

# Shaping Gods: from Göbekli Tepe to Kaneš, Ḫattuša, and Beyond

Alfonso Archi

**Abstract:** The spectacular finds at Göbekli Tepe and Nevalı Çori: monolithic pillars representing stylized humans decorated with a large variety of animals, are the representation of an animist cosmos, in which animals and plants being may appear as persons, capable of will. Çatal Höyük represents a stage in which gods started to be shaped: the bull represented the Storm-god (a concept which reached the Classical period), the stag the god of the wild fauna, and female figurines symbolized the Mother-goddess. In Egypt, where gods were usually represented by animals, zoomorphism presents a continuity which ended only with the introduction of Christianity. The archaeological finds from Kaneš and the Hittite texts document an extraordinary continuity: each deity was represented by an animal, portrayed in the vessel with which the celebrant (the royal couple or also a priest) reached a kind of communion with the god in drinking of the same wine and eating of the same bread.

## 1. Pre-Pottery Neolithic A and B periods: cosmic animism at Göbekli Tepe and Nevalı Çori

The discovery of cult buildings at Nevalı Çori (8600-7900 BC), on the east bank of the Euphrates, and of the spectacular settlement of Göbekli Tepe (about 15 km north-east of Urfa, and 40 km south-east of Nevalı Çori), to be dated to 9600-8000 BC, have prompted a re-examination of our understanding of the ritual practices of communities of sedentary hunter-gatherers in Southeastern Anatolia. In recent years, another eleven minor settlements belonging to the Göbekli Tepe culture have been identified on a 100 km line around this site.

Standing out at Nevalı Çori is a cult building in stone that presents thirteen monolithic pillars with T shaped capitals set into a wide bench running along the interior walls (Hauptmann 1993; 2012, 13-8). The excavations at Göbekli Tepe, directed by Klaus Schmidt from 1995 until 2014 (the year of his untimely death) have brought to light buildings consisting in several rectangular rooms with floors, which show the beginning of the process which led to the formation of sedentary communities of the Pre-Pottery Neolithic A and B periods. Animal husbandry was not yet practiced there, according to the results of osteological investigations. Megalithic circular enclosures (with even three rings of walls), enclosing several T-shaped monolithic pillars, can be described as centres for communal purposes such as cult rites and ceremonial festivals. These enclosures (not all excavated) number at least twelve, for a period of perhaps ca 200-250 years (Dietrich *et al.*, 2016). On some of these pillars a pair of human arms and hands are depicted, the horizontal part on the top representing the head. These are three dimensional sculptures of stylized humans which rise around 3.5 m from the floor. Two pillars portray beings wearing a belt and a loincloth made of animal skin. The anthropomorphic figures of pillars 18 and 31 bear necklaces representing respectively a crescent with a disc with another element, and a bucranium (Otto 2015, 190-93). Several animals are depicted on the pillars, such as foxes, gazelles, wild donkeys,

Alfonso Archi, University of Rome, Italy, alfonso.archi@gmail.com, 0000-0002-7194-7272

Referee List (DOI 10.36253/fup\_referee\_list)

FUP Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing (DOI 10.36253/fup\_best\_practice)

Alfonso Archi, *Shaping Gods: from Göbekli Tepe to Kaneš, Ḫattuša, and Beyond*, © Author(s), CC BY 4.0, DOI 10.36253/979-12-215-0109-4.07, in Livio Warbinek, Federico Giusfredi (edited by), *Theonyms, Panthea and Syncretisms in Hittite Anatolia and Northern Syria. Proceedings of the TeAI Workshop Held in Verona, March 25-26, 2022*, pp. 29-56, 2023, published by Firenze University Press, ISBN 979-12-215-0109-4, DOI 10.36253/979-12-215-0109-4

snakes, cranes, ducks, vultures, spiders, scorpions, and insects (Schmidt 2008, 2011a; 2011b; 2013; Dietrich and Schmidt 2016; cf. Sagona, Zimanski 2009, 57-64).

Schmidt has suggested the following analysis:

Because it can be safely assumed that the pillars represent anthropomorphic beings, one of the most relevant questions concerns the meaning of the combination of the anthropomorphic carvings and the various motifs depicted on the pillars. Preliminary it can be concluded that animals played an important role in the spiritual world of the PPN (Pre-Pottery Neolithic) community of Göbekli Tepe. Since the site's inhabitants relied on hunting for their protein supply, one possible explanation for these figurations might be the performance of hunting rituals; however, a comparison between the faunal assemblage attested at the site and the iconography does not support that idea. [...] Mammalian bone fragments form the bulk of the material, but remains by ungulates predominate, constituting over 90 percent of the total sample. This is also the case in other PPN archaeofaunas collected in the Upper Euphrates basin. [...] Although each enclosure features animal figures that look threatening, we doubt whether the role of animals within the symbolic world of the PPN can be reduced to this simple level of apotropaica. It is important to note that not only are animals depicted on pillars, but also a complex system of symbols. In addition to the animals and symbols depicted in bas-relief, there is the group of three-dimensional sculptures and high reliefs, which seems to offer somewhat different symbolism. There are two main species depicted, a wild boar and a predator. The sculptures and high reliefs seem to be mainly apotropaic in their functions. The animals and symbols depicted in bas-relief are meant to transmit mythic narrations. (Schmidt 2011a, 925-26)<sup>1</sup>

This interpretative analysis was also presented in an article intended for a wider audience entitled “First came the temple, later the city”, where Göbekli Tepe, was, however, correctly defined as “a Stone Age ritual center” (Dietrich *et al.*, 2012). In a subsequent study, Dietrich and Notroff (2015) reasserted the validity of their use of terms such as “special buildings” (*Sondergebäude*), “sanctuaries”, or “temples” contrary to criticism by Banning (2011), who had argued that «archaeologists tend to impose western ethnocentric distinctions of sacred and profane on prehistory, while anthropology in most cases shows these two spheres to be inseparably interwoven». While conscious of the limits imposed by the lack of written sources, they cite several studies by archaeologists, which «speak out in favour of the possibility of archaeological insights into beliefs even for non-literate times and societies, however restricted by the limits of archaeological evidence» (Dietrich and Notroff 2015, 76). The circular buildings of Göbekli Tepe present benches and the pillars are richly decorated with zoomorphic as well as anthropomorphic figures, some of them attached to the pillars, like a high-relief of a predator, and a bear. Several limestone heads, a larger-than-life mask, and miniature masks have also been found (Dietrich, Notroff, and Dietrich 2018). Clay figurines seem to be completely absent<sup>2</sup>, while a figurine representing a mother with child has been found in (the later) Nevalı Çori settlement (Hauptmann 2012, 22 Fig. 14)<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> A comprehensive presentation of Schmidt's excavations is Schmidt 2010.

<sup>2</sup> The ithyphallic figurine with legs dragged towards his body, published by Dietrich, and Schmidt (2016), was found close to the surface, therefore impossible to attribute to any sure horizon of Göbekli Tepe.

<sup>3</sup> Female iconography is absent. The graffito representing an open-legged woman, perforated by a phallus (Hauptmann 2012, 20 Fig. 12), in a strange style, has to be regarded as a later work.

An anthropomorphic stele (80 cm high) was found in Kilisik (in the region of Adıyaman), a male statue in Göbekli Tepe, and another (193 cm high) in Yeni Mahalle (in the region of Urfa; Hauptmann 2012, 18-22 Figs. 10, 11, 13).

A relief on a long rocky wall to be dated approximately to the period of the reliefs of Göbekli has been recently found at Sayburç, also in the region of Şanlıurfa, and it reports a naked male figure in a frontal position with two lions at each side, followed on the left by a man hunting a wild bull (see: <https://arkeofili.com/sanliurfa-sayburca-leoparli-insan-sahnesi-bulundu/>, last visited 02/08/2023).

Cauvin has highlighted how symbolic material (from the beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> millennium BC) preceded the emergence of an agricultural economy in the Near East in the 9<sup>th</sup> millennium BC, proposing that a cognitive change anticipated the economic change, so that the natural world surrounding humans was made intelligible through symbolism. He referred in particular to the woman and bull symbolism, through which the Divine became personified (1994, 44-52; 98-101; 2001).

In his concluding remarks of a detailed survey of evidence of ritual practice and ceremonies in Early Neolithic societies, Watkins asserts that «if concepts of supernatural agents are, as Boyer has characterized them, a combination of recognizably human-style agency with a counterintuitive component that distinguishes them as supernatural and makes them memorable, the only candidates are the inscrutable anthropomorphic monoliths of Göbekli Tepe (including the smaller, later aceramic Neolithic examples from that site), and the similar monoliths from Nevalı Çori, which also date the later aceramic Neolithic» (2015, 158)<sup>4</sup>.

## 2. The cosmic system in the interpretation of Marshall Sahlins

The phases of the Göbekli Tepe settlement, however, conceptually precede «the birth of the gods» as described by Cauvin (above) and this is the reason why Watkins is uneasy in applying Cauvin's model to those exceptional finds. It is Sahlins (2017) who offers the interpretative key of this world in following «H.M. Hocart's and other anthropologists' who lead in freeing (him)self from anthropological conventions by adhering to indigenous traditions (23)». The common social science tradition considers cosmology as the reflex of sociology, but «human societies were engaged in cosmic systems of governmentality even before they instituted anything like a political state of their own» (23-24). «[These] were set within and dependent upon a greater animistic universe comprised of the persons of animals, plants, and natural features, complemented by a great variety of demonic figures, and presided over by several inclusive deities» (25). «While the Chewongs (of the Malaysian interior) profess to abhor cannibalism, like animist hunters generally, they nevertheless subsist on "people like us," their animal prey» (26). For them «the human social world is intrinsically part of a wider world in which boundaries between society and cosmos are non-existent» (29). «The recent theoretical interest in the animist concepts of indigenous peoples of lowland South America, northern North America, Siberia, and Southeast Asia has provided broad documentation of this monist ontology of a personalized universe. Kai Århem offers a succinct summary: "In the animist cosmos, animals and plants being and things may all appear as intentional subjects and persons, capable of will, intention, and agency."» (36).

<sup>4</sup> Some interpretations of the figurative representations from Göbekli Tepe have been suggested by Becker *et al.* 2012, 30-8.

Anthropologists used to name these forces which permeated the universe and opposed such earlier societies, preceding the birth of the gods, as “mana”, a term used by the Polynesians. The pillars of Göbekli Tepe, on which so many kinds of animals are depicted, offer an extraordinary and unexpected representation of such an animist cosmos from about 10000 BC, while the stylized humans may represent the “inclusive deities” who presided over them! Sahlins (62-64) further remarks that Jacobsen had already <formulated the concept of a “cosmic state” in reference to Mesopotamian polities of the third millennium B.C.>. Jacobsen in fact wrote:

Human society was to the Mesopotamian merely a part of the larger society of the universe. The Mesopotamian universe – because it did not consist of dead matter, because every stone, every tree, every conceivable thing in it was a being with a will and character of its own – was likewise founded on authority [...] The whole universe showed the influence of the essence peculiar to Anu [Sky, king and father of the gods] (Jacobsen 1946, 152)

One can add the Sumerian poem *Lugale* to the evidence mentioned by Jacobsen, in which the god Ninurta defeats the monstrous demon Agsag (Asakku), and his army of stone warriors, whose corpses will form the mountains (van Dijk 1983; Heimpel and Salgues 2015). A recent analysis of the animistic representation of rivers, springs, and plants according to the Mesopotamian sources is given by Perdibon (2019, 41-198).

### 3. The Early Pottery Neolithic Site of Çatal Höyük

Several rooms decorated with elements of symbolic content have been found at Çatal Höyük, the famous Early Pottery centre that stretches from about 7400 BC to the end of the seventh millennium BC. They are the same size as domestic houses and share some of the same features (houses may also present manifestations of the sacred). Wall paintings represent the hunting of a stag (Mellaart 1967, Pl. 46-47; 54-57; 61-63) and of a bull rendered in a larger size, surrounded by men, some dressed in leopard skins (Pl. 64). There are other complete images of leopards, and many pairs of bulls’ horns are set in the walls. Wild boar jaw bones, animal skulls, and vulture beaks are encased in clay supports in the walls<sup>5</sup>.

Çatal Höyük represents a stage in which a community elaborated the shaping of gods starting from an indistinct animistic cosmos. The stag epitomizes the realm of the wild fauna, and the bull the masculine force. These animals were also the ones that provided meat to the humans. Receiving something from the spirits, one had to give them something in exchange (as Marcel-Mauss has written), and that was done through rites celebrated in those shrines. Raptors also played an important role in symbolism. At Göbekli Tepe a fragmented sculpture depicts a bird grasping a human head (Nottroff *et al.* 2017, 61), and a pole is decorated with two human figures with a bird (the engraved wings and the tail feathers are preserved) sitting on top of the two heads; another stone pole with a human head topped by a bird was found at Nevalı Çori (Otto 2015, 193-97). The symbolism of raptors is also attested at Mureybet (Cauvin 1994, 46), and a wall painting from Çatal Höyük depicts vultures (necrophagous animals)

<sup>5</sup> For Çatal Höyük, see Mellaart 1967; Düring 2001; Sagona and Zimansky 2009, 85-97 (where several tables are reproduced). For a recent presentation of the settlement of Çatal Höyük, see Barański *et al.* 2021; Mazzucato *et al.* 2021.

attacking small headless human figures (Mellaart 1967, Pl. 48-49), perhaps symbolizing the function of defleshing the corpses: a rite for the Netherworld.

Some female figurines from the Khiamian period document the birth of the symbolism of the woman in the tenth millennium (Cauvin 1994, 44-8). The striking elements connected to the bull and the numerous figurines from Çatal Höyük, two thousand years later, confirm the progression in these symbolisms. In the first case there is a consolidation of a supreme male deity in the figure of a bull, which will remain common to most of the cultures of the ancient Near East with the animal of the Storm-god, and also of Zeus in the classical world. In the second case there is the emergence of a divinity in human form. Two figurines of steatopygous women sitting on a throne flanked by two leopards can only be representations of the Mother-goddess (Mellaart 1967, 182-84, Fig. 49-53). The two human figures in relief, shown with outstretched arms and legs in Shrine E VI B. 31 have been correctly thought to represent women, perhaps giving birth (Mellaart 1964, 47-9, Fig. 6-7, Pl. III, IV)<sup>6</sup>.

#### 4. The representation of animals in the seals from Kültepe/Kaneš and in vessels shaped like animals

The scenes depicted on the seals of the Anatolian group from Kültepe/Kaneš (19<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries BC) represent gods, and the spaces between their figures are filled with animals or parts of animals turned every which way. These seals present the same symbolism of the Hittite period: the Storm-god rides a bull, and Innara/KAL, the Tutelary god of wild animals, is on a stag; <sup>p</sup>KAL.LÍL, the Tutelary god of the Countryside has a hare, an eagle, and a crook as attributes; and the War-god rides a lion (Özgüç 2006, 24-5; see CS 255, CS 256, CS 257, CS 258, CS 265). A god is portrayed on a small, thin, gold folio standing on a lion. He holds a shaft-hole axe in his right hand, while in his left he holds a smaller lion figure from its hind legs (Kulakoğlu 2008). Vessels in the form of animals (including birds), usually in red, but also with brown or yellowish polished slip, were quite common (Özgüç 2003, 196-213; Kulakoğlu and Selmin 2010, Pl. 191-223)<sup>7</sup>.

There are not many examples of this kind of vessels in Hattuša, however, because the Hittites used cult vessels in silver or gold, which were melted down in later periods<sup>8</sup>; only a silver rhyton in the form of a protome of a stag (the Schimmel rhyton), and a silver vessel in the form of a fist have survived<sup>9</sup>.

The symbolism of the bull and the stag is attested much earlier (Early Bronze Age III) in the core of the land of Hatti, by the famous “standards” of Alaca-Höyük (Arinna), decorated with figurines of stags, bulls, and in one case an onager, which accompanied the members of the royal family to the Netherworld.

<sup>6</sup> The photo from the time of the excavation is also published in Sagona and Zimanski 2009, 90 Fig. 1, who suggest that an animal could be represented there instead. See, however, the graffito representing an open-legged woman from Göbekli Tepe (cited in note 2, above) to be dated to a period later than the pillars. The so-called squatting-woman is attested from Luristan to Northern Syria in later period as symbol of fertility and eroticism, also being portrayed in relation with men and in scenes of sexual intercourse, see Mazzoni 2002.

<sup>7</sup> *BIBRU* vessels at Kültepe/Kaneš have been found in houses (Özgüç 1991, 54-5).

<sup>8</sup> On some rhyta from Boğazköy, see Schachner 2018, and for a vessel in the form of a fist, see Schachner 2019.

<sup>9</sup> For the Schimmel rhyton, see Güterbock 1989; for the Boston fist, see Güterbock and Kensdall 1995. Another fist has been found in Hattuša (Schachner 2019). This kind of vessel (of five and three minas of silver) were sent to the king of Egypt as a gift (see EA 41, 39-43).

## 5. Zoomorphism in Egypt

The Hittites associated some animals to particular gods: the bull to the Storm-god, the stag to the God of nature, the lion to the War-god, the winged-lion to Ištar, and other gods were represented by a large variety of animals.

In Egypt each animal represented a single god, with a remarkable continuity until the introduction of Christianity: Horus could be portrayed as a falcon, Hathor as a woman with a cow's head; the union of the two brothers Re (the Sun) and Osiris could be represented by a ram-headed mummy with the sun-disk on it. The cult of sacred animals or of divine powers in animal form is proven by the care with which these animals were buried from the earliest part of the Early Dynastic period, such as the Apis bull<sup>10</sup>. Objects were carried on poles; evidence of the worship of sacred objects. There is no evidence for the worship of anthropomorphic deities in pre-dynastic Egypt. The earliest kings of a unified Egypt still have animal names: Scorpion, Cobra, etc. The “anthropomorphization of powers” (*Vermenschlichung der Mächte*) took place between 3000 and 2800 BC. “This process may be related to the fact that the powers that were worshiped as deities came more and more to show a human face, and their original animal or inanimate form changed in a human one” (Hornung 1982, 105)<sup>11</sup>. The “mixed form” of gods, combining human and animal elements, which is so characteristic of Egypt, developed later, and «the animal, vegetable, or inanimate attribute serves to define the figure more precisely» (Hornung 1982, 123)<sup>12</sup>.

## 6. The representations of gods according to the “cult inventories” and the *bibru* vessels in the form of animals

Divine representations based on a very large selection of cult inventories (Hazenbos 2003, 175-90; Cammarosano 2018, 87-102) show that in most of the minor cult centers the gods were represented by “stelae”, <sup>NA</sup>4<sup>ZI</sup>.KIN *an-na-al-la-an* 1 <sup>NA</sup>4<sup>ZI</sup>.KIN KÙ.BABBAR UGU-*kán kal-[ma-ra]* <sup>D</sup>UTU<sup>SI</sup> DÙ-at <sup>D</sup>UTU ME-E <sup>URU</sup>Gur-ša-ma-aš-ša “1 stele (in place) since of old. His Majesty (commissioned to) make 1 stele of silver (with sun) r[ays] on the top (for) the Sun-goddess of the Water of Guršamašša” (Cammarosano 2018, 170-71). Only one passage mentions that the stele was engraved with the image of a “Nursing Mother”, *an-ni-iš :ti-ta-i-me-iš*, KBo 2.1 I 33. A stele was rather rarely substituted by a statuette<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> For a detailed analysis of animal worship and animal embalming in Egypt, see Colonna 2021.

<sup>11</sup> Morenz (1960) named these powers as “mana” according to his time (chapter 2: “The Gods”); Thoth could be represented as a bird, with the head of an ibis, and also as a baboon, because the divine had multiple incarnations.

<sup>12</sup> «No thinking Egyptian would have imagined that the true form of Amun was a man of a ram's head. Amun is the divine power that may be seen in the image of a ram, among many others, as Horus shows himself in the image of the hawk whose wings span the sky, and Anubis in the image of the black canine (“jackal”) who busies himself around tombs in the desert» (Hornung 1982, 124). «A most unusual group statue brings together in a curious fashion cow, lion-headed goddess, uraeus, and goddess with sistrum on her head, showing four forms of Hathor next to one other. We should not assume that the Egyptians imagined Hathor as a woman with a cow's head. It is more plausible to see the cow as one possible manifestation of Hathor, and the cow's head and cow's horns as attributes that allude to a manifestation of the goddess or a part of her nature. In Hathor there is the maternal tenderness of the cow, but, among many other characteristics, also the wildness of the lioness and the unpredictability of the snake. Any iconography can be no more than an attempt to indicate something of her complex nature» (Hornung 1982, 113).

<sup>13</sup> This is the case of spring Sinarāšši, whose stele was substituted by a statuette representing a woman in sitting position, of iron, 1 span height, KBo 2.1 II 10-11, 15; see Cammarosano 2018, 194-95.

Representations in the form of small-sized statues, mostly of goddesses, often decorated with silver, were also frequent; these statuettes could either be on an animal or have a symbol attributed to that particular god<sup>14</sup>. Šeri and Ғurri, the two bulls which pulled the chariot of the Syrian Storm-god, whose cult was introduced in Ғattuša at the beginning of the Empire period, were also made in pottery, in a smaller dimension, like the two bulls from Kuşaklı (now in the Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi of Ankara), KBo 39.86 II 8'-9': <sup>GIŠ</sup>GIDRU<sup>HLA</sup> 1-ŠU<sup>GIŠ</sup>MAR.GÍD.DA 1-ŠU<sup>GUD</sup>Še-ri 1-ŠU<sup>GUD</sup>Ғur-ri 1-ŠU “the staffs: 1 (libation); the chariot: 1 (libation); the bull Šeri: 1 (libation); the bull Ғurri: 1 (libation)”. Šeri and Ғurri were “drunk from a horn”, *si-az e-ku-zi*, KUB 11.22 V 14'-16'. Male gods could also be represented by an object, such as “staffs”, <sup>GIŠ</sup>GIDRU, “daggers”, <sup>GÍR</sup><sup>15</sup>, and sun disks (for the Sun deities). Zithariya was represented by a hunting bag, <sup>KUŠ</sup>*kurša*. Male gods were often also represented by vessels in form of animals, such as rhyta (*BIBRU*), bowls (*GAL*), protomes of animals (*GÚ*), or horns (*SI*), that is by the media itself through which one reached a communion with the god performing the rite of “drinking a god” (below § 8). One drank the god through his image.

Aniconism, zoomorphism (including vessels in the form of animals), or objects pertaining to a god, are all archaic ways in representing a god. Furthermore, the autumn and spring festivals, which are extensively documented for central Anatolia so as to form the basic pattern of the seasonal celebrations in this region (below § 11), must go back to time immemorial. Not only many of the deities of the countryside, but also those of the capital, Ғattuša, whose festivals were celebrated by the king and queen, had been received from the Hattians, as is demonstrated – among other cases – by the pantheon of the *KI.LAM* festival<sup>16</sup>. The people who diffused Indo-European languages did not share a common pantheon. The Hittites adopted the Hattian Eštan, that is <sup>UTU</sup> = *Ištanu*- for the Sun-goddess of Earth (besides *Wurunšemu*), but also for the Hattian supreme Goddess of heaven, differently from the Luwians, who had *Tiwad*, (the Palaic *Tiyaz*). The male solar deity of the Hittite pantheon acquired a personality when the Hittites came in contact with the Syrian milieu<sup>17</sup>.

It was Güterbock (1983) who explained the symbolism through which the Hittites experienced the world that surrounded them, in his fundamental essay in the *Festschrift Bittel*. He classified the representations of the gods according to three groups: anthropomorphic images, zoomorphic, or as objects, basing himself on the “cult inventories” concerning the provincial cities and villages of Ғatti<sup>18</sup>. According to him, the term *DINGIR<sup>LM</sup>-tar* (*šiu*niyatar, from *šiu(n)*- “god”) should be interpreted as “Götterdarstellung”, so that “(God NN) *DINGIR<sup>LM</sup>-tar 1 wakšur*” would mean: “God NN: (his) image (is) a

<sup>14</sup> See Cammarosano 2018, 63-74.

<sup>15</sup> See KBo 2.1 I 32: <sup>HUR.SAG</sup>Šu-wa-ra-aš <sup>5 URUDU</sup>GÍR; KUB 31.1+ I 4'-8': <sup>URU</sup>Ta<sup>1</sup>-ra-am-ka<sup>4</sup> <sup>DZ.A.BA<sub>4</sub>.BA<sub>4</sub></sup>*DINGIR<sup>LM</sup>-tar 1 GÉŠPU KÙ.BABBAR KI.LÁ.BI 20 GÍN.GÍN 2 <sup>URUDU</sup>A-RI-TUM <sup>GAL 1 URUDU</sup>T-MI-IT-TUM 3 <sup>URUDU</sup>GÍR 1 <sup>URUDU.GIŠ</sup>ŠUKUR 1 <sup>GIŠ</sup>TUKUL ZABAR 1 <sup>URUDU</sup>HA-AŠ-ŠI-IN-NU Ú-NU-TÚ ŠA <sup>DZ.A.BA<sub>4</sub>.BA<sub>4</sub></sup>*ta-ru-up-ta* “Town Taramm(e)ka. The War-god: (his) image is 1 silver fist, its weight 20 shekels, 2 large shields, 1 lance, 3 daggers, 1 spear, 1 mace, 1 axe: the equipment of the War-god is complete”.*

<sup>16</sup> See the Old Hittite manuscripts of the *KI.LAM* in Burgin 2019.

<sup>17</sup> For the Sun-deities of the Early 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BC, see Steitler 2017, 15-7 (on previous interpretations), and 179-96. For an insight discussion on Hittite *šiwatt*-, *\*djiwot*-, and on “Solar and Sky deities in Anatolia”, see Melchert 2019. One should ascribe to a later syncretism the fact that a Luwian ritual mentions “a *Tiwad* above, and a *Tiwad* below”, *šarr]i Tiwata inta-ḫa Tiwata*, KUB 32.10+ I 12' (restoration by Steitler).

<sup>18</sup> Güterbock had at disposal the texts edited by von Brandenstein (1943), those by Jakob-Rost (1961, 1963), and also the dissertation by Carter (1962). This study has been included in Hoffner 1997, 115-25.

*wakšur* vessel”<sup>19</sup>. This image was the tangible aspect of a deity, so that *šuniyatar* should be understood more exactly as “spirit holder; divinity” (CHD Š, 507)<sup>20</sup>. The following passage, <sup>D</sup>*Iyayaš* DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup>-*tar* ALAM GIŠ KÙ.BABBAR GAR.RA MUNUS<sup>TI</sup> TUŠ-*an*, should therefore mean: “Goddess Iyaya: (her) spirit holder is a statue of a woman sitting, (made of) wood, inlaid with silver”.

The basic rite of the spring festival (attested for the main deities of all the cities and villages, below, § 11) consisted in a procession in which the divine image was brought to an open-air place by a stele representing that deity, more exactly it was brought to the deity itself: a male god to a mountain, a goddess to a spring. The only possible interpretation of this rite is that in spring, with the rebirth of Nature, the image had to be re-loaded, so-to-speak, with divine power through this contact.

#### 7. Gods and their vessels (*BIBRU*) in the form of animals<sup>21</sup>

Güterbock (1983= Hoffner 1997, 120-23) has already shown how often animals are associated to gods in the descriptions of images of gods in the cult inventories, as in KUB 38.2 I 7'-15': “The vi[gorous] Ištar: [a statuette ...] seated, from her shoulders [wings protrude], in her right hand [she holds] a cup of gold, [in her left hand] she holds a gold (hieroglyphic sign for) ‘Good(ness)’. Beneath her there is a base, plat[ed] with silver. [Beneath] the b[ase] lies a sphinx (*a-ú-i-ti-ya-aš*), plated with silver. And to the right [and left] of the wings of the sphinx stand Ninatta and Kulitta, their eyes of silver plated with [gol]d”<sup>22</sup>.

*awauwa*- “spider” KUB 54.10 II 8': *BI-IB-RA* GUŠKIN;

*auiti* “sphinx, winged lion,” KBo 30.175, 4'-5': *a-ú-i-ti-ya-aš* *BI-I*[*B-RI*]; KBo 48.262.a II: 2 *BI-IB-RU a-ú-i-ti* [...<sup>NA,Z</sup>]A.GÌN; KUB 2.10 V 39: *a-ú-i-ti* GUŠKIN; KUB 16.83 obv. 49: <sup>D</sup>*Pitenhi* (*BIBRU*); Ištar

*šāiu*- “?” KUB 12.1 IV 23': 1 *ša-a-i-u-uš* GUŠKIN;

*šašā*- (a bird) KUB 44.6 I 4'-5': [*BI-I*] *B-RU ša-ša-a-na* ZAB[AR];

*zinzapu*- (a bird) KUB 5.10 I 3: z. *BI-IB-RU* GUŠKIN; KUB 12.15 V 21: z. *BI-IB-RU* [; without *BIBRU*: KBo 33.167 III 4; KUB 10.91 III 13;

*A-JA-LI* “stag” Bo 5036 III 13-14<sup>23</sup>;

*LU-LIM* “stag” KBo 48.262.a+ II 12-14: 4 *BI-IB-RU LU-LIM* GUŠKIN NA<sub>4</sub> ŠÀ 1<sup>EN</sup> 4 GÌR<sup>MEŠ</sup>

GUB-*za* 2 IGI-*zi* GUB-*za* 1<sup>EN</sup> 4 GÌR<sup>MEŠ</sup> *ša-ša-an-za*;

<sup>GUD</sup>AMAR “calf” <sup>D</sup>*Tūḫašail* KUB 59.37, 18'-19';

ANŠE.KUR.RA “horse” <sup>D</sup>*Iyarri* (KUB 15.5 II 33'-36': de Roos 2007, 74);

DÀRA.MAŠ “billy wild goat” <sup>D</sup>U of the thunder: (KBo 19.128 V 5': Otten 1971, 12)

<sup>GUD</sup> “ox/bull” KBo 48.262.a+: II 9-11: 4 *BI-IB-RU* GU<sub>4</sub> ŠÀ 1<sup>EN</sup> 4 GÌR<sup>MEŠ</sup> [GUB-*z*] *a* GUŠKIN NA<sub>4</sub> 1<sup>EN</sup> 4 GÌR<sup>MEŠ</sup> *ša-ša-an-za* GUŠK[IN] NA<sub>4</sub> 2 IGI-*zi* GÌR<sup>MEŠ</sup> *ša-ša-an-za* GUŠK[IN] NA<sub>4</sub> 2 IGI-*zi* GÌR<sup>MEŠ</sup> GUB-*te-eš* GUŠKIN NA<sub>4</sub><sup>24</sup>; KUB 12.1 IV 20'-21': 6 *BI-IB-RU* GUŠKIN

<sup>19</sup> Cf. KBo 2.1 II 33: 1 *wa-ak-šur* ZABAR<sup>PÚ</sup> *Ḫa-pu-ri-ya-ta-aš*; KUB 31.1+ I 1'-2': <sup>URU</sup>*Ta<sup>1</sup>-ra-am-me-ka<sub>4</sub>* <sup>D</sup>U KARAŠ <sup>D</sup>AMAR.UTU-*a[š]* DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup>-*tar* 2 *wa-ak-šur* KÙ.BABBAR KI.LÁ.BI 2 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR “Town Tarammeka. Storm-god of the army, Šanta: (their) images are 2 silver *wakšur*-vessel, their weight is 2 minas of silver”.

<sup>20</sup> A betyl was a “stone imbued with psyche” according to the definition of Philo of Byblos. For <sup>(LÍ)</sup>*šuniyant*- “imbued with the god, ecstatic”, see Francia 2022.

<sup>21</sup> See Carruba 1967; Soysal 2014/15, who list the materials used for these vessels: metals, different kinds of stones, wood

<sup>22</sup> Last translation of the text: Cammarosano 2018, 294-99.

<sup>23</sup> See Carruba 1967, 90, note 6.

<sup>24</sup> See Otten 1989, 366-67.

- [ŠA<sup>B</sup>]<sup>A</sup> 4 GUD IGI-zi GUB-an-te-eš ŠÀ 3 GUŠKIN NA<sub>4</sub> 1<sup>EN</sup> GUŠKIN pu-u-ri-in (Siegelová 1986, 448); KUB 42.42 IV 11': [x BI-IB-R]U GUD 2 AŠ-RA GUŠKIN GAR.R[A; KUB 42.100+: III 27': <sup>D</sup>U AN<sup>E</sup>: 3 GÚ GUD KÚ.BABBAR; KBo 25.173 I 7': BI-IB-RU GUŠKIN; <sup>D</sup>IM: KBo 27.67+ I 4', II 1, 35 and 44, 55 (Klinger 1996, 302, 306, 310, 312); <sup>D</sup>U GA<sub>5</sub>-AŠ-RU KUB 38.1+ 29'-30': BI-IB-RU GU<sub>4</sub> GIŠ KÚ.BABBAR GAR.RA 4 KI.GUB pár-ka<sub>4</sub>-aš-ti 1 SIG.KUŠ; <sup>D</sup>U ŠAMĒ VSNF 12.28 II 13'-14': Klinger 1996, 610; <sup>D</sup>IM È<sup>TIM</sup> GAL KBo 19.128 VI 10'-11': Otten 1971, 16; <sup>D</sup>IM URU Hi-iš-ša-aš-ḫa-pa: ABoT 33+ IV 5'-6': BI-IB-RU GUD KÚ.BABBAR; <sup>D</sup>U URU Li-iḫ-zi-na, KUB 38.3 I 1-3: BI-IB-RU GUD GIŠ 4 KI.GUB KÚ.BABBAR GAR.RA SAG.DU-ŠÚ GABA<sup>HI.A</sup> GUŠKIN GAR.RA pár-ka<sub>4</sub>-aš-ti 1 SIG.KUŠ; <sup>D</sup>IM/U and <sup>D</sup>IM/U URU Zi-ip-pa-la-an-da KBo 14.33 I 12': (StBoT 37: 426, 458, 482); KBo 19.128 IV 34'-35', 42'-43': Otten 1971, 10, 12; KUB 1.17 II 31-33.
- GUD.AM "Auerochse" KUB 12.3, 10.
- GUD.AMAR "calf" Bo 6514 IV 3; KUB 59.37, 7'.
- GUD.MAḪ "bull" KUB 42.100+: III 27'-28'.
- <sup>PÚ</sup>Ha-pu-ri-ya-ta-aš KBo 2.1 II 34: AN.BAR 1 še-kan;
- <sup>D</sup>U <sup>M</sup>Zi-ya-zi-ya KBo 2.13 obv. 1: AN.BAR;
- <sup>D</sup>U URU A-aš-ša-ra-ad-da (KBo 2.1 II 40-41, 34-35): AN.BAR 1 še-kan;
- <sup>D</sup>U URU Ma-al-li-it-ta-aš KUB 38.6 + 57.106 IV 16': GIŠ NAGGA GAR.RA 4 GUB-za;
- <sup>D</sup>U URU Ma-ra-a-aš KBo 2.1 I 28-29, 34-35: AN-NA-KI GAR.RA 4 GUB-za; changed in: KÚ.BABBAR 4 GUB-za 1 še-kan;
- <sup>D</sup>U URU Pa-re-en-ta-aš KBo 2.1 III 7-8: AN.BAR 1 še-kan;
- <sup>D</sup>U URU Ša-na-an-ti-ya KBo 2.1 IV 1-3: AN.BAR 4 GUB-aš 2 še-kan;
- <sup>D</sup>U URU Ša-ru-wa-la-aš-ši KBo 2.1 III 1-3: AN.BAR 1 še-kan;
- <sup>D</sup>U URU Wa-at-tar-wa KBo 2.1 II 24-25: AN.BAR 1 še-kan;
- MUŠEN "bird" KUB 7.38 obv. 12.
- PÌRIG.TUR "leopard" KUB 48.262.a+ II 21-23: 3 BI-IB-RU PÌRIG.TUR ŠÀ 1<sup>EN</sup> 4 GÌR<sup>MEŠ</sup> GUB-za 2 GÚ PÌRIG.TUR GUŠKIN<sup>NA+ZA.GÌN</sup> mušnuwa[nza] parzašša.
- SIM<sup>MUŠEN</sup> "dove" KUB 16.83 I 50: GUŠKIN SIM<sup>MUŠEN</sup>.
- ŠAḪ "pig" KBo 31.54, 5'.
- BI-IB-RU ŠAḪ ZABAR (KUB 44.6 I 3', 4').
- TI<sub>8</sub><sup>MUŠEN</sup> "eagle" BI-IB-RI<sup>HI.A</sup> KBo 18.178 rev. 2'-3: KÚ.BABBAR ... [1<sup>EN</sup>] GÚ TI<sub>8</sub><sup>MUŠEN</sup>; KBo 48.262.a+ II 15: 4 BI-IB-RU TI<sub>8</sub><sup>MUŠEN</sup> GUŠKIN<sup>NA+ZA.GÌN</sup>; KUB 12.1 IV 11': 1<sup>EN</sup> GÚ TI<sub>8</sub><sup>MUŠEN</sup>.
- ḪUR.SAG Lūla (KUB 40.110 rev. 4-5).
- <sup>D</sup>Kammamma<sup>D</sup>Ḫašgallā (KUB 55.18 II 8'-9': IŠ-TU BI-IB-RI GU[ŠKIN] TI<sub>8</sub><sup>MUŠEN</sup>)
- <sup>D</sup>KAL<sup>URU</sup>Ḫatti (KUB 55.18 III 2'-3').
- [ḫumanteš] DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup> (KBo 54.143 obv. 3'-4).
- UDU.KUR.RA "mountain sheep" KUB 12.1 IV 10'-11' (Siegelová 1986, 446): [x BI-]IB-RU GUŠKIN ŠÀ<sup>BA</sup> 2 UDU.KUR.RA IGI-zi GUB-an-te-eš [x GUB-a]n-te-eš EGIR-pa pár-za uš-kán-e-eš; KUB 42.100+: III 28': <sup>D</sup>U AN<sup>E</sup>: 1 BI-IB-RU UDU.KUR.RA KÚ.BABBAR.
- UDU.ŠIR "ram" BI-IB-RU KÚ.BABBAR 4 GÌR<sup>MEŠ</sup> a-ra-an-za.
- <sup>D</sup>Ḫilašši (VSNF 12.21 + KBo 13.217 II 1').
- <sup>D</sup>Šawašḫila (VSNF 12.21+ II 14'-15').
- <sup>D</sup>Kataḫziwūri (VSNF 12.21+ III 18", 22").
- <sup>D</sup>Ziparwā (VSNF 12.21+ III 7", 10").
- UR.MAḪ "lion" BI-IB-RI KÚ.BABBAR 1 GÚ UR.MAḪ (KBo 9.91 obv. 15-17); 3 BI-IB-RU UR.MAḪ ŠÀ 1<sup>EN</sup> 4 GÌR<sup>MEŠ</sup> GUB-za SAG.DU-SÚ GABA GUŠKIN AN.BARGE<sub>6</sub> 1<sup>EN</sup> GÚ UR.MAḪ GUŠKIN<sup>NA+ZA.GÌN</sup> NA<sub>4</sub>mu-u[š-nu-wa-an-za] ḫe-eš-ḫi-ši-kán SAG.DU UR.MAḪ NA<sub>4</sub> 1<sup>EN</sup>

GUŠK[IN] *pu-u-ri-iš-ti-it-ta-li-ta-i-me-eš* (KBo 48.262.a+ II 16-20)<sup>25</sup>; 1<sup>EN</sup> GÚ UR.MAḪ [GUŠKI]N NA<sub>4</sub> (KUB 12.1 IV 22'-23'); KUB 48.119 rev.<sup>2</sup> 9; *BI-IB-RU* UR.MAḪ GUŠKIN<sup>HUR.SAG</sup> *Aškašepa* (on a gold B.: KUB 1.17 V 28': Klinger 1996, 436; gold).

<sup>D</sup>Iyarri (in a dream stood on a lion – his form however was like that of the Storm-god – ‘This statue they will make exactly so’; 46'-51': ‘in a dream one said to His Majesty: ‘make Iyarri (represented as) a veiled woman’, Iyarri (represented as) a veiled woman they shall make’): KUB 15.5 II 39'-44'; de Roos 2007, 75).

<sup>D</sup> GAL.ZU (KBo 19.128 V 39'-40': Otten 1971, 14).

ZA.BA<sub>4</sub>.BA<sub>4</sub> (KUB 10.89 I 20: Klinger 1996, 506).

## 8. The Hittite ceremony of “drinking a god” and the ritual meal

The Akkadian term *BIBRU* is translated “rhyton”, although it had just one opening, and not a second one through which the liquid could get out, which explains the Greek name (Tuchelt 1962). This type of vessel was used in religious festivals, and the form of the rhyton was that of the animal which represented the worshiped deity. KUB 10.89 I 20'-29' (Klinger 1996, 506-07) concerns a monthly festival: “King (and) queen drink (*akuwanzi*) sitting (the War-god) Zababa with a rhyton in the form of a lion staying on his four (legs), (*IŠTU BIBRI UR.MAḪ IV arantet*). The cup-bearer brings one large mouthful of bread made of mash from outside. He gives (it) to the king. The king breaks (*paršiya*) (it), and bites (*wāki*) (it). (One plays) the lyre; one sings; the entertainer speaks; the *palwatallaš palwaizzi*; drum (and) castanets. The dancers dance. One brings a bowl (*huppar*) of wine to the entertainer. (The cup-bearer) who has to come bowing (comes)”. The same rite was then performed for other deities, without specifying every time what kind of vessel was used (in some cases it was a “bowl”, GAL). A shortened (and more usual) formulation of the same rite is given in the parallel text KUB 10.24 VI 11'-16' (Klinger 1996, 478-79): “[King (and) que]en drink sitting Zababa [with] a gold rhyton. (The cup-bearer) receives (then the wine) in an empty [*išk*] *aruh*-vessel”.

One must also consider that the “bowl / cup”, *zeri* / GAL could have been shaped like an animal (which is very seldom expressed), see VSNF 12.28, 9': “The king drinks standing the Goddess of Arinna and the (other) gods from a bowl in the form of a stag (*IŠ-TU GAL lu-la-ya-ma-az*)” (Klinger 1996, 610)<sup>26</sup>.

Considering that the verb *eku-* “to drink” takes the accusative of the name of the deity, and that this act was followed by the king biting the bread for the deity, one has to deduce that the climax of the rite consisted in the act performed by the king (and the queen) in drinking of the same wine (or beer) and eating of the same bread as the god:

Der Höhepunkt im Verlauf der Feste in der hattisch-heth. Tradition bestand in Trinken, *eku-*, die Gottheit. Diese Handlung, die nicht als „GN tränken“ aufgefasst werden darf, wurde ursprünglich nur vom König und von der Königin vollzogen. Der Zelebrant gelangte zu einer mystischen Kommunikation mit der Gottheit, indem er aus einem besonderen für die Gottheit bestimmten Gefäß das für die Gottheit bestimmte Getränk trank, das dann für sie „libiert“, *sipant-*, wurde, das heisst ihr zu trinken gegeben wurde. Nach dem Opfertrank fand ein Nahrungsoffer statt: der König brach ein Brot, das dann fortgetragen wurde. (Archi 1979, 200-01).

<sup>25</sup> See Otten 1989, 366-67.

<sup>26</sup> For *lulayama-*, to be related to *lulim(m)i-*, an epithet of <sup>D</sup>KAL, the Stag-god, see Alp 1983, 125 note 158. Such *zeri-* vessels could be rhyta like those of nos. 212-216 in Kulakoğlu and Selmin 2010, Pl. 213-216.

The officiant had to break the bread for the god and eat a bite before presenting it to him on the altar; then he had to swallow a sip of the wine (in some cases beer) which he had to then “libate”, in pouring it from the rhyton, or “bowl”, *zeri-* / *GAL*, or a pitcher, *KUKKUB*, into the *huppar* vessel (*huppari sipanti*): as the bread was placed on the altar, the wine had to be offered by pouring it at the base of the altar, and the cup-bearer had to receive this liquid in an empty vessel: <sup>U</sup>SAGI-*aš išgaruḫit* GUŠKIN RIQUTI *šer epzi* (see Kammenhuber 1971, 147-50; Singer 1984, 47; II 15-21). Other vessels used for “drinking a god” were *aššuzeri-*, and GEŠPU “fist”. The Boston silver bowl in the form of a fist represents king Tudḫaliya IV, dressed with a long “ritual dress”, holding the “lituus” (*aniyatta*/KIN<sup>HI.A</sup>-*ta*, <sup>GIS</sup>*kalmuš*) while he is performing a libation in front of an altar (*ištanana-*, ZAG.GAR.RA) on which bread and meat offerings are placed. He is pouring wine from a pitcher at the foot of an altar; behind him is a bowed cup-bearer holding a kantharos, followed by a man playing a small drum, two musicians playing lyres, a man beating some castanets, and a last person holding a kind of “alphorn” in both hands, probably the “man who plays the *palwa*” (<sup>U</sup>*palwatallaš palwaizzi*). At the other side of the altar, in front of the king is the Storm-god, standing and grasping the reins to which two horses are hitched (Güterbock and Kendall 1995, 52-3).

In the Schimmel stag vessel a king is portrayed making an offering to the Stag-god KAL (together with his *paredra* Ala). Behind the god there is a hunting spear, hunting bag, quiver and a dismembered stag. The king, being a devotee of this god<sup>27</sup>, is portrayed wearing a short dress suitable for a hunter, pouring a libation to the god from a pitcher; he is followed by a drum-player and the bowed cup-bearer who holds a kantharos (Güterbock and Kendall 1995, 54).

Friedrich (1952, 40) explained the construction of the verb *eku-* / *aku-* “to drink” followed by a divine name in the accusative as “to drink a deity”, refusing the causative meaning “tränken”, “give to drink”, adducing the Eucharist for comparison: “an unserer Abendmahl erinnerend”. Already Forrer had published a paper entitled “Das Abendmahl im Ғatti-Reiche” in the year 1938 (Forrer 1940), as Güterbock (1998, 121) has remarked. The Hattian-Hittite rite was in fact a meal shared between the deity and the royal couple.

It was Kammenhuber’s (1971 = 1993, 475-91) merit to have defined this basic rite which the Hittites had received from the Hattians, and had preserved in the festivals of the Hattian-Hittite tradition, one of the largest corpora of the Hittite documents. According to her, «wenn der heth. König eine oder mehrere Gottheiten „trinkt“, handelt es sich um eine Libation: er libiert in einer Schale (*huppar*). [...] Eine Handlung, der sicher tiefere magische Vorstellungen zugrunde liegen» (1971, 147-48; 153). In the later period (particularly in the 13<sup>th</sup> century BC), however, the verb *eku-* also assumed the meaning “to give to drink, to toast to DN” because of a contamination with cults from the south-eastern regions (of Hurrian origin)<sup>28</sup>.

<sup>27</sup> This king – not dressed in the usual cloak, but with a shorter one – could be Tudḫaliya “the hunter” (see Hawkins 2006). For a different interpretation of the hieroglyphic signs in the captions, see van den Hout 2018.

<sup>28</sup> A good example is the *Ritual of Wišuriyanza*, KBo 15.25 rev. 14–17: GAL(.DUMU).É.GAL š[*ipa*] *nzakizzi nu ḫantezz[i pa]lši* <sup>U</sup>GAL ŠA-ME-E *e-ku-z[i]* EGIR-ŠU *ma A-N[A<sup>PI</sup>]M e-ku-zi* EGIR-ŠU-*ma A[-NA<sup>KA</sup>]L e-ku-zi ak-ku-uš-ki-u-wa-ni-ma* TUŠ-*aš* “The chief of the palace servant makes a libation: he drinks first (to) the Sun-god of Heaven; then he drinks to the Storm-god; and then he drinks to the Tutelary-god. We then drink sitting”, see Carruba 1966, 4-7. The passages concerning the verb *eku-* in the cult and ritual documents have been collected in Kammenhuber and Archi 1975/77.

Reactions to her thesis were negative, preferring the meaning “to drink (to the honour of) DN; to toast to DN”<sup>29</sup>. Kammenhuber’s incontrovertible answer (1991, 225) was: «Die Hethiter hätten die schönere, aber interpretierende Übersetzung des neu-englischen Ausdrucks „to toast somebody“ bezeichnen können, wenn sie es gewollt hätten»<sup>30</sup>!

Güterbock (1998) accepted in a second time the thesis that the literal understanding of the phrase *eku-* + DN in the accusative, “to drink god NN”, is correct. He then remarked that according to a passage (his § 8) of the Old Hittite festival text KBo 17.74+, the king “drinks the bowl (GAL) of the Sun-goddess” and her daughter Mezzulla (see below); in several passages from a later manuscript of this festival, instead, the king drinks a deity (in the accusative) “from a bowl (or) a rhyton”: DN *IŠTU GAL / IŠTU BIBRI ekuzi*. One should, therefore, deduce that “drinking the cup of a god” means to drink part of the wine offered to a god, which in a later manuscript is expressed as: “to drink a god (in drinking some wine) from his cup”! He then (Güterbock 1998, 127-29) quoted two passages from KUB 55.18 (a later fragmentary text with poor syntax) concerning a local festival celebrated by a “priest”, <sup>LÜ</sup>SANGA, with the participation of a local community<sup>31</sup>:

KUB 55.18 II 6'-11':

- 6' *na-aš-ta ša-an-ḫa-an-zi nu* <sup>LÜ</sup>SANGA  
 7' <sup>D</sup>*Ka-am-ma-am-ma Ḫa-aš-ga-la-a*  
 8' *ša LUGAL-ya šUM-šU GUB-aš IŠ-TU BI-IB-RI K*[<sup>Ü</sup>.BABBAR]  
 9' <sup>TI</sup><sub>8</sub><sup>MUŠEN</sup> *pi-ya-an-zi na-an-za-kán kat-ta* [Ø]  
 10' *A-NA GAL.GIR<sub>4</sub> la-ḫu-u-wa-i na-an-kán IŠ-T*[<sup>U</sup> GAL.GIR<sub>4</sub>]  
 11' *e-ku-zi*

“Then they sweep. (To) the priest they give (to drink) standing the deity Kammamma (and) Ḫašgalā, and the Name of the king from a s[ilver] rhyton in the form of an eagle: he pours it (i.e.: the wine) in the earthenware cup clay, and he (i.e., the priest) drinks it / him (the deities Kammamma and Ḫašgalā)”

The second passage, KUB 55.18 III 2'-5', is:

- 2' [*nu*?] <sup>D</sup>GAL.ZU GUB-aš IŠ-TU BI-IB-RI K<sup>Ü</sup>.BABBAR  
 3' [<sup>TI</sup><sub>8</sub>]<sup>MUŠEN</sup> *ša* <sup>D</sup>KAL <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-at-ti pa-an-ga-u-i-y*[*a*]

<sup>29</sup> For criticism expresses about Kammenhuber’s thesis, see the bibliography in *HW*<sup>2</sup>, 30. Soysal 2008 – followed by Goedegebuure 2008 – suggested, moreover, that the ending *-n* was a development of the Hattian dative ending *-n*, so that such an ungrammatical construction would have remained in use for ca 400 years!

<sup>30</sup> Kammenhuber refers, as an example, to the expression: *waršuli eku-* “zur Befriedigung / Besänftigung trinken”; better: “to drink (in honour)”, which does not belong to any Hittian-Hittite festival, but which occurs several times in the *ḫišuwas* Festival from the Hurrian milieu of Kizzuwatna, as in the passage KBo 15.37 V 18–23: “*te-pu* (GEŠTIN) *šuppiyahḫanzi na-aš-ta* <sup>LÜ</sup>SANGA *nam-ma IŠ-TU BI-IB-RI DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup> ḫa-a-ni nu-uš-ša-an A-NA GAL LUGAL la-ḫu-u-wa-i nu LUGAL pa-a-i ... LUGAL-uš wa-ar-šu-li e-ku-zi* “One consecrates part (of the wine). The priest draws again wine from the rhyton of the god, and pours it in the bowl of the king, then he gives (it) to the king”. Music and songs. “The king drinks: ‘Health’”. In this particular case the *BIBRU* is filled with the wine which is then distributed to individual bowls. This expression also refers to other participants, KUB 25.32+ IV 13: <sup>LÜ</sup>MES<sup>S</sup> *ḫumanteš wa[ršuli]* <sup>NAG</sup>-zi “(they place) the thigh on the altar, and they drink three times the rhyta in honour in staying”. KUB 45.44 II 6: *ape-ya waršuli akuanzi*; IBoT 1.1 III 22–23: 2 *BE-LU-ši* [*menahḫanda*] *wars[uli akuanzi]* “2 lords drink in honour of him (i.e. the king)”.

<sup>31</sup> See the transcription in Groddek 2002, 32-3.

- 4' [p]i-ya-an-zi na-at-za-kán kat-ta A-NA GAL<sup>HI.A</sup> [GIR<sub>4</sub>]  
 5' [l]a-a-ḫu-wa-an-zi na-at-kán ar-ḫa a-ku-wa-an-z[i]

“They give to the assembly (to drink), standing, the god GAL.ZU from the silver rhyton in the form of an eagle of the Tutelary-god (i.e. the Stag-god) of Ḫatti: they pour **it** down into [earthenware] cups, and drink **it** out”.<sup>32</sup>

Güterbock was right in noting that GAL.ZU (without the divine determinative in the following passage) has to be read: GAL-SÚ = Akk. KĀSU: KBo 15.59 III 9'-10': LU-GAL-uš GAL.ZU *ekuzi* human[ti-ya] *akuwanna piyanazi* “the king drinks the bowl; they give everybody / the assembly to drink”<sup>33</sup>. This text belongs to the *ḫišuwaš* festival, of the Hurrian tradition from Kizzuwatna. This interpretation makes it very probable that <sup>p</sup>GAL.ZU of the Hattian-Hittite festivals was the deified bowl, because – as Güterbock (1998, 127) writes – «once the bowl was deified it could well have been treated like other deities»<sup>34</sup>.

The text does not present a correct wording, which makes it ambiguous; moreover, the singular accusative enclitic of the common pronoun *-an* in the first passage should refer to the wine (!), while the nominative-accusative neuter singular in the second passage can only refer to the wine.

Güterbock's final deduction (1998, 129) is formulated as follows: «it seems to me that the passage (above) shows that the liquid is the deity, or the deity is the liquid, since here the deity is poured from a *BIBRU* into a cup from which the celebrant then drinks». Taracha, who has recently revived this interpretation, writes:

The idea of the wine symbolizing a god in Hittite liturgy implies a kind of mystical thinking comparable to the idea of consecration of the sacramental wine into the Redeemer's blood in celebration of the Eucharist. Like in the Eucharist, at the hearth of Hittite cult ceremonies are the breaking of bread and drinking of the wine of a god from the cup. (Taracha 2019, 716)

Indeed, the wine poured into such a cup, and offered as a drink to a deity, became imbued with the spirit of the god, and could be fateful for anyone unfaithful to him, as a passage from the Instruction for the Priests and Temple Personnel shows:

(In order to detect who has taken away something of the gods' property,) then you will drink empty the rhyton of the deity himself. If you are innocent, (then it is due to) your patron deity (*šumel*<sup>p</sup>KAL-KU-NU). But if you are guilty, then you will be destroyed along with your wives and your sons. (Miller 2013, 262-64, ll. 52-55).

<sup>32</sup> According to KBo 19.128 V 39'-40', one drinks <sup>p</sup>GAL.ZU with a *BIBRU* in form of a lion (Ottén 1971, 14).

<sup>33</sup> On (DUG) GAL = KĀSU = *zeri*, see Güterbock 1964, 97-8. The whole passage KBo 15.59 III 3'-10' is: EGIR-ŠÚ-ma LUGAL-i a-ku-wa-an-na pī-an-z[i] <sup>lv</sup>SAGI ta-pī-ša-ni-it KÙ.[BABBAR] PA-NI DINGIR<sup>lmm</sup> šī-pa-an-ti (music) <sup>lp</sup>Al-da ka-lu-ut-ta LUGAL[-uš] 1 NINDA.GUR<sub>4</sub>.RA pār-ši-ya na-an PA-NI <sup>pm</sup>[da-a-i (?)] LUGAL-uš GAL.ZU(/-SÚ) e-ku-zi ḫu-ma-an-ti-ya a-ku-wa-an-na pī-an[-zi] “And then one gives to drink to the king; the cup-bearer libates with a *t*-vessel of silver to the god (i.e. <sup>pm</sup>). (Music.) The king breaks a loaf (to) the circle of the river Alda, and [places] it in front of the Storm-god. The king drinks the bowl (GAL.ZU/-SÚ). One gives to everybody to drink”. The parallel passage in IV 13'-14' has: nu <sup>lp</sup>Al-da ka-lu-ut-ta e-ku-zi <sup>lv</sup>[SAGI.A] ta-pī-ša-na-za KÙ.BABBAR PA-NI DINGIR<sup>lmm</sup> šī-pa-a[n-ti] “He drinks the river Alda. The [cup-bearer] libates with a *t*-vessel in front of the god”. The Hittite translation of the *ḫišuwaš* festival uses the wording of the Hattian-Hittite festival, so that the celebrant “drinks”, *ekuzi*, gods (in the accusative), and even objects (named in Hurrian) belonging to Teššup(!); see KUB 32.84 IV 2, 4, 6, 8 *passim* (Wegner 2002, 28-9; 36).

<sup>34</sup> Heffron (2014, 167-72) follows Güterbock's interpretation.

<sup>D</sup>GAL.ZU appears among the gods of the KILAM festival already in the Old Hittite manuscripts KBo 20.33+ obv. 25, and KBo 38.12+ II 39<sup>35</sup>, until a very late period (see KBo 19.128 V 39', Otten 1971, 14).

That the king drank wine from the bowl presented for the libation to a god is proven by the Old Hittite ritual performed “when the Storm-god thunders” (Neu 1970; 1980, 62-9), also preserved in a later faithful manuscript (KBo 17.74+; Neu 1970), which presents the following passages, I 21: <sup>L</sup>ki-i]-ta-aš ḫal-za-i GAL <sup>D</sup>IM (LUGAL MUNUS.LU-GAL) a-ku-an-zi “the repeater cries (the name of the god). King (and) queen drink the bowl of the Storm-god”; every time music follows. Similar passages are: II 6: GAL <sup>D</sup>UTU <sup>D</sup>Mezzulla akuanzi; II 42: GAL <sup>D</sup>IM <sup>D</sup>Wašezzil akuanzi; 46: GAL <sup>D</sup>Inar akua[nzi]; IV 6: GAL <sup>D</sup>UD GE<sub>6</sub> akuanzi; IV 15': GAL <sup>D</sup>Tuḫašail akuanzi; IV 8' GAL <sup>D</sup>U Wašezzili akuwanzi. In some other cases, on the other hand, the king and queen “sipped the wine (from) the bowl of god NN with a (gold or silver) spoon: GAL <sup>D</sup>IM šuppištuwarit akuwanzi: III 12', 25', 27', 32', 42', 47', 52'; GAL <sup>D</sup>UTU: III 20'<sup>36</sup>.

A later text also mentions that the celebrants drank directly from the BIBRU, KBo 39.154 + KUB 25.32+ III 43'-44': “They put (the breads) back on the stele for the Sun-goddess of the Earth. One drinks nine times from the rhyton, standing (IŠ-TU BIB-RI GUB-aš 9-ŠU a-ku-wa-an-zi (McMahon 1991, 72-3). Note that not only the BIBRU but also the GAL.ZU could have been in the form of an animal, more precisely the protome of an animal, in this way representing the deity who “was drunk”.

The “festival”, EZEN, celebrated by the king and queen therefore consisted in a ritual meal together with the gods, through which the king reached a mystic union with the deity in sharing the drink and the bread offered to him. This act was renewed in every monthly and seasonal festival, also extending the benefit to members of the court who took part in this common meal. KBo 19.128 VI 10'-16': «The king drinks in standing the Storm-god of the Palace from a rhyton in the form of a bull<sup>37</sup>. One plays the lyre. The cup-bearer gives to the king a large bread. The king breaks it and places it on the altar. The king gives to drink to the lords in (their) hand» (Otten 1971, 16-7); KUB 10.88 I 5-10: «One places the tables of the gods; one places the tables of the king, of the queen, of the king's sons, of the dignitaries: eighteen tables. One fans the fire. One places 43 tables of the Countries, (but) one does not fan the fire» (Archi 1979, 204).

This text shows how the king (and the queen) first created a mystic union with the god in drinking (*eku-*) of the same wine and eating (*wek-*) of the same bread offered to him. This bread was then offered to the god in placing it on the “altar” (ZAG.GAR.RA), while the wine was poured as a libation (*sipant-*) in the *huppar* vessel at the foot of the altar. Additional wine (or beer) and bread were distributed to the assembly (*ašeššar*) of the Palace personnel, or to the local communities, creating an inclusive union through

<sup>35</sup> These texts are transcribed in Burgin 2019, 32; 84. In the first text <sup>D</sup>GAL.ZU appears in a long list of deities whom the king “drinks”. Although all the gods whom he “drank” were not necessarily represented by an image in front of him, in this particular case the deified bowl could be that used in celebration. For other passages concerning this god in later manuscripts of the KILAM festival, see Singer 1984, 240.

<sup>36</sup> The CHD (Š, 641) lists some passages according to which large amounts of *šuppištuwareš* are in gold or silver. It is peculiar that the <sup>D</sup>UG *kattakaranta-* vessel, identified with the arm-shaped vessel, was so rarely used for libation. For a “libation”, *sipant-*, with this vessel by the king, see e.g., in KUB 11.35 II 26'-68'. Mielke (2007, 164-65) has proposed that this vessel was not used for libations; see, further, Fantoni 2021, 101-02.

<sup>37</sup> Some words may have been recited over the rhyton in this moment, KUB 36.89 obv. 8: “one breaks a bread, they full the rhyta”, INIM-an III-ŠU an-da me-ma-i.

a common meal. Only the officiant, however, drank from the wine of the gods. Even so, the shared ritual meal extended its mystical significance to all the members who took part in the rite<sup>38</sup>.

### 9. Drinking in the Royal Funerary Rite

The Funerary Ritual celebrated for “a great loss”, *šalliš waštaiš*, that is for the death of the king or the queen, when “they become a god”, DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup>-*iš kišari*, is a document represented by late manuscripts in some different versions. The first edition, by Otten (1958), has been superseded by the one by Kassian *et al.* (2002; here: FR), which includes more texts.

Day I. “The cup-bearer pours a beer libation from the libation vessel (<sup>DUG</sup>*išpandu-waza*). One gives then to eat to the deceased (*akkanti*), and one gives him three times to drink (*-ši akuwanna pianzi*” (FR, 56-7).

Day II. “The palace attendants give [to drink] to the deceased (*akkanti*) from the *huppar*-vessel”; they put a vessel and bread in front of the bed of the deceased. Ritual meal of the assembly. They give (to the deceased) to drink”, *akuwanna pianzi*; (the celebrant) “drinks”, *ekuzi*, Taurit, the Sun-goddess, Mezzulla; ... “he drinks” the Storm-god and the Storm-god of Zippalanda – the Tutelary-god KAL – the Favourable Day (<sup>PUD</sup>.SIG<sub>5</sub>) – Izzistanu – the Sun-goddess of the Earth – his Soul three times; at the third time he breaks the bowl and put it in the hearth (FR, 88-99, dupl.164-75).

Day III. The corpse is burnt on a pyre. “They give to drink three times (to the participants) and they drink three times his Soul” *nu akuwanna 3-šU pianzi nu 3-šU-pát apel ZI-šU akuwanzi* (FR, 264-65).

Day VII. “Great meal”, NAPTANU GAL. He drinks the Sun-goddess of Arinna – the Storm-god and the Storm-god of Zippalanda – the Tutelary-god KAL – the Favourable Day (<sup>PUD</sup>.SIG<sub>5</sub>) – the Sun-goddess of the Earth – his Soul and the Favourable Day three times, at the third time he breaks the bowl and put it in the hearth (FR, 324-33, dupl. 344-49).

Day VIII-IX. “They give to drink”, *akūanna pianzi*, to the statue of the deceased on the sitting-chariot. Great meal: bread is given, the cup-bearer gives (them) to drink. “He drinks the Sun-goddess, the Storm-god, the Tutelary-god KAL, the Sun-goddess of the Earth, each one separately once. They break loaves ... He drinks the grandfathers (and) the grandmothers (of the deceased)”, *huhḫiš hanniš ekuzi*. “He drinks three times his Soul. When he drinks his Soul for the third time and says the name of Favourable Day, he does not break the bread. The cup-bearer smashes the *iškaruḫ*-vessel against the ground (FR, 386-89, dupl. 422-25).

Day X. “They give to drink”, *akūanna pianzi*, to the statue of the deceased in the house” (FR, 432-33, dupl. 440-41).

Day XII. Great meal. “He drinks the Sun-goddess, the Storm-god, the Tutelary-god KAL, the Sun-goddess of the Earth, each one separately once. ... They give to drink to (!)<sup>39</sup> the grandmothers (and) the grandfathers. ... He drinks three times his Soul. When they give to his Soul to drink (*akūanna pianzi*) ...” (FR, 486-87).

Day XIII. “They lift the statue. ... They give (roasted liver and hearth) to the Soul of the deceased to bite. ... They offer wine and fine oil. They give to the deceased to

<sup>38</sup> Several passages concerning the ritual meal of the “assembly”, *ašeššar*, are quoted in Archi 1979.

<sup>39</sup> See here below.

drink; and he drinks his soul” (*akkanti akuwanna pianzi nu apel z1-an ekuzi*) (FR, 500-05). “They pour fine oil from above on the wine” (FR, 506-07 l. 26).

Day XIV. “He drinks the Sun-goddess of the Earth ... he drinks the grandfathers (and) the grand mothers. ... They pour fine oil into the hearth. ... While they drink the soul of the deceased, one cup-bearer stands down, by one side of the hearth and one cup-bearer stands by the other side. They hold pitchers of wine. When he drinks the Soul of the deceased, the cup-bearers pours as libation (*sipanzakanzi*) (the wine) into the hearth from one side and from the other side” (FR, 510-13).

On the first two days “one gives to drink to the deceased”; a ritual meal follows. The celebrant drinks the three major deities of the pantheon, and then the Sun-goddess of the Netherworld and the Soul of the deceased together with the Favourable god: a tutelary god who has to accompany the deceased in his difficult journey to the Netherworld<sup>40</sup>. The divine names have no case termination, but the soul is always in the accusative: *z1-an*. The celebrant drinks from a “bowl”, *GAL*, which he smashes afterwards against the ground (FR, 174-76 ll. 32; 39-40). The vessels used to drink the Soul on the following days were also broken. On the third day the corpse was burnt on a pyre.

Over the following days one also drinks the gods and Soul (in the accusative), while “one gives to drink” to the statue of the deceased (*akkanti akuwanna pianzi nu apel z1-an ekuzi*), because the statue represents the deceased in this world, while the Soul is the entity of the deceased which will reach the meadows of the Netherworld (*ú.SAL-wa paiši*, FR, 516 l.13). One also “drinks” the grandfathers (and) the grandmothers (in the accusative) of the deceased (*huhhiš hanniš ekuzi*), who will receive him there. The passage for Day XIV describes this sequence: first the celebrant “drinks” the deceased (by drinking from the bowl); then two cup-bearers pour the wine in a libation into the hearth so that it dissolves.

Manuscript KUB 30.19+ (Day XII) is the only one which writes inaccurately: “They gave to drink to the grandmothers (and) the grandfathers. ... He drinks three times his Soul. When they give to his Soul to drink (*akūanna pianzi*) ...”.

#### 10. The basic pattern of the local cults according to the “cult inventories”

Muwattalli II was principally focused on maintaining control of northern Syria and the confrontation with Egypt. It is quite uncertain if this and his policy concerning the Arzawa states were his motivation for moving his capital to the south, to Tarḫuntašša. The core region of Ḫatti was first entrusted to Arma-Tarḫunta, Šuppiluliuma I’s nephew, and later to Ḫattušili III, according to the custom of entrusting governmental charges to close relatives, an action which provoked tensions in an area which also suffered incursions by the Kaška people.

It was the explicit duty of the king to ensure the correct celebration of the rites in the core regions of the state, and – when necessary – to restore them. The attacks from the Kaška, who for a certain period of time even succeeded in gaining control of the area of the Upper and Middle Kızılırmak, where Nerik was located, along with the transfer of the capital, and the civil war, had all contributed to reduced central control.

The rites were moreover registered in “tablets”, *GIŠ.ḪUR/TUPPA*<sup>H1.A</sup> *gulzattar*; *GIŠ.ḪUR šīyanza*, and they could have been damaged or lost.

<sup>40</sup> For the difficult journey of the Soul to the Netherworld, see Archi 2008.

Muwattalli (KUB 42.100 I 17', III 32', IV 38), Ғattušili III, “the father of his Majesty (IV 15')<sup>41</sup>, and even Muršili II, “the grandfather of His Majesty” (i.e., of Tudḫaliya IV: I 20', III 22', IV 10') had already begun to restore festivals in the recovered area of Nerik, so that the cult obligations could be celebrated there correctly. One document also mentions Urḫi-Teššub<sup>42</sup>. It was however Tudḫaliya IV who actively engaged in a systematic control of these obligations<sup>43</sup>. As Hazenbos (2003, 11-4) has recalled, this king complained in a prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna that cults were neglected, and he vowed to restore them:

I shall [confess] my sin [before you] and never again shall [I] omit the festivals, not again shall I interchange [the festivals] of the spring and of [the autumn], and [the festivals of the spring] I shall perform punctually in spring, [the festival of the a]utumn I shall perform punctually in autumn, [and to you] in the temple I shall never leave out[ the festivals]! (KBo 12.58 + 13.162 obv. 6-10; Hazenbos 2003, 12).

Tudḫaliya's documents prove that they proceeded rather systematically, region after region in registering the cults of each city and village, in order to verify that the rites were celebrated at the right date and in the right form. It was essentially «une œuvre de restauration des cultes» (Archi 1973, 8)<sup>44</sup>.

There is evidence that Tudḫaliya personally supervised this cult reorganization: <sup>m</sup>Tudḫaliyaš LUGAL.GAL / <sup>D</sup>UTU<sup>si</sup> dāiš / ME-iš “instituted”: KBo 12.56 I 8', and KUB 25.23 IV 48': “One temple will be built”; VS 28.111 obv. 16': ALAM<sup>HI.A</sup> É.DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup> <sup>D</sup>UTU<sup>si</sup> AŠ-KU[-UN] “His Majesty has established statues and a temple”; KUB 25.23 IV 63'-64': PA-NI <sup>D</sup>UTU<sup>si</sup> <sup>m</sup>Tudḫaliya [...] KIN<sup>2</sup>-ti “Before His Majesty Tudḫaliyas [X] wrote it” (Hazenbos 2003, 35).

Tudḫaliya introduced several gods according to the religious feeling and political situation of his time, as exemplified in KBo 70.109 + KUB 57.106+, and its dupl. KUB 38.6 + 57.56. The text has to be dated to the period in which Nerik and the cult of its Storm-god and that of Kaštama were restored (these gods are mentioned in practically all of the preserved section concerning twenty-eight settlements), but it is not possible to determine the region to which this inventory refers. The cult of the two major deities of Aššur was introduced in several peripheral cities or villages: the Storm-god of Aššur (§§ 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 22, 25); Ištar (<sup>P</sup>LIŠ) of Nineveh (§§ 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 22, 25, 26), and even Ištar of Babylon: (<sup>P</sup>LIŠ of Karduniya, § 25). The river Baliḫ (in the Luwian form Baluḫašša), and Milku (§ 6, and § 6, 7, 12, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27 re-

<sup>41</sup> See further KBo 12.53+; Cammarosano 2018, 271-75.

<sup>42</sup> IBoT 2.131 17'-19': «When Urḫi-Teššub re-established (the cult of) Pirwa, he spoke (as follows): “while they rebuild the vineyards, let the wine be provided by the temple”», (Cammarosano 2018, 262-63).

<sup>43</sup> For a list of the numerous cult inventories which mention Tudḫaliya IV, see Hazenbos 2003, 13-4, and Cammarosano 2018, 20-3, who also lists three documents from Šarišša, referring to “the father of the king”, i.e., Ғattušili. Cammarosano (2012) has devoted an article to the problem of dating the so-called “cult inventories”, in which, aiming to support the thesis that Tudḫaliya IV did not innovate these cults, does not focus the role of this king in the cult restorations.

<sup>44</sup> For these reasons Goetze (1933, 159-60) used the term “Kultreorganisation”; he is followed by Hazenbos (2003, 11-3). Laroche (1975 = 2016, 455-58) stressed the fact that in some cases new offerings and even festivals and other gods were introduced, temples were (re)built, images of gods were substituted, or even made for the first time. This, however, does not justify denoting this activity “réforme religieuse”, as he did, see Archi 2006, 150-53, who defined it as a “restoration”. Cammarosano (2012) also stresses the fact that for these cult inventories “reorganization” cannot mean the action of giving a new order.

spectively) were Syrian gods, while Piḫami and Piḫaim(m)i, are Luwian epithets of the Storm-god (§§ 3 4, 6, 8, 9, 12).

Another text, KBo 12.53 + KUB 48.105, which may concern the region between Kirikkale and the Tuz Gölü (the cities of Durmitta and Nenašša are mentioned in obv. 19' and 29') lists in obv. 42' the goddess Nanaya (Archi and Klengel 1980, 144-45), whom the Hittite knew also from the Appu story.

Several deities mentioned in KBo 70.109+ (and KUB 57.106+) were also introduced in Syria, in the so-called *Rituel Anatolien* (Emar VI.3 472-490);<sup>45</sup> they have been listed by Prechel (2008, 244):<sup>46</sup>

<sup>D</sup>IM KUR Nerikka & <sup>D</sup>IMIN.BI; [<sup>D</sup>IM] piḫaimmi & <sup>D</sup>IMIN.BI; <sup>D</sup>IM putalim(m)i & [<sup>D</sup>IMIN.BI]; <sup>D</sup>IM of Nerikki; <sup>D</sup>IM ŠA ŠAMÊ; <sup>D</sup>Handas/šima (cf. <sup>D</sup>Hantašepa); <sup>D</sup>IŠTAR URU Šamuḫa, <sup>D</sup>Tašmišu, <sup>D</sup>IMIN.BI, <sup>HUR.SAG</sup>Harḫia & <sup>HUR.SAG</sup>Daliyani (cf. the mountains Ḫaḫarwa and Zaliyanu); <sup>D</sup>Taḫagu & <sup>D</sup>Taḫagunanu (see the *daḫanga* of the Storm-god of Nerik: probably to identify with the cave of the spring at Oymağaç); <sup>D</sup>IM piḫaimmi; <sup>D</sup>IM putalim-mu; <sup>D</sup>IM ḫapaimmi; <sup>D</sup>30 and <sup>D</sup>IM ŠA ŠAMÊ; <sup>D</sup>IM ŠA ŠAMÊ, <sup>D</sup>Allanu, <sup>D</sup>Hurraš, <sup>D</sup>Šeliš, <sup>D</sup>Ḫazi, <sup>D</sup>Nani, <sup>D</sup>Mušitu; <sup>D</sup>Madi, <sup>D</sup>Nergal, <sup>D</sup>IMIN.BI; <sup>D</sup>Milku; <sup>D</sup>Put[alimmu]; <sup>D</sup>Nergal; <sup>D</sup>Šanda; <sup>D</sup>Tenu.

That some Kizzuwatnean and Syrian deities were included in some cult inventories, together with Luwian gods, has to be explained with the political situation at the time of Tudḫaliya (Archi 2002)<sup>47</sup>. Prechel (2008), in examining the list of the gods in the *Rituel Anatolien* from Emar, has more precisely suggested that the Emar text could be compared with a cult inventory of the Hittite archives. In particular, she has noted that in a fragment published by Goodnik Westenholz (2000, 76-8), an autumn rite by the stele (*sikkānu*) of the Storm-god piḫaimu is mentioned in line 3; this recalls the rite by the stele from the Hittite cult-inventories. The text could therefore concern cults to be performed on behalf of a Hittite “colony” at Emar, who brought some cults with them, just as some legionaries of Imperial Rome did.

The areas involved in the preserved inventories include the whole Hittite heartland, from the north: Nerik (Oymağaç) and Ḫakmiš (near Amasia), to the central area (with Durmitta towards the west), Ḫattuša, Zippalanda (Uşaklı Höyük, east of Yozgat), and to the eastern valley of the Kızılırmak: Sarissa (Kuşaklı Höyük), Karaḫna, Šamuḫa (Kayalıpınar), (Hazenbos 2003, 191-99; Kryszew in Cammarosano and Kryszew 2021, 39-62).

Each town or village could have had some different festivals, but the texts present the same basic pattern for them: a rite initiated in the autumn festival, which found its accomplishment in the spring festival, and was strongly concerned with the survival of each of those communities, a rite, therefore, which was celebrated from time immemorial. This rite was the festival of the “filling”, *šuḫḫa-*, of the storage vessel or “pithos”,

<sup>45</sup> See Arnaud 1986, 458-76.

<sup>46</sup> One cannot, therefore, accept Cammarosano's statement (2015, 207), that «the most likely explanation for the exceptional occurrence of Assyrian and Syro-Mesopotamian deities in Anatolia would be that these settlements were located along ancient roads of the Old Assyrian trade network, more precisely in the area west of Kaneš/Neša»; (repeated in Cammarosano 2018, 436).

<sup>47</sup> Cammarosano (2015, 205-09; 2018, 436), follows Forlanini (1992, 178) who, having remarked that the city of Mallitta in KBo 70.109+ // KUB 38.6+ (CTH 527.40) is mentioned in an Old Assyrian itinerary, just suggested that these gods, including the Baliḫ River (luwianized *Baluḫaššaš!*), the goddess Nanaya, and even the Storm-god of Assur, were introduced in that area by Assyrian merchants. The *Rituel Anatolien* shows instead clearly that the introduction of such deities in central Anatolia has to be attributed to Tudḫaliya IV as a consequence of his religious feeling determined by his policy towards the eastern regions of the Empire. For the city of Mallitta see now also Barjamovic (2011, 320-01; 340).

*ḫarši(yalli)*-<sup>48</sup>, with grain, which was celebrated in “autumn”, *zenant-*, while in “spring”, *ḫamešḫant-*, the “opening”, *kinu-*, of the vessel was celebrated. “Avec cette cérémonie, durant laquelle on transformait en pain la céréale de l’année précédente, le nouveau produit, à peine germe, était lié à l’ancien unissant ainsi le cycle agricole d’une année à l’autre, et favorissant ainsi la croissance de la nouvelle récolte» (Archi 1973, 15-8).

These seasonal rites prescribed that in spring the images of the god were brought in a procession led by the local priest (to which the representatives of each community took part) to the deity itself, who was identified with a mountain in the case of a male deity, or a spring in the case of a female deity, according to an animistic conception<sup>49</sup>. The exact point was marked by a “stele”, <sup>NA4</sup>*ḫuwaši-* / <sup>NA4</sup>*ZI.KIN*, which represented the deity. The image (a statue, a vessel, or even a stele) which represented the deity in the shrine of the city or village was placed beside that stele in order to be – so-to-speak – reloaded with the essence of that particular deity (Archi 1973, 18-24). See, for example, KBo 2.7 obv. 6’-17’<sup>50</sup>:

- 6’ *ma-a-an* <sup>A-NA</sup> <sup>HUR.SAG</sup> *Ši-id-du-wa zé-e-ni* <sup>DUG</sup> *ḫar-ši šu-uh-ḫa-a-an-zi* 1 <sup>NINDA</sup> *dan-na-aš pá-r-ši-an[-zi]*  
 7’ 1 <sup>UDU</sup> *an-na-al-li-in* <sup>HUR.SAG</sup> *Ši-id-du-wa* <sup>BAL-an-zi</sup> 12 <sup>BÁN</sup> *ZÌ.DA* 1 <sup>DUG</sup> *ḫu-u-up-pár-aš KAŠ* <sup>GIŠ</sup> *ZAG.GAR.RA*  
 8’ 4 <sup>PA</sup> *(ZÌ.DA)* 4 <sup>DUG</sup> *KAŠ aš-nu-ma-aš EZEN-ŠÚ tar-ra-a-wa-a-an-za*  
 9’ <sup>GIM-an-ma</sup> <sup>DI</sup><sub>12</sub> *-ŠI DÙ-ri te-et-ḫa-i* <sup>DUG</sup> *ḫar-ši ge-e-nu-an-zi* 1 <sup>UDU</sup> <sup>BÁL</sup><sup>1</sup> *-an-zi* ½ <sup>BÁN</sup> *ZÌ.DA* 1 <sup>DUG</sup> *ḫa-n[é-eš-ša-aš KAŠ]*  
 10’ <sup>GIŠ</sup> *ZAG.GAR.RA* 1 <sup>BÁN</sup> *ZÌ.DA* 1 <sup>DUG</sup> *ḫu-u-up-pár KAŠ aš-nu-ma-aš ZÍZ ma-al-la-an-zi ḫar-ra-an-zi*

- 11’ *lu-kat-ma* <sup>HUR.SAG</sup> *Ši-id-du-wa-an* <sup>NINDA.GUR4.RA</sup> <sup>DUG</sup> *ḫar-ši-aš* <sup>NA4</sup> <sup>ZI.KIN</sup><sup>HLA</sup> *pé-dan*<sub>x</sub> *-zi*  
 1 <sup>NINDA</sup> *dan-na-aš pá-r-ši-an[-zi]*  
 12’ 1 <sup>GUD</sup> 1 <sup>UDU</sup> <sup>HUR.SAG</sup> *Ši-id-du-wa* 1 <sup>UDU</sup> <sup>P</sup> <sup>U</sup> 1 <sup>UDU</sup> <sup>P</sup> <sup>UTU</sup> 1 <sup>UDU</sup> <sup>P</sup> <sup>KAL</sup> 1 <sup>MÁŠ</sup> <sup>GAL</sup> <sup>P</sup> <sup>IMIN</sup> <sup>IMIN</sup> <sup>BI</sup>  
 13’ 2 <sup>BÁN</sup> *ZÍD.DA* 1 <sup>DUG</sup> *KA.GAG ŠA* 3 <sup>BÁN</sup> 1 <sup>DUG</sup> *ḫu-u-up-pár-aš KAŠ* <sup>GIŠ</sup> *ZAG.GAR.RA* 1 <sup>PA</sup> 4 <sup>BÁN</sup> *ZÍD.DA*  
 14’ 2 <sup>DUG</sup> *KAŠ* 1 <sup>DUG</sup> *KA.GAG aš-nu-ma-aš* <sup>DINGIR</sup><sup>LUM</sup> *še-eš-zi*

- 15’ *lu-kat-ma* <sup>UTÚL</sup> *ši-ya-am-mi DÙ-an-zi* ½ <sup>BÁN</sup> *ZÍD.DA* 1 <sup>DUG</sup> *ḫa[-né-e]š-ša-aš KAŠ* <sup>GIŠ</sup> *ZAG.GAR.RA* 3 <sup>BÁN</sup> *ZÌ.DA* 1 <sup>DUG</sup> *KAŠ aš-nu-ma-aš*  
 16’ <sup>DINGIR</sup><sup>LUM</sup> *kar-ap-pa-an-zi* <sup>INA</sup> <sup>É</sup> <sup>DINGIR</sup><sup>LIM</sup> *-ŠÚ-an ar-ḫa pé[-da]*<sub>n</sub> *-zi* <sup>NINDA</sup> *dan-na-aš pá-r-ši-an-zi*  
 17’ <sup>DINGIR</sup><sup>MEŠ</sup> <sup>NA4</sup> <sup>ZI.KIN</sup> *ma-aš-ma-aš pé-dan*<sub>x</sub> *ḫar<sup>1</sup>-kán<sup>1</sup>-zi*

- 6’ When, in autumn, they fill the pithos for Mount Šidduwa, they break 1 *dannaš* loaf;  
 7’ They offer 1 sheep, as of old, to Mount Šidduwa. 12 <sup>BÁN</sup>-measures of flour; 1 bowl of beer (for) the altar.  
 8’ 4 <sup>PĀRISU</sup> measures (of flour), 4 vessels of beer (are) at disposal (of the community). His festival is so provided.  
 9’ When spring comes (and) it thunders, they open the pithos. They offer 1 sheep. ½ <sup>BÁN</sup>-measure of flour 1 ju[g] of beer

<sup>48</sup> See <sup>NINDA</sup>*ḫarši-* (HW<sup>2</sup>III, 358-69): a type of bread.

<sup>49</sup> For a description of these festivals, see Cammarosano 2018, 11-30.

<sup>50</sup> See Cammarosano 2018, 210-3.

- 10' (for) the altar. 1 BÁN-measure of flour, 1 bowl of beer (are) at disposal (of the community). They grind (and) mill the barley.
- 11' The following morning they bring (the image of) Mount Šidduwa (and) the loaves of bread of the pithos to the stelae. The break 1 *dannaš* loaf.
- 12' (They offer) 1 ox (and) 1 sheep to mount Šidduwa, 1 sheep to the Storm-god, 1 sheep to the Sun-goddess, 1 sheep to the Stag-god, 1 goat to the Heptad.
- 13' 2 BÁN-measures of flour, 1 KA.GAG-vessel (of) 3 BÁN-measures, 1 bowl of beer (for) the altar. 1 PĀRISU (and) 4 BÁN-measures of flour,
- 14' 2 vessels of beer, 1 KA.GAG-vessel (of beer are) at disposal (of the community). The god spends the night (there).
- 15' The following morning they prepare a *šiyami* dish. ½ BÁN-measure of flour, 1 j[u]g of beer (for) the altar. 3 BÁN-measures of flour, 1 vessel of beer (are) at disposal (of) the community.
- 16' They take up (the image of) the god, (and) bring him away (back) to his shrine. They break *dannaš* bread.
- 17' (They have accomplished the rite) to bring the gods to their stele.

Problems in performing such kind of processions because of a not safe political situation are presented in KUB 25.23 I 8'-16'<sup>51</sup>:

- 10' *lu-kat-ti-ma* LÚ.MEŠ SANGA LÚ.MEŠ GUDU<sub>12</sub> BE-LU<sup>HI.A</sup> EL-LU-TI<sup>HI.A</sup> X[...]
- 11' *an-da a-ra-an-zi nu* HUR.SAG H<sub>1</sub>al-wa-an-na-an HUR.SAG-i UG[U p]é-dan<sub>x</sub>-zi
- 12' *nu ma-a-an iŠ-TU* LÚ KÚR *kat-ta ki-it-ta-ri na-[a]n* HUR.SAG-i pé-dan<sub>x</sub>-zi na-an [N<sup>A</sup>.ZI.KIN *pé-ra-an ta-ni-nu-wa-an-zi*]
- 13' N<sup>A</sup>.ZI.KIN-ya G<sup>IS</sup>ha-a-ra-u-i *kat-ta-an ar-ta-ri* 3 NINDA UP-NI *pár-ši-ya-an-zi*
- 14' KAŠ-ya *ši-ip-pa-an-zi ma-a-an iŠ-TU* LÚ KÚR *ú-ul kat-ta ki-it-ta*
- 15' *na-an* N<sup>A</sup>.ZI.KIN G<sup>IS</sup>ha-a-ra-u-i *ka[t-t]a-an íD-an-kán ta-pu-ša*
- 16' *ta-ni-nu-wa-an-zi*

- 10' The next morning the priests, the anointed priests, the lords, the free-men [...]
- 11' arrive. They carry Mount H<sub>1</sub>alwanna up to the mountain (of his name).
- 12' If the land is in the hand of the enemy, they carry him to the mountain. [They place] him [in front of the stele,]
- 13' and the stele stands under a poplar. They break 3 loaves of (1) handful (of flour),
- 14' and they pour a libation of beer. If (the land) is not in the hand of the enemy,
- 15' they place him at the stele under the poplar next to the river.

An animistic perspective may have needed to represent the elements of Nature in a tangible form. In reorganizing the cults in the region of Nerik, Tudhaliya IV decided to represent a mountain, which previously had no image at all, in the form of a male statue; this was deposited in the shrine of another mountain god, while he represented this deity as a stele, placing it on an elevation in a neighbouring village: an aniconic tangible representation of this god. KUB 7.24 + 58.28 obv.<sup>52</sup>:

- 1 HUR.SAG *Ma-li-ma-li-ya-aš an-na-la-za* DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-tar *ú-ul e-eš-ta*
- 2 P<sup>U</sup>TU<sup>ŠI</sup>-an<sup>m</sup> *Tu-ud-ha-li-ya-aš* ALAM LÚ AN.BAR 1 *še-kan ½ še-kán-na*
- 3 IGI<sup>HI.A</sup> KÜ.GI A-NA UR.MAḤ AN.BAR-aš-kán *ar-ta-ri šà é* HUR.SAG *Ku-ku-mu-ša-an-kán*
- 4 *pé-dan<sub>x</sub>-zi* N<sup>A</sup>.ZI.KIN-ya-an-kán I-NA<sup>URU</sup> *Taḥ-ni-wa-ra pa-aš-šu-i še-er ti-ya-an-zi*
- 5 I PA ZÍZ PA GEŠTIN<sup>DUG</sup> *ḥar-ši šà é* HUR.SAG *Ku-ku-mi-ša iš-ḥu-u-wa-an-zi*

<sup>51</sup> Hazenbos 2003, 31; 36; Cammarosano 2018, 362-63.

<sup>52</sup> Hazenbos 2003, 27-9.

- 1 Mount Malimaliya. Formerly there was no divine representation.
- 2 His Majesty Tudḫaliya (made) him (in form of) an iron statue of a man 1½ *šekan* (high);
- 3 his eyes (are) of gold; he stands on a lion of iron. In the shrine of Mount Kukumuša
- 4 they carry him. And in form of a stele they place him in the village of Taḫniwara on a block.

Similarly, a female deity, the Great Spring, represented as an iron statue of a sitting woman, was placed in the temple of the Storm-god during the time of Tudḫaliya IV. In spring this statue was brought to the Spring from which she was named, and deposited by the stele which made the Spring more tangible, thereby accomplishing then the prescribed rites, KUB 17.35 III 23-38<sup>53</sup>:

- 23 1 ALAM MUNUS TUŠ-za AN.BAR PÚ.GAL DUTUŠI DÙ-at ŠÀ É DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup> U pé-dan<sub>x</sub>-zi
- 24 ma-a-ana-NA PÚ.GALEZEN [D]I<sub>12</sub>-ŠI DÙ-an-zi ŠE.NAG(-an)-zi<sup>LÚ</sup> SANGA[-za ŠE.NAG-zi]
- 25 DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup> ŠE.NAG-zi PÚ-kan ša-ra-a ša-an-ḫa-an-zi
- 26 <sup>LÚ</sup>SANGA-kán DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup> TA <sup>GIŠ</sup>ZAG.GAR.RA ME-i na-an-kán TA É [DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup>]
- 27 pa-ra-a ú-da-i nu DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup> INA PÚ pé-e-da-i DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup> P[A-NI<sup>NA</sup>ZI.KIN]
- 28 ta-ni-nu-wa-an-zi nu-kán <sup>LÚ</sup>SANGA 1 UDU A-NA PÚ.GAL BA[L-ti]
- 29 ŠÀ PÚ-an-kán ḫu-kán-zi šu-up-pa ti-an-zi 6 <sup>NINDA</sup>da[n-na-aš]
- 30 1 <sup>DUG</sup>ḫu-up-pár KAŠ INA <sup>GIŠ</sup>ZAG.GAR.RA NINDA.GUR<sub>4</sub>.RA pár-ši-an-zi B[I-IB-RU-kán]
- 31 šu-un-na-an-zi 2 BÁN ZÌ.DA 4 DUG KAŠ aš-ša-nu-ma-aš GU<sub>7</sub>-zi [NAG-zi]
- 32 GAL<sup>HI.A</sup>-kán aš-ša-nu-wa-an-zi <sup>MUNUS.MEŠ</sup>ḫa-zi-ka<sub>4</sub>-ra-za GURUN ú-d[a-an-zi]
- 33 DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup> GILIM-an-zi UN<sup>MEŠ</sup>-na-za GILIM-iz-zi GUD UDU peš-ka<sub>4</sub>-[an-zi]
- 34 GA.KIN.DÙ dam-ma-aš-ša-an-zi PA-NI DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup> ti-an-zi UN<sup>M</sup>[<sup>ES</sup>-ni-ya pí-an-zi]
- 35 DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup>-ma-aš-kán du-uš-kn-zi DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup> INA É DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup> <sup>MUNUS.MEŠ</sup>[ḫa-zi-ka<sub>4</sub>-ra-za]
- 36 ar-ḫa pé-e-da-an-zi <sup>GIŠ</sup>ZAG.GAR.RA ta-ni-nu-wa-an-zi
- 37 2 NINDA UP-NI pár-ši-an-zi KAŠ BAL-an-zi
- 38 [Š] U.NÍGIN 1 UDU 2 BÁN ZÌ.DA 5 DUG KAŠ ANA EZEN<sub>4</sub> DI<sub>12</sub>-ŠI URU-aš [pé-eš-ke-ez-zi]

- 23 1 statuette of a woman seated, of iron: the Great Spring. His Majesty (commissioned it to be) made. They bring (her) into the shrine of the Storm-god.
- 24 When they celebrate the spring festival for the Great Spring, they perform ablutions. The priest [washes himself];
- 25 they wash the goddess; they clean the spring out.
- 26 The priest takes the goddess from the altar and brings her out of the shrine,
- 27 and brings the goddess to the spring, They place the goddess in fr[ont of the spring.]
- 28 The priest sacri[fices] 1 sheep to the Great Spring.
- 29 They slaughter it (so that the blood flows) inside the spring. They place the meat, 6 *dannaš* loaves,
- 30 (and) 1 bowl of beer at the altar. They break the loaves of bread and fill the r[hyta].
- 31 2 BÁN -measures of flour, 4 vessels of beer (are) at disposal (of) the community. They eat, they drink.
- 32 They provide the bowls. The *ḫazikara*-women bri[ng] fruit.
- 33 They put a wreath on the goddess, the people put on wreaths. They sup[ply] cattle and sheep.
- 34 They press cheese (and) place it in front of the goddess, [and give (it) to] the people.

<sup>53</sup> Cammarosano 2018, 174-77.

- 35 They entertain the goddess. (Then) the *hazikara*-women carry the goddess away  
(back) to the shrine,  
36 (and) place (her) upon the altar.  
37 They break two loaves of one handful of flour, they offer a libation of beer.  
38 [T]otal: 1 sheep, 2 BĀN -measures of flour, 5 vessels of beer: the town [regularly  
supply] to the spring festival.

The excavations of the city of Šarišša (Kuşaklı) have allowed us to identify one of these sanctuaries: the ruins of a simple building on top of a hill, 2.5 km outside the city, near a pond (Müller-Karpe 2017, 121-24). Documents from Ḫattuša mention that the king reached the “stele”, <sup>NA+</sup>*huwaši-*, of the spring Šuppitaššu of Šarišša by chariot, and texts nos. 1-3 from Šarišša concern the spring festival which the king celebrated by the <sup>NA+</sup>*huwaši-* of the Storm-god (Wilhelm 1997, 9-20).

Some more detailed texts of these cult-inventories clearly show that it was distinguished from the offerings of bread, meat and drinking vessels placed on the altar, which the celebrant had to taste in order to accomplish the mystical union with the deity (“they break the loaves of bread and fill the rhyta”, line 30 here above) from one side, and the provisions of bread and beer for the representatives of the community who took part in the feast, from the other side.

Next morning, they take up the deity (DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup>) from the altar, and they carry the deity (outside) to the stele. They present loaves of breads (made of the barley) of the pithos (<sup>DUG</sup>*har-ši*) before the deity ... They wash and anoint the stele. They place the deity in front of the stele, and the priest offers 1 bull and 1 sheep to the Sun-goddess of the Water. They slaughter (them) at the stele, place the meat (there, and) break the loaves of bread of the pithos. (They place dishes, vessels of beer) at the altar. They break the loaves of bread and fill the *BIBRU*-rhyton (for the deity). 1 *PARISU*-measure (and) 2 BĀN-measures of flour, 4 vessels of beer (are) the provisions (for the community). They eat, they drink. They provide the cups. The *hazikara*-women bring fruit. They put a wreath on the deity. They rejoice over the deity (DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup>-*ma-aš-kan duškanzi*). They step into a wrestling fight; they throw the stone. When evening comes, they take up the deity. (KUB 17.35 II 18'-26: Cammarosano 2018, 170-72).

While there is here a very clear distinction between the offerings for the god and the provisions for the participants of the rite, in other passages the wording is rather terse, as in KUB 56.39 III 15-18: 1 UDU ... NINDA.GUR<sub>4</sub>.RA<sup>MEŠ</sup> [(.)] *pár-ši-ya-an-zi BIB-RI*<sup>HI.A</sup>-*kán šu-un-n[a-a]n-zi GAL*<sup>HI.A</sup>-*kán [aš-š]a-nu-wa-an-zi* “1 sheep ... They break the loaves of bread [(.).] They fill the rhyta (and) provide the cups”. That these rhyta were for the god while the cups for the community is made clear by the passage which follows:

Next morning they make a *šiyami*-dish out of the meat. [ $\frac{1}{2}$  BĀN-measure of flo]ur, 1 jug (of beer) at the altar.  $\frac{1}{2}$  BĀN -measure of flour, 1 bowl of beer [(are) the provi]sions (for the community). The *hazkara*-women go (for providing) fruit; they put a wreath on the deity. [When darkness] seizes the leafy branches, the *hazkara*-women carry the deity away [to the temple;] they place (the deity) in front of the altar. The break [3?] loaves of bread, fill the rhyta, carry the [la]mps out, (and) close the temple. (KUB 56.39 IV 23-29: Cammarosano 2018, 252-55).

Both the autumn and spring festivals were concluded with a ritual meal: the gods were provided with food and wine or beer, and the celebrant drank from the rhyton (*BIBRU*) or the cup which would then be left on the altar, and broke the bread for it; then the assembly of participants ate and drank as well. Spring festivals, moreover, required enter-

tainment for the gods: DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup> / DINGIR<sup>MES</sup>-*ma-aš-kán dusk(išk)anzi* “they rejoice the god(s)”, so that the *ḥazikara*-women provided flowers and fruit, and men competed in athletic games, such as wrestling and boxing, a tradition which has survived in some countries, such as in Turkey and Scotland, even today (Cammarosano 2018, 43-4; 127-29)<sup>54</sup>.

#### 11. The cosmic animism of the Hittites

Humans have produced authorities such as chiefs and kings in order to protect and govern their societies, but before instituting anything like a political state, they recognized that they could not govern weather, the seasonal cycle, or even their own lives, so that the world which surrounded humankind was made intelligible through symbolism. Humans believed they lived in an animistic cosmos which comprised animals, natural features, and elements of the landscape like mountains and rivers, so that boundaries between society and the cosmos were non-existent. The society that lived in the “Land of Ғatti” in the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BC still maintained this belief: myths demonstrate that the process of anthropomorfization of the gods was accomplished, but the forces which they represented could still be expressed by animals, and (as is known) by mountains, rivers, and springs as part of an animated network of forces, so extensively documented by myths and rituals, and diffused in every settlement as is recorded so well in the cult-inventories<sup>55</sup>. The Assembly of the gods convened as witnesses in the political treaties is always followed by cosmic forces such as “the Gods of Heaven, the Gods of Earth, Mountains, Rivers, Springs, Clouds, Heaven, Earth, and the Great Sea”. The Muwattalli’s Prayer organizes the list of the gods geographically, according to cult centres, and those of the main gods of each centre is concluded by: <Male Gods, Female Gods, Mountains, Rivers of GN> (Singer 1996, 32-9).

#### Bibliography

- Alp, Sedat. 1983. *Beiträge zur Erforschung des hethitischen Tempels*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Archi, Alfonso. 1973. “Fêtes de printemps et d’automne et réintégration rituelle d’images de culte dans l’Anatolie Hittite.” *Ugarit Forschungen* 5: 7-27.
- Archi, Alfonso. 1979. “Das Kultmahl bei den Hethitern.” In *VIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, 197-213. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu basımevi.
- Archi, Alfonso. 2002. “Kizzuwatna Amid Anatolian and Syrian Cults.” In *Anatolia Antica, Studi in Memoria di Fiorella Imparati* 1, eds. Stefano de Martino, and Franca Pecchioli Daddi, 47-53. Firenze: LoGisma (Eothen 11).
- Archi, Alfonso. 2006. “Hurrian Gods and the Festival of the Hattian-Hittite Layer.” In *The Life and Times of Tudḫaliya IV. Proceedings of a Symposium held in Honour of J. de Roos, 12-13 December 2003, Leiden*, ed. Th. P. J. van den Hout, 147-63. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Archi, Alfonso. 2008. “The Soul has to Leave the Land of the Living.” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religion* 7: 169-95.
- Archi, Alfonso, and Klengel, Horst. 1980. “Ein hethitischer Text über die Reorganisation des Kultes.” *Altorientalische Forschungen* 7: 143-57.
- Arnaud, Daniel 1986. *Recherches au Pays d’Aštata. Emar VI.3. Textes sumériens et accadiens*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.

<sup>54</sup> This interpretation of the rites of the autumn and spring festivals has already been proposed in Archi 1973, 14-27.

<sup>55</sup> For the cult of mountains, see Haas 1982, and for that of rivers and spring the study by Gerçek 2019.

- Banning, Edward B. 2011. "So Fair a House: Göbekli Tepe and the Identification of Temples in the Pre-Pottery Neolithic of Near East." *Current Anthropology* 52/5: 619-60.
- Barański, Marek Z., et al. 2021. "Integrating Records of Mellaart and Hodder research projects at Çatalhöyük: the GDN Area." In *Communities at Work. The Making of Çatalhöyük*, eds. Ian Hodder, and Christina Tsoraki, 51-70. Ankara: British Institute of Archaeology (Çatalhöyük Research Project Series 15).
- Barjamovic, Gojko. 2011. *A historical Geography of Anatolia in the Old Assyrian Period*. Copenhagen: The Carsten Niehbur Institute of Near Eastern Studies.
- Brandenstein, von, Carl-Georg. 1943. *Hethitische Götter nach Bildbeschreibungen in Keilschrifttexten*. Leipzig: Hinrichs (MVAeG 46/2).
- Burgin, James M. 2019. *Functional Differentiation in Hittite Festival Texts. An Analysis of the Old Hittite Manuscripts of the KILAM Great Assembly*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (StBoT 65).
- Cammarosano, Michele. 2012. "Hittite Cult Inventories. The Dating of the Texts and the Alleged Cult Reorganization of Tudḫaliya IV." *Altorientalischen Forschungen* 39: 3-37.
- Cammarosano, Michele. 2015. "Foreign Gods in Ḫatti A New Edition of CTH 510," *KASKAL* 12: 199-244.
- Cammarosano, Michele. 2018. *Hittite Local Cults*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press (WAW 40).
- Cammarosano, Michele. 2021. *At the Interface of Religion and Administration: The Hittite Cult Inventories. With a contribution by Adam Kryszewski*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (StBoT 68).
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1966. *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišurijanža*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (StBoT 2).
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1967. "Rhyta in den hethitischen Texten." *Kadmos* 6: 88-97.
- Carter, Charles. 1962. *Hittite Cult Inventories*. Diss.: University of Chicago.
- Cauvin, Jacques. 1994. *Naissance des divinités Naissance de l'agriculture*. Paris: CNRS Édition.
- Cauvin, Jacques. 2001. "Ideology before Economy." *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 11: 106-7.
- Colonna, Angelo. 2021. *Religious Practice and Cultural Construction of Animal Worship in Egypt from the Early Dynastic to the New Kingdom. Ritual Forms, Material Display, Historical Development*. Oxford: Archeopress Publishing Ltd (Archeopress Egyptology 36).
- De Roos, Johan. 2007. *Hittite Votive Texts*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Dietrich, Oliver, et al. 2012. "Göbekli Tepe. First Came the Temple, Later the City," *Actual Archaeology* 2: 1-13.
- Dietrich, Oliver. 2016. "Göbekli Tepe, Anlage H. Ein Vorbericht beim Ausgrabungstand von 2014." *Der Anschnitt. Zeitschrift für Kunst und Kultur im Bergbau. Beiheft 31: Anatolian Metal VII*: 53-69.
- Dietrich, Olivier, and Notroff, Jens. 2015. "A Sanctuary, or so Fair a House? In Defense of an Archaeology of cult at Pre-Pottery Neolithic Göbekli Tepe." In *Defining the Sacred. Approaches to the Archaeology of Religion in the Near East*, ed. by N. Laneri, 75-89. Oxford-Philadelphia: Oxbow Books.
- Dietrich, Olivier, Notroff, Jens, and Dietrich, Laura. 2018. "Behind the Mask: Early Neolithic Miniature Masks (and one larger-than-life example from Göbekli Tepe (and beyond)." <http://www.asor.org/anetoday/2018/09/Behind-the-Mask>, last visited 02/08/2023.
- Dietrich, Olivier, and Schmidt, Klaus. 2016. "A Short Note on a New Figurine Type from Göbelki Tepe." *Neo-Lithics* 1/17: 43-6.
- Düring, Bleda S. 2001. *Constructing Communities; Clustered Neighbourhood Settlements of the Central Anatolian Neolithic ca. 8500-5000 CAL BC*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten (PIHANS 105).
- Fantoni, Caterina. 2021. "The Arm-shaped Vessels in Anatolia and the Eastern Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age: A Morphological and Contextual Analysis." *Asia Anteriore Antica* 3: 93-123.
- Forlanini, Massimo. 1992. "Am mittlerem Kızılırmak." In *Hittite and other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Sedat Alp*, eds. Heinrich Otten et al., 171-79. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Forrer, Emil. 1940. "Das Abendmahl im Ḫatti-Reiche." In *Actes du XX<sup>e</sup> Congrès International des Orientalistes, Bruxelles 1938*, 124-28. Louvain: Bureau du Muséon.

- Francia, Rita, 2022 “The <sup>(LU)</sup>šuniyant- in Hittite Texts: ‘prophet’, ‘ecstatic?’” *Studia Hethitica, Hurritica et Urartica* 1: 165-84.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1952. *Hethitische Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag.
- Gerçek, İlgi N. 2020. “Rivers and River Cults in Hittite Anatolia”. In *Cult, Temple, Sacred Spaces. Cult Practices and Cult Spaces in Hittite Anatolia and Neighbouring Cultures. Proceedings of the First International HFR Symposium, Mainz, 3-5 June 2019*, eds. Susanne Görke, and Charles W. Steitler, 253-78. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (StBoT 66).
- Goedegebure, Petra M. 2008. “Appendix: Hattian Origins of Hittite Religious Concepts: The Syntax of “To Drink (to) a Deity’ (Again) and Other Phrases.” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religion* 8: 67-73.
- Goetze, Albrecht. 1933/1957. *Kleinasiens*. München: Beck (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1933; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1957).
- Goodnick Westenholz, Joan, and Westenholz, Aage. 2000. *Cuneiform Inscriptions in the Collection of the Bible Lands Museum Jerusalem. The Emar Tablets*. Groningen: Styx Publications (Cuneiform Monographs 13).
- Groddek, Detlev. 2002. *Hethitische Texte in Transkription. KUB 55*. Dresden: Verlag der TU (DBH 4).
- Güterbock, Hans G. 1964. “Lexicographical notes (II).” *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 22/74: 95-113.
- Güterbock, Hans G. 1983. “Hethitische Götterbilder und Kultobjekte.” In *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasiens. Festschrift für Kurt Bittel*, eds. Reiner Boehmer, and Harald Hauptmann, 203-17. Mainz: von Zabern.
- Güterbock, Hans G. 1989. “Hittite kurša- “Hunting Bag”. In *Essays in Ancient Civilization Presented to Helene J. Kantor*, eds. Albert Leonard, and Bruce Williams, 113-19. Chicago: Oriental University Press.
- Güterbock, Hans G. 1998. “To Drink a God.” In *XXXIV<sup>me</sup> Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, eds. Hayat Erkanal, Veysal Donbaz, and Altin Uguroglu, 121-29. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi.
- Güterbock, Gustav H., and Timoty Kendall. 1995. “A Hittite Silver Vessel in the Form of a Fist.” In *The Age of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*, eds. Jane Carter, and Sarah Morris, 45-60. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Haas, Volkert. 1982. *Hethitische Berggötter und hurritische Steindämonen. Riten, Kulte und Mythen*. Mainz: von Zabern.
- Hauptmann, Harald. 1993. “Ein Kultgebäude in Nevalı Çori.” In *Between the Rivers and Over the Mountains: Archaeologica, Anatolica et Mesopotamica Alba Palmieri Dicata*, eds. by Marcella Frangipane, Harald Hauptmann, Mario Liverani, Paolo Matthiae, and Matcheld Mellink, 37-69. Roma: Università di Roma ‘La Sapienza’.
- Hauptmann, Harald. 2012. “Frühneolithische Kultbilder in der Kommagene.” In *Gottkönige am Euphrat: Neue Ausgrabungen und Forschungen in Kommagene*, ed. Jörg Wagner, 12-22. Darmstadt-Mainz: von Zabern.
- Hawkins, David J. 2006. “Tudḫaliya the Hunter.” In *The Life and Times of Tudḫaliya IV. Proceedings of a Symposium held in Honour of J. de Roos, 12-13 December 2003, Leiden*, ed. Theo P. J. van den Hout, 49-76. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Hazenbos, Joost. 2003. *The Organization of the Anatolian Local Cults During the Thirteenth Century B.C.* Groningen: Styx Publications (Cuneiform Monographs 21).
- Heffron, Yağmur. 2014. “The Material Culture of Hittite ‘God-drinking’.” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religion* 14: 164-85.
- Heimpel, Wolfgang, and Emanuelle Salgues. 2015. “Lugal oder wie Ninurta dem Tigris mehr Wasser shuf.” In *Erzählungen aus dem Land Sumer*, ed. Konrad Volk, 33-67. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hoffner, Harry A. Jr. 1997. *Perspectives on Hittite Civilization: Selected Writings of Hans Gustav Güterbock*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago (AS 26).
- Hornung, Erik. 1982. *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt. The One and the Many, Ithaca*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Jacobsen, Thorkild. 1946. “Mesopotamia.” In *Before Philosophy*, eds. Henri Frankfort, et al., 137-234. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

- Jakob-Rost, Liane. 1961. "Zu den hethitischen Bildbeschreibungen" (I. Teil). *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 8: 161-217.
- Jakob-Rost, Liane. 1963. "Zu den hethitischen Bildbeschreibungen" (II. Teil). *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 9: 175-239.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1971. "Heth. *ḥaššuš 2-e ekuzi* 'der König trinkt zwei.'" *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 14: 143-59.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1991. "Nochmals: der hethitische König trinkt Gott NN." In *Text, Methode und Grammatik. Wolfgang Richter zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. Walter Gross, Hubert Irsigler, and Theodor Seidel, 221-26. Erzabtei St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1993. *Kleine Schriften zum Altanatolischen und Indogermanischen 2. Teilband, 1969-1990*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies, and Archi, Alfonso. 1975/77. 'eku-/aku-'. *Materialien zu einem hethitische Thesaurus. Lief. 3-6*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Kassian, Alexei, Andrej Korolëv, and Andrej Sidelt'sev. 2002. *Hittite Funerary Ritual šalliš waštaiš*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag (AOAT 288).
- Klinger, Jörg. 1996. *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (StBoT 37).
- Kulakoğlu, Fikri. 2008. "A Hittite God from Kültepe". In *Old Assyrian Studies in Memory of Paul Garelli*, ed. Cecile Michel, 13-9. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten (PIHANS 112).
- Kulakoğlu, Fikri, and Selmin Kangal. 2010. *Anatolia's Prologue. Kültepe Kanesh. Assyrians in Istanbul*. Kayseri: Kayseri Metropolitan Municipality.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1975. "La réforme religieuse du roi Tudhaliya IV et sa signification politique." In *Les syncrétisme dans les religions de l'Antiquité, Colloque de Besançon (22-23 Octobre 1973)*, eds. Françoise Dunand, and Pierre Lévêque, 87-94. Leiden: Brill.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 2016. *Études Anatoliennes Recueillies par Alfonso Archi & Hatice Gonnet*. Subartu 37. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Mazzoni, Stefania. 2002. "The Squatting Woman: Between Fertility and Eroticism." In *Sex and Gender in the Ancient Near East. Proceeding of the 4<sup>th</sup> Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Helsinki, July 2-6, 2001*, 2, eds. Simo Parpola, and Robert Whiting, 367-77. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.
- Mazzucato, Camilla, et al. 2021. "An Integrated Approach to the Study of Socio-material Networks at Çatalhöyük." In *Communities at Work. The Making of Çatalhöyük*, eds. Ian Hodder, Christina Tsoraki, 147-75. Ankara: British Institute of Archaeology (Çatalhöyük Research Project Series 15).
- McMahon, Gregory. 1991. *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago (AS 25).
- Melchert, Craig H. 2019. "Solar and Sky Deities in Anatolian." In *Qazzu warrai Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Kazuhiko Yoshida*, eds. Adam Catt, Ronald Kim, and Brent Vine, 239-49. Anna Arbor-New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Mellaart, James. 1964. "Excavation at Çatal Hüyük, 1963. Third Preliminary Report." *Anatolian Studies* 14: 39-119.
- Mellaart, James. 1967. *Çatal Höyük: A Neolithic Town in Anatolia*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Mielke, Dirk Paul. 2007. "Red Lustrous Wheel-made Ware from Hittite Contexts". In *The Lustrous Ware of the Late Bronze Age Cyprus and The Eastern Mediterranean*, ed. Irmgard Hein, 404-09. Wien: Austrian Academy of Science.
- Miller, Jared. 2013. *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Morenz, Siegfried. 1960. *Ägyptische Religion*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Müller-Karpe, Andreas. 2017. *Sarissa. Die Wiederentdeckung einer hethitischen Königsstadt*. Darmstadt: von Zabern.
- Neu, Erich. 1970. *Ein althethitisches Gewitterritual*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (StBoT 12).
- Neu, Erich. 1980. *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (StBoT 25).
- Notroff, Jens, et al. 2017. "More than a Vulture: A Response to Sweatman and Tsikritsis." *Mediterranean Archaeology and Archaeometry* 17/2: 57-74.

- Otten, Heinrich. 1958. *Hethitische Totenrituale*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Otten, Heinrich. 1971. *Ein hethitisches Festritual (KBo XIX 128)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (StBoT 13).
- Otten, Heinrich. 1989. "Tiergefäße im Kult der späten hethitischen Grossreichszeit." In *Anatolia and the Ancient Near East. Studies in Honor of Tahsin Özgüç*, eds. Kutlu Emre, Barthel Hrouda, Matchild Mellink, and Nimet Özgüç, 365-368. Ankara: Anadolu Medeniyetleri Arastirma ve Tanitma Vakfi Yayinlari.
- Otto, Adelheid. 2015. "9,000 Years of Cultic Traditions in Northern Mesopotamia and Syria? Thoughts about the Crescent, the Bull and the Pole with Human Heads". In *From the Treasures of Syria. Essays on Art and Archaeology in Honour of Stefania Mazzoni*, eds. Paola Ciafardoni, and Deborah Giannessi, 185-202. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Özgüç, Nimet. 2006. *Kültepe-Kaniš / Nesa. Seal Impressions on the Clay Envelopes from the Archives of the Native Peruwa and Assyrian Trader Uşur-ša-Ištar son of Aššur-imitti*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi.
- Özgüç, Tahsin. 1991. "The Newly Discovered Cult Objects from the Karum of Kanesh." In *Near Eastern Studies Dedicated to H.I.H. Prince Takahito Mikasa*, eds. Masao Mori, Hideo Ogawa, and Mamoru Joshikawa, 320-35. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (BMECCJ 5).
- Özgüç, Tahsin. 2005. *Kültepe Kaniš/Neša*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Perdibon, Anna. 2019. *Mountains and Trees, Rivers and Springs. Animistic Beliefs and Practices in Ancient Mesopotamian Religion*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (LAOS 11).
- Prechel, Doris. 2008. "Hethitische Rituale in Emar?" In *The City of Emar Among the Late Bronze Age Empires. History, Landscape, and Society. Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference, 25.-26.04 2006*, eds. Lorenzo d'Alfonso, Yoram Cohen, and Dieter Sürenhagen, 243-52. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag (AOAT 349).
- Sagona, Antonio, and Paul Zimansky. 2009. *Ancient Turkey*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Sahlins, Marshall. 2017. "The Original Political Society." In *On Kings*, eds. David Graeber, and Marshall Sahlins, 23-64. Chicago: Hau Books.
- Schachner, Andreas. 2018. "Teşubs Stiere - Zwei neu Darstellungen von Stieren aus Ғattuša und Umgebung." In *Altorientalische Studien für Reinhard Dittmann anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstags*, eds. Kai Kaniuth, Danile Lau, and Dirk Wicke, 257-66. Münster: Zaphon.
- Schachner, Andreas. 2019. "'Die Faust Gottes?' - Ein Trinkgefäß der althethitischen Zeit aus der nördlichen Unterstadt von Ғattuša." *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 69: 345-49.
- Schmidt, Klaus. 2008. "Die Steinzeitlichen Heligtümer am Göbekli Tepe." *Colloquium Anatolicum* 7: 59-85.
- Schmidt, Klaus. 2010. "Göbekli Tepe: -The Stone Age Sanctuaries. New Results of Ongoing Excavations with a Special focus on Sculptures and High Reliefs", *Documenta Praehistorica* 37: 239-56.
- Schmidt, Klaus. 2011a. "Göbekli Tepe: A Neolithic Site in Southeastern Anatolia." In *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia 10,000-323 B.C.E.*, eds. Sharon Steadman, and Gregory McMahon, 917-33. Oxford: University Press.
- Schmidt, Klaus. 2011b. *Sie bauten die ersten Tempel*. München: Beck.
- Schmidt, Klaus. 2013. "Adler und Schlange: 'Großbilder' des Göbekli Tepe und ihre Rezeption." In *Der Anschnitt. Zeitschrift für Kunst und Kultur im Bergbau*, ed. Ünsal Yalçın, 145-52. Bochum: Deutsches Bergbau-Museum (Beiheft 25 - Anatolian Metal VI).
- Siegelová, Jana. 1986. *Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis im Lichte der Wirtschafts- und Inventardokumente*. Praha: National Museum Praha.
- Singer, Itamar. 1984. *The Hittite KILAM Festival 2*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (StBoT 28).
- Singer, Itamar. 1996. *Muwatalli's Prayer to the Assembly of Gods Through the Storm-God of Lightning*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Soysal, Oğuz. 2008. "Philological Contributions to Hattian-Hittite Religion (I)." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religion* 8: 45-66.
- Soysal, Oğuz. 2014/15. "Tiergefäß.A.II Philologisch. Bei den Hethitern," *Reallexicon der Assyriologie* 14: 2-4.

- Steitler, Charles W. 2017. *The Solar Deities of Bronze Age Anatolia. Studies on Term of the Early Hittite Kingdom*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (StBoT 62).
- Taracha, Piotr. 2019. "In search of the Holy Grail: Hittite <sup>D</sup>GAL.ZU reconsidered." In: *Stories Told Around the Fountain. Papers Offered to Piotr Bieliński on the Occasion of His 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, eds. Alina Pieńkowska, and Daniel Szeląg, 713-19. Warsaw: University of Warsaw.
- Tuchelt, Klaus. 1962. *Tiergefäße*. Berlin: Mann (Istanbuler Forschungen 22).
- van den Hout, Theo P.J. 2018. "The Silver Stag Vessel: A royal Gift." In: *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 53: 114-128.
- van Dijk, Jan J.A. 1983. *Lugal ud me-lám-bi nir-ġál. Le récit épique et didactique des Travaux de Ninurta, du Déluge et de la Nouvelle Création*, Leiden: Brill.
- Watkins, Trevor. 2015. "Ritual Performance and Religion in Early Neolithic Societies." In *Defining the Sacred. Approaches to the Archaeology of Religion in the Near East*, ed. Nicola Laneri, 153-60. Oxford-Philadelphia: Oxbow Books.
- Wegner, Ilse. 2002. *Hurritische Opferlisten aus hethitischen Festbeschreibungen. Teil II: Texte für Teššub, Ḫebat und weitere Gottheiten*. Roma: CNR - Istituto di Studi sulle Civiltà dell' Egeo e del Vicino Oriente (ChS I/3-2).
- Wilhelm, Gernot. 1997. *Keilschrifttexte aus Gebäude A (Kuşaklı-Sarissa 1.1)*. Rahden-Westf.: Marie Leidorf.
- Wilhelm, Gernot. 2015. "The Sacred Landscape of Sarissa". In *Sacred Landscape of Hittites and Luwians*, eds. Anacleto D'Agostino, Valentina Orsi, and Giulia Torri, 93-9. Firenze: University Press (StAs 9).