

In questo modo ha avuto origine un conflitto le cui conseguenze non erano certo auspiccate da nessuna delle parti in causa: al suo termine, a quanto pare, gli Anatolici occidentali, stremati ed impoveriti da una guerra crudele (né Omero né la tradizione greca ci risparmiano notizie circa i saccheggi e le distruzioni subite da quelle genti), spinti dalla disperazione, hanno dato vita ad una serie di aggressioni.

Ad Oriente hanno provocato il crollo dell'Impero hittita, ad Occidente, consapevoli delle ricchezze detenute dai Micenei, hanno praticato una politica di saccheggio *mirato*, ovvero una sorta di pirateria su larga scala (costume che è proseguito nei secoli successivi), distruggendo il sistema palaziale sino ad allora imperante presso i Micenei, i cui centri – ed i rispettivi magazzini – sono stati l'obiettivo privilegiato.

A loro volta i Greci, anch'essi impoveriti, hanno reagito riprendendo l'ormai tradizionale politica di espansione verso oriente, ma stavolta con maggior successo, basti pensare alla grecizzazione di Cipro e della Pamfilia agli inizi del I millennio²².

Poiché però tutto ciò è avvenuto in un diverso contesto politico, sociale e storico, come reazione e nel contempo partecipazione al movimento dei cosiddetti "Popoli del Mare", questa è ormai un'altra storia.

A noi basti constatare che, a quanto sembra, il confronto tra Micenei ed Hittiti costituisce, nella II parte del II millennio, la miglior chiave di lettura dello sviluppo storico dell'area egeo-anatolico-cipriota.

"Our God" and "Their God" in the Anitta Text

Itamar Singer (Tel Aviv)

The Anitta text,¹ the oldest Hittite historical account, is set in a period of ethnic diversity and conflict in central Anatolia.² The antagonism between the Hittite bloc of Kaniš/Neša and Kuššara and the Hattian bloc of Ḫattuša and Zalpa is reflected in the different treatment accorded by the Kuššaran dynasty to Kaniš/Neša, on the one hand, and Ḫattuša, on the other. While the population of the former are treated "as mothers and fathers", Ḫattuša is razed to the ground and cursed forever. It is suggested below that a close scrutiny of the account of the latter episode provides further evidence of the ethno-religious disparities between Hittites and Hattians at the beginning of the second millennium B.C.

Three deities are mentioned in the Anitta text, and they are clearly distinguished with regard to their residence and their role:

First is the Storm-god of Heaven, *nepišaš Tarḫunaš* (IŠKUR-naš). He is the protector of the Kuššaran dynasty, leading both Piṭhana and Anitta to their sweeping victories. The conquered cities are presented to him, and future kings are warned not to resettle them.³

The second deity is *Šiu(na)šummiš*, the god of Neša. From the earliest years of Hittitology it was realized that this is a composite name, formed by the appellative *šiu(na)*-, "god", and the enclitic possessive pronoun, *-šummi*. The latter was gener-

¹ For a comprehensive text edition see E. Neu, *Der Anitta-Text* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 18), Wiesbaden 1974. I wish to thank Professor Harry A. Hoffner for his valuable comments.

² I. Singer, "Hittites and Hattians in Anatolia at the Beginning of the Second Millennium B.C.", *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 9 (1981), pp. 128 ff. See also Neu, *Anitta*, p. 130, n. 319; T. R. Bryce, *The Major Historical Texts of Early Hittite History*, University of Queensland, Brisbane 1982, 32 ff.

³ For the consecration of conquered cities to gods, see Hanna Roszkowska-Mutschler, "Some Remarks on the Execration of Defeated Enemy Cities by the Hittite Kings", *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 7 (1992), pp. 1-12. For the Hittite attitude towards the deities of neighbouring countries, see I. Singer, "The Thousand Gods of Hatti: The Limits of an Expanding Pantheon", *Israel Oriental Studies* 14 (1994).

²² Cfr. e.g. M.I. Finley, *La Grecia dalla preistoria all'età arcaica*, ed. it. 1972, p. 103.

ally interpreted as a variant of *-šmi-*, "your (pl.)" or "their".⁴ In 1973, on the evidence of the Zalpa text, Otten has established beyond any doubt that *-šummi-* is first person plural, "our".⁵ The text relates that *Šiu(na)š-šummiš*, literally "Our God", was captured in the past by the king of Zalpa and was brought back by Anitta to his original abode in Neša.

The third deity is *Halmašuit-*, the deified throne, who is involved in the conquest of Hattuša by Anitta. Anitta built temples to all three deities in Neša, and adorned them with the spoils of war.

These are the basic data on the deities of the Anitta text, more-or-less agreed upon in all current interpretations. It should be added in passing that *ḪUTU-az* (l. 11) probably does not refer to the Sun-god *per se*, but is rather an idiomatic expression, "from sun (to sun)", or the like.⁶

Some serious complications are introduced in this basic picture when we turn to the current interpretations of lines 45-48, the scene which describes the takeover of Hattuša. Unfortunately, at a crucial point the text is broken and the case ending of the deity *Halmašuit-* has to be restored. The standard restoration, following Forrer,⁷ has been a dative *Hal-ma-š[u-it-ti]*, "[to] *Halmašuit-*".

ma-a-na-aš [] ap-pé-ez-zi-ia-na ki-iš-ta-an-zi-at-ta-at ša-an
Ḫal-ma-š[u-it-ti]
Ḫi-i-uš-mi-iš pa-ra-a pa-iš ša-an iš-pa-an-di
na-ak-ki-it da-a-aḫ-ḫu-un pé-e-di-iš-ši-ma ZA.AḪ.LI-an a-ni-
e[-nu-un]

When it (i.e. the town) finally was plagued by hunger,
Šiušmiš handed it over [to] *Halmašuit-*.
 I took it at night by assault and sow[ed] cress⁸ in its place.

⁴ E.g., E. Laroche, *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites* (RHA VII, 46), 1946-47, p. 76; idem, "Les noms Anatoliens du 'dieu' et leurs dérivés", *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21 (1967), 174; J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (1952), p. 197; V. V. Ivanov, *Chrestomatija po istorii Drevnego Vostoka* (1963), p. 306, n. 2; A. Kammenhuber, *Saeculum* 9 (1958), p. 150; *Handbuch der Orientalistik* (1969), p. 190. For the grammatical origin of the compound *Ḫiušummi-* cf. H. Eichner, *Untersuchungen zur hethitischen Deklination* (Doct. Diss., Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1974), pp. 19, 73 n. 23.

⁵ H. Otten, *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 17), 1973, p. 35 (already indicated in ZA 53, 1959, 180).

⁶ F. Starke, "Halmašuit im Anitta-Text und die hethitische Ideologie vom Königtum", *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 69 (1979), 53. This replaces Starke's previous interpretation of *ḪUTU-az* as a cardinal point, "in the south"; *Die Funktionen der dimensional Kasus und Adverbien im Althethitischen* (StBoT 23), 1977, p. 96 f.

⁷ *BoTU* II (1922), p. 46; Neu, *Anitta*, p. 12; G. Steiner, "Struktur und Bedeutung des sog. Anitta-Textes", *Oriens Antiquus* 23 (1984), p. 61, n. 48.

⁸ For this rendering of ZA.AḪ.LI, rather than "weeds", see S. Hutter-Braunsar, "Die Terminologie der Zerstörung eroberten Acker- und Siedlungslandes in hethitischen Königsinschriften", in: *Der orientalische Mensch und seine Beziehungen zur Umwelt*, Grazer

This restoration implies that Hattuša was delivered by the god of the conqueror (*Šiušmiš*) to the god of the conquered city (*Halmašuit-*), a most unusual procedure. One expects exactly the opposite, the city-god relinquishing the city to the god of the conqueror.

Neu has already drawn a parallel between the sowing of weeds on the ruins of Hattuša and an evocation text in which the site of an enemy city becomes the grazing land of the sacred bulls of the Storm-god, *Šeri* and *Hurri*.⁹ In this text, as one indeed expects, the gods of the enemy are exhorted to hand over their city to the Hittite Storm-god and his representative, the king (II 20-36):

And she (the Old Woman) says as follows: "Behold, I have placed for you, gods of the enemy city, a *gulšan*¹⁰ beer jug; [on the r]ight(?) and on the left I placed for you covered tables. I spread out for you trails with white cloth, red cloth, blue cloth; let these clothes be your trails! Set out on these and turn to the king in favor! Turn away finally from your own lands!". As soon as the Old Woman has finished saying these words, she sacrifices one sheep to the gods of the enemy city and one sheep to the goddesses of the enemy city.

Only when the gods of the city are persuaded to relinquish it, can the king turn to the Storm-god and ask for his military support in the actual conquest of the city:

Behold, the town was hostile towards me. Then I invoked the Storm-god, my lord: "Let the Storm-god, my lord, fulfill my wish and let him realize my wish." He delivered it to me and I devastated it. I made it sacrosanct. As long as (there is) heaven, earth [and] son of man, let no son of man (re-)settle it in the future. This enemy town, together with field, pasture, threshing-floor, garde[n and e]verything¹¹ (belong) to the Storm-god, my lord.

Morgenländische Studien, Bd. 2, 1989, pp. 211-213; Roszkowska-Mutschler, *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 7 (1992), p. 2 f.

⁹ KUB 7, 60 (CTH 423); Neu, *Anitta*, p. 117. For recent treatments of this text, see V. Haas-G. Wilhelm, *Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna* (1974), 234 ff.; R. Lebrun, "Le fragment KUB VII 60 = CTH 423", *Hethitica* 11 (1992), pp. 103-115; Roszkowska-Mutschler, op. cit., pp. 7 ff. Harry Hoffner kindly informs me (30.11.1992) that he has identified a duplicate text, KUB 59, 59, which provides valuable restorations in the main text.

¹⁰ See CHD 3/1 sub *limma*.

¹¹ III 22': [ku]-[e]-da-na-az-zi-ia is ablative of *kuitta*, "everything" (Hoffner).

[Make?¹²] it the pasture of your bulls, Storm-god, my lord, (of) Šeri (and) Hurri. Let Šeri (and) Hurri graze (on it) forever! Whoever (re)settles it and takes away the pasture of the bulls of the Storm-god, Šeri (and) Hurri, let him be the opponent of the Storm-god, my lord. If any son of man (re)settles that enemy town, even [one] house or two houses, or even if some army (and) cavalry (re)s[ettles] it, let my lord [destroy] this house or [two] houses, or this army [and cavalry].¹³

Another rare insight of how the takeover of an enemy city was conceived by the Hittites is provided by the so-called Puḫanu chronicle, a text of Old Hittite origin.¹⁴

... as long as(?) the Storm-god of Ḫalab runs at our side. As soon as [we have entreated(?) him, he (i.e. the god of Ḫalab) will come to us and he will be the one who will begin to run in front of us. The male gods of the Storm-god sent me to the king (saying): "Go (and) find the Great Ones and let the Great Ones say to the king: 'You have shown me respect, (therefore) I have come'".

This unusual dialogue between the Storm-god of Ḫalab and the representatives of the Hittite king clearly shows that the takeover of an enemy city was conceived by the Hittites not just as a military enterprise, but also as a complex theological procedure, in the course of which the consent of the city's deities had to be obtained by entreaty and not by force. Only when the Storm-god of Ḫalab acknowledges his satisfaction with the respect bestowed upon him by the conquerors may the takeover of the city be considered as fully accomplished. The same concept, only in a more laconic portrayal, is found in the description of Anitta's capture of Hattuša, relinquished by its goddess Ḫalmašuit-.

¹² III 23': perhaps [i-i]a'-an-za-an, with double accusative (Hoffner). For similar formations see Th. van den Hout, "Remarks on Some Hittite Double Accusative Constructions", in O. Carruba (ed.), *Per una grammatica Ittita/Towards a Hittite Grammar* (Studia Mediterranea 7), Pavia 1992.

¹³ III 11'-38'. Cf. the similar curse laid by Joshua on anyone who resettles Jericho (Joshua 6.26). The curse is said to be fulfilled on Hiel of Bethel (I Kings 16.34).

¹⁴ CTH 16 b. For a new edition see O. Soysal, "KUB XXXI 4 + KBo III 41 und 40 (Die Puḫanu-Chronik). Zum Thronstreit Hattusilis I.", *Hethitica* 7 (1987), 173-253. In the translated passage (KBo III 40 rev. 7'-11') I follow Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, "The History of Warfare According to Hittite Sources: The Annals of Hattusilis I (Part II)", *Anatolica* 11 (1984), p. 71; for a more detailed commentary, see I. Singer, *Israel Oriental Studies* 14 (1994).

By analogy with these cases¹⁵ it is quite obvious that Ḫalmašuit- must be the deity who relinquishes the city and not *vice versa*. As the patron goddess of Hattuša she must first be supplicated to give up her city, and only then can the conqueror expect a successful assault. In other words, the restoration *Ḫalmašuit[ti]*, in dative case, does not provide a satisfactory interpretation of the passage. F. Starke reached the same conclusion from a syntactical point of view and suggested a nominative case instead, *Ḫal-ma-š[u-i-iz]*, as an apposition to *Šiuš-miš*, "My God".¹⁶

When it finally was plagued by hunger,
Ḫalmašui[z], My God, handed it over.
I took at night by assault and sow[ed] cress in its
place.

Although grammatically sound, this interpretation leads to the unexpected equation of Ḫalmašuit- with "My/Our God" of Neša. This entails far-reaching theological and ideological consequences. Starke challenges the traditional identification of Ḫalmašuit- as a Hattian throne-goddess¹⁷ and claims that she is neither a goddess nor Hattian, but rather a deified concept of Hittite kingship. He considers the perfect Proto-Hattian form *Ḫanwašuit*, corresponding to Hittite *Ḫalmašuit-* in a bilingual text,¹⁸ as a "Protohattisierung." There is, however, no suggestion for an alternative Hittite etymology. Though accepting his syntactical analysis, I find Starke's interpretation difficult from a contextual point of view.

Is there any solution which would provide a rendering of the sentence that is both grammatically sound and contextually reasonable? I believe there is, and it only entails a slight change in the morphological analysis of *Šiušmiš*. The possessive compound *Šiušmiš*, which occurs in the text only here, has generally been analyzed as *Šiuš-miš*, "My God", i.e. 1st person singular.¹⁹ No adequate explanation has been given for this unusual change of the possessive pronoun, whereas

¹⁵ A similar concept is reflected in the stealing of the Palladion, on which the prosperity of Troy depended, by the Greeks.

¹⁶ ZA 69 (1979), p. 59. G. Steiner, *OrAnt* 23, p. 61, n. 48 objects to this solution on the ground that the verb *para pai-*, "to give up", "to relinquish", requires an indirect object. A perusal of the occurrences of *para pai-* shows that an indirect object is not always necessary, especially when the beneficiary (in this case Anitta) is mentioned in the next sentence. Cf., e.g., Hatt. IV, l. 67: *n-at-kan appan tarnahhun, n-at para pihhun*; Bronze Tablet III 14: *nu LUGAL-UTTA ŠA KUR URU DU-tašša para pai*.

¹⁷ A. Archi, "Trono regale e trono divinizzato nell'Anatolia ittita", *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 1 (1966), 83 ff.; E. von Weiher, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 4 (1972), 62; Neu, *Anitta*, 118 f.; M. Popko, *Kultobjekte in der hethitischen Religion* (1978), 59 ff.

¹⁸ E. Laroche, *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites* (1946-47), p. 21 f.

¹⁹ H. G. Güterbock, ZA 44 (1938), p. 141 n. 1, hesitated whether the various forms of *Šiu(na)š(u)mi-* should be analyzed as *Šiu-naš-miš* "Mein Gott", or rather as *Šiu-naš-šmiš* "Ihr Gott". However, all forms were universally related to one and the same deity.

throughout the text we only encounter "Our God", *Šiu(na)š-šummiš*.²⁰ This is all the more peculiar since Anitta's personal god, who leads him from victory to victory, is clearly the Storm-god of Heaven.²¹ Moreover, in the curse inflicted on Hattuša, it is the Storm-god who will punish the offender and not this alleged *Šiuš-miš*.

I suggest analyzing *DŠiušmiš* as *DŠiuš-šmiš*, i.e. "Their God",²² which is indeed an appropriate apposition to Halmašuit-, the city goddess of Hattuša:

When it finally was plagued by hunger,
Halmašu[iz], *Their God*, handed it over
I took (the town) at night by assault and
sow[ed] cress in its place.
Whoever becomes king after me and resettles
Hattuša,
let the Storm-god of Heaven smite him!

This solution solves the difficulties, grammatical and contextual, raised by previous interpretations and restores sense and order in the divine world of the Anitta text.²³

Halmašuit-, "Their God" (*DŠiuš-šmiš*), is rehabilitated as the Hattian patron goddess of Hattuša.²⁴ She is the one who relinquishes her city to Anitta, the represen-

²⁰ Neu, *Anitta*, pp. 66, 130; Starke, *ZA* 69, p. 65: "Im übrigen scheint es bezeichnend, dass nur einmal von "meiner Gottheit" und sonst, vor allem bei der erstmaligen Erwähnung (Z. 39), von "unserer Gottheit" die Rede ist. Es handelt sich also nicht um eine nur persönliche Gottheit des Anitta, die als solche einem grösseren Kreis vorgestellt werden müsste."

²¹ In rev. 57 the deity is explicitly designated *BE-LI-IA*, "my lord" (in dupl. B; A is broken). See also obv. 2, where Anitta is described as the beloved of the Storm-god of Heaven.

²² The expected morphological form for the enclitic possessive pronoun, 3rd person plural nom. com. (with the noun in singular), is *-šmiš* (possibly *-šmeš*). Although I am not aware of an exact parallel, one may compare the dative form *šiu(ni)-šmi*, "to their god", attested in the *MELQET*-lists of the KILAM festival (I. Singer *StBoT* 27, p. 153; *StBoT* 28, p. 108 ff.): "They take one goat, etc. ... to the temple of Inar, and they slaughter it to their god."

Compare also the following composite forms: *hu-ul-pa-zé-ni-eš-mi-ša* = *hulpa(n)zeneš-šmiš=a*, "their studs(?)" (*StBoT* 28, p. 139 with refs.); *ú-mi-wa-aš-hu-uš-mu-uš* = *unuwašhuš-šmuš*, "their ornaments (acc.)" (*StBoT* 28, p. 177 with refs.); *LUGAL-uš-mi-iš* = *haššuš-šmiš*, "your (pl.) king" (*StBoT* 17, p. 55 f. with ref.); *a-ri-eš-me-eš* (KBo VI 2+ III 19) = *areš-meš*, "my companions", or, *areš-šmeš*, "your (pl.) companions" (see Starke, *ZA* 69, p. 83 n. 70a). A preference for "My God" or for "Their God" in the Anitta text can only be reached through contextual considerations.

²³ The occasional appearance of the determinative DINGIR with *šiu(na)-* (usually in pre-imperial texts) is not inconsistent with its interpretation as a common noun, and the same applies to the Anitta text compounds *DŠiuš-šummiš* "our god" and *DŠiuš-šmiš* "their god" (see Starke, *ZA* 69, p. 55 f.). Similar cases, in which a common noun has a determinative with identical meaning, are *GIŠtaru-* "wood, tree", *ŠIKarawar*, "horn", *MUŠilluyanka-* "snake".

²⁴ She is still listed in the pantheon of the capital city in the Muwatalli Prayer (KUB VI 45 I 52 = 46 II 17: *DAG-ti-iš*).

tative of the Storm-god. As a token of gratitude Anitta builds a temple for her in his capital Neša. This is in accordance with the wellknown Near Eastern custom of carrying away the gods of the enemy and providing them shelter in the land of the conqueror.²⁵

"Our God", *Šiu(na)š-šummiš*, appears in the text only as the deity of Neša, who was returned by Anitta from its exile in Zalpa. The identity of this elusive deity, who is never again mentioned with this appellative, remains unknown.

The Celestial Storm-god is consistently the god who secures victories for Anitta and his father, and the takeover of Hattuša no longer poses an exception to the rule.

The highly significant distinction between "Our God" of Kaniš/Neša and "Their God", Halmašuit- of Hattuša, can best be understood in the context of an ethnic-religious disparity between the Hittite "Land of Kaniš" and the still Hattian "Land of Hatti". With Anitta's unification of central Anatolia, the various regional pantheons merged into a complex, exceedingly receptive pantheon. "Their God" joined "Our God" and lived together in harmony with the "Thousand Gods of Hatti".

²⁵ For references see Singer, *IOS* 14, n. 20. That the custom was current in the classical world as well has already been noted by L. Wohleb, "Die altrömische und die hethitische evocatio", *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 25 (1927), pp. 206-209 (see also Haas and Wilhelm, *Hurr. und Luw. Riten*, p. 235). Livius (V 21, 3.5) relates that at the siege of the Etruscan city of Veii, the city goddess, Juno Regina, was entreated to come to Rome, where a temple would be erected in her honor. For *Evocatio* in general (with Greek parallels), see F. Pfister, in Th. Klauser (ed.), *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, VI (1966), 1160-1165.