

HETTITOLOGIE

GLATZ, C. — *The Making of Empire in Bronze Age Anatolia. Hittite Sovereign Practice, Resistance, and Negotiation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2020. (27 cm, XIII, 371). ISBN 978-1-108-49110-5. £ 75.00.

As the author of the book under review writes, the Hittite kingdom has often been neglected by those researchers who have engaged the ancient empires either through a comparative approach or within the framework of global history.

Furthermore, general books on the kingdom of Hatti usually focus on its political history, such as Trevor Bryce's volume *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (Oxford 2005), and thus a complete treatment that combines the textual record with the archaeological evidence has been lacking.

This book contains ten chapters. The first chapter, "Empire is always in the making," introduces the reader to the study of Hittite culture. The author surveys several ancient and modern "empires" and challenges the idea of empires as monolithic structures. Instead of asking whether the Hittite state qualifies as such an empire, the author chooses to focus on "the Hittite imperial network" and to examine the "political production" and strategies of subjugation used by the Hittite kings. Hittite sovereign practice is seen by Glatz as a continuous attempt to incorporate conquered territories and communities into a well-connected network.

Chapter 2, "Empire at home," briefly describes the environment in which the Hittite kingdom developed. Trying to reconstruct a diachronic "mental geography" of the Hittite ruling elites, the author distinguishes between an early period when the capital Ḫattuša coincided with the whole state and a later period when the core of the kingdom was considered to consist of at least two main regions, namely the upper and the lower land.

The central role played by Ḫattuša in Hittite royal ideology is examined in the third chapter. The process that led to the formation of centralised polities in Anatolia was not a Hittite innovation but had already started in the Middle Bronze Age. The author here mentions Kültepe/Kaneš/Neša and the archaeological and textual documentation that this site has provided. When dealing with King Anitta and the well-known text that narrates his achievements, she argues that this document is "an origin myth" that "creates rather than recalls" historical events. Although it is undoubtable that this text was preserved and copied by Hittite scribes because it celebrated the most remote past, it is not true that all the preserved fragments of the Anitta texts are Late Bronze Age copies; in fact, manuscript KBo 3.22 is considered one of the oldest texts in Hittite (see A. Kloekhorst and W. Waal, "A Hittite Scribal Tradition Predating the Tablet Collection of Ḫattuša?", *ZA* 109 [2019], 189-203). Thus, I would not completely deny the historical value of this document.

As the author writes, the choice of Ḫattuša as the capital of the kingdom remains "an intriguing question", although its "dramatic topography" had undoubtedly fascinated the first rulers of the Hittite dynasty. The precise moment when Ḫattuša became the administrative and political capital is at the centre of a historical debate. As is well known, Beal argued that Ḫuzziya I had already resided in Ḫattuša, whereas Kloekhorst assumed that Neša was the capital during the reign of this king, although this is not supported by the archaeological evidence from Kültepe (R. Beal, "The Predecessors of Hattušili I", in G. Beckman, R.H. Beal and G. McMahon eds., *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr.*, Winona Lake 2003, 24-25A; Alwin Kloekhorst, *Kanišite Hittite*, HdO 1/132, Leiden and Boston 2019, 258-262).

The third chapter, "Sovereign performance", concerns the role played by religious festivals in the political and economic organisation of the Hittite state. The author's assumption that the scenes depicted on the İnandiktepe vase might refer to "the requisition of agricultural surplus" from the estate of this site is attractive, although the interpretation of

the depicted images remains a difficult task and there are no clear connections between the images and the description of the festival in the written documents (see S. de Martino, "The Celebration of Hittite Festivals in Comparison with Archaeological Evidence", in G.G.W. Müller ed., *Liturgie oder Literatur?* [StBoT 60], Wiesbaden 2016, 91-103).

The fourth chapter, "The Pontic shatter zone", is of great interest. It offers an in-depth analysis of the distribution of settlements in northern Anatolia and the relations among the Kaška tribes and the Hittite government. The archaeological sources are the only ones available if one aims at writing the Kaška history from a Kaškean emic perspective, since these peoples have not left any written documents. The author poses the question whether the mention of the Kaška in the Hittite texts indeed refers to a single specific ethnic group, or whether it is instead "merely an imperial fabrication". Thus, the label "Kaška" might refer to those peoples who lived in the Pontic region and were not fully controlled by the Hittite central power.

The fifth chapter, "Nesting faults", investigates the function of the Hittite landscape monuments. I disagree with the author concerning the identity of Kuwalanamuwa, who was the patron of two monuments, namely the İmamkulu and the Hanyeri reliefs. Glatz identifies him with an official who was active during the reign of Muḫli II. This assumption implies that the earliest monumental reliefs bearing Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions were carved by Hittite dignitaries before the practice was adopted by the kings of Ḫatti. Instead, I argue that Kuwalanamuwa might be identified with an official who lived in the late 13th century BC and is documented in several texts and sealings. This personage also occurs in some tablets from Ugarit and was clearly a powerful and ambitious official, as A.R. Burlingame recently wrote ("New Evidence from Ugaritic and Hittite Onomastics and Prosopography at the End of the Late Bronze Age", *ZA* 110 [2020] 196-211).

The contested eastern periphery is at the centre of the sixth chapter ("Arresting geographies – ambiguous edges"), which gives a complete overview of the archaeological data on the Euphrates region. The area of Malatya and the region of İsuwa had indeed been a theatre of conflict between Ḫatti and Mittani before, and later with Assyria. The creation of the kingdom of İsuwa by Muwatalli II, who installed his brother Halpašulubi on the throne, certainly aimed at solving the problem of the political instability of this region.

The seventh chapter, "Discipline and *différence*", is devoted to the Hittite administrative apparatus, including the practice of sealing documents and the officials who owned a seal. Theo van den Hout has made a significant contribution on this topic in his recent book *A History of Hittite Literacy* (Cambridge 2020).

The eighth chapter, "Plain things", deals with ceramic production. The function of the pre-firing potmarks is carefully taken into consideration here. The author stresses the fact that only a very few potmarks are preserved and contests the assumption that they were intended "to convey any specific post-firing information". Furthermore, Glatz argues that Late Bronze Age Anatolian pottery does not show the features of a production that was directly controlled by the central government; instead, it represents the "outcomes of more complex, localised process of partial mimesis and mixing".

The fall of the Hittite kingdom and the survival of the peripheral regions are the topics of the ninth chapter,

“Ceasing Empire”. In the tenth chapter, “Concluding thoughts”, Glatz reaffirms the main aim of the volume: “I wanted to move beyond this main empire-centric perspective to wrestle more vigorously from the available archaeological and textual records and define more explicitly the tensions of the Hittite imperial [network] *in the making*”. Indeed, the vantage point from which the author surveys Hittite Anatolia is more complex than usual; it does not privilege the documents produced by the Hittite royal chancellery but also gives space to all the available evidence coming from the peripheral areas. In short, the landscape and material analysis in this book challenge the image of a Hittite *Einheitsstaat*, the “well-oiled” institutional apparatus not only able but also willing to control and homogenise all the aspects of its subjects’ live. According to the author, such sweeping abstraction is the result of overly enthusiastic readings of imperial self-narration.

In conclusion, we are grateful to Claudia Glatz for this extremely significant contribution to our knowledge of Hittite Anatolia and for demonstrating how productive a more complex and transdisciplinary methodology of research can be.

University of Torino –
Department of History
September 2021

Stefano DE MARTINO