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Introduction

1.1 Context

This book is about the relationship between two religious systems, and about how understanding of one can be enhanced by understanding the other. The two religious systems are those of ancient Greece and of Hittite Anatolia.

Greek religion is known best from the Greek city-states of the 1st millennium BC—it is particularly well documented from the 5th century BC down to the period of the Roman Empire, but its origins go back to the Late Bronze Age (LBA), as we have known since the decipherment of Linear B in 1952. It is clearly associated with speakers of ancient Greek, an Indo-European language, and probably originated in a fusion between Indo-European traditions and pre-Indo-European traditions of the Aegean region, including that of Crete.

‘Hittite religion’ means primarily the religion of the Hittite kingdom, which dominated Central Anatolia for much of the period between the 17th and the 12th centuries BC, at times controlling territory from the Aegean in the West to the Euphrates River in the East. It is known mainly from the cuneiform archives in the Hittite capital at Boğazköy (Hattusa), discovered in 1906 and deciphered in 1915. The Hittite religion had absorbed elements of several religious traditions in Anatolia, including that of the Hattic culture of N. central Anatolia, that of the Luwians who occupied parts of the South and West and that of the Hurrians in the East. Some of these traditions are associated with Indo-European languages (Hittite, Luwian), some with non-Indo-European ones (Hattic, Hurrian). Hittite religion also owed a lot to the cuneiform culture of N. Syria and Mesopotamia, which had long exerted an influence in Central Anatolia, for example via the Assyrian trading network based on the mercantile hub at Kültepe-Kanesh (20th–18th centuries BC).

The Hittite kingdom came to an end around 1180 BC, but the religious culture, particularly the Luwian tradition, lived on into the 1st millennium BC in the so-called ‘Neo-Hittite’ states of SE Anatolia and N. Syria, where kings commemorated their achievements in monuments in Hieroglyphic...
Luwian. The Luwian language, religion, and onomastics also survived in Cilicia, Lycia, Caria, and other areas of Anatolia into the Greco-Roman period. Hittite religion and Greek religion can thus be said to have existed over roughly the same chronological period, although Hittite religion is best attested in the LBA and not so well in the 1st millennium BC, while Greek religion is best attested in the 1st millennium BC, and not so well in the LBA. The apparent difference (as so often) comes down to the uneven distribution of evidence. Hence it should be clear that contact between these traditions, and adoption of elements in one by the other, could have happened at any time.

A student of ancient Greek religion might well ask, why Hittite religion in particular? After all, we know of a number of other religious traditions from the Ancient Near East. In the early days the most significant archives available were the Neo-Assyrian ones at Nineveh in N. Iraq and those of various Sumerian city-states in Mesopotamia. More archives were found in N. Syria: on the Euphrates River the Amorite kingdom Mari (Middle Bronze Age, excavated from 1933) and the Hittite protectorate Emar (Late Bronze Age, excavated 1972–6). Finally, an archive of texts was found on the Mediterranean coast at Ugarit (Late Bronze Age, excavated from 1929), which turned out to be a W. Semitic city-state, alternately in the Egyptian and Hittite spheres of influence, and with connections to Crete. There is evidence for religious practice and belief for all these cultures. But for the student of ancient Greek religion, the Hittite evidence is particularly important for two reasons.

First, because as a source for religious practice it is particularly rich and diverse. The archives provide detailed information about the religious system of the Hittite state, including festivals, purification rituals, oracle-consultations, prayers, and myths. Hittite religion is thus more comprehensively documented than any other ancient religious tradition in W. Asia, even Egypt. They also document the religious practice of neighbouring Anatolian states which the Hittites were interested in. In the East was the Hurrian state of Mitanni, where some of the gods were Indo-Iranian in origin; towards the West was Arzawa-Mira, bordering on the Aegean.

The second reason is that the Hittites are likely to have been in direct diplomatic contact with Mycenaean Greece, known to them as Ahhiyawa. The hypothesis that Ahhiyawa is Greece was originally proposed by Emil Forrer in 1924, but not widely accepted. However, developments in the understanding of the geography of W. Anatolia have made it certain that Ahhiyawa was in the West, and virtually certain that it should be identified
with all or part of Mycenaean Greece, the most powerful state in the period, known to have been active in W. Anatolia at this time.¹ The Hittites and Ahhiyawans maintained diplomatic relations at times, and one subject that concerned them seems to have been the city of Wilusa in NW Anatolia, which there is good reason to suppose was known to later tradition as (W)ilion or Troy.² The closest contact was no doubt between Ahhiyawa and the minor states of W. Anatolia (Assuwa, Arzawa, and the Seha River Land), which were its neighbours. No archives have been found for them (yet), but the Hittite texts document an Arzawan ritual tradition which might well have become known to Greeks, and also refer to episodes of cooperation, e.g. between the kings of Arzawa and Ahhiyawa in the late 14th century BC. Since they were also in close contact with the Hittites, these states could have acted as intermediaries.

The Hittite kingdom is not the only state of the Ancient Near East to have had dealings with the Aegean; there’s evidence that Mari was in contact with Minoan Crete in the 18th century BC, and Ugarit probably had direct contact with Crete as well (see pp. 155–156). In the 15th century BC, Mycenaean envoys seem to have visited Egypt.³ However, Greek relations with Anatolia seem likely to have been closer, particularly with W. Anatolia, but even with the Hittites themselves: at one stage a deity from Ahhiyawa was apparently even present in the Hittite capital, the only Mycenaean deity attested outside the Aegean area (see §5.3).⁴

It might be added that the Greeks’ own view was that their religion was connected to areas bordering the Aegean, particularly Anatolia, Crete, and Thrace; only Aphrodite has a primary home further away in Cyprus. Zeus was born on Crete; fierce Ares is safely out of the way in Thrace.⁵ Dionysus is associated with all of them, but perhaps mostly with Thrace, along with his priest Orpheus (see §9.6.2.). But the links to Anatolia are particularly strong: Cybele migrated from Phrygia, perhaps around 600 BC, and later Sabazios. There was a major cult of Artemis at Ephesos, supposedly founded by Amazons;⁶ her statue had an exotic ‘polymastic’ form, and she was apparently worshipped under the name Oupis (p.196). And Hecate, a Greek

---

¹ For Ahhiyawa, see p. 99. For the purpose of this book I assume the new orthodox position outlined by Beckman, Bryce, and Cline in The Ahhiyawa Texts (2011).
² The equation between Wilusa and Troy was first suggested by Kretschmer (1924). It is broadly accepted today, though there are dissenters: see Gander (2017). On Wilusa see §5.4.
³ Kelder (2009).
⁴ A theonym in a 7th century inscription from Ekron has been interpreted as the name of a goddess of Mycenaean origin: see Finkelberg (2006: 114–15).
⁵ Il. 13.301, Od. 8.361.
⁶ Paus. 7.2.7 = Pindar fr. 174; Mac Sweeney (2013: 137–56).
goddess associated with magic and the chthonic sphere, is regarded as primarily Carian, at home in Lagina (see §9.6.1).

### 1.2 Greek Religion and the Near East

This work on Hittite and Greek religion takes place in the context of a broader debate about the relationship between Greek religion and all the religious systems of the Ancient Near East. People have been interested in questions of this sort from at least the 5th century BC when Herodotus claimed that the names of most of the Greek gods were Egyptian (2.50). The subject was transformed by archaeological investigation of the Ancient Near East and the discovery of cuneiform culture. Most of the scholars who have written on the subject tend to argue in favour of some version of the hypothesis of widespread cultural diffusion from East to West. An early sign of this was the German ‘Panbabylonianism’ movement which originally argued for Babylonian influence on the Bible.\(^7\) Diffusionism enjoyed a second vogue in Britain from the 1920s and 1930s;\(^6\) some of this was promoted by archaeologists, e.g. V. Gordon Childe, for whom culture developed independently in primary centres (Mesopotamia, the Nile Valley, the Indus) and was then diffused to secondary centres; some of it was down to the Myth-Ritual school which saw basic patterns such as ‘sacred kingship’ emanating from East to West; this drew on the work of James Frazer, though Frazer was not himself a diffusionist.\(^9\) A popular model in the 1960s was early (4th–3rd millennia BC) migration to the Aegean from Anatolia and further East.\(^10\) Cyrus Gordon and Michael Astour postulated influence from Ugarit and Israel.\(^11\) The most recent wave came in the 1980s with the work of Walter Burkert, Martin West, Sarah Morris, and others, who advocated widespread influence on early Greek religion art and narrative poetry, mostly in the so-called ‘Orientalizing Period’, i.e. the 8th century BC,\(^12\) and mostly via the Levant via Cyprus.

---

\(^7\) See Larsen (1995).

\(^8\) See Renfrew (1972: 55–60).


\(^10\) See e.g. Vermeule (1964: 57); see Renfrew (1972: 57).

\(^11\) Gordon (1962); Astour (1965).

\(^12\) Burkert (1992 [1984]); West (1997); Bremmer (2008a); Morris (1992). Key collected volumes on the subject are Ribichini et al. (2001) and Janowski et al. (1993) (though the latter is mostly concerned with relations between Near Eastern societies); some relevant papers appeared in Volume 6 of the Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions (2006). On culture contact in general, see Prechel (2005).
Some have advocated that diffusion could have happened from or across Anatolia, possibly in the LBA.¹³

Not everyone has embraced the idea of diffusion. As early as 1911 Lewis Farnell felt obliged to argue that Greek religion and the religions of the ancient Orient were quite unalike, with no sign of influence. In so doing, he overstated the differences in some respects, giving voice to some crude stereotypes about religions of the Ancient Near East, e.g. that Eastern religions differ from Greek religion in not being political.¹⁴ In the 1970s Colin Renfrew rejected Childe’s model of diffusion in the Bronze Age Aegean, arguing instead for Aegean culture being ‘essentially the product of local processes’.¹⁵

Two other general criticisms may be made. First, a preoccupation with diffusion may lead us to misunderstand the interactions with foreign religion in ancient cultures. Encountering other peoples’ gods was part of the lived experience of many ancient Greeks, but the main thing on their minds in most situations—except perhaps military conflict—was establishing good relations by finding common ground. Foreign gods were routinely equated with deities they were familiar with, the process of ‘translation of gods’ much discussed recently by Mark S. Smith and others.¹⁶ Whole pantheons might be mapped onto each other, with equations made between gods on the grounds of personality, sphere of activity, or name. Of course, once the equations had been made, people might begin to speculate about origins—whether this or that god came first. Once an equivalence had been established between two deities, a rapprochement between them might follow, one or both borrowing features from the other; thus, through the process that it often called ‘syncretism’, a new theo-phenotype emerges which owes something to two or more background cultures. On the other hand, even quite close and sustained contact with another religious tradition does not have to result in one group adopting anything from the other one at all; people can also ignore and they can resist.¹⁷

Another criticism of the model of borrowing is that even if cultural practices may have originated in the Ancient Near East, these are generally reworked to suit the host culture, and are irrelevant for the purpose of understanding it. Oriental origins are relevant only if Greeks were aware
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¹³ The so-called ‘via Phoenicea’ and ‘via Anatolica’, terms coined by Marrazino (1947).
¹⁴ Farnell (1911: 21): ‘for no other religion of which we have any record was so political as the Hellenic’; cf. Farnell (1911: 305): ‘the rapturous fanatic and self-abasing spirit of the East contrasting vividly with the coolness, civic sobriety, and self-confidence of the West’.
¹⁵ Renfrew (1972: 55–8, 474–8).
¹⁷ See Febvre (1925: 224–5).
of them, and even where they realized that something was foreign, they may have been thinking of proximate origin rather than ultimate origin. As Nicolas Purcell says (2006: 24):

If a Carian learned the latest Assyrian fashions from their versions in Sardis, sailed to Olbia with a Milesian vessel and passed the taste on to the Scythians in the *chora*, do you really want to call that ‘Orientalization’? It now seems quaint to predicate a change of the place or time of the ultimate genesis of the change, rather than the milieu in which it operated.

And compare Robin Osborne (2006: 154):

What happens in the period between, say, 750 and 600 BC in the central Mediterranean that seems to me singular, and worth keeping the term Orientalization for, is the taking up of various ideas, motifs and skills of whose proximate Eastern origin those taking them up were aware – though they are likely to have had neither knowledge nor interest in their ultimate origins.

These are valid points, if our aim is to understand Greek culture as it was experienced by Greeks. And one could add that Greeks sometimes imagined things were foreign when they weren’t, such as when they represented Hecate, who was quite possibly a Greek goddess, as originating in Caria. But I would argue that that is not only a valid object of research but also that it is worth investigating processes of diffusion even if these would not have been known to Greeks themselves. In a similar way, it is legitimate to investigate what genetics tells us about the migration of human populations, even though we can be pretty sure that this will to a lesser or greater extent be in conflict with people’s beliefs about their history and origin.

That does not mean that we should be satisfied with the models of borrowing that have been proposed hitherto. Burkert’s preferred explanation is the agency of wandering religious experts, and West’s book, as has been pointed out, offers no model for how change comes about, but rather an arsenal of metaphors.¹⁸ It fact there are many ways it could have happened: via alliances, diplomacy, and dynastic marriage; via war and other forms of crisis; via peer-polity interaction and festival networks.

Another factor, perhaps more important than any other, is the role of contact zones where people from different religious traditions could have lived in close proximity for long periods (see further §4.5).

1.3 Anatolian Religion and Ancient Greece: State of the Question

Partly because the Hittite religious archives are so rich and diverse, many links have been found between them and many other religious traditions. Parallels have been claimed with the religious systems of early Italy (at least partly the result of common Indo-European traditions);¹⁹ with those of early Israel (presumably via Neo-Hittite influence in the region);²⁰ and even with India via the Hurrians whose pantheon included Indo-Iranian gods.²¹ But from the beginning there was great interest in the possibility that links might be found with Greece; in fact, the hypothesis of Hittite influence on Greece had been suggested even before the decipherment of the language (mainly because Amazons were believed to be Hittite).²²

¹⁹ Lexical parallels between Hittite and Latin include Hittite saklai (custom, ceremony) and Latin sacer. The Hittite word for ‘consecrated parts of a sacrifice’—suppa (see p. 257)—has been thought to have a parallel in the Umbrian tablets from Iguvium (Watkins 1975: 208–14; see HEG II/2.14, 1191; Untermann 2000: 719–20); the Hittite ritual practice of evoking the deities of enemy lands has a parallel in the Roman evocatio ritual: see §10.5. On Hittite ištīl and Latin religio see Lebrun (2004). For the possible Anatolian background of the Etruscan hero Tarkhon see pp. 190–191; Herodotus, Hist.1.94, reported that Etruscans had Lydian ancestry, and this view has been defended by modern scholars: see Beekes (2002) and (2003a).
²⁰ See Janowski et al. (1993).
²¹ See the treaty between Suppiluliuma I and Shattiwaza, Beckman (1999a: 6A§14). For the treaty gods, see Thieme (1960). Early on, the Hittite deity Inara was seen as related to the Vedic Indra: Kretschmer (1927b, 1930a); Przulsiki (1939); Machek (1941); cf. Lincoln (1976: 45, n.13). One Indo-Iranian deity who turns up somewhat unexpectedly in Anatolia is the fire god Agni or Akni: Otten and Mayrhofer (1965). The chthonic deity Ugur has the epithet Saummatar, which has been thought to derive from Indo-Iranian ‘soma-dhana’ or ‘soma-dhara’: Güterbock (1961: 10 and 17–18) (‘it would be nice if one could say that this queen . . . turned to an Aryan god whose name was derived from the soma-drink when she was concerned about her husband’s health’; Haas (1994a: 368); Tischler, HEG II/1/14:1152–4.
²² Here is Sayce (1883: 431) on Lydian religion: The Hittite priestesses who accompanied the worship of the goddess as it spread through Asia Minor were known to Greek legend as Amazons. The cities founded by the Amazons—Ephesos, Smyrna, Kyme, Myrina, Priene, Pitane—were all of Hittite origin. In early art the Amazons were robed in Hittite costume and armed with the double-headed axe, and the dances they performed with shield and bow in honour of the goddess of war and love gave rise to the myths which saw in them a nation of woman-warriors. The Thermodon, on whose banks the poets placed them, was in the neighbourhood of the Hittite monuments of Boghaz Keui and Eyuk, and at Komana in Kappadokia the goddess Ma was served by 6000 ministers; see also Wright (1886: 75); Sayce (1910) argued that a figure on a gate at Boğazköy represented an Amazon; cf. Reinach (1910); Leonhard
Early pioneers included Bedrich Hrozný, the decipherer of Hittite, who noticed that the Hittite verb *spand-* (‘consecrate’) seemed to be cognate with Greek *spendo* (‘libate’) and that the Hittite theonym Telipinu resembled the name of the Greek hero Telephus. Archibald Sayce suggested in 1925 that the name of the Samothracian god Kad/smilos recalled the minor Hittite deity Hasamili, and that the name of the semi-mythical Leleges might go back to the Lulahhi deities. Sayce also found traces of Cybele and Attis in the Hittite texts (see pp. 181–182). In 1930 the classicist Walter Porzig drew attention to striking parallels between the Hittite Illyrykka myth and the Greek myth of Typhon in Apollodorus (see §7.3). The first link between a Hittite ritual and a Greek ritual seems to have been made in 1931 by Viktor Gebhard who pointed out that some Hittite elimination rites published by Friedrich a few years before resembled Ionian scapegoat rituals. The great Swiss scholar Emil Forrer, who had correctly (as we now believe) identified the Ahhiyawa mentioned in Hittite historical texts, also made contributions in this area. He seems to have been the first to observe parallels between the ‘Song of Kumarbi’ and Greek poetry (1935), which remains the most significant parallel between the cultures (see §7.1). Five years before that, he published a speculative paper which argued three theses.

The deity Apaliuna in the treaty between the Hittite king and Alaksandu of Wilusa was Mycenaean Greek Apollo. The equation of Apaliuna and Apollo is generally accepted today, though there are doubts about the direction of the borrowing. The Roman deity Vulcanus, along with the Cretan god Zeus Welkhanos, who may be related to him, were linked by Forrer to the Hittite verb *walh-mi,* ‘I strike’, and in particular to what he called the ‘Walhannases-giants’.

(1911); on Amazon see also later Cavaignac (1950); Echevaria (1987). In the three-volume Gli Hethei-Pelasgi P. Cesare A. de Cara (1894–1902), who has a whole chapter on Hittite Amazons (1.528–47), argued for a comprehensive Anatolian-Pelasgian influence on Greece and Italy, using philological arguments, many of them naïve. Hall (1909) was ahead of his time. Others speculated about relations between Greek and Phrygian religion, e.g. Kretschmer (1890) on Semele.

24 Sayce (1925: 163). For the lulahhi deities, see p. 188, n.33. 25 Forrer (1931).
26 See §5.4. Notice that whereas the consensus today is that Wilusa is Troy, Forrer located it in Cilicia, along with Arzawa.
27 Capdeville (1995) argues that they both reflect the same Aegean koivû. On Welkhanos, see further Neumann (1985).
These he hypothesized to exist on the basis of an interpretation of a Hittite theonym which starts with the cuneiform sign gül, read by Forrer as the logogram GUL, which can indeed stand for the Hittite word *wallh-* ‘strike’; today the theonym is interpreted as ‘Gulses’, a name for a group of mother goddesses connected with fate (see pp. 198–199).²⁸

The name of the Cyclops he derived from Hittite kalulupa = ‘finger’ on the analogy of the Greek culture heroes known as Idaean ‘Dactyls’, literally ‘Fingers’, a name appropriate for craftsmen. A nice idea, but a shot in the dark!²⁹

After the Second World War a flurry of papers appeared about the Kumarbi-Cycle and Hesiod, beginning with one by R. D. Barnett (1946) who also did important surveys of oriental influence on Greek civilization,³⁰ and the Austrian Hellenist Albin Lesky who published several papers on the same subject in the same period.³¹ This paved the way for later work (e.g. Walcot 1966 and Kirk 1970). We also see in this period more attempts to connect Hittite rituals and Greek religion: in 1950 Olivier Masson published on purification rituals, and Theodore Gaster proposed a common framework for understanding ritual, myth, and drama in the ancient world along the pattern of seasonal changes, drawing on Frazer and the Myth-Ritual school, in which he incorporated the new Hittite material.³²

Another important development after the Second World War was the discovery of the Karatepe bilingual inscription which accelerated the decipherment of Hieroglyphic Luwian. Helmuth Bossert in his study of the inscription (1952–3a, 1952–3b) made two bold suggestions with religious implications: first, that the Luwian deity Pihassassi might be the model for Greek mythical horse Pegasus and, second, that the Greek word ἑῖρας, the *vox propria* for a Bacchic wand, might go back to Hieroglyphic Luwian tuwarisa (‘vineyard’).³³ In 1958 Leonard Palmer argued that the language of Linear A, the script used in the Minoan Neo-palatial period, was a form of Luwian, that Crete and that the Aegean had been colonized from

²⁸ On logograms, see p. 22.
³¹ Lesky (1950, 1954); Lesky’s interest in the Hittites went back several decades: cf. Lesky (1926). From the same period: Otten (1949).
³² Masson (1950); Gaster (1950). ³³ On both of these see §9.3.4 and §9.6.2.
W. Anatolia at the beginning of the Middle Helladic period (ca. 2000 BC), and hence that Luwian was a ‘substrate’ language (see p. 64).

From the 1960s the volume of work increased, with contributions by Hittitologists, Hellenists, and linguists. Hellenists benefited from the increasing accessibility of the Hittite texts for non-specialists (e.g. the translations included in Pritchard’s *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, first published in 1950, and the *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* (StBoT) series, which began in 1965) as well the appearance of demystifying secondary literature, such as Oliver Gurney’s *Some Aspects of Hittite Religion* (1977). From the 1970s a key player was Walter Burkert, particularly in his 1979 book, where he compared the myth-ritual of the disappearing god Telipinu to Greek religion (see p. 93). It should be said that Anatolia never occupied a central position in Burkert’s work on the Orient and Greece;³⁴ nor did it in Martin West’s, with the exception of the Kumarbi-Cycle. (One factor here may have been that many of the key Hittite religious texts only became known in the 1980s.) In the 1980s and 1990s important contributions were made by Jan Bremmer, e.g. his classic study of scapegoats (1983); and by Billie-Jean Collins, who studied aspects of religion other scholars had ignored, such as animal sacrifice (1995). More recently, Mary Bachvarova has made extensive use of religion in her ambitious theory of Anatolian influence on Greek epic (2016).

Hopes that influence would be proved have been for the most part disappointed. In the 1920s and 1930s the pioneers like Hrozný, Sayce, and Forrer might reasonably have expected that further research into Hittite–Greek religious relations would yield more smoking guns, e.g. more evidence for awareness of each other’s divinities, more matches in the ritual lexicon (e.g. *spendo–spand*) and in theonyms (e.g. Apollo–Apaliuna), or obviously parallel myths. In fact, almost everything that has come to light in recent decades is by way of general parallels: types of ritual, and types of gods. Some linguistic matches have been suggested but all are contested;³⁵ and the closest we come to theonymic matches seem to be those between Telipinu and (Apollo) Delphinios (see §9.3.3) and between Yarri and Ares (see §9.3.2), neither of which is certain. And this despite the fact that the evidence for contact between Mycenaean Greece and the Hittites has actually increased. On the face of it, this would seem to indicate that, though

---

³⁴ For his position on this see in particular Burkert (1998).
³⁵ Linguistic matches: see pp. 79–80.
Hittites and Greeks were sometimes in contact, they tended not to share religious practices.

1.4 Aims and Methodology

Thus, the question of the relation between Hittite and Greek religion to a large extent comes down to investigating such broad patterns of similarity and difference. In other words, it is a form of comparative religion, a methodology with a long history, not in all respects glorious.³⁶

Seen in terms of the long-term development of human religious culture, such broad similarities between the Hittite and Greek religious systems can be explained in various ways. One key factor could be human nature, and it is worth remembering that at least some ritual practices and beliefs may be very early, going right back to the Palaeolithic.³⁷ Another is that social and religious practice probably reflects underlying conditions, such as the environment and economic organization; thus, if the underlying conditions were similar in different areas, their social and political structure would tend to become similar as well by a process of ‘convergent evolution’. Underlying conditions do not predetermine the outcome, but they tend to set limits on variation. These two explanations are sometimes called ‘homology’ and ‘analogy’.³⁸

Diffusion could also be a factor, and some diffusion could be very old. In W. Asia and Europe, for example, some religious ideas might have spread with agriculture at the start of the Neolithic period (i.e. 10,000 BC–7000 BC); the most likely direction would be from the East (from N. Syria and SE Turkey, where agriculture seems to have first developed), but it is bound to have been more complicated than that, and the situation in the LBA/EIA could be the result of overlapping and intersecting patterns of diffusion in many directions over many millennia.

³⁶ Malul’s (1990) study of the relation between Mesopotamian culture and the Hebrew Bible is an excellent guide, though he doesn’t discuss Greece.
³⁷ See articles in Insoll (2011).
³⁸ Homology v. analogy: Woodard (2006: 88–90). Trigger (2003) suggested that similar forms of complex society must have developed independently in different parts of the world, as similar modes of production and economic organization were developed, and that religion to some extent mirrors those changes. He suggests, for example, that as human society becomes more complex with a centralized political authority which demands the payment of tribute, so people in these societies independently come to imagine a corresponding idea of a divine order as a model for the human one, with gods who require a form of tribute just as human rulers do.
If we move closer to the historical period, it is likely that both Greece and Anatolia drew on one or more common sources. Some similarities are likely the result of a shared Indo-European inheritance, since Greek, Hittite, and Luwian are Indo-European languages, descended from an original Proto-Indo-European language probably spoken around the Black Sea in the 4th millennium BC,³⁹ and since culture and language probably go together to some extent. Indo-European speaking populations are usually thought to have gradually spread into Anatolia and Greece, starting in the 3rd millennium BC; we know little about the cultures that were there already, but it is possible that there was already some sort of common religious culture in the Aegean and W. Anatolia, which served as a sort of substrate to the new arrivals. A third common source could have been the cultures of Syria and Mesopotamia, whose impact can be traced as far as the Aegean already in the 3rd millennium BC. Later on, parallels between the Kumarbi-Cycle and Hesiod may be explained as common borrowing in a similar way (see §7.4).

Finally, another factor could indeed have been diffusion from Anatolia to Greece in the historical period. This could have been direct via the West, and notice that in some cases the Hittites could have passed to the Greeks something which they had earlier themselves adopted from Syria, so that we can speak of a ‘transanatolian’ route.⁴⁰ Diffusion from Anatolia to Greece could also have been indirect, via the mediation of a third culture. Such third cultures might include the minor states in the West, with which the Mycenaeans were in regular contact (see §5.1, p. 103); possibly also the Levant or Cyprus; or the indeed Phrygians, who occupied Central-West Anatolia from the early 1st millennium BC, if not earlier. A new culture arriving from outside might be expected to have brought its own religious practices, along with its own language, but in many cases in the ancient world new cultures seem to have absorbed and preserved much of the ‘native’ culture (which thus becomes a substrate), as indeed the Hittites had done themselves in N. central Anatolia, and as happened time after time in the Ancient Near East.

Historians of Greek religion have mostly been interested in using similarities to reconstruct origins, whether recent cultural contact and influence, or alternatively residues of fairly recent migrations (such as those of speakers
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⁴⁰ Efe (2007). The concept goes back to Marrazino (1947); some have been sceptical about the transanatolian route, including French (1986) and Burkert (1998), though see Bremmer (2006: 30) = Bremmer (2008a: 335).
of Indo-European languages). Much recent work on the subject by scholars such as Martin West and Walter Burkert comes down to using comparison in this ‘historical’ way. There are dangers here, however: looking for similarities runs the risk of attaching significance to patterns which could be coincidental, universal, or the result of convergent development.

Thinking about origins is important, but there are other ways of using comparative data. The primary technique is to chart regional patterns of similarity and variance for any given aspect of religion. A good example might be animal sacrifice: questions we might ask are, Which religious cultures have animal sacrifice with ritualized killing, and which do not? Which animals are used where? For example, which cultures use pigs and which avoid them? Which cultures make use of burned offerings? How is the blood used? How is the idea of the god consuming the offering imagined? We can then try to explain how these patterns came about, e.g. on the basis of regional variations in animal consumption or in terms of the type of society: mobile pastoralists, settled farmers, or city dwellers.⁴¹ A similar mapping of types of ritual by region can be undertaken for divination, e.g. looking at the relative prevalence of hepatoscopy or augury (see §4.2). Such patterns of similarity may occasionally be explained in terms of diffusion or migration within the historical period, but more important factors may be the underlying environmental and social conditions, and possibly also some form of prehistoric diffusion or migration. Speculation about origins is legitimate, but the primary object of comparative work should be simply to establish what is attested where.

Reflection on similarities and differences between two cultures usually reveals that they have a lot in common, but it also shows that aspects of each of them are unique. In fact it may be that in some cases the desire to assert religious difference is a motivating factor for ancient cultures. Thus, to take the case of animal sacrifice, Greek animal sacrifice has many similarities to animal sacrifice as practised in other cultures; but burning the tail on the altar is a uniquely Greek practice not shared by any other culture.

Another use of similarities is to help us understand. If we find traces of a similar phenomenon in two cultures, but we have more data for it in one culture than in the other (a common occurrence, since our evidence for any one ancient culture is full of gaps), it may be possible to use the better documented culture to explain the less well documented one. The main

⁴¹ See on this see e.g. Abusch (2002).
application of this technique has usually been to reconstruct the prehistory of rituals: let’s say that we have clear evidence for ritual practice in culture A, while for culture B we have no evidence for the ritual practice, but some evidence that would be compatible with it having once existed; then the evidence of culture A may allow us to infer by analogy that it once existed in culture B as well. A famous case is the model of initiation rituals, which was introduced into the study of Greek myth and religion entirely on the basis of comparative data (see further p. 84).

In practice, all of these approaches can be applied to the same data set, though it is important to keep them conceptually distinct. Thus, comparison may help identify regional trends; it may provide clues that help us understand the deep history of religious practices; it may sometimes, used in conjunction with historical data, provide a basis for an argument for borrowing or influence; and finally, it often illuminates the differences between cultures, and reveals what is distinctive about each of them.

1.5 Plan of the Book

The task, then, is to apply this methodology to the two religious systems. The main problem we face is the immense amount of data. Rigorous and systematic comparison would be a truly gargantuan task, requiring us to take account not just of these two cultures, but of the religious systems of all neighbouring cultures as well, and a reasonable sample of all the other ones in the world. In practice, to make it manageable one has to focus on some limited sections of the subject.

My choice is to focus on two sorts of topic. First, to maximize the chances of finding interaction and borrowing, we need to focus on zones and historical contexts where there was probably contact, and to assess the evidence in each case (Chapters 5–8). Second, we can focus on specific aspects of religion, and assess what the evidence tells us about the relationship between the cultures (Chapters 9–12). The first four chapters—including this one—are introductory.

Chapters 2 and 3 aim to provide an introduction to Hittite and Greek religion respectively. Chapter 2, ‘Hittite Religion and its Reception in Anatolia’, is aimed at those with little knowledge of the Hittites, begins
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42 See Malul (1990: 54).
with an overview of Hittite history, and looks at various aspects of the religions system: strata, sacred geography, the pantheon and a number of specific aspects. The last section looks briefly at continuity of Hittite and Luwian religion in the 1st millennium BC. Chapter 3, ‘Greek Religion in the LBA and EIA’, which is aimed primarily at those who are not experts in Greek religion, and can be skipped by those who are, presents a survey of Greek and Aegean religion, covering Minoan religion, Mycenaean religion, and Greek religion of the 1st millennium BC, addressing inter alia issues of continuity. The final section looks at Greek religion in Anatolia.

Chapter 4, ‘Working with Comparative Data: Historical and Typological Approaches’, develops further the methodological principles sketched in this introduction. One key point I aim to emphasize is that although it is legitimate to try to find out whether one religious system had borrowed something from another, it is much harder to prove borrowing than has sometimes been assumed, but that is not the only way of using the comparative method. I illustrate my approach with some examples from the history of the subject.

Chapters 5 and 6 concern the zone of contact in Western Anatolia and the E. Aegean, the ‘Aegean–Anatolian Interface’, to use Penelope Mountjoy’s terminology. Here we know not just that Greeks and Anatolians, including Hittites, were in intermittent contact in the LBA, but that Greek involvement in the area continued into the 1st millennium BC, albeit both cultures had been transformed. How great the change was in W. Anatolia depends on how much continuity we think there was from LBA Arzawa to the Lydians and Carians of the EIA, a subject which has been much debated of late. Chapter 5, ‘Anatolian–Greek Religious Interaction in the LBA: Modes of Contact’, looks at this contact in the LBA, suggesting that religious ideas might have moved in either direction as the result of political alliances and diplomatic exchanges. Chapter 6, ‘The West Anatolian Contact Zone: Arzawa and Scapegoat Rituals’, looks at the so-called corpus of purification rituals associated with ritual specialists from Arzawa and assesses the hypothesis that they might have influenced the Greek religion of the EIA.

The subject of Chapter 7, ‘Generations of Gods and the South East’, is a second key area of contact, the NE corner of the Mediterranean comprising Cilicia, the Levant, and Cyprus. This had long been an area of intense East–West contact, perhaps primarily mercantile in nature. This is the most likely route by which the so-called King Cycle of myths reached Greece, if it did, perhaps bringing with it associated ideas about categories of celestial and chthonian gods. Paradoxically, although
these myths are best preserved in Hittite translations or adaptations discovered in the archives of Boğazköy, it is more likely than not that the lender culture was in this case Ugarit or some other state in NW Syria. The orthodox view that the main period of contact was the 8th century BC could be right (though our ideas about this are changing in the light of new discoveries from Tell Tayinat and other sites). However, such links were probably already established in the LBA and they could be even earlier than that.

Chapter 8, ‘Becoming Cybele: Phrygia as an Intermediate Culture’, examines a third major contact zone in NW Turkey around the 7th century BC. Here Greek colonists established themselves and will have come into contact with the Phrygian population, who took over the area previously occupied by the Hittites in the EIA. Links between Phrygians and Greeks could be much older, perhaps going back to a time before the Phrygians migrated into Anatolia. NW Turkey is the most likely context for the transmission to Greece of the cult of the goddess whom the Greeks knew as Phrygian Cybele, although her divine personality may in fact owe a good deal to Greek ideas of the Great Mother. The question arises whether or not Phrygian Cybele owes something to the Hittite religion of five centuries before.

The final four chapters look at aspects of religion, beginning in Chapter 9, ‘Comparing Pantheons’, with the deities themselves. The Greeks associated a number of their deities with Anatolia, and there are many general resemblances between the two pantheons, and some types of deity seem to be common to both—fate goddesses, goddesses of springs. But examination of the evidence leads to the conclusion that there was no significant Hittite influence on the Greek pantheon, which is surprising, given that there was contact between Hittites and Greeks. Perhaps any interaction there was with Anatolia was with the West, i.e. Arzawa and earlier Assuwa, about whose religion we know little.

Chapter 10, ‘War-Rituals’, compares Hittite military rituals with those of Greece, setting them in the context of other religious traditions of the Ancient Near East and the Mediterranean. The hypothesis that one culture might adopt another’s military rituals is plausible because we know that techniques of warfare and military technology themselves tended in some cases to migrate. Hittite military rituals and Greek military rituals of the 1st millennium BC do not seem particularly close, but Greek poets and writers seem to have knowledge of some rituals which resemble Hittite ones, so it seems there may be some memory of an historical reality here.
Chapter 11, ‘Festivals, Amphictiones, and the Calendar’, examines the relation between the richly attested festival culture of Hittite Anatolia and Greece. The closest to Greek festivals are the local Hittite festivals described in cult inventories, where we get a sense of communal celebration. The big state festivals seem less close, though, paradoxically, these are the ones visiting foreign delegates from places like Greece might have witnessed. The Hittite texts also attest to the operation of religious networks, which have been compared to Greek amphictionies. One of the striking differences is that unlike Greek festivals and those of some parts of the Ancient Near East, Hittite festivals do not seem to be celebrated on a fixed monthly calendar, but motivated by the seasons.

Finally, Chapter 12, ‘Animal Sacrifice: Understanding Differences’, looks at animal sacrifice in the two cultures. In Greece, animal sacrifice is often presented as the single most important religious ritual and an action of great political symbolism, which can define a social group. In Hittite Anatolia, animal sacrifice was regarded as one of three types of offering, alongside libation and bread, the last being less stressed in Greece; and there is much less emphasis on social significance, though there is some. Hittite texts are unusual in the detail with which they describe animal sacrifice, and this gives us lots of opportunities to compare and contrast it with Greek practice. Some things seem very similar, such as the distinction between modes of offering aimed at upper and lower deities. But there are also differences; for example, the form of offering with the highest prestige is not animal sacrifice at all, but ‘god drinking’, a form of libation in which the participants imbibed the spirit of the deity by drinking from a vessel that was supposed in some way to embody him.
2

Hittite Religion and its Reception in Anatolia

2.1 Historical Context

The main period of Hittite history, comprising the periods of what are conventionally called the Old Kingdom and the New Kingdom, covers about 500 years, from the early 17th century BC till the apparent collapse of the New Kingdom in the early 12th century BC. After that, Hittite and Luwian traditions survived to some extent in the so-called Neo-Hittite kingdoms of SE Anatolia and N. Syria.

Before the Old Kingdom, we can trace the origins of Hittite power in the later phases of the Assyrian trading network in Anatolia in the 18th century BC.¹ At that time much of Anatolia was probably under the control of the same groups who show up in records from the later 2nd millennium BC, among them the Hattic people (speakers of a non-Indo-European language) in the central bend of the Kizilirmak, and the Luwians (speakers of an Indo-European language related to Hittite) to the South and possibly West of that. Hattic Hattusa was itself a node in the network, along with Purusḫanda (Acemhöyük?), which may have been Luwian, but the centre was at Kültepe-Kanesh. In the so-called Anitta Proclamation Anitta, king of Kanesh, tells how his father Pitḫana, from the obscure city of Kussara, took over Kanesh, and how he himself waged a wide-ranging war, conquering among other places Zalpa/Zalpuwa on the Black Sea (where he retrieved a divine statue of ‘our god’ that had previously been removed),² and Hattusa, which he sowed with cress and declared must never be resettled. Later Hittite traditions preserved a memory of this period: they called their language Nesite (after Kanesh), and the ‘singer of Kanesh’ was a frequent participant at festivals, invoking a specific set of gods (see p. 26). Zalpuwa also remained

¹ See Barjamovic (2011); Larsen (2015).
² Proclamation of Anitta§11; Steitler (2017: 190–2).
important in Hittite ideology, for example in being associated with the royal funeral (see p. 30).

For the Old Kingdom, the nearest we have to an ancient overview is the Edict of Telipinu (late 16th century BC), which begins with a king called Labarna, who consolidated rule in the SE. Hattusa probably did not become the capital until the reign of Hattusili I (ca. 1650–1620 BC),³ who campaigned more widely in Anatolia, and also in Syria, having crossed the Euphrates, self-consciously emulating the great Sargon of Akkad who had crossed it in the opposite direction around 2300 BC. Hattusili’s successor was his grandson Mursili I (1620–1590), who sacked first Aleppo, destroying the kingdom of Yamhad, and then Babylon, from where he attempted to ‘god-nap’ the statues of Marduk and Zarpanitum.⁴ Mursili was assassinated by his brother-in-law Hantili, and after a period of decline and contested successions, the kingship fell to Telipinu who for the first time set out principles for succession in his Edict, which also covers reforms related to the economic organization of the kingdom, establishing the so-called ‘houses of the seal’ which had an economic role.⁵ Telipinu also made the first known Hittite treaty, with Kizzuwatna in the South-East.

While for the 15th century (sometimes known as the ‘Middle Kingdom’)⁶ little information survives, we’re much better informed about the New Kingdom (sometimes called the ‘Empire Period’), particularly the reign of Suppiluliuma I (1350–1322 BC), his son Mursili II (1321–1295), and the various kings of the 13th century BC. The New Kingdom is supposed to start with a king called Tudhaliya (numbered I/II because of uncertainty about whether there was another homonymous king at around the same time),⁷ who launched a campaign in the West against Assuwa. Later on with his coregent Arnuwanda he dealt with the W. Anatolian warlord Madduwatta, who had been at war with ‘Attarisiya of Ahhia’ (apparently Ahhia is the same as Ahhiyawā, one of the earliest references to it in Hittite texts). In the South-East the main threat was from the Hurrian kingdom which has been encroaching into Syria and Kizzuwatna; Tudhaliya brought Kizzuwatna back into the Hittite orbit.

During the reign of his successor Arnuwanda and his queen Asmunikal, territory in the North including Nerik was lost to the semi-nomadic
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³ For dates, I follow Bryce (1998: 375–82), who uses the so-called ‘Middle Chronology’. The reader should be aware that dates are provisional.
⁴ G. Wilhelm in RIA 8: 434–5 s. Mursili I, at 435; the statue of Marduk was abandoned in mid journey at Hana: Schwemer (2008: 141); it was supposedly returned 24 years later.
⁶ See Archi (2003).
Kaska-tribes, and the crisis continued under Arnuwanda’s son Tudhaliya III, when various enemies attacked, including Arzawa which stormed across S. central Anatolia. It is at this time that Amenhotep III established diplomatic relations with Arzawa, assuming the Hittites were a spent force. Tudhaliya III may have abandoned Hattusa and moved to Samuha-Kayalpinar in the East, but eventually the Hittites fought back, and continued their campaign into N. Syria. This was also the period when the Hittite state seems to have absorbed a degree of Hurrian religion and culture, as we see from the some of the royal names (e.g. Asmunikal above; Tudhaliya III was also called Tasmisarri), coming either via Kizzuwatna or Syria.

Tudhaliya’s son Suppiluliuma continued to consolidate the kingdom, as we know from the well-preserved Deeds of Suppiluliuma compiled by his son. His main focus was in N. Syria, where he installed sons as viceroys in Aleppo and Carchemish, established relations with Ugarit, and neutralized the threat of Mitanni. Hittite activity in the East encroached on territory claimed by Egypt, which produced a reaction—Suppiluliuma was invited to send his son to marry the widowed queen of an Egyptian pharaoh, apparently Akhenaten; the son was duly sent and disappeared. Suppiluliuma’s successor was his son Arnuwanda II, who soon died, and then another son Mursili II, who is relevant to this book mainly for his decisive interventions in the West, taking action against the kingdom of Arzawa which had allied itself with Ahhiyawa (see p. 99).

Mursili’s son and successor Muwatalli II was also concerned with the West, but his main focus was on Syria and the Levant, where he led a pan-Anatolian army against the Egyptian forces of Ramesses II at Battle of Qadesh (1274 BC). He also moved the Hittite capital to Tarhuntassa in the South-East, closer to Syria. Muwatalli’s immediate successor was his son Mursili III/Urhi-Tessub, whose reign saw the restoration of the capital to Hattusa, and the reconquest of Nerik, the latter organized by his uncle Hattusili. The same uncle later deposed him and drove him into exile, going on to rule for three decades as Hattusili III (1267–1237). Hattusili took the precaution of making his other nephew Kurunta (Ulmi-Tessub) king of the appanage kingdom of Tarhuntassa (a number of treaties were made between Kurunta and Hittite kings, including the Bronze Tablet discovered in 1986). Under his successors,
Kurunta may have made a claim for independence.¹¹ Hattusili’s major achievement in foreign policy was the great treaty with Egypt (1259 BC), and the subsequent royal marriage (1246 BC), the latter negotiated in part by his wife queen Puduhepa. Hattusili’s successor was his son Tudhaliya IV whose reign saw conflict with Assyria, which had absorbed what was left of Mitanni. The Hittites were defeated at the Battle of Nihriya. Tudhaliya also campaigned in Lukka (as we know from the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription from Yalburt near Konya) and apparently in Alashiya-Cyprus, perhaps attempting to control access to Assyria.

The last Hittite king known to us is Suppiluliuma II (written Suppiluliam), who also battled in Cyprus and probably in the South-West. The kingdom is usually supposed to have fallen around 1180 BC, based on Egyptian evidence for the movement of the so-called Sea Peoples, backed up by Ugaritic records. The causes are uncertain. One factor might be the increasing strength of Assyria. Another might be climate change. Eric Cline (2014) talks of a ‘systems collapse’; Stefano de Martino (2018) has argued that the Hittite state had become progressively weaker from the 14th century due to a variety of factors.

At its greatest, Hittite influence stretched from the Aegean to the Euphrates, a network held together by dynastic relationships and treaties. There was good connectivity across Anatolia, as we see from Mursili II’s Extensive Annals, where forces from Carchemish are summoned and deployed on the Western front.¹² The Hittites were predominantly a land power who saw the sea as the limit to their territory,¹³ although military operations against Cyprus were somehow organized in the mid 13th century (presumably using vassals like Ugarit); for the purpose of trade, they made use of the merchants of Ura, a city or territory on the South coast, probably near the mouth of the Calycadnus/Göksu River near Silifke.¹⁴

### 2.2 Sources

Our sources for Hittite religion are mostly documents; iconography and material culture are limited (see below). The documents are mostly
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¹¹ Bronze tablet: Beckman (1999a: no. 18c); Otten (1988); claim for independence: Singer (1996b).
¹² AhT IB§5.
¹³ Three times in the Telipinu Edict: CTH 19, §3, §6, §8; for parallels in texts of Hattic origin see Klinger (2000).
cuneiform texts from the archives in the capital, most of them dating from the New Kingdom, but some of them from the Old Kingdom.¹⁵ A few texts have been found in other places, including:

Maşat Höyük (ancient Tapikka) dating to the early 14th century BC, reign of Tudhaliya III
Kuşaklı (ancient Sarissa)
Ortaköy (ancient Sapinuwa), also dating to the reign of Tudhaliya III; and Kayalpınar (ancient Samuha).

The language of most of the texts is Hittite,¹⁶ albeit written in part with Sumerian or Akkadian logograms (modern transcriptions use capitals or italicized capitals for these). This means that for some key concepts, the logogram that was used by scribes to write it is known, but the corresponding Hittite word is either unknown or uncertain. One example is the word for festival EZEN₄ (festival): see p. 36. One important convention of the writing system is that it makes systematic use of ‘determinatives’ to indicate the class of a noun or name; thus, theonyms are generally written with the logogram for ‘god’, which is usually represented today by a superscribed letter ‘D’, standing for the Sumerian for deity, ‘dingir’.

Other languages are found in the archives as well, corresponding to different cultural traditions: Hattic, Luwian, Hurrian, Palaic (another member of the Anatolian branch of Indo-European), and Babylonian. Luwian may have been the language of much of the population at the time, contrasting with the elite Hittite.¹⁷ Hittite religious texts frequently cite Hattic, Luwian, and Hurrian words; Luwian words perceived as foreign are often designated as such by a special prefixed symbol, the so-called ‘Glossenkeil’ (<<)). Some texts were translated from other languages, including mythological narratives, such as the Kumarbi-Cycle, originally in Hurrian (see

¹⁵ They can be distinguished by details in the script: van den Hout (2009) provides an overview of this complex issue.
¹⁶ Hittite language: grammar: Hoffner and Melchert (2008); Francia (2005); dictionary: the best tool is the Chicago Hittite Dictionary (CHD), though so far only a few letters have been published (L–N, P, S). Similarly incomplete, though still immensely useful, are the etymological dictionaries of Tischler (HEG) and Puhvel (HED). Kloekhorst (2008) provides a useful overview of the whole language; Weeden (2011) has provided a guide to logograms; the standard sign-list Rüster and Neu (1989). Introductory guide to the language: van den Hout (2011).