

CHARLES W. STEITLER

THE SOLAR DEITIES OF BRONZE AGE ANATOLIA

# Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten

Herausgegeben im Auftrag  
der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz,  
von Elisabeth Rieken und Daniel Schwemer  
Band 62

Charles W. Steitler

## The Solar Deities of Bronze Age Anatolia Studies in Texts of the Early Hittite Kingdom

2017

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

This book represents the revised version of the doctoral thesis accepted by the Philosophische Fakultät I of the Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg (Germany) in the summer semester of 2014.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek  
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek  
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our website <http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2017  
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.  
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.  
Printed on permanent/durable paper.  
Printing and binding: ☉ Hubert & Co., Göttingen  
Printed in Germany

ISSN 0585-5853  
ISBN 978-3-447-10798-3

## CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	XI
Abbreviations .....	XIII
Bibliographical Abbreviations.....	XIII
General Abbreviations .....	XVII
Symbols.....	XVIII
Preface .....	XIX
1. Introduction .....	1
1.1 Recent Developments in the Study of Hittite Religion .....	1
1.2 Motivations for a Study of the Solar Deities of Anatolia.....	4
1.3 Limits, Methods and Structure .....	5
1.3.1 Limits of the Study .....	5
1.3.2 Methods of the Study.....	9
1.3.3 Structure of the Study .....	12
2. History of Research of the Anatolian Solar Deities.....	13
2.1 <i>Kultschichten</i> and the Names of Solar Deities .....	13
2.2 Diachronic Approach.....	17
2.3 Typological Approach .....	18
2.4 Summary of More Recent Studies .....	20
3. Typology of the Solar Deities.....	25
3.1 The Connection Between Deities and Cultural Milieus .....	25
3.2 Means of Categorizing Solar Deities in Subtypes.....	26
3.3 Summary of the Types of Solar Deities.....	28
4. The Sun-goddess in Old Hittite Sources.....	31
4.1 Names of the Sun-goddess.....	31
4.1.1 <sup>d</sup> UTU .....	31
4.1.2 Eštan and Ištanu.....	32
4.1.3 Wurunšemu.....	59
4.1.4 Derivations from Geographical Names.....	64
4.2 Festival Texts .....	69
4.2.1 The KILAM Festival.....	69
4.2.2 The Thunder Festival ( <i>CTH 631</i> ).....	72
4.2.3 Festival of the Moon and Thunder ( <i>CTH 630</i> ).....	75
4.2.4 Fragments of the Festival for the Deities of the Netherworld ( <i>CTH 645</i> )	76

4.2.5	Festivals Celebrated by the Prince ( <i>CTH 647</i> ).....	83
4.2.6	Festivals from the Cult of <i>Ḫanḫana</i> ( <i>CTH 668</i> ).....	86
4.2.7	Festivals Mentioning the <i>NIN.DINGIR</i> Priestess ( <i>CTH 649</i> ).....	90
4.2.8	Festival(s) Mentioning the <i>ašuša(ta)la-men</i> ( <i>CTH 665</i> ) .....	91
4.2.9	Festival of the Month ( <i>CTH 591</i> ).....	95
4.2.10	Festival of <i>Tetešḫapi</i> ( <i>CTH 738</i> ).....	98
4.2.11	A Hattic Song for the Sun-goddess ( <i>CTH 736</i> ).....	100
4.2.12	Festival(s) Involving the Men of <i>Tuḫumiyara</i> ( <i>CTH 739</i> ).....	123
4.2.13	Festival Fragment <i>KBo 20.10+</i> ( <i>CTH 669</i> ).....	124
4.2.14	Other Attestations of <i>Wurunšemu</i> .....	125
4.3	Magical Rituals, Building Rituals and Myths.....	131
4.3.1	Ritual for the Foundation of a Palace ( <i>CTH 414</i> ).....	131
4.3.2	A Hattic Myth in the Context of a Foundation Ritual ( <i>CTH 726</i> ).....	140
4.3.3	An Old Hittite Collection of Rituals for the Royal Couple ( <i>CTH 416</i> ) ...	144
4.3.4	A Historical Fragment Containing an Invocation ( <i>KUB 36.107</i> ).....	150
4.3.5	Birth Rituals ( <i>CTH 430.1</i> and <i>CTH 730</i> ).....	151
4.3.6	The “Incantation of the Soul” ( <i>CTH 734</i> ).....	154
4.3.7	Other Attestations of <i>Eštan</i> in Hattic texts .....	155
4.4	Historical Texts and Instructions .....	159
4.4.1	The Annals of <i>Ḫattušili I</i> ( <i>CTH 4</i> ) .....	159
4.4.2	The <i>Puḫanu</i> Chronicle ( <i>CTH 16</i> ) .....	162
4.4.3	An Old Hittite Instruction for the King ( <i>CTH 438</i> ).....	164
4.5	The Sun-goddess in Connection with <i>Inar<sup>d</sup>KAL</i> in the “Triad” .....	167
4.6	Summary.....	172
5.	The Sun-god in Old Hittite Sources .....	177
5.1	Identifying the Sun-god in Anatolia in the Early 2 <sup>nd</sup> Millennium BC .....	178
5.1.1	Potential Milieus of the Hittite Sun-god’s Origin.....	178
5.1.2	Reflexes of PIE <i>*djéu-</i> in Texts from the Old Assyrian Period.....	184
5.1.3	The <i>Anitta</i> Text: An Early Witness to an Indo-European Sun-god? ...	190
5.1.4	Relationship of <i>šiu-/*šiw-</i> to <i>Tiwad-/Tiyat-/šiwatt-</i> .....	192
5.1.5	Conclusions.....	195
5.2	Anatolian Mythology .....	196
5.2.1	Hittite-Luwian vs. Hattian Mythological Traditions .....	196
5.2.2	The Role of <i>Kamrušepa</i> and <i>Kataḫzipuri</i> in Relation to the Sun-god...	199
5.2.3	Mythological Texts .....	204
5.3	Magical Rituals.....	214
5.4	Historical and Juridical Texts.....	218
5.5	The Palaeon Sun-god in Old Hittite Sources .....	221
5.6	Summary.....	226
6.	The Sun-goddess of the Earth in Old Hittite Sources.....	229
6.1	Magical Rituals.....	232
6.2	Mythology .....	238

6.3 Prayer.....	238
6.4 Historical Texts .....	242
6.5 Summary .....	243
7. Local Solar Deities in Old Hittite Sources.....	247
7.1 Solar Deities with Chthonic Connections .....	247
7.2 The Solar Deity Alongside Uriyadu/Weriyadu .....	253
7.3 The Solar Deity with Ḫammanni and Mamma .....	259
7.4 Solar Deities in the Cult of Zalpa (CTH 733).....	271
7.5 The Sun-goddess of Iṣtanuwa .....	278
7.6 Summary .....	280
8. The Sun-goddess of Arinna in Middle Hittite Sources .....	281
8.1 Festival Texts .....	282
8.1.1 Local Festivals in Arinna .....	283
8.1.2 The AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival.....	293
8.1.3 The <i>nuntarriyašḫaš</i> Festival (CTH 626) .....	301
8.1.4 The <i>ḫaššumaš</i> Festival (CTH 633) .....	305
8.1.5 Festival of Telipinu (CTH 638).....	307
8.1.6 Festivals of the Hurrian Milieu .....	310
8.2 Prayers.....	312
8.2.1 Ritual and Invocation of the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 385.10) .....	313
8.2.2 A Hymn and Prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.I).....	316
8.2.3 The Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal (CTH 375).....	318
8.2.4 Fragments of MS Prayers (CTH 385 and CTH 389) .....	321
8.3 Treaties and Historical Texts .....	323
8.4 Summary .....	324
9. The Sun-gods in Middle Hittite Sources.....	329
9.1 The New Status of a Formerly Marginal Deity .....	329
9.2 The Hittite Sun-god in the Middle Hittite Sources .....	331
9.2.1 Magical Rituals .....	331
9.2.2 Mythological Texts.....	345
9.2.3 Prayers.....	366
9.2.4 Festival Texts.....	376
9.2.5 Historical and Administrative Texts.....	379
9.3 The Luwian Sun-god in Middle Hittite Sources.....	382
9.3.1 Festivals.....	382
9.3.2 Magical Rituals and Mythology .....	385
9.3.3 Historical and Administrative Texts.....	402
9.4 The Palaeon Sun-god in the Middle Hittite Sources .....	403
9.5 The Hurrian Sun-god in the Middle Hittite Sources.....	407
9.6 Reflections of the Babylonian Sun-god in the Middle Hittite Sources.....	413
9.7 Summary .....	415

10. The Sun-goddess of the Earth in Middle Hittite Sources.....	417
10.1 Festival Texts.....	417
10.2 Magical Rituals.....	419
10.3 Treaties, Historical and Administrative Documents.....	421
10.4 Summary.....	421
11. The Solar Deities and Hittite Kingship.....	425
11.1 The Anatolian Tradition of the Old Hittite Sources.....	425
11.2 The Integration of Mesopotamian Concepts.....	430
11.3 The Royal Title “My/Our Sun”.....	431
11.3.1 Origins of the Title.....	431
11.3.2 Attestations of “My Sun” with Phonetic Complements.....	436
11.3.3 On the Discrepancy Between “My Sun” and “Our Sun”.....	443
11.4 The Royal Iconographic Tradition of the Empire Period.....	444
11.5 Summary.....	451
12. Conclusion.....	455
12.1 Summary.....	455
12.2 Outlook: The Solar Deities in the Empire Period.....	459
Glossary.....	463
Hittite.....	463
Sumerograms.....	479
Akkadograms.....	486
Luwian.....	488
Hattic.....	491
Divine Names.....	499
Geographical Names.....	502
Personal Names.....	503
Numerals.....	503
Bibliography.....	505
Indices.....	563
General Index.....	563
Divine Names.....	571
Geographical Names.....	577
Personal Names.....	579
Hittite.....	580
Luwian.....	581
Palaic.....	581
(Proto-)Indo-European.....	582
Hattic.....	582
Sumerograms.....	582

Index of Cited Texts.....	583
Cuneiform Texts.....	583
Hieroglyphic Luwian Monumental Inscriptions.....	605



## PREFACE

This book is a revised version of my doctoral dissertation submitted to the Philosophische Fakultät I of the Julius-Maximilians-Universität, Würzburg, and defended in July 2014. My work has benefited greatly from the academic expertise and insights of Prof. Dr. Daniel Schwemer, who supervised the dissertation. Prof. Schwemer initially agreed to serve as second advisor while he held a post at the School of Oriental & African Studies, London, and then served as the main advisor once he had taken up his position in Würzburg. I would like to thank him for his diligence in offering advice, discussing my research and sharing his own knowledge of the religious traditions of ancient Anatolia and the Near East. After completing my doctoral studies in Würzburg, Prof. Schwemer continued to advise me in preparing the publication of this book. He and Prof. Dr. Elisabeth Rieken, as co-editors of *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten*, proofread the manuscript and provided an immense number of corrections and suggestions, which have significantly improved the quality of this study. I thank them for accepting this book into the StBoT series. I would also like to thank the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, for covering the printing cost subsidy of the publication.

Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Gernot Wilhelm graciously served as the interim supervisor of the dissertation during the initial phase of my doctoral work. In addition to this, my thanks are also due to him for introducing me to the languages, history and culture of the ancient Near East, and especially for sparking my interest in Hittitology during my master's program in Würzburg. Over the years, he has been continuous source of support and encouragement to me. I would also like to thank him for permission to use the lexical files of the Hethitologie-Archiv, Mainz, in November 2013.

Prof. Dr. Jared L. Miller (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München) served as the second reviewer of my dissertation. He contributed numerous thought-provoking questions and suggestions regarding the dissertation's content as well as many valuable recommendations for improving its language and style.

I would like to thank my colleagues at the Lehrstuhl für Altorientalistik in Würzburg with whom I have had the privilege of working and interacting over the past years. Dr. Alfredo Rizza was helpful in introducing me to some of the challenges of studying the Hattic language and gave feedback and corrections for parts of the dissertation. I benefited from frequent discussions of my work with Dr. Francesco Barsacchi during his year-long stay in Würzburg. I am also grateful to Prof. Dr. Gerfrid G. W. Müller for his technical support with regard to the online *Hethitologie-Portal Mainz* (without which my research would have been considerably impaired) as well as for making the necessary modifications to the font used in this publication.

After joining the project, *Corpus der hethitischen Festrionale* (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz), I have profited from many fruitful discussions

and suggestions from my colleagues there. Dr. Michele Cammarosano had already read and commented on portions of the original dissertation, and also proofread the entire final draft of the manuscript before it went to press. Dr. Susanne Görke also proofread a substantial portion of the manuscript. Dr. James Burgin gave feedback and corrections for the introductory chapters. Dr. Silvin Košak has offered several suggestions for readings and interpretations of the texts, and I have learned much from his knowledge and experience since I arrived in Mainz. I thank all of the aforementioned persons for assisting in the preparation of this book. Of course, the responsibility for any mistakes within it lies solely with the author.

On a more personal note, I am very grateful to my parents, Charlie and Fran Steitler, who despite the ocean between us have found so many ways to support me in my academic endeavors. Although I can never repay them, I hope to give my own children as much as they have given me.

I deeply appreciate the support and kindness that my father-in-law, Ernst Schroth, has shown to me for more than a decade. Without his help, I could not have carried out my studies.

Most of all, I would like to thank my wife, Esther Steitler, who has worked and sacrificed even more than I have to make my research possible. I am so thankful to have someone at my side who complements me and enriches my life the way she does. Her encouragement has carried me through many valleys, her patience has gone beyond what is reasonable, and her faith in me has kept me going when I might otherwise have given up. I dedicate this book to her.

Finally, I confess that I could have accomplished nothing on my own apart from the grace and strength that God has continually provided. All praise belongs to him.

Mainz, July 2017

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Recent Developments in the Study of Hittite Religion

The study of “Hittite religion” has undergone number of important advances in the past two decades. The upsurge of research in this field might be considered a second wave of scholarship, which was preceded by initial systematic and compact studies of Hittite religion that appeared from the 1930s on. These drew upon the first published hand copies of the cuneiform tablets found at the Hittite capital of Ḫattuša (Boğazköy).<sup>1</sup> From the 1970s on, subsequent generations of scholars were able to carry out more detailed and extensive studies, taking advantage of the continually growing corpus of texts and of other archaeological discoveries from the excavations at Boğazköy (uninterrupted since 1952) as well as of finds of new explorations at other Hittite settlements and monuments in Anatolia.

Two general approaches to studying Hittite religion can be identified in the research of the past twenty years. On the one hand, some scholars have given preference to a systematically structured presentation of the religion of the Hittites, prominently including those elements that were borrowed from Syria and Mesopotamia.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 These works include Furlani 1936, Goetze 1933b: 122–160, 1957: 130–171, Gurney 1977, Güterbock 1950, Laroche 1946–1947, Otten 1964 and von Schuler 1965b, to name some of the most prominent studies covering broad aspects of Hittite religion.

2 Haas’ monumental work (1994) should be given most prominent mention here. Rather than presenting, as its title implies, a history (*Geschichte*) of Hittite religion, Haas has produced something more akin to a “systematic theology” of Hittite beliefs, incorporating elements that were merely peripheral in or foreign to Anatolia, but then implicitly portraying these as representative of “Hittite religion” as a whole. The Hittite pantheon (Goetze 1957: 131 described it as “chaos”) is more or less neatly structured by Haas 1994: 315–488, leaving one to wonder whether the categories that he employed adequately reflect the structure of the Hittite pantheon as the Hittites themselves understood it. While he devoted much space to the Syro-Mesopotamian influences upon Hittite religion, Haas’s systematization paid less attention to the various distinct *inner*-Anatolian traditions. Furthermore, Haas did not address the diachronic developments as much as one might have expected for a study of the evolution of a set of religious practices and beliefs (see especially the reviews by Beckman 1997, Hoffner 1997a, Hutter 1997 and Popko 1995b). Apart from his chapter on the Neolithic to the Early Bronze Age periods (Haas 1994: 39–78), whose relevance to a study of Hittite religion is doubtful (see Beckman 1997: 281), Haas treated the entire spectrum of Hittite history (from the mid-17<sup>th</sup> to the early 12<sup>th</sup> century BC) more or less uniformly and employed various typological categories of myths, deities, festivals, etc. Popko 1995b: 473 stated that Haas’s monograph differs little from previous works that present “particular issues in a rather synchronic plane, noting the changes but on the margin of a static description.” The remarks by Hutter 1997: 87 are especially fitting: “... I think it is still a task for the future to research the ‘history’ of religion in Hittite Anatolia spanning at least half a millennium. The Old Hittite period, the important turning point of religious thought in Middle Hittite times and the

However, since most Syro-Mesopotamian influences upon Hittite religion did not predate the early Empire period, such portrayals neglect the status of Hittite religion in the Old Hittite period especially in favor of the early and late Empire periods. On the other hand, an explicitly diachronic approach has been taken by other scholars, who gave independent portrayals of the religion of the Old Hittite, early and late Empire periods successively.<sup>3</sup> The present study adopts an explicitly diachronic approach to studying Hittite religion due to the numerous advantages it presents for its specific purposes.<sup>4</sup>

Recent years have also witnessed an increased interest in the various so-called *Kultschichten* of Hittite religion, or “milieus”.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps the most significant example of this is the examination of the Hattian religious milieu by Klinger 1996b. With regard to Luwian religion, Starke 1985 edited the corpus of cuneiform Luwian texts, most of which can be considered “religious” in nature, and Hutter 2003 contributed a

---

official religion and cults of the New Hittite kingdom deserve a treatment of their own ... The same can be said about ethnic diversities of Anatolia which also are reflected in different cults.” The categories employed by Haas and the weight which he attributed to these categories are, in turn, shaped more by early 20<sup>th</sup> century study of religion that heavily emphasized a comparative approach and relied all too optimistically upon interpretations based on vague similarities between different cultures or religions.

- 3 Popko 1995b: 473–483 sketched an approach that gives due attention to the historical development of Hittite religion in accordance with the dating of the relevant Hittite text sources available to us. He employed this method in his own concise monograph on Hittite religion (Popko 1995a). That this approach does not successfully produce convincing new findings in every case cannot necessarily be used to call the entire method into question. Klinger’s critique (1998: 214 with n. 17) that certain text genres are underrepresented in Popko’s presentation of some periods of history while other genres are overemphasized in other periods (e.g., the fact that Popko only dealt with the genre of mythology within the chapter dealing with the Empire period) can be justified in part. Nevertheless, the dating of some text compositions is controversial and cannot necessarily be settled in the context of an overarching study of Hittite religion. Furthermore, the dearth of a text genre in a particular period may either be the result of an accidental state of preservation and/or discovery, or it could reflect the fact that a genre did not play a role in that period. Taracha 2009 also employed a diachronic approach similar to Popko’s, although he divided his treatment of Hittite religion into only two periods, the Old Hittite and Empire periods, without designating a separate historical Middle Hittite or early Empire period.
- 4 See the reviews of Popko 1995a by Hoffner 2004: 124 and van den Hout 1999a: 342, both of whom credited Popko with having presented a truly *historical* overview of Hittite religion.
- 5 On the use of the term “*Kultschichten*”, see Klinger 1996b: 6–16. The term “*Schichten*” (layers) implies a chronological deposition of elements of religion, beginning with the oldest and ending with the youngest. Although some elements of Hittite religion can be traced back to the earliest historical period of the Hittite kingdom while others do not occur until later, it is far too simplistic to describe Hittite religious traditions in terms of sequential “layers”, accumulated one after the other. Rather, they were intertwined with one another throughout the historical periods. We have therefore chosen to avoid the use of the term “layers” or *Kultschichten*, as this connotes a static sequence. Preference is given instead to the term “milieu” to express the dynamic coexistence of ethnolinguistic groups and culturally distinct populations alongside one another in Anatolia. At the same time, one should keep in mind that one milieu can reflect more archaic traditions of Anatolia in the Hittite period than another, e.g., the Hattian milieu (older) vs. the Hurrian (later).

valuable, albeit provisional, overview of Luwian religion. In addition to these, one must also mention the general study on the Luwians and their language by Yakubovich 2010 as well as several essays concerning Luwian religion in Mouton *et al.* 2013. On the contrary, the Palaic texts and speakers and the Palaean religion especially have not generally been the focus of intense research, since the Palaic text corpus is significantly smaller than the Luwian. However, the study of the festival of Ziparwa by Marcuson 2011 will hopefully spur on further investigations of Palaic and the Palaean religion. Our understanding of Hurrian religion in the context of the Hittite kingdom has been significantly informed by the volumes of the *Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler*, as well as by the editions of individual (groups of) Hittite ritual texts of the Hurrian milieu (e.g., Görke 2010 and Strauß 2006).

The number of journal articles and encyclopaediae and lexica entries that are dedicated to individual deities has steadily increased over the years. However, only a few deities pertaining directly to religion in Bronze Age Anatolia have been selected as the topic of an entire monograph, e.g., the “tutelary” deities<sup>6</sup> (McMahon 1991), Išḫara (Prechel 1996), the solar deities (D. Yoshida 1996), Ḫebat (Trémouille 1997), Lelwani (Torri 1999), Telipinu (Mazoyer 2003) and the Sun-goddess of the earth (Lorenz-Link 2016; see also U. Lorenz 2008). The philological investigation of any deity attested in the Hittite texts will greatly benefit from the collection of DNs in the three-volume *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon* (van Gessel 1998–2001). This reference work was exhaustive at publication, but in the meantime is also in need of an update since more than twenty further KBo volumes have since appeared, in addition to other publications of Hittite texts found at various locations in Anatolia. Nevertheless, Van Gessel’s work demonstrates that the sheer mass of attestations of deities such as the Anatolian Storm-god<sup>7</sup> and the solar deities<sup>8</sup> has been one of the main factors deterring scholars from carrying out a comprehensive study of either of these.<sup>9</sup>

Another important development in understanding the history of religion in Anatolia has been the recognition of interdependence and mutual influence among the religions of the various cultural milieus of Anatolia in the early 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BC, i.e., during the Old Assyrian (OA) period and in the era immediately preceding the

---

6 These will be referred to in general as “Stag-gods” when their names are written logographically as <sup>d</sup>KAL (see Section 4.5 below). The alternative reading of this logogram as <sup>d</sup>LAMMA is based upon an alleged identity of the deity as a protective or “tutelary” deity.

7 The occurrences of <sup>d</sup>10 and <sup>d</sup>ISKUR are given in van Gessel 1998–2001: vol. 2, 643–675 and 749–831, to which the syllabographic writings of the various names of the Storm-gods must also be added.

8 In addition to the (semi-)logographic writings with <sup>d</sup>UTU (van Gessel 1998–2001: vol. 2, 844–899), see also the syllabographic attestations of the various names of the solar deities (van Gessel 1998–2001: vol. 1, 46, 53, 67f., 205f., 400–403, 519, 523, 542, 565).

9 The Sun-goddess of the earth is an exception (see Lorenz-Link 2016). A monograph on the Anatolian Storm-gods was published by Deighton 1982. This study contained only modest results and can hardly be considered a comprehensive examination of the Storm-gods, much less so in light of the many texts published in the three decades after her monograph appeared. Concerning the Storm-god in Mesopotamia and Syria, see in general Schwemer 2001, 2007c, 2008b (the latter with a summary discussion of the Storm-god in Anatolia on pp. 17–24).