in the OH pantheon. This too seems to me an overstatement in view of the OH text of law 169, in which either storm-god or sun-god can be appealed to for justice. The male sun-god of heaven is clearly the god of justice in all periods of Hittite history and is paired here with the storm-god as the head of the pantheon. The female sun-goddess is never, to my knowledge, the deity of justice. Furthermore, in the Telipinu Myth, which gives a fairly full picture of the OH pantheon, the storm-god stands at the head of the pantheon and the goddesses Hannahanna (^{D}NIN.TU) and Kamrusepa play prominent roles, but the sun-goddess of Arinna (the female solar deity) is nowhere in evidence. Her mention in the Annals of Hattusili I (CTH 4: KBo 10.2 and dupls.) could be considered an addition by the NH scribe (see Popko's resort to this kind of argument in p. 70, n. 153). But I think it unlikely that her manifold role in the text would have been entirely fabricated by a copyist. According to this text, booty was dedicated to her temple in Hattusa, and it accommodated seven deities (i 37–39). The male sun-god of heaven, a son of the Great Storm-god, also figures in CTH 322 and 323, myths that reflect the OH pantheon, although their copies are NH.

P. 71: although his discussion of the goddess Halmassuit is judicious, it is not clear why such significance is attributed to the fact that she was "never depicted in human form." After all, this is true of the vast majority of deities whose names occur in Hittite texts! Why should only this deity be considered "simply a personified cult throne"? Many ancient deities were represented only by animals or objects and not by anthropomorphic figures.

The cult inventory texts (for example, KBo 2.1) inform us of many cases where older representation was in the form of stelas (*ḫuwaši*) later replaced by statues.

The cautious presentation of the evidence for the goddess Inar is admirable. Yet I think one can be more confident in the use of the Illuyanka myths, where she is the daughter of the Great Storm-god and is a goddess of the steppe (*gimras*).

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

The University of Chicago

The Kingdom of the Hittites. By TREVOR BRYCE. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Pp. xvii + 464. $60.

For years there has been a crying need for a reliable summary of what is known of the history of the Hittite Kingdom. Until the appearance of this book, teachers of history made use of chapters in the *Cambridge Ancient History* by O. R. Gurney, Albrecht Goetze, and others. But those essays were composed in the 1960s, and in a discipline developing as rapidly as Hittitology they were in need of major revision.

Trevor Bryce is well known to Hittitologists as the author of many perceptive essays on aspects of Hittite history. He is well qualified to write an overview such as the present one.

One year after the publication of the present volume, a volume by the German Assyriologist and Hittitologist, Horst Klengel, appeared, which treats the same subject but with an entirely different style of presentation. Klengel's presentation is oriented to the specialist who controls the original sources, while Bryce's book, although certainly as respectable in its scholarship and thorough research, is presented in a form more "friendly" to a general reader.

Bryce's book contains a list of Hittite kings, up-to-date as of the publication of the book in 1998 but now in need of slight revision (a seal impression published by H. Otten, in *Archäologische Anzeiger* [2000]: 375–76, shows that Tudhaliya I/II, the "founder" of the so-called New Kingdom was the son of a Kantuzili known to have been the Overseer of Elite Chariot Fighters, who with Himuili, Chief of the Palace Servants, murdered Muwattalli I, who in turn had become king by murdering King Huzziya II). Three pages of convenient and accurate line-drawn maps show the Assyrian merchant trade routes, the modern cities and archaeological sites on Anatolia and North Syria, and the world of the Hittites and the ancient Near East in the Late Bronze Age. Fourteen chapters survey the phases of Hittite history in chronological order. The author judiciously combines archaeological and textual evidence, but his strength is in the textual data.

Two useful appendixes cover (1) the subject of Hittite chronology, a very difficult subject, and (2) an overview of the sources for Hittite history. Bibliography and indexes round out the book.

This book can be confidently used as a textbook in universities and graduate schools. Graduate students, who should be able to read European languages (German, French, Italian, etc.) should

be expected to use this book in tandem with H. Klengel's more technical volume.[1]

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

The University of Chicago

[1] Horst Klengel, Fiorella Imparati, Volkert Haas, and Theo P. J. van den Hout, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches,* Handbuch der Orientalistik, erste Abteilung, Nahe und Mittlere Osten, 34. Band (Leiden and Boston, 1999).

Ethnoarchaeology of Anatolia: Rural Socio-Economy in the Bronze and Iron Ages. By JAK YAKAR. Tel Aviv University, Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology, Monograph Series, no. 17. Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology of the Institute of Archaeology, 2000. Pp. xii + 531 + 154 figs.

Jak Yakar is well known to Hittitologists for a number of articles published from the 1970s to the present. His contributions principally concern archaeology and historical geography of Anatolia during the Late Bronze Age. Yakar controls all of the latest developments in the field of Hittitology, although he does not pretend to be a specialist in the texts.

The book under review is a very ambitious undertaking. Ethnoarchaeology is a relatively new approach in the study of ancient Middle Eastern civilizations. It combines the insights of traditional archaeology with those allowed by anthropological studies of ethnicity. Yakar's book takes a holistic approach to understanding ancient Anatolian societies. He first describes the Anatolian landscape (chap. 1), including geology, geography, palaeoclimate, and vegetation cover. A second chapter surveys Anatolian societies from the Early Bronze Age through the end of the Ottoman state. In chap. 3, Yakar considers in turn the various ethnic groups that inhabit Anatolia: Turks, Türkmen, Törük, Tatars, Kurds, Arabs, Gypsies, Armenians, etc. Chap. 4 describes in some detail the ethnography of the Anatolian countryside: the traditional Anatolian village (the *köy*), the farm (*çiftlik*), farmstead, ranch, dispersed settlement, seasonal campsite (*yayla*), village architecture and economy, and nomadic and seminomadic communities. In chaps. 5–11, he examines in turn the various geographical regions of Anatolia during the Hittite period: Central Anatolia (chap. 5), which was the Hittite heartland; the Black Sea region (chap. 6), where the lands of Tummanna, Pala, and the Kaska were located; the Marmara region in the northwest (chap. 7), where the kingdom of Wilusa (Ilios, Troy) was located; the Aegean region (chap. 8), where the land of Arzawa and Minoan and Mycenean colonies were located; the Mediterranean region (chap. 9), where the Lukka, Tarhuntassa, Kizzuwatna, and Mukish were located; Eastern Anatolia (chap. 10); and Southeastern Turkey (chap. 11), where the Hurrian-dominated kingdoms were located. In chap. 12, eight "inherent elements in Anatolian society" are discussed.

It has always been a desideratum, and one seldom realized, to combine the insights derived from archaeology, study of the texts, and ethnography. Few specialists in the texts have had the training or ability to attempt this. One thinks of the late Hans Gustav Güterbock, whose publications often combined archaeological and philological evidence in a responsible yet creative way, as an exception. And although it comes as no surprise that the principal shortcomings of Yakar's book are in the textual sphere, he has made a welcome contribution with this book.

Permit me to add only a few criticisms. Although the author shows familiarity with a wide selection of current secondary literature in his subject area, it is unfortunate that all too often statements are left without bibliographical support. For example, on the geographical distribution of the Hattian people (the so-called Proto-Hattians), he claims that it is generally assumed that they extended from the Black Sea to Paphlagonia, Laconia [*sic*], and Cappadocia. But no footnote attributes this view to any scholar. When attributing the Hattic language to the "natives of central Anatolia," i.e., to the predecessors of the Hittites, he cites for support Trevor Bryce's 1998 survey of Hittite history rather than a publication devoted to the question of the Hattians and their language. In citing Indo-European