

Lisa Wilhelmi

Materiality and Presence of the Anitta Text in Original and Secondary Context

Considerations on the Original Nature of the Proclamation of Anitta (CTH 1) and Its Transmission as Part of Hittite Traditional Literature

1 Introduction

The so-called Anitta text (CTH 1)¹ is a much-discussed literary work that can be traced in the archives of the Hittite capital city Ḫattuša/Boğazköy throughout the history of the Hittite kingdom. Its significance lies in the fact that it recounts events which precede the first Hittite kings, who are attested in contemporary sources, by approximately a century² and that both periods are separated by a ‘dark age’ due to a hiatus of textual records that follows the demise of the Old Assyrian trading colonies in Anatolia and lasts until the establishment of Hittite administration at Ḫattuša. The composition, which is preserved in Hittite language, narrates the conquest and incorporation into their existing sphere of influence of Kaneš/Neša, which was itself in control of a substantial area, at the hands of Piḫana, ruler of Kuššara, before setting out to detail his son Anitta’s own achievements.

Rather than dwelling on details of reading, reconstruction or interpretation of single text passages, the present contribution aims to make observations concerning the origin and nature of the text and the wider implications of its transmission as part of Hittite traditional literature throughout Hittite history.

This article emerged from the Heidelberg Collaborative Research Center 933 “Material Text Cultures. Materiality and Presence of Writing in Non-Typographic Societies”. The CRC 933 is financed by the German Research Foundation (DFG).

1 Editions of the text have been published by Neu 1974 and Carruba 2003. In addition, translations were provided by Hoffner 2003 and Beckman 2006. For detailed bibliographical references see <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/> sub CTH 1.

2 See recently Barjamovic/Hertel/Larsen 2012, who estimate the conquest of Kaneš/Neša by Anitta’s father Piḫana which marks the start of the narrative at around 1750 BC (p. 40), roughly a century before the traditional estimate of Ḫattušili I’s accession to the throne in Ḫattuša in 1650 BC (p. 51).

2 Anatolia in the First Third of the Second Millennium BC

The events of the Anitta text centre on Kaneš/Neša, modern Kültepe, which is located about 20 kilometres to the North West of the Turkish city Kayseri and was the location of an Old Assyrian colony based in the lower town of the city. Part of the Old Assyrian trading network, which had established outposts called *kārum* and smaller stations referred to as *wabartum* throughout Anatolia and Northern Syria, it functioned as the nerve of the activities and was the de facto representative of Assyrian administration in Anatolia. It was organised to mirror the political and religious institutions of the capital city Assur and served as its point of contact for any directives from the seat of the kingdom, modifying these as it saw fit before relaying the information to other merchants' seats. Particularly the excavations in the lower town—some tablets have also been discovered on the upper mound—have yielded large numbers of cuneiform tablets in Old Assyrian script and language and do not only give insight into the trading activities and the lives of the Assyrian families in Anatolia and at home in Assur but also bear some indication of the political situation in early second millennium Anatolia.

The textual records of the lower town come from two stratigraphic levels labelled II and Ib; although the lower town shows on-going occupation and there is evidence for the presence of a limited number of foreigners also in level Ia, the archaeological data is characterised by a decreasing level of prosperity and a lack of associated large administrative buildings as well as any written sources.³ Level II and Ib are divided by a horizon of destruction, which is also evident on the upper mound, and a number of changes in the material culture of the settlement are traceable, but it can now be demonstrated that the gap in textual records amounts to four years only and that the oft-maintained complete occupational hiatus and cessation and subsequent revitalisation of all Anatolian-wide Assyrian activities did not take place.⁴ The destruction of the settlement at Kaneš/Neša level II bears evidence of the political scenery of Anatolia and Northern Syria, which was characterised by relatively small interdependent states, which were often in conflict with one another. This seems to have prompted the Assyrians to found dependencies in all the major political centres, and the inner-Anatolian shifts in power and the move towards larger polities in the early second millennium BC may have been part of the still unclear circumstances leading to the abandonment of the Assyrian trading outposts following level Ib.

Due to the absence of textual records from the following 'dark age' the start of the Hittite archives and the first datable text sources from the reign of Ḫattušili I

³ Barjamovic/Hertel/Larsen 2012, 51f.

⁴ Barjamovic/Hertel/Larsen 2012, 28ff.

(ca. 1650 BC) create an artificial starting point to Hittite history, which does not reflect the historical situation.⁵ A combination of references contained in historiographic documents from Ḫattuša and glimpses in the texts from the late Old Assyrian period show that the emergence of a larger political entity in Anatolia that is to manifest itself as the Hittite kingdom ruled from Ḫattuša, is by no means accidental or without previous development and that these shifts are foreshadowed already in the late *kārum* period. The inclination to create coalitions between city-states and form realms with larger territory is reflected in the reference to local rulers as servants, i.e. vassals, of the kings of Mama and Kaneš/Neša in the letter sent by Anum-Ḫirwe to Waršama⁶ and the military exploits of Piḫana and his son Anitta described in the Anitta text illustrate this further. The available evidence relating to the period prior to the establishment of Ḫattuša as capital suggests the existence of a ruling family or elite, whose members were not all located in a single city but positioned in a number of regional centres, and struggles for predominance amongst the family members are immediately apparent.⁷

The later Hittite capital Ḫattuša itself was the seat of a local ruler during the Old Assyrian period and the base of a *kārum* in the lower town⁸ and it was important and meddlesome enough to be destroyed and accursed by Anitta.⁹ Due to the reevaluation of the Assyrian eponym list and its implications for the chronology of the Old Assyrian period it can now be shown that there may not have been a hiatus between the last known king of Kaneš/Neša, Zuzu, and Ḫattušili I's predecessors.¹⁰ The strong links between Kaneš/Neša and Ḫattuša¹¹ imply a certain amount of cultural continuity and

5 Although there is no evidence for a settlement hiatus in Ḫattuša in the period preceding the Old Hittite kingdom as has often been claimed (Neve 1984, 89), it is more than likely that the royal name Ḫattušili, 'the one of Ḫattuša', is of significance and has to be connected to a conscious move of the capital to this city (cf. below; thus also Bryce 1983, 58).

6 The letter from Anum-Ḫirwe of Mama to Waršama of Kaneš/Neša (see Balkan 1957), which refers to other local rulers as the servants, i.e. vassals, of either kings (ll. 4–14), was discovered on the upper mound of Kaneš/Neša.

7 The struggles do not end with the reign of Ḫattušili I, but are at the centre of a number of texts from his reign and remain commonplace throughout the period described in the Telipinu edict (*CTH* 19, see below).

8 At the time of the overview published by Dercksen 2001 some 71 tablets had been published (*ibid.* 49). Note, however, that the estimate of "little more than fifty years" of Assyrian trading activities in *kārum* Ḫattuš has to be reevaluated on the basis of evidence from the texts from Kaneš/Neša to having lasted "more than a century" (Barjamovic 2011, 297).

9 A king of Ḫattuša, whose name is lost in the break is first mentioned in relation to an uprising against Anitta following his father's death (l. 14) and the destruction and subsequent cursing of Ḫattuša following a military conflict with its king Piyušti features in the second part of the Hittite Anitta text (l. 36–51).

10 Barjamovic/Hertel/Larsen 2012, 51.

11 Next to the fact that the Anitta text features prominently in the archives of the Hittite capital, the native word used for the language Hittite, *nešumnili* "that of Neša", bears witness to a strong

the fact that no written sources are available for the interim period may have to be sought not in their absence but in the fact that Ḫattuša was not at the centre of the kingdom preceding the accession of Ḫattušili I. The texts associated with his reign do not only show an awareness of the era preceding government in Ḫattuša, but actively seek to link Ḫattušili I with preceding generations.

3 References to the Pre-Ḫattuša Period in Old Hittite Historiographic Texts

Written more than a century after the establishment of Hittite administration at Ḫattuša, the Telipinu edict¹² does not begin its historical account with the reign of Ḫattušili I, but with reflections on his predecessor Labarna's reign. This shows that the ancient historiographers considered him an extrinsic part of Hittite history and that modern understanding of Ḫattušili I as founder of the Hittite kingdom is based predominantly on a lack of pertinent textual records from the period preceding his reign.¹³ Labarna's position as founder of the dynasty is also reflected in the so-called Cruciform Seal: in an effort to legitimise the reign of the Empire Period ruler Šuppiluliuma I, who had ascended the throne by dubious means at the cost of his brother Tudḫaliya the Younger, it lists not only a genealogy extending back four generations but, on the reverse of the seal, adds the first four rulers of the Hittite kingdom together with their queens, starting with Labarna and his wife Tawananna.¹⁴

identification with the previous power centre.

12 *CTH 19*. The text is preserved in fragments from a total of nine manuscripts in Hittite language (*KBo* 12, 7 + *KBo* 12, 12 + *KBo* 12, 5 + *KBo* 3, 68 + *KBo* 3, 1; *KBo* 3, 67 + *KUB* 31, 17 + *KUB* 31, 3; *KUB* 11, 5; *KUB* 11, 6; *KBo* 19 97 + *IBoT* 3, 84 + *KUB* 11, 2; *KBo* 12, 6; *VBoT* 107; *KBo* 19, 96 + *KUB* 11, 1; *KBo* 7, 15 + *KBo* 12, 4) as well as two very fragmentary examples of an Akkadian language version (*KBo* 19, 96 + *KUB* 11, 1; *KBo* 7, 15 + *KBo* 12, 4). For bibliographical references see www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk.

13 Attempts to attribute the land donation tablet discovered at İnandık in 1968 (İK 174–66, published by Balkan 1973) or a letter sent by a Hittite sovereign to the ruler of Tikunāni (Salvini 1994) to Labarna I, have not been corroborated by the evidence.

14 The seal, which has not been discovered but can be reconstructed from a number of sealings, had two sides, which arranged four panels around a central circular field, giving it the appearance of a 'Maltese cross' and bore a total of ten names of Hittite kings with their respective queens. It has been shown by Dinçol et al 1993 (particularly 96f. sub 'history') that the central panel of the obverse identifies the owner of the seal as the Empire Period ruler Muršili II, who is surrounded by the four kings preceding his father and predecessor Šuppiluliuma I, who appears in the central field of the reverse. Surrounding the latter are arranged the names of four Old Hittite kings starting with Labarna.

From the introduction to the Annals of Ḫattušili I (CTH 4),¹⁵ Tawananna is known to have been the sister of Ḫattušili I's father and she appears to function here as the link to the previous generation of Hittite rulers and to legitimise the reign of the new king.¹⁶ Further, the introductory statement of the Akkadian version of this text reads *ina* ^{umu}KÛ.BABBAR-*ti* LUGAL-*utta* *itepuš* “he exercised kingship in Ḫattuša”, putting particular emphasis on the location of the geographical situation. This indicates that the establishment of the city as the capital of the kingdom was directly related to Ḫattušili's person and was at the centre of his association with the, seemingly, additional name Ḫattušili, “the one of Ḫattuša”.¹⁷ The possibility that the power base of the realm was originally located elsewhere is complemented by the use of the additional title “man of Kuššara”, attested in the Hittite version of the annals.¹⁸

Further witness to Ḫattušili's close association with Kuššara, which incidentally is also the origin of Anitta's father Piḫana, comes from his so-called Political Testament (CTH 6),¹⁹ which installs his grandson Muršili I as heir to the throne and, according to the colophon, was composed in the city, where the Hittite king was laid up during a severe illness.²⁰ The text provides instructions for the heir and the Hittite administration alike that are to ensure a successful reign and gives anecdotal evidence of examples of discord in the royal family that have had an adverse impact on the fate of the land Ḫatti. After recounting the struggle for predominance on the part of Ḫattušili I's own children, the text makes reference to Ḫattušili's grandfather's appointment of Labarna as successor to the throne and the following upheavals.²¹ The passage is

15 CTH 4. The text is preserved in a near-complete Akkadian copy (KBo 10, 1) as well as one relatively well-preserved (KBo 10,2) and fragments of four further manuscripts in Hittite language (KBo 10, 3; KUB 23, 41 (+) IBoT 3, 134 (+) KUB 57, 48 + VBoT 13; IBoT 4, 264; KBo 50, 198 and KUB 23, 20 (+) KUB 23, 33 (+) KUB 40, 6).

16 ŠA ^{munus}TA-WA-NA-AN-NA DUMU ŠEŠ-ŠU (KBo 10, 2 i 3) “the son of the brother of Tawananna”. The passage is only partly preserved in the Akkadian parallel text, but can be restored on its basis: *ša* ^{munus}ta-w[a-na-an-na] DUMU ŠEŠ-ŠU (KBo 10, 1 obv. 1). Although Ḫattušili I's father is most likely to be identified with the would-be usurper and rival of Labarna I, Papaḫdilmah (Beal 2003, 16f.), his own accession to the throne seems to have been justified.

17 In the Akkadian version of the Annals (CTH 4.I) as well as the Political Testament (CTH 6) and the Tikunāni Letter the issuing king is always referred to as L/Tabarna, while he appears as Ḫattušili I in the Hittite language Annals (CTH 4.II) and any later references to his person, likely to be partly due to an effort to distinguish him from his predecessor of the same name.

18 LÚ ^{umu}KU-UŠ-ŠAR “man of Kuššar” (KBo 10, 2 i 2).

19 The bilingual, Akkadian-Hittite, composition is preserved on a single manuscript: KUB 1, 16 (+) KUB 40, 65. For bibliographical references see <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/>.

20 *i-nu-ma* / LUGAL GAL *ta-ba-ar-na i-na* ^{umu}ku-uš-šar^{ki} *im-ra-aš-šú-ma* “When the Great King Tabarna had become ill in Kuššara” (KUB 1, 16 col. 1f.).

21 ḫu-uh^ḫ-ḫa-aš^ḫ(A^ḫ)-mi-iš [la-ba-a]r-na-an^ḫ DUMU-ša-an ^{umu}ša-na-ḫu-it-ti iš-ḫu-na^ḫ-aḫ-ḫi-iš [EGIR-an-da-m]a-kânIR.MEŠ-ŠU^ḫ LÚ.MEŠGAL^ḫ.GALud-da-a-ar-še-etḫu-ur^ḫ-tal-li-e-er[nu-uš-š]a^ḫ-an^ḫ 'pa-pa-aḫ-di^ḫ-il-ma-ḫa-an a-še-še-er “My grandfather appointed [Laba]rna, as his son in Šanaḫuitta, but [afterwards] his servants, the high officials, altered his words and placed Papaḫdilmah (there).”

further evidence that preceding the establishment of a firm Hittite administration in Ḫattuša the elite, which ruled central Anatolia, installed members of its family in the major political centres to apportion responsibility for smaller entities within the kingdom, a practice that was not given up by Ḫattušili and is evidenced throughout the Old Hittite kingdom.²²

In addition to occasional references found in sources relating to the Old Hittite period, three compositions discovered in the Hittite archives are set—in two cases entirely, in one at least partly—in a period preceding a Hittite kingdom based on Ḫattuša as capital and strike connections to the period of the Old Assyrian *kārū* in general and to Kaneš/Neša in particular.

Two tablet fragments subsumed under the lemma *CTH 2²³* concern Anum-ḫirwe, who is otherwise known as king of Mama from a letter sent to Waršama of Kaneš/Neša and found in Kültepe.²⁴ The events described focus on an occurrence surrounding the cities Zalwar and Ḫaššuwa in Northern Syria, both of which are closely associated with Anum-ḫirwe in documents from Mari.²⁵ It appears that both fragments formed part of *Sammeltafeln*, that also contained the “story of the shepherd boy”,²⁶ which in turn contains a fragmentary reference to a servant girl of one Anitta,²⁷ whose identity and function remain lost in the broken context.

Another historical narrative is presented by the Zalpa Story (*CTH 3*),²⁸ which is divided into two distinct parts, not only because of the break in the written sources. Although not dated with absolute certainty due to the lack of royal names used in the composition, the second part seems to relate to the early reign of Ḫattušili I and his immediate predecessors, while the first part presents events taking place in the more distant past in a semi-legendary account involving a queen of Kaneš/Neša and her 30 sons and 30 daughters from two multiple births.

(*KUB 1*, 16 iii 42–25). It appears that the grandfather in question has to be equated with a certain BULGAL-*ma* mentioned in the offering lists for deceased kings found at the Hittite capital (*CTH 661*) where he appears as father of the usurper Papaḫdimaḫ, who in turn has been shown to have been Ḫattušili I's father and is at the centre of the throne rivalries outlined in the passage.

22 The edict details the fate of Ḫattušili's son Ḫuzziya in Tappašanda (*ibid.* ii 63–67) and makes reference to rulers of provincial centres that are not to seek influence over the new heir to the throne (*ibid.* ii 61f.).

23 While *KUB 36*, 99 exhibits Old Hittite ductus, *KBo 12*, 3 is written in a late hand. For bibliographical references see <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/>.

24 *g/t 35*, published by Balkan 1957.

25 Miller 2001, 68.

26 An additional fragment preserving part of this story is *KBo 50*, 2; for which see Haas 2006, 27, “die Geschichte vom Hirtenknaben”.

27 GÉME 'a-ni-it-ta (*KBo 50*, 2 obv. 5').

28 *KBo 7*, 30 (+) *KBo 52*, 1 (+) *KBo 50*, 3; *KBo 12*, 63; *KBo 12*, 19; *KBo 12*, 18; *KBo 12*, 92; *KUB 23*, 23; *KBo 3*, 38; *KUB 48*, 79; *KBo 22*, 2; *KBo 26*, 126 as well as the unpublished *Bo 9011*. For bibliographical references see <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/>.

Finally, the Anitta text (*CTH* 1) relates the conquest of Kaneš/Neša by Anitta's father Piṭhana of Kuššara and Anitta's own subsequent military activities in wider Eastern Anatolia including Ḫattuša itself (see below).

4 Anitta of Kuššara and Kaneš/Neša in Contemporary and Later Hittite Sources

The existence of the historical person Anitta, son of Piṭhana, ruler of Kaneš/Neša, is beyond doubt and secured by a number of contemporary sources:

A type of Old Assyrian legal text attested in Kültepe and elsewhere and usually referred to as *iqqāti* documents due to a prominent formula within the texts,²⁹ provides evidence on contemporary local rulers, referred to as *rubā'um*, and a high official by the title *rabi similtim*, who is most likely to be understood as the designated heir to the throne. Three documents of this type name Anitta as *rabi similtim* next to his father and predecessor Piṭhana, who is introduced as *rubā'um*,³⁰ while in a further three examples Anitta himself is entitled *rubā'um*.³¹ The texts exhibit the interaction between the rulers and the Assyrian merchants.

In 1954 a bronze spearhead (frequently referred to as 'dagger' in older literature (fig. 1) was found together with a badly damaged bronze vessel³² during the excavations on the upper mound of Kültepe in a layer of burnt debris of a building that was of "monumental size" and later interpreted as a palace.³³ The weapon, which according to the excavator is of the so-called Cypriote type but without exact parallels in its particular stylistic features,³⁴ bears the short inscription É.GAL *a-ni-ta ru-ba-im* "palace of Anitta, the ruler".

The contemporary sources give little detail on Anitta's reign and the information has to be supplemented from the Hittite narrative of the Anitta Text (*CTH* 1), which is preserved in a number of fragmentary manuscripts. The best preserved of these is

²⁹ Forlanini 1995, 123. For an up-to-date list of the known *iqqāti* documents see Kryszat 2008, 161f.

³⁰ kt k/k 9; kt š/k 3; *TC* 3 214a/b. Cf. Kryszat 2008, 164f. Piṭhana is attested alone in a further text without title (kt n/k 11).

³¹ He occurs once simply as *rubā'um* (kt 89/k 371), once with the addition of ša *Ākkuwa* (*OIP* 27 1), the implications of which need to be considered, and in the third document is given the more powerful title *rubā'um rabūm* (*OIP* 27 49a/b).

³² The vessel, which seems to have had two spouts, has (spoutless) pottery parallels in level Ib of the *kānum* area of the city (Özgüç 1956, 36). Its state of preservation made it impossible to decide whether it may once have borne an inscription too.

³³ Balkan 1955, 78, Özgüç 1956, 33.

³⁴ Examples of the Cypriote type are found throughout Anatolia, Syria and Iran and share a "bent tang", but their exact appearance can vary considerably (Özgüç 1956, 36).

written in Old Hittite ductus (*KBo* 3, 22), while the remaining three are dated on palaeographical grounds to the 14th (*KUB* 26, 71) and 13th century (*KUB* 36, 98+; *KBo* 22, 5), i.e. the Empire Period. In addition, two *Sammel tafeln*, *KUB* 26, 71 and *KUB* 36, 98+, present the Anitta text as well as passages of the Chronicle of Ammuna (*CTH* 18), a historiographic text centred on the reign of one of the lesser-known Old Hittite monarchs. As far as can be ascertained, the late fragment *KBo* 22, 5 is not an exact copy but has to be understood as a parallel text including passages that differ from those of the other manuscripts.

As reconstructed on the basis of the available manuscripts, the composition starts with an introductory passage emphasising Anitta's relationship to the Storm God, characterised by Erich Neu (1974) as the *prooemium* (obv. 1–4),³⁵ before relating the circumstances of the conquest of the city Neša, apparently, although not explicitly stated, during the reign of Anitta's father Piḫana (obv. 5–9). There follow additional military activities of Anitta himself after his father's death (obv. 10–29, 30–32) and instructions concerning a "tablet" and the "gate" of Anitta (obv. 33–35), which present a break in the narrative. Following this, further military activities against Zalpa, Ḫattuša and Šalatiwara are recounted (obv. 36–rev. 10), followed by a building report (rev. 11–14) and a hunting report (rev. 15–19), before returning to the subject of renewed military activities against Šalatiwara (rev. 20–28) and an alliance with the ruler of Purušḫanda (rev. 29–35).³⁶

5 The "Original" Anitta Text – Questions of Date, Language and Circumstances

Since the discovery of the Anitta text among the tablet finds from the Hittite capital and the initial publication of the Old Hittite manuscript and one of the *Sammel tafeln* by Emil Forrer in 1922,³⁷ questions regarding the origin, circumstances and date of the composition as well as its original language have arisen, which have been at the centre of many discussions since and have often led to varying results.

Although disagreeing on its proposed original language, most early studies of the text suggested that the Hittite composition found on clay tablets in the archives of Ḫattuša should represent the transmission of a coherent monumental inscription from the reign of Anitta, identical in contents and structure to the composition found in the Hittite archives. This is now generally rejected and a combination of infor-

³⁵ Line numbers follow Neu 1974's manuscript A = *KBo* 3, 22, which preserves the entire length of the left margin.

³⁶ For a full translation of the text refer to Neu 1974 and Carruba 2003.

³⁷ Forrer 1922 nos. 7 and 30.



Fig. 1: The bronze spearhead of Anitta with detail of the inscription É.GAL ¹a-ni-ta ru-ba-im (after Willinghöfer 2002).

mation from more than one separate contemporary texts from the reign of Anitta is assumed by most.³⁸ The first of these concludes with instructions concerning a gate and a curse, which cannot be accommodated in the middle of a coherent narration³⁹ and is very likely to represent the closing paragraph of a ‘monumental’ inscription placed in ‘Anitta’s gate’, probably that of his palace, as is indicated by the sentence

KBo 3, 22 obv. 33: ʾke-e ud-da-a-ar¹ []i² i-na KÁ.GAL-ia t[e² x x x]
KUB 36, 98a obv. 4': []tup-pí-ia-ʾaz a-na KÁ¹[]
 “These words *by means* of a tablet in my gate ...”⁴⁰

³⁸ Principally Steiner 1984, and followed by Klinger 2005, 139 and Beckman 2006, 216. See also Carruba 2001, 68f., §9 2), who toils with the idea of an Old Hittite composition based on oral transmission, which seems unlikely in light of the passage concerning the gate.

³⁹ Although cf. Haas 2008, 29f., who maintains that the composition is the direct copy of an inscription affixed to the palace gate at Kaneš/Neša and explains the presence of the passage concerning “tablet” and “gate” in the middle of the text as a miscopied colophon from an original two-column tablet.

⁴⁰ Collation of the photograph of *KBo* 3, 22 shows the traces to be compatible with the reading ʾud-da-a-ar¹, contrary to the hand copy (cf. also Neu 1974, 25). Further, the traces before the break bear resemblance to the beginning of TE and it is likely that a 1st person singular preterite form has to be

This initial source, which will be referred to as the Anitta inscription in the remainder, is followed by two distinct narratives of military campaigns, the first of which culminates in building and hunting activities, while the second concludes with the report of a forged alliance with another major political power.

As regards the possibility of a composition that does not pre-date the Hittite administration in Ḫattuša, this seems somewhat unlikely in light of the inclusion of the passage that details the curse of the city Ḫattuša. While this could be explained if the text set out to discredit Anitta's deeds and legitimise the local dynasty, the text bears no indication of this. On the contrary, Anitta is invested with the title LUGAL "king" and associated with the city Kuššara, which also plays an important role in the identity of Ḫattušili I.

A compilation of *CTH 1* from more than one source adds a certain complication to the question of the original language used, as it is theoretically possible that not all sources were written in the same language. In any case, it is necessary to allow for a process of evaluation and possible editing of the original sources. This invalidates the argument that the typical Boğazköy ductus, exhibited already in the Old Hittite manuscript could only be accounted for if the composition was translated from a different language, as a mere copying process could not explain the loss of an original Old Assyrian ductus, which would have been the only type of ductus available to the local Kaneš/Neša scribes at the time.⁴¹ Additionally, the discovery of letters in the *kārum* at Kültepe written in a script different to that of the Old Assyrian texts and closer to the Old Babylonian cursives of the Northern Syrian region, from which the Hittite ductus is derived,⁴² means that it is not entirely out of the question that a precursor to the later Boğazköy ductus was already in use in Anatolia preceding the start of the Hittite archives at Ḫattuša.

Traces of a Hittite language tradition pre-dating the archives of Ḫattuša could be the apparently 'antiquated' form of the Hittite language employed in the text⁴³

restored, so that *teḫhun* "I placed" is thinkable and this would fit the available space. But see Neu 1974, 25f., who concludes that the only possible readings are AR or ŠI and arrives at a reconstruction *š[iyanun]*, which, however, cannot lead to the offered translation "diese Worte habe ich auf einer Tafel in meinem Tor eingedrückt/gesiegelt" as this would require *tuppi-* to be in the accusative case. For further discussion of this and other previously proposed readings see Miller 2012, 278f., who leaves the question open to debate. As he points out, the restoration of an akkadographic Gtn imperative form *š[ī-TA-AS-SI/SA]* (with Steiner 1984, 67), is unlikely given the fact that the Akkadian verb *šasû* is not used as an Akkadogram. The traces following the break in *KBo 3, 22* look most like the end of IT, while AZ is more likely for the parallel in *KUB 36, 98a*. The alternation of the instrumental ending *-it* in the Old Hittite manuscript with the ablative ending *-az* in the later manuscript is not surprising as the latter incorporates the function of the former form the Middle Hittite period onwards.

⁴¹ "Die Entstehung eines Textes in Boğazköy-Schrift [...] ist völlig undenkbar." (Güterbock 1938, 143).

⁴² Hecker 1996.

⁴³ Neu 1974, 132f. citing the complete lack of the locative particles *-za* and *-kan* and the divine name ^d*sius*.

and the use of an otherwise unexplained Old Babylonian sign form in the Hittite copies.⁴⁴ The use of the Sumerogram AZ.ĜI.A “bears” instead of UG.ĜI.A “animals” in the second part of the inscription detailing Anitta’s hunting prowess, which has been cited as a misunderstanding evidencing a translation from Old Assyrian into Hittite is not conclusive:⁴⁵ a parallel from the Hittite KI.LAM festival text,⁴⁶ which describes a festival connected to the gate house, shows the same association of bears with boars, stags, lions and leopards as the passage in question and would support the logogram present in the text.⁴⁷

Arguments for the suitability of one of the two languages for reaching the intended audience, which have been brought forward in favour of both languages,⁴⁸ have to be suspended in the absence of any comparative material.

6 A Question of Material

Having established that the existence of an inscription by Anitta in the gate of his palace, which forms part of the later Hittite narrative, is likely, some thought should be given to the nature of its medium and location. As reflected by the introduction to the most recent translation of the text, the inscription of Anitta has usually been assumed to have been written on a stone tablet,⁴⁹ despite the fact that no parallels for inscriptions of this type can be found in Anatolia during the Old Assyrian period.⁵⁰ In fact, monumental stone inscriptions in cuneiform writing are also unknown from the duration of the later Hittite kingdom, when the hieroglyphic writing system was used

⁴⁴ The sign NE displays two final verticals (Otten 1951, 43f).

⁴⁵ *KBo* 3, 22 rev. 60ff. with duplicates; thus Haas 2006, 29 n. 28.

⁴⁶ *nu* DINGIR-na-aš / [ĥu-u]-r¹-tar PIRIG.TUR KÙ.BABBAR UR.MAḤ KÙ.SIG₁₇ / [ŠA]Ĥ.GIŠ.GI KÙ.BABBAR ŠAḤ.GIŠ^{na}ZA.GIN / r²AZ² KÙ.BABBAR ū-wa-an-zi IT-TI / DĀRA.ĜI.A A-ŠĀR-ŠU-NU *ap-pa-an-zi* “The [ani]mals of the gods—the silver leopard, the golden lion, the silver [b]oar, the lapis lazuli boar, the silver bear—are coming. They are taking their place together with the stags.” (*KBo* 10, 25 vi 4–8). The passage is also cited as a comparison by Haas 2006, 31.

⁴⁷ Even if a mistake was to be propagated, this would more likely have to be attributed to a simple copying error of two very similar signs, especially if the scribe was unfamiliar with the Sumerian language.

⁴⁸ Cf. Kammenhuber 1958, 150, who believes the local languages to be inept for this purpose, but Klengel 1999, 28 n. 51, who can only understand an inscription displayed in the city gate as aimed at the local population and thus written in their language.

⁴⁹ Haas 2006, 28: “Der ursprüngliche Schriftträger, eine Steintafel, scheint am Palasttor von Kaneš/Neša angebracht gewesen zu sein.” This might go back to Neu’s assumption “es handelt sich dabei wohl nicht um eine Tafel aus Metall”, which is based entirely on his understanding of the (uncertain) reconstruction of the verb šiya- “(to) seal” (see above, note 39) as not compatible with a material other than clay.

⁵⁰ As noted by Steiner 1984, 66.

in all known instances and was a much later development in any case.⁵¹ The complete absence of any such inscriptions making use of the established script in Hittite Anatolia could only be accounted for with difficulty if one assumes their presence in earlier periods of Anatolian history, as remnants or memory of their existence would have certainly survived and given rise to similar works.

It is thus more probable that the text was written on metal, most likely in the form of a tablet, a practice that has parallels in the Hittite period:

one of the most prominent amongst the state treaties concluded by the Hittite kings is that issued by the late king Tudḫaliya IV for his cousin Kurunta of Tarḫuntassa (*CTH 106*), due to the fact that it was written on a bronze tablet discovered in 1986 during restoration works to the inner side of the city wall of Ḫattuša.⁵² The tablet had been deposited horizontally (fig. 2) and seemingly with great care in a pitch that was dug close to the wall, approximately 30 cm below the surrounding plastered street level and some 35 meters to the west of the sphinx gate in the south of the city. It is possible that this was a secondary location and that the tablet was originally placed in the gate itself.⁵³



Fig. 2: Bronze tablet in situ (taken from Neve 1993, 23).

Although no further surviving examples of metal tablets are known to date, the inscription of treaty texts on tablets made of precious metal can be assumed for the majority of the finalised treaties as is underlined by a passage from the Egyptian language version of the peace treaty between Ḫattušili III and Ramses II (*CTH 91*). The text, as inscribed on the stele of Karnak and the Ramesseum, states that it represents

⁵¹ See Hawkins 2000, 2: “Unlike the Mesopotamians the Hittites did not use their borrowed cuneiform script to write monumental inscriptions on stone.”

⁵² Otten 1988, 1.

⁵³ Neve 1987, 405ff.

the “copy of the silver tablet that the great king of Ḫatti, Ḫattušili” had brought to Egypt through his messenger.⁵⁴ Items made of precious metal generally have worse chances of survival in the archaeological record than those made of stone or other material due to the value of the material and its ability for re-modelling, so the situation of the evidence is not surprising.⁵⁵

Leaving aside the large gap in time that separates Anitta’s rule in Kaneš/Neša from the conclusion of the cited treaties during the Empire Period, a find from the Old Assyrian period already discussed, namely the Anitta ‘dagger’ (see above), shows that the technique for the incision of cuneiform script on metal objects was available during the reign of Anitta in Kaneš/Neša and that this was practiced.

A further piece of evidence can be added to the discussion and bridges the gap between the Old Assyrian and the Hittite Empire Period: a statement near the end of the Hittite version of the Annals of Ḫattušili I (*CTH* 4.II) states: *nu-za ki-i ALAM-IA ŠA KÜ.SIG₁₇ i-ia-nu-u[n] / na-at A-NA ^dUTU ^{urru}TÚL-NA GAŠAN-IA ti-it-ta-nu-nu-un* “I made this, my golden statue and I set it up before the Sun-goddess of Arinna”.⁵⁶ This indicates that the annalistic account of the Old Hittite king was inscribed on a metal statue dedicated to the deity and placed in the temple.

The use of metal as material for tablets and artefacts for compositions that were of great importance to the authors, due to its valuable, aesthetic and durable characteristics is not singular to the Hittite sphere and is paralleled throughout Mesopotamia.

7 A Question of Purpose

The association of written sources of legal importance with the city gate is not surprising given the fact that this locality was considered a place of jurisdiction not only by the Hittites.⁵⁷ This is illustrated, for example, by the discovery of an Empire Period land donation tablet issued by Arnuwanda in the lower western gate.⁵⁸ Although written on sealed clay tablets⁵⁹ comparison with this text group offers an interesting parallel formulation to the wording in *CTH* 1 that might have further implications for the exact nature and purpose of the original Anitta inscription that served as the

⁵⁴ The term used is *’nw ḫd* “writing tablet of silver” (Edel 1997, 16/17 l. 3(4)).

⁵⁵ Cf. also Moorey 1994, 221 with reference to gold and silver.

⁵⁶ *KBo* 10, 2 iii 21–22 // *KUB* 23, 20 5’f.

⁵⁷ Cf. for example the statement in a Hittite law *KBo* 6, 26: *ták-ku-uš A-NA KÁ É. GAL⁷ ú-wa-te-ez-zi nu te-ez-zi* “If he brings them to the gate of the palace, and he speaks: ...”. For a discussion of the judicial importance of the gate in Ḫatti see Miller 2012, 276.

⁵⁸ Rüster/Wilhelm 2012, 231.

⁵⁹ The difference in material used might be explained by the fact that land donation tablets were issued for individuals and generally intended for safekeeping in archives.

administration. The availability of these documents and the continuity in tradition necessitate a reconsideration of the circumstances of the introduction of cuneiform writing in Ḫattuša proper and lend credibility to the possibility that the reasons for the absence of written sources from the period preceding Ḫattušili I may have to be sought in a move of the capital city and with it the administration rather than an actual absence of writing. This seems particularly relevant in light of the fact that the important centre Kuššara remains as yet un-located and that texts written in a ductus differing from that of the Old Assyrian merchants have started to come to light in the Old Assyrian trading outposts.

Further, the impetus for the creation of a work such as the Anitta text suggests strong links between the early Hittite kings and the rulers of the pre-Hittite city-states and emerging larger political entities. The tradition of the text throughout the Hittite historic period, finally, underlines the significance of the composition as well as other historical compositions to the Hittite ruling class.

Abbreviations

CTH Laroche, Emanuel (1971), *Catalogue des Textes Hittites*, Paris.

Bibliography

- Balkan, Kemal (1955), *Kaneš/Neša kârum'unun kronoloji problemleri hakkında müşahedeler/ Observations on the Chronological Problems of the Kârum Kaneš/Neša* (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından, Series VII 28), Ankara.
- Balkan, Kemal (1957), *Letter of King Anum-Ḫirbi of Mama to King Warshama of Kanish* (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından, Series VII 31a), Ankara.
- Balkan, Kemal (1973), *Eine Schenkungsurkunde aus der althethitischen Zeit, gefunden in İnandık 1966* (Anadolu Medeniyetlerini Araştırma Vakfı yayınları 1), Ankara.
- Barjamovic, Gojko (2011), *A Historical Geography of Anatolia in the Old Assyrian Colony Period* (Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications 38), Copenhagen.
- Barjamovic, Gojko/Hertel, Thomas/Larsen, Mogens Trolle (2012), *Ups and Downs at Kanesh. Chronology, History and Society in the Old Assyrian Period* (Old Assyrian Archives, Studies 5/ Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 120), Leiden.
- Beal, Richard H. (2003), "The Predecessors of Ḫattušili I", in: Richard H. Beal, Gary Beckman and Gregory McMahon (eds.), *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry H. Hoffner Jr. On the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Winona Lake (IN), 13–35.
- Beckman, Gary (2006), "The Anitta Text", in: Mark W. Chavalas (ed.), *The Ancient Near East. Historical Sources in Translation* (Blackwell Sourcebooks in Ancient History), Malden/Oxford/Victoria, 216–219.
- Bryce, Trevor R. (1983), *The Major Historical Texts of Early Hittite History* (Asian Studies Monograph 1), Brisbane.

- Carruba, Onofrio (2001), “Anitta res gestae: paralipomena I”, in: Gernot Wilhelm (ed.), *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 45), Wiesbaden.
- Carruba, Onofrio (2003), *Anittae Res Gestae* (Studia Mediterranea 13, Series Hethaea 1), Pavia.
- Dercksen, Jan G. (2001), “‘When We Met in Ḫattuš’. Trade according to Old Assyrian Texts from Alishar and Boğazköy”, in: Jan G. Dercksen, N. J. C. Kouwenberg and Theo J. H. Krispijn (eds.), *Veenhof Anniversary Volume. Studies Presented to Klaas R. Veenhof on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday* (Publications de l’Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 89), 39–66, Leiden.
- Dinçol, Ali M./Dinçol, Belkıs/Hawkins, David/Wilhelm, Gernot (1993), “The ‘Cruciform Seal’ from Boğazköy-Ḫattuša”, in: *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 43, 87–106.
- Edel, Elmar (1997), *Der Vertrag zwischen Ramses II von Ägypten und Ḫattušili III. von Ḫatti* (Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 95), Berlin.
- Forlanini, Massimo (1995), “The Kings of Kaneš/Neša”, in: Onofrio Carruba, Mauro Giorgieri and Clelia Mora (eds.), *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia. Pavia 28 giugno–2 luglio 1993* (Studia Mediterranea 9), Pavia, 123–132.
- Forrer, Emil (1992), *Die Boghazköi-Texte in Umschrift*, vol. 2: *Geschichtliche Texte aus dem alten Chatti-Reich* (Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 42), Leipzig.
- Güterbock, Hans Gustav (1938), “Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babyloniern und Hethitern bis 1200”, in: *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 44, 45–149.
- Haas, Volkert (2006), *Die hethitische Literatur. Texte, Stilistik, Motive*, Berlin/New York.
- Hecker, Karl (1996), “Zur Herkunft der hethitischen Keilschrift”, in: David I. Owen and Gernot Wilhelm (eds.), *Richard F. S. Starr Memorial Volume* (Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians 8), Bethesda.
- Hoffner, Harry A. (1997), “Hittite Canonical Compositions – Historiography. Proclamation of Anitta of Kuššar”, in: William W. Hallo (ed.), *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 1: *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, Leiden/New York/Cologne, 182–204.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies (1958), “Die hethitische Geschichtsschreibung”, in: *Saeculum* 9, 136–155.
- Klengel, Horst (1999), *Geschichte des hethitischen Reichs* (Handbuch der Orientalistik 1.34), Leiden.
- Klinger, Jörg (2005), “Herrscherinschriften und andere Dokumente zur politischen Geschichte des Hethiterreiches. 1. Der sogenannte Anitta-Text”, in: Bernd Janowski and Gernot Wilhelm (eds.), *Staatsverträge, Herrscherinschriften und andere Dokumente zur politischen Geschichte* (Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge 2), Gütersloh, 139–141.
- Kryszat, Guido (2008), “Herrscher, Kult und Kultradition in Anatolien nach den Quellen aus den altassyrischen Handelskolonien, Teil 3/1. Grundlagen für eine neue Rekonstruktion der Geschichte Anatoliens und der assyrischen Handelskolonien in spätaltassyrischer Zeit”, in: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 35 (1), 156–189.
- Miller, Jared (2001), “Anum-Ḫirbi and His Kingdom”, in: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 28 (1), 65–101.
- Miller, Jared (2012), “The (City-)Gate and the Projection of Royal Power in Ḫatti”, in: Gernot Wilhelm (ed.), *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Würzburg 20–25 July 2008*, Winona Lake (IN), 675–685.
- Moorey, Peter R. S. (1994), *Ancient Mesopotamian Materials and Industries. The Archaeological Evidence*, Oxford.
- Neu, Erich (1974), *Der Anitta-Text* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 18), Wiesbaden.
- Neve, Peter (1984), “Ein althethitischer Sammelfund aus der Unterstadt”, in: Hans Gert Bachmann, Kurt Bittel, Rudolf Naumann, Peter Neve, Winfried Orthmann and Heinrich Otten (eds.),

- Boğazköy*, vol. 6: *Funde aus den Grabungen bis 1979* (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft), Berlin, 63–89.
- Neve, Peter (1987), “Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy-Ḫattuša”, in: *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1987, 381–412.
- Otten, Heinrich (1951), “Zu den Anfängen der hethitischen Geschichte”, in: *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 83, 33–45.
- Otten, Heinrich (1988), *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Beihefte 1), Wiesbaden.
- Özgüç, Tahsin (1956), “The Dagger of Anitta”, in: *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten XX/77*, 33–36.
- Salvini, Mirjo (1994), “Una Lettera di Ḫattušili I Relativa alla Spedizione Contro Ḫaḫḫum”, in: *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 34, 61–80.
- Steiner, Gerd (1984), “Struktur und Bedeutung des sogenannten Anitta-Textes”, in: *Orientalia* 23, 54–73.
- Veenhof, Klaas R. (2003), *The Old Assyrian List of Year Eponyms from Karum Kanish and Its Chronological Implications* (Türk Tarih Kurumu vi, 64), Ankara.
- Willinghöfer, Helga (ed.) (2002), *Die Hethiter und ihr Reich. Volk der 1000 Götter. Anlässlich der Ausstellung „Die Hethiter. Das Volk der 1000 Götter“ vom 18. Januar bis 28. April 2002 in der Kunst- und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland in Bonn*, Stuttgart.

