"In Hattuša The Royal House Declined" Royal Mortuary Cult in 13th Century Hatti.[*]

ITAMAR SINGER
Tel Aviv University

The grave political consequences of Muwatalli's *de facto* division of the kingdom, followed by Hattušili's usurpation of the throne, have been discussed intensively in recent years (see Bryce 2005: 230 ff.; 259 ff., with bibliogr. refs.). In this paper I intend to focus on the impact of these far-reaching political developments upon the cult of the royal ancestors. It goes without saying, that in traditional societies the ideological foundations of the living are intimately connected, indeed dependent, on a continuous bond with their dead ancestors, and any disruption in the chain of generations might cause catastrophic results[1].

The subject of the royal funerary cult has been investigated repeatedly over the years, both with regard to its ideological matrix and its socio-economic aspects: let it suffice to mention in passing Otten's seminal studies on the so-called King Lists and on the royal funerary ritual in the fifties (1951; 1958), the studies of del Monte (1973; 1975), Imparati (1977) and Archi (1979) on various aspects of the mortuary cult in the seventies, and, more recently, van den Hout's studies on the royal funerary ritual (1994, 1995b; cf. also Kassian et al. 2002) and on tombs and memorials (2002). I do not intend to deal here with the entire scope of this vast domain, but rather to concentrate on the postulated changes that occurred in the royal funerary cult in the last century of the Hittite kingdom.

But before we set out on this journey which begins with Muwatalli's transfer of his capital to Tarhuntašša, it is worthwhile to sum up briefly the current views on the Hittite terminology of mortuary institutions, while adding a few comments of my own. With some reservations, I accept the basic distinctions of van den Hout (2002: 86 f.), who, following Imparati (1977: 62 f.) and others, defines the Stone House (É.NA$_4$) as a *functional* term, denoting a "tomb", i.e., "the last resting place of the bodily remains of members of the royal dynasty", whereas $^{NA4}hekur$ denotes the *form* of the edifice, i.e. a "monument" situated on a "rocky outcrop" or a "mountain peak". A $^{NA4}hekur$ could accommodate different types of institutions besides a "memorial monument" for a deceased monarch, such as a mountain sanctuary, a palatial complex, etc.[2]. 'The tomb and the monument of a

---

[1] For the importance of mortuary rituals for the survival of society see, e.g., Bloch 1971; Thomas 1985; Metcalf - Huntington 1991.

[2] For references to the various *hekur*-monuments, see Imparati 1977 and van den Hout 2002: 74 ff. The semantic proximity between the *hekur* and the Stone House is demonstrated by Muršili II's well-known complaint about his stepmother Tawananna who turned over his father's entire estate "to the *hekur* of the Tutelary Deity, to the Divine Stone House" (KUB 14.4 ii 4' f.). See van den

certain ruler may overlap, but not necessarily, in which case the monument is in fact a "cenotaph", a honorary tomb for a person buried elsewhere.

The rarely attested late terms É.GIDIM, "house of the dead", and *ḫaštiyas pir*, "house of the bones", obviously refer to tombs, and are therefore semantically equivalent to the Stone House (see further below). Because of the phonetical similarity, *ḫaštiyas pir* has been associated by some scholars with the important edifice ^É*ḫešti/a-*, which already figures prominently in OH texts. A third component was added to this chain of equations by Kammenhuber (1972: 300)[3], who maintained that "KBo 17.15 bestätigt mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit NA₄-*an parnaš* (Gen. Sg.) 'der Steine Haus, Steinhaus' (…) als eine heth. Bezeichnung des hattischen *hešta*-Hauses." This triple equation, however, which has enjoyed a rather broad acceptance[4], rests on shaky foundations. Irrespective of the question regarding whether an etymological (Puhvel, HED 3: 322) or a folk-etymological (Kammenhuber 1972: 323) connection may or may not (Groddek 2001: 216) be established between *hešta-* and *ḫaštai-*, a functional overlapping between *hešta-* and É.NA₄ must certainly be rejected[5]. As already established in earlier studies, and recently reiterated by Torri (1999), the ^É*hešta-* was a temple dedicated to the Underworld deities headed by the goddess Lelwani. Like other temples in Hattuša, it may have served on occasion also to pay homage to deified kings, but this secondary function does not justify its equation with the final resting place of the Hittite kings and queens. The appearance of the "men of ^D*hešta*" (in a very fragmentary context) on the reverse of the tablet KBo 9.36, the obverse of which carries an offering list for the royal ancestors, does not lend support to the equation, and neither do a few fragmentary references to ^É*hešta-* (some restored) in similar texts (Haas - Wäfler 1977: 117). In a more general vein it should be noted, that the mere appearance of two or more cult institutions in the same context does not in itself establish a close proximity between them, let alone an equation[6]. Much more is needed for safe equations and identifications in the complex topography of Hattuša, notably a

---

Hout 2002: 87 f. for the various interpretations of this phrase, of which the best is probably the one which takes the two locations as being in apposition.

[3] The attribution of this equation to Götze and Otten (Puhvel, HED 3: 322 f.; Torri 1999: 32, n. 79) is inaccurate, inasmuch as they pleaded for an etymological connection between *hešta-* and *ḫaštai-*, but not for a functional equation between *hešta-* and the Stone House.

[4] Its main proponents were Haas and Wäfler in their elaborate study on ^É*hešti/a-* (1976; 1977). After several observations on the connection between the ^É*hešti/a-* and the Stone House(s) (pp. 117 ff.), their final verdict is given: "Wenn auf Grund der Quellenlage auch nicht definitiv zu beweisen, so scheint es doch sehr wahrscheinlich, dass zwischen dem *heštā*-Haus und dem Ahnenkult ein enger Zusammenhang bestand" (p. 122). Cf. also Puhvel, HED 3: 319-323, with further refs.

[5] For a clear distinction between the ^É*hešta-* and the É.NA₄, see Taracha 1998: 190; 2000: 195; Groddek 2001: 217. Cf. also van den Hout 2002: 74, n. 3: "The exact relation of the *hešta*-house to both the *hegur* and Stone House remains a problem. Although it seems to have functioned as a temple for chthonic deities and there might be links with the ancestor-cult, clear evidence for a funerary purpose is lacking."

[6] For example, the mere mention of a Stone House in KBo 17.5, a text which describes various rituals celebrated in the *hešta*-house, has been taken as a proof for the equation between the two edifices (Kammenhuber 1972: 300; Puhvel, HED 3: 322), but this has rightly been criticized by Torri (1999: 31).

---

demonstrable functional overlapping. We shall return to the problem of the correspondence between texts and topography later on, but first a few more observations are in order concerning the two main architectural terms dealt with in this paper, the Stone House (É.NA₄) and the ^{NA₄}*hekur*[7].

The "Stone House (of the Gods)"[8] was the place where the cinerated bones of the deceased kings and queens were brought after the cremation ceremony according to the royal funerary ritual (van den Hout 1994: 56 ff.; Kassian et al. 2002). This was also the place where the king, warned by a foreboding omen, was taken to hide for seven days among the dead while the substitute king took his place in the palace (Kümmel 1967: 60-63; van den Hout 1994: 46; Haas 1994: 207 ff.)[9]. Much importance was attributed to the fact that the texts use indiscriminately both singular and plural forms of É.NA₄. In my opinion, the reason might simply be that this royal cemetery or mausoleum served as the collective resting place for all members of the royal family and was therefore thought of, as in other royal cemeteries throughout history, as a *single* institution which housed *multiple* burial monuments of many kings. Thus, when we encounter in the texts a "Stone House of Tuthaliya", a "Stone House of Arnuwanda" and so on, these do not necessarily represent separate edifices in different locations, but rather the individual tombs of those kings within the single institution of the royal cemetery, which must have been a sizable complex situated somewhere in Hattuša or its vicinity.

There were of course Stone Houses in other cities as well (see refs. in Haas 1994: 244; Taracha 2000: 201; van den Hout 2002: 84 f.), but I believe that members of the Hittite royal house were buried, as a rule, in the central cemetery in Hattuša. This was the case, for example, with Piyassili, who died in Kizzuwatna but whose body or remains were brought by Muršili to Hattuša[10]. There was even a specific ritual prescribed for such a case[11], which is probably referred to also in the catalog entry: "When they transfer the bones of a dead person"[12]. It is possible, of course, that an immediate transfer of a dead person was impossible and this is probably the situation described in the fragmentary passages adduced by van den Hout (2002: 84 f.). But contrary to his view (*ib.*: 85, with n. 76), according to which a burial outside the capital may have been a deliberate choice for manifold reasons, I doubt that the immediate members of the Hittite royal family would have been left permanently far from the central Stone House in Hattuša. Throughout the ages, members of royalty have always strived to find their eternal resting place amongst

---

[7] Other terms which are related to the cult of the ancestors, but are not discussed here, are the House of the Father(s) (É *attaš*) and the House of the Grandfather(s) (É *ḫuḫḫaš*). For these terms see, e.g., Taracha 1998: 191 ff.; 2000: 192 ff. (with previous bibliography).

[8] For a full catalog of references see van den Hout 2002: 80 ff. (with refs. to previous studies on p. 80, n. 44).

[9] The bed on which the real king sleeps during this week may be the same bed in the Stone House on which the bones of the incinerated king were placed on the second day of the royal funerary ritual (Otten 1958: 68 f.; van den Hout 1994: 48).

[10] *AM* 108 f., restored by the dupl. fragment KBo 10.38, 6; cf. del Monte 1993: 92; van den Hout 1994: 56 (with refs.); 2002: 85.

[11] KUB 30.27 obv. 7'-9'; Otten 1958: 98 f.; van den Hout 2002: 85.

[12] KUB 30.65 ii 12; Otten, *ib.*; CHD, L-N: 441a; Dardano 2006: 164, 170.

their ancestors, be it in the Valley of the Kings in Egypt, in the Royal Cemetery in Assur, in Westminster Abbey, in St. Denis, in Escorial, or in the nearby Basilica di San Lorenzo[13]. Just think of the efforts invested in the recent reunification of the Romanoffs under one roof in St. Petersburg.

If some member of a royal family did not enjoy the company of his ancestors, this must have had a weighty reason. Either his contemporaries excluded him from the ancestral graveyard out of contempt, as in the case of Caligula and Nero (Davies 2000: 19, 147), or else an eccentric monarch such as Akhenaton or Muwatalli, may have chosen for himself a new capital and a new burial ground for ideological reasons (Singer 2006). But these were exceptions to the rule, and I think that the Hittites followed the common custom of collective burial of most, if not all members of the same dynasty in one royal cemetery. Therefore, I think that the funerary structure at Gâvurkalesi (see refs. in van den Hout 2002: 91) may have been a *hekur* monument, but not the Stone House of a Great King or Queen of Hatti. Alternatively, if it was a Stone House, it could have served as the final resting place of the king(s) of a secondary or vassal state.

To round out this theoretical introduction on royal burials, we must consider two exceptional situations. The first is when a new dynasty comes to power, which is not relevant in the Hittite case. In principle, the first kings of a new dynasty can either continue to be buried in the same traditional cemetery, like the Pharaohs of several New Kingdom dynasties, or they can inaugurate a new burial ground, like the Roman dynasties, each with its own mausoleum[14].

The second exception to the rule is quite relevant to Hittite history. What happened when a schism occurs in the royal line of succession and each of the two competing branches claims for itself legitimacy and the right of "possessing" the royal ancestors? This is exactly the situation that occurred after the usurpation of Hattušili, and I believe that it bore important consequences for the royal funerary cult.

When Muwatalli transferred his capital to Tarhuntašša in the Lower Land he took with him the gods of Hatti and the GIDIM.ḪI.A. This famous statement, repeated twice in Hattušili's Apology (ii 1, 52), has often been pondered upon. What exactly does GIDIM mean in this context? It is often rendered by the Latin term *manes*, and most scholars assume that it must refer to the statues of the ancestors[15]. However, as shown by Archi in his study on ᴰ*Zawalli* (1979: 93, n. 30), the term GIDIM is clearly distinguished from ALAM, "statue, image" (Hittite *ešri-* ; HW², E: 126 f.). The Hittite meaning of GIDIM

does not entirely overlap with its Akkadian equivalent, *etemmu*, the spirit or the soul of a person which continues to exist after the death of the person[16]. This spiritual concept is better expressed by *ištan(zan)-* and ᴰ*Zawalli*[17]. GIDIM, with its Hittite reading *akkant-*, usually refers to the "dead" in general or to its earthly remains (Otten 1958: 143 f.; Archi 1979: 92 f.).

Does this mean that Muwatalli actually dug out the cinerary remains of his ancestors and carried them to Tarhuntašša[18]? Morbid as this may sound, it is not unparalleled in the ancient Near East. When the Chaldean king Marduk-apal-iddina II (Merodach-baladan) was chased out from Babylon by Sargon and fled to Elam through the Sea Land, "he gathered the gods of the entire extent of his land, together with the bones (GÌR.PAD.DU.MEŠ = *eṣmāte*) of his forefathers from (their) graves" (CAD, E: 342a). By doing this he avoided the kind of treatment that Assurbanipal later meted out to the remains of the Elamite kings, by opening their tombs and removing their remains to Assur, thus depriving them of funerary offerings (Bayliss 1973: 117, with refs.).

If so, Muwatalli followed the general tendency of monarchs to keep the remains of their ancestors, which possessed vital spiritual and political powers, as close as possible to them. I differ in this respect from van den Hout (2002: 73 f.), who thinks that "the Hittites did not, on the whole, seem to attach much importance to the physical remains and were more interested in an ancestor cult that made use of statues of various kinds of icons". Cultural history shows that people, almost everywhere and anytime, do attach great importance to their physical remains, and they often go out of their way to possess even a tiny bit of the real or make-believe relics of a revered personage, be it a king, a saint or a martyr[19]. I do not think that the Hittites were any different in this respect and the careful treatment given to the bones of their cremated monarchs serves as proof. Van den Hout himself supplied several references for the transportation of human bones over long distances (1994: 50; 2002: 85).

Where Muwatalli may have deposited the transferred remains of his ancestors is another question. Perhaps in the famous ᴺᴬ⁴*hekur* SAG.UŠ of §10 in the Bronze Tablet, probably the first Eternal Peak of its kind[20]? In any case, a few years after Muwatalli's death, his son Urhi-Tessub moved the capital back to Hattuša, taking with him the gods of Hatti, of Arinna and of the Cedar Land. No mention is made of the GIDIM.ḪI.A, but one can hardly imagine Urhi-Teššub, who did everything in his power to restore his authority

---

[13] Obviously, the desire to be buried in the company of ones ancestors is not restricted to royalty. This is not the place to deal with the vast etnographical literature on relevant burial practices (see, e.g., Metcalf - Huntington 1991), but suffice it to mention in passing one of the most conspicuous examples, the spectacular reburial ceremony of the "return *famadihana*" among the Merina in Madagascar, which periodically encapsulates the bond between the living and the dead (see Bloch 1971: 159 ff.).

[14] In Rome, for example, each dynasty had its own Mausoleum, but it was not necessarily founded by the first emperor of the new dynasty. Vespasian, for instance, was first buried in the Mausoleum of Augustus, with the rest of the Julio-Claudians, and only later were his ashes brought to the Mausoleum of the Flavian Dynasty (Davies 2000: 24).

[15] E.g. Otten 1951: 110; Popko 1995: 153; van den Hout 2002: 74, n. 1.

[16] For the Mesopotamian concept of the immortal soul, see Bayliss 1973: 116; Selz 2006 (with further literature).

[17] Archi 1979: 91 ff.; 2001: 5, n. 14; van den Hout 1994: 44; 1998: 83; Collins 2006: 43 f.

[18] Archi 1979: 93, n. 30; Haas 1994: 243, n. 37; Börker-Klahn 1994: 365.

[19] As epitomized by Metcalf - Huntington 1991: 141 in connection with the enshrinement of royal relics in Thailand: "Stored in the palace, they [the royal relics] formed a kind of charismatic stockpile, distilled from the genius of ancient kings." Cf. Archi's statement (2001: 8) in connection with the ancestor cult in Ebla: "It was thanks to the continued 'presence' of ancient rulers that their descendants could claim the throne for themselves."

[20] For the interpretation of this passage see van den Hout 2002: 76 and the bibliography cited in n. 22.

over the entire land, renouncing the privilege of his ancestors' physical proximity as guarantors of his own legitimacy.

Hattušili's coup and the installation of Kurunta as King of Tarhuntašša created a new and problematic situation. From now on, who would be the official guardian of the royal ancestors? And where would the remains of Muwatalli find their final resting place? Together with his ancestors in the royal Stone House in Hattuša, or rather in proximity to his second son Kurunta in Tarhuntašša? It is generally assumed that the Eternal Peak of §10 was the tomb of Muwatalli and that it must have been located somewhere in the south, perhaps at Sirkeli[21]. This monument could indeed have been a memorial dedicated to Muwatalli, but I doubt that it contained his earthly remains. According to the Royal Offering Lists (see below) Muwatalli was worshipped together with his predecessors in Hattuša.

The *de facto* division of the Hittite Kingdom introduced a highly explosive situation, in which the two royal branches competed for legitimacy not only through mundane political means (such as inscriptions and seals), but also through a contest for accessibility to the cult places of their common royal ancestors. Thus, Kurunta's access to the Eternal Peak (of his father) was initially denied, perhaps by his half-brother Urhi-Teššub. Later on Hattušili and Tuthaliya felt secure enough to return those rights to Kurunta, being confident that Muwatalli's real remains, and thus his divine powers, remained in the Stone House of Hattuša. The kings of Tarhuntašša had to content themselves with effigies or cenotaphs.

In Hattuša itself the cult of the deified kings was regulated through the so-called Royal Offering Lists (CTH 660-661)[22]. In the preserved parts of these texts there is hardly any clue pointing to the location where these offering rituals were carried out, but it stands to reason that they were performed close to the royal tombs, i.e. at the Stone House. Taking into account the large quantities of cattle and sheep that were sacrificed in homage to the entire Hittite dynasty, "44 kings" according to one of the lists[23], I assume that this must have been a wide open location on the outskirts of the city or in its vicinity[24]. I find it difficult to accept the currently proposed localizations of the Stone House, either in Yazılıkaya Room B (Imparati 1977: 62 f.; van den Hout 1994: 52; 2002: 80) or in the

palace area on Büyükkale (Haas 1994: 248). The latter proposal would conform with the widespread funerary custom in the ancient Near East of digging royal tombs beneath the floors of palatial buildings[25], but no indications for this have been found in the area of Büyükkale which was entirely excavated[26].

A location of the Stone House in the northern part of the city, not far from the cemetery of Osmankayası and Yazılıkaya, would seem plausible, and indeed, such a suggestion has been advocated by Rudolf Opfermann (1982). He pointed towards the lowest city terrace in the northwest corner of Boğazköy, the area called Mihraplikaya, which serves nowadays as a threshing floor. In the winter this deep depression is entirely inundated. A trial trench dug by Bittel in 1955 reached the remains of a thick wall and a drainage canal at a depth of over three meters, beneath sterile alluvial deposits (Bittel 1957). Perhaps further investigations in this unexplored area of the city might bring more results.

Not only is the location of the Stone House unknown, but also its form and structure. In order to envisage what the Hittite royal cemetery might have looked like, we might perhaps draw inspiration from other places and periods. For example, the cremation burials in northern Syria in the first millennium BCE, notably at Zincirli and at Tell Halaf (Niehr 2006, with refs.). Over the grave which contained the urn and precious offerings, a life-size seated statue of the deceased was erected (*ib.*: 124 ff., with Abb. 5-6). From a later period one may compare the Ancestors Gallery of Antiochus I of Commagene at Nemrud Dağ, with its row of standing stones and altars dedicated to his ancestors (Jacobs 2002, with refs.). Each ancestor had his or her name carved at the back of a stele and had an offering table in front. Perhaps the *Ahnenreihen* in the Hittite Stone House had a similar appearance.

If the location and form of the Stone House have yet to be discovered, we have important information on the chronological sequence of the so-called King Lists. Much has been written on their early parts in search of the origins of the Hittite monarchy[27]. Much less attention has been given to the final part in these lists and its significance. A glance at Otten's editions (1951; 1968; 1987, Abb. 2-3) immediately reveals the surprising fact that none of the lists goes beyond Muwatalli II. Some of the lists end or break up before the age of Šuppiluliuma I, whereas those that do get to him, provide an exceptionally replete representation of his family, including his wives and his sons Telipinu and Piyaššili. Incidentally, this raises the intriguing question until when did the kings of Karkamiš and Halab continue to be buried with their ancestors in Hattuša, and when did they inaugurate their own royal cemeteries in Syria.

---

[21] Otten 1988: 42 ff. with n. 78; van den Hout 2002: 89 ff.

[22] Otten 1951; 1968; Haas - Wäfler 1977: 106 ff. The "[form]er *labarna*s" are allegedly mentioned also in the ritual for the substitute king, KUB 24.5+ obv. 6' (Kümmel 1967: 8, 15, with previous biblio.), but, in my opinion, the restoration [*tarpal*]*iuš labarnuš*, "[substitu]te *labarna*s", makes more sense in this context than [*karuil*]*iuš labarnuš*. Cf. Goetze 1955: 355.

[23] One wonders what the total of "44 kings" (ŠU.NIGIN 44 LUGAL.MEŠ) in Text E (KUB 11.8 + 9) iii 14 might be referring to. It must certainly include more than "kings", for there were no more than thirty Hittite monarchs (Wilhelm 2004: 76). The count must have included all the recipients of offerings, including queens and princes. Indeed, a rough count of all the names figuring in these lists adds up to a total of around forty names.

[24] Text E (KUB 11.8 + 9) iii 15 has the difficult form *wa-ar-ḫu-uš-du-wa-na-ti* (Otten 1951: 68). Nakamura 2002: 137 suggests the emendation *wa-ar-ḫu-uš-du-wa-aš*[17] UD[19]-*ti*, "Tag des *warḫušdu*", which he relates to the rare term [GIŠ]*warḫušdu-*. The latter may be etymologically connected to *warḫui-* "rough, bushy, thickly grown". If so, this might indicate a wooded or bushy area as the location of the ritual, but this remains highly speculative.

[25] See Matthiae 1997 with numerous refs.; cf. also Archi 2001. For the *kispu* offerings to the statues of the ancestors (including Sargon and Naram-Sin) in the throne room of Mari, see Jonker 1995: 53 f. with refs.

[26] In early reports an identification of Building C with the Stone House was suggested (Bittel 1940: 24 f.; but cf. idem 1970: 85), but this attempt was later abandoned and replaced by another identification of Building C, namely, as a shrine for the rain cult (Neve 1971; 1982: 113 ff.).

[27] For recent discussions see Carruba 1998: 97 ff.; 2007; Beal 2003: 31 ff.; Forlanini 2004: 381, n. 50. For comparative material from Syria (see refs. in Taracha 2000: 194, n. 125), cf. the king lists from Ebla (Archi 2001) and from Ugarit (Vidal 2005 and 2006).

Only List C (KUB 11.7+36.122) continues beyond Šuppiluliuma and includes an offering for Muršili (rev. 14 *Mur-ši*-DINGI]R-*LIM*) and one for Muwatalli (rev. 15 NIR.GÁL)[28]. After the paragraph divider there is an additional offering, but the name is unfortunately missing. If the composition of this new paragraph is similar to the previous one, it should contain the name of Muwatalli's successor, but I would not risk guessing who this might be. Or better perhaps, could this line have provided the name of Muwatalli's mysterious wife? Remarkably, Muwatalli and his anonymous successor receive a "fattened ox and a [fattened] sheep", whereas Šuppiluliama and Muršili receive only regular ones. With regard to the dating of this list, Muwatalli provides a *terminus post quem*, but this does not necessarily point to Hattušili III as the author[29]. The ancestor cult, which goes back to much earlier times[30], must have persisted until the very end of the Hittite kingdom[31].

Now, is this a most remarkable coincidence that none of the preserved lists carries the line of kings beyond Muwatalli II, or are we confronted with some kind of "structural" break in the sequence? The suspicion increases when we find this same chronological limitation in other offering lists for kings or queens, where it can hardly be blamed on the poor preservation of the text.

There is the well-known list of the Sun-goddesses of Arinna of various queens, which were worshipped at Tahurpa during the fifth day of the *nuntariyašhaš* festival[32]. It includes Walanni, Nikalmati, Ašmunikal, Duduhepa, Henti and Tawananna, stopping short before Muršili's unfortunate wife Gaššuliyawiya. There are also the libations and offerings presented to the statues of ancient kings in various temples during the main festivals[33]. Here we find Hattušili, Tuthaliya and Šuppiluliuma in one list (KUB 10.11 iii 29, iv 2, 21-23), and the same kings plus Muršili in others (KBo 2.29 obv. 10-14; 30 i 12-15). Although this cult of royal images in temples is an altogether different religious phenomenon, to be addressed in the following, it is nevertheless noteworthy that here too the bottom line does not go beyond the turn of the 13th century.

In conclusion, I believe that the composition of the Royal Offering Lists, especially their later part, should be taken more seriously than sometimes assumed[34], and I strongly suspect that the absence of kings and queens after Muwatalli II in these and other lists is not accidental, but marks a deliberate discontinuation of the royal line as represented in

---

[28] When Muwatalli I was discovered, there was initially some confusion about the identity of the various Muwatallis mentioned in the lists, but it is now evident that this one is Muwatalli II (Haas - Wäfler 1977: 107; Carruba 1990: 542 with n. 7; 1998: 102; Haas 1994: 243, 247; Beal 2003: 31).

[29] As suggested by Otten 1951: 57; 1968: 111; Haas - Wäfler 1977: 107; Haas 1994: 248.

[30] Van den Hout 1994: 57; 2002: 86. Although the extant offering lists are all Late Hittite, they certainly go back to earlier originals (Kassian et al. 2002: 12 f.).

[31] Perhaps the spelling *Šu-up-p]i-lu-li-ia-ma* in KUB 11.7+KUB 36.122 rev. 13, referring to Šuppiluliuma I, may indicate that List C is a very late copy (Carruba 2007: 137).

[32] CTH 626.IV; Bin-Nun 1975: 197 ff., 275; Nakamura 2002: 90, 188.

[33] Otten 1958: 110-112; 1968: 126 (Tabelle VI); Archi 1979: 92, n. 28; Haas 1994: 804 f.

[34] For an appraisal of the credibility of these lists, see Bin-Nun 1975: 273 f. with n. 194 (with a refutation of Kammenhuber's excessive skepticism); Carruba 1988: 198 ff.; 1998: 102, n. 32; Carruba 2007 and in this volume.

---

offering ceremonies. The possible reasons for this structural break are not too difficult to fathom. If Hattušili III and his successors were to be included in the offering lists, what about Muwatalli's two sons, Urhi-Teššub and Kurunta? The easiest way would be to simply ignore them, but that would not be in the Hittite spirit. As shown by the elaborate *mantalli* rituals, a lot of effort and means were invested in order to reconcile such "public enemies" of the past, lest they took revenge on their wrongdoers. Simply ignoring them in the ancestor cult could become a dangerous offense, to be severely punished by the gods and the dead[35]. A more "politically correct" way was to simply "freeze" the offering lists after Muwatalli II, and to transform the funerary cult of Hattušili III and his successors into a different *modus operandi*. In other words, I think that the cult of the royal ancestors up to and including Muwatalli II was continued as before, but that subsequent deified kings of Hattuša received a different form of worship, a personalized cult in individual funerary monuments[36]. In the remaining part of this paper I will try to substantiate this premise and to examine in more detail the evidence for the funerary activities of the last three kings of Hatti.

Hattušili III

Hattušili III is well-known for his generous grants to religious institutions and to individuals, all of them exempted from duties toward the state. Two of these institutions may plausibly be associated with the ancestor cult. The first is the ([NA4])*hekur pirwa*, an important religious and economic institution which figures prominently in texts of Hattušili III and Tuthaliya IV. It is indirectly connected to the Stone House through an oracle text (KUB 16.27) which associates the *hekur pirwa* with "the men of Stone House" (Del Monte 1975: 334; van den Hout 2002: 83, 88). There is an ongoing debate about the meaning of *pirwa* in this composition, usually written without the divine marker. Several scholars (recently, Tischler, HEG, P: 619 ff.; Pecchioli Daddi 2005: 575) endorse an etymological connection with Hittite [NA4]*peru-/peruna-* , "rock, cliff", which would fit well the rocky location of *hekur*s (but cf. CHD, P/3: 313).

CTH 88 (KBo 6.28 + KUB 26.48) is an extensive document granting the *hekur pirwa* exemption from all kinds of duties and levies (Imparati 1975: 154 f.; 1977: 39 ff.). It opens with a lengthy historical preamble, better known as the "Concentric Invasion", which describes the catastrophic situation of the kingdom before Šuppiluliuma's accession to the throne. Then it carries down the historical development until Hattušili's own days. What lurks behind this historiosophic treatise is obviously the parallel between the two usurpers who saved their kingdom from collapse. Less clear is the relationship between this lengthy

---

[35] One might argue that other Hittite kings, such as Tahurwaili and Tuthaliya the Younger, are also missing from the lists, but these belonged to the distant past, whereas his two nephews weighed heavily on Hattušili's conscience, and this moral burden was reassumed by his successors as well.

[36] Relying on different arguments, van den Hout (2002: 86) had already reached a similar conclusion in his interpretation of the Stone House. One of the options he put forward is: "It is conceivable that there existed a general É.NA4 (DINGIR-*LIM*) where the urns of kings and queens were deposited but that later kings preferred their own (Divine) Stone Houses." His other option is less convincing.

historical introduction and the subject matter of the text, the ḫekur pirwa. Perhaps the answer is hinted at in the final sentence of the historical preamble, according to which even the city of Hattuša was burnt down and only the ḫešta-house was miraculously spared (obv. 15). Does this indicate some sort of connection between the ḫekur pirwa and the ḫešta-house (Imparati 1977: 47)? As for the question why this institution received such preferential status, Imparati suggested that the ḫekur pirwa and its personnel might have been involved somehow in the civil war on Hattušili's side.

In this connexion, the intriguing phrase in rev. 18 deserves to be underlined: Ḫattuši=ma ḫaššuwas pir (É.LUGAL) tepawešta "In Hattuša the Royal House declined". Unfortunately, the following phrase, beginning with n=at, is not preserved. Then follows the usual stipulation: "... (the one) who will follow (me), my son, my grandson (who) will become king in Hattuša, should [not] carry [away anything] from the ḫekur [pirwa, and ....] he should not take anything. But if the ḫ[ekur pirwa will be im]poverished, he should compensate it"[37].

What is the meaning of this exceptional phrase about the "declining royal house"? As already noted by Otten (1963: 19), it establishes a linkage between the future of the dynasty and the welfare of the ḫekur pirwa. But it must also hint at some past decline of the Royal House in Hattuša. The denominative verb tepaweš- basically expresses some kind of reduction, decline, perhaps even impoverishment. Its cognates tepnu-and tepšanu- are used in late texts in the sense of "disgrace" or "humiliate" (Rieken 1999: 221 f.). As defined by Güterbock (repr. 1997: 75), "É.LUGAL is literally 'house of the king', which never means 'palace' but either 'royal house' in the sense of 'royal family' or 'estate of the king'." Whichever sense one prefers, I strongly suspect that this unique phrase can only refer to the civil war against Urhi-Tessub and its dire effects on the royal house of Hatti. It also recalls Puduhepa's dramatic statement in her letter to Ramses (KUB 21.38 obv. 10' f.): "As you my brother know the House of Hatti (É KUR URUḪatti), do I not kn[ow] it? The House [has been bu]rnt(?)/trans]ferred(?)[38] [.........................….] and whatever remained, Urhi-Tessub gave it to the Great God". The lesson has been learned by Hattušili and he calls upon his successors to faithfully preserve the rights of the ḫekur pirwa in order to avoid further disgrace to the royal house[39].

The derivatives of tepu- bring to mind another intriguing expression, tepu pedan, "the small place", apparently an antonym of šalli pedan, "the great place", the well-known expression for "throne" or "capital" (CHD, Š/1: 99). Van den Hout (1994: 57, n. 81; cf. CHD, P: 339 f.) suggested that "the small/humble place may have to do with the loss of kingship or maybe even with a king's demise," a meaning that would fully conform with the "declining royal house" discussed above[40].

---

[37] Otten 1963: 19 f.; Imparati 1977: 39 f.; Tischler, HEG, P: 619.

[38] For the restoration of the verb in question, see Singer 1998: 537 f.

[39] KBo 12.140 rev. 12' mentions a ḫekur pirwa ᵐTut[ḫaliya. If this refers to Tuthaliya IV, it may indicate that eventually Hattušili appointed his son Tuthaliya to administer this estate as well, like other religious institutions. See further below.

[40] For the possible meanings of tepu pedan, see also Haas 1994: 92, n. 43 ("wahrscheinlich eine Grabgruft"); Kassian et al. 2002: 338 f.; Tischler, HEG T/2: 313.

Hattušili's other, more explicit reference to a mortuary edifice is in his Apology (KUB 1.1 iv 75): "I made myself a Bone House (ḫaštiyas pir) and I dedicated it to the goddess". The only other attestation of ḫaštiyaš as a location is in the small fragment Bo 3826[41] which lists several golden statues or statuettes, at least one of which was deposited "in the inner-room of the Bone House" (É.ŠÀ ḫaštiyaš). Leaving aside the complex problem of the etymological connection between ḫaštai- and ḫišta- (see above), it must be conceded that semantically a Bone House or Bone Inner-room can only refer to a grave, which establishes a clear parallel with the Stone House.

What does Hattušili mean by saying that he "made himself" (-za iya-) a Bone House, and why the new terminology? Could this mean that he started to build a new burial chamber for himself and for his family? And if so, was this monument situated in the vicinity of the (old) Stone House or in some other location, perhaps closer to the ḫekur pirwa? In any case, this unique reference to the establishment of his own Bone House seems to mark Hattušili's departure from the ancient custom of collective royal burials in the Stone House and the initiation, for the political reasons mentioned above, of a new norm of individual funerary structures, which may have combined the functions of both a Stone House and a ḫekur, that is, a monumental resting place for himself and his closest family members. This mortuary institution may be referred to in Hattušili's letter to Kadašman-Enlil II of Babylon (KBo 1.10+ rev. 58-61), in which he asks for a stone carver to set up for him statues (ALAM.ALAMMEŠ) in the "Family House" (É IM.RI.A = bīt kimti), a Babylonian term referring to a family mausoleum (Bonatz 2002: 76).

Another important development in the official cult was the process of "sacralization" of royalty, which has been detected by van den Hout (1995a: 564, 571) in Tuthaliya's hieroglyphic inscriptions, and more recently by Pecchioli Daddi (2006: 127) in the cult practices of the city of Hurma. I would suggest that this sacralization already began in the previous generation. In her prayer for the well-being of her husband Puduhepa promises to dedicate to Liliwani a lifesize statue of Hattušili should he recover from his illness: "a silver statue of Hattušili, as big as Hattušili himself, with its head, its hands and its feet of gold, which I will weigh out separately" (Singer 2002: 104). Also in her vow to the same goddess she promises to dedicate a golden "head" (SAG.DU) of Hattušili (KUB 15.17+ i 8; Otten/Souček 1965: 36, n. 5). Perhaps Puduhepa also made a statue of herself, if the reference to an ALAM MUNUS.LUGAL in the oracle text KUB 22.70 obv. 21 can be attributed to her. The queen's statue was decorated with a golden wreath "borrowed" from the goddess of Arušna (van den Hout 1994: 49). Through these pious acts the royal couple joined the company of their revered ancestors who were conceived as the guardian spirits of Hittite royalty and their images were worshiped in temples. The first Hittite monarch known to have introduced this practice was Hattušili I, who erected his golden statue in the temple of the Sun-goddess of Arinna[42].

---

[41] Published in Otten 1958: 112. Cf. also Haas - Wäfler 1977: 116 f.; Börker-Klähn 1994: 366 f.; van den Hout 1995a: 554.

[42] KBo 10.2 iii 21 ff. Could this statue of Hattušili I have remained in the temple of the Sun-goddess of Arinna until the late imperial period? This may seem unlikely, but not entirely impossible, if one considers that Šamši-Adad made offerings to the statues of Sargon and Naram-Sin in the "throne

I mentioned before the offerings to the images of Hattušili, Tuthaliya, Šuppiluliuma and Muršili in the temples of Hattuša (e.g. KBo 2.30 obv. 12-15). Otten (1951: 58 f.) initially thought that the first two were Šuppululiuma's grandfather and father, respectively, but it is now obvious that these images represented the "founding fathers" of the Hittite kingdom, who are also evoked in the extended genealogies of late kings. Accordingly, they must represent Hattušili I, Tuthaliya I, Šuppiluliuma I and Muršili II (Haas 1994: 247). This age-old Mesopotamian tradition of setting up effigies of venerated kings in temples[43] was first emulated by Hattušili I and then by a few other kings who had a justified claim to grandeur. It has little to do with the Royal Offering Lists which strived for comprehensiveness in representing the royal succession line. According to some Mesopotamian scholars, the dedication of statues in temples had a completely different theological function, that of "permanently reminding the deity of the existence of the donor and, in exchange for gifts, asking for help and attention" (Jonker 1995: 80). I think that such a distinction between "the cult of the dead" (*Totenkult, Totenpflege*) and "the worship of important ancestors" (*Ahnenverehrung*) is also befitting for ancient Anatolia[44]. The names of glorious kings of the past – Hattušili, Tuthaliya, Šuppiluliuma – were taken up by Late Hittite kings in the hope that their glory would radiate upon their present namesakes.

Following Neve's original insight, I would classify in the category of *Ahnenverehrung* the Tuthaliya relief (BOĞAZKÖY 19) from "shrine A" within the temenos-wall of Temple 5 in the Upper City. In other words, I subscribe to the view that this image portrays Tuthaliya I of the early Hittite Empire[45], rather than Tuthaliya IV[46]. The same applies, in my mind, to the figure of Šuppiluliuma from the entrance of Chamber I in *Südburg*, which must represent Šuppiluliuma I acting as the protecting ancestor of the builder, Šuppiluliuma II (Hawkins 1995: 19).

Tuthaliya IV

If Hattušili III was a great *innovator* in many respects, some of which were dictated by his usurpation of the throne, his son was a great *consolidator* of the state institutions and the religious legitimacy of his reign. Tuthaliya's meticulous "clean up" of the enormous

---

[43] room" of Mari (Jonker 1995: 53, with refs.). In any case, the statues of revered kings must have been periodically refurbished or sculpted anew.

[43] For the offerings made to the statues of living and dead monarchs in Mesopotamia, see Limet 1970: 68 (with refs. in nn. 4, 5); Wilhelm 1972; Kutscher 1974; Tsukimoto 1985: 21 with n. 90, 89 with n. 341; Jonker 1995: 223 ff. (with further refs.).
The statues of celebrated Hittite kings set up in temples should not be confused with the seated effigies of the dead king and queen which were carried around in a cart or chariot during the royal funeral ceremony (for which see van den Hout 1994: 61 ff.; 1995b: 199 ff.).

[44] It also recalls the distinction between "Tomb Cult" and "Hero Cult" in early Greece (Antonaccio 1995; Whitley 1995). Note in particular the penetrating observation of A. Snodgrass (cited in Antonaccio 1995: 6 f.) that "the two most important characteristics of a hero are his association with an epoch of greatness, whether distantly past or relatively recent, and his usefulness to later generations."

[45] Neve 1993: 34-36, Abb. 100-104; Gonnet 1995: 194; Hawkins 1995: 19.

[46] Van den Hout 1995a: 556; 2002: 89.

cultic apparatus of the state was stimulated by a deep sense of malaise and remorse over the circumstances of his father's and his own accession to the throne. But, as it often happens under similar circumstances, humility and penitence soon led to an excessive campaign for self-aggrandizement and sacralization of the king's person.

In relation to the world of the dead, who posed a constant threat to his kingship through curses and magic spells, Tuthaliya's "purification" program included an extensive oracular inquiry for possible grievances caused to various deceased persons. The recorded results of this penetrating "soul searching" are collected under CTH 569, in which the *mantalli* rituals and the remunerations offered to six deceased members of the extended royal family are described in detail[47].

Another oracular inquiry, grouped together under CTH 574, investigated cases of cultic negligence and impurity related to "the Stone House of the fatherly gods" (É.NA₄ DINGIR-*LIM addaš*)[48]. Mention is made of the individual Stone Houses of Tuthaliya, Arnuwanda and Šuppiluliuma, who must be the Early Empire kings (Haas 1994: 244, with refs.). The nature of the transgressions established in this inquiry is generally of a neglect of certain offerings and rituals: the meat of oxen and sheep that was literally "snatched away" from the mouth of the divine recipients during the *taḫi-* festival (KUB 19.39 ii 36, 41; del Monte 1975: 332 f.); ritual offerings for the dead that were discontinued (KUB 22.35 ii 2'-7'; del Monte 1975: 335 f.); the festivals of the *garana-* and *šeli-* that had not been celebrated for three years (KUB 18.16 ii 4-6; del Monte 1975: 336), and so on. Another serious offense had to do with some temple officials who visited the Stone House but did not purify themselves from contacting the dead when they returned to their temple (KUB 16.34 i 5-10; del Monte 1975: 330). The cumulative effect of all these failures may perhaps point to a general neglect of the state cult before Tuthaliya's accession to the throne, recalling the neglect of certain festivals by Šuppiluliuma I and their rectification by Muršili II. However, this impression might be at least partially false or exaggerated. Any investigation as thorough as Tuthaliya's would have "discovered" similar transgressions in the strict rules, and his comprehensive purification program probably reveals more about his own character and agenda than about his father's negligence.

What seems to be rather surprising in Tuthaliya's extensive "cult *reparation*" program (I prefer this term over "cult *reform*") is the lack of references to the erection or renovation of mortuary monuments. There is a single reference to a *ḫekur pirwa Tut*[*ḫaliya* (KBo 12.140 rev. 12'), but the context is fragmentary. Assuming that the king is Tuthaliya IV, the question remains whether this refers to his own building activities (Imparati 1977: 60 f.; van den Hout 2002: 79, 88), or perhaps to his son's, who built a *ḫekur* SAG.UŠ in homage to his father.

In any case, there are no further references to the mortuary cult, notably, to the Bone House (*ḫaštiyaš pir*) built by his father. In short, Tuthaliya seems to have been more preoccupied with the renovation of the cult of the gods throughout the kingdom, leaving

---

[47] For partial discussions see del Monte 1973: 381 f.; 1987: 106 ff.; Archi 1979: 87. For an edition of the entire group of texts, see van den Hout 1998.

[48] del Monte 1975: 330 ff.; van den Hout 2002: 83 f.

the institutions of the dead, including his own mortuary monument, to his pious son Šuppiluliuma.

Šuppiluliuma II

The last king of Hatti may perhaps be designated as the ultimate protector of the dead ancestors. Two of his most substantial texts are dedicated to mortuary monuments: the Eternal Peak built in honour of his father (CTH 121) and the treaty imposed on the people of Hatti to respect the funerary cults (CTH 256).

The so-called Battle of Alašiya text (CTH 121)[49] probably consists of cuneiform versions of two hieroglyphic inscriptions: first, a statue of Tuthaliya inscribed with his manly deeds which was set up by his son in the Everlasting Peak ([NA4]*hekur* SAG.UŠ), and second, an inscription in which Šuppiluliuma recounted his own victory over the "enemy of Alašiya". The cuneiform text ends with the endowment of the Everlasting Peak with a domain consisting of 70 villages, followed by a typical warning clause directed against anyone who might take anything away or impose *šaḫḫan* taxes on this institution.

Ever since the discovery of this text there has been an ongoing debate over the identification of this Everlasting Peak in Hattuša. Otten (1963: 22 f.) suggested that Room B in Yazılıkaya, with its obvious funerary character and its dedication to Tuthaliya, was the *hekur* SAG.UŠ mentioned in this text. Furthermore, the feet of a colossal statue found in the village of Yekbaz originally stood at the northern end of the room and could very well belong to the statue (ALAM) on which Šuppiluliuma inscribed the manly deeds of his father. This view is still maintained by some scholars[50], but others[51] follow the alternative identification suggested by Güterbock (1967: 81). On the basis of Steinherr's and Laroche's comparison of the beginning of the hieroglyphic inscription at Nişantepe with obv. ii 22 ff. in the cuneiform text, Güterbock suggested to locate the Everlasting Peak built by Tuthaliya at Nişantepe. Recently, van den Hout (2002: 80) stated that "the identification of Nişantepe as the *hekur* SAG.UŠ, 'Eternal Peak', seems assured", although he admits that Neve's excavations at Nişantepe[52] did not adduce any support for this identification.

I think that there is a third solution which, as far as I can see, has not been explicitly presented[53]. The axiomatic assumption that the *hekur* SAG.UŠ built by Šuppiluliuma for his father and his own Alašiya victory inscription should be located in one and the same

[49] KBo 12.38; Otten 1963; Güterbock 1967; Hoffner 1997: 193; Giorgieri - Mora 1996: 65 f.; Singer 2000: 27; Bolatti Guzzo - Marazzi 2004; de Martino 2007: 489. Torri (KBo 49, Inhaltsübersicht, p. VI) suggests a possible join with KBo 49.245 (487/t), which was also found in the House on the Slope and exhibits a similar handwriting. The only preserved signs on obv. 1 of the tiny fragment are LUGAL.GAL, perhaps preceded by Tuthaliy]a in Šuppiluliuma's genealogy.

[50] For refs. see van den Hout 2002: 78 with nn. 27-28.

[51] For refs. see van den Hout 2002: 78 with nn. 29-30.

[52] For refs. see van den Hout 2002: 79 with nn. 36-37.

[53] Although Hawkins (1995: 59) succinctly hinted at it by distinguishing between the Eternal Peak, the identification of which with Yazılıkaya Chamber B he considers as "virtually certain", and the narrative of Šuppiluliuma's naval battle which "should exist somewhere on NIŞANTAŞ itself."

place (van den Hout 2002: 78) is not only unnecessary, but, in my mind, outright implausible. In fact, the passages in which Šuppiluliuma speaks about his own deeds (ii 22 ff. and col. iii) do not mention the *hekur* SAG.UŠ at all. Then, after a large gap (the end of col. iii and the beginning of col. iv), the end of the text returns to the operational instructions relating to the estate granted to the Eternal Peak. I see no reason whatsoever for the assumption that "the remains of column iv were also an integral part of the second inscription" (van den Hout 2002: 78). In fact, it would be quite peculiar if Šuppiluliuma would place his own inscription in the mortuary monument of his father. In short, Room B in Yazılıkaya may very well be the *hekur* SAG.UŠ of Tuthaliya, as originally suggested by Otten[54], whereas Šuppiluliuma's Alašiya text, *may have been* inscribed on the Nişantepe rock[55]. The architectural remains at Nişantepe, with the impressive gate flanked by two sphinxes, "are not necessarily part of a funerary structure" (van den Hout 2002: 78). But even if they are, they could perhaps belong to an Eternal Peak built by Šuppiluliuma for himself, with a fitting inscription below. In any case, the evidence is not sufficient to determine the function of this building, unlike Room B at Yazılıkaya which perfectly matches the information gathered from the texts.

With the Eternal Peak (*hekur* SAG.UŠ) of Tuthaliya *redomitus*, I would like to revive another identification within the sacred complex of Yazılıkaya. At the Turkish Historical Congress at Ankara in 1981 (which commemorated the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Kemal Atatürk), I suggested that Room A with its assembly of gods was the *ḫuwaši* of the Storm-god of Hatti (Singer 1986; cf. also id. 1983: 101). As for Room B, I followed the identification with the *ḫešta*-house suggested by Güterbock, Otten and Bittel (Singer 1986: 251 f., with refs.; id. 1983: 113), but I added that "it is not impossible that in the closing decades of the 13th century this structure may have acquired an additional function as a shrine for the cult of the dead or as a funeral temple of Tuthaliya IV." I still stand behind those identifications, although I am somewhat less confident about the location of the *ḫešta*-house after Torri's study on Lelwani (1999). She would rather seek this edifice on Büyükkale (*ib.*: 31), following Haas - Wäfler (1977: 121; Haas 1994: 245) and others (Meyer 1995; cf. also Groddek 2001: 217). Indeed, the temple of Lelwani, with its hearth, window and wooden bolt, does not seem to fit into the narrow corridor of Room B, but the *ḫešta*-house may have included also the structures in front of the rock chambers. If the *ḫešta*-house was after all located at Yazılıkaya, this would create a perfect harmony between the ceremony of bringing the New Year to the *ḫešta*-house on the 11th day of the AN.TAH.ŠUM-festival, and the assembly of gods in the Main Chamber, who are probably gathered there to celebrate the New Year together with the head of the pantheon (Otten

[54] Perhaps Room B was not only a monument dedicated to Tuthaliya IV, but also the final resting place of his earthly remains. One of the niches on the wall may once have contained his bones and ashes (van den Hout 1994: 52 with previous refs. in n. 63). This possibility, however, was rejected by Neve (1989: 351 f.) who suggested that the three trough-shaped cavities served as receptacles for liquid offerings (*Weihwasserbecken*) for the three divine entities carved on the walls of the gallery (nos. 81, 82 and 69-80).

[55] I say cautiously *may have been inscribed*, since David Hawkins has not yet been able to find any reference to Alašiya in the badly weathered inscription.

1956: 101 ff.). That Šuppiluliuma II would have chosen to turn (part of) the *ḫešta*-house into a memorial dedicated to his father, is in itself not inconceivable.

We finally come to the most dramatic expression of Šuppiluliuma's dedication to the dead ancestors, a document which can only be described as the ultimate bond between the Living and the Dead. ABoT 56 (CTH 256) is a large two-column tablet with less than half of each line preserved. There are very few fully restorable phrases and no duplicates are known. This intriguing text has been referred to by many scholars, but a full treatment has first been presented by Giorgieri in his dissertation on oath texts (1995: 292-319; cf. also Giorgieri - Mora 1996: 64 f.).

The text is identified by its contents and its colophon as an oath and treaty imposed by Šuppiluliuma on the entire population of Hatti. The colophon, written in an oversize handwriting, identifies it as "the first tablet, incomplete, of the oath (*linkiyaš*) of Šuppiluliuma son of Tuthaliya." In its overall structure, it does not differ much from regular state treaties, including the customary stipulations of loyalty and the long list of witness gods. But then, the other partner to this unique treaty are the dead (iii 9': *ŠA GIDIM.ḪI.A išḫiul*), or more specifically "the houses of the dead" (iii 7': É.MEŠ GIDIM.ḪI.A)[56] and "the city of the dead" (iii 19': URU-*LUM* GIDIM.ḪI.A). This last term (an exact cuneiform rendering of *necropolis*) appears here in the singular, perhaps referring to the royal cemetery of Hattuša, or else, to "which(ever) city (belongs to) the dead", i.e., the various towns and villages endowed for the maintenance of these mortuary institutions.

There are many intriguing passages and expressions in this unique text, including the exceptional list of witness gods, but I will focus on §16' (iii 23'-32'; Giorgieri 1995: 301 f., 313 f.), which seems to encapsulate the gist of the entire text.

21	*nu šu-um-me-eš* LÚ^{MEŠ URU}KÙ.BABBAR [
22	A-NA GIDIM^{ḪI.A} *kiš-an še-er l*[*i-in-ik-tén* (?)
23	LÚ^{MEŠ} KUR.KUR ^{URU}*Ḫat-ti-ma-aš-ma-aš* LA[?]/AT[?][-
24	*iš-ḫi-ú-ul ku-wa-at-tin ar-ḫ*[*a tar-na-at-te-en*
25	LUGAL-*UT-TA ŠA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫat-ti* DINGIR^M[^{EŠ}
26	LUGAL-*UT-TA ŠA* ZAG^{ḪI.A}-*ma ku*-[
27	*na-at* UN^{MEŠ}-*za i-ia-an*[-*du*[?]
28	LUGAL-*UT-TA te-e-pa-u-wa* A[?][
29	*ku-i-e-eš* ^{GIŠ}*al-kiš-ta-nu-u*[*š*
30	*iš-ḫi-ú-li a-pu-u-uš*[
31	*ki-nu-na ŠA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫ*[*at-ti*
32	*a-pu-u-uš ḫar-kán-*[

---

[56] The rare term É(.MEŠ).GIDIM, House(s) of the Dead, must refer to the Stone House (Haas - Wäfler 1977: 119; Haas 1994: 220, n. 221; but cf. van den Hout 2002: 74, n. 3), or perhaps more generally to all types of funerary institutions.

The previous short paragraph (§15'; iii 21'-22') contains only a warning to the people of Hatti to keep their obligations to the dead. Therefore, -*šmaš*, "(to) them", in l. 23' must refer to the dead and *how*[57] their bonds were not respected by the people of Hatti. Lines 25-26 may refer to the divine punishment meted upon the "kingdom (*ŠARRŪTA*) of Hatti" and the kingdom of the borders(?)"[58]. Then the "population" (UN^{MEŠ}-*za* = *antuhšannanza*) is called upon to do something.

The next line has again *ŠARRŪTA* followed by the plural *tepawa*. Once again we encounter this adjective expressing decrease or decline associated with the kingship/kingdom (see above on *ḫekur pirwa*). Here too, like in Hattušili's *ḫekur pirwa* text, it must relate to the declining or impoverished kingdom of Hatti[59]. In fact, the motif of degradation or humiliation also appears in another passage of this text, §10' (ii 35), here with the Luwian equivalent of *tepnu-*, *zantalli-* (Giorgieri 1995: 311).

The following line has the obscure *kuieš* ^{GIŠ}*alkištanuš* "those who [...] the bows/branches (acc.)". What are bows or branches of a tree doing in this passage which deals with declining kingship? Could perhaps "branches" be conceived here in an abstract meaning, i.e. "the branches of a royal family"[60]? In the last three lines of the column the "treaty" is mentioned again in the context of the present situation.

All in all, the comprehension of this passage is still very tenuous, but, as already implied by Otten (1963: 5) and Giorgieri (1995: 311), it must have provided some sort of historiosophical explanation for the decline of Hatti as being the revenge of the dead for their negligence and humiliation. Obviously, the misfortunes that shook the Hittite royal house in the 13th century are not conceived as the result of human actions and their consequences, but rather as divine punishment for failing piety towards the dead.

To sum up this remarkable but poorly-preserved document, it would seem that its all-embracing message of the vital bond between the Living and the Dead is unique in Hittite literature, and I am not aware of clear parallels within the Near Eastern corpus either. Of course, grants to individual funerary institutions are well represented in the Hittite corpus (CTH 252; CTH 88; CTH 121), but this document seeks to guarantee the rights of *all* mortuary institutions throughout the kingdom, or to put it in more dramatic words, to "immortalize" the obligations of the Living towards the Dead and *vice versa*. What an historical irony – or was it a premonition? – that this extraordinary ceremony, probably carried out near one of Hattuša's funerary monuments, would mark the final throes of a

---

[57] With the Luwian adverbial form *kuwati(n)*, "how", as convincingly argued by Giorgieri 1995:313.

[58] For *šarrūtu(m)* as "kingdom", besides "kingship", see AHw 1190 ("*Königtum, Königsherrschaft, Majestät*"). E.g., the rendering "great kingdom" fits the expression *šarrūta rabītam* in the historical preamble of the Aleppo Treaty (KBo 1.6 obv. 11) better than "great kingship". In fact, our distinction between "kingship" and "kingdom" may be non-existant in some Near Eastern languages (e.g. Hebrew *malkut*, which can designate both " kingship" and "kingdom").

[59] Cf. Otten 1963: 4 f.: "...hatte das Königtum eine Machteinbusse erfahren".

[60] I could not find support for such a meaning in the Hittite material (HED 1: 35 f.; Haas 2003: 366 f.), but it is perhaps worth noting that one of the Akkadian words for "branch" is *ḫuṭāru*, which has the additional meaning of "sacred staff" (CAD, Ḫ: 265). It is perhaps not irrelevant to recall that its Hebrew cognate, *ḥoṭer*, is the "shoot" in the famous verse in Isaiah 11, 1...ויצא חוטר מגזע ישי "Then a shoot will spring from the stem of Jesse...".

dying empire! The last two kings of Hatti desperately strove to win back the support of the divine world: while Tuthaliya invested his efforts in reactivating the cult of the gods, Šuppiluliuma pinned his hope on the divine dead. But neither of these saved Hatti from the inevitable collapse.

Bibliography

Antonaccio C.M.
1995   *An Archaeology of Ancestors. Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece*, Lanham, Maryland.

Archi A.
1979   "Il dio Zawalli", *AoF* 6, 81-94.
2001   "The King-Lists from Ebla" in: T. Abusch et al. (eds.), *Historiography in the Cuneiform World*, Bethesda, 1-13.

Bayliss M.
1973   "The Cult of the Dead in Assyria and Babylonia", *Iraq* 35, 115-125.

Beal R.H.
2003   "The Predecessors of Hattušili I" in: G. Beckman, R. Beal, G. McMahon (eds.) *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Winona Lake, 13-33.

Bin-Nun Sh.R.
1975   *The Tawananna in the Hittite Kingdom* (THeth 5), Heidelberg.

Bittel K.
1940   "Hethitische Bestattungsbräuche", *MDOG* 78, 12-28.
1957   "Versuchsgrabung in der nördlichsten Unterstadt" in: R. Naumann et al. *Boğazköy III*, Berlin, 23-28.
1970   *Hattusha, The Capital of the Hittites*, Oxford/New York.

Bittel K. et al.
1958   *Die hethitischen Grabfunde von Osmankayasi*, Berlin.

Bloch M.
1971   *Placing the Dead. Tombs, Ancestral Villages, and Kinship Organization in Madagascar*, London/New York.

Bolatti Guzzo N. – Marazzi M.
2004   "Storiografia hittita e geroglifico anatolico: per una revisione di KBo 12.38" in: D. Groddek – S. Rössle (Hrsg.), *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an E.O. Forrer*, Dresden, 157-185.

Bonatz D.

2002   "Fremde 'Künstler' in Hattuša. Zur Rolle des Individuums beim Austausch materieller Kultur in der Späten Bronzezeit" in: H. Blum, B. Faist, P. Pfälzner, A.M. Wittke (Hrsg.), *Brückenland Anatolien?*, Tübingen, 69-83.

Börker-Klähn J.
1994   "Ahnengalerie und letzte Dienste derer von Hattuša" in: *Cinquante-deux reflexions sur le Proche-Orient ancien offertes à Leon de Meyer*, Leuven, 355-367.

Bryce T.
2005   *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, New Edition. Oxford.

Carruba O.
1988   "Stato e Società nel Medio Regno Eteo" in: *Stato, economia, lavoro nel vicino Oriente antico*, Milano, 195-224.
1990   "Muwatalli I", *X. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara 1986. II. Cilt*, Ankara, 539-554.
1998   "Hethitischen Dynasten zwischen Altem und Neuem Reich" in: S. Alp – A. Süel (eds.), *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology (Çorum, Sept. 1996)*, Ankara, 87-107.
2007   "Per una ricostruzione delle liste reali etee" in: D. Groddek – M. Zorman (Hrsg.), *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden, 131-142.

Collins B.J.
2006   "A Note on Some Local Cults in the Time of Tudhaliya IV" in: Th.P.J. van den Hout (ed.), *The Life and Times of Hattušili III and Tuthaliya IV (Fs. de Roos)*, Leiden, 39-48.

Dardano P.
2006   *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattuša* (CTH 276-282) (StBoT 47), Wiesbaden.

Davies P.J.E.
2000   *Death and the Emperor*, Cambridge.

Forlanini M.
2004   "La nascita di un impero. Considerazioni sulla prima fase della storia hittita: da Kaniš a Hattuša", *Or* 73, 363-389.

Giorgieri M.
1995   *I testi ittiti di giuramento*. Dottorato di Ricerca, Università degli Studi di Firenze.

Giorgieri M. – Mora C.
1996   *Aspetti della regalità ittita nel XIII secolo a.C.*, Como.

Goetze A.
1955   "Removal of the Threat Implied in an Evil Omen" in: J.B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton, 355-356.

Gonnet H.

1995   "Le culte des ancêtres en Anatolie Hittite au IIe mill. avant notre ère" *Anatolica* 21, 189-195.

Groddek D.
2001   "'Mausoleum' (É.NA₄) und 'Totentempel' (^Éḫištā) im Hethitischen", *UF* 33, 213-218.

Güterbock H.G.
1967   "The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered", *JNES* 26, 73–81
1997   "The Hittite Palace" (repr.) in: H.A. Hoffner, Jr. (ed.), *Perspectives on Hittite Civilizations: Selected Writings of Hans Gustav Güterbock*, Chicago, 75-79.

Haas V.
1994   *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, Leiden/New York/Köln.
2003   *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica*, Berlin/New York.

Haas V. – Wäfler M.
1976   "Bemerkungen zu ^Éḫeštī/ā- (1. Teil)", *UF* 8, 65-99.
1977   "Bemerkungen zu ^Éḫeštī/ā- (2. Teil)", *UF* 9, 87-122.

Haller A.
1954   *Die Gräber und Grüfte in Assur*, Berlin.

Hawkins J.D.
1995   *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattuša* (SÜDBURG) (StBoT Bh. 2), Wiesbaden.

Hoffner H.A.
1997   "The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus: Two Inscriptions of Šuppiluliuma II" in: W.W. Hallo (ed.), *The Context of Scripture*. Vol. I. Leiden, 192-193.

van den Hout Th.P.J.
1994   "Death as a Privilege. The Hittite Royal Funerary Ritual" in: J.M. Bremer, Th.P.J. van den Hout, R. Peters (eds.), *Hidden Futures. Death and Immortality in Ancient Egypt, Anatolia, the Classical, Biblical and Arabic-Islamic World*, Amsterdam, 37-75.
1995a   "Tuthalija IV. und die Ikonographie hethitischer Grosskönige des 13. Jhs." *BiOr* 52: 545-573.
1995b   "An Image of the Dead? Some Remarks on the Second Day of the Hittite Royal Funerary Ritual" in: O. Carruba, M. Giorgieri, C. Mora (ed.), *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia (Pavia 1993)*, Pavia, 195-211.
1998   *The Purity of Kingship. An Edition of CTH 569 and Related Hittite Oracle Inquiries of Tuthaliya IV*, Leiden.
2002   "Tombs and Memorials: The (Divine) Stone-House and Hegur Reconsidered" in: K.A. Yener - H.A. Hoffner Jr. (eds.), *Recent Developments in Hittite Archaeology and History. Papers in Memory of Hans G. Güterbock*, Winona Lake, 73-91.

Imparati F.

1975   "Una concessione di terre da parte di Tudhaliya IV", *RHA* 33, 5-211.
1977   "Le istituzioni cultuali del ^{NA₄}ḫékur e il potere centrale Ittita", *SMEA* 18, 19-64.

Jacobs B.
2002   "Die Galerien der Ahnen des Königs Antiochos I. von Kommagene auf dem Nemrud Dağı" in: J. Munk Hojte, ed. *Images of Ancestors*, Aarhus, 75-88.

Jonker G.
1995   *The Topography of Remembrance*. Leiden/New York/Köln.

Kammenhuber A
1972   "Keilschrifttexte aus Boğazköy (KBo XVII)" *Or* 41, 292-302.

Kassian A., A. Korolëv, A. Sidel'tsev
2002   *Hittite Funerary Ritual šalliš waštaiš* (AOAT 288), Münster.

Kümmel H.M.
1967   *Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König* (StBoT 3), Wiesbaden.

Kutscher R.
1974   "An Offering to the Statue of Šulgi", *Tel Aviv* 1, 55-59.

Limet H.
1970   "L'organisation de quelques fêtes mensuelles à l'époque néo-sumérienne" in: A. Finet, ed. *Actes de la XVIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, Ham-sur-Heure, 59-74.

Matthiae P.
1997   "Where Were the Early Syrian Kings of Ebla Buried?", *AoF* 24, 268-276.

Metcalf P. – Huntington H.
1991   *Celebrations of Death. The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual* (Second Ed.), Cambridge.

Meyer J.W.
1995   "Ergänzende Bemerkungen zur Topographie von Hattuša", *AoF* 22, 125-136.

del Monte G.F.
1973   "Il terrore dei morti", *AION* 33, 373-385.
1975   "La fame dei morti", *AION* 35, 319-346.
1987   "Inferno e paradiso nel mondo Hittita" in: P. Xella, ed. *Archeologia dell'Inferno*, Verona, 95-115.
1993   *L'annalistica ittita*, Brescia.

de Martino S.
2007   "Il tratatto tra Ḫatti e Alašiya, KBo XII 39" in: M. Alparslan – M. Doğan-Alparslan – H. Peker (eds.), *VITA. Festschrift in Honor of Belkis Dinçol and Ali Dinçol*, Istanbul, 483-492.

Nakamura M.
2002   Das hethitische nuntariyašha-Fest, Leiden.

Neve P.
1971   Regenkult-Anlagen in Boğazköy-Hattuša (IstMitt Beiheft 5), Tübingen.
1989   "Einige Bemerkungen zu der Kammer B in Yazılıkaya" in: K. Emre et al. (Hrsg.), Anatolia and the Ancient Near East. Studies in Honor of T. Özgüç, Ankara, 345-355.
1982   Büyükkale. Die Bauwerke: Grabungen 1954-1966, Berlin.
1993   Hattuša. Stadt der Götter und Tempel, Mainz.

Niehr H.
2006   "Bestattung und Ahnenkult in den Königshäusern von Sam'al (Zincirli) und Guzāna (Tell Ḥalāf) in Nordsyrien", ZDPV 122, 111-139.

Opfermann R.
1982   Private brochure entitled "Versuch einer Lokalisation der Nekropole hethitischer Könige". Ein Referat von Rudolf Opfermann während der Tagung der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft in Berlin am 15. Mai 1982 gehalten.

Otten H.
1951   "Die hethitischen "Königslisten" und die altorientalische Chronologie", MDOG 83, 43-71.
1956   "Ein Text zum Neujahrfest aus Boğazköy", OLZ 51, 101-105.
1958   Hethitische Totenrituale, Berlin.
1963   "Neue Quellen zum Ausklang des hethitischen Reiches", MDOG 94, 1-23.
1968   Die hethitischen historischen Quellen und die altorientalische Chronologie, Wiesbaden.
1987   Das hethitische Königshaus im 15. Jahrhundert v. Chr., Wien.

Otten H. – Souček V.
1969   Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar (StBoT 8), Wiesbaden.

Pecchioli Daddi F.
2005   "Pirwa. Anatolische Gottheit", RlA 10, 573 - 575.
2006   "The System of Government at the Time of Tutḫaliya IV" in: Th.P.J. van den Hout (ed.) The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tutḫaliya IV (Fs. de Roos), Leiden, 117-130.

Rieken E.
1999   Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen (StBoT 44), Wiesbaden.

Selz G.J.
2006   "Was bleibt? Der sogenannte "Totengeist"und das Leben der Geschlechter" in: E. Czerny et al. (eds.), Timeless Studies in Honour of Manfred Bietak. Vol. III, Leuven, 87-94.

Singer I.
1983   The Hittite KI.LAM Festival I (StBoT 27), Wiesbaden.
1986   "The ḫuwaši of the Storm-god in Hattuša" in: IX. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara 1981. Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, IX. Dizi, Sa 9. I. Cilt, 245-253.
1996   Muwatalli's Prayer to the Assembly of Gods Through the Storm-God of Lightning (CTH 381), Atlanta.
1998   "From Hattuša to Tarhuntašša. Some Thoughts on Muwatalli's Reign" in: S. Alp – A. Süel (eds.), Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 1996, Ankara, 535-541.
2000   "New Evidence on the End of the Hittite Empire" in: E.D. Oren (ed.), The Sea Peoples and Their World: A Reassessment, Philadelphia, 21-33.
2002   Hittite Prayers, Atlanta/Leiden.
2006   "The failed reforms of Akhenaten and Muwatalli", British Museum Studies in Ancient Egypt and Sudan 6, 37-58.

Taracha P.
1998   "Funus in effigie: Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Totenritualen", Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej 46 (Festschrift M. Nowicka), 189-196.
2000   Ersetzen und Entsühnen, Leiden/Boston/Köln.

Thomas L.V.
1985   Rites du mort: Pour la paix des vivants, Paris.

Torri G.
1999   Lelwani. Il culto di una dea ittita, Roma.

Tsukimoto A.
1985   Untersuchungen zur Totenpflege (kispum) im alten Mesopotamien (AOAT 216) Neukirchen-Vluyn.

Vidal J.
2005   "El culto a las tumbas de los ancestros en el Levante Mediterráneo", Antiguo Oriente 3, 55-64.
2006   "The Origins of the Last Ugaritic Dynasty", AoF 33, 168-175.

Whitley J.
1995   "Tomb Cult and Hero Cult. The uses of the past in Archaic Greece" in: N. Spencer (ed.), Time, Tradition and Society in Greek Archaeology, Routledge, 43-63.

Wilhelm G.
1972   "Eine neusumerische Urkunde zur Beopferung verstorbener Könige", JCS 24, 83.
2004   "Generation Count in Hittite Chronology" in: H. Hunger – R. Pruzsinszky (Hrsg.), Mesopotamian Dark Ages Revisited, Wien, 71-79.