"My Sun-God"
Reflections of Mesopotamian Conceptions of Kingship among the Hittites*

The founder of the Hittite Empire opens his treaty with a Syrian vassal as follows: "Thus says My Majesty, Šuppiluliuma, Great King, King of Hatti, Hero ... ", making use of a titulary that was to remain, with some elaboration, standard for subsequent rulers of Hatti. The initial element here, which I have rendered as "My Majesty," is a heterogram, ḫu₂₅₄ duplication, pronounced in Akkadian as /Šamšī/, but probably spoken by the Great King’s scribes as Hittite /Istanus ūmis/, literally "My Sun-god." Although the writing is invariable, in discourse it may be applied to the first, second, or third person. By convention, Hittitologists translate this expression as "My/Your/His Majesty," respectively. The fact that the monarch refers to himself as ḫu₂₅₄ demonstrates that this term belongs to the official ideology of Hittite kingship and is not simply a piece of flattery from the mouths of subordinates.¹

Eighty years ago the historian Eduard Meyer suggested that Egyptian influence lay behind the adoption of this title by the Hittites,² and this opinion is still held by some scholars.³ However, the earliest attestation of ḫu₂₅₄ is in the Middle Hittite treaty of Zidanta II with Pilliya of Kizzuwatna (mid-fifteenth century BCE by the middle chronology).⁴ At this time no significant direct contact had yet been

---


¹ For a full translation, see my Hittite Diplomatic Texts (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996, 1999), 54-58.


⁵ See the remarks of G. van Driel, drawing on the work of medievalist H. Wolfram, in his review of M.-J. Seux, Épithètes, BOr 36 (1969): 78.


established between Ḥatti and Egypt. Furthermore, no other aspect of Hittite kingship reveals obvious Egyptian features. It therefore seems prudent to seek models for the epithet dUTU closer to the Hittite homeland.

Unfortunately, we know next to nothing of the prehistory of Hittite kingship. The Old Assyrian letters and business documents from the kārum, or “trading colony,” at Kültepe/Kaniš (nineteenth and eighteenth centuries) provide few details concerning the local princes. And it remains uncertain whether Anitta of Kuššar, the sole contemporary Anatolian king to have left a record of his deeds and gods, should be considered a direct forerunner of the later Hittite royal family. We may reasonably suppose that, like early Hittite religion, Hittite monarchy as an institution combined features from the inherited Indo-European culture of the Hittite invaders with elements borrowed from the indigenous Hattic civilization encountered in Anatolia. Reconstructions of conceptions of rule in proto-Indo-European society, uncertain as they necessarily are, do not identify the king with the Sun-god or with any other particular deity. On the other hand, if the third-millennium tombs at Alaca Höyük were constructed for kings, and if their occupants were Hattians, and if the “standards” found in them present solar symbols, we might have some evidence for an association of Hattic monarchy with the sun. All of this is obviously extremely uncertain.

When we turn to the south, we can observe that in the eighteenth-century archives of the city of Mari on the Euphrates in southeast Syria, king Zimri-Lim is addressed in several letter salutations as kakkabī, “My Star,” and that on at least one occasion he is apostrophized as Šamī, “My Sun(-god).” These

---

11 This document has been edited by E. Neu, Der Anitta-Text StBoT 18 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1974).
13 See J. Klinger, Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Keilschrift StBoT 37 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1996).
14 Several key terms referring to aspects of the Hittite monarchy, namely L/Tabarna, Tawananna, and tukḫmanda-, were borrowed from this source. Cf. J. Pulverel, “Hittite Royal Titles: Hattic or Indo-European?” JES17 (1989): 351-61.
17 Only the extravagant contents of the graves have led archaeologists to apply the designation “royal.” While those laid to rest in these tombs were undoubtedly important persons within their society, there is no certainty that they were kings and queens.
18 See the brief comments of E. Alzinger, “Are the Ritual Standards of Alacahöyük Royal Symbols of the Hattian or the Hittite Kings?” FsTÖzgüc, 1-2.
20 See CAD K, 47, and earlier W. Moran, “New Evidence from Man on the History of Prophecy,” Biblica 50 (1969): 33. Moran notes that the correspondents in question all seem to be members of Zimri-Lim’s immediate family and suggests that “My Star” was perhaps a term of affection.
21 ARM 10.99: 5-6. The identification of the ruler here as Zimni-Lim is not entirely certain.
22 Strictly speaking, šamī is a suffixed form of the common noun šamāš, “sun (as a celestial body),” but since it is impossible to affix a genitive pronoun to the absolute noun šamaš indicating the divine name, it is quite possible that the deity is nonetheless intended in such names.
usages clearly do not constitute official royal epithets, but they nonetheless demonstrate that astral and solar appellations could be employed as respectful forms of address to a human superior. Similarly, personal names like Šamš-Adad, meaning “My Sun is the Storm-god,” Aššur-šamšī, “Aššur is My Sun,” or even Ummī-šamšī, “My Mother is My Sun,” utilize the solar reference as a token of reverence.

Mesopotamian rulers are also on occasion equated with the Sun-god. For instance, the semi-legendary Enmerkar of Uruk is called “the Sun-god of the land” (dUtu kalam-ma-ka), while Rim-Sin I of Larsa is named “mighty king, Sun-god of his land” (lugal-kala-ga dUtu kalam-ma-na). The seal of the Hurrian lord Talpuš-atili of Nagar bears the title “Sun-god of the land” (dUTU māti), and Hammurapi as well as several neo-Assyrian kings are each referred to as “the Sun-god of his people” (Šamaš nīšēši).

I, the king, from the womb I am a hero,
I, Šulgi, from my birth I am a mighty man:
I am a fierce-faced lion, begotten by a dragon,
A more typical relationship between a monarch and the gods in Mesopotamia, however, is presented in the scene carved on the upper portion of the stele bearing Hammurapi’s “Law Code.” Here the king holds his hand to his face in a gesture of obeisance, while the seated Šamaš, whose cap is marked by the horns that indicate divinity in ancient Near Eastern iconography, hands over to him the “rod and the ring” symbolic of royal office. In Sumer, Babylonia, or Assyria, the monarch held his office in trust for the deity or deities who were in theory the proprietors of each state. It was at their initiative that a human ruler was created, raised, and elevated to this honor and duty. In the third millennium this tutelage was often expressed through the language of familial relations.

All of these aspects of divine patronage are evident in the following excerpt from a hymn in praise of king Šulgi of the Ur III dynasty (twenty-first century):

---

33 Name of the founder of the Old Babylonian “Kingdom of Northern Mesopotamia,” as well as of four later Assyrian monarchs.

34 For references for the latter two names, see CAD Š/I, 337.


36 Lines 309-10, which present a nice collocation of the divine and royal “suus.” This passage is rendered by Th. Jacobson, The Harps that Once Sumerian Poetry in Translation (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1987), 300 as “The day dawned / and unto Utu, / whom he had risen, / it made the country’s / "Utu," (the king) / lift up the head.”

37 UET 6/1, 91.8.


I am the king of the four regions,
I am a shepherd, the pastor of the black-headed [people],
I am the noble one, the god of all the lands,
I am the choice of the holy heart of An, god of Heaven,
I am the man whose fate was decreed by the god Enlil,
I am Šulgi, the beloved of the goddess Ninlil,
I am he who was nursed by the goddess Nintu,
I am the one endowed with wisdom by the god Enki ...

It is probably his patronage of one of the king's primary areas of responsibility, that of justice, that accounts for the prominent role played by the Sun-god in the investiture of Hammurapi. In the prologue to the inscription on his stele of the "Law Code," Hammurapi claims that he has been designated "to rise like the sun-god Shamash over all humankind, to illuminate the land." The comparison of the ruler with the god here is a simile and not an equation. This suggests that the solar characterizations of the Mesopotamian king cited earlier are also to be regarded as metaphorical.

In Hatti, however, the association of the king with the sun went well beyond metaphor to quasi-identification. In addition to the title UTUŠI with which we began our discussion, this is shown by reliefs on the walls of the rock sanctuary of Yazılıkaya just outside the Hittite capital city of Bogazköy/Ḫattuša. Here king Tudḫaliya IV of the second half of the thirteenth century, patron of the shrine, is depicted in his royal "priestly" outfit: long robe, skull-cap, and earrings. He stands upon a pair of peaks, probably indicating his association with the divine mountain from which he had taken his name, and he holds this name out before himself in the form of Hittite hieroglyphs. In the procession of gods at the same site, the Sun-god is dressed exactly like the monarch, only the presence of the winged disk above his head distinguishes the deity from the king.

In parallel fashion, the chief wife of the Hittite king was associated with a solar figure, the Sun-goddess of the city of Arinna, at least to the extent that...
each deceased queen was represented in a temple by an image of this deity.\(^4\) I do not want to give the impression, however, that Hittite royalty normally enjoyed deification during their lifetimes. The very fact that members of the royal family were said “to become a god” upon death\(^4\) indicates that up until that moment they had been mere mortals. The offerings that royal personnages received from their descendants were simply a more sumptuous manifestation of the post-mortem sustenance owed by every Hittite family to its ancestors. Departed Hittite monarchs were traditionally the recipients neither of true worship nor of prayers.

We have evidence in our sources for true deification only in the cases of two of the last Hittite kings, Tudḫaliya IV and his son Šuppiluliuma II,\(^4\) whose claims to the throne were questioned from some quarters.\(^4\) One indication of this elevation to genuine divine status is an image of Šuppiluliuma on a relief slab recently recovered in Ḫattuša.\(^4\) Here the monarch appears in his alternate, “warrior” costume, wearing but a kilt and shouldering a bow. He has also, however, been allotted the horns of divinity. It is extremely unlikely that this relief was created at the command of a successor after the ruler depicted had died, for Šuppiluliuma II was almost certainly the final ruler to sit upon the throne of Hatti. Circumstances thus indicate that divination of the living Hittite king was a late and exceptional measure taken from weakness rather than from strength, and for political rather than primarily religious motives.\(^5\)

Indeed, the Hittite monarch, like the ruler in contemporary Mesopotamia, was the regent of his nation’s patron gods. His stewardship took the form of the priesthood of the Storm-god and of the Sun-goddess of Arinna. The king’s position as deputy is made crystal clear in the following blessing spoken by a priest on his behalf:

May the Tabarna, the king, be dear to the gods! The land belongs to the Storm-god alone. Heaven, earth, and the people belong to the Storm-god alone. He has made the Labarna, the king, his administrator and given him the entire land of Hatti. The Labarna shall continue to administer the entire land with his hand. May the Storm-god destroy whoever should approach the person of the Labarna, [the king], and the borders (of Hatti)!\(^5\)

Note also the invocation of the gods in a prayer of king Muwattali II of the fourteenth century:

Divine lords – Sun-goddess of Arinna, my lady, and all the gods of the Land of Hatti, (my) lords – whose priest I am, who have conferred upon me, from
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45 dUTU URUTUL-na ŠA Ru-la-an-[q], etc., KUB 25 14 (CTH 626) i 25-30, transliterated by S. R. Bin-Nun, Theth 5, 199.
44 DINGIR-LIM kiš-. See H. Otten, HTR, 119-20.
47 The father of Tudḫaliya, Ḫattušili III, was a usurper who had displaced his own nephew. Descendants of the latter continued to pose a danger to the line of Ḫattušili throughout the remaining years of Hittite history. See H. Klengel, Geschichte, 258-59, 290, 306-8.
50 Compare the earlier divinization of Narām-Sin of Akkad, a measure that may well have been taken in order to facilitate the integration of formerly independent city-states into a regional empire. See W. W. Hallo and W. K. Simpson, The Ancient Near East. A History. Second ed. (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace, 1998), 57-58.
(among) all (others), the rulership over Ḫatti.\textsuperscript{52}

Later in the same text, the king appeals to his personal deity, the Storm-god of Lightning, as follows:

Storm-God of Lightning, my lord, I was but a mortal, (whereas) my father was a priest of the Sun-goddess of Arinna and of all the gods. My father begat me, but the Storm-god of Lightning took me from (my) mother and reared me; he made me priest of the Sun-goddess of Arinna and of all the gods; for the land of Ḫatti he appointed me to kingship. So now I, Muwatalli the king, who have been reared by you, by the Storm-god of Lightning, am pleading...\textsuperscript{53}

Here we may recognize the themes of divine election and nurture of the king, similar to motifs we encountered earlier in the passage from the hymn of Šulgi. Although Muwatalli does not boast of divine descent, as had the Sumerian ruler, in another passage an unnamed Hittite king calls the Storm-god his "father."\textsuperscript{54}

Let us now return to the image of Tudḫaliya IV in his "priestly" garments. In this mode of depiction, the ruler carries not a weapon but the curved staff known to the Hittites as a kalmuš. This object, which is without doubt to be identified as a shepherd's crook,\textsuperscript{55} was an emblem of royal office.\textsuperscript{14} It signified the king's role as shepherd of his people. Mesopotamian monarchs could also be distinguished by a herdsman's staff, and as early as pre-Sargonic times kings were awarded the title "shepherd."\textsuperscript{17} Indeed, "shepherd" was the most common epithet of the Kasite rulers contemporary with the kings of Ḫatti.\textsuperscript{58}

Also of interest in this connection is Tudḫaliya's gown, whose antecedents seem to lie in the so-called "open wrap-around garment" (offenes Wickelgewand) known in Mesopotamia during the late third and early second millennia.\textsuperscript{19} A possible north Syrian intermediary might be seen in the clothing of Idrimi of Alalakh as depicted in his seated statue.\textsuperscript{59}

I now recall the Hittite royal titulary with which I began. The king styles himself "My Majesty, Šuppiluliuma, Great King, King of Ḫatti, Hero." The final element here is the Sumerogram UR.SAG, equivalent to Akkadian QAR-RĀDU, and read in Hittite as ḥaštali–.\textsuperscript{60} This epithet is first attested in Mesopotamia for the Sargonic king Šar-kališarrī, and is later borne by Hammurapi and Samsuiluna of the Old Babylonian period.\textsuperscript{61} As far as I am aware, the designation "Hero" is not employed by the Egyptian pharaoh.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{52} CTH 381 i 17-19, translated by I. Singer, Muwatalli's Prayer to the Assembly of Gods Through the Storm-God of Lightning (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 31.

\textsuperscript{53} CTH 381, iii 25-33, slightly modified from the translation by Singer, Muwatalli's Prayer, 40.

\textsuperscript{54} KUB 29 1 (CTH 414) i 26: nu EGIR-pa ad-da-ažši-ma-an 4U-an wa-al-hu-uš-ši-mi, "Then afterward I will praise repeatedly my father, the Storm-god."


\textsuperscript{56} Sumerian šibur, Akkadian šbirru. See CADŠ/II, 377-78.


\textsuperscript{58} See M.-J. Seux, Épithètes, 310-11; and J. A. Brinkman, "The Monarchy of the Kasite Period," in Le palais et la royauté, 405.

\textsuperscript{59} See K. Bittel, Yaz., 120; and E. Strommenger, "Herrscher. B. In der Bildkunst," RIA IV (1972-75): 351.

\textsuperscript{60} J. Puhvel, HED 3, 235-36.

\textsuperscript{61} See CAD Q, 142-43.0

\textsuperscript{62} According to CAD Q, 142-43, the Egyptian ruler is called qarrādu only in the Ḫattušili-Ramses treaty, where the use of the epithet is certainly due to Hittite influence.
By now the thrust of my argument should be clear. Hittite royal ideology resembles that of Mesopotamia in numerous respects: in epithets of the king, in the subordinate but intimate relationship of the monarch to the patron deities of the state, in the role that the king plays within human society, and even in his costume. Given the influence that the venerable civilization of the south exercised in other areas of Hittite elite culture,\(^6\) there can be little doubt that Hittite kingship owed much to Mesopotamian forerunners. In further support of this argument we may recall that Hittite monarchs made explicit use of the Old Akkadian rulers Sargon and Naram-Sin as positive and negative exemplars, whose deeds were to be emulated or avoided, respectively.\(^6\)

Finally, it is surely significant that the expression giving rise to my discussion, “My Sun-god,” is without exception expressed in Hittite texts by means of the compound Sumerographic/Akkadographic form \(^\text{dUTUSI}^\text{6}\).\(^5\)

I am not claiming that Hittite kingship was a mere imitation of the Mesopotamian institution. There were a number of important differences between the two structures of domination,\(^6\) including the deference that the monarch in Hatti had to show to the assembly of noblemen,\(^7\) and the freedom that the Hittite king enjoyed in choosing his successor from among a group of eligible candidates.\(^8\) Nonetheless, I believe that I have demonstrated that Mesopotamian influence on Hittite kingship was considerable.

---


\(^8\) On the rare forms with phonetic complementation in -\textit{i}-, which demonstrate that the term was actually pronounced in Hittite, see O. Carruba, “Die Hajasa-Verträge Hattis,” \textit{Follo}, 73 n. 29.


\(^10\) See my “The Hittite Assembly,” \textit{JAOS} 102 (1982): 435-42. Even though I argue there that the king’s power was essentially independent of this body, the \textit{pangu} could nonetheless be convened to judge murderous members of the royal clan and to look after an underage successor to the throne. No comparable role is apparent for the \textit{puḫru} in contemporary Babylonia or Assyria.