver to envoys from Zirānum, Nihrija, Anzawawa(?) (CV 18)
- 7: Issues to envoy of Halab (CV 91 with duplicate 94)
- 18: Shoes to Ea-malik, messenger from Karkemish (CV 85)
- 25: Garment to Kuzzuri of Šurnat, and garment to Sumu-Addu retainer of Bin-Dammu who went to Halu-rabi (CV 84); wine from Hawurni-atal of Nawali (CV 113); wine from Kuzzuri of Šurnat when he came to meet the king (CV 111)

VIIIa

- 1: Issue to retainer of Bin-Dammu (CV 80 with duplicate 89)
- 3: Foodstuff when Buriġa and Bin-Dammu met with the king (CV 131 and 132)
- 4: Set of clothing to Bin-Dammu (CV 99)
- 6: Items to Bin-Dammu and his retainers when he met the king (CV 72); presents for the Halab court (CV 53)
- 7: List of wine shipments from Nawali, Kuzzuri of Šurnat, Aġa-abu of Šunā (CV 117)
- 18: Items sent to Mehhili of Japṭur (CV 79)
- 20: Silver to retainers of Kahat king (CV 14)

IX

- (day lost): item to Zigē of Amaz when he met the king (CV 95)
- 4: Silver to Idin-Kubi, retainer of Halu-rabi (CV 11)
- 10: Silver for purchase of jewelry, to Iṣi-ahu the “overseer of the merchant offices” (*wakil kārī*) (CV 65)
- 11: Silver from Abdila-ila “when with Till-Abnû(?) he gave” (CV 55)
- 20(+x): Silver to 5 named envoys when king swore(?); latest text sealed with royal seal of Mutija (CV 10)
- 25: Sheep brought by Jaqbija “when with Till-Abnû he gave” (CV 166)
- 29: Ox delivered by Zigē of Amaz “when he was made *madārum*” (CV 164)

X

- (day lost): 127 sheep from Hammu-Epuh of Amaz (CV 165)

18/x-19/xi: Numerous texts attest the presence of Bin-Dammu. Most record issues of oil for the “delegates of the auxiliaries and the countrymen”
 24/xi: latest text sealed by servant of Mutija (CV 161)

XII

- 12: Latest text from this year (and only one from this month) (CV 76)

YEAR Amer-Ištar

I

- (days lost): earliest texts from this year (FI 89 and 140)

II

- 6: Wine from Bunu-Ištar of Hālabā (FI 5)
- 9: A coat to Bin-Dammu when he went from to Hušlā (FI 90); a garment to the cook of Bin-Dammu (FI 141)
- 13: Wine from Qarradu of Nadbum (FI 6)
- 15: Wine from Tatturru, the general (FI 7)
- 25: Issues when Bin-Dammu stayed (FI 109)
- 27: Wine from the priestess Tarīš-mātum of Nawali (FI 8)

28: Wine from Ilīja of ... (FI 9); wine from priests of Adad of Nawali (FI 10)

30: Wine and honey from Zigē of Amaz (FI 11)

III

1: Date on treaty between Till-Abnû and Jamši-Hatnû of Kahat (L.T.-3)

1: Wine from Ukku of Nawali (FI 12)

11: Issues for the “meat-house” during the *elunnum*-festival (FI 127)

15: Silver ring to retainer of Qarrādu of NaDBum when he came to Takūn-mātum (FI 111)

18: Silver ring to (same) retainer when he brought ... to Takūn-mātum; earliest text sealed with seal of Till-Abnû (FI 112)

20: Garment to Ahuni, envoy from Halab, when he was sent off from Zurra (FI 91)

28: Issue in Nawali (FI 139)

29: Silver rings issued in Šunā (FI 114)

IV

2: Garments and silver issued to Ea-malik, Niqmija-El, Aki-Erah, Šupir-nanu, ... of Kiran, Tahe of Kallahubri, Ili-malik, Šadu-... of ..., and Hindu of Buzahi, when king met the lú Kahat (FI 115)

3: Issues of oil for sacrifice by king during *hamandunu*-festival, for Qutū in Tehhi, and for Tarīš-mātum, the priestess, when the king went to Nawali (FI 128)

6: Isolated example of text sealed with seal of Mutija “servant”, note of axes received (FI 116)

7: Wine from Zazija(?) of Tehhi (FI 13)

30: Wine for the king when envoys of Numha(?) and Šupir-nanu stayed (FI 14)

V

11: Wine from Alī-waqrum, the merchant (FI 15)

13: Garments for Takūn-mātum, Aja-Hammu, and Tatur-mātum, the “maid” of the king (FI 94)

20(+x): Wine for the king when Kabi-Larim of Andarig and Šupir-nanu of Kahat stayed (FI 16)

VI

(day lost): List of spears from Azamhul and Tille (FI 124)

VII

4: Shoes etc. for Ilurānu when he went to Halab (FI 96)

12: Issue in Kahat (FI 97)

IX

28: Donations of sheep from Hilabukanum, Kallahubri, and Šuri, when the king went to Kahat (FI 129)

X

- 6: List of garments when enemy reached gate of Šubat-Enlil (FI 98)
 18: Garments to Sillabi and Hubidam when they came for meeting (FI 100); garment present of Akuki the envoy, from Nihrija (FI 101)
 22: Donations of animals from i.a. Samsu-malik of Azamhul (FI 131)

XI

- (day lost): Silver rings to “maids” of the governor (*šāpīṭum*), latest text from this year sealed with seal of Till-Abnû (FI 121)

XII

- (no day): Latest text from this year, list of silver rings to many named individuals (FI 122)

YEAR Ipiq-Ištar

II

- 16: Earliest text from this year; water bags to Jaridi-Addu envoy of Halab and Irim-munu when they went to Halab (FI 82)

III

- 14: Silver issued to Mašum to buy garments from *habbātum* (FI 105)
 15: Remaining equipment from journey to Kahat added to journey to Kudimmar, and issue to envoy Ilurānu (FI 83)
 26: Wine from elders of Urkiš and Amursakkum (FI 3)

IV

- (no day): Account for contributions received during journey to Nahur (in Ašnakkum and Šuduhum) (FI 135)
 18: Issues of oil to Ahum-maršum the *habbātum* and Dadu-maraš, general of Andarig, in Nahur, and issues in Heššum (FI 126)

VII

- 15: Only sealed text from this year: seal of Till-Abnû “servant” (FI 106)
 24: Shoes to Jaddin-Addu, envoy of Hawurni-atal of Nawali (FI 84)

VIII

- 3: Garments for Halu-rabi and his two companions (FI 85)
 8: [Wine] when *habbātum* stayed (FI 4)

IX

- 26: Weapon to Nuhumi-Addu of Qirdahat (FI 108)

XII

- 23: Latest text from this year; garments brought to the king in Zabalum (FI 88)

YEAR Nimer-Kubi**V**

6: Wine when ... came with Abdu-Ištar (FI 20)

VII

2: Wine when *šāpiṭum* stayed (FI 21)

VIII

12: Wine from Kabizza of Huraṣā when *šāpiṭum* and Tišwen-atal stayed, wine when Aja-abu and others stayed (FI 24)

15: Wine in temple of Bēlet-Apim when the king [took?] Šunhum (FI 25)

20: Wine when Tišwen-atal stayed (FI 26)

23: Wine for king and envoys at night (FI 27)

YEAR Išme-El**I**

2: Wine for offering when Abdu-... stayed (FI 29)

III

2: Wine during *elunnum*-festival when the king stayed in the “temple of the goddess” (FI 30)

26: Wine for the king, at night (FI 31)

V

4(+): Wine in the *hamrum* morning and night when Akkuja died (FI 32)

VII

1: Wine for king when Abdi-Ištar stayed (FI 33)

1(+x): Wine for envoy of Arrapha, and wine when king went to – and returned from Zatumri (FI 42)

2(+x): Wine at night when envoys of Babylon stayed (FI 43)

3: Wine in *hamrum* and when envoys of Babylon stayed (FI 34)

4: Wine when *šāpiṭum* and *wedūtum* stayed (FI 35)

11-12: Wine for *hamrum* in the morning (FI 37-38)

28: Wine when *šāpiṭum* stayed

VIII

8: Wine for the general Tišwen-atal (FI 45)

9: Wine when the king swore, and wine at night when the *šāpiṭum* stayed (FI 46)

21: Wine for the general Tišwen-atal when he went to the fieldcamp of the *habbātum* (FI 49)

22: Wine for envoys from Babylon, for Kabi-larim and Teššena when they returned from Babylon (FI 50)

IX

20: Wine when Tišwen-atal stayed (FI 52)

21: Wine when men from Kahat stayed (FI 53)

24: Wine for *habbātum* (FI 54)

X

2(+x): Wine when envoys of Babylon stayed (FI 61)

5(+x): Wine when envoys of Arrapha, Bizune, and Shehuwa stayed (FI 79)

XI

15: Wine when Ilī-Epuh came (FI 64), wine when “sons” stayed, when Tišwen-atal and “maids” of the king stayed, and when Hazikakku stayed (FI 65)

17: Wine when “sons” stayed in the (palace?) gate (FI 69)

26: Wine (FI 68)

XII

23: Latest text from this month (FI 71)

YEAR warki Išme-El

I

2: Wine for journey to Zatumri (FI 77)