

Altorientalische Forschungen	12	1985	2	259–268
------------------------------	----	------	---	---------

TREVOR R. BRYCE

## A Suggested Sequence of Historical Developments in Anatolia during the Assyrian Colony Period\*

In 1972, M. T. Larsen discussed a fragmentary text belonging to the Assyrian Colony period of Anatolian history in an article entitled “A Revolt against Hattuša”.<sup>1</sup> The text, written in Old Assyrian cuneiform, was first published by N. B. Jankowskaja.<sup>2</sup> It was subsequently translated and discussed by Hecker and Veenhof,<sup>3</sup> and finally by Larsen who produced the following revised reading and interpretation:

break

[š]a A-[a]m-ku-[a-i]-<sup>1</sup>i/um<sup>1</sup>

a-na-kam-ma<sup>2</sup> ku<sup>2</sup> [x] ú<sup>2</sup>-ma

ru-ba-um ša Ši-na-ḫu-tim

A-am-ku-a-i-um

5' ú Kà-pí<sup>1</sup>-it-ra-i-um

a-wa-sú<sup>1</sup>-nu!

a-na iš-té-et

iš-ku-nu-ma Ḫa-tù-š[a]-i-a[m]

i-ták-ru

10' [a-n]a<sup>2</sup> Kà-ni-ši<sup>1</sup> i<sup>1</sup>? [(x)]

[x (x) i<sup>1</sup> na<sup>2</sup> ú[. . .]

break

(left edge)

[x x x x]-in<sup>2</sup>

“... of the man of Amkuwa . . . The prince of Šinaḫuttum, the man of Amkuwa,

\* The following abbreviations are used in this paper: AJA—American Journal of Archaeology; ArOr—Archiv Orientalní; ATHE—B. Kienast, *Die altassyrischen Texte des orientalischen Seminars der Universität Heidelberg und der Sammlung Erlenmeyer-Basel*, Berlin 1960; CAH—Cambridge Ancient History; CTH—E. Laroche, *Catalogue des textes hittites*, Paris 1971; HUCA—Hebrew Union College Annual; JCS—Journal of Cuneiform Studies; JIES—Journal of Indo-European Studies; KTHahn—J. Lewy, *Die Kültepe-texte aus der Sammlung Frida Hahn*, Berlin—Leipzig 1930; KTP—F. J. Stephens, *The Cappadocian Tablets in the University of Pennsylvania Museum*, in: *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research* 11 [1927], 101–136; OIP—Oriental Institute, Publications; SBOT—Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten; TTC—G. Contenau, *Trente tablettes cappadociennes*, Paris 1919; ZA—Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.

<sup>1</sup> In: JCS 24 [1972], 100–101.

<sup>2</sup> *Klinopisnye teksty iz Kjul'-Tepe v sobraniyach SSSR*, Moscow 1968, text no. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Note Larsen's comments op. cit. 100

and the man of Kapitra have made common cause, and they have rebelled against the man of Ḫattuša. To' the men of Kaneš . . ."

Larsen suggested that on linguistic grounds the text should probably be dated to the Ib period of Kaneš, the second phase of the Assyrian colonies of Cappadocia. Five place names are mentioned in the text—Amkuwa, Šinaḫuttum, Kapitra, Ḫattuša, and Kaneš. According to Larsen's interpretation, three of these—Amkuwa, Šinaḫuttum, and Kapitra—were in conflict with Ḫattuša. The significance of the reference to Kaneš is unclear as the text breaks off at this point, but Larsen suggests it may indicate an appeal to Kaneš by the "rebel" towns for assistance against Ḫattuša.

It still remains to be seen whether it is possible to construct a plausible historical context within which this event can be placed.

During the Colony period, central Anatolia was dominated by several major geo-political units sometimes designated as *mātu* in the merchant texts—namely the kingdoms of Ḫatti, Kaneš, Burušhattum, and Waḫšušana.<sup>4</sup> To this list we should probably add the kingdom of Zalpa, which almost certainly lay to the north of the kingdom of Ḫatti, in or near the Pontic zone,<sup>5</sup> although Zalpa's status is not altogether clear from the texts (see below). The names of at least two of these kingdoms figure in the well known text dealing with the rebellion of 17 local rulers against the Akkadian king Naram-Sin (c. 2380–2325 B.C), whose realm at the height of his power extended from the Persian Gulf through central Anatolia. The list of rebels includes a king of Ḫatti called Pamba, and immediately after, a king of Kaniš called Zipani.<sup>6</sup> The name of the next king in the list is broken, but Singer suggests, very plausibly, that it should be restored as Nur[-Dagal, king of Purušḫanda] (=Burušhattum), the king who figures in the "King of the Battle" tale about Sargon.<sup>7</sup> If this admittedly late text can be accepted as historically authentic, then it indicates that at least two and possibly three of the *mātu* of the Colony period already existed as kingdoms with royal houses for several hundred years or more before the arrival of the Assyrian merchants.

We cannot be altogether sure how far the authority or influence of each of these kingdoms extended at the beginning of the Colony period, or what relationships they had with one another or with the lesser communities which lay within the general areas where they were located. However, we may assume that early in the period conditions were relatively stable in central Anatolia, and that the Anatolian kingdoms co-existed on relatively peaceful terms. Such conditions may well have been a major incentive in encouraging the expansion of Assyrian commercial enterprises into the region. Assyrian merchants were sensitive to such matters, and were highly reluctant to trade in areas where conditions were unsettled.<sup>8</sup> As Orlin has pointed out, "it was a *sine qua non* of Assyrian trade that the local rulers themselves be on good terms with each other, the peaceful relations

<sup>4</sup> Cf. I. Singer, in: JIES 9 [1981], 127. Note in the merchant texts the designations *Mat Burušhattum* (KTHahn 1 : 3), *Mat Kaniš* (TC 18 : 42), *Mat Waḫšušana* (KTHahn 1 : 3–4, KTP 10.23).

<sup>5</sup> See in particular H. Otten, *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa*, Wiesbaden 1973, 58ff. (SBoT 17).

<sup>6</sup> CTH 311, obv. line 11. See H. G. Güterbock, in: ZA 44 [1938], 67ff. and Singer 127.

<sup>7</sup> Singer 127.

being affirmed by formal oaths”<sup>9</sup> with parity-type treaties forming the basis of these relations.

Turning to the question of the geographical extent and political structure of the various *mātu*, we can reasonably assume that each *mātum* had as its focal point a chief city whose ruler (*rubā’um*, or *rubā’um rabi’um*) exercised authority broadly over the communities lying within the territory of the *mātum*. Thus Piyuṣti is designated in the Anitta inscription<sup>10</sup> as the king of Ḫatti, the *mātum*, but the outcome of his conflict with Anitta is the destruction of Ḫattuṣ(a), presumably the royal seat and administrative capital of the *mātum*. How large was the *mātum* of Ḫatti, the territory subject to Ḫattuša, before its destruction by Anitta? What towns or communities did it encompass? It is possible that the fragmentary “Revolt against Ḫattuša” text provides some indication of this. If Larsen’s reading *i-ták-ru* in line 9 is correct, and the verb does in fact mean “to rebel against” in this context, then this would seem to indicate that the towns which form the subject of the verb—Amkuwa, Šinaḫuttum, and Kapitra—were disaffected subjects attempting to break their ties with Ḫattuša. And by implication, they probably all lay within the *mātum* of Ḫatti. We have as yet no clue to the location of Kapitra, which appears not to figure in the later Hittite texts. Šinaḫuttum, however, is almost certainly to be identified with the Hittite Šanaḫuitta, which is probably to be located to the north east of Ḫattuša on or near the upper Halys,<sup>11</sup> and Amkuwa was probably situated in the vicinity of the modern Alişar (it may in fact be Alişar).<sup>12</sup> On the basis of these locations, and if Amkuwa and Šinaḫuttum were subjects of the king of Ḫatti, it would be apparent that the king’s realms encompassed much of the territory lying within at least the southern part of the Halys basin, and may well have extended a considerable distance north of Ḫattuša.

If in the text in question *i-ták-ru* has the more general meaning “to open hostilities” (Larsen’s alternative suggestion), then, of course, it becomes less clear that the towns in conflict with Ḫattuša were rebellious subjects of the king of Ḫatti. Nevertheless, it seems most likely that what we have here is a reference to a rebellion by several principalities within the *mātum* of Ḫatti who sought to break from the overlordship of the Ḫattuša-based king of Ḫatti, perhaps with the assistance of, or in alliance with, Kaneš. If the realm of the king of Ḫatti extended throughout much if not all of the Halys basin, then it obviously incorporated a number of other important communities in addition to the three referred to above. Tawiniya, for example, almost certainly lay within the *mātum* of Ḫatti. It had

<sup>8</sup> Note the letters ATHE 66 (lines 9–14) and KTHahn 1 in which the Assyrian merchants Puzur-Aššur and Idi-Ištar (respectively) indicate that they will not trade in areas where conditions are unsettled and the security of themselves and their goods is at risk.

<sup>9</sup> L. L. Orlin, *Assyrian Colonies in Cappadocia*, The Hague–Paris 1971, 238.

<sup>10</sup> CTH. The most recent edition of the text is E. Neu, *Der Anitta-Text*, Wiesbaden 1974 (SBoT 18). For a recent historical commentary on the text, see T. R. Bryce, *The Major Historical Texts of Early Hittite History*, University of Queensland 1982, 28–43.

<sup>11</sup> See the references cited by G. F. del Monte and J. Tischler, *Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes VI*, Wiesbaden 1978, 342.

<sup>12</sup> There is a strong consensus of opinion amongst scholars on this identification; see del Monte and Tischler 21.

an Assyrian *kārum* attached to it, and a local ruler with the status of a *rubā'um*.<sup>13</sup> (We should, however, recognise that the term *rubā'um* cannot be defined in any absolute sense in the Assyrian texts. While it was sometimes used to designate the ruler of a *mātum*, it could also be used, as we have seen, in reference to a subject ruler within the *mātum*.<sup>14</sup> The term is not in itself a reliable guide to the status of the person so designated or the nature of the community or land over which he ruled.)

In addition to the chief city and subject principalities in each *mātum*, there must also have been numerous smaller settlements. Some of these had Assyrian *wabārtum* settlements attached to them (although we cannot always assume that the presence of a *kārum* or *wabārtum* necessarily reflected the size and status of the Anatolian community to which it was attached), but others must simply have been small villages, hamlets, or farmsteads. In the Assyrian texts, the term *ālānū* is used as a general designation for the various Anatolian communities. We note from the Anum-ḫirbi letter<sup>15</sup>, for example, that the kingdom of Mama, originally the site of an Assyrian *wabārtum*, incorporated a number of *ālānū* (12 of them are referred to in the letter), at least some of which had local rulers subject to the *rubā'um*, the king of Mama. This is indicated by the reference to *šarru* in lines 10 and 14 of the document. In the second phase of the Colony period *šarrum* seems to denote a vassal of the *rubā'um*.<sup>16</sup> It seems that in some instances a vassal ruler could exercise a significant degree of power on his own, as evidenced by Anum-ḫirbi's complaint that Waršama's vassal, ruler of Taišama, destroyed 12 of the *ālānū* of Mama.

At this point, we might look briefly at the other major kingdoms of central Anatolia during the Colony period, as a preliminary step towards attempting to arrange in sequence the major historical and political developments as recorded in the texts of this period.

The city of Kaneš was the focal point of a *mātum* which lay between the *mātum* of Hatti to the north and the *mātum* of Buruṣḫattum to the south. The importance of Kaneš from a commercial point of view is indicated by the establishment of the Assyrians' chief *kārum* there, a reflection perhaps of the city's excellent strategic location at the geographical centre of gravity of the central Anatolian states. Yet in the level II period Kaneš was probably overshadowed by Hatti and perhaps also by Zalpa which apparently inflicted a military defeat on the city (see below). Perhaps it was not until after Piṭhana had conquered the city and established his dynastic seat there (level Ib period)<sup>17</sup> that Neša/Kaneš came into high political prominence.

<sup>13</sup> See Orlin 85–86 no. 103. For possible locations of Tawiniya, see the references cited by del Monte and Tischler 416.

<sup>14</sup> For a detailed discussion of the term, see M. T. Larsen, *The Old Assyrian City-State and its Colonies*, Copenhagen 1976, 121–129.

<sup>15</sup> Edited by K. Balkan, *Letter of King Anum-ḫirbi of Mama to King Waršama of Kanish*, Ankara 1957.

<sup>16</sup> See Balkan 26 and Orlin 74. Orlin comments that the terms seem to be synonymous in the level II period of Karum Kaneš, although in Ib *šarrum* appears to denote a vassal of the *rubā'um*. See also Larsen 118–119, 123.

<sup>17</sup> See the references cited by O. R. Gurney, in: *CAH II.1*, Cambridge 1973, 232 n. 8.

Zalpa was the site of an Assyrian *wabārtum*,<sup>18</sup> and was ruled by a *rubā'um*, according to the merchant texts. References to its ruler in the Anitta inscription suggest that his status was similar to that of the king of Ḫatti. Both rulers are accorded the title LUGAL in the surviving Hittite copies of the inscription, and both figure in the inscription as the principal enemies of Anitta. It seems not unlikely that the kingdom of Zalpa had the status of a *mātum* (though this is never explicitly indicated in the merchant texts), lying adjacent to and probably to the north of the *mātum* of Ḫatti. We note that in the Anitta inscription reference is made to the removal of the statue of Šiu, god of Kaneš, to Zalpa by the Zalpan king Uḫna (lines 39–40). This very likely indicates a military conquest of Kaneš, which is perhaps to be associated with the destruction of level II of the city.<sup>19</sup> If so, the attack on Kaneš may have been carried out with the collaboration or support of the king of Ḫatti, especially if the territory of Ḫatti lay adjacent to that of Kaneš. A military coalition between Zalpa and Ḫatti towards the end of the first phase of the Colony period is not inconceivable, given the likelihood that such a coalition was formed or re-formed in the conflicts with Piṭhana and Anitta during the second phase.<sup>20</sup> One may speculate that Kaneš provoked the attack which brought about its destruction at the end of level II by over-exploiting its position at the hub of the Assyrian trading network in Anatolia. We have several examples on record of a principality or kingdom “closing the road” (or threatening to do so), that is to say, closing off the route running through its territory to a neighbouring territory and thus blocking the activities of the Assyrian merchants.

Burušhattum was clearly the most important power centre south of the Halys up to the time of the conquests of Piṭhana and Anitta. It was the chief city of a *mātum* and at least one of its rulers bore the title *rubā'um rabi'um*,<sup>21</sup> (great king) a title also assumed by Anitta after his extensive conquests north and south of the Halys,<sup>22</sup> and it probably exercised authority over a territory similar in extent to that of the kingdom of Ḫatti. The honour which Anitta accorded its ruler after the city opened its gates to him is perhaps a further reflection of the status of Burušhattum.<sup>23</sup>

In the south-east the territory of the *mātum* of Burušhattum probably bordered on that of Waḫšušana. Waḫšušana was the seat of a *rubā'um* and the site of an Assyrian *kārum*, and is designated as a *mātum* in the Assyrian texts.<sup>24</sup> Its likely

<sup>18</sup> This Zalpa should be distinguished from the “southern” Zalpa, which lay in northern Syria and was the site of an Assyrian *kārum*. See K. R. Veenhof, *Aspects of Old Assyrian Trade and its Terminology*, Leiden 1972, 292 with n. 423 (contra Orlin 88) and M. T. Larsen 237–239.

<sup>19</sup> Orlin makes the point that the removal of the statue must indicate a major defeat and destruction of the city (op. cit. 243–244).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Singer 130.

<sup>21</sup> TTC 27: 6–7. The ruler in question is unnamed.

<sup>22</sup> As recorded in a contract text from Aliṣar, which deals with the release of six prisoners and contains the clause “In the hand of the Great Prince (*rubā'um rabi'um*) Anitta, Peruwa was commander of the fortress” (see I. Gelb, *Inscriptions from Aliṣar and Vicinity*, Chicago 1935, 50 (OIP 27)).

<sup>23</sup> After the surrender of Burušhattum/Purušhanda, its ruler was taken back to Neša by Anitta and given a place of honour on his right hand (Anitta inscription lines 73–79).

<sup>24</sup> See Orlin 87–88.

independent status is indicated by a "parity-type" treaty with Kaneš (ATHE 66), and Orlin suggests the likelihood of similar treaties between Kaneš and Buruṣḫattum and Buruṣḫattum and Waḥṣuṣana.<sup>25</sup> On the other hand Landsberger argued that "Waḥṣuṣana was one of two lands (with Buruṣḫattum) that made up the domain of the 'Great Prince' of Buruṣḫattum".<sup>26</sup> Whether or not this was so at the outset, Waḥṣuṣana may have eventually become absorbed into the kingdom of Buruṣḫattum, or else, as Orlin suggests, lost its power to another principality in the region—perhaps Šalatiwara.<sup>27</sup> The basis for this suggestion is that Waḥṣuṣana appears nowhere in the Anitta text which ends with the account of the defeat of Salatiwara and the surrender of Buruṣḫattum. Perhaps the unsettled, turbulent conditions referred to in the letter KTHahn 1 in connection with Buruṣḫattum and Waḥṣuṣana led to the decline and disappearance of Waḥṣuṣana as a significant commercial and political power in the region.

On the basis of the above, we can draw the following tentative conclusions regarding the overall political structure of central Anatolia during the first phase of the Assyrian Colony period: The region consisted of five major kingdoms, two of them lying within the Halys basin (Zalpa and Ḫatti), and three south of the Halys (Kaneš, Buruṣḫattum, and Waḥṣuṣana). Each unit had as its focal point a chief city whose ruler (*rubā'um*, or *rubā'um rabi'um*) exercised authority broadly over the communities lying within the kingdom, some of which must have been quite substantial settlements with Assyrian *kāru* attached to them and under the immediate control of a local *rubā'um*. Relations between the various kingdoms were generally peaceful, and were probably governed by treaties. And it was probably the general stability of the region as a whole that encouraged the commercial enterprises of the Assyrians.

For the Assyrian colonists, central Anatolia offered the attractions of a series of already well established urban centres within the framework of relatively coherent political structures conducive to profitable commercial activities throughout the region. And in turn the Assyrian merchant system may well have helped promote political, social, and commercial developments which led eventually to major changes in the Anatolian political structures.

A likely consequence of the merchant system was a greater degree of Anatolian territorial consciousness, and perhaps a more precise demarcation of territorial boundaries. There were obviously important practical considerations involved in the clear definition of territories—e.g. the tolls and dues payable to the local rulers of the territories through which the merchant caravans passed, and the fact that passage from one territory to another virtually required the assent of the local ruler—an assent which might be withheld by a local ruler by way of a commercial sanction against the ruler of a neighbouring territory into which the caravan sought access. And indirectly the merchant system must have promoted closer contacts between the various Anatolian kingdoms and communities. The routes travelled by the merchants provided a regular communication network throughout central Anatolia, and the trading activities of the merchants clearly required a

<sup>25</sup> Orlin 238.

<sup>26</sup> B. Landsberger, in: *ArOr* 18, 1/2 [1950], 338.

<sup>27</sup> Orlin 240.

high degree of cooperation and agreement amongst the various local rulers—a matter on which, as mentioned above, the merchants were highly sensitive.

Yet by bringing the various kingdoms and communities into closer contact with each other and by bringing into sharper focus the importance of territorial control, from both a political and a commercial point of view, the Assyrian merchant system provided a number of bases for conflict amongst the kingdoms and communities. Amongst the most likely causes of conflict were (a) the possibility of a local ruler “closing the road”, i.e. preventing right of passage through his own to a neighbouring territory (implied, e.g., in the Anum-ḫirbi letter, line 36), (b) the commercial incentives for expanding one’s own territory, (c) the incentives for a local subject ruler to break away from his overlord and establish himself as an independent ruler in his own right.

I suggest that unrest and hostility amongst a number of Anatolian communities were becoming increasingly marked by the end of the first phase of the Assyrian colonies, as reflected perhaps in KTHahn 1, referring to the turbulent state of the kingdoms of Buruṣhattum and Waḥṣuṣana. The end of the period is archaeologically attested by the destruction of level II at Kanesh—perhaps, as suggested above, the result of military action by Zalpa and Hatti. Further evidence of conflict amongst the Anatolians during the Colony period is provided by three documents in particular—the so-called “Revolt against Hattuša” text, the Anum-ḫirbi letter, and the Anitta inscription. These three documents all belong, I believe, to the second phase of the Colony period, represented archaeologically at Kaneš in the Ib level.

On the basis of these documents, I would like to suggest the following sequence of events in the second phase of the Colony period:

(1) *The destruction of Kaneš II* and the abandonment of the site for some 30 years must have left a political vacuum in the region south of the Halys which may well have promoted the growth of the kingdom of Mama. We can conclude from the Anum-ḫirbi letter that the territory of Mama lay adjacent to that of Kaneš.<sup>28</sup> The letter can with some confidence be assigned to the Ib period, especially since Waršama, the addressee of the letter, is obviously the same as the Waršama whose name appears in a list of kings (including Inar and Anitta) appearing on a tablet discovered in 1962 in level Ib of Karum Kaneš.<sup>29</sup> The events which constitute the main subject of the letter must have occurred some years after the resettlement of Kaneš to allow for the resurgence of the kingdom of Kaneš under the addressee’s father Inar, with the incorporation of a number of vassal communities, and the succession of Waršama himself.

(2) *The resurgence of Kaneš*. We cannot be entirely sure that Inar was the first ruler of the resettled city, though even if he was not he may well have been responsible for the political and military resurgence of the kingdom. This resurgence may have involved a series of military conquests, reflected perhaps in the reference to Inar’s 9-year siege of Haršamna (lines 29–31). To judge from the Anum-ḫirbi letter, the rise of Kaneš was not perceived of initially as a threat to the king-

<sup>28</sup> On various possibilities for the location of Mama, see Balkan 33, who concludes that “Elbistan, on the one hand, and the region of Comana Cappadocia and Göksun, on the other, are the best proposals for the localisation of Mama” (op. cit. 33).

<sup>29</sup> Reported by M. Mellink, in: *AJA* 67 [1963], 175.

dom of Mama which made no attempt to capitalise on Inar's preoccupation with the long siege by invading his territory (lines 32–34).

(3) *Conflicts between vassal rulers of Kaneš and Mama*. These conflicts are probably a reflection of increasing instability in at least some of the Anatolian kingdoms during the Ib period. In this case they apparently occurred in the border zone between Mama and Kaneš and illustrate the dangers posed by rebellious vassal rulers who sought to carve out an independent kingdom of their own. This is made clear by Anum-ḫirbi's words: 'Will a *rubā'um* of Taišama become a third *rubā'um* with us?' (lines 15–16). Situations of this kind could well have been responsible for a progressive fragmentation of the political structures of central Anatolia—the gradual breakdown of the old kingdoms into smaller independent units, considerably increasing the complexity of the Anatolian political scene and the potential for conflicts and disputes over borders and territorial rights. The 'Revolt against Ḫattuša' text may indicate a similar process within the kingdom of Ḫatti.

(4) *Pithana's conquest of Neša/Kaneš*. We have noted that after the destruction of Kaneš II the site was abandoned for some 30 years before it was reoccupied. Where did the dispersed population go? If the destruction was carried out by the king of Zalpa, perhaps with the support of the king of Ḫatti, it is conceivable that at least some of the population were resettled in the conqueror's homeland, like the NAM.RAMEŠ of Hittite times. But others may have sought refuge elsewhere outside the Halys basin, and some may have resettled in Kuššara, the original home of Pithana and Anitta.<sup>30</sup> We note that in Anitta's account of Pithana's conquest of Neša, Pithana displaced the king of the city but did no harm to the populace whom he treated as 'mothers and fathers' (lines 7–9). It is quite possible that this expression indicates close ethnic and even kinship affinities between Neša and Kuššara, as several scholars have already noted.<sup>31</sup> And if so, since Neša seems to have had a predominantly Indo-European population,<sup>32</sup> in contrast to the prevailing Hattian population across the Halys, then presumably Kuššara's population was also predominantly Indo-European. Perhaps the statement in the Anitta inscription indicates that Neša was in fact the parent city of Kuššara, or alternatively it may simply be that Kuššara's ethnic affinities with Neša attracted Nešite refugees there after the destruction of their own city.

In either case Pithana's conquest of Neša might in fact represent the re-establishment in the city of a ruling family which had fled from it on its destruction at the end of level II, or else the establishment of a ruling family with kinship or close ethnic ties with the original population.

Who was the king overthrown by Pithana? Quite possibly it was Waršama, the addressee of the Anum-ḫirbi letter, whose hold over his kingdom may have been

<sup>30</sup> With regard to the location of Kuššara, Gurney supports the suggestion made by J. Lewy that it may have been situated in the vicinity of modern Şar (J. Lewy, in: *HUCA* 33 [1962], 45ff., supported by Gurney 234). Cf. P. Garelli, *Les Assyriens en Cappadoce*, Paris 1963, 120, who favours a location south east of Elbistan rather than west of it. J. Macqueen prefers a more north-easterly location, in the area around modern Divriği (The Hittites and their Contemporaries in Asia Minor, London 1975, 21). For other suggestions, see del Monte and Tischler 230.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Orlin 243 n. 73, Singer 128, Bryce 33.

<sup>32</sup> Note Garelli's 6 : 1 ratio of Nešite to Hattian names at Kaneš (op. cit. 127ff.).



relatively weak at the time, if one can accept at face value Anum-hirbi's claim that one of his vassal rulers was attempting to carve out an independent kingdom for himself. If this action can be taken as reflecting a significant degree of instability in the kingdom of Kaneš, then Piṭhana may well have exploited the situation to establish his own rule in the city.

(5) *Consolidation of the kingdom of Kaneš by Piṭhana and Anitta*. This was accomplished by the subjugation of the communities lying south of the Halys—perhaps for the most part those incorporated in the kingdom of Kaneš which may have begun to break up under Waršama. We note also in this context the first attempted intervention by the king of Ḫatti. There is no indication that the authority of the king extended south of the Halys, but it is conceivable that some form of alliance existed between Ḫatti and Kaneš prior to Piṭhana's conquest,<sup>33</sup> and the Ḫattian king's intervention may have been designed to help restore the previous regime to the city. In any case Piyušti (the Ḫattian king) may have seen the establishment of the Kuššaran dynasty in Kaneš as a threat to Ḫattian interests across the Halys, and in fact Piṭhana's and Anitta's empire-building intentions may already have begun to become evident. If Ḫatti had in fact collaborated in the destruction of Kaneš at the end of level II, and the Kuššaran dynasty represented the restoration of a regime similar to that unseated in the destruction of the city, then the reason for Ḫattian intervention at the time of Anitta's conquest would be self evident.

(6) *The revolt against Ḫattuša*. If we can attribute the document dealing with this revolt to the Ib period, I suggest that historically it belongs after the first stage of Anitta's conquests—especially if the reference to Kaneš in the text indicates an appeal by the “rebel communities” to Kaneš for assistance. At this stage the regime at Kaneš was openly hostile to the king of Ḫatti, and had consolidated its position south of the Halys to the extent that it might well have been in the position, and perhaps welcomed the opportunity, to give material assistance to principalities within the Halys basin seeking to break their ties with Ḫattuša. And certainly the document must be dated before the end of the second phase of Anitta's conquests, which resulted in the destruction of Ḫattuša.

(7) *The second attack on Kaneš by the king of Ḫatti*. Conceivably this attack was provoked by some form of intervention by Anitta in the Halys basin—perhaps, as suggested above, Anitta lent support to the rebels against Ḫattuša. We have no clear indication of the strength of Piyušti's support in this final conflict with Anitta, although this support may have been considerably reduced if the Revolt of Ḫattuša text indicates a significant degree of fragmentation within the kingdom. We can infer from lines 38–48 of the Anitta text that Zalpa supported Ḫatti in the conflict, and as suggested above, there may have been a longstanding alliance between the two kingdoms, whether a parity-type alliance or a subject alliance on the part of Zalpa. In any case the conflict ended in a decisive victory for Anitta, the destruction of Ḫattuša, the recovery of the statue of the god Šiu from Zalpa, and the extension of Anitta's authority throughout the Halys basin.

(8) *Final campaigns of Anitta south of the Halys*. These campaigns resulted in the conquest or surrender of the territories which presumably belonged to the

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Singer 130.

kingdoms of Buruṣḫattum and Waḥšušana. As we have noted above, Waḥšušana is not mentioned in the Anitta inscription, and its territory may already have been absorbed within the framework of the kingdom of Buruṣḫattum, or else it had been supplanted by another southern state—perhaps Šalatiwara (as already mentioned), the only state to offer significant resistance to Anitta, and one which apparently acted independently of Buruṣḫattum.

I suggest, then, that the following are the main stages in the political and historical developments that occurred in central Anatolia during the Assyrian Colony period:

(A) 1st phase of the Assyrian Colony period, a relatively stable period, with five major geo-political units, or *mātu*, consisting of a number of communities and principalities focussing on a chief city in each case whose ruler exercises general authority over them. Relations between the *mātu* are generally peaceful, encouraging the establishment of the Assyrian merchant system in the region.

(B) The merchant system promotes closer links between the various units, necessitating the development of more formal relationships through a treaty system, develops a greater consciousness of territorial demarcations, and provides the basis for disputes over territory, the imposition of sanctions by cutting the communication routes, and incentives for the smaller states to establish their independence and to deal with the merchants in their own right.

(C) The end of the first phase: signs of serious unrest and conflict amongst a number of the Anatolian states, resulting (perhaps) in the decline and disappearance of Waḥšušana as a major power in the south and the destruction of Kaneš.

(D) 1st half of the 2nd phase of the Colony period; further evidence of conflict and fragmentation both between and within the various kingdoms and principalities, as illustrated by the Anum-ḫirbi letter and the Revolt against Ḫattuša text.

(E) 2nd half of the 2nd phase of the Colony period: The conquests of Piḫana and Anitta result in an extensive unified political structure encompassing the whole of the Halys basin up to the Black Sea, and the whole region south of the Halys down to Buruṣḫattum, with Kaneš as its focal point. The old geo-political units are either totally broken up (as in the case of Ḫatti) or cease to exist as distinct entities and are placed under the immediate control of local rulers appointed by Anitta.