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SUMMARY

In this dissertation, I investigate the impact of the extended religious and political elements in the ancient Near East of the Late Bronze period that influenced the reigns of Hattušili III, his consort, Queen Puduhepa, circa 1267 to 1237 BCE and their son Tudhaliya IV circa 1237 to 1228 BCE. As rulers of the Hittites, they were not the greatest and most influential royals, like the great Suppiluliuma I circa 1322 to 1344 BCE, but their ability to adopt an eclectic approach similar to that of their great predecessors regarding religion, politics, international diplomacy and signing treaties made this royal triad a force to be reckoned with in the ancient Near East. Therefore, central to this investigation will be the impact of Hattušili III’s usurpation of the throne and Puduhepa’s role in the Hurrianisation of the state cult and pantheon. Also included is a brief investigation into the continuation of the reorganisation and restructuring of the Hittite state cult and local cult inventories by Tudhalia IV and his mother Puduhepa after the death of Hattušili III. By researching this royal triad, their deities, their Hurro-Hittite culture and the textual evidence of their rule, it becomes possible to assemble some of the elements that impacted on their rule. I have used available transliterated translated texts and pictures to support and illustrate the investigation of this complex final period in the history of the Hittite Empire.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The thirteenth century BCE in ancient Anatolia is well documented. However, this should not give one unlimited confidence in researching the basic elements describing the last period of the Hittite Empire (ca 1400-1200 BCE). New discoveries reveal previously unsuspected angles of Late Hittite history that call for a comprehensive reassessment of the previously known facts. The historical and religious picture of the last decades of the Hittite Empire, when Hattušili III and Puduhepa, followed by their son Tudhaliya IV, were on the throne has radically changed and continues to change as research for this dissertation is being done. The new data and its implications have been discussed extensively over the last decades, both in specialized articles and more general presentations at symposia dealing with the end of the Bronze Age in the Eastern Mediterranean (Singer 2011:666) (see Figure1.1).

1.1 BACKGROUND
An overview of the historical development in Anatolia is important because, from the point of view of the history of its religions, it is important to note that Anatolia was not a politically united region from the third millenium BCE until the middle of the seventeenth century BCE (Haas 1994:13). Anatolia consisted of twenty local ‘kingdoms’ until the establishing of Kānesh, and soon lost its leading position to Hattuša (Haas 1994:13).

1.1.1 The Hittites’ homeland

![Figure 1.1](http://www.freebibleimages.org) Satellite view of the Mediterranean Sea coastline

![Figure 1.2](http://www.futurelearn.com) Anatolia circa 2500 BCE Short online-course on: Superpowers of the ancient Near East (2015).
1.1.1.1 \textit{From where did the Hittites originate?}

Modern scholars were aware of the Hittites through Biblical, Egyptian and Mesopotamian texts, but who they really were remained largely unknown (Macqueen 1999:23). It took many years after the discovery of Hattuša in the late nineteenth century CE to decipher some of the clay tablets which contained information about this mainly unknown ethnic group from central Anatolia (see Figure 1.2). The Hittites’ homeland stretched from the western coast across Anatolia\textsuperscript{3} to the east through Syria north of Damascus to the western border of Mesopotamia (Bryce 2012b:725) (see Figure 1.1). The mountainous region of Anatolia was rich in metal deposits that were economically important and would help the Hittites, their vassals and their neighbours to gain political and economic power in the ancient Near East (Macqueen 1999:15).

Anatolia was predominantly an agrarian and pastoral society consisting of small villages and peasants living in close relationship to the land. This relationship between people and land dominated Hittite culture, ‘touching every sphere of life’ (Gorny 1989:79). Anatolia was a difficult environment for farmers, villagers, city dwellers and the élite to survive in. The lack of interest in excavating Anatolian villages and small farms resulted in only a small number of excavations. Thus, an interpretation of village life is largely based on speculation and available textual sources (Gorny 1989:80). Too few excavation attempts have been made to allow for an analysis and interpretation of the important contributions peasants in central Anatolia made to society. Archaeologists are compelled to rely on the excavation of major cities to understand daily life in Hittite Anatolia (Gorny 1989:80).

1.1.1.2 \textit{The Hattians}

The Hattians had an important and lasting influence on the culture of the Hittites although scholars like Burney (2004:106) are of the opinion that they arrived later in central Anatolia than the Hittites or any of the other Indo-European groups. Burney (2004:105) mentions that it is not clear how long the Hattians lived in central Anatolia, but according to him they seem to have been the first settled population group in the central part of the country (see 3.2.1).

\footnote{The term ‘Anatolia’ is derived from Greek and refers to the east. It was first used by a Byzantine writer in the tenth century CE (Gorny 1989:79).}
(a) Archaeological or linguistic roots
According to Gorny (1989:82), it has repeatedly been suggested that the roots of the Hittites may be tracked archaeologically to the Hattians of the third millennium who built rectangular shaft tombs (see Figure 1.3) at Alaça Höyük (see Figure 2.2), a few kilometres north of Hattuša.

For several generations, the royal family of Alaça Höyük was buried in these tombs, which contained valuable metal ritual objects (Gorny 1989:82). Ceremonial standards (see Figure 1.4) were often found in the tombs of important people. Linguistically, the Hittite-speaking people are almost always associated with the migration of Indo-European peoples into Anatolia. Collins (2007:23) states that here is an ongoing debate amongst scholars about the Indo-European migratory groups’ original homeland as well as how and when these groups settled in Anatolia.

(i) Anatolia and archaeology in our time
The people of Anatolia are known to us through a combination of Hittite, Egyptian and Mesopotamian historical texts, but the exact location of their kingdoms is a problem because there are no surviving maps from the period or any known cartographic knowledge or methods implemented by the Hittites (Rivers 2015:2). ‘Anatolia’ is generally defined in agreement with Harmanşah’s (2015a:6) view which refers to the geographical and geological part of the Anatolian peninsula rather than to a model used in Turkish archaeology that views Anatolia as a historically and culturally unified and meaningful

---

landscape throughout history. Harmanşah (2015:6) explains: ‘Today when one refers to ‘Anatolian archaeology’ or ‘Anatolian civilizations’, one more or less assumes that Anatolia corresponds to the modern nation-state boundaries of Turkey, although the Anatolian peninsula in that specific configuration was never a [culturally or politically] unified geographical entity in antiquity (my insertion).’ He also maintains that in archaeology such fixed definitions are ‘rarely questioned and almost always left fuzzy.’

Larsen (2015:244) reminds us that archaeology is slowly enlarging our knowledge of the Early Bronze period political traditions in central Anatolia. According to him, large palaces, all destroyed by fire, are being uncovered in several places in central Anatolia. The question is posed by him as to whether destruction took place as a result of massive numbers of migrating people moving through the region or whether it was the result of local political upheavals which regularly occurred in central Anatolia.

(b) Indo-European migrations into Anatolia
Bryce (2012b:723) tells us that in the third millennium BCE a group of people known to us as the ‘Hittites’ migrated with other Indo-European speaking groups to Anatolia. These migratory groups were apparently mentioned in cuneiform texts from the Old Assyrian trading posts which were found in the archives of Hattuša. Ünal’s (1988:52) theory is that the Hittites came from their Indo-European homeland somewhere between the Danube River and the Ural Mountains. Ünal (1988:53) informs us that when the Indo-European migratory groups arrived in Anatolia, the Assyrians, Nešites, Hattians and Hurrians with their own cultures were already firmly settled. Gorny (1989:82), on the other hand, informs us that the Hattians, Nešites and Hurrians are also categorised as Hittites, and he argues that the presence in Anatolia of these different ethnic groups only confuses the situation.

Other established groups in Anatolia were the Kashkan tribes (to the north) (see Figure 2.2), the Arzawa people (to the west) (see Figure 2.2) as well as other indigenous Anatolian inhabitants whose tribal names are unknown (Ünal 1988:53). Gorny (1989:82) suggests that we should rather understand the name ‘Hittite’ as the personification of ‘an artificial categorization of peoples who lived under the banner of Hattuša.’
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5 A massive building is being uncovered at Yassi Höyük in an excavation conducted the Japanese archaeologist Masako Omura (Larsen 2015:303).
Gorny maintains that any substantial information about human migration during this period remains unclear. He is also of the opinion that the lack of archaeological data is mainly the cause of wide difference of opinion among scholars. It seems, as Gorny (1989:82) writes, ‘the origins of the Hittites lie hidden, for now, within the fabric of late Anatolian prehistory.’ According to him, the development of Hittite culture was slow, but it was stimulated to growth when the old Assyrian trade merchants arrived in central Anatolia at the beginning of the second millennium BCE.

1.1.2 The Hittites’ cultural-linguistic background

The cultural-linguistic origins of the Hittites are confusing, considering the many names for their language as well as those of some of their Anatolian neighbours (Van de Mieroop 2016:128). The Hittites called their language Nesili, the language of Neša, the indigenous name of Kānesh, the city which was taken in the eighteenth century BCE by Pithana the father of Anitta, who is considered the founder of the Hittite royal dynasty, and where the main Assyrian merchant colony was located (Bryce 2012b:726; cf. Van de Mieroop 2016:128 & Van den Hout 2011:2). The Egyptians and Mesopotamians referred to them and their language as Hittite and to their land as Hatti (Bryce 2012b:726). Technically, the Hittites spoke Arzawan, which was also the name of a kingdom to the west of Hatti. Some scholars believe that this important neighbour (which will not be discussed in this dissertation) of the Hittites was located more towards southwestern Anatolia (Bryce 2005b:47).

1.1.2.1 Written and spoken languages of the Hittites

Goedegebuure (2016:46) speculates that Luwian was not a language spoken by the Indo-European groups on arrival in Anatolia (see Figure 1.2). She argues that Luwian was invented by Indo-European Anatolians living in and around Hattuša. The language was based on a combination of the phonetization of Luwian hieroglyphs and Hittite. Eventually there were three written Indo-European languages that existed next to one another in Anatolia during the Hittite civilization: Hittite/Arzawan, Luwian, and Palaic (Anthony 2007:43). Anthony also tells us that the earliest Hittite inscription, dated around circa 1900 BCE, makes it the oldest written and earliest preserved member of the Indo-European family of languages. To create a spiritual structure for their state, the Hittites adopted elements from indigenous cultures of Anatolia (Ünal 1988:53). A form of symbiosis with groups of people the Hittites came into contact with developed in all their fields of activity as well as their religion and art. The Hittites eventually became a multicultural, -ethnic,-
religious and -linguistic group of people. Their military power, however, could not compensate for their lack of cultural, spiritual and religious progress and development (Ünal 1988:53).

1.1.2.2 The Hittites and religion

As with many of the aspects of Hittite history, our understanding of Hittite religion is incomplete (Ryan 2015:710). The sudden downfall of the Hittite Empire (ca 1200 BCE) and the collapse of the Bronze Age leave us with limited primary sources and many gaps in our knowledge about Hittite religion. What we do know is constrained due to the varying quality of existing texts found at different sites in the Hittite Empire. Beckman (2005:344) explains that Hittite religion is difficult to reconstruct because the most helpful primary sources contain instructions for the king about his cultic responsibilities and not much else. Collins (2007:157) writes that recovered texts from the libraries and archives of Hattuša contained mainly practical instructions compiled by the scribes to assist court officials in organising and assisting the king in maintaining his cultic responsibilities.

Religion progressively became an integral part of Hittite lives. This integration with daily life did not produce any significant theological reflection or examination amongst the Hittites. Görke (2013:42) writes that none of the many cuneiform texts excavated at Hattuša dealing directly or indirectly with Hittite religion can be regarded as Hittite ‘scripture’ as such. Most of these cuneiform texts are about festivals, cultic rituals, deities, religious beliefs and offering practices (Görke 2013:42). It can be said that Hittite religion seemed to be a combination of Indo-European and non-Indo-European religious elements. Their state cult was the result of them, in a sense, indiscriminately adopting belief systems, cults, deities and traditions from other regions and cultures in Anatolia and being labeled in history as ‘the Hittites of a thousand gods’ (De Martino 2013:410).

1.1.3 The Old Assyrian trade networks in Anatolia (ca 1900-1830 BCE)

Historically, the road to the Hittites’ eventual position as a politically powerful empire was long and difficult. This road, for the Hittites, started with a widespread network of trading communities in central Anatolia. The Assyrians who lived in northern Mesopotamia in the late third and early second millenniums BCE developed very successful trade networks largely carried out by private entrepreneurs across central Anatolia and Mesopotamia (Kuhrt 1998:92). These family-run merchant businesses were based in Aššur (see Figure 2.2), the central trading point, and subsequently they established a network of
about 40 profitable trading posts covering central Anatolia (Radner 2015:30; cf. Van den Hout 2013:22). They traded in textiles from Babylonia, tin from the east, and silver and gold from Anatolia (Van de Mieroop 2016:95; cf. Van den Hout 2013:22). These trading posts stretching from the east also introduced ‘the era of the written record’ to Anatolia (Bryce 2005b:21; cf. Van den Hout 2013:22). According to Kuhrt (1998:92), there were two types of Assyrian trading centres: the kārum, meaning quay or harbour in Akkadian, which was the primary trading centre (Kültepe) of a city like Kānesh, and the wabartum, a smaller trading centre that functioned under the authority of the nearest kārum. More than 20 000 cuneiform clay tablets, mostly written in Akkadian (see Figure 1.11) that merchants left at Kānesh, contained valuable information about this ancient merchant system. The tablets show the beginning of Anatolian recorded history and give information about early Hittite culture and where the name for their language, Nesi, originated (Bryce 2005b:15; cf. Collins 2007:25).

1.1.3.1 Kānesh/Kültepe

The Anatolian city of Neša/Kānesh/Kültepe, situated south of the Marassantiya River (today the Kizil Irmak) (see Figure 2.2), was chosen by the Old Assyrian merchants as their central trading post in Anatolia. Kānesh was also located to the north of several passes through the Taurus Mountains and it was ideally situated for the redistribution of precious metals, wine and agricultural products (Gorny 1989:85). According to Larsen (2015:243), texts as well as the material culture of Kānesh only give a partial impression of what life was like in the kārum of Kānesh. It was a place where people of many different ethnic backgrounds, languages, and cultural and religious traditions interacted with one another. The presence of the Assyrians in Anatolia must have had a strong influence on life in the region (Larsen 2015:243).

![Aerial view of Kānesh/Kültepe and the excavation site of the kārum](http://www.kultepe.org)
Figure 1.6
Artist’s impression of Kānesh/Kültepe

Figure 1.7
Map of the Old Assyrian trade network

Figure 1.6 shows the compound (kārum) of Kānesh/Kültepe (compare Figure 1.5) used by the Assyrian merchants for their mule and donkey trains. Kültepe is situated below the fortified city of Kānesh. To the right in the picture (1.6) is the headquarters of the Assyrian
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8 http://safaksalli.wordpress.com
traders and behind it, top right, is the volcanic mountain Erciyes Daği. Gorny (1989:85) tells us that Kānesh, as the foremost marketplace of Anatolia, became the gateway through which the outer regions of Anatolia could be reached from northern Mesopotamia (see Figures 1.7 & 2.2). It took about fifty days during the trading season from Aššur to Kānesh by donkey caravan carrying tin and textiles (see Figure 1.6) which were traded (along with the donkeys) for silver or gold on arrival in Anatolia (Kuhrt 1998:94) (see Figure 1.7). During winter, it was impossible to travel through the Taurus Mountains because all passages were blocked with ice and snow.

(a) Trade settlements becoming small city-states

Texts revealed that there were at least twenty-one Assyrian trade settlements, of which only three have been located by archaeologists (Bryce 2005b:21). The settlements are Hattush (Hattuša), Ankuwa (Alisar) in the basin of the Marassantiya River, and Neša or Kānesh to the south (Bryce 2005b:23). Gorny (1989:82) suggests that the Old Assyrian trade network was possibly an economic model for the political centralization of power in Hittite Anatolia. He mentions further that small city-states formed around local trade centres like Kānesh and Hattuša as well as other centres. The growth of these regional ‘kingdoms’ sometimes led to conflict because they competed for space, but such struggles also created the first phase of integration that eventually led to Hattuša taking political control in Anatolia (Gorny 1989:85). Rivalry ensued amongst these city-states because of an increased demand for resources and commodities, and their economic competition lead to political struggles in Anatolia during the early second millennium BCE (Gorny 1989:85). The rivalry of this period is known to us through a few important Hittite texts, e.g. the Edict of Telepinu (see 1.1.4.3 [a]). Some contemporary scholars argue that the Assyrian trade networks were the catalyst for Hittite literacy (Van de Mieroop 2016:119). The reason for coming to such a conclusion is that the Hittites saw more than just material and economic benefits from the Assyrian trade network.

(b) The relationship between the Assyrians and the Anatolians

Their relationship was guided by an intricate fusion of power, economy, culture and social traditions (Larsen 2015:243). What was important was the strong influence the Assyrian literate technology had on the Anatolians, who had their own hieroglyphic script but took over the Assyrian cuneiform to write administrative and diplomatic texts (Larsen 2015:243). The Anatolian merchants were not only inspired by the wealth of the Assyrian merchants,
but also by their high cultural status, of which writing was sought after as a prestigious symbol in the ancient world (Van de Mieroop 2016:119).

(i) No acculturation between the Assyrians and Anatolians
Larsen (2015:244) informs us that the meeting between the Assyrians and Anatolians did not result in the ‘Assyrianisation’ of the Anatolian kingdoms. He emphasises the process that used to be called ‘acculturation’ did not take place. A huge absorption by one side of the other’s cultural traditions (as would happen between the Hittites and all the cultures they came into contact with) did not happen. Larsen (2015:244) posits that it was rather a process of ‘hybridisation’, a mixture of cultures between the Assyrians and Anatolians. It was an interaction between two different cultural, social and political groups who influenced each other, creating something new and different.

(c) Material culture of Kānesh
The archaeologist and former expedition director of Kānesh/Kültepe, Özgüç, stated emphatically, according to Larsen (2015:244), that the material presence of the Assyrians at Kānesh was ‘hardly visible at all.’ Apart from clay tablets and seals, it is hard to find anything in the material culture of Kānesh that is of Assyrian origin. Larsen informs us that in the kārum of Kānesh houses were built in the local style with mud brick and large amounts of wood. The objects found in these houses were also characteristic of local Anatolian traditional practices.

Figure 1.8
Pitcher from Kültepe

Figure 1.9
A humorously shaped vessel

Figure 1.10
Lead figurine of a god
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An example is the pottery found in graves as well as in the local style buildings dating from the Early Bronze Age that became typical of the Hittite ceramic style after the Assyrians left (see Figure 1.8). Their pottery was varied, daring and some of it humorously shaped (see Figure 1.9), while some pieces were most probably used for religious purposes. They were found in the kārum in the house of a certain Elamma (Larsen 2015:267). Small lead statues (see Figure 1.10) also found in the houses are identified by archaeologists as protective deities for families most likely referred to in texts as ‘your god, our god’, showing continuity of Anatolian cult practices from the kārum period into the Hittite Kingdom. Their iconography was borrowed from their predecessors in central Anatolia, the Hattians (McMahon 1991:3).

1.1.3.2 Commercial and legal records from Kānesh/Kültepe

The thousands of texts found at Kānesh contained detailed information in the form of transactions and legal documents about the booming international trade between Egypt, the Caucasus, Central Asia and the Indus valley in the early second millennium BCE (Bryce 2005b:21). The cuneiform clay tablet in its case (Figure 1.11) from the kārum of Kānesh/Kültepe archive is a clay envelope containing the record of a testimony given in court in a business ownership dispute. The cylinder seal imprint on the front of the clay tablet depicts worshippers approaching a seated figure (perhaps a king) holding a cup (Alparslan-Dogan & Alparslan 2013:123).

![Figure 1.11](image)

(A) The end of the Old Assyrian trading colony

The prosperous trading period lasted well over a century before Kānesh was destroyed by internal military conflict (Van den Hout 2013:22). The culturally and economically profitable
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Assyrian trade routes came to a sudden end with the arrival of the Hurrians in the region around circa 1780 BCE (Macqueen 1999:20). After this, according to Van den Hout (2013:22), business picked up again but never recovered fully before completely coming to an end around circa 1720 BCE. Later, the Hurrians played a significant role in the history of the Hittite Kingdom and the whole of the Near East, but at the time when they came onto the scene in Anatolia they appeared to be troublesome intruders (Macqueen 1999:20).

1.1.4 Hattuša/Boğazköy

Originally, Hattuša may have been selected for settlement because there was enough water for the inhabitants and the city was built in a natural stronghold on a tributary of the river Marassantiya, the Halys of antiquity and now the Red River (see Figure 2.2) near the modern Turkish town of Boğazköy (Gorny 1989:86) (see Figures 1.12 & 1.13).

Figure 1.12
View of the location of Hattuša

Figure 1.13
Location of Hattuša and Yazilikaya

Figure 1.14
Reconstruction of Hattuša (ca 1300-1400 BCE)
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12 http://www.basarchive.org
13 http://www.google.com.tr
Bittel (1970:12-13) tells us that the valleys around Hattuša were fertile and the region also seemed to have forests. The most important aspect of Hattuša’s position was that it was conveniently situated near the trade routes from east to west and north to south (Gorny 1989:86). Gorny is of the opinion that the Assyrian merchants who travelled with their merchandise through the gateway Hattuša provided must have broadened the people of Hattuša’s sociopolitical consciousness. Gorny (1989:86) continues: ‘as this political consciousness evolved into a complex state ideology, the city began to struggle for control of its own destiny.’ The textual material of the history of the period of the Assyrian traders in Anatolia shows that Hattuša indeed established itself socio-politically as a major regional power alongside Kānesh (Gorny 1989:87). Hattuša’s development into a political power in central Anatolia started early in its history and, according to Gorny (1989:86), it happened in phases.

Hattuša seems to have been a regional power in circa 2300 BCE, if textual information about the period is correct (Gorny 1989:86). A king named ‘Pamba of Hatti’ was, according to ancient texts, one of seventeen kings who opposed the invasion of Naram-Sin (ca 2213-2176 BCE), the King of Agade, into Anatolia. Hattuša was destroyed several times, but it reasserted itself every time as a leading city of central-north Anatolia (Gorny 1989:87). By circa 1520 BCE the Hittite capital was fortified by huge ramparts that enclosed many temples, palaces, storerooms, living quarters and a state library/archive with thousands of cuneiform clay tablets (Krupp 2000:2). The texts from Hattuša’s state library were written in at least eight languages (Seeher 2011:192). Not even in multilingual Babylon were so many languages written and spoken as in Hattuša (Ünal 1988:54). The enormous walls (see Figure 1.14) and gates of Hattuša (the Lion, Sphinx and King’s gates) were an advertisement for Hittite political and military strength, which they acquired in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BCE.

Gorny (1989:87) believes that Hattuša’s sociopolitical importance due to its central position in Anatolia together with the centralization of its economy, as the result of contact with the Assyrian merchants, paved the way for the establishment of a royal ideology of the Old Hittite Kingdom. According to him, the royal ideology found its most persuasive manifestation in the Edict of Telepinu (see 1.1.4.3 [a]).
1.1.4.1 Understanding Hittite texts

The number of Hittite texts first compiled by Hittitologists in 1971 CE contained 25 000 clay tablets, only about fifteen percent of the original archives excavated at Hattuša (Kuhrt 1998:232). The majority of the texts were found in the Great Temple area of Hattuša (see Figures 6.2 & 6.3) and a smaller number were excavated from the ruins of the royal citadel, Büyükkale (Kuhrt 1998:232). Like most of their Near Eastern contemporaries, Hittite literature included mythology, administrative documents and historical texts. According to Hoffner (1990:1), to understand any society one has to attempt to do it realistically within its living context. It is impossible to understand an ancient era or its society intuitively. What we can do is to attempt to understand the Hittites, not only from their few remaining small and monumental artifacts, but most importantly from their writings (Hoffner 1990:1).

1.1.4.2 Hittite historiography

Van de Mieroop (2016:120) tells us that the Hittites were literate people who recorded a huge amount of information about themselves. However, it remains difficult to recreate a chronology of the Hittite Empire from their information. The reason for this is that their concepts, despite them keeping detailed records of history, were totally different from modern ones. They did not write their history for educational or informative purposes. Instead, they mixed myth and religion with historiography (Liverani 2004:173-180). Liverani (2004:173) confirms that texts from the ancient Near East should be viewed as information about the people who wrote them and should not be regarded as accurate portrayals of any events described in them.

1.1.4.3 Hittite historical texts

Their many texts are diverse in literary genre and pose problems for modern scholars when reconstructing Hittite chronology. Most of the texts were written in the last hundred years of the existence of the Hittite Empire (Van de Mieroop 2016:149). He also mentions that most of the historical annals are copies of earlier records. Many works that are considered ‘literature’ in our time, such as fictional tales, are also copies from earlier Mesopotamian texts (Macqueen 1999:149). Copies of prominent historical texts composed under the guidance of some of the Old Kingdom as well as Empire kings were kept at the royal court of Hattuša (Liverani 2004:27). One of these documents, which had a profound influence on Queen Puduhepa’s husband Hattušili III (ca 1267-1237 BCE) after he illegally took the throne from his nephew Urhi-Teshub (ca 1271-1239 BCE), is the Edict of Telepinu.
(a) The Edict of Telepinu (ca 1525-1500 BCE)

Historians can reconstruct much about what the reasons were for the so-called Dark Age of Hatti that characterized the end of the kārum period. Details about it were painstakingly recorded in The Edict of Telepinu. This edict discloses that during the initial period when the Hittites dominated central Anatolia, there was harsh infighting amongst the royal household (Gorny 1989:89). Telepinu’s wife and son were also murdered and Telepinu decided to put an end to siblings, kings and other members of the royal household killing one another. Telepinu summoned the assembly (panku) to hear this 'edict' or 'proclamation' which gave instructions for the succession to the throne (Burney 2004:269). The assembly was only summoned to listen to Telepinu’s decisions, not to debate them.

The edict wanted to establish the fundamental principles of the organisation of the Hittite state. In the narrative of the edict, which Telepinu claimed to have written himself, he pictured Hantili I who was guilty of murdering Mursili I as a remorseful person: ‘Hantili was afraid: “Who will protect me?”… Wherever he moved, the lands rebelled against him and then the gods took their revenge for the blood of Mursili.’ The inheritance of the throne was now fixed on direct succession from father to son. Previously, kings could choose whomever their successors would be or change their choice if they wanted to. All that was allowed now with Telepinu’s new regulations was that the king did not have to choose his eldest son as his successor (Burney 2004:269). Telepinu rather showed the king as the saviour who restored order and glory to the Hittite Kingdom. Telepinu decided to focus on defeating Hatti’s foreign enemies and to draw up new laws:

As soon as I, Telepinu, seated myself on the throne of my father, I campaigned in Hassuwa (on route to Commagene) and destroyed Hassuwa. My troops were also in Zizzilippa, and there was a battle in Zizzilippa. As soon as I, the king, came to Lawazzantiya [eastern Cilicia], Lahha was hostile to me and made Lawazzantiya rebellious to me. The gods gave him into my hand.

Telepinu is still viewed as one of the greatest Hittite kings for his efforts to bring peace to the royal house and land of Hatti.

---

15 Kuhrt (1998:246), translation after Laroche. Please note, in the transliterations and translations from Sumerian, Middle Egyptian, Akkadian, Luwian and Hittite by linguists Beckman, Bryce, Collins, Güterbock, Hoffner Jnr, Laroche, Melchert, Singer, Smith, Van den Hout and Wilhelm, I tried to make the translations of these ancient texts as accessible as possible to give it flow, often omitting where a paragraph or passage is broken or annotated.
1.2 THE RISE OF THE KINGDOM OF MITANII\textsuperscript{16} (ca 1504-1492 BCE)\textsuperscript{17}

Evidence of the presence of a strong Hurrian element amongst the people of northern Syria is found in the many Hurrian personal names from the second millennium BCE. For a thousand years (ca 2500-1300 BCE) the Hurrians occupied a huge area of northern Mesopotamia and Syria, territory east of the Tigris River and in southeast Anatolia (Giorgieri 2015:1; cf. Kuhrt 1998:286). After the Hittite king Mursili I (ca 1620-1590 BCE), conqueror of Aleppo and Babylon, was assassinated, the power vacuums he created were partly filled by these Hurrian tribes from the east. They united and formed the powerful kingdom of Mitanni in northern Mesopotamia and Syria (see Figure 1.15) (Anthony 2007:50; cf. Godenho 2015). The kingdom of Mitanni became one of the most powerful kingdoms in the ancient Near East, and a constant coal of fire in the Hittites’ shoes for two hundred years (Anthony 2007:50).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{hatti_and_mitannian_kingdom_circa_1400_bce.png}
\caption{Hatti and the Mitannian kingdom circa 1400 BCE\textsuperscript{18}}
\end{figure}

Despite the Hittites and the Hurro-Mitannians sharing some cultural similarities, they were perpetually engaged in war with each other, which eventually resulted in the destruction of the Mitannian kingdom by Suppiluliuma I (ca 1344-1322 BCE).

\textsuperscript{16} In this dissertation, the northern Syrian region will sometimes be referred to as Hurro-Mitanni and southeastern Anatolia as Hurro-Kizzuwatna or just Kizzuwatna.
\textsuperscript{17} I follow the conventional chronology with all dates requiring lowering by ten years for the ‘low’ chronology, as in Kuhrt (1998:290).
\textsuperscript{18} http://www.wikiwand.com/mitanni
1.2.1 The Hurrians
We have little historical, archaeological or linguistic information about these people who once were part of one of the most important civilizations in the ancient Near East. We do know that the Hurrians (see Figure 1.16) were instrumental in creating and transmitting Mesopotamian traditions in the ancient world as far as Greece (Giorgieri 2015:1). It seems that the Hurrians, like the Hittites, had confusing origins. They were not an Indo-European speaking group like the Hittites, but they worshipped the same gods (Kuhrt 1998:284).

1.2.1.1 Hurrian name and language
The name of the Hurrian people and their language was based on the name Hurri, an ancient geographical term mentioned in cuneiform sources of the second millennium BCE referring to people living in the north of upper Mesopotamia (Kuhrt 1995:284) (see Figure 1.16). The Hurrian language, not related to Indo-European or Semitic, seems to have been related to Urartian, which made it difficult to introduce and understand the mechanism of the life-changing chariot in the ancient Near East (Anthony 2007:50; cf. Kuhrt 1998:284). On the other hand, the influence of the Luwians became so strong that their language, closely related to Hittite, as well as their hieroglyphic script replaced the spoken and written language of the Hittites during the Empire period (ca 1430-1210 BCE) (Singer 1994:84).
1.2.1.2 The Luwians and their language

The term Luwian indicates a language, a script and an ethno-linguistic group of people (Yakubovich 2010:27). The term is also applied to the indigenous people who lived in western and southern Anatolia in addition to the Hattians before the arrival of the Hittites as well as to the Hittite reign. The Luwian culture prospered in Bronze Age western Anatolia. To date, they have been explored mainly by linguists who learned about Luwian people through the many texts from Hattuša. So far, only a few excavations have been conducted in formerly Luwian areas, resulting in excavating archaeologists not taking Luwians fully into account in their reconstructions of the past (Mouton et al 2013:56). The Luwian-speaking people were from the lower land of Hatti, Tarhuntassa and Kizzuwatna, south of the Marassantiya River (Bryce 2003a:88) (see Figure 2.2). They became an integral and important part of Hittite society, being settled at the crossroads between the central
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19 http://theancientneareast.com/hurrians
Anatolian, Hurrian and Syrian cultures (Hutter 1997:74). The absorption by the Hittites of Luwian as well as Hurrian cultural elements contributed largely to the development of the Hittite civilization (Singer 1994:83). The connection between Hatti and the Luwian-speaking people in south Anatolia became very important. This contact existed from as early as the Old Kingdom period (ca 1650–1500 BCE).

Figure 1.17
Luwian and Hittite-speaking areas in Anatolia, middle second millennium BCE

There was also frequent contact between the Luwian people and Hurrian tribes from the east (Bryce 2003a:89). Luwian hieroglyphs were also the script used to engrave the names of the procession of deities on the rock reliefs at Yazilikaya.

Figure 1.18
Luwian hieroglyph inscription

20 Image taken from Goedegebuure (2016).
Luwian-speaking educated people, according to Goedegebuure (2016:41), with knowledge of the sound of Hittite as well as Luwian and the ability to recognise some basic Luwian symbols would have been able to ‘read’ Luwian. Goedegebuure (2016:40) informs us that a local person would have been able to read Luwian (see Figure 1.18) engraved at the bottom of the north gate of a stronghold at Karatepe (Cilicia) in the eighth or seventh centuries BCE.

1.2.2 Puduhepa enters Hatti’s centre stage
Centre stage in the land of Hatti at the end of the thirteenth century was Puduhepa (ca 1290–1210 BCE), a Luwian-speaking Hurrian noblewoman and priestess from the cult city Lawazantiya in Hurrian-Kizzuwatna (classical Cilicia) (see Figure 2.2). Puduhepa married the Hittite prince and military general Hattušili in circa 1275 BCE. He later became King Hattušili III after seizing the Hittite throne from his nephew Urhi-Teshub (also known as Mursili III, ca 1271-1264 BCE) in circa 1267 BCE (see 4.2). Hattušili III and Puduhepa ruled over Hatti until circa 1237 BCE (Bryce 2003a:88). Supported by her husband, Puduhepa systematically introduced the Kizzuwatnean-Hurrian pantheon to the Hittites (Burney 2004:32). The open-air rock sanctuary of Yazilikaya with its procession of recognisable Hittite and Hurrian gods and goddesses is directly linked to the powerful influence of Puduhepa on the Hittite state cult and on her husband Hattušili III as well as their son and successor Tudhaliya IV.

1.3 RESEARCH PROBLEM AND QUESTIONS

What was Puduhepa’s (ca 1290-1210 BCE) and Hattušili III’s (ca 1267-1237 BCE) role in the Hurrianisation of the Hittite state cult and pantheon? What was Puduhepa’s role in the reorganisation and rationalisation of the Hittite state cult and religion into a Hurro-Hittite state cult and pantheon? Was she a facilitator or manipulator working towards this amalgamation to the advantage of the Hittite royal house rather than the people of Hatti?

Why does it seem important to take the broader background of the New Hittite Empire (ca 1430-1210 BCE) and its rulers into account?

Was the impact of elements of foreign cultures, their politics and religions, in particular those from the Hurrians on the Hittites, as profound as suggested by scholars?
How did Great King Hattušili III and his consort and queen, Puduhepa manage to conduct a successful personal and work partnership in the ancient Near East where constructive partnerships between a husband and a wife were virtually unknown?

How did their co-regency, diplomatic ties and correspondence with vassal and other significant international rulers in the region reflect an equal footing between the couple?

What role did dreams, prayers, myths and magic play in the lives of Queen Puduhepa and Hattušili III?

Where did the Hittite elite worship their multitude of deities? Where was the centre of their state cult? How important was their relationship to sacred shrines and nature in their worship?

Why was the state-sponsored seasonal religious cult festivals so important to the King and the Queen of the Hittites? Which of these cult festivals were important to Queen Puduhepa as a Hurrian priestess trying to Hurrianize the Hittite State cult?

Did Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE) play a more important role than his parents in reorganising and consolidating the Hittite state cult inventories during his reign?

Who was responsible for building the Yazilikaya open-air sanctuary and what was its purpose?

What were the legacies of Great King Hattušili III, Great Queen Puduhepa and Great King Tudhaliya IV, the royal triad, in the Late Empire dynasty of their time?

1.4 HYPOTHESIS

Analysing and interpreting relevant transliterated translated texts as well as discussing different views of scholars about the Late Hittite Empire period might help answer the assumed impact on Hittite civilization of the Hurrians from Southwest Anatolia. The reform of the Hittite state cult, pantheon, festivals and cult inventories are claimed to have been proposed by Puduhepa and finished by her son Tudhaliya IV in the Late Empire period.
This general hypothesis is challenged and debated amongst a new generation of Hittite scholars, and in this study such an assumption will be discussed. The supposed function, purpose and use of the Yazilikaya sanctuary as a visual testimony of the amalgamation of the Hurrian and Hittite pantheons still need satisfactory answers. Investigating the apparent role Queen Puduhepa as a Hurrian priestess played in establishing this final Hurrianization of the Hittite state pantheon might clarify its purpose in the Late Empire period (ca 1209 BCE).

1.5 AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

My primary aim is to investigate Puduhepa’s and Hattusili’s role in Hurrianizing the Hittite state cult and festivals during their reign. In order to set the scene, it will be necessary to discuss the broad background of their most important royal ancestors and predecessors whose lives and actions in Hittite religion and society had a profound influence on generations of Hittite rulers.

Politics and religion were the centre of every aspect of Hittite life at the royal court. My objective is to investigate both Hattušili and Puduhepa’s roles in religion, local and regional politics, diplomacy, vassal and international treaties, law, and society. Hattušili III’s role as an innovator of old cults and his wife’s role as an initiator, facilitator and manipulator in Hittite society will be investigated. I studied available transcribed translated primary texts containing information about them as well as their political and religious roles in the last years of the Hittite Empire. In order to narrow down the field of study, the focus is on Hattušili III, Queen Puduhepa and their son’s eventual so-called completion of Hittite religious state cult reforms (or reorganisation) as described in cult inventories and festival texts depicted in the Hurro-Hittite pantheon of Yazilikaya. As co-regents and diplomats, both King Hattušili III’s and his wife Queen Puduhepa’s influence in the region will be demonstrated by their correspondence and treaties with vassal and regional rulers.

The royal couple’s involvement as chief priest and priestess in the important seasonal state cult festivals will be discussed at the hand of the already mentioned transliterated translated available festival texts. The importance of dreams, prayers, myths and magical rituals in religious ceremonies and Hittite daily life were part of this investigation. Places of worship like the Great Temple at Hattuša and sacred places like rock reliefs and springs were important locations for the worship of their multitude of deities. Local religious cults and
traditions are not as well documented as those of the royal establishment of Hattuša. Near the end of the Hittite Empire, during the reign of Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE), he attempted with the help of his scribes to document, incorporate and reorganise local cults into that of the Hittite state cult and religion. In this study, the reorganisation rather than reform of the state and local cults in the land of Hatti, currently widely debated and challenged by modern Hittitologists, is briefly discussed because as yet there are no conclusions to the debate.

1.6 LITERATURE REVIEW

A wide variety of material taking many forms was consulted. This dissertation depends on primary sources focusing on books, documents and articles, of which many are transliterated translated texts and epigraphic objects referring to the lives and times of Hattušili III, Queen Puduhepa and their son Tudhaliya IV. Information about them is contained in official and private correspondence as well as historical, ritual, votive, prayer and festival texts in addition to dream reports, rock reliefs and clay seals (De Roos 2006:17). Most of the primary source texts date from the last fifty years of the Hittite Empire (ca 1258 BCE).

1.6.1 Primary sources
Van den Hout (2011:911) describes the Hittite written tradition as incomparable in the ancient Near East because it allows scholars to describe the development of a major power over a period of five hundred years from illiteracy to a competent, literate administrative bureaucracy.

From archaeological excavations at Hattuša in the previous century, more than ninety volumes of cuneiform tablets have been published (Hoffner 1990:2). These texts cover a wide variety of genres: state treaties, historical narratives, myths, stories, prayers, descriptions of festivals and rituals, and oracular techniques. Together with a compilation of personal, divine and geographical names, these have been edited and analysed, according to Hoffner (1990:2).

Some of these important transliterated translated primary sources are available in Beckman’s (1996) Hittite Diplomatic Texts. De Roos’s (2007) Hittite Votive Texts, translated and discussed by him, explain the close relationship between the Hittites and their personal
deities as well as why vows were made to the benefit of both gods and humans. Hoffner Jr’s (1990) *Hittite Myths* is a source for understanding the Hittites although they were not very original in creating their own myths. This book contains the first English translations of a collection of myths and tales of the Hittites. Hoffner’s translations are based on the original clay tablets on which the myths were written and, according to the publisher, recent textual discoveries and studies on these texts have been taken into account by the author. Hoffner Jr’s book (2009) *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom* is the first book in English containing letters from ancient Hatti dealing not only with official correspondence, but also discussing matters like the relationships, duties and private lives of officials employed by the royal court. He gives an overview of letter writing between the major kingdoms in the ancient Near East as well as how letter writing, as well as the sending, receiving and storing thereof were done. All this information will be used to understand some of the letters relevant to this study. This book is an excellent supplement to Bryce (2005b).

Laroche’s landmark publication (1971) *Catalogue des textes hittites*, a book of his own translations of Hittite texts into French, is often consulted and translated into English by scholars clarifying the meaning of their own translations. His work will also be referred to in this dissertation where it is needed and when cited by authors of various articles and books. Singer’s (2002) translation of *Hittite Prayers* is important because, in his own words, they are ‘amongst the most personal and imaginative Hittite texts, and thus provides various important insights into the intellectual world of Hittite royalty’ (Singer 2002:15). The prayers were some of the first Hittite texts to be transliterated and studied by Hittitologists like Güterbock, Goetze and Gurney in the early twentieth century CE. It is an invaluable source for ‘eavesdropping’ on kings and queens praying to their deities thousands of years ago. The system of regular communication by correspondence between the kings of the ancient Near East was a key element of their success in their challenging task of controlling the diverse people in the region.

To study this interesting phenomenon, Bryce’s translations and those by other scholars in his book *Letters of the Great Kings of the ancient Near East. The royal correspondence of the Late Bronze Age* (2003b) was consulted because these letters contain important transliterated translations of correspondence between the royal houses of Hatti, Ugarit, Mesopotamia, Mitanni and Egypt. This book is an important primary source in enabling the reader to reconstruct the era as the authors perceived and experienced it. This is the closest one can get to the actual time the original authors of the correspondence lived. For Egyptian
primary sources, the translation of Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature vol. II* (2006), was consulted for the translation of the prayers of Rameses II during the battle of Kadesh. For the relevant quotations from *The Amarna letters*, Moran’s 1992 publication was used.

In addition to the translations already mentioned, other Hittite and Luwian texts were translated by Van den Hout in *The Apology of Hattušili III* (2003), which was consulted because it is regarded as the best translation available. For some Luwian hieroglyph inscriptions, Goedegebuure’s translations for a public lecture at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago: *Luwian hieroglyphs. An indigenous Anatolian syllabic script from three thousand five hundred years ago* (2016), was consulted, as well as Wilhelm’s rather dated but useful translations from Hurrian in his book, *The Hurrians* (1989). Jürgen Seeher’s (2011) *Gods carved in stone. The Hittite rock sanctuary of Yazilikaya* is an updated primary source on recent excavations at Yazilikaya ‘made easy’ for non-professional archaeologists to understand and was used together with Cimok’s book, *The Hittites and Hattuša* (2008), also as a visual resource. They are both of the few contemporary studies about the stone art and iconography of Yazilikaya. Seeher is also in charge of the German excavation at Hattuša and Yazilikaya.

### 1.6.2 Secondary sources

The secondary sources about the Hittites provide a quite comprehensive outline of the growth, development and collapse of the Hittite Empire (Bryce 2012b:728). The information changes often as new historical, linguistic and archaeological research is published. I studied specialist books and articles about ancient Anatolia, Hattušili III, Puduhepa, Tudhaliya IV and Yazilikaya in a variety of journals, periodicals, monographs and electronic sources (from JSTOR) published by scholars from Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, Italy and the USA.

Memorial volumes generally called ‘*Festschriften*’ containing a wide variety of articles written in honour of Hittite scholars were consulted. The complete source information of these ‘*Festschriften*’ will appear in the references. These compilations will form the basis of this study because of the variety of valuable articles they contain. For the history of Hittite research and archaeology, I consulted *Across the Anatolian plateau. Readings in the archaeology of ancient Turkey* (2002), edited by Hopkins. It contains papers which reveal valuable scientific and interdisciplinary information about Anatolian archaeology. Genz and Mielke’s (2011) *Insights into Hittite history and archaeology* contains information of great
value since it consists of concise contributions and overviews by a variety of scholars on the latest Hittite research and archaeology.


Three indispensable specialist resources on the general history and culture of the Hittites support a large part of this study. They are: Trevor Bryce’s work *Kingdom of the Hittites* (2005b), Amélie Kuhrt’s *Ancient near East c.3000 - 330 BC*, 2 vols. (1998), and especially Billy Jean Collins’s *Hittites and their world* (2007), as well as some of her and Bryce’s many articles published in academic journals or delivered as papers at conferences. These articles and books add perspective to the background of the Hittites’ relationships and treaties with other states in the ancient Near East and provide better understanding of their very complex religious cult and many festivals.

Bryce’s book *Life and society in the Hittite world* (2002) forms part of the author’s enormous contribution to Hittite scholarship and the information he provides was often used as the framework for chapters and paragraphs of this dissertation. Bittel’s *Hattusha the capital of the Hittites* (1970) was a groundbreaking publication and is still cited as secondary study on the Hittites and their capital city. Another valuable contemporary resource is the articles and books by Harmanşah (2015) about Anatolian rock monuments, e.g. *Place, memory, and healing. An archaeology of Anatolian rock monuments*. Another classic study about the Hittites that was consulted is Gurney’s *The Hittites* (1980), reprinted with revisions as his research broadened. It is a very dependable source which has withstood time. In 1983, the author Morris wrote and published a biographical novel of the Hittite king Suppiluliuma I (ca 1344-1322 BCE), *I, the Sun*, based on information from Gurney’s book. Morris’s novel was rereleased in 2013. Comprehensive articles or books on Hittite religion in publications or dictionaries of the history of religions are very limited. A few new books have been published and articles written in the past twenty years. These were important reference tools for this study.

Singer’s book (2011) *The calm before the storm* (edited by B J Collins), published posthumously by the Society of Biblical Literature, is a collection of forty of his essays presenting his profound insight into the complicated forces which were at work on all levels in the society of the Hittite Empire. The volume’s epilogue includes his defence of Hittite historiography as a response to postmodern trends in ancient Near Eastern studies, driven by his commitment to the search for historical truth. In the Hittite historical field, Singer was an expert on the international affairs of the thirteenth century BCE, the *Pax Hethitica*, the Golden Age of Hatti. His studies also dealt with the diplomatic relations between Hatti and other great powers as well as with the Hittite domination of Syria, especially the kingdoms of Amurru and Ugarit.

Joost Hazenbos’s (2003) book *The organisation of the Anatolian local cults during the thirteenth century BC* is indispensible for researching the reorganisation of the local cults of the Hittites as well as a comparative study of the research of the new Italian Hittitologist and philologist Michele Cammarosano (whose writing was introduced to me by professor Theo van den Hout), a student of renowned scholars like De Martino, Hazenbos and Miller. He has published articles in two parts on Hittite cult inventories, which open up a significant reappraisal of the so-called ‘reforms’ of Great King Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE). There is an additional study translated from Turkish which presents a different perspective on the Hittites; it is the Alparslan-Dogan’s book with contributions by renowned Hittitologists over the world: *Hittites - an Anatolian empire/ Hititler bir Anadolu Imparatorlugu* (2013). This book contains updated information about archaeological excavations in Turkey. Piotr Taracha’s

Puduhepa’s life in relation to her roots in Kizzuwatna and subsequently as queen and priestess in Hatti is contained in Darga’s chapter (1994) ‘Women in the historical ages’ from the book *Nine thousand years of Anatolian women*, published by the Ministry of Culture of the Turkish government. This chapter is the framework for most of the research about her life in general. Otten’s classic study *Puduhepa: eine Hethitische königin in ihre Textzeugnissen* (1975) was of great value as a guide to the study of relevant historical, votive, prayer, correspondence and dream texts attributed to Puduhepa or composed by her scribes. Horst Ehringhaus’s (2005) *Götter, herrscher, inschriften. Die Felsreliefs der Hethitischen grossreichezeit in der Türkei* was consulted as an iconographic source of Yazilikaya and other stone wall carvings dating from the Hittite Empire period.

1.7 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The complexity of the Hittites, who were an eclectic people, makes it impossible for this study to avoid researching and discussing their state cult and religion against the very broad historical background of their politics, religion and culture. The actions of Hattušili III, his wife Puduhepa and their successor Tudhaliya IV regarding the Hittite state cult, the pantheon, several festivals and cult inventories cannot attempt to be investigated other than against the broader context of their history.

1.7.1 Research method and approach

This is a qualitative historical study investigating the available documentation and interpreting information. The main research design map for this dissertation is that of Mouton (2011:170). An attempt will be made to reconstruct the life and times of Queen Puduhepa and her family by identifying the events that motivated her to merge Hurrian and Hittite cult practices and their pantheons. I rely on the use of transliterated translated texts, material objects and iconographical sources to find the meaning of people’s lives during the Late Empire period of the Hittite Kingdom. Most of the information made available is about the royalty and élite at the court of Hattuša. The ability to reconstruct events of this period will depend on the reliability of the documents studied and subsequently the accuracy of its primary interpretation by Hittite scholars on whom my research, investigation and writing depend. This is also an archaeological investigation in order to determine the meaning and
function (not the iconography) of the procession of deities carved on the walls of the Yazılıkaya sanctuary.

Porada (1982:506) wrote that methods of recording archaeological data and techniques as well as the level of scholarship in archaeology would change and develop over the years, which it did. Science and the ability to extract analysis from large amounts of data has made it possible to change one's view of history by looking at detail. In archaeology, bone analysis tells us where people lived based on the isotopes, from the water they drank, preserved in their bones. DNA tells us when one tribe of people moved into contact with another. Dating rings on trees make it possible to date buildings constructed with wood beams. We can use computers to cross-reference known events like eclipses and the reign of kings with documents like letters or lists of items in a caravan or ship (see 2.5.1.3). Trade documents from an early era make it possible to determine the chronology of the events recounted in the document, including lesser events that were only meaningful to the individuals who left or stored the documents. In our time, computers applied to linguistics can help trace the migration of people who spoke a given language. The time has passed when philologists work separately from the archaeological contexts in which texts were found. Exploring and applying new methods and specialised fields to record data is not a simple or self-evident task. It is developing and growing with other related technologies, enhancing all the disciplines contributing to archaeological research.

1.7.1.1 Theoretical framework
The framework for this study has been created within a historical context to contextualise the information collected. The predecessors of the royal couple and their influence on them is important for this study. My approach is holistic and multidisciplinary, taking into account the textual, religious, political and socio-cultural elements of the Old Kingdom which were the cornerstones for the Hittite Empire. It includes disciplines such as anthropology, history, art, iconography and archaeology.

It is important to understand texts as archaeological artefacts because this puts them in meaningful contexts which interact with various other elements of material culture. Texts and objects represent the reality of people’s lives thousands of years ago. Elements of cultural and social anthropology will be applied to investigate some cultic practices, belief systems, artistic expressions and customs of the people with whom the Hittites came into contact across ancient Anatolia, northern Syria, Mesopotamia and Egypt. These ‘foreign’
cultures and social organisations were not regarded as inferior to those of the Hittites. They assimilated these into their culture and social structures. It seems the Hittites were multicultural from the start.

1.7.1.2 Structure of the dissertation

Chapter Two: A New Hittite Empire Emerging. In this chapter I will discuss and analyse the role of the significant royal predecessors to the reign of King Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa in circa 1267-1237 BCE. During the second period of Hittite rule in central Anatolia, strong kings emerged. The Hittite Empire expanded and came into military, diplomatic and cultural contact with other major ancient Near Eastern civilizations like Egypt and Mesopotamia. This resulted in a change in the formulation of the imperial ideology of the Old Hittite kings (Gorny 1989:90).

Chapter Three: A marriage not made in heaven. Hattušili III maintained that it was the will of his protective goddess, Ištar of Šamuha, for him to marry the fifteen-year-old Hurrian priestess and noblewoman Puduhepa, daughter of the priest Pentipšarri who presided over the cult centre of Ištar in the city of Lawazantinya. Whether it was a chance meeting between Puduhepa and Prince Hattušili on his way back from northern Syria to the cult city of Hakpiš, north of Hattuša, or the older Prince simply falling in love with the young woman remains only speculation. In this chapter, the unlikely successful marriage of Hattušili III and Puduhepa is discussed from a cultural, religious and political perspective.

Chapter Four: Puduhepa and Hattušili III's co-regency, diplomacy and correspondence. In this chapter, the consequences of Hattušili III’s illegal overthrow of his nephew Urhi-Teshub are discussed as well as the effective role Puduhepa fulfilled as an active, successful consort and queen in affairs of state as well as political, legal and religious matters. The result was that their relationship could be described as one of the closest, most enduring and constructive partnerships in the ancient world.

Chapter Five: Dreams, prayers, myths and magic. In this chapter, the Hittites’ way of communicating with their many deities through dreams, prayers, myths and magic will be discussed. The dream world of Puduhepa as well as aspects of her and Hattušili III’s ‘collective’ dreams will be examined together with Puduhepa’s prayers on behalf of her husband.
Chapter Six: The Great Temple and sacred places. The Great Temple of Hattuša and other sacred places in the land of Hatti played a very important role in their state cult and festivals. In this chapter, the most significant sacred places as well as the possible meaning and function of the open-air rock sanctuary at Yazilikaya will be discussed.

Chapter Seven: Great King Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa on the festival road. The Hittite deities had to be honoured because, for the Hittites, much depended on their goodwill. The gods could not be neglected and at certain times lavish festivals were conducted in their honour. King Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa in their roles as chief priest and priestess of the state cult presided at these festivals. It took many months every year to travel with their entourage from one festival to the other at cult cities and sanctuaries in the land of Hatti. In some of these main seasonal festivals, the Hurrian influence of Puduhepa can be seen and is discussed as part of her Hurrianization of the Hittite state cult and pantheon.

Chapter Eight: Conclusion. Hittite religion, culture and their civilization were immersed for hundreds of years with all kinds of foreign elements, not only from Luwian-Hurrian elements. In this final chapter, King Hattušili III’s, Queen Puduhepa’s and their son Tudhaliya IV’s legacies on the Late Hittite Empire period will be discussed and an effort will be made to answer some questions about any impact their reign might have had on ordinary people apart from the élite of Hatti.

1.7.1.3 Delimitations and limitations of the study

(a) Delimitations
The focus of this study is to ascertain what Queen Puduhepa’s role was in the merging of the Hurro-Hittite pantheons and the reforms brought about in the Hittite state cult. She did not only fulfil her role as queen and priestess, but she was also a wife, stepmother, mother and mother-in-law in her own right and was thus a powerful woman. It is important to conduct this study against the widest possible cultural background of the empires across the ancient Near East in the Late Bronze Age. The study focuses on the Late Bronze Age, circa 1600-1200 BCE, until the fall and much-debated disappearance of the once powerful Hittite Empire. I have included the time preceding the reign of Hattušili III, highlighting some of his most important predecessors like Suppiluliuma I (ca 1350-1322 BCE) and Hattušili III’s brother Muwatalli II (ca 1295-1272 BCE). The chronology used in this study is based
on the middle range model. Bryce (2005b:380) suggests it is largely associated with three
synchronisms he refers to: circa 1595 BCE for the fall of Babylon; circa 1327 BCE for the
death of Pharaoh Tutankhamun; and circa 1279 BCE for the accession of Pharaoh
Rameses II.

The Mitannians are briefly included in this study because before and during the Hittite
Empire period circa 1650-1200 BCE they controlled a huge area including Syria and
northern Mesopotamia. Despite their vast influence, they remain largely unknown because
of the absence of lists of their kings and because no libraries of literature have been found.
The Hittites referred to them as Hurrians because Hurrian was the language the Mitannians
spoke. This provides us with an anchor to try to track where these people came from and
how they formed themselves into a state in the Near East that was ultimately destroyed by
the Hittites under the command of King Suppiluliuma I. The time frame used in this study
translates to the Late Bronze Age, circa 1600-1200 BCE, for all the cultures: Egyptian,
Hittite, Mitannian, Mesopotamian and Babylonian.

(b) Limitations

(i) Clay tablets and linguistics in Hatti
What we know about the Hittites is extracted from clay. Thousands of tablets uncovered in
the library and archives at modern-day Boğazköy, the Hittite capital Hattuša, included many
accounts of prayers, cult practices, pleas to the gods for the relief of plagues, administrative
and economic information, correspondence between royal houses, even the training and
care for horses for which the Hittites became renowned, and much more. Most information
for any research on the Hittites and their civilization, which lasted for approximately six
hundred years, needs to be taken from these cuneiform clay tablets and be transliterated
and translated by linguists and Hittite scholars in the United States, the Netherlands,
Germany, Italy and Turkey, where the main research on the Hittites is conducted.
Iconographically, the Hittites are by far not as well represented as the remains of the
magnificent art of ancient Egypt, Assyria, Babylon and Mesopotamia. International interest
seems to be focused more towards the spectacular archaeological artefacts excavated in
these regions. The best iconographical remains from the Hittite Empire seem to be the
stone wall carvings on the walls of the Yazılıkaya open-air religious sanctuary.
A debilitating drawback for any person researching the Hittites at any period of their civilization is a researcher’s lack of philological or linguistic knowledge of the original ancient languages of Hatti in which the texts were originally written. Knowledge of Akkadian, Hittite, Luwian and Ugaritic is highly recommended for research about the people of Hatti.

(ii) Hittites in the Hebrew Bible
References to people as ‘Hittites’ are found throughout the Hebrew Bible. Before the age of archaeology, which started on a grand scale in the late nineteenth century CE, Biblical scholars regarded the Hittites as a small tribe of people living in the hills of Canaan during the time of the patriarchs. Archaeological finds changed this perception and placed the Hittites in the centre of modern-day northern Turkey. In this study, I will not attempt to speculate about the identification or discrepancies, nor the similarities between the Biblical perceived Hittites or those identified as Hittites by archaeologists in general.

(iii) People of Hatti
This study is limited because it cannot discuss an alternative view of the effect (if any) that changes in the Hittite state cult and religion had on the ordinary people of Hatti. We simply do not know to what extent the Hurro-Hittite pantheon depicted at Yazilikaya was accepted by the common people of the land of Hatti, or by other members of the élite, so close to the end of the Hittite Empire (Van den Hout 2014c).

(iv) Contact with western Anatolia
During the Empire period, Hattuša was in contact with people and rulers of western Anatolia and Mycenae, but this study will focus on contact between the Hittites and the people of central, upper and lower Anatolia, Egypt, Syro-Palestine, northern Mesopotamia, northern Syria, Babylonia, and south and southwestern Anatolia.

(v) Hittite or Anatolian archaeology?
According to Gorny (2002:2), Anatolian archaeology transcends the boundaries of both Hattuša and the Hittite Empire, and it remains an important task for future Anatolian scholars to define the precise role of Hittite archaeology. The criteria by which to classify something as Hittite or Anatolian are still not clear and it is not unlike trying to define the role of ‘Biblical archaeology’ within the context of Syro-Palestinian archaeology (Gorny 2002:2). Hittite history cannot be discussed and studied separately from other events that have taken place in Anatolia throughout time (Gorny 2002:2). Methodologically, Anatolian
archaeology is still developing and growing, and individual sites like Yazilikaya are better understood in the context of complex societies that emerged under the influence of a complicated set of internal and external forces of Hittite society (Gorny 2002:2). The information I have used has its limitations regardless of great strides that have been made and the substantial transformation in Anatolian archaeology since its inception more than eighty years ago.

(vi) Use of images

In the absence of a substantial number of well-preserved artefacts, orthostats, reliefs, statues or buildings from the Hittite Empire period, the iconographical representations and depictions to illustrate the Hittite state cult practices and performance will be taken from examples depicted at Alaça Höyük, Carchemish, Zincirli and Alalakh of the Neo-Hittite period (ca 1100-730 BCE). It is clear that cult practices as described in cuneiform texts changed very little over centuries in Anatolia, and this is also the reason for using portrayals from later times in this study. The pictures of these artefacts and murals are mainly retrieved from the internet and the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations in Ankara, Turkey and the book Syro-Hittite Monumental Art and archaeology of performance by Gilibert (2011).

(vii) Not an iconographical interpretation of Yazilikaya

This study will not include an iconographical analysis of the stone gods and goddesses of Yazilikaya. They will only be discussed as representations of the Hurrian and Hittite deities identified and incorporated into the Hurro-Hittite pantheon of Yazilikaya. The reliefs are badly weathered and many figures are either nameless or the Luwian hieroglyphs are illegible. Only the figures of deities which were identified by archaeologists will be discussed. Conclusions I draw regarding the purpose and meaning of Yazilikaya will be speculation and a choice between the few analyses found in a variety of literature about the sanctuary.
CHAPTER TWO
A NEW HITTITE EMPIRE EMERGING (ca 1430-1210 BCE)

The context within which the Old Hittite Kingdom (ca 1650-1430 BCE) (see Figure 2.1) developed into an empire to be reckoned with in the ancient Near East (at the end of the Late Bronze Age) will be the background to this chapter. The complicated historical, political and gradually changing religious elements of the New Hittite Empire (ca 1430 BCE-1210 BCE) were introduced by a dynasty of New Hittite kings after contact with neighbouring civilizations. It is important to discuss the unfolding, broad background of the eclectic, sometimes confusing Hittite civilization to ascertain what influence the political developments in Anatolia and their neighbours had on the reigns of Hattušili III and Puduhepa (ca 1267-1237 BCE) as well as that of their successor son, Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE), at the end of the Hittite Empire (ca 1210 BCE).

2.1 FROM KINGDOM TO EMPIRE (ca 1430-1210 BCE)

The Old Hittite Kingdom (see Figure 2.1) emerged from Hattuša, and the Hittite influence expanded as far as the Black Sea, the Upper Euphrates, northern Syria and the Mediterranean Sea (Hutter 1997:74).

Figure 2.1
The Old Hittite Kingdom circa 1650-1430 BCE (compare Figure 2.2)\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{22} \url{http://www.history-world.org}
The Hittite Kingdom declined during the century before circa 1430 BCE because of wars and domestic strife amongst its rulers and their families. Significant Hittite kings came to power in Hatti after a period of weakness caused by this strife, and they helped to build the Hittite Kingdom into an empire before Hattušili III illegally seized power in circa 1267 BCE. The New Hittite Empire emerged under the leadership of King Tudhaliya I/II (ca 1400-1350 BCE) in the fifteenth century BCE. This period, also known as the Pax Hethitica period, was when the Hittites had the greatest influence on the ancient Near East (Rivers 2015:18).

2.2 HITTITE RELIGION

The term ‘Hittite religion’ is a general description for various religious beliefs and an attempt to combine these within the area of central Anatolia where the Hittites had much influence from the eighteenth to the early twelfth century BCE (Hutter 1997:74). According to Hutter, Hittite religion was always a syncretistic, interconnected network of religions favoured by

---

23 http://www.ancient.eu
the Hittite state. Chronologically, Hittite religion consisted of different layers or ‘cultic strata’ which can be linked to the Hattians of ancient Anatolia, the Indo-European Hittites, the Luwians who later settled in south and southeast Anatolia, and the Hurrians who passed on Syrian and Babylonian ideas and thought to Anatolia (Haas 1994:6; cf. Hutter 1997:74). To date, no known text gives us a detailed, cosmological explanation of the origin of the Hittite religion (Beckman 1989:98).

Texts from the Empire period (ca 1430-1210 BCE) recovered from Hattuša and other regions of the ancient Near East reveal no documentation of personal religious experiences, theological ideas, individual spiritual biographies or records of people’s private devotions (Collins 2007:157). Scholars are left with many loose ends in this regard. Most numerous amongst the above-mentioned texts found at Hattuša were the festival texts referring to detailed manuals for the step-by-step performance of all the rites for festivals which were part of the official Hittite state cult (Güterbock 1997b:87; cf. McMahon 1995:1981). What the Hittite religion really was, Hutter (1997:78) tries to answer in a somewhat ‘exaggerated’ manner: he suggests that it ‘never existed [as] a Hittite religion for everybody.’ This complex, polytheistic religion reached its climax during the rule of Hattušili III, Puduhepa and their son Tudhaliya IV in the Late Empire period (Hutter 1997:78). We have to bear in mind that the growth of the Hittite state religion as a political sequence of events was important to the royal house but of little importance to the common people (Haas 1994:238).

### 2.2.1 Historical and theological elements of Hittite religion

To the Hittites, their religion symbolised their exposure to the whims of natural forces that they, on their part, had to quieten down with the aid of magic and divination (Lehmann 1977:267). That made their religion, with the exception of the naming of their deities, similar to the religions of neighbouring regions. From the surrounding regions, many local Anatolian gods, who did not assemble in a so-called heaven of their own or were not set apart as such, had similar characteristics to the official state cult and deities. These gods were included in the official pantheon (Lehmann 1977:267). The Hittites believed that the world was teeming with spirits and supernatural powers that lived above and below the earth (Bryce 2002:135). All animate and inanimate objects had a living spirit or god residing in them. Even metals and elements like fire were regarded as alive and capable of showing human emotion. Bryce (2002:135) quotes a vivid snake analogy about emotion ‘felt’ by fire:
The fire, the son of the sungod, bore ill will, and it came to the point that he went forth into the dark night, he slid into the dark night, and coiled himself together like a serpent.\(^{24}\)

Lehmann (1977:267) remarks that apart from the sungoddess of Arinna and the stormgod of Hatti, the Hittite pantheon was a ‘motley assortment’ of deities without ‘rank or hierarchy.’ The Hittite pantheon developed from a humble beginning into a highly complex system by the fourteenth and thirteenth century BCE (Gurney 1977:4). The concept of divine grace and protection in Hittite religion developed only gradually (Lehmann 1977:267). Beckman (2005:344) also believes that ‘the Hittites knew what they were about when they ‘did’ (meaning, how they applied and practised their religion, fulfilling rituals in their temples and shrines) and they saw no need to write down theoretical explanations for the benefit of those not already participating in their belief system.’ McMahon (1995:1989) reminds us that the Hittites did not have a creation story. While they had a reasonably logical perspective on religion, their literature hardly contains any conventional wisdom about the nature of humanity.

2.2.1.1 Nature of Hittite deities

Hittite gods were thought of as supernatural but also as thoroughly human in their behaviour. They were seen as holding vast power over elements in nature, but an omnipotent or omnipresent god would have been entirely alien to them (Ryan 2015:710). The gods of the Hittites did not offer any moral or spiritual upliftment to their worshippers (Bryce 2002:139). Despite this, they were more powerful and possessed greater wisdom than humans. Like the gods of ancient Greece and Rome, they showed the same emotions as humans: they could be deceptive, neglect their responsibilities, enjoy carnal pleasure and entertainment, and they liked dancing, music, comedy acts, athletics and even horse racing. Despite their predisposition to human frailties, the gods were concerned with ensuring the exercise of fairness, justice and correct behaviour amongst their mortal worshippers (Bryce 2002:139). According to Bryce (2002:139), ‘a life lived in obedience to the gods in which a mortal pursued no evil course ensured that the mortal would enjoy the protection and blessings of the gods.’ Those who offended the gods would have to carry the consequences of the gods’ wrath.

\(^{24}\) See abbreviations: KUB XLIII 62 ii Lines 5’-6’.
The Hittites believed in vengeance, punishment and in the notion of sins of the ancestors visited upon their children.

Amongst the Hittites, any god could be called upon as defender of justice and punisher of wrongdoing. Hattušili III proclaimed that his patron deity, İštar, had acknowledged the justice of his cause and guaranteed his final victory in his conflict with Urhi-Teshub (Bryce 2002:140). The stormgod of Hatti too was sometimes called upon to act as a god of justice. Hittite prayers often had the characteristic of a defence made before a judge, a common concept among many near Eastern religions (Karasu 2003:225).

2.2.1.2 Human-divine relationship

The relationship of the Hittite gods with their worshippers was that of masters and servants (Taracha 2009:80). Like the mortal Hittite king, the immortal masters, the gods, took care of their subjects in order not to suffer themselves (Singer 1994:88). Prayer texts were not found in large numbers by archaeologists in the excavations at Hattuša, but those that have been found can be studied and give us insight into how the Hittites viewed human-divine relationships. Hittite prayers combined asking for something earnestly, expressing gratitude and attempting to justify their actions to the gods. The Plague prayers of Mursili II are a very good example of these combined prayers (McMahon 1995:1981).

Beckman (2005:345) writes that these two groups of gods and humans were very different in terms of power and influence. They were also interdependent to the point of sharing the same food, drink and shelter in the temple or home. In Hittite iconography and myths, the divine world was mirrored as part of human society (Collins 2007:173; cf. De Martino 2013:410). The royal establishment treated the Hittite gods and goddesses with the same respect and dedication as their servants were compelled to treat the royals (Beckman 2005:346). Angry or offended deities could punish people or the whole of Hatti by inflicting defeat in battle or by bringing plagues to the people (Beckman 2005:345). Humans regularly reminded the deities that if they only served their own interests, human worship would be withdrawn and the deities would ‘starve’ to death (Beckman 2005:345). The status of the gods was determined, according to Collins (2007:174), by each deity’s standing in the pantheon, which in turn depended on the significance of his or her natural environment.
2.2.2 A different imperial ideology

The establishment of the New Empire period was a second phase of dominance for the Hittites, this time under the leadership of two strong kings: Tudhaliya I/II (ca 1420-1370 BCE) (see 2.3.1 for clarification of I/II) and his son Suppiluliuma I (1350-1322 BCE). The Hittite state expanded geographically and ideologically under their leadership because the Hittites came into military, cultural and diplomatic contact with major powers around them (Gorny 1989:89). Ultimately the Hittite imperial ideology changed and it became more theocratic with divine election and empowerment of the king playing a more important role in their society. Politics and religion were also never far apart throughout Hittite history.

2.2.2.1 The gods gaining a prominent place in Hittite politics

Gorny (1989:89) writes that the belief of divine involvement in politics was not totally unfamiliar to the Hittites even before the Old Kingdom period (ca 1650-1430 BCE). It found its most far-reaching expression during the final phase of the Empire period, during the reign (ca 1267-1237 BCE) of Hattušili III and Puduhepa. Characteristic of this was ‘an increased emphasis on the sacral character of royalty as well as a greater involvement by the divine in the affairs of state’ (Gorny 1989:89). It was especially apparent in war and it was tradition that a king saw godly intercession between two opponents as a form of judgment from the deities (see 2.4.1.1 [a]). According to Gilan (2011:277), the New Hittite Empire period was not only one of political conquest but their culture underwent a complete revival with the introduction of new cultural traditions and religious practices from the Hurrians in northern Syria (Hurro-Mitanni) and, most of all, from Kizzuwatna in southeastern Anatolia.

2.2.3 New social, religious and political elements of the Empire period

The Hittites pioneered several significant elements in Anatolia during the Empire period (circa 1430-1210 BCE):

- The Hittites invented iron-ore-smelting and were masters of metals in the Near East. They were the first to use iron weapons and to make spears, swords, helmets and shields for their armies (Brandau & Schickert [sa]:[sl]).
- In war they used light, spoke-wheeled chariots that could carry two soldiers and a driver, an innovation at the time (Brandau & Schickert [sa]:[sl]).
- The first written peace treaty under international law was drawn up between the great King Hattušili III and Pharaoh Rameses II circa 1258/59 BCE (Brandau &
Women attained equal rights (Brandau & Schickert [sa]:[sl]).

The Hittites had a highly developed judicial system practising the principle of ‘pay damages instead of punishment’ (Brandau & Schickert [sa]:[sl]).

They had a tolerant state religion which allowed people to worship their own gods (Brandau & Schickert [sa]:[sl]).

2.3 SIGNIFICANT PREDECESSORS OF PUDUHEPA AND HATTUŞILI III’S REIGN (ca 1267-1237 BCE)

A new generation of Hittite kings, as mentioned in 2.1, was responsible for re-establishing the Empire in Hatti at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the thirteenth century BCE. They built a strong army, resumed negotiating treaties, and advanced their political goals by randomly adopting local religions and cults into the Hittite state cult and religion (Podany 2010:305).

2.3.1 Tudhaliya I/II (ca 1420-1370 BCE): the re-emerging Hittite Empire

Tudhaliya I/II came to power in the era in which the Hittite Empire was under attack from all sides. The attackers were Arzawan armies from the west and south (see Figure 2.2), hostile Kashkan mountain tribes from the north, and Isuwan forces from across the Euphrates in the east (Bryce 2012b:728). The custom of referring to the king/kings as Tudhaliya I/II derives from ambiguity amongst scholars as to whether the Hittite armies were led by one or two different kings named Tudhaliya in the eastern and western campaigns (Bryce 2012b:728). Tudhaliya I/II and his son Suppiluliuma I were outstanding fighters ‘for gods and country’ against the various enemy coalitions who wanted to destroy Hatti (Cline 2014:x). Kashkan attacks forced the royal family to abandon Hattuša and flee to Šamuha (see Figure 2.2) in northern Syria (Bryce 2012b:729). There they were out of the way of the Kashkan tribes moving through the region. Father and son as joint leaders of the Hittite army launched their campaigns from Šamuha to win back control over Hatti and its vassal states (Bryce 2005b:148).

2.3.1.1 Roots of the Hurro-Hittite cultural symbiosis

The Hittites proved to be destructive to the Hurrians of northern Syria and southern Anatolia from a political perspective, but paradoxically built up a significant cultural relationship with them (Giorgieri 2015:2). Tudhaliya I/II’s dynasty became culturally and
religiously strongly affiliated to the Mitannian-Hurrians of northern Syria and the Hurrians of Kizzuwatna, lasting eight generations (Westenholz 1998a:75). Gurney (1977:13) mentions that the so-called Hurrian cultural invasion of Hatti began in the fifteenth century BCE when a queen with the Hurrian name Nikalmadi married Tudhaliya I/II. According to Gurney (1977:14), an effective westward expansion of Hurrian culture and influence imported Babylonian deities to Hatti in Hurrian guise, specifically the god *Ea* with his wife *Damkina, Anu and Atu, Enlil and Ninlil*, and the goddess *Ishara*.

It appears that the ancestral gods of the Hurrians were the stormgod *Teshub*, the sungod *Shimegi*, the moongod *Kusuh*, the wargod *Astabi* and a deity named *Kumarbi* who was equated with the Babylonian god *Enlil*, as well as the goddess *Šauška* who was identified with *Ištar* (see 3.1.2.2). These gods and goddesses were found wherever Hurrians settled (Gurney 1977:14). According to Gurney (1977:14), the Hurrian pantheon, which had such a huge influence on the Hittites, was mainly formed in Hurro-Mitanni (northern Syria). Gurney also points out that this is the area where the great Hurrian goddess *Hepat* originated from, along with her mother, *Allani*, and *Kubaba*, the goddess of Carchemish.

The crowning moment of Hurrian and Luwian cultural and religious influence on Hittite civilization was reached in the final years of Hatti’s existence in the thirteenth century BCE, as depicted in the reliefs of the Hurro-Hittite deities at Yazilikaya (Bryce 2012b:733; cf. Güterbock 1997b:182). By circa 1450 BCE the cultural traditions from the Hurrian-speaking parts of southern Anatolia where Puduhepa (ca 1290-1210 BCE) came from were already adopted by the Hittite dynasty (Giorgieri 2015:2). Hittite kings introduced Hurrian culture to their capital city Hattuša as well as other Anatolian towns. Between circa 1400-1200 BCE, Hurrian was spoken away from its original areas and became the language of cult and learning in Hittite Anatolia (Giorgieri 2015:2).

### 2.3.1.2 Luwian-speaking Hurrians of Kizzuwatna

In the Old Hittite Kingdom (ca 1650-1400 BCE) Hurrians were regarded as foreigners, but in the Empire period ordinary people, workers and slaves had Hurrian names. For example, at the royal court a cupbearer had the Hurrian name Arimelku (Güterbock 1997b:182). Pilliya, King of Kizzuwatna, and Papanikri of Kummanni also had Hurrian names and both were distinguished authors of magical texts (Güterbock 1997b:182). These magical texts which played an important role in Hittite cult practices during the
Empire period (see 5.3.4) reflected the mixed Luwian and Hurrian elements from Kizzuwatna. The interchange between Hurrian and Luwian personal names in some scribal families as well as Hurrian deities mentioned in Luwian texts reflects the merging of these two groups of people (Güterbock 1997b:182).

(a) Puduhpepa (ca 1290-1210 BCE): a Luwian speaking Hurrian priestess

Puduhpepa as a Hurrian priestess and noblewoman from Kizzuwatna inspired many ordinary Hurrians and priests to settle in Hattuša. As Queen she remained interested in the cults of her homeland, Kizzuwatna, and played an important role in continuously adding Hurrian elements to the Hittite state cult (Güterbock 1997b:182; cf. Burney 2004:230). Güterbock also mentions that ‘the Hurrian element never changed the ethnic character of the Anatolian population.’ There were many Hurrians of different trades and professions in Syria and southeast Anatolia. Added to that, the position of Hurrian women was surprisingly strong in their society (Güterbock 1997b:182; cf. Burney 2004:81). Puduhpepa’s life (ca 1290-1210 BCE) was recorded in historical texts describing Hurro-Hittite religious rituals, festivals, legal procedures, oracles and inventory lists. There is only one image of her, showing her involvement in a libation ritual on the rock relief at Fraktin (see Figure 6.11), and a few clay seals (De Roos 2006:18; cf. Darga 1994:32).

2.3.1.3  Puduhpepa’s royal Hurrian predecessors

In the early Hittite Empire, all their queens had Hurrian names, e.g. Dadu-Hepa and Henti, both wives of Suppiluliuma I; Tanu-Hapa, wife of Mursili II or Muwatalli II; and Puduhpepa (Güterbock 1997b:181). Most of the Hittite queens and princes’ Hurrian names were changed to Hittite names on their accession to the throne of Hatti. Güterbock (1997b:182) poses the question whether it was fashionable for the royals to choose Hurrian names for themselves or whether the early Hittite dynasty was originally Hurrian. Subsequently, he found evidence of a possible Hurro-Hittite Empire of Hatti backed by evidence of the execution of Hurrian magical rituals in cult practices associated with the Hurrian stormgod Teshub.

The royal establishment of Hatti made their first major religious changes when they adopted into their royal culture Hurro-Kizzuwatnean cultural and religious elements (Goedegebuure 2012:412). The major source of information about these influences were found in hundreds of Hurrian cuneiform texts in the archives and libraries of Hattuša, still being transliterated, translated and interpreted by various Hittitologists in Europe and the
United States (Van den Hout 2014c:28). Furthermore, Van den Hout (2014c:28) agrees with Güterbock that long before Puduhepa’s marriage to Hattušili III (ca 1275 BCE), the cross-cultural and religious Hurrian influence on the Hittite state cult and pantheon was already visible, particularly when King Tudhaliya I/II (ca 1400-1350 BCE) married the Hurrian noblewoman, as already mentioned, establishing relations with the Hurrian region of Kizzuwatna. According to Darga (1994:30), there is information from historical texts available on the family of only two Hittite queens. One is that of Suppiluliuma I’s (ca 1350-1322 BCE) third wife, the daughter of a Babylonian king, and the other is Puduhepa. For example, in a votive dedication to the Hattian goddess of the underworld, *Lelewani*, associated with the chthonic role of the sungoddess, Puduhepa refers to herself as ‘Puduhepa, the daughter of the city of Kummani’ (Kizzuwatna in Hurrian) (Burney 2004:178; cf. Darga 1994:30).

2.3.2 Suppiluliuma I (ca 1350-1322 BCE): ‘I, the Sun’

For many years Suppiluliuma I was chief adviser and fellow soldier to his father, but he was not Tudhaiya I/II’s first choice for succession (Bryce 2005b:149). Another son, presumably older than Suppiluliuma I, by the name of Tudhaliya the Younger (also known as Tudhaliya III) became King. Conflict erupted between the two brothers and their supporters (Bryce 2005:154). The circumstances are not clear, but it seems that Suppiluliuma I was involved in the murder of his brother (Van den Hout 2013:31).

---

25 Title of the historical fictional account, *I, the Sun*, of Suppiluliuma’s life (see references).
Suppiluliuma I came to the throne when the mighty Amenophis III (ca 1417-1379 BCE) ruled in Egypt and Kadashman-Enlil I (ca 1374-1360 BCE) was King of Babylon (Kuhrt 1998:194:336). Once alone on the throne, it took him most of his reign to chase the Arzawan army out of southeast Anatolia as well as drive the persistent Kashkans back north (Van den Hout 2013:31).

2.3.2.1 A new beginning for the Hittite Kingdom

A new beginning started for the Hittite Kingdom when Suppiluliuma I brought a period of weakness for the Hittites to an end (Beckman 1989:68; cf. Hoffner Jr 1990:2). When the Hittite Empire began to take shape with the rule of Suppiluliuma I, the ethnic and cultural pluralism of the Hittites increased as their political expansionism added more foreign elements to their culture (Hutter 1997:74).

(a) Defeating Mitanni

Suppiluliuma I’s tenacity as a military commander and diplomat was miscalculated by the Egyptians and Babylonians. He restored and fortified Hattuša as capital of Hatti. He first conquered lands the Hittites had lost in Anatolia during their dark age in the Old Kingdom period (ca 1650-1430 BCE) before he turned his attention to Mitanni in northern Syria (Macqueen 1999:46). His first attack on Mitanni was unsuccessful, but the second attack, when his army sacked the capital city Washshukanni, (see Figure 2.2) led to the murder

---

of the Mitannian king Tushratta (ca 1364-1347 BCE). The Hurrian Kingdom of Mitanni could not stand up against this military expansion of the Hittite Empire of Suppiluliuma I who finally, in his second attack, destroyed their great Hurro-Mitannian Kingdom in circa 1340 BCE (Giorgieri 2015:2; cf. Hoffner 1990:2). Suppiluliuma’s military successes resulted in a well-defended eastern Syrian border and in the conclusion of treaty agreements with vassal rulers (Beckman 1996:34). He made the wealthy Syrian cities of Carchemish and Aleppo vassal states, and forced Mitanni also into vassal status (Macqueen 1999:46-47).

(b) Elements of religious tolerance
Goedegebuure (2012:412) comments that, contrary to general expectations, Suppiluliuma I was religiously tolerant in planning his campaigns in Anatolia and Syria, east and west of the Euphrates River. She mentions as an example his tolerance when he ordered the Hittite army not to destroy the citadel and city-gods of Carchemish. This restraint shown by his army made it possible for Suppiluliuma I to appoint one of his sons as viceroy of the city of Carchemish (Westenholz 1998a:76).

(c) Implementing diplomacy
With the Hittites’ most significant enemy, the Hurro-Mitannian Kingdom, defeated, Suppiluliuma I tried again to advance his kingdom’s interest in the region peacefully. He was a diplomat who saw the virtues of caring for his people through peaceful means (Macqueen 1999:46). He set the example for later rulers like Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa by negotiating and signing treaties to avoid engaging in war or overextending the Hittite Empire.

Most information about Suppiluliuma I’s actions is found in his son Mursili II’s Deeds of Suppiluliuma (Bryce 2005b:149). Mursili II subsequently described his father as one of the least pious kings in Hittite history (Goedegebuure 2012:412). Suppiluliuma I also rejoined the ‘Brotherhood of Great Kings’ after his army destroyed the Hurro-Mitannian Empire and he reconquered Syria. As a renewed member of the ‘Brotherhood’, Suppiluliuma I regained equal status to the kings of Egypt, Assyria, and Babylonia (Westenholz 1998a:76).

---

27 See references [Beckman (1996)] for his translations of Suppiluliuma I’s treaties.
28 See 2.5.
(d) Elements of future diplomatic marriages

Queen Puduhepa (ca 1290-1210 BCE) would in years to come copy King Suppiluliuma I in developing with her husband, Hattušili III, an impressive network of diplomatic marriages for the sole purpose of strengthening diplomatic relationships with neighbouring states. Suppiluliuma I set an example by marrying a Kassite-Babylonian princess in a diplomatic move against the Assyrian threat looming from the east (Cline 2014:67).

2.3.2.2 Tutankhamun’s widow tries her luck

Egypt, on the other hand, remained a threat for the Hittites in Syria (Bryce 2005b:180). With the Hurro-Mitannian Kingdom out of the way, Hatti was the only significant rival empire to Egypt. An unusual letter, as a symbol of peace, was delivered to Suppiluliuma I by Egypt. An existing text from the reign of Mursili II (ca 1321-1295 BCE) gives us information about this letter from the late Pharaoh Tutankhamun’s widow to Suppiluliuma I. In this unusual letter from the widowed Queen Ankhesenamun (see Figures 2.4 & 2.5), she expressed her desire to marry one of Suppiluliuma I’s sons (Cline 2014:68):

My husband is dead. I have no son.
But they say that you have many sons
if you would give me one of your sons,
he would become my husband.
I will never take a servant of mine
and make him my husband!29

Figure 2.4
Tutankhamun and Ankhesenamun30

Figure 2.5
Queen Ankhesenamun31


Ankhesenamun’s request had never been made before by any of the royalty of Egypt. Her request was also not regarded as believable because the bridegroom was promised that he would become Pharaoh of Egypt (Cline 2014:68). Suppiluliuma I doubted the letter’s authenticity. After a second letter from Ankhesenamun and a visit from an Egyptian envoy, he finally complied and Suppiluliuma I sent his son Zannanza to Egypt, who subsequently died mysteriously. It is possible that he was murdered on his way to Egypt (Bryce 2005b:154). A potentially powerful diplomatic marriage with possible repercussions for Egypt and Hatti never happened. It became the prelude to yet another war between the two Empires. We learn from Singer (2006a:27) that the loss of the King’s successor as well as a border dispute near Kadesh again disrupted relations between Hatti and Egypt for almost a century. After Zannanza’s death there was retaliation by Suppiluliuma I (Cline 2014:70). He sent another son, Arnuwanda, to invade Egyptian territory in southern Syria.

(a) **Disaster strikes Hatti**

Arnuwanda returned to Hattuša with loot from the cities he had conquered. He also brought the deadly bubonic plague, probably carried by infected Egyptian prisoners of war (Cline 2014:66). This plague devastated Hatti for twenty years. Suppiluliuma I, his second son and new heir Arnuwanda II, as well as other members of the royal family died from this plague (one of several over time) (Van den Hout 2013:32). The Hittites believed this particular plague was the wrath of the gods delivered upon Suppiluliuma I in anger for his murder of Tudhaliya ‘the Younger’ as well as his breach of an old Hittite-Egyptian treaty when the Hittites invaded Amurru in Syria (Van den Hout 2013:32). In his first plague prayer Suppiluliuma I’s son Mursili II addressed the assembly of deities about his father’s death; he also perceived his father’s passing as retribution from the gods. The reason being that Suppiluliuma I never asked forgiveness for murdering his brother:

\[
\text{But now you, O gods, my lords, have eventually taken vengeance on my father for this affair of Tudhaliya the Younger. My father died because of the blood of Tudhaliya, and the princes, the noblemen, the commanders of the thousands, and the officers who went over to my father, they also died because of that affair.}
\]

\[
\text{This same affair also came upon the land of Hatti, and the population of the land of Hatti began to perish because of this affair.}^{32}
\]

---

Hittite scholars regard Suppiluliuma I as the most significant monarch of the New Hittite Empire among the predecessors of Hattušili III because he brought Anatolia again under Hittite control with his shrewd diplomacy and powerful army (Cline 2014:67).

2.3.3 Mursili II (ca 1321–1295 BCE): a royal warrior

Mursili II ascended the throne when the bubonic plague was still raging. Thousands of people died from the disease (Van den Hout 2013:32). Despite the devastation caused by the plague in Hatti, Mursili II was able to re-establish Hittite power in the region (Macqueen 1999:47). As the new monarch, he was in an uncertain situation because of revolts in the areas his father had conquered and because his ability to crush these revolts was doubted (Liverani 2014:305). Mursili II started his reign the same way as many of his predecessors: by attacking the western Anatolian rival Kingdom of Arzawa (Macqueen 1999:47). He placed a pro-Hittite king on the Arzawan throne, deported many of its inhabitants and made it a vassal state of the Hittites. Mursili II also defeated another Anatolian rival, the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa (see Figure 2.2) (Kuhrt 1998:256). Although he did not have the outstanding qualities of his father, Mursili II was described in military records as equally brutal and powerful as other Hittite kings (Bryce 2005b:220). With most of Anatolia under Hittite rule, Mursili II could turn his attention north of Hattuša where the Kashkan tribes remained.
troublesome, and he succeeded temporarily in reducing their threat to Hattuša (Kuhrt 1998:257).

Mursili II ruled for about twenty-two years and successfully saved the Hittite Empire from disappearing into oblivion after the disastrous bubonic plague (Macqueen 1999:48). He made an important contribution to the Hittite literary heritage of historical documents and prayers. They show his humanity, sensitivity, and strong conscience (Bryce 2005b:220). Mursili II stands out amongst his fellow royal warriors as a king who preferred treaties with vassal states and their leaders to military loyalty. He followed his father’s policies by implementing state treaties as instruments of diplomacy (Van den Hout 2013:34). Mursili II’s reign, like that of Suppiluliuma I, set an example for future monarchs like Hattušili III and Puduhepa to implement diplomacy in the region rather than war (Van den Hout 2013:34).

2.3.4 Ugarit and Hatti in the Late Bronze Age
Many Akkadian cuneiform clay tablets found in the archives of Ugarit on the Syrian coast bore seal impressions like the one with Mursili II’s name on in Figure 2.7. The stone seals of Hittite kings, members of the royal family and high officials were like ‘business cards’ impressed on correspondence, treaties, trade documents and royal gifts (Bryce 2012b:726; cf. Örnek 2004). The city-state of Ugarit (see Figures 2.2 & 2.8) in the Late Bronze Age had very large libraries and archives (Westenholz 1998a:79). Many Akkadian mythological and ritual texts as well as texts in western Semitic languages were found in the Ugarit archives and libraries (Westenholz 1998a:79). It is Westenholz’s view that Ugarit was ‘cosmopolitan’, with Hittite, Hurrian, Babylonian, Sumerian, and western Semitic deities integrated into Ugaritic culture.

The inscription on Mursili II’s seal reads (see Figure 2.7):

The seal of great Mursili, King of the monarch of the city of Hatti, lover of the god Amzi, the god of thunder, son of the great King Suppiluliuma, the monarch of the countries of Hatti, the hero...

Like many of the seals, this one contains a combination of Hittite and Luwian, with the name and titles of Mursili in the inner circle in hieroglyphic Luwian and his name, titles and genealogy in cuneiform Hittite in the two outer rings (Bryce 2012a:26).

2.3.4.1 Puduhepa’s involvement in judicial affairs in Ugarit (ca 1240 BCE)

There are judicial documents which demonstrate the independent role of the future Queen of Hatti, Puduhepa, in judicial affairs in Ugarit. Some interesting documents like the Ukkura document about international shipping laws written in Akkadian, with Queen Puduhepa’s seal impression (see Figure 2.9) on the front, were excavated at Raš Shamra (Ugarit) (Darga 1994:31). Hittite international law preserved the diversity of local legal tradition in the region as well as the vassal states (Hoffner 1990:3). The seal impression from Ugarit shows Puduhepa (ca 1290-1210 BCE) and her son, King Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE). It is the only known royal seal which mentions the name of a king’s mother, Puduhepa. The cuneiform writing in the circle around the seal impression reads: ‘son of Hattušili and Puduhepa’ (Darga 1994:31).

36 From Highlights of the National Museum of Damascus:47.
According to Darga (1994:31), it is an indication that Tudhaliya IV wanted to record the name of his mother on the seal and not only that of his father. At the time, we are told, Puduhepa ruled on behalf of her son as he was still too young. There is some real doubt amongst scholars about this seal’s authenticity. It is suspected that it might be a fake or reproduction of an original clay seal (Van den Hout 2014a).

(a) The *Ukkura affair*

The text of this document contains the minutes of a case known as the ‘Ukkura affair’. It is about an Ugaritic ship that sank outside the limits of its coastal waters. The inquiry into the sunken ship was made in the name of the Hittite King, Tudhaliya IV, who was most probably too young to rule, and his mother, Queen Puduhepa, was in charge of the administration of justice (Darga 1994:31). In the document it becomes clear that Queen Puduhepa discovered some disparity and brought a complaint before the court (Gülyaz [sa]b). Valuable goods and animals that were entrusted to the accused, GAL.₂U (his Akkadian first name), and his father, Ukkura, were missing (Gülyaz [sa] b).

Queen Puduhepa demanded that GAL.₂U and his father swear under oath at the temple of *Lelwani*, goddess of the underworld, that they had not stolen the goods. According to the document, quoted by Gülyaz ([sa]b), GAL.₂U said before the court that he had given the goods to his mother and considered himself innocent. An extract from the testimony of his father, Ukkura, the Queen’s ‘leader of ten’, reads:

---

I have never done anything wrong with the king’s stores, which are always with me. I have never taken away anything that the Queen has entrusted to me. The horses and mules that I had, belonged to me.  

The text also contains testimonies of witnesses and ends suddenly because the tablet is fragmentary. The eventual court decision is also not known. This action of Queen Puduhepa confirms her active and independent role in the Hittite judicial system in the Late Hittite Empire, confirming her exceptional leadership, for a woman, in the land of Hatti.

### 2.3.5 Muwatalli II (ca 1295-1271 BCE): Rameses II's nemesis

It was Muwatalli II who extended Hatti’s borders the furthest south. However, despite his successes in the Levant, he suffered setbacks at the hands of the Kashkan tribes in the north. It was one of the reasons that forced him to move the capital temporarily from Hattuša to Tarhuntassa in the south (see Figure 2.2) (Kuhrt 1998:257). Kozal & Novak (2013:230) write that Sirkeli (see Figure 2.2) could have been the location of the Hurrian cultic city of Lawazantiya, hometown of Queen Puduhepa, or it might have been near Tarhuntassa. It could also have been the Hurrian religious centre Kummani (see Figure 2.2).

#### 2.3.5.1 Muwatalli II’s presumed reasons for relocating the Hittite capital

The inscription (Figure 2.11) to the right of the robed King Muwatalli reads: ‘Muwatalli, great King, the hero, son of Mursili, great King, the hero’. It refers to Muwatalli II, son of Mursili II, which currently makes it the oldest known Hittite rock relief discovered in Turkey.

One can assume that the decision of Muwatalli II to relocate the Hittite capital city was also politically motivated because he moved the capital away from attacks from the troublesome Kashkan tribes (Collins 2007:158). This move of the capital and cult could also have been part of a strategic decision of Muwatalli II in preparation for his battle against Rameses II at Kadesh (ca 1247 BCE). Collins (2007:158) provides an example of the interconnectedness of politics and religion in her exploration of the reasons why she thinks Muwatalli II moved the Hittite capital from Hattuša to Tarhuntassa.

---

Presumably, according to her, he wanted to refocus the state religion on the southern cults.

Van den Hout (2013:35) is of the opinion that Muwatalli II moved the capital because, as high priest, he wanted to dedicate a single city (Tarhuntassa) to the cult of a single god, his own Luwian protective/patron god, the stormgod of lightning (Goedegebuure 2012:413).

2.3.5.2 Prince Hattušili: King of Hakpiš
Muwatalli II appointed his youngest brother, Prince Hattušili, in the very important position of army commander, chief of the royal bodyguards (GAL MEŠEDI) as well as King of the upper land of Hatti to keep the Kashkan tribes (see Figure 2.2) firmly under his control (Macqueen 1999:48). The appointment of Prince Hattušili, an experienced military commander and charioteer, as ‘King’ of Hakpiš was significant and successful because he kept the constantly problematic Kashkan tribes from invading Hattuša for a long time (Van den Hout 2013:34). Bryce (2005b:232) suggests that Hakpiš’s position was strategically important because it was situated between Hattuša and the cult city of Nerik (see Figure 2.2).

---

40 http://www.hittitemonuments.com/sirkeli/
41 Hittite scribes used Sumerian and Akkadian words in their texts. In the transliterations and translations of these cuneiform texts, different letter formats are used to distinguish between Hittite words in lower case and Sumerian and Akkadian words in capitals (Van den Hout 2011:11).
(a) Servant and priest of the stormgod of Nerik
Prince Hattušili was a committed servant and priest of the stormgod of Nerik and rebuilt the god’s ruined cult city just north of Hakpiš (Collins 2007:57). Later in Hattušili’s life, his wife Puduhepa reminded the sungoddess of Arinna in a prayer of her husband’s good service record at Nerik. Hattušili also named one of his sons Nerikkali in honour of the storm god of the cult city (Collins 2007:57).

(b) King and Queen of Hakpiš (ca 1275/76 BCE)
In the year after their marriage, Prince Hattušili took Puduhepa with him to Hakpiš where she became the ‘Queen’ of Hakpiš. According to De Roos (2006:20), when Puduhepa first reached northern Anatolia (see Figure 2.2), before they became a couple as King and Queen of Hakpiš, Hattušili had to spend some time calming down unrest caused by the Kashkan tribes attacking the city. In a letter (KUB 21.38 I 59ff) to an unknown king (most probably Rameses II) years later, Puduhepa reported about her arrival at her house in Hakpiš which she simply described with an È which is the Akkadian for house, not as an È.GAL (palace) or an È.LUGAL (palace of the god) (De Roos 2006:20).

2.3.5.3 Rumours of war between Egypt and Hatti
The main threat for Muwatalli II was Egypt, as it had also been for his predecessors. Having recovered from the instabilities of the Amarna period, Pharaoh Seti I and his son Rameses II wanted to regain Egypt’s lost influence in Syria (Van den Hout 2013:34). Both the rulers of Amurru and the area around Kadesh were forced to resume their loyalty to Egypt. The consequence was inevitable; war between Hatti and Egypt. In that first war between the two empires, Rameses II’s powerful father, Seti I (ca 1294 -1279 BCE), was victorious (Van den Hout 2013:4).

Hatti lost both Kadesh and Amurru (Bryce 2006:2) (see Figure 2.2). Rameses II was encouraged by his father’s success and enthusiastically took up the fight against Hatti where his father left off. He led his huge army a few years later against the Hittites at Kadesh (ca 1274 BCE) (Burney 2004:141). Although Muwatalli II’s imperial activities in the Levant were successful, he would also lead the Hittites into the most famous of ancient battles at Kadesh (ca 1274/75 BCE). This battle occurred because the Egyptians (in ca 1286 BCE) expanded their territory and influence northwards in the Levant (see Figure 2.12) and the Hittites at the same time moved south, threatening the Egyptian vassal territories in western Syria (Van de Mieroop 2016:151). Bryce (2005b:232) adds that
another positive element for Muwatalli II’s preparation for war was that his experienced military commander, his brother, Prince Hattušili of Hapkiš, was leader of the Hittite chariot teams. They had to fight against Rameses II and his chariots. Hattušili’s participation was important for Muwatalli II.

2.4 BATTLE OF KADESH (ca 1274/75 BCE)

The Egyptians increased their influence northwards (in ca 1286 BCE), while the Hittites moved south and intruded on Egyptian vassal states (see Figure 2.12), resulting in one of the best documented battles of the ancient world: the battle of Kadesh (Van de Mieroop 2016:146). At the time of the battle, Rameses II was only interested in destroying the Hittite Empire and claiming their vassal territory as his own (see Figure 2.12). He marched with his troops into the Levant in circa 1274 BCE to take on the Hittite army of King Muwatalli II (ca 1295-1271 BCE) (Van de Mieroop 2016:151). Prince Hattušili, as a successful military commander, supported his brother, King Muwatalli II, at Kadesh and was his brother’s most important commander in charge of the infantry and charioteers (Collins 2007:55; cf. Ritner & Van den Hout 2016). Van de Mieroop (2016:151) states that the Egyptians described the battle of Kadesh as a major confrontation between two huge armies (most probably an exaggeration), led personally by both kings. The scale of the battle and the tactics used reveal that the Bronze Age armies were as sophisticated as any army from later periods in history.

![Figure 2.12](https://youtu.be/d8f1FUwTv8Q?t=9m4s) Decisive battles-Kadesh Egypt vs. Hittites. Start time at 9:04 min to 21:53 min (Retrieved 6 October 2015).

---

42 View the link [https://youtu.be/d8f1FUwTv8Q?t=9m4s](https://youtu.be/d8f1FUwTv8Q?t=9m4s) Decisive battles-Kadesh Egypt vs. Hittites. Start time at 9:04 min to 21:53min (Retrieved 6 October 2015).

43 Murnane (1990:xvi).
2.4.1 Rameses II’s chariots against Prince Hattušili’s charioteers

According to Van de Mieroop (2016:152), the technology of warfare had changed since the early second millennium BCE. The armies now had horse-drawn chariots that enabled the soldiers to travel at high speed while shooting arrows (see Figure 2.13). Although the equipment was costly, it was effective and everybody used it in battle. At the time of the battle of Kadesh, the Hittite army was a well-oiled machine with the king’s brother, Prince Hattušili, as commander-in-chief leading the troops and élite charioteers into battle (Macqueen 1999:57) (see Figure 2.14).

The Hittites never had unlimited numbers of soldiers to go into battle because their homeland was under populated most of the time (Bryce 2002:101). This was a perpetual problem because Hatti had been depleted of numbers of people for more than twenty years because of the plague that had broken out at the end of Suppiluliuma I’s reign (ca 1370 BCE). However, Muwatalli II mustered over 47 000 troops against Rameses II for the battle of Kadesh (Bryce 2002:102).

---

45 Lorenz (2011:132). From a mural depicting the battle of Kadesh at Abu Simbel.
24.1.1 Differences in the religious beliefs of the Hittite King and Egyptian Pharaoh during military campaigns

As with many other expressions of life and death, military campaigns were heavily linked to the religious beliefs of the Hittites and the Egyptians.

(a) The Hittite King

It was standard practice for the Hittite King to ask the blessing of the gods in a series of rituals meant to bring good fortune to the commander and his army (Ryan 2015:695). The gods were also involved in the planning of military action, with some commanders laying out different variations on specific strategies in battle, like at Kadesh, hoping the gods would approve of one over the others (Ryan 2015:695). The Great Kings of the Hittites only gained divine status after death, and when they ascended the throne they were the chief priests of the state pantheon and religion. Prophetic assistance was regularly requested, though it is not precisely known how they established a particular outcome or plan. From a variety of texts, we know that both oracles and entrail readings formed integral parts of the Hittite religions’ process of divination (see 5.3.4.1). According to Ryan (2015:695), it is likely that these rituals played a part in determining whether or not the gods were in favour of a specific plan for a campaign. Except for this mystical element, the Hittite military’s structure at Kadesh was practical, planned and organized.

(b) The Egyptian Pharaoh

There were similarities as well as many differences in the belief systems of Egypt and the Hittites. The ancient Egyptians also worshipped a multitude of gods and goddesses, like the Hittites. These deities presented themselves in many forms and the Egyptians shared complex relationships with them (Gahlin 2011:17). In the role of king, the Pharaoh was regarded as divine and as the link between the deities and the people. To some extent, the Pharaoh was also the servant of the gods, although high priests acted on his behalf in religious ceremonies. The gods subsequently rewarded the people with blessings, granting them victory in battle, successful harvests, and recovery from sickness (Gahlin 2011:13). The battle of Kadesh, like all other battles, was seen as a personal duel between the Pharaoh and his enemy, the Hittites (Spalinger 2005:77). Rameses II, as the subordinate and son of Amun, shoots his arrows at the enemy, Muwatalli II of the Hittites, who is seen within the Egyptian political-theological framework as the one who upsets Truth (Ma’at). The battle is personalised into a duel - the ‘superhuman’ Rameses II attacking his enemy (Spalinger 2005:77)
2.4.2 Outcome of the battle of Kadesh
The battle of Kadesh ended as a stalemate. It was a devastating ambush, a strategic defeat and temporarily the end of Rameses II’s conquest campaign in the north of Syria (Rivers 2015:27). In a sense, it was a tactical military victory for Rameses II and a strategically important one for the Hittites whose control over Amurru was restored (Ritner & Van den Hout 2016).

2.4.2.1 For the Egyptians, Kadesh was about battle tactics and personal glory
The morning after the battle, Rameses II agreed to Muwatalli II’s proposal to a diplomatic end to the fighting (Shaw 2012:135). The troops were worn out and had no desire to start fighting again (Ritner & Van den Hout 2016). Muwatalli II suffered the loss of important members of his immediate family and household during this battle. Two of his brothers died, one of who drowned in the Orontes, and his shield bearers, the chief of his bodyguard and his personal secretary were killed (Ritner & Van den Hout 2016). Ritner (and Van den Hout) in their lecture at the Oriental Institute (2016) stated that the Egyptians recorded and interpreted this battle from their perspective in no less than thirty sources in the form of tablets and murals all over Egypt. The scale of the battle and the tactics used reveal that armies of the Bronze Age were as sophisticated as countless military operations from later periods in history (Rivers 2015:28).

(a) Rameses II, the show-off poet
Rameses II returned to Egypt with much fanfare and exaggeration, erecting monuments, commissioning inscriptions and overseeing the carving of reliefs, all proclaiming the battle of Kadesh was a major victory for him (Rivers 2015:27). Ritner, in his lecture at the Oriental Institute (2016), informs us that the Hittite prisoners of war who were taken to Egypt by Rameses II constructed the reliefs of the Egyptian interpretation of the battle at Abu Simbel. Rameses II’s ‘victory’ poem was written by his scribe Pentwere and inscribed on the walls of five temples across Egypt: Abydos, Luxor, Karnak, Abu Simbel and the Ramesseum, as well as on two papyri fragments in hieratic Egyptian (Lichtheim 2006:57). This ‘Kadesh poem’ presented Rameses II’s point of view of the battle. This ‘poem’ accompanied these enormous reliefs of scenes commemorating the fighting. The poem includes Rameses II’s pleas to the principle god of the Egyptians, Amun, for guidance and help during the battle:

I am alone, there’s none with me!
My numerous troops have deserted me, Not one of
my chariotry looks for me,
I keep on shouting for them,
But none of them heeds my call.

I know Amun helps me more than a million,
More than a hundred thousand charioteers,
More than ten thousand brothers and sons
Who are united as one heart…

Amun is more helpful than they,
I came here by the command of your mouth,
O Amun, I have not transgressed your command!46

There are no reliefs from the Hittite Kingdom portraying a Hittite king annihilating his enemies in battle or rejoicing over the dead as depicted in Egyptian and Assyrian reliefs (Bryce 2002:100).

2.4.2.2 For the Hittites, Kadesh was about Amurru

Van den Hout, in his simultaneous lecture about the Hittites with Ritner, who spoke about the Egyptians at the Oriental Institute (2016), mentions that the battle was reported in only four Hittite texts discovered so far. He states the battle was all about Amurru (see Figure 2.12). Muwatalli II and his army were more interested in controlling northern Syria than anything else. One of these four Hittite texts referring to the battle, found at Hattuša, was incorporated into a vow by Hattušili, chief commander of charioteers and infantry of the Hittite army, in circa 1275 BCE:

As far as that campaign that His Majesty is going on is concerned, if you, o Gods, march ahead of me and I will conquer Amurru, that is, either I will conquer it by armed force, or it will make peace with me.47

Van den Hout (Oriental Institute 2016) informs us that Tudhaliya IV, son of Hattušili and Puduhepa, recorded the only explicit Hittite text referring to the battle in circa 1225 BCE, fifty years after the battle:

Muwatalli and the king of Egypt fought a battle over the people of Amurru he destroyed by force, he subjected it and installed Sapili as King in Amurruš48

Ritner and Van den Hout (2016) mention there were also two marginal references to the battle, specifically referring to the relocation of Hattuša to Tarhuntassa and the marriage of Hattušili’s daughter to Rameses. Kuhrt (1998:258) confirms that the battle allowed Muwatalli II to consolidate Hittite power in Amurru, located in the Damascus region (see Figure 2.12). He was also in a position to retake Hattuša and the city of Nerik, the cult center of the important storm god of Nerik, where Hattušili was in charge for many years, fighting the troublesome Kashkan tribes. Collins (2007:55) agrees with Kuhrt (1998:258) that, for the Hittites, Amurru’s subsequent return to Hittite rule and the re-establishment of the border between Hittite and Egyptian territories were the most important outcomes of the battle of Kadesh. Today the area is known as Tell Nebi Mend on the Homs plain in Syria (Kuhrt 1998:258).

(a) Speculation about Muwatalli II’s disinterest in glory for Hatti

The lack of Hittite accounts of the battle of Kadesh could be the result of a certain disinterest in war itself that was encouraged by the Hittite’s code of law that changed from circa 1500 BCE onwards. The Hittites did not relish in stories of war and their administrative documents showed that war victories were never exploited or even depicted on their monuments, displaying royal power like the Egyptian Pharaohs (Ritner & Van den Hout 2016). According to Ritner and Van den Hout, Hittite documentation leading to the battle as well as the scarcity of references to it afterwards were connected to a certain amount of disinterest from the King. Van den Hout in his lecture (with Ritner) at the Oriental Institute (2016) said he is of the opinion that, because there was a huge difference between Hittite kingship and that of the Egyptian Pharaohs, the outcome of the battle was underplayed by Muwatalli II because it was custom for Hittite kings not to dwell on victory in battle. The role of the Hittite king as the embodiment of nature, the one who guaranteed fertility/life and food to his subjects, was more important than the role of being chief of the army.

Another possible reason for the lack of Hittite documentation about the battle of Kadesh is that somewhere in southern Anatolia (Sirkeli perhaps), a not-yet located, unexcavated library of the city of Tarhuntassa (see its location in Figure 2.2) might reveal some much-needed information (Ritner & Van den Hout 2016). Van den Hout said in his talk that he has a hunch that such a possibility is improbable, but he does

49 To view and listen to their lecture, go to: http://youtube Oriental Institute Public Lectures (Retrieved 31 January 2016).
not give his reasons for saying so. Eventually strength and vitality, important facets of Muwatalli II’s reign, gave way to a short period of unrest in the Hittite Empire. He adds that about ten years after the battle of Kadesh, the Hittites under the leadership of Muwatalli II’s brother Hattušili III signed the so-called ‘eternal peace’ treaty with Rameses II (Ritner and Van de Hout 2016).

**2.4.2.3 Prince Hattušili remained in northern Syria (ca 1274/75 BCE)**

After the battle of Kadesh (ca 1274/75 BCE), King Muwatalli II ordered his brother, Prince Hattušili, to remain in northern Syria for some time to help maintain peace. After Hattušili’s release from this peacekeeping command, on his way home to Hakpiš in northern Hatti he stopped in the cult city of Lawazantiya in the land of Kummanni in the Kizzuwatna region (see Figure 2.12) to pay homage to the goddess Ištar/Šauška who he believed had protected him since childhood (Collins 2007:55; 60). There he met the young priestess Puduhepa whom he married and took with him to Hakpiš. It would be a relationship, marriage and co-regency that was unique by ancient Near Eastern standards because the couple worked and ruled as equals. This element and others of their reign as well as the positive consequences which resulted from their union will be discussed in Chapter Three.

**2.5 HATTUŠILI III AND THE ‘BAND OF BROTHERS’**

From as early as about 2300 BCE, the Near Eastern kings established a unique band of brothers (a royal brotherhood of the great powers in the ancient Near East) to create a sense of family and diplomacy (Podany 2010:10) (see Figure 2.16). It was an arrangement that survived for more than two centuries until most of its major powers, including Hatti, collapsed in circa 1200 BCE (Podany 2010:191). They regarded their peers as ‘blood’ brothers, expecting loyalty at all times (Podany 2010:10). The Late Bronze Age lasted about 500 years, from the early seventeenth to the early twelfth century BCE, and throughout this period the complex politically and culturally diverse people of the Near Eastern world were mainly controlled and capitalised on by four brothers (Bryce 2003b:2). These four who shared power over the region were the kings of Egypt, Hatti, Assyria and Babylon (see Figure 2.15). According to Bryce (2006:1), they succeeded in maintaining a kind of balance and stability between their kingdoms. Van de Mieroop (2016:137) tells us that these powerful kingdoms also developed a system that successfully joined people over thousands of kilometres through economic
and diplomatic pursuits. Furthermore, they developed a system of a new, international upper-class whose members most probably had more in common with each other than with the subjects of their kingdoms (Van de Mieroop 2016:144).

After the Hattušili-Rameses treaty was concluded in circa 1258/59 BCE, the Hittites and Egyptians never activated their peace treaty in defence of one another because they never again fought each other in war. This helped start a time marked by the renewed diplomatic ‘brotherhood’ of Kings, where these two former enemies - Hatti and Egypt - became allies of the people of Mesopotamia and northern Syria. They applied diplomacy according to a prescribed system and wrote their letters in the diplomatic language of the time, Akkadian cuneiform (Podany 2010:15).

Figure 2.15
The centres of power in Southwest Asia in the late second millennium BCE

According to Klengel (2011:42), Hattušili III, who was branded as a usurper, proudly remarked that all the kings of the Near East started sending him diplomatic envoys and gifts after his daughter’s marriage to Rameses II. The marriage of the Hittite royal princess to Rameses II strengthened Hattušili III’s position in southern Anatolia, specifically in the region of Tarhuntassa (see Figure 2.2) and against the western kingdom of Ahhiyawa (see Figure 2.15). Hattušili III also started corresponding with the Assyrian and Babylonian kings (Klengel 2011:43).

2.5.1 The ‘Brotherhood of Kings’ imitating family relationships
Terminology used in family relationships played an important and prominent role in diplomatic exchanges between royal courts in the ancient Near East (Bryce 2003b:81). They preferred to address one another as ‘My Brother’ and as ‘Great King’. The letters they ‘wrote’ or dictated to their scribes expressed brotherly love and esteem for one another, but the reality was that they deeply distrusted each other and often quarreled (Bryce 2006:1). Royal correspondence also gave a closer insight into the private lives of the royals in the different regions (Podany 2010:11). Lack of communication was seen as a potential threat and a negligent correspondent would be rebuked into replying (Cunliffe 2015:152).

The right to address a Great King as ‘Brother’ or members of his family as ‘Sisters’,

---

‘Sons’ or ‘Daughters’ was not taken for granted (Bryce 2003b:81). It demonstrated that one had achieved the status of Great King and the ‘Brotherhood’ implied that all the members had to have equal status (Bryce 2003b:81). Rameses II, Queen Nefertari, Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa addressed one another as ‘My Sister’ and ‘My Brother’ in their letters (Bryce 2003b:81) (see 4.3.5.1). For the most part, the ‘Brotherhood’ system worked as the ‘member’ states rarely faced each other directly in war. The Levant happened to be the stage for many proxy wars between the principal members of the ‘Brotherhood’ and they fought border skirmishes with each other over vassal territory, but at the same time they did not stop trading with each other in rare commodities and royal princesses (Van de Mieroop 2016:152) (see 4.4).

2.5.1.1 Brotherly correspondence from Amarna

A large collection of royal correspondence that was written in several languages was discovered in Amarna, giving some insight into the Brotherhood Kings and officials and how they dealt with each other. The ‘Brothers’ sent these letters as well as gifts to one another. Their correspondence provides fascinating insight into the social and economic organization of the time (Cunliffe 2015:153). The gifts acted as a camouflage for trade between them. This is recognised by reading the complaints when the ‘Brothers’ felt they deserved more than what they received from another king (Ancient Letters 2008). When the King of Assyria neglected to send gifts to Hattušili III, the latter wrote:

When I assumed Kingship, you did not send a messenger to me. It is the custom that when Kings assume kingship, the Kings, his equals in rank, send him appropriate gifts of greeting, clothing befitting kingship, and fine oil for his anointing. But you did not do this today. 52

Other archives found at Hattuša and Ugarit and in smaller numbers in other palaces throughout the Near East show that communication between the Great Kings and their vassals was quite intensive (Cunliffe 2015:152). The minor kings often complained in their letters and made excuses for why their taxes and tributes to the king were late. Various other correspondences were from officials sending information about diplomatic treaties that were agreed to or not. Treaties themselves would become letters with copies kept by the parties involved (Ancient Letters 2008).

2.5.1.2 The age of intercultural and political elements in the ancient Near East

The centuries from circa 1500 to 1200 BCE were also singled out as the international age of ostentatiousness and luxuriousness, diplomacy, cultural exchange, and imperial and commercial expansion (Singer 2011:x). The ancient Near East functioned for the first time as a consolidated international network stretching from the Nubian Desert to the Black Sea and from the Aegean to the Iranian plateau (Cunliffe 2015:156). The exchange of precious goods and works of art between the Hittites and their neighbours helped to mediate intercultural influence and strengthen political and economic ties in the region (Feldman 2006:26).

2.5.1.3 Raw materials as the ‘crude oil’ of the Late Bronze Age

A comparison with our modern era is relevant but will not be discussed in depth in this dissertation. Cline (Oriental Institute 2015) explains in his lecture that bronze itself connected all the regions of the ancient Near East. The strategic importance of tin and copper in the Late Bronze Age was no different from that of crude oil today (Cline 2014:xvi). The availability of tin and copper to produce bronze weapons was a preoccupation of the Great Kings of Hattuša and the Pharaohs in Thebes. The quantity of rare, raw materials on the move, essential to maintain the political status quo, was enormous (Cunliffe 2015:156). A spectacular case in point of the scale and complexity of the exchange systems then in operation is provided by a shipwreck that was found near Uluburun off the southern coast of Anatolia (Cunliffe 2015:156). The ship sailed anti-clockwise around the eastern Mediterranean and sank with a full cargo including ten tons of copper in ox hide-shaped ingots and one ton of tin.
An analysis of the archaeological remains of this Uluburun shipwreck is important because it gives us an idea of the range and scale of the trading systems which were operating to satisfy the huge demand of the Great Kings. At the same time, it implies the existence of a skilled mercantile class (Cline 2014:78; cf. Cunliffe 2015:156).

55 http://www.maritimehistorypodcast.com
2.5.1.4 Diplomacy rather than war

Control of the land and people between the Great Kings was often in dispute (Bryce 2006:1). In a region frequently experiencing conflict and war, major military action between the ‘Brothers’ was avoided. The ‘Band of Brothers’ followed set diplomatic rules and procedures to avoid war when they had a dispute with one another (Podany 2010:10). If a Great King wanted to further his interests and broaden his influence internationally, experience and political skills were the best means for him to achieve his goals (Bryce 2006:2). Podany (2010:305) points out that all ‘Brotherhood’ and diplomatic missions were initially linked to state-initiated wars because the kings wanted to know who their official allies were when going to war. Podany (2010:191) also notes that the ‘Brotherhood’ was flexible enough not to disintegrate when major changes occurred in the fortunes of their members, like Mitanni being conquered by the Hittite Empire of Suppiluliuma I and subsequently losing ‘membership’ of the Brotherhood of Kings. According to Bryce (2005:266), Hattušili III as king was apparently reluctant to take on military campaigns and he had no desire to expand Hittite territory beyond what was established by his grandfather Suppiluliuma I (circa 1344 BCE).

During Hattušili III’s reign, with Puduhepa by his side he created a new image as diplomat and mediator in the Near East rather than professional soldier and combat general in charge of the charioteers in the Hittite army at Hakpiš (Bryce 2005b:266). Hattušili III wanted to secure the safety of the Hittite vassal territories by establishing official diplomatic ties with the rulers of regions bordering Hatti (Bryce 2005b:266). His main aim was to clear his name of the stigma of his illegal deposing of his nephew Urhi- Teshub. The latter remained persistent in getting back the throne of Hatti. Hattušili, on the other hand, was determined to convince his royal ‘Brothers’, especially the kings of Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria, that he was now the legitimate King of Hatti (Bryce 2005b:266).

2.5.2 The Hittite Empire expanding

The Hittites achieved great success in building their new empire under the leadership of the influential and powerful but not flawless predecessors of Hattušili III and Puduhepa as well as their successor, Tudhaliya IV. Like all political institutions, the New Hittite Empire also experienced its quota of weaknesses and disputed succession battles between kings. During such times the kingdom lost land and people. These kings, whose military capabilities extended the borders of Hittite territory, brought their foreign adversaries to their knees (Beal 2011:597; cf. Podany 2010:306). All the complicated historical, political
and religious elements which developed in the early part of the New Hittite Empire had a profound influence on the reign of Hattušili III and Puduhepa in the Late Empire period (Beal 2011:597). More significant for the Hittite Empire’s long-term success was the gift of peace the new kings brought to the ancient Near East. The Hittite Empire prospered for about 500 years with remarkable skill in creating peace as well as expertise in war. Hittite administration was very well organised and their officials practised careful record-keeping (Beal 2011:597). The Hittite Empire continued developing the important aid for diplomacy, the international treaty, by means of which they put together their ‘Brother’ Empires (see 2.5) and their conquered subordinate states in a network of peaceful partnerships and relationships.

2.5.2.1 Early signs of the end and the collapse of regional kingdoms
As mentioned before, the Hittites absorbed many other ethnic and cultural elements which they applied in their own society. Through their system of transportation of people and goods in war and peace as well as their foreign cultural influence and commerce, they succeeded in the course of five to six hundred years in becoming culturally and politically one of the great powers of the Late Bronze Age. The multiple cultures of the ancient Near East all interacted and were, to a certain extent, dependent upon each other in the Late Bronze Age. The region was, in reality, on the brink of collapse by circa 1177 BCE as a consequence of various natural and man-made disasters and catastrophes (Cline 2014:1).

Despite the international Pax Hethitica period for the Hittite Empire, which started circa 1274/75 BCE, local circumstances in the land of Hatti were quite different, according to Singer (2002:96). As discussed in paragraph 2.3.5.1, Muwatalli II’s division of the Hittite Kingdom by relocating the royal cult to Tarhuntassa and its impact as well as the civil war Hattušili III waged (ca 1267 BCE) against his nephew Urhi-Teshub (ca 1271-1264 BCE) tell us that the moral consequence of these actions weighed heavily on the conscience of the last generations of Hittite kings (Singer 2002:96). Singer is of the opinion that it was Hattušili III’s illegal, forceful take-over of the Hittite throne in particular that contributed to the end of the Hittite Empire (ca 1200 BCE). The network of the band of royal brothers fell apart during the course of the twelfth century BCE as a result of instabilities brought about by social inequalities partly caused by external events like the increased mobility and rise in power of nomadic people dominated by the Aramaeans and Chaldaeans living on the edges of the deserts of the ancient Near East (Cunliffe 2015:160). The unified system of
'Brothers’ maintained an unstable balance and then disintegrated, leaving a very different political geography in the ancient Near East at the end of all the disruption (Cunliffe 2015:157).

2.5.2.2 Assyria on the rise again
Assyria was a conquered power during the early part of the Late Bronze Age, with its capital city Aššur on the Tigris River (in modern Iraq) sacked and looted by the Hurro-Mitannians (Godenho 2015). Soon the Assyrians were to rise again under King Aššur-ubalit (ca 1365-1245 BCE), replacing Mitanni (Bryce 2003b:2) (see Figure 2.20). It did not take the Assyrians long to prove themselves a force to be reckoned with, not least in their ability to survive for many years (Godenho 2015). They commanded a strong international presence in the Near East after other ancient Near Eastern superpowers disappeared or left the stage (Godenho 2015).

Figure 2.20
The geographical rise of Assyria from circa 1800 until 627 BCE

2.6 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, some of the major predecessors and ancestors of Hattušili III and Puduhepa’s reign were discussed, and in a traditional society like theirs, the fundamental principles of the living were closely connected and dependent on an unbroken relationship with their predecessors. Muwatalli II’s relocation of the Hittite capital to Tarhuntassa (see 2.3.5.1), dividing the Hittite kingdom and, as we shall see in Chapter Four, Hattušili III’s
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eventual illegal overthrow of the throne (see 4.2), are the kind of consequences resulting from earlier political developments that had far-reaching effects on the monarchs of Hatti (Singer 2011:679). The division of the Hittite kingdom by Muwatalli II introduced the very volatile situation in which two branches of the royal family, Urhi-Teshub and his uncle Hattušili III, would compete for political legitimacy as well as accessibility to the cult places of their common royal predecessors and ancestors (Singer 2011:685). These events caused disruptions for generations and had damaging results for the survival of the Hittite Empire, which was at its height from the mid-fourteenth to the thirteenth century BCE but, ironically, was also in the early stages of its final decline. Hattuša remained the important religious, political, and administrative heart of the Hittite Empire, but despite these outward appearances, it is noticeable that Hattušili III and Puduhepa's usurpation of the Hittite throne made them the rulers of a region that was on the verge of collapse.
CHAPTER THREE
A MARRIAGE NOT MADE IN HEAVEN

‘A land and its people may become wicked enemies of Hatti, but not its gods. The latter are always welcome in Hatti’ (Singer 1994:91). Therefore, the Hittites never met a god they did not like.

The Hittite state deliberately imported several deities and their cultic traditions into the capital, Hattuša, so that gods who originated from elsewhere could be together in one place (McMahon 1995:1985). These foreign gods were adopted by the official Hittite pantheon because they had acquired political and territorial power in Anatolia (Hutter 1997:79).

Van den Hout (1995:1112) writes that it was not impossible that Hattušili and Puduhepa’s marriage was not ‘made in heaven’ with Ištar of Šamuha’s intervention, but rather that the older Hattušili simply fell in love with the young, strong Puduhepa.

This chapter presents an overview of the elements that supported the successful marriage of Hattušili and Puduhepa within the Hittite state, its complex religion and the phenomenal growth of its pantheon. It provides a background to the context within which Queen Puduhepa, her royal scribes and her son Tudhaliya IV influenced the Hittite state cult and festivals, reorganising the cult inventories and merging the Hurrian and Hittite pantheons as depicted at Yazilikaya in the Late Empire period (ca 1370-1215 BCE).

3.1 PRINCE HATTUŠILI MARRIES THE PRIESTESS PUDUHEPA (ca 1275 BCE)

During Hattušili’s stopover in the city of Lawazantiya, he met the fifteen-year-old noblewoman and priestess Puduhepa (ca 1275 BCE) (Frantz-Szabó & Ünal 2006:106; cf. Gold 2015:19). Puduhepa was the daughter of a Hurrian priest, Pentipšarri, who presided over the cult centre of Ištar in Lawazantiya (Van den Hout 1995:1112).
According to Darga (1994:30), it was not a chance meeting between the much older man (about forty) and the fifteen-year-old ‘handmaiden’ of the goddess *Ištar* of Lawazantiya. The two of them could easily have met at the offering ritual Puduhepa's father Pentipšarri performed on behalf of Hattušili to his protective deity *Ištar* (De Roos 2006:19). Darga (1994:30) tells us that *Ištar* instructed him in a dream to marry Puduhepa. Hattušili was already the father of children from unknown women in Hattuša and Hakpiš. He must have been struck by Puduhepa's beauty as well as her position as a daughter of a priest of *Ištar* (De Roos 2006:19; cf. Gold 2015:17).

Bryce (2003b:100) adds that love as the primary foundation for marriage was a rare and isolated occurrence amongst the royalty of the ancient Near East. In Hattušili’s ‘Autobiography’, his scribe wrote about his marriage to Puduhepa:

> At the behest of the goddess I took Puduhepa the daughter of Pentipšarri, the priest, for my wife: we joined in matrimony and the goddess gave us the love of husband and wife.

> We made ourselves sons and daughters. The goddess, my lady, appeared to me in a dream saying: 'Become my servant with your household!' so the goddess' servant with my household I became.

> In the house, which we made ourselves, the goddess was there with us and our house thrived.  

---


58 From Collins (2007:12).
The fragment from the Bitik vase (Figure 3.1) shows us an intimate bridal chamber scene frozen at that moment when the man’s hand reaches out to lift the headdress of the woman (Collins 2007:124). Their marriage benefitted both Puduhepa and Hattušili. Many cuneiform tablets from Hattuša and Ugarit bear witness to Puduhepa as a devoted wife when she married Hattušili. She married him in a ‘magnificent’ festival that lasted five days (Darga 1994:30; cf. Gold 2015:19).

3.1.1 The young Puduhepa circa 1275 BCE

We have no specific information about Puduhepa’s youth. Her mother is unknown but, in a dream which was recorded⁵⁹ (see 5.1.1), she saw her deceased father alive again: ‘I saw in a dream how my father was alive again’ (De Roos 2006:20). She saw him during ‘the night of ritual weeping’, which De Roos tells us was never mentioned again elsewhere in transliterated translated texts from Hattuša. The actions of her father and its meaning in this dream are not clear. Her father drew water from an old well. He said something about a dead wolf which had come mysteriously alive again. Without knowing the significance within the dream of the once dead but now revived wolf, it is not possible to say whether Puduhepa’s memories of her father were good or bad.

---

In Figure 3.2 we see a romantic Victorian portrayal of black eye-paint being applied by an Egyptian servant to the face of a young woman. It was for millennia an ancient custom in the Near East for both men and women to wear make-up, and it was something the young Puduhepa would have done as well (Roaf 1994:130). De Roos (2006:19) believes even with the information we have about her, it is not possible to reach a point where we can say, ‘That’s typical of Puduhepa!’ At best, we can search in available texts for a better understanding of her character as an important element of her impact in Hittite society.

### 3.1.1.1 Wife, mother, stepmother and the royal children of Hattuša

At the beginning of her life at Hattuša (ca 1267 BCE) after living in Hakpiš (see 2.3.5.2 [b]), she prayed to the sungoddess of Arinna about her own pregnancies, but also about her concern for Hattušili’s health. This would remain so for thirty-six years of marriage (ca 1265-1239 BCE):

> This matter, I, Puduhepa, your maid, made into a prayer to the sungoddess of Arinna, my lady, lady of the Hatti-lands, queen of heaven and earth. Have pity on me, O sungoddess of Arinna, my lady, and hear me. Even among humans one speaks the following saying: “To a woman of the birth stool the deity grants her wish.” Since I, Puduhepa, am a woman of the birth stool and have devoted myself to your son, have pity on me’ Then she asks: ‘Grant life to [Hattušili], your servant!’

In a letter to Rameses II dated circa 1245/1246 BCE she wrote about her stepchildren who lived with them in the palace in Hattuša. Puduhepa was then about forty-four years old and had already given birth to her own six sons and daughters by then. One of her daughters (only her Egyptian name was known: Maathorneferure) (see 4.3.5.3) was about to marry Rameses II:

> The daughters of the king whom I discovered when I came to the palace gave birth with my assistance, and I raised their children. I also raised the children who had already been born and I made them commanders in the army.

---

Puduhepa’s recollection in the letter gives us an idea of how, when she was young, aged twenty, she was busily involved not only in her own pregnancies, but also with her pregnant step-daughters and raising the boys who became officers in the army. It gives one the impression that she was a very healthy, strong young woman who, in her letter, rightly stresses her capabilities to fulfill her duties (De Roos 2006:20).

In Figure 3.3 we see reliefs that could just as well have been a depiction of life for the many children in the palace of Hattuša during Puduhepa’s early years as Queen. The orthostat, which is part of a larger relief (in Assyrian style) of Yariri/Araras and Kamani, made up the front face of the royal palace buttress at Carchemish when the Neo-Hittite king Araras (ca 815-790 BCE) ruled. The relief shows the relaxed atmosphere between royal children playing at court. On the left two young princes are playing with knucklebones, in the centre another two are spinning tops, and on the right the queen, or a wet nurse, is carrying the king’s youngest son Tuwarsais (Osseman [sa]).

*Figure 3.3
Royal Hittite children playing* 63

---
3.1.2 Hattušili III (ca 1267-1237 BCE), ‘servant’ of the goddess Ištar/Šauška of Šamuha

When Hattušili III’s patron goddess Ištar/Šauška appeared in a dream and commanded him that ‘you and your household shall be my servants!’, the king carried this out without delay.\(^{64}\)

Before Hattušili III and Puduhepa were on the throne, there was a gradual increase in the importance of goddesses associated with Ištar. These were imported or inspired by the Mesopotamian and Syrian pantheons (Beckman 2000:21). The result of this is that we do not encounter a solitary goddess but rather many female deities with their own special functions and abilities. Hattušili III dedicated his life to serving his protective goddess Ištar/Šauška (Bryce 2002:146). As a child, he was sickly and not expected to live long. His father, Mursili I (ca 1321-1295 BCE), entrusted him to the care of his chief scribe Mittannamuwa, who seemingly cured the boy (Van den Hout 1995:1109).

Hattušili’s father had a dream wherein the goddess Ištar/Šauška ordered him: ‘hand him (Hattušili) over to me and let him be my priest, then he will live.’ Mursili I obeyed the goddess and dedicated his son to her cult (Van den Hout 1995:1112). Texts confirm that Hattušili’s health sadly did not improve and that he suffered from ill health for the rest of his life (Van den Hout 1995:1109). Under the guidance and protection of Ištar/Šauška, Hattušili achieved great things. He also overthrew his nephew Urhi-Teshub, the rightful heir to the throne. Hattušili III justified his actions because he professed his patron goddess Ištar/Šauška was always by his side (Bryce 2002:146). He believed she favoured him and protected him against his enemies as well as granting him victory in battle. Darga (1994:32) tells us Ištar/Šauška of the Hittites was associated with but not the same as her Mesopotamian namesake and she was also associated with but not the same as Puduhepa’s patron deity Ištar of Lawazantiya.

3.1.2.1 Ištar before arriving in Anatolia (ca 2000-1600 BCE)

Ištar was first identified in Hittite texts from the Assyrian Trade Colony period (ca 1900-1830 BCE). She was merged with the Babylonian Inanna (see Figure 3.5) before her

\(^{64}\) Text after Van den Hout, cited by Collins (2007:56).
worship spread from Hurrian Nineveh through northern Syria to eastern Anatolia. Beckman (2000:18) sheds more light on what he calls a ‘curious development’. *Ištar’s* influence expanded over time and by the end of the second millennium BCE she had ‘absorbed most other Mesopotamian goddesses’. He (Beckman) informs us that the number of gods were also fewer, not as radical as the goddesses and that the reason why this happened is unclear. Beckman (2000:18) stresses that in the religions of the ancient Near East it never occurred that a goddess manifested herself as the supreme deity on her own.

An early example (Old Babylonian period circa 2000-1600 BCE) of the merging of goddesses is seen in the ‘Queen of the night’ relief (see Figure 3.4 a & b) from Ur representing both the ancient Mesopotamian goddess *Ištar*, goddess of sexual love and war and her sister and rival, the goddess *Ereshkigal* who ruled the underworld.

![Figure 3.4 Mesopotamian *Ištar* found at Ur](http://www.britishMuseum.org/com12540c_1.jpg) © Image AN3337600. Digitally reconstructed by Timson and Collon of the British Museum’s new media unit.

---
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Figure 3.4(b), the digital re-construction of the ‘Queen of the night’ relief, shows this Ištar/Ereshkigal was originally painted red, wearing a horned headdress and earrings (compare with Figure 3.5 of a combined Ištar/Inanna), and holding in her hands rods of justice which were religious symbols of Mesopotamia. The goddess’s multi-coloured wings hang down her sides and end in talons of a bird of prey, similar to those of the two owls next to her. This figure against a black background most probably associated the goddess with the night. She stands on the back of two lions and at the bottom is a pattern that represents mountains. The plaque is made of baked straw-tempered clay and may have been placed in a shrine in Ur. It was probably created in Babylonia (southern Iraq) during the reign of the Babylonian king Hammurabi between circa 1792 and 1750 BCE.

3.1.2.2  Ištar the Hittite goddess of Šamuha as Šauška
The Hittite Ištar of the city of Šamuha was depicted as a winged, ‘gender-bending’, weapon-carrying goddess of war and sexual love (Bachvarova 2013:25; cf. Burney 2004:230). She had both male and female characteristic as she was depicted in clothes at Yazilikaya (see Figure 3.21). She was brought to Anatolia by the Hurrians as Šauška and integrated into local Hittite culture. As time passed, Šauška, Hepat, her son
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Šarrumma and a variety of deities of Hurrian origin were ‘promoted’ in their divine ranking and added to the Hittite pantheon (Burney 2004:231).

3.2 THE HITTITE PANTHEON

The ‘thousand gods of Hatti’ as a description of the Hittite pantheon is not an exaggeration (Singer 1994:81). It was the result of a long-term development into a confusing plethora of deities of the Hittite polytheistic pantheon.

The stormgod of Hatti and the sungoddess of Arinna headed the Hittite pantheon. According to Bonatz (2007b:3), the establishment of the stormgod as principal male god in the Hittite pantheon brought to completion the gradual process that replaced the bull cult with that of the stormgod. The Hittite state grew from a small Anatolian principality in the second millennium BCE into a huge empire (Singer 1994:81). The gods of their conquered regions were welcomed, included in the state pantheon, and worshipped as the empire expanded to Kizzuwatna, Syria and western Anatolia. The result was that the Hittites met more gods that they liked. Rather than ignoring these gods or merging them with their own traditional gods, as the Romans would do later in history with the Greek pantheon, the Hittites, to everybody’s confusion, took on more gods (Beckman 2000:20).

3.2.1 Hattic influence

The principal religious doctrines on which the Hittites based their pantheon are Hattic and Hurrian (McMahon 1995:1983). The early state religion of the Hittites was possibly a combination of Hittite religious tradition and Hattic religion as a result of Hattic culture being well established by the time the Hittites settled in Anatolia (McMahon 1995:1984).

The creation of the chief deities of the Hittites was inspired by the Hattians during the Old Kingdom period (ca 1600-1400 BCE) and continued to be an important part of the Hittite pantheon until the Empire period (ca 1400-1200 BCE) (Burney 2004:106). For example, the chief deities like the stormgod, the sungoddess, the son, daughter and granddaughter of the Hittite state religion remained Hattian for a long time (Burney 2004:106).
McMahon (1995:1984) informs us that it is not easy to identify what each of these traditions owed one another as far as religious synthesis was concerned. According to him, all we know is that Hattic gods, festivals and myths provided the basis for the earliest Hittite formal worship and theology. Hattian priests and priestesses presided over local cults by which the demands of the deities were communicated. Hittite cultic rituals were conducted in Hattic (Burney 2004:105). The order of significance and ranking of the deities in their state pantheon varied, but the impact of the Hattian cult, mythology and art on the Hittites continued to exist in their cultural history.

3.2.1.1 Towards inclusiveness and syncretism within the Hittite pantheon

Adopting many of the local Hattic gods into their state pantheon was the start of a process that strongly indicated to the Hittites’ inclination towards inclusiveness and syncretism (McMahon 1995:1985).

This early process of attempting to create uniformity amongst the deities and their respective pantheons might have been influenced by the principle of using logograms to write the names of the gods. These logograms showed the similarities of many gods whose names were written with identical symbols (McMahon 1995:1985). Similarities among local deities gave them entrance to the circles of major deities like the stormgod and sungoddess. Throughout Hittite history the gods could be individually identified by their geographical origin added to their names. Examples of this are the stormgod of Nerika and the sungoddess of Arinna (McMahon 1995:1985). The god lists from treaties and royal instructions inform us that from the Old Kingdom period onwards, a politically-oriented Hittite pantheon with a hierarchical structure developed (McMahon 1995:1985).

3.2.1.2 Other Hittite deities related to the sun

Apart from the sungoddess of Arinna, the Hittites also had other gods and goddesses related to the sun, for example the sungoddess of the earth from Hattic origin who represented the sun during the night, *Ištanu* the sungod of heaven/sky, or the Babylonian sungod *Šamaš* in the guise of a shepherd, great lord of human beings and animals. *Šimegi*, the Hurrian sungod, is also male, and there are other sungods who are mainly
characterized by their different personalities rather than by their different characteristics (Karasu 2003:228).

3.2.2 Stormgods and the Hittites

Stormgods and other elemental deities were common throughout the religions of many Indo-European people. For example, Zeus, the supreme god of the Greeks, was associated with lightning. So too was the Roman god Jupiter, and Indra, the Aryan god of war, was associated with storms (Macqueen 1999:111). The Hittites’ high regard for the stormgod developed after pre-Hittite times when Pithana, founder of the Nesite dynasty, and his son Anitta honoured the deity as chief god of the realm (Bryce 2002:281).

The stormgod was regarded as the real king and owner of the land of Hatti, but the land itself had to be tended to by a mortal king (Karasu 2003:225).

Bryce (2002:144) tells us that the stormgod was not regionally perceived as a universal god or a god of all living beings, but rather as a god who had a specific identity, function and location. Texts describe a confusing mass of stormgods: those of the army, the palace, the door-bolt of the palace, the fields, the meadows and rain. They were associated with local communities, sub-regions and districts where they were worshipped separately from one another. In texts the stormgods also appeared separately from one another because the scribes tried to make the Hittite pantheon more distinguishable by attaching their cult cities to their names, for example the stormgod of Nerik, Zippalanda or Aleppo (Collins 2007:173).

The people of the region were the stormgod’s priority, their enemies were his enemies, his people depended on him for protection, and he also shared booty brought back after wars and suffered defeat with them when they were beaten in war (Bryce 2002:144).

Before Puduhepa started her reform programme, the Hittites most probably did not question whether all their stormgods were local versions of the same god (Bryce 2002:145). Theological speculation and contemplation was never a feature of Hittite religion. Their religion was much more focused towards its practical, down-to-earth, functional and useful aspects (Bryce 2002:145).
As Bryce (2002:145) remarks, even if it was assumed that all the stormgods were actually one and the same, the Hittites did not want to take the risk of offending a local god whose favour and goodwill they needed. An example of this approach is the trouble King Mursili II took in identifying the specific stormgod who caused his speech difficulty in order to enable him to perform the rites of conciliati on that were a preamble of healing his speech impediment (Bryce 2002:145).

According to Bonatz (2007b:3), the different forms of stormgods of Anatolia express two inherent features: ‘a celestial stormgod and a terrestrial water-god.’ Bonatz states that textual evidence reveals that attempts were made to create out of their collective features the image of one single stormgod who would personify the emerging dynastic idea of the Kingdom: the stormgod of heaven. Out of this approach developed the typical synthesis carried out by Hittite religion, integrating other ‘foreign’ gods into their pantheon instead of doing away with or ignoring them (Bonatz 2007b:3).

The stormgod’s original name in Hittite remains unknown (Collins 2007:174; cf. Karasu 2003:225). In Hurrian he was Teshub, in Luwian cuneiform and hieroglyphics he was Tarhunt, in Akkadian Adad, and in Hattic Taru. The divine bulls Seri and Hurri (see Figure 3.20) drew his chariot and he shared the great temple at Hattuša with the sungoddess of Arinna, supreme goddess of Hatti (Collins 2007:175).

3.2.3 The huge growth of the Hittite pantheon

Beckman (2013:288) tells us that the most important deities of the staggering number of gods were those on which human survival depended. They were the stormgods who delivered much-needed rain for dry farming, the flow of springs and rivers, together with the solar deities, sun- and moongods and goddesses, whose light was the foundation of all life and the fertile earth (Beckman 2013:288; cf. Collins 2007:174).

There were deities of vineyards, grain and orchards who were directly responsible for successful crops as well as those of war, pestilence and wildlife, with personal protective deities often serving as intermediaries to other gods on behalf of humans (Collins 2007:174). Added to the plethora of deities were those who presided over the world of
the dead, warfare, reproduction, sexuality and patron deities who watched over particular places, towns and individual people (Beckman 2013:288). Gurney (1977:16) believes the substantial growth of the Hittite pantheon was mainly influenced by Kizzuwatna, Queen Puduhepa’s home and cult territory. Kizzuwatna’s main cult centres were located in the cities of Kummanni and Lawanzantiya, which were both associated with Puduhepa.

3.2.3.1 Treaty lists and deities
Our main source of information about the divine names of ‘the thousand gods of Hatti’ is from the treaty lists (Gurney 1977:4). The complete Hittite pantheon was more or less fully represented in these lists (Gurney 1977:6). The lists contained the names of the deities regularly called upon to witness treaties being sworn and concluded with vassal rulers and foreign powers. Gurney (1977:6) informs us that the order of the deities’ names on the treaty lists stayed fixed from the first treaty Suppiluliuma I (ca 1344-1322 BCE) and a vassal leader made until the end of the Hittite Empire (ca 1200 BCE).

The lists of deity groups are endless. Each had different logograms to show which group of deities they were attached to (Gurney 1977:4). Even the names of Babylonian gods as well as local deities of a particular cult centre were inserted in the lists.

(a) Accumulating more gods for the pantheon
The already complex mixture of the Hittite multicultural pantheon became more complex with elements added from Syrian, Hurrian (Mitanni and Kizzuwatna) and Mesopotamian origin (Singer 1994:85). The Hittites, true to their eclectic nature, added more gods of heaven, earth, mountains, rivers, springs and clouds to the already staggering number of treaty witnesses (Singer 1994:92). Treaty lists with these nameless gods also concluded treaties. The more deities they added, the more confusing the pantheon became.

In two vassal treaties, two well-known northern Syrian mountains, Hulla and Zaliyanu, were also added as representations of deities in the one and in the other the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers were mentioned as divine witnesses to the treaties (Gurney 1977:6). Singer (1994:81) adds that some fifty years ago, more than six hundred Hittite deities were already listed by Hittitologists. As new texts are added, the list keeps growing. Gilan
(2011:280) states that celebrating the festivals of all these deities as well as regularly observing and maintaining their cults ‘was most probably the most important task (and nightmare) of Hittite society.’

The Hittites imported with all the deities many of their rituals, especially magic, from the mixed Luwian and Hurrian culture of Kizzuwatna (Gurney 1977:16). We can only note a handful of the most prominent and well-documented Hittite gods. Many of the gods worshipped by the Hittites have been diminished to names only found on a couple of tablets and about which little or nothing is known (Ryan 2015:737). The ‘imported’ gods were demonstrated by their foreign names, their rites and prayers dedicated to these ‘foreign’ deities (Bursill-Hall 2012; cf. Gold 2015:20). The Hittites preferred to preserve the foreign names of these gods and address them in their original languages until the end of the Hittite Empire (ca 1200 BCE). As in most polytheistic religions, these Hittite deities were worshipped in ceremonies near mountains, rivers, in shrines and city temples (Singer 1994:101) (see 6.2). Once the gods approved, the content of the treaty agreement it became holy and could not be violated (Bryce 2002:140).

(b) Adopt a god to prevent revolt

Adopting gods from other cultures into the Hittite pantheon also made the transition of new vassal states into the Hittite Empire easier. It prevented revolts that could be caused by enforced shifts in religious practices (Ryan 2015:726). A second reason for the enormous number of deities was that most towns and villages in the Hittite Empire had their own versions of similar tutelary or other deities. A single god could be turned into many different local deities with little difference between them except their names (Ryan 2015:722).

3.2.3.2 Other possible reasons for the expanding pantheon

(a) Polytheism and politics

Beckman (2005:344) believes that studying the background of a polytheistic religion and cult like that of the Hittites (in contrast to monotheistic faiths) reveals a system that made orthodoxy and heresy impossible because no early textual evidence of a previous
religious structure could be found. Beckman’s view is reinforced by archaeological excavations which provide no textual evidence describing faith or dogma of the early Indo-European tribes of which the Hittites were a part. Collins (2007:158) adds that over time the Hittites’ religious polytheism was aided and popularised by the ruling élite and not the ordinary people. Polytheism reflected a system wherein regular political reforms in the region were accommodated. Politics also played an important role in the way Hittite kings expressed their piety. It functioned to the advantage of individual Hittite kings who took the opportunity to promote their favourite cults in the politics of the time (Collins 2007:157). One can assume that King Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa were no exceptions during their reign.

(i) Relocation of the capital cult city
Collins (2007:158) provides an example of the interconnectedness of politics and religion in her search for the reasons why Muwatalli II (ca 1295-1272 BCE) moved the Hittite capital from Hattuša to Tarhuntassa (see 2.3.5.1). The cult city of Tarhuntassa was situated in western Kizzuwatna. Its name is derived from the Luwian stormgod Tarhunt, the patron god of Muwatalli II (ca 1295-1272 BCE). The latter brought huge changes and reform to the Hittite state cult by relocating it from Hattuša to Tarhuntassa (see Figure 2.2). These reforms of Muwatalli II ultimately failed and his son Urhi-Teshub moved the centre of the Hittite state cult back to Hattuša before his overthrow by his uncle Hattušili III (ca 1267 BCE). Melchert (2003:91) adds that Tarhuntassa and its location played a decisive strategic role in the final decades of the Hittite Empire.

Van den Hout (2013:35) believes that Muwatalli II moved the capital because as high priest he wanted to dedicate a single city (Tarthuntassa) to the cult of a single god, his own Luwian patron god, the stormgod of lightning (cf. Goedegebuure 2012:413). One can assume that this decision of Muwatalli II was also politically motivated because it moved the Hittite capital away from attacks from the troublesome Kashkan tribes (cf. Collins 2007:158). This move of the capital and cult could also have been part of a strategic decision of Muwatalli II in preparation for his battle against Rameses II at Kadesh (ca 1247 BCE) (Van den Hout 2013:35).
(ii) Political unification of ethnic regions in Anatolia

The political unification of different ethnic regions in Anatolia became central to the Hittite Kingdom absorbing the different cultural and religious components that subsequently became the core of Hittite civilization (Singer 1994:83). The Hittite kings and their conquering armies brought not only booty from the battlefields of the ancient Near East to adorn their palaces and temples, but more importantly they brought priceless cultural wealth which was integrated into and became an indispensable part of Hittite literacy, literature, mythology and religion (Singer 1994:85).

Hittite royal inscriptions often describe a huge number of royal prisoners, livestock and material objects taken by the king back to Hatti after victorious military campaigns (Liverani 2014:316; cf. Gilan 2011:277). Gilan (2011:280) informs us that this booty was presented to the sungoddess of Arinna during complex festive rituals without a specific ceremony prescribed. The tens of thousands of prisoners were mainly taken to fill the ever-growing depopulation of the Hittite countryside caused by constant military campaigns (Liverani 2014:316). According to Liverani (2014:316), the deportations were not sufficient because of more wars and the resettlement of people in other territories. When the king and his army fought a battle away from home, the allocated priest of the sungoddess of Arinna went up to the roof of her temple and recited an incantation to her at daybreak in the rising sun (Gilan 2011:278). Gilan (2011:278), quoting from Singer’s translation of Hittite prayers, states that the royal couple was instructed to deliver the war booty to their true owners, the gods:

She (the sungoddess of Arinna) gave them (the Hittite royal couple) a battle-ready, valiant spear saying: 'May the hostile foreign lands perish by the hand of the labarna (the Hittite king), and let them take goods, silver and gold to Hattuša and Arinna, the cities of the gods!' 'May the land of Hattuša graze abundantly in the hands of the labarna and the tawannanna (the queen).'

Gilan (2011:276) has another perspective on the royal couples’ political goals. He argues that new evidence concerning ritual activities of the King on his return from war shows no
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deliberate attempt to structure ritual practices into political goals or to gain advantage from the glory of battles just won in order to demonstrate the King’s political power. According to Gilan, future research into its textual inheritance may bring a different perspective on political ambition and shed new light on the relation between ritual activity and political power in the Hittite Empire.

3.2.4 Gods and kings

The winged disc of the sungod also often depicted in Hittite art can be seen above Tudhaliya IV’s name carved in Luwian hieroglyphs (see Figure 3.7) (Taracha 2009:90).

3.2.4.1 ‘My Sun’

The king’s affiliation with the divine world is most distinctly expressed by the assimilation of his image with that of the sungod. Since Hattušili I (ca 1650-1620 BCE) the king bears the title ‘My Sun’ (dUTUši) and assumes the features of the sungod (Bonatz 2007b:8). This title for the king could be interpreted as an attempt to expand the Hittite Empire’s religious ideology of dominion as well as making a political statement because the image of the sungod was seemingly interchangeable with that of the king. Bonatz (2007b:8) explains further that this is clearly shown through comparisons of the depictions of Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE) on reliefs numbers 64 and 81 at Yazilikaya (see Figures 3.7 & 3.8) with the representation of the sungod Ištanu of relief number 34 (see Figure 3.6) in Chamber A of the Yazilikaya sanctuary where he is depicted with the winged sun disk attached to his head.
In the depictions of Tudhaliya IV in reliefs numbers 64 and 81 (see Figures 3.7 & 3.8), both are wearing a long robe and rounded skullcap carrying the *lituus*. These two portrayals are distinguished by the different cartouches of Tudhaliya IV’s name with its attached winged sun disks.

3.2.4.2  *The Hittite ivory plaque from Megiddo*

A collection of ivories found at Megiddo in 1937 included a small plaque (see Figures 3.9 & 3.10) from the Late Hittite Empire period. The plaque is crowded with carved figures in such a way that they resemble monumental Hittite rock sculptures similar to the stone gods and goddesses of the sanctuary at Yazilikaya (Alexander 1991:164).

The plaque serves as an example of images that appeared not only in the iconography of Hatti, but also throughout the ancient Near East.
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All three drawings of these reliefs, reliefs 34, 64 and 81 at Yazilikaya, are copied from Cimok (2008:119-140).
Figure 3.9
Hittite Megiddo ivory plaque
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The composition on the plaque reflects the natural and supernatural worlds of the Hittites. The plaque may have reached Palestine as war booty, as an item of trade or as a diplomatic gift from Puduhepa and Hattušili III (Alexander 1991:182). Bonatz (2007b:8) suggests that a political statement is also assumed for this ivory plaque. The sungod appears twice, crowned with an oversized winged disc and standing on top of an ‘Atlantis-type’ composition of about thirty figures: winged two-headed lions; mountain gods; human-headed genii; bull-men; the naked figure of the goddess Šauška (see detail Figure 3:31); and four bulls standing on earth mounds. He mentions that all these figures include symbolic elements of water, earth and fertility, all subordinated to the power of the sun (Bonatz 2007b:8).

According to Alexander (1991:182), the political message of the plaque may have conveyed the following: because the sungod image was a variant of the king’s, by having the winged disk superimposed the ivory plaque would be a constant reminder to vassal rulers in Syria and Palestine of the power of their neighbour to the north, the Hittite Great King. The ivory plaque may also have reached its final destination at Megiddo after the fall of the Hittite Empire and had no religious, economic or political value other than that of its material (Alexander 1991:182).

3.2.4.3 Patron gods
Images of kings embraced or taken by the hand by their personal deities, like Tudhaliya IV by Šarrumma, are repeated on many reliefs and clay seal impressions. Every Hittite king was under the protection of his own patron/protective/guardian deity. In general, there were Hittite patron deities or tutelary deities (see 3.2.5) for nearly everything one can think of: a patron deity of the king, a patron deity of a town, of the army, the arrow quiver, the home, the countryside, and many more objects and elements (Beckman 2013:21). Hattušili III had Ištar of Šamuha, and Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE), his son and successor, is seen in the embrace of his protective/patron god Šarrumma (see Figure 3.8) (Beckman 2013:289).

3.2.4.4 The royal family worshipping their patron gods
Hutter (1997:84) cites Haas (1994:260), informing us that the royal palace at Hattuša had a special temple which was dedicated to the private gods of the royal family. Hutter also mentions that choosing one god as their special patron deity, like Šauška in the case of Hattušili III and Puduhepa, is an indication of the impossibility for the king and his family to worship all the gods of the official pantheon. Hutter (1997:84) tells us that Hattušili III’s brother Muwatalli II, who chose the Luwian stormgod of lightning (pihaššašši) as his special god, also honoured the gods and goddesses of their grandmother and grandfather (Suppiluliuma I) in the special temple in the palace.

3.2.4.5 Royal ancestor veneration
Royal ancestor veneration was practised amongst the Hittites, and a royal mortuary cult was a common occurrence in the ancient Near East because the kings sought the support
of their late predecessors (Bachvarova 2016:149). The ‘divinity’ of the dead royal ancestors expressed the belief that they had a different status from the living. This different status enabled them to bestow, like the gods, blessings and welfare on the royal family if they were properly worshipped. Hutter (1997:84) also mentions that the dead were still considered part of the family because the name for the day of the dead was ‘the day of the father and the mother’, and in a moving passage from a ritual for the dead, when the priest asked where the dead person had gone, the answer to the question read: ‘the mother approached him and took his hand.’ It remains the obligation of the living king, as head of the royal family, to uphold family ties by providing for the cult of the dead in the palace. Furthermore, Hutter (1997:85) states that a series of Hittite texts called šalliš waštaiš, written for the dead king, provides evidence that rituals for the deceased king lasted up to fourteen days. In and around Hattuša, several places have been identified from texts as funerary structures. Unfortunately, archaeologists have not yet discovered second millennium BCE royal tombs at Hattuša or in other parts of central Anatolia. Excavations have shown that fire played an important role in Hittite society (Cimok 2008:117). At death, bodies were either cremated or buried unceremoniously with sparse grave goods and no funeral monuments. It is possible that austerity in funeral matters was part of Hittite culture (Van den Hout 2014b:75).

3.2.5 Hittite tutelary deities
There were Hittite ‘tutelary’ or ‘protective’ deities for nearly everything one can think of added to the plethora of the pantheon – protective deities of a town, of the army, the arrow quiver, the bedroom, the countryside, and a variety of most unlikely items, as mentioned before. The Mesopotamians had protective spirits such as patron deities who watched over one’s person. The Hittites used the Sumerian logogram LAMA in writing the titles, not the names, of their protective/tutelary deities (McMahon 1991:2). In Anatolia, protective deities could already be identified from miniature lead statues found in the Old Assyrian Trade Colony period in the kārum at Kanesh (see Figure 1.10). From antiquity to the Old Hittite Kingdom period, certain gods were associated with the stag: a sacred animal and the deity was also armed with weapons standing on its back, sometimes with
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a bird or hare in its hand. It demonstrated continuity stemming from the Hittites’ extensive borrowing from their predecessors, the Hattians, in Anatolia.

The tutelary deity among the Hittites was shown in many different forms, such as the tutelary god of the countryside and the tutelary deity of the hunting bag (*kurša*), both well known in the iconography of tutelary deities associated with the hunt (McMahon 1991:51). In Figure 3.11, a fragment of a beautifully crafted ritual rhyton (see Figure 7.23), the tutelary hunting deity of the countryside stands on his sacred animal, a stag, receiving a libation from a king, or a priest could stand in for the king (Collins 2007:176). Collins tells us that the depiction of this tutelary deity of the field or countryside was popular in Hittite relief art.

3.2.5.1  *Tutelary gods and hunting symbols*

Birds of prey (see 7.3.6.2 & 7.3.6.3) were often found as companions to hunting tutelary gods, as in Figure 3.8. Collins (2004b:84) tells us that the identity and gender of the seated deity with a peaked cap (left in picture) is not known, but she suggests that the two deities (the other being the deity on the stag’s back) are one and the same. She (Collins 2005:34) also mentions that the two images of the deity may show its heavenly and earthly presentation. This offering scene on the Schimmel rhyton combines cultic ceremony with hunt scenes and is closely related to the practice of falconry amongst the Hittites.

Deities who were not depicted in human form were also represented by ordinary objects. Added to the two anthropomorphic images of the god in the Schimmel relief is the object hanging from the tree behind the seated deity (see Figure 3.11). According to Collins (2005:35), it is the *kurša*, the hunting bag, an ordinary cult object made of leather and associated with (or ‘filled with’) the tutelary deity standing on the stag. When the bag needed to be replaced, it was done in a cult ceremony (McMahon 1995:1990).
3.2.5.2 Substantial changes in the position of tutelary deities under Hurrian influence

The position of tutelary deities declined with the growing influence of the Hurrians because such deities were not eminent in Hurrian religious thinking (Hutter 1997:79). Festival texts of the time of Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE) show that the tutelary deities did not disappear completely from the official state and dynastic cult. However, Hutter (1997:79) tells us that these deities were not mentioned in prayers and they were never selected as a personal tutelary deity for a king. McMahon (1991:51) writes that the middle position of a tutelary deity in the procession of deities at Yazilikaya shows its unimportant place in the pantheon. He also confirms Hutter’s (1997:79) observation that despite the tutelary deities’ protective characteristics, the kings, who had their own patron gods, did not receive patronage or protection from any of the tutelary deities.

3.2.6 Images representing Hittite deities

The Hittite gods were, in the majority of cases, represented in human form, which was appropriate because they had human characteristics, needs and weaknesses (Bryce 2002:157).

3.2.6.1 Cult figurines

Depictions of Hittite deities in the form of cult figurines were already present in central Anatolia in the Old Assyrian Trade period (see Figure 1.10). Great monumental art and
statues of the Hittites disappeared long ago, leaving us with very few remains of religious iconography from the Hittite world. We are left with a few impressions from Old Kingdom cylinder seals and a collection of small figurines of short, sometimes stooped gods and rock reliefs which Bryce (2002:158) says: ‘out of context may appear stiff, ill-proportioned, static and impersonal.’

From the Early Hittite and the Empire periods, scattered reliefs show the gods seated or standing while receiving offerings or standing in a specific pose, of which the Fraktin rock reliefs depicting Puduhepa and Hattušili III offering libations are the best known (see Figure 6.36). Certain fundamental features of iconography mark most Hittite images: a peaked cap with horns and typical Hittite dress with turned-up shoes, kilt and often a sword in the belt. Individual deities had their own exclusive visual images and symbols, and they were identifiable from these; the stormgod (see Figure 3.13) usually carried a mace or held a bolt of lightning as well. The figurines (see Figures 3:12; 3:13 & 3:14) were often made from precious metals and ivory. Ištar had wings (see Figures 3.4 a & b) and the moongod had a crescent moon on his pointed hat. The gods and goddesses were often shown standing on animals (see Figures 3.11 & 3.18) and the stormgod was also represented standing on a chariot drawn by the bulls Seri and Hurri (see Figure 3.20) (Bryce 2002:160; cf. McMahon 1995:1990).

![Gold figurine of a Hittite god](http://www.bible-history.com)

Figure 3.12

Gold figurine of a Hittite god
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McMahon (1995:1990) informs us that part of Puduhepa and her son Tudhalia IV’s procedure of rationalising the Hittite pantheon included not only the syncretising and arrangement of the hierarchy of deities, but also making the form of the gods similar. There were also zoomorphic presentations of gods as seen at Alaça Höyük (see Figure 3.15) where the stormgod was represented as a bull or where an animal image in the form of a ceremonial drinking cup represented a deity (see Figures 7.22 & 7.23). This historical development can be seen in cult inventories which sometimes recorded the replacement of non-anthropomorphic cult objects with an image in the shape of a man or a woman as part of the state’s renovation of the local cult.

3.3 THE HURRIAN PANTHEON

The Hittites faced the Hurrians of northern Mesopotamia for the first time early in their history as a state in the sixteenth century BCE. The strong influence of the Hurrians on
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Hittite culture started gradually and by the time of Queen Puduhepa (ca 1290-1210 BCE) their cultural influence, especially in the religious area, dominated the Hittite Empire (McMahon 1995:1985). McMahon mentions that the older Anatolian Hattic traditions of the Hittites were replaced by Hurrian mythology that enabled a new pantheon to be established along with a Hurrian style of conducting religious ceremonies, magic and divination. As discussed, the Hurrian cultural ‘invasion’ of the Hittites started in the fifteenth century BCE, long before Puduhepa married Hattušili (ca 1275 BCE) (Gurney 1977:13). Gurney tells us that the Hurrian pantheon was differently assembled, with local deities and some principal gods already integrated in their pantheon. Deities of Mesopotamian origin appeared in the treaty lists of gods during Suppiluliuma I’s reign (ca 1344-1322 BCE).

The Mesopotamian deities were *Ea, Ištar of Nineveh and Allatum*, which was most likely the Akkadian name for *Lelwani*, the Queen of the underworld who changed from male to female under the influence of Akkadian theology and played a central part in the prayers of Queen Puduhepa in the thirteenth century BCE (Gurney 1977:16). *Allatum* was regarded as the mother of *Hepat*, although in some treaty lists they were mentioned separately. Gurney (1977:17) remarks that, according to the Hukkana treaty (a regional one), the goddess *Hepat*, who became very important in the Hurro-Hittite pantheon in Queen Puduhepa’s time, was already installed as a local goddess of Kummani during the time of Suppiluliuma I’s conquests in northern Syria (Hurro-Mitanni).

### 3.3.1 The Hurrian stormgod *Teshub*

*Teshub* was depicted and worshipped in the image of a bull (see Figures 3.15 & 3.16), and *Šarrumma*, *Teshub*’s son, originally a mountain god, was given the title ‘*Teshub*’s calf’ (Gurney 1977:17). It did not happen often that a Hittite god was depicted as an animal, unlike the Egyptian gods who were often depicted as zoomorphic or as hybrids (combining body parts of animals with those of humans). One reason why the stormgod was symbolised as a bull could be because the Indo-European settler tribes took over the land of Hatti and adopted the bull-cult from the Hattians (Lehmann 1977:268). The bull-cult was regarded mainly as a fertility cult, but Lehmann (1977:270) points out that frequent repetition of such a statement does not warrant its correctness.
3.4 PUDUHEPA AND THE DEITIES OF HER TIME

Queen Puduhepa’s presence in Hattusa was important for the Hittite court’s religious outlook in the second half of the thirteenth century (Van den Hout 2014a: see e-mail). As the daughter of Pentipšarri, a Hurrian priest of Ištar, she was dedicated to the cult of Ištar of Lawazantiya. In the Hittite Empire period, the state cult and religion came under its strongest Hurrian influence through the important role Queen Puduhepa played in the process. The second part of Puduhepa’s Hurrian name referred to Hepat (see Figure 3.18), chief goddess of the Hurrian pantheon, consort of the god Teshub and counterpart to the powerful Hittite sungoddess of Arinna (see Figure 3.17) (Van den Hout 1995:1112).

The sungoddess is believed to have been a native, non-Indo-European deity who was accepted by the Hittites when they entered Anatolia (Macqueen 1999:111). According to Beckman (2000:21), the partner of the sungoddess, the stormgod of Hatti, developed from the Indo-European ‘god of the bright sky’. Solar gods were common among Indo-European people, but in the end the Hittites’ solar deity was different because she was female (Macqueen 1999:111). Evidence of the Hittite sungoddess’ relationship to the sun was found in the texts of Akkadian hymns, which revealed a strong Mesopotamian
influence, as well as the use of sun discs in the cult of Arinna (Karasu 2003:227). Karasu mentions that although the Hurrian god Teshub was equal to the stormgod of the Hittites, the same relationship did not exist between the supreme goddesses Hepat and Arinna (before the Hurrian Puduhepa married Hattušilli III) because the goddesses had different characteristics.

According to Karasu (2003:227), Hepat, supreme goddess of the Hurrians, ‘does not show any evidence of a relationship to the sun.’ The change occurred when Puduhepa saw to it that Hepat was equated with the sungoddess of Arinna. This equation also points towards the merging of deities in the Hurro-Hittite pantheon (see the second stanza in the extract below). As quoted in the text of Puduhepa’s prayer to the sungoddess of Arinna (see 5.2.1.4), we find testimony to this change probably dictated by Puduhepa herself:

In Hatti land you take for yourself the name of
the sun goddess of Arinna and besides in the land
that you made the Cedar land (Hurri), you take for
yourself the name of Hepat.76

3.4.1 Puduhepa’s association with the goddesses Arinna and Hepat

The sungoddess of Arinna (the city) was the supreme patron solar and chthonic (underworld) goddess of the Hittite state and monarchy (Gurney 1980:141). She was adopted by the Hittites from the Hattians and she was said to ‘direct the kingship and the queenship’ (Beckman 2000:21, citing KBo 1.1 rev 35). It was Queen Puduhepa’s remarkable accomplishment to promote the sungoddess of Arinna to head of the Hittite pantheon (Gold 2015:17). This was mainly due to Puduhepa’s influence when the priests of Hattuša created an official pantheon out of the huge variety of local Anatolian cults and centred it in the cult city of Arinna (Gurney 1952:141; cf. Gold 2015:16). Even before the Empire period, the king, writes Gurney (1952:141), regularly consulted the sungoddess in times of battle or national crisis.

The small gold amulet in Figure 3.17 dates from the Late Bronze Age (ca 1550-1200 BCE), when the Hittite Empire was at its height. This amulet depicts an enthroned Hittite

sungoddess, most likely representing Arinna, associated by many scholars with the modern-day site of Alaça Höyük, northeast of Hattusa. She was also called Wurusemu, with the large disk-shaped halo representing the sun, and on her lap sits, presumably, one of her divine children (Biblical Archaeology Review 37.1, 2011).

The goddess Hepat (see Figure 3.18) was identified in a prayer of Hattušili’s (see below) to the sungoddess of Arinna (Gurney 1980:142). According to Gurney, there was no trace of conscious merging between these two goddesses before this prayer of Hattušili. Singer (2002:97) adds to Gurney’s statement that this prayer is probably the ‘most political’ Hittite prayer of Hattušili. He was trying to reduce the force of his past sins (the overthrow of Urhi-Teshub) and other offences, including those of other kings since the days of Mursili II (ca 1321-1295 BCE) onwards, referring to his liberation of the stormgod of Nerik, son of the sungoddess of Arinna, and the cult city of Zippalanda:
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To the sungoddess of Arinna, my lady, lady of the Hatti lands, Queen of heaven and earth, lady of the kings and Queens of Hatti, torch of the Hatti land. You are the one who rules the kings and Queens of Hatti

O sungoddess of Arinna, my lady. You are the one who chooses and the one who abandons. Contrary to the other gods, you took for yourself as your share the Hatti lands, out of esteem for the stormgod of Nerik, stormgod of Zippalanda, your son.

I brought the city of Nerik up like a stone out of deep water. I picked it up for the sake of the stormgod of Nerik, your son. I resettled the land of Nerik and rebuilt the city of Nerik.

For the sake of the land of Nerik I engaged my body and soul. Those who were kings in the past, and to whom the stormgod had given the weapon, kept defeating the enemies, but no one recaptured the land of Nerik, and no one rebuilt it.81

Singer (2002:96) tells us that on a theological level, this prayer of Hattušili is a ‘deliberate departure from Muwatalli’s reform centred around his patron god, the stormgod of lightning, and a return to the dominance of the great goddesses of Anatolia: the sungoddess of Arinna, Hepat of Kummanni, and Ištar/Šauška of Šamuha and their children, Šarrumma and the stormgod of Nerik/Zippalanda’.

3.4.1.1 The divine first family during Hattušili III and Puduhepa’s reign

The traditional divine Hittite triad and first family during the reign of Hattušili III and Puduhepa in the Late Empire period were Arinna the sungoddess, the stormgod of Hatti, and their son the stormgod of Nerik and Zippalanda. The Hurrian counterpart of the triad, instigated by Puduhepa, became Hepat, Teshub and their son Šarrumma (Taracha 2009:90). The human royal family ruled Hatti on behalf of these deities. This dynastic ideology is seen on the stone walls in the sanctuary of Yazilikaya where two convergingprocessions of gods on the left and goddesses on the right were carved onto opposite walls. These two columns of deities meet in the central panel in the depiction of Teshub, Hepat and Šarrumma. The most important woman in the Hittite state cult was the queen. As chief priest of every other deity in the pantheon, the king was in the first place responsible for the sungoddess of Arinna and her cult because since time immemorial his association with the stormgod coincided with that of the queen’s.

From ritual texts, we learn that the Queen was, with her husband, the focal point of Hittite worship. This is clearly illustrated on the unfinished rock relief at Fraktin of Queen Puduhepa (see Figure 6.11). Throughout Hattušili III’s reign, Queen Puduhepa had a strong influence on her husband, urging him to include Hurrian deities and cults in the Hittite state cult and religion (Liverani 2014:322). The Hurrian nature of deities represented at Yazilikaya and other cult centres in Anatolia supports several Hittite scholars’ arguments that Puduhepa presumably brought tablets from Kizzuwatna that were important sources in reorganising the Hurro-Hittite pantheon (Alexander 1991:173).

It is general knowledge amongst Hittite scholars that Kizzuwatna’s regional cults and festivals had a huge influence on the Hittite imperial capital. According to Harmanşah (2015a:103), this was evident from Puduhepa’s import of the cult of the deity of the night, Lelwani, from Kizzuwatna to the Hittite city of Šamuha (see Figure 2.2).

3.4.1.2 Puduhepa and the Hurro-Hittite pantheon

Under the strong Hurrian influence of Queen Puduhepa, the pantheon that became known as the Hurro-Hittite pantheon was more strictly structured than before. With the syncretization of deities, some of their names were changed and more gods were added (McMahon 1995:1985). She urged her husband to include Hurrian elements in the Hittite state cult (Liverani 2014:322).

*Teshub*’s importance as head of the pantheon was shown by his prominence in the lists of oath-deities and at the head of the procession of gods at Yazilikaya. In Hurrian mythology (see 5.3.1) he was depicted as ruler of heaven (McMahon 1995:1985). The high-ranking position of the goddess *Hepat* in the pantheon was in part due to Mursili II’s (ca 1321-1295 BCE) devotion to her and to Puduhepa, whose name suggests her personal connection with the goddess. In a later version of the pantheon, the divine couple’s son *Šarrumma*, a south-Anatolian Hurrian god, was syncretised with the stormgod of Nerik (McMahon 1995:1986). *Šarrumma*’s prominence is seen because of his position at the Yazilikaya sanctuary on the male and female sides of the procession. In each case he is depicted right behind his father or mother (see Figure 6.29). This assimilation of the deities during King Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa’s reign was done mainly for sacrificial purposes by grouping the deities into uniform ‘circles’ (*kalutis*)
according to their origin, function and attributes (De Martino 2013:410; cf. Gurney 1977:17).

3.4.1.3 Circles (kalutis) of Hurro-Hittite deities

These circles (kalutis) are important for the identification and interpretation of the Hurro-Hittite procession of deities on the walls of the Yazilikaya sanctuary, which will be discussed later. The goddess statuette (see Figure 3.19, compare to Figure 3.18) has many similarities in her features to the goddesses of Yazilikaya, with her large ears wearing an earring and long braided hair that stretches down her back to the floor (Seeher 2011:25). There were two kalutis of the Hurrian pantheon, one for gods and the other for goddesses. The lists of gods start with Teshub, and a small circle of gods associated with him, not in any specific order, were: his brother Tasmisu, his father the god Kumarbi the Hurrian corn deity, Suwaliyat and a god under the Akkadian logogram of Ninurta (Gurney 1977:17).

The other gods in Teshub’s circle were Ea, Kusuh the moongod, Simegi the sungod, the group Astabi, Lupatig and Husui, who seem to have combined between them the character of the wargod, Zababa of Kal (logogram), and the god of plagues, Nerigal (logogram). Then there was the male version of Ištar/Šauška (see Figure 3.22) and another deity related to them, Pinirkir (see Figures 3.28 & 3.29). This was followed by Tenu, vizier of Teshub, the god of the sky and the earth, and at the end of this kaluti were the attendants of Teshub, which included his son, Šarrumma, the bulls Seri (‘Day’) and Hurri (‘Night’) (see Figure 3.20) and the mountains Namni and Hazzi (modern Jebel el Akra in Syria) (Gurney 1977:17). According to Burney (2004:250), textual information shows that these sacred bulls acted as a link between people and gods. There is a possibility that they were also associated with the domestic cult. Scholars seem to agree that their main function was to draw the stormgod’s chariot.
The kaluti of goddesses starts with Hepat, her son Šarrumma and daughter Allanzu. The rest of the goddesses in Hepat’s circle are grouped in pairs, for example Šarrumma and his sister are both paired with their mother (Gurney 1977:17). Next is the pair Darru-Dakitu, who appears to indicate only one deity, who most probably was Dakitu, the Semitic name of Hepat’s servant. Two other goddesses follow, with Hurrian names based on the verb hute- “to write”: Hutena-Hutellura. They were goddesses of fate and were equated with their Hittite counterparts. Gurney (1977:18) informs us about the rest of these pairs of goddesses in Hepat’s kaluti, which later became very significant in the many cult rituals and prayers of Queen Puduhepa.

The most important of the remaining pairs of goddesses were Ishara of ancient Mesopotamian origin, regarded by the Hittites as guardian of oaths and bearer of fatal diseases, together with Lelwani ‘lady of the underworld’, Ereshkigal or Allatum. Next was Nikkal, the Sumerian goddess Ningal who was the wife of the moongod Kusuh who had a popular cult at Kummani, and Ištar as the great Hurrian goddess Šauška with her attendants Ninatta and Kulitta (Gurney 1977:18) (see Figure 3.21). Minor goddesses who follow these are not important for this discussion.

---

82 A goddess standing on a sphinx, with a long-necked bird above her head, probably part of some furniture. Seeher (2011:25).
83 Guide to The Museum of Anatolian Civilizations:129
Gurney (1977:18) confirms for us that by a process of syncretism, these Hurrian deities were to some extent identified with their Hattian and Hurrian counterparts, as demonstrated in the first part of Puduhepa’s prayer as quoted in 5.2.1.4. It seems that Hattušili also encouraged a Hattian revival and reclaimed the cult city of Nerik that was overrun many centuries before by the Kashkan tribes. Hattušili restored the cults, rituals and myths of Nerik with those of Hattian deities (Gurney 1977:19). Some of these texts contained parts in Hattic with Hittite translations. The chief god of Nerik was the stormgod of Zippalanda and he was also identified with Šarrumma, son of the stormgod of Hatti.

The rest of the local gods were the mountain god Zaliyanu and his spouse Zashapuna as well as both Nergal and the war god Wurunkatte who had cults at Nerik. The Hurrian pantheon demonstrates that their deities and religious cult became predominant in Hatti as demonstrated on the walls of the Yazilikaya sanctuary, which will be discussed in Chapter Six.

3.4.2 Šauška the Hurrian goddess

Ištar often appeared under her Hurrian name Šauška (see Figure 3.21) and important cult centres like Šamuha on the upper Euphrates and Lawazantiya in Kizzuwatna were dedicated to her (Bryce 2002:147). As a female Šauška was often depicted naked as goddess of love and sexuality, and in her male role she was god of the battlefield and war, with her weapon a mace and a lion as her animal symbol (Bryce 2002:147). During the second millennium BCE, the nude Ištar in some form or another was often seen in the art of Anatolia and Syria (Alexander 1991:167).

Bryce (2002:147) maintains that the dual aspect of Šauška’s personality enabled her to hold sway over human conduct and actions. She was able to incite peace, love and harmony or conflict and hatred. The passion and emotions evoked by love and war became important in future poetic literature, for example in Latin erotic poetry of the Augustan age and as a theme in the writing of Virgil (Bryce 2002:147).

The drawings of Figure 3.22 show the impressions of the winged Šauška and her two attendants from two Hittite seal rings. According to Seeher (2011:59), the rings were
excavated from the west building of Nişantepe at Hattuša. Seeher (2011:58) points out that above the depiction of *Ninatta* and *Kulitta* (left in drawing) and the Luwian hieroglyphs in Figure 3.21 of the Yazilikaya mural there is no symbol of divinity.

![Figure 3.21](image1.png)

**Figure 3.21**
Drawing of relief of *Ninatta* and *Kulitta*, attendants of Šauška, in the middle, and *Ea* the god of wisdom,

![Figure 3.22](image2.png)

**Figure 3.22**
Depiction of the winged Šauška with her two attendants on Hittite seal rings,

It simply shows them as the attendants of the deity Šauška. Both female figures are depicted wearing ankle-length pleated skirts, long-sleeved blouses and round caps with a strip, and they are each carrying an object: a mirror and a horn-shaped ointment container.

---

84 Seeher (2011:59).
Ornan (2010:471) sheds more light on the mirror Šauška’s attendant Ninatta holds: it indicates femininity that, together with the spindle, signifies womanliness in Hittite iconography. Ornan (2010:471) believes the mirror Ninatta carries signifies on one hand her femininity as she appears in a row of male gods on the relief and on the other hand it is associated with Šauška herself. Šauška is shown here in her male embodiment and the mirror stresses her femininity despite her masculine appearance (Ornan 2010:471; cf. Seeher 2011:60). Ornan (2010:471) believes that it explains Šauška’s inclusion among the male deities of Yazilikaya and it emphasises her double gender characteristics and role.

3.4.2.1 Womanliness through the looking glass

It is clear from Hittite records, according to Ornan (2010:471), that the role of mirrors in Hittite iconography was as ‘a gender signifier.’ It represented womanliness ‘together with the spindle’ (Ornan 2010:471). According to Ornan (2010:471), the special meaning of the spindle and the mirror as symbols of femininity is emphasised by its close association with the bow, arrows or a mace representing manhood. He (Ornan) tells us that there was a saying that womanliness is taken away in favour of manliness by exchanging these objects. Ornan (2010:472) continues that as Hittite tradition developed, there were increasing numbers of visual representations of female figures holding mirrors on reliefs, seals, plaques and bowls (see Figure 3.23). These objects were mainly associated with Hurrian imagery of goddesses and queens (on cylinder seals) as excavated in Nuzi in Hurro-Mitanni (near Kirkuk in modern Iraq) (see Figure 3.24), where the earliest known map dating from the dynasty of Sargon of Akkad (ca 2437-2200 BCE) was also found.

![Image](image.png)

Figure 3.23
Seal impression from Nuzi of a goddess carrying two mirrors

---

86 Cited by Ornan (2010:472)
The meaning of the mirrors, spindles, bows, arrows and maces (see Figure 3.25) as gender signifiers were also implied, as stated by Ornan (2010:471), in rituals against impotence when a eunuch, whose sexual conduct was the opposite of the petitioner, was included in the ceremony.

---

88 Cited by Ornan (2010:471).
3.4.2.2 A carved ivory figurine of Šauška

A carved ivory figurine of Šauška (see Figure 3.26) was found in one of the many temples excavated at Hattusa. She represents an out-of-the-ordinary image of a warlike goddess with a powerful, rigid expression and a short, tightly wrapped kilt with a dagger inserted sideways in her belt. The kilt shows her Anatolian connection and the horned headdress indicates her Mesopotamian origin, and on the side of her head the large, curled locks are reminiscent of the Egyptian goddess Hathor (see Figure 3.27) (Cimok 2008:81; cf. Graff 2008:188). Her dual appearance of male and female is shown in this ivory of Šauška. Her twisted legs and lifted arms suggest that she is either dancing or brandishing a weapon (Graff 2008:188).

![Figure 3.26](image1.png)  
**Figure 3.26**  
Hurrian goddess Šauška

![Figure 3.27](image2.png)  
**Figure 3.27**  
Egyptian goddess Hathor

3.4.2.3 The winged figurine of the Elamite goddess Pinigir/Pinirkir

Aruz (1991:5) is of the opinion that the figurine of bronze, gold and silver with sickle-shaped wings emerging from the goddess’s shoulders (see Figure 3.28) belongs to a group of miniature representations of Hittite deities associated with the cult of Ištar of Šamuha. This figurine may have been an amulet worn by a person or a votive dedication that was placed in a shrine. Abdi (2017:9) refers to a well-documented religious ceremony of the Hittites, the babilili-Ritual, where Pinigir/Pinirkir is described as an Elamite goddess.

---

89 Ivory figurine found at Hattuša. Çorum Museum, Turkey. From Aruz et al (2008:188).
According to Abdi (2017:9), Pinigir/Pinirkir took part in two Hittite cult ritual ceremonies: she took part in the babillli-Ritual that removed sins from worshippers and she also had the power to deal with Hittite chariot war horses. Pinigir/Pinirkir is described by Beckman, according to Abdi (2017:9), as a sexually ambiguous form of Inanna/Ištar who made her way into the Hittite pantheon by way of the Hurrians who had closer geographical contact with the Elamites. According to Abdi (2017:10), with the information available about Pinigir/Pinirkir's contradictory syncretised functions as goddess of love, sex and war, she is associated with many goddesses like the Hurro-Hittite Šauška, Astarte in Syria-Palestine and Inanna/Ištar in Mesopotamia who possessed the same characteristics. Abdi (2017:9) mentions that in the Old Elamite period (ca 2700-1600 BCE) Pinigir/Pinirkir was the highest goddess in the Elamite pantheon.

The best evidence to identify the figurine (Figure 3.28) is found at Yazilikaya where, among the depictions of the deities carved in procession on the walls, Šauška appears (see Figure 3.21) with upraised wings wearing a pointed cap, kilt and belt, and with arms bent as if holding a weapon with a Luwian inscription. In Figure 3.29 (see below) from the same procession, Pinigir/Pinirkir is depicted with no weapons, wearing a skullcap and dressed in a short kilt (compare Figure 3.28 and Figure 3.29) (Cimok 2008:124).

![Figure 3.28](http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/works-of-art/1990.255)  
The winged Pinirkir

![Figure 3.29](http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/works-of-art/1990.255)  
Drawing of Pinirkir on rock relief at Yazilikaya

---

3.4.2.4 Šauška’s prominent place among the deities of Yazilikaya

Graff (2008:188) tells us that Ištar’s merging with Šauška suited Queen Puduhepa. It also contributed to the flourishing of Šauška’s cult at the royal court during the Late Hittite Empire period. It was during King Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa’s reign that the reliefs of the Yazilikaya sanctuary were created and the sanctuary was completed when Tudhaliya IV was king.

Hattušili III had a special interest in and revered Šauška because of her aid to him at critical times in his life, and he built a sanctuary for her in Šamuha as well as at Yazilikaya (Alexander 1991:173).

3.4.2.5 More images of Ištar/Šauška in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries BCE.

The form of Ištar as a (frontal) nude goddess was already present at the beginning of the second millennium and could have originated from Syrian and Hurrian tradition (Alexander 1991:168). There are Syrian seal impressions from the Old Assyrian Trade Colony period showing her with a garment inside a wreath, holding it stretched out to the side to reveal her naked body. She was often depicted with figures like the stormgod, combining the power of water and fertility (Alexander 1991:168).

According to Alexander, the image of a frontal nude Ištar holding a garment and wreath was depicted for a long time. In Figure 3.30, a drawing of a fourteenth century BCE molded terracotta plaque of Šauška excavated at Alalakh (see Figure 2.2) shows the popularity of depicting a goddess in this way. Another variation of this image of Šauška as a frontal nude with wings and Teshub as stormgod on his chariot is seen in the late thirteenth century BCE rock relief at Imamkulu (see red in Figure 3.32). Šauška holds her garment out on either side of her body, the edges of which ripple down in a zigzag pattern. Her headdress is decorated with flowers and she holds what looks like lilies in each hand, which could perhaps symbolise fertility (Alexander 1991:170).
The Hittite Megiddo ivory (see Figures 3.9; 3.10 & 3.31) is generally thought to date from the Late Hittite Empire period. Below the stormgod and bull-man (see detail Figure 3.31) is a nude figure different from the rest of the plaque but common to the art of the Hittite Empire and identified by Alexander (1991:167) as the goddess Šauška.

It became tradition in Hittite iconography from very early on (ca 1500 BCE) to display the queen with her husband or on her own in official representations (Ornan 2010:467). The visibility of Queen Puduhepa in the Fraktin relief (see 6.2.2 & Figure 6.11) is derived from this older Hittite tradition. An example of the official portrayal of a queen on her own, in

---
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an offering scene in front of Šauška (Figure 3.33) is seen in a relief from Malatya (see Figure 2.2).

Figure 3.33
A queen making a libation offering in front of Šauška

3.4.3 The Hittites never met a god they did not like
Before the collapse of the Hittite Empire, the growth of their pantheon was out of proportion, seemingly creating confusion and disorder with no hierarchy amongst the gods. Singer (1994:101) finds some reasons behind this constant picking-up and adoption of deities by the Hittites from all over the ancient Near East. He maintains that ‘in most polytheistic religions, the gods were eternally associated with geographical life forms – mountains, rivers, water sources, cities and lands. The only way a conqueror could consolidate his reign over a new territory was by coming to terms with its gods, the ‘real’ rulers of the land. The more the kingdom on earth expanded, the more the kingdom of heaven expanded as well.’

Singer (1994:101) also believes that despite many centuries of close connections between Hatti, Egypt and the Ahhiyawa lands (see Figure 2.2) as well as the great religious influence from Syria and Mesopotamia (through direct borrowing or Hurrian intervention), ‘the Hittites felt compelled to please and feed on a regular basis only the gods that lived within the confines of their jurisdiction. Because the Hittites seemed not

\[^{94}\text{From a wall relief at Malatya (see Figure 2.2), cited by Ornan (2010:466).}\]
to feel animosity, contempt or rivalry towards other gods, they never met a god they did not like’ (Krupp 2000:8). These masses of gods and goddesses played a role in the Hittite state cult, but they were never worshipped by the ordinary people (Hutter 1997:79).

As Singer (1994:101) points out, rather than assessing their gods against the gods of others, the Hittites soon realised there are similarities between all known pantheons, with gods of similar character only bearing different names. They believed, according to him, that all gods, ‘ours’ and ‘theirs’, deserved respect and reverence. One could come to the conclusion that the Hittites never met a god they did not like, while it seemed that the common people of Hatti were quite content not to acquaint themselves with all the foreign gods and rather continued worshipping their traditional local gods.

3.4.4 Puduhepa, a caring woman and priestess in an uncommonly successful royal marriage

Early on in her life as Queen of the Hittites, Puduhepa promised to serve and conduct the service of the Hittite State cult for the gods, to observe its regulations and rituals, and to celebrate the traditional annual and monthly festivals for the gods (see 7.2.3). Religious duties which previously had been neglected in Hatti were restored by Puduhepa (De Roos 2006:21). Puduhepa is praying without her husband, as quoted in 5.2.1.4. It illustrates that she was independent and self-supporting from the beginning of their marriage. Because of her education in Kizzuwatna as the daughter of a priest, she was familiar with offerings, prayers, rituals and vows. According to De Roos (2006:21), Puduhepa faithfully tried to please the gods by regularly performing compulsory religious duties. When she experienced great distress and problems, the rituals of Kizzuwatna, her homeland, were her comfort.

She was constantly concerned about her husband and her extended family’s well-being and attended to all of them with devotion. Puduhepa’s independent attitude as queen is also very clear from her correspondence with Egypt (see 4.3.5.1). The content of her correspondence was often about her anxiety regarding the sending away of her daughter for a diplomatic marriage which played an important role in international politics. As far as Puduhepa was concerned, motherly feelings always played an important role as she
mentions her own feelings (which was unusual for the time) in her correspondence. Bryce (2005b:289) tells us that Puduhepa was an extraordinary positive, important and powerful person in the royal court of Hatti in the Late Empire period. She was influential in many political, diplomatic and state cult decisions made by Hattušili III.

In the next chapter the co-regency and diplomatic ventures of King Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa will be discussed in the light of their successful marriage, supporting one another while facing the political, family and diplomatic challenges of their time. It resulted in an era of one of the closest, most enduring and constructive partnerships ever recorded between a husband and wife in the ancient Near East (Bryce 2005b:289).

3.5 CONCLUSION

The many-sided goddess Ištar/Šauška, whose domain included sexuality and war, appears frequently in texts dating from the Hittite Empire referring to Hattušili III and Puduhepa (Beckman 1989:99). According to Hattušili III, she granted him the right to rulership of the Hittites and as his protective deity instructed him in a dream to marry the young Puduhepa. Their union clearly was unique for that period in Anatolia and the ancient Near East. Their marriage is regarded as one of the most extraordinary partnerships in ancient history (Bryce 2005b:289). Puduhepa was not only a caring mother, wife, priestess, formidable diplomat and marriage negotiator (‘manipulator’), but she made sure that Hurrian religious thinking never disappeared in Hatti after the deaths of her husband and son Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE) (Hutter 1997:79). Puduhepa and Hattušili III were well aware that the enormous growth of the Hittite pantheon was creating more confusion and disorder and that there was no hierarchy amongst the gods (Singer 1994:81). The many gods played a role in the Hittite state cult, but the local people never worshipped them (Hutter 1997:79). After Hattušili III’s death Puduhepa and their son Tudhaliya IV tried to consolidate, reorganise and restructure the Hittite state cult with limited, if any, success (Cammarosano 2012:3).
CHAPTER FOUR
PUDUHEPA AND HATTUŠILI III’s CO-REGENCY, DIPLOMACY AND CORRESPONDENCE

Hattušili was convinced that it was his patron goddess Ištari/Šaušqa who had instructed him in a dream (see 5.1.1.5) to become King of Hatti. Puduhepa would play 'a very active and successful role in affairs of state, political, legal and religious matters, performing her duties alongside and on an equal footing with her husband, as well as independently of him' (Darga 1994:30).

4.1 URHI-TESHUB (MURSILI III, ca 1271-1264 BCE): AN OBSTACLE TO THE THRONE

Muwatalli II was assassinated (ca 1272 BCE) in unknown circumstances (Burney 2004:212). His sole heir tuhkanti (the person second in command to the King) was Urhi-Teshub (see Figure 4.1), his son from a concubine, who adopted the throne name of Mursili III (Ritner & Van den Hout 2016). It is not clear from texts whether transition of power to Urhi-Teshub was peaceful or not (Collins 2007:56).

---

95 Drawing of Urhi-Teshub’s seal impression by Zurkinden-Kolberg, cited by Bonatz in Heinz & Feldman (2007:125). His patron god is the stormgod Teshub, his chariot pulled by Seri and Hurri. The winged discs were the symbols of the King as powerful as an eagle.

Urhi-Teshub reigned for only seven years (Van den Hout 2013:36). He overruled some of his father's controversial decisions immediately by reinstating Hattuša as the capital of the Empire by transferring the seat of power back from Tarhuntassa (Collins 2007:57). He also lifted a controversial ban on Muwatalli II’s Hurrian wife Danuhepa\(^9\) (Van den Hout 2013:33). She had caused strife in the royal household and had been sent into exile instead of being sentenced to death as oracle consultations authorized the King to do (Burney 2004:211).

Information about Urhi-Teshub is limited to the biased accounts of his uncle Hattušili who was entrusted by Muwatalli II with the upbringing of his other nephew, Urhi-Teshub’s brother, Kurunta (Van den Hout 2013:36). At Urhi-Teshub’s accession, Hattušili remained governor of Hakpiš as well as of the cult city Nerik in the north. Both cities were important cult and political centres in the northern region of Hatti (see Figure 2.2 for their location). The consequence of Urhi-Teshub’s ascension was that tension between Hattušili and himself increased. Puduhepa no doubt supported her husband despite him violating the legalities of dynastic succession in his ambition to become King. According to Hattušili in his ‘Autobiography’, kingship was promised to him and justified in a dream from Ištar/Šauška (Van den Hout 2013:36) (see 3.1.2).

Prince Hattušili disposed of his nephew Urhi-Teshub (Mursili III) as King when Urhi-Teshub succeeded in dismantling his uncle’s power as governor of the cities of Nerik and Hakpiš (Collins 2007:58). Hattušili blamed Urhi-Teshub for not showing him any respect (Van den Hout 2013:36). Urhi-Teshub stood no chance against the vast military experience of his uncle (Van den Hout 2013:36). He did not take into account that recruiting troops in a territory where Hattušili was known and respected was a fatal strategic error (Collins 2007:59). Hattušili enlisted Kashkan tribes against his nephew.

They were able fighters familiar with the terrain of the mountainous areas of northern Hatti. In a brief but violent civil war, Hattušili seized the throne and sent Urhi-Teshub into

---

\(^9\) Collins (2007:56) ascribes Danuhepa as wife of Muwatalli II, Urhi-Teshub’s father, rather than of Mursili II, his grandfather.
exile to the Syrian province of Nuhašše (see its location in Figure 2.2). Hattušili’s coup d’état was concluded in circa 1267 BCE (Gold 2015:19).

Urhi-Teshub, we are told by Bryce (2012b:723), was determined to regain the throne and tried to win support from foreign kings. He even tried to set up a rival kingdom in the south of Anatolia. Subsequently, in King Hattušili III’s diplomatic endeavours internationally and with vassal rulers, he never felt secure on the throne of Hatti because when his deposed nephew fled from Syria to Egypt, he received protection from Hattušili’s most powerful ‘brother’, Rameses II (Bryce 2005b:268). Whether this occurred before or after the Hattušili-Rameses peace treaty, it nevertheless increased tension between Hatti and Egypt for many years (Bryce 2005b:268). Rameses II possibly used the Urhi-Teshub dilemma to make sure that his treaty partner, Hattušili III, fully observed the terms of their peace agreement (Bryce 2005b:280).

There might have been a time when Urhi-Teshub was no longer useful to Rameses, who contemplated handing him over to his royal ‘brother’ in Hattuša (Bryce 2005b:280). This could have resulted in Urhi-Teshub fleeing Egypt, avoiding recapture by the Hittites as well as the Egyptians (Bryce 2005b:280).

Rameses II, Hattušili III and Puduhepa exchanged angry letters when they discovered that the fugitive Urhi-Teshub, with the help of his supporters, had returned to Hatti without their mutual knowledge (Bryce 2005b:281). Rameses II ordered Hattušili III and Puduhepa to search for Urhi-Teshub, upon which they took exception to such a suggestion and rejected the order. An angry Rameses II wrote back:

As what you have written to me regarding the matter of Urhi-Teshub: it is not the case that he went to the land of Kadesh! It is not the case that he went into the land of Aleppo! It is not the case that he went into the land of Kizzuwatna! ---- thus you have written. Look, I do not understand these words you have written about this matter of Urhi-Teshub...I do not know where he is lodged. He has flown like a bird. 98

Urhi-Teshub survived Hattušili and Puduhepa’s as well as Rameses II’s unceasing attempts to hunt him down. According to Bryce (2005b:281), Urhi-Teshub’s presence

remained for many years a source of tension between the two ‘great brothers and sister’, Puduhepa.

4.1.1 Kurunta (ca 1281–1227 BCE), another contender to the throne

Some scholars like Van den Hout (2013:36; cf. Bryce 2006:6; cf. Liverani 2014:308) are of the opinion that Urhi-Teshub’s brother Kurunta (see Figure 4.2) was also a contender for the throne. Both brothers were obstacles in their uncle Hattušili’s way to fulfill his ambition and Ištar’s promise for him to be crowned Great King of Hatti (Van den Hout 1995:1117).

For Hattušili III, the consequence of having Urhi-Teshub out of the way was the probability of having to deal with Kurunta’s possible revenge. To keep Kurunta at a safe distance from Hattuša, Hattušili III appointed him as viceroy of the former capital, Tarhuntassa. As Muwatalli’s son, Kurunta had a right to the Hittite throne, but some scholars are of the opinion that he never forced his claim to become Great King while his uncle Hattušili III, who had raised him, was still on the throne (Bryce 2005b: 271). It was made clear by Hattušili III that, after his death, the succession was to stay within his own, immediate family. Van den Hout (2013:36) informs us that a series of treaties between Hattušili III and Kurunta show indulgence toward the latter. Several other documents from Hattušili III’s reign also suggest that as King he constantly defended himself (Liverani 2014:308) against members of the royal family who felt they were negatively affected by Hattušili III’s usurpation of royal power for himself and his immediate family.

Although unlikely because of the close childhood friendship between Kurunta and his cousin Tudhaliya (Bryce 2005b:269), it is possible that Kurunta violently took the throne back from Tudhaliya IV around circa 1228 BCE. Seal impressions from that period found at Hattuša and a rock cut inscription recently found near Konya (see its location in Figure 2.2) in central Turkey refer to Kurunta as ‘Great King’, ‘Labarna’ and ‘My Sun’ (Bryce 2012b:722). His occupancy of the throne, according to Bryce (2012b:722), would have been brief, for Tudhaliya IV, son and successor of Hattušili III, became King and ruled for many years. Kurunta subsequently disappeared altogether from Hittite history.
4.2 HATTUŠILI’S COUP D’ÉTAT (ca 1267 BCE)

Texts reveal that Hattušili overthrew his nephew largely out of fear for his own life. He was well aware of the ruling of ‘The Edict of Telepinu’ (see 1.1.4.3 [a]) that no member of the royal family was immune from punishment for crimes committed against his family (Kuhrt 1998:249). The deposed King was a problem for Hattušili for several years. The new King was to ensure that the right of succession to the throne remained within his lineage of the royal family (Collins 2007:61). The Hittite Empire remained unstable at the beginning of Hattušili III’s reign and serious divisions amongst the royal family remained.

4.2.1 Dynastic succession
Singer (2002:96) writes that the problem of legal dynastic succession dominated the political agenda of the last generations of kings of the Hittite Empire. Hattušili III, as an experienced politician and army general, maneuvered himself out of a very tight spot regarding dynastic succession. He did that by forming alliances and seeking acknowledgement from the rulers of Babylon and Egypt to confirm his reasons for claiming the Hittite throne. The rulers of Babylon and Egypt, like Hattušili III, saw a mutual enemy in the growing power of Assyria in northern Mesopotamia (Kuhrt 1998:263; cf. Macqueen 1999:50).

Hattušili III’s reign was determined by his diplomatic accomplishments. Hattušili III not only made a peace treaty with Egypt but also with Babylon, putting the Hittite Kingdom on good terms with two of the three great powers of the time (Egypt and Babylon) (Ryan 2015:386). Assyria remained a problem because King Adad-Nirari I (ca 1307-1275 BCE) opposed Hattušili III’s reign for the rest of his life (Ryan 2015:386). Relations between Hatti and Assyria only improved under Shalmaneser I (ca 1274-1245 BCE).

4.2.2 Hattušili III’s ‘Autobiography’
The much-debated ‘Autobiography’ (or Apology) about the life and reign of Hattušili III was found in fragments in the eastern storerooms of the Great Temple of Hattuša. The historical reliability of the ‘Autobiography’ of Hattušili III has always been challenged because some scholars dismiss it as propaganda that should be disregarded as a record
of factual events while others are of the opinion that the ‘Autobiography’ contains historical events of limited accuracy although, as Burney (2004:112) writes, ‘none can deny the largely propagandist intent.’ Figure 4.3 shows a portrayal of the Neo-Hittite King Barrakib of Sam’al (ca 730 BCE) in conversation with his scribe. It is an illustration of a possible similar situation between Hattušili III and his scribe, in daily conversation dictating a letter or document.
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**Figure 4.3**

A king sitting on his throne before his scribe

In his ‘Autobiography’, Bryce (2006:5) tells us, Hattušili III wanted to justify his overthrow of the throne as well as transferring succession to his family lineage as Hattušili III’s coup was ‘blatantly’ illegal, which his son Tudhaliya IV admitted years later (Bryce 2006:5). According to Van den Hout (2003, 1:199), the ‘Autobiography’ existed in at least eight different manuscripts, illustrating its importance for the Hittites. Van den Hout is of the opinion that the composition of the ‘Autobiography’ is difficult to categorise and that the text is possibly a proclamation to institute the cult of the goddess Ḫ巴士 of Šamuha,
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99 King Barrakib of Sam’al (ca 730 BCE) (modern Zincirli, see Figure 2.2) before his scribe. The Aramaic inscription next to the king’s head reads: ‘I am Barrakib, son of Panammuwa.’ The inscription next to the moon motif reads: My Lord, Ba’al of Harran.’
appointing his son Tudhaliya IV and future generations as her priests and priestesses and granting her temple exemption from tax.

During his life Hattušili III attributed his achievements to the special direction his patron goddess *Ištar* of Šamuha gave him (Van den Hout 1995:1109):

*Ištar, my lady, who held her mantle over me in every respect, favoured me. Ištar, my lady, put my enemies and enviers at my mercy and finished them off.*

Hattušili claimed that *Ištar* also guided him to the throne of Hatti and that the composition of the ‘Autobiography’ resembles the glorification of *Ištar* (Van den Hout 2003:199). Bryce (2005b:246) adds that the ‘Autobiography’ is ‘a largely self-laudatory and self-justificatory account of Hattušili’s progress to his seizure of the throne.’ The favourable outcome of the civil war against his nephew was the result of Hattušili III not being perceived in the ‘Autobiography’ as committing a sin but as the recipient of the gods’ (in this case *Ištar’s*) will (Ferguson 2010:60). Van den Hout (1995:1108) adds that the way in which Hattušili III took over the throne demonstrated that he was also a successful, calculating politician. He (Van den Hout) also mentions that the text of the ‘Autobiography’ is frequently compared to the Old Testament story of Samuel and David in 1 Samuel 15 to 2 Samuel 8.

Apart from the ‘Autobiography’, many more personal documents like edicts, proclamations, instructions and prayers were composed during Hattušili’s life. He was devout as many texts bear witness to, but he remained very aware of the importance of religion as an aid in political propaganda (Van den Hout 1995:1108).

### 4.2.2.1 Hattušili III’s ‘Autobiography’ and the Sinai covenant

Collins (2007:110) suggests that there were theoretical similarities linking the Sinai covenant between Yahweh and Israel with the Hittite vassal treaties concluded in the Late Bronze Age. The relevant scripture passages, according to her (2007:110), are in
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100 Text after Van den Hout in COS (1.77:199).
Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy and Joshua 24. The theoretical elements characteristic of both Hittite treaties and Biblical covenants are: the prologue which contains the review of the relationship between the two parties before entering into the present agreement; the preconditions to accountability by the vassal and the responsibilities of the king toward the subject; the placing of the treaty in the temple and its periodic reading to the vassals; and the summons of witnesses to the treaty and the proclamation of curses on those who broke the terms of the treaty agreement (Collins 2007:111).

Hattušili III’s ‘Autobiography’, according to Taracha (2009:81), is a covenant made by the King with Ištar of Šamuha that merged with the Hurrian goddess Šauška. The combined status of Ištar/Šauška is reflected in the ‘Autobiography’:

Ištar’s (Šauška’s) divine providence I will proclaim.
Let everybody hear it!

And may in future his majesty’s son, his grandson and further offspring of his majesty be respectful among the gods toward Ištar (Šauška)\(^\text{102}\)

Taracha (2009:81) comments that this quoted text is a valuable source in the debate amongst scholars about the origin of monotheism. The belief that one god could be the only god of a family or tribe originated in the religious thinking of the elite of different regions of the ancient Near East during the Late Bronze Age (Taracha 2009:81). The religious reforms that Pharaoh Akhenaten introduced represented this striving towards one god. It is interesting to compare Hattušili III’s bond with Šauška/Ištar to the covenant between Yahweh and Israel, which stands at the root of henotheism (monotheism), the worship of one deity (Taracha 2009:81). During Hattušili III and Puduhepa’s reign, there are some signs in their conduct as chief priest and priestess of the Hittite state cult that they had started a process with the help of their scribes and temple officials to reorganise and merge deities of similar function into one, for example Šauška/Ištar and Arinna/Hepat.

\(^{101}\) See Collins’s (2007:110) footnote 43 for the relevant passages.

As Collins (2007:110) explains, the Sinai covenant, like the Hittite vassal treaties, is an agreement between two individuals, God and the people of Israel, with every Israelite in the position of the vassal king. Collins (2007:110) is of the opinion that the whole structure of the Pentateuch ‘is that of a political treaty between God and Israel…patterned after the Hittite political treaty.’ The Hittite kings used treaties to define the boundaries of vassal states, rewarding the faithful and taking away from the rebellious. In the same way, Yahweh gave the ‘promised land’ to the people of Israel, defining with precision its geographic borders (Num.34:2-12) (Collins 2007:111).

4.2.2.2 The nature of Hittite scribes
Syrian cuneiform was brought to Anatolia around the middle of the seventeenth century BCE. The Hittite kings employed scribes for many centuries from regions they conquered. Van den Hout (2015:203) informs us that there was a distinction between scribal craftsmen and scholar-scribes amongst the élite of the Hittite Empire. Hittite scribes were schooled and trained along the same lines as their Mesopotamian counterparts (Van den Hout 2015:204). There are texts, according to Van den Hout, that list the general status of Hittite scribes as the same as that of diviners, musicians, table servants, cupbearers, spearmen, gatekeepers, singers, reciters, beer brewers, bakers, water providers, temple-court sweepers, bird breeders, potters, and porridge makers. The scribes were thus part of a large group of servants, specialists and professionals on whom the royal elite relied for the daily running of the state (Van den Hout 2015:207).

Interest in foreign traditions became important amongst the Hittite rulers because, as will be discussed, foreigners had become members of the royal family and specialist scribes were ordered to collect foreign wisdom and to cultivate and transmit it for the benefit of future generations (Van den Hout 2015:204). An example is that, once in office, Queen Puduhepa ordered the chief scribe Walwaziti, son and successor of Mittanamuwa, to start collecting texts from her homeland, Kizzuwatna:

When Queen Puduhepa called upon Walwaziti, the chief scribe, in Hattuša to search for tablets from Kizzuwatna, he had these tablets of the hišuwa-festival copied.103

According to Van den Hout (2015:215), the scribal signature at the end of the above quotation shows that Walwaziti did not do the copying himself but that it was copied by his scribes. There were apparently many fathers and sons in the scribal profession, but according to Van den Hout (2015:213), none of them were explicitly mentioned. When searching for scholars in Hittite society, one could consider looking at this group of élite individuals.

4.2.3 Great King Hattušili III (ca 1267-1237 BCE)

In the ancient Near East, the human kingdoms were modeled on the kingdoms of the gods and the king’s authority was assured because he was the focal point between the two worlds (Collins 2007:109). In his time, Great King Hattušili III as ‘steward of the divine’ occupied this most important position in the world of Hittite society and their deities (Gilan 2011:280).

4.2.3.1 Commander-in-chief of the army

Bryce (2002:100) tells us that although war rather than peace ruled the way of life in Hatti, the destruction of war was rarely addressed by the Hittites. Bryce refers to Imparati (1987:188) to explain this attitude: peace for the Hittites was not ‘the absence of exterior wars’ but rather appeared to have been the ‘absence of civil wars’ and ‘an absence of conspiracies against the royal court.’ Deities like the goddess Ištar/Šauška (see 3.1.2.2), whose role was mainly a military one, showed that war was viewed as an ordinary, unavoidable, ‘divinely sanctioned’ part of life (Bryce 2002:100).

The Hittite Kingdom was constantly military prepared, but within this practical position the king ideologically wanted to present himself not as the encourager of aggression, but rather as the one campaigning only in reaction to ‘unprovoked aggression by his enemies or rebellion by disloyal vassals, or states or communities who provided asylum for his fugitive subjects’ (Bryce 2002:100). The ultimate goal of the king’s military campaigns was to restore peace and stability. Hattušili III, like his predecessors, was appointed commander-in-chief of the army by Teshub, the stormgod of Hatti, and ruled the land as the god’s deputy (Beckman 1995:529-43; cf. 2005:347; cf. Bryce 2011:87). The justification for his cause was never questioned because he believed that his deities, the
sungoddess of Arinna, the stormgod *Teshub, Mezzulla* and *Ištar/Šauška*, marched before him into battle (Bryce 2002:101).

Hittite monumental art showed the king carrying a lance, sword and bow (see Figure 4.2), but battles, like Kadesh, were never portrayed (Lorenz 2011:131) (see 2.4.1.1 [a]). There are no reliefs from the Hittite Kingdom of a king annihilating his enemies in battle or rejoicing over the dead as depicted in Egyptian and Assyrian reliefs (Bryce 2002:100). There is also no evidence in written records of the kings’ military campaigns providing evidence of them taking pleasure in destruction and cruelty or exploiting victory in war (Lorenz 2011:131; cf. Ritner & Van den Hout 2016).

### 4.2.3.2 Chief judicial authority

In his capacity as chief judge in the land of Hatti, Hattušili III had to preside over a range of legal and vassal disputes (Bryce 2011:88). Many criminal and civil offences could only be tried by the King’s court. Bryce (2011:88) mentions that the constant flow of offences and litigation could become too much for the King to handle. He delegated much of the court’s work to officials, but mainly to members of the royal family (Bryce 2011:88). According to Bryce (2011:88), Queen Puduhepa shared her husband’s judicial duties from early in their marriage. After Hattušili’s death, according to Bryce (2011:88), Puduhepa became more involved in judicial matters, intervening in contentious legal matters and also giving her opinion on cases from Hittite vassal states (see 2.3.4.1).

### 4.2.4 Great Queen Puduhepa (ca 1290-1210 BCE)

It was tradition in Hatti for the queen to be subordinate to the king (Silver 2010:2). The queen’s responsibilities were to manage the royal household, called ‘the palace’ in Hittite texts. At the palace in Hattuša, Puduhepa oversaw affairs within the royal establishment and had a greater role in government than most of her predecessors because of her husband’s chronic illness (Silver 2010:2).

Puduhepa’s independent initiatives and activities did not apply to all Hittite queens (Darga 1994:30). Her personal involvement seems to have been the result of her personality and ambition. Her husband, Hattušili III, referred to her in a personal and affectionate way, an
exception for any royal couple in Hittite history (Silver 2010:2). Being on an equal footing and playing a very successful and active part in the affairs of the state, international politics, legal and religious matters, Puduhepa and her husband were an exceptional royal couple in Hittite history (Darga 1994:30).

4.2.4.1 An informal view of Puduhepa
A more informal view of Puduhepa is found in her correspondence, prayers, votive texts and dream reports (De Roos 2006:18). According to Darga (1994:31), no documents were found describing Puduhepa’s private life or social activities. In general, no texts have been found about the social lives of any Hittite women. Some of Puduhepa’s social activities were revealed in ritual texts that were mainly associated with religion and cults (Darga 1994:31). We get a tiny glimpse of her feelings when we read about her dreams and vows as ‘Great Queen Puduhepa of the city of Kummani’ to ‘Lelwani goddess of the underworld’ (Darga 1994:32) (see 5.2.1.5).

4.2.4.2 Puduhepa’s influence on state affairs
There are known documents that testify to Queen Puduhepa’s influence on the vassal states of Hatti (Darga 1994:31). Puduhepa corresponded with vassals of King Hattušili, for example the ruler of Amurru, and she cared about the general welfare of the people as seen when she requested in a time of famine for corn to be shipped to Hatti (Burney 2004:231). Another example of Queen Puduhepa’s powerful influence was during Rameses II’s reign when she requested King Niqmaddu II of the city of Ugarit, a vassal state of Hatti, to draw up a peace treaty with Egypt (Darga 1994:31).

Darga (1994:31) and Gold (2015:20) inform us that the negotiations for the Hattušili-Rameses peace treaty were largely entrusted to Queen Puduhepa because of her husband Hattušili III’s ill health. Darga (1994:31) states that the fact that Puduhepa was entrusted with these negotiations helped Egypt’s Pharaoh to maintain better relationships with the small vassal states of the Hittite Empire.
4.3 HITTITE TREATIES

The treaty system became an important instrument in the implementation of Hittite authority in the ancient Near East (Bryce 2012b:730).

Eagle and snake made an alliance and swore to be friends; but eagle stood at the top of the tree, and snake at its base.104

The Hittites left us a larger number of political treaties from the ancient Near East than from any other empire in the region (Liverani 2004:53). Half of all preserved treaties in the ancient Near East were written by Hittite officials (Beckman 2006:282).

Bryce (2012b:725) mentions that we find the first example of a Hittite treaty between King Telipinu (ca 1525-1500 BCE) and Išputahšu, the ruler of Kizzuwatna, when it was declared a kingdom. According to Burney (2004:269), Telipinu’s motive may have been to ward off the possibility of Kizzuwatna joining a Hurrian alliance against Hatti. Instead of regaining Kizzuwatna (formerly a Hittite vassal state) by military force, Telipinu made a treaty of alliance with its ruler (Bryce 2012b:725). King Telipinu, who was responsible for the saving of the Old Hittite Kingdom (ca 1650-1400 BCE) from total destruction, not only established fixed rules for royal succession but also adopted the policy of treaties between equals and subordinates (Bryce 2012b:725).

Thirty-five treaties and other agreements, of which the texts are only mentioned but not yet recovered, are being used for research amongst Hittitologists (Beckman 2006:282). Six preserved treaties of Hattušili III (ca 1267-1237 BCE) and his successor, Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE), are listed here (Beckman 2006:300). Beckman continues that most of the treaties were composed in Akkadian, but that Hittite was used when treaties were made between Anatolian diplomatic partners. These documents were referred to in both languages as ‘binding and oaths’ (Akkadian: rikiltu and Hittite: išhiul). These stipulations were the two most important components of a treaty: the obligation of binding and formalising oaths.

4.3.1 Treaties between rulers of equal status

It is known to us that the kings of Babylonia, Assyria and even Ahhiyawa in the Aegean (see Figure 2.2) were considered equal to the King of Hatti (Beckman 2006:288). The best example of a treaty between rulers of equal status is the Hattušili–Rameses peace treaty, negotiated by representatives of Rameses II and Hattušili III (ca 1258/59 BCE) (Beckman 2006:288). In this Hattušili-Rameses agreement, neither party was required to impose anything on the other as was expected of vassal rulers. The treaty called for the mutual giving up of hostilities between the parties, the reaffirmation of former treaties, a mutual defense agreement, the guarantee of the designated heir to the Hittite throne (not applying to the Egyptian throne) and the extradition of fugitives (Beckman 2006:289).

Treaties had to be renewed regularly, taking into account political changes that might have occurred in the region as well as when a previously equal ruler became the subject (Liverani 2004:53). The repeated renewal of treaties was necessary because they were agreements between two kings and not between two states (Liverani 2004:53). International treaties between two Great Kings were also personal and remained active for as long as the respective kings remained on their thrones (Bryce 2006:5).

4.3.2 Divine endorsement of treaties

Hittite kings regarded their treaties made in the presence of deities as semi-religious agreements (Burney 2004:289). Singer (1994:93) tells us that it was important for Hittite officials and scribes assisting in drawing up state and vassal treaties to have a fundamental knowledge of foreign pantheons. The reason for this was that the deities of both parties were petitioned in a similar way as human witnesses to be witness to and subsequently guardians of these legal agreements (Hawkins 1998:65).

It was not excessive for the Hittite kings to appeal not to one or a few but to all the gods of both treaty partners to witness and protect the terms of a vassal or international treaty and to punish any breach of these terms (Bryce 2002:140). The deities alone had the power and the right to do this as the guarantors of the oaths sworn. The detailed lists of divine witnesses in Hittite treaties are very useful for research in the reconstruction of the religious history of the second millennium BCE (Beckman 2006:286).
4.3.3 Possible reasons for drawing up the Hattušili-Rameses ‘peace’ treaty

Fifteen years (ca 1258/59 BCE) after the war between the Hittite and Egyptian armies at Kadesh, Hattušili was on the throne at last and drew up a treaty with Rameses II. Bryce (2006:2) argues that the treaty was not drawn up because their personal relationship had improved. It was mostly a hostile and distrustful relationship despite their exchange, in typical Late Bronze Age royal correspondence style, declaring their affection and esteem for one another (Bryce 2006:3).

It seems that Rameses II had lost interest in launching new conquests in Syria and decided to maintain the northern frontier of his Syro-Palestinian territories in the region of Damascus (Bryce 2006:3). A priority for Egypt was to rather secure their land against invasion from Libya in the west, and Rameses II preferred to direct his attention to his monumental building projects (Bryce 2006:3). Bryce suggests that despite this change, Rameses II might have felt the need to boost his image amongst his subjects with an international achievement other than a military conquest. The best way to secure that would have been a diplomatic achievement in the form of an alliance with his old enemy, the Hittites (Bryce 2006:3). The treaty could also represent what the Hittites wanted most from Egypt: peace and co-operation, because they could not ignore the continuous threat of Assyria at Hatti’s borders (Bryce 2006:3).

Assyria’s attempts to gain control of Hittite territories in Syria would have given them access to the Mediterranean and lead to war with the Hittites (Bryce 2006:3). This was, according to Bryce (2006:4), Hattušili III’s strongest motive for concluding a treaty with Rameses II. Such an alliance would have been binding and Rameses II would have been obliged to support Hatti if the Assyrians invaded their territory (Bryce 2006:4). At the time, Assyria was making big progress in developing and expanding their kingdom, creating the possibility that their conquests could extend to the northern Syrian coast as well as to Egyptian territories and cities to the southern Levant (Bryce 2006:4). The treaty does not refer specifically to the Assyrian threat, but the mutual defence obligations in general make provision for the possibility of such an attack by Assyria (Bryce 2006:4). According to Bryce (2006:4), the Assyrians did not attempt to cross the Euphrates and make war
with Hattušili III. Bryce (2006:4) believes that an Egyptian-Hittite alliance deterred the ambitious Assyrians from crossing the Euphrates to make war against them.

Another possible personal reason why Hattušili III wanted a pact between him and Rameses II was that his deposed nephew Urhi-Teshub (Mursili III) kept on resurfacing as a threat to his uncle, who wanted him extradited by Rameses II from Egypt. Urhi-Teshub was determined to get his throne back and his relocation by Hattušili III to the Nuhašše lands in Syria (see 4.1) appeared to have been a huge mistake by the King (Bryce 2006:5). This provided Urhi-Teshub with access to Babylonian as well as Assyrian officials in order to win their support in restoring him to the Hittite throne. Hattušili III had him moved to another location, but Urhi-Teshub fled Syria and resurfaced in the court of Rameses II, where the Pharaoh granted him refuge, as previously discussed (see 4.1). As Bryce (2006:5) writes: ‘all this had a profoundly unsettling effect on Hattušili’s regime.’

4.3.3.1 Correspondence between Hatti and Egypt before and after the peace treaty

The main themes of the royal diplomatic correspondence were the establishment of peace between the two empires, the Egyptian exile of Urhi-Teshub and the marriage of the daughter of Hattušili to Rameses II (see 4.3.5.1) (Beckman 1996:122). Eventually, Rameses II acknowledged Hattušili III as Great King of Hatti though the latter complained that the Pharaoh addressed him as though he was a servant, to which Rameses II responded in anger:

That I would have written to you as to a servant from amongst My servants are simply not true!

Have you not received the Kingship, and did I not know this? Was it not in my heart? You are a Great King in the Hatti lands! You are a hero in all lands!

The sungod and the stormgod have granted that you exercise Kingship in the Hatti lands in the place of your grandfather.105

After the peace treaty, Rameses II was not afraid to refer in his correspondence to the animosity of the past. In a letter about the escapee Urhi-Teshub, Rameses II wrote that

---

105 [http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/bmsaes/issue6/bryce.html](http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/bmsaes/issue6/bryce.html)
he was convinced that he alone had crushed the Hittites at Kadesh (Van de Mieroop 2011:222):

> The King sat on his throne on the western side of the Orontes River and the leading division was in the camp he had set up. While the King knew that Muwatattli, King of Hatti, had left the area of Aleppo, the King did not know where he was. And the King of Hatti attacked him with his army and all the countries that sided with him. But the King of Egypt defeated him on his own, although my army was not with me, although my horses were not with me. And I took the enemies from Hatti to Egypt in full view of the people of Egypt and the people of Hatti…"\(^{*106}\)

### 4.3.4 The Hattušili-Rameses treaty circa 1258/59 BCE

Many years of hostility between Egypt and Hatti ended when Hattušili III concluded a treaty with Pharaoh Rameses II, fifteen years after the battle of Kadesh (Bryce 2006:1). The treaty, composed independently in Akkadian and Egyptian in both capitals, Pi-Ramesse and Hattuša, was intended to establish ‘peace and brotherhood for all time’ between the two Great Kings (Bryce 2006:1; cf. Sürenhagen 2006:59). According to Bryce (2006:1), there were no noticeable discrepancies between the two versions of the treaty, which, according to him, show they were negotiated and discussed in advance.

Eventually, the Hittites and Egyptians agreed to a peace treaty and alliance, sealed with a diplomatic marriage (Kuhrt 1998:263). The text of the treaty first expresses the friendship and goodwill between the two Kings. After these formalities and niceties, details are given of an actual military alliance between Hatti and Egypt. In the end, the promise of mutual support in the treaty did not remain rhetorical. Van de Mieroop (2011:223) tells us that Hittite charioteers were stationed at Pi-Ramesse and Egyptian soldiers travelled to Hatti. Collins (2007:61; cf. Bryce 2006:3) mentions that the treaty was an opportunity for Rameses II for self-propaganda. Hattušili III wanted international recognition of his kingship and at the same time built support at home to ensure that the right of succession to the throne of Hatti remained with his lineage (Collins 2007:61).

The only divergence between the Hittite and Egyptian versions of the treaty (see Figures 4.4 & 4.5) was related to the question of succession to the throne. Because Hattušili was

worried that his son would not be accepted as his successor, he included a clause in the treaty that the Egyptian King should secure his succession (Van de Mieroop 2016:146). Hattušili need not have feared because the treaty obligations were never put to the test and the royal succession remained in his lineage until the fall of the Hittite Empire in the twelfth century BCE (Bryce 2006:6).

4.3.4.1 Queen Puduhepa a co-signatory of the Hattušili-Rameses treaty
Queen Puduhepa and her husband both signed the Hattušili-Rameses treaty during a time of frequent contact between the two superpowers supported by intense diplomatic and mercantile activity in the region via land and sea routes (Collins 2007:62; cf. Feldman 2006:26).

4.3.4.2 The ‘eternal peace’ treaty in our time
At the entrance to the Security Council chamber of the United Nations in New York is a replica of the Akkadian version of the ‘eternal’ treaty, symbolic of peace and goodwill between nations of the modern world (see Figure 4.6).

Figure 4.4
Akkadian clay copy of the Hattušili-Rameses treaty

Figure 4.5
Egyptian translation of the treaty on stone
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(a) ‘Blast from the past’

Each millennium of the ancient Near East had its own specific regional politics. The type of political organisation during the Middle and Late Bronze Ages, which form the background and context for this dissertation, was that of ‘several major powers struggling with one another for dominance over minor states, and making and breaking alliances’ as their rulers thought necessary (Beckman 2006:280). These are similar political struggles we experienced (and still do) during the twentieth century in our world. Bryce (2006:1) is of the opinion that the replica of the ‘eternal’ peace treaty in New York is a misleading symbol because the treaty was part of a world where making war was the norm and peace a deviation from it. Nothing has changed in our time.

4.3.4.3 The Hattušili-Rameses treaty sealed by a royal wedding

It was thirteen years after the signing of the Hattušili-Rameses treaty that Queen Puduhepa and Hattušili III sealed it by sending one of their daughters to marry the elderly Rameses II. It was often the case that daughters of the king’s chief wife were reserved for the most important marriage alliances, as was the case with Puduhepa’s daughter

---


110 http://www.en.wikipedia.org/blastfromthepast ‘Blast from the past’ is the title of a romantic comedy film (1999) about an eccentric scientist who built a nuclear war fallout shelter in his backyard in fear of an imminent nuclear war between the United States of America and the Soviet Union.
who was chosen to marry Rameses II (Bryce 2003b:107). A second daughter, Kiluš-Hepa, followed her sister to marry Rameses II after Hattušili’s death (Collins 2007:62).

4.3.5 Queen Puduhepa as principal wife leading wedding negotiations

Puduhepa was described as first among Hattušili III’s many wives and concubines. It is likely that Hattušili III’s other children Nerikkali and Gashulaviya, mentioned in tablets, were from a previous wife (Darga 1994:30). Nerikkali married the daughter of King Benteshina of Amurru, and his sister Gashulaviya married his father-in-law, King Benteshina, on condition that she became Queen of Amurru. These marriages were politically motivated and manipulated in favour of the Hittites who wanted to regain Amurru as a vassal state from Egypt (Darga 1994:30) (see 4.4.1).

Some of Hattušili and Puduhepa’s children are also named in tablets from Hattuša. They were Tudhaliya IV, his father’s successor, as well as one of their two daughters who were sent as brides to Rameses II of Egypt. Darga (1994:30) mentions that Egyptian sources refer to the first daughter who married Rameses II as Maathorneferure. She received the title of Great Queen of Egypt when she married the Pharaoh; the second daughter who later married the elderly Rameses II was Princess Kiluš-Hepa (Queen Puduhepa [sa]).

4.3.5.1 Correspondence between Puduhepa and Rameses II

Puduhepa wrote to Rameses II (see Figure 4.8) and discussed international affairs with him as his equal (Silver 2010:2). Her letters and personal seal indicated her equality with Hattušili III in international politics (Darga 1994:30). It would have been unthinkable, according to Beckman in Silver (2010:2), for the Egyptians to allow a queen to share the same status as her husband. It was the Hittites who allowed Puduhepa to take this role, not the Egyptians (Silver 2010:2). Rameses II addressed Puduhepa as ‘Great Queen’ in the familial manner of one monarch to another, calling her his ‘sister’ as he would call Hattušili his ‘brother’ (Silver 2010:2). Puduhepa writes to ‘brother’ Rameses II about diplomatic marriages and, interestingly, the men in her life, her husband and son

Tudhaliya IV, are not discussed at all. Instead, it is all about her, the mother-in-law, and her marriage arrangements (see 4.4.1) (Routledge 2015). She wrote to Rameses:

The daughter of Babylonia and the daughter of Amurru, whom I, the Queen, took for myself- were they not indeed a source of praise for me before the people of Hatti?

It was I who did it. I took each daughter of a Great King, though a foreigner, as daughter-in-law.

And if at some time his (the royal father’s) messengers come in splendour to the daughter-in-law or one of her brothers or sisters come to her, are they not also a source of praise for me?

Was there no woman available to me in Hatti? Did I not do this out of consideration for renown?112

Puduhepa reminds Rameses that although kings may have been swapping daughters like gold or horses, each of the diplomatic marriages also involved a mother-in-law. In the case of Puduhepa, at least, the mother-in-law not only had a voice or influence, she was both famous and influential (Routledge 2015). In the extract from Rameses II’s reply (see Figure 4.7) to Queen Puduhepa, after pleasantries were extended, we read about Rameses II’s satisfaction with Puduhepa’s favourable response to the successful conclusion of negotiations over her daughter joining Rameses II’s harem at Gurob (see Figure 4.12):

Say to Puduhepa, Great Queen of Hatti, my sister, 
Now Rameses, beloved of Amun, Great King, King of Egypt, 
Your brother, is well. His houses, his infantry, his 
horses, his chariots, and everything in all of his 
lands is exceedingly well. May you, my sister, be 
exceedingly well.

May Hattušili, Great King of Hatti, my brother be 
well...Say to my sister: in respect to that which my 
sister wrote to me regarding her daughter ...

I am very pleased about this relationship which the 
sungod created when he satisfied my sister regarding 
the wish she expressed to him. 
The sungod and the stormgod will see to the 
completion of all the arrangements...

They will install her in the household of the King, 
your brother, since she is intended for rule in 
Egypt.115

113 http://www.atamanhotel.com/Hattušiliis.html
114 http://www.britishmuseum.com Museum’s photographic service.
4.3.5.2 The bridal convoy travelling from Hattuša to Pi-Ramesse

Kitchen (1982:85) informs us that in the late autumn of circa 1246 BCE the Hittite princess left Hattuša, surrounded by soldiers, envoys, charioteers and dignitaries from Egypt and Hatti, with her dowry of animals, slaves and wealth to be presented to Rameses II on her long-awaited arrival in his palace at Pi-Ramesse. Two years of bartering and negotiations between Hatti and Egypt had been concluded (Kitchen 1982:86). We are told that there was general rejoicing in Egypt about two people whose marriage united the formerly warring royal houses (Gold 2015:18; cf. Silver 2010:2). In the main temples of Egypt (Thebes [Karnak], Elephantine, Aksha, Abu Simbel and on the west side of the Nile at Amarna), enormous copies of inscriptions were composed and engraved to commemorate the wedding (Kitchen 1982:85).

Kitchen (1982:88) says that besides the magnificent state occasion of the royal wedding, the splendour of the dowry, and the Hittite princess next to the proud Pharaoh, the royal scribes also recorded the practical advantage of this union for all the people. A scribe wrote: ‘thereafter, if a man or woman went out on business to Syria, they could even reach the Hatti-land without fear haunting their hearts, because of the victories of his majesty’ (Kitchen 1982:88). Kitchen tells us that great, spectacular ‘royal events’ like the wedding between the royal houses of Egypt and Hatti were the last of their kind for many centuries. Fortunately, in Egypt the collective memory of these glittering events was immortalized on Rameses’s monuments so that future generations would not forget that once upon a time, a foreign princess of great beauty became Queen in Egypt (Bryce 2003b:107).

According to Klengel (2011:42), this dynastic marriage was not only the result of ‘brotherhood’ and peace between the Hittites and Egyptians, but it also strengthened Hattušili III’s position among the leading rulers of the region. Collins (2007:62) mentions a second wedding to another daughter of Hattušili and Puduhepa that took place ten years later, after both Hattušili and Maathorneferure’s deaths. Apparently Puduhepa, still in her role as Queen during her son Tudhaliya IV’s reign, also arranged this wedding in circa 1234 BCE to secure continued relations with Egypt (Collins 2007:62; cf. Ritner & Van den Hout 2016).
4.3.5.3 Puduhepa’s daughter marries Rameses II (ca 1246 BCE)

The Hattušili-Rameses peace treaty of circa 1258/59 BCE was sealed when Hattušili III offered his daughter (see Figure 4.9) in marriage to Rameses II in the autumn of Rameses II’s thirty-fourth year as Pharaoh, circa 1246 BCE (Kitchen 1982:83). Rameses II agreed to Hattušili III’s proposal and the latter, rather foolishly, promised an impressive dowry with his daughter’s hand. Hattušili III/Puduhepa wrote to Rameses II:

Greater will be her dowry than that of the daughter of the King of Babylon, and that of the daughter of the King of Barga.

This year, I will send my daughter, who will bring (also) servants, cattle, sheep and horses, to the land of Aya – may my brother send a man to take over these in Aya!.

Rameses II accepted this offer and in his reply sketched his arrangements for receiving the Hittite princess and her dowry at the border of Aya in southern Syria, near the Egyptian province of Upi, north of Damascus (see its location in Figure 2.2) (Kitchen

---

117 See Figure 4.10.
1982:83). According to Kitchen (1982:84), Rameses II was not happy when there was a delay on the Hittite side in delivering the dowry. He reproached Hattušili III in a letter, which did not reach the Hittite King who was travelling and attending local cult festivals and rituals. Rameses II received a rather impolite response from Queen Puduhepa (Kitchen 1982:84).

It seems that Rameses II was over-enthusiastic in accepting Hattušili III’s exaggerated dowry offer. Rameses II proceeded, Kitchen (1982: 84) tells us, to demand a ‘golden handshake’ from Hattušili III when the dowry did not arrive on time at his palace at Pi-Ramesse. Queen Puduhepa was furious and scandalised by Rameses II’s cheek in demanding delivery of the dowry (Kitchen 1982:84). She found Rameses II’s demands outrageous and in her reply to him she did not mince her words (Kitchen 1982:84). The image of the great Rameses II, grand builder of magnificent temples, developer of gold mines, pleading poverty was, according to Queen Puduhepa, inappropriate behavior from the ‘hero’ of Kadesh (Kitchen 1982:84):

Thus speaks Puduhepa, Great Queen, and Queen of the land of Hatti: say to Reamašeša, (Rameses) Great King, King of the land of Egypt, my brother: … I wrote I would give a daughter to you…I will give you both my daughter and the dowry. And you will not disapprove of it. But at the moment I am not able to give her to you…as you, my brother, know the house of Hatti… is a house relocated (to Tarhuntašša).

To whom should I compare the daughter of heaven and earth whom I will give to my brother? Should I compare her to the daughter of Babylonia, of Zulabi, or of Assyria? Does my brother have nothing at all? Only if the son of the sungod, the son of the stormgod, and the sea have nothing, do you have nothing! Yet, my brother, you want to enrich yourself at my expense! It (such behavior) is unworthy of your name and lordly status.\(^\text{118}\)

In this same letter, Queen Puduhepa scolded Rameses II for not allowing a visit from the envoys of the father of a Babylonian princess in his harem at Gurob (Kitchen 1982:84). Queen Puduhepa berating him did not discourage Rameses II and he kept on debating issues with her (Kitchen 1982:85). When plans for his marriage to Puduhepa’s daughter were finalised, Rameses wrote to Puduhepa, not the King:

\(^{118}\) Text after Hoffner (2009:282-283).
The Great King, the King of the land of Hatti, has written to me thus: let the people come and pour sweet-smelling oil on my daughter’s head and let her be taken to the house of the Great King, the King of Egypt, my brother.\textsuperscript{119}

Kitchen (1982:85) tells us that a special delegation from Egypt travelled to Hattuṣa in the early summer of circa 1246 BCE to anoint the princess. Her mother, Queen Puduhepa, wrote proudly: ‘When fine oil was poured upon (my) daughter’s head, the gods of the netherworld were banished… on that day, the two great countries became one land, and you the two Great Kings found real brotherhood…’(Kitchen1982:85). Figure 4.10 (a) and (b) show a modern soapstone (steatite) scaraboid copy of an ancient rectangular plaque. The scaraboid is glazed blue-green with the double-plumed cartouches with the names of Rameses II on Figure 4.10 (a), and the hieroglyphs of the Egyptian name of Puduhepa and Hattušili III’s daughter, Maathorneferure on the underside (b) of Figure 4.10. On the right (Figure 4.10[b]), the hieroglyphs read: ‘daughter of the ruler of Kheta’ (Hatti).\textsuperscript{120}

A transliterated translation of the princess’s Egyptian name in the cartouche on side B could be: ‘the most beautiful one Neferu of the goddess Ma’at goddess of truth, order and justice, who beholds the god Horus son of the Ra.’\textsuperscript{121} Alternatively her name could also

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{scaraboid.jpg}
\caption{Figure 4.10 (a) Rameses II’s Horus names \hspace{1cm} Figure 4.10 (b) Egyptian name of Hittite princess (right)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{119} Text after Silver (2010:2).
\textsuperscript{120} http://www.petriecat.museums.ucl.ac.uk My translation. © The Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology UCL. UC61296 (Retrieved 19 December 2015).
\textsuperscript{121} My translation.
be translated as: ‘Mahornefrure: she who beholds the falcon King that is the visible splendour of Re.’

Rameses II honoured the occasion of his marriage to Hattušili III and Puduhepa’s daughter in a number of inscriptions, including the one in Figure 4.11 at Abu Simbel (Van de Mieroop 2011:223). The depiction accompanying the inscription shows Hattušili III presenting his daughter to Rameses II in an honourable way. This is only an artist’s rendition; the Hittite King never accompanied his daughter in person to Egypt. Van de Mieroop (2011:223) tells us that Rameses II liked to portray himself as the leading person in this diplomatic alliance marriage with Hatti, but the reality was that the two Kings were equal. Queen Puduhepa demanded from Rameses II that her daughter become his ‘chief wife’, a request he granted (Van de Mieroop 2011:223).

4.3.5.4 Queen Maathorneferure in the harem at Gurob

There is evidence from a papyrus (papyrus 32795) (see Figure 4.13) found at Gurob that after her marriage to Rameses II Queen Maathorneferure lived in the palace at Gurob (see Figure 4.12) (Grajetzki et al 2000-2003).

---

122 Text after Kitchen (1982:89). Referring to Rameses II.
In the Gurob papyrus (see Figure 4.13), an inventory of gifts is recorded for:

- the King’s wife Maathorneferure (may she live)
- the daughter of the great ruler of Hatti,
- a garment of twenty-eight cubits, four palms,
- breadth four cubits,
- bag of fourteen cubit…

Maathorneferure is also recorded in the papyrus as:

- member of the palace of women ...

According to Klengel (2011:42), this dynastic marriage was not only the result of ‘brotherhood’ and peace between the Hittites and Egyptians, but it strengthened Hattušili III’s position among the leading rulers of the region. During Rameses II’s sixty-five-year rule and after his marriages to the first Hittite princesses, the Egyptian-Hittite relations remained good. Rameses II was still the ruler of Egypt when Puduhepa and Hattušili III’s son Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE) reigned (Peker 2013:76).

4.3.5.5  Letters and gifts of friendship between Puduhepa and Nefertari

Puduhepa corresponded with Rameses II’s great royal wife Nefertari/Naptera, ‘she for whom the sun doth shine’, calling her ‘sister’ (Darga 1994:30) (see Figure 4.14). Puduhepa also started a correspondence with one of their sons whose name is unknown

---

124  http://www.ucl.ac.uk/museums-static/digitalegypt/Welcome.html Gurob shortly after Maathorneferure’s marriage to Rameses II circa 1246 BCE.
125  http://www.ucl.ac.uk/museums-static/digitalegypt
Puduhepa and Nefertari were clearly not blood relations at all; ‘sister’ was an intimate, familial way of addressing one another, which was a royal privilege granted by the King (Darga 1994:30).

Thus says Naphtera, Great Queen of Egypt: say to Puduhepa Great Queen of Hatti, my sister: I, your sister, am well. My land is well.

May you, my sister, be well! May your land be well! I have now heard that you, my sister, wrote to me inquiring about my health and that you are writing to me in regard to the relationship of good peace and the relationship of good brotherhood, which exists between the Great King, the King of Egypt and the Great King, the King of Hatti, his brother…

I have now sent you a present as a gift of greeting for you, my sister.¹²⁷

Queen Nefertari’s letter of friendship to Puduhepa (see Figure 4.15) closes, as was the custom of the Great Kings, with a list of luxury goods sent as ‘gifts of greeting.’ Nefertari wrote:

And may you, my sister, be informed about the present which I have sent you in the care of Parihnawa, the messenger of the King:

One very colourful necklace of good gold made up of twelve strands. Its weight eighty eight shekels.¹²⁸ Five dyed linen garments of good fine thread. Five dyed linen tunics of good fine thread. A grand total of twelve linen garments.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ http://www.convert-me.com approximately 4.990-carat weighed 997.9 grams.
Exotic items like the stone bottle and earrings (see Figures 4.16 & 4.17) were often given as gifts of friendship, royal dowry or to seal new political and imperial relationships between the Hittite Empire and other dynasties in the Late Bronze Age (Cline 2014:78).

As the privileged and respected mother of Rameses II, Queen Tuya was also allowed the opportunity to correspond with the Hittite royal court after the conclusion of the ‘eternal’ peace treaty between Egypt and Hatti (Darga 1994:30).

---

131 From the Guide to The Museum of Anatolian Civilizations,132.
Sadly, the ultimate gift, from our perspective, was to give your daughter or sister in marriage to a ‘brother’ king (Routledge 2015). The royal families of the ancient Near East became related as a result of negotiated marriages, which were also a way of transforming their symbolic ‘brotherhood’ into an actual ‘family’ (Podany 2010:10).

4.4 THE MARRIAGE MARKET IN THE EMPIRE PERIOD

Egypt never really accepted the principle of equality between kings, and this resulted in things not always working out smoothly between ‘the brothers’ (Routledge 2015). The pharaohs, on the one hand, were very enthusiastic to acquire Mitannian, Hittite or Babylonian princesses, but they were not interested in sending their Egyptian princesses to other regions (Routledge 2015). This caused problems for the other kings because it would have been very obvious to their people that their princesses went to Egypt and no Egyptian princesses were exchanged in return (Routledge 2015). This seemed like an insult. Bryce (2003b:109) tells us that the Babylonian King, Kadashman-Enlil I (ca 1374-1360 BCE), wanted to put the Egyptian Pharaoh’s one-sided marriage arrangements to the test. He was so frustrated with Pharaoh Amenophis III that he wrote to him, requesting

\[132\] http://www.ucl.ac.uk/museums-static/digitalegypt Bottle with a silver foot, incised with blue filled cartouches of Rameses II and Queen Nefertari. Nineteenth Dynasty, Thebes.

his daughter’s hand in marriage. The Pharaoh replied bluntly: ‘Never since the beginning of time has the daughter of the King of Egypt been given in marriage to anyone!’ (Bryce 2003b:109). Kadashman-Enlil I insisted. ‘You are the King’, he said. ‘You do whatever you like’ (Bryce 2003b:109). When Amenophis III remained uncompromising, Kadashman-Enlil I tried another tactic. He suggested that his royal brother could comply with his request while not deviating from the Egyptian tradition by sending an impostor princess.

Someone in Egypt must have beautiful grown-up daughters available. Why not send me any beautiful woman, as if she were your daughter. Who would say, “She is not the daughter of the King?”

In other words, send me a beautiful Egyptian woman, any woman, and I will introduce her in Babylon as an Egyptian princess. The Babylonian King suggested sheer treachery and missed the point that the reason why the pharaohs never sent their daughters to marry foreign kings had everything to do with the pharaoh’s image and how people perceived him (Bryce 2003b:109). The pharaoh’s status would have diminished greatly if a fake princess was passed on as genuine because he would be perceived as breaking a tradition never before granted to a foreign king. Bryce (2003b:109) tells us that it certainly would have diminished Amenophis III’s status. It shows the extremely patriarchal world in which the women who were exchanged seem to have had very little influence or say, and in many cases they were not even named (Routledge 2015).

It took a strong, powerful woman to turn patriarchal conventions on its head. Queen Puduhepa succeeded with her tough and uncompromising negotiations with Rameses II over his marriage to her daughter Maathorneferure circa 1246 BCE (see 4.3.5.3) (Bryce 2005b:297). She also took the initiative to arrange other diplomatic marriages, which sometimes turned out unsuccessfully (Bryce 2005b:297).

### 4.4.1 Marriages between the royal courts of Amurru, Babylon and Hatti

Bryce (2005b:267) tells us that Hattušili III strengthened his position as Hittite King and broadened his basis of support in the region through every formal agreement he

---

concluded with vassal or international rulers. One example is the Amorite king who was reminded that he had to thank Hattušili III for his restoration to the throne of Amurru although it was a formal decision made by Urhi-Teshub. Hattušili drew up a new treaty with the Amorite King Benteshina and a double diplomatic marriage between the royal houses strengthened their relationship, like many other political marriages did at the time (Bryce 2005b:268). Hattušili III also gave one of his daughters as wife to the King of Babylon.

According to Bryce (2005b:295), it is quite obvious that Puduhepa was very active in arranging these royal marriages. Puduhepa even assumed the responsibility of finding Kurunta (see Figure 4.2) a wife. Bryce (2005b:475) tells us ‘that regardless of any choice made by Puduhepa’, Tudhaliya IV gave his cousin the option of choosing his own wife. This decision apparently caused tension between Tudhaliya IV and his mother, Puduhepa, early in his reign. As successor to the throne and to secure Hattušili’s family line, Tudhaliya IV needed a Babylonian princess as wife (Bryce 2005b:297).

4.4.2 Great Queen mother-in-law

As mother-in-law, Puduhepa did not always succeed and some unpleasantness occurred at the royal court (Bryce 2005b:299). Before Puduhepa and Hattušili's first daughter married Rameses II, she referred to two Hittite marriages to foreigners that she had arranged in a letter to him. These diplomatic marriages seem to have been mainly about the royal mother-in-law, Puduhepa, acquiring ‘exotic’ daughters-in-law. One of them, the ‘daughter of Babylon’, was probably the wife of Tudhaliya IV; however, there are no previous, clear references to him having a wife (Bryce 2005b:298). Another daughter-in-law, the ‘daughter of Amurru’, was married to Nerikkali, the older brother of Tudhaliya IV (Bryce 2005b:297). ‘Brother’ Rameses II was not happy about the Babylonian marriage link between the Hittite royals and Babylon. Rameses II did not regard the King of Babylon as a ‘Great King’ anymore and Puduhepa responded in a curt manner: ‘If you say ‘the King of Babylon is not a Great King’ then you do not know the status of Babylon’ (Bryce 2005b:297).
Despite Rameses’ negative reaction to the Babylon-Hittite connection, the Hittite royal court recognised Kudur-Enlil (ca 1254-1246 BCE) as Great King of Babylon. These ties strengthened the Hittite-Babylonian alliance against threats of war from Assyria (Bryce 2005b:299). This connection could also have helped to boost Tudhaliya IV’s status above that of his older brother Nerikkali. Bryce (2005b:298) is of the opinion that Puduhepa influenced the situation and that she was responsible for arranging the marriage. Bryce adds that Puduhepa might have regretted her actions as an oracle text from the reign of Tudhaliya IV reveals that the reason for a Hittite king being ill (not Hattušili III) was because of a split amongst the royal women at the palace. They broke up into two groups, one group supported Queen Puduhepa and the other supported her opposition.

There seems to be agreement amongst scholars (Singer, cited in Bryce 2005b:473) that the queen in question was Puduhepa because she continued to exercise her official authority in foreign and domestic affairs after Hattušili’s death. This formidable woman’s presence at court, administering her power within the palace, led to intrigues being plotted against her (Bryce 2005b:298). The leader of the group rallying against Puduhepa in this instance was her daughter-in-law, the princess (we do not know her name, she was merely titled the DUMU.SAL GAL: great princess) married to Tudhaliya IV. Apparently Puduhepa tried to bring the King’s mother-in-law into disrepute and Tudhaliya IV was caught in the middle of these opposing groups. On one side was his powerful, energetic, aged mother and on the other his wife and her supporters.

Bryce (2005b:299) tells us that it seems the outcome of the dispute was that Puduhepa was expelled from the royal court. It appears that it did not last long and only strengthened this remarkable elderly queen’s position. He sheds more light on Puduhepa’s old age, declaring that she remained quite powerful and influential in foreign as well as domestic affairs during most of her son Tudhaliya IV’s reign; she might even have outlived him (Bryce 2005b:299).

4.4.2.1 Unpleasant consequences of the international marriage market

There were occasions when marriage alliances between royal families had unpleasant consequences and turned out to be hazardous, even before the marriages took place
The journey itself to the new home of the bride or groom was dangerous. According to Bryce (2003b:111), to be the child, especially the daughter of a Great King was not an enviable privilege. The young girls were often treated as items of barter and regarded as nothing more than high-class moveable property (Bryce 2003b:111). Many princesses were used as instruments of diplomacy, dispatched to a foreign court that suited the needs of their father's kingdom (Bryce 2003b:112). Some girls landed up in polygamous households where they spent the rest of their lives knowing little of the culture, language and customs of their new country. Often the royal brides would slip into obscurity after the wedding celebrations were over. Promised visits by their own people were hardly ever fulfilled and often the new husbands prevented access to the women (Bryce 2003b:112). Royal brides were in a way like treaties: they did not link two kingdoms, but rather linked the two rulers of the kingdoms. If one partner died, the surviving one had to draw up a new treaty with his successor to reaffirm the alliance. As Bryce (2003b:113) explains: ‘a royal bride was the personal link between the king who gave her and the king who received her.’
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**Figure 4.18**

*Victorian portrayal of the Babylonian marriage market*

The Victorian painter Edwin Long (1875) portrays in his painting (see Figure 4.18) a provocative scene of young Near Eastern women being auctioned into marriage. This
painting was inspired by a passage in the Histories of Herodotus. It also shows some detail in the background copied from Ancient Assyrian art.

**4.4.3 Iconographic representations of Hittite royal couples**

It seems that in the late third and second millennium BCE, portrayals of a king and his queen in one visual presentation were more common than before (Ornan 2010:465). At Tell Mozan in northern Syria, seals from as early as the end of the Akkadian period (ca 2198 BCE) were discovered in the royal storehouse of Hurrian Urkesh. It depicts Queen Uqanitum DAM Tupkiš with the King (Ornan 2010:465) (see Figure 4.19). According to Ornan (2010:466), the court image of the Queen and King in this sealing was used for royal propaganda. The seated royal couple is facing each other, which put them on an equal footing. The Queen is depicted with her children in her role as the one who secures the future dynasty and in other portrayals she carries a cup symbolizing political power (Ornan 2010:466).

![Figure 4.19](image)

*A reconstructed seal impression of the royal couple from Tell Mozan*¹³⁶

---

Ornan is of the opinion that the royal couple on the Tell Mozan sealing is reminiscent of the later monumental representation of Hattušili III and Puduhepa on the unfinished rock relief at Fraktin (see Figure 6.5). He posits that the royal couple is also depicted in ‘an equally balanced composition, though they are not identical.’ He also points out that on the royal offering scene relief from Alaça Höyük (see Figure 4.20), the queen is depicted in an ‘unequally balanced composition’ standing behind the worshipping king. A similar, unequally balanced representation (see Figure 4.21) of Tudhaliya IV and a queen is portrayed on a wall relief at Alalakh.

4.4.3.1 Seal impressions of Hattušili III and Puduhepa

Iconographically there are few representations of Hattušili III, with the exception of some seals and a depiction of him on the Fraktin relief (see Figure 6.7). There are also images of Hattušili in Egypt: one on the colossal statue of Rameses II at Tanis in the northern Nile delta region and the other one is on a mural of the marriage scene of his daughter to Rameses II in the temple at Abu Simbel (see Figure 4.11) (Van den Hout 1995:1107; cf. Collins 2007:63). There is also a portrayal of Hattušili III with Puduhepa on a seal impression discovered at Hattuša (see Figure 4.22 [a] & 4.22 [b]).

---

137 From Alaça Höyük (See Figure 7.21).
Archaeologists have discovered four bullae with clay seal impressions of Puduhepa: one at Tarsus, another at Ugarit (Rash Shamra) and two at Hattuša (Darga 1994:31). Two of them are illustrated here (Figures 4.22 [a] and [b] & 4.23). On the impression of her seal (see Figure 4.23), the writing above the inner circle contains Puduhepa’s name and title in hieroglyphic Luwian. On both sides of Puduhepa’s name, under the winged sun disc, signs for ‘my sun’ (my majesty) symbolizing royalty, Darga explains (1994:31), is her royal title ‘Great Queen’ in Luwian hieroglyphs. The outer ring of the seal reads, according to Güterbock (1997a:143), ‘seal of Puduhepa, Great Queen, queen of the land of Hatti, daughter of the land of Kizzuwatna, beloved of Hepat.’ It is known from Egyptian sources, according to Darga (1994:31), that the Hattušili-Rameses II peace treaty between Hatti and Egypt (ca 1258/59 BCE) was recorded on silver and also contained the personal seal of Puduhepa on one side of the plaque. Apparently the two royal impressions that sealed the silver tablets of the peace treaty visually depicted both Hattušili III and Puduhepa (Ornan 2010:466). Hattušili III as King was shown in the familiar embrace of the stormgod of Hatti.
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Puduhepa is similarly depicted in the embrace of the goddess *Hepat* (sungoddess of Arinna), which was an unusual portrayal for a queen (Ornan 2010:466). All the clay seals, especially the independent ones with the Queen’s name on them, are proof of Puduhepa’s equal status to her husband and her independence as the Queen (Darga 1994:31).

4.5 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, one can say that although Hattušili III came to power by seizing the throne from his nephew Urhi-Teshub, an act he tried to justify in his ‘Autobiography’, the Hittite Empire enjoyed a time of relative peace and stability when diplomacy took priority over military campaigns (Burney 2004:111). The international diplomatic highlight of Hattušili III’s reign was the Hattušili-Rameses treaty after many years of distrust and hostility between the Hittites and the Egyptians. It was a treaty that lasted for many years, sealed by the marriage of Hattušili III and Puduhepa’s daughter to Rameses II (see 4.3.5.3).

Queen Puduhepa was as good as equal to her husband Hattušili III. She continued her high-ranking status after his death (Burney 2004:231). Puduhepa’s role in affairs of state is most remarkably demonstrated in her correspondence with the royal house of Egypt from the time of the Hattušili-Rameses treaty. Fifteen letters survive, including four written
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to Puduhepa by Rameses II, from which quotations are given in this chapter. Puduhepa’s authorship of her letters is shown in the traditional way, through the use of her own seal (see Figure 4.23). She was, more than any other queen, a royal matchmaker in the Late Bronze Age. One can perhaps be so bold as to speculate that Puduhepa could have diplomatically manipulated, rather than negotiated, some of the members of the royal houses of the ancient Near East into political marriage alliances. Puduhepa did not have an unblemished record as a mother-in-law herself (see 4.4.2). She also corresponded with Hittite vassals like the ruler of Amurru, showing her concern for the well-being of the people of Amurru (see 4.2.4.2). Burney (2004:231) says: ‘Though accidents of preservation have been favourable to the reputation of Puduhepa, one suspects that no other Hittite queen equaled her’, while Collins (2007:62) writes: ‘The respect and power accorded to her as queen both in Hatti and the international community is unparalleled in the Late Bronze Age Near East.’
CHAPTER FIVE
DREAMS, PRAYERS, MYTHS AND MAGIC

Dreams for the Hittites were one of the most important methods of communication by which the future as planned by the gods could be revealed. The Hittites believed that omens were revealed in dreams and humans had to have special knowledge to be able to interpret their meaning (Beckman 1989:106; cf. Collins 2007:166). Dreaming, the Hittites believed, carried people into a secret realm filled with mystery, like entering a small room which looks through a window into the next world inhabited by the divine dead (Mouton 2007:317). The reality was that deities rarely spoke directly to humans. According to Beckman (2010:27), special techniques had to be applied for communication from the gods to humans. Gods could communicate with people spontaneously in dreams or while the person was sleeping under supervision of a priest (Beal 2004:381). In general, communication was possible through oracles and omens. The ‘dreamers’ were only a chosen few people from Hittite society: The King and Queen or other members of the royal family, and officials of the royal court.

5.1 THE HITTITE DREAMWORLD

According to Beckman (2010:30), ‘dreams and their interpretations were most serious matters to the Hittites.’ According to present documentation, dream literature was introduced to the Hittites by the Hurrians (Ünal 2013a:478). The first surge took place during the reign of Tudhaliya I/II and the second during the reign of Puduhepa. The third took the form of translated literature also influenced by the Hurrians (Ünal 2013a:479). Every message conveyed by the gods through dreams was taken seriously by Puduhepa and Hattušili III (Ünal 2013a:482). They received dream messages in three ways: in words, images or a combination of both (Ünal 2013a:481).

Among dreamers, dreaming manifested itself in different ways. More than a hundred dream-related texts have been found so far at Hattuša (Beckman 2010:26; cf. Ünal 2013a:484). This does not include dreams recorded in literary texts like the Epic of
Gilgamesh and the Hittite ‘Tale of Appu’ (Beckman 2010:26), which are impossible to place in chronological order because they have not yet been sufficiently researched (Ünal 2013b:476). This confirms the general character of Hittite documentation: their cuneiform texts were mainly created by the royal bureaucrats for the royal bureaucracy. In Hittite texts of the Empire period, omens via dreams were the most common form of communication between humans and deities (Collins 2007:169). Sadly, these texts reveal nothing about the lives or dreams of ordinary Hittites (Beckman 2010:26). Beckman is of the opinion that the interpretation and significance of dreams and visions of the common people of Hatti differed in no way from the dreams and visions of the royal family. Ünal (2013b:484) gives his own examples of dreams of ‘ordinary’ people: one was of a corporal in the Hittite army and another was of a regiment’s commander’s dream.

5.1.1 Puduhepa dreaming

Hittite dream literature is closely connected to Puduhepa. Dreams were recorded in a variety of different texts, including those relating to divination and votive offerings, rituals, prayers, mythology, letters, and historical texts (Mouton 2007:315). We are told that Puduhepa’s dreams separate her from all other women of antiquity (Ünal 2013a:486). Under her influence it appears that all prohibitions relating to dreams were swept away at Hattuša. According to Ünal (2013a:486), the dreams were written as they were ‘seen’, without any alteration by scribes or seers, or adjustments to fit literary moulds or, with some exceptions (which we will discuss), exploitation for political or prophetic purposes.

5.1.1.1 Types of dreaming

(a) Natural dreaming

When an expected dream did not take place naturally and an urgent problem needed solving, the person concerned made a wish before lying down to sleep (for intentional sleep) in the temple courtyard or another quiet and sacred place and waited until the hoped-for message arrived (Ünal 2013b:479).
(b) Intentional (*incubatio*) dreaming

Ünal (2013a:480) tells us that the term for intentional dreaming as well as the occupation of a person who facilitated intentional dreaming is widely debated amongst scholars. He explains that from Luwian the word (LÚ.maššanāmī) can be translated as 'man of god, someone who enters a state of ecstasy.' The term has also been translated as ‘mouthpiece (messenger) of the god’. The Hittites believed that this was the way the gods communicated directly with people. Specifically, when people who had died appeared in dreams, magic rituals were performed as a preventative measure because the belief was that the dreamer had gone to the threshold of the world of the dead (Ünal 2013b:480). In states of ecstasy, the Hittites believed, the dreamer proceeded close to a deity, establishing direct contact and receiving messages or commands to convey to the people (Ünal 2013b:480). Anyone ignoring these messages was punished.

5.1.1.2 Puduhepa and Hattušili III’s collective dreams

A considerable amount of Puduhepa and Hattušili III’s dreams were visionary dreams that relayed messages and were used for divination in magic rituals (Ünal 2013b:484). Ünal continues that the impression is given when reading Puduhepa and Hattušili III’s dreams that they were not spontaneous, natural dreams but the result of the so-called *incubatio* (intentional) sleeping. It is important to keep in mind that dreaming was a personal experience and there was no way of making sure whether interconnected dreams were genuine or falsified. The identity of the deity communicating a message in a dream was in most cases unknown and could only be ascertained by divination (Ünal 2013b:481). An example of this is contained in a text referring to whether the deity who appeared to Puduhepa in a dream was the stormgod of Nerik or the goddess Šauška/Ištar of Lawazantiya.

Puduhepa and Hattušili III had many of their dreams recorded by their scribes. The recorded texts of their dreams were the basis for a new kind of literary genre which created propaganda for the royals in Hattuša. Until their reign, dreams did not play a central role in daily life. Until then, dreams were not recorded in detail. According to Ünal (2013b:484), there were no dreams recorded or recounted at that stage in the ancient
world. There was nothing to compare to the dreams Puduhepa and Hattušili III claimed to have dreamt (or ‘seen’).

Ünal (2013b:484) is of the opinion that it is not possible to interpret ancient dreams in the modern sense using Freud’s methods. Oppenheim (1956:185) writes that even if it were possible, interpretation of classical dreams would not reflect the psychological state of the dreamer at the time. However, Ünal points out that Puduhepa’s dreams do not resemble any known classical dreams from a later period in antiquity. He (Oppenheim 1956:185) believes that because her dreams have not been manipulated, some of them can be analysed according to Freudian principles. Puduhepa’s dreams have not been turned into a literary genre for a wide readership or revised in any way (Ünal 2013b:486). Various kinds of dreams and their implementation were exclusive to Puduhepa. There are parts of texts available revealing that she had silver or gold tablets made recounting her dreams, which she offered to the goddess Hepat of Kummani (Ünal 2013b:486).

5.1.1.3 Facts or fiction?
The very important (for them) ‘collective’ dreams of the royal couple, Ünal (2013b:484) believes, were probably concocted, or literally dreamt up. Oppenheim (1956:197) is in agreement that many of their dreams may have been forged and fictitious. Ünal (2013a:482) quotes from the prologue to such a dream: ‘O god of the sun, we have carried out fully the message you sent to us in a dream.’ Oppenheim (1956:197) labeled these dreams as ‘message dreams’. His analysis of these collective dreams confirms Ünal’s (2013b:484) suspicion that Hattušili III and Puduhepa often invented dreams to serve their personal and political interests and ambition.

A typical example of a ‘collective’ dream of Puduhepa is described in Hattušili III’s ‘Autobiography’. According to Oppenheim (1956:197), this dream is particularly interesting because it is the first known recorded dream of a woman in the ancient Near East. The goddess Ištar/Šauška appears on many occasions in the collective dreams of Puduhepa and Hattušili III. The goddess kept on assuring Hattušili III that she would give
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him the entire land of Hatti. This Ištar/Šauška also appeared in the dreams of his enemies and told them that their power was spent and that all the people of Hatti would turn towards Hattušili III. Both these dreams were fabricated or might have been the result of wishful thinking. It demonstrated the close relationship of dreams to Queen Puduhepa’s social and political role at the time. It was the type of dream that was not recorded amongst Mesopotamian or Egyptian women (Ünal 2013b:486).

Some of Puduhepa’s and Hattušili’s dreams were cryptic, which was in a sense a debilitating feature because the messages were incomprehensible, ambiguous and vague. In such circumstances, the message had to be investigated by divination in order to work out exactly what the god meant. A divination text referring to Puduhepa, Ünal tells us, describes how a woman by the name of Mala had a golden wreath made for Puduhepa’s hekur/hegur (memorial) house (see 6.3.4.4) and the god of the city Arušna demanded to be given the golden wreath. Mala refused to give it to him and had a silver substitute made instead (Ünal 2013b:486).

5.1.1.4 A symbolic dream of Puduhepa

Some dreams reported in texts were clear, like those of Hattušili, but most of the time insufficient detail was provided to the dreamer and the nocturnal vision was revealed through symbols requiring decoding (Beckman 2010:29).

Beckman (2010:30) quotes from his translation of a symbolic dream reported by Puduhepa and explains that he has ‘no idea’ what its meaning was other than ‘a desire’ for prestigious modes of travel rather than an expression of ‘repressed sexual urges.’ Here Puduhepa is speaking:

> Perhaps the horses would trample me. I, the Queen, seated myself on the ground and began to cry. The charioteers laughed at me, and then they led those horses away from me, so that none of them trampled on me or urinated on me. As I then got ready to go, I said as follows: “Won’t the personnel of the ass stables flee? The grooms will certainly run away!” Then… said to me: “Because the gods recognise your voice, you ought not to curse so wholeheartedly!”…I, the Queen, answered: “I only talk about that which I know and him whom …May the gods not turn them [the horses] over to him!”
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Beckman (2010:30) concludes that the scribe who recorded Puduhepa’s dream was uncertain of what was important and what not. He included anything she remembered of the dream, which demonstrates the complex process of Hittite dream analysis.

Ünal (2013b:485) is of the opinion that Puduhepa had very complex personal and social relationships with the people of Anatolia and that could have been a reason for her having her mostly confusing dreams written down. Ünal maintains that it is impossible to interpret these hidden, bewildering dreams of hers. What is important is that despite the complicated psychological world of her dreams, she perceived them as another manifestation of divine will and that is why she and her husband took it so seriously. Ünal (2013b:485) continues by saying: ‘anyone who reads these fascinating and original texts can only be grateful that they were recorded meticulously at all. Looking at the interpretation (if at all possible!) of these complex dreams, considerable light is thrown on the human and psychological concerns and social structures of Puduhepa’s time.’

5.1.1.5 Dreams in Hattušili’s ‘Autobiography’

Beckman (2010:28) informs us that Hattušili III’s ‘Autobiography’ contains recurring uninvited, sinister dreams. The text of the ‘Autobiography’ is dedicated to his patron goddess Šauška/Ištar who supported him with the dreams she sent him. The most important display of the goddess Šauška/Ištar’s support for Hattušili via his dreams is included in some of the quotations from Otten’s translations, cited by Beckman (2010:28,29):

Šauška, my lady, sent Muwatalli, my brother, to Mursili, my father, through a dream saying Hattušili’s years are short; he does not have long to live. Hand him over to me so that he will be my priest and will live.

As mentioned before, the goddess’s wishes were honoured and Hattušili worked in her service. She remained his patron goddess, protecting him during his life. As an adult, Hattušili was falsely accused of something unknown to us. He mentions her instructions to him:
Šauška, my lady, appeared to me in a dream, and through the dream she said to me: “I will entrust you to a favourable deity. Do not be afraid!” And through the deity I [Hattušili] was acquitted.

When Hattušili married Puduhepa in accordance to a dream he claimed he received from the goddess Ištar:

Then the goddess, my lady, appeared to me in a dream saying: “Become my servant along with your household,” so I did become the servant of the goddess, along with my household.

When Hattušili started the process to overthrow his nephew Urhi-Teshub, Šauška appeared to Puduhepa in a dream about Hattušili:

At that moment, Šauška, my lady, appeared to my wife in a dream saying: “I will march before your husband and all of Hattuša will go over to your husband’s party…I will take him up and install him in priesthood for the sungoddess of Arinna (that is, I will make him Great King).”

Beckman (2010:29) concludes: ‘Justification of the ruler and his actions as divinely ordained is indeed the primary function of dreams in Hittite historical texts.’ The messages from these dream visions were varied: it could be the gods expressing their anger, demanding the building of a new temple, or expressing the desire to receive valuable gifts, while demanding specific rites in the process. This type of dream by an important person, pledging gifts to a deity, was only found in Hittite sources (Beckman 2010:29).

5.2 HITTITE PRAYERS

The Hittite prayers developed in the Old Anatolian cult from invocations to the gods in the form of brief benedictions for the royal couple. The majority of cuneiform tablets of Hittite prayers found at Hattuša were official prayers or longer invocations called mugawar, dating back to the Hittite Empire period, delivered by a high priest on behalf of the King, the Queen or other royals (Lebrun 2004:359). Singer (2002:6) confirms that most Hittite prayers are voiced in the name of the King, by himself or by a scribe or a priest on his behalf. Therefore, exceptions like the independent prayers of Queen Puduhepa for the healing of her husband can easily be explained, according to Singer (2002:6). De Roos (1995:1997) informs us that the only Hittite prayers that have come down to us are found
in official texts approved by the state. We do not have any records of the prayers of private persons who did not take part in state activities but no doubt must have had the need to address the gods in the same way the elite did (De Roos 1995:1997).

Many of the prayers of official texts applied to Hattušili III and Puduhepa. It seems that the collection of prayers known to us is restricted to the ruling royals only rather than to other members of the royal court. The gods called upon in these prayers were the stormgod of Hatti combined with the Hurrian god *Teshub* and the sungoddess of Arinna combined with the Hurrian goddess *Hepat* and her circle of deities together with the stormgod of Nerik (Lebrun 2004:359). None of the prayers came across as spontaneous or in adoration of the deities (Lebrun 2004:359). The down-to-earth Hittites prayed to their gods as if they were glorified kings who had to assist them in trouble. An example of this is Mursili II's many prayers, which were motivated by a plague (see 2.3.2.2 [a]) which after twenty years threatened to destroy Hatti completely (Singer 2002:61).

5.2.1 Structures of Puduhepa's prayers

5.2.1.1 Arkuwar prayers

Hittite prayers called *arkuwar* (argument or plea), often used by Puduhepa, were like a defense before a judge and compiled like legal documents (Lebrun 2004:359). The person who prayed presented his or her case personally or with the help of a scribe before a divine judge; defending, justifying or confessing to some wrongdoing, and trusting that the god would be forgiving. The result, good or bad, depended on the quality of the arguments (Bryce 2002:140; cf. Lebrun 2004:359). In times of crisis such as the plague (which Mursili II was confronted with during his rule) or when King Hattušili III was dangerously ill, the ruler would appear in person before the gods to present Hatti's *arkuwar* (plea) (Beckman 2013:290).

In Hattušili III’s circumstances, Puduhepa pleaded with the deities on his behalf. It was important that any obstacles in the way of the functioning of the cosmos were rectified and the king was expected to report directly to the deities through these prayers (Beckman 2013:290). According to Beckman (2013:290), communication from the gods to the king and other humans was often more complex. The gods communicated with
humans mainly through omens and oracles (Beckman 2013:290). People or an individual might be contacted directly by the deity appearing in a dream, or a third party may speak a prophecy or a foreboding structured in the shape and form of unusual human or animal behaviour (Beckman 2013:290).

Bryce (2002:140) emphasises that righteousness and justice rather than grace and mercy regulated judgment by the Hittite gods. To ensure the effectiveness of the arkuwar, the Hittites placed it within the structure of prayers and rituals called mugawar (setting in motion), which were believed to put an angry, sulking god in a better mood (Lebrun 2004:359). An example:

O sun god, my lord, just lord of judgment, king of the universe. You rule constantly over the lands. You alone bestow victory. You alone in your justice always have mercy. You alone are just; you alone always have mercy, you alone respond to prayers of supplication. You alone are the merciful sun god.143

5.2.1.2 Walliyatar hymns

Hymns identified as walliyatar (to strengthen) often preceded prayers to win a deity’s favour. Lebrun (2004:359) also cites Güterbock’s (1978:125) observation that most of these prayers were translations or adaptations of similar Babylonian prayers. These prayers were closed with a malduwar (promise), a short votive prayer in which the god was promised rich offerings if the plea was answered positively (Lebrun 2004:359).

5.2.1.3 Wekuwar prayers

Another type of short prayer that was sometimes attached to the arkuwar prayer was the wekuwar (to ask for insistently) in which the deity was insistently asked to protect the king, the royal family and the land of the Hittites (Lebrun 2004:359). Puduhepa’s prayers to the sungoddess of Arinna and the goddess of the underworld, Lelwani, on behalf of Hattušili’s health are examples of wekuwar prayers attached to the arkuwar prayers (Lebrun 2004:359).
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5.2.1.4   Puduhepa’s prayer to the sungoddess of Arinna and her circle of deities
Hattušili III was often ill and at death’s door (Silver 2010:2). Queen Puduhepa was
genuinely concerned and cared for him with great affection and reverence (Darga
1994:32). Her genuine piety was demonstrated by her vows and pleas dedicated to her
Puduhepa’s votive prayers, her love and loyalty to the King are clearly expressed.

(a) Puduhepa’s regular pleas to the gods
In her direct pleas to the sungoddess Arinna and her circle of deities, Puduhepa reminds
her that Hattušili was dedicated like no king before him to the goddess’s beloved son
Zippalanda, the stormgod of Nerik. The introduction to this prayer reflects Puduhepa’s
confidence of character. It is important to note her vocalising the official syncretism
between the Anatolian sungoddess Arinna and the principle goddess of the Hurrian

O sungoddess of Arinna, my lady, Queen of all the lands!
In Hatti you gave yourself the name sungoddess of Arinna,
but the land which you made, that of cedar,
there you gave yourself the name Hepat.

I, Puduhepa, am your long-time servant,
a calf of your stable, a corner stone of your foundation.

You picked me up, my lady, and Hattušili,
your servant, to whom you married me
and too was attached by destiny
to the stormgod of Nerik, your beloved son.¹⁴⁴

The whole text of the prayer is a defense and plea for her husband. This prayer is a typical
example of an arkuwar prayer. It is also important to note the account of historical events
given in the prayer as well as her description of the political situation in which Hattušili III

As prince, Hattušili rebuilt the cult city of Nerik for the sungoddess of Arinna’s son
Zippalanda (Silver 2010:2). Singer (2002:101) tells us that Puduhepa reminded the

goddess in the following prayer that no other king before Hattušili managed to recapture and rebuild the city:

Those who were former kings, to whom you had given weapons, kept defeating the surrounding enemy lands, but no one succeeded in taking the city of Nerik…

But he who is your servant, Hattušili… Was not even a king, but only a prince.

Yet, it was up to him to take the city of Nerik. Hattušili, your servant, took pains for the god’s will and engaged his body and soul until he rebuilt Nerik, the beloved city of the god, my lord.145

Puduhepa continued to plead with other deities in Arinna’s circle, such as Zintuhi, granddaughter of the sungoddess and stormgod:

O Zintuhi, my lady, beloved granddaughter… you are an ornament on the breast of the stormgod and of the sungoddess Arinna, and they watch you

Time after time… Zintuhi, my lady, in this matter express your providence…to your grandfather, and to your grandmother, transmit life and long years for Hattušili, your servant! May it come forth from their mouth.146

Their daughter Mezzulla and their son Zippalanda, the stormgod of Nerik, were also addressed by Puduhepa:

O Mezzula…say to the stormgod, your father and to the sun goddess your mother, they listen to it indeed. They will not refuse it. These words, which I, Puduhepa, your maid, have made into a prayer… intercede on my behalf… I will give you towns including deportees.

O stormgod of Zippalanda…beloved son…announce to…your father and to…your mother…who will not refuse your word. They will hear you… These, which I, Puduhepa, your maid, made into a prayer announce it for me…and pass it on for me.147

An example of the phrasing of a promise to a deity is given by De Roos (2007:1): ‘if you do, then to you, O god, I will give…’ Puduhepa promised each of the deities in this prayer a life-size statue of Hattušili III plated in silver with golden hands and feet, a precious jewel, an estate with servants, and a golden shield (Singer 2002:102). It was a masterful public relations exercise of Queen Puduhepa to ensure her favourite deity’s importance by praying frequently and publicly to her for the restoration of her husband’s health (Gold 2015:16).

Puduhepa’s words to Zintuhi, as to the other deities, were: ‘If you will hear these words Zintuhi, my lady, and you will pass them on to the stormgod, your grandfather, and to the sungoddess, your grandmother, I will make for Zintuhi, my lady, a great ornament’ (Singer 2002:104). If Queen Puduhepa was uncertain that the gifts she promised the deities might have been inadequate, she could avoid their possible dissatisfaction by making an oracular inquiry to determine what best to give them (De Roos 2007:1).

Queen Puduhepa, like the rest of the ruling class of Hattuša, was rational and materialistic in her thinking (De Roos 2007:1). She was not always sure that the god she asked would grant her request and accept her precious gifts like a silver statue, jewels, servants and gold. Such gifts, however, were not easily given, as we read from a passage from another oracle text: ‘The offering which the king must make for the god was determined: … one fat ox and six sheep. He has already made the promise, but only when the king is healed, shall he give them’ (De Roos 2007:1).

Singer (2002:32) states that Puduhepa tried to strengthen the effect of her promise to the deities by referring to a folk saying: ‘to a woman of the birth stool the deity grants her wish.’ De Roos (2007:4) adds that the people on whose behalf the king as chief priest mediated were sometimes similarly uncertain regarding the acts of the gods. The gods also took risks, De Roos (2007:4) tells us, asking the question: ‘Will they actually give what is promised once the wish has been fulfilled?’

Apart from the gods who saw to it that the ‘rewards’ owed them were given, the priests of the particular god’s temple also made sure the vow was fulfilled to ward off the god’s
punishment (De Roos 2007:4). Votive texts found at Hattuša are not only of a religious nature, but they also give us information about the socio-economic organisation connected to the state cult. They show the economic functioning of a temple in the time of Hattušili III and Puduhepa’s reign (Darga 1994:32).

5.2.1.5 Goddess Lelwani, lady of the underworld

Lelwani was originally a Hattian goddess of the underworld worshipped by the Hittites from the Old Kingdom (ca 1600-1400 BCE) onwards. Lelwani was associated with the chthonic role of the sungoddess of Arinna/Hepat (Burney 2004:178).

Lelwani represented the course of the sun during the night and her sanctuary was at Hattuša (Collins 2007:177). Collins (2007:177) also tells us that Lelwani’s chthonic nature may have been the result of her merging with the Hurrian goddess Allani, who guarded the gate that separated the upper-earth from the underworld. According to Darga (1994:32), a well-known votive prayer excavated from the palace library at Hattuša, containing the pleas and vows of Queen Puduhepa to the Hittite goddess of the underworld, Lelwani, was titled: Lelwani, infernal goddess of the underworld. The Hittites feared the powers from the underworld would pay them too much attention and made many offerings to prevent them from harming humanity (Collins 2007:176).

Lelwani was the goddess people appealed to in rituals performed for the dead (Collins 2007:177). People believed that she lived under the earth with at least twelve ancient deities (Collins 2007:177) whose role it was to ascertain the cause of something evil and subsequently remove it to the underworld. Lelwani was also responsible for carrying the spirits of the dead to the underworld, while her worship included the placing of offerings and sacrifices in the ground (Collins 2007:177).

148 In early Hittite tradition, she was referred to as ‘king of the underworld’, which was later changed for whatever reason to ‘lady’ of the underworld (Collins 2007:176).
5.2.1.6 Puduhepa’s regular votive prayers to Lelwani

*Lelwani* attained her ‘highest’ status during the reign of Hattušili III when Puduhepa prayed to her regularly for the cure of the King. Her requests to *Lelwani* were often specific, like asking for a cure for inflammation of the King’s feet:

Somebody said again and again to me in a dream:
make a vow to the goddess Ningal as
follows: if that disease fire-of-the-feet of His Majesty will pass quickly, I shall make for Ningal ten oil flasks of gold set with lapis lazuli.149

Puduhepa’s votive prayer to *Lelwani* continues:

*Lelwani*, my lady, whatever you say to the gods they grant you.
Support me in this matter...!

If Hattušili, your servant has been defamed before you,
O gods, by a human hand, or if any of the upper gods or the lower gods has been offended by him, or if anyone has offered to the gods in order to damage Hattušili,
you, goddess, my lady, do not listen to those evil words!

Don’t let the evil get to Hattušili, your servant! Do not turn us over to our adversaries...let the life of Hattušili,
your servant and of Puduhepa, your maid,
come forth from your mouth before the gods,
grant to Hattušili ...and to Puduhepa ...long years,
months and days!150

The royal family members in service of the cult of the goddess *Lelwani* are mentioned individually in the same way as those in the circle of the sungoddess of Arinna and the goddess *Hepat* (Darga 1994:32).

5.2.1.7 Puduhepa’s ‘donation’ to Lelwani’s temple

Amongst the thousands of prisoners of Hittite expansionistic wars in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BCE were many women and children (Liverani 2014:316). Liverani (2014:316) tells us that the royal house and élite were proud of these expansionist wars, but it had a negative effect on the Hittite economy and population. These campaigns

required larger armies and brought considerable loss of human life, and to make up for the human loss, tens of thousands of prisoners were taken to Hatti (Liverani 2014:316).

To fill the gaps in the population, deported people were settled in new territories. These prisoners were the property of the gods and subsequently of the royal chief priest and priestess, Hattušili III and Puduhepa. Queen Puduhepa ‘donated’ such a group of young girls, boys, babies and widows with children to serve in the temple of Lelwani (Liverani 2014:317). Darga (1994:32) is of the opinion that this gesture showed Puduhepa’s ‘social’ concern and involvement in the lives of the temple personnel and deported people. The women from this group served in Lelwani’s temple with their children and they were given an important place in votive texts, according to Darga (1994:32). The women’s duties were to help prepare food and the male temple personnel had to plant vegetables and fruit trees and work as bakers and dairymen. All these tasks and procedures connected with Lelwani’s temple were for the purpose of providing King Hattušili III with a healthy diet so that he could live a ‘healthy and long life’ (Darga 1994:32).

It is my understanding that in our day and age we would interpret Puduhepa’s actions as a disguise to employ women and children as slaves to serve in Lelwani’s temple, or perhaps she really wanted to give them an opportunity to survive. We do not know. My assumption was made from the following extract from a translation of a text in which Puduhepa herself described her ‘donation’ of people to the temple. Liverani (2014:317) quotes Del Monte’s text:151

The woman called Abbâ; one of her daughters called Niwa; one other daughter is dead; one son called Dudu. Total: four people. The woman receives a prisoner of war. This family was already assigned to the service of the temple of Lelwani.

The woman called Mamma; one of her daughters called Shaushkatti; two of her sons called Teshmara and Yarraziti. Total four people. Mamma receives a prisoner of war. She was already assigned to the service of the temple.

A young girl named Titai I have given as fiancé to Apallu; I have given to Apallu a young boy to raise, Tatili brother of Titai, but I have not released him yet.

A newborn baby called Pitati;…given to Piya, son of Pitawiya, to raise him…

151 Del Monte’s text quoted from Otten & Souček (1965:16-22).
The text ends: ‘In total: twenty three people that Haranaziti has brought from the expedition against the town of Zikeshara’ (Liverani 2014:317). It also demonstrates how Puduhepa arranged marriages for the young girls in the temple and allocated the upbringing of orphans to their relatives, as Darga (1994:32) describes in her essay.

5.3 HITTITE MYTHOLOGY IN PUDUHEPA’S TIME

The gradual Hurrianization of significant cultural characteristics of Hittite society reached a climax in the thirteenth century BCE when Hattušili III and Puduhepa ruled the Hittites (Lebrun 1995:1979). Many mythological texts were discovered between the huge amount of clay cuneiform tablets in the archives and libraries of Hattuša (De Martino 2013:414). Mythological texts from these archives reflect the synthesised nature of Hittite society and the familiarity of their scribes with Mesopotamian literature (De Martino 2013:414).

Early mythological texts serve as an example that Hittite theology and the Hittites themselves were indebted to other cultures to enable them to develop their own theology (McMahon 1995:1981). From as long ago as the Old Hittite Kingdom, myths depicting a simple pantheon seem to have been translated from Hattic into Hittite (McMahon 1995:1981). Hittite scribal schools followed Mesopotamian traditions by copying from Akkadian their epics and myth cycles, adding a distinguishable Hittite flavour to the stories. The scribes would, for example, change some settings from southern Mesopotamia to the north - a more familiar region to the Hittites (Macqueen 1999:149). The epic poem of Gilgamesh and the tale of Atrahasis are both translated examples of Mesopotamian origin.

5.3.1 Hurrian myths

The gradual Hurrianization of the Hittite culture in the thirteenth century BCE was dependent on the complete intermixing of Hurrian deities into the theological setting of the Hittites (Lebrun 1995:1979). A major contributor to this developing process was the adaptation of Hurrian myths. These were independent literary works and they portrayed a pantheon and homeland that were not the same as in Hattic mythology (McMahon 1995:1982). In Hurrian myths, disturbance in nature takes place because the gods have
possibly disregarded their role in the universe due to some conflict between dynasties. The picture of the speech and action of the gods in the mythological texts presents us with vibrant accounts of the gods’ personalities (McMahon 1995:1989).

In the mythological texts, the gods seem ignorant of humans. This fact essentially plays no role in their heavenly disputes. McMahon (1995:1989) sheds more light on the matter by stating that Hurrian theology is inclined towards the concept of one supreme god; a universal god who wins that place by takeover and then rules to a limited degree through oppression. This may originate from Mesopotamian mythological texts which recount cosmic battles for supremacy in the heavens on which Hurrian myths were based. From the Hittite Empire period onwards, some surviving Hurrian myths were translated into Hittite, introducing gods from the Hurrian and Mesopotamian pantheons. One cycle of myths which revolved around the dynastic struggle for the control of the heavens was the *Kumarbi cycle* (McMahon 1995:1982). Puduhepa and her priests were already responsible for the adoption of *Teshub, Hepat* and Šauška into the official Hittite pantheon as well as the position of the Mesopotamian god *Ea*, which was strengthened by the process of his assimilation into the Hurro-Hittite pantheon (Lebrun 1995:1979).

Lebrun (1995:1979) tells us that the transmission of Hurrian as well as Canaanite myths created an extremely good basis for theologians to improve the function of the Hurrian deities within the Hittite pantheon. Most important was to explain the kingship and importance of *Teshub* and his divine circle who assimilated with the Luwian god *Tarhunt*. According to Lebrun (1995:1979), the *Kumarbi cycle* of stories ‘was an excellent vehicle by which to do so.’ He mentions that the *Kumarbi cycle*’s ‘enchanting poetic idiom was a matchless resource for instilling pedagogic and moralistic values’ (Lebrun 1995:1979).

5.3.1.1 *The Kumarbi cycle*

*Kumarbi*, the ancient god of Urkesh (see Figure 5.1), the Hurrian grain god frequently referred to as the ‘King of the gods’, was the principal god in this most important remaining text of Hittite-Hurrian mythology (Burney 1994:165). According to Giorgieri (2015:3), most scholars believe that this is a story about gods, consisting of mythological narratives/songs organised as a cycle, whose central theme was the competition between
Kumarbi and his son Teshub for kingship over the gods. The story opens with a
description of the process of transition of kingship from father to son (titled: ‘The kingship
of heaven’). In other written accounts of the cycle, Kumarbi tries to get the kingship back
from Teshub by creating a sea-dragon, Hedammu, and a stone monster, Ullikummi, to
oppose him (‘The song of Ullikummi’) (Giorgieri 2015:4). Burney (2004:166) informs us
that the theme of the Kumarbi cycle is typically Hurrian: it is about a removed king of the
gods attempting to be reinstated. Kumarbi, as the Hurrian grain god with an ear of corn
in front of him, is represented amongst the stone relief pantheon at Yazilikaya (Burney
2004:166).

5.3.1.2 The Kumarbi cycle’s literary status
Güterbock (1997b:61) describes the Kumarbi cycle as a work of literature. His description
is a modern classification which had no equivalents in Hurrian or Hittite. Giorgieri (2015:3)
points out that not all narrative texts, like this one, are in the Hurrian language but that
their origin is in Hurrian culture. According to Güterbock (1997b:61), this Hittite epic was
written in a sophisticated literary style and whether it is a translation or a free adaptation
from Hurrian is in his opinion of secondary importance. Giorgieri (2015:3), on the other
hand, explains that the ancient definition Hittite scribes implemented to classify literary
compositions of Hurrian origin, like the Kumarbi cycle, used the Sumerian logogram (sign
or character representing a word or phrase) ŠIR for ‘song.’ According to him (Giorgieri
2015:3), it is not clear if they were in fact sung at Hittite cult festivals, although ‘let me
sing’ in Hurrian or ‘I will sing’ in Hittite was found in the first part of respective texts. What
is important is that Hittite scribes later made changes to Hurrian compositions and made
their own versions which were different from the Hurrian originals. What matters,
according to Güterbock (1997b:61), is that the cycle reflects ‘a very complex mythology
whose elements can be traced back through the Hurrians to the Babylonians.’ From upper
Mesopotamia and northern Syria (Mitanni) to southeast and central Anatolia, people’s
agriculture and economy depended on the forces of nature which made cultivation of the
land in all its forms possible for their survival (Hutter 1997:75).

Thus, the cosmological and so-called ‘calendar’ myth of the Hurrian grain-god Kumarbi
received special attention in Hittite religion (Hutter 1997:75). The Hurro-Mesopotamian
background to this myth should also be considered because it begins with the succession of godly rulers in heaven like Alalu, Anu, and Ea with his vizier Izzummi who are all originally Babylonian, then Kumarbi and Teshub who are Hurrian (Güterbock 1997b:61). Lebrun (1995:1979) adds that because of lack of evidence, it is difficult to estimate the effect or influence ‘foreign myths’ had on the Hittite people. There was a profound difference between official and popular religion in Hittite society. Myths of Hurrian origin were better known amongst the Hittite royalty and ruling classes than among the common people (Lebrun 1995:1979). The Hittite people lived and worshipped their gods far from and outside the places where theological and political theorising and speculation took place.
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*Kumarbi, Teshub’s father*\(^{152}\)

Lebrun (1995:1980) links the Kumarbi cycle with the Greeks (Hesiod’s *Theogony*) and mentions that linguistic, cultural and religious continuity between the Hittites and the Greeks of Anatolia is slowly becoming more evident in southern Anatolia (Cilicia, Pisidea, Pamphylia, Lycia), and he proposes that it is possible that the memory of myths associated with Kumarbi survived in homes and religious centres like Tarsus, Kummani of Kizzuwatna and Carchemish for centuries.

\(^{152}\) Cimok (2008:127). Kumarbi, the god of agriculture in the Hurrian pantheon at Yazilikaya.
5.3.1.3 Hittite cosmological concepts

There seem to have existed two different cosmological concepts among the Hittites when looking at Hurrian-influenced myths which were part of the *Kumarbi* cycle of myths. They show a partitioning of the world into three vertical sections: the first consisting of heaven, earth, and the underworld; an older, Hattian-Anatolian two-part world of heaven-earth/underworld; and a younger, Mesopotamian-influenced cosmology in three parts: heaven-earth-underworld (Görke 2013:46).

5.3.2 Anatolian myths

Anatolian myths mainly benefited the Hittite cult (Hoffner 1990:214). The Hittites inherited a poor range of myths from their predecessors, but it did not mean that they did not have other myths (Archi 1995:2374). Güterbock (1997b:61) informs us that the Anatolian myths themselves were much simpler than the complex myths they adapted from Hurro-Mesopotamian mythical traditions, like the *Kumarbi* cycle. The Anatolian deities also formed families, but they did not have a succession of rulers and their myths did not contain Babylonian elements which could be misleading as Babylonian word signs were used to write the names of the gods (Güterbock 1997b:61).

As in all the regions of western Asia except Babylonia, the stormgod as provider of rain was the highest-ranking god and central figure in Anatolian, Hurrians and Syrian myths (Güterbock 1997b:61). According to Güterbock (1997b:61), the stories told about the Anatolian stormgod were different. In the *Kumarbi* cycle the struggle of Teshub, the last king in the divine dynasty, with the stone monster is described as a ‘world-shaking battle involving all the gods’ (Güterbock 1997b:61). Güterbock states that the Anatolian stormgod is ‘simply a great god of the land whose well-being and well-meaning are badly needed.’

If the Anatolian stormgod went into hiding because somebody made him angry, his favour had to be regained by doing something that pleased him. Telling the story at the yearly agricultural spring festival (March) of how the stormgod ultimately overcame the stone monster was a way of securing much-needed rain for the Anatolian grain growth season (Güterbock 1997b:61). Güterbock (1997b:61) sums it up by saying that the Anatolian
myths are very close to what are called nature myths, already possibly removed from the original form of the myths (like the Kumarbi cycle). He (Güterbock) expresses his doubt that listeners to the myth at festivals knew that the stone monster meant drought because for them it was sufficient to hear that the stormgod defeated his enemy.

5.3.2.1 Myths of the disappearing god
This group of myths was also rooted in original ancient Hattic myths about vanishing gods who stayed away from their usual place in nature. These types of myths, with more than one god playing the part of the straying deity, usually accompanied rituals of attraction to entice the gods back to Hatti (McMahon 1995:1982).

There are a number of myths from northern and central Anatolia that refer to several vanishing gods like Telipinu and the stormgod of Nerik as well as lesser-known storm- and sungods associated with the region (De Martino 2013:418). In all the texts referring to them, a god withdraws in anger, leaves and hides himself and becomes alienated from the land he protected. Since the god does not perform his duties, everybody suffers and run the risk of dying. By performing the appropriate rituals, the disappeared god must be found and asked to return. There is a close connection between the rituals and myths in the texts urging the disappeared god to return because the Hittite people suffered famine and drought in his absence (De Martino 2013:419). The land of Hatti was often the victim of natural disasters that took place at random and was attributed to hostile, dark forces (Bryce 2002:214).

Some being is responsible for disaster, so it is assumed that it is a force with power over nature. The question is asked why this power withheld life-sustaining elements and the reasons are given in terms of human emotions (Bryce 2002:214). The foundation of myths is found in these emotions. Matters can be restored by driving from this god negative human emotions that led to malice and the matter can be solved like a family quarrel (Bryce 2002:214). The best preserved of these myths that were recited in cult ritual ceremonies are three versions that refer to the disappearance of Telipinu. None of the versions explain the cause of Telipinu’s anger, but a hypothesis exists that the ritual and
myth might be connected to a sin or the behaviour of the Hittite King that offended the gods and caused Telipinu’s anger (De Martino 2013:419).

De Martino (2013:419) tells us that the three versions of the myth share several common elements and themes. The main issue was that Telipinu’s departure was devastating: life, growth and affluence vanished and the gods had to find a solution. The sungod invited all of them to a banquet, but their worries only increased and they decided to search for Telipinu. The sungod sent a sharp-eyed, strong and powerful eagle to find the hidden Telipinu, but the eagle failed to find him. Finally, the sungod himself went to search for his son Telipinu, but he did not find him. Finally, the goddess Hannahanna charged a bee with the difficult task, an action the sungod complained about because an insignificant bee with small wings could not succeed in such a difficult assignment. The bee was, contrary to all expectation, successful in finding Telipinu. It stung him on his hands and feet, which woke him up. De Martino (2013:421) is of the opinion that the bee succeeded because it is seen as an ideal mediator between the world of people and gods and the natural world. Bees flew free, producing wax and honey in the wild country where Telipinu was hiding. These products were highly valued by the people living in the villages and towns because beekeeping was part of their daily lives and economy (as it still is in modern Turkey). Stein (2016) tells us that honey was commonly used in Hittite cult rituals and Hittite laws dating from the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BCE, during the rule of Hattušili III and Puduhepa, expressed severe punishment for thieves of bee swarms and beehives.

In the myth, the bee brought Telipinu back home and a ritual was performed that assured his protection of the land of Hatti. The three versions of this myth each end with their own descriptions of the effects of Telipinu’s return: the weather changes and becomes good, the gods are again worshipped, and society returns to normal. Telipinu takes care of the King and the Queen and the symbols of prosperity, an eyan-tree and a hunting bag (kurša) hanging from it (see Figure 3.11), is positioned in front of Telipinu (De Martino 2013:421) (see 3.2.5.1). There is also a political and historical interpretation of the myth: the period of desolation because of Telipinu’s disappearance might refer to the time before the foundation of the Hittite Kingdom. Telipinu’s return cast him in the role of the founding god of Hittite political power (De Martino 2013:422).
5.3.2.2 The Illuyanka myth (ca 1400-1200 BCE)

There are two versions of The Illuyanka myth on the same tablet and dates from the Empire period (ca 1400-1200 BCE). As far as its content and language are concerned, it seems that the myth dates from the Old Kingdom period (ca 1650-1400 BCE) (De Martino 2013:415). This myth celebrating the end of winter is important in that its narrative, in both versions, links it to the origin of the purulli festival. It was an important festival in the yearly itinerary of the royal couple (see 7.2.4.1).

According to De Martino (2013:415), it is not clear if the myth was read or ritually performed during the purulli festival. The narrator of both versions was Kella, a priest of the stormgod of Nerik. The protagonist in the first version is Illuyanka, a big snake or dragon that lives in a hole in the ground. In this narrative Illuyanka fights and beats the stormgod. The daughter of the stormgod helps her father when she asks a mortal named Hupašiya to assist her. He promises his help on condition of him having sexual intercourse with the goddess. The motif of a sexual relationship between a goddess and a mortal appears in several tales of the ancient Near East, like the epic of Gilgamesh.

The meaning of this in the Illuyanka myth can only be guessed if we presume that the mortal man, Hupašiya, acquired divine courage and strength through his relationship with the goddess (Hoffner 1990:133). He goes to the hole of Illuyanka and ties him up to

---

enable the stormgod to kill the reptile (see Figure 5.2). A house is built for Hupašiya, not allowing him to look out of the window. He eventually does, sees his family and asks the goddess to let him go home and he is punished for it (De Martino 2013:415). Looking through the window is a narrative motif often used in Hittite and other Near Eastern texts; in the myth of Illuyanka, the window represents the symbolic border between the divine world and the world of people (De Martino 2013:418).

This myth has been interpreted in several different ways, one interpretation being that it implies the opposition between chaos and order in the seasonal cycle, with Illuyanka as winter and the stormgod as spring celebrating the end of winter (De Martino 2013:418).

(a) No single Hittite mythology
Güterbock (1997b:62) emphasises that we need to distinguish between Anatolian myths and those taken from the Hurro-Mesopotamian and Syrian original sources. The scribes of Hattuša included these mostly conflicting documents in their own writing. It clearly illustrates the complexity of the Hittite civilization. Güterbock (1997b:62) adds that despite the importation of Hurrian myths, the Anatolian mythical tradition continued to exist beside it mainly because their mythical stories continued to be written in Hittite.

5.3.3 Mesopotamian myths
5.3.3.1 The Epic of Gilgamesh (early second millennium BCE)
The Gilgamesh epic appears in Hattuša not only in Akkadian but also in Hurrian and Hittite (Macqueen 1999:149). De Martino (2013:414) mentions that the Akkadian version was written in more than one edition, the Hurrian version is limited to a few fragments, and texts were regularly edited to suit the audience, whether they were Mesopotamian or Anatolian. An example of such an edited version is the episode of the struggle of Humbaba, the giant of the pine forest, which was set outside Mesopotamia in Hurrian territory. The Hurrian gods Teshub and Shimegi were included in the epic, suggesting to the readers that it had reached the Hittites through transition from the Hurrians (Macqueen 1999:149).
5.3.3.2 The myth of Atrahasis (before ca 1645 BCE)

The myth of Atrahasis, who saved humanity from the flood, is documented on Hittite and Akkadian tablets. The god Enki warns Atrahasis about the coming flood and gives him instructions for the boat he had to build, warning him that the flood will last for seven days:

The flood roared like a bull,
Like a wild ass screaming the winds howled
The darkness was total there was no sun.\textsuperscript{154}

Atrahasis (‘extra wise’) and, in the epic of Gilgamesh, Ut-napishtim (‘He found life’) are both antecedents of the biblical Noah (McCall 1990:50). According to De Martino (2013:414), the Hittite version of this story had new characters and elements added to it. Macqueen (1999:151) reminds us that the Hittites were known for not writing down their own epic myths.

5.3.4 Magic rites

Magic was fully acknowledged among the Hittites as a substantial part of official and private life (Hutter 1997:85). They regarded deities as the most important authorities on magic, which was conceived as a technique that could be taught and learned (Haas 1994:877). Hurrian and Mesopotamian magic practices influenced the Hittites (Burney 2004:182). According to Beckman (2005:351), the majority of ‘composers’ of magic texts and those who practised magic were not from Hatti but from other regions in Anatolia, notably Kizzuwatna and Arzawa. The practitioners were called ‘seers’ or ‘old women/wise women’. Male magicians were sometimes described as ‘priests’, but mostly as ‘diviners’ (Burney 2004:183).

It was mainly goddesses like Šauška who were actively part of magic, who fostered the belief that women were negatively or positively the chief experts in magic. Magic rituals were an important part of everyday religion. Subsequently, Puduhepa had lengthy purification or incantation rituals carried out on behalf of Hattušili (Hutter 1997:85). Was a god responsible for an illness suffered by the King? Queen Puduhepa often asked this question in connection with Hattušili’s lifelong ailments. However, it could possibly also

\textsuperscript{154} Text by McCall (1990:51).
have been the consequence of his usurpation of the throne. We simply do not know (Van den Hout 2014c). If a god was responsible, who was this angry god? And was this the only god? If this was not the case, more gods were asked about it until the question ‘Is this all?’ could be answered in the affirmative (Beal 2004:381).

Both ‘white’ magic, which aims to recreate integrity, and ‘black’ magic, which creates disorder, are connected to the cosmic order and the gods. There are many Hurrian and Hittite ritual texts containing incantations for rituals for ‘white’ magic (Haas 1994:876). Hittite texts describe magic as a process of antithesis, for example: sick opposite healthy, impure opposite pure, bound opposite unbound (Hutter 1997:85). If a person had been affected negatively, he or she could be treated with incantations. If a person was in need because of some wrongdoing, a ritual practitioner could be asked to intervene to pacify the gods, to remove misfortune and bring the person into harmony with the cosmic order (Haas 1994:888). We learn from Hutter (1997:85) that magic rituals had the same meaning for the official state cult as for people’s private religious well-being.

5.3.4.1 Divination

Hittite divination included translated omen texts from Mesopotamia and Syria as well as characteristically Hittite forms of oracles which allowed ordinary people to communicate with the gods (McMahon 1995:1982). The Hittites believed that divine displeasure of the gods was the source of most evils in the world (Beckman 2003:204). Beckman (1989:106) points out that the Hittites regarded oracles as more important than omens. When the Hittites wanted to extract more relevant information from the gods to solve and gain clarity on a particular problem, they questioned their gods by oracle (Beal 2004:381). The Hittites developed a ‘science of divination’ so that they could communicate with their gods, find out what their reasons for their anger were, and bargain with them as to what they required for restitution (Beckman 2003:204). Beckman (2010:29) informs us that the largest source for Hittite dreams were the collection of reports by divination experts.

The oracle’s questions to the deities were phrased in a ‘yes/no’ format which helped to answer the ultimate question: ‘Is this all?’, in other words, are there any additional factors fuelling the deity’s anger? Often, as Collins (2007:167) explains, ‘oracular investigations
were conducted not for advice but for the purpose of determining the source of divine anger or impurity.’ The Hittite diviners meticulously researched the problems referred to them and made sure that they could determine the exact situation or aspect thereof which would cause a deity to get angry, and they made sure that there were no additional factors behind the deities’ anger (Beckman 2003:204).

The gods were asked to reply to the questions in one of six different ‘divine’ languages, as they were called (Beal 2004:382). Ancient Mesopotamian scholars created a huge dictionary through studying these ‘divine’ languages long before the Hittites were literate (Beal 2004:380). According to Beal (2004:381), some of these ‘divine’ languages were changed by the Hurrians and passed on to the Hittites. Beal (2004:382) also mentions that important answers would often be checked by asking for an answer to the original question in a different divine language. One particular ‘divine’ language was so-called ‘flesh oracles’ (extispicy): the examination of sheep’s (or Hurri-bird’s) entrails (see 7.3.6.2). A number of lumps and marks on the liver and gallbladder and different twists of the animal’s intestines were either favourable or not, thus influencing the answer positively or negatively (Beal 2004:382).

Other oracles involving divine languages were, for example, symbol oracles, which included the manipulation of symbolic tokens; augury oracles, or the observance of bird behaviour; and snake oracles, which included the reading of the movement and behaviour of snakes in a water dish; and observing the motion of oil in water (Collins 2007:168). Beal (2004:382) tells us that the ‘language’ of the snake oracle originated in Anatolia. It was read and interpreted by a woman who practised magic and performed the required rituals. McMahon (1995:1982) informs us that the liver evidence in the oracle texts showed that the Hittites were not always content to simply wait for the gods to send them a message. The importance they attached to oracle texts in their divination literature is a clear indication that they wanted to serve their gods correctly and appropriately. After the identity of the deity who caused the specific problem was established and the reason for the deity’s anger known, compensation was required to please and pacify the angry deity (Collins 2007:167).
5.3.5 All roads lead Puduhepa and Hattušili III to sacred places in Hatti

There were a significant number of religious festivals celebrated during the Hittite year. We know this from the huge number of festival texts found in the royal archive of Hattuša (Bryce 2002:188). About one hundred and sixty-five festivals were included in the official Hittite calendar. This large number of festivals reflected many local community and rural festivals which were also celebrated but were never recorded (Bryce 2002:188). Beckman (1989:102) also mentions that the king, his royal entourage and officials did not neglect to honour and serve minor deities of smaller sanctuaries and shrines in the villages of rural Hatti. Some festivals were dedicated to a number of deities at the same time, but some of the gods called for undivided attention and it was preferable to play it safe by avoiding the risk of offending them if they were not given the acknowledgement they thought was owed to them (Bryce 2002:188).

It was of great importance that the King and Queen of Hatti performed their cultic duties at the crucial, prescribed times of the agricultural year because of its importance for the prosperity of the Hittite Empire. In Chapter Six the Great Temple at Hattuša and sacred places of offering and worship the royals visited during these state cult festivals in the land of Hatti will be discussed. In Chapter Seven we will travel with them and their entourage of officials, musicians, acrobats, priests and transportable statues of their deities along the roads of Hatti. Their procession for the purulli (spring) festival (see 7.2.4.1) started from Hattuša, stopping at the cult city of Arinna, and ended at Nerik (see Figure 2.2), one of the leading sacred cities of Hatti along with Arinna, Šamuha (see Figure 2.2) and Zippalanda (Burney 2004:214).

5.4 CONCLUSION

Dreams, a complicated consequence of human psychology, were differently understood and explained among ancient Near Eastern cultures, including Anatolia (Ünal 2013b:476). As has been discussed in this chapter, in the lives and times of Hattušili III and Puduhepa, dream interpretation held an ambivalent position between religion and the occult (Ünal 2013b:476). Puduhepa and her husband believed that dreams had their origin in outer sources such as natural forces or deities and that they were sent to the
sleeping person. Thus, dreams were seen as a channel through which the person was in contact with living occult beings, deities and natural forces (Beckman 2010:26). The dreams of Puduhepa and Hattušili III provide valuable insights into their spiritual world, their regency, their sociological and psychological problems, fears, joys, concerns and desires.

More than a hundred dream-related Hittite texts have been found (Beckman 2010:26). Hittite dream literature is closely connected to certain historical figures like Puduhepa. Her dreams were recorded in a variety of texts relating to divination and votive offerings, rituals, prayers, mythology, letters and historical texts (Mouton 2007:315). Queen Puduhepa was so fascinated by dreams that she appointed her own dream interpreters, one who was identified as the wife of a certain Gazzuwalla and another identified as Zulki (Ünal 2013b:479). As Oppenheim (1956:197) and Ünal (2013b:484) speculate, many of the so-called ‘collective’ dreams of the royal couple were probably concocted, forged and fictitious to serve their personal as well as political interests. Another possibility is that Puduhepa’s intentions were not malicious but manipulative when she used her dreams as a tool to manipulate the deities and society in her and her husband’s favour (see 5.2.1.4). We do not have records of the private prayers of Hattušili III and Puduhepa but mainly their collection of prayers that were contained in official texts, as discussed in 5.2. Apart from the official triad of deities to whom royal prayers were directed, the goddess of the underworld Lelwani received most of Puduhepa’s votive prayers for the health of her husband. This remained a concern through their marriage and reign.

Important information about the mythologies of the ancient world and the Hittites was also found in the libraries and archives at Hattuša. The transmission of mythological texts of Mesopotamian and Hurrian origin are important elements showing the impact of foreign cultures on Anatolian myths, as described in 5.3.2, and were most probably transmitted by travelling performers (see 7.3.3.1) and traders in luxury goods (see 2.5.1.2 and 2.5.1.3) (Bachvarova 2016:211). The Hittites were also influenced by Hurrian and Mesopotamian magic practices (Burney 2004:182). The majority of magic texts were composed by magicians and diviners from Kizzuwatna, from where Puduhepa came. Consequently, the goddess Šauška played a significant role in Hittite magic as Puduhepa
herself carried out daily purification and incantation rituals on behalf of Hattušili III (see 5.3.4). Hittite divination texts, omens and oracle texts also originated from Mesopotamia and Syria (McMahon 1995:1982). The Hittites performed their magic, addressed their deities, told their myths and dreamt their dreams with extraordinary imagination which they believed justified their actions and strengthened their political power.
CHAPTER SIX
THE GREAT TEMPLE AND OTHER SACRED PLACES

Towns and cities of all sizes had at least one temple, which was administered by the priests and staffed by cult personnel (Haroutunian 2004:317). Only a select number of cities in Hatti were main cult centres: Arinna, Nerik, Zippalanda, Šamuha, Carchemish and Hattuša (see Figure 2.2). According to Haroutunian (2004:317), Tudhaliya IV, Puduhepa’s son, organised a vast catalogue (see 8.1.4) containing details about the local cults with a comprehensive account of the property of various temples, descriptions of images of the gods maintained by those temples and lists of its religious personnel during his reign.

Outside the cities, local temples and temple-dependent farmers cultivated large areas of land. This made the Hittite temples powerful agents in the society and economy of ancient Anatolia. The wealth and supplies created and controlled by the temples were important for the welfare and existence of the palace and urban communities (Haroutunian 2004:317). When creating wealth, the complicated local administrative organisation of the temples had to take care of the needs and see to the comfort of its local patron deity. The presence of the deity was perceived as essential for the community’s prosperity. There was an unceasing fear that the god might abandon the temple as well as the community, with disastrous results for all the people (Haroutunian 2004:317). McMahon (1995:1993) tells us that nothing angered the gods more than neglect of their required cult.

6.1 THE GREAT TEMPLE OF HATTUŠA

Time and the destruction of wars have left little trace of Hittite buildings. The renovation of Hattuša’s Great Temple was inspired by Hattušili III and Puduhepa. The temple was built during their reign, most likely where the old temple of the stormgod stood. Tudhaliya IV, who succeeded his parents, organised most of the building work (Bryce 2005a:32). He had the acropolis renovated and doubled the size of the city.
Figure 6.1
Location of the Great Temple

Figure 6.2
Plan of the Great Temple (compare Figure 6.3)

Figure 6.3
Aerial view of the foundations of the Great Temple

---
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Today the most impressive and largest Hittite religious building excavated is the Great Temple (also known as Temple One) (see Figure 6.1) (Beckman 2004a:262). Tudhaliya IV’s ambitious building programme was carried out late in the thirteenth century BCE, near the end of the Hittite Empire. He developed the new ‘Upper City’ area south of and above the Old City, where the Great Temple complex was erected (see Figure 6.1). Beckman (2004a:262) informs us that the Upper City of Hattuša was long believed to be a residential area until the remains of thirty-one small freestanding temples built by Tudhaliya IV were relatively recently discovered. It seems that Tudhaliya IV’s extensive building programme turned Hattuša into a city of gods. It is not clear where the city’s inhabitants who built the temples had their homes.

6.1.1 Centre of the state cult
The Great Temple of Hattuša was the focal point of the Hittite state cult (Haroutunian 2004:317). The temple complex was dedicated to the principal gods, the stormgod of Hatti who shared it with the supreme goddess of the land, the sungoddess of Arinna (Collins 2007:175). The most important festivals in honour of these deities were celebrated there. The temple’s entrance was through an enormous, ornate gateway designed in the typical Hittite architectural style with a courtyard between the entrance and the central part of the temple (see middle of Figures 6.2 & 6.3). On the far left side of the courtyard stood a small building which was a ritual cleansing house (tarnu-building) (see Figure 6.2) and two cult rooms (see Figure 6.2 middle left), one for the stormgod of Hatti and the other for the sungoddess of Arinna.

Temples not only housed statues of the principal Hittite gods. They also provided accommodation for the priests and craftspeople who served in the temples (Collins 2007:160; cf. Gurney 1980:151). The many storerooms and workshops surrounding the Great Temple (see Figures 6.2 & 6.3) produced objects and stored products for the state cult’s ceremonies (Beckman 1989:102). Because the Hittite pantheon was so large, many lesser deities were attended to in specially consecrated chapels or cult rooms. Even items like windows, door bolts and fireplaces received their own offerings in the course of a cult ritual in the temple (Beckman 2004a:262). Collins (2007:162) adds to this that it cannot be overlooked how important it was to supply the gods of the underworld with whatever
they needed. Outside the Great Temple, Collins tells us, there was a cave with steps leading to an underground room which at one stage was filled with water, enabling the temple personnel to work out what the needs of the gods of the underworld were without inconveniencing them.

6.1.1.1 Inside the temple
The housing of divine images in the sacred space of the temple was a common ancient Near Eastern practice since the worshippers believed that the deities resided partly in these images. Beckman (1989:102) mentions that traditional temple duties were not regularly recorded in texts, but the festivals and celebrations in honour of the deities were well documented with a monthly or annual schedule of worship drawn up for each deity.

6.1.1.2 Priests and temple personnel
In a Hittite temple priests and temple personnel of different rank were responsible for attending to the resident deity’s needs by preventing the deities from getting angry or upset. Little is known about how the priesthood itself was structured and where exactly they fitted into the temple hierarchy (Collins 2007:158). The priests and temple personnel had to follow a strict daily ritual of awakening the deity’s statue, washing it, clothing it, feeding it and bringing it to the cult platform for the day’s duties as well as putting it to bed again at night (Gurney 1980:152; cf. Haroutunian 2004:318).

The instructions to the temple personnel were formalised in the ‘Instructions for Temple Personnel’ which also made clear what the god’s attitude was towards sin; retribution in such an instance was certain, not just for the offender, but also for his whole family (Haroutunian 2004:318). Deviation from the behaviour that was required by the gods was regarded as sin. Theft from the temple stores, violation of the purity standards and neglect of daily caring for the gods were punishable by death (McMahon 1995:1988). McMahon tells us that daily offerings to the gods were so fundamental that they were hardly mentioned in religious literature. The funding for all these complex religious preparations and rituals came from donations made by the king and vassal rulers. Members of the community also donated gifts of precious items, divine images, cultic objects and
livestock to the temple. The compulsory food and animal offerings during the festivals provided a regular, major source of income for the temples (Haroutunian 2004:318).

6.2 SACRED PLACES: ROCK RELIEFS AND SPRINGS

Mountains, rivers and springs were sacred in Hittite Anatolia. These elements were included among the deities the Hittites summoned to witness treaties. Mountains themselves were personified as deities. They could also be the dwelling places and locations of gods, specifically the stormgods. Often small shrines at the foot of a mountain were connected to bigger temples elsewhere (Beckman 2004a:264). Water was the most important element for the Hittites and was specially revered by them. It was essential for the increase of their crops and livestock and often their sacred places were created at or near springs. The Hittites believed that rocks were the homes of deities and that they provided magical powers that attracted the gods (Ökse 2011:220). All the Hittite rock reliefs face in the direction of springs, pools and rivers, underlining the importance of the combination of rock and water which made their locations sacred. Niches, platforms or cup marks (see Figure 6.6) show that some cult rituals were performed at these places (Ökse 2011:237).

6.2.1 Landscape monuments for royal propaganda

Harmanşah (2015b:383) informs us that during the Late Bronze Age, ‘landscape monuments’ of the Anatolian peninsula were often carved with the backing of various regional powers like the Hittite state and its vassals. The reliefs cut into rocks (ten of them) were all situated close to settlements during the Empire period (Seeher 2011:168). Seeher tells us that some of these reliefs were carved on open rock faces and were visible from a distance. Others were screened off by buildings, walls or trees and were situated in natural sanctuaries outside the city, like Yazilikaya. The open rock faces depicted kings or their sons (see Figures 2.11 and 4.2) and were regarded as landmarks and symbols of rule. Essentially, the rock-cut reliefs functioned as propaganda, demonstrating the power and possession of the kings (Seeher 2011:169). The rulers of the thirteenth century BCE like Tudhaliya IV, Puduhepa’s son, steadily conveyed themselves through rock-cut reliefs more to the inhabitants of the land of Hatti. At that stage, the kings had themselves
(and their consorts) already portrayed on their seals (see 4.4.3). Tudhaliya IV intensified this form of propaganda, claiming his power as King with his image magnified in stone and his name and account of his deeds also carved in stone (Seeher 2011:170) (see 8.1.4).

6.2.1.1 Places of communication with the underworld and ancestors
Harmanşah (2015b:384) also uses the term ‘landscape monuments’ when he refers to Hittite rock reliefs like Fraktin (see 6.2.2) and spring monuments like Eflatunpinar (see 6.2.3) and Yazilikaya (see 6.3). He continues to explain that reliefs and monuments like these created places of unusual human interaction, particularly places for communicating with the underworld, the world of the divine and dead ancestors. He states that Hittitologists have recently pointed out the possible association of such monuments with a number of expressions in Hittite texts, especially in hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions, as well as treaties and ritual texts. For example: ‘eternal peak’, \( \text{NA}_4.\text{HEKUR.SAG.UŠ} \), in the Hittite texts is understood as a commemorative rock-cut monument, a memorial posthumously dedicated to a royal ancestor but not necessarily involving a burial (Taracha 2009:134; cf. Van den Hout 2002:74-75). Rock-hekur has also been translated as rock sanctuary and associated with sites like Yazilikaya. It is often compared to a ‘Divine Stone House’, \( \text{É.NA}_4\text{DINGIR.LIM} \), or the hesti-house, both associated with funerary installations (Hawkins 1998:71).

6.2.2 The Fraktin rock relief
Fraktin (see its location in Figure 2.2) is situated at a junction of routes from Kizzuwatna to central Anatolia. Harmanşah (2015b:384) tells us that a series of Imperial Hittite rock reliefs were found in the contemporary province of Kayseri in south-central Anatolia. The well-known thirteenth-century rock relief at Fraktin (see Figure 6.5) is carved on a volcanic bedrock façade, depicting two separate scenes merged into one. The figures of the relief are identified by the hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions as Great King Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa. The inscription next to her singles out Puduhepa as ‘Great Queen, daughter of Kizzuwatna, having become a god’ (Harmanşah 2015a:104) (see Figure 6:4). It is a familiar expression in Hittite for being deceased.
Harmanşah (2015a:105) suggests that the Fraktin relief was carved after the death of Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa, partly as a funerary commemorative monument. Like Chamber B at Yazılıkaya (see Figure 6.26), it has been identified as a rock- *hekur,* associated with the funerary cult of her son Tudhaliya IV.

6.2.2.1 A commemorative monument

Above the Fraktin relief there are surface remains of a monumental building with closely-packed artefacts as well as cup marks (see again Figure 6.6) and circular basins in the rock surface nearby (Harmanşah 2015b:384). Harmanşah suggests that this rock relief monument could, like similar ones, be associated with the ‘Eternal peak,’ NA₄.HEKUR.SAG.UŠ, or the ‘Divine stone house’, É.NA₄.DINGIR.LIM, monuments of dead royal ancestors. Those monuments were not simply tombs or commemorative monuments but ‘large self-supporting institutions employing cultic, administrative and other personnel, and mostly enjoying some kind of tax exemption’ (Van den Hout 2002:91). Beckman (2004a:263) believes that rock carvings like Fraktin could have been created to focus on religious cults. He motivates his assumption by describing the libation scene of Hattušili III and Puduhepa at Fraktin and the image of Muwatalli II at Sirkeli as connected to some cult activities. He (Beckman 2004a:264) also suggests that proof of religious activity was found in the cup marks mentioned above (see Figure 6.6).
According to Harmanşah (2015a:104), the stormgod in the Fraktin relief is portrayed in an unusual way. He is holding a crook on his shoulder (see Figures 6.7 & 6.8). The crook is a ceremonial device usually carried by the Great Kings and interpreted as a shepherd’s crook, which relates to the idea of the king being the shepherd as well as a symbol of justice and judicial power. Harmanşah (2015a:105) tells us that the libation scenes of the Fraktin rock relief display are ‘a complex narrative of ritual action.’ Bonatz (2007b:29), on the other hand, interprets the unusual representation of the stormgod with a crook on his shoulder as possibly the image of a hunting or tutelary god of the fields.
The clothing and headgear of the royal couple are, according to Beckman, cited by Silver (2010:2) and Bonatz (2007b:29), much the same as those of the divine couple Teshub and Hepat (compare reliefs number 42 & 43 in Figure 6.29). Silver (2010:3) continues that the clothes suggest ‘a kind of identification on the human level with the figures on the divine level’, leading to the suggestion that the Fraktin scene portrays Hattušili and Puduhepa in the afterlife (Bonatz 2007b:29).
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Harmanşah (2015b:391) maintains that the carving of commemorative rock reliefs, inscriptions and rock-cut tombs as well as creating open-air sanctuaries and shrines in the Late Bronze Age Anatolia was an ever-evolving practice. Harmanşah writes that rock reliefs in and around Anatolia were never finished. They were often regarded as politically motivated monuments that marked or guarded territorial borders and important mountain passes and river valleys. Their inscriptions were repeatedly changed for symbolic and political reasons as circumstances changed for the political establishment (Harmanşah 2015b:383).

6.2.3 Eflatunpınar: a sacred water sanctuary

According to Beckman (2004a:264), the most spectacular sacred water sanctuary in Puduhepa’s lifetime was at Eflatunpınar, a few kilometers east of the lake of Beyşehir near the classical city Iconium/Konya (see Figure 6.13). Where there were no rock formations at a significant spring, an artificial façade such as at Eflatunpınar was built with huge stone blocks (Ökse 2011:236). Ökse suggests that the enthroned couple on the left and right of the middle panel of the façade (see Figures 6.14 & 6.15) represents the official gods of the Hittite Empire, Hepat and Teshub.
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Cammarosano (2015:228) though finds it very unlikely that the Eflatunpınar monument (see Figures 6.14 & 6.15) may have been a *huwaši* (standing stone) sanctuary. He suggests that the splendour and perplexity of the place and its water suggest a holy spring rather than a *huwaši* sanctuary.
Seeher (2011:41) describes the five mountain gods with raised forearms and skirts decorated with scales standing in the water (see Figures 6.14 & 6.15) as demonstrating the connection of mountains and water. The middle three figures have openings through which water could run, creating the vision of mountain springs. Ökse (2011:225) proposes the possibility that the male god of the inner scene of the façade represents the storm or mountain god and the smaller goddesses on both sides could be spring goddesses.

### 6.3 THE YAZILIKAYA ROCK SANCTUARY

The discovery of Yazilikaya in 1834 after it was abandoned for more than three thousand two hundred years was a very important event which began scientific research into the Hittites (Seeher 2011:5). During this very long period, the rock reliefs portraying more than ninety human, animal and mythical figures deteriorated badly. The buildings collapsed and the boulders changed shape because of natural erosion (Seeher 2011:150). Nevertheless, the depictions on the stone walls of Yazilikaya were a mystery to scholars at the time of its discovery. Yazilikaya (meaning ‘inscribed rock’) (see Figures 6.16 & 6.17) is located one kilometre north-east of Hattuša/Boğazköy. It is set in a natural rock outcrop, forming a complex of open-air cult chambers (Beckman 2004a:263). It has a natural entrance in front of which buildings were added. Inside on the rock surfaces, sculptors carved large reliefs primarily of Hurrian deities. The sanctuary had been in use before it was further developed during the reigns of Hattušili III and Tudhaliya IV (Bryce 2005b:325).

---

**Figure 6.16**

Yazilikaya after the uncovering of the buildings' foundations in 1966

---

During the thirteenth century, King Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa began to develop the site into a state religious sanctuary and they commissioned most of the rock carvings and sculptures. They ordered the construction of an elaborate series of temples and protective walls around Chamber A (Krupp 2000:4). Today we know that Puduhepa and her son Tudhaliya IV eventually completed this project when they reorganised the Hittite state pantheon (see 8.1.3 & 8.1.4).
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6.3.1 Visualising the Hurro-Hittite pantheon

Until the time when Tudhaliya IV introduced his consolidation of local cults in Hatti (see 8.1.4), there were no clear, distinct or definite attempts made in Hittite religious iconography to demonstrate how they visualised their deities (Bonatz 2007b:5). Bonatz tells us that defining an iconographic symbolic system in Hittite Anatolia has always been a complicated undertaking. The development in cultural interaction in the Anatolian region constantly changed their religious symbolism. There was an ongoing lack of uniformity or stability in Hittite religious art (Bonatz 2007b:1). A clearly defined concept of the divine world and its visual representation developed only gradually from the Middle Bronze Age to the Late Bronze Age in Hatti under foreign influence as well as from deep-rooted elements of mixed religious traditions which were bound to prehistoric Anatolia (Bonatz 2007b:1). A first attempt at a visual depiction of the Hittite state cult was made by Tudhaliya IV with the rock-cut sanctuary of Yazilikaya. Like his parents, he also commissioned sculptures and he himself is also depicted in the reliefs (Krupp 2000:2). The reliefs in Chamber A of sixty-five deities of the Hurro-Hittite state pantheon are, according to most Hittitologists (Beckman [1989]; Bittel [1989]; Bonatz [2007b]; Bryce [2005a]; Cammarosano [2015]; Canby [1989]; Collins 2004b; Harmanşah [2015 a & b]; McMahon [1991]; Van den Hout [2002]; Van Loon [1985]), iconographically the most informative and most researched evidence of Hittite religion. Because of their late date, circa 1250 BCE, the rock-carved deities are not regarded as typical expressions of a Hittite belief system but rather of a Hurro-Hittite code of belief (Bonatz 2007b:5; cf. Van Loon 1985:19).

6.3.1.1 Additions to Yazilikaya during Hattušili III and Tudhaliya IV’s reign

Van Loon (1985:19) writes that between circa 1500 and 1200 BCE, a number of architectural additions in several phases were made to the sanctuary. In phase one, circa 1500 BCE, the space in front of Chamber A was surrounded by a terrace wall. In a second phase, circa 1250 BCE during Hattušili III reign, a temple with steps, an altar and standing room were built (see middle of Figure 6.19), and in a third phase, circa 1225 BCE, a gatehouse and outer wall were added. Apparently, Chamber B was adapted at the same time to serve the cult of the deceased Tudhaliya IV. In a final phase, phase four, the east wing
of the temple (right in picture Figure 6.19) was replaced by a second temple-like structure giving access to Chamber B (Van Loon 1985:19).

Figure 6.19
Reconstruction of the temple buildings at Yazılıkaya after the different building phases\textsuperscript{172}

Bryce (2002:196) refers to the archaeologist Kurt Bittel’s remark that this complex was built in a ‘strikingly careless manner’ with rubble for foundations, and he concluded that these ‘lightly constructed buildings’ would not have remained undamaged if it were in regular daily ritual use. The building complex was most probably only used on special occasions during the year. The question remains: What were these occasions and what was the function and purpose of Yazılıkaya?

6.3.1.2 Architectural reconstruction of Yazılıkaya
Naumann, an architectural historian, in his reconstruction drawing (see Figure 6.20) of Chamber A shows how it would have looked in the thirteenth century BCE when Puduhepa was still alive.

\textsuperscript{172} Seeher (2011:132).
It gives the impression that the interior was a combination of architecture and nature, with the boulders and reliefs integrated into an orderly fashion (Seeher 2011:150). It seems as if the reliefs were cut on predominately white blocks of stone, making them stand out clearly (Seeher 2011:151) (see Figure 6.20). Most impressive of the reliefs of Yazilikaya is the procession of deities in Chamber A (see Figure 6.21).

---

Figure 6.21
Map of Chamber A

What we do know is that the rock reliefs of Yazilikaya are regarded as the definitive example of Hittite ideological art, and whatever ceremonies were performed there had political meaning validating royal power (Krupp 2000:4). The deities depicted here were not simply those of the Hittite Empire pantheon with their Hurrian names written in Luwian hieroglyphs. On the walls of Chamber A we see the whole central pantheon based on Hurrian-Kizzuwatna tradition (Seeher 2011:155).

6.3.2 An interpretation and the function of Chamber A

Queen Puduhepa as the initiator of the reliefs did much during her husband’s reign and her lifetime to establish Hurrian-Kizzuwatnean elements in the Hittite state religion (Van Loon 1985:20). We are told in Hittite texts that Puduhepa brought tablets listing the names of Hurrian gods to her husband Hattušili when they married (Krupp 2000:2). For the interpretation of the Yazilikaya sanctuary, it is important to note that the King chose those deities who were significant to him and his kingdom. The inscriptions on the reliefs above the deities’ greeting fists (see Figure 6.28) are their Hurrian names in Luwian hieroglyphs. Van Loon (1985: 20) also mentions that these images could also represent the gods’ Hattic, Nesian or Luwian equals. Canby (1989:125) remarks that although the imagery of the reliefs are Hurrian, the style of the figures and the type of sanctuary are completely Hittite.

6.3.2.1 A New Year festival sanctuary

Seeher (2011:155) argues that there are two credible opinions amongst scholars as to the function of Chamber A. Traditionally there is common consent amongst scholars that the function of Chamber A was associated with the great spring festival of plants, the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival (see 7.2.3.1) (Bonatz 2007b:6). A cuneiform tablet from Hattuša describes the long rows of gods and goddesses on these walls, at the head of which stands the stormgod and his consort:

At the beginning of the year, a great feast of the sky and the earth was celebrated for the stormgod. All the deities gathered and entered the house of the stormgod.\textsuperscript{175}

\textsuperscript{175} Text after Otten, quoted by Seeher (2011:155).
Similar practices existed in Sumer and Babylon where images or statues of deities were brought together in the ceremonial house (*bīt akitu*) for the festival of the New Year (Krupp 2000:3; cf. Seeher 2011:155).

### 6.3.2.2 Huwaši stones

A second option for interpreting Chamber A could be that it was a *huwaši* shrine (Seeher 2011:155). It was a term that was often found in Hittite cuneiform texts. The Hittite gods could be represented as cult objects or totems referred to mainly in festival texts and cult inventories as *huwaši* stones (standing stones) (Bryce 2002:156). Some of these cult stelae were made from wood or silver and were very small, like the Yeniköy soapstone stela which is only a few centimeters high (see Figure 6.23). On this small soapstone stela, the tutelary deity of the countryside is depicted standing on the back of a deer (compare Figure 3.11) (see 3.2.5.1) This small stela was considered as a small-scale model of a *huwaši* (Cammarosano 2015:228). A Luwian hieroglyph stela from the Lower City of Hattuša has a standing object on the right (see Figure 6.22) that may be a *huwaši* stone (Cammarosano 2015:226).

---

Deities for whom a temple could not be built were represented by these *huwaši* stones set up in temples on altars where ritual offerings and dedication were made to them in the same way as to a particular god in his or her own temple (Ryan 2015:757). The *huwaši* stones were washed, anointed, clothed, and given food and drink just like the statues of the gods. The cuneiform tablet from Hattuša in Figure 6.24 gives a topographic description of the area surrounding a city and mentions as many as five different *huwaši* shrines (Seeher 2011:156).

According to Cammarosano, it is clear that the *huwaši* stelae, unlike figurines that also embodied the deities, seem to have had a connection with the ancestral era of the Hittites as they played a role in spring and other festivals held in cities on the periphery of Hattuša. The priests sometimes placed these *huwaši* stones in public areas for general worship, and the name *huwaši* signified that the area itself marked that of the place or presence of a god. They were situated on the outer edge of a town beside a road or near a river, fountain or rock, either secluded or assembled into open-air sanctuaries situated in gouges or on mountains, and were possibly associated with some kind of sacred tree(s) (Cammarosano 2015:225). At the *huwaši* stelae, a sacrifice to the god was made and a feast was held for him and his worshippers. There was entertainment for everybody, mock battles, wrestling, weight lifting, horse racing and archery contests judged by the king (Bryce 2002:191). All this was performed in a fun-filled festival spirit.
6.3.2.3 *A huwaši sanctuary*

In an account of the Hittite KI.LAM festival (see 7.3.3) held annually at Hattuša, a king was described as going outside the city into a *huwaši* of the stormgod of Hatti (Seeher 2011:156). The location was not described, according to Seeher, but he maintains that it is possibly Yazilikaya that is being referred to. *Huwaši* stones were found all over the Hittite Empire. Van den Hout (2002:73) mentions that there is much debate amongst scholars about the possibility that Yazilikaya’s rock formation, specifically the large peak rock of Chamber A with the central relief panel of *Teshub* and *Hepat* carved on it, was a *huwaši* stone (see Figure 6:25). Cammarosano (2015:227) is uncertain about such a hypothesis that Chamber A could be a *huwaši* shrine of the stormgod of Hattuša. According to him, the taper-shaped rock of Chamber B (Figure 6.26) could also be perceived as only a *huwaši* stone. Van den Hout (2014c) expressed his opinion that we simply do not know if these rocks were *huwaši* stones or shrines.

---
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6.3.2.4 A place for coronation rituals

A less believable option is the interpretation by Haas (2004:639) who suggested that Chamber A could have functioned as a place of atonement and purification where rituals were performed as part of coronation ceremonies for kings. Seeher (2011:157) disagrees with this view because due to the nature of these rituals, harmful substances were deposited in a confined space between the high rock walls and could become dangerous to human life. Seeher (2011:157) is of the opinion that Yazilikaya seemed to have been unsuitable for rites and rituals involving the symbolical removal and disposal of objects affecting people.

6.3.3 Identifiable Hurrian male gods on the left wall

An imposing procession of forty male gods, the kaluti (circle of deities) of Teshub (see 3.4.1.3), displays a Hurrian concept that the stormgod Teshub was chosen by the other gods to lead the pantheon (Bonatz 2007b:6; cf. Gurney 1977:19). The procession starts on the north side of Chamber A and continues along the curving wall on the west side (see Figures 6:21 & 6.27). The marching procession leads to the central panel on the back wall of Chamber A where the stormgod Teshub meets and greets his wife, Hepat, and the children (Bonatz 2007b:5; cf. Van Loon 1985:20) (see Figure 6.29). The male gods wear short kilts and single or multiple-horned pointed caps related to their ranking in the pantheon (Bonatz 2007b:5).

Not all the names of the male gods in the procession following Teshub can be read with certainty because of some very difficult readings and uninformative iconography (Bonatz 2007b:5; cf. Gurney 1977:22). The procession of male gods, numbers 1 to 25 in Figure 6.27, depicts from numbers 1 to 12 the twelve gods of the underworld marching (compare them to the clearer images of the chthonic gods, numbers 68 to 80 in Chamber B, Figure 6.33). The reliefs from numbers 13 to 25 in Figure 6:26 are a mixture of unidentified mountain and other gods. According to Gurney (1977:22), the mountain gods from numbers 13 to 15 appear to be named ‘divine mountains’ (see Figure 6:27).

---

181 All the images of recognisable male and female deities in Chambers A and B, numbers 1 to 83 as seen in Figure 6:21, are copied from Cimok (2008:119 –140).
Figure 6.27

Detail drawing of the left wall of Chamber A showing the positions of the male gods\textsuperscript{182}

\textsuperscript{182} Seeher (2011:32).
Number 16a: A mountain god whose name could be *Namni* and number 17 (Bonatz 2007b:6) show two mountain gods ready to fight with their caps bent forward and their fists raised. Van Loon (1985:21) comments that their pose is reminiscent of a Hurrian myth of a stormgod from an older generation of gods fighting and defeating his enemies. The scale pattern indicates rocky mountains. He (Van Loon) refers to the designs on the sides of a gold bowl found at Hansalu, West Iran (ca 1000 BCE), showing a mountain god with his fists raised in a fight against a mountain monster (see Figure 6.28).

![Figure 6.28](image)

*A mountain god (right in drawing) with raised fists on the golden Hansalu bowl*\(^{183}\)

Porada (1962:99) wrote that it is tempting to link the scenes on the Hansalu vase with the Hurrian god *Kumarbi*'s epic tale (see 5.3.1.1). Van Loon (1985:21) concludes that the 'boxing' pose of the mountain gods of Yazilikaya is seen only where bent-capped gods are portrayed (as the two mountain gods in numbers 16a & 17 above). A possible interpretation might be that they were part of an older generation of gods showing their former aggressiveness or present submission in their raised fists, and their defeat and

punishment portrayed by their bent caps (Van Loon 1985:21). These gestures are different from those of the goddesses on the right wall of Chamber A whose right fists were held forward in a greeting gesture and the fingers of their left hands were held as if in a prayer (see Figure 6.30). The male gods from numbers 26 to 42 (in Figure 6.27) are recognisable from Hattic, Hurrian, Mesopotamian and Sumero-Akkadian decent.

Number 26: A Hurrian god *Pisaisapi*. This chthonic god’s name is written with the logogram ‘sword’ (Van Loon 1985:21).

Number 27: *Nergal*, a Sumero-Akkadian god of the underworld.
Numbers 28 & 29: The Hurrian bulls of heaven, *Seri* and *Hurri*. They are standing on and holding Luwian hieroglyphic logograms (signs) for ‘earth’ and a crescent moon for the ‘heavens’ or ‘sky’ as it was their role in mythology to support heaven (Bonatz 2007b:6). Like the Greek Atlas, they had to prevent a clash between these two forces (Van Loon 1985:22). They are also often shown harnessed to the stormgod *Teshub*’s chariot (see Figure 3.32).

Number 30: *Hesue*, an important Hurrian war god, or also called in his logogram the *war god Zababa* (Cimok 2008:124). Gods are sometimes described as carrying severed human heads and his name could also be derived from the logogram ‘human head’ (Van Loon 1985:22). In the Mesopotamian pantheon, he was the husband of *Ištar*. 
Number 31: The winged Hurrian god *Pirinkir* (see Figures 3.28 & 3.29).

This deity is closely associated with the goddess Šauška and, according to Van Loon (1985:22), it is likely that *Pirinkir* was an alternative form of this war goddess (see 3.4.2.3).

Number 32: This god’s name is written half logographically and half phonetically, ANTLER-ti (aKAL), a Hurrian tutelary god and added to *Teshub’s kaluti* in this procession (Gurney 1977:22). Some readings of it has suggested that it is the name of the prominent Hurrian god *Nubadig* (Van Loon 1985:23) The stag is the animal of tutelary gods in general and particularly of the chase (Van Loon 1985:22) (see 3.2.5).

No 33: *Astabi* was another Hurrian war god. Here he is also added to the stormgod *Teshub’s kaluti* (Gurney 1977:22).
Number 34: *Sun god of the Sky (Ištanu).* Originally a Hattian female deity. In Hittite iconography the sun god of the sky was assimilated to the King, who is addressed as ‘My Sun’ and who also refers to himself as such (see 2.3.2 and 3.2.4.1).

Number 35: The Hurrian moon god. He is identified by his Luwian hieroglyph and a large crescent moon on his headdress.

Numbers 36 & 37: *Ninatta and Kulitta,* attendants/sacred whores of Šauška. They were identified by Luwian hieroglyphs and the mirrors they carried (see
Figure 3:20). They may have been later additions to the procession and are the only females on this left side of the procession.

Number 38: The Hurrian goddess of war, Šauška, depicted in contrast to the other goddesses on the east side of Chamber A (see Figure 6:27). She is included in the Hurro-Hittite pantheon not only because Hattušili III was specially devoted to her (Cimok 2008:126) (see 3.1.2), but because of her bisexual character and being part of Teshub’s kaluti (Gurney 1977:22). Like the planet Venus, which is seen at dawn and nightfall, Šauška inspired men to war and love (Van Loon 1985:23).

Number 39: Ea, originally the Mesopotamian water god and god of wisdom.

Numbers 40 & 41 (see Figure 6:29): Teshub’s father Kumarbi and a Hurrian god identified as Tasmisu, the brother of the stormgod Teshub.
This god is usually mentioned as between Kumarbi and Teshub in the Hurrian pantheon. Kumarbi is the Hurrian god of agriculture, symbolised by an ear of corn above his left hand (see 5.3.1.1). Kumarbi appears on the back wall of Chamber A in accordance with his rank as chief deity of the older generation of Hurrian gods, now unseated by his son Teshub. Tasmisu is similar to the Babylonian god Ninurta who defeated the lion-eagle Anzu (Van Loon 1985:23).

6.3.3.1 The central group of deities on the back wall
Krupp (2000:5) is of the opinion that the two processions of male and female deities making their way towards the central panel could have been a sacred marriage scene of Teshub and Hepat (Numbers 42 and 43) (see Figure 6.29), the two supreme Hurrian-inspired deities. Krupp’s interpretation of this central panel transforms Yazilikaya into ‘a cosmic matrimonial altar’ where the wedding of the procreative power of the sky and the reproductive power of the earth was witnessed by an audience of deities (Krupp 2000:3). Such ceremonies were deeply rooted in the culture of the ancient Near East since circa 3500 BCE.
Yazilikaya seems to have been the venue for similar religious rituals celebrating growth and continuity. Bittel (1970:108), who excavated at Yazilikaya for more than thirty years, also identifies the imagery of the reliefs as from a sacred marriage. Hepat and Teshub’s unification personifies the power of new life and the renewal of the world order (Krupp 2000:5). Beckman (1989:101) also views the central panel in Chamber A of the sanctuary as probably the scene of an annual purulli (New Year) festival, a festival carried out in a similar outside space as in the akitu house of Babylon and Mesopotamia. According to Gurney (1977:39), the two spring festivals of AN.TAH.ŠUM and purulli had much in common. It might be possible that these two festivals were in some way the same (Gurney 1977:39) (see 7.2.3.1 and 7.2.4.1). Hittite society, like their pantheon of deities, was feudal and rooted in rank and privilege. The unification of the royals in marriage was similar to that of the gods and was politically motivated. The royals identified with the highest gods in order to renew their supremacy as rulers. They regarded it as similar to the renewal of the fruit of the lands during the New Year festivals (Krupp 2000:5).

Seeher (2011:64). See Figure 6.21.
(a)  *Teshub* (number 42)

The Hurrian god *Teshub*, number 42 (Figure 6.29), is the highest-ranking god in the pantheon as the stormgod of heaven/sky and is depicted as taller than his brother *Tasmisu* (Van Loon 1985:23). On his shoulder *Teshub* carries a big mace and above his left fist in a greeting gesture are the Luwian hieroglyphs for ‘god’ and ‘lightning.’ He stands on two mountain gods, most probably named *Namni* and *Hazzi*, emphasising his command of the mountaintops where storms gathered force (Krupp 2000:5; cf. Seeher 2011:67). Versions of this stormgod under an assortment of names are found all over the ancient Near East. The Babylonians called him *Marduk*, the supreme deity among their gods, in Assyria he was the tempest god *Adad*, in Canaan he was the lord of lightning and cloudburst, *Baal*, and in other parts of the ancient Near East he was *Tarhun* holding the hammer of thunder in his hand (Krupp 2000:2). Behind *Teshub* on his left is a playful calf wearing a pointed cap with the inscription: ‘the bull calf of *Teshub*’ (Van Loon 1985:23; cf. Seeher 2011:67).

(b)  *Hepat* (number 43)

In number 43 is *Hepat*, the Hurrian earth-mother goddess, standing upright on the back of a feline, most probably a leopard, another ancient symbol of sovereignty. Her right fist is in a greeting gesture and the fingers of her left hand are lifted as if she is pleading with *Teshub* (Bonatz 2007b:5; cf. Van Loon 1985:24). Her dress is worn in a similar way to those of Babylonian women, who wrapped their garments clockwise from the right elbow. Her showing earring is identical to those of the gods and king, and she wears a three-turreted crown as was the custom for major goddesses (Van Loon 1985:25). Krupp (2000:2) is of the opinion that as *Teshub*’s bride, after union with him she delivered the world’s seasonal cycles of birth, death and rebirth. The other deities surrounding the divine couple are giving their formal consent to the marital partnership between heaven (*Teshub*) and earth (*Hepat*). According to Eliade (1978:140), the Hittites in this way assembled their multitude of deities as an enormous family lead by the heavenly couple whose union sustained fertility and fruitfulness of the earth.
(c) Šarrumma (number 44)

_Teshub_ and _Hepat’s_ son and heir accompanies his divine parents. Like his mother, Šarrumma stands behind his mother _Hepat_, on a leopard (a symbol of sovereignty) (Bonatz 2007b:5; cf. Krupp 2000:2). Šarrumma is the only male deity amongst the goddesses in the central scene on the right, number 44 on the wall of Chamber A. He is identified by his Hurrian name carved above his right fist (see Figure 6:29).

6.3.3.2 The procession of identifiable Hurrian goddesses on the right wall

Numbers 45 and 46 are described as the ‘daughter of _Teshub_’ (Allanzu) and the ‘granddaughter of _Teshub_’ (Kunzishalli), each standing on a wing of a double-headed eagle (see 7.3.6.4) (Bonatz 2007b:5). Together the group of deities from numbers 40 to 46 completes the divine Hurrian family of _Teshub_ and _Hepat_.
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There is a space, number 46a (see Figure 6.26), in the procession of goddesses with a surviving hieroglyph that might mean ‘little one’ (Tarru Takitu). She was a servant of the goddess Hepat (Cimok 2008:131).

---

Numbers 47 and 48 are the Hurrian goddesses of fate and helpers at childbirth. As the other goddesses, their headdresses show their rank (Van Loon 1985:25). Number 49 is Allatu, queen of the Hurrian underworld and analogous in character to Lelwani of the Hittites (see 5.2.1.5).

The identity of number 50 is not known and her name was most probably carved on the lost rock in front of her (Cimok 2008:131). Cimok informs us that number 51 was identified as the goddess Naparpi. The goddesses from number 52 onwards are largely unknown except for number 53 whose name is Tapkina, wife of Ea, and number 54 who portrays Nikkal, wife of the moongod. Not much can be identified about the remaining goddesses, numbers 55a to 63 (see Figure 6.30). Next is the portrayal of the only human figure

6.3.3.3 Great King Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE)

Hattušili III (ca 1267-1237 BCE) was succeeded by one of his younger sons, Tudhaliya IV. It is not clear when and why Tudhaliya IV was appointed his father's successor above his older brother Nerikkali before Hattušili's death (Ryan 2015:391). Tudhaliya IV (see Figure 6.31) inherited a daunting list of problems and crises from his father, Hattušili III. These problems were complex and of great consequence as he faced the loss of territory and the disintegration of Hittite vassal states (Bryce 2005b:299). Tudhaliya IV tried diplomatically and militarily to keep the Empire unharmed.

Claims are made by scholars that the Hittites suffered a severe famine on top of everything else for many years and that Hatti became more dependent on shipments of grain from Egypt and Canaan (Bryce 2005b:322). It seems that Tudhaliya IV’s reign was also influenced by his unusual relationship with Kurunta (see 4.1.1), Urhi-Teshub’s brother. Despite Kurunta’s status as the brother of the deposed King, Hattušili III did not hesitate to confirm Kurunta’s rule over Tarhuntassa, and Tudhaliya IV upheld this ruling through the early years of his reign (Ryan 2015:405). There is a possibility that the close friendship between Tudhaliya and Kurunta prevented succession squabbling within the family (Ryan 2015:405). Hattušili III was aware of the close friendship between his son and Kurunta and regarded it as a guarantee that succession to the throne would stay in his family (Bryce 2005b:273). Kurunta was also in line to become king, but according to Bryce (2005b:273), he chose to honour his oath to rather support Tudhaliya IV to ascend the throne. Apparently for the time being, Kurunta remained loyal to his cousin Tudhaliya, who wrote:

At that time when my father appointed my older brother as *tuhkanti*, I was still not at that time marked for kingship. But Kurunta already showed his loyalty to me and gave me in person the following oath: “If your father does not appoint you to kingship, in whatever position your father places you, I will be loyal only to you and be your loyal servant.”

---

Despite severe pressures, Tudhaliya IV’s reign was characterised by a number of concrete accomplishments in Hatti like his building projects and military successes beyond its borders. He crushed rebellions and regained ground to the west of Hattuša (Bryce 2005b:324). Bryce tells us that during his reign, the inevitable war between the Assyrians and the Hittites took place. When his father reigned, territorial disputes were dealt with using diplomacy. However, the Assyrians continued their attacks into traditionally Hittite domain in northern Syria and this forced Tudhaliya IV to take military action against them (Ryan 2015:405).

The battle of Nihriya was anything but a draw. The Assyrians defeated the Hittites, whose power was undermined, resulting in a series of revolutions of vassal states. Kurunta also turned against his old friend. Scholars differ about the reasons for this, but there seem to be two possibilities. The first is that Kurunta forced Tudhaliya from the throne for a short time. This does not seem possible because no records from Tudhaliya’s reign mentioning a coup that shifted the kingship have been found anywhere (Ryan 2015:405). The most likely possibility is that Kurunta, ruler of the former capital Tarhuntassa, broke away from the Hittite Empire controlled by Hattuša and formed his own kingdom (Ryan 2015:419). Reports of an attack on Tarhuntassa by a Hattušan king back up this assumption. By the time of the attack on Tarhuntassa, it is a possibility that a son of Urhi-Teshub and the nephew of Kurunta ruled (Ryan 2015:419). If his cousin Kurunta temporarily removed Tudhaliya from the throne, the latter soon regained control and restored the damage caused in Hattuša.

6.3.3.4 Tudhaliya IV the builder

Tudhaliya’s huge building projects during his reign near the end of the Hittite Empire were significant elements contributing to the flourishing Hittite material culture. He developed the Upper City, extending it with many temples, doubling the size of Hattuša and its royal citadel, and built the rock sanctuary of Yazılıkaya. Hattuša was regarded as one of the greatest cities in the ancient Near East (Bryce 2005b:324). All Tudhaliya IV’s significant redevelopment projects in Hattuša started during the reign of his parents, Puduhepa and Hattušili III (ca 1267-1237 BCE) (Bryce 2005b:325). In retrospect, Tudhaliya IV left
monuments and smaller temples behind in Hattuša at a time when the Hittite Empire was already in irreversible decline (Bryce 2005b:325).

6.3.3.5 The Yazilikaya relief of Tudhaliya IV

Opposite the procession on the left wall of Chamber A (see Figures 6.30 & 6.31: relief number 64), in a well-protected place, is the relief of Great King Tudhaliya IV standing on two mountain peaks recognisable by their scale patterns (Seeher 2011:85).

According to Cimok (2008:134), this relief implies that the last decorations of Chamber A probably took place under Tudhaliya IV’s rule (ca 1237-1228 BCE). The King himself may have had the relief added to the gallery. Scholars assume this because Tudhaliya IV was the first Hittite king who uncharacteristically deified himself before his death. He is depicted clothed in a priestly outfit identical to that of Ištanu, the sungod of the sky on the left wall of Chamber A (see number 34 in Figure 6.27). According to Seeher (2011:85), this similarity is not significant because high-ranking Hittites often had themselves portrayed similarly. In this relief the King, in a long robe with a sash, a skullcap and shoes
with upturned toes, clutches in his left hand a long staff with a coiled end (called a kalmuš). Above his extended right arm is a very well preserved cartouche that symbolises royal supremacy with his Hurrian name and full title in Luwian hieroglyphs. In the centre of Figure 6.32, under the two disks carved as stars, each in a circle on top of the other, is the hieroglyph *tu* (it looks like a Hittite upturned shoe) on which a bearded mountain god stands (Seeher 2011:83). The star in the circle pattern represents Venus as *Ištar* who was often paired with the sungod. From the lower disk stretches a pair of wings generally identified as a winged sun disk, common in the ancient Near East. To his right and left is the royal title labarna (depicted as a dagger over a flower). This depiction is framed by the title ‘Great King’ on both sides (the tall cone stands for ‘king’ and above it the spiral cone means ‘great’) (Seeher 2011:83). Krupp (2000:6) informs us that the purpose of the portrayal of Tudhaliya IV in Chamber A may have been to document his transformation into a god. The King’s earthly death was depicted by the Hittites as his induction into the company of the gods. The relief may have been carved just after his death or even during his lifetime (Krupp 2000:6).

6.3.4 Chamber B

In the smaller Chamber B, the theme of divine patronage of the king is, according to Krupp (2000:6), restated. He points out that the Luwian hieroglyphs are more explicit and the depictions of the reliefs are smaller. Seeher (2011:93) tells us that Chamber B was not used like Chamber A because originally it was only accessible from the back of the rock massif. An artificial entrance through a narrow passage giving the impression of entering the earth was later created between Chamber A and B (Krupp 2000:7).
6.3.4.1 The entrance to Chamber B

Two fierce, lion-headed winged demons serve as guards at the narrow entrance to Chamber B (see Figure 6.33 and reliefs numbers 67 and 68). In the absence of hieroglyphic inscriptions, their identity is not known (Seeher 2011:93). Van Loon (1985:28) informs us that lion- (and eagle-) headed demons were popular animal supernatural beings to the Hurrians. In reliefs numbers 67 and 68 their opened jaws and raised claws were seen as a threat to anybody who might have approached the narrow passage with ill intent. Relief number 68 (identical to number 67, see Figure 6.33):

---

Seeher (2011:100).
6.3.4.2 The function and meaning of Chamber B

Seeher (2011:159) states that reconstructing the function and meaning of Chamber B is complicated. He is of the opinion that the difference in decoration of the reliefs depicts its different function. Two reliefs concern Tudhaliya IV, who is represented twice in this chamber. The two other reliefs contrast this depiction as they are concerned with the afterlife. Bonatz (2007b:6) writes that if Chamber A was created as a space of worship for the Hurro-Hittite state pantheon, then Chamber B was defined in texts as a divine stone house, É.NA₄ (DINGIR-LIM), constructed as a funeral sanctuary for the King, Tudhaliya IV. First, on the east side of the chamber as a relief (see number 81 in Figure 6.33), he is embraced by his protective deity Šarrumma holding him by the wrist, seemingly leading the King, and secondly there is a colossal statue of Tudhaliya IV, which was located against the north wall of the chamber (see Figure 6.33), the middle square to the right of cartouche number 83 with Tudhaliya IV’s name. Šarrumma, the son and heir of Teshub and Hepat, personifies divine succession and his protective embrace of Tudhaliya IV represents royal succession (Krupp 2000:6).

According to Bonatz (2007b:6), it has been suggested that relief number 81 shows the King on his way to the underworld, or it could constitute the close bond between the King and the stormgod, legitimising the King’s actions as righteous and sanctioned by the god.

The Hittites also regarded the King’s earthly death as his induction into the company of the gods. This relief could have been carved shortly after Tudhaliya IV’s death (Krupp 2000:6).

Reliefs numbers 81 and 83 (see their positions in Chamber B in Figure 6.33):

The very unusual relief of the swordgod depicted in number 82 emphasises the theme of death and the underworld in Chamber B. This is a portrayal of the swordgod Nergal (Ugur in Hurrian), referred to in a passage from a Hittite invocation ritual in which the stormgod trapped eight unwelcome gods, named the ‘primeval gods’, Aduntarri, Zulki, Irpitiga, Nara, Namšara, Minki, Amunki and Aabi, in the underworld, transforming them from clay into swords with their blades driven into the ground (Gurney 1977:41). Seeher (2011:114) quotes the text which reads: ‘He makes them as swords, spreads them on the ground,

\[190\] Cimok (2008:139).
\[191\] Cimok (2008:69). A second cartouche of Tudhaliya IV in Chamber B.
and sets the gods up in this way'.\textsuperscript{192} Seeher suggests that ‘to spread’ can also mean to pierce, to stick into, or to be stuck.

As Gurney (1977:41; cf. Seeher 2011:159) points out, it cannot be coincidence that in another Hittite invocation ritual ‘the bronze swords of Nergal’ and the ‘twelve gods of the crossroads’ are mentioned in the same context.\textsuperscript{193}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{drawing.png}
\caption{Drawing of relief number 82\textsuperscript{194} (compare its position in Chamber B, Figure 6.33)}
\end{figure}

Seeher (2011:159) mentions that this is not convincing evidence, but it helps in identifying the relief opposite \textit{Nergal} as gods of the underworld. Seeher (2011:114) says furthermore

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Text after Otten (1961), quoted by Gurney (1977:41).
\item Text after Güterbock (1964), quoted by Gurney (1977:41).
\item Cimok (2008:138).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
that apart from these quotations, support for the identification of the swordgod is very slim.

6.3.4.3 The twelve gods of the underworld
The twelve running gods of reliefs numbers 1 to 12 (see Figure 6.27) are repeated here as the twelve chthonic gods (see Figure 6.34) and they are a good example of rock reliefs cut mainly on smooth white stone (see Figure 6.35). They are associated with Nergal, the Sumero-Akkadian god of the underworld (Cimok 2008:117). They are less weathered than the matching relief panel in Chamber A. The reason for their good state of preservation is that Chamber B was narrow and soon after the sanctuary was abandoned, the reliefs were buried under sand that was washed into the chamber by rainwater (Seeher 2011:104). The beardless contingent of marching chthonic gods (without any names inscribed above them) appear in kilts, boots and single-horned pointed caps, shouldering short swords with curved blades (scimitars) (see Figure 6.34). It seems that the curved blade swords on the left were only carried by gods associated with death.

Figure 6.34
The twelve chthonic gods (compare Figure 6.33 relief numbers 69 to 80)\textsuperscript{195}

Bittel wrote that the enclosed Chamber B was ‘a temple of the dead, the funeral temple of a king’ (Krupp 2000:7). Beckman (2004a:263) agrees that Chamber B is ‘almost certainly’ the mausoleum of Tudhaluia IV, perhaps designed by his son Suppiluliuma II

\textsuperscript{195} [http://www.hittitemonuments.com](http://www.hittitemonuments.com), Chamber B.
(ca 1207-1200 BCE), advised by his grandmother, the then aged Puduhepa (Burney 2004:320). From this the hypothesis is drawn that Chamber B was connected with royal mortuary practice. According to Seeher (2011:159) and Van den Hout (2002:73), there is no convincing alternative explanation that Chamber B must have been part of the cult of Great King Tudhaliya IV after his death. The question remains whether Chamber B was his tomb or only a memorial. There are two expressions in Hittite texts that are relevant in this context: the divine stone house (É.NA₄ [DINGIR-LIM]), which is the name for a tomb or a mausoleum, and the eternal peak (na₄hekur [hekur] SAG.UŠ), which indicates a memorial.

According to Seeher (2011:159), there are only a few textual fragments using these terms and there is no final conclusion yet about their real meaning. Van den Hout (2002:74) argues that in view of new textual and archaeological material, it is possible to look again at these two terms and their architectural meaning. He argues that the divine stone house and the hegur-monument could in some cases have been identical in that every divine stone house was a tomb and ‘sometimes a tomb took on the form of a hegur-monument.’

6.3.4.4 A divine stone house or hegur-monument for Puduhepa’s son
On the left of the marching gods (see Figure 6.34) are no carved reliefs but two oblong niches set at about the same height as the chthonic gods (compare Figure 6.33). These niches compare in size and shape with the niche on the opposite side (see Figure 6.33) above relief number 81 (Seeher 2011:105).
Figure 6.35
Two niches in Chamber B (compare its position in Figure 6.33, next to relief number 69)\textsuperscript{196}

Figure 6.36
The third niche in Chamber B next to relief number 81, diagonally across relief number 69\textsuperscript{197}

Van den Hout (2002:73) writes that one of ‘the most surprising and intriguing aspects’ of second millennium Hittite archaeology is the apparent unmistakable absence of recognisable royal tombs. There are no tombs comparable to the magnificent graves at Alaça Höyük (see Figure 1.3) of the late third millennium BCE or the ancient burial mound at Gordion from the first millennium BCE. It could have been the consequence of what was described in a preserved Hittite Royal Death Ritual: that the king or queen’s body

\textsuperscript{196} Seeher (2011:107).
\textsuperscript{197} Seeher (2011:107).
was cremated in the evening of the day on which he or she died or on the following night (Seeher 2011:162). The ritual makes it clear that fire played a most important role in ‘transmitting’ to the body of the deceased that which was important for the royal afterlife (Van den Hout 2002:73).

The ashes that remained were put into a silver vase that was placed inside the ‘divine stone house’ together with all the other precious objects of gold and silver used during the fourteen-day long funeral rites. Not much space was needed because there was not a big sarcophagus. According to Seeher (2011:162), it is possible that the deep niches in the walls of Chamber B (see Figures 6.35 & 6.36) might have been used for this purpose. Van den Hout (2002:73) also comments that it is not clear whether the burnt remains were moved afterwards to a more lasting place or left there.

Beckman (2004a:263) mentions that mausoleums were most probably built for all the Hittite kings during the Empire period. The only other possible site for such a mausoleum, apart from Chamber B, was discovered southwest of Ankara (at Gavur Kalesi, the ‘fortress of the infidel’).

6.3.5 Chamber C
This small chamber was only discovered in 1966. A plinth-like block sunk into the floor and layers of ash and charcoal mixed with bones of birds and other animals, which seem to have been part of sacrificial offerings, were found there (Krupp 2000:7; cf. Seeher 2011:119) (see 7.3.6.2). Seeher (2011:119), who is at present in charge of the excavations at Yazilikaya, is of the opinion that it is difficult to interpret what these discoveries mean. He suggests that there is a possibility that rituals involving fire connected to practices in Chamber B could have taken place there. There is also a possibility that it was some sort of side room for personnel to enter Chamber B from outside, or it was perhaps associated with relief number 83 (see Figure 6.33), the second cartouche bearing Tudhaliya IV’s name (Seeher 2011:119).
6.3.6 The use of colour on the reliefs at Yazilikaya

All cultures in the ancient Near East created colourful works of art. It is a tradition that continued through centuries in their art and could also be seen in the use of colour by the Greeks and Romans. Harmanşah (2016) uses an example of Brinkmann’s colourful recreated image (see Figure 6.37) of a scene from the famous, well-preserved Alexander sarcophagus (ca 320 BCE) displayed at the Archaeological Museum in Istanbul on his course website on world history of art and the built environment (see Figure 6.38).

Figure 6.37
Brinkmann’s colour recreation of the Alexander sarcophagus (compare Figure 6.38)\(^{198}\)

\(^{198}\) [http://www.art-sheep.com](http://www.art-sheep.com) The physical evidence of this bas-relief carving was attained by Brinkmann using ultraviolet and raking light to examine the marble sculptures and recreate the original colour scheme of the reliefs.
Long before the Greeks and Romans, the Egyptians and Mesopotamians used colour pigment on their sculptures and reliefs. In Hittite cuneiform texts, colours are often mentioned although, as in the case of the reliefs of Yazilikaya, it has seldom been supported by archaeological finds (Seeher 2011:151). A stone relief with colourful fragments of wall plaster (yellow, brown, red, blue, white and black) were found in the royal citadel of Hattuša (Seeher 2011:151). It is guesswork as to whether the reliefs of Yazilikaya were painted despite the many references we find once again in cuneiform texts of the symbolic meaning the Hittites attached to colours. There are many references about statues and statuettes of deities in colourful clothes. Over time paint (see Figure 6.39) would have washed off (see Figure 6.40) the Yazilikaya reliefs, but it cannot be used as an argument against the idea of these reliefs possibly being painted. It is possible that they were repainted every year or for certain festival days related to cult activities at Yazilikaya (Seeher 2011:151). For this study, I have taken the liberty of reimagining the possible use of colours in a reconstruction drawing of the deities Teshub and Hepat in the central relief on the back wall of Chamber A.
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Gurney (1977:22) quotes from a passage in a cult inventory which describes a colourfully dressed Teshub standing on mountain gods (see Figure 6:39):

Weather god of Heaven, a male statue, plated with gold, in his right hand he holds a club, in his left hand he holds a golden symbol of good, standing on two mountains in the form of male statues plated with silver.

There was frequent contact on diplomatic and cultural levels between Egypt and Hatti in the Late Bronze Age and the possibility exists that Hittite artists used a similar colour

---

200 Colouring by myself according to the colour spectrum used in ancient Egyptian art in Figure 6.41.
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spectrum to that of the Egyptians, as seen in Figure 6.41. The ancient Egyptians’ concept of colour was strongly connected to their landscape, as the Hittites’ would have been to their landscape of mountains, springs, and rivers. Without going into detail, for it is not within the scope of this discussion, the colours of uadj (see Figure 6.41) broadly represent life related to water; kek was identified with darkness, the darkest shades of blue. In the Egyptian language there are many words that describe this concept similarly because darkness was an important feature in the culture of the Nile Valley (Tiradritti 2007:29). kem is the colour of cultivated land (kemet) which was submerged by floodwaters every year; desher describes the various shades of the desert (desheret), bright pink at dawn, yellow at midday and red at dusk (Tiradritti 2007:29); and hedj describes the sunlight and all shiny things like silver, gold and high quality limestone the Egyptians used for building.

6.4 CONCLUSION

As Seeher (2011:167) and Bryce (2002:196) explain about Yazilikaya, this important and highly acclaimed site’s true meaning and significance still escape us and the purpose and function of Chambers A and B remain hypothetical. The reason why scholars at this stage cannot say any more about their meaning than what we have explored in this chapter is that the cuneiform texts which have been transliterated and translated do not provide solid evidence and there are no comparable sites like Hittite royal tombs nor huwaši shrines identified anywhere in Anatolia.

What makes Yazilikaya unique, as Seeher (2011:167) proposes, is that it corresponds in essence to a Hittite temple, with the reliefs of Chamber A as the inner sanctuary and the many deities worshipped at Yazilikaya as similar to that in Hittite temples. The Hittites were masters at stone masonry and their skills and technology were demonstrated in the reliefs commissioned by their kings. It is likely that, above all, the rock-cut reliefs in general functioned as propaganda for the king and queen as a public demonstration of their power and possessions, declaring to the people of Hatti ‘[t]his land is under our rule’ and the depiction of the Hurro-Hittite deities enforced their claim ‘[t]he gods are with us’ (Seeher 2011:169).
CHAPTER SEVEN
GREAT KING HATTUŞILI III AND QUEEN PUDUHEPA
ON THE FESTIVAL ROAD

Between the northern hemisphere’s spring and autumn, the times of sowing and reaping, a number of the major Hittite state cult festivals were celebrated for centuries. We do not know what the Hittites’ concept of time was or how they would refer to the days and months, but the year was made up of four seasons, as we know today (Beckman 2004a:259). In earlier times the Anatolian year started in autumn, but by the time of the Hittite Empire, the Hittites followed the Babylonians by starting their year in spring (Beckman 2004a:259).

Much depended on the benevolence of the deities in whose honour these seasonal cult festivals were held. The fertility of the soil, abundant rain, fruitful harvests, as well as the increase of livestock and game for hunting were dependent on the deities’ goodwill. The gods could not be neglected during the year, but at certain times, like during the festivals, they were lavishly treated and entertained (Bryce 2002:189).

7.1 KING HATTUŞILI III BEHIND A MASK

Bryce (2002:12) refers to Hittite kings as ‘men behind masks’. In the available texts, we have very rare glimpses of what really went on behind the walls of palaces and in the lives of Hittite kings. Hattušili III lived behind a mask because his life and deeds were concealed behind formal, carefully phrased texts like his ‘Autobiography’ (see 4.2.2), annals, letters, decrees and treaties. Hattušili III is furthermore a typical example of such a king living behind a mask because he was trying, rather unconvincingly, to justify his action of dethroning his nephew in his long ‘Autobiography’. Nowhere in that document, in his defence of his action, does Hattušili comment negatively about his nephew Urhi-Teshub’s kingship. Hattušili III insists that his only justification for the usurpation was a personal one. He does not mention that his nephew Urhi-Teshub belittled him, disregarding him as a vastly experienced military general and vassal prince. As king, Urhi-
Teshub stripped his uncle of the high office granted him by the late King Muwatallī II, Urhi-Teshub’s father and Hattušili’s brother (Bryce 2002:14).

Hattušili III, after he became king, was kept at a distance from his subjects (as was customary for all Hittite kings) while he supposedly had direct communication with the pantheon of deities which greatly increased the sense of mystery around any king (Bryce 2002:19). The king acquired the image of being suspended between heaven and earth, prompted by royal names such as ‘My Sun’, comparable to the phrase ‘Your Majesty.’ The sun image was taken from northern Syria and was closely connected to the portrayal of a winged sun-disc (Bryce 2002:19). The monuments, letters and proclamations of the Hittite kings show us a public face they themselves wanted others to see, with the result that we are forever kept in the dark about who the kings really were, including their private lives, peculiarities and defects. Bryce (2002:13) cautions that in the absence of substantial evidence about a king’s life, even a small clue or passing reference is dangerous because it cannot be used to create a king’s whole personality, as was the case with Hattušili III and his predecessors.

7.1.1 Purity regulations for Hattušili III

McMahon (1995:1990) and Collins (2007:179) tell us that apart from Hattušili III ‘living behind a mask’, his position as chief priest also caused extreme concern over his purity. His purity (and that of his family) was most important for the state cult because, of all human beings, he was closest to the gods; his good health was synonymous with that of the land. It goes along with the Hittite belief that impurity could be transferred from person to person, and the king as the highest priest of the land had to maintain his cultic purity at all costs. McMahon (1995:1988) sheds more light on the king’s purity issue, stating that it was not only the king whose impurity could endanger the land; anybody who was impure could anger the gods. McMahon tells us that in Hittite law certain offences are described as crimes of impurity (hurkel) and were punishable by death. Cleansing for the king from impurity was based on rituals where a series of approved magical actions were performed by the priests.
Two purification rituals, *itkalzi* and *itkahhi*, performed on behalf of Hattušili III were derived from the earliest Hurrian influence on the state cult (Collins 2007:179). The *itkalzi* rituals used the analogy of rites of transmission: ‘As water is pure... so [may the sacrificer, Hattušili] be pure before the gods and people.'\(^{204}\) The *itkahhi* was hymn-like incantations used in the ceremony (Collins 2007:179). Blood was rarely used as a purifying element in any Hittite cult ceremonies; it was later introduced from Hurrian Kizzuwatna with burnt offerings and the sacrifice of birds (Collins 2007:180). When a new temple for *Lelwani* (see 5.2.1.7), the Kizzuwatnean goddess of the night, was established, blood was used for the purification of her statue as well as the area (cella) where her cult image was kept (Collins 2007:180).

A high level of purity was maintained when the King travelled through Anatolia at the time of the festival processions (Macqueen 1999:116). People only caught a distant glimpse of him, surrounded by servants and bodyguards, as he passed along the processional road (Bryce 2002:15). It speaks for itself that Queen Puduhepa, with her concern for her sickly husband, Hattušili III, took extra care by not exposing him to their subjects during their seasonal cult festival tours. This extreme concern ensured that the King was always removed from all forms of contact with people, animals or objects that could cause pollution. This resulted in a huge barrier between the King and the majority of his subjects in military and other contexts (Bryce 2002:15).

Hattušili III also remained a distant figure to his subjects on long military campaigns because his royal tent was pitched out of the way of the common soldiers’ camp to keep the already sickly Hattušili free of contamination (Bryce 2002:15). Subsequently, as principal celebrant Hattušili III performed a wide variety of time-consuming religious tasks celebrated in numerous sacred places and temples in Anatolia. He played a leading role in these religious festivals that took him to the main cult centres of his kingdom (Bryce 2002:29).

7.1.2 Queen Puduhepa in the public eye

An unanswerable question about Queen Puduhepa remains: did the strict purity regulations of the Hittites perhaps contribute to the fact that she lived, for that time, such a long life, into her eighties or nineties? It is not known from texts what she died of and when exactly, but it is assumed that she also survived her son Tudhaliya IV (Van den Hout 2014a). We know more about female members of the royal family than about their husbands mainly because of comments made about them by other people (Bryce 2002:13). We have clear, interesting descriptions of Suppiluliuma I’s tyrannous Babylonian wife and, above all, from many documents about Puduhepa.

7.2 STATE CULT FESTIVALS

The Hittite gods demanded continuous declarations of devotion through offerings, sacrifice and worship. This led to the establishment of the detailed and complicated calendar of state cult festivals (McMahon 1995:1993). Food and other material things were handed over from individuals or a community to a deity, an evil spirit, a phantom, or to whatever chosen embodiment of a divine being (Beckman 2004b:336). As the cultic calendar of the Hittites developed, so did the scope of their festivals. The longer festivals involved cultic journeys in which the King and Queen and their religious entourage only travelled to various temples in the capital, Hattuša, or to local shrines and stelae (*huwaši* stones) in the countryside. Sometimes the King was compelled to break away from military campaigns and return home to be on time to attend these cult festivals (Gilan 2011:281).

7.2.1 Purpose of the state cult festivals

Twice a year, in spring and autumn, the royal couple would set out for at least thirty-eight days, travelling from one major festival to the other through the towns and villages of Hatti (Beckman 2013:290 & 2005:347). The King took the celebrations in honour of the gods and the maintenance of their cults very seriously because the fate and prosperity of Hatti depended on his participation (Gilan 2011:280). Despite festivals being the heart of the Hittite state cult, information about ceremonial schedules and sites of worship of all the gods and goddesses varied (Beckman 2004a:260). Rituals were carried out by priests in
many towns and villages in Hatti, but the rituals of the major cults, such as that of the stormgod and sungoddess, were primarily performed by the King as chief priest and the Queen as chief priestess and representative of the sungoddess of the Great Temple in the capital Hattuša (Kuhrt 1998:277).

These seasonal journeys of Hattušili III and Puduhepa also took them to other cities whose cults had become part of the Hittite state festivals. Such journeys included other celebrants as well as the images of the deities carried on wagons. If Hattušili III could not be present at these festivals for whatever reason, he could be represented by Queen Puduhepa, a prince of their immediate family, a high-ranking official, or even a symbolic animal hide. We can assume that during some of the arduous cult festival tours, Queen Puduhepa stood in for her elderly, sickly husband (Beckman 1989:102). Puduhepa had the authority to perform state cult ceremonies independent from her husband if he was away on military campaigns.

If Hattušili III disregarded his religious duties or displeased the gods in any way, for example by breaking an oath, it could bring divine fury upon the whole Kingdom of Hatti (Bryce 2011:87). Gilan (2011:280) mentions that many Hittite royal prayers demonstrate this Hittite belief that negligence of the cult of important deities could have terrible consequences for them. That is why it was important for the King and the gods to remain in regular contact and maintain a good relationship: ‘so that difficulties in the functioning of the cosmos might be rectified to their mutual benefit’ (Beckman 2013:290).

### 7.2.2 The chief priest’s and priestess’s role in the cult festivals

The highest-ranking priests of the Hittite state cult were Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa, and most of the major state festivals were designed to be celebrated by them. The Hittites thought kingship was divinely inspired, but Hattušili III, like the kings before him, was not viewed as divine or as a god the way the Egyptians saw theirs. A Hittite king was believed to attain divinity only after death (Kuhrt 1998:277).

Hattušili III served as go-between for the gods and their human worshippers. He also protected and controlled his subjects. He had to oversee his subjects fulfilling their
obligations towards the gods, affirming him being in charge of all the worship of the state cult (Beckman 2005:346). Hattušili III regularly had to perform the important prescribed religious rituals because for the Hittites the most direct path to political stability lay in the king and in subjects maintaining harmonious relations with the gods (McMahon 1995:1990).

Queen Puduhepa, as chief priestess, joined Hattušili III regularly for his compulsory extravagant seasonal state cult festivals tours (Beckman 1989:103; cf. Darga 1994:32). Her role in the cult ceremonies and rituals was important and it was described in a publication of ritual texts known as Description of festivals (Darga 1994:31).

7.2.3 Major state cult festivals attended by Puduhepa and Hattušili III
Because the Hittites were preoccupied with the influence of their gods on nature, they celebrated many of their seasonal cult festivals worshipping the weather gods whom they believed sent growth and sustenance for their crops and flocks (Beckman 1989:99). According to Beckman (2004a:260 & 2005:347), by the time of the Empire period the king’s cultic duties had been combined into two main annual cult journeys through the heart of the land of Hatti. The royals travelled to cult cities such as Katapa, Arinna and Ankuwa as well as other cities as outlined in tablets (Güterbock 1997c:89). The festival procession to a sacred place outside the city was part of the spring festival in Hattuša as well as in a number of the local festivals listed in the cult inventories (Güterbock 1997c:68). Güterbock (1997c:89) tells us that it was a custom amongst the Hittites that could by compared to the Babylonian akitu festivals.

Burney (2004:231) is of the opinion that these two major cult festival tours and their attendance by the royals were undertaken in an atmosphere of genuine piety. Güterbock (1997c:68) informs us that descriptions of individual parts of these two great festivals are available in translations describing that the most important phase of the festivals was when the offerings to the gods were made, accompanied by music, dancing and acrobatics.
7.2.3.1 The AN.TAH.ŠUM festival

Hattušili III and Puduhepa attended the important spring festival of the crocus (or fennel) plant (AN.TAH.ŠUM), incorporating several local spring festivals into one long festival lasting for about forty days. Güterbock (1997c:89) adds that apart from the long trips the royals made, many different temples in the capital of Hattuša were also visited and many gods worshipped in the course of these long-lasting festivals. The main theme of the friezes of the large vase from Hüseyindede depicting musicians playing castanets, a tambourine and a lyre (see Figure 7.1) is the spring festival, the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival, held at the beginning of the Hittite agricultural year (Güterbock 1997c:89).

7.2.3.2 The nuntarriyašha festival

In autumn the royals attended the elaborate festival of haste (nuntarriyašha), which was celebrated over a period of fifty days (Beckman 1989:103 & 2004a:260). This festival incorporated local autumn festivals into one ritual (Haas 1994:827). One central theme of this festival of harvesting was that the goddess of Arinna (Hepat) was offered new fruits, young wine and fresh honey by Queen Puduhepa (Hutter 1997:81).

Figure 7.1
Musicians playing castanets, a tambourine and a lyre

---

205 Alparslan-Dogan & Alparslan (2013:588): Large Hüseyindede relief vase.
Gilan (2011:283) sheds more light by mentioning that a recent translation of this cult of the festival of haste reveals that a victorious Hittite king on his return from battle would often not celebrate his victory in the capital or present his booty to the stormgod and sungoddess, as was the tradition. The Hittite king was then upon his return, ‘hastily’ sent on the road again to attend another major cult festival. Later, Hutter (1997:81) tells us, Hattušili III and Puduhepa as well as their son Tudhaliya IV added minor festivals as well as new rites to the nuntarriyašha-festival’s ritual.

7.2.4 The most important festivals of the final years of the Hittite Empire
The most important state cult festivals during the final years of the Hittite Empire when Hattušili III and Puduhepa were on the throne were:

- the New Year purulli (meaning ‘of the earth’) festival held in the cult city of Nerik (see its location Figure 2.2) (Beckman 2004a:206);
- the hišuwa festival of which the meaning of the term is unknown but associated with the religious reforms of Queen Puduhepa who dedicated it to the stormgod of Hatti on behalf of her husband, Hattušili III (Beckman 1989:103);
- the KI.LAM festival (festival of the gate building) in which food produced in cities and towns of central Anatolia was put on show for the royal couple (Gurney 1980:154; cf. Beckman 2004a:260). We do not have much information on these last two festivals.

Cuneiform texts about the hišuwa- and KI.LAM festivals were made available for transliteration and translation as recently as the 1960’s. Laroche, the French linguist and Hittitologist, Güterbock (1997c:90) tells us, was still working on these transliterations and translations when Güterbock and Haas (1994:848) wrote and interpreted parts of the texts.

7.2.4.1 The purulli (New Year’s) festival and Puduhepa
This Hattian festival originated from the cult centre at Nerik and goes back possibly as far as pre-Hittite times (Haas 1994:696). It was one of the major festivals on the Hittite calendar, celebrated at the beginning of the New Year. Its main purpose was to
strengthen the growth of nature and the vitality and charisma of the royal couple, but also to renovate the palace, thus symbolically renewing kingship (Hutter 1997:81).

The festival had an inevitable chthonic character and was dedicated to the goddess Lelwani of the underworld. Her cult played an important role in Queen Puduhepa’s prayers and pleas for Hattušili III’s health and survival. It is a possibility that Puduhepa’s scribes were responsible for the shorter version of this festival as she often had to represent the King because his ill health prevented him from presiding at the festival (Gurney 1980:155). Gurney (1980:155) explains that when the King attended and celebrated the purulli festival in person, a tablet with descriptions and instructions in the minutest detail described the ceremony.

According to Beckman (1998:103), this festival description, like most others, was dull, monotonous and repetitive. During this festival, the myth of the slaying of the dragon (also called the Myth of Illuyanka, the great dragon of Hittite mythology) (see 5.3.2.2) was acted and recited (Gurney 1980:154). Hutter (1997:81) speculates that this long New Year’s festival was recorded on thirty-two tablets and not celebrated annually but only every seventh or ninth year. He adds that it was because of increasing political pressure from the warring Kashkan tribes in the north that it became difficult to celebrate this festival at Nerik. He writes that the festival was shortened and some parts were skipped or resumed at other cult centres.

7.2.4.2 Puduhepa introducing Hurrian elements to the hišuwa festival
Before Puduhepa became Queen of Hatti, cult festivals were already related to politics. It was information about local rites and magic that helped her and her priests to institute reform of the Hittite state cult festivals (Collins 2007:177). Güterbock (1997c:89) mentions too that another festival named EZEN (h)išuwaš has become available in cuneiform (CTH 628). The title of the text reads:

When Queen Puduhepa called the chief of scribes, UR.MAH-ziti, to look in Hattuša for tablets of Kizzuwatna, he wrote these tablets of the EZEN hišuwaš.
According to Güterbock (1997c:90), the text of this festival contains many speeches in Hurrian and it deals mainly with Hurrian deities. It includes long lists of deified mountains and rivers ranging from Kizzuwatna to Syria. The purpose of the rites of this festival was to purify the King and the royal family and to secure their well-being (Güterbock 1997c:90). Haas (1994:848) is of the opinion that Puduhepa and her priests compiled the hišuwa festival. The festival lasted nine days and it was dedicated to the stormgod of Hatti and the welfare of the state on behalf of Hattušili III.

Dinçol (2013:585) quotes from a text which talks about a mime play with dance and music performed at the hišuwa festival (see Figure 7.2):

Three percussionists fight in front of the statue of the stormgod and [symbolically] fight with him. In the meantime, the drummers sing 'the song of war' playing drum and castanets. One drummer blows horns in the temple.²⁰⁶

![Figure 7.2](image.png)

Four musicians with a shofar and bass drum²⁰⁷

![Figure 7.3](image.png)

A lyre, double-flute, castanets and dancing²⁰⁸

Drama was part of the Hittite cult. Van den Hout (2014b:77) explains that mythological stories like the ‘disappearing deity’²⁰⁹ were acted out by a cast of characters. At religious

---

²⁰⁹ When misfortune struck, it was blamed on a deity withdrawing in anger over something upsetting. When it was decided which deity it was, a rite was performed (Van den Hout 2014b:77).
festivals, strange and comical stories were told. Dramas were staged to entertain and explain religious or royal ideology to the audience.

### 7.2.5 A variety of state cult festivals

The official festival calendar contained more or less one hundred and sixty-five festivals (Bryce 2011:87). Many of these were celebrated annually or even more frequently. Some festivals lasted for a few hours while others went on for longer than a month. Beckman (2004a:260; cf. Gurney 1980:153) informs us that some of this large number and great variety of festivals' titles were preserved: festivals of the cold weather, the month, cutting of grapes, thunder, rain, grove, torch, invocation of a priest and in honour of a few gods. Descriptions of these exist in a series of large tablets. None of the rites of these festivals were practised chronologically, but it was important that they were performed during the right season; otherwise it could have had serious consequences for the worshippers (Beckman 2004a:260).

Many of these festivals were celebrated in and around Hattuša. Distinctive features of these festivals were the storage in autumn of grain in pots (*pithoi*) (see Figure 7.4), kept during winter in silos and storerooms (see Figures 7.4 & 7.5) and ritually opened by the priests in spring (Beckman 2004a:260)

---
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7.2.5.1 Festival texts and cult inventories (catalogues)

It is generally assumed that Puduhepa’s son Tudhaliya IV reorganised the Hittite cult inventories at the request of his mother as part of a reform programme (Burney 2004:71). In recent research, Cammarosano (2012:3) states that this assumption is being challenged, debated and reappraised (see 8.1.3 & 8.1.4).

Festival texts focused on specific festivals, while cult inventories were written with regard to specific towns (Cammarosano 2013:69). Görke (2013:50) tells us that festival texts which described old Hattian-Anatolian cultic rites seem to present the possibility of a large audience and many non-cultic people being present at the offering scenes in the inner temple. Hurrian- or Mesopotamian-influenced festival texts seem to describe offering scenes with only cultic personnel and an inner circle of high-ranking court officials and musicians present (Görke 2013:50). She points out that passages in the festival texts that describe offering scenes in the temples bring to light that large numbers of the Hittite population seem to have taken part in offering scenes, sometimes even assisting the king in a major state festival like the old Hattian-Anatolian AN.TAH.ŠUM festival.

7.2.5.2 Festivals for tutelary deities

Many festivals were celebrated in honour of tutelary deities, of which ‘the festival of all tutelary deities’ seemed to have been one that gave an intriguing insight into the Hittite religious perspective of new tutelary deities to protect everything. These deities were created, so to say, in situ by the author of festival texts (McMahon 1991:83) (see 7.2.5.1). McMahon (1991:52) informs us that Tudhaliya IV was the promoter of ‘the festival of all tutelary deities’ although he had his own patron god and protector, Šarrumma, who was depicted on the walls of Yazilikaya (see Figures 3.7 & 3.8).

According to McMahon (2011:51), many cities in the Hittite Empire had their own tutelary deity inherited from the Hattian pantheon, but it was not noted in the state archives. In the early history of the Hittites, the tutelary deity was quite important since it was sometimes included in older treaties in a triad with the stormgod and the sungod or sungoddess (McMahon 1991:51).
7.2.6 Relief vases portraying state cult festival rituals

Three vases belonging to a group known as the Bitik-Inandiktepe vases are decorated with reliefs, religious subjects, royal figures, festivities and cult objects, offerings, celebrations and entertainment by musicians, dancers, and acrobats in honour of the gods at cult festivals (compare Figures 7.1, 7.6 & 7.7) (Yildirim 2013:228).

The Inandik relief cultic vase (see Figure 7.6) as well as two recent finds (see Figures 7.1 & 7.7) from Hüseyindede Höyük in Sungurlu, in the Çorum province in the Black Sea region north-west of Bogazköy where the Hattian traditions were preserved since the Old Kingdom, are astonishing examples of Hittite figurative art portraying rituals during Hittite cult festivals (Yildirim 2013:235). These vases give a timeless portrayal of Hittite cult festivals lacking in the iconography of the Hittite Empire period. Collins (2004a:444) describes the scenes on the Inandik relief vase as possibly taking place at a wedding ceremony. Güterbock (1997c:89) interprets it as a possible visual reenactment of the offering ritual at the New Year’s festival (see 7.2.3.1).

---
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7.3 STATE CULT FESTIVAL RITUALS

Reading texts recording cult festivals in honour of the Hittite gods is not very interesting or absorbing, according to Bryce (2002:189). The texts are very repetitive and contain little variation. The reason for this is perhaps that they serve simply as reference manuals for the guidance of participants in the ceremonies (Bryce 2002:189). For us to appreciate the importance of the information of these festival texts, we have to look beyond their set form to the actual religious experience they demonstrate (Bryce 2002:189). The sights and sounds of the Hittite state cult festivals in and around Hattuša will be highlighted in the next paragraphs in order to recreate the colourful energetic processions. This will give us an idea of how the Hittites entertained and demonstrated their hospitality to their gods. Entertainment was an everyday element in Hittite religious life. The forms it took were dancing, singing, music, boxing, stone throwing, wrestling, bull-leaping, and horse racing (Genz & Mielke 2011:309).

7.3.1 Music and dancing

Like other Near Eastern societies, most of the Hittite rituals during festivals were accompanied by music, dance, acrobatics and bull leaping. These magnificent ceremonies involved entertainment for both deities and worshippers. It made the King and Queen as well as the gods happy (Dinçol 2013:582). Music and dance were the centre of Hittite festival processions and crucial for the observance of all Hittite cult festivals (Collins 2003:105). As a symbol of divine power and civilization, music had its own protecting deities as in Egypt and Mesopotamia. Musicians accompanied the royal couple on their seasonal festival travels (Dinçol 2013:582). Texts tell us that there were many professional musicians and singers involved in these state cult activities. The most important musicians amongst them were the singers known from Mesopotamian sources. It is assumed by Dinçol (2013:583) that Hittite musicians were trained in temple or palace schools in Egypt and Mesopotamia. According to him (Dinçol), it is not clear how and where female musicians were trained. The main forms of making music were playing the lyre and singing. Dinçol (2013:583) tells us that the cultic singer (LúGALA=Lúšahtarili) became an important assistant at cult festivals.
Evidence of music among the Hittites comes from cuneiform texts (see hymn in Figure 7.37), with limited information on musical practice in the Hittite state cult, painted relief vases (see Figures 7.1, 7.6 & 7.7) and stelae (Dinçöl 2013:582). Information about Hittite music is best documented in the state cult festival texts (called festival rituals) where cult practices were overseen by the King or in his absence by the Queen, a prince or a high priest or priestess. Juggling and acrobatics were prescribed in festival texts too and mock battles were staged for entertainment. On the neck of the smaller vase (see Figure 7.7) is portrayed a cult festival with dancers (see Figure 7.3). Music and acrobats performing bull-leaping are portrayed in Figures 7.8 and 7.9. Bull-leaping was common in the Aegean and Near Eastern cultures but unconventional in Hittite figurative art (Yildirim 2013:236).

Figure 7.8
Drawing of bull-leaping and musicians on the small Hüseyindede vase

Figure 7.9
Bull-leaping relief

7.3.2 The King and Queen enter the throne room

King Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa, consort and high priestess of the realm, enter the throne room from the tarnu building (ritual cleansing house) and the separate cult rooms, one for the stormgod of Hatti and the other for the sungoddess of Arinna, after they have both been ritually cleansed and dressed in their festival clothes by their attendants. Whatever their outward appearance, Hattušili III or any other king is a servant, the slave of the gods in whose honour the forthcoming ceremonies and festivities will be held (Bryce 2002:187). Bryce tells us that at this stage the chief of the royal blacksmiths presents the King with a crook (kalmuš) (see Figure 6.31) and a gold, silver or iron spear. The crook (kalmuš) is a symbol of the King’s judicial power and the spear of his military power (Bryce 2002:187).

7.3.3 The procession of the KI.LAM festival

Güterbock (1997c:89) describes a festival with the unusual name of EZEN.KI.LAM, ‘festival of the gate building’. According to him, the festival describes in detail how the King and Queen travelled during this festival from one gate of the Upper City of Hattuša to the next (see Figure 7.14). This festival was also part of the Old Hattian-Anatolian tradition. It was a short festival and contained unique descriptions of a procession of animal images taking place in the palace’s courtyard (see middle Figures 7.10 & 7.11) and a ‘great assembly’ of offerings to various gods at the huwaši stones (see 6.3.2.2) where sacrifices were made and a feast held for the gods and their worshippers (Bryce 2002:191; cf. Görke 2013:48).

A scribe checked if everyone who had to be there was present. The palace doors opened and the royal couple stepped into the courtyard. The King briefly examined his entourage of royal bodyguards, priests, temple personnel, singers, musicians, actors, acrobats and dancers. He then lead them through the main gate of the palace complex (see Figure 7.10).
The King and the Queen stepped onto their waiting carriages and were followed by an ox-drawn wagon carrying statues resembling the god to be honoured. The image of the god was not simply a lifeless object but the embodiment of the god himself. The golden statue shone in the sunlight, then the god merged with his image and remained there as guest of honour for future ceremonies (Bryce 2002:188). His worshippers believed that the god was looking forward to the entertainment and feasting they were about to share. The cult images were transported to sacred places in the country marked by huwaši stones (see 6.3.2.2) where sacrifices were made and a feast held for the gods and their worshippers (Bryce 2002:191).

The symbols of the hunt in the form of animals made of precious metal were carried behind the dancers in the procession. Collins (2003:105) writes that by the Late Bronze Age, when Hattušili III and Puduhepa were on the throne, hunting was no longer a regular part of Hittite life. She (Collins) suggests that the KI.LAM festival celebrated a prehistoric tradition where hunting and cultic performance were inseparably linked. Before the procession began, the King was presented, in exchange for his spear, with the ceremonial axe (adze) decorated with the image of the stormgod Teshub (see middle front of Figure 7.13). The festival journey began. The festival procession left the palace gate at the acropolis (see Figure 7.10) and proceeded along the ceremonial way, leaving the city...
through the King’s Gate (see Figures 7.14; 7.15 & 7.16) and passing outside the city wall before entering it again through the Lion Gate (see Figures 7.14; 7.17 & 7.18).

Figure 7.12
The King’s and Lion Gates of the Upper City of Hattuša

Figure 7.13
Hittite ceremonial axe

---

218 Alparslan-Dogan & Alparslan (2013:236).
Figure 7.14
Plan of Hattuša during Hattušili III and Tudhaliya IV’s rule

Figure 7.15
The King’s Gate of Hattuša (see Figure 7.14)

Figure 7.16
Reconstruction of the King’s Gate

---

219 http://www.basarchive.org
220 http://www.global.britanica.com
221 http://www.luwianstudies.com
The processional way was lined with inhabitants of the city and foreign visitors in anticipation of the spectacle to pass by them. In the distance the sound from the drums, cymbals, tambourines and castanets was heard. A fragment from the upper tier of the Inandik vase portrays two acrobatic dancers turning summersaults.

Perhaps the crowd had a passing glimpse of King Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa protected and isolated by their attendants and the royal bodyguard (Bryce 2002:190). A group of dancers including acrobats (see Figures 7.19 & 7.20) performed and danced before Hattušili and Puduhepa as part of the procession. The rest of the entertainers were brightly dressed dancers, jugglers and jesters whose primarily purpose was to entertain the gods being honoured as well as the crowd.

---

7.3.3.1 Foreign visitors at the state cult festivals

One way in which religious elements were transferred between cultures was through religious festivals (Rutherford 2016:67). The Hittite state-sponsored seasonal festivals could also be seen as an intentional formal way of transmitting their religion across linguistic and geographical borders instead of by the difficult-to-record casual way of transmission by merchants, mixed marriages and wandering performers (Bachvarova 2016:219). During the reign of Hattušili III and Puduhepa, state-sponsored festivals were mainly for the local people and royalty but were also attended by diplomats and merchants from other regions (Rutherford 2016:68). These festivals became a meeting place where people from different political and religious backgrounds met and took the knowledge they gained back to their own cultures.

Another possibility was that a festival organised by a major power like the Hittites of the Empire Period was a way of bringing together different groups under its control or sphere of influence. Rutherford (2016:68) tells us that the well-documented KI.LAM festival was attended by representatives from all over Anatolia, including dancers from local towns and supervisors responsible for grain storage throughout the Hittite Empire. The use of festivals as an expression of power became well known in later periods of the ancient

---

224 Osseman, © Photograph. The Museum of Anatolian Civilizations.
Near East. It is even possible that festivals were there to commemorate and dramatise historical conflict or interaction between different groups of people (Rutherford 2016:69).

### 7.3.4 In the temple

On its way, the procession stopped at other city temples (see Figure 7.14) where the royal couple was welcomed, dances performed, hymns sung, and Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa as well as other high officials entered the Great Temple’s *cella*. As Gurney (1980:155; cf. McMahon 1995:1993) wrote, ‘it made it almost a distinctly royal ritual event.’ The chief priest and priestess washed their hands thoroughly and they proceeded to make libation at the holy places within the temple: the offering table, the hearth, the throne and even a door bolt (Bryce 2002:190).

![A Hittite king and queen performing a cult ritual](www.panoramio.com Alaça Höyük. Photograph: Yamanturk, E)

At the offering table, the King washed his hands again and broke one of the loaves of bread (see Figure 7.21). Some of these loaves resemble human figures or parts thereof; a finger, a hand, a tongue. Others were shaped like a bird, a piglet or a cow, or inanimate objects like a ball, a ring or a wheel (Bryce 2002:190).

---

7.3.4.1 ‘Drinking’ the gods

The royals were handed silver rhythons (drinking cups) full of wine, shaped in the form of a bull, a stag or a fist (see Figures 7.22, 7.23 & 7.24). The ‘drinking’ of the gods by the King and the Queen was an important votive act, a uniquely Hittite practice, according to Collins (2007:165). With this act the King and Queen came into mystical union with the divine guest symbolised by the cup they drank from.

Figure 7.22
Bull rhython

Figure 7.23 (see Figure 3.11)
Stag rhython

Figure 7.24
Fist-shaped rhython (back and front)

Figure 7.25

227 http://www.mfa.org/collections/hittitedrinkingvessel
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They drank to every holy place and different sections in the temple while music accompanied them. Dinçol (2013:584) and Görke (2013:42) describe it for us by quoting the following texts:

The King and Queen drink the stormgod of Hatti three times standing. He breaks thick breads. The Hattian singer sings. King and Queen drink Hepat's mušni (son), Hepat Šarrumma three times. He breaks thick breads. The Hurrian singer sings.

7.3.4.2  The fist-shaped silver rhython

The frieze on the fist-shaped silver rhython (see Figures 7.27 & 7.28) with the name of Tudhaliya (possibly IV, but there is no consensus whether it was him or Tudhaliya II or III) portrays a libation of the King to the stormgod Teshub, accompanied by live music.

---

Figure 7.26
Detail on rhython with King Tudhaliya IV (right) pouring a libation to the stormgod Teshub (left)\textsuperscript{228}

\textsuperscript{228}  http://www.mfa.org/collections/hittitedrinkingvessel, figures 7.26 & 7.29.
The cup duplicates in detail the features of the human hand (Güterbock & Kendall 1995:1788). The focal point is the cult scene depicted on the back of the hand, with the King pouring a libation in front of an offering table behind which stands the stormgod *Teshub* holding the reins of a bull (Güterbock & Kendall 1995:1773). Around the reverse of the cup the King is followed by cult personnel and musicians (see Figures 7.28 & 7.29). Both Kendall and Güterbock (1995:1961) are of the opinion that the relief shows a springtime ceremony that passed over a mountain covered with trees, travelling across a field to an outlying sanctuary of the stormgod or the god in whose honour the festival was held. It was even suggested that the tower behind the final figure (see drawing Figure 7.29) symbolises Hattuša and that the outlying sanctuary of the stormgod *Teshub* could have been Yazılıkaya (Güterbock & Kendall 1995:1977). The musical instruments used in this cult ritual are depicted in Figures 7.30 and 7.31 as well as described in a ritual text:

---
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The King and the Queen drink Taurit seated. They play a large lyre; do not sing; there is no sacrificial bread.

Figure 7.30
Drawing of Figure 7.31 with large and small lyres

Figure 7.31
Fragments from the Inandik vase with the lyre musicians and figures sitting at the offering table

The King and the Queen drink the sungod seated. The cult singers sing, playing castanets and clapping.

7.3.5 Offerings

Beckman (2004b:338) comments that none of the terminology used by the Hittites in their offering rituals were original. It was only in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BCE, during the life of Queen Puduhepa, that the Hittites borrowed a complicated lexicon from Hurrian and Luwian to construct the different kinds of offerings. The general basic

---

230 Text after KBo 4.9 rev.30-32, cited by Dinçol (2013:584).
231 Alparslan-Dogan & Alparslan (2013:586)
principle of their offerings was that they had to be completely or partly destroyed in order to pass from the human world to the recipient deities in their own realm. Liquids were poured, bread was broken, vessels were smashed and animals were killed. Apart from the gods who saw to it that they received the ‘rewards’ owed them, the priests of the particular god’s temple also made sure vows were fulfilled to ward off the deities’ punishment (De Roos 2007:4).

The offering rituals went on for a long time because at the major festivals, many gods were included and each received a variety of offerings. It was a process of monotonous repetition of sacrifices and libations (Gurney 1980:155). The purification rituals of the offering elements used for the festivals were accompanied by liturgy, recitation, singing and dancing (see Figures 7.34 & 7.35).

When the King and Queen give their chalices to the sister of god (a priestess), they play lyres and tambourines, and the hapi-men dance.

---

235 Drawing from Cimok (2008:85).
236 Text after KUB.20.32 III 10-12, cited by Dinçol (2013:585)
Based on the seasons, a selection of food offerings was laid out to attract the gods. The food (honey, oil, fruit, cheese and different kinds of bread) was presented to the specific deity. Drink offerings were standard libations (milk, wine and beer) and offered with a variety of other Hittite beverages (McMahon 1995:1998). According to Collins (2007:164), as the colourful textiles and branches were spread on the ground to show the gods the way to the offering table, the priests summoned the gods. Collins quotes from such a prayer she translated (2007:164):

If you are in Nineveh then come from Nineveh...
If you are in the rivers and streams then come from there...
If you are with the sungoddess of the earth and the primordial gods then come from those.²³⁹

7.3.5.1 Singing
Dinçol (2013:583; cf. Collins 2003:105) informs us that the majority of the singers in the cult activities were women. He mentions that apart from professional musicians, other attendants such as comedians, physicians (singing and dancing with tambourines for magic and shamanic reasons) and priestesses could also play music and sing. No doubt, Puduhepa as a priestess from a priestly family would have been an accomplished musician and dancer. Songs were written in Hittite, Luwian, Hattian and Hurrian, illustrated by expressions like ‘the women from Nerik sing in Hattian’ or ‘the musicians sing in Hurrian’ (Dinçol 2013:583).

²³⁸ Cimok (2008:85).
7.3.5.2 A Hurrian offering hymn

A clay tablet (see Figure 7.37) with the text and musical notation of a Hurrian cult-offering hymn 6 was excavated in the 1950’s at the royal palace of Ugarit (see Figure 7.36). It is a hymn to Nikkal (ca 1400 BCE), a Semitic goddess of orchards and wife of the moon god, and was also known as a Zaluzi to the gods or simply as h.6 (Laroche 1971:463, 487). The top section of the hymn is in Hurrian and is divided by a double line showing the musical instructions for a singer as well as the notation in Akkadian (see Figures 7.37 & 7.38).

It is the earliest known musical score in history. Below another dividing line on the same side of the tablet is a colophon in Akkadian which reads: ‘This is a song in the nitkibli tuning, a zaluzi... written down by Ammurabi.’ The meaning of the text of the hymn is not clear and it seems only one translator’s interpretation is used, according to Buccellati (2003). The second verse (of three) reads:

Once I have endeared the deity, she will love me in her heart; the offer I bring may wholly cover my sin, bringing sesame oil may work on my behalf.

---

242 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/hurrian songs. The Semitic name of a scribe, but there was no single composer named for this hymn, although four Hurrian names were found on clay fragments related to this tablet (accessed 16 November 2014).
7.3.6 Sacrifice

The baffling variation of Hittite sacrifices can be narrowed down to five basic types:

- Toasting the gods, or ‘god drinking’ (see 7.3.4.1);
- Attraction offerings (paths of fruits, sweets and coloured textiles) laid out to attract the deities (Collins 2007:164);

244 www.riseearth.com (Retrieved 5 July 2016).
245 www.openculture.com/cdn8
246 www.riseearth.com, Nineveh (ca 700 BCE).
• Bloodless offerings consisting of breads and libations of beer, wine and other Hittite beverages (see 7.3.5);
• Sacrifice of pure/virgin animals (Collins 2007:164; cf. McMahon 1995:1993);
• Burnt offerings restricted to Syrian and Hurrian sources (see 7.3.6.1).

Sacrifice was a central element of the Hittite state cult. In order to obtain the full attention of their gods, humans performed extravagant rituals to ensure the deities’ continued nourishment and at the same time secure the deities’ goodwill towards humans (Beckman 2005:347; cf. Collins 2007:164). Beckman (2004b:336) informs us that in line with the multicultural characteristics of Hittite religion, their sacrificial activity was not according to a regular set of rules. According to Beckman, Hittite sacrifice rituals were a continuously changing, disorderly collection of concepts and procedures copied from the Indo-Europeans, Mesopotamians, Hurrians and indigenous Hattians.

Meat offerings were exactly and clearly described, according to McMahon (1995:1993). Texts only infrequently identify the origin of offerings. Most offerings were obtained either from the temple stores or from the estates of important officials. Blood sacrifice of animals without any deformity and in good condition was the climax of the majority of the cult offering rituals (Gurney 1980:152). Huge quantities of meat were consumed at these offerings (Beckman 2005:348; cf. Collins 2007:165). It was common practice in Hittite sacrifice to partly or completely destroy the elements presented to the deities in order for the offering to reach the intended deity in the kingdom of the gods (Beckman 2005:349).

Figure 7.40
Fragment of the Inandik vase showing a bull sacrifice

Figure 7.41
Drawing of the bull sacrifice in Figure 7.40
7.3.6.1 An unusual Hurrian-Luwian sacrificial practice

The unusual sacrificial practice of eagles and falcons as burnt offerings was introduced to Anatolia from a Hurro-Luwian cult practice in Kizzuwatna. Collins (2007:166) explains that these bird offerings (see Figure 7.42) were made in honour of the chthonic deities like Lelwani. The religious practice of divination through observing the movement of birds in Anatolia was a well-developed Luwian tradition that left many traces in many different religious practices in the rest of the ancient Near East (Mouton & Rutherford 2013:341). The Hittite bird oracular technique also comes from the Luwian world and the Luwian language dominated the bird oracle terminology (Mouton, Rutherford & Yakubovich 2013:332).

Burney (2004:301) mentions that skeletons of birds of prey were found in crevices of a rock outside Chamber B and in the small room/chamber, Chamber C, at Yazilikaya. These as well as some rock-carvings on the walls of the sanctuary are associated with features of the underworld. On the central panel of Chamber A of the Yazilikaya sanctuary is also the relief of a double-headed eagle (see Figures 7.47).

![Figure 7.42](http://hubpages.com) Offering of a bird of prey in a cult procession

---

7.3.6.2 Eagles in cult rituals

The ritual uses of eagles show their close association with the royal house as the King’s personal messenger to the gods (see Figure 7.43). Also in a ritual for the royal couple, a live eagle is waved over the King and Queen as the practitioner recites the incantation:

I release the eagle to the sky, and after I say these words: ‘I have not released it, the King and Queen have released it. Go now. To the sungoddess and the stormgod say: as the sungoddess and the stormgod are eternal, let the King and the Queen also be eternal.’

An eagle’s wing was used in ritual practice to summon the gods. Collins (2004b:87) tells us that in such rituals, the wing symbolically supplied the means for the gods to come into the presence of human participants. In the Hurrian hišuwa festival (see 7.2.4.2), the ritual cult assistant dipped an eagle’s wing into a cup of water and sprinkled the King with it. In each of the above examples, the eagle was the intermediary between the royal and divine kingdoms as well as the personal messenger of the King (Collins 2004b:87).

7.3.6.3 Hittite kings and birds of prey

Eagle and falcon imagery was also closely connected to the Hittite royal house, demonstrated in their texts and iconography (Collins 2004b:86) (see Figure 7.44 & 7.45). The eagle had qualities that the King (symbolically) desired: ‘eyes like those of an eagle, (seeing) like an eagle’ (Collins 2004b:86). The golden eagle (see Figure 7.43) was present in Anatolia and was regarded as particularly trainable for falconry (Collins 2004b:84).

The eagle was also important in Hittite literature where, in contrast to its iconography, it was not focused on as a predator, but rather for its powerful speed, keen eyesight and supposedly divine ranking (Collins 2004b:86). Collins mentions two royal rituals closely associated with the eagle. In a ritual for the foundation of a new palace, a personified eagle receives instructions from the deified throne on behalf of the King:

When the King comes into the house, then the “Throne” calls the eagle saying: “Go. I am sending you to the sea. But when you go, then look into the field and forest for whoever remains there.” The eagle answers: “I have looked into them and Išduštaya and Papaya, the infernal ancient deities, the in-laws are sitting there, crouched.” The “Throne” answers: “And what are they doing?” The eagle answers him: “One holds a wool spindle, they hold full spindles. They are spinning the years of the King. There is no limit to the number of his years.”

Collins (2014:86) also comments that the eagle acts on behalf of the King in this mythological text. The eagle is ordered later in this ritual to bring a pottery bowl and to entwine the tails of a lion and a leopard, symbolising the union of the heart and soul of the King.

---
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7.3.6.4 Portrayals of double-headed eagles

Motifs of double-headed eagles were common in Anatolia from the Middle Bronze Age onwards and often appeared on clay and stone stamp seals (see Figure 7.48) from the nineteenth and eighteenth centuries BCE Kārum period. Seeher (2011:69) informs us that there is no explanation in Hittite texts for these motifs. They were possibly regarded, according to him, as symbols of power and watchfulness.

The double-headed eagle emblem could refer to falconry, according to Collins (2004b:84), because the eagle wears a neckband (see Figures 7.46 & 7.47) used by falconers to control their birds. However, Collins (2004b:84) also asks the question of how a chariot in the form of a bird driven by the stormgod and pulled by bulls could be interpreted. The importance of this motif in the iconography of the Hittites is unquestioned though she agrees with Seeher (2011:69) that its purpose and significance is little understood.

The double-headed eagle survived antiquity and became a symbol for Byzantium, the Holy Roman Empire, the Seljuk Empire in Persia, the Russian Empire and many other countries, cities and rulers of today (Seeher 2011:69).

---
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7.3.6.5 *The Hurri-birds from Kizzuwatna*

Live birds like the eagle and falcon together with large birds like the Hurri-bird (a large bustard, one of the largest birds capable of flying in the world) (see Figure 7.49) were also used to purify sacred spaces like the temple and the palace as well as members of the royal family. The impact of Puduhepa’s homeland, Kizzuwatna, is especially noticeable in the apparently complex bird divination and offering rites. Under the influence of the Babylonians, the Kizzuwatnaeans sacrificed bustards and pigeons (kept in cages), eagles and falcons in the form of smoke offerings. The fact that the name for bustards is in Hurrian and those of some other birds in Luwian points to their origin in Kizzuwatna (Ünal 2013a:467). Ünal (2013a:467) is of the opinion that despite ongoing debate about the identity of the Hurri-bird species, it was the bustards, native birds of Kizzuwatna and Syria, that were used for divination when their entrails were studied as well as sacrificed in cultic smoke offerings. They were four times the size of a goose and available in abundance.

---
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At Alalakh (see its location in Figure 2.2) a letter was found telling about these Hurri-birds, sent to the king (most probably Hattušili III), that died of heat before they reached Hattuša. The text explains that the purpose of sending the live birds was for them to be used in divination and sacrifice, not as a gift of gourmet food for the king (Ünal 2013a:467).

### 7.3.7 The festival banquet

King Hattušili III would offer the god the choicest cuts of meat and fat from the sacrificial animals. The temple personnel also joined in the communal meal (Beckman 2005:348). As Bryce (2002:191) describes, the atmosphere became relaxed and everybody joined in sharing the banquet meal (see Figures 7.50 & 7.51). At the sign from the King the entertainers would appear. The highlight of the entertainment in which the deity took particular delight was wrestling (Bryce 2002:191). The most distinctive form of Hittite dance was the animal imitation dances (Collins 2003:105). In the course of a festival ritual, masked dancers dressed like wolves, leopards, lions and bears acted out hunting scenes (Collins 2003:105).
During Puduhepa’s time as Queen, hunting was no longer popular amongst the Hittites. It is more likely that warlike enactments were staged at the festivals. Priestesses and jesters also danced during the cult ritual:

Six women parade before the King, hold each other’s hands and dance quietly. They turn right and left, in place, their faces being turned to the King not otherwise.258
7.3.7.1 The dancing queen

Dancers were often professional (see Figure 7.52 and Figure 7.53), but other participants of the ceremony might also have been called upon to dance (Collins 2003:105). The Queen was called upon to dance in the cult ritual as well as some of the dignitaries on occasion:

The Queen curtseys and holds the mantle on her shoulders. The oracle gives her the axe\textsuperscript{261} and the Queen curtseys again and dances before the god.\textsuperscript{262}

Sometimes a person would promise gifts to the deities in return for a divine favour (Beckman 2005:349). These non-food offerings consisted of precious metals like silver and other valuable material objects, even land and its dependents. These kinds of offerings were integrated into the temple’s economic culture (Beckman 2005:349). When the banquet and entertainment ended, the King and Queen washed their hands again and departed. After visiting all the city gates, the royal couple would step onto their carriages. Dinçol (2013:584) illustrates this by quoting from part of a KI.LAM festival text:

The King sits in a carriage. They drive around the halentuwa building; the Queen gets in and follows the King. The cult singers and females playing drums run before and after the King. They continuously play drums and castanets, but do not sing.\textsuperscript{263}

Finally, during the KI.LAM festival, when they reached the temple of the grain goddess, agricultural products from storehouses from various central Anatolian towns and cities were displayed and presented to them (see Figure 7.54) (Güterbock 1997c:89). Often the celebrants of these festivals would travel beyond Hattuša to the sacred places in the country which were marked by the huwaši-stones (see 6.3.2.2). The same rituals as before were followed and entertainment was provided for the worshippers (Bryce 2002:191).

\textsuperscript{261} See 7.3.3 and Figure 7.10.
\textsuperscript{262} Text after KUB 45.32 III 6-8, cited by Dinçol (2013:585).
\textsuperscript{263} Text after KBo 10.24 rev. IV 5-21, cited by Dinçol (2013:584).
7.3.7.2 *Hittite women’s role in the state cult*

In Hittite society, the position of women in many parts of their lives was not, like that of Queen Puduhepa, always to their advantage. This information is disclosed to us by some of the many texts excavated at Hattuša (Beckman 2000:18). In their society women still lived according to certain patriarchal values. In religious matters, however, women’s position was different. They played an important role, having access to temples and taking part in many state cult ceremonies (Beckman 2000:19). Women were often present in the temples in the subordinate roles of singers, musicians and priestesses, but they also had the opportunity to direct the rites in which they participated (Beckman 2000:19). Beckman is of the opinion that females’ participation in official worship in the temples became more important by the time Puduhepa was chief priestess of the realm.

7.3.7.3 *Gender equality depicted at Yazılıkaya?*

According to Beckman (2000:22), the processions of deities on the walls of Yazılıkaya make a clear statement about equality between the sexes in Hittite religion. He supports his view by his observation that ‘male and female, god and goddess, are symmetrical and of equal importance for the proper functioning of the cosmos.’

---

264 [http://www.hittitemonuments.com](http://www.hittitemonuments.com), Zincerli (Sam’al).
7.3.7.4 State cult festivals and popular religion

Beckman (2004a:259) points out that it is hardly possible to measure any significant influence from these state cult festivals and activities on the ‘ordinary’ people of Hatti because little is known about their religious life. Burney (2004:80) agrees that the state cult did not dominate the lives of ordinary people in Hatti because their own domestic (family) cults were more meaningful to them than those of the state (see 7.2.5.1).

To be able to cope with hardship, war and sickness, according to Burney (2004:182), most people in the ancient Near East felt they needed the power of magic. For the Hittites, he explains, magic provided a connection between the state religion and the unsophisticated beliefs and practices of the ordinary people. Beckman (2005:351) also points out that neither the Hittite people’s religious practices nor their ritual texts were written or directed by the scribes, priests or other temple personnel of Hattuša. Hittite magic texts were a compilation of individual instructions rather than official texts deriving from temple schools (Burney 2004:182).

The Hittite magical texts revealed more information than similar texts from Mesopotamia and Egypt. They contained information about the practitioners of magic, their names and professions (whether physician-exorcists, midwives, temple slaves or singers) as well as the emergencies they attended to (Burney 2004:183). In Hittite thought, according to Collins (2007:180), treatment for illnesses was often a combination of magic and medicine. Religious practice amongst the people of Hatti was performed without any official priest of the state cult present to act as intermediary (Beckman 2004b:430).

According to Beckman (2005:251), the textual records of the execution of magic rites provide us with some insight into the practice of popular religion by the ordinary people who hardly participated in ceremonies or entered the temples and sanctuaries of the royal elite, priests and state officials. The ritual texts for cult rites were collected throughout Hatti by ‘royal agents’ of Queen Puduhepa’s son Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE) (Beckman 2005:351; cf. Haroutunian 2004:430) and stored in the Hittite state archives at Hattuša. The information contained in these texts was also used on demand by the King himself or by a member of the royal court if they needed to refer to it when a problem or crisis had to be solved. In the ritual practice of magic to remove evil from an individual or community, humans and animals like bulls, goats, rams, birds and even mice featured prominently (Burney 2004:183). The technical word for such a living carrier, or scapegoat, was nakkussi, a Hurrian word that, like most religious terms, originated from Kizzuwatna (Burney 2004:183).

Beckman (2005:351) also informs us that the cult ceremonies where these magic rites were performed had to take place far away from people’s dwellings or agricultural grounds on river banks, near springs or wells, or in the open air, like Yazilikaya, to avoid contamination. He adds that the cult ceremonies of the ordinary people were performed only as the need for them arose in circumstances when they had to deal with specific life problems that required intervention. Their cult ceremonies were private and different from those of the royal state cult festivals. They were not performed regularly and were put into practice to deal with a range of problems in the lives of individuals or families (Beckman 2004b:430). They covered many facets of people’s daily lives. They were rites of passage performed at the birth of a child, when puberty was reached and at the death
of a person. They were also performed to purify the army after defeat or when there was a personal crisis like a family feud or impotence had to be addressed because fertility was of critical importance to the Hittites. The high mortality rate amongst them and the absence of children also affected people’s status in society (Beckman 2005:350 & 2004b:430).

(a) Wise women

According to Collins (2014:245), we have a reasonable amount of written evidence about women’s roles in Hittite rituals, for example birth rituals which were specially created. Women also had many different roles in various other rituals. They could authorise certain rituals as well as be the key objects themselves to the implementation and success of a rite (Collins 2014:246). The women who were responsible for managing ritual performance were regarded as professional people with their titles written in Sumerian logograms as munusŠU.GI, which is translated as ‘old woman’. Collins (2014:246) emphasises that such a label does not carry a detrimental undertone in Hittite context. She explains that the Hittite reading for this Sumerian term means ‘she of birth’, indicating her association with rituals of childbirth.

Puduhepa, as chief priestess of Hatti, although focused mainly on the royal family, also had an extensive knowledge of the Hurrian and Hittite cult rites that could assist the broad spectrum of problems people had to deal with. The term that Collins (2014:246) uses, ‘Wise Woman’ instead of ‘old women’, better reflects the respect with which these women were treated in Hittite society. There are many examples, according to Collins (2014:246), of ‘Wise Women’ working with their male counterparts as soothsayers, physicians and diviners. These rituals have been preserved through the huge inventory of local cults (see 8.1.3.1) in northern and central Anatolia collected by Queen Puduhepa’s son, King Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE) (Beckman 2004b:317, 430). The records were kept in the state archives at Hattuša.
7.4 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the focus was on the royal couple as chief priest and priestess of the state cult attending state-sponsored seasonal festivals, as well as Hittite festival texts and archaeological records showing us how important the role of the official 'state-sponsored' religion of the Hittite Empire was (Bachvarova 2016:219). The Hittite state-sponsored festivals served many religious, social and political functions: appeasing the gods and ensuring a proper flow of the seasons, building community and affirming identity, asserting and displaying the court’s right to rule, and its membership of the local nobility in the region. To convey its message, the ideology of kingship required an audience drawn from the community as well as from outside Hatti, such as diplomats and other elites (see 7.3.3.1). The political function of the Hittite cult festivals also provided the motivation and means for the exchange of oral traditions with other regions in the ancient Near East. The Hittite state-sponsored seasonal festivals could also be seen as an intentional formal way of transmitting their religion across linguistic and geographical borders instead of by the difficult-to-record, casual way of transmission by merchants, mixed marriages and wandering performers (Bachvarova 2016:219). The Hittites were obsessed with assembling and describing festivals. According to Bachvarova (2016:221), we should not assume that the festival texts were actually performed as written. Bachvarova (2016:221) is of the opinion that it is difficult to decide whether the records of the Hittite festivals were meant to be descriptive or prescriptive. One can only surmise that the texts that were performed at festivals looked in their broad outlines like their descriptions and the myths attached to them.

Spring and autumn festivals were put to use to strengthen the unity of the centre of the Hittite Empire, making peace with the gods restoring their relationship with angry deities and the royal dead on behalf of the royal family. In some festivals like the spring AN.TAH.ŠUM festival (see 7.2.3.1) and the autumn nuntarriyašha festival (see 7.2.3.2) the royal couple, together and separately, travelled by chariot to a variety of towns and mountains mostly within a day’s ride of Hattuša to participate in a series of local festivities, returning between trips to Hattuša to visit the temples there. In this way, the connection between the centre of the Empire and its hinterland was enacted, asserting the hegemony.
of Hattuša over Hittite territory. The autumn KI.LAM (gatehouse) festival, on the other hand, was performed in the Hittite capital, Hattuša.

In this chapter, a reconstruction of the procedure followed in celebrating the KI.LAM festival was attempted (see 7.3). Lasting three days, the festival moved through various temples belonging to specific gods and other public places (see 7.3.3). The festival displayed the unity of all parts of the Hittite Empire by bringing regional performers, administrators, as well as male and female choruses to the Hittite capital. Each region of the Empire ceremonially presented the results of their labour: crops, handiwork, song and dance; all elements that sustained the kingdom. The theme of this festival could be summarised as the human ability to turn products of nature into things of culture (Bachvarova 2016:223). In conclusion, it is apparent that the Hittite state-sponsored seasonal festivals mainly served the state cult and its political interest. The rich Hittite sources also explain how these festivals were an important milieu, showing that festivals could also be imported from other regions, like Queen Puduhepa who imported Hurrian elements into festivals from Kizzuwatna (see 7.2.4.2).
CHAPTER EIGHT
CONCLUSION

8.1 THE RULING ROYAL TRIAD IN THE LATE EMPIRE PERIOD

8.1.1 Religious and political elements that impacted on the reigns of the royal triad of the Late Hittite Empire period
This investigation into the extensive religious and political elements that impacted on the reigns of King Hattušili III, Queen Puduhepa and their son Tudhaliya IV in the Late Empire period (ca 1267-1228 BCE) had to take place against the broad background of the New Hittite Empire (ca 1430-1210 BCE). Complicated historical, political and religious elements were introduced to the Empire by a new dynasty of kings as a result of their contact with neighbouring civilizations. In order to understand some of these confusing elements of the eclectic Hittite civilization and their interconnected society, the reign in the Late Empire period of the ‘royal triad’, Hattušili III, Puduhepa and Tudhaliya IV, has to be discussed within the context of the unfolding, broad historical background of the Hittite Empire (see Chapter Two).

8.1.1.1 The impact of foreign cultures on the Hittites
An answer to the question about whether the impact of foreign cultures was profound on the Hittites (see 1.3) is given through the fact that since time immemorial, Hittite religion, politics and culture were influenced and impacted by a variety of foreign elements. The profound foreign cultural and religious influence on the Hittites was not only from the Luwians and Hurrians as discussed in this investigation (see 1.2.1 and 3.3).

In the long run, the Hittites were unable to prove their own culture as more powerful than the cultural influence from the Luwians from Arzawa to Kizzuwatna and the Hurrians from Kizzuwatna to Hanigalbat. The Hittites were compelled to accept these profound influences officially. The chaotic state in which their religion and pantheon of a thousand gods eventually found itself was the result of many centuries of foreign contact without discernment. The Hittites developed a welcoming attitude towards other religions and their
deities as a consequence of them overcompensating for political reasons to accommodate foreigners. They seem never to have met a god whom they did not like (see 3.4.3).

8.1.1.2 Hattušili III and Puduhepa’s partnership

Great King Hattušili III and Queen Puduhepa succeeded in conducting an exceptional personal and work partnership in the ancient Near East. Hattušili III was much older than Puduhepa and he suffered from ill health most of his life. She often had to represent him locally and internationally (see 4.3.4.1). She also acted as chief priestess in the state-sponsored Hittite cult festivals if the king was not well enough to attend or if he was participating in a military campaign.

8.1.1.3 Hattušili III and Puduhepa’s co-regency, diplomatic ties and correspondence

Hattušili III and Puduhepa’s co-regency, diplomatic ties and correspondence reflect the trust and bond between them, not only as a married couple, but also as an unusually powerful husband- and-wife team in the mainly paternalistic ancient Near East. Queen Puduhepa was a co-signatory of the Hattušili-Rameses treaty (ca 1258/59 BCE) (see 4.3.4.1) and we are told that the negotiations for this important treaty were largely entrusted to her because of Hattušili III’s ill health (see 4.2.4.2). Queen Puduhepa also had a powerful influence on state affairs dealing with vassal territories like Ugarit and Amurru (see 4.2.4.2). Puduhepa corresponded with Rameses II and discussed international affairs with him as an equal. According to Darga (1994:30), Puduhepa’s letters and personal seal (see Figure 4.23) showed her equality with her husband, Hattušili III (see 4.3.5.1).

8.1.1.4 The royal couple’s dream communication

Puduhepa and Hattušili III were fascinated by dreams that they believed were ways through which the gods communicated the future to them (see 5.1.1.2). Their scribes recorded many of the royal couple’s dreams at a time when it was not customary to record dreams in the ancient Near East. These recorded dream texts formed the foundation for a new kind of literary category that was used as propaganda for the royal family (see 5.1.1.2). Puduhepa and Hattušili III claimed to have dreamt collectively and such dreams were regarded as visionary dreams relaying messages to them that could also be used for divination in magic rituals. We are informed by scholars (Ünal 2013a:482 and Oppenheim 1956:197) that these ‘collective’ dreams were probably fake and fictitious. There is a strong impression amongst scholars that Hattušili III and Puduhepa regularly
invented dreams to serve their personal ambition and political interests (see 5.1.1.3)

8.1.1.5 Queen Puduhepa’s prayers
Different forms of prayers (see 5.2) were very important to Queen Puduhepa to win the favour of a god or a group of deities to protect the king, the royal family and the land of Hatti (see 5.2.1). The goddess of the underworld *Lelwani* (see 5.2.1.5) attained her highest status during the reign of Hattušili III and Puduhepa because it is to her that the Queen addressed her regular votive prayers for the cure of her husband (see 5.2.1.6). Many official prayer texts found at Hattuša applied to Hattušili III and Puduhepa and seem to have been aimed at the ruling royalties and not the other members of the royal court. None of the prayers seemed to have been spontaneous or prayed in reverence of the gods (see 5.2). The prayers were mainly directed at the gods to assist the Hittites when they were in trouble, of which Mursili II’s many prayers are a good example (Singer 2002:61).

8.1.1.6 Near Eastern myths and magic in the Hittite state cult
Myths and magic played an important part in the Hittite state cult and religion. At the time of Hattušili and Puduhepa’s reign, mythological texts from the archives of Hattuša reflected the synthesised nature of Hittite civilization with that of the Mesopotamians and Hurrians (see 5.3). Hittite scribal schools followed Mesopotamian traditions by copying from Akkadian texts their epics and myths. A distinguishable Hittite flavour was added to these myths by changing the setting of some myths from southern Mesopotamia to the northern, more familiar region of the Hittites (see 5.3). Magic texts were composed by magicians and diviners who came from Puduhepa’s homeland, Kizzuwatna. The Hittites believed that the telling of myths and the performing of magic strengthened them and justified their actions in the land of Hatti and beyond.

8.1.1.7 Places of worship for the royal family and the celebration of state-sponsored cult festivals
The Hittite state cult was centred in the Great Temple of Hattuša. The temple was dedicated to the principal gods of the Hittites. At the beginning of the reign of Hattušili III and Puduhepa, the traditional Hittite divine triad in Hatti was the sungoddess of Arinna, the stormgod of Hatti and their son, the stormgod of Nerik and Zippalanda. During Hattušili III and Puduhepa’s reign, at the instigation of Puduhepa, the traditional Hittite triad was
replaced by the Hurrian triad of deities, namely the stormgod *Teshub*, the principal Hurrian goddess *Hepat* and their son *Šarrumma*. They subsequently became the divine first family of the Hurro-Hittite pantheon (see 3.4.1.1). One can draw a parallel between the royal triad of Hattuša and the divine Hurro-Hittite triad of deities. The ruling royals’ legacies were as successful, imperfect and human as those of the divine first family (see 2.2.1.1). The most important festivals in honour of these principal deities were celebrated in the Great Temple (see 6.1). Mountains, rivers and springs were also sacred places for the Hittites and they were the dwelling places of the many stormgods of Hatti.

The Hittites also believed in the importance of water and it was revered by them as essential for their survival and that of their crops and livestock. The major Hittite state-sponsored seasonal cult festivals like the spring AN.TAH.ŠUM festival and the autumn nuntarriyašha festival were very important to the royal couple as the highest-ranking priest and priestess of the Hittite state cult. They travelled by chariot with a large entourage to the towns and villages of Hatti, making peace with the gods and restoring relationships with angry deities and their ancestors. Puduhepa introduced Hurrian elements to the *hišuwa* festival, where the rites of the festival were mainly performed for the purification of the King and the royal family and in order to secure their well-being (see 7.2.4.2). This festival that was in all probability compiled by Puduhepa and her priests lasted for nine days and was performed on behalf of Hattušili III and dedicated to the stormgod of Hatti to secure the welfare of the state.

Despite the size and power of Hattuša, its kings never managed to complete the process of unification, reorganisation and centralisation of their complex state cult and religion. The consequences were that local cults rather than the state cult survived, local officials stayed in power, and Hittite kings like Hattušili III and Tudhaliya IV were forced to develop some official integration between local and state cult practices. They succeeded in combining several local cult festivals with theirs and the royal entourage continued to travel throughout the land of Hatti to confirm their priestly role as leaders of the Hittite Empire’s state cult (Liverani 2014:324) (see Chapter Seven).

In conclusion, the legacies of Great King Hattušili III, Great Queen Puduhepa and their son, Great King Tudhaliya IV, the royal triad, in the Late Empire period will also be
8.1.2 The legacy of King Hattušili III as an innovator, usurper, mediator and conciliator

Before usurping the Hittite throne, Hattušili III recaptured the very important Hattian cult centre at Nerik (see 2.3.5.2[a] and its location in Figure 2.2). As a conciliator, he saw to it that the role of the stormgod of Nerik was transferred to the cult centre of Hakpiš, which was strategically in a favourable position between the cult city of Nerik and Hattuša. Along with his dominant Hurrianising policy of the state cult influenced by Puduhepa, he encouraged the revival and innovation of Hattian cultic traditions at Nerik and Hakpiš (Burney 2004:214).

As discussed in Chapter Four (see 4.2), Hattušili III’s usurpation of the Hittite throne caused the Hittite Empire (in its late period) to remain unstable and caused serious divisions amongst the royal family. The image that was created of Hattušili III during his reign (ca 1267-1237 BCE) was that of a diplomat, mediator and conciliator in the region (Bryce 2005b:266) (see 2.5). Bryce confirms that Hattušili III did not expand Hittite territory beyond the frontiers established by his great predecessors mainly as a consequence of reigning for too long and his increasingly bad health. The longer the elderly, sickly Hattušili III ruled, the more the question intensified regarding which of his sons would succeed him (Bryce 2005b:294).

As Bryce explains, there were many challenges to the throne from various contenders. The descendants of Urhi-Teshub (see 4.1) might have aspired to restore their royal status as well as Hattušili III’s eldest son Nerikkali, who for unknown reasons (see 8.1.4) stood down as his father’s legitimate successor (tukhanti) (Bryce 2005b:294). There were also Hattušili III’s sons from previous marriages, who Puduhepa claimed to have raised (see 3.1.1.1), who wanted to claim the throne. The matter of succession must have been very important to Puduhepa. Her prayers and pleas to the gods on behalf of her husband might not have been entirely unselfish, according to Bryce (2005b:294). On the death of her husband, Puduhepa’s position could have become uncertain if the succession had not worked out as she had planned. If any of the sons mentioned had succeeded Hattušili III,
Puduhepa’s days as reigning, domineering queen might have been numbered (Bryce 2005b:294). Bryce (2002:13) describes Hattušili III as a ‘scheming and ruthlessly ambitious man, yet betraying in his letters a desperate need for the approval of his royal peers.’ One can conclude that it was the *leitmotif* (recurrent theme) of Hattušili III’s reign: to be accepted by his peers and family as the legitimate Great King of the Hittites. In my opinion, his equally overbearing but magnificent wife, Queen Puduhepa, attained credibility in the eyes of foreign rulers on Hattušili’s behalf.

8.1.3 The legacy of Great Queen Puduhepa as an initiator, facilitator and manipulator

Puduhepa, when she married Hattušili III, brought clay tablets to Hattuša from Kizzuwatna with lists of Hurrian deities, cult practices and festivals, which suggests that part of the role she wanted to fulfil as chief priestess and Queen of Hatti was initiating a religious programme with a strong Hurrian influence (Burney 2004:231). When Puduhepa and Hattušili ascended the throne of Hatti (ca 1267 BCE), many of the foreign deities the Hittites had been adding to the already enormous Hittite pantheon for centuries had similar functions (Gold 2015:20). Puduhepa intended to facilitate reform of this chaotic situation by amalgamating and merging gods, re-evaluating and reorganising the gigantic and ever-growing Hittite pantheon. As chief priestess, she was responsible for extensive change and a significant re-evaluation of state cult practices and traditions in every part of the Hittite world (Bryce 2011:88). She launched the creation of syncretisms between some major Hittite deities with their Hurrian counterparts (Gold 2015:20). Puduhepa was responsible for an early successful merging of the two great goddesses of Anatolia, *Arinna* and *Hepat* (Singer 2002:101) (see 3.4.1).

As chief priestess and consort of the King, Puduhepa also pleaded regularly in a rather manipulative way with the principal deities and their *circles* (*kalutis*) for the health and survival of Hattušili III. In her prayer for the well-being of her husband, Puduhepa promised in a manipulative way to dedicate to *Lelwani* a life-size statue in silver and gold of Hattušili should he recover from his illness (see 5.2.1.6). Also in a vow to the same goddess, Puduhepa manipulated the situation by promising to dedicate a golden head of Hattušili III as well as a statue of herself with a golden wreath ‘borrowed’ from the goddess
Arušna to Lelwani (Singer 2011:691). Through these so-called pious acts, Puduhepa saw to it that she and Hattušili III joined, untraditionally before their own deaths, the company of their esteemed ancestors who were venerated as the protector spirits of Hittite royalty, with their images worshipped in their temples (Singer 2011:691) (see 3.2.4.5).

As discussed in Chapter Five, both Hattušili and Puduhepa’s collective dreams (see 5.1.1.2) were also regarded as manipulatively interpreted in favour of the royal family. One could add that the diplomatic marriages Puduhepa arranged between the royal houses of the ancient Near East were also manipulative in a political and diplomatic sense and not always successful (see 4.2.2). Güterbock (1997b:182; cf. Haas 1994:848) tells us that Queen Puduhepa ordered her chief scribe, Walwaziti, a member of a distinguished Hurrian scribal family, to collect tablets from Kizzuwatna containing Hurrian festival and cult practices which she wanted to implement in Hittite festivals. Such copies contained, for example, the cult ritual for the hišuwa festival (see 7.2.4.2) and other important Hittite cult festivals. As the King’s chief consort, her religious role as reigning Queen continued into the reign of her son Tudhaliya IV. As chief priestess, sometimes referred to by the honorary title of ‘Tawananna’ (widow of the king), her role remained considerably authoritative over the state cult and its resources (Bryce 2011:88).

In conclusion, one can say that Puduhepa and her husband were the main initiators of the final phases of religious reorganisation and rationalisation, not reform, into a syncretised Hurro-Hittite pantheon and state cult as depicted on the walls of the sanctuary at Yazılıkaya. Bryce (2002:137) is of the opinion that the syncretisms were perceived as reducing the many similar deities but also ‘reflecting the progressive Hurrianisation of Hittite culture’ under Puduhepa’s influence. Her and her husband’s intention could have been to encourage a greater sense of cultural and political orderliness within the Hittite Empire (Bryce 2002:138). From their point of view, Puduhepa and Hattušili III’s official attempts to promote sovereign unity on cultural and political levels could not contradict the ‘spirit of tolerance’ the Hittites were known for and thus they had to see to it that local traditions, beliefs and deities were maintained (Bryce 2002:138).

The completion of this process of reorganisation of the overwhelmingly confusing
religious chaos was ascribed to Puduhepa's son Tudhaliya IV. He clearly did it for political reasons too, wanting to incorporate the people of Hatti and their local cults into the Hittite state cult. Tudhaliya IV, according to Bryce (2002:138), wanted to reassure the people of Hatti that he did not intend with his reorganisation to destroy local religious traditions or show any indifference towards them. Bryce (2002:138) concludes that, in his opinion, Tudhaliya IV wanted to strengthen the local religious traditions and at the same time demonstrate that, in spite of increasing threats to the Hittite Empire, he was still in control and concerned about the welfare of his subjects. Abstract concepts of cultural uniformity and theological theorising were not important to local communities in Hatti (Bryce 2002:138). Tudhaliya IV had to take into account that the local people did not want to lose their own identity and their local gods to a broader, impersonal, unified pantheon (Bryce 2002:138).

8.1.4 The legacy of Great King Tudhaliya IV (ca 1237-1228 BCE) as a consolidator of cult inventories (catalogues)

The answer to the question regarding whether Tudhaliya IV played a more important role than his parents in reorganising and consolidating the Hittite state cult remains open and perhaps lies in ongoing research being done about Hittite cult inventories in the Late Empire period. During this time Tudhaliya IV was responsible for trying to make the local cults of Hatti more understandable by way of cult inventories (catalogues) which contained information on a variety of local cult offerings and descriptions of festivals (Cammarosano 2013:63), at the request of his mother, Puduhepa.

The purpose of cult inventories was not to pass on information for the correct execution of specific festivals, but rather to provide information on the cults of a given town at a specific time (Cammarosano 2013:68). Consequently, cult inventories were, as a rule, not copied or revised with the objective of creating new versions. These catalogues were discarded as soon as they were no longer in use or they were replaced by a new report. This explains why, according to Cammarosano (2913:68), virtually no duplicate manuscripts of cult inventories are documented and almost all cult inventories date from the Late Empire period. He is of the opinion that it is possible that only the most recent records were occasionally kept in the archives for a long time. Cult inventories varied
between ‘temporary’ and ‘permanent’ records and often did not contain information about who wrote them. Cammarosano (2013:69) tells us that almost half of the Hittite cult inventories contained festival descriptions that were inserted into texts referring to certain towns. The cult inventories were also never connected to the state cult because they applied to festivals that did not include the King.

Cult inventories are generally viewed against the background of an assumed reorganisation of the local cults and religious reform encouraged by Puduhepa and Tudhaliya IV. Cammarosano (2012:3) writes that according to the latest textual research dealing with these assumptions, reorganisation and reform of local cults in the Late Empire period are debatable. Their reorganisation could not be dated only to Tudhaliya IV’s reign by scholars; similar action towards reorganisation had already existed in earlier Hittite periods. Recently, Cammarosano and his colleagues have not found any substantial new elements in Tudhaliya IV’s cult inventories (Cammarosano 2012:3). Subsequently, scholars agree that the possibility exists that no actual ‘reform’ of cult inventories ever took place in Hatti. Perhaps only the reorganisation of existing local cults took place. We can therefore conclude that some reorganisation of the already known elements of local cults, contained in the inventories, was more likely to have been undertaken by Tudhaliya IV and his mother rather than them trying to reform these completely.

Tudhaliya IV’s desire to ‘clean up’, as Singer (2011:692) puts it, the enormously complicated cultic structure of the Hittite state was apparently caused by his deep sense of unease and guilt over his father’s initial seizure of the Hittite throne and subsequently his own ascent. Sadly, Singer (2011:692) continues, ‘Tudhaliya IV’s modesty and remorse soon led to an excessive campaign for self-promoting and the sacred quality of the king’s role’ in society. Tudhaliya IV actively intensified his royal propagandistic methods in addressing the people of Hatti. He did it in the form of public propaganda common amongst Hittite rulers of the thirteenth century BCE. Enlarged images in stone as we have seen at Yazilikaya displayed not only a likeness of himself and his name, but his son Suppiluliuma II (1207- [sa]) was possibly responsible for having his father’s deeds inscribed on the statue that stood in Chamber B at Yazilikaya (Seeher 2011:170-171).
If Tudhaliya IV had ever tried reorganising the overwhelmingly confusing religious chaos, he clearly did it for political reasons trying to incorporate the people of Hatti and their local cults into the state cult. Bryce (2002:138) concludes that, in his opinion, Tudhaliya IV instead wanted to strengthen the local religious traditions and at the same time demonstrate that, despite increasing threats to the Hittite Empire, he was still in control and concerned about the welfare of his subjects. Tudhaliya IV can be described as a great consolidator of the Hittite state cult and institutions in the same way his father was a great innovator of Hittite cultic traditions (Singer 2011:692).

8.1.4.1 Tudhaliya IV and Yazilikaya

The answer to the question of who was responsible for the building of the open-air sanctuary of Yazilikaya and its purpose is twofold. There is much consensus these days amongst scholars that it was built during the reign of Tudhaliya IV and originally planned by his mother Queen Puduhepa and father Hattušili III (Liverani 2011:324). It is presumed that Tudhaliya VI died before his elderly mother and that it was turned into a space for his mortuary cult as well as for the celebration of festivals (Bachvarova 2016:152). Hittite practices of royal ancestor veneration (see 3.2.4.5) were associated with several different types of rock reliefs and buildings (see 6.2.2.1 and 6.3). Reverence for ancestors was a crucial element in the state-sponsored festivals originating from Hattuša. Yazilikaya makes us imagine one way in which homage to ancestors was carried out in a festival context. The living rock walls of the main chamber were carved with reliefs of the Hurro-Hittite gods processing towards one end (see Figures 6.27 & 6.30), while the twelve Anunnaki-gods (former gods) appeared in a group on their own wall (see Figure 6.34). The side chamber, Chamber B, shows the deified Tudhaliya IV embraced by his personal god, Šarrumma, along with the underworld god Nergal in the form of a sword. The niche would have contained his cremated remains (see Figure 6.36). Bachvarova (2016:152) agrees with other scholars like Van den Hout (2002:73) that this must have been Tudhaliya IV’s ‘stone house’ or mausoleum. The base of a monumental statue of Tudhaliya IV remains in Chamber B (see Figure 6.33, block in middle left at the end of the passage).
8.2 NIGHT FELL MYSTERIOUSLY ON THE HITTITE EMPIRE (ca 1200 BCE)

The Hittite Empire came violently and mysteriously to an end early in the twelfth century BCE (Sagona & Zimansky 2009:287). It was only another incident within the context of the collapse of eastern Mediterranean lands in the Late Bronze Age. Over time many reasons for the collapse of these civilizations have been suggested, including a prolonged drought, earthquakes, risings of local populations, the collapse of trading networks, and the invasion of warlike groups collectively known as the Sea Peoples who destroyed the Hittites before moving on to raid Egypt (Sagona & Zimansky 2009:287).

As far as the demise of the Hittite Empire was concerned, a combination of a number of the factors suggested above may have been responsible for its end. Rivalries within the royal house between the descendants of Hattušili III and his nephews Urhi-Teshub and Kurunta (see 4.1 and 4.1.1) possibly weakened the Hittite Empire to the point of total destruction. According to Bryce (2012b:738), some signs during the reigns of these last kings of the Empire made its end evident. The final event which marked the end of the Hittite Empire was the fall and subsequent destruction of Hattuša. A question that remains open, according to Bryce, is the circumstances under which this occurred. The strongest theory that remains about Hattuša’s end is that a large part of its population, most notably the last king, Suppiluliuma II (ca 1207-[sa]), and his family abandoned the city before its destruction. Seeher (cited by Bryce 2012b:738), until recently the main archaeologist in charge of excavations at Hattuša, informs us that all indications are that many of the buildings in the city, including the palace, were systematically cleared of their contents by their occupants who took these with them on their departure. There are clear signs that large parts of the city were destroyed by fire, but according to Seeher (in Bryce 2012b:738), when invaders entered Hattuša the city was almost deserted.

Some scholars assume that the city’s inhabitants moved to the southeast and settled in southeastern Anatolia and northern Syria where the Iron Age ‘New Hittite’ Kingdom emerged from the late second millennium onwards (Bryce 2012b:783). This possible ethnic and cultural continuity between the Late Hittite Empire and its alleged Neo-Hittite successors raise more questions than answers, according to Bryce (2012b:738), because
the reasons for the fall of the Hittite Empire and the subsequent history of its populations remain matters for speculation. The question of where the inhabitants of Hattuša went after they abandoned the city is a question only archaeology may one day answer. All we know is that night fell fast and mysteriously for the Hittite.
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