Hanigalbat and the land Hana.

From the annals of Hattusili I we know that in his 3rd year the Hurrian enemy attacked his kingdom. Thanks to the text of Hattusili I (“ruler of Kussara and (who) reign the city of Hattusa”) we can be certain that c. 60 years after the abandonment of the city of Kanesh, Hurrian armies extensively entered the kingdom of Hatti. Remarkable is that Hattusili mentioned that it was not a king or a kingdom who had attacked, but had used an expression “the Hurrian enemy”. Which might point that formerly attacks, raids or wars with Hurrians armies were known by Hattusili king of Kussara. And therefore the threatening expression had arisen in Hittite: “the Hurrian enemy”.


The Babylonian text of the bilingual is more specific: “the enemy of Ḫanigalbat”. Therefore the scholar N.B. Jankowska thought that apparently the Hurrian kingdom Hanigalbat had existed probably from an earlier date before the reign of Hattusili i.e. before c. 1650 BC.

Normally with the term Mittani one is pointing to the mighty Hurrian kingdom of the 15th century BC. Ignace J. Gelb reported on “the dragomans of the Habigalbatian soldiers/workers” in an Old Babylonian tablet of Amisaduqa, who was a contemporary with Hattusili I. The existence of powerful Hurrian state or confederacy at the time of Hattusili I in northern Mesopotamia cannot be excluded at all according to Michael Astour. He stated that Habigalbat is an early form of Hanigalbat or Haligalbat.

---

1 N.B. Jankowska 1991, M Diakonoff ed., Early Antiquity 238–244. He observed that the Akkadian text of the tablet was written in Old Babylonian and not in Middle Babylonian (note 17 chapter one).
2 According to Frans van Koppen (2004:21) Hurrian troops were already called Ḫanigalbatean troops’, when Hattusili I and Mursili I were fighting against Aleppo. These Ḫanigalbatean troops were also active in Babylon south. Michal Astour remarked already in 1989 that apparently a Hurrian state was powerful enough to have invaded and briefly occupied most on Hittite Anatolia in the early reign of precisely Hattusili I. M.C. Astour 1998, Hittite History and Absolute Chronology of the Bronze Age, 44.
3 I.J. Gelb 1968, The word for Dragoman in the Ancient Near East, Glossa2, 97-98. He remarked that it is possible to conclude that our dragomans were specialists in Hurrian and/or Indo-Aryan languages.
4 Michael G. Astour 1972, Ḫattušiliš, Ḫalab and Ḫanigalbat, Volume 31, 103. Astour stated that the state Hanigalbat-Hurri existed as early as the very beginning of the Hittite Old Kingdom, which does not excluded the presence of vassal rulers within it.
Gelb remarked that the country of Hanigalbat is identical with the country of Mitanni or the country of the Hurrians (1968: 105).

All the found Hittite and Babylonian texts in Hattusa are from c. 1500 BC or from a younger date, perhaps just some are from c. 1650 (Anitta Text). So they are probably made from oral narratives, whether from texts in Babilili or perhaps from texts in picture drawing on wood.

Most remaining Hittite tablets are from the 14th and 13th century BC. The Hittite text is clear: a Hurrian enemy attack! in a time period that the Mitanni kingdom was not yet formed from a number of small states in Upper Mesopotamia.

According to the ‘Akkadian’ part (in Babilili) of the bilingual, Hattusa had declared that the enemy came from the land ha-ni-gal₂₂₂-bat. Miguel Valério has in 2011 argued that Hani-Rabbat (= Great Hani) is the correct West Semitic name of Mitanni against the consensual Hanigalbat.

---


6 Babilili (in the tongue of Babylon) from the periphery, of the Akkadian language-area. Andrew George stated that the chancery of Yarim-Lim of Alala could write excellent formal Old Babylonian (Andrew George 2007, Babylonian and Assyrian, 47).

7 Scribes of Hattusa has written Hanikalbat with the GAL sign. They wrote in babbili, a form of Old Babylonian. Linguists have established that the GAL sign stands for KAL. In Akkadian it means dannun(a), which translated strong. In Hittite, KAL is attested in several words, like KAL, KAL-tar, KALAG.GA, KAL. In Hittite KAL (Hittite innarrawant-) is also meaning ‘strong/masculine’ (Johannes Friedrich 1990) and strong, powerful, potent (Arnaud Fournet 2014, lire le cuneiforme Houriet et Hittite). Scribes of Hattusa knew almost certainly very well the difference between GAL and KAL and their different signs. Many linguists have agreed that Han-GAL- bat means Great Hani. So when scribes of Hattusa wrote Hani-KAL- bat, they have perhaps meant “Strong Hani”. However than the meaning of the addition —bat cannot be translated. They did not write dannun, because one has probably used a Sumerogram, conform the expression in Hattusa and because one has to draw then only one sign for this word in the tablet. In the text in babbili (the annals of Hattusili I) the term Hanikalbat has perhaps written conform the traditions of the scribes of North Syria, or according to the tradition of a “Mesopotamian scribe” who stayed at Hattusa, in service of the king of Hattusa. But it is also possible that the scribe in Hattusa has tried to translate the Hittite name or expression for “the land of the Hurrian armies” into babbili. And it is possible that an Anatolian had learned to write very well in babbili. The educated chief scribe of Hattusili III has also written Hanikalbat with a GAL sign in a letter to the king of Assyria, while the kings of Mittani often had written Ha-li₂₂₂₂₂₂₂gal-bat = Great Hali (land). Almost certainly the chief scribe of Hattusili III has written Hanikalbat on purpose.

Alfonso Archi described the early texts of the Old Kingdom in Hittite (2010, When did the Hittites begin to write in Hittite? StBoT band 54, 40 – 42): The Uršu-text is probably the earliest extant original text from Hattusa. According to Kempski (1983:33) the text is written in an old Babylonian dialect, which is closely similar to that of Mari. The text, however, has a number of sign forms that in Hattusa underwent a separate development than the Syrian variants, becoming unique in the Hittite capital, at least at the time of Telipinu. The numerous ‘Hittitisms’ in the Akkadian of this text are best explained by Kempinski’s hypothesis: “Es scheint, dass der Verfasser das Dokument während des Diktats aus dem Hethitischen ins Akkadische übersetzte, . . . ein hethitischen Original oder auch nur eine frühe hethitischen Übersetzung haben nie bestanden.” And on page 42: The Annals of Hattusili I (CTH4) was a monumental inscription for a ‘gold statue of myself’, most probably in Akkadian, composed along the lines of a Syrian model. The reference to ‘a gold statue of myself’ is attested only in the Hittite text.

The scribes in Hattusa wrote ha-ni-gal-gal-bat in the annals of Hattussili I. In later times when they wrote ha-ni-gal-gal-bat (or Ha-ni-kal-bat), they normally meant the kingdom Mitanni. The GAL₉ sign stands for KAL in the Hittite language. The scribes in the New Kingdom of Hattusa have also used the name Mitanni (KUR UR¹ Mitanni), for instance during the reign of Šuppiluliuma I, c. 1325 BC. Kings of Mitanni mentioned themselves as king of Ha-li₉-gal-bat = Great Hali (land)¹⁰. Mostly the called their country Ḫurwuḫe and sometimes as kūr Mi-it-ta-an-ni-e-wa (Astour 1972:103 JNES vol.31). In one Nuzi text and in one letter of Hattusili III of Hattusa the term Hani-gal₉-bat¹¹ was also used. In an Armana letter both of these terms were used in one text¹². Hana Land is often written in texts of Mari and Terqa, while the expression “Hani land” has not been found separate.

Eva von Dassow stated that the realms of Alalakh, Arraphe, Kizzuwadna, and Tunip among others, were each ruled by their own kings under the overlordship of Mittani.¹³ It is remarkable that the chief scribe¹⁴ of king Hattusili III had used that old name ha-ni-gal-gal-bat, because Šuppiluliuma I had already finished the independent status of Mitanni (about 120 years earlier). During the reign of Hattusili III Mitanni was a vassal state of the King of Assyria¹⁵. The king of Hanigalbat had written Hattusili III that the city Turira would be his city.

---

⁹ Harry Hoffner 2009, Letters from the Hittite Kingdom, 71. In the Armana text 21.06 : LUGAL KUR mi-ta-an-ni.

¹⁰ According to W.F. Albright, Ḫanigalbat is the Babylonian form (1922, The Origin of the name Cilicia, AJ of Philology, Vol43 No2, 167)

¹¹ (KBoI 14, letter to Adad-nērārī I king of Assyria).

¹² Miguel Valério 2011: 178. Also in one texts is ha-na-gal-bat and in another ha-ne-gal-ba-tum written.

¹³ Eva von Dassow, Levantine polities under Mittanian Hegemony, 18.

¹⁴ The letter of Hattusili III to the king of Assyria was very important for the king of Hatti, the letter will certainly have been edited or corrected by the chief scribe from the well trained and skilled scribe-family of Mittanamuwa in Hattusa. The scribe-family continued at least to the 13th century BC: “The hand of Talmi-Tešub, son of Walwažiti, Chief of the Scribes, grandson of Mittanamuwa, apprentice of MAḪ-DINGIRMES-na, in front of Walwažiti, the Chief of the Scribes, wrote (this text)” KBo 15.37 + Rev. VI, CTH 628. (Giulia Torri 2010, The Scribal School of the Lower City of Hattusa and the Beginning of the Career of Anuwanza, Court Dignitary and Lord of Nerik. Stefano Martino described the relation of Mittani and the family of Miattana-muwa, the Chief Scribe of Muwattalli II and Hattusili II.” His name clearly refers to the country of Mittani and we can suppose that this family was in some way connected to the Hurrian tradition and culture. Considering the presumbable origin of Mittana-muwa and the fact that Hurrian names were in vogue during the Late Hittite Empire, we would expect that only Hurrian names had been adopted for the members if this family; on the contrary, it seems that election (that is Anatolian and Hurrian names) was the trend also among the higher levels of the Hittite society.” From the five names of Mitta-muwa’s children appeared one to be clear of an Hurrian origin, one name a combination of Hurrian and an Anatolian element, and one a combination of Hurrian and Luwian. The other two do not belonged to a Hurrian tradition. Walwa-ziti, a son of Mittana-muwa, had two sons Talmi-Tešub and Ḫulanabi: the first one held a typical Hurrian name; the second one had the name of the Anatolian river Ḫulana (the Porsuk Çay) plus the Hurrian suffix of the genitive –ve. Another son of Mittana-muwa, Ali-ḫešiš had a child with a typically Hurrian name (Tulbi-Tešob) and the second one an Anatolian name (Kuwalana-ziti). Stefano Martino 2011, Eothen 11, Hurrian names in the kingdom of Hatti, 30-31.

This was not accepted by Hattusili III, so he wrote to Adad-niari I the king of Assyria, who was the overlord of Hanigalbat: "Turira is mine, or Turira is yours. It does not belonged to the king of Hanikalbat".16

Valério stated that there is an etymological link between the Hanaeans of Hana and *haniahhena* of Mitanni.17 In the literary sources from Alalakh IV the *haniahhe* are mentioned between many subgroups. According to Alberto R.W. Green the term derives from Akkadian *hanu* and the Hurrian adjectival ending -*ḫḫe* and the contexts of these references would imply that the *haniahhena* were a class of people coming out of *Hana*.18

![Map of Mirko Novak 2007, Mittani and the Question of Absolute Chronology.](image)

---

16 Gary Beckman 1999, Hittite Diplomatic Texts, second edition, 148
17 Valério 2011, Hani-Rabbat as the Semitic name of Mitanni, 175.
18 Alberto R.W. Green 1983, Social Stratification and Cultural Continuity at Alalakh, Studies in honor of George E. Mendenhall, 192-195. In a number of references the occupations of the *haniahhena* are listed as weavers, tanners, potters, musicians, shepherds, blacksmiths, grooms etc. A theory which has received general acceptance is that they were essentially semi-nomadic tribal people who roamed through the regions around Mari living in encampments called *nawātum*. Another view is that *haniahhena* represent the cultural continuity of certain resident peoples who were in the region as early as the 18th century and who, in the later 15th century social structure, were then characteristically indentified by their traditional names.
I.J. Gelb described that two rulers of Mari have called themselves as “king of Mari, Tuttul and the country Ḥanna” and that one of them fought with "the seven kings, sheikhs of Hanna”.  

He reported that the name Land of Ḥanna in the oldest sources was written as Ḫi-na and Ḫe-na and in a Babylonian geographical list as Ḫe-a-na. Zimri-Lim the king of Mari is called the king of the Ḥanaæans as well as the king of the Akkadians.

The borders of the land Hana are not known; the capital of Hana was perhaps in the neighbourhood of Terqa at the Euphrates.

The Euphrates is often assumed as a border, however it is certainly an option that the kingdoms Terqa and Mari had a reign which controlled the east banks of the Euphrates because of the trade along the river. Their title, "king of Tuttul" points also to the control of parts of the east banks of the Euphrates.

Amanada H. Podany reported in 2014 that texts and buildings of the kingdom of Hana were also found more north on the Habur in the Middle Hana period, suggesting perhaps that the centre of the kingdom in that area, rather than at Terqa. Podany (2014:72) stated that the “kings of the land Hana” ruled for at least seven generations from the late 15th century to around 1300 BC.

In the 14th century BC the Hittite king Šuppiluliuma had conquered the western part of the land of Hana (including the lands of the banks of the Euphrates) and it is mentioned in his treaty with king Šattiwaza of Mittani as Aštata. According to Daria Gromova (2013:105) the text of the Šattiwaza treaty suggests that the lands of Aštata and Nuḫaše had resisted the Hittite king much more...
strongly than the kingdom of Halap. From the treaty text it appears that several cities, which were located in the Land of Mitanni were taken by his son Piyassili and added to the Land Aštata. The city Emar, built by the Hittites near the old city Emar, became the capital of Aštata.

In the late 12th century BC Middle Assyrian kings took control of the Habur Area. Miguel Valério (2011:180) pointed to a Middle Assyrian text (DeZ3281), in which AN.TA= city (cities) of the Upper Hanu” is mentioned. Apparently to distinguish this area from a lower Hanu land, for instance more down along the river or to a Hanu (Hana? ) land across the Euphrates. Upper Hanu has to be located in the Habur, probably in the neighbourhood of Harran. Therefore I wonder did a geographical difference exist between the terms Hana and Hani (Hali) in the Bronze Ages? Is it more than just a linguistic difference between the two names?

A result of the writing in texts of the different languages of Mari/Terqa (west Semitic), Hattusa (Nesili and Babbili) and the Habur (Hurrian)? That Semitic scribes of Mesopotamia would have called Hanigalbat in their own tongue Hani rabbat is almost certain. Hanigalbat seems to be just the name of an extended upper land of Hana. It seems to be called Great Hana/Hane/Hani/ Hali Habi/Hanu in texts.

Great Hani (Hanigalbat), the land where many Hurrian tribes and troops had lived at least from the time period of the first Nesite kings, like Hattusili I. In the Hittite Tale of the Cannibals the king of Ilânsura felt himself to be threatened by the hostile way of the Hittite army, he sent golden cups to “the kings of the Hurrian army” asking for help. He had asked the help of the kings (plural!). According to Massimo Forlanini this narrative originated from c. 1700BC, the time period of the first Nesite Tabarna of Hattusa.

---

26 The earliest mention of the name Mitanni occurs in an inscription of an Egyptian commoner mentioned by W.Helck (1962:117), The astronomer and clockmaker of pharaoh Amenhotep I mentioned in his ‘biography’: the foreign country called Mitanni (spelled M’ta-ni). The term Mitanni (earlier Maitani) seem to be particularly connected with the royal dynasty, and since the latter was of Indo-Aryan stock or influenced by Indo-Aryan culture influences and scrupulously observed the custom of Indo-Aryan name-giving among its male member, the same origin is possible for Mitanni (Astour 1972:106). I.M. Diakonoff suggested that Mai(t)ma(n)ne, later Mitanne was the dynastic-tribal name of the state.

27 Juan-Pablo Vita 2002, Warfare and the army at Emar, AoF, 29-1, 114, also Trevor Bryce 2005:186. The territory of the Hittite kingdom of Carchemish was situated east and west of the Euphrates.

28 M. Fales remarked that a typonym Hana ēlītu = an upper Hana is attested by the Dūr-Katlimu letters and texts, 2011, Transition: The Assyrians at the Euphrates, 50 note 21.

29 The geographical name Khabur is attested in texts. Gelb 1961:37 pointed also to a text generally assigned to Sargon of Akkad in which “the nine Ḫanaean (?) kings” (9 LUGAL.E.NE) are mentioned, their territory is written as KUR Ha-nu-ū.

30 Massimo Forlanini 2006, Upper Mesopotamia in the middle of the 17th century according to the Hittite text, KASKAL vol.6, 49-66. Massimo Forlanini described the narratives of the ‘Tale of the Cannibals’ (KB0 3.60) in which a Hittite army made a march through
The difference between the meaning of $GAL_9$ (strong) and $GAL$ (great) is not very large. It is in my opinion an option that $ha-ni-gal_9-bat$ would have fit better before the time period in which the great kingdom of Mitanni had arisen. It might have been a better use for scribes in Hattusa to point to the danger from that area of the many different “Hurrian” troops and armies\textsuperscript{31}, who attacked several Nesite kings in the early kingdom.

The chief scribe of Hattusili III used the old name in which Hattusa had called the land of the Hurrian armies from the east. It appears that Hattusili III was interested in his ancestor Hattusili I, the lion king. Hattusili III has pointed with pride to his famous ancestor and while he mentioned his old title: ruler of Kussara, which stands alone in historical texts of Hattusa, besides in the texts of Hattusili I. His father Mursili II had made a treaty (CTH75) with Talmi-Šaruma king of Halap.

---

\textsuperscript{31} In texts from Egypt also appear the habit to write “Huri troops” to point to the kingdom of Mittani, G. Wilhelm, Šuppiluliuma I. und die Chronologie der Amarna-Zeit, in: R. Hachmann, Kāmid el-Lōz 20: Die Keilschriftbriefe und der Horizont von El-Amarna (Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Alterrurnskunde 87), Bonn: Habelt 2012, 249. In Hittite texts often the term $URU$ Mitanni = land Mittani has written in the time period of Šuppiluliuma I, for instance in the treaty with Šattiwazzas (Gernot Wilhelm 2007, Bemerkungen zu der Erklärung Šattiwazzas CTH 52, in: Festschrift in Honor of Belkıs Dinçol and Ali Dinçol, 778.
(Aleppo), and his brother Muwattalli II had renewed the tablet of the treaty, because it was stolen. And in this treaty text the term Hanigalbat is used 32.

Apparently the chief scribe of Hattusili III has chosen for the old term Hanikalbat, while the geographical noun Hanigalbat was already well known by the scribes of the king of Hattusa. And in the text of the treaty one can see that both the terms Hanigalbat and Mitanni are used to refer to the same kingdom 33. Hattusili III had established first in his letter to the Assyrian king that "the [people of the] city of Turira had constantly plundering his land. They plundered the land of Carchemish and the land of Aštata (?)". Hattusili was aware that Hanigalbat (Mittani) was not a great kingdom anymore and that Hurrian troops or bands attack cities of the kingdom of Hatti, like in the old times of Hattusili I. For instance the TAR-PI troops in the time period of Hattusili III had similarities with the hostile Hurrian bands during the reign of Hattusili I.

Yoram Cohen and Lorenzo d ‘Alfonso described the ‘renewed’ Hurrian threat for the Hittite kingdom 35. They stated: As now generally recognized, after the Hittite subjugation of Mittani, already by the time of Mursili II, the protectorate state promoted hostile actions against both Assyria and Hatti” and they referred to the studies of Wilhelm (1989) and Bryce (1998) for the hostilities against Hatti.

When the context of the letter to the King of Assyria is closely analyzed, one can establish that the chief scribe of Hattusili III had adequate used an old Hittite term for the “Hurrian enemy”.

This observation fits also in the tradition of the kings of Mitanni to mention themselves as rulers of Halagalbat (Great Hali land) 36, whether Hanigalbat (Great Hani land), Mitanniewa or Ḫurwuḫe. From the time period that the lands of the kings of the Hurrian armies became united in the kingdom of Mitanni. One can see that king Tušratta called his kingdom in his own language normally Ḫurwuḫe and once kur Mi-it-ta-an-ni-e-wa in his Hurrian-written letter. 37

---

32 Transliteration Daria Gromova 2013, The historical preamble of the Talmi-Šarruma Treaty (CTH75) and some chronological problems of the history of Halap, 103): LUGAL KUR Ḫa-la-ap Ḫi-it-ti UUG LUGAL KUR Ḫa-at-ti |ma Ḫa-at-ti |ma. Translation: The king of Halap committed a sin against the king of Hanigalbat. And against Hattusili, the king of Hatti, he committed a sin.

33 Daria Gromova (2013:103) line 23: And the king of Mitanni gave cities and borders districts to the citizens of Astata and Nuhašše.


36 KUR Ḫa-la-gal-bat ug KUR mi-i-y-ri-i Amarna letters 20.17.

37 Michael C. Astour 1972, Ḫattusilišš, Ḫalab and Ḫanigalbat, JNES vol. 31, 103.
By the destruction of the kingdom Yamkhad and its capital Halab by king Mursili I and the raid on Babylon, Mittani had become the new power in the Near East, also because Mursili I was murdered by the husband of his sister in Hattusa, when he came back from his raid to Babylon. In the time period of Šuppiluliuma I Mitanni lost much of his territory and became at first dependent upon Hattusa and later to Assyria. It is interesting that Šuppiluliuma I has mentioned the king of Mitanni the king of the land of Hurri, when he became hostile against Hatti, together with the king of Egypt and many kingdoms in Syria. It proves once again that the kings of Hatti considered Hanigalbat as the kingdom of the Hurri.

Michael Astour remarked that "the contention, that after Tušratta, Hurri and Mitanni were to separate kingdoms is not borne out by textual evidence. Even less justified is the retrojection of the alleged duality and rivalry of Hurri and Mitanni to the inception of their statehood." Astour stated that only an united north Mesopotamian state (i.e. the great kingdom Mitanni or Ḫurwuḫe), could have had the overlordship over both Alalah near the Mediterranean Sea and the region of Arrapha-Nuzu east of the Tigris. In the Alalah texts of the 15th century (level IV), all the three names are used interchangeably; we find there kur Ḫurri, kur Mi-ta-ni and the term Ḫanigalbatūtu for the people of Ḫanigalbat.

The view that to consider Hanigalbat as the kingdom of the Hurri appears not only to have been a Hittite tradition, but it was an official formula in the Late Bronze Syria, too. Idrimi king of Alalah called Parattarna king of Mitanni systematically “mighty king, king of the Hurrian warriors” (dan-nu LUGAL ERĪN MES Ḫu-ri ki). The title king of the Hurrians was also used in the treaty between Niqmepa, king of Alalah and Muskis, and MIR-IM, king of Tunip, to designate their joint Mittanian overlord. More over its was the tradition of the kings of Hanigalbat themselves according to their native tongue Ḫurwuḫe (with variant in spelling and formatsive Astour 1972:103).

---

38 Rafal Kollinski, Making Mittani Assyrian, 9.
40 In a treaty of Tudhaliya II with the king of Kizzuwatna the ruler of (the land of) Hurri is also mentioned and that the people of Isuwa fled to the land of Hurri. The Hittite king made an alliance against the Hurrians: "If any cities of the land of Hurri interfere in the cities of Sunashshrua (of Kizzuwatna), we will fight side by side against the ruler of Hurri, in any of his cities" (Beckman1999:22).
41 Michael C. Astour 1972, Ḫattušiliš, Halab and Ḫanigalbat, JNES vol. 31, 103
42 Michael C. Astour 1996, Who was the Hurrian king at the Siege of Emar? in EMAR: the History, Religion, and Culture of a Syrian Town in the late Bronze Age editor M.W. Chavalas,33. Idrimi was a son of the king of Halab, who fled to the city Emar, right on the Mittanian border, after a revolt against his father. According to Michael Astour Idrimi was able to return to his country and to recover the throne of his ancestors after seven years of exile. He had to made a vassal treaty with Parattarna the king of the Hurri-people. From that moment the title and the residence of Idrimi and his successors change. They no longer called themselves 'king of Halab' (the name Yamkhad went out of use after 1531) and the transfer their capital to Alalah. But this does not mean, as is often claimed, that Idrimi ceded Halab to Mitanni and retrained only the region of Alalah. It was not the city itself of Halab that Idrimi
In Akkadian texts of the last king of Emar a king of the troops of the Hurri-land appears, who had besieged Emar around 1235 BC. One has asked the question who this king of the Hurrian land was. Michael Astour rightly remarked that in that period a kingdom of Mittani was no longer in existence. He stated that: "It should, however, be clear that at the time of the siege of Emar, whenever we place it, there was only one 'king of the Hurrian troops,' namely, the Assyrian grand vizier and commander-in-chief who, in addition, carried the title 'king of Hanigalbat' and was called at Emar by the familiar Syrian version of the title".44

In the course of the 13th century BC Assyria had gained full control of the region west of the Assyrian homeland, and thereupon superimposed its own administrative structure on the land already know as Hanigalbat. Sometimes the “Grand Vizier” of the kingdom of Assyria was also dubbed šar (māt) Hanigalbat. F. Wiggermann (2000) suggested that the Assyrian Empire would have been (administratively) divided into two parts: the east with Assur as its capital, and the west Hanigalbat, where a branch of the royal family ruled as “grand viziers” (sukkallu rabû) and a “king of Hanigalbat”. Mario Fales remarked that it should not be entirely ruled out that an impulse toward decentralization was consistently operating within “Hanigalbat”. In a text from that time period is mentioned a dynasty of "kings of the land of Mari". So one can observe that when the kingdom Hanigalbat had lost her independence, the term Hanigalbat kept her geographically and administratively importance of the land west of Assyria.

Even in the 7th century BC the term Hanigalbat did not fade into nothingness. Some rulers of Babylonia are called a ‘soldier of Ḫabi’ and several kings of Babylon belonged to a dynasty of ‘Ḥabigal’ in that time period. M.C. Astour has suggested that since the title of Šar (king) Hanigalbat was, in point of fact, devoid of political and administrative significance, it might have

---

44 Ibidem 1996:35.
45 Mario Fales 2011, Transition: The Assyrians at the Euphrates between the 13th and 13th century BC.19-20. G. Torri reported about a chief of the scribes with the name
47 Frederic Mario Fales 2014, The Two Dynasties of Assyria, AOAT Band 412, 201-204,‘Babylonian King list A’.
been justified by reasons “of a religious order”, i.e. the care and feeding of gods of the former Mittanian land. 48
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**Appendix : The land Hana, the Steppe and the Amorites.**

![Map of Syria and Mesopotamia](image)

Fig. 1. Map of Syria and Mesopotamia, rainfall 4.2–3.9 ka b.p. (after Weiss 2012b, fig. 5).

Giorgio Buccellati described in 1992 49 the relation between the term Amurru (Amorites) and the peasant-herders or agro-pastoralists of Mesopotamia. And in particular to the region where the Middle Euphrates and the Lower Kabur basin, where the land only along a very narrow strip the ab Purattim (in Arabian zôr) is irrigable. He saw this land as the region of Hana. The peasants of the ab Purattim discovered the potential of the steppe for their hers by tapping its water through the systematic developments of wells. Buccellati suggested the instead of “sedentarization of the nomads” it would be more accurate to speak of “nomadization of the peasants” (1992:87). He stated

---

48 M.C. Astour 1996, Who was the King of the Hurrian Troops at the Siege of Emar ?, 30.

the the MA.TU or Ammurru refers to this rural class of nomadizing peasant-herders, a class that is developing an ethnic identity as a result of an the particular circumstances. The sociopolitical, or tribal, groups that emerge in the process (such as Haneans or Suteans) are smaller the broader group subsumed under the terms for the Amorites. The latter, then, remains a term that describes the lifestyle of these individuals as much as it refers to their broad ethnic identity.

According to Buccellati this is somewhat similar to a specific connotation that the term ē Arab has today, where in the language of settled (Arab) people it refers to the nomadic (Arab) people, i.e. to the Bedouin.

His continuation of this statement is very interesting: “Why is it, then, that by the Old Babylonian period it became an archaic term, when the class of people to which it refers is more in evidence than ever? In my opinion it was replaced by two terms, which are normally understood as tribal names: banū Yamina and banū Sam‘āl. These covey, I submit, the same semantic range that the term Amurru had in earlier times, except that they split in two: ‘the sons of the right river bank’ and ‘the sons of the left river bank’ correspond to what in Arabic is known as the šamia and the jezira, respectively, that is, the the steppe to the south and west of the Euphrates in its middle course, and the steppe to the north and the east, contained by a ‘meso-potamian (i.e. inter-riverine) island’ (which is the literal meaning of jezirra) between the Euphrates and the Tigris’. Buccellati stated the ‘sons of the steppe lying on the left or the right river bank’ are terminologically (as well as, in my understanding, genetically) very close related to the ‘sons of the irrigation district’ (mārū ugārim) as Old Babylonian Akkadian says of the settled farmers.

According to Buccellati this kind of pastoral nomadism characterizes the region of Hana. The entire region was firmly under control of Mari (and of Terqa after the destruction of Mari) in the early
second millennium. He stated that in the third millennium the situation was probably analogous, as may be assumed from the extraordinary significance of Mari texts of the royal archives of Ebla: Emar (by the big bend of the Euphrates) and Tuttul (at the mouth of the Balikh) may have controlled a portion of the steppe, but as most as far as the ranges of Palmyra and the Jebel Bishri.

The control of Mari presumably extended already as far as the Orontes basin, making Mari a kingdom directly bordering Ebla. From the Mari texts it is known that Hana territorial control over the steppe, at least at the time period of the kingdom of Mari, extended all the way to the west, since Mari was directly in contact with Qatna over matters pertaining to herds and their grain rights. Buccellati stated: “Neither Tadmor/Palmyra nor any other oasis had achieved anything even remotely approaching an urban status in the second millennium: the steppe was effectively a vast rangeland, exploited by peasant-herders more or less dependent on the central power in the aḫ Purattim. In this respect, Mari and Terqa seem to have controlled the entire environmental niche represented by the steppe, and to have aptly subsumed it under the geopolitical term Khana.”

According to Buccellati one does not to view the Amorites as nomads or semi-nomads who are treating Hana from the outside, however we should understand them as the unique outgrowth, from within, of the rural class of Hana.

Appendix 2: Uper Mesopotamia in the Mittani Period

Mirko Novák (Bern University) described in his article Upper Mesopotamia in the Mittani Period the borders of Mitanni Empire and the most likely location of its capital: “The kingdom was centered in Upper Mesopotamia, namely inside the Habur triangle, a region that Assyrian sources refer to as Hanigalbat. The subjugated regions west of the Euphrates and east of the Tigris were ruled by local dynasts and gained the status of vassal kingdoms, while the central heartland was directly controlled by the king. Mitanni was bordered by the lands of Isuwa and Alsu in the north and Babylonia in the south. Kizzuwatna was its northwestern neighbor and the vassal sates of Egypt limited it to the southwest. In the east, a glacis of surrounding vassal states including Arrapha and Assur extended to the piedmont area west of the Zagros Mountains.” (page 345–346). According to Novak the cities of Waššukanni and Taidu are known to have been of uttermost importance. “Although neither one has been clearly indentified yet, it is highly probable that the can be located in Tell Faḫariya and Tell al Ḥamidiyya respectively. King Ṣuppiluliuma I advanced against Waššukanni, therefore it seems likely, that this city was the residence of the Mittanian king Tušratta. But it is still unclear whether the empire had just one real capital, or whether the kings moved between several residences. According to Novak the most plausible reconstruction of the

---

[52] This suggestion is based on a letter from Tell Ḥuera (TCH92.G.151) Jakob 2009:49.
geopolitical situation might be that Waššukanni was the original residence of the great kings of Mitanni, prior to its subjugation first by the kings of the Land of Hatti and then by the kings of Assyria. In the time after the reduction of Mitanni from a great kingdom to a dependent regional kingdom, its political centre was transferred to Taidu. The most important religious centers were Ḫarran (the city of the Moon God) and Kaḥat (the seat of the Stormgod).

Appendix 3: The Ḫirana tribes in the land of Subartu, the Land of Suḫi and the Land of Mari.
Daisuke Shibata described that the Land of Mari was attested in texts even long after the great city of Mari located at modern Tell Hariri. Shibata stated that the toponym referred to the Middle Euphrates region, presumably around the former city of Mari. But he also pointed out that at the end of the second millennium that the term Land of Mari was used for a region in the Middle Habur around the city Tabetu, as well. In his examination of the term Land of Mari he described a Middle Babylonian letter from Dūr-Kurugalzu, the capital of the Kassite kingdom of Babylon:

“The army of the Ḫirana-tribes, its half is stationed in the Land of Subartu, in the cities, [where] an Assyrian [king] seized, and its half is stationed in the Land of Suḫu and the Land of Mari [before]my[Lord].[…].is placed at/along the Euphrates.”

According to Shibata the letter most probably dates to the reign of Shalmaneser I (ca. 1270 – 1240 BC). The land of Subartu indicates the Habur Region. It is interesting that the Land of Mari is connected with the land of Suḫu in this letter. The land of Suḫu was located in the Lower-Middle Euphrates, where the river is streaming eastwards and then southwards (see map below).

Was the army of the Hirana tribes similar with the famous Hurrian worriers of the early and middle second millennium? It is already mentioned in this article, that the Mittanian kings were called “the king of the Hurrian troops”. Had these tribes already formed the basis of “the Hurrian enemy” for Hattusili I, the king of Hatti, around 1650 BC? And had they in modern times called “the sons of the right river bank” and “the sons of the left river bank”? 

Map of Daisuke Shibata 2011.