Šanahuitta and some observations on the Early Period of the Hittite Kingdom

Turgut Yiğit

Ankara

When considering the early phases of the Hittite Kingdom documented by a limited number of texts, one is confronted with many unresolved and disputed issues. These include how the Kingdom was established, which location was meant to be the center, which dynasty played a role in it, who was more effective during the process and the events influencing the establishment of the kingdom: none of which can be precisely explained.

In cuneiform sources Šanahuitta is rarely reflected in roles worthy of note. Before showing how Šanahuitta played a part in documents pertaining to the Old Hittite Period, it is necessary to consider the older records pertaining to the Assyrian Trade Colonies Period where Šanahuitta is mentioned in three different texts. It is generally accepted that the place mentioned in these texts in the form of Šinahuttum, is the Šanahuitta referred to in subsequent cuneiform sources of the Hittite Period. However, there are various views on the identification of Šinuhtu with Šinahuttum cited in texts pertaining to the Assyrian Trade Colonies Period[1].

A fragmentary text from Kültepe reveals the earliest record on the settlement of Šinahuttum, in an essential context[2]. This short text is translated by Larsen as follows[3]: "…of the man of Amkuwa…prince of Šinahuttum, the man of Amkuwa and the man of Kapitra made common cause and they revolted against Hattuša…to the men of Kaniš…".

This text on Šinahuttum of the Assyrian Trade Colonies Period, though short, is the only one offering some data[4]. According to the section quoted above, it can be concluded that Šinahuttum was either a small principality or a city-state with a single administrative center. Amkuwa (Ankuwa), one of the two settlements mentioned in the document, is also a settlement

---

[1] K. Nashef, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der altassyrischen Zeit*. (RGTC 4). Wiesbaden 1991, p. 107; M.T. Larsen, "A Revolt Against Hattusa", *JCS* 24/4 (1972), p. 101.

[2] Both Nashef, RGTC 4, p. 107 and Larsen, *JCS* 24/4, p. 101 reject this; while J. Lewy, "Naram-Sin's Campaign to Anatolia in the Light of the Geographical Data of the Kültepe Texts", *Halil Edhem Hatıra Kıtabı*, vol. I, Ankara 1947, p. 16 and P. Garelli, *Les Assyriens en Cappadoce*. Paris 1963, pp. 123-124 accept this to be true.

[3] Larsen, *JCS* 24/4, p. 100.

[4] KTK 10 (N.B. Jankovskaya, Klinopinsny teksty iz Kjul-Tepe v sobranijach SSSR, No 10, Moscow 1968).

known from the cuneiform texts of the Hittite Period[5]. There are no further sources concerning Kapitra. It can be understood that the three settlements (Amkuwa, Šinahuttum and Kapitra) by uniting their forces were able to resist a much stronger authority[6]. Perhaps they had accepted the authority of another city, a much stronger one, probably bound to Hattuša. They must have decided on such a political and military collaboration in order to revolt against Hattuša. In fact, bearing in mind the political structure of Anatolia at the dawn of the 2nd millennium BC, it was usual that a central authority ruled over a surrounding area comprised of minor settlements[7]. This situation existed in particular in central Anatolia and has been confirmed by archeological findings lists[] written documents.

Because of the form of the name[8]: Hattuša, the document in question evidently pertains to the later phase of the Assyrian Trade Colonies Period. It comes from the Hattuša archive, and appear to be concerned with events relating to the early phase of the Hittite History, parallel to those referred to in the Anitta Text, written in the Hittite language[9]. If the expression "man from Kuššara" were to be inserted in the broken space in the first intelligible line of the fragment, then the brief account of this document from Kültepe could reflect the deed of Anitta from Kuššara (as depicted in the Anitta Text), who led an expedition against Hattuša.

The brief mention in this tablet points to the localization of Šanahuitta, which will be referred to below.

There are two other texts of the Old Assyrian Period containing the name of Šinahuttum. Neither the first text, which is a contract[10], nor the second text provide any information on the city[11]. However, the latter attracts attention because it connects Šinahuttum with the city of Wahšušana[12], which is often referred to in the Assyrian documents[13].

The name Šanahuitta is only found in three texts belonging to the Old Hittite Period. Two of these texts, going back to the time of Hattušili I, are the principal historical sources. They are the Annals of Hattušili I depicting six years of military dealings by the king, and the Testament of Hattušili I which conveys the internal events of the king in question, designating his successor and offering him and his nobles advice. Dating from the same period, an additional text: the

Extensive Annals, also refers to the city of Šanahuitta encompassing an equivalent content to the Annals, though the document in question is rather fragmentary.

Šanahuitta is referred to in the Testament as follows: "...My grandfather had proclaimed his son Labarna (as a heir to the throne) in Šanahuitta. Afterwards his subjects, his great men defied his word, and set Papahdilmah (on the throne). How many years passed, how many (of them) have escaped ..."[14].

The Šanahuitta city is referred to in this document because the Hittite king Hattušili I mentions an act of his grandfather, the king two generations prior. The king's grandfather (the section of the text with the name of this king is missing; according to the royal offering lists[15], he was PU-šarruma) announced his son Labarna as heir to the throne in Šanahuitta. The notables, however, disregarding him, cast their preference for Papahdilmah, his other son, and crowned him king. Later in the text it can be understood that they were punished for this and Labarna ascended the throne.

The other principal historical source, the Annals, refers to the city of Šanahuitta in two separate places[16]. In the Akkadian version the name is "Šahuitta" (KBo X 1 obv. 2) or "Šanahut" (KBo X 1 obv. 23); in the Hittite version "Šanahuitta," as in other documents.

Šanahuitta is mentioned in relation to the first military expedition, in the Hittite version: "[The Great King Tabar]na Hattušili, king of Hatti, man of Kuššara, (says): in the land of Hatti he ruled as king. Son of Tawananna's brother. He went to Šanahuitta and he could not destroy it, (but) destroyed its country. The soldiers in two places, as a garrison I left. I gave whatever sheepfolds were (there) to (my) garrison troops..."[17].

In the Annals this city is subjected to a military campaign and siege also in the fourth year of the king's deeds: "In the next year I went to Šanahuitta to war, and I battled Šanahuitta for five months. And in the sixth month I destroyed it. I the Great King my desire I satisfied..."[18].

What is understood from this text is that Hattušili I, when launched his first expedition to Šanahuitta, was unable to take control of the city, though he had conquered its territories. Later, he carried out a campaign in the west and southeast. The Hurrians took the opportunity to invade the Hittite territory[19]. Undiscouraged, the Hittite king returned to the eastern regions in the fourth year and occupied Šanahuitta after a siege lasting five months. The name Šanahuitta is also found in the Extensive Annals, which deals with some of the events in more detail than the Annals of Hattušili I. However many parts of the text are missing, so it is impossible to get a full

[5] See Nashef, RGTC 4, pp. 9-10; G.F. del Monte – J. Tischler, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte.* (RGTC 6). Wiesbaden 1978, pp. 19-23.

[6] Larsen, *JCS* 24/4, p. 100; K.R. Veenhof, "N.B. Jankovskaya, Klinopinsny teskty iz Kjul-Tepe v sobranijach SSSR (Cuneiform texts from Kültepe in collections in the USSR)...", *BiOr* 27 (1970), p. 367.

[7] K. Balkan, *Mama Kralı Anum-Hirbi'nin Kaniš Kralı Waršama'ya Gönderdiği Mektup.* Ankara 1957, pp. 32-343.

[8] For this see below.

[9] A. Ünal, "Hitit Kenti Ankuwa'nın Tarihçesi ve Lokazisyonu Hakkında", *Belleten* 45/2 (1981), p. 439.

[10] *ICK* 1, 21 A 6, 7, 10, 21 B 3, 12.

[11] *VAT* 13516 rev. x+3.

[12] Nashef, RGTC 4, pp. 133-135.

[13] Lewy, *Halil Edhem Hatıra Kitabı*, p. 15.

[14] KUB I 16 III 41-45 [F. Sommer – A. Falkentstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadisch Bilingue des Hattusilis I* (*Labarna II*). München 1938, pp. 13-15].

[15] KUB XI 7 19. H. Otten, "Die hethitischen 'Königslisten' und die altorientalische Chronologie", *MDOG* 83 (1951), p. 65.

[16] In the Hittite edition: KBo X 2 I 4, 46, and in the Akkadian version: KBo X 1 öy. 2, 23, 24; moreover in the fragment belonging to this text: KUB XXIII 33+XL 6, 5.

[17] KBo X 2 I 1-8.

[18] KBo X 2 I 46-49.

[19] KBo X 2 I 9-45.

conception of the text. As a result of a comparison with the Annals of Hattušili I[20], it is suggested that the section relating the expedition to Šanahuitta must have been in the missing first column[21].

Although limited, the records about Šanahuitta pertaining to the Old Hittite period do reveal that this city had a significant role at the time in question, especially before and after to the existence of the Hittite Kingdom in Central Anatolia. The sources are lacking, however, of the information concerning its location and status within the Hittite Kingdom. Moreover, Šanahuitta does not appear to have an evident role during the New Kingdom.

According to the Annals, the initial campaign against Šanahuitta and its occupation following a later campaign, all indicates Šanahuitta's significance for the Hittite Kingdom. According to the document pertaining to the Assyrian Trade Colonies Period mentioned above[22], the city must be situated near Hattuša, in a region which was part of Hattuša's interests.

Considering the narration of the second campaign, when Šanahuitta was occupied after a five month siege, it would appear that the city was strong and in a fortified position. Having established Hattuša as the center of the kingdom, Šanahuitta belonged to a region politically essential for the Hittite rule. It was referred to in connection with the enthronement in the Testament probably because it was an important city in political and religious terms.

Although Šanahuitta cannot be precisely located[23], the Kültepe tablet and the Annals of Hattušili I show that it could not have been far from Hattuša. According to KTK 10, Amkuwa, Šinahuttum (Šanahuitta) and Kapitra were situated in the same region and had been proclaimed to be under Hattuša's authority. It is unlikely that the authority of Hattuša, a small kingdom at that time, would have extended that far. The reference to the name Kaniš in the text at least ascertains the basic direction in which to look for Šanahuitta from Hattuša (towards Kültepe, Kayseri). Moreover, it must be borne in mind that Amkuwa is generally accepted to be localized in the same direction, in Alişar[24]. What was depicted in Hattušili's I Testament was probably Šanahuitta's significant role prior to the settlement of the Hittite dynasty in Hattuša, not involving any matter controversial on the location of the city.

The evidence of the Testament and that of the Annals considered together facilitate some interpretations. Before Hattuša, which would be the capital city of the Hittite Kingdom for more than four centuries, the name Kuššara was evident in Hittite political history. Not only did the kings, Pithana and Anitta, of the Early Hittite Period originate from Kuššara, but also Hattušili I, who is considered to be the founder of the Hittite Kingdom, and established its center in Hattuša, was linked with Kuššara. The Hittite kings felt a distinctive remembrance of the city of their

forefathers. One can take into account that the grandfather of Hattušili, whilst proclaiming his son Labarna the heir to the throne in Šanahuitta, had his capital in Kuššara, one of the oldest Hittite cities. Probably, that small Hittite kingdom had Kuššara as its center, and Šanahuitta was bound to this kingdom. Having been the stage for that enthronement event, it is possible that it was a politically and religiously significant city or the city chosen to raise the crown prince. Indeed, considering the focal point given to Šanahuitta, it would be fitting to conclude that this city was in the days of the king's grandfather, an administrative center. Pursuing the course of events, it is known that even though Labarna was the proclaimed heir to the throne, after the death of the king's grandfather, Papahdilmah was crowned king by the nobles of the kingdom.

This was, however, short-lived, and finally Labarna regained the throne which was rightfully his. According to his Annals, Hattušili I initially launched a campaign against Šanahuitta and although he could not conquer the city, looted its territories; despite the failure of the first campaign, he persisted and destroyed Šanahuitta. From this persistence it would appear that Hattušili I was motivated by vengeance or the elimination of a political adversary. Hattušili I was among those who had seized Labarna's right to the throne. These adversaries were forced to leave Šanahuitta or Kuššara, if Kuššara had been their base. They must have chosen to settle in Hattuša, a city which in the past had been damned in order to deter any settlement after it was destroyed by king Anitta, who belonged to a Kuššara lineage[25]. However, the censorious tone of the author, *id est* Hattušili I, in the Testament diminishes such a notion.

In the historical documents Hattuša is seen as the center of the Hittite Kingdom, a fact which is also confirmed by archaeological findings. From the texts pertaining to the period of Hattušili I, the founder of the Hittite Kingdom, and from other Hittite documents, it is clear that this king had chosen Hattuša as the center of his kingdom[26]. In fact, aside from the name Labarna, the king had taken the new name Hattušili derived from the name of the city[27]. Even before Hattušili I, Hattuša was inhabited by Hittites and a prior presence of Hittites in the region has to be accepted[28]. In fact, beside what was said on Šanahuitta, the possibility should not be

---

[20] KBo III 46 III 43, 47. A. Kempinski – S. Košak, "CTH 13: The Extensive Annals of Hattusili I (?)", *Tel Aviv* 9/2 (1982), p. 91.

[21] Kempinski – Košak, *Tel Aviv* 9/2, p. 88.

[22] KTK 10. See above notes 3 and 4.

[23] For opinions on this subject see Del Monte – Tischler, RGTC 6, p. 342; G.F. del Monte, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte*. Supplement. (RGTC 6/2). Wiesbaden 1992, p. 137.

[24] See Del Monte – Tischler, RGTC 6, p. 21.

---

[25] T.R. Bryce, "Hattusili and the Problems of the Royal Succession in the Hittite Kingdom", *An.St.* 31 (1981), pp. 14-15; G. Steiner, "Die Zerstörung von Hattusa durch 'Anitta' und seine Wiederbesiedlung durch Hattusili I", *XI. Türk Tarih Kongresi*. Ankara 1994.

[26] Hattuša is quite clearly the focal point of events narrated in the Testament (KUB I 1 II 19, 60, 69, 72). Further, in the Annals, Hattušili I mentions Hattuša as "my city" (KBo X 2 I 44, III 10), and also that the booty was brought to Hattuša (KBo X 2 II 23). It is possible to enhance such examples as these.

[27] Labarna was the name of one of the first kings, who probably laid the initial foundations of the kingdom. It was adopted as a royal name initially by Hattušili and later as a title by the Hittite kings in the form of Tabarna (T.R. Bryce, *The Kingdom of Hittites*. New York 1998, p. 69; R.H. Beal, "The Predecessors of Hattušili I", *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. G. Beckman, R.H. Beal, G. McMahon Ed. Winona Lake, Indiana 2003, p. 25.

[28] According to Beal, *Hittite Studies in Honor of A. Hoffner*, pp. 24-25, Hattuša had not been rebuilt by Hattušili I. The city was instead a previous settlement which functioned as a capital at the time of Hattušili's I grandfather. Beal's approach to the text concerning Zalpa is different from that of this article. He mentions also archaeological findings supporting his thesis.

disregarded that Hattuša had a political constitution in which a king from the Hittite dynasty prior to Hattušili I had taken an active role.

The name of the city of Hattuša in the Assyrian texts of the Trade Colonies Period is given as "Hattuš"[29]. The name of Hattuša in the text from Kültepe mentioned previously, is not the usual form "Hattuš", but "Hattuša", which is that of the Hittite documents[30]. That is to say, it was according to the usage of the Hittites. Because the name of this city appears again as "Hattuša" in a letter from the Mari archives, this is the proof that the Hittites had inhabited Hattuša at the time in question.

KBo III 38[31], a text concerning the relations between Hattuša and Zalpa, tells of three generations of kings (without any reference to their names) as *A-BI A-BI* LUGAL "king's grandfather," *A-BI* LUGAL "king's father" and LUGAL "king." In the lines recounting the struggle of the "king's father" and of the "king" with Zalpa, it can be deduced that Hattuša was the center of their kingdom and they led their actions from there[32]. LUGAL, the "king," was responsible for the redaction of the text. It is still disputed whether this "king" was Muršili I or Hattušili I. However, according to Muršili I's reference to Hattušili I as *A-BI* LUGAL, the "king's father", in some palace chronicles and also in some other documents[33], LUGAL is accepted as Muršili I, *A-BI* LUGAL as Hattušili I and *A-BI A-BI* LUGAL as a person preceeding Hattušili I[34]. While from the text it is clearly seen that the "king" and the "king's father" had maintained their relationship with Zalpa from Hattuša, although the city is not mentioned, it must be accepted that the same situation applied to the "king's grandfather." So, therefore, a predecessor must have reigned before Hattušili I and this was not Labarna I who had reigned before Hattušili I according to the Edict of Telipinu. This is because Labarna I must have belonged to a different branch of the royal family as explained below. Consistent with this, Hattuša, aside from being inhabited by the Hittites before Hattušili I, was already at that time the center of a political structure established by the Hittites.

Hattušili I never gives the name of his father in any of his documents. He does not even clearly state whether his father was king or not. At the beginning of his Annals, he presents himself[35] as the "son of Tawananna's brother"[35], which can be interpreted to mean that his father

was not king. The manner in which he introduced himself might be part of the strategy to present himself as the legitimate king even though he had probably seized power in opposition to the customary law of succession. If his father had been king, he would not have needed such a definition. It seems that Labarna was his predecessor since the introduction of the Edict of Telipinu, giving a summary of Hittite history until the time of this king, begins by recounting the actions of king Labarna[36] and continues with a brief account of Hattušili's deeds. Therefore a Labarna had reigned before Hattušili and this immediately evokes the idea of Labarna being the same Labarna who had been proclaimed heir to the throne by the grandfather of Hattušili I in the city of Šanahuitta. After having been proclaimed heir, Labarna was unable to occupy the place to which he was entitled. As mentioned above, however, it has to be deduced from the Testament that he regained his throne. Those who had supported Papahdilmah were consequently forced to leave the administrative center of the Hittite kingdom together with Papahdilmah, moving to Hattuša. Labarna, conversely, exercised his sovereignty over the territories which belonged traditionally to the Hittite dynasty. Hattušili, a descendent of the supporters of Papahdilmah settled in Hattuša, was the initiator of that movement which created a vast political state in Anatolia with Hattuša as its center. Having seized the power, he must have chosen the other major Hittite kingdom as his main focus for his military expeditions. Šanahuitta was the city which had sheltered the main division inside the Hittite dynasty. The kingdom where the grandfather of Hattušili I was king, must have had Šanahuitta as center, a city in Central Anatolia not far from Hattuša and Kuššara, this last being the city of the Hittite forefathers. Furthermore, Šanahuitta had to be a place easily to defended, and of strategic importance. The conquest of Šanahuitta meant Hattušili could repossess the city of his forefathers and take over the heritage of the former Hittite dynasty. Thus, the king was seen as the successor of Labarna in the Edict of Telipinu. Hattušili I is known to have concurrently borne the name Labarna; therefore, he is recognized in our lists as Labarna II. The king Labarna of the previous generation was Labarna I. Therefore, there were two kings with the name Labarna. This royal lineage, despite being disputed in the early period, continued until the time of the cruciform seal Muršili II, which offer together the names of the great kings and the great queens[37]. In brief, there were two Labarnas in the royal lineage. While Labarna I belonged to the old dynasty, Labarna II, also distinguished as Hattušili because he belonged to the dynastic branch that settled in Hattuša, was the person who deserves to be recognized as the real founder of the state.

The section the Edict of Telipinu reporting the deeds of Labarna I relates that this king conducted military campaigns and sent his children to be administrators in the places he conquered[38]. Then it lists the names of the cities that he conquered as follow: Hupišna (Kybistra/Eregli), Tuwanuwa (Tyana/Kilisehisar), Nenašša (Nanessos in Aksaray), Landa (Larende/Karaman), Zallara (near Tuz Golu?), Purušhanda (Acemhoyuk?), Lušna

---

[29] K. Bittel, "Hattuša" *RlA* 4 (1972-75), p. 162; in addition see E. Bilgiç, "Anadolu'nun İlk Yazılı Kaynaklarındaki Yer Adları ve Yerlerinin Tayini Üzerine İncelemeler", *Belleten* 10 (1946), p. 417 and id., "Die Ortsnamen der 'kappadokischen' Urkunden im Rahmen der alten Sprachen Anatoliens", *AfO* 15 (1945-51), p. 33.

[30] Bittel, *RlA* 4, p. 162; Balkan, *Mektup*, p. 53.

[31] CHT 3.

[32] KBo III 38 obv. 18-28, rev. 20-29. See H. Otten, *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa*. (StBoT 17). Wiesbaden 1973, pp. 8-13.

[33] In KBo III 34 (CTH 8), KBo III 28 (CTH 9), KUB XXXVI 105//VBot 33 (CTH 9) and also in KBo III 44 (CTH 39), a text pertaining to the time of Muršili I, Muršili I refers to Hattušili I as *A-BI* LUGAL.

[34] H.A. Hoffner, "Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Hittites", *Or.* 49 (1980), p. 291; H. Otten also accepts Muršili I as the author of the text (Otten, StBoT 17, p. 62).

[35] KBo X 2 I 1-3.

[36] KBo III 1 I 1-12.

[37] A. Dinçol, B. Dinçol, J. Hawkins, G. Wilhelm, "The 'Cruciform Seal' from Boğazköy-Hattusa", *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 43 (1993), p. 87.

[38] KBo III 1 I 1-12.

(Lystra/Hatunsaray). When focusing on the locations of these cities it can be seen that they were situated in the region south and southwest of the Kizilirmak bend in Central Anatolia, in close proximity to one another but far from Hattuša. This being the situation, the campaigns against these settlements were not initiated from a center such as Hattuša, but had set forth from a place further towards the south or southwest of Hattuša, from Šanahuitta, the place that is supposed to be the center of the kingdom of Labarna I. A text which is declared to be a duty list from the Hattuša archives, since it mentions Šanahuitta together with the three places[39] that Labarna I conquered and where he had appointed his children as administrators as stated in the Edict of Telipinu, supports the established geographical location. This location is concordant with the localization of Šanahuitta as mentioned above. Moreover, the differences between the list of settlements conquered by Labarna I according to the Edict of Telipinu and the places where Hattušili I had launched his military expeditions according to his documents, reinforce the notion that there were two kings with the same name: Labarna I and Labarna II (Hattušili I).

A political process was initiated by the Hittites first from the city of Kuššara and then from Hattuša. During this time it is possible that Šanahuitta had been the center for a short duration. The Hittites under the leadership of Labarna II (Hattušili I) emerged from a group that had chosen a different path due to the struggles within the Hittite dynasty, and therefore, took control of Šanahuitta. This group annexed the other branches of the Hittite dynasty, dominating the territories under their control. It followed an important phase, when Central Anatolia was conquered without any difficulty. In fact, as stated above, none of the cities occupied by Labarna I according to the edict of Telipinu were the objects of the campaigns conducted by Hattušili I.

In general, however, the sites conquered by Labarna I were situated within the territories where Hattušili I conducted military expeditions and then conquered.

---

[39] KUB XXVI 2, rev. 1-4, in the following order: Šanah[uitta], Nenašša, Hupišna, Tuwanuwa (H.G. Güterbock, "The North-Center Area of the Hittite Anatolia", *JNES* 20 [1961], p. 88).