Life and Society in the Hittite World. By TREVOR BRYCE. Oxford: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2002. Pp. xiv + 312, illus.

The book under review follows on the heels of Trevor Bryce's *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (Oxford, 1998), which was a narrative of political history. The new book completes Bryce's study of Hittite history by presenting the social and economic history of the Hittite state. In successive chapters we learn of "King, Court and Royal Officials," "The People and the Law," "The Scribe," "The Merchant," "The Warrior," "Marriage," "The Gods," "The Curers of Disease," "Death, Burial and the Afterlife," "Festivals and Rituals," "Myth," "The Capital," and "Links across the Wine-Dark Sea."

The fact that the book under review concentrates on social and economic history should not put anyone off. Hittite evidence does not lend itself to lots of graphs and charts and this book is very engagingly written. Bryce always attempts to bring Hittite society to life. Unimportant yet fascinating details, such as the private letters to their opposite numbers that scribes appended to royal letters, add immeasurably to the reader's enjoyment. Bryce is to be praised for pointing out that magic rituals were not just for the elite, as other authors have asserted, but contain clauses concerning what those of modest means may substitute for high-priced ingredients (p. 203). The discussion of how myths may have actually been performed (pp. 212f.) is fascinating.

In many places Bryce paints engaging pictures of daily life. Many are solidly based on the texts or archaeology; some are totally speculative, with no evidence one way or another (such as a description of the Hittite port of Ura), but they always ring true. As with Bryce's political history, here he deftly navigates among competing ideas on many points and generally chooses the most reasonable and presents it in a straightforward readable way (without—for better or for worse—confusing and boring us by explaining and then destroying all the losing theories).

Of course there are mistakes and places where, despite his usual surefootedness, Bryce has gone astray:

p. xi: I suspect that Huzziya I was simply Ammuna's illegitimate son, as the text has been traditionally understood. Tahurwaili was probably not just a usurper, but represented the legitimate male line, being a son of Ammuna's brother, Zuru (as opposed to Alluwamna, the son-in-law of Ammuna's son-in-law [Beal, *THeth* 20, 329 n. 1257]). Zidanta II was probably a nephew of Hantili II (Beal, *THeth* 20, 330 w. n. 1261, 560).

p. 6: On "servitude," see below to p. 78.

p. 15: No Middle Eastern monarchy was "absolute and unaccountable." This is a Roman imperial concept. While nothing like the U.S. Constitution's clear checks and balances existed, ideology had it that all kings were simply servants of the gods, who could depose them (by causing a rebellion to be successful), should they not rule with justice. For a fine discussion of this concept, see Bryce himself on p. 18.

pp. 19, 140: Hattusili's favorite deity was not Ishtar, but Shaushga, a Hurrian goddess, who was, however, similar to the Babylonian goddess Ishtar.

p. 20: I have recently argued that Hittite kings did not have personal names and then take "throne names," but rather had a "Hittite" name as king of the Hittites and a Hurrian name as king of Hurrians in Kizzuwatna and Syria. Either or both could be their personal name. There is no evidence that they changed their names at their accession to the throne, and indeed considerable evidence to the contrary. See *GsImparati* (Eothen 11), 55–70.

pp. 27, 66f.: I think it unfortunate that Bryce has chosen to follow Imparati's suggestion that the title "son of the king" was honorific. There is no evidence for someone receiving this title, and much evidence for holders of the title being either actual sons of the king or descendants of kings. That there are many "sons of the king" about is easily explained by the existence of numerous sons of the king by women other than the queen and by the hereditary nature of the title. For a modern state run almost exclusively by sons and grandsons of just one admittedly overly fecund king, note the case of Saudi Arabia.

p. 29: I'm not sure that SUHUR.LALs were a class of royal concubines, rather than just "attendant women."

p. 51: "In view of the heavy demands imposed on the kingdom's manpower by constant military campaigns, slave labour must have become an indispensable element in the economy of the kingdom." There is little evidence for such a statement. The Hittite army had a corps of standing army troops who were paid rations. Those people (soldiers and others) supported by land grants-in-pay had "associates," not slaves, who did the farming when the grantee was on duty. Warfare was only a summertime affair and levies of the citizenry, when needed, could usually be timed to avoid planting and harvest, the only times when maximal personnel were needed in agriculture. Great secular and religious estates were certainly run by bound peasantry, but these workers were not slaves. When slaves are mentioned in texts, the references are consistent with house slaves or craftsmen rather than agricultural slaves.

p. 58: That the difficulties of mastering cuneiform "precluded all but a specially trained minority from ever acquiring competence" is belied by the history of writing in China. It is true that generally in the ancient Near East only a small group of scribes ever became literate, but that is because these were the only ones who needed to. When wider literacy was needed, as for instance by the Old Assyrian merchants, a wider circle of people was perfectly capable of learning cuneiform.

p. 62: While Bryce refers to "prisoners-of-war recorded in the Annals of Mursili II," these were not in fact prisoners-of-war (i.e., captured soldiers—*ŠABTŪTU / appanteš*) but rather captured civilians to be transported and resettled (NAM.RA.MEŠ / *arnuwalēš*).

p. 75: It is an important point that granting fragmented estates to retainers weakened the position of that retainer in disputes with the king in particular, but on the other hand it benefited the retainer economically by diversifying his economic risk.

p. 78: Bryce is to be commended for being one of the few in ancient Near Eastern studies to realize that civilians captured during conquest and resettled should not be called "deportees" (by definition people forcibly expelled *from* your country), since they are instead being forcibly brought *into* your country. Bryce uses the term "transportee," which he as an Australian knows is the correct English term. This word has the added advantage of being the precise literal translation of the Hittite term *arnuwalaš*. He is surely right to point out that the influx of thousands of these transportees would have prevented any labor shortages. He is also correct to point out that they were a valuable commodity, used as much as anything else to (re)populate sparsely inhabited parts of the kingdom (p. 100). That those captured by soldiers became slaves is likely; those given to temples could not leave or marry out, but could freely bring in brides; and those captured by the king seem to have been given land, aid in setting up a farm, and a several-year tax break, and appear to have become ordinary peasants.

p. 95 l. 7: for "second" read "third."

p. 96: Bryce's description of what little we know of Hittite merchants is good. Fortunately, he does not fall into the trap of parroting the theory-driven nonsense found in some other books to the effect that people hadn't evolved enough to have markets or that proto-Soviet "oriental" despots needed to control everything and therefore stamped out trade, with the result that there were no merchants, only buying agents. That said, it is perhaps churlish to complain that Bryce minimizes the Hittites' role in commerce. The fact pointed out by Bruce that Hittite merchants were angering the king of Ugarit by

acquiring too much real estate in Ugarit surely points to the important role they played in international nautical trade.

Why do we assume that those born on the east coast of the Mediterranean or on Cyprus and even on the coast of totally woodless Egypt were born sailors, both merchant and naval, but those born on the well-wooded southern coast of Anatolia "were passive participants" in sea trade, and when a navy was needed that it was up to Ugarit to provide it? This is particularly odd when the evidence concerning the merchants of Ura shows that Hittite seafarers were equal to or even superior to those of Ugarit. Similarly, in an earlier period, while the Assur-to-Kanish trade appears to have been pretty exclusively in the hands of Assyrians, in trade within Anatolia the Assyrian had many Anatolian colleagues and competitors. Since the Hittite laws (§5) give varying damages, depending on whether the murdered merchant was in Hatti, or Luwia (western Anatolia), or elsewhere, and since the later copy (KBo 6.3 i 10) of the laws specifically indicates that the merchant in question is a Hittite, we have evidence here too for trade in the hands of Hittites, not just those of foreigners.

p. 99: While Mursili II likes to present himself as often prevailing through kindness, whereas the Assyrian kings customarily presented themselves as blood-curdling terrors in order to frighten adversaries into non-resistance, even Mursili II was capable of the latter tactic. In his year ten, during the storming of the mountain fortress of Aripsa, its complete plundering and the carrying off of all of its people caused its neighboring fortress of Dukkama to surrender on terms. A certain amount of scorched-earth policy, particularly employed to force the Kaskaeans to give battle, can also be seen in Mursili's autobiography.

p. 103: In recent times in Anatolia (see British Admiralty, *A Handbook for Anatolia*, vol. 1 [1919], 230f.) most grain was planted in the autumn—September on the plateau and late November in the low country. Should this not be carried out, a secondary planting could be done the following early spring. Thus planting may not have been much disrupted by the summer campaign season. It is on harvests, particularly those on the plateau (July/August, but May/June in the lowlands) where military campaigns would have had the greatest impact.

p. 112: That horses and chariots were introduced to the Hittites by the Hurrians is far less certain than Bryce would have us believe. There are two purely Hittite horse-training manuals in Middle Script and Middle Hittite language that are as old or older than the Kikkuli text (in New Script). For the dating of these and their Hittite character, see E. Neu in *Kaniššuwar: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock* (Chicago, 1986), 151–63, also F. Starke, *Ausbildung und Training von Streitwagenpferden*, *StBoT* 41 (Wiesbaden, 1995), 109–33. Furthermore, all of these horse-training texts are Middle Hittite, but chariotry is already mentioned in the Old Hittite and even pre-Old Hittite periods (Beal, *THeth* 20, 141–44; Starke, *StBoT* 41, 124). There were certainly Hurrians in the neighborhood in those days too, but there is no evidence one way or another that the Hittites got the idea of chariotry from them.

pp. 113, 181: The translation relies on an outdated translation by Goetze from the 1950s. Bryce should have used that of B. J. Collins, in *Context of Scripture* 1 (1997), 166, which would have shown that the symbols of femininity were distaff and spindle (see, already, N. Oettinger, *StBoT* 22, 10f. [1976]), not a mirror. Productivity and not vanity was considered the primary characteristic of Hittite women.

p. 135: I do not see how Hittite polytheism is a more "extreme form" than anybody else's.

p. 135: Sharruma does not stand behind both his mother and father on the Yazılıkaya reliefs, but only behind his mother, and ahead of his sister. Behind his father Tessub is the latter's brother Tashmishu, as shown by the god lists (see H. G. Güterbock in K. Bittel et al., *Yazılıkaya* [1976], 172).

p. 138: It seems unlikely that "Tudhaliya sought to build up as much credit as he could with the divine powers in the ever darkening final years of the empire" through massive building activity. If the situation was "ever darkening" it is unlikely that there would have been sufficient funds or available personnel for such widespread building activity. Furthermore, since it appears that the empire went on some twenty-five more years after Tudhaliya's death under Tudhaliya's younger son Suppiluliuma II, and since both of these kings had notable military successes, it seems unlikely that it occurred to Tudhaliya that the empire might not outlive his son. Without the benefit of hindsight, it would have appeared that the empire was in pretty good shape compared to the situation in many previous reigns. If Tudhaliya's religious renovations were based on something more practical than piety, then chances are it had to do with his less-than-stellar claim to the throne, being a younger son of a usurping younger son. The extraordinary concerns surrounding his accession are detailed by Th. van den Hout, *Purity of Kingship* (1998). The nearly successful seizure of the kingdom by Kurunta, representing the elder line, shows that these fears were not misplaced.

p. 139: Mesopotamian and Hittite gods, unlike those of Greece and Rome, do represent morality, especially the Sungod, god of justice (pp. 141f.). And, as Bryce himself points out later (p. 140), "any god could be invoked as a defender of justice and punisher of wrong doing."

p. 143: I do not think that the Sungoddess was bisexual. The only evidence for this view is from an older prayer to the Sungod that was transformed into a prayer to the Sungoddess in which in a few cases the adapter failed to change "my lord" to "my lady." See I. Singer, *Hittite Prayers* (2002), 49–50, with bibliography. On the other hand, Bryce is correct that bisexuality is a characteristic of Ishtar/Shaushga, a characteristic appropriate to this goddess of liminality. The excellent discussion on this goddess by R. Harris, *Gender and Aging* (2000), 158–71, would have further informed the discussion on p. 147.

p. 148: The male tutelary deity Kurunta (LAMMA) is portrayed as a god standing on a stag. The tutelary deity of the hunting bag is, of course, another type of tutelary deity.

p. 149: I am disappointed not to find a discussion here of the grandmother goddess Hannahanna. This important deity, according to Hittite mythology, exhorts her son the Stormgod to get himself moving and search for the missing god. Then when that fails, she comes up with the idea of sending the bee on this errand, finally resulting in the finding of the missing deity (see p. 212). In another version, it is Hannahanna herself who goes missing and must be found in order to save the gods and mankind from disaster. The reality of the traditional Middle Eastern woman's role in society (which, ignorant Western comments to the contrary, continues to this day) is totally ignored. Hannahanna is also important, since many writers have ignorantly spilled much ink on Anatolian "mother goddesses." The reality is that the goddess who gives birth is not the same as the goddess who aids in childbirth. In Hittite Anatolia, the Sungoddess of Arinna / Hepat is the wife who gives birth, whereas Hannahanna, the experienced old grandmother, past childbearing herself, aids women in childbirth, a situation probably reflecting human birthgiving and midwifing practice. Bryce also neglects the Gulses, the goddesses who spin the fates.

p. 160: It is only the young male gods at Yazılıkaya who wear short tunics extending to just above the knee. The older male gods, such as Kumarbi, Ea, Kushuh, and Pishaishapi, wear tunics reaching their ankles, but slit to allow a bare striding leg.

p. 172: Kings Mursili I, Tudhaliya II, Arnuwanda II, Arnuwanda III, and probably Hantili II, all seem to have failed to produce a son of the first rank, not just Muwattalli II.

pp. 200, 213f.: The theory of "sympathetic magic" or "analogic magic" is the idea of late Greek philosophers, taken up by medieval European magicians, wary of prowling inquisitors. Hittites and ancient Mesopotamians were attempting to communicate with spirits, whether gods or the essences of a piece of cedar, by saying and simultaneously acting out exactly what they wanted the spirit to do.

p. 201: While Bryce is certainly correct that *hasawa-* does not literally mean "old woman," the form of the noun (contra many previous authors) is not correct for a meaning "(she) of birth" (**hassuwa-*); see Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, vol. Ḫ, 229.

p. 211: For "flew into a rage," read "became sullen" (*Chicago Hittite Dictionary*, vol. Š [2002], 13–15). Telipinu is not angrily destroying things but going missing, thus by his inaction causing disaster. Bryce's paraphrase of the myth has one other major flaw: it omits entirely the grandmother goddess Hannahanna (see comment to p. 149, above).

p. 230: In *FsHoffner* (2003) I hope I have shown that Hattusa was not refounded by Hattusili as is often stated, but was already a royal seat several generations earlier.

p. 252: Bryce underestimates people's abilities to speak multiple languages when they live in close proximity to others speaking these languages. I have met people in rural parts of today's Hatay fluent in Arabic, Turkish, and Kurdish and have been addressed in heaven knows how many languages by shopkeepers in Istanbul's *bedestan*.

pp. 230–53: Bryce's description of the capital is quite good, but there should have been a cross reference to p. 77 for a description of the massive granaries recently excavated. There also should have

been some discussion of the water basins, both large and small, and the fresh-water and drain-water systems of the city. One hopes that the second edition will include a description of a city other than the capital for parallels and contrasts, now that the excavations at the provincial capital Sarissa/Kusaklı have progressed to the point that distinctive features are recognizable (reports published each year in *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient Gesellschaft*).

pp. 254f.: I fail to see how Tudhaliya IV's enormous building activities at Hattusa entailed a "concentration of resources," since by all accounts Tudhaliya was also building and renovating all over the empire. Again, this shows a prosperous kingdom with considerable surplus, and only our hindsight suggests that the king would have been prudent to use these resources massively to overfund the peacetime military.

p. 256: There is considerably more time that needs to be accounted for in the chronology given here. If we guess with Bryce that Tudhaliya IV's reign ended around 1209 (p. xi), and it seems quite clear that the empire lasted until around 1180/1175, then Tudhaliya's younger son Suppiluliuma II would appear to have had a reign of twenty to twenty-five years, not the "few years" Bryce assumes. The current excavator of Boğazköy, J. Seeherr, has suggested that perhaps the reason for the relative dearth of material related to Suppiluliuma II at Hattusa (compared to that connected with Hattusili III and Tudhaliya IV) is that Suppiluliuma may have moved the capital elsewhere, leaving an active, but diminished Hattusa.

p. 227 n. 30: For "brother" read "younger son."

None of these suggestions should imply that this is anything but a fine book. They are given in the hope that the second edition will be even better. There is nothing available which is as good on Hittite history as Professor Bryce's two books. Both are highly recommended for the expert, the student, and the interested layman. We wish them both a long life, with many future editions incorporating new discoveries.

RICHARD BEAL
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO