

19

The cult of the storm god in the Syro-Anatolian region: Regional continuity and local innovation in figurative representations between the Late Bronze and Iron Ages

NATHAN LOVEJOY, Institute for the Study of the Ancient World (ISAW), New York University

Introduction

The cult of the Storm God not only persisted through the Late Bronze–Iron Age transition but flourished across the Syro-Anatolian region with little change after the end of the Palatial Age. It is not until the 10th–8th centuries BCE that the cult was altered by significant innovations in the conceptualization of the Storm God and his monumental representations, both abrupt and progressive, as well as local and regional. Specifically, though the overall composition of monuments depicting the Storm God is quite diverse in all periods, the iconography of the Storm God was consistent between the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age and once again after several developments took place during the 10th century BCE that resulted in a more reduced repertoire of monumental forms. It is to be stressed that beyond the continuity of the cult, the preeminence of the Storm God in the pantheons of the Syro-Anatolian region persists throughout these periods, as does his role in kingship, both earthly and divine.

One meaningful innovation, on the other hand, is the definition of the cult of the Storm God of the Vineyard, best known from his representations in Tuwana. This specific Storm God appears to have been distilled from both Anatolian and Semitic sources, rearing his head with varying prominence over the course of several centuries in the kingdoms of Palastina, Sam'al, Hiyawa, and Tuwana. Another innovation comes in the depiction of the Storm God with royal attributes—or perhaps the depiction of individual kings with divine attributes—often in the form of statues in the round, and with a close connection between the king of the gods, specific kings, and their shared kingship. In contrast with the slow development of the Storm God of the Vineyard, spanning centuries, the ambiguity between royal and divine portraiture of the Storm God and kings emerges abruptly in the monuments of the 8th century BCE.



Figure 19.1. Map of the Syro-Anatolian region with micro-regions, kingdoms, and sites bearing monumental representations of the Storm God from the Late Bronze and Iron Ages. Image source: Google Earth Pro.

In this paper, I will present the preliminary results of a diachronic analysis of geographically and politically grouped monumental representations of the Storm God. Much of this work has benefited from the significant contributions of preceding scholars, specifically the major textual compilations of the CHLI (Hawkins 2000) and KAI (Donner and Röllig 2002), Bunnens' (2006) synthesis of Storm God monuments included in the second major publication from Tell Ahmar, and Schwemer's (2001; 2007; 2008) monumental study of Storm-gods of the Near East, among many others. To these studies, I intend to contribute a chronological, geographical, and political analysis of the corpus of monuments and inscriptions associated with the Storm God and to elucidate several developments in the conception and depiction of the Storm God and the specific regional and local contexts of these developments. My goal is not to interrogate the meaning and significance of the vast corpus of iconography or even the various changes noted in this paper;¹ rather, this paper aims to provide a broad survey of the material over the *longue durée* in order to identify a number of notable developments and innovations in the traditions of monumental representations of the Storm God.

By examining all monumental representations of the Storm God in the Syro-Anatolian region,² in conjunction with the corpora of Luwian, Phoenician, and Aramaic inscriptions of

1. For such reference works, see Orthmann (1971), Genge (1979), Kohlmeyer (1982), and Aro (2003).

2. Monuments are primarily divided by associated polities, when known, or alternatively by geographic location. The monuments of Guzana have been excluded due to their significant ambiguity and the lack of clarity as to who is represented in various monuments. The early use of statues in-the-round (ca. 10th–9th century BCE), however, could have substantial bearing on the understanding of the spread of this tradition throughout the later Syro-Anatolian region, a tradition that became quite prevalent in the 8th century BCE, as will be

the same area, this paper seeks to elucidate contrasting elements of local tradition and innovation as well as consistency and variety within the visual and textual manifestations of the cult of the Storm God. Particular attention has been paid to the form of the monument, the stance or posture of the Storm God, the objects he holds, and his attire as well as his role in inscriptions, particular epithets associated with the deity, and the other gods with whom he is grouped. It will become clear that visual representations of the Storm God found in the Iron Age display local interpretations of, and modifications to, several Late Bronze Age traditions, and that certain innovations or trends developed and spread across the Syro-Anatolian region at certain moments in time (fig. 19.1).

Preeminence of the storm god: Divine kingship and royal ideology

In both the second and first millenniums BCE, the Anatolian pantheon was led by the Storm God, frequently joined by a consort and supported by other deities.³ While this was not the case in many Semitic contexts in Syria, the Storm God always held an important role in the upper echelons of these panthea.⁴ During the Late Bronze Age, in both Anatolia and Syria, myths were composed detailing the Storm God's rise to power and his acquisition of kingship in heaven. The Hittite myth of "Kingship in Heaven"—a 14th or 13th century BCE Hittite composition inspired by Hurrian mythology and part of a series known as the Kumarbi Cycle (Hoffner 1998; Weeden 2018, 353)—describes the ascendance of the Storm God Teššub to the pinnacle of the pantheon and his role as king in heaven. Likewise, in the Ugaritic Ba'al Cycle, the Storm God Ba'al fights for divine kingship over the gods of the sea and underworld in much the same way (Smith 1994; Smith and Pitard 2009). Similarities between these stories, along with others, suggest a common origin—due to the central role of the Sea and certain geographic elements shared across these myths, Ayali-Darshan (2015, 50) has proposed a Levantine source near the mountain Jebel al-'Aqra by the mouth of the Orontes River.⁵ Already in the early second millennium, a Celestial Storm God or Storm God of Heaven was invoked from Anatolia to Upper Mesopotamia (Schwemer 2008, 15), and it is likely during this time that a myth of the Storm God and his divine kingship spread across the Near East, perhaps transmitted from the Temple of the Storm God at Aleppo and through political interactions with the surrounding kingdom of Yamhad (Ayali-Darshan 2015, 40).

The Storm God's preeminence as king in heaven is conveyed to earthly kings through his divine support. In texts, this is usually expressed by sentences attesting to his physical presence and leadership during military action (see Mouton, this volume), and by his prominence in the list of divine witnesses to oaths. For instance, the Celestial Storm God is the primary force behind the legitimacy of Hittite rule over Ugarit in the 14th century BCE, as he leads the list

made clear through the formal analysis. The inscriptions of Hama were included in the analysis, but since the kingdom produced no extant monumental representations of the Storm God, its artistic traditions cannot be considered in this study.

3. For detailed studies of Anatolian religions, refer to Haas (1994), Taracha (2009), and Hutter (2021).

4. See, for instance, the deity lists from Ugarit in Pardee (2002: 11–24).

5. Hurro-Hittite *Hazzi*, Semitic *Šapanu/Zaphon*, Classical *Casius*.

of divine witnesses to the oath sanctioning the treaty between Suppiluliuma I and Niqmadu II of Ugarit (Beckman 1996, no. 4). Similarly, throughout the Iron Age, the Storm God plays many roles—providing support for military and construction activities, ensuring paternal succession, providing courage and protection, receiving offerings, responding to prayers, etc. His most prominent role, however, is as the primary litigator in curse formulae, empowering the words of mortal kings and rulers, most frequently invoked with the divine epithet—acting as the Celestial Storm God, the king of heaven. While the Storm God is found with many epithets, this Celestial Storm God is the most prevalent in the Iron Age and the most consistent in his role extending from the Late Bronze Age. Despite the demise of the dynasties ruling under his aegis – prominently, the Great Kings of Hatti and the Kings of Ugarit – this continuity in the primary role of the Storm God as legitimator of earthly kingship appears to be ubiquitous across the Syro-Anatolian region, though it is manifested differently in local and regional contexts throughout the Iron Age.

Descriptions of the monuments

One of the most meaningful elements of continuity during the transition is the iconography pertaining to the Storm God of the Late Bronze Age Hittite Empire and the kingdom of Ugarit with that of the Early Iron Age Syro-Anatolian region. The transference of iconography very probably occurred due to the persistence of the Hittite dynasty ruling the kingdom of Karkemiš and the cult sites of Aleppo and 'Ain Dara in the region, as well as the rapid formation of other local kingdoms such as Malzi and Palastina, during this transition (Weeden 2013; Manuelli and Mori 2016). The early monuments from these locations reflect a cultural memory of the major Late Bronze Age cultic traditions of the Syro-Anatolian region, as well as the beginnings of several significant innovations. In the following section, I will describe the extant monuments with representations of the Storm God, arranged chronologically and by region or polity.

A limited number of Late Bronze Age monumental representations of the Storm God in Anatolia exist today. Those come from four regions: north-central Anatolia, west-central Anatolia, south-central Anatolia, and the Karkemiš region. From the north, we have a relief orthostat from Alacahöyük, dated to about the 14th century BCE, that depicts a king presenting offerings to a seated Storm God; the god is depicted with a horned cap, long robe, curled toes, long pigtail, and chest-length beard. Also in the north is the well-known open-air sanctuary of Yazılıkaya, which depicts the Storm God Teššub and his consort Hebat in its central scene. Teššub is depicted striding across two bent mountain deities, a mace resting upon his shoulder, with one hand outstretched before him, seemingly supporting his epigraph; while his image is quite eroded, he clearly wears a short skirt and tall horned cap, has curled toes, a long pigtail, and a chest-length beard.

Two representations of the Storm God from the west are difficult to interpret. First, the Eflatunpınar monument, built beside a pond and dated to the second half of the 13th century BCE, is both unique and heavily eroded. The monument, composed of several carved blocks, depicts the Storm God and Sun-goddess seated under individual winged disks in the central

scene. Below them are mountain deities, between and beside them appear to be other minor deities, and above the entire scene is a large winged disk. Details of this Storm God are too eroded to make out, aside from a tall cap, presumably pointed, upon his head. Equally problematic is the perhaps unfinished Fasillar statue found seemingly discarded on open ground. The large monolith depicts the Storm God standing upon a mountain deity between two lions; his hand is raised, perhaps smiting, and he wears a short skirt and tall cap with frontal projections that may have been intended as horns.

In the southern portion of the Plateau, there are also two representations of the Storm God, both dated to the 13th century BCE. The rock relief at Fraktın depicts the Storm God receiving libations from the Hittite king Hattusili III. The god is depicted holding a crook against his shoulder and a damaged item before him, perhaps a cone or TONITRUS sign; he wears a short, pointed skirt, a pointed cap with a single horn, and has curled toes. The İmamkulu rock relief, on the other hand, depicts the Storm God of Aleppo driving a bull-drawn eagle-chariot, holding a mace in a smiting position, and riding upon bent mountain deities, possibly towards an exposed Ištar-Šauška figure. The Storm God wears a horned cap and short skirt and has curled toes and a long pigtail.

A single representation of the Storm God from the vicinity of Late Bronze Age Karkemiš is found upon the Cağdıñ stele. The god is shown holding a spear in front of his chest and stylized lightning in the form of two TONITRUS signs before him. He wears a short, pointed skirt with tassels, a pointed horned cap, and what is either a necklace or the collar of a tunic; the figure has no perceptible beard.

A Late Bronze Age stele from Ugarit (ca. 14th–13th century BCE) depicts the Storm God Baʿal smiting with a mace and holding a spear of ~~lightning or~~ vegetation. He wears a helm with horns, a short skirt, and a pigtail, and stands upon a wavy motif. Before the god is a small figure—probably a royal person (i.e., a king), who wears a long robe, rather than a skirt. This combination of motifs is strikingly similar to several Iron Age representations of the Storm God—a connection that will be considered following the formal analysis of the monuments.⁶ Additionally from Ugarit, while not monumental in size, are some small bronze figurines depicting Baʿal in the same way: smiting, likely with a club and ~~lightning/vegetation~~-spear (though these objects are always missing), and wearing a bulbous cap and short skirt.

One final monumental image of the Storm God is also typically interpreted as belonging to the Late Bronze Age, ca. 13th century BCE; it appears on an orthostat of the Temple of the Storm God at Aleppo, associated with the epigraph ALEPPO 5. The figure is identified by this epigraph, as well as the adjacent inscription ALEPPO 6, as the Halabean Storm God. This Storm God stands in a smiting pose albeit with no weapons, only closed fists; he wears a short, pointed kilt, a slightly bulbous horned cap, a pigtail, and has curled toes. The relief has been dated based on the paleography of the epigraph, specifically concerning the sign combination GENUFLECTERE-*MI*, as well as stylistic interpretations of the figure and the comparison of

6. Bunnens (2006) finds this combination consistent with the monuments of Tell Ahmar/Masuwari, particularly in his analysis of TELL AHMAR 6; however, even greater parallels may be found with the monuments of ARSUZ 1 and 2 of Palastina or İVRİZ 1 of Tuwana.



Figure 19.2. Comparison of the style of headgear worn by the Storm-gods in the Early Iron Age relief orthostats from Malizi (Relief D of the Lion Gate at Arslantepe; MALATYA 11) and the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age orthostats from Aleppo (Storm God temple at Aleppo; ALEPPO 5 and 6). Image source: Tayfun Bilgin, www.hittitemonuments.com, v. 1.78.

technical features of the carved orthostat with those of the adjacent orthostat (Hawkins 2011; Kohlmeyer 2011). However, the earliest radiocarbon date associated with the reliefs suggests that the adjacent relief, at least, was installed ca. 11th century BCE, and no clear stratigraphic evidence was found to distinguish two iterations of construction, though a displacement of some orthostats was noted by the excavators (Kohlmeyer 2000; 2009; 2011; 2020). Likewise, a formal and stylistic comparison of the relief with those of contemporaneous Karkemiš and Malizi demonstrates striking similarities. Take for example the distinct iconography of the horned cap worn by the Storm God of Aleppo and those worn by several deities in the orthostats of the Lion Gate of Arslantepe; its central element is uniquely composed of a series of vertically arranged circular elements bisected by a vertical bar (Lovejoy 2023). While this is not the place for an extended review of dating criteria for what is believed to be the earliest extant representation of the Storm God at Aleppo, suffice it to say that an Early Iron Age date is at least possible; here, however, a Late Bronze Age date has been accepted and the relief of the Storm God from Aleppo is interpreted as an inspiration for the subsequent Iron Age representations throughout much of the Syro-Anatolian region (fig. 19.2).

The rest of the representations of the Storm God attributed to a Halabean provenance, if not necessarily bearing the same epithet, are all dated to the Iron Age. The next, chronologically, is also found on an orthostat in the Aleppo temple, this one is associated with the epigraph of ALEPPO 4 and is dated to the late 10th–early 9th century BCE. The figure is depicted driving a bull-drawn eagle-chariot, resting a mace upon his shoulder, wearing a short, pointed skirt, a conical cap with small horns, sporting slightly curled toes, long hair, and either no beard or barely visible stubble. The associated epigraph identifies the chariot-riding figure as the Mace-god, perhaps to be understood as the Storm God of the Mace, or the divine mace that the Storm God wields. A stele from the same period (BABYLON 1), which was found in Babylon (apparently looted by a Neo-Babylonian king), depicts the Storm God smiting with an axe and lightning-trident; he wears a short skirt, bulbous horned cap, long pigtail, and has curled toes. While not found within the vicinity of Aleppo, the inscription on the stele identifies the figure

as Halabean Tarhunza, leading Hawkins (2000) to suggest a Halabean provenance.⁷ None of these images of the Storm God appear stylistically similar to one another; they appear to represent entirely different workshops, periods of construction, or conceptions of the Storm God.

There are several representations of the Storm God from Iron Age Karkemiš, which were created between the 11th and 8th century BCE. The chronological differences evident in these images suggest several developments in the way the Storm God was supposed to be represented upon stone. First, in the 11th and 10th centuries BCE, the Storm God was depicted on orthostats at the Water Gate and in the Long Wall of Sculpture, but from the late 9th century BCE on, we only find the deity depicted on stelae. Second, the stance and objects held by the Storm God change periodically: in the 11th century BCE, he is seen driving a bull-drawn chariot and holding a mace in a relief from the Water Gate; in the 10th and 9th centuries BCE, he is smiting with an axe and lightning trident on an orthostat in the Long Wall of Sculpture associated with KARKAMIŠ A1a and on the KÖRKÜN stele; and in the 8th century BCE, he stands erect, holding a lightning trident before him and another, perhaps cone-like object to his chest upon a stele from Shamak (KARKAMIŠ A17a) and the CEKKE stele. Finally, while the Storm God appears to wear a short skirt and bulbous horned cap and to have curled toes in all representations of the early periods, during the 8th century BCE he is only found wearing a long robe, an apparently hornless conical cap, and with no curled toes.

It is also possible that these different models represent different versions of the Storm God, as several representations are explicitly labeled. The late 9th century BCE KÖRKÜN stele identifies the smiting god holding an axe and lightning trident as the Halabean Tarhunza, while the similarly stylized deity on the 10th century BCE orthostat in the Long Wall of Sculpture appears to be labeled as the Mighty Tarhunza; in this case, “mighty” may simply be a description of the Storm God of Aleppo, who—in Karkemiš—wields an axe and lightning trident in a smiting posture. While neither of the 8th century BCE representations is *explicitly* labeled, the associated inscriptions strongly suggest that the figures are Celestial Tarhunza on the CEKKE stele and simply Tarhunza on the KARKAMIŠ A17a stele. It could be that these gods are, by this time, one and the same; both are the primary deities in their inscriptions, described alongside numerous other gods, including the Sun-god, who is, indeed, depicted as the winged disk and identified as Tiwad in the KARKAMIŠ A17a stele. Similarly, they are both represented in the same long robe with what looks like the same objects held before them—perhaps identifying marks of the Celestial Storm God of the 8th century BCE.

The majority of representations of the Iron Age Storm God from Malzi come from the relief orthostats of the Lion Gate at Arslantepe and are dated to the 11th/early 10th century BCE; a singular example from the late 8th century BCE comes from the same site upon a rough stone block. The early representations are all adorned in a short, pointed skirt and a horned cap, and have long pigtails and curled toes. In reliefs K, B, C, and D (MALATYA 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively), the Storm God is represented in a smiting posture holding a bent cudgel and stylized lightning.

7. However, note Bunnens (2006), who suggests a closer stylistic tie to the works of Karkemiš than those of Aleppo. While I do not see this particular parallel, it is likely that the stele was created elsewhere and offered to the Aleppo temple, before being carried off to Babylon.

In addition to this figure in relief K, a second iteration of the Storm God appears just behind the first, this time driving a bull-drawn eagle chariot and bearing the same bent cudgel overhead. And in the damaged relief H, with no preserved inscription, the Storm God is once again represented twice: first carrying a spear and what looks like a torch or club, and then jabbing with the same spear at a long serpent. These images of the Storm God are quite standardized and only differ based on the scene in which they are depicted. The lone late 8th century BCE example, however, looks quite different; while still bearing a smiting posture with curled toes, this Storm God holds an axe and lightning trident. Additionally, the horned cap is, here, much more bulbous, the skirt is flat, rather than pointed, and the pigtail is much shorter. Finally, the epigraphs associated with representations (all dated to the 11th/early 10th century BCE) simply identify the figures as the Storm God, without phonetic compliments, and only occasionally with the name of a city. This god is presumably Tarhunza, but this cannot be confirmed based purely on internal evidence.

The images of the Storm God of Iron Age Masuwari represent a limited chronological scope, spanning only the 10th to early 9th centuries BCE. All figural monuments take the same form, a somewhat irregularly shaped monolithic stele. The Storm God is consistently depicted below a winged disk, smiting with an axe and lightning trident, wearing a short skirt and bulbous horned cap, and with a pigtail and curled toes. He is optionally represented upon a bull that stands on a guilloche design (TELL AHMAR 2, 6, and probably 1); in the earliest example (Stele C), which is uninscribed, a bird is depicted beneath the god's elbow. All representations with an inscription are dated to the late 10th–early 9th centuries BCE. TELL AHMAR 6 is the only inscription that explicitly labels the associated figure—in this case, Tarhunza of the Army, who is given credit for all but paternal succession in the inscription, which is the responsibility of Celestial Tarhunza. In every other inscription bearing a representation from the group, Celestial Tarhunza is the primary deity, and the only Storm God, aside from a small number of references to an epithet-less Tarhunza, with a roll in the inscribed deeds. Due to the extreme similarities among the representations, it seems unlikely that the different Storm-gods of Iron Age Masuwari were depicted with different characteristics, unless, of course, each stele depicts Celestial Tarhunza, and TELL AHMAR 6 simply highlights the deity's role as military benefactor. Finally, it is also worth noting that, while the inscription TELL AHMAR 5 explicitly identifies the Halabean Tarhunza, the stele itself bears no image; thus, either the stele was set up in the vicinity of a separate image, or the stele itself embodied the god without the need for a visual representation.

Only two figural representations of the Storm God of Iron Age Kummuh are known today: both stelae, one from the 10th century BCE (ADIYAMAN 2) and one from the early 8th century BCE (ADIYAMAN 1). The earlier exemplar depicts the Storm God in a smiting pose with what looks like a bent cudgel behind him and a second object, broken off, before him (perhaps some form of lightning). The figure wears a short skirt, bulbous horned cap, a long pigtail, and has curled toes. The latter representation shows the Storm God in a long robe, standing upon a bull, with straight toes. The name of the figure on the ADIYAMAN 2 stele is missing due to damage, while that of ADIYAMAN 1 appears to be Celestial IRNILA-ean

Tarhunza—presumably some otherwise unknown local version of the Celestial Storm God. The limited evidence allows minimal interpretation for the local cult, however, the transition from a smiting figure to one standing tall in a long robe by the 8th century BCE appears consistent with regional comparanda.

Only a few representations of the Iron Age Storm God from Sam'al remain today, and these similarly demonstrate great variety as well as a number of cultural influences. An orthostat from Zincirli is the earliest example, dated to the 10th century BCE, upon which the Storm God is depicted in a smiting posture with an axe and lightning trident; he wears a bulbous horned cap and a short skirt. Two stelae found out of context in Gaziantep and Islahiye, respectively, are both dated roughly to the 9th century BCE and depict the Storm God wearing a short skirt and bulbous horned helmet, smiting with an axe; one holds a lightning trident before him, while the other holds a narrow object, perhaps grain. The next representation of the Storm God does not come until the mid-8th century BCE in the form of a statue from Gerçin, near Zincirli (KAI 214). The Storm God is dressed in a long robe and a horned cap, and his arms are bent forward, perhaps holding two objects, although the hands are broken off, so this cannot be confirmed. Lastly, a stele from Gözlühöyük, near Islahiye, dated loosely to the 8th/7th century BCE, depicts the Storm God smiting with an axe and the top of a lightning trident; he wears a short skirt, and what has been called an Egyptianizing horned cap and Assyrianizing curly hair and beard (Bunnens 2006). These representations are too unique to compare with each other, yet they seem to reflect changes in cultural influences on the region.

Two irregularly shaped, monolithic stelae (ARSUZ 1 and 2) are the only extant representations of the Storm God in Iron Age Palastina. The two figures were evidently created using the same model in the late 10th century BCE, albeit with certain variations. Both Storm-gods wear short skirts, bulbous horned caps, pigtails, and curly beards; they both hold a lightning trident before them and the wrist of a king, holding grapes and grain, behind them. Immediately above both gods is a winged sun disk. The motif of the Storm God leading the king is unique in the Syro-Anatolian corpus, as is the representation of the deity standing on vegetation. Likewise, this connection between the Storm God, grapes, and grain is the earliest of the Iron Age. One seemingly accidental difference between the two monoliths appears at the feet: the figure of ARSUZ 1 has curled toes, while the figure of ARSUZ 2 has bare feet. Likewise, the addition of a rosette above the winged disk of ARSUZ 1 may have been the result of the creative flare of the carver, or simply a way to fill empty space on the irregularly shaped stele. The motif below the Storm-gods, however, appears to be an intentional difference: the deity in ARSUZ 1 stands atop a vegetal motif, while the deity of ARSUZ 2 stands upon the back of a bull. The two lower motifs likely represent two separate functions of the same Storm God—fertility/abundance and military support, perhaps. Both figures are accompanied by roughly the same inscription and are explicitly identified as the Mighty Storm God without a phonetic complement. The Celestial Storm God is the litigator of the inscription and may be behind the descriptor “mighty,” if it is not itself an epithet.

Only from the 8th century BCE do we find representations of the Storm God in Maraş. In four out of the five examples, the deity is smiting with an axe and lightning trident. In three

of those four, he is beneath a winged disk, wearing a bulbous horned cap and short skirt, and showing a long pigtail. While he is depicted with curled toes upon the KÜRTÜL and MARAŞ 11 stelae, his toes are straight, and he stands upon a bull in the stele from Karaçay Köy. On another stele from Maraş, the smiting Storm God wears an Assyrianizing beard, hair, and long robe. The singular representation of the Storm God that is not smiting is dressed in a long robe with his arms bent forward and his hands held to his chest (MARAŞ 3). In the three inscriptions with representations, only Tarhunza is mentioned, without an epithet. The figure of MARAŞ 3 is explicitly identified as Tarhunza, and the others should probably be considered the same Storm God.

The Storm God of Iron Age Tuwana is found represented in rock reliefs and on stelae only in the late 8th century BCE, perhaps extending into the early 7th century BCE. The images from this region are unique, with the most characteristic feature being the presence of grape vines and grain stalks on either side of the deity in every representation. In most cases, the Storm God stands in a pointed skirt with volutes on the sides, toes slightly curled, wearing a horned cap, and with shoulder-length curly hair and a chest-length curly beard. His arms are bent, one raised before him holding a stalk of grain that grows from the ground, one against his chest holding a grape vine that grows from the ground behind him (İVRİZ 1 and 2, BOR 2, and KEŞLİK YAYLI 1). The alternative model comes with a flat fringed skirt, a more bulbous horned cap, and no curled toes. These deities are also posed differently, with both arms raised in a smiting posture, wielding an axe and a bunch of lightning; in one case the top of the bunch of lightning appears like the top of a lightning trident (NİĞDE 2). With the change in posture, the grape vines and grain stalks are depicted flanking the figure. This alternative appears to be a modification of the presumably earlier model; the change in attire, slightly longer hair, lack of curled toes, and the different posture with the bunch of lightning instead of the lightning trident could be due to Assyrian influence, perhaps resulting from the campaigns of Sargon II in the last quarter of the 8th century BCE. Only in the case of İVRİZ 1 and NİĞDE 2 are the figures explicitly identified as Mighty Tarhunza and Tarhunza, respectively. This does not allow any interpretations regarding differences within the regional corpus, however, a suggestion that all figures represent a Tarhunza of the Vineyard, named in several other contemporary inscriptions of the region, is reasonable on account of the unique vegetal motifs present in *all* representations.⁸

The only two representations of the Storm God of Iron Age Hiyawa were created in the late 8th century BCE. One, the statue bearing the Phoenician monolingual KARATEPE inscription, was explicitly identified as Ba'al KRNTYŠ; the other, the CİNEKÖY statue, is presumably an image of Tarhunza/Ba'al, as they are the only Storm-gods mentioned in the bilingual text upon the statue's base. Both were statues in the round, composed of an erect, columnar figure, dressed in a long robe, with their arms bent at right angles, standing upon a separate base featuring two bulls, one pair held by a small anthropomorphic figure, the other yoked to a chariot. While these two figures clearly come from a similar conception of the Storm God, they also display

8. For instance, SULTANHAN and BOR 1; see also, Hadad of the Vineyard in the 8th century BCE funerary stele of KTMW from Zincirli (Pardee 2009; Lipiński 2016), and the divine pair of the Grain-god and Wine-god, often associated with the Storm God in ARSUZ 1 and 2, TELL TAYINAT 2, and KARATEPE.

several striking differences, most notably the headwear (CİNEKÖY's is horned, while KARATEPE's is not), the beard, and the hair. While the objects in both statues' hands are damaged, those of CİNEKÖY are very likely grain and grapes, representing a variation of the motif commonly found in Tuwana during the same period.⁹ Another monument likely discovered in Hiyawa, though connected politically with the kingdom of Karkemiš,¹⁰ comes in the form of an inscribed stele (ADANA 1) depicting the Storm God with grapes and grain even more similar to those of Tuwana, strengthening this claim.

Finally, a single representation of the Storm God of Iron Age Hadattu/Arslan Tash is found upon an 8th century BCE stele. The figure is dressed in a long robe, parted and exposing the front leg; he stands, striding, upon a bull, wearing an Assyrianizing cap, hair, and beard. Demonstrating similar cultural influence, he is depicted in a smiting pose, wielding two Assyrian-style bunches of lightning.

Analysis

Form and iconography

Several selected elements from these monuments provide insight into the progression of the display of the Syro-Anatolian Storm God between the Late Bronze and Iron Ages. First among these is monumental form. While the monuments of the Late Bronze Age exist as urban and landscape monuments—on orthostats, stelae, and rocks in the landscape—their limited number and the centuries separating them from their Iron Age counterparts make it problematic to claim that they are direct antecedents of later traditions, though they very well could be. Throughout the Iron Age, however, several trends do emerge. Depicting the Storm God on the orthostats of Iron Age cities and temples was an early, albeit brief, practice, spanning only the 11th and 10th centuries BCE. Representing the Storm God on free-standing stelae was common across Syro-Anatolia, particularly between the 10th and 8th centuries BCE, perhaps occupying the role previously held by less mobile representations on orthostats and natural rockfaces. In the 8th century BCE, we once more find depictions of the Storm God on rock reliefs in Tuwana, as well as the innovation of representing the Storm God in statues in the round, particularly in Hiyawa and Sam'al (Table 19.1).¹¹

An examination of the stance or posture of the Storm God also shows several strong trends. The most prevalent posture is that of the smiting Storm God, which seemingly persisted from the Late Bronze Age through the Iron Age in most parts of the Syro-Anatolian region. Addi-

9. Wicke (2015) suggests that they are lightning and a plant, possibly grapes; Tekoğlu et al. (2000) and Bunnens (2006) do not hazard a guess. The objects of the Karatepe statue are largely missing, but they may have been the same.

10. Commissioned by Atika, son of Kamani of Karkemiš, dedicating it to the MAS(A)HULNALI Storm God (ADANA 1).

11. While I have excluded the monuments of Guzana/Tell Halaf from my discussion due to problems with discovery, reconstruction, and the uncertainty of their identification as Storm-gods, one could observe the ambiguity of divine and royal attribute 9th-century statues in-the-round as perhaps influential in later monuments of Hiyawa and Sam'al.

Table 19.1. Typology and distribution of forms of Storm God monuments. All dates BCE, early end of date ranges used for consistency and simplicity.

	Orthostat	Stele	Rock-relief	Statue	Stone Block
14 th c.	NCA	Ugarit			
13 th c.	Aleppo	Karkamis	NCA; SCA	WCA	WCA
12 th c.					
11 th c.	Karkamis; Malatya				
10 th c.	Aleppo; Karkamis; Sam'al	Aleppo; Masuwari; Kummuh; Palastina			
9 th c.		Karkamis			
8 th c.		Karkamis; Tuwana; Hadattu	Tuwana	Hiyawa; Sam'al	Malatya

tionally, seals from Late Bronze Age Syria and Anatolia quite consistently depict the Storm God in either a smiting or standing position, wearing a short skirt and horned cap, most frequently holding or shouldering a mace.¹² Much less prevalent, but appearing intermittently during the same time span, is the Storm God riding or driving a chariot. In contrast, the seated Storm God is only found in the Late Bronze Age, and the standing Storm God was depicted only in the 13th and 8th centuries BCE. A single example in two copies of a guiding Storm God was created in 10th century BCE Palastina; this posture may descend from earlier smiting stances like that of the Ugaritic Ba'al stele, may fit within the 10th century BCE smiting milieu, and may also have inspired later smiting and standing positions like those of Tuwana and Hiyawa (Table 19.2).

Table 19.2. Typology and distribution of stances held by the Storm God in monuments. All dates BCE, early end of date ranges used for consistency and simplicity.

	Smiting	Chariot	Seated	Standing	Guiding
14 th c.	Ugarit		NCA		
13 th c.	WCA; SCA; Aleppo	SCA	WCA	NCA; WCA	
12 th c.					
11 th c.	Malatya	Malatya			
10 th c.	Aleppo; Karkamis; Masuwari; Kummuh; Sam'al	Aleppo			Palastina
9 th c.	Karkamis				
8 th c.	Malatya; Sam'al; Maras; Tuwana; Hadattu	Hiyawa		Karkamis; Kummuh; Sam'al; Maras; Tuwana; Hiyawa	



Smiting and standing Storm-gods are typically depicted with an object in one or both of their hands, the exception being two early smiting Storm-gods who only bear closed fists and a few damaged monuments in which objects cannot be positively identified. The most common

12. See for example, Herbordt (2005) [BoHa 19]; Schaeffer (1956) [Ugaritica III]; Beyer (2001) [Emar IV]; Beyer specifically identifies Ba'al with a mace and spear, Hadad with a mace and lightning, and both with a bulbous cap, while most depictions he labels Teššub.

weapon of the Late Bronze Age Storm God is the mace, which falls out of use around the end of the 10th century BCE,¹³ followed by the spear and crook/bent cudgel, which similarly are not used after the 10th century BCE. Emerging *only* in the 10th century BCE and extending at least through the end of the 8th century BCE is the pair of axe and lightning—often in the form of a trident—which seems to replace all other weapons of the Syro-Anatolian Storm God. And while not a weapon, stalks of grain and bunches of grapes are also held by the Storm God in the 8th century BCE in Tuwana and Hiyawa, and through the proxy of the guided king in 10th century BCE Palastina. This depiction of a tall stalk of grain may come from a similar concept as the vegetation or lightning spear held by Ugaritic Ba'al of the Late Bronze Age. While this may be a loose connection, it appears that these local innovations of depicting the Storm God with axe and lightning or grape and grain originated in the south and east of the Syro-Anatolian region, only later expanding to the north and west (Table 19.3).

Table 19.3. Typology and distribution of objects held by the Storm God in monuments. All dates BCE, early end of date ranges used for consistency and simplicity.

	Mace	Fist	Spear	Crook/Bent Cudgel	Axe and Lightning	Grapes and Grain
14 th c.	Ugarit		Ugarit			
13 th c.	NCA; SCA	WCA; Aleppo	Karkamis	SCA		
12 th c.						
11 th c.	Karkamis		Malatya	Malatya		
10 th c.	Aleppo			Kummuh	Aleppo; Karkamis; Masuwari; Sam'al	Palastina
9 th c.					Karkamis	
8 th c.					Malatya; Sam'al; Maras; Tuwana	Karkamis; Tuwana; Hiyawa

Finally, the attire of the Storm God can also be temporally defined. While the Storm God is depicted wearing a short skirt or kilt in almost all parts of the Syro-Anatolian region throughout the Iron Ages, it is only during the 8th century BCE that he is frequently represented in a long robe. This may reflect eastern influence, particularly that of Assyria, or it may be a product of blending royal and divine attributes in monumental display (Lovejoy 2022).

Regarding headwear, the Storm God is adorned with a tall or pointed, horned cap from the Late Bronze Age to the end of the 10th century BCE, particularly in regions maintained by the Hittite empire. However, a bulbous horned cap emerged at Karkemiš in the 11th century BCE and became the standard headwear of the Syro-Anatolian Storm God between the 10th and

13. However, Ba'al of the Mace is invoked in the curse formula of the 9th-century BCE Kilaamuwa inscription (KAI 24), and Ba'al KRNTYŠ from the late 8th-century BCE KARATEPE inscription has been interpreted as the same deity; neither accompanying image appears to depict a Storm God with a mace.

8th centuries BCE; this cap resembles the bulbous, albeit often hornless, cap of several bronze figurines of Baʿal found in the vicinity of Ugarit. Lastly, in the 8th century BCE, a short, rather rounded, horned cap adorned the Storm God on several monuments from Tuwana, Hiyawa, and Samʿal (fig. 19.6).

Table 19.4. Typology and distribution of attire worn by the Storm God in monuments. All dates BCE, early end of date ranges used for consistency and simplicity.

	Short Skirt	Long Robe	Tall/Pointed Cap	Bulbous Cap	Rounded Cap
14 th c.	Ugarit	NCA	NCA; Ugarit	Ugarit	
13 th c.	NCA; WCA; SCA; Aleppo; Karkamis		NCA; WCA; SCA; Aleppo; Karkamis		
12 th c.					
11 th c.	Karkamis; Malatya		Malatya	Karkamis	
10 th c.	Aleppo; Karkamis; Masuwari; Kummuh; Palastina; Samʿal		Aleppo	Aleppo; Masuwari; Kummuh; Palastina; Samʿal	
9 th c.	Karkamis				
8 th c.	Samʿal; Maras; Tuwana	Karkamis; Kummuh; Samʿal; Maras; Hiyawa; Hadattu		Malatya; Maras; Tuwana	Samʿal; Tuwana; Hiyawa

Storm God of the Vineyard

I have already suggested that the image of the Storm God with grape and grain may have been inspired by the Ugaritic representations of Baʿal, but one should also consider the textual evidence and the appellation Storm God of the Vineyard alongside this imagery.¹⁴ This epithet has never been found associated with the Storm God in the Late Bronze Age, *contra* several interpretations of a Hittite ritual (KUB 43.23) based on the original translation of Haas (1988). Haas reads “the Storm-god of the ‘greening’ Vineyard,” and several scholars citing him have followed suit, typically omitting the adjective to better accord with the Iron Age epithet, a connection to which Haas himself briefly alluded at the conclusion of his article (e.g., Hutter 2003; Mazoyer 2005). However, close attention to the syntax of these lines suggests that they can well be read otherwise, with the “vineyard” not as part of an epithet of the Storm God, but rather as an object of the ritual.¹⁵ See here below the transcription of the passage, the original translation by Prof. Haas and the one I suggest:

Transcription of the passage of the Hittite Ritual KUB 43.23 (from Haas 1988, 132):

14. Matessi and Lovejoy (in press) have recently sought to identify the developmental trajectory of this cult through an archaeological and historical analysis of the evidence associated with the Storm God of the Vineyard and relevant polities and geographical regions.

15. This assertion has also recently been supported by Schwemer (2022, 376, n. 97).

(Vs. 1–2) [D^IŠKU]R-na-aš DINGIR.LÚ^{MES} ú-wa-te-et-te-en D^IM-an
 [hu-e]l-pi2-na-aš G^IS^IKIRI₆-aš GEŠTIN LUGAL-uš ku-in ʿda-x[.]
 [] ʿeʿ-ez-du e-ku-ud-du...

Translation by Prof. Haas (1988, 132):

Bringt, (ihr) männlichen Götter des [Wettergott]es, den Wettergott des „[grün]enden“ (??) Weingartens herbei. [] Welchen der König [] [und] (?) er soll essen (und) trinken.

Alternative translation by author:

You male gods should bring the [Stor]m God (statue). The wine which the king tak[es](?) of/from the [fre]sh crop of the garden, the Storm God should eat and drink it [].

Even though with my translation the denomination Storm God of the Vineyard would be an innovation of the Iron Age, what this text and others do confirm is the Anatolian Storm God's role in providing agricultural fertility and abundance already in the Late Bronze Age, including for the founding and success of vineyards (e.g., KUB 35.1; Hutter 2003, 224, 231). It also demonstrates that, in the Hittite tradition, several subordinate deities aided the Storm God in his protection and provision of agricultural space; specifically, among the list of deities that should receive offerings during the ritual are the god Telipinu of the Garden—the son of the Storm God and a deity that is typically associated with vegetation (see also Mazoyer 2005)—and the goddess Maliya, here defined as “the mother of wine and grain.” This organization is largely paralleled in the Ugaritic pantheon with Baʿal strongly connected to agriculture and fertility and aided by directly subordinate agriculturally focused deities; in fact, in the Ugaritic Baʿal Cycle, the Storm God's personal messengers are named Gapn and Ugar, which can be translated as “Vine(yard)” and “Field.”¹⁶

In the Iron Age, with evidence dating to as early as the 10th century BCE, separate supportive Grain- and Wine-gods, also subordinate and connected to the Storm God, were invoked in the inscriptions of Karkemiš and Palastina (KARKAMIŠ A11a and A2+3; ARSUZ 1 and 2, TELL TAYINAT 2) and, later, in the late 8th century BCE, in Hiyawa and possibly Tuwana (KARATEPE; İVRİZ 2).¹⁷ Visual representations of these subordinate deities appear on the monuments bearing these inscriptions in the form of iconographic divine symbols; for instance, the grain and grape held by the guided king of Palastina on the ARSUZ stelae and, perhaps, the

16. Note, however, that Smith and Pitard (1994, 222–23, esp. n. 39) have suggested that these two minor deities may be “entirely literary characters” due to their absence from any rituals discovered at Ugarit. This is in contrast with the evidence from Iron Age cultic inscriptions in which the Wine- and Grain-gods are regularly active participants, suggesting an innovation in cultic practice derived from mythical tradition.

17. In the Hittite myth of “Kingship in Heaven,” Teššub is the son of Anu, the Sky-god, and Kumarbi, the Grain-goddess. In the ARSUZ inscriptions, the Good-god Kumarma and the Wine-god Tipariya are mother and father of the Celestial Storm God. The phonetic similarity and logographic equivalence between Kumarma and Kumarbi suggest syncretism between the Hurrian and Syro-Anatolian deities. Weeden has also cautiously proposed that the hitherto unattested “Tipariya has been attracted into the role of father of the storm-god on the basis of the name's superficial partial homonymy with Luwian *tipas*- ‘sky,’ as a stand in for Anu, the sky deity” (Weeden 2018, 353).

grain stalk and grape vines that flank the Storm God of the Vineyard on several of the monuments of Tuwana, stand both as the result of the gods' divine support and as symbols of the deities themselves. While the evidence leaves a roughly three-century hiatus of attestations of these subordinate agricultural deities or agriculturally focused Storm-gods in the Syro-Anatolian region, it stands to reason that their position within the cultic or mythical traditions of the Storm God(s) survived the fragmentation of the Hittite empire and the fall of the kingdom of Ugarit, and persisted in relative continuity in the lands of the most powerful Early Iron Age kingdoms in the region. It should also be noted that, while the earliest Iron Age attestations of these deities come from the kingdoms of Palastina and Karkemiš—often considered “rump states” of the Hittite empire, descending from its Late Bronze Age traditions—the manifestation of specific and individual Grain- and Wine-gods is more reflective of a continuity of expressly *local* traditions, removed from political control or association.

Additionally significant is the emergence of the epithet, Storm God of the Vineyard, in the late 8th century BCE in Tuwana and Sam'al (SULTANHAN, BOR 1; Pardee 2009 [KTMW Inscription]). While the Early Iron Age Storm God with subordinate Grain- and Wine-gods appears to be a distillation of Late Bronze Age traditions, this epithet and associated iconographic repertoire illustrates an evolution in the preceding conceptions of the Storm God and his role in agriculture. Notably, the entire corpus of images of the Storm God bearing grape and grain is found only in the same regions where the Storm God is connected to the Grain- and Wine-gods or qualified by the epithet “of the Vineyard.” This suggests that the tradition is a local or micro-regional innovation developed from a combination of Anatolian and Syro-Levantine concepts, imagery, and cultic traditions, which has roots in Late Bronze Age Hatti and Ugarit; it then began to assume its Iron Age form in 10th century BCE Karkemiš and Palastina and solidified into a regional tradition with local variations and expressions in 8th century BCE Tuwana, Hiyawa, and Sam'al. This trajectory suggests a northern Levantine origin for the tradition with a northern expansion and development, a process extending from at least the 13th century BCE through the 8th century BCE. While innovative, this construction illustrates cultural and cultic *continuity* from earlier Anatolian and North Syrian traditions, only slowly altered through progressive developments in local and regional contexts, perhaps connected to the growing significance and display of elite wine consumption and feasting¹⁸ and thus viticulture and vineyards themselves as well as agricultural fertility and abundance of foodstuffs,¹⁹ with grain and vine as representative icons (fig. 19.3).

18. See, for instance, the opulence depicted in the banquet scene carved on an orthostat in the Palace of Aššurbanipal at Niniveh in which the Assyrian king and his queen relax beneath grape vines, eating and/or drinking in a fertile garden after success at the Battle of Til-Tuba (Albenda 1974).

19. See Castellano (2021), which shows on a palaeobotanical basis an increase in viticulture from the Early to Late Iron Ages at the site of Niğde-Kınık Höyük in the heart of the kingdom of Tuwana; see also the archaeobotanical results published in Karakaya (2019) and Welton et al. (2019), which provide similar evidence for increasing viticulture over the same periods at the site of Tell Tayinat, the capital of the kingdom of Palastina/Patina/Unqi.



Figure 19.3. Monumental representations of the Storm God of the Vineyard. **Top left**, NİĞDE (Niğde Archaeological Museum; image source: Tayfun Bilgin, www.hittitemonuments.com, v. 1.78); **top right**, BOR 2 (Niğde Archaeological Museum; image source: *ibid.*); **bottom left**, Baal with Thunderbolt (Louvre Museum via Wikimedia Commons, CC BY-SA 3.0 <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>); **bottom right**: ÇİNEKÖY (Adana Archaeological Museum; photo by author).

King, god, or something new?

A final innovation that is noteworthy is the ambiguity of royal and divine attributes in the representations of the Storm God in the 8th century BCE. In Karkemiš, Sam'al, and Hiyawa in particular, the Storm God was at this point depicted standing erect, in a long robe and rounded cap with close, wrapping horns or without; he held divine or seemingly mundane objects out before him and he often stood upon a bull or bulls, depending on the medium of display. This is a dramatic change from the hyper-consistent display of the Iron Age Storm God in a short skirt with a pointed or bulbous horned cap standing in a combative posture; likewise, the long robe—previously considered characteristic garb of the royal figure or elite mortals in the Iron Age Syro-Anatolian region—appears to be used indiscriminately or, more likely, intentionally ambiguously to construct a conceptually hybrid image of king and god (Lovejoy 2022).

Similarly, in the 8th century BCE, each of these kingdoms inscribed their ambiguous monuments to the Storm God in a different script or script-combination. While the monu-

ments of Karkemiš were all composed in Hieroglyphic Luwian, those of Hiyawa were variously inscribed in Phoenician and Luwian, and those of Sam'al were written in local Sam'alian and Aramaic.²⁰ From this, it is apparent that the concept and image of the Storm God were in no way connected to a specific script or language, but rather by shared imagery, iconography, and mythology. Additionally, while the Karkemišean monuments were all stelae, those of Hiyawa and Sam'al took the new form of large columnar statues, demonstrating variability in representational form, even when depicting the same Storm God. Notably, the inscriptions on these statues were also composed by the respective ruler of the country in the first person, seemingly identifying the figure as both king and deity. The combination of these criteria of the monuments illustrates an abrupt innovation throughout the region that suggests a significant conceptual change in the relationship between individual kings and the Storm God himself—one in which the royal figure could embody the divine authority of the king of the gods through monumentality and ambiguity.

In contrast with earlier images in which the royal figure, dressed in a long robe, was accompanied, embraced, or guided by the Storm God wearing a short skirt (such as in the *Umar-mungszene* of Yazılıkaya, the Ugaritic stele of Ba'al, the ARSUZ stelae of Palastina,²¹ or even the nearby and contemporaneous rock-cut monument of Tuwana at İvriz), several monuments of the 8th century BCE seem to depict either, or both, the Storm God and a local king, combining the iconography of both royal and divine repertoires, and variously identifying the represented figure as the Storm God and/or a living or deceased king. For example, the double identifications of the inscribed statue at Karatepe as the ruler Azatiwada of Hiyawa in the first person and as Ba'al KRNTRYŠ with the near demonstrative pronoun (“this”) or the inscribed statue of Hadad and/or Panamuwa (I) of Sam'al discovered at Gerçin with similar grammatical ambiguity, suggest a direct and significant connection between ruler and god, and perhaps the construction or perpetuation of local divinely supported dynastic cults. While this visual and conceptual construction is not a ubiquitous trend in the region, it provided the Syro-Anatolian kingdoms of the 8th century BCE with a variant for standard representations of king and god, allowing for visual statements of individuality and local expressions of power through the specific king's association with the region's mythical king of the gods—the Storm God, perhaps specifically the Celestial Storm God.²²

So, what inspired all of these changes? Considering the timing, it is quite likely that the increasingly diverse sociopolitical environment, alongside Assyrian interventions during the 9th and 8th centuries BCE—especially after the expansion efforts of Tiglath-pileser III through the conquests of Sargon II—resulted in dramatic expressions of local identity in response to new inter-polity interactions and imperial pressures. While these three kingdoms selected roughly the same new template for their Storm God monuments, the local variations exuded a unique social, political, and religious identity that established their royal legitimacy through their individual connection to the Storm God and set them apart from not only the Assyrian empire but also their neighboring small kingdoms (fig. 19.4; Lovejoy 2022).

20. See Giusfredi and Pisaniello (2021) for a recent historical and linguistic analysis of Sam'al.

21. However, note the above-mentioned variations between the stelae.

22. See also Bunnens (2006, 57–58).



Figure 19.4. Monuments demonstrating ambiguity between divine and royal portraiture. Left to right: CEKKE (Aleppo Museum; image source: Hawkins [2000, plate 42]); King of Sam'al (Istanbul Archaeology Museum; image source: Tayfun Bilgin, www.hittitemonuments.com, v. 1.78); KARATEPE (Karatepe-Aslantaş National Park; photo by author); ÇİNEKÖY (Adana Archaeological Museum; photo by author).

Conclusions

In summary, this study has provided an analysis of the diachronic development of the monumental representation associated with the cult of the Storm God across the Syro-Anatolian region between the Late Bronze and Iron Ages, with specific attention paid to regional, local, and political contexts. While the primary iconography and ideological preeminence of the Storm God persisted through the transition from the Bronze Age to the Iron Age, it is during the transition from the Early to Middle Iron Age, sometime between the 10th and 9th centuries BCE, that we find an influx of regional and local developments in iconography as well as subsequent innovations in the conception of local Storm-gods and their depictions.

Though variability in monumental form is characteristic of Late Bronze Age representations of the Storm God, the Iron Age is characterized by a progressive shift from rocks as the primary medium, to stelae, and finally to increased variability once again, including the innovative use of statues in the round. The most common stance of the Storm God, depicted on monuments of all periods and across the Syro-Anatolian region, is the smiting position; alternative stances, such as the seated, guiding, or chariot-riding Storm-gods, appear in isolated contexts, indicating sporadic innovations or attempts at variation alongside the continuity of the traditional smiting figure. The weapon of the Storm God changes diachronically, with some variability in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages, changing from the mace as the most com-

mon of several options to the axe and lightning bolt/trident as the sole martial option after the 10th century BCE. The attire of the Storm God underwent similar diachronic changes: while he was adorned with a short skirt on monuments during all periods, he was also depicted with a long robe during the 8th century BCE. Additionally, his headwear changed from a tall, pointed, horned cap to a bulbous horned cap around the 11th–10th century BCE, with a rounded horned cap added to the repertoire during the 8th century BCE. My goal here is not to identify the reasons behind these formal changes in iconography. I am instead interested in underscoring that these changes are various, and this suggests no uniform or overarching cause or process, but rather indicate specific and largely disconnected developments to the wider tradition.

Among these changes, I have devoted my attention to the development of two major innovations in the conceptualization and representation of the Storm God. The Storm God of the Vineyard, primarily attested during the 8th century BCE in an isolated region of Syro-Anatolia, especially encompassing the kingdoms of Tuwana, Hiyawa, and Sam'al, appears to be derived from a combination of Hittite and Ugaritic mythological conceptions of the deity and his close relation with the agricultural deities of grape and grain, with their respective characteristics of fertility and abundance. The connection between the Storm God and the Grape- and Grain-gods manifested in Late Bronze Age Ugarit and Hatti and received in Early Iron Age Karkemiš and Palastina precedes the final evolution into the Storm God of the Vineyard during the Middle Iron Age, the product of a lengthy process of modification and innovation. This process resulted not in a single intraregional Storm God of the Vineyard, but one with several local variations, presumably reflective of different beliefs and conceptions of the deity, his role, and the ways in which he should be displayed.

The abrupt emergence of ambiguity in royal and divine portraiture occurred only in the 8th century BCE across the majority of the Syro-Anatolian region.²³ This development suggests a conceptual change in the relationship between king and Storm God in which local kings were not only supported by the deity but physically embodied his divine kingship; whether this was in life or only in death cannot be determined. However, what is clear is that these changes occurred alongside the formation of several small kingdoms, around the time of Assyrian intervention, and in the following centuries of increased interaction and political and cultural pressure. While the cult of the Storm God persisted through the Late Bronze and Iron Ages with many core elements unchanged, this continuity was altered by sporadic and progressive changes throughout the course of its development—both in local and regional contexts—and in response to the increased cultural and political variability of the Syro-Anatolian region as well as to the external imperial pressures of Assyria.

23. However, see notes 2 and 11.

Bibliography

- Albenda, Pauline. 1974. "Grapevines in Ashurbanipal's Garden." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 215: 5–17.
- Aro, Sanna. 2003. "Art and Architecture." In *The Luwians*, edited by Craig Melchert, 281–337. Leiden; Boston: Brill (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 1, The Near and Middle East 68).
- Ayali-Darshan, Noga. 2015. "The Other Version of the Story of the Storm-God's Combat with the Sea in the Light of Egyptian, Ugaritic, and Hurro-Hittite Texts." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 15 (1): 20–51.
- Beckman, Gary. 1996. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. Atlanta: Scholars Press (Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World 7).
- Beyer, Dominique. 2001. *Emar IV: Les sceaux; Mission archéologique de Meskene-Emar, Recherches au pays d'Assata*. Fribourg: Éditions universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, Series Archaeologica 20).
- Bilgin, Tayfun. 2023. "Hittite Monuments," v. 1.78, last modified January 14, 2023. www.hittitemonuments.com.
- Bunnens, Guy. 2006. *A New Luwian Stele and the Cult of the Storm-God at Til Barsib-Masuwari*. Leuven: Peeters (Publications de la Mission Archéologique de l'Université de Liège en Syrie, Tell Ahmer 2).
- Castellano, Lorenzo. 2021. "A New Anthracological Sequence from Niğde-Kınık Höyük (Turkey): Woodland Vegetation and Arboriculture in Southern Cappadocia from the Late Bronze Age to the Ottoman Period." *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences* 13, 49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-021-01284-6>.
- Castellano, Lorenzo. 2018. "Staple Economies and Storage in Post-Hittite Anatolia: Considerations in Light of New Data from Niğde-Kınık Höyük (Southern Cappadocia)." *Journal of Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology & Heritage Studies* 6 (4): 259–84.
- Dinçol, Belkıs, Ali Dinçol, John David Hawkins, Hasan Peker, Aliye Öztan. 2015. "Two New Inscribed Storm-God Stelae from Arsuz (İskenderun): ARSUZ 1 and 2." *Anatolian Studies* 65: 59–77.
- Donner, Herbert, and Wolfgang Röllig. 2002. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften 1*. 5th edition. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Genge, Heinz. 1979. *Nordsyrisch-südanatolische Reliefs: Eine archäologisch-historische Untersuchung, Datierung und Bestimmung*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard (Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab Historisk-filosofiske meddelelser 49).
- Giusfredi, Federico, and Valerio Pisaniello. 2021. "The Population, the Language and the History of Yadiya/Sam'al." In *Beyond All Boundaries: Anatolia in the First Millennium BC*, edited by Annick Payne, Šárka Velhartická, and Jorit Wintjes, 189–223. Leuven: Peeters (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 295).
- Haas, Volkert. 1994. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. Leiden; New York: Brill (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 1, The Near and Middle East 15).

- Haas, Volkert. 1988. "Magie in hethitischen Gärten." In *Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae: Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by Erich Neu and Christel Rüster, 121–42. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Hawkins, John David. 2011. "The Inscriptions of the Aleppo Temple." *Anatolian Studies* 61: 35–54.
- Hawkins, John David. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Volume 1: Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter (Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft, N.F. 8).
- Herbordt, Suzanne. 2005. *Die Prinzen- und Beamtsiegel der hethitischen Großreichzeit auf Tonbullen aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern (Boğazköy-Hattusa 19).
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. 1998. *Hittite Myths*. 2nd edition. Atlanta: Scholars Press (Writings from the Ancient World 2).
- Hutter, Manfred. 2021. *Religionsgeschichte Anatoliens: Vom Ende des dritten bis zum Beginn des ersten Jahrtausends*. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer (Die Religionen der Menschheit 10.1).
- Hutter, Manfred. 2003. "Aspects of Luwian Religion." In *The Luwians*, edited by Craig Melchert, 211–80. Leiden; Boston: Brill (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 1, The Near and Middle East 68).
- Karakaya, Doğa. 2019. *Botanical Aspects of the Environment and Economy at Tell Tayinat from the Bronze to Iron Ages (ca. 2.200–600 BCE), in south-central Turkey*. PhD dissertation, Universität Tübingen.
- Kohlmeyer, Kay. 2020. *The Temple of the Weather God of Aleppo*. Münster: Rhema (Qal'at Haleb Occasional Papers 1).
- Kohlmeyer, Kay. 2011. "Building Activities and Architectural Decoration in the 11th Century BC: The Temples of Taita, King of Padasatini/Palistin in Aleppo and 'Ain Dara." In *Empires after the Empire: Anatolia, Syria and Assyria after Suppiluliuma II (ca. 1200–800/700 B.C.)*, edited by Karl Strobel, 255–80. Florence: Logisma (Eothen 17).
- Kohlmeyer, Kay. 2009. "The Temple of the Storm God in Aleppo during the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages." *Near Eastern Archaeology* 72 (4): 190–202.
- Kohlmeyer, Kay. 2000. *Der Tempel des Wettergottes von Aleppo*. Münster: Rhema.
- Kohlmeyer, Kay. 1982. *Land des Baal. Syrien – Forum der Völker und Kulturen*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Lipiński, Edward. 2016. *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics IV*. Leuven; Paris; Bristol: Peeters (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 250).
- Lovejoy, Nathan. 2023. "Networks of Specialized Knowledge: Cult and Its Imagery in Early Iron Age Malizi and Palastina." *Near Eastern Archaeology* 86 (2): 112–121.
- Lovejoy, Nathan. 2022. "Ambiguity of Divine and Royal Portraiture and the Hiyawan Image of Kingship: Political Identity through the Monuments of ÇİNEKÖY and KARATEPE." *Bulletin of the American Society of Overseas Research* 387: 113–38.
- Manuelli, Federico, and Lucia Mori. 2016. "The King at the Gate: Monumental Fortifications and the Rise of Local Elites at Arslantepe at the End of the 2nd Millennium BCE." In "The

- Origin of Inequality,” edited by Andrea Cardarelli, Alberto Cazzella, and Marcella Frangipane, thematic issue, *Origini* 39: 209–41.
- Matessi, Alvise, and Nathan Lovejoy. In press. “Resilient Vines? Religious Motifs and Areal Contacts between Central Anatolia and the Eastern Mediterranean in the Post-Hittite Period.” In *Change, Order, Remembrance: Crisis and Religion in the Ancient Near East*, edited by Marta Pallavidini, Costanza Coppini, and Johannes Bach. Dubsar; Münster: Zaphon.
- Mazoyer, Michel. 2005. “Télipinu au Tabal.” *Res Antiquae* 2: 427–38.
- Orthmann, Winfried. 1971. *Untersuchungen zur späthethitischen Kunst*. Bonn: R. Habelt.
- Pardee, Dennis. 2009. “A New Aramaic Inscription from Zincirli.” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 356: 51–71.
- Pardee, Dennis. 2002. *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature (Writings from the Ancient World 10).
- Schaeffer, Claude. 1956. *Ugaritica III: Sceaux et cylindres hittites, épée gravée du cartouche de Mineptah, tablettes chypro-minoennes et autres découvertes nouvelles de Ras Shamra*. Paris: P. Geuthner (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 64).
- Schwemer, Daniel. 2022. “Religion and Power.” In *Handbook Hittite Empire: Power Structures*, edited by Stefano de Martino, 355–420. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter (Empires through the Ages in Global Perspective 1).
- Schwemer, Daniel. 2008. “The Storm-Gods of the Ancient Near East: Summary, Synthesis, Recent Studies, Part II.” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 8 (1): 1–44.
- Schwemer, Daniel. 2007. “The Storm-Gods of the Ancient Near East: Summary, Synthesis, Recent Studies, Part I.” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 7 (2): 121–68.
- Schwemer, Daniel. 2001. *Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen: Materialien und Studien nach den schriftlichen Quellen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Smith, Mark. 1994. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle, Volume 1: Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU 1.1–1.2*. Leiden: Brill (Vetus Testamentum Supplements 55).
- Smith, Mark, and Wayne Pitard. 2009. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle, Volume 2: Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU 1.3–1.4*. Leiden: Brill (Vetus Testamentum Supplement 114).
- Taracha, Piotr. 2009. *Religions of Second Millennium Anatolia*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 27).
- Tekoğlu, Recai, André Lemaire, İsmet İpek, and A. Kazım Tosun. 2000. “La bilingue royale louvito-phénicienne de Çineköy.” *Comptes rendus des séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 144 (3): 961–1007.
- Weeden, Mark. 2018. “The Good God, the Wine-God and the Storm-God of the Vineyard.” In “Viticulture and Wine in Hittite Anatolia and Its Ancient Near Eastern Context: Philological, Archaeological and Comparative Perspectives,” edited by Carlo Corti, special issue, *Die Welt des Orients* 48 (2): 330–56.
- Weeden, Mark. 2013. “After the Hittites: The Kingdoms of Karkamish and Palistin in Northern Syria.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 56 (2): 1–20.

- Welton, Lynn, Timothy Harrison, Stephen Batiuk, Elif Ünlü, Brian Janeway, Karakaya Doğa, David Lipovitch, David Lumb, and James Roames. 2019. "Shifting Networks and Community Identity at Tell Tayinat in the Iron I (ca. 12th to Mid 10th Cent. B.C.E.)." *American Journal of Archaeology* 123 (2): 291–333.
- Wicke, Dirk. 2015. "Assyrian or Assyrianized: Reflections on the Impact of Assyrian Art in Southern Anatolia." In *Mesopotamia in the Ancient World: Impact, Continuities, Parallels; Proceedings of the Seventh Symposium of the Melammu Project Held in Obergurgl, Austria, November 4–8, 2013*, edited by Robert Rollinger and Erik van Dongen, 561–601. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag (Melammu Symposia 7).