

## ON THE WRITING OF HITTITE HISTORY\*

AHMET ÜNAL

THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE

The publication of a new edition of *The Hittites and their Contemporaries in Asia Minor* by J. G. Macqueen provided the opportunity to make available to the English speaking public an up-to-date survey of Hittite history and culture based on the latest textual and archaeological data. Unfortunately this edition has failed to live up to this promise. Our comments below highlight the shortcomings of the book and provide some additions, corrections, and suggestions for yet another revision.

SINCE 1975 THE FIRST EDITION of this book has been serving laymen and decorating the racks of scholarly libraries. It is easier to read than O. R. Gurney's *The Hittites*, includes more illustrations, refrains from detailed scientific discussions, and does not include all fields of Hittite culture, some of which could be boring for the general reader. Besides, as opposed to Gurney, Macqueen's main sources for reconstructing Hittite/Anatolian culture are the archaeological data, which he scrutinizes meticulously, rather than the Hittite texts. It is a well known and sad fact that archaeology sells better and lures more readers than an illustration of historical facts based on written sources, which, admittedly, are sometimes dull. This does not mean, however, that Macqueen's book has sold more than Gurney's work, nor can it compete with it. With very few exceptions, it has little to present to learned scholars and Hittitologists.

The "revised and enlarged" new edition seems to be the same as the old one in its general layout. Although no reasons are given to justify this second edition, we assume that the book has gone out of print and the interest of the general reader has occasioned the new edition. There is no explanation in the preface as to what extent the author has changed, updated or modified the content of his book in light of recent discoveries and research. The only clue is given by the publisher on the flap of the dust jacket which, of course praising the book, reads as follows: "Hailed by reviewers as 'stimulating,' 'outstanding' and of 'enduring value' when it first appeared in 1975 *The Hittites*

has now been completely revised by the author and is republished in a new format with additional illustrations." A superficial check against the first edition reveals, however, that the book is far from being up-to-date and hardly reflects the newest discoveries and publications.

The book consists of the following 9 chapters:

1. Background and environment (pp. 11–21). The author starts with a very brief overview of the geographical setting of Anatolia, the historical background of Hittite history, and its prehistoric cultures including the Neolithic, Chalcolithic, Early Bronze Age, and the period of the Old Assyrian Trading Colonies.

2. Who were the Hittites? (pp. 22–35). Discovery of the Hittites, decipherment of their language, diffusion of Indo-European languages (Hittite, Luwian, Hieroglyphic Luwian, Palaic) in Anatolia, the Indo-European homeland and Hittite migrations into Asia Minor, archaeological evidence on the Hittite penetration into Asia Minor, Hattians, origins of the alleged "Greek" speaking population in northwest Anatolia, and Luwians in mainland Greece (known since P. Kretschmer [1896] as speakers of *-anthos* and *-assos* languages), are treated briefly.

3. The Hittites and their neighbors (pp. 36–52). This chapter makes up the bulk of the book and deals with the geographical position of Arzawa and its neighboring countries, Ahhiyawa, the supply of tin (for the source of which Macqueen proposes, astonishingly, such distant regions as Bohemia and Britain!), the history of the Hittite Empire during the Old, Middle and Empire periods, and finally the fall of the Empire about 1200 B.C. The historical outline is very brief, superficial, and lacking in insight. At the end of this chapter the author rightly warns the reader not to

\* Review article of *The Hittites and their Contemporaries in Asia Minor* (revised and enlarged edition). By J. G. MACQUEEN. New York: THAMES AND HUDSON, 1986. Pp. 176, 149 ill., bibliography, and index. \$22.50.

exaggerate the role of iron in explaining the political-military power of the Hittites or the allegedly Indo-European origin of the dynasty. He also remarks correctly that the Hittites were in no way "barbarians" before their raid on Babylon (1590 B.C.).

4. Warfare and defence (pp. 53–73). This chapter is one of the most exhaustive sections of the book. From the point of view of warfare and strategy it explains the strategic settings of the countries of the Kaškeans in the north, Azzi-Hayaša in the northeast, Išuwa in the southeast, Kizzuwatna in the south and Arzawa in the southwest and west. Following this Macqueen deals with the main sorts of weapons, such as chariot, spear, sword, dagger, and bow. A long section is devoted to the description of fortifications in excavated Anatolian sites.

5. Society and administration (pp. 74–78). This chapter starts with a description of the character of Anatolian settlements. The author stresses, sometimes unnecessarily, the rural, village character of most of the settlements. He then touches briefly on various items such as land tenure, marriage, slavery, deportees, and the administrative system, including the king, queen, and the ruling classes.

6. Daily life in Late Bronze Age Anatolia (pp. 79–108). Under this heading Macqueen subsumes many different aspects of Hittite culture. First of all he discusses the residential architecture, shops (mainly from Beycesultan and Troy), palaces, agriculture, trade, industry, clothing, jewellery, seals and pottery. Strangely, he finishes this chapter with some remarks on "Mycenaean pottery in Anatolia" (see below).

7. Religion (pp. 109–35). In this chapter Macqueen discusses only some peripheral aspects of the complicated religion of the Hittites. He gives some new explanations and mentions the Anatolian and non-Anatolian background of Hittite religion. He subsumes under the latter category only the "Indo-Europeans" (i.e., the Hittites) and the Hurrians, disregarding Mesopotamian influences. He then proceeds, under the misleading subtitle "village religion," to the cult, magical ritual (at the wrong place!), the open air sanctuaries, and other temples of smaller size. The rest of the chapter is devoted to the role of the king as head of religious affairs, a description of the Great Temple at Hattuša as the nucleus of the king's religious activities, the other temples at Hattuša (II–VII), Yazılıkaya, and burial practices.

8. Art and literature (pp. 137–53). This chapter begins with a deprecating account of Hittite-Anatolian art. In connection with relief sculptures the author recognizes, however, the unique aspects of Hittite low-relief, rock-carving as an original contribution to

second millennium art. Under the heading "art" he unfortunately discusses only stone sculptures, noting the other artifacts of art such as pottery, seals and statuettes only in passing. The second part of the chapter mentions briefly myths, historical texts of narrative nature, and prayers as literary works.

9. Epilogue: Anatolia after the fall of the Hittite Empire (pp. 154–60). It has become customary for any book or monograph on Hittite history to have an appendix which deals with events after the downfall of the Hittite Empire in 1200 B.C. Macqueen's book is no exception; he tries to give an overview of the so-called Neo-Hittite states using mostly the Neo-Assyrian sources. He further mentions in passing the Urartians, Muski, Cimmerians, Phrygians, Lydians, Medes, and Persians.

Macqueen's book is, on many points, controversial. Being aware of the enormous difficulties one has in providing any account of Hittite-Anatolian history and civilization, I will restrict my remarks in the following only to the important points.

The book does not include any discussion of chronology, no practical tools such as a chronological table, and no king list. The pictures are old and do not reflect the newest discoveries: cf. nos. 38, 101, 106 (it does not show the lintel, "seen restored to its original position"), and 113.

P. 11f. A more detailed geography would help the reader understand Anatolian history better. The map on pp. 12–13 gives unnecessary place names such as Eflani, Bolu, Gerede, Ilgaz, etc., which are obviously taken from the British surveys in the related areas, while, on the other hand, missing some important names such as Arslantepe, Büğet, Hacibektaş, İkiztepe, and Yanarlar near Afyon. (For a complete map showing the locations see M. Forlanini-M. Marazzi, *Atlante Storico del Vicino Oriente Antico*, Fasc. 4.3: *Anatolia: L'Impero Hittita* [1986], Tav. Iff.) This shows that the author did not pay enough attention to Turkish excavations and did not evaluate their results; this is also traceable in the course of his handling of the archaeological material in the main text. It is significant in this connection that his work does not reflect the correct spelling of Turkish names; correct the following: Acemköy, Alışar, Cayönü, Dundartepe, Ergani, Gumushacıköy, Tepecik, to Acemhöyük, Alışar, Çayönü, Dündartepe, Ergani, Gümüshacıköy, Tepecik.

P. 14f. The reader expects at least some mention of the Stone Age cultures.

P. 21. During the Old Assyrian Colony period there were at least 17 small kingdoms in Anatolia. Of these the author mentions only Kuššara.

P. 27. In connection with the archaeological evidence on Hittite origins Macqueen begins his discussion with southwest Anatolia, which is archaeologically one of the most poorly investigated regions. Why not start with Central Anatolia, the core of the Hittite culture? With respect to archaeological evidence on Hittite migrations into Asia Minor, citation of J. Mellaart is misleading (cf. also p. 32), because Mellaart changes his opinion every couple of years; cf. for example, his latest view bringing the Indo-European Hittites into Anatolia as early as the beginning of the third millennium B.C. in *JIES* 9 (1981): 135ff., esp. p. 145. One wonders how Macqueen can trace the Indo-Europeans coming from the northwest and arriving by 2600 B.C. in Beycesultan. What archaeological objects can he call “Indo-European” in Beycesultan XVIIa? The truth at this point is that no archaeological traces of the Hittite migrations into Asia Minor have yet been discovered; see B. Brentjes, *AoF* 13 (1986): 224ff., esp. p. 237: “Es gibt bisher keine Möglichkeit, die Kulturen der Hethiter, Mitanni und die der Iraner (graue Khurvin-Ware) auf europäische Kulturkomplexe zurückzuführen.”

P. 32. What arguments influence the author to assume that the occupants of the Alaca tombs were the Kurgani people and were speaking an Indo-European language? It is confusing to maintain that the language of these people “although probably Indo-European, was almost certainly not proto-Hittite.”

P. 33f. Macqueen, probably under the influence of present day fads, resurrects an old and unproven proposal, i.e., Mycenaean Greeks in the Hittite texts. The reader wonders, also, what might have encouraged him to overemphasize the role of the Mycenaean Greeks and Achaeans under the heading “Early Greeks in Anatolia,” which does not appear in the first edition. On what grounds are such statements made as: “No discussion of the linguistic background to Hittite Anatolia can be complete without some mention of the suggestion that another important group of Indo-European speakers was to be found there in the late third and throughout the second millennium BC.” The whole idea is based on the theory that speakers of Greek entered the northwestern area of Anatolia simultaneously with the Hittite migrations and later became the neighbors of the Hittites. The author also expresses the opinion that the Trojans were a Greek speaking people and the Trojan War was therefore “an inter-state conflict within the orbit of the Greek world” (p. 35). Note the contrast to this statement on p. 34: “So theories that there were Greeks in north-west Anatolia during the Middle and Late Bronze Ages seem to be without foundation.”

These topics are truly side issues which encroach upon the main interest of the book: Hittite history. Indeed, since the book’s first edition in 1975, not a single piece of linguistic evidence has turned up which would place these matters in a new light. Nor do the archaeological data, with the exception of the “discovery” of a few Mycenaean pottery sherds in different sites on the Aegean coast and central Anatolia, offer any clue which would change the general picture. The discussion of Homeric Greeks and Mycenaeans in the Hittite texts, bequeathed by E. Forrer to Hittitology at its very beginning, was only a fantasy lacking any real foundation. Unfortunately, it has become a heavy burden for Hittitology.

The truth is that we do not have a single piece of evidence that the so-called Mycenaean Greeks are mentioned in the Hittite texts. Whoever wants to have a closer look at textual evidence on Aḫḫiyawa may refer to the less regarded, but nevertheless useful book of G. L. Huxley, *Achaeans and Hittites* (1960), where the related linguistic material is given in synopsis. From the archaeological and philological points of view, the dissertation of E. R. Jewell, “The Archaeology and History of Western Anatolia During the Second Millennium B.C.” (University of Pennsylvania, 1974), is very useful but apparently was not accessible to Macqueen. Forrer’s and F. Sommer’s studies and the ever increasing number of articles written in recent years are too confusing. For more on this subject see my forthcoming review of F. Schachermeyr, *Mykene und das Hethiterreich*, in *JNES*.

P. 36. How can the author call Mersin “the threshold of the Syro-Mesopotamian world” and ascribe the fortress there to Ḫattušili I?

P. 37. Is the historical section the correct place for the subtitle “The geography of western Anatolia?” In his discussion of historical routes between central and western Anatolia the author does not mention the important role of the Menderes and Gediz valleys. On the basis of my own travels in Lycia and Pamphylia, I disagree with Macqueen’s explanations for the lack of any settlements in these regions during the second millennium as owing to the fact that some sites may have been overlooked, “or that all settlements there were built of stone which was reused and so has left little or no trace, or that they were mere collections of wooden shacks on the hillsides or among trees” (pp. 37ff.). It is improbable that the Lycians, the true masters of masonry, would have reused the remnants of second millennium ruins. At the end of a long discussion, everything becomes confusing with regard to the location of Arzawa. The alternative maps given on pp. 38ff. do not help. Map 22 contains grievous

errors in placing Upper Land, Šamuḫa, and Kuššara so far east of Sivas.

P. 40. The author is to be commended for not accepting the theory equating Aḫḫiyawa with the Achaeans.

P. 41ff. In this new edition of his book the author exaggerates the role of tin and trade very much. In this section he supports opinions or adopts theories from other researchers that are hardly acceptable, such as overemphasizing northwestern Anatolia (according to Macqueen, Wiluša!) as being on the tin route, and that the tin was brought into Anatolia from Bohemia or even Cornwall in Great Britain—perhaps relying too heavily on the theories of J. Muhly, *Copper and Tin*, passim. The linguistic and archaeological material uncovered since 1975 does not justify changing our views drastically. Recent field work and surveys conducted by a Turkish team under Aşlıhan Yener have revealed that tin sources supplying this metal in ancient times are to be located in the central parts of the Taurus Mountains (Bolkadağ) (as reported in her papers in Yale, Chicago and Los Angeles). And the recent discovery and excavation of a shipwreck of the fourteenth century B.C. off the south coast of Turkey at Ulu Burun carrying ingots of pure tin (G. F. Bass, *National Geographic Magazine* 172.6 [1987]: 692–733 and idem, *AJA* 90 [1986]: 269–96), suggest that the traditional reconstruction of the routes for the distribution of tin are valid.

Pp. 44ff. Hittite history as given in these pages is very poorly described; it is devoid of any kind of insight and is written without carefully using the written documents. Macqueen does not give a detailed account of the history of the Hittites' neighbors, making the word "contemporaries" in the book title unnecessary. In his representation of Hittite history, the author exaggerates the role of trade as such; we know well enough that trade during Hittite times in Anatolia did not play the role it once did in the third millennium and during the period of the Old Assyrian Trading Colonies; see in general H. Klengel, *Handel und Händler im alten Orient* (1979), 103ff., esp. p. 130.

P. 48. According to recent studies, Piyamaradu has to be dated to the reign of Ḫattušili III, not Muršili II. The important role Ḫattušili III played under the reign of his brother Muwatalli is not mentioned; cf. A. Ünal, *THeth* 3 (1974): 47ff.

P. 53. Why under the general heading of "Warfare and defence" is there a subtitle "North and north-east"? Here we see exaggerated the role of the Kaškeans as a permanent danger. A discussion of the northern borders and the military measures against the

Kaškeans should refer to the *bēl madgalti*-instructions which are a particular creation of the Hittite bureaucracy for this region. The author's attribution of the identification of Ḫanḫana with Inandik (in note 46) should be not K. Balkan, but S. Alp.

P. 54. Išuwa is not lost to Assyria under Ḫattušili III. It seems to be an appanage kingdom with close relations to the Hittite dynasty, since Kilišuḫepa, the daughter of Ḫattušili and Puduḫepa, was married to one of the Išuwan kings (see. H. Klengel, *OrAnt* 7 [1968]: 63ff.; idem *RIA* 5 [1976–80]: 215; H. G. Güterbock, *JNES* 32 [1973]: 135ff.).

P. 59. That "the slashing-sword, a vicious-looking weapon shaped like a sickle" is a military weapon is obviously deduced from the sickles of the so-called twelve warrior gods in chamber B at Yazılıkaya. But is it correct to attribute these tools to military usage? If, on the other hand, the author's information derives from an object from Boğazköy, it is still wrong, because "die sichelförmige, doppelschneidige Klinge" from Boğazköy is dated to the *kārum* period; R. M. Boehmer, *Die Kleinfunde* (1979), 10ff. with note 55 and Taf. VIII/2644. In the description of warfare, military tactics (offensive and defensive) are missing.

The city plan of Boğazköy on p. 65 does not reflect the most recent discoveries; see P. Neve, *AA* (1985): 324; (1986): 366. To the sites yielding important military architecture must now be added Maşat, Emar-Meskene and El-Qitar. The reasons involved in the creation of sophisticated buildings and architectural work at Yerkapı and the tunnel underneath was certainly not "to facilitate escape to the more friendly south" when the city was under the siege of the Kaškeans (p. 68). In Yerkapı we have to deal with one of the most distinguished representative architectural works in the ancient world, which served as a sign of political power and/or a religious symbol as well; cf. A. Ünal, *Fs. Bittel* (1983), 533ff. It is remarkable that the author describes in this chapter only fortresses and fortifications, as if the Hittites did not have any other military buildings.

P. 74. Macqueen wrongly tries to understand "the life and organization of a small Hittite community" by comparing it with a Turkish village. He maintains on p. 96 also that the "peasant's life was little different from that of his contemporaries anywhere in the Aegean-Middle Eastern world, and remarkably similar to that of his descendants in present-day Turkey." This results from his misunderstanding the realities of Turkish village life (see my note in *OrNS* 54 [1985]: 425ff. on the rapidly changing nature of the Turkish village). What the author presents under the heading of "village society" is simply incorrect. He does not

provide a full account of Hittite land tenure. He is wrong when he says that the most important figures in village life were the Elders. The description of the government system on pp. 77ff. does not explain the bulk of the Hittite system of political, military and religious government and its complicated bureaucracy.

P. 79. There is within the author's own terminology a contradiction when he calls some Anatolian settlements "towns," since in preceding chapters he calls them simply villages. The most recent discoveries in the Upper City of Boğazköy disclose that ordinary people did not have any residence within the fortified areas which served ultimately as a governmental, administrative and religious center. The other smaller settlements outside of Hattuša confirm this view. The private residences of common people are not to be looked for at the tops of the mounds, but rather in the lower cities which were also enclosed with city walls, as the recent discoveries at Maşat show.

P. 87 and passim. Macqueen inflates the results of the British excavations in Beycesultan, using them to illustrate Hittite daily life; here in connection with "shops." We do not have shops from other sites, and the Hittite language, as we presently understand it, does not have a word for "shop." The author in general tries to relate non-Hittite finds and sites such as Troy, etc. to the Hittites and uses them to illustrate Hittite culture. This is absolutely misleading.

P. 104. On the basis of the surveys of C. A. Burney and J. Mellaart, the author tries to give some idea of the distribution of so-called Hittite pottery in northern and northwestern Anatolia. This is deceptive because the pottery of the Assyrian Trading Colony period is not Hittite in the strict sense and the results of the surveys are incomplete (see A. Ünal, *Fs. E. Akurgal* [= *Anadolu* 22 (1987)], forthcoming).

P. 122. The author does not consider the recent discoveries of temples in the Upper City of Hattuša. He cites only the first seven temples in Hattuša, whereas P. Neve has discovered in the meantime some 30 temples (see P. Neve, *AA* [1985]: 323ff.; idem. [1986]: 365ff.).

P. 132. Hittite burial practices and their cemeteries are a dilemma in Hittite archaeology. To date we do not have a single cemetery of a genuine Hittite settlement. What are given here and elsewhere as Hittite cemeteries, places such as Osmankaya, Ilica, Gordion, Büget, Seydiler and Yanarlar, and Kazan-kaya are, in most cases, pre-Hittite, i.e., they date to the Old Assyrian Colony period (see A. Ünal, *Fs. E. Akurgal* and *The Hittite City and its Precedents in Asia Minor*, both forthcoming).

Pp. 137ff., esp. p. 148, do not deal with reliefs, pottery, glyptic and other small objects as part of "art."

P. 153. Is the subtitle "songs" justified simply on the basis of this single Hittite "poem," the so-called "Soldatenlied," the nature of which is still controversial?

In addition to these objections we must stress again that the framework of this book does not rest on the solid ground of the written sources. Archaeological data, which Macqueen uses as his main sources (especially the results of British excavations), are in some cases over- and misinterpreted. As far as the secondary sources are concerned, he uses mostly the publications written in English, dismissing the bulk of material written by a huge team of international scholars. For improvements we can, therefore, only look forward to a third edition.