



Review: [Untitled]

Reviewed Work(s):

Die Hethiter: die Kunst Anatoliens vom Ende des 3. bis zum Anfang des 1. Jahrtausends vor Christus by Kurt Bittel

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.

Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol. 38, No. 4. (Oct., 1979), pp. 297-299.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2968%28197910%2938%3A4%3C297%3ADHDKAV%3E2.0.CO%3B2-R>

Journal of Near Eastern Studies is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a major publication appearing in a pidgin dialect. It is beyond me why a publishing house such as Brill, which does so much publication in English, cannot hire a native speaker, at least on a job basis, to edit English language texts for correctness of idiom and style.

DENNIS PARDEE

The University of Chicago

Die Hethiter: die Kunst Anatoliens vom Ende des 3. bis zum Anfang des 1. Jahrtausends vor Christus. By KURT BITTEL. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1976. Pp. 360 + 5 maps.

While scholarly treatises on philological, historical, legal, or religious aspects of antiquity rarely attract a wide audience, those touching the arts of early man find a remarkably enthusiastic reception among the educated public. In keeping with this predictably broad interest, most bookstores prominently display their stocks of coffee table art books. Few of these even include examples of Hittite art. And still fewer exclusively treat that one area of ancient Near Eastern art. Some books of this type merely reproduce the same photographs of the same artifacts which have appeared repeatedly in surveys of ancient Near Eastern art. The book under review is in no sense of the word a "coffee table art book."

Kurt Bittel is the world's leading authority on Hittite archaeology. He has directed the excavations at the site of the Hittite capital since 1931 interrupted only by the Second World War. He holds a post-retirement position as "Honorarprofessor" at the University of Tübingen, where he taught from immediately after the war to 1953. He served the Archaeological Institute of Istanbul for many years as its director. In 1960 he became President of the German Archaeological Institute and held that position until his retirement in 1972. He is easily the best qualified person to write a book on Hittite art.

The present German edition follows the primary, French edition published by Lib-

rairie Gallimard in the series *L'univers de l'art*.

Bittel's book (hereafter B.) has only one comparable predecessor, Ekrem Akurgal's *The Art of the Hittites* (London, 1962) (hereafter A.), which contains 174 plates, 24 of which are in color. Both authors restrict their coverage to the period ca. 2500–700 B.C. Neither includes the art of Anatolia prior to ca. 2500, as does, for example, U. B. Alkim, *Anatolia I: From the Beginnings to the End of the Second Millennium B.C.*, nor the centuries following, although Akurgal has devoted other books to the later periods (see B., page 319, entries 226 f.). Since therefore the B. and A. books are so similar in size and aim, I will compare them in the following remarks.

In what follows, criticism of photographic technique is naturally directed toward the respective photographers and in no way constitutes criticism of Professors Bittel or Akurgal, who made the best possible use of the photographs put at their disposal.

B. contains many more plates (341) than A. (174). Many of the same artifacts are depicted in the two books, although, since the two authors collaborated with different photographers, the photographic plates are by no means identical. The following is a list of instances where the same artifacts from Alaca Höyük were photographed independently for the two volumes. I use the convention (pl. number of A.) = (pl. number of B.): I = 16; III = 19; V = 13; VI = 11; VII = 15; 1 = 1; 3 = 17; 7 = 24; 8, 9 = 23; 10 = 18; 11 = 20; 17 = 14; 21 = 28, 29; 42 = 46; 88 above = 215; 88 below = 186–87; 90–91 = 228; 92 = 212; 93 above = 218; 94 = 226; 96 below = 227; 97 = 225. The following plate numbers designate Alaca Höyük objects included in A.'s plates, but not in B.: II, IV, 4, 5, 6, 11 below, 13, 15, 18–20, 37–38, 47 below, 89, 92, 93 below, 96 above. One artifact from Alaca Höyük appears in B. (172) and not in A.

The picture obtained from the Alaca sampling, however, is not necessarily representative. As a whole there are many more items portrayed in B. and not in A. than

vice versa. The following, using plate numbers from B., is a listing of objects photographed for B. which are not found in A.: Acemhöyük: 44–45, 47, 49, 89; Alaca Höyük: 172; Alişar: 141; Boğazköy: 50, 53, 72, 78–80, 82, 156, 164; Eflatun Pınar: 257; Horoztepe: 27; Kültepe: 48, 51, 55, 59, 65–6, 69, 70, 76, 83, 88; Troy: 135–38; Yozgat: 21.

On the whole, the photography of B. is superior to that of A. Superior in lighting are B. 28 and 29 to A. 21 below, and B. 196 and 198 to A. 100 and 101. The following are photographed from a better angle: B. 19 to A. III; B. 13 to A. V; B. 11 to A. VI; B. 20 to A. 11 above; B. 228 to A. 90 and 91. The color film and developing/printing techniques of the two books have resulted in photos of the same objects showing marked differences in color. Generally B.'s film and developing accentuates the reds and browns (the "warmer" aspects), while A.'s emphasizes the yellows and pale greens (the "cooler"). This can be seen particularly in photos of gold objects. Cases where I suspect B. to be more accurate are B. 19 = A. III; B. 11 = A. VI. B. includes more color plates than A. As a rule, the choice of what objects should be shown in color is good in B. I personally feel that color photography should have been used for all the ivory artifacts (it was used in B. 33 but not in B. 187 and 248).

Less often A.'s photography is superior to B.'s. The lighting is more even and diffused, casting softer shadows and improving perception of details in A. VII (= B. 15), A. 88 above (= B. 215). Frequently, where A. gives two shots (one frontal and one full profile) of an object, B. gives only one. Sometimes, when this one shot is taken at a 45° angle, it may actually be more useful than the two of A. (see examples above under B.'s better angle). But usually B.'s one exposure does not allow for examination of all aspects of the object as seen from several viewpoints: A. 8–9 better than B. 23; A. 42 than B. 46; A. 23 than B. 7 and 32; A. 42 than B. 46. Rarely A.'s color is probably better than B.'s: A. I to be preferred to B. 16. There are a few instances, in which the artifact itself was in a different condition

when photographed for A. and B. The Horoztepe sistrum had all its rungs and discs when photographed for A. but lacked two rungs when photographed for B. In A.'s photos of the Bitik vase, the plaster of Paris used to fill in the missing areas was untinted (white) in A.'s photo (XIV) but tinted brick-red in B.'s (140, 144). The untinted state allows easier eye contrast for preserved versus restored areas.

Locating the discussion in the main text for each plate is not easy in B. In A. the plate numbers have been printed in the margin opposite the line of text in which the object is discussed.

The selection of artifacts in both books is excellent. There is not too much overlapping, and where there is, the different photos of the same object often help considerably in perceiving its appearance. In terms of photographic plates, I would say that serious students should own both books.

The text of Bittel's book is very well organized. Cautiously the author describes what can be known at present about the development of human society in earliest Anatolia down to the appearance of the Hittites. Unlike Akurgal he does not discuss this pre-Hittite culture of Anatolia under the rubric of "Hattians." His discussions reveal the depth of his experience as an archaeologist and the painstaking accuracy of his scholarship. In following chapters he places the artistic achievements of the Hittites, including architecture, which receives comparatively little treatment in Akurgal, within the context of what can be determined from both written and nonwritten evidence about their history and culture. Bittel's field association with eminent Hittitologists has allowed him to follow the developments in the study of the texts much more closely than would have been possible for an art historian or archaeologist whose knowledge of the texts was limited only to acquaintance with selected articles in scientific journals. All in all I find the presentation of Hittite history and culture on the basis of which the author views and interprets the art to be eminently reliable and satisfying.

While both Akurgal and Bittel books have chronological charts, A.'s is more general, listing levels and time periods, but leaving specific royal names for a separate Hittite king list. B.'s chart is much more detailed. Having more parallel columns, B. includes Greece and Babylonia in the synchronistic table. B. also contains royal names, both of Hittite kings and kings of other areas. B.'s absolute dates follow the low chronology (Hammurapi = 1728-1686). A. includes among the Hittite royal names the immediate predecessors of Šuppiluliuma I whose existence has been questioned; B. leaves them out.

Both volumes contain indexes, but neither provides an index to objects shown in the plates, a feature which would have been most welcome. In addition, B. has 5 two-color maps, which are very useful.

In the description of objects photographed there is occasionally discrepancy between not only A. and B., but other books of a similar purpose. For example, the orthostat reliefs at Alaca Höyük are said by A. to be basalt, by B. to be andesite, and by U. B. Alkim (*Anatolia I*, pls. 115 f.) to be grey porphyry.

A few of the plates either portray scenes similar to situations described in texts (B. plate 177 shows a cult official carrying an animal head, reminding one of passages from rituals and festivals where severed animal heads are mentioned: *KBo* 15.37 iii 43; *KUB* 27.16 iii 23 f.; *KUB* 28.102 + iii 18-27; *KUB* 32.123 iii 48 f.; etc.) or objects whose cultic use is described in such texts. B. 178 shows the silver ox rhyton, which was used in a pair on the sixteenth day of the Antahšum festival (*KBo* 11.51 iv 6-7; *KUB* 2.5 ii 33-39). One text (*KUB* 25.1 iv 21-23) describes the cupbearer seizing it by the horns and pouring a libation. Once (*KBo* 20.33 obv 10) the smiths ([LÚ.MEŠ].E.DÉ) bring two of them into the temple for cultic use.

Professor Bittel's book is an impressive, scholarly, and useful tool for all persons interested in the study of ancient Anatolian history, language, and culture. Not only

archaeologists but philologists should read and digest its contents.

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

The University of Chicago

Nubia: Corridor to Africa. By WILLIAM Y. ADAMS. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977. Pp. xxv + 797 + 24 pls. \$35.

Prof. Adams's large new history of Nubia is intended to take advantage of the many new discoveries in the sixteen years since the second edition of Arkell's *History of the Sudan to A.D. 1821*. The chief area of expansion in this new study has been the later periods, especially medieval Nubia, which are his main areas of interest. The book is clearly a major effort and considerable contribution in that it summarizes much that has been learned and integrates it into a coherent view of Nubian history. Moreover, Adams has a very readable writing style which helps the narrative move clearly and quickly. Yet as I proceeded through the volume it became apparent that there were some problems that needed to be discussed in this review that may tend to make the book appear in a more unfavorable light than it deserves. Leaving aside the introductory material and the basic description chapter, which seem unexceptionable, we may discuss some problems with the early part of the work, beginning with the history of the history itself.

Prof. Adams (p. 66) mentions Budge's *The Egyptian Sudan* as the "basic corpus of textual material on Nubian history." While Budge may indeed be a convenient collection, it cannot be considered a "basic corpus" which no longer exists. Budge was a facile translator but not up to the best standards of his own day and better editions of the texts and translations into European languages of most Egyptian texts have appeared since. Some important groups of documents are not mentioned in this chapter. Private stelae especially of the Intermediate Periods from Upper Egypt and Nubia, the Execration Texts, administrative records, including graffiti and letters, as well as native Nubian