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Abstract
This paper deals with 'Anatolian archives' from Kültepe, i.e. groups of tablets written in the Old Assyrian dialect but belonging to Anatolians. It is possible to trace their provenience and sometimes to identify the names of their owners. An analysis of the tablets' shapes, signs, syntax and grammar as well as the contents of some of these documents allow one to characterize them as tablets written by Anatolians.
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During the Old Assyrian period Assyrians and local people lived together, along with other foreign merchants, in the lower town of Kaniš and in several other Anatolian towns. Among the 22,500 cuneiform tablets written in the Old Assyrian dialect discovered at Kültepe, a few groups of documents belonging to Anatolians show that these local inhabitants adopted cuneiform writing and the Old Assyrian dialect for their own purposes without attempting to adapt the writing system to their own language, as did the Hittites and the Hurrians centuries later.

In the following pages the expression 'Anatolian archive' thus refers to tablets written in the Old Assyrian dialect with Old Assyrian cuneiform signs, but composed or commissioned by an Anatolian individual and belonging to Anatolians. Most of the Anatolian archives from Kültepe are still unpublished, but excavation reports sometimes indicate houses in which such archives were found as well as the names of their owners, and these houses were located within the merchants' district. Comparison of the categories and contents of the available tablets belonging to Anatolians with documents belonging to Assyrians suggests limited use of writing by Anatolians, whereby the study of the characteristics of the Old Anatolian written corpus, such as the shape of the tablets, the signs, the writing of some personal names, syntax and grammar, can be instructive. The results allow one to identify and depict the owners of the Anatolian archives and the scribes of their tablets.

* ArScAn-Histoire et archéologie de l'Orient Cunéiforme, CNRS, Maison René-Ginouvès, Archéologie et Ethnologie, Nanterre. I wish to express my warmest thanks to Marie-Henriette Gates for correcting the English text.
1. Inventory of the Anatolian archives

Up to the present, ca. 22,750 documents written in the Old Assyrian dialect have been recovered, of which 22,500 were found at Kaniš. Only 41 tablets were unearthed on the upper mound, while the great majority, 22,460 texts, come from the houses of merchants settled in the lower town. Most of the 4,800 tablets discovered before the official excavations, which started in 1948, are published, while of the 17,700 tablets unearthed during the official Turkish excavations only a thousand have been published so far. Thus only about 25% of the texts discovered at Kültepe have been published, and this study can therefore only offer some initial insights into the topic.

1.1. Houses in Kaniš belonging to Anatolians

The few tablets found on the upper mound are not taken into account here, because they were dispersed in several buildings. It is almost impossible, for the moment, to estimate the proportion of Kültepe documents from the lower city belonging to Anatolians vs. those belonging to Assyrians, but in general, the number of Anatolian archives seems to be quite small.

To gain a general picture of the Anatolian archives, one must distinguish between karum level II and level Ib. This classification is complicated, since it is now clear from the eponym lists that only three years separated the two levels (Gümbattu 2008). Moreover, the archaeological dating of texts is far from precise. The available archaeological data for level II are much more detailed than for level Ib. T. Özgüç (1948: 111; 1949: 114; 1959: 81; 1964: 27; 1986: 1–15; 2003: 100–101) published full reports, including some plans, of the excavations in the lower city that took place from 1948 to 1959 and from 1959 to 1983.

According to T. Özgüç (1959: XXII) about a hundred separate archives were found in level II. During the first decades of excavations, K. Balkan, epigrapher of the site together with E. Bilgiç, was reading the texts in order to identify some of the archive owners. Later, the archives of Šuppiḫšu were identified by L. Matouš.

In the south-eastern quarter of squares A–Z/5–30, several archives belonging to Anatolians were found (Fig. 1):

2 The citadel produced only 41 tablets, attributed to levels 8 and 7; see Donbaz (1998); Michel (2003: 115–116; 2006: 444; 2011b); T. Özgüç (1999: 93, 103, 114). These documents are contemporaneous with karum levels II and Ib. Several texts, e.g. Kt n/t 2100 (adoption) and Kt y/t 4 (loan in cereals; AKT 1 79), deal with transactions between Anatolians.
3 See the discussion by Kryszat (2008b: 159–165) about the first group of texts from 1962 (Kt n/k). Balkan (1955: 65, n. 8) reckons that 10 of the 20 tablets attributed to level Ib from the excavations of 1949 and 1954 belong in fact to level II. One noteworthy characteristic of the Ib tablets is the presence of seal impressions on the tablet itself, which contrasts with the impressions from karum level II, which are on the envelopes (see for example Kt j/k 625 edited by Donbaz 1989: 84, 97).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square</th>
<th>Owner of the house (year excavated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/21</td>
<td>Šarnikan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T–U/25</td>
<td>Galulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U–V/22</td>
<td>Šarabunuwa (1955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U–V/23–24</td>
<td>Šakdunuwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y–Z/26–27</td>
<td>Peruwa (1951; 1954)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1: Southeastern district of karum level II with houses belonging to Anatohians.
Other houses in this area were identified as belonging to Assyrian merchants such as Ṭab-ahum, Alāhum (1950) and Aṣṣur-emūqi. 4

In the north-western quarter, west of the area excavated by B. Hrozny, who found the archives of Pūšu-kēn and Imdimū in G-I/9–10 in 1925 (Hrozny 1927), it was revealed that area A-G/8-12 had been inhabited mainly by Assyrians, some of them well known, such as Laqēpum and Adad-sulûlî (1948). To the east of Hrozny’s excavations was a mixed residential sector with houses belonging to Anatolians and Assyrians (dated to levels II and Ib). Unfortunately, the names of most of the Anatolian inhabitants of this area, except Šuppiahšu, are unknown (Fig. 2). 5

These plans are far from complete. The entire area has now been excavated and seems to have been densely inhabited, as suggested, e.g., by the remains uncovered in area LV–LX/125–130, excavated mainly during the first half of the 1990s. 6

Tablets from karum level Ib are quite rare, totalling as of the year 2000 only some 340 tablets (T. Özgüç 1986: 17–21). In 2001 archaeologists exposed a large house from this level containing a further 143 texts, including an eponym list and a letter of king Ḫurmiṣli (Günbatti 2005). Apart from the eponym list (KEL G; Günbatti 2008) the only text discovered in 2001 already published belongs to the heirs of Šalim-Aṣṣur, an Assyrian merchant. 7

1.1.1. Šuppiahšu’s house

The house of Šuppiahšu, excavated in 1959 (Kt k/k) in area M–N/11–13, was one of the biggest of level II with its 130 m² and 8 rooms (Fig. 3). Rooms 1–3 were added to the original five, perhaps once the owner had become wealthy. 8 A staircase from room 1 led to a second floor, where the family slept. Room 3 had a very large oven, 2.40 m. in diameter. Rooms 4 and 5 contained several pots, a silo and a hearth on a platform. Rooms 6 to 8 were used as storerooms. The smallest one, room 8, divided in two parts by a partition, was a kind of cellar reached by stepladder and was filled with stacked vessels. According to T. Özgüç (1986: 10; see also pls. 34, 2 and 36, 36), ‘The small archive of Šuppiahšu, consisting of tablets and unopened envelopes, was found in this room on the floor near the pottery ... It is clear that the tablets, which were found on the floor and along the base of the walls, had fallen from shelves at the time of the conflagration. Archives are found to have been stored in pots, baskets and boxes on shelves, and on straw matting in a room corner.’

4 I have tried to reconstruct an incomplete plan comprising excavated houses in squares A–Z/5–30, which correspond to only part of the excavated area. This plan of karum II has been reconstructed according to various publications of T. Özgüç (see above). F. Kulakoğlu gave me a plan including squares LV–LX/125–128; may he receive my warmest thanks. This area is now better known by a plan published by Kulakoğlu (2010: 45).


7 Text Kt 01/k 325, published by Albayrak (2004).

8 T. Özgüç (1959: XXII) provides a list of owners of karum II houses, including Šuppiahšu, and analyzes his house (T. Özgüç 1964: 33–34, figs. 3–5 and 1986: 9–10, 117, fig. 16a–b and plan 4).
Fig. 2: Northwestern district of karmun level II with the house of Šuppiahšu.
1.1.2. Peruwa's house

In 1951 archaeologists working in area Y-Z/28 found a small three-room house (7.5 × 4.5 m.). In the north-western corner of the large room, identified later as the courtyard, they discovered 64 tablets, fragments and unopened envelopes arranged in two baskets. On the 43 envelopes N. Özgüç counted 85 different seal imprints, among which 60 belonged to local people. The owner of the archive was Peruwa.

Work continued in this area in 1954, extending Peruwa's house substantially (T. Özgüç 1959: 92–94 and fig. 50). It too can be counted among the largest houses of level II, with 14 rooms distributed over 224 m² (Fig. 4). In addition to the tablets unearthed in 1951 in the courtyard (room 1), more unopened envelopes were found in a small cubicle, room 2, and in a basement, room 12.

1.2. Status of publication of the Anatolian archives

Most of the Anatolian archives unfortunately remain unpublished, and the date of some of them is much debated. Among the texts from the regular excavations of level II about ten Anatolian archives have been recognized.

The 64 documents unearthed in 1951 (Kt d/k) in the house of Peruwa were assigned to K. Balkan, but he published only four of them, while Kienast published one further text.9

---

9 According to a preliminary report of the 1951 excavations published two years later (N. Özgüç 1953: 289–305), that season was conducted by N. Özgüç while her husband was in Great Britain.

10 Kt d/k 5 (Balkan 1967: 408, n. 1); Kt d/k 19 (id. 1974: 35); Kt d/k 28 (id. 1979: 52); Kt d/k 48 (id. 1974: 35); Kt d/k 29 (Kienast 2008: 46–47). During my first stay in Ankara, in July 1991, E. Bilgiç allowed me to work on this group of texts, and the data presented in this paper are based on my readings of the entire
A substantial part of the 196 documents discovered in 1954 (Kt f/k) belonged to the same merchant and are still unpublished except for two texts. At least six other tablets belonging to a man called Peruwa, were found in 1950 (Kt c/k) and have been published recently.

A small archive containing 5 texts belonging to a certain Şarnikan, son of Arruba, was discovered in 1953 (Kt e/k).

An archive belonging to one Şarabunuwa was excavated in 1955 (Kt g/k), none of which has been published yet. The first 17 tablets (Kt g/k 1–17) are loan contracts preserved with their envelopes, but it is not known how many of the 413 tablets and envelopes unearthed in 1955 belong to Şarabunuwa.
A small archive of Šuppiaḫšu found in 1959 (Kt k/k) is still unpublished.\(^5\)

In 1962 were discovered 2,158 tablets, fragments and envelopes, including 7 dealing with the business of Ašēt, son of Arrurbaš, *alāḫšinnum* of Dateša.\(^6\) These texts seem to date to the very end of *kūrum* level II.\(^7\)

The archives of Assyrian and Anatolian merchants unearthed in 1963 were found mixed together and are supposed to come from the same building.\(^8\) Among the Assyrian owners are the merchants Aššur-iddī, son of Agua, Iddin-Sin and Ušur-ša-Ištar. Among the tablets belonging to Anatolians are 7 documents from a woman’s archive, Madawada (Albayrak 1998: 1–14). Other Anatolian names do not seem to be linked to a specific archive.\(^9\)

In many archives are found some single texts dealing only with Anatolian names, but this does not necessarily imply that the whole archive would have belonged to an Anatolian family. Among the group of tablets uncovered in 1987, for example, are contracts mentioning only Anatolian names, though others clearly belong to Assyrians (Hecker 1997).\(^10\) At least three loan contracts belonging to Šiwašmi, priest of the deity Ḥigiša, were excavated in 1988 and 1989.\(^11\)

Among the tablets uncovered before 1948 there are also documents belonging to Anatolians. Some were edited by Eisser and Lewy (1930/1935) in their study of Old Assyrian legal documents, including mainly family contracts, others by Kienast (1984: nos. 10–11, 13, 15–17, 20–22, 25–26, 28–29, 32, 34, 37) in his treatment of sale contracts. Dercksen edited those dealing with a selection of Anatolian institutions,\(^12\) and the documents relating to Enišaru’s family and business were studied by Veenhof.\(^13\)

Of the 480 tablets from *kūrum* level Ib a significant proportion belongs to Anatolian archives.\(^14\) A few have been edited by Donbaz (1989; 1990; 1993; 1999; 2001; 2004a), but

\[\text{\footnotesize 15 Šuppiaḫšu’s archive must have been quite small, since only 5 of the 121 documents unearthed in 1959 mention his name (Kt k/k 31: 1, 8; 33: 12; 34: 1; 35a: 12; 35b: 6; 36: 17, 18). T. Özguç (1964: 32) reports ca. 800 tablets for this archive, but there seems perhaps to be some confusion with another group of texts.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 16 Kt n/k 71–77, published by Donbaz (1988).}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 17 According to Kryszat (2008b: 159–161) this name is a homonym of the *rabi maḥirīm* mentioned in Kt n/k 32, 8, 34, dated to *kūrum* level Ib.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 18 Building B-D/11–12, room 2. The texts were published by Albayrak (2006) in AKT 4; see also Veenhof (2009).}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 19 E.g., Kt o/k 52, dealing with the transfer of 4 fields and a garden by Kubidaḫšu to Ašu’ad, persons not mentioned elsewhere in the archive.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 20 A certain Kikarsa(n) occurs several times (Kt 87/k 39: 1, 8; Kt 87/k 126: 12, 18, 21; Kt 87/k 266: 3; Kt 87/k 285: 7, 17, 19, 25; Kt 87/k 303: 5; Kt 87/k 312: 4) and could be the owner of a group of texts.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 21 Kt 88/k 1082, Kt 88/k 1087 and Kt 89/k 358; see Donbaz (1996); Dercksen (2008: 88). According to Kryszat (2004: 177) it is a *kūrum* level II archive.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 22 Dercksen (2004: 156–165): BIN 4 209; Prag I 568; Ka 1113; Münster 2432; Kay 294; SUP 1; VS 26 100; VS 26 101.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 23 Veenhof (1978): CCT 5 49d; CCT I 10b; TC I 168; TC 3 327; ICK I 129; Prag 1 697; JCS 14, no. 12.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 24 Including at least the following: from 1949: Kt b/k 21; 1953: Kt e/k 167; 1958: Kt j/k 625; 1959: Kt k/k 9–11, 14 (Donbaz 1989: 81–84); 1962: Kt n/k 11, 14, 31–32, 39 (Donbaz 1989; 2008; Kryszat 2008b); 1964: 10 tablets; 1965: 10 tablets, including Kt r/k 15, 19 (Donbaz 1989: 78–81); 1967: 15 tablets, including Kt s/k 3, 10; 1968: 2 tablets; 1973: Kt 73/k 74, 76, 78; 1987: Kt 87/k 39 (Donbaz 1993: 146–148); 1988: Kt 88/k 713 (Donbaz 1993: 145–146); 1989: 30 texts, including Kt 89/k 358–383 (Donbaz 1993);}\]
most are still unpublished. The owners of these documents, consisting of scattered texts rather than real archives, are therefore not yet known.

2. Contents of some Anatolian archives

There are at least three difficulties in studying the contents of Anatolian archives. First, as noted, they are for the most part still unpublished. Second, there are many homonyms in the Anatolian onomasticon; several merchants, for example, were called Peruwa (see below). Third, the number of tablets discovered in the houses of Anatolian merchants is always very small compared to the numbers found in the houses of Assyrians. Nevertheless, it is possible to eke an idea of their contents from a sample of Anatolian archives.

2.1. Small Anatolian archives of kārum level II and their contents

Among the few published Anatolian archives from level II are found the following groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (/k): no. of texts</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>Name not cited</th>
<th>Loan contracts (creditor)</th>
<th>Purchase and other contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950 (c/k): 625</td>
<td>Peruwa, s. Suppibra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953 (e/k): 509</td>
<td>Šarnikan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (slave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962 (n/k): 727</td>
<td>Ašêt, s. Arurubaš</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (slave), 1 (house)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963 (o/k): 728</td>
<td>Madawada</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (slave)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These archives rarely deal with long-distance trade.

2.2. Peruwa's archive unearthed in 1951

The 64 tablets unearthed in 1951, 45 of which were preserved together with their envelopes, belong to the archives of Peruwa. The name Peruwa is found in 48 of them, while the others concern predominantly Assyrians. These 48 texts comprise the following:

1999: Kt 99/k 138–139; 2001: 143 tablets. To these one should add the following tablets uncovered before 1948: Eisser and Lewy (1930/1935: nos. 3, 189, 276); Kienast (1984: no. 18); Dercksen (2004: 172–174 [TC 1 122; TC 3 214]).

29 The seal impressions on the envelopes were published by N. Özgüç (2006: 59–92).
2.3. Contents of the Anatolian archives and comparison with the Assyrian archives

Anatolian archives contain predominantly loan and purchase contracts as well as some contracts concerning family matters. They are quite different from what can be reconstructed of the Assyrian archives, which contain the following groups of texts:

- letters received from merchants in Aššur or in other Assyrian settlement in Anatolia;
- loan contracts, judicial documents, trial proceedings and verdicts and various familial and commercial contracts;
- lists, private notices, memoranda, etc.

Very few letters were found in the Anatolian archives, since their native owners did not need to maintain contact with families and colleagues living in Aššur, as did the Assyrians. There are two categories of letters received by Anatolians:

- those dealing with trade, usually sent by Assyrian colleagues; a single letter (Kt d/k 2), found in 1951, was written by an Assyrian (Buzāzu) and addressed to Peruwa and to two Assyrians, Ab-šalim and Aššur-malik;
- those mixing trade and matters concerning daily life written by Assyrians to their Anatolian wives (Michel 1997; 2008b).

The loan contracts owned by Anatolians are quite similar to those belonging to Assyrians, but are much more numerous as a proportion of the archives in which they were found. They concern silver and grain, and a default interest is noted. The debtors are generally Anatolian colleagues. The few documents mentioning loans to Assyrians concern significant amounts of silver, between 1 and 5 minas. The main difference concerns the calendar. The Assyrian loan contracts are usually dated by a week (ḫamušītu), a month and a year (eponym, limu), the deadline for the payment being given in weeks (Michel 2010a). The Anatolian loan contracts, in contrast, rarely use the Assyrian week and eponym system, preferring to indicate payment dates relating to seasonal events, such as festivals or agricultural activities (Veenhof 2008a: 234–245; Michel 2010a). For example, the loan contracts of Peruwa unearthed in 1951 employ the following payment deadlines: ḫarpū, ‘summer’.

---

30 Larsen (2008); Michel (1998; 2008c); Veenhof (2003).
Some of Ṣuppiaḥšu’s loan contracts dealing with grain in the context of joint land ownership further state that the debtor must cultivate a field of a certain measure as part of the payment: ‘2 fields, his share (in a partnership), of 2 naruq surface (240 l), (the debtor) will cultivate; the 6 jars (180 l.) of seeds are at his (expense)’.

The purchase contracts, many of which have been studied by Kienast (1984), concern slaves, houses and land. While both Assyrians and Anatolians bought slaves and houses, the purchase of land was typically Anatolian. Among the tablets belonging to Peruwa excavated in 1951 are four purchase contracts in which he buys five slaves (Kt d/k 11; 33; 41; 49), one text in which he pays for a house (Kt d/k 38), and six purchase contracts in which he buys seven fields (Kt d/k 6; 10; 27; 40; 42; 52), one of which includes a spring (Kt d/k 27). Some of these mention a possible claim involving land linked to a service obligation (tuzinnûm; e.g. Kt d/k 11).

Anatolian archives also contain family contracts dealing with marriage and divorce, adoption, brotherhood and division of estate, revealing traditions that differ from those of the Assyrian family contracts. The few marriage and divorce contracts suggest, for example, that Anatolian marriage was exclusively monogamous and that man and woman enjoyed equal property rights (Michel 2010b; 2011a). A marriage contract found among the archives unearthed in 1951 concerns an Assyrian merchant and an Anatolian woman, Peruwa acting as a witness (Kt d/k 29). The great majority of marriage and divorce contracts deal with mixed couples. In fact, the Assyrian merchants were allowed to take a second wife in Anatolia and, after several years in Anatolia, could decide to go back to Aššur. They had to formalize their separation from their Anatolian wife by an official document detailing the woman’s divorce compensation and decisions concerning the children (Michel 2008b: 222–225). Such legal documents pertaining to Anatolians could be concluded by an oath involving Assyrian and Anatolian gods (e.g. Prag I 651 or ICK I 32).

Most of the family contracts dealing with Anatolians are dated to kirum level Ib and are issued under the jurisdiction (ina qaṭē) of the local ruler and the rabi simmillûm, who usually corresponds to the crown prince (Veenhof 2003: 454; Dercksen 2004: 140–145, 168, 172–173). Once a case was settled, raising a renewed claim could lead to a fine and even a death penalty (e.g. Kt j/k 625 or Kt k/k 1). Also dated to kirum Ib are contracts registering the formation of joint property ownership between natural or adopted brothers working

---

31 Kt d/k 17 and Kt d/k 46. Anatolian contracts of level Ib were notarized (iqqā’it), and thus dated, by the king and crown prince.
for and in an estate under the supervision of their father and mother (aṭāḥū). Others deal with division of property among heirs. Some family contracts mention service obligations linked to the ownership of a ‘house of the king’, such as arḫālum and unuššum (Dercksen 2004).

3. Characteristics of the Anatolian corpus

There are at least two problems in distinguishing between tablets written by Anatolians and those written by Assyrians. The first concerns the connection between the persons mentioned in a document and the text’s author. Must a tablet dealing with Anatolian matters have been written by an Anatolian scribe? Second, Anatolian archives are very few in comparison to the enormous quantity of documents unearthed in the lower city, and they are not equally distributed between karum levels II and Ib. Anatolian archives represent less than 5% of the total number of tablets from level II, while they constitute at least 25% of those from level Ib. Thus, some of the characteristics said to be typical of the karum Ib tablets may in fact be attributable to Anatolian scribes.

3.1. Tablets, signs and spelling

Tablets belonging to Anatolians seem, in general, less carefully shaped than Assyrian ones. They are approximately square or rectangular, with rounded corners, Fig. 5 illustrating types of tablets dating to both karum levels. Kt 93/k 473 is a level II tablet written by the well-trained Assyrian merchant Aššur-taklāku, owner of the archives unearthed in 1993. He produced documents with a very small and tight script enabling him to write at least 40 lines on a tablet less than 5 cm high. Kt 88/k 990 is a level II slave purchase contract belonging to an Anatolian man. Its writing is much bigger and more widely spaced. Kt n/k 27 is a level Ib judicial report dealing with Assyrians and has a regular script compared to that of Kt 89/k 365, a legal decision concerning a house that was the subject of a dispute among Anatolians. However, tablet shape and style are not always certain criteria according to which one can distinguish between documents written by Assyrians as opposed to those drafted by Anatolians, since Assyrians could also write tablets that are not well shaped and written, as may be seen in Kt 93/k 279, a letter sent by Ištar-wēdāku to Aššur-taklāku.

The signs written by Assyrians usually employ more numerous but also more regularly placed wedges, and a vertical that is supposed to terminate at a horizontal, or vice versa, generally does so quite precisely. Wedges forming a sign are placed more tightly together in texts referring to Assyrians, more loosely in tablets belonging to Anatolians. Once again, this distinction can also differentiate an educated merchant or a scribe from a person who had learned the basic principles of writing but had not received formal training.

Kryszat (2008a) lists two categories of signs that distinguish documents produced by educated merchants or scribes. Group A comprises those most often used (90%) as well as

Fig. 5: Tablet types of *kārum* levels II and Ib.
simple signs, such as $l_a$, $t_i$ and $a_b$, while group B (10 %) contains more elaborate signs, such as $l_a$, $t_i$ and $a_b$. Group B signs disappear during the reign of Naram-Sin (ca. 1872 B.C.). According to Kryszat, none of the texts written by Anatolians uses the signs of Group B. But, as mentioned, the majority of Anatolian documents date to level Ib, a period during which Group B signs were no longer in use.

It is also possible to identify a number of peculiarities in the Anatolian documents that suggest that their scribes were writing in a language other than their mother tongue:

- Some vowels that are seldom written plene in normal Old Assyrian orthography are written plene, especially in proper names, but also in some nouns, even extending to the final vowel of conjugated verbs;
- Duplicated signs or words;
- Unusual syllabic sequences;
- Anatolian knowledge of ideograms seems to be quite poor; one finds, e.g., $w_a-h_r-i-m$ for usual ITI in the loan contract Kt d/k 22b: 18;
- As Kryszat (2008a: 235–236) has noted, Anatolian names are written with a final (nom. sg.) -aš by Anatolian scribes, but not by Assyrians.
- The writing of Anatolian proper names is not fixed and vowels alternate between $a$, $u$ and $i$, but naturally such variation in the writing of Anatolian names can result from Assyrians failing to hear them correctly as well.

3.2. Syntax and grammar

There are several syntactical and grammatical peculiarities in the Anatolian documents as well. These have been listed in detail by Kienast (1984: 31–32), who noticed that, among 20 contracts dealing with Anatolians, only one contains no mistakes. Among the peculiarities one finds:

34 Some of these have been previously observed by Dercksen (2007); Kienast (1984: 31–35); Kryszat (2008a).
35 E.g., in proper names: $A-l_i$ (Kt c/k 1635: 3); $P_e-r_u-w_a$ (Kt c/k 154: 2); $S_u-p_i-a-h_s_u-u$ (Kt e/k 154: 16); $L_u-l_u-u$ (Kt d/k 13a: 1; Kt k/k 37a: 16); $A-s_i-e$-e$-e$ (Kt n/k 76: 12); $K_a-l_u-u$-a (Kt n/k 76: 8); in substantives: e-se-e (Kt d/k 16b: 8); s-mi-i (Kt n/k 75: 8); s-e-re-e-šu (Kt 88/k 1050: 6); verbal forms: iš-qū-lu-u (Kt e/k 156: 12); ė-šu-bu-ū (Kt e/k 156: 14); i-du-nu-u (Kt d/k 12b: 11; Kt d/k 12a: 17); u-ša-ba-ū-šu (Kt d/k 17b: 14); such forms are less common in Assyrian texts.
36 E.g.: ša-tim ša-tim (Kt d/k 20a: 9–10); i-tü-ru i-tü-rü (Kt d/k 42b: 12–13); i-gi i-gi (Kt k/k 10: 27); 1 ma-na KU.BABBAR, 1 ma-na KU.BABBAR (Kt k/k 19: 14–15).
37 Ḥa-ra-am-id-nam (Kt e/k 155: 3); Ki-ka-ar-āš-nah-šu (Kt d/k 9b: 18; Kt d/k 9a: 4).
39 Pē-ru-a (Kt c/k 1634: 17), Pē-ru-wa (Kt c/k 1637: 2), Pē-er-wa (Kt d/k 28b: 6, 17, 19; Kt d/k 40b: 9, 16); Pî-ir-kä (Kt d/k 15b: 7–8; Kt d/k 15a: 16–17), Pär-kä (Kt n/k 168: 6); Iš-pi-nu-ma-an (Kt e/k 155: 2), Iš-pu-nu-ma-an (Kt 88/k 90: 4); Ši-ri-šu-ma-an (Kt d/k 52b: 3), Ša-ak-ri-šu-ma-an (Kt 84/k 169: 3); Ši-ḫu-ur-pi-a (Kt n/k 72: 4), Šu-ḫar-pi-a (Kt n/k 31: 6), Šu-ḫu-ur-pi-a (Kt 89/k 376: 2); Lu-li-ū (Kt k/k 37: 3) for Lu-lu (Kt 80/k 25: 3).
Confusion of singular and plural forms, accusative and dative cases as well as feminine and masculine genders,

- Omission of the conjunction * between two nouns.

Anatolians were not well trained in the scribal art and, while some mistakes can be regarded as conditioned by differences between the scribes’ mother tongue and the language in which they were writing (gender confusion), others must be attributed simply to poor command of Akkadian (errors in number and case).

4. Owners of the Anatolian archives and the authors of their documents

Before trying to define who wrote the texts, an attempt should be made to identify the owners of the archives. This is not an easy task because the tablet finds from various loci are mixed, and there are many homonyms within both the Assyrian and the Anatolian communities.

4.1. The owners of Anatolian archives

Anatolian archive owners are, for the most part, wealthy, a fact confirmed, for example, by the large houses of Šuppiaḥšu and Peruwa dating from kārum level II (see above). According to several loan and purchase contracts, some Anatolians owned many fields, and others strengthened their relationships with the Assyrians by way of mixed marriages. Thus, Enišaru, son of Kunsat gave his daughter as wife to an Assyrian named Laqēpum, and there are many more such examples (Veenhof 1978; Michel 2008b). Other Anatolians had official or cultic functions in Kaniš (Veenhof 2008a: 230–233); thus, Šiwašmi, the priest of Ḥiḏiša, loaned enormous amounts of grain to various groups of people on several occasions.

The case of Peruwa, son of Šuppibra, whose archive was unearthed during the excavations in 1950 (Kt c/k) and subsequently published by Albayrak (2005: 101; 2007: Kt c/k 1642), is of particular interest. Albayrak remained noncommittal on whether this merchant should be considered identical to Peruwa, owner of the 1951 (Kt d/k) archives and part of those from 1954 (Kt f/k). Indeed, at least 20 individuals can be shown with reference to their differing fathers’ names to have borne the name Peruwa. The owner

49 The latter distinction, of course, does not exist in Hittite or Luwian, which distinguish rather between animate and inanimate. Examples of singular instead of plural forms include: *sāl-mi-šu-un ú i-mi-šu-<nu>* (Kt d/k 17e: 16–18); *sāl-mi-šu-<nu>* (Kt d/k 19a: 17–18); gender confusion: *a woman called ‘son of’* (AAA 1/3 8: Šimnuman dumu <munus> Tatali), masculine and feminine suffixes confused (TC 3 214A ašar libiša instead of ašar libbiša). In a dispute between two women (Kt c/k 1637) one finds confusion in number and gender: Tepulka u Šuppišika dumu <munus> (no plural) Kunwan iżziču (masc. instead of fem. form), betam rebetam Šuppišika ilqe (masc. instead of fem.) betam šaniam Tepulka talqe (here fem. is correct). See Dercksen (2007).

41 E.g. Kt c/k 1639b: 16; Kt d/k 9b: 11; Kt d/k 34b: 6; Kt f/k 625: 14–15.

42 There are several other Anatolian merchants named Peruwa mentioned in the archives unearthed in 1951: a son of Ḥalkiašu (Kt d/k 16a: 1–2); son of Nakiaḥšan (Kt d/k 22a: 1–2; 22b: 20–21); son of Ka-
of the 1951 archive is referred to as the chief shepherd in a loan contract in which he is creditor (Kt d/k 51). If one assumes that the marriage contract between Puzur-Šamaš and Hašušarnika found in 1951 was witnessed by the owner of 1951 and 1954 (Kt d/k 29), then he would be the same man whose archives were unearthed in 1950, since, according to the envelope of this contract (Kt d/k 29a: 1), his father's name is Šu-pê-e-eb-ra. Thus, Peruwa's archives would have contained perhaps more than 150 documents. He is known to have been active around Aššur eponym no. 96 (under the reign of Puzur-Âššur II)\(^{43}\) and to have loaned silver, barley and wheat to many individuals, even to a whole village. He was important enough to have his own standard measure.\(^{44}\) Peruwa seems to owe his wealth at least in part to his official position, as he seems to have received land from the king, to have purchased further fields as well, and finally, to have been able to produce far more crops than he needed.

The other Anatolian owners of archives also seem to have been very wealthy, and it appears reasonable to assume that only affluent persons needed to record their most important transactions. Not only Anatolian men but also women could own an archive, as witnessed by the tablet collection of a certain Madawada, published by Albayrak (1998).

4.2. Authors of documents belonging to Anatolians

There are criteria according to which authors of official documents belonging to Anatolians and those who wrote private texts can be distinguished.

4.2.1. Authors of Anatolian official documents

The Old Assyrian written dialect served as the diplomatic language between the Anatolian kingdoms, and it may be supposed that texts emanating from chancelleries were written by official scribes appointed by the palace. Only very few official Anatolian documents are published. Veenhof recently published a document in which the merchant Ḥannan-Nārum, son of Elâlî, had taken up the function of scribe in Māmā (AKT 5 51: 40–41), proposing that Ḥannan-Nārum served as scribe for the Assyrian community or in the service of the local palace (AKT 5, p. 161). The several copies of treaties between Anatolian and Assyrian authorities were clearly written by Assyrians. The scribe of the letter sent by Anum-Hirbi, king of Mama, to Waršama, king of Kaniš, is unknown (Kt g/t 35 = Michel 2001: no. 62, kārum Ib). Likely is Veenhof's (2008a: 48) suggestion that he was an Assyrian, the erasures, piriya (Kt d/k 34a: 8); and son of Mulua (Kt d/k 44a: 3). Another Peruwa, son of Ḥupuašu, appears as a witness in a text excavated in 1954 (Kt f/k 59: 22–23). Further homonyms of Peruwa are found in other archives: son of Dada (CCT 1 33b: 15), son of Enna-Sin (Prag I 478: 27), son of Ḥamuria (ICK 1 27B: seal A), son of Ḥanu (Kt s/k 10: 3, 18), son of Kanana (Prag I 674: 5), son of Karunuwa (KKS 36A: 14; B: 14), son of Šadaḫšu (VS 26 125: 19), son of Šakrjuman (Kt k/k 37b: 13), son of Tarikuda (Kt v/k 152: 8), son of Walâḫšīna (KTS 1 46a: 3, 7), son of Zapāli (Kt n/k 73: 5).

See Kt f/k 51, a loan contract belonging to Peruwa and dated to the eponym Kubiya, son of Ikkupiya, whereby the father’s name is an error for Karriya (KEL 96; Veenhof 2003: 34, 53–55).

\(^{43}\) Ina karpitim ša Peruwa (Kt d/k 19b: 8–9).
use of wrong signs, etc. being 'indications that the writer was an Assyrian trader, who knew very well how to handle the stylus, but who may have been less experienced in writing such a diplomatic letter and, not being a professional writer, may have made a few scribal mistakes (without somebody to correct him) and may have used "colloquial diction". The local king might also have dictated his letter to a translator, who could thus be responsible for some of the errors. It is most probable that the less official letter sent by the ruler of Tuhpiya to an Assyrian merchant was also written by an Assyrian (Kt 85/k 87 = Michel 2001: no. 93).

4.2.2. Authors of Anatolian private documents

The Anatolian private archives are mainly composed of contracts. Unfortunately, contrary to the Old Babylonian tradition, scribes are very rarely mentioned among the witnesses in the Old Assyrian contracts. While there is therefore no explicit indication about the authors of documents, Kryszat (2008a: 234) has suggested that Anatolian contracts mentioning at least one Assyrian among the witnesses could have been written by him in his function as a scribe. Where no Assyrian is mentioned, the document would have been written by an Anatolian. He quotes as an example a tablet bearing no Assyrian name and showing typical features of some Anatolian written texts, such as the ending of personal names with a final -āš (Kt 88/k 713).

While this hypothesis certainly explains some cases, it does not seem to be universally valid. Several texts belonging to Peruwa’s archives and bearing at least one Assyrian name show specific Anatolian features, such as lengthened vowels (Kt d/k 35b; Kt e/k 156). In another document, a loan contract owned by Peruwa and dealing with the debt of a whole village (Kt d/k 28), a certain Aššur-idū completes the roster of witnesses, but the scribe used some Anatolian word endings (e.g. makreš).

Some contracts were nicely written with very few mistakes, and it is plausible that Assyrian scribes were paid by some Anatolian families to produce their contracts in accordance with Anatolian customs. Moreover, all contracts supervised by the local ruler may have been written by an official scribe, perhaps an Assyrian. However, it is clear that some Anatolians learned the Old Assyrian dialect and cuneiform script in order to be able to write simple documents on their own.

4.3. How did Anatolians learn to speak, read and write the Old Assyrian dialect?

To answer this question, one must distinguish between language and writing, as did the inhabitants of Kaniš: the scribe, Dub. Sar., wrote tablets while the Targumannum acted as translator. The existence of a ‘chief of the translators’ (rabi Targumannē) indicates that translators worked predominantly for the administration in the context of com-

---

45 See also Balkan (1957: 18-30) about the language of the letter and figs. 1-6 for the ductus.
46 A list of these iqqātē tablets can be found in Kryszat (2008b: 161-165). See also Veenhof (2008a: 46-50).
mercial and diplomatic relations between the local palace and the Assyrians or other foreigners (Ulshöfer 2000). Further, Anatolian merchants learned enough of the Old Assyrian dialect, and Assyrians knew some Hittite words (used in some texts), so that the two communities were able to communicate. Some Assyrians married Anatolian women (Michel 2008b), while Assyrian widows occasionally married Anatolians, and communication between such couples was presumably no problem, the children of such unions being exposed to both languages, so that the succeeding generation would have been bilingual.

Writing marked a second step. The study of the Old Assyrian school texts and scholarly production found at Kaniš and Aššur has led to an understanding of how the Assyrians learned to read and to write. Since the syllabary was quite limited – some 150 signs, consisting mostly of syllables along with a few logograms – many Assyrians were able to read and write their own contracts and letters. About ten Old Assyrian school texts from Kaniš are extant, all of them found in houses inhabited by Assyrians, while the case of a list of proper names (Kt 00/k 12) is less clear. Eight documents belonging to the same archive as the list have recently been published, i.e. a tablet dealing only with Anatolians (Kt 00/k 1), two treaties between Assyrian and Anatolian authorities dated to level Ib (Kt 00/k 6 and Kt 00/k 10), three Assyrian legal texts (00/k 7, 14, 16) and one letter belonging to Assyrians (Kt 00/k 17). Again, these documents would appear to have belonged to an Assyrian archive. One can therefore conclude that none of the Old Assyrian school texts have been found in an Anatolian archive. As for the language, one can imagine that some educated Assyrian men who were married to Anatolian women could have taught their wives and children the basics of cuneiform writing (Michel 2009). The process would perhaps have taken longer than a normal scribal education, however, since Anatolians had first to learn the Old Assyrian dialect before being able to read and write it.

The few Anatolian archives excavated at Kaniš consist predominantly of loans and sale contracts. They suggest that some Anatolians adopted the cuneiform script and the Old Assyrian dialect. These archives belonged to wealthy individuals, such as Peruwa, the chief shepherd, who was able to accumulate enough wealth to buy a whole village. The data provided by these documents concern mainly the Anatolian elite that traded with the Assyrians. Documents written by Anatolians show characteristic features, such as mistakes with feminine and masculine suffixes and the addition of nominal case endings to Anatolian names, which were often omitted by the Assyrians.

Anatolians had first to learn the Old Assyrian dialect before they could read and write it. Acquiring this knowledge took some time, and we have quite a few Anatolian archives for the best documented years of kārum level II. An increase of mixed marriages could have led to a rise in bilingual individuals, and we should search the archives for bilingual scribes.

47 Michel (2008a). Among these are two small exercise tablets with arithmetic problems unearthed in 1948 and 1984 (Kt a/k 178 and Kt 84/k 3), which would also have belonged to Assyrian archives.
49 If any such documents exist, they are still unpublished.
have facilitated access to the Assyrian language and writing among Anatolians, and in fact, there are far more Anatolian archives in proportion from karum level Ib than from level II.

Anatolian words are found in documents in the Old Assyrian dialect belonging to both Assyrians and Anatolians, and there is no question that it would have been possible to write down the native language spoken in Kanis during the karum period (Dercksen 2007). Moreover, the existence of about fifty titles of Anatolian officials, most of them borrowed into Akkadian and employed in the form rabi plus a substantive, witnesses a highly structured administration in which each economic sector was represented (Michel 2011a). Anatolians did not adapt the cuneiform script to their own language, even though it could have provided an efficient tool in their highly structured administration and complex society. Instead, Akkadian retained its prestige, serving not only diplomatic purposes but also, even if only sparingly, in the local administration, as suggested by a list of Anatolian persons found on the citadel (Bilgic 1964; Günbatti 1987).
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