At the beginning of the second millennium BC, certain sites in central Anatolia, such as Aşemhöyük and Kültepe, underwent considerable changes and attracted Assyrian merchants from the southeast. These sites have been excavated for several decades now. They have yielded abundant findings and have allowed us to better understand the environment and material culture of the societies indigenous to the region. The earliest written sources discovered in Anatolia are foreign: they belong to the archives of merchants from Aşşur, who settled at the city of Kaniş in the 19th and 18th centuries BC. Kaniş, whose modern name is Kültepe, is located nearby the modern city of Kayseri. Although these documents record the trade relations between Assyrians and Anatolians, they also indirectly document the political organization of Anatolia and its constituent states. To reconstruct the history of a region based primarily on foreign sources necessarily limits the results: we are restricted to those areas of activity, within which the Assyrian merchants operated, and even within these areas, we get a very partial and fragmentary account of events. For example, the Assyrians never named the rulers of the different city-states that they resided in. Fortunately, the few surviving archives belonging to Anatolians offer a more detailed account.

The period on which this article focuses is several centuries earlier than the founding of the Mittani state; in examining this era we would be hard pressed to learn, from the Anatolian point of view, something about the state’s origins or the circumstances of its rise to power. This study aims instead to paint a picture of the history and organization of Anatolia in the first centuries of the second millennium BC. A synoptic description of the Anatolian region and its resources during this period will permit us to better understand the political and economic organization of the small Anatolian states and to better analyze the different conflicts that set them against one another during the period documented in the Old Assyrian archives. In the kārum of Kaniş, the Assyrians interacted regularly with Anatolians as well as other foreign merchants, including the Hurrians, who would later found the state of Mittani.
1 Anatolia and its resources at the beginning of the second millennium

Hundreds of sites dating to the Bronze Age have been excavated in Anatolia. Nevertheless, only three sites from the Middle Bronze are known by their ancient names: Kültepe, in ancient times called Kaniš, Boğazköy, formerly Hattuša, and Ališar, which seems to have once been known as Amkuwa. Although some sites, like Kültepe, have been excavated for over half a century, there have been, until now, very few attempts at a scholarly synthesis of the findings. Our understanding of material culture, society, and the political organization of sites in Anatolia regularly improves, as does our knowledge of the chronological context of archaeological finds. The development of different sites and their importance was directly linked to their geographic location.

1.1 The Anatolian space

Anatolia consists of a central plateau with clay deposits that was shaped by numerous volcanic formations and lacustrine depressions, bordered to the north and south by mountain ranges. The Asian peninsula of Turkey encompasses several geographic zones, all of which were more or less populated during the Middle Bronze Age in the first half of the second millennium BC.

To the north of the Anatolian plateau, the region bordering the Black Sea, there are large areas covered by woods and rich deposits of copper and silver, especially in the Pontic chain to the east. In this area there are relatively few urban centers that date to the Bronze Age, with the exception of the plain between the Kızılırmak and the Yeşilırmak. In the West, there are also only a few major sites inhabited during this time period (see below).

The Anatolian plateau takes up the major part of the Asian peninsula of Turkey. The Kızılırmak flows through its central part, which was densely populated during the Bronze Age; the river serves as a natural border. The most important sites of the Middle Bronze age were located in the fertile plane nestled along river bends. To the west of the Kızılırmak, the soil is drier and there are fewer inhabited sites. To the southwest, in the irrigated plane of Konya there were also fewer settlements, mainly inhabited by farmers and shepherds. To the southeast of the Kızılırmak, in the plane of Kayseri, Kültepe was the most important among a number of settlements that were occupied during the Middle Bronze age.

The long range of the Taurus Mountains also forms a natural border between the Anatolian plateau and Cilicia to the south, as well as the Arab plateau to the southeast.
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plains of Göksun, Elazığ and Elbistan, irrigated by numerous waterways, contain a concentration of smaller Bronze Age sites; these villages, inhabited by farmers, seem to have been oriented toward the Euphrates rather than toward Central Anatolia. The Assyrian caravans coming from Mesopotamia had to cross the Taurus at one of the few mountain passes, but they also had to travel through very densely forested land. To the southeast of the Taurus, the Euphrates constituted an additional natural border. The cities situated on the other side of the river, although strictly speaking not a part of Anatolia, nevertheless participated in the Assyrian trade network, even though the major commercial exchanges only occurred once the Euphrates had been crossed.

1.2 Transportation in Anatolia

The Anatolian plateau itself did not pose any major problems for the transportation of persons and goods; the areas close to the mountain ranges and rivers, however, were difficult to access and to cross. The waterways, depending on their size, depth, and the rapidity of their currents, were either crossed at a ford or with the help of a ferry or a bridge; one group of texts records the costs of using various river crossings. Guarded toll bridges spanned smaller streams, while travelers who crossed the Euphrates had to use ferries or small boats that were put at their disposal. Travelling through the arid steppes and mountain ranges posed other problems that were potentially dangerous to men, animals and the goods they were transporting, and thus certain precautions had to be taken. Accounts recording the employment of carriers and the renting of beasts of burden indicate that crossing the mountains was costly and difficult. Additional men had to be hired to protect against the bands of thieves that plied their trade in the mountains, stealing from and sometimes killing the passing merchants. The trade agreements concluded between the Anatolian rulers and the Assyrians defined waterways and mountains as dangerous areas. A treaty signed between the Assyrians and the Anatolian authorities of Hahhum, a city on the Euphrates, addresses losses on the river itself, in the surrounding mountains, and anywhere within the lands of the local sovereign. Crossing the Anti-Taurus and Taurus was especially perilous for caravans coming from Aššur.

The Anatolian climate, continental in nature, featured hot and dry summers contrasted with cold winters and heavy drifts of snow until well into springtime. These climatic variations impacted the movement of caravans, imposing a hiatus on long-distance com-
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mmercial activity in winter, as the routes through the mountains became inaccessible due to snow and storms. In fact, allusions to interruptions in travel due to freezing temperatures and closed roads during the cold season are common in the surviving documentation. Even though forests covered much of the Anatolian plateau, merchants were forced to travel through desert-like areas during the dry season and therefore had to choose their itineraries based on sources of water and places where they could re-provision. The journey was divided into several stages, with breaks at inns, where people and animals alike could rest. Caravan accounts included fees for inns, totaling several shekels of silver or tin or several minas of copper; other expenses included fodder and rent for stables for the donkeys as well as lodging and food for the merchants. A salary was sometimes added for the guards. Thus, the regular passage of large caravans played an important role in local economies.

1.3 The resources of the Anatolian states

The Anatolian plateau was largely covered by forests, but a sizable portion of the region consisted of arable land and pastures. Farming and breeding livestock were the principle activities of the small Anatolian states. The past several years have seen an increase in archaeobotanical studies for various excavations of smaller sites in Anatolia, yet such studies are beginning for larger cities like Kültepe and Acemhöyük. Research carried out on the botanical remains at Kaman Kalehöyük, however, reveals the presence of no less than half a dozen varieties of grain. According to the textual evidence, the majority of non-irrigated fields were devoted to the cultivation of barley and wheat. The fields were alternately cultivated and allowed to lay fallow. The many loan contracts that were made out to the Anatolians provide a good documentation of the ancient agricultural calendar. Wheat was sown in autumn (erāsum, “to work” and “to sow”), barley in the spring. Once the grain had ripened (kubur uttítim, from July to October), the grain was harvested with sickles (ṣibit niggallim, esādum “to harvest”), after which it was taken to the threshing floor (adrum). Finally, the grain was sold in sacks at the market, or stored in large jars in the palace warehouses. The Anatolians also cultivated sesame in order to make oil for food, perfume, and light.

In this period, land was owned either by farmers or by palace officials. Parts of the cultivated land were under the direct control of the palace itself. The urban population and the merchants of the kārum, meanwhile, lived on the surplus agricultural goods sold at the markets. This surplus also provided the funds for hiring men and animals for the caravans and paid for their re-provisioning at the roadside inns across the plateau. Certain fields
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were tied to the palace by a service obligation (tuzinnnum) whereas other domains (ubādinnum) were given to high officials by the king. Landowners were required to give a portion of their harvests to the palace as a kind of tax. According to Yakar (1998), the communities that were established on the semi-arid plateau in the area around Kaniş had a largely self-sufficient agricultural economy. Nevertheless, the poorest farmers produced barely enough food for survival; they were often obliged to borrow grain in order to get by until the next harvest. They frequently mortgaged their lands against these debts.

Irrigated farmland was used by both the palace and individual landowners for the cultivation of fruit trees, vegetables, lentils, chickpeas, onions, leeks, aromatic plants, spices and animal fodder (in particular, vetch). Commoners also paid a fee for the use of irrigated water. Olive picking took place in autumn (serdum). To the north of Kaniş, grapes were also cultivated; the harvest took place in September (qitip kerānim).

Sheep and goat were allowed to graze the steppe and fallow fields. These herds were usually owned by the palace and were raised for meat, fat, milk, and wool. The sheep were plucked in the spring and the palace sold their wool in large quantities to the Assyrian merchants, who played the role of intermediaries in its trade; the wool produced at Mamma and Luhusaddia was particularly valued. The palace also raised mules, horses, oxen and dogs. Excavations of the kitchens at the palace of Açemhöyük have revealed the remains of sheep and goats, but also of oxen and pigs. Commoners, meanwhile, often raised a few sheep and pigs in their backyards.

It was not, however, Anatolia’s agricultural production that attracted the Assyrian merchants but rather its richness in minerals. The Anatolians possessed great quantities of copper, but they depended on Assyrian imports for the supply of tin, which was used to produce the highly valued bronze. The Assyrians, meanwhile, purchased gold and silver from the Anatolians to take home with them. Silver was extracted in the Taurus Mountains in the region to the south of Niğde; it was also imported from the west, and the city of Buruşhattum was one of its major markets. Along with copper, silver was one of the principal forms of payment for small expenditures. One part of the silver acquired by the Assyrians was converted to gold at a rate of six to eight shekels of silver for one shekel of gold. The gold came from the west and southwest of Anatolia, as well as from the mountains to the northeast of Malatya.
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Anatolia was a major producer of copper; the most heavily exploited mines could be found along the coast of the Black Sea and in the region of Ergani. Durhumit was the principal market for copper. Copper was a cheap metal, and it served as a currency for the purchase of common goods. When it was alloyed with the tin that was imported by the Assyrians it was used to manufacture bronze. The Assyrians purchased copper at Durhumit, refined it and traded it for silver at the markets in Buruṣhattum, Wahšušana and Kaniš. Bronze was used for the manufacture of tools, weapons, plateware and many other objects. Metallurgical workshops discovered at Kültepe contained many moulds for bronze tools, weapons and ingots.

2 The Anatolian states: organization and relations

The textual record offers little information about the political structure, size, and economic importance of the different Anatolian centers. The rare allusions to the political sphere principally concern the Anatolian elite – for the most part, princes and palace officials involved in negotiations with the Assyrians. We can also glean information from the sources regarding events that interrupted trade activities, such as conflicts, rebellions, or the absence of the ruler. The latter could be either due to the king being on a journey or the throne being vacant. The growing number of publications of tablets from Kaniš in the last two decades has made it increasingly possible to reconstruct more and more fragments of Anatolian history. We must nevertheless recall that the surviving sources are primarily Assyrian and therefore only concern the regions within Anatolia that were visited by the Assyrian merchants.

2.1 The zone of Assyrian activity in Asia Minor

At the beginning of the second millennium BC, a dozen or so localities in central Anatolia underwent a process of rapid development: they were generally situated along the principal axes of circulation, and included Kültepe, Açemhöyük, Karahöyük Konya and Boğazköy. Built on the ruins of Early Bronze Age settlements, these sites were fortified and now included an upper part with a palace and temples – signalling the development of monumental architecture. The evolution of these cities seems to have been accompanied by profound political, economic and social changes. Indeed, it is at this moment that they – having pre-
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viously been nothing more than the capitals of very small territorial states – began to attract the interest of Assyrian merchants, who established themselves in *kārum* (or *wabartum*), located in the lower part of the cities.²⁹

The sites in the heartland of the Anatolian plateau are the main sources for our knowledge of Anatolian chronology: they have furnished us with a highly precise stratigraphy as well as numerous texts, seals and seal impressions. The Assyrians chose the site at Kültepe as the center of their commercial operations in Asia Minor, which explains the more than 17,000 cuneiform texts discovered there over the last sixty years. Most of them were excavated in the lower city, which included living quarters for both Anatolian and Assyrian merchants, the central office of the *kārum* (*bēt kārim*, which has yet to be excavated), and a sanctuary for the god Aššur. The citadel site reveals 18 strata of human occupation, ranging from the Early Bronze Age to the Roman period (levels 10–6 correspond to the Middle Bronze Age); the lower city’s stratigraphy only covers the Middle Bronze Age (IV-I). Levels IV and III, which date to the end of the third millennium BC and cover a considerable surface area, have not furnished us with any written sources. Level II, which corresponds to the principal phase of Assyrian settlement in the area, was used from the last decades of the 20th century BC until 1835 BC. Most of the archives that have been excavated thus far date to this period. The texts allow us to estimate that approximately 500 Assyrians lived in the lower city. The quarter partially burned down but it does not seem to have been abandoned, as level Ib shows signs of occupation two or three years after the end of level II.³⁰ This second period of Assyrian inhabitation lasted until the end of the 18th century. Trade with Assyria slowed down during this period, and the written sources exhibit few different sign forms and spellings.³¹ The merchant quarters in Alişar (Amkuwa) and Boğazköy (Hattuš), which have each yielded less than one hundred tablets in excavations, are contemporaneous with the level Ib at Kaniš.³² Level Ia of Kaniš, meanwhile, corresponds to a phase of Assyrian withdrawal; no written documents have been unearthed from this period, although the discovery of ceramics imported from Syria testifies to the ongoing exchanges occurring at this time between Anatolia and Upper Mesopotamia.³³

The trade documented in the detailed archives of the merchants at Kaniš dealt mostly with metals and textiles – neither of which has left much of a trace in the archaeological record. On the other hand, the rich findings of furniture discovered at Kaniš and other sites on the Anatolian plateau gives us an excellent idea of the material culture of the Bronze Age in the region. Ceramics, seals, and impressions of seals allow us to delimit the areas, in which the Assyrian merchants were active. This area can be specifically defined by the toponyms mentioned in the Assyrian archives. For example, to the Southwest, the site of Karahöyük
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Konya produced a considerable number of seal impressions showing that this site was part of the trade network that was initiated by the Assyrians. According to the texts, Burušhattum and Šaladuwar were the two most western cities in the Assyrian trade network. Burušhattum can no longer be identified with Açemhöyük, but Karahöyük Konya is a possible candidate for its modern location, although Barjamovic (2011) situates it further to the west. Šaladuwar was probably situated to the northwest of the Salt Lake, perhaps in the bend formed by the Sakarya Nehri. Wahšušana and Nenašša were also located to the West of Kızılırmak. The cities of Ulama and Ušša, which were situated in the southern part of the plateau, also belonged to the trade network. To the north, the Assyrians traveled as far as Zalpa (Zalpuwa), close to the Black Sea. In the southeast, we assume that they never went further than Hahhum (Samsat), a city on the Euphrates, because the city of Karkemiš is not mentioned in the texts.

2.2 The political organization of Anatolia

At the beginning of the second millennium BC, central Anatolia was divided into multiple political centers, ranging in size from small, fortified city-states to true territorial states with a capital and surrounding villages. The archives of Kaniš mention about 500 toponyms. Unfortunately, their importance remains obscure in most cases. The Assyrians doubtlessly took up residence in the largest and most economically developed of the cities. The economic resources of these states varied considerably depending upon their geographic location: certain regions played a crucial role in the silver trade (Burušhattum to the west), others in the copper trade (Durhumit to the north) and still others in wool (Mamma and Luhusaddia to the south).

The Assyrian terminology for Anatolian political entities is not at all precise. The term mātum, “country”, logically refers to the territory of a city-state. But certain Assyrian marriage contracts make a distinction between ālum, “the City” (meaning Aššur), and mātum, “the Country”, which corresponds in this case to Central Anatolia. The archives dating to Level II of the kārum at Kaniš (19th century BC) mention the territories of Burušhattum, Kaniš, Luhusaddia, Wahšušana and Zalpa to the north. The region situated along the interior of the Kızılırmak bend – the “Hattum” – contained several important cities, including Amkuwa, Hattuš, Tawinia, and Tuhpia. A marriage contract summarizing the area of activity for one Assyrian merchant references Kaniš, Burušhattum and the Hattum.
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The Assyrians first established themselves in Kaniš, the capital of a territorial state, which became their administrative center for the entire period. There were about ten villages belonging to the kingdom of Kaniš (including Dadasun, Hailawakuwa, Meliliya, Tālahšušara, Tātaša, Tiwara and Utiša). Next, the Assyrians slowly settled the region between Upper Mesopotamia and Anatolia, and they created kārums in the cities of Eluhut, Nihria, Hahhum, Uršu, Southern Zalpa, Timilkia, Tegarama, and Šalahšuwa. Then they expanded their zone of activity towards the north (Hattuš, Šimala, Šinahutum, Tawinia, Tišmurna, Tuhpia, Durhumit, Šamuhā), and to the west (Wahšušana and Šaladuwar) and towards the southwest (Nenašša, Burušhattum). They also established themselves in about fifteen wabartums – a trading post under the authority of the nearest kārum – at Amkuwa, Hanaknak, Hurrama, Karahna, Kuburnat, Kuššara, Mamma, Šamuhā, Šupplulīlia, Ulama, Upē, Ušša, Wašhania, Northern Zalpa and Zimishuna. During the period of the kārum II, the Assyrians settled in more than forty localities.

In the next phase, which corresponds to level Ib of the kārum at Kaniš (18th century BC), some states increased in size and importance, while others disappeared entirely from the Assyrian zone of activity. Kaniš was among the largest with more than twenty villages in its territory, as recorded in a list of palace personnel discovered in the remains of the citadel. The kingdom of Mamma also seems to have had vassals, according to a letter sent by its king. Burušhattum in the west disappeared entirely from the documentation in this period, while Wahšušana became insignificant. The number of cities with an Assyrian merchant “colony” also diminished: the texts mention only ten kārums (Durhumit, Eluhhut, Kaniš, Kuburnat, Šaladuwar, Šupplulīlia, Tawinia, Tegarama, Wahšušana and Wašhania) and five wabartums (Amkuwa, Hurrama, Mamma, Šamuhā, Timilkia).

In spite of all this information, it is impossible to delineate the frontiers of the kingdom of Kaniš or its neighbors. The territory of Kaniš bordered to the southeast the territories of Luhusaddia, Hurrama, and Šalahšuwa. Contracts for the sale of slaves seem to suggest that the major political frontier was the Euphrates.

2.3 The internal political organization of Anatolian states: the example of Kaniš

Each city-state was ruled by a dynasty. The rulers were alternately called rubāʿum, “prince”, and rubātum, “princess”, but were also often known just by a nisba (“Man of GN”: Hattušaša, Nenaššaša, Wahšušanaša, Timilkiaša and Tīpurziaša). The Akkadian term
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šarrum “king” was used in the plural as šarrānum during the kārum Ib to designate petty kings, vassals of the princes of Mamma and Kaniš. The Sumerian equivalent, LUGAL, was used for the term rubā’um in the expression LUGAL GAL, meaning “Great Prince” (the equivalent of rubā’um rabi’um). Certain kingdoms were governed by a princely couple, others by a princess ruling alone. In these latter cases, we are not certain whether the woman in question was a widow or the daughter of a ruler who died without a male heir.

In the kārum II period, we know of fifteen Anatolian states that were governed by a “prince”: Amkuwa, Burušhattum, Durhumit, Hattuš, Hurrama, Kaniš, Kuburnat, Luhusaddia, Mamma, Nenašša, Šinahutum, Tawinia, Timilkia, Tuhipa, Wahšusšana, Wašhania. At Burušhattum, the local ruler was sometimes called “Great Prince”, rubā’um rabi’um and must have had vassals.

Anatolian legal documents in the kārum Ib period give the name of a local ruler and of his rabi simmiltim (literally “chief of the stairs”), a title which sometimes corresponds to that of crown prince. Coming from Kaniš, these sources are primarily concerned with the local dynasty (see below). Princes are also referenced at other Anatolian sites – at Amkuwa, Kaniš, Luhusaddia, Mamma, Šalahšuwa and Tawinia – but we do not know their names.

The ruler exercised power from his palace. It was the center of the Anatolian administration and housed many hundreds of people, including high officials in charge of different sectors, workers, and artisans. The building called the “palace of Waršama”, dating from layer Ib at Kaniš, occupied more than a hectare. Old Assyrian sources dating to the level II period mention palaces at fifteen different locations; in the following period, only the palace at Šalahšuwa is mentioned. The fifty surviving titles we have for Anatolian officials (generally constructed on the principle of rabi+substantive) suggest a sophisticated administration that oversaw every sector of the palace economy. However, we know little about the activities of individual officials. The known titles are Assyrian translations of Anatolian terms, and they sometimes cause confusion. At the top of the hierarchy was the rabi simmiltim; below him were the rabi sikkatim, who had commercial and military responsibilities (he supervised the “chief of the troops”, rabi ummanātim), and the rabi hursātim, “chief of warehouses”, who was in charge of the palace storage units. The responsibilities of the “second man”, the šinašhilum, are unclear, as are those of the “steward” (alahhinnum), especially as it appears to be possible for one person to hold both offices. These two terms, borrowed from Hurrian, are attested in other Akkadian texts; they also appear in the abstract form in the Old Assyrian corpus (alahhinnuttum, šinahiluttum). The “majordomo”, rabi bētim,
supervised the palace domain, while the “chief of the gates”, *rabi abullātim*, along with the “chief of the porters”, *rabi ūtuʾē*, oversaw the palace entrances, undoubtedly assisted by the guards under the authority of the “chief of the guards”, *rabi maṣṣarātim*.

Among the prince’s intimates were the “chief scepter-bearer”, *rabi ḥattīm*, the “chief cup-bearer”, *rabi šāqē*, and the “chief of the tables” *rabi paššūrē*. The prince’s private staff perhaps also included the “chief vizier”, *rabi šukkallīm*, the “chief of the heralds”, *rabi nāgirē*, the “chief of the messengers”, *rabi lāsimē*, and the “chief of the interpreters”, *rabi targaṃannē*.

The “men”, *awīle*, the “workers”, *sābē*, and the “slaves”, *urde*, were overseen by three different officials. The artisans, under the overall direction of the “chief of the workers”, *rabi sābē/sābīm*, were further separated into different trades, each supervised by another chief, such as the “chief of the metalworkers”, *rabi nappaḥē*, who worked closely with the “chief of the arms”, *rabi kakke*, himself answerable to the *rabi sikkatīm*. In the agricultural sector, we find the “chief of the barley”, *rabi šeʾē*, the “chief of the threshing floor”, *rabi adrim*, the “chief of the gardens”, *rabi kirātim*, and the “chief of the gardeners”, *rabi nuk(i)ribē*. Other officials were given charge of a single sector of production, like the “chief of the vegetables”, *rabi ěrqē*, the “chief of the wine”, *rabi kirānim*, the “chief of the flax”, *rabi kittātim*, and the “chief of the oil”, *rabi šamnim*, who was charged with collecting (sesame?) oil and distributing it throughout the palace. The “chief of the wood”, *rabi esse*, was probably responsible for supplying the palace and its kitchens with firewood. The officials who oversaw the palace flocks were given titles reflecting the animals they were charged with supervising: the “chief of the horses”, *rabi sisē*, the “chief of the mules”, *rabi perdim*, the “chief of the dogs”, *rabi kalbaṭīm*. One Peruwa, apparently “chief of the shepherds”, *rabi rēʾē/rēʾīm*, whose records were unearthed during the earliest excavations at Kültepe, accumulated enough wealth to purchase an entire village. The goods produced by the palace lands were doubtlessly sold under the authority of the “chief of the market”, *rabi mahīrim*. In the religious domain, finally, the prince had at his disposition the “chief of the oblates”, *rabi šariqē*, and the “chief of offerings”, *rabi niqē*. The palaces of Anatolia were clearly economic centers, and had many dealings with foreign merchants.

Aside from palace officials and artisans the Anatolian population was essentially rural, free but poor (*hupšum*). The farmers cultivated just enough to support the needs of their family, and the majority of the land belonged to the urban elite and to the palace. The prince often bestowed land or even entire villages on palace officials, either as gifts that they were then free to resell, or as compensation for services rendered. The service due to the king or to a high official – called *arḥālum*, and mentioned only in the archives at Kanis ˇ – was required only if someone lived in the “household of the king”; if the person left the household (because of a divorce, for example), he became exempt from service.51 Among the kinds of service that counted for the *arḥālum* was the corvée (*unušsum*), principally docu-
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mented during the *kārum* Ib and whose name, Hurrian in origin, also appears in the second half of the second millennium at Alalakh IV and at Ugarit (as *beľu* *unuššim*). In one surviving trade agreement, the ruler of Kaniš promises not to disturb the Assyrians while taking a census of the people bound to the *unuššum* service.

It was not unusual that individuals entered into slavery in order to pay off a debt, either sold by a relative or by themselves; they could buy their freedom back after a certain amount of time had passed. The amount of time that had to pass was agreed upon when the person was sold into debt slavery, and usually they had to pay at least double the price of their original debt. The sale of Anatolian slaves was supervised by the reigning prince or by one of his representatives.

The texts offer little information on the priesthood, and we have no understanding of the organization of the temples. The only temples mentioned are those to Anna and Nipas. The patron deity of Kaniš seems to have been Anna (*ilat ālim*) and the texts give other names to the deities revered by the inhabitants of the city-state: Hikiša, Ilalianta, Kubabat, the Lord of the Battle (*Bēl qablim*), Nisaba (Halki), Pirwa, the storm god, and the sun god. We also know the names of a certain number of priests, either because they appear in commercial transactions, or because they were landowners, but we know nothing of their activities in the religious cult.

### 2.4 Foundations for a political history of Anatolia

Giving a continuous account of the political history of Anatolia during the *kārum* periods would be impossible at this stage; in fact, the information given by the Assyrian archives on local political events is brief and undated. During the level II at Kaniš (ca. 1950–1835 BC), the Anatolian city-states, whether powerful or weak, were sometimes allies and sometimes rivals; their urban centers were all fortified, suggesting repeated conflict. Each city-state secured trade agreements with the Assyrians independently of the others. The absence of a strong central power in Anatolia undoubtedly helped the commercial activities of the Assyrians, whose business in turn guaranteed a certain degree of intra-Anatolian stability by unifying the local trade in copper and wool. The peace guaranteed by the commercial treaties reflected an ideal situation, not necessarily the reality: the correspondence of merchants testifies to various internal political problems, including unrest following the death of a prince, rebellions of various kinds, and the forming of coalitions and conflicts between the Anatolian states. A vacant throne or political instability within a city-state often
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brought caravan traffic to a halt, or even caused the city to be closed to foreigners.\(^{57}\) The absence of a local sovereign during a military expedition could plunge the state into anarchy;\(^{58}\) similarly, the belligerent behavior of a ruler could disrupt trade in the region: “the king has shed blood and his throne is no longer secure. The treaties are postponed. The princes are watching one another.”\(^{59}\) Certain texts refer to the oaths (\textit{mamı¯tum}) sworn by different sovereigns so as to form an alliance, like that between Wahšušana and Kaniš;\(^{60}\) but the references to conflicts between Anatolian states are more frequent, as Assyrian merchants were sometimes unwillingly involved. Aššur-taklāku, whose archives were excavated in 1993, seems to have been taken hostage in the war between Tawinia and Wašhania.\(^{61}\) The movements of kings are also mentioned in the archives whenever they cause the caravan routes to be closed to commercial traffic;\(^{62}\) these royal journeys reflected diplomatic relations between certain Anatolian princes.

The period of the \textit{kārum} II was marked by an ongoing war to the west between the cities of Burušhattum and Wahšušana, a conflict in which Šaladuwar was involved several times: “Invade the land of Wahšušana! Otherwise, I am your enemy.”\(^{63}\) And again: “until the \textit{rabi sikkatim} makes the princes of Burušhattum, Ušunalam, and Wahšušana swear an oath, he must not visit (these places)”.\(^{64}\) The battle turned in favor of the city-state of Burušhattum, the main market for silver, which took on importance at the end of the \textit{kārum} II, during which the Assyrian community abandoned the city of Wašhšušana.\(^{65}\) In the same period (or perhaps at the beginning of the \textit{kārum} I\(_b\)), the princes of Šinahutum, Amkuwa and Kapitra joined in an alliance against the king of Hattuš.\(^{66}\)

The information at our disposal for the period of the \textit{kārum} I\(_b\) in Kaniš (ca. 1830–1700) changes as the sources are of lesser quality and of a very different nature. References to relations between the principalities become rarer, and the majority of references to the local princes themselves come from Anatolian contracts notorized by the local sovereign and by the \textit{rabi simmiltim}; \textit{kārum} I\(_b\) has also yielded several trade agreements. Hurmelî, Harpatiwa, Inar and his son Warša/uma, Pithana and his son Anitta, and Zuzzu succeeded to the throne of Kaniš during the 18th century BC.\(^{67}\) In a letter addressed to Waršama, prince of Kaniš, Anum-hirbe, Hurrian prince of Mamma, recounts the invasion of his kingdom and the plundering of his villages by a vassal of the ruler of Kaniš; he also refers to the long
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\(^{65}\) Barjamovic et al. 2012; Veenhof, in print.  
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The siege of Harsamna carried out by his father, Inar.\textsuperscript{68} The same conflict may have been referenced in an unpublished letter sent to the \textit{kārum} at Kaniš by the assembly of Aššur: it gives an account of a war between Harsamna and Zalpa, just after the death of Šamši-Adad and the ascension of Išme-Dagan to the throne.\textsuperscript{69} The reigns of Pithana and Anitta are documented by the Anitta text, a later Hittite document, which recounts how Pithana, king of Kuššara, conquered Kaniš and dethroned its king.\textsuperscript{70} Anitta succeeded his father to the throne of Kaniš and enjoyed great success on the battlefield: he bestowed upon himself the title of Great Prince (\textit{rubā’um rabium}). He destroyed Hattuš around 1730\textsuperscript{71} and occupied the palace of Waršama, which he had not destroyed. As the new king of Kaniš he ordered the construction of two temples. Zuzu, king of Alahzina, the latest of the conquerors of Kaniš, is the last known ruler (Great Prince) of Kaniš; he probably reigned from about 1725 until the last years of the 18th century.\textsuperscript{72} The rivalries between Anatolian states seem to have been the cause of the end of the \textit{kārum} Ib: several kingdoms disappeared entirely and are no longer documented during the Hittite period.

3 The population of the trading posts in Anatolia

The main motivation for the presence of the Assyrians in Asia Minor was above all related to trade and was based on the treaties ratified by local authorities; other merchants, coming from Syria and Upper Mesopotamia, also frequented the Anatolian trading posts. At Kaniš, the relations between foreign merchants (especially Assyrian) and the Anatolians went beyond just the exchange of trade-goods; interactions between the two communities are visible in the material culture, the language and the writing. Mixed marriages became common and a hybrid society developed within the lower city.\textsuperscript{73}

3.1 The Assyrians

The Assyrians living in the lower city quarters were administratively and legally independent from the local authorities. Yet they were connected to the government of Aššur via the \textit{kārum} at Kaniš. Interactions with local authorities were determined by the treaties signed by the representatives of the \textit{kārum} and the local prince; these agreements recognized the mutual and complementary interests of the two parties and guaranteed peaceful coexist-

\textsuperscript{68} Balkan 1957; Miller 2001.
\textsuperscript{69} Günbatti 2005.
\textsuperscript{70} Waršama, ca. 1750; Carruba 2003; Barjamovic et al. 2012.
\textsuperscript{71} Kryszat 2008c.
\textsuperscript{72} Kt j/k 625 and Kt 89/k 625; ca. 1716 according to Barjamovic et al. 2012.
\textsuperscript{73} Michel 2010.
ence between them. The Anatolian palace collected an import duty on merchandise and
had preemptive purchasing rights to textiles; in exchange, the Assyrians were permitted to
reside within the kārum and were accorded certain protections. Similarly, their caravans,
men, animals and merchandise were protected along guarded routes.\textsuperscript{74} The first Assyrians
to settle at Kaniš, usually the eldest sons of trading families, came to Anatolia to represent
their family firms. They did not necessarily come from the wealthiest classes of Aššur, but,
being generally richer than the indigenous population, they quickly became the major
creditors in Anatolia. Many of them had houses in the kārum; others lived temporarily in
the homes of other Assyrians, sometimes leaving their archives there.\textsuperscript{75}

Two treaties dating from the kārum Ib have been discovered at Kaniš in recent years:
one was negotiated with the Great Prince of Kaniš (either Anitta or Zuzu) and the other
with dignitaries from Hahhum.\textsuperscript{76} They guaranteed that caravan traffic would continue
even during times of conflict, and depict a situation slightly different from that of the
kārum II. The texts thenceforth distinguish Assyrians who resided in the kārum (wašbū-
tum) from those involved in the caravan trade with Aššur (ālikūšša harrān ālim).\textsuperscript{77} The
former, who were completely invested in intra-Anatolian trade, seem to have been less
prosperous, and often in debt. Individual clauses in the treaties therefore protected Assy-
rian households with tamkārum or widows from seizure of property by Kanišites, hapīrū, or
the local prince.\textsuperscript{78}

3.2 The “Anatolians”

In the lower city, the Assyrians dealt with many different ethnic groups whom they invari-
ably designated with the generic term nu’a’um, meaning “Anatolian”. For the Assyrians,
this term was not pejorative; the Anatolians, meanwhile, designated the Assyrians by the
word tamkārum, which signifies “the merchant”.\textsuperscript{79} The Anatolians in Kaniš lived either in
the citadel or in the lower city; those who lived in the latter were often merchants. Many of
them bore personal names with either a Hittite or Luwian etymology; certain others had
names of Hattic origin – an agglutinative language which does not belong to any known
linguistic family but which seems to have been influenced by Luwian.\textsuperscript{80} The Hittites and
Luwians, both Indo-European populations, seem to have arrived in central Anatolia during
the last centuries of the third millennium. Hittite became the dominant language in central
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\textsuperscript{75} Michel – Garelli 1997, 27–34.
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\textsuperscript{80} Garelli 1963, 127–168; Dercksen 2002; Goedegebuure 2008.
Anatolia from about the 19th century forward; the majority of linguistic borrowings discovered in the Old Assyrian archives are taken from an early form of Hittite.81

The archives discovered in certain houses in the kārum in Kaniš show a concentration of houses belonging to the Assyrians in the north and more houses belonging to the Anatolians in the south, but the separation between the communities was not so clear. Assyrians and Anatolians interacted on a daily basis and the use of different languages does not seem to have been an obstacle to communication, a fact confirmed by the numerous “native” words to be found in Old Assyrian texts. The interpreters (targumannum) were not numerous and seem to have been principally employed by the government administration to maintain commercial and diplomatic relations between local palaces and the kārum offices. It is possible that these translators may have offered their services to other foreign merchants doing business in Kaniš.

3.3 The Hurrians and other foreigners in Anatolia

The archives taken from Kaniš mention other groups of foreigners, designated by the languages they speak: certain personal names have an Amorite or Hurrian etymology, and certain individuals are identified as natives of foreign places, such as Ebla, indicating that there were close commercial contacts between the Anatolian plateau and northern Syria.82 The laws of the city of Aššur prohibited Assyrians from selling gold to the different groups they traded with at Aššur (except to the Elamites) or on the road to Asia Minor, including the Akkadians (meaning Babylonians) to the south of Aššur with whom they traded goods; the Amorites, whose territories they crossed where the Euphrates curves to the west, at the Upper Jazirah (where the village of Nihriya, among others, is located); and the Subareans (or Hurrians), who lived to the north of Aššur along the Tigris and in the mountains of Upper Mesopotamia.83 The gods of Amurru and Subartu are invoked in a treaty ratified between Aššur and Apum.84

During kārum Ib period (18th century), the Hurrians, who several centuries later would found the kingdom of Mittani, progressively settled west of the Euphrates, south of the Anti-Taurus, and east of Anatolia.85 Although tablets dating from the kārum II at Kaniš contain words of Hurrian origin86 as well as cloth produced in Hurrian territory or woven in the Hurrian style,87 the majority of Hurrian personal names mentioned in the Old Assyrian

81 Dercksen 2007.
83 Michel 2001, no. 2.
85 Veenhof 2008c; Wilhelm 2008; Michel 2012.
86 Dercksen 2007.
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archives appear in texts dating from the kaṟum Ib. This is the case, for example, with two letters addressed to a Hurrian named Unapše, who had temporarily or definitively settled in Kaniš. In the first of these letters, Ehli-Addu, writing from western Syria, reclaims the reimbursement of a debt left unpaid for two decades; he mentions witnesses in the city of Haššum, quite certainly located in the region of Gaziantep. In the second letter, Abduata asks Unapše to send a tablet containing a proposition about a sale of textiles to a scribe who understands and reads Hurrian. In both cases, these letters have no connection to other documents in the archive. Two other documents excavated in 1990 contain foreign names, mostly Hurrian. The arbitration Kt 90/k 358+359, dating presumably to the kaṟum Ib period and concerning commercial affairs that took place in part at Buruşhattum, involved one Urumum and the Hurrian Dakip-šarri. The letter Kt 90/k 360 was addressed to five persons bearing Amorite and Hurrian names: G/Kalali, whose official title, halsušlu, was Hurrian, the Amorite Zimri-Addu, or Hašip-Teššup, a Hurrian personal name that is mentioned in the archives of Shemshara, and later in those of Nuzi. The foreign syllabary and composition of this letter, which recalls festive days spent by the author in the company of the ruler of Kaniš, suggests that it was sent from somewhere along the Upper Tigris or east of the river. These various documents indicate that during the kaṟum Ib, new populations took an interest in trade with Anatolia. Finally, the best known Hurrian, who moved into Anatolia in the 18th century BC, is the ruler of Mamma, Anum-hirbe, who was the author of a letter sent to his counterpart at Kaniš.

3.4 Relations between different ethnic groups

At Kaniš, the Assyrians settled in the lower city; they purchased houses built in the local style and used the pottery produced by local craftspeople for their everyday needs. Nevertheless, certain traces bear witness to their foreign origins. Artifacts discovered in their tombs and houses indicate cultural practices that were typical for the Assyrians. Although they were immersed in a cultural and linguistic environment that was very different from their own, the Assyrians adapted their vocabulary to the local realities. The Old Assyrian tablets include numerous loanwords, not only from an early version of Hittite spoken at Kaniš, but also from Hurrian. Unfortunately, the documentation is very vague when it
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comes to information on the integration of other foreigners into the culture of the lower city at Kaniš; for example, written documents mentioning the Hurrians, whose presence is particularly well attested during the kārum Ib, are still too few to allow for any major conclusions.

The Anatolians, meanwhile, adopted the system of syllabic writing used by the Assyrians but did not attempt to apply it to their own language; they preserved the Old Assyrian dialect, which had become the language of diplomacy. It is well known that Anatolian scribes in the major urban centers wrote contracts that contained certain grammatical errors, for example, confusing grammatical genders, clearly indicating the different linguistic environments.96 Furthermore, some of the houses, in which archives were found, belonged to indigenous Anatolians. The Anatolians, who traditionally used stamp seals, began using the cylinder seal under the influence of the Assyrians and developed a local style that borrowed elements from Old Babylonian, Old Assyrian and Old Syrian styles, all of which had arrived through trade.97

At first the Anatolians acted as clients of the Assyrians: they purchased Assyrian merchandise, paid directly or with credit, and those who did not belong to the elite often appeared in the records as debtors to the Assyrians, owing small sums of silver, copper, or sacks of grain. Some Anatolians, however, entered into real trade partnerships with the Assyrians: they were entrusted with merchandise, lending capital and selling slaves. During their lengthy residency in Anatolia, certain Assyrians, already married at Aššur, got married for a second time to Anatolian women.98 Others settled in Kaniš with their families; Assyrian widows took Anatolian men as second husbands. The Assyrian population of Kaniš decreased perceptibly during the second half of the 18th century (at the end of the kārum II); nevertheless, long-distance trade continued with Aššur. According to the royal archives at Mari, in the 18th century BC (during the kārum Ib), great trade caravans still traveled between Aššur and Kaniš, and this trade remained profitable both for investors in Aššur and Assyrians in Kaniš, who had accounts at the local trading post. Many Assyrian merchants gradually climbed upwards on the social scale, while other Assyrian merchants got more and more involved in the local trade in copper and wool, lost contact with their compatriots in Aššur, and at times became impoverished. Specific clauses included in the treaties dating from the kārum Ib make some attempts at protecting these Assyrians, who were cut-off from their homeland and increasingly immersed in a hybrid Assyrio-Anatolian community.99
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The Old Assyrian archives excavated at Kaniš, Amkuwa and Hattuš allow us to reconstruct some aspects of the political, economic and social history of Anatolia in the first centuries of the second millennium BC. The presence of the Assyrians in Central Anatolia was primarily economic and not political. They were the most numerous and best organized foreigners in the Anatolian trading posts, especially at Kaniš, where they did business with other merchants from southwestern Turkey, from northern Syria and from Upper Mesopotamia. Among the Upper Mesopotamians, individuals bearing Hurrian names, although rare during the kārum II, seem to have become well established in eastern Anatolia during the kārum Ib. Their arrival in Anatolia from Upper Mesopotamia, where certain Hurrian rulers reigned (in, for example, the state of Idamaras¹⁰⁰), seems to have coincided with the reign of Šamši-Adad.¹⁰¹ Letters found at Kaniš, most probably dating to the kārum Ib, which contain an unusual syllabary as well as Hurrian expressions and personal names, show the increasing interest the Hurrians had for Anatolia, where certain Hurrian speakers had taken power.¹⁰² In any case, the documentation of the Hurrian presence in Anatolia in the 18th century BC remains limited: only 2% of the discovered documents at Kaniš date from the kārum Ib period, and they are for the most part still unpublished. Finally, with the departure of the Assyrians involved in long distance trade at the end of the 18th century, writing disappeared from Anatolia for nearly a century, during which time the Hurrian presence must have slowly taken on a more substantial and structured form.¹⁰³
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