Hitchcock repeatedly featured innocent people accused of crimes they did not commit, for example, Manny Balestrero in *The Wrong Man* (1956, US) was arrested and prosecuted for armed robberies, but ultimately cleared. Albeit, Hitchcock's 'innocent' characters were sometimes simultaneously guilty of other crimes, as in *The Lodger: A Story of the London Fog* (1927, UK), where the Lodger was not a much-wanted serial killer, but did plot the death of the real killer to avenge his sister's murder. Alternatively, characters that were technically innocent shared the spiritual guilt and moral culpability having benefitted from the crime, as in *Strangers on a Train* (1951, US), wherein Guy Haines became a murder suspect when he wished his cheating, manipulative wife dead and (circuitously) got his wish.

Hitchcock's dramatic dilemmas often resulted in a struggling pursuit of integrity and redemption amongst a sea of sinners. For example, *I Confess* (1953, US) concerned Quebec priest, Fr. Michael Logan, who heard Otto Keller's confession of murder and then became a police suspect himself when he dutifully kept silent to preserve the seal of the confessional despite risking his own life, freedom, and reputation. Surviving persecution and a crucifying court, Logan was faithful to the sacrament of confession and compassionately gave absolution to a fatally-wounded Keller who *in extremis* sought his forgiveness-cum-pious death.

Subtextually speaking, biblical resonances echoed in the romantic (prelapsarian) bliss of Logan (Adam) and Ruth (Eve) within a garden setting (Eden) that was compromised by the blackmailing lawyer Villette (the serpent), including the obligatory apple eaten by a woman outside the courtroom. Keller was a Cain-figure, a greedy agent of evil without a country, full of lies, driven by murderous compulsions, and also a Judas-figure, the money-obsessed church caretaker and friend of Logan who readily betrayed him to the authorities.

Furthermore, Hitchcock filmed from behind Via Dolorosa statues of Roman soldiers and a cross-carrying Jesus to highlight the burdened Logan's Christ-figure construction whilst treading towards secular tribulation bearing another man's sin. Elsewhere, Hitchcock framed Logan against an altar Christ and acourtroom crucifix to link the martyrs. Christ-figure imagery also occurred in *The Lodger* when the innocent, mob-beaten Lodger (Jesus) dangled crucifixion-like from a fence (cross), was lowered with limp arms and head (death-like), and then was tenderly embraced (Pieta-like) by a maternal Daisy (Mary).

Other Christ, crucifix, and cross imagery occurred in *Mr. & Mrs. Smith* (1941, US) when a physically inconvenienced Ann made "X" cross signs with her snow skis at film's end, in *Notorious* (1946, US), two cross-like wall lights hung near Alicia Huberman's cupboard containing multiple "X" cross window struts and shadows. In *The Wrong Man* (1956, US), Manny prayed before a picture of a sacred heart Christ and used rosary beads with crucifix in court, whilst in *Torn Curtain* (1966, US), the university clinic's prominent Red Cross sign symbolized the synthesis of communism and Christianity.

Hitchcock also employed scripture in *Shadow of a Doubt* (1943, US) when Uncle Charlie presented a bottle of burgundy at dinner and quoted Saint Paul: "Take a little wine for thy stomach's sake" (1 Tim 5 : 23). In *The Birds* (1963, US), the Irish drunk proclaimed "the end of the world" and recited: "Thus said the Lord God unto the mountains and the hills, and the rivers and the valleys: Behold I, even I, shall bring a sword upon you, and I will devastate your high places" (Ezek 6 : 3); however, the restaurant waitress wryly countered with: "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning that they may follow strong drink" (Isa 5 : 11). Hitchcock, as *de facto* theologian, subtextually implied that the eerily calm yet violent birds were metaphorically God-in-nature; whose awe-inspiring power and unpredictable avian actions were incomprehensible to humanity.

Bibliography: ■ Blake, R. A., *Afterimage: The Indelible Catholic Imagination of Six American Filmmakers* (Chicago, Ill. 2000). ■ Forrest, S. K., *The Catholic Hitchcock* (Ann Arbor, Mich. 2010). ■ Hatt, H., "'Notorious': Penance as a Paradigm of Redemption," in *Image & Likeness: Religious Visions in American Film Classics* (ed. J. R. May; New York 1992) 126–34. ■ Hurley, N. P., "Alfred Hitchcock," in *Religion in Film* (ed. J. R. May/M. Bird; Knoxville, Tenn. 1984) 177–81. ■ Hurley, N. P., *Soul in Suspense: Hitchcock's Fright and Delight* (Metuchen, N.J. 1993). ■ Knowlton, B. C./E. R. Knowlton, "Murder Mystery Meets Sacred Mystery: The Catholic Sacramental in Hitchcock's *I Confess*," in *Roman Catholicism in Fantastic Film: Essays on Belief, Spectacle, Ritual and Imagery* (ed. R. Hansen; Jefferson, N.C. 2011) 196–208. ■ Lyden, J. C., *Film as Religion: Myths, Morals and Rituals* (New York 2003). ■ Sitney, P. A., "Let Me Go into the Church Alone: The Roman Catholic Subtext of *Vertigo*," in *The Hidden God: Film and Faith* (ed. M. L. Bandy/A. Monda; New York 2003) 248–59. ■ Sterritt, D., "*The Wrong Man*," in *The Hidden God: Film and Faith* (ed. M. L. Bandy/A. Monda; New York 2003) 94–99. ■ Tallon, P. "*Psycho*: Horror, Hitchcock, and the Problem of Evil," in *Hitchcock and Philosophy: Dial M for Metaphysics* (ed. D. Baggett/W. A. Drumin; Chicago, Ill. 2007) 49–61. ■ Walker, M., *Hitchcock's Motifs* (Amsterdam 2005).

Anton Karl Kozlovic

Hitler, Adolf

→National Socialism/Nazism

Hittites

I. History

The Hittites spoke an Indo-European language Nesite or Kanesite (*Nesili, Kanisumnili*), which we call

"Hittite." People with Nesite names are first attested amongst those interacting with the Assyrian merchants who established a karum, or merchants' quarter, (1974–1720 BCE, by the middle chronology) at Kanes/Nesa (modern Kültepe near Kayseri). As seen in the treaties, letters, and business documents of these merchants, Anatolia was in this period divided into numerous city states. Eventually, as the texts and an inscription from karum level 1b attest, the ruler of Kanes, Anitta, built a short-lived central Anatolian empire (Collins 2007: 29). The conquests of him and his father were recorded by later Hittite scribes in the Anitta Chronicle which recounts Anitta's destruction and cursing of the city of Hattusa (modern Boğazköy/Boğazkale), the center of people speaking the Hattic (*Hattili*) language (Hoffner 1997a: 182–4).

Due to the discontinuation of Assyrian mercantile activities in Anatolia, there is a historical gap in the textual evidence. The next available sources indicate a dynasty of Nesite speakers ruling from the new capital of Hattusa. They preserved Anitta's inscription, but claimed descent from an otherwise unknown Huzziya I. The first king whose deeds are known, PU-Sharruma, ruled uneasily over an Anatolian empire in which he placed his sons and relatives as subordinate rulers, a practice typical of Hittite rule down to the end of their empire. He left his kingdom to his daughter, Tawananna, and son-in-law, Labarna. Their reign was sufficiently successful to be later remembered as a golden age, and their personal names became titles of later royalty (as Caesar>Kaiser and Czar came to be used for later Roman and European emperors).

The next king, Tawananna's nephew, Hattusili I fought his way to the throne. He crushed opposition in Anatolia, so that his direct or indirect sway reached from Adaniya (Cilicia) on the Mediterranean to Zalpa on the Black Sea and westwards to Arzawa on the Aegean. Additionally, he crossed the Amanus Mountains into Syria, severely weakening the "great kingdom" of Yamhad/Aleppo and destroying its appanage state of Alalah (archaeological level VII) thereby becoming himself a "great king." As a side effect, cuneiform literacy was reintroduced from Syria into Anatolia, first to write Akkadian and then Hittite (as well as Hattic and the Indo-European Luwian and Palaic). Hattusili is thus the first historical king to whom we can attribute historical records. He begins the Hittite tradition of kings writing accounts of their "manly deeds," that is their military and cultic achievements. The king refers to himself as a lion, and brags that only he and the great Mesopotamian hero-king Sargon of Akkad ever led an army across the Euphrates. It is perhaps in the reign of this king that a compilation of legal edicts was issued (Hoffner 2000: 106–19). It was with this reign or soon thereafter that the first of many historical texts, festivals, rituals, myths, prayers and didactic literature, were written down in Hittite. Many of these would be copied over and over for centuries, until the end of the kingdom. However, unique to Hattusili is a text in which the king lampoons his generals for failing to take the city of Urshu. As Hattusili was dying, he dictated a text explaining what disobedience it was that had led him to disinherit his son and another heir in favor of his daughter's son, Mursili. He begs the boy and his guardians to remember his words, and begs his daughter not to listen to "old women" and to protect him from "the dark earth" (that is, death) (Beckman 2000: 79–81).

When Mursili I came of age, he staged the most audacious campaign in Hittite history. After first finishing off Yamhad/Aleppo, he continued all the way down the Euphrates and sacked Babylon, ending Hammurapi's dynasty (and the Old Babylonian period; 1595 BCE). He gave Babylon's god Marduk to his allies, the Kassites. His reward was to be murdered by his sister's husband, Hantili I, who claimed in his own apologia that sacking Babylon "made the gods sick," Hantili I had a long and eventful reign that included battles in Syria and fighting off invading Hurrians in his homeland. A series of murders led to Ammuna's long and disastrous reign, with the loss of Arzawa (the Aegean valleys around Ephesos) and Adaniya, which became independent Kizzuwatna. There followed a series of murders and a bloodless coup,out of which Telipinu emerged as king. He attempted to reestablish order by laying out the rules of succession to be policed by an assembly (*pankus*) (van den Hout 1997a: 194–198). His edict was prefaced by a long historical introduction in which he argued (somewhat against the evidence) that the kingdom thrived when the royal family was united and declined when murderers reigned. Telipinu recognized Kizzuwatnan independence in return for an alliance, signing with Isputahsu, ruler of the kingdom, the first known of a long series of those treaties, which were henceforth typical of Hittite foreign policy (Beckman 1999). He also resumed campaigning in Syria, a near disaster. Telipinu's grandson Hantili II saw the loss of the northern third of the kingdom to the decentralized uncivilized Kaska, who were henceforth to prove a major threat to the Hittite state.

Several generations later, one of the Hittites' greatest leaders, Tudhaliya II "liberated" Kizzuwatna from its subordination to the Hurrian kingdom of Mittanni in northern Mesopotamia, and perhaps married a Kizzuwatnan princess, Nikkalmati. He inflicted a serious defeat on Mittanni, reconquering much of Syria, including Aleppo. In the west, he defeated Assuwa (a geographical term to reappear in the Roman province of Asia), whose coalition included Taruisa (Troy) and Wilusa (Ilios). Arzawa was also defeated and subjugated. Alasiya (Cy-

prus), too, came under Hittite "protection." Luwian and Hurrian religious influence flooded Hatti from Kizzuwatna and Syria, and Hittite kings subsequently had both a "Hittite" (i.e., Hattic, Luwian or Hittite) and a Hurrian name. Although the following king, Arnuwanda I annexed Kizzuwatna and installed a relative as priest-king there, independence-minded lords in the west appealed to Ahhiyawa (Achaea, the Mycenaean Greeks). On the northern front, despite treaties with individual towns, Arnuwanda was reduced to asking the gods to relieve the suffering caused by Kaskaean looting to think about their own interests in helping him.

The reign of Arnuwanda's son Tudhaliya III was a disaster. Syria was again lost to Mittanni. Enemies from all directions deeply penetrated the kingdom, and even the capital, Hattusa, was destroyed, forcing the king to move to Sapinuwa (Ortaköy). Tarhuntaradu, king of Arzawa, dared to write to Egypt seeking a marriage alliance, telling the Egyptians that the Hittites were incapacitated.

Fortunately, Tudhaliya III had a military genius to lead his armies, his son, Suppiluliuma. Oddly, the kingdom was left to a different son, Tudhaliya the Younger. Suppiluliuma I and the magnates soon broke their oaths to Tudhaliya the Younger and killed him. Thereupon Suppiluliuma I proceeded to reestablish Hittite dominance in Anatolia. Tarhuntaradu of Arzawa was brought in chains to Sapinuwa. After taking a Kassite Babylonian princess as wife and intriguing with Mittanni's subordinate states in Syria, such as Ugarit under Niqmadu II, Supiluliuma I unexpectedly left them to face Mittannian retaliation on their own. Then in a brilliant campaign, he surprised Mittanni by attacking not from the west as expected, but from the north, into its heartland, destroying their capital Wassukkanni. Rather than pursuing the retreating Mittannian king deeper east, he turned west to trap Mittannian forces between his army and the armies of his new Syrian allies. Pharaoh Ahkenaten, Mittanni's ally, more interested in installing his new religion, largely ignored calls for help. A dossier of the diplomatic demands and duplicitous maneuverings of the small Syrian states squeezed between the great powers is preserved for us in the Amarna Letters (Moran). Mittannian subordinate states in Syria either signed a treaty (e.g., Amurru) with Suppiluliuma I, or were besieged and their kings replaced by a friendly relative (e.g., Kadesh).

While Suppiluliuma I was conducting a successful siege of Kargamis, he received a letter from the recently widowed Egyptian queen (either Nefertiti or Anchesenpaaten) asking for a Hittite prince to be made her husband and pharaoh. By the time shocked Suppiluliuma I had checked out the situation and sent Prince Zananza, it was too late, and Zananza was murdered en route to Egypt. In retaliation, Suppiluliuma I sent Crown Prince Arnuwanda across the border to devastate Egyptian Syro-Palestine. Meanwhile, he installed another son, Piyassili/Sarri-Kusuh as king of Kargamis and viceroy of Syria, while a third son, Telipinu was moved from "Priest" of Kizzuwatna to King of Aleppo and priest to the all-important Stormgod Addu/Hadad of Aleppo. Suppiluliuma I then married a daughter to exiled Mittannian prince Shattiwaza, and sent Piyassili to install him as king of Mittanni. While this gambit was to prove unsuccessful in the long term, the imperial organization set up by Suppiluliuma I was to prove resilient and preserved the empire for another four generations, until the end of the kingdom.

Unfortunately, Arnuwanda's army, returning from its successful punitive exhibition, brought back a plague to Hatti. Suppiluliuma succumbed and after a short reign so did Arnuwanda II, leaving an inexperienced younger son, Mursili II as successor to the throne. Mursili II spent his accession year praying and celebrating the festivals of the Sun goddess of Arinna in order to get this powerful goddess on his side. Then, he had to inflict enough damage on the decentralized Kaska that he could take his army further afield against more major powers. Mursili II was to spend two of every three of his yearly campaigns against the Kaska, alternating these with other campaigns. First, he chased Arzawan king Uhhaziti to Ahhiyawa, and broke up his kingdom. Then, he had several campaigns against rebellious Syrian subordinate states, supported by Egypt, and against Azzi-Hayasa to the north-east. After ten years of reign, Mursili II had proven himself a worthy successor to his father, a fact commemorated in our finest history writing, his memoirs (Beal: 82–90) and a biography of his father (Hoffner 1997b: 185–92). But, in a series of heart-rending prayers, he begged the gods to tell him by oracular inquiry, dreams, or a prophet why after twenty years they were still punishing their country with the plague. The answer was that Suppiluliuma I neglected offerings to the Mala River, killed his brother, and transgressed the border into Egyptian territory, and that the sins of the father descend to the son. Mursili II confessed his sins, made restitution to the gods and begged for mercy (Beckman 1997: 156–60).

With the accession of Horemhab and subsequently Seti I, Egypt began again to pursue expansionist policies in central Syria and so came into conflict with the Hittites. The defection to Egypt of Bentešina king of the large Syrian state of Amurru set the stage for a showdown between Mursili's son Muwattalli II and the young Pharaoh Ramses II. Muwattalli moved his capital south to Tarhuntassa, while making his brother Hattusili king of the new northern appanage state of Hakpis (Amasya?) with a duty to pacify the Kaska. The rival armies, made up of every possible ally (including the Kaska), met

at Qidš (misread today as Qadesh; Tel Nebi Mend; 1275), the southernmost and most contested of the Hittites' Syrian tributary kingdoms. A ruse by Muwattalli, and Ramses impetuousness, resulted in the near destruction of the Egyptian army, but Ramses' personal bravery and the unexpected arrival of Egyptian reinforcements saved the remnants of Ramses army from annihilation. In his inscriptions Ramses claimed a great victory, but the above account of the true disaster can be teased from his own account. Amurru returned to the Hittite fold under king Sapili and the border remained just south of Kadesh.

On Muwattalli's death, Mursili III/Urhi-Tessub, a concubine's son became king and moved the capital back to Hattusa. But he was driven into exile in Egypt by his powerful uncle Hattusili III. Although in his apology (van den Hout 1997b: 199–204) and dedication of spoils to his patron deity Sausga of Samuha, Hattusili III argues "would the gods have given victory to a junior king over a Great King if his cause was not just?," being a usurper he did not feel entirely secure. He thus sought to make peace with neighbors: a Kassite Babylonian bride for his heir; a treaty with Ramses II (1259 BCE), a daughter sent to Ramses' harem (1246 BCE) (without demanding the traditional reciprocal bride) and a double marriage alliance with reinstalled Bentesina of Amurru.

With the support of his powerful mother Pudu-Hepa, Tudhaliya IV succeeded his father. He seems to have spent much of his reign refurbishing the local temples. He did reestablish Hittite influence over Cyprus but despite his best efforts, Assyria annexed Mittanni as an appanage kingdom (Hanigalbat). Tudhaliya's son Suppiluliuma II led a successful campaign across southern Anatolia and Cyprus. Despite moving the capital, presumably away from the Kaska threat, in the end he could not defeat the "Sea Peoples" from the Aegean while simultaneously holding back the Kaska. With the loss of political power, Hittite culture and language disappeared from central Anatolia. Ugarit and much of Syria were destroyed (ca. 1175 BCE).

Initially, on the ruins, the Sea Peoples founded a large state called Palestine, stretching at least from Aleppo to Sheizar. On the other hand, the Hittite cadet dynasty founded by Piyasili son of Suppiluliuma I in Kargamish survived and king Kunzi-Tessub took up the title "Great King." In southern Anatolia and Syria, called by outside powers "Hatti," sprang up many small "Neo-Hittite" states mixing Hittite and Aramean culture in varying degrees, writing in the Luwian language and its hieroglyphic script or in alphabetic Phoenician or Aramean. These included Tabal (Ereğli-Niğde), Hilakku (Rough Cilicia), Hiyawa (a.k.a. Que; Cilician Plain) under a Luwianized Greek dynasty of Mopsos/Moksu, Melid (Malatya), Kummuh, (Commagene; Samsat), Gurgum (Mar'ash), Sam'al (Zincerli), Patin/Unqi (Tell Tayinat), Arpad (Tel Rifa'at), and Hamath.

These independent kingdoms stopped fighting each other long enough to form coalitions in an attempt to resist Assyrian encroachment. The coalition of Urhilina of Hamath, Adad-idri (Ben Hadad II) of Damascus, Ahab, Ahaziah and Joram of Israel, Jehosaphat and Jehoram of Judah and allies ("the twelve kings of Hatti and the seacoast") were particularly successful against Šalmaneser III at Qarqar in 853 BCE and again in 849, 848 and 845, until Jehu's bloody coups destroyed the coalition and left Israel subjected. From 866 until 708 the "Hittite" states were one by one subjugated, and, except for distant Hilakku and Tabal, after rebelling, annexed and their populations mixed into the Assyrian melting pot.

Bibliography: ■ Beal, R. H., "The Ten Year Annals of Great King Mursili II of Hatti," in *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 2 (ed. W. W. Hallo; Leiden 2000) 82–90. ■ Beckman, G., "Plague Prayers of Mursilil," in *Contexts of Scripture*, vol. 1 (ed. W. W. Hallo; Leiden 1997) 156–60. ■ Beckman, G., *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (SBLWAW 7; Atlanta, Ga. ²1999). ■ Beckman, G., "Political Testament," in *Contexts of Scripture*, vol. 2 (ed. W. W. Hallo; Leiden 2000) 79–81. ■ Bryce, T. R., *Life and Society in the Hittite World* (Oxford 2002). ■ Bryce, T. R., *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (Oxford ²2005). ■ Collins, B. J., *The Hittites and Their World* (SBLABS 7; Atlanta, Ga. 2007). ■ Hallo, W. W./K. L. Younger (eds.), *The Context of Scripture*, 3 vols. (Leiden 1997–2002). ■ Hoffner, H., "Proclamation of Anitta of Kussar," in *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 1 (ed. W. W. Hallo; Leiden 1997a) 182–84. ■ Hoffner, H., "Deeds of Suppiluliuma," in *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 1 (ed. W. W. Hallo; Leiden 1997b) 185–92. ■ Hoffner, H., "Hittite Laws," in *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 2 (ed. W. W. Hallo; Leiden 2000) 106–19. ■ Hout, T. van den, "The Proclamation of Telipinu," in *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 1 (Leiden 1997a) 194–98. ■ Hout, T. van den, "Apology of Hattusili III," in *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 1 (Leiden 1997b) 199–204. ■ Moran, W., *The Amarna Letters* (Baltimore, Md./London 1992). ■ Steadman, S./G. McMahon, *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia* (Oxford 2011).

Richard H. Beal

II. Archaeology, Culture, and Arts

1. Discovery. Archaeological research on the Hittites started after the period, between 1879 and 1882 when the philologist Archibald H. Sayce suggested the existence of a major power in Syria and south Anatolia, based on the distribution of hieroglyphic inscriptions (Hieroglyphic Luwian). Building upon the evidence from the Bible and the available Assyrian sources, he proposed to identify this power with the Hittites (Hogarth; Alaura). At that time the two major sites of Böğazköy (Çorum, Turkey), and Al-Qa'lat (Jerablus, Syria) had already been explored, and from the latter some monumental remains were also unearthed and removed. Due to Sayce's reconstruction, in the next circa thirty years research on the Hittites focused on Syrian and South

Anatolian sites, such as Hama *Hamath*, Al Qa'lat Jerablus *Karkemiš*, Zincirli, and Sakçagözü. While as a fact many figural orthostats, Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions, and reliefs come from this region, today we know that most of them date to the post-Hittite and Neo-Hittite periods (Early and Middle Iron Ages, ca. 1200-700 BCE). The site of Böğazköy, hiding the remains of the Hittite capital *Hattusa*, was first excavated for two years by Ernest Chantre (1893-94), but long-term excavations only started in 1906 under the direction of Hugo Winckler and Theodor Makridi. The identification was immediate, thanks to the discovery of the Temple I and the Büyükkale archives of cuneiform tablets. After 1907 it became clear that the region defined by the course of the Kızıl-ırmak (Hittite *Marasantiya*, lat. *Halys*), was the core of the Hittite empire, whose power lasted almost 500 years covering the Anatolian Late Bronze Age (LBA, ca 1700-1200 BCE). Since 1906 the excavations at Böğazköy have been ongoing with interruptions only in correspondence to the two world wars. After more than a century, the site is one of the most extensively and intensively excavated sites in the world (Schachner).

2. Settlement Pattern and Urban Sites. For the past century, the archaeology of the Hittites was almost identical with the archaeology of the Hittite capital. In fact the city of *Hattusa* is in many respects unique and its urban organization finds little comparison at any other Hittite site since excavated. The dimension of the capital, 181 ha, is almost six times bigger than the average regional Late Bronze Age site (Okse). However, the difference in dimension does not necessarily correspond to a similar difference in population; the vast majority of the area enclosed by the imposing fortification walls of the Hittite capital was occupied by public structures, some of which held a prevalent cultic, economic or administrative function, while most, such as the Temple I complex or the sacred pool of Südburg encompassed multiple functions. For number and scale, these public structures represent the main difference between the capital and the other centers of the Hittite polity.

Today other Late Bronze Age sites have been investigated and are under excavation in Anatolia, providing a base for understanding the territorial organization in the different regions of the empire. In areas where survey data have been collected and published, the settlement pattern of Central Anatolia is characterized by fortified sites of regional vs. local dimension. Hamlets and dwellings have very rarely been identified. This may depend on the methodology of most surveys in Anatolia (few intensive surveys), or on late Holocene alluvial fans that would have buried most of the sites in valleys and lower plains. In fact, prehistoric and Roman/Late antique small and flat sites have been identified by surveys, so that it seems more likely that a general settlement pattern of Late Bronze Age Anatolia was characterized by the absence or the scarcity of unfortified hamlets. This would be the result of a high level of conflict among the different communities of Anatolia, well known at least for the Early Bronze Age II and the Middle Bronze Age, but likely still endemic in Hittite Anatolia, as the continuous military campaigns of each new Hittite king against rebellious or enemies invading the country testifies (lastly Bachhuber).

Claudia Glatz (131-34) has recently shown that the general continuity in number, density and dimension of the settlements from the end of the third millennium to the beginning of the Late Bronze Age does not correspond everywhere to a continuity in occupation of the main sites. Rather, in the Plateau, the passage from the Middle Bronze Age to the Hittite period is characterized by a strong discontinuity of occupation, with the main Middle Bronze Age sites abandoned and new regional sites built at the beginning of the Late Bronze Age. This evidence likely indicates a deliberate attempt to assert a discontinuity in the collective memory of the main regional centers before the creation of Hittite polity. This attempt is observed only in the core of the empire, because elsewhere the largest settlements are characterized by a continuity of occupation. While this could be understood as the result of a lower level of integration in the Hittite polity (Glatz), it may also depend on the quality of political relations. Politically well-integrated regions, as Syria in the 13th century BCE, show little evidence of Hittite acculturation, but this may depend on an attitude of controlling far regions through the enforcement and support of the existing legal institutions, and/or local elites, rather than ineffective integration.

The urban organization of Hittite cities is still little known, mainly because only a few cities have been investigated to an extent that makes it possible to approach this topic (Mielke 2011; 2013). Close to the capital *Hattusa* are Kuşaklı *Sarissa*, Maşat Höyük *Tapikka*, Örtaköy *Sapinuwa*, and Alaca Höyük, complemented by peripheral sites such as Oymaağaç *Nerik* (?) in the Pontic region, and Ras Shamra *Ugarit*, Meskene *Emar*, and Tell Afis in Syria.

A typical urban feature of the Anatolian sites is the stark distinction between a citadel and a lower city, marked by elevation and exclusivity (presence of citadel walls as in Hattusa and possibly Buklukale, or perimeter walls of a massive building with controlled access, as in Inanıktepe, Kuşaklı Höyük and Maşat Höyük). The seats of the highest representative institutions of each city were located within the citadel: such buildings can be more secular, like the royal Palace (texts indicate that many peripheral centers had a building named "royal palace," like the capital), but may also have a primary

religious connotation as in the case of the temples of the Storm-god both in Kuşaklı and Oymaağaç. The separateness of the citadels does not directly reflect the storing of goods and revenues – even though the case of Maşat shows also the presence of official storerooms in the local palace; rather, it provides a physical representation of a social discontinuity between the elite entering and acting on the citadel, and the rest of the inhabitants of the town. This by no means prevented the construction of other important buildings of cult and administration in the lower town.

While the presence of citadels is part of the west-central Anatolian Bronze Age, a peculiar feature of Hittite cities is the inclusion of natural elements within the city walls, in particular the use of rocks and natural outcrops as part of the architecture; outcrops are worked into the stone socle or the paving of important public buildings.

Fortification walls are the best known element of Hittite architecture (lastly Mielke 2013; Seeher). The technique adopted to build fortification walls is identical for many Hittite sites: a stone foundation and socle built with medium to large sized hewn stones assembled with the casemate technique in which two parallel stone side walls were joined at regular intervals by perpendicular stone walls, and the subsequent room was filled by earth, stone and/or rubble. On top of the socle a superstructure in mudbrick was raised up and then covered with mud plastering. This type of fortification is replicated in many of the Hittite sites, and was likely the work directed by specialists of the central government who followed official instructions. Indeed a text of instructions for the governors of the frontier centers (Miller: 212-37), contain detailed instructions for the restoration of plaster, walls, and roofs with a high degree of details on construction materials, dimensions and building elements that implies the existence of building instruction for fortifications as well.

Recently, more attention has been devoted to public architecture for the storing of food and water. Andreas Schachner (2011) suggests that the focus on food storage and water supply is the key element in the nascent formation of the first empire of Anatolia. Huge stone plastered silos and granaries were uncovered at Böğazköy, Kuşaklı , Alaca and Kamankale (Harmansah). Ponds, dams, and access to springs became part of the urban plan, as in the capital, or of the modification of the landscape immediately outside the city-walls, as in the case of Kuşaklı and Alaca Höyük.

3. Material Culture. The most characteristic feature of Hittite material culture is the high degree of continuity with the previous Bronze Age tradition of Central Anatolia, as is seen in particular for pottery production (Schoop 2006; 2013). Most shapes and surface treatments of the Hittite productions are attested in the assemblages predating the Late Bronze Age. Most of the pottery production, and increasingly towards the centuries of Hittite political hegemony over Anatolia, is rather plain (often defined in literature as drab-ware), which is interpreted as a result of large scale, industrial production. This production may have been directly or indirectly controlled by the central power and possibly related to food redistribution. Only a small percentage of fine ware is red slipped and well-polished. While early types such as the spouted jugs were for a long time considered the most characteristic vessels of the Hittite ceramics, they fell out of production very early. From the Early Empire on, red slipped fine ware was no longer locally produced, but rather imported from South Anatolia, or even from Cyprus (red lustrous wheel-made ware). As in the earlier periods, it is suggested that this fine ware, now consisting of the so called "libation arms" and spindle bottles, was associated with the cult, and in particular with the libation of liquids, mainly wine. Miniature vessels, even if not finely executed, have been also connected to cultic activity, so that cultic activity has been often suggested for buildings and installations, like artificial basins, where fragments of fine and miniature wares had been uncovered. Craftsman masterworks of Hittite ceramics associated with cult are large jars with figurative representations of feasting; these were modeled and painted white and rose on a red slip polished outer surface with scenes divided in distinct registers (Inandik and Huseyindede vases).

Metallurgy was highly developed in Anatolia already from the Early Bronze Age, and likely represented a core aspect of the Hittite economy. Hittite texts, however, offer very little information; metals are mainly referred to as tributes from subjugated lands. The scant information from administrative texts seems to emphasize the use of copper over bronze for tools and weapons. Bronze and iron were primarily used as precious metals. While mining was likely part of the Hittite economy, tributes and recycling were probably the primary sources of raw material for the metal industry.

4. Figurative Art. Hittite figurative art is best known through landscape monuments representing divinities, mainly the Storm-god, the king, the queen and some high dignitaries of the empire. Often they are portrayed together with a short legend in Anatolian Hieroglyphic indicating their identities (mainly name and title); in some other cases, Hieroglyphic Luwian monumental inscriptions without imagery served as landscape monuments. The sanctuary of Yazilikaya, a few kilometers outside the Hittite capital *Hattusa*, is an example of the former case; a temple building served to separate the public from two natural courts defined by rocky outcrops. In chamber A, two processions of gods and goddesses whose identities are disclosed by Hi-

eroglyphic Luwian legends, are engraved on the NW rocky walls, facing the relief of king Tuthaliya IV. Chamber B, often considered a mortuary chamber of that king, displays his portrait in an *Umarmungszene*, the elaborated sword-god relief of Nergal, god of the Netherworld, as well as the twelve gods of the netherworld.

Many Hittite landscape monuments are scattered all over western and Central Anatolia. Since most landscape monuments were commissioned by the rulers and governors of these peripheral regions, they adopted the imagery of power from the core of the empire. However, their function was likely related to competition among elites and with the central power, rather than with its direct manifestation (Glatz). The legacy of the Hittite imagery of power is likely tied with the survival of these local governors in South Central Anatolia (Mora/d'Alfonso).

Bibliography: ■ Alaura, S., *"Nach Boghasköy!" Zur Vorgeschichte der Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy-Ḫattuša und zu den archäologischen Forschungen bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg* (13. Sendschrift der DOG; Berlin 2006). ■ Bachhuber, C., "James Mellaart and the Luwians: A Culture-(Pre)history," in *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean* (ed. A. Mouton et al.; Leiden 2013) 279–304. ■ Genz, H./D. P. Mielke, *Insights into Hittite History and Archaeology* (Colloquia Antica 2; Leuven 2011). ■ Glatz, C., "Empire as Network: Spheres of Material Interaction in Late Bronze Age Anatolia," *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 28 (2009) 127–41. ■ Harmansah, O. (ed.) *Of Rocks and Water: Towards an Archaeology of Place* (Joukowsky Institute Publications 5; Oxford 2014). ■ Hogarth, D .G., *Carchemish I: Introductory* (London 1914). ■ Mielke, D. P., "Key Sites of the Hittite Empire," in *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia. 10,000–323 BCE* (ed. S. R. Steadman/G. McMahon; Oxford 2011) 1031–54. ■ Mielke, D. P., "Şehirler ve Yerleşim Düzeni/Cities and Settlement Organization," in *Hititler: Bir Anadolu İmparatorluğu/Hittites: An Anatolian Empire* (ed. M. Doğan Alparslan/M. Alparslan; Istanbul 2013) 136–47. ■ Miller, J., *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts* (*SBLWAW* 33; Atlanta, Ga. 2013). ■ Mora, C./L. d'Alfonso, "Anatolia After the End of the Hittite Empire: New Evidence from Southern Cappadocia," *Origini* 34 (2012) 385–98. ■ Mouton, A. et al. (eds.), *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolian and the Aegean* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 64; Leiden 2013). ■ Okse, A. T., "Hethiterforschung anhand von Geländebegehungen: Darstellung der Probleme und Möglichkeiten der Auswertung," in *Strukturierung und Datierung in der hethitischen Archäologie/Structuring and Dating in Hittite Archaeology* (ed. D. P. Mielke et al.; Byzas 4; Istanbul 2006) 167–83. ■ Seeher, J., "Hitit Mimarliği/Hittite Architecture" in *Hititler: Bir Anadolu İmparatorluğu/Hittites: An Anatolian Empire* (ed. M. Doğan-Alparslan/M. Alparslan; Istanbul 2013) 314–35. ■ Schachner, A., *Hattusa: Auf der Suche nach dem sagenhaften Großreich der Hethiter* (Bonn 2011). ■ Schoop, U.-D., "Dating the Hittites with Statistics: Ten Pottery Assemblages from Boğazköy-Hattuša," in *Strukturierung und Datierung in der hethitischen Archäologie/Structuring and Dating in Hittite Archaeology* (ed. D. P. Mielke et al.; Byzas 4; Istanbul 2006) 215–39. ■ Schoop, U.-D., "Gündelik Hayatın ve Ayrıcalığın Nesneleri: Hitit Çanak Çömleği/Objects of Daily Life, Objects of Distinction: The Study of Hittite Pottery", in *Hititler. Bir Anadolu İmparatorluğu/Hittites: An Anatolian Empire* (ed. M. Doğa-Alparslan/M. Alparslan; Istanbul 2013) 356–71. ■ Steadman, S./J. G. McMahon, *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia. 10,000–323 B.C.E.* (Oxford 2011).

Lorenzo d'Alfonso

III. Language and Texts

1. Language. The Hittite language belongs to the Indo-European language family, and is related to e.g., Sanskrit, Latin, Greek and most modern European languages. As the oldest attested language of this family it is of great importance for the study of comparative Indo-European linguistics. Together with Luwian (cuneiform and hieroglyphic), Palaic, Lydian, Lycian, Carian, Pisidic, and Sidetic, Hittite forms the subgroup of *Anatolian languages*. Of these Anatolian languages, Hittite is by far the best known and best attested. In many respects, the Anatolian languages hold a special position within the Indo-European language family. It is now generally agreed that the Anatolian branch must have split off from Proto-Indo-European already at a very early stage.

The rediscovery of the Hittite language began at the end of the 19th century when an archive of cuneiform tablets was excavated in Egyptian Amarna, which contained two letters that were not written in Akkadian, but in a hitherto unknown language. In 1905, excavations in the Hittite capital Hattuša (modern Boğazköy/Boğazkale, ca. 150 km east of Ankara) produced thousands of tablets written in that same unidentified language, which, in 1915, was coined Hittite and deciphered by Bedřich Hrozný. Derived from Gen 10 : 15 which mentions the sons of Heth, the newly discovered Indo-European speaking people in Anatolia were initially identified with the biblical Hittites. The Hittites themselves, however, referred to their language as *nešili* – "Nešite, the language of Neša." The town Kaneš/Neša (modern Kültepe) was an important Anatolian city in the beginning of the 2nd millennium BCE. It has been attempted to introduce the term "Nešite," but "Hittite" remains the most current term by convention.

2. Cuneiform Sources. In the Hittite empire, two writing systems were in use: the cuneiform script and an indigenous hieroglyphic script (see below). The cuneiform texts are by far the largest source: it is estimated that altogether some 30,000 Hittite clay tablets and fragments have been found. The cuneiform script was first introduced to Anatolia in the beginning of the 2nd millennium BCE, when merchants from Assur settled in various locations in Anatolia. All tablets from this period are written in Old Assyrian, there is no evidence for using the Hittite language. By that time, the script was apparently not taken over by the Anatolians and after the Assyrians left (ca. 1725 BCE), the cuneiform script was no longer in use in Anatolia.

After more or less a century without written evidence, the cuneiform script reappears again in the Hittite period. The Hittite cuneiform script differs from the Old Assyrian cuneiform and in its *ductus* most resembles the script of Alalah in northern Syria. It is generally assumed that Hattušili I (ca. 1650–1600 BCE), the first well-known king of the Hittite Empire, brought back the script (and scribes) from his Syrian campaigns. It appears that the Hittites initially took over the language that was associated with the script and first wrote in the Akkadian language. Only in a later stage, they began to record texts in their own language and a Hittite cuneiform tradition emerged.

3. Find Spots. The overwhelming majority of texts stems from Hattuša with the most important find spots being all in the oldest part of the city, i.e., the Lower City. These include the storerooms of Temple I, the *Haus am Hang* and several locations on the citadel Büyükkale (notably building A and E). Further, some smaller collections have been found in the Upper City. In the area around Hattuša, smaller archives have been excavated in Maşat Höyük (ancient Tapigga), Kuşaklı (ancient Šarešša?), and Kayalipinar (ancient Šamuha?) as well as a larger collection in Ortaköy (ancient Šapinuwa?). Further, there have been incidental Hittite tablet finds in e.g., Amarna, Ugarit, Tarsus, Alalah, Emar, and Alaca Höyük.

4. Dating. Hittite texts span the whole period of the Hittite Kingdom (ca. 1650–1180 BCE). The Hittite texts do not contain any form of dating, which makes their exact dating difficult. Based on paleographic and linguistic developments, three chronological periods are generally distinguished: Old (1650–1500 BCE), Middle (1500–1350 BCE), and New Hittite (1350–1180 BCE).

The overwhelming majority of the texts stems from the last period. Older compositions could be recopied in later times, so that Old Hittite compositions may survive in New Hittite script.

5. Text Genres. The Hittite texts corpus holds a wide variety of text genres. They have been categorized by Emmanuel Laroche in his *Catalogue des textes hittites* (1971), which has been continued online (Košak/Müller). The classification runs as follows:

- historical texts (annals, treaties, edicts, letters),
- administrative texts (land deeds, administrative lists, economic records, instruction texts, hippological texts, tablet inventories, labels),
- legal texts (law texts, court depositions),
- scholarly texts (lexical list, literary texts),
- mythological texts,
- hymns and prayers,
- ritual texts,
- cult inventories,
- divinatory text (oracle reports, vows, omen texts),
- festival texts,
- texts in other languages.

The annals are year-by-year accounts of the Hittite kings, who can to some extent be seen as the founders of this genre. More than half of the treaties found in the entire ANE stem from Hattuša. The treaties (and other texts) that have come down to us are mostly archival copies, the land deeds represent almost the only original sealed documents.

The amount of economic and administrative texts is limited; most records regarding daily administration such as regular accounts of offerings, rations, agricultural dues, receipts etc. are missing (see also below). The law texts include a collection of 200 laws, which are comparable to the laws of Hammurabi, though the punishments are less harsh and the emphasis lies more on the compensation of the victim.

The literary and mythological texts include both Mesopotamian and Hurrian literature in translation and original language such as the Gilgamesh epic and the Kumarbi cycle, as well as stories of Hattian-Hittite origin (see "Hittites VII. Literature"). The overwhelming majority of the texts are of religious nature with extensive festival protocols representing the largest corpus.

Most compositions are written in Hittite, but texts (partially) written in other languages are also represented in the Hittite tablet collections. These include the Indo-European languages Luwian and Palaic; Hattian, the language of the original inhabitants of Anatolia before the arrival of the Indo-European speakers; Hurrian, the language of the neighboring kingdom of Mitanni, and Sumerian and Akkadian.

6. Tablet Collections. A distinction can be made between text genres that were kept and copied for a longer period of time (group A), and tablets of which no (later) copies were made and that were discarded or recycled after a certain period (group B). In the latter group, we find most economic and administrative texts, correspondence, court depositions, vows, cult inventories and oracle reports, which mostly stem from the late period. Group A includes historical compositions, treaties, edicts, laws, instructions, as well as hymns and prayers, ritual and festival texts, myths, literary texts, omen texts and lexical lists. The tablets of group A are generally quite large (ca. 27x20 cm), and they are usually divided into two columns on each side. The texts are internally divided by means of paragraph lines, ending with a double end line. Tablets of Group A usually have a colophon at the end of the composition, indicating the title, sequence number, whether or not the composition is complete, and sometimes the name of the scribe and his genealogy.

All documents found in Hattuša belonged to the same administration; there is no division be-

Fig. 24 Südburg inscription (Iron Age)

tween temple and palace. Most text genres have been found spread over all locations and copies of the same compositions have been unearthed on various find spots. We can, however, discern some tendencies: e.g., the storerooms of Temple I seem to have been the economic center, whereas room A of the palace seems to have served as an archive in the modern sense, i.e., the storage of older tablets.

Archaeological evidence for the physical storage and arrangement of the tablets is limited. Larger tablets may have been placed next to each other on shelves on their right side, so that the colophon could easily be consulted. Of interest are the so-called tablet inventories, documents listing titles of compositions, occasionally marking whether or not the series were complete. A large number of the titles listed in the inventories have no counterpart in the textual record. Although the exact archival organization may largely escape us, it is clear that the Hittites took great care to maintain their tablet collections. Compositions were constantly copied and preserved for future reference, and the texts inform us that older tablets were consulted on a regular basis.

7. Anatolian Hieroglyphs. In addition to cuneiform writing the Hittites also used an indigenous hieroglyphic script, of which the origins are debated. It was used for the Luwian language, a language closely related to Hittite and probably spoken by the majority of the people. The Anatolian hieroglyphs survived after the fall of the empire until around 700 BCE. The script has been attested mainly on seals and seal impressions and on rock reliefs (see fig. 24). Most hieroglyphic inscriptions stem from the Iron Age. In that period, this script was also used for private and economic documents, of which some examples on lead strips have survived.

8. Other Writing Materials. Apart from clay, wood was used as a writing material. These wooden documents have not come down to us, but their existence is evident from attestations of a DUB.SAR.GIŠ (scribe-on-wood) and numerous references to wooden tablets (GIŠ.HUR and GIŠ *lē'u*) in Hittite texts. Textual references on clay tablets show that these wooden writing boards were used for various ends, including economic, commercial, and religious documents. It has been suggested that the missing daily administration as well as private records, which are also absent, were written down on wood, and as a consequence have all perished. What kind of script, cuneiform or hieroglyphs, was

used on these wooden documents remains a matter of discussion. Considering the fact that in the Iron Age, the hieroglyphic script was used for private letters and economic records, it is very conceivable that the Anatolian hieroglyphs were already used for these ends in the Hittite period and that the missing wooden documents were written on in hieroglyphs.

Finally, the Hittites also made use of metal as a writing material. The texts inform us that important documents, such as treaties, were laid down on metal. They could be executed in gold, silver, bronze, and iron. Only one example has survived, the bronze treaty of king Tudhaliya with Kuruntiya of Tarhuntašša (Otten).

Bibliography: ▪ Hawkins, J. D., *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, vol. 1 (Berlin/New York 2000). ▪ Hoffner, H. Jr./G. Melchert, *A Grammar of the Hittite Language* (Winona Lake, Ind. 2008). ▪ Hout, T. van den, *The Elements of Hittite* (Cambridge 2011). ▪ Hout, T. van den, "The Written Legacy of the Hittites," in *Insights into Hittite History and Archaeology* (ed. H. Genz/D. P. Mielke; Colloquia Antiqua 2; Leuven 2011) 47–84. ▪ Kloekhorst, A., *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden 2008). ▪ Košak, S./G. G. W. Müller, *Catalog der Texte der Hethither (CTH)* (online ressource, available at www.hethiter.net; Accessed May 30, 2015). ▪ Laroche, E., *Catalogue des textes Hittites* (Paris 1971). ▪ Otten, H., *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: Ein Staatsvertrag Tuḏḫalijas IV* (Wiesbaden 1988). ▪ Waal, W. J. I., "They Wrote On Wood – The Case for a Hieroglyphic Scribal Tradition in Hittite Anatolia," *AnSt* 61 (2011) 21–34. ▪ For Information on Hittite Texts and Bibliography, see www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de.

Willemijn J. I. Waal

IV. Society

Hittite society should be considered as dynamic, multifaceted, and complex, composed of a heterogeneous population inhabiting a wide expanse of territories. The resulting cultural, linguistic, and ethnical diversity of Hittite society is also diachronically related to the major changes experienced by the Hittite authority throughout its history. Moreover, the strong interconnection with Mesopotamian traditions introduced continuous cultural influences (particularly north Syrian and Hurrian) to greater Hittite society. Little can be said about the groups of Indo-European speakers who moved into Anatolia well before the early 2nd millennium BCE and written records inform us merely about their presence (Melchert). However, it is clear that they created a centralized polity over a variety of Anatolian native populations, and Hittite civilization is the result of the integration of these earlier elements (Goetze: 23). The written evidence seems to indicate a fragmented linguistic environment that likely originated from different ethnic identities and contributed to socio-political diversity.

Information on political developments, the central administration and social organization is overwhelmingly based on the cuneiform texts, in particular sources generated by the central authority (laws, administrative regulations and oaths, treaties), while the rarity of administrative or judicial records of daily life strongly limits our perspective. Archaeology reveals very little about private quarters in Hittite cities, while more is known about public spaces (including palaces and temples). Accordingly, any idea of society in the Hittite context must account for the limited perspective allowed by the extant evidence; a representation provided by the central ruling elite and not always inclusive of different societal strata. Therefore most of our information concerns the royal court. The king, usually indicated with the title *labarna* or *tabarna*, or "Great King" (sum. LUGAL.GAL) is the political, administrative, judicial, military, and religious head of Hittite power (Bryce). The king is not deified, he only "becomes a god" after his death. Besides the king two female figures carried a prominent role: the queen (bearing the title tawannanna) and the queen mother, who seems to have been very influential, particularly in cultic matters. In the cult, the royal couple often acted jointly; the involvement of the royal family in the cult is also mirrored by the appointment of the royal heir, the tuhkanti, as the highest priest of the temple institutions at the main sacred centers in the land. The king exercised absolute monarchy, but his main political decisions required proclamation in front of an assembly, the *pankuš* (Old Kingdom, ca. 1600–1500 BCE); this assembly of army and court high officials apparently had some degree of control even over the king's political conduct.

Members of the king's family occupied almost all the highest offices of the secular and religious administration and of the army, so that the Hittite empire appears to some extent as a large household polity (Starke). The formulation of standard instructions for classes of officials (Miller) indicates on the other hand the attempt to build an imperial bureaucracy beyond familial ties. Far from the core of the empire, local kings submitted to Hittite hegemony and provincial lords, local chiefs and councils of elders were common. The king of Hatti would often stipulate treaties with "the people" rather than local rulers in those cases where pseudo-egalitarian or tribal systems of command existed. Interpretation of the Hittite state as a "feudal" state has often been suggested (Goetze: 28); the insistence in the texts on the concept of loyalty (hitt. *paḫšuwar*, "protection") gives a sense of the attempt to centralize a relatively loose structure into a more rigid organization; this was particularly difficult in Anatolia and represents the inherent weakness of a system rich in internal competing interests. The use of the term "vassals" in literature corresponds to the idea that all functionaries – officials in regional centers, military personnel, civilian dignitaries – respond to a personal relationship of

loyalty to a superior lord, ultimately the king himself. The practice of land grant in exchange for this obligation must have been the rule and original tablets of land grants dating back to the Middle Kingdom period (ca. 1500–1300 BCE) have been recovered.

The Hittite Laws are the most informative source on social conditions and recognize two social classes: slaves and freemen. The existence of a third category of people including the deportees, the *ILKU*-people and the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-people shows how degrees of "freedom" can be rather fluid: those classified in this category were allocated to work positions, were not allowed to move (glebae adscripti; Goetze: 28), and had to perform corvée for the royal court but were not considered slaves. Slaves seem to be more respected over time and gained more equality in personal rights; marriage was possible between slaves and freemen as well. A view from the southern periphery of the empire reveals the existence of different conceptions of social organization than the one represented in the texts from the Hittite royal archives (d'Alfonso).

A parental family was the basic structural unit of Hittite society; severe regulations in the Hittite laws are dedicated to prohibitions against other types of union and sexual conduct. Social boundaries within Hittite society were sanctioned in this and other cases by taboos and prohibitions that originally were rooted in the customs of the ruling elite and ultimately became part of the official norms of the empire (Cohen).

Bibliography: ■ d'Alfonso, L., "'Servant of the king, son of Ugarit, and servant of the servant of the king': RS 17.238 and the Hittites", in *Pax Hethitica*, FS I. Singer (ed. Y. Cohen et al.; Wiesbaden 2010) 67–86. ■ Bryce, T., "Hittite State and Society," in *Insights into Hittite History and Archaeology* (ed. H. Genz H./D. P. Mielke; Colloquia Antiqua 2; Leuven 2011) 85–98. ■ Cohen, Y., *Taboos and Prohibitions in Hittite Society: A Study of the Hittite Expression natta āra ('not permitted')* (THeth 24; Heidelberg 2002). ■ Goetze, A., "State and Society of the Hittites," in *Neuere Hethiterforschung* (ed. G. Walser; Wiesbaden 1964) 23–33. ■ Imparati, F., "Private Life Among the Hittites," in *CANE* (New York 1995) 571–86. ■ Melchert, H. C., "Indo-Europeans" in *Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia* (ed. S. R. Steadman/G. McMahon; Oxford 2011) 704–16. ■ Miller, J. L., *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts* (SBLWAW 31; Atlanta, Ga. 2013). ■ von Schuler, E., "Gesellschaft: B. Bei den Hethitern," *RLA* 3 (Berlin 1971) 233–243. ■ Starke, F., "Zur 'Regierung' des hethitischen Staates," *ZABR* 2 (1996) 140–182.

Andrea Trameri

V. Religion

Here an overview is given of the religious system of the Kingdom of Hatti in the 17th–13th centuries BCE, including the pantheon, regular and exceptional cult performances, and the relationship between human beings and their gods. Cuneiform tablets of religious content are the main source of our knowledge but several difficulties need to be considered: (1) The most ancient phase of the Hittite religion is scarcely documented or is only known through the re-interpretation of the late-Hittite documents. Nor can we ignore the fact that during a period of 500 years Hittite religion changed considerably. (2) The very concept of Hittite culture and identity is difficult to define because the original Indo-European heritage of the Hittites was enriched by the cultural elements of other ethnic layers including the Indo-European Palaic and Luwian, the native Hattian, the Hurrian, and the external Semitic elements from Syria and Mesopotamia. These cultural components are present with different levels of penetration which also varies depending on the historical period. (3) Written documents come mainly from the State archive of the capital city Hattuša and minor sites in Anatolia (Ortaköy/Šapinuwa, Maşat Hoyük/Tapikka, Kuşaklı/Šarišša, Kayalıpinar/Šamuḫa (?), Oimağaç/Nerik), and Syria (most of all Ugarit and Emar). Information about local cults is scarce and comes only through the filter of the official religion. We do not have any sources that directly describe the private religion and religiosity of the people.

Biblical references led to the rediscovery of Hittite civilization in the 20th century. Although the identity of the biblical Hittites mostly refers to the first-millennium neo-Hittite populations of Syria (Singer: 725–30), many studies in search of connections have shown how religious elements circulated between Anatolia and Palestine along the course of two millennia.

1. Gods and Mythology. The word for god "*šiu-*" mostly attested in old texts, has an Indo-European origin. In later texts it is usually replaced by the Sumerian logogram DINGIR. In the 15th–13th centuries BCE, the pantheon is a complex system formed by the juxtaposition with, and absorption of, local gods and panthea of central Anatolia and deities of Hurrian and Mesopotamian speaking areas (Archi 1993: 1–18). This pantheon is handed down in the lists of gods evoked as witnesses in political treaties between Hittite kings and their vassals in Anatolia and Syria. The main component of the pantheon is a mixture of Hattian and Hittite gods connected by kinship relations that can be only partly reconstructed by mythology. At the top of the pantheon there are a couple of deities. The main deity is a Sun-goddess with chthonic features named Eštan in Hattian and Ištanu in Hittite. She is addressed as Wurunšemu – "Mother of the Earth," and Sun-goddess of the city Arinna. Her male counterpart is a Storm-god named (^{d}U/ ^{d}IM), Taru in Hattian and Tarḫunt in Hittite, who is the lord of the rain and thunder. They have a daughter, Mezzulla, also named Tappinu, and a number of sons who are minor Storm-gods such as Telepinu and the Storm-gods of the cities Nerik and Zip-

landa. The goddess Zintuḫi is their grandchild (Klinger: 141–52). Inara, main deity of Ḫattuša, is also a daughter of the Storm-god Tarḫunt. Other gods associated with the most ancient Hattian-Hittite tradition are Pirwa, Ḫašammili, Kamrušepa, Kašku (the Moon-god) and Kuzanišu (the deified fire-place), recorded in the festival texts as a group worshipped by the Singers of Kaneš, who chanted in Hattian and Hittite (Archi 2004: 11–26). Ḫalmašuit, the deified throne, is also a part of this tradition as it is mentioned in the text of Anitta (CTH 1), conqueror of Kaneš in pre-Hittite period, and in the foundation myth of Hittite kingship preserved in the construction ritual CTH 414. A standardized representation of local panthea is in the Prayer of the king Muwattalli II to the assembly of gods, CTH 381 (Singer: 85–94).

From the 15th century BCE, Hurrian gods were introduced in the State religious system but they mostly remained separate entities worshipped in the Hurrian language. Their representation is in the chamber A of the rock sanctuary of Yazilikaya near Ḫattuša. The Storm-god is equated to the Hurrian Tešub, and the Sun-goddess Arinna to Ḫebat. They have a son Šarruma. In the list of gods of Hurrian festival texts this couple is always associated with rows of Hurrian male and female gods. Only in a few later texts are some of these gods worshipped together with those of central Anatolia (Archi 2006: 147–63).

Some information about the pantheon derives from the mythological texts (Hoffner 1998). Anatolian myths include the *mugawar*, myths of the vanishing gods, and the tale (*uddar*) of the dragon Illuyanka. The *mugawar* were inserted in magical rituals with the hope of evoking the disappeared deities and bringing back health and fertility to the world. The most complete are the Myth of Telepinu, in three versions, and the Myth of the Disappearance of the Sun-god. There are also several extant fragments concerning the disappearance of other gods. The tale of the fight between the Storm-god and the dragon Illuyanka, in two versions, is inserted in the frame of the cult of the *purulli*-Festival, an old-Hittite festival of the New Year. These myths take place in central Anatolia and illustrate the existence of a structured mythology of which just a few episodes have been preserved. Myths of Hurrian origin are called SÌR (songs). The so-called Kumarbi cycle is composed of an unknown number of songs orally transmitted to the Hittites, and all of them narrate the fight of the Storm-god with the primeval god Kumarbi and his supporters for supremacy.

There are also myths involving humans like the "Song of Release" about the destruction of Ebla, the "Song of the Hunter Kešši", the tale of "Appu and his two Sons", and the tale of "The Sun-god, the Cow, and the Fisherman."

2. Organized State Religion and Local Cults. The king was the highest priest who officiated all the seasonal ceremonies accompanied by the royal family, officials, and clergy. He became a god after his death, and the passage to divine condition was marked by a funeral lasting several days (Kassian et al.). There are more than 150 names of festivals ($EZEN_4$) but only some of them can be identified. There were regular (SAG.UŠ/*ukturi*) festivals that followed the agricultural cycle, and great festivals performed every six or nine years. It is difficult to reconstruct how the cult was performed in the Old Hittite period. The KI.LAM festival, e.g., took place in Ḫattuša and its greater environs and lasted three days. It was celebrated by the royal couple and by the priestess NIN.DINGIR. Other festivals were celebrated only occasionally such as those performed for a rainstorm (CTH 630, CTH 631). The best examples of Old Hittite ceremonies are preserved on the friezes of two vases from İnandıktepe and Hüseyindede (Taracha: 68–74). The registers of these vases show processions to the altars (*ištanana*-) of the gods with musicians, dancers, priests, and two main figures that are probably the royal couple. Festivals of the Late Period were also characterized by processions in the city to the temples of the gods. Additionally, religious processions also occurred outside the city. The divine statue was brought to an open-air shrine by a *ḫuwaši* stone, where several dances and sport performances were taking place. The *ḫuwaši* can be compared with the Syrian *sikkanum* and the *maṣṣēbâ* of the OT (Hutter: 87–108). Every festival was characterized by animal sacrifices. Animals were consecrated (*šipant*-) and slaughtered. Their parts were cooked and offered to the gods and the participants gathered in a great assembly (*šalli ašeššar*). Together with the royal couple, priests ($GUDU_{12}$, *tazzelli*, and $^{LÚ/MUNUS}$SANGA), court-attendants ($LÚ^{MEŠ}$.É.GAL), high officials (DUMU.LUGAL), and male and female musicians and performers ($^{LÚ/MUNUS}$*palwatalla*, ^{LÚ}ALAM.ZU_9, $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*ḫalliyareš*; $^{MUNUS.MEŠ}$*zintuḫeš*, $^{MUNUS.MEŠ}$*ḫazkarai*) partook in this religious activities. Tablemen, cooks, cupbearers, guards, and doormen had duties like cooking and cleaning up, and washing and bringing the tools for the rituals. Temple servants (*karimnaleš*) and watchmen (*ḫaliyatalleš*) had the duty to control access to the area of the temple in like the priests (*kōhănîm*) and Levites who shared the guard of the Tabernacle (Singer: 747). The most important festivals of the Imperial period were the $EZEN_4$ AN.TAḪ.ŠUM named after a plant of the Spring, probably the crocus, which lasted thirty-eight days, and the $EZEN_4$*nuntarriyašḫaš* "the festival of the Haste", in autumn, which lasted thirty-three days. Both included a journey of the royal couple through the cities of central Anatolia and were formed through a process of state assimilation of older and local festivals. These festivals followed

the same schema of state festivals performed in spring and autumn and are documented in cult inventories which review religious customs and the conditions of temples, gods, statues, and paraphernalia of towns and shrines in Anatolia (Hazenbos).

3. Individual Religion and Religiosity. We only have documents relating to the personal religious practices of the royal family (prayers, oracles, vows, rituals). We are not able to judge how much of this documentation may reflect propagandistic purposes or real personal belief of the king, his family, and the court as a reflection of what the kingdom's population possibly believed and practiced. Prayers (*arkuwar*) were an attempt by the king to justify himself and his actions before the gods. They assume the form of a lawsuit with the confession of the crime and its mitigating elements: the god is the supreme judge of human life (Singer: 5–6). The concept of inherited guilt and collective punishment clearly emerges in these documents and is similar to the biblical conception (Singer: 748). In case of illness, epidemic, or any other misfortune an oracular investigation was made to ascertain the god's will. Oracles encompassed various techniques: Extispicy, sheep oracles, augury, lecanomancy, and the KIN-symbol oracles (Beal: 57–81). At the same time, a god's will could be divined from dreams as evidenced in votive texts. The result of such inquiries revealed whether a deity was angry with the mortal and the reasons for it, as well as the requests of the deity to be pacified. The remedy was represented by a votive offering or a magical ritual. Vows (*malteššar*) consisted of a promise made to a god, and the description of the reward that the god will receive after the vow is fulfilled. Additionally, a physical illness or state of impurity was often connected with the violation of a god's will and the remedy was the performance of magical rituals. These rituals represent a large corpus of texts of various cultural (Hittite, Hurrian, Luwian) and geographical (Kizzuwatnean, Arzawean, Syrian) origin. The main performers were the female (^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI/ *ḫašawa-*) and the male practitioners named AZU/ ḪAL (*barû*), MUŠEN.DÙ. The client was generally called EN.SISKUR, rarely was he addressed as king. Magical rituals were composed of a chain of actions and spells based on the principles of sympathetic and analogical magic. They open with a list of ingredients and tools and, after a series of rites of purification and cleaning, they close with the elimination of the impurity. Several motifs attested in this written material were probably the reflection of a popular science circulating in the region. Like in the biblical rites, evil and impurities were cast away with different methods such as burial, buring or being driven into the wilderness (Wright 1987). The most famous parallel with the Bible (Lev 16) is the rite of the scapegoat in the Arzawa rituals of Ašḫella (CTH 394) and Uḫḫamuwa (CTH 410) (Janowski/ Wilhelm: 109–69; Zatelli: 254–263; Hoffner 2003: xxxii). Generally, the principles that govern the analogical magic and its forms are similar to those attested in biblical literature. In all these cases a genetic affinity cannot be demonstrated, but rather the diffusion of patterns which circulated for several centuries in the same geographic area from the Mediterranean Levant up to Anatolia (Wright 1993: 473–508).

Bibliography: ■ Archi, A., "How a Pantheon Forms: The Cases of Hattian-Hittite Anatolia and Ebla of the 3rd Millennium B.C.," in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament* (ed. B. Janowski et al.; Freiburg i.Br. 1993) 1–18. ■ Archi, A., "The Singer of Kaneš and his Gods," in *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität* (ed. M. Hutter/S. Hutter-Braunsar; Münster 2004) 11–26. ■ Archi, A., "Hurrian Gods and the Festivals of Hattian-Hittite Layer," in *The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tuṯḫaliya IV: Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Honour of J. De Roos, 12–13 December 2003, Leiden* (ed. T. P. J. van den Hout/C. H. van Zoest; Leiden 2006) 147–63. ■ Beal, R., "Hittite Oracles," in *Magic and Divination in the Ancient World* (ed. L. Ciraolo/J. Seidel; Leiden 2002) 57–81. ■ Haas, V., *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion* (Leiden 1994). ■ Hazenbos, J., *The Organization of the Anatolian Local Cults during the Thirteenth Century B.C.: An Appraisal of the Hittite Cult Inventories* (Leiden/Boston, Mass. 2003). ■ Hoffner, H. A. Jr., *Hittite Myths* (SBLWAW 2; Atlanta, Ga. ^{2}1998). ■ Hoffner, H. A. Jr., "Hittite-Israelite Cultural Parallels," in *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 3 (ed. W. W. Hallo; Leiden 2003) xxix–xxxiv. ■ Hutter, M., "Kultstelen und Baityloi," in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Gordsyrien, und dem Alten Testament* (ed. B. Janowski; Göttingen 1993) 87–108. ■ Janowski, B./G. Wilhelm, "Der Bock, der die Sünden hinausträgt: Zur religionsgeschichte des Azazel-Ritus Lev. 16,10.21f.," in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien, und dem Alten Testament* (ed. B. Janowski et al.; Göttingen 1993) 109–69. ■ Kassian, A. S. et al., *Hittite Funerary Rituals, šalliš waštaiš* (AOAT 288; Münster 2002). ■ Klinger, J., *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion des hattischen Kultschicht* (Studien zu den Bögazkoy-Texten 37; Wiesbaden 1996). ■ Singer, I., *Hittite Prayers* (SBLWAW 11; Atlanta, Ga. 2002). ■ Taracha, P., *Religions of Second Millennium Anatolia* (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 27; Wiesbaden 2009). ■ Wright, D. P., *The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature* (SBLDS 101; Atlanta, Ga. 1987). ■ Wright, D. P., "Analogy in Biblical and Hittite Ritual," in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien, und dem Alten Testament* (ed. B. Janowski et al.; Göttingen 1993) 473–508. ■ Zatelli, I., "The Origin of the Biblical Scapegoat Ritual: The Evidence of Two Eblaite Texts," *VT* 48 (1998) 254–63.

Giulia Torri

VI. Hittites in the Bible

The gentilic "Hittite" (MT *Ḥittî*) is attested forty-eight times in the writings of the HB. In most instances, it occurs as a collective singular (*haḥittî*) in the Deuteronomistic lists of nations which inhabited the land of Canaan prior to Israel, namely "the Hittites, the Girgashites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites" (Deut 7:1; cf. Gen 15:20; Exod 3:8, 17; 13:5; 23:23, 28; 33:2; 34:11; Num 13:29; Deut 20:17;

Josh 3:10; 9:1; 11:3; 12:8; 24:11; Judg 3:5; 1 Kgs 9:20; 2 Chr 8:7; Ezra 9:1; Neh 9:8). Moreover, these Hittite inhabitants of the land can also be designated as "sons/daughters of *Ḥēt*" (Gen 23:3, 5, 7, 10, 16, 18, 20; 25,10; 27,46) in light of the claim that they were descendants from the eponym *Ḥēt*, a son of Canaan (Gen 10:15; cf. 1 Chr 1:13).

While the vast majority of biblical references assume the presence of Hittites in Palestine, there are a few exceptions as well. First Kings 10:29 (cf. 2 Chr 1:17) reports that Solomon maintained trade relations with "all the kings of the Hittites" (*kol malkê haḥittîm*) to whom he sold horses and chariots he had previously imported from Egypt (cf. 1 Kgs 11:1). The "kings of the Hittites" are mentioned once more in 2 Kgs 7:6 where they are envisaged as a potential military threat to the Arameans' siege of Samaria. It has convincingly been argued that the respective passages reflect the existence of the "first-millennium Neo-Hittite kingdoms of Syria and southern Anatolia" (Singer: 726).

A similar historical context must also been maintained as the background of the references to "the land of the Hittites" (*ʾereṣ haḥittîm*) in Josh 1:4; Judg 1:26. They are obviously inspired by the expression *māt Ḥatti* ("land of *Ḥatti*") which became a popular designation for Syria (and ultimately for the entire region west of the Euphrates) in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources (van Seters: 64–67). In light of the fact that most texts of the HB postdate the respective period, it is not reasonable to assume that the various biblical passages which count the Hittites (*haḥittî*) among the indigenous population of Palestine provide authentic information on the ethnic structure of that region during the 2nd millennium BCE. Rather, they are likely to reflect an archaizing tendency in the description of the earliest history of Israel, with "Hittite" used more or less as a synonym for "Canaanite" or "Amorite" (van Seters: 81; Singer: 755–56; see however Gerhards: 162–74; Lebrun).

The few biblical passages mentioning individual Hittites by name fit smoothly into this overall picture. In the Patriarchal Narrative, a couple of verses refer to "Ephron the Hittite" (*ʿEprôn haḥittî*), son of Zohar, from whom Abraham purchased the burial cave Machpelah at Hebron (Gen 23:8, 10, 13–17; 25:9; 49:29, 30; 50:13). While trade relations with a Hittite were apparently not regarded as problematic, the picture changes with regard to family relations. Esau's marriages with "Judith daughter of Beeri the Hittite," and "Basemath daughter of Elon the Hittite" (Gen 26:34) resp. "Adah daughter of Elon the Hittite" (Gen 36:2) become the target of implicit polemics in Gen 27:46 (cf. Judg 3:5–6). The passages reflect the postexilic controversy about mixed marriages (cf. 1 Kgs 11:1; Ezra 9:1; Neh 9:8) which can also be perceived in the background of Ezekiel's pejorative remark on Jerusalem's descent from a Hittite mother and an Amorite father (Ezek 16:3, 45).

Two more Hittites are mentioned by name in the context of the David Saga. Besides "Ahimelech the Hittite" (*ʾAḥîmelek haḥittî*) who is referred to only once (1 Sam 26:6), there is the prominent figure of "Uriah the Hittite" (*ʾÛrîyâ haḥittî*), the husband of Bathsheba, who falls victim to David's conspiracy (2 Sam 11:3, 6, 17, 21, 24; 12:9, 10; 23:39; 1 Kgs 15:5; 1 Chr 11:41). In the present text, the narrator purposefully stresses the piety of Uriah to highlight the ignonimy of David's behavior. Like Ephron and the other Hittite individuals mentioned in the HB, Uriah should therefore primarily be judged as a literary character. Whether these Hittite individuals are purely fictitious or not, cannot be decided with any certainty. However, the fact that even their names (with the possible exception of Uriah) are of Semitic origin suggests that they probably are.

Bibliography: ▪ Gerhards, M., "Die biblischen Hethiter," *WO* 39 (2009) 145–79. ▪ Lebrun, R., "Hittites et Hourrites en Palestine-Canaan," *TrEu* 15 (1998) 153–63. ▪ Singer, I., "The Hittites and the Bible Revisited," in *I Will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Times*, FS A. Mazar, vol. 2 (ed. A. M. Meir/P. de Miroschedji; Winona Lake, Ind. 2006) 723–56. ▪ Van Seters, J., "The Terms 'Amorite' and 'Hittite' in the Old Testament," *VT* 22 (1972) 64–81.

Christoph Berner

VII. Literature

The biblical Hittites (sons of Heth) are listed in a long line of descendants of Noah's son Ham (Gen 10:15) making them part of the universal recreation and repopulation of the world after the flood. As the biblical story narrows to follow the Israelites, the Hittites become part of the environment that Israelites inhabit. As such, the Hittites are depicted in three ways. First, they are potential partners for marriage – Esau takes two Hittite wives (Gen 26:34) and in Judg 3 the author mentions that Israelites intermarried with various peoples, including the Hittites. The biblical text denounces these marriages. Second, the Hittites are listed formulaically as a group living in Canaan that will be destroyed by YHWH or the Israelites during the conquest (Deut 20:17; Exod 13:5; Josh 1:4). Third, despite the negative statements about intermarriage and their intended conquest, individual Hittites are depicted as hospitable and loyal; Ephron the Hittite sold Abraham the Cave of Machpelah as a burial site for Sarah when Abraham was a stranger in the land (Gen 23), and Uriah the Hittite fought bravely for King David (2 Sam 23), and was subsequently betrayed by him.

The Hittites are most prevalent in literature through the specific character of Uriah. In Rudyard Kipling's "The Story of Uriah," (1919) the title invokes the death of Uriah at David's command, while the poem tells the story of Jack Barrett's inex-

plicable transfer to Quetta, his death, and the mourning of his widow. Kipling focuses on the sacrifices and suffering of Jack (the Uriah character) after being transferred from a safe military outpost to one that was overrun by fever. Most famously, Charles Dickens' character Uriah Heep aggressively pursues Agnes, David's beloved, in *David Copperfield* (1849/50). Both Dickens and Kipling recast the story of David and Uriah in a British social context: for Dickens the class system motivates Uriah's greediness while Kipling transfers the story structure to the Anglo-Indian War.

As metaphor and metonymy for the stranger and the conquered, the Hittites have largely been eclipsed by the Canaanites, and thus as a group the Hittites are rarely mentioned in literature. When they are mentioned, they are often used to invoke history and a sense of morality. For example, in *I, Anatolia: A Play for One Actress* (*Ben, Anadolu*, 1984) by Güngör Dilmen Kalyoncu, the Hittites are praised as an early civilization from the same land the actress inhabits, and as Hittite stone tablets are tossed on stage, the actress fears that she is being stoned as a reproach. In the play, the Hittites are a great historical civilization to be remembered on the threat of punishment, though the play itself makes light of the actual possibility of punishment. Again, as in the Bible, the Hittites are part of the environment and historical backdrop of the main story.

The historical and moral depictions of the Hittites are further intertwined by Charles Simic in his poem "Concerning My Neighbors, the Hittites." By categorizing the Hittites as neighbors, he suggests that they are part of the environment, but also that they are due certain kinds of treatment on biblical grounds. In the poem, Simic ascribes various paradoxical behaviors and beliefs to the Hittites, such as thinking that "lead floats" and "a leaf sinks," while also alluding to different ways the Hittites have been depicted historically – as "mound builders," and "Asiatic horses" (Simic: 16-17). Later in the poem, Simic writes, "the stones haven't said their last word" (Simic: 18). He suggests that so little is known about the historical Hittites that they can represent and be represented by myriad interpretations and perversions of who they were. The image of the neighbor in the title and several NT references in the first stanza suggest that the Hittites are objects of moral obligation: they are not a tabula rasa upon which to project orientalist ideas.

While Simic suggests that readers be careful not to see themselves or the unrecognizable other in the Hittites, the fact that there are so many gaps in our knowledge of them has led to Hittites featuring in speculative fiction. The science fiction writer, Ben Bova, penned *The Hittite* (2011), a loosely-based historical fiction piece about the journeys of Lukka the Hittite warrior who brought down the walls of Jericho and fought at Troy. Michael Findley has also begun a historical fiction series called *The Hittites*, with the first book in the series entitled *Ephron* (2015). And late in her career, the young adult author, Joanne Williamson wrote *Hittite Warrior* (1999), which chronicles the adventures of the character Uriah Tarhund during the time of the Judges in Judea.

Bibliography: ■ Bova, B., *The Hittite* (New York 2011). ■ Dickens, C., *David Copperfield* (London 2004). ■ Dilmen, G., *I, Anatolia: A Play for One Actress* (Ankara 1991). ■ Findley, M., *Ephron: The Hittites Book One* (Lansford, Pa. 2015). ■ Kipling, R., "The Story of Uriah," in *Selected Works of Rudyard Kipling*, vol. 3 (London 2012). ■ Simic, C., "Concerning My Neighbors, the Hittites," in id. *New and Selected Poems: 1962–2012* (Boston, Mass. 2013) 16–19. ■ Williamson, J., *Hittite Warrior* (Bathgate, N.D. 1999).

Kristel Clayville

Hitzig, Ferdinand

Ferdinand Hitzig (1807–1875) was a German OT scholar, born as the son of a pastor in Hauingen (Baden). Johann Peter Hebel was his most prominent teacher at school in Lörrach and Karlsruhe. In 1824, Hitzig began his studies in theology and classics at Heidelberg University, which he continued at the University of Halle-Wittenberg from 1825 to 1827. In Halle, Wilhelm Gesenius exerted great influence on his thinking. After obtaining his theology degree in 1827, Hitzig joined the University of Göttingen where he studied academic theology under Heinrich Georg August Ewald. In 1829, he completed his PhD degree in theology and philosophy with a thesis on *Cadyti urbe Herodotea Dissertatio* (Treatise on the City of 'Cadytus,' Solely Named in Herodotus). In the same year, he was appointed private lecturer in OT studies at Heidelberg University. Following a publication on *Des Propheten Jonas Orakel über Moab* (1831, The Prophet Jonah's Prophecies on Moab), he became professor of theology at the newly-founded University of Zurich in 1833. In 1861, he was offered a professorship succeeding Friedrich Wilhelm Carl Umbreit in his chair at Heidelberg University, where he worked until his death.

Hitzig's academic profile is clearly outlined in his study *Der Begriff der Kritik, am Alten Testamente praktisch erörtert* (1831, The Notion of Criticism, Practically Discussed with Regard to the OT). In his view, "criticism" is to *positively* improve, by philological analysis, the corrupted Hebrew text as well as the determination of its age and contexts, and he applied this approach in numerous studies and essays (primarily short commentaries on all prophets, the book of Psalms, and some of the books of Wisdom). At times, this approach produced new and sometimes daring interpretations (e.g., through derivations from Sanskrit) as well as unusual historical assignments. In the academic world, the validity of these radical hypotheses and