



---

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Billie Jean Collins

Source: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 320 (Nov., 2000), pp. 93-95

Published by: [The American Schools of Oriental Research](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1357648>

Accessed: 08/12/2010 07:41

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. 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/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=asor>.

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.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*The American Schools of Oriental Research is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.*

<http://www.jstor.org>

very accurate description of the subject matter covered in his discussion of Bronze and Iron Age Europe (2000–500 B.C.). De Hingh reviews the technological developments in agricultural production during this period and uses palaeoethnobotanical evidence to discuss crop management and change over time. The most interesting, and controversial, of his discussions centers on his methodology for defining landownership using archaeological (nontextual) evidence. Though he offers no failsafe litmus test, his discussion is thought-provoking and worthy of perusal.

The article by R. Hagesteijn (chap. 7) on “Abundance versus Shortage: Access to Land in Early South-East Asia,” and that by H. J. M. Claessen (chap. 8) entitled “State and Land in the Realm of the Incas,” would be useful reads for those interested in land management and distribution as it is structured in rather dictatorial empires more interested in generating wealth than in the welfare of their peoples (the Khmer empire in Hagesteijn’s article, and the Incan in Claessen’s). Though the climates and geographical terrains are different from those found in the Middle East (tropical for the Khmers, mountainous for the Incas), the relationships between villager/peasant and royalty, in the context of land tenure, would be of interest to Near Eastern researchers.

The articles (chaps. 9 and 10) by M. A. van Bakel on “Land and Its Uses in Aboriginal Hawaii” and “The People Who ‘Eat from One Land’” by L. E. Visser are well-written, well-researched, and detailed archaeological studies. Van Bakel’s study focuses on land usage, as well as the symbolic perception of “land” in the complex chiefdoms of precontact Hawaii; Visser undertakes a “comparative perspective of present-day shifting cultivation practices . . . [in] Southeast Asia and the Pacific” (p. 160). Both are excellent reads, but it is difficult to see how the subjects explored in these two articles could serve as comparative material for those working on Near Eastern climates and cultures.

The final article, by G. Hesselning, is on present-day Africa and is entitled “Land Tenure in Evolution: Access to Natural Resources in Africa.” Hesselning explores the confusing (to non-Africanists) concepts of landownership and management, social and kinship relationships, and the vital importance of land to individual survival in African contexts. In addition, he describes how European colonization served to destabilize these concepts in the previous two centuries. Hesselning’s is a superior study on a difficult topic, and it is worth reading simply to gain insight into the situation of land tenure in Africa today.

The volume concludes (chap. 12) with a succinct offering by G. van Driel that he entitles “Landless and Hungry? An Assessment.” This concluding piece could just as easily have been placed at the beginning of the volume as an introduction. It sums up the themes explored and the methodology used and is a good primer to the volume as a whole.

The overall presentation of the volume, including its font, spacing, and paper texture, is of high quality. Most articles offer numerous sources that are properly documented. There are a few typos and grammatical errors (some articles were translated into English from their original languages), but these are minimal and are not distracting. Individually the articles range from good to very high quality, and the subjects covered are interesting, particularly to those engaged in the target regions and periods.

While this reviewer finds the volume and its subject matter quite pleasing, it would be inappropriate to recommend that “this book belongs on the shelf of every Near Eastern archaeologist.” Yet it is appropriate to suggest that it should appear on the shelves of any research institution devoted to Near and Middle Eastern topics. The studies on Mesopotamia and Egypt, as well as other regions of the world, provide good reading, extensive sources, and alternative views on the concepts at hand. There is a great deal to recommend in this collection of works, particularly to those interested in the study of land tenure, agriculture, and the individuals and institutions associated with the working of the land. For such researchers this volume is a must.

**Sharon R. Steadman**

State University of New York College at Cortland  
steadmans@cortland.edu

***Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon*, by Ben H. L. van Gessel. *Handbuch der Orientalistik, Abteilung 1, Band 33*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998. 2 volumes. xxviii + 1069 pp. Cloth. \$282.00.**

In 1947, Emmanuel Laroche, one of the preeminent scholars of Hittite religion, published a small work entitled *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites* (Laroche 1947). This book consisted of a list of Hittite gods, providing a few textual references, with variant spellings of each deity’s name and a brief discussion of the nature of the deity, if it was in fact knowable. For many years this volume provided a valuable resource for Hittitologists attempting to bring some order to their understanding of Hittite religion. Since 1947, however, more than 60 new volumes of published tablet copies have appeared—containing thousands more texts than Laroche had access to—rendering his work of severely limited value.

Thus, a new, comprehensive catalog would be most welcome. Such a catalog ideally would be a reference tool for specialists that would comprise information on the contexts in which a particular deity might be found, including the deity’s ethnic identity and place in the pantheon, the epithets he or she may have, the cities in which the deity was worshiped, and the types of offerings he or she received. For the nonspecialist such a catalog would provide a starting point for comparative research.

Unfortunately, the work under review is not that catalog. It is, however, a promising start, being a thorough cataloging of the attested divine names of the Hittite pantheon. Beside the better-attested deities, the catalog does not neglect references to such groups of deities as, for example, the thousand gods of Hatti, the gods of heaven and earth, and the primordial gods. It also lists fragmentary divine names. Only the deities appearing exclusively in the reliefs at Yazılıkaya and those occurring in purely Hieroglyphic Luwian contexts are excluded from the collection. The author is to be congratulated for his meticulous undertaking of such a formidable task.

Unlike Laroche's *Recherches*, van Gessel's contribution, however, does not take a synthetic approach to the materials that the author has so methodically collected. The deities are listed alphabetically with no attention given to their demography, either geographic (e.g., Anatolian, North Syrian) or ethnic (e.g., Hurrian, Palaic, Mesopotamian). Given the present size of the corpus, this is, on the one hand, practical, but at the same time, indices listing divine names according to their ethnic and/or geographic milieu would have added immensely to the value of the work.

Each alphabetic entry is organized grammatically by case. Text references are listed beside each orthographic variation but are not identified as to CTH number, date of the text, or its genre, so that the user must do basic groundwork on each reference in order to determine whether it is useful for his or her particular purpose. Such a structure makes searching the data by text genre difficult (for example, determining a deity's frequency in oracles, treaties, festivals, and so on). Without dates of composition for the text references, the value even for the philologist/linguist—who cannot easily determine whether a particular spelling belongs purely to a particular phase of the language—is also limited.

Some of the text references cited are given an asterisk indicating that they are referred to again in the second part of the entry. This usually involves providing a context (without translation) with additional information about the deity in question. The transition from the lexeme to the second part of each entry is marked by an asterisk at the beginning of the line, which is barely noticeable amid all the graphic symbols in use in the text, so that it is difficult to tell where one is within the entry. The simple provision of additional headers would have made the work much more user friendly. This section of the entries is designed to provide the following information about each deity: family relations and other connections, epithets, temples and shrines, priests and servants, cult places, attributes, feasts, and miscellanies. The brief passages cited—in broad transcription without translation—are further subdivided by language: Hittite, Sumerian, Akkadian, Hattian, Hurrian, Palaic, and Luwian. But the transition from one of these subdivisions to the next is not flagged (except inconsis-

tently by a short line), so that the reader must be knowledgeable in Hittite even to follow the organization of the material.

More seriously, it is not clear what criteria the author uses for including a reference in the second half of the lemma. He cites, for example, "when for Išhara they prepare the autumn festival" *KBo* 21.42 i 1 (p. 202), but does not provide the equally interesting context of *KUB* 30.26 i 2: "When a man is made ill by Išhara."

Footnotes are provided at the end of each entry marking cases where a particular reading is contested or problematic. Finally, relevant literature on the deity in question is cited.

Nowhere in the two-volume work are the gender, origin, or function of the deity (p. x) indicated; rather, the reader is referred to the literature at the end of each entry, which the author admits (p. xii) to being incomplete.

Some of the conventions adopted in the volume add to the difficulty in using the catalog. Syllabic writings for names of deities are cited in capitals/small capitals, which is easy to confuse with the convention for transcribing Sumerian, particularly where syllabic spellings are cross-referenced within the Sumerian lemmas. The use of the symbols </> and <(/>), despite some explanation on page ix (with n. 16), is simply mystifying (see, e.g., sub Ammunki, p. 29).

Such a work is extremely important as a compilation of raw data, but it does not provide the level of synthesis or interpretation to justify its publication outside of electronic media. As a print publication, it suffers from lack of indices listing divine names and their orthographic variants, by ethnic orientation, and even possibly by general type (war gods, nature gods, mother goddesses, etc.), which would have made the volume both easier to navigate (in light of all the variant spellings and multiple headings within each entry [e.g., no cross-reference under Hawantali to Hapantali]) and more functional as a reference tool for the specialist.

In an electronic medium, the work could be made easy to use and eminently helpful by means of searchable text and internal cross-referencing. As a scholarly print publication, however, it only further serves to isolate Hittitology from mainstream scholarship as an arcane subject of limited interest.

Billie Jean Collins  
Emory University  
bcollin@emory.edu

## REFERENCES

- KBo* 21 = Otten, H.  
1973 *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, Vol. 21. Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 89. Berlin: Mann.

KUB 30 = Ehelolf, H.

1939 *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, Vol. 30: *Texte verschiedenen Inhalts (vorwiegend aus den Grabungen seit 1931)*. Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin.

Laroche, E.

1947 *Recherches sur les noms de dieux hittites*. Paris: Maisonneuve; reprinted from *Revue hittite et asianique* 7 (1946–1947): 7–139.

***Reconstructing the Society of Ancient Israel*, by Paula M. McNutt. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999. xiv + 284 pp. Cloth. \$27.00.**

The use of social science theory to provide interpretive models or frameworks by which the nature of Israelite society, in its origins and development, can be understood and evaluated has had a significant albeit sporadic role in biblical studies for more than a hundred years. Names such as W. Robertson Smith and Max Weber are linked firmly to the burgeoning of critical biblical study in the late 19th and early 20th centuries; and Weber's work on *Ancient Judaism* arguably has had the greatest impact of any sociologically informed study of ancient Israel. Weber's advantage, virtually unparalleled in the social science approaches to the biblical world, was that he was a sociologist, not a biblical theologian or historian. Virtually all of the other studies of the sociocultural context of the Israelites have been conducted by scholars who are outsiders, in terms of formal or systematic training, to the disciplines of sociology and anthropology. Therein lies the difficulty and the challenge for scholarship on Israelite society. Clearly there are risks involved in the crossing of disciplinary boundaries; yet the benefits—in terms of generating new hypotheses and fresh perspectives on ancient Israelite society and its cultural products—are manifold.

McNutt's book addresses the needs of those students and scholars of the Hebrew Bible who wish to know the nature and results of crossing disciplinary boundaries. *Reconstructing the Society of Ancient Israel* is not McNutt's own reconstruction, but rather a clear and comprehensive presentation of the many important studies emerging from the renewed attention in the last few decades, after a hiatus of more than half a century, to the value of the social sciences in reconstructing ancient Israel. Not only does McNutt discuss the wide range of sociologically and anthropologically informed research on the major periods of Israelite history; she also introduces her readers to the social science concepts and methods upon which biblical scholars base their constructs. Those two aspects of reconstructing Israelite society are skillfully interwoven, and McNutt is to be commended for carrying out the arduous task of scrutinizing and summarizing a vast amount of disparate material.

An introductory chapter reviews the sources, methods, and models that characterize past and recent attempts to reconstruct ancient Israel. Particularly important is McNutt's awareness of the way the convictions, aims, and interests of the researcher affect the interpretive process, no matter how powerful the intention for balance and objectivity may be. Yet such interpretive choices may in the long run be beneficial, providing as they do different angles of vision from which to view the distant past.

*Reconstructing the Society of Ancient Israel* then proceeds, in five chapters, to examine in chronological order the beginnings of ancient Israel (chap. 2) and its "tribal" period (chap. 3), the process of state formation (chap. 4), and the nature of monarchic Israel and Judah (chap. 5), and the Babylonian and Persian periods (chap. 6). It should come as no surprise that, despite this division according to archaeological-political categories, the latest period, with one chapter, receives far less attention than do the premonarchic and monarchic eras, for which two chapters each are devoted—one analyzing the processes associated with the major transitions ("origins" and state formation), the other describing the culture of Israel (in the prestate and state periods). The subsequent monarchic decline and then obliteration, on account of the powerful external instrumentality of Mesopotamian imperialism, has not attracted much social science analysis, perhaps because it would more properly fall in the domain of Assyriologists. The book ends with an epilogue, which both summarizes the salient points of the preceding chapters and also points to the areas of agreement among the variety of constructs of Israelite history and society.

McNutt's extensive treatment of the transitions from LB II to Iron I and from Iron I to Iron II consists first of a review of the existing but incomplete biblical and archaeological data and then of the models from the social sciences that have been used in different ways to integrate those data into constructs of Israelite social processes. Her explicit strategy of not taking a stand or offering a solution in the face of contradictory theories is a wise one, and she maintains this neutrality to a great extent by her skillful positioning of various models, whereby she explains the contested feature of one as segue into the advantageous features of the next. Yet something of her predisposition can be ascertained from the extensive coverage she gives to the role of chieftaincy in the transition from "tribal" to monarchic sociopolitical organization. This focus on chieftaincy may in fact be justified—not because it is part of an evolutionary model tracing increasing social complexity from tribe through chieftaincy to kingship, but rather because Israelite "tribes" themselves may be less egalitarian than has been argued. McNutt does acknowledge that scholars such as Norman Gottwald, who have suggested a socioeconomic egalitarian character for early Israel, have since revised their views; yet she maintains a sense that egalitarianism, though not absolute, was still a