

ՀՈԴՎԱԾՆԵՐ

ARTICLES

ADMINISTRATIVE AND POLITICAL SYSTEM AND ECONOMY OF THE KINGDOM OF KANESH*

Robert Ghazaryan

Abstract

The state of Kanesh was one of the state formations established in Asia Minor during the Bronze Age. It played a significant role in the process of formation and establishment of the Hittite state (mid-XVII century BC - early XII century BC). The city was the second center of the Hittite state after Kussara, and its territory served as a base for the further expansion of the Hittite state. It is important to emphasize that the city was also the capital and the center of the international trade network (in more than forty cities) organized by Assyrians. The state structure of Kanesh, its system of government also had an influence on the Hittite state system. All these lead us to study and explore the history of that city-state, to have an understanding of its state order, economy, and socio-economic relations.

Keywords: Kanesh, Asia Minor, karum, “Cappadocian” sources, economy, trade, Hittite Old Kingdom, Kussara, dignitary, management system.

Introduction

The state of Kanesh was one of the city-states of Asia Minor. The main written sources of the history of Kanesh are the “Cappadocian”¹ trade tablets. They are also the first written local sources on the history of Asia Minor and adjacent territories. Most of them were discovered near the present-day Kültepe (Turkish lit. “Ash hill”, near the present-day Karahöyük settlement) and date back to the XX-XVIII centuries BC².

Due to the lack of written sources, it is difficult to form an idea about the initial (early Bronze Age) phase of the city’s history. However, the archaeological material allows us to claim that there was a settlement in the “Upper City”³ at that period (archeological layers 18 to 11)⁴. It is evident that the history of the state of

* This study has been carried out within the framework of the grant received from the Committee of Science, Republic of Armenia (grant N. 20TTSH-047).

The article was submitted on October 21, 2022. The article was reviewed on November 3, 2022.

¹ The “Cappadocian” written sources that have been deciphered and published, represent the history of Kanesh of about at least 1970-1710 BC, but most of them date back to 1895-1865 BC.

² Of the approximately 23,500 tablets found at karum, about 23,000 are from level II and only 500 are from level Ib. Only 40 tablets were found in the Kanesh citadel (“Upper City”). All the rest were found from the karum area. In “Cappadocian” sources Hittite proper names, as well as words borrowed from Hittite were mentioned for the first time. See [25: 69].

³ The city consisted of “Upper” and “Lower” parts. The royal palace, royal structures, temples, etc. were located in the “Upper city” or citadel. The karum was located in the “Lower city”.

⁴ According to archaeological data, the archaeological layers of Kanesh (18 archaeological layers) generally start from the Late Early Bronze Age and reach the Roman period. The period of the king-

Kanesh dates to as early as the second half of the III millennium BC. At least the archaeological material found at the site shows that the settlement existed before the Assyrian traders arrived there.

An inseparable part of the history of Kanesh is the trade karum established by Assyrians (Akk. *kārum*, colony), which was also the main international trade hub of the region. This trade was often interrupted or damaged as a result of wars between different city-states, which also fought to establish control over international trade routes and markets. Kanesh was not always successful in that struggle. The city was destroyed twice: in 1835 BC and in 1725 BC.

State System of the City-state of Kanesh

According to “Cappadocian” sources, the state of Kanesh was ruled by the king (referred to in “Cappadocian” sources as *ruba’um* - prince, king, direct translation from Akk. - great man) whose power over his subjects was quite immense [8: 117-118]. The king’s power was probably similar to that of the kings of the Hittite state, which the Hittites believed was god-given⁵. The king could also be the commander-in-chief, high priest and supreme judge. The Kanesh kings of different periods, e.g. Anitta, Zuzu also bore the title of great king [28: 74, 76].

Zipani is the first Kanesh king to be mentioned among the seventeen kings who, according to the source, were defeated by Naram Sin (2254-2218 BC) [22: 43].

The existing information about the Kanesh kings of a later phase has been restored after the discovery of “Cappadocian” sources. Those texts also contain information about the kings of Kanesh whose names are not mentioned, or whose names are mentioned only once, and it is very difficult to give any clear information about them. Moreover, it is virtually impossible to specify the dates of their rule⁶.

dom of Kanesh (XX-XVIII centuries BC) as evidenced by “Cappadocian” sources, is within the 8th to 7th archaeological layers (8-II, 7-Ib). According to Middle Chronology, level II of karum dates to ca 1970-1840 BC, and level Ib - ca 1840-1700 BC. [38: 22: 41].

⁵ IBOT 1.30 (CTH 821.1).

⁶ For example, the text AKT 6, 113 mentions an unnamed Kanesh ruler. The text Kt j/k 9; RIMA 0.33.4: 16 mentions a king going to the temple of the god of Anna of Kanesh, but his name is not mentioned. The text Kt n/k 1716b; Kt d/k 46 mentions another king who visited the temple of the god of Nipas of Kanesh. The text ICK 1, 178 mentions a certain king Labarsa [24: 20, n. 3; 28: 108]. The name Labarsa is interesting here: it is similar to the name of Labarna, a Hittite king of a later period. However, it is not clear where he came to power, in Kanesh or in another city. The name La-[ba]-arna-aš is also found in the text Kt 88/k 713.3. There he acts as a witness [10: 145]. Letter KTK 10 mentions that an alliance was formed against Hattusa between the towns of Šinaḫuttum, Amkuwa, Kapitra and a man named Kuku, who was probably the king of Kanesh [2, 294f., n. 1176; 3: 49 and n. 175]. We also have information about Warb/pa, mentioned in a text about divorce and in another text related to slave trade. Both texts are confirmed by a certain Warb/pa referred to as *rubā’im* and a certain *Ḫalkiašu* is mentioned as *rabi simmiltim* (head of the citadel) [28: 79-80, 107-110]. But again, it is not clear whether they operated in Kanesh or another city.

In the period of the Kanesh archaeological layer Ib the kings about whose reign some information can be given are also mentioned. Those kings [11: 123-132] are Ḫurmeli (ca 1790 BC)⁷, Inar (ca 1790-1775 BC), Warsama (son of Inar, ca 1775-1750 BC), Piṭhana (who was also the king of Kussara⁸, ca 1750-1740 BC), Anitta (son of Piṭhana, ca 1740-1725 BC) and Zuzu (ca 1725-1710 BC)⁹.

An important position in the Kanesh governance system was also occupied by the queen (Akk.: *rubātum*), as mentioned in a number of “Cappadocian” sources¹⁰. A text has been preserved in which the Queen of Kanesh wrote a letter to the rulers of the cities of Luḫuzatia, Ḫurama, Šalahšua as her subjects [18: 28-35]. Here we can see the commonalities between the reign of the queens of that period and the reign of Hittite tawananna (queen) of a later period. In both cases, the queens participated in state affairs, sometimes acting independently. We can also state that the role of women in general was greater in Kanesh than in Assur, and in Kanesh a ruling queen was mentioned as well: she negotiated on behalf of the state. Probably, after the king’s death, his wife, the queen, could rule the state alone or together with her heir. Later, these traditions were also partially transferred to the period of the Old Hittite Kingdom (ca 1650-1450 BC)¹¹.

A letter from an Assyrian merchant also mentions a certain Ḫabuala who was the “queen’s shepherd” (Akk.: *rēi’um ša rubātim*), probably the overseer of the queen’s herd of cattle [28: 107].

Probably the queens of Kanesh, like the Hittite queens later, kept their high position in the court after the death of their husbands, the kings. And like the Hittite queens, they also participated in ritual, religious ceremonies and were the chief priestesses of the state.

No traces of royal burials have been found in the archaeological site of Kanesh, which may indicate that they have either not been discovered yet, or that

⁷ The name of king Ḫurmeli was Hittite. The name of this king meant “man from the city of Hur(ra)ma”, which shows that he was from another city and had probably seized power in Kanesh. See [11: 124; 12: 265; 21: 162].

⁸ Kussara was probably north-east or south-east of Kanesh, between Tegarama and Ḫurama. There was also a trade haven, a station (Akk. *wabartum*-station) of Assyrian traders in Kussara [13: 81; 2: 143-150; 6: 135; 16: 1391-1395].

⁹ [11: 128]. Zuzu was simultaneously the “great” king of the state of Alaḫzina. Probably in 1725 BC Zuzu seized power in Kanesh. The name Zuzu is also found in the texts from the period of the Hittite Old Kingdom, see Bilgin 2015: 195-196. That name was also mentioned during the period of the New Hittite Kingdom, see KUB 21.38 obv. 22’; [17: 281-290].

¹⁰ ATHE 62; ATHE 66; CCT 6,34a; ICK 1, 13a; Kt m/k 24; Kt m/k 35.

¹¹ There is also a tale about the Queen of Kanesh, the so-called “The Queen of Kanesh, Her Thirty Sons and Thirty Daughters” [29]. The text was written in the XVII century BC in Old Hittite script, but the tale was created earlier, before Anitta conquered a significant part of Asia Minor. Apart from Kanesh, other cities are also mentioned here: Zalpuwa, where the queen’s sons find shelter, Tamarmara, where they learn important information, Ḫattusa, which fights and defeats Zalpuwa. There are different interpretations for this story [33: 119-134; 34: 123-128].

they were probably buried in another place. However, it can be assumed that Piṭhana and Anitta who were from Kussara were buried either there or nearby.

Interestingly, in the public administration system of the kingdom of Kanesh there is no mention of structures such as *panku* (People's Assembly) and *tuliya* (Council of Elders) of the Hittite kingdom. It may mean that the governance of the state of Kanesh was carried out solely by the king and the court officials, without coordinating matters with the people or the representatives of the Council of Elders.

According to "Cappadocian" sources, there were other positions at the court of Kanesh as well, e.g. *rabi simmiltim* (literally, the name of the position is translated from Akkadian as the Chief of the Staircase, probably referring to the "staircase that led to the city or main gate"). That official was actually the head of the citadel, probably also the head of the court, and he was the second in rank in the states of Asia Minor. Usually, the king's brother or uncle held that position. Very often that position was held by the crown prince as well. The names of some of Kanesh's *rabi simmiltims* are known, particularly Turupanni, Ḫarpatiwa, Wanuššala, Šamnuman, Ḫalkiašu, Anitta, Peruwa, Ištar-ibri. Interestingly, in one of the texts of Kanesh (Kt.01/k294) the names of two *rabi simmiltims* are simultaneously recorded in relation to one case: one is the former *rabi simmiltim* of king Inar and the other is the newly appointed *rabi simmiltim* (Šamnuman) [3: 13, 36].

Other positions of the Kanesh court have also been mentioned, namely *rabi sikkatim* (probably a person who had commercial and military responsibilities), *rabi mahirim* and *rabi ummanātim* (head of the market), *rabi šabim* (military leader), *rabi šarīqī* (chief of the slaves of the temple, at the same time involved in trade activities), *rabi huršātīm* (his counterpart in the Hittite royal palace was the position of ^{LU}antuwašalli, the head of storehouses), *rabi abullātīm* (chief of the city gates who guarded the entrances to the palace), *rabi bētīm* (head of the palace), *rabi maššarātīm* (commander of the garrison), *rabi haṭṭim* (chief macebearer), *rabi šukkallim* (grand vizier, probably had advisory duties), *rabi nāgirē* (chief of the heralds), *rabi lāsimē* (chief of the messengers) and *rabi targumannē* (chief of the translators, chief court interpreter) [28: 109, 112; 26: 171-172].

Three other high-ranking Kanesh officials organized and supervised the construction work: *rabi awīlē* (chief of the men), *rabi šābē/šābim* (chief of the workers), *rabi urdē* (chief of the slaves). *Rabi šābē* probably supervised the heads of various trades (*rabi nappāhē*, "chief of the metalworkers", *rabi kakkē* "chief of the arms", *rabi kittātīm* "chief of the linens", *rabi ašlākē* "chief of washers").

Religious issues were under the control of the following officials: *rabi šarīqē* (chief of the oblates) and *rabi niqē* (chief of offerings) [26: 172].

As regards court cases, several professions were mentioned that were actively involved in these processes. They were *dayyānum* (judge), *rābišum* (attorney or solicitor) and *ṭupšarrum* (scribe) [26: 179].

The geographical location, as well as the lack of natural borders, made the Kanesh kingdom a political entity vulnerable from all sides, and its integrity and

security could only be maintained through an efficient army. We have no clear information about the army of the state of Kanesh. It must have consisted of infantry and chariots as the army of Old Hittite Kingdom in a later period.

Economy of Kanesh

The available information shows that the Kanesh court was quite actively involved in economic activities.

The economy of Kanesh city-state was mainly based on agriculture and cattle breeding. In addition, domestic and international trade and crafts were also important fields [9; 23]. The main items of international trade were tin and wool fabric [23].

The main grain crops grown in the fields around Kanesh were barley (Akk.: *še'um*) and wheat (Akk.: *aršātum*). These crops were referred to in the texts under the common name of *uṭṭutum*.

There was an irrigation system around the city, and those who used it paid money (Akk.: *gamrum*). The money was probably received by one of the court officials, *rabi šaqiātīm* (chief of the irrigated fields). Some of the lands were gardens, and horticulture was also one of the important fields of economy in Kanesh. This work was equally coordinated by the Kanesh court and it was under the supervision of *rabi kiriātīm* (chief of the gardens) and *rabi nuk(i)ribbē* (chief of the gardeners). This position is comparable to the Chief of Gardeners (Sumerian: GAL LÚ.MEŠNU.GIŠ.KIRI₆) of the Hittite court. Kanesh also had *rabi ūrqē* (chief of the vegetables) who controlled this field on behalf of the state.

Cattle breeding was another key field of economy. The “Cappadocian” sources also mention the official *rabi rē'im* (chief shepherd or head of herdsmen) [9: 149-154]. It is comparable to the official of the Hittite court GAL LÚSIPA and GAL LÚNA.GAD (chief of the shepherds)[5: 321-322].

The following officials, too, were associated with agriculture: *rabi še'ē* (chief of the barley), *rabi adrim* (chief of the threshing floor), *rabi sisē* (chief of the horses), *rabi perdim* (chief of the mules), *rabi kalbātīm* (chief of the dogs), *rabi alpātīm* (chief of the oxen), *rabi šamnim* (chief of the oil), *rabi ešše* (chief of the wood), *rabi ṭābātīm* (chief of the salts) [26: 172].

The positions of *rabi karānim* / *rabi kirānim* (chief of the wine) and *rabi šāqē* (the chief cupbearer) known from the “Cappadocian” sources can be compared with the positions of GAL LÚGEŠTIN (chief of wine or chief of the wine stewards) and LÚGAL.SAGI(.A) (cupbearer, senior of wine waiters) of the Hittite Kingdom¹². That official also held an important position in the Hittite court. The name of his position can be roughly translated as chief of the cupbearers or chief of the wine.

¹² [5: 142-147, 156-158]. Interestingly, according to the text Kt j/k 625 2-3, Tudḫaliya was the chief of the cupbearers of Zuzu, the last king of Kanesh. At the same time, the name Tudḫaliya was mentioned in the text “*Hittite offering list for the Royal Ancestors*” (KUB 11 7 i 10-12) as one of the ancestors of the Hittite kings.

That official was mentioned as a military commander as well, who was also entrusted with conducting important military operations. For example, during the reign of the Hittite king Mursili II (1321-1295 BC), Nuwanza who held the position of the chief of the cupbearers was among the main military commanders of the Empire [14: 100]. It is difficult to state what duties this official had during the Kanesh period. We can simply guess that he was also the royal chief of the cupbearers and held a high position in the court. He was probably also involved in the procurement of grapes and wine production for the court.

In the “Cappadocian” texts we also record the production of wine in the region for the first time. The information about wine (Akk.: *karānum/kerānum*, Hittite: *wiyana-*, wine) in those texts mainly refers to the areas between the Euphrates and the Taurus mountains, e.g. the cities of Mamma, Tegarama [14], Ursu, Unibgum were mentioned as the main centers of wine production from where it was imported to Kanesh. The information preserved about “grape harvest” suggests that there was viticulture in the vicinity of Kanesh as well [2: 98-99, 210-211; 36: 153-154, 164-165, 220; 7: 41-42].

From the “Cappadocian” sources we also learn about three types of land around Kanesh. The first type was the land that used an irrigation system and had one owner. The second was the so-called ḪA.LA.NI-type land, which had less value because it had several owners. The third type of land was not connected to the irrigation system [9: 139-157; 7: 41-42].

Population of Kanesh

According to estimates, in the XVIII century BC 25,000-30,000 inhabitants lived in Kanesh and the city occupied an area of 170 to 230 hectares. It was one of the largest cities of the region during this period. Assyrians mostly lived in the “Lower city” and their number was 3,000-3,500¹³. They called the local inhabitants of Kanesh *nuā’um*. And the locals called Assyrians *tamkārum*. Assyrians also used the name *nisbe-*, which meant “the man from Kanesh”, thus distinguishing the people of Kanesh from other people of Asia Minor. As the “Cappadocian” sources show, various peoples lived in Kanesh: Hittites, Luwians, Assyrians, Hurrians, Amorites, among others [1: 100-107].

According to research, local people made up $\frac{3}{4}$ of the population during the period of the II karum level and lived in separate districts. In Kanesh, the locals mostly lived in the southeast and southwest quarters of the city [31: 321]. And Assyrians mostly inhabited the northwestern part of karum [30: 14].

It is interesting that many Early Bronze Age settlements in the surrounding areas of Kanesh were abandoned in the Middle Bronze Age, which is probably because the inhabitants of these settlements moved to the more developed and

¹³ [4: 66 and Fig. 1]. During that period the city of Assur occupied an area of about 55 hectares and had a population of about 7,000 - 10,000. See [27: 81].

populous Kanesh, the capital of the state. This also suggests that during that period the population of Kanesh grew not only naturally, but also artificially [19].

It is likely that the Nesite, i.e. the Hittite language, served as the lingua franca in both Kanesh and the surrounding areas. At the same time, it should be noted that the Akkadian language was used as a written medium, and it was mastered not only by the newcomer Assyrians and those who arrived from other parts of Mesopotamia, but also by the local people who were in close contact with Assyrian traders and who also wrote, read and communicated in that language. It is equally important to state that many locals were married to Assyrians and bilingual communication was common in their families [20: 232].

Interestingly, although the imported Mesopotamian cuneiform system was mainly used during that period, there is also evidence that the Hittite-Luwian hieroglyphic script was used at the same time. The end of the Assyrian trade also marked the end of the use of cuneiform in the region, which only resumed during the Hittite Old Kingdom [37].

Since the “Cappadocian” sources were mainly written by or for merchants, it should come as no surprise that a number of specializations directly related to trade are also mentioned there. Some examples include the following: *ummeānum* (investor), *tamkārum* (Assyrian) merchant, creditor, agent), *kaşşarum* (harnesser, packer), *sāridum* (donkey driver) [26: 174].

Assyrians also had a self-governing body in Kanesh. In a certain sense they were autonomous in karum. The “great men” of karum also had judicial powers within the community. Assyrian merchants were mainly divided into three groups: “elite merchants” (Akk.: *šāqil dātīm*), who had “accounts” in the karum administration system, paid fee (Akk.: *dātum*) to the karum regime, and joined the ranks of seniors of karum. Then there were Assyrians living in karum (Akk.: *ašbūtum*), and the third group was actively involved in the caravan trade with Assyria (Akk.: *ālikū ša harrān ālim*) [3: 78].

The assembly of the Assyrians in Kanesh functioned like the assembly of the city of Assur and was subject to it as well. The assembly consisted of “small and big” people (Akk.: *šahher, rabi*). The assembly also had its *tuṣšarrum* (secretary) and *šiprū ša kārim* (envoys/messengers of the *kārum*) [26: 173].

The Assyrians that settled in Kanesh preserved their religious traditions and ceremonies. They swore before the statue of God Assur, which had a cult structure in Kanesh.

Conclusions

Thus, we have come to the following conclusions:

- Probably already at the end of the third millennium, the areas around Kanesh were mainly inhabited by the Hittite-speaking population. Although Kussara and Nesa were separate states, the population mainly spoke Hittite (Nesite).

- The settlement of Kanesh existed from the Early Bronze Age. One proof of this is that the “Old Palace” (Layer 8) and the “Warsama Palace” (Layer 7) discov-

ered in the “Upper city” were built on top of structures that date back to the Early Bronze Age. They were probably similar structures as well [32: 82, 97].

- Considering that Nesa/Kanesh was mostly inhabited by Hittites, the history of the Hittite state can be traced back to at least the XX century BC and the phase from that period to the beginning of the Old Hittite Kingdom can be called the Early Kingdom, which lasted from the XX century BC to mid-XVII century.

- Hittite was later used as the written language during the Old Kingdom. However, no text written in Hittite was found in Kanesh, which in its turn suggests that the formation of the Hittite cuneiform language took place later, from the period of reign of Ḫattusili I until the reign of Telipinu [35: 103-104].

- Anitta was in fact the first of the Hittite kings to bear the title of great king (LUGAL.GAL). Of course, this was not equivalent to the title of the kings of the period of the New Hittite Kingdom (XIV-XIII centuries BC), because at that stage the Hittite kings were one of the most powerful rulers in the Near East.

- Unlike the Old Hittite Kingdom (before the time of King Telipinu), there probably existed the order of inheritance of the throne from father to son. Examples include Inar-Warsama and Piḫana-Anitta successions.

- Judging from the list of the court agencies of Kanesh, one may assume that the positions in the later Hittite state may have been borrowed from the Kanesh court.

- If Nesa-Kanesh was abandoned around 1700 BC, probably the local court, the royal family moved to Kussara and then from there to Ḫattusa.

- The state archive of the state of Kanesh has not been found to date. It can also be assumed that they managed to move it from the abandoned Kanesh to Kussara.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Никитина А.Д., Этнический состав международной торговой колонии Каниша (XIX в. до н.э.) (Nikitina A. D., Ethnic composition of the population of the International Kanish Trade Colony (1800 BC)), Вестник Древней Истории (Journal of Ancient History), 3 (250), 2004, с. 100-107 (in Russian).
2. Barjamovic G., A Historical Geography of Anatolia in the Old Assyrian Colony Period, University of Copenhagen, 2011, 519p.
3. Barjamovic G., Hertel Th., Larsen M. T., 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 Stambul 120. Leiden, Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2012, 161 p.
4. Barjamovic G., The size of Kanesh and the demography of the early Middle Bronze Age Anatolia. In Current Research at Kültepe/Kanesh: An Interdisciplinary and Integrative Approach to Trade Networks, Internationalism, and Identity, edited by Levent Atıcı, Fikri Kulakoğlu, Gojko Barjamovic, and Andrew Fairbairn, pp. 55-68. Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplement Series Volume 4. Atlanta, 2014, Lockwood Press.

5. Bilgin R.T., Bureaucracy and Bureaucratic Change in Hittite Administration. A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Near Eastern Studies) in the University of Michigan, 2015, 548p.
6. Carruba O., *Anittae Res Gestae*, *Studia Mediterranea*, N 13, Italian University Press, 2003, 184p.
7. Corti C., Wine and Vineyards in the Hittite Kingdom: A case study of Northern Anatolia and the Southern Black Sea coast, *Ancient Near Eastern Studies / Supplement*, 51, 2017, pp. 39-58.
8. Dercksen J.G., The Assyrian Colony at Kanesh, *Hattuša-Boğazköy. Das Hethiterreich im Spannungsfeld des Alten Orients*. 6. Internationales Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 22.-24. März 2006, Würzburg, Wiesbaden, 2008, pp. 109-124.
9. Dercksen J.G., Observations on land use and agriculture in Kanesh. In: C. Michel (ed.), *Old Assyrian Studies in Memory of Paul Garelli*. *Old Assyrian Archives, Studies* 4. *PIHANS* 112, Leiden, Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2008a, pp. 139-157.
10. Donbaz V., Some Remarkable Contractors of 1-B Period Kültepe Tablets II. Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors. *Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç*. Ed. M. Mellink et al. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1993, pp. 131-54.
11. Forlanini M., The Kings of Kaniš, *Atti*. In: “Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia (Pavia 28 VI - 2 IX 1993)” (ed. O. Carruba), Pavia, 1995, pp. 123-132.
12. Forlanini M., The Offering List of KBo 4. 13 (I 17'-48') to the local gods of the kingdom, known as "Sacrifice List", and the history of the formation of the early Hittite state and its initial growing beyond central Anatolia1, 2007, pp. 259-280.
13. Forlanini M., The historical geography of Anatolia and the transition from the kārūm-period to the Early Hittite Empire. *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian Period*. *Old Assyrian Archives, Studies*, Vol. 3., *PIHANS*, vol. 111, 2008, pp. 57-86.
14. Ղազարյան Ռ., Խեթական պետության հարավարևելյան սահմանային շրջանը, Մերձավոր և Միջին Արևելքի երկրներ և ժողովուրդներ, XXX, Երևան, 2016, Երևան, էջ 19-30 (Ghazaryan R., The South-Eastern border region of the Hittite State, The Countries and Peoples of the Near and Middle East, XXX, Yerevan, 2016, pp. 19-30) (in Armenian).
15. Ղազարյան Ռ., Մուրսիլի II-ի «Տասնամյա» տարեգրությունը, Երևան, 2013, 142 էջ (Ghazaryan R., The “Ten” year annals of Muršili II), Yerevan, “Gitutyun” publishing house, 2013, 142p. (in Armenian).
16. Ghazaryan R., Kussara - the cradle of Hittite state, *The English Historical Review*, Issue 559 (2), December 2017, Volume 132, Oxford University Press, 2017, pp. 1391-1395.
17. Hoffner H., *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*. *Writings from the Ancient World*, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009, 472p.
18. Kienast B., *Die altassyrischen Texte des orientalischen Seminars der Universität Heidelberg und der Sammlung Erlenmeyer-Basel, Untersuchungen Zur Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, Berlin, 1960, 184 S.
19. Kontani R., Sudo H., Yamaguchi Y., Hayakawa Y.S., Odaka T., Archaeological survey in the vicinity of Kültepe at Kayseri Province, Turkey. In *Current Research at Kültepe/Kanesh: An Interdisciplinary and Integrative Approach to Trade Networks, Internationalism, and Identity*, edited by Levent Atıcı, Fikri Kulakoğlu, Gojko Bar-

- jamovic, and Andrew Fairbairn, pp. 95-106. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplement Series*, Volume 4. Atlanta, 2014, Lockwood Press.
20. Kryszat G., The Use of Writing among the Anatolians. In: J. G. Dercksen (ed.), *Anatolia and the Jazira During the Old Assyrian Period (PIHANS 111)*, Leiden, 2008, pp. 231-238.
 21. Kryszat G., Herrscher, Kult und Kulttradition 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, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, Vol. 35, Issue 1, 2009, S. 156-189.
 22. Kulakoglu F., Kültepe Kanesh-Karum: The earliest international trade center in Anatolia, in *Anatolia's prologue Kültepe Kanesh Karum. Assyrians in Istanbul*, Kulakoglu Fikri, Kangal Selmin (Editor), Istanbul, 2010, pp. 40-51.
 23. Lassen A.W., The Trade in Wool in Old Assyrian Anatolia, *The Trade in Old Assyrian Anatolia*, *Jaarbericht "Ex Oriente Lux"* 42, 2010, pp. 159-179.
 24. Lewy J., Apropos of a Recent Study in Old Assyrian Chronology, *Orientalia*, nova series, vol. 26, f. 1, 1957, pp. 12-36.
 25. Michel C., Considerations on the Assyrian settlement at Kanesh, *Current research at Kültepe-Kanesh. An Interdisciplinary and Integrative Approach to Trade Networks, Internationalism, and Identity*, Lockwood Press, 2014, pp. 69-84.
 26. Michel C., Were there only merchants at Aššur and Kaneš? Overview of professions attested in the Old Assyrian Sources, İ. Albayrak, M. Çayır & H. Erol. *Cahit Günbattı'ya Armağan*, 2015, pp. 171-184.
 27. Michel C., *Economy, Society, and Daily Life in the Old Assyrian Period. A Companion Assyria*. Edited by Eckart Frahm, 2017, pp. 80-107.
 28. Orlin L.L., *Assyrian Colonies in Cappadocia. Studies in Ancient History*, Hague, Paris, 1970, 276p.
 29. Otten H., *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten*, Heft 17. Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1973, XIII+91S.
 30. Özgüç T., Kültepe-Kaniş II: Eski Yakındoğu'nun Ticaret Merkezinde Yeni Araştırmalar / New Researches at the Trading Center of the Ancient Near East. *Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları Series V. Seri*, volume 41. Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1986, 150p.
 31. Özgüç T., Karum Kanish as a city of international trade. In *Çağlar Boyunca Anadolu'da Yerleşim ve Konut Uluslararası Sempozyumu / International Symposium on Settlement and Housing in Anatolia through the Ages*. 5-7 June 1996, Istanbul. (In cooperation with United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (HABITAT II)), 3-14 June 1996, Istanbul, pp. 321-330. Istanbul, 1999, Ege Yayınları.
 32. Özgüç T., Kültepe-Kaniş/Neša Sarayları ve Mabedleri / The Palaces and Temples of Kültepe Kaniş / Neša. *Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları Series V*, volume 46. Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1999a, 159p.
 33. Singer I., Hittites and Hattians in Anatolia at the Beginning of the Second Millennium B.C., *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 9, 1981, pp. 119-134.
 34. Singer I., Some thoughts on translated and original Hittite literature, *Israel Oriental Studies*, 15, 1995, pp. 123-128.
 35. Van den Hout Th., The Rise and Fall of Cuneiform Script in Hittite Anatolia, in Chr. Woods, E. Teeter, G. Emberling (ed.). *Visible Language. Investigations of Writing in the Ancient Middle East and Beyond*, Chicago, 2010, pp. 99-108.

36. Veenhof K. R., Eidem J., *Mesopotamia: The Old Assyrian Period*. *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 160/5. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Göttingen, Academic Press Fribourg, 2008, 383p.
37. Waal W., *Writing in Anatolia: The Origins of the Anatolian Hieroglyphs and the Introductions of the Cuneiform Script*, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, Akademie Verlag, 39, 2, 2012, pp. 287-315.
38. Yazicioğlu Santamaria G.B., *The people of Kanesh: Residential mobility, community life, and cultural pluralism in a Bronze Age city in Anatolia, Turkey*. A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Division of the Humanities in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The University of Chicago. Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, 2015, 591 p.

ABBREVIATIONS

AKT - (Ankara) Kültepe Tabletleri, Ankaraner Kültepe-Texte, Ankara (1990-2018.)
ATHE - B. Kienast, *Die altassyrischen Texte des orientalischen Seminars der Universität Heidelberg und der Sammlung Erlenmeyer*, Berlin, 1960.
CCT - *Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets in the British Museum* (Londres).
CTH - Laroche E., *Catalogue des textes hittites*, Paris, 1971; Editions Klincksieck, 267 p.
IBoT- *Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde Bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri*(nden Seçme Metinler) (Istanbul/Ankara).
ICK - ICK 1 - Hrozný, Bedrich. 1952. *Inscriptions cunéiformes du Kultépé*. Vol. 1. MAO 14. Prague: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství. ICK 2 - Matouš, Lubor. 1962. *Inscriptions cunéiformes du Kultépé*. Vol. 2. Prague: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství.
PIHANS - *Publications de l'Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul* (Leiden).
KEL - Kültepe Eponym Lists.
Kt - Kültepe Tabletleri.
KTK - N.B. Jankowskaja, *Klinopisnye Teksty iz Kjul'Tepe v Sobranijach SSSR*, Moscou, 1968.
KUB - *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boğazköi* (Berlin, 1921ff.).
REL - Revised Eponym List.
RIMA - *Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods* (Toronto).

Robert Ghazaryan
Institute of Oriental Studies of NAS RA
rghazaryan@orient.sci.am

ORCID: 0000-0002-6994-7695

**ՔԱՆԵՇԻ ԹԱԳԱՎՈՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՎԱՐՉԱՔԱՂԱՔԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՄԱԿԱՐԳԸ ԵՎ
ՏՆՏԵՍՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ**

Ռոբերտ Ղազարյան

Քանալի բառեր՝ Քանեշ, Փոքր Ասիա, կարում, «կապադովկյան» աղբյուրներ, տնտեսություն, առևտուր, խեթական Հին թագավորություն, Կուսսարա, պաշտոնյա, կառավարման համակարգ:

Քանեշի պետությունը բրոնզեդարյան ժամանակաշրջանում Փոքր Ասիայում ձևավորված պետական կազմավորումներից մեկն էր: Այն կարևոր նշանակություն է ունեցել խեթական պետության (մ.թ.ա. XVII դ. կեսեր - XII դ. սկիզբ) կազմավորման և կայացման գործընթացում: Քաղաքը հանդիսացել է խեթական պետության մեզ հայտնի երկրորդ կենտրոնը Կուսսարայից հետո, և նրա տարածքը հենք է հանդիսացել խեթերի պետության հետագա ընդարձակման համար: Կարևոր է շեշտել, որ քաղաքը նաև աշուրցիների կողմից կազմակերպված միջազգային առևտրական ցանցի (ավելի քան քառասուն քաղաքներում) կենտրոնատեղին էր, մայրաքաղաքը: Քանեշի պետական կառուցվածքը, կառավարման համակարգը նույնպես իրենց ազդեցությունն են թողել խեթական պետական համակարգի վրա: Այս բոլորը մեզ թելադրում են ուսումնասիրել և հասկանալ այդ քաղաք-պետության պատմությունը, տալ նրա պետական կարգի, տնտեսության, սոցիալ-տնտեսական հարաբերությունների մասին պատկերը: