

CHAPTER III

THE HITTITES

A FORGOTTEN EMPIRE. HITTITE MONUMENTS: Sendjirli, Boghaz Koi. Other recent excavations. HITTITE DECIPHERMENT: Sayce's early work. Peiser. Jensen. Condor. Sayce's later work. Thompson. Delitzsch. Hrozný. Sommers. Forrer. Friedrich. Gotze. Delaporte. Sturtevant. Cowley. Frank. Meriggi. Gelb. Bossert. HITTITE HISTORY: First appearance. Hyksos possibly Hittites or Hurrians. The Mitanni. Kingdom of "Hittite City." Carchemish. Samal and Yadi. Hamath.

1. **A Forgotten Empire.**---Among the peoples who are said to have been in Palestine in the Patriarchal age are the Hittites (Gen. 23:10; 25:34, etc.). They are mentioned most often in the list of peoples whom the Israelites drove out of the country when they conquered it: "the Canaanite, the Hittite, the Amorite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite," and the man who first suspected that anything more than this could be known of them survived until 1933. This man was Prof. Sayce of Oxford. In the inscriptions of the Egyptian kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties there is also frequent mention of a people called Kha-at-tu. Slowly, too, during the nineteenth century rock-carvings, often accompanied by inscriptions in a peculiar hieroglyph, were found scattered throughout northern Syria and Asia Minor. The figures of gods and men on these carvings usually wore caps of a peculiarly pointed type and shoes turned far up at the toe. In 1876 it dawned upon Prof. Sayce that these were all references to the Biblical Hittites. He proceeded to elaborate this view in two articles published in the *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, Vols. V and VII.

About the same time the Rev. William Wright independently started the same idea, and gave it expression in his book, *The Empire of the Hittites*, 1884, 2d ed., 1885. At this period it was impossible to discern more than that there had been a widely scattered Hittite civilization, which might have been an empire.

2. **Hittite Monuments.**---This civilization, it was seen, had left its monuments at Hamath in Syria at Carchemish on the Euphrates, at various points in ancient Cappadocia, Lycaonia, and Phrygia,

as well as near Smyrna in Asia Minor and on the Lydian mountains to the west of Sardis. In 1891 Prof. W. Max Muller, of Philadelphia, reached the conclusion from a study of the Egyptian inscriptions that the Hittites had come into Syria from the northwest, and that their main strength was in Asia Minor. Among the letters found at El-Amarna in Egypt in 1887-1888 were some from Dushratta, a king of Mitanni. A study of these made clear that the Mitanni inhabited the region on both sides of the Euphrates north of Carchemish, and that they were of the same stock as the Hittites. Our sources of information indicate that the territory of the Mitanni lay to the east of the Euphrates, but scattered monuments of the Hittite type are found on the west of the river.

(1) *Sendjirli.*---From 1888 to 1891 a German expedition excavated at Sedjirli, near the head waters of the Kara Su in northern Syria, and brought to light most interesting remains of a civilization that was fundamentally Hittite. Inscriptions found here dated in the reigns of Tiglath-pileser III and Esarhaddon were in Aramaic. By this time there had been an influx of Aramaeans,

but the art shows that Hittites held the place at an earlier time, and there is reason to believe that one of the kings mentioned here had, about 850 B.C., joined in a Hittite federation.

(2) *Boghaz Koi*.---Among the monuments known to Prof. Sayce at the beginning of his brilliant studies of the Hittites, were some from Boghaz Koi, in Asia Minor. Different travelers had noted that here must have been a somewhat extensive city, adorned carvings of the peculiar Hittite type. In 1906 the late Prof. Winckler, of Berlin, excavating here in connection with the authorities of the Turkish Museum at Constantinople, discovered an archive of clay tablets inscribed in Babylonian characters. A group of similar tablets from Cappadocia had been previously purchased by the British Museum. Winckler's discovery was important because he found some of the tablets inscribed in Hittite written in cuneiform characters. Of those written in the Babylonian language, one contained a copy of the great treaty between Hattusil, a Hittite king, and Ramses II of Egypt. There were also tablets containing Sumerian and Semitic equivalents of Hittite words. Owing to the long illness of Winckler, which followed these discoveries, were not given to the world until more than decade had passed.

75

In 1907 Winckler and Puchstein, in conjunction with Makridy Bey of the Turkish Museum, made a thorough examination of the remains of walls and buildings at Boghaz Koi. The results were afterward published in a handsome volume entitled *Boghaskoi, die Bouwerke*, Leipzig, 1912 (see Figs. 23 and 25). The Germans in 1931, 1932, and 1936 further explored the site, bringing to light additional tablets.

(3) *Other Excavations*.---An American expedition consisting of Drs. Olmstead, Charles and Wrench, of Cornell University, explored in Asia Minor in 1907-1908. The members of this expedition collated all the known monuments of the Hittites, but so far only their collation of the inscriptions has been published.

The Institute of Archaeology of the University of Liverpool also sent one or more expeditions to explore the Hittite country. In 1910 they excavated to some extent at Sakje-Geuze, not far from Sendjirli.

From 1911 until the outbreak of the Great War in 1914, the British Museum conducted an examination at Jerablus, the site of ancient Carchemish.

It was found that the site of Carchemish was occupied from about 1750 – 1200 B.C. by a small town, the wall of which was traced. This town was destroyed by an enemy about the date last mentioned, but was, not many years later replaced by a much larger city. The wall of which was fortified with strong gates and towers, was also traced. This city, occupied by the Hittites until captured by Sargon of Assyria in 717 B.C., contained an acropolis, which Sargon surmounted with a palace, the ruins of which were uncovered. The expedition unearthed several inscriptions written figures of men and lions, seals, jewelry, and many small objects. H.H. Van der Osten to make an archaeological survey of the Hittite country in Asia Minor. He chose a site for excavation and since 1927 has explored Alishar Huyuk. Below strata of the Roman period at least two strata of earlier civilizations were found.

Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient Gesellschaft, Nos. 72 December, 1933, and 75, 1937
Garstang in the *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*, I (1908), 97-117
Carchemish, Pt I by D.G. Hogarth, London, 1914, Pt. II, by C.L. Woolley, 1921
Van der Osten, *Explorations in Central Anatolia*, 1926, Chicago 1929
See Van der Osten, *The Alishar Huyuk Season of 1927*, Chicago, 1930

76

In addition to these places, Hittite remains have been observed at Yaila, Marash, Ginaour-Kalesi, Karaburna, Kizil Dag, Fraktin, Ivriz, Kara-Bel, Mount Sypilus, Tashji, Asarjik, Bulghar-Maden, Gurun, and Kara Dag. One who will look up these places on a map of modern Turkey will see that Hittite monuments are distributed from near the shores of the Aegean Sea to the Euphrates at Carchemish and to Hamath in Syria.

3. Hittite Decipherment.

(1) *Sayce's Early Work.*---Prof. Sayce, whose insight first grasped the significance of the Hittite monuments, was also the first to attempt the solution of the riddle which the inscriptions present. In 1880 he thought he had found a key to the writing, such as the Rosetta Stone had been to Egyptian, in the so-called "Boss of Tarkondemos" (see Fig. 26). This "boss" consisted of a round silver plate, in form like half an orange, which must have covered the knob of a staff or dagger. This had been described by Dr. A.D. Mordtmann, in the Journal of the German Oriental Society in 1872. The original was then in the possession of Alexander Jovanoff, a numismatist of Constantinople, who had obtained it at Smyrna. The "boss" bore in its center a figure of the peculiar Hittite form, flanked on both sides by writing in the Hittite characters were capable of being read in more than one way. Using the key thus obtained, Sayce enlarged his list of supposed sign values and in 1884 and 1885 published as known the values of thirty-two Hittite signs. In the years that followed Ball and Menant took up the discussion of the Hittite signs, but with no decisive result.

In 1889 Winckler and Abel published in one of the volumes of the Royal Museum at Berlin the first installment of the text of the El-Amarna letters, in which there were two from Dushratta, King of Mitanni, in which there were two of the text of the el-Amarna letters, in which there were two from Dushratta, King of Mitanni, in the native language of that country, though written in Babylonian characters. In the following year, 1890, Profs. Jensen, Brunnow, and Sayce all published in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* studies of this language, Sayce even venturing a translation of a part of the text. Each of these scholars had worked independently of the others, but none of them seems to have suspected that the language had anything to do with Hittite.

(2) *Peiser.*---In 1892 Dr. Peiser, then of Breslau University, published his book on the Hittite inscriptions, in which he essayed another method of decipherment, Layard had found four Hittite seals in the palace of Sennacherib at Nineveh. Peiser inferred that these must be seals of four Hittite kings mentioned in the inscriptions of that time, and proceeded to assign each seal to the name of a known Hittite king, and interpret the signs on the seal by the name of that king as spelled out in the cuneiform characters of the Assyrian inscriptions. Having obtained in this way tentative values for several signs, he proceeded by inference to guess at other signs, and so tentatively read some inscriptions.

(3) *Jensen.*---Prof. Jensen, of Marburg, wrote in the same year an unfavorable review of Peiser's work. When reading the proofs of his review he added a postscript to say that he believed he had himself discovered the key to Hittite. Two years later, 1894, he published in the Journal of the German Oriental Society his method of solving the problem. Jensen's starting-point was gained from inscriptions from Jerablus, the site of ancient Carchemish, Hamath, and other places. He inferred that a certain sign was the determinative for city, and that the names preceding this sign were names of places. Gaining in this way some values for signs, he read the names of some kings. He found that these names had nominatives ending in *s* and accusative cases ending in *m*; he accordingly leaped to the conclusion that the Hittite language was a member of the Indo-European group of languages, as this is the only known group of tongues in which this phenomenon occurs. This inference later research has in part confirmed. Jensen,

however, went further and endeavored to show that the Hittites were the ancestors of the Armenians of later time. This theory led to the publication in 1898 of his book, *Hittiter und Armenier*. Of the correctness of this view he has not been able to convince other scholars. By this time Jensen and others had begun to see that Mitannians and the Hittites were kindred peoples and worshiped the same gods. It is now recognized that Jensen correctly ascertained the value of some signs, though many of his guesses, like those of his predecessors, have proved incorrect.

(4) *Conder*---In 1898 Lieut.-Col C.R. Conder published *The Hittites and Their Language*, a work in which he presented still another decipherment of the inscriptions. Conder's decipherment was based on a comparison at the Hittite characters with the Sumerian pictographs on the one hand and the syllabify which

78

was used by Greeks in Cyprus, Caria, and Lydia on the other. He assumed that if a picture had in Sumerian a certain syllabic value, and if the Cypriot syllabary presented a character somewhat resembling it which had a similar value, the Hittite character which most closely resembled these must have the same value, since the Hittites lived between the two peoples who used the other syllabaries. This system of decipherment has attracted no adherents because it is based on a fallacious inference. It does not follow because a nation lives between two other nations, that its institutions are kindred to those of its neighbors. One could not explain writings of the Indian tribes of Arizona, for example, by comparing them with books printed in English in St. Louis and in Spanish in Los Angeles! In 1899 Messerschmidt, who was collecting in one body all the known Hittite inscriptions for publication, published a study of the language of the letters of Dushratta. Messerschmidt's later publication of the Hittite inscription made it far easier for scholar to study the subject.

(5) *Sayce's Later Work*--- Stimulated by Jensen's efforts, Prof. Sayce returned to the study of Hittite in 1903, and published in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology of that year (Vol XXV) a new decipherment. He followed Jensen's readings as proved, and with the originality and daring that characterize so much of his work, launched many new readings. Some of these have commended themselves to his successors.

In 1909 Ferdinand Bork returned to the problem of the language of Mitanni, and published a pretty complete decipherment of the Mitanni tablets in the El-Amarna letters. In 1911 Dr. B.B. Charles, the philologist of the Cornell expedition to Asia Minor, published as Part II of volume of *Travels and Studies in the Nearer East*, which was to have embodied, had it been completed the results of the Cornell expedition, his collation of the Hittite inscriptions. This publication added some new texts to those previously known. In 1912 Prof. Clay of Yale, rendered the subject of Hittiteology a distinct service by including in his volume of Personal Names from Cuneiform inscriptions of the Cassite Period a list of Hittite and Mitannian proper names, and a list of the nominal and verbal elements, which enter into the composition of such names.

Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft, 1899, Heft 4.

79

(6) *Thompson*.---Another attempt on a large scale to unravel the mystery of the Hittite inscriptions is that of R. Campbell Thompson, "A New Decipherment of the Hittite Hieroglyphs," published in *Archaeologia*, second series, Vol. XIV, Oxford, 1913. Mr.

Thompson, was a member of the British expedition which excavated Carchemish, and gained the idea which gave him the starting-point for his decipherment from an inscription excavated by that expedition. This inscription contained many proper names, and, after passing it and looking at it every day for a long time, it occurred to Mr. Thompson that a certain elaborate sign which frequently occurred to Mr. Thompson that a certain day for a long time, it occurred to Mr. Thompson that a certain elaborate sign which frequently occurred in it might be part of the name of the Hittite King Sangar, who is frequently mentioned by Ashurnasirpal II and Shalmaneser III of Assyria. In seeking proof for this Mr. Thompson was led into a study of the texts, which resulted in a new interpretation of the Hittite signs. His work is logical at every point, he makes no inference without first examining all the occurrences in the known texts of the group of signs in question, and he tests his inferences wherever possible by the known results of a study of Mitannian and cuneiform Hittite.

(7) *Delitzsch*.---After the death of Prof. Winckler, the cuneiform tablets which he had discovered at Boghaz Koi were turned under whose general direction Weidner worked, published in May, 1914, a study based on twenty-six fragments of lexicographical texts which Weidner was working. These texts defined Hittite words in Sumerian and in Assyrian. Although the texts are very fragmentary, Prof. Delitzsch was able to gain in this way a vocabulary of about 165 Hittite words, the meanings of most of which were known, and to ascertain some facts about the grammar of Hittite.

We seemed in 1915 just on the eve of a complete mastery of the secrets of the Hittite inscriptions, and, in part, this was true. Some features of their speech seemed to resemble features of the Indo-European family of languages, but other features appeared to denote Tartar affinities. In a number of instances the influence of the Assyrian language could clearly be traced. Pictures of Hittites appear in Egyptian reliefs. Two distinct types of face are there portrayed. One type has high cheekbones, oblique eyes, and wears a pigtail, like the peoples of Mongolia and China; the other has a clean-cut head and face, which resemble somewhat the early Greeks. These were the Indo-Europeans.

80

(8) *Hrozny*, a Bohemian scholar, published in the *Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin*, no. 56 (December, 1915), a resume of a new study of Hittite decipherment. This was followed in 1917 by the publication of a book on the Language of the Hittites, and in 1919 by a book on Hittite Cuneiform Texts from Boghaz Koi. These studies are based on copies of cuneiform tablets Constantinople made by Professor Hrozny and Dr. Figulla before the war. Hrozny concluded that Hittite is not only an Indo-European language, but that it also belonged to the western half of the Indo-European family. In other words, he found it more closely related to Greek, Latin, Keltic, and the Teutonic tongues than to the Slavonic, Lithuanian, Armenian, and Persian languages, or to Sanscrit and its daughters. According to Hrozny, then, the Hittites came from western Europe or the center from which the western European peoples radiated. He thought they crossed into Asia by way of the Bosphorus. He supported his contention by some interesting philological analogies. The Mitanni, on the other hand, belonged, he thought, to the eastern half of the Indo-European family. They were closely related to the Slavs, Lithuanians, Armenians, Persians, etc. The indications seem to be that they entered Asia by way of the Caucasus. That the ruling class of the Hittites was of Indo-European stock and that the grammatical structure of the language as well as many elements of its vocabulary are Indo-European was further demonstrated by Ferdinand Sommers and acknowledged by Professor Bloomfield. The present writer's own study of the language convinced him of the truth of this view. The declension of the noun, the general scheme of the conjugation of the verb, the substantive verb "to be" are all Indo-European. The pronouns are practically identical with those

of Latin and of some of the older Greek dialects. Many of the roots of individual words are identical with those in Greek and Latin, while others are identical with those in the Teutonic group of languages. All this has been learned by the study of the Hittite documents written in the cuneiform character, which Winckler discovered at Boghaz Koi. All that remained for a complete understanding of the language was to work out more completely the meaning of words and the finer shades of grammatical construction.

Die Sprache der Hethiter, Leipzig 1916, and *Hethitische Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazkoi* 1919 Leipzig
Hethitisches, Leipzig, 1920-1922
Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 41, pp. 195-210

81

Through the labors of E. Forrer, Johannes Freidrich, and Albrecht Gotze in Germany, Louis Delaporte in France, and Professor E.H. Sturtevant in America, progress is being constantly made in our knowledge of the grammar and vocabulary of the language. Delaporte published in 1929 a grammar of Hittite; Sturtevant, a glossary, which has gone through two editions, and a comparative grammar, while the present writer has published a manual for beginners in Hittite. A study of the tablets from Boghaz Koi reveals the fact that no less than six languages in addition to Sumerian and Akkadian (as the Babylonian Semitic is called) are contained in them. The language spoken by the ruling dynasty at Boghaz Koi (that of Subbilliuma and his successors) was an offshoot of the Indo-European family of languages. Embedded in the texts of this language there are eighteen quotations of proverbs, which are said by the writers to be Hittite. Scholars call this Proto-Hittite. This real Hittite language is clearly not an Indo-European language. The fact is that the ruling dynasty represented an Indo-European race that had conquered a non-Indo-European race who were the real Hittites.

Another dialect, of which about seven hundred words are preserved in the tablets, is the Luyyish---spoken in the city of Luyya. (See p. 409. 23.) One fragment of a text is bilingual---Hittite and Luyyish. Luyyish seems, like Hittite, to have been Indo-European.

Still another language, of which the tablets from Boghaz Koi contain about 3500 lines, is the Hurri (formerly read Harri). The Hurri occupied the kingdom of Mitanni and the country east of it. The Mitannians were Hurrian by race. Although it was formerly inferred that the Mitannians were Indo-European from the fact that their gods were Mitra, Varuna, and Indra, gods of the Aryans in India, it now appears that only the ruling class in Mitanni were of the Indo-European stock, and that they were neither numerous enough nor strong enough to impose their language on the country as the Indo-Europeans at Boghaz Koi did, but spoke the language of their non-Indo-European subjects, who were the Hurri.

Delaporte, *Elements de la grammaire Hittite*, Paris, 1929
E.H. Sturtevant, *Hittite Glossary*, 2d, Baltimore, 1936; a *Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*, Philadelphia, 1933, and in collaboration with George Bechtel, *Hittite Chrestomathy*, Philadelphia 1935.
G.A. Barton, *A Hittite Manual for Beginners*, Paris, 1928; and in collaboration with Baruch Weitzel, *A Hittite Chrestomathy*, Paris 1932

82

Yet another language, represented in the tablets by five extracts, is the Balish. The passages in question are proverbs, which contain words identical with words in Hittite and Luyyish. Whether they are borrowed words, or whether Balish was really in Indo-European tongue, we cannot yet tell.

In four tablets there are quotations of the Manda language. We are now in a position to see that in all probability the great mass of the people who are vaguely called Hittites by Biblical writers and by the Assyrians were neither Indo-Europeans nor Semites.

The art found at Juzi, at Tell Halaf, at Tell Billah, and Tepe Gawra is as Speiser has shown, connected with that of the Hittites and the ancient Elamites, and shows that the Proto-Hittites shared the civilization of the Elamites.

(9) While the cuneiform Hittite has attracted much attention in recent years, the hieroglyphic Hittite has not been neglected. In 1920 Dr. A.E. Cowley, in his "Schweich Lectures" on the Hittites, devoted a chapter to the decipherment of these characters. He started anew as though nothing had previously been done collecting groups of signs from different inscriptions, grouping those which were followed by the same determinative, and assuming that they were proper names; he grouped those that were written by means of the same signs in the different inscriptions tentatively equated them with known names that would be likely to be mentioned, and so obtained probable values for many signs.

(10) A similar effort was made in 1923 by a German scholar, Dr. Varl Frank, who followed much the same method as Cowley, but accumulated a larger number of names and worked out his values in greater detail.

(11) In 1929 an Italian scholar, Piero Meriggi, published another attempt to advance of this baffling writing. Like his predecessors, he attempted to gain phonetic values by the analysis of the hieroglyphic writing of known proper names. He afterward pursued the subject, elaborating his method in at least two other essays.

Mesopotamia Origins, Philadelphia, 1930

Die sogenannten hettitischen Hieroglypheninschriften, Leipzig, 1923 in Band XVI of *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, edited by Geiger, Littman, and Steindorf

Die hethitische Hieroglyphenschrift, in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, XXXIX (1929-30), pp 165-212

Orientalische Literatur-zeitung XXXVI (Feb 1933) 73 ff. and *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatische-aegyptische Gesellschaft*, XXXIX (1934), Heft

(12) More ambitious is the work of Ignace J. Gelb, who, building upon the work of all his predecessors, and coordinating his results with the knowledge obtained from the cuneiform Hittite, has extended his work further and essayed the translation of some simple inscriptions.

(13) Professor Emil O. Forrer, of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, in April, 1932, published a different method of attacking the problem. In so far as he ventured to give phonetic values to Hittite signs his results often differ from those of his predecessors.

(14) Helmuth T. Bossert published in 1932 an article in which he advanced the decipherment materially toward a secure foundation.

(15) In 1933, Hzrony, who had found the key to the Hittite cuneiform, published new and partly independent decipherment. This work embodied new and independent discoveries. As a result the decipherment of the Hittite hieroglyphs has been put upon a solid basis. Some fifty phonetic characters and many ideograms can now be read with considerable confidence. The language is related to the cuneiform Hittite, and appears to be related to the Luyyish dialect already mentioned.

4. Hittite History.

(1) *First Appearance.*—The earliest reference to the Hittites which we have in any written record occurs in a Babylonian chronology, which states that "against Shamsu-ditana the men of the country of Khattu marched." Shamsu-ditana was the last king of the first dynasty of Babylon. His reign terminated in 1870 B.C. Khattu land, as will appear further on, was the name later given to the Hittite settlement in Cappadocia. One would naturally suppose that the name would have the same significance here, but of this we cannot be certain. The tablet on which this

chronicle was written was inscribed in the Persian or late Babylonia period, but there is evidence that it was copied from an earlier original. If its statement is true, the Hittites had made their appearance in history and were prepared to mingle in that melee of the races, which occurred when the first dynasty of Babylon was overthrown. Nothing

Hittite Hieroglyphs I, Chicago, 1931, II 1934

"Die sogenannte hehithische, Bilderschrift," in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, XLVIII, 137-169

Mitteilungen der altorientalischen Gesellschaft, VI Heft 3, 1932

Les inscriptions hittites hieroglyphiques, Paris 1933

Sturtevant, *Language* VIII, 1933, 273-279

L.W. King, *Chronicles Concerning Early Babylonia Kings*, London, 1907, Vol II, p. 22

84

is said in the chronicle as to the location of the land of Khattu, but there can be no doubt that the Hittites approached Babylonia from the northwest. Their seat must have been in the region where we later find the Hittites, or Mitanni. At what period the Hittites came into this region we can only conjecture. The excavations at Sakje-Geuze reveal a civilization there extending back to about 3000 B.C., which resembled a civilization there extending back to about 300 B.C., which resembled that found at Susa in Elam belonging to the same period. This civilization may not have been Hittite in its beginnings. Mr. Woolley, a member of the British expedition which excavated at Carchemish, in a study of the objects found in tombs at Carchemish, in a study of the objects found in tombs at Carchemish and at other places near by, thinks it possible that the coming of the Hittites is marked by a transition period in the art---a period the termination of which he marks by the date of the fall of the first dynasty of Babylon. It may well be that Indo-Europeans followed by Mongols came about 2100 or 2000 into this region, or that the Mongols were there earlier and that the Indo-Europeans followed by Mongols came about 2100 or 2000 into this region, or that the Mongols were there earlier and that Indo-Europeans came. In the resultant civilization it would seem, from the information that we have, that here was a mingling of the two races; (see Fig. 24).

(2) Hyksos Possibly Hittites or Hurrians.----Since the Hittites were able to help overthrow the first dynasty of Babylon, some scholars have recognized the possibility that those invaders of Egypt who established the dynasties called Hyksos may have been Hittites, or may have been led by Hittites. There is much evidence that many Semites entered Egypt at that time, but as Syria and Palestine were peopled with Semites earlier than this, such an invasion would naturally have had many Semites among its camp followers if not in its armies, even if the leaders were Hittites. At present, however, this is but a possibility. Some slight evidence in favor of the possibility may be found in the name of the king of Jerusalem who was a vassal of Amenophis IV, and who wrote the letters from Jerusalem, which are in the El-Amarna collection. (See p. 442, 2) His name was Abdi-Hepa, and Hepa was a Hittite and Mitannian deity. Abdi-Hepa, had grown up a trusted subject of the Egyptians. His ancestors must therefore, have been in Palestine for some time. A settlement of Hittites there in the Hyksos days would account for this. The twenty-third chapter of Genesis represents the city of Hebron as in the possession of the Hittites when Abraham purchased the cave of Machpelah as a place of burial for his dead; and, though many scholars regard Genesis 23, which gives this account as a late composition

85

its representation would receive some confirmation from archaeology if the Hyksos were Hittites.

There is a possibility that the Hittites were in southern Palestine earlier than this. Brugsch thought that he found in an inscription in the Louvre, written by an officer of Amenemhet I, King of Egypt, 2000-1970 B.C., a statement that this officer had destroyed the palaces of the Hittites near the Egyptian frontier of Palestine. This reading was defended by Prof. Sayce, though other Egyptologists, such as W. Max Muller and Breasted, claim that the word that is thought to be Hittite is not a proper name, but a common noun meaning nomads. The text of the passage is uncertain, and no important inference can in any case be made from it.

During the period when we obtain glimpses of the history of the Hittites, they flourished here and there, such as that of the Mitanni in Mesopotamia, the Hittites at Boghaz Koi, the kingdoms of Carchemish, of Hamath, and Tyana. These flourished at different times all the way from 1400 to 700 B.C., and there were doubtless other kingdoms also, for the Hittite sculptures near Smyrna and Manissia cannot have been made by any of these, unless possibly the great Hittite kingdom at Boghaz Koi may once have extended its power to the Aegean.

(3) The Mitanni.---The earliest of these kingdoms which we can trace is that of the Mitanni. Why it took the name Mitanni we do not yet know. The people were really Hurri, Mattiuaza, son of Dushratta, in his treaty with Subbiluliuma, twice employs the phrase "...we Hurri." Perhaps the ruling house were Aryans, for Indra, Varuna and Mitra were among the Mitannian deities, but the Hurrians as a race were not, as Hrozný once thought, Aryans. When Thothmes III of Egypt extended his conquests to the Euphrates in 1468 B.C. he came into contact with the Mitanni. The king of the country is not named, but it was claimed that her chiefs hid themselves in caves. There is some reason for believing that their chief city was near Haran, Mesopotamia, the city where Abraham sojourned for a time (Gen. 11:31, 12:4). If this be

History of Egypt II, 404, 405

Expository Times, Nov. 1914 pg. 91

Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern, 319

Ancient Records, Egypt, I 227, 228

G.A. Barton, *Semitic and Hamitic Origins*, Philadelphia, 1934

Breasted's *Ancient Records, Egypt. II*, 773

Winckler in *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1913, Heft, 4, p.81

86

true, it gives a new meaning to Ezekiel 16:3: "The Amorite was thy father and thy mother was a Hittite." Thothmes evidently touched the kingdom of Mitanni on its western border. He did not penetrate its heart or overcome its king. Although he took tribute, he does not tell us the name of the king of the Mitanni whose armies he fought.

Half a century later the king of the Mitanni was Artatama I. He was a contemporary of Thothmes IV of Egypt, who ruled 1420-1411 B.C. Perhaps it was their mutual fear of the rising power of the Hittite kingdom at Boghaz Koi that led Artatama and Thothmes IV to form an alliance. At all events, such an alliance was made, and Thothmes married a daughter of Artatama's grandson says that the Egyptian king sent his request for her hand seven times before Artatama yielded to his solicitations. Artatama I was succeeded by Shutarna I, whose reign overlapped a part of that of Amenophis III of Egypt, 1411-1375 B.C. Among the queens of Amenophis III was a daughter of Shutarna I. Before the reign of Amenophis III had ended Shutarna I had been succeeded by Dushratta, who continued their friendly relations with Egypt. Dushratta's reign also overlapped in part that of Amenophis IV of Egypt, 1375-1357 B.C., and Dushratta wrote several letters to both of these Egyptian kings. It is from these letters that we gain most of our information about Mittanni.

Meanwhile the great kingdom of the Hittites at Boghaz Koi had entered upon its era of expansion under Subbiluliuma, who pushed his conquests first eastward and then southward.

Dushratta feared to meet the Hittite in battle and retired to the eastward, allowing much of his country to be overrun. This land Subbiluliuma gave to one of his allies, and Dushratta was murdered soon afterward by his son, Sutatarra, who usurped the crown. Soon after this the Assyrians invaded the lands of the Mitanni from the east, and the land already distracted by its internal divisions, was thrown into a worse confusion. At this juncture Subbiluliuma crossed the Euphrates again and entered Mitannian territory. He was accompanied by settlers who brought cattle sheep, and horses to remain in the country. Advised by an oracle, he deposed Sutatarra and placed upon the throne Mattiuaza, a son of Dushratta, who had been heir apparent and who had fled when his father was murdered. To Mattiuaza Subbiluliuma gave his daughter in

87

marriage, and Mitanni became a vassal state of the Hittite realm. After this our sources tell us no more of its history.

Near the Mitanni was another kingdom of the Hurri, who were certainly of the same race, for in the time of Subbiluliuma they were ruled first by Artatama II, a brother of Dushratta, and then by Sutarna II. This state also became a part of Subbiliuma's kingdom.

(4) Kingdom of "Hittite City."---The wave of migration from the northeast, which brought the Mitanni into, upper Mesopotamia had swept on westward into Cappadocia, where the greatest Hittite state afterward developed. The monuments erected by the Hittites were nearly all of a religious character. In the earlier time they wrote few historical inscriptions. Such inscriptions as we have in Hittite hieroglyphics seem to come from the later periods and to record alliances. It is probable that in the development of the Hittite state in Cappadocia first one city and then another had the upper hand. The Hittite monuments at Eyuk are of a more primitive character than those at Boghaz Koi, and it is natural to suppose that a Hittite state flourished here before the rise of the one at Boghaz Koi. Be that as it may, the most powerful Hittite monarchy of which we know arose at Boghaz Koi, which they called "Hittite City." This monarchy emerged about 1400 B.C. Its first king was Hattusil I, of whom we know no more than that he was the founder of the great dynasty which ruled from the "Hittite City" for two hundred years.

The king who laid the foundations of the greatness of this dynasty was Subbiluliuma, the next king, whose conquests over the Mitanni and Hurri we have already traced. He conquered also a number of neighboring states, and compelled them to sign with him treaties of alliance, which made them his vassals. Chronicles of these events were discovered by Winkler among the clay tablets found at Boghaz Koi. Subbiluliuma also turned his armies southward and conquered Syria down to the confines of Palestine. These conquests were in progress when some of the El-Amarna letters, written. Here he pursued the same policy that he had pursued in Mesopotamia, and compelled the conquered countries to enter into treaties with him, which subjugated them to his will. Among the kings so treated was the Amorite King Aziru, who at that time ruled Amorites living in the southern part of the valley

88

between the Lebanon mountain ranges and in the region afterward occupied by the tribe of Asher. They also held some of the southern Phoenician cities. This represents the most southerly extension of Subbiluliuma's power.

Whether Subbiluliuma also extended his conquests to the west of Asia Minor, we have no means of knowing. Some scholars suppose that he had done so before the conquest of Mitanni. Certain it is that Hittite rock sculptures of gigantic size exist in the mountains near Smyrna and Manissia, to the west of Sardis. These sculptures represent the great Hittite goddess. Near Smyrna there are also the remains of great buildings. We know of no Hittite monarch who would be so likely to have carried Hittite power to these parts as Subbiluliuma. If he did so, possibly in later time the Hittites here became independent. At all events, some centuries later they were known to Ionian Greeks in this region, for Homer's *Odyssey*, Book XI, line 521, records the tradition that some Hittites were killed with Euryplous.

When Subbiluliuma died he was succeeded by his son, Arandas, whose occupation of the throne was brief, and who seems to have been without effective power. After a short time he was replaced by his brother, Mursil, who appears to have enjoyed a long reign. Subbiluliuma, called by the Egyptians Seplel, was reigning when Amenophis IV of Egypt came to the throne in 1375 B.C., for he sent an embassy to congratulate him, and Mursil appears to have reigned until after the year 1320 B.C. The two reigns, therefore, covered more than half a century. The first years of Mursil's reign were apparently passed in peace, but soon after 1320 Shalmaneser I invaded the countries in the eastern part of the Hittite confederacy, conquering all the territory east of the Euphrates, and a considerable territory to the west of that river. Meantime, Mursil had renewed the treaty with the Amorites of Syria, whose king at this time was Abbi-Teshub or Abi-Adda. Ere long, however, trouble arose for him on his southern border. Seti I of Egypt came to the throne in 1313 B.C. and began a series of vigorous campaigns, for the conquest of Palestine. In time he came face to face with the Hittite power in Syria.

At this juncture Mursil died and was succeeded by his son, Mutallu, who soon met Seti I in battle and convinced that monarch that it was unwise to attempt to extend Egypt's empire in Asia to the Euphrates, as Thothmes III had done. Owing to internal

troubles in Assyria the eastern border of the Hittite realm was left undisturbed for a considerable time, during which Mutallu could devote himself to other matters. In 1292 B.C. Ramses II succeeded Seti I as king of Egypt and soon began vigorously to push Egyptian conquests into northern Syria. Mutallu recognized the importance of the struggle and collected a large army from all his allies. These forces were drawn from all parts of Asia Minor; even the countries of the extreme west contributed their quota. Aleppo and states in that region also contributed their share. A great battle was fought at Kadesh on the Orontes in 1287 B.C., in which Mutallu, by surprising his foe, disorganized a part of the Egyptian forces and endangered the life of Ramses himself. By the opportune and endangered the life of Ramses himself. By the opportune arrival of reinforcements the Egyptians escaped entire defeat, so that the result was a drawn battle.

The battle had cost the Hittites much. The slaughter of their forces had been enormous. Among the slain were many chieftains, including the king of Aleppo. The Amorites at once threw off their allegiance to the Hittites, and many of the other troops mutinied. Mutallu was assassinated. He was succeeded by Hattusil II, the Khetasar of the Egyptian inscriptions. Assyria had become weak, so that Hattusil was no longer pressed upon his eastern border. After a little he reduced the Amorites once more to submission, and compelled them to take back their king, Put-akhi, whom they had driven out at the time of their rebellion against Mutallu. He gave Put-akhi a Hittite princess for a wife. Later, about 1271 B.C. Hattusil concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with Ramses II of Egypt. The treaty, which guaranteed this alliance, has come down to us. (See Chapter I, p. 20)

Hattusil II must have enjoyed a long reign, but we do not know the date of his death. He had two successors, Dudkhalia and Arnunta, whose reigns are known to us, and who continued the

sway of the dynasty down to and about 1200 B.C. They were respectively the son and grandson of Hattusil II. An edict of Dudkhalia concerning the vassal states has survived, in which the name of Eni-Teshub, King of Carchemish, appears. Carchemish would seem to have been the chief of the allied states. Of Arnunta we have no details, though two fragments of royal edicts and a seal of his own have come down to us. He was called, "the great king, the son of Dudkhalia." After him our sources fail, and the story ends

90

in darkness. We know, however, that the days of the power of this dynasty were over. Egyptian sources tell us that tribes from western Asia Minor and from beyond the sea swept over Cilicia and northern Syria soon after the year 1200 B.C., and there was then no Hittite power there to restrain them.

(5) Carchemish.---Of the other Hittite kingdoms far less is known. Carchemish, which as we have just seen, played an important part in the federation of the great Hittite power, continued its existence for several centuries. In the time of Ashurnarsirpal II and Shalmaneser III the kingdom of Carchemish entered into alliance with these kings and preserved its existence by becoming their vassal. Judging from the meager reports hitherto published of the British excavation at Carchemish, this was a flourishing period in the history of the city. A hundred years later, in the reign of Sargon, Pisiris, who was then king of Carchemish, defied the Assyrian, who brought the kingdom to an end in 717 B.C. (C. Isa. 10:9.)

(6) *Samal and Yadi*.---When the Aramaeans swept westward about 1300 B.C. they apparently dislodged the Hittites from a number of their sites and occupied their country. Among the places so occupied was the site of Sendjirly mentioned above. All the carvings found among its architectural remains reveal the influence of Hittite art, but the inscriptions found there are in Aramaic. These inscriptions show that there were in that region two petty kingdoms named, respectively, Samal and Yadi. The names of several kings of these monarchies who ruled between 850 and 730 B.C. have been recovered. They are Aramaean.

(7) Hamath.---Farther to the south, at Hamath on the Orontes, a Hittite kingdom existed in the time of David. Its king was then called Toi or Tou, who made an alliance with David (2 Samuel 8:9, f.; 1 Chron. 18:9, f.). This kingdom was probably the outgrowth of the earlier occupation of the Orontes Valley, three hundred years before, by the Hittites of the great empire. It continued until the time of Ahab. Its king was then Irhulina, who along with Ahab, Ben-Hadad of Damascus, and several other kings made an alliance to resist the encroachments of Shalmaneser III of Assyria in 854 B.C. See Part II, ch. XIX, 6) Irhulina caused several inscriptions to be made on stone, which survived at Hamath until our time. According to Mr. Thomson's interpretation of them they are all records of Irhulina's various alliances. By the

91

next century, however, the Aramaeans had captured Hamath, for in the reigns of Tiglath-pileser III (745-727) and of Sargon (722-705 B.C.) the names of its kings were Semitic. These names were, respectively, Enu-ilu and Yau-bidi, or Ilu-bidi.

We gain glimpses also of a number of other Hittite states. There was, for example the state of Kummukh, which lay to the west of the Euphrates, and another in western Cilicia, that had its center at Tyana, the modern Bor. These states appear to have reached their zenith after the fall of the great Hittite dynasty, which reached their zenith after the fall of the great Hittite dynasty, which had its capitol at Boghaz Koi. Doubtless as time goes on we shall learn of the existence of

many other small Hittite kingdoms, which flourished at one time, or another. At some time, either when the Hyksos were making their way into Egypt or when Subbiluliuma was pushing southward into Syria, the Hittites mentioned in the Old Testament must have made some small settlements in Palestine. Here the Hebrews came into contact with them. They were really an unimportant outlying fringe of the great Hittite people, but they had the good fortune to have their names preserved in the most immortal literature in the world, the Bible, and so their memory was ever kept alive, while that of their more illustrious kinsmen was utterly forgotten. It is only archaeological research that has restored something of the original perspective.

The Hittite laws, written in cuneiform on tablets found by Winckler at Boghaz Koi, are translated in Part II, Chapter XIV, p. 40 7 ff.

John Garstang, *The Hittite Empire*, London, 1929

G. Contenau, *La civilization des Hittites et des Mitaniens*, Paris, 1934

Louis Delaporte, *Les Hittites*, Paris 1936

A. Gotz, *Hethiter, Churriter and Assyrier*, Oslo, 1936