

Chapter 7. Torri emphasizes that the single copies and cursive script of the inventories show them to be living administrative records (p. 165). However, she does not mention that the cult inventory texts are overrepresented at the HaH. The ratio of the festival texts in the HaH, the most common type of text there, to those in Temple 1 is 603 to 1684, or around 36% (data taken from Table 22, p. 170). In comparison, the ratio of the cult inventories stands at 62% (95 HaH vs. 151 Temple 1—data from the online *Konkordanz*, since it is not listed in Torri's book²). Contextualizing the overrepresentation of the clearly day-to-day religious administrative cult inventories would have strengthened the implicit argument that the HaH was not just a passive archive.

Chapter 8 addresses the chancellery texts. The sections offer detailed philological commentary, but few conclusions are offered.

Chapter 9 deals with the texts of the scribal tradition. The significant presence of foreign literature in translation at the HaH is critical to the thesis of Torri that the structure functioned at least in part as a place of scribal education. Torri clarifies in the first section of the chapter (pp. 215–27) that Hittite scribal education differed from its Mesopotamian contemporaries. Instead of in a centralized É.DUB.BA, evidence suggests

that elementary scribal education took place in the family home. The “School Texts” of Mesopotamian origin found at Ḫattuša were thus another form of advanced technical literature in translation, to be counted alongside the omen texts and Mesopotamian hymns. This explains why there are many fewer exemplars of the lexical lists and vocabulary, and almost none that betray signs of a novice's hand. Likewise, texts in other foreign languages (Hurrian, Hattian, and Luwian), along with mythological texts and magical texts demonstrate the importance of the HaH as place of knowledge production, where the diversity of sources reflected the erudition expected of the scribal circles working to prepare new texts.

Chapter 10 recapitulates and expands upon the conclusions of each chapter of the book. These for the most part follow what has been discussed above. It is in addition emphasized that the distribution of colophons and text findspots suggests that at least the higher-level scribes did not work in one location. Thus, it is Torri's opinion that every text storage site in Ḫattuša can be conceived of as part of single connected *scriptorium*.

In summary, as the first book-length treatment of an archive at Ḫattuša, Torri's book is a considerable achievement. It is a testament to Torri's diligence, built on a decade and a half of work in the form of research articles, handcopies and transliterations of the texts from the HaH. Its combination of archaeology and philology offers a blueprint for future studies, even if the intransigence of the data can lead only to limited conclusions.

² S. Košak, hethiter.net/: *hetkonk* (2.plus); accessed July 3, 2023; search terms Fundort “Haus am Hang”, CTH-Bereich “VIII: KULTINVENTARE (CTH 501–530).”

Officials and Administration in the Hittite World. By Tayfun Bilgin. Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records 21. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019. Pp. xvi + 507 + 9 figures + 38 tables. \$119.99 (cloth).

REVIEWED BY N. İLGI GERÇEK, *Bilkent University*

This book is an investigation of the administrative organization of the Hittite state, with a particular focus on the extensively documented upper rungs of Hittite state administration. As the first book-length treatment of Hittite administration, it makes a considerable contribution to the field. The book aims to collect and analyze extensive data on the highest administrative offices and officials through a prosopographic investigation based on both cuneiform and glyptic sources. Additionally, it aims to assess and classify the overall administrative organization of the Hittite state. The main lines of inquiry investigated throughout the book are the duties and responsibilities of high-level offices and

officials, diachronic change in administrative structure and practices, the presence and extent of hierarchical organization in the highest levels of state administration, and the role of kinship ties — particularly relation to the royal family — in determining the relative rank and responsibilities of administrative offices and officials.

In the Introduction, Bilgin explains his decision to focus the investigation on the highest levels of administration as being motivated by two factors: firstly, these offices constitute the “central government” and are extensively documented (p. 2); secondly, it allows for a manageable scope of study (p. 13). He identifies

top-level officials primarily based on the presence of the designations “Grandee/Great,” “Lord,” and/or “Prince” in their titles (^{LÚ}GAL, EN/BĒLU, DUMU.LUGAL, along with their hieroglyphic counterparts MAGNUS, DOMINUS, and REX.FILIUS), but also considers contextual information indicating their rank and importance, such as their presence as witnesses in administrative or juridical documents like treaties and land-grants, their access to the king, or their position in the Hittite military. In the remainder of the Introduction, Bilgin situates his investigation within the impressive (if disjointed) body of scholarship on Hittite officials and administration. He also discusses methodological, terminological, and chronological considerations. Furthermore, he very briefly outlines his overall evaluation of Hittite administration, which aims to determine “how patrimonial vs. bureaucratic it was” (p. 1) within a Weberian theoretical framework. This analysis focuses on some key features such as specialization, fixed rules, and hierarchy (pp. 11–12).

Chapter 1 (“The Royal Family”) delves into the role of the royal family, namely the king, the queen, and the crown prince, in the state’s administrative structure. Bilgin’s characterizations of the Hittite state (as an absolute monarchy), the king (as an absolute monarch), and long-debated collective institutions such as the *panku* (advisory council on judicial matters) and *tuliya* are uncontroversial. In considering the role of the queen, Bilgin asserts that while they exercised considerable power over cultic institutions, “there is no evidence that Hittite queens had any significant involvement in matters beyond the cultic domain” (p. 24). However, in the discussion that follows, the well-documented political agency of Hittite queens Ašmunikal, Puduhepa, and Tanuhepa, and their involvement in administrative affairs beyond cultic functions, from co-issuing edicts to the disbursement of land-grants, from presiding over legal cases to representing the Hittite state in diplomatic affairs, are all treated without further justification as exceptional.

Chapter 2 (“Provincial Administration”) explores the territorial administration of the Hittite state, employing a method of analysis that consists of what Bilgin refers to as “individual” and “collective” prosopography (pp. 9–10). This involves examining the attestations of individuals bearing specific titles, and subsequently discussing the general features of the office in question. It focuses first on the government of the appanage kingdoms (Kizzuwatna, Aleppo, Karka-

miš, Hakkim/ḫiḫ, Tarhuntašša, Išuwā, and Tumanna), and then discusses the government of provinces under individual governors and titles (EN KUR-TI “Lord of the Land” and EN URU-LIM / EN URUGN “Lord of the City [of GN],” BĒL/EN MADGALTI or Hitt. *am[wa]riyaš išha-* “Lord of the Watch[tower],” ^{LÚ}UGULA.KALAM.MA “Overseer of the Land,” and ŠAKIN MĀTI). Bilgin sees a diachronic development in territorial administration from the Old Kingdom, when cities incorporated into Hittite territory were assigned to members of the royal family designated as “Prince” or “Man of the City” (DUMU/LÚ URUGN), to the Empire Period, when central provinces within the Hittite territory were assigned to governors, while appanage kingdoms were ruled by cadet branches of the Hittite ruling dynasty. The chapter would benefit from a general discussion of the territorial *organization* of the Hittite state — a topic that remains understudied in Hittitological scholarship — as well as a more in-depth treatment of the economic, judicial, military, or cultic *administration* of the provinces or appanage kingdoms, without which the data presented—though valuable in its own right — becomes difficult to synthesize.

Chapter 3 (“The Top-level Offices of Hittite State Administration”) may be considered the focal point of the investigation. Employing the same prosopographic methodology used in the previous chapter, it explores the Hittite state’s highest offices and officials. Bilgin groups these top-level officials into three categories: a top tier of the most important and highest-ranking high-level officials (pp. 97–299), a lower tier of high-level officials (pp. 299–324), and the group of officials known as LÚ SAG “courtiers” (pp. 324–45). The chapter concludes with a brief overview of the military responsibilities of the officials discussed earlier in the chapter (pp. 345–59).

The first group comprises the highest-level offices and officials (see Table of Contents, p. v, sections 3.1–3.12 for a list of the titles, and Tables 6–17 for the officials). Many of these top-level offices were frequently (though not exclusively) held by members of the royal family. This can be inferred from the fact that the individuals bearing top-level titles are also attested in other contexts with the title DUMU.LUGAL “prince” (hier. REX.FILIUS) designating the sons and relatives of Hittite rulers, and often appear to have held other prominent offices throughout their careers. However, it is noteworthy that while some offices like that of the GAL MEŠEDI “Chief of the (Royal) Bodyguards” were

entrusted exclusively to the closest relatives of the ruling king, bearers of other titles such as GAL SIPA and GAL NA.GAD “Chief of the Herdsmen/Shepherds” are not attested with princely titles, and for yet other titles, such as GAL SAGI “Chief (of the) Cupbearer(s),” a relation to the royal family cannot be ascertained.

The available sources do not afford us a clear view of the *administrative* duties of these highest-level officials of the Hittite state. On the contrary, as Bilgin mentions at various instances throughout the course of the monograph (pp. 295, 394, 397), there does not seem to have been clear divisions between the responsibilities of these top-level officials. The evidence rather suggests that the relative rank and the range of duties of a particular office may have fluctuated over time and/or in relation to the specific capabilities and circumstances of its bearer. Several of these top-level officials attested in our sources were predominantly (or, in a few cases, exclusively) active in the military domain (e.g., GAL MEŠEDI, GAL GEŠTIN, GAL/UGULA KUŠ₇, GAL UKU.UŠ, and UGULA NIMGIR.ÉRIN.MEŠ), while others (e.g., GAL KARTAPPI, *antuwasašalli*, GAL SIPA and GAL NA.GAD) appear to have had some military duties alongside other responsibilities. Aside from their military activities, individuals bearing top-level titles are regularly attested as witnesses in land donation texts, edicts, or treaties, and are documented as participants of cult ceremonies alongside the royal family and/or other high-ranking officials.

The lower tier of high-level officials (for a full list, see Table 18, p. 318), though not as prominent or well-attested as the first group, appear to have had more tangible (or at least more clearly defined) administrative duties, including cultic functions (GAL LÚ.MEŠ SANGA “Chief Priest” and GAL LÚ.MEŠ GIS^{GIS}GIDRU “Chief of the Staff-bearers”), judicial duties (GAL MUBARRI “Chief of Litigations”), food provision in cultic settings (GAL [LÚ.MEŠ]MUHALDIM “Chief of the Cooks”), and supervision of the palace warehouse or treasury (GAL LÚ.MEŠ ŠÀ.TAM “Chief of Treasurers”). Also listed in this chapter are a group of “less significant” GAL-level officials (pp. 308–309) who were at an advanced stage in their line of work and/or were in charge of employees in a certain trade. This group also includes women such as the GAL MUNUS.MEŠ *zintubi*- “Chief of *zintubi*-women,” or GAL MUNUS.MEŠ ŠU.GI “Chief of the ‘Old Women.’”

The last title treated in Chapter 3 is LÚ SAG, which designated “close and personal attendants of the king and members of the innermost circle of the state ad-

ministration” (p. 325). Bilgin appropriately translates the title as “courtier” (rather than “eunuch”), since its bearers appear not to have been eunuchs in the literal sense (pp. 340–41). These individuals are attested with several other titles that identify them as members of various occupation groups such as clerks (SCRIBA, SIGILLUM), priests (SACERDOS₂), seers, augurs, physicians (L. 135.2, AVIS₃+MAGNUS), attendants (URCEUS), and inventory supervisors (MAGNUS.PITHOS, PITHOS.VIR.DOMINUS). It is particularly important to note that this title is not attested in sources before the Empire Period, and that there is no evidence to suggest individuals with the title LÚ SAG were in any way related by blood to the royal family.

Chapter 4 (“Administrative Documents”) presents an overview of the three main groups of administrative documents. It concentrates on the *išbiul* and *lingai*- “instruction and oath” genre, which comprises a diverse spectrum of documents that sought to delineate the responsibilities of Hittite officials and to ensure their loyalty to the ruling king. The chapter only briefly touches upon the two additional groups of texts mainly related to economic administration: land donation texts and inventory documents. Bilgin’s examination of the instruction and oath genre is particularly valuable, in that he not only presents a concise description of each composition, but also provides insights into the genre’s development, starting with the early prototypes from the reign of Telipinu, through the Early Empire period when the most comprehensive instruction and oath documents were composed, to the Empire Period, during which the “oath” component gradually became more prominent. Bilgin also considers how and under what circumstances such documents were altered, re-edited, or produced (pp. 381–82) — e.g., because an oracular investigation determined the necessity of binding the kitchen personnel by oath to ensure the purity of the king!

Chapter 5 (“Collective Analysis of the Offices and Officials”) considers a number of important questions that pave the way for the final assessment of Hittite administration. Bilgin first discusses the significance of the so-called “dual offices” (pp. 399–407) that are attested in pairs, sometimes with the designation “Right” (*kunna*-/*ZAG-na*) or “Left” (*GÜB-la*). Bilgin demonstrates that dual offices developed in the Old Kingdom for the purposes of distributing both the responsibilities and the power held by high-level officials, and remained in use in the Empire Period. As for

the significance of the Right/Left designation, Bilgin considers several possibilities and suggests that it potentially reflects the relative rank of the officials, with “Right” indicating higher status and “Left” denoting lower status (p. 404).

Bilgin next considers continuity and discontinuity in Hittite offices (pp. 407–13). He observes a consistent change in administrative practices throughout Hittite history best reflected in the steady increase in the number of offices and finds evidence for “turning points” of administrative transformation. The first such turning point was the reign of Telipinu when a number of new offices were introduced, and the second coincided with the reigns of Tudhaliya I/II and Arnuwanda I, which saw the development of detailed instruction and oath documents and the creation of new offices, as well as changes in the territorial organization and administration such as the creation of frontier districts and appanage kingdoms. We may also add the rise of the LÚ.MEŠ SAG in the thirteenth century as another key transformation in the history of Hittite state administration.

Bilgin approaches the question of hierarchy among high-level officials (pp. 413–23) through witness lists—in the land donation texts for the Old Kingdom and for the Empire Period, the two Tarhuntašša treaties (CTH 106.II.2 and CTH 106.I) and the Šahurunuwa Text (CTH 225). Bilgin recognizes a distinct and consistent pattern of how certain individuals are ranked in the witness lists, which appears to be more or less independent from their titles. However, he also admits that this perceived hierarchy within the witness lists may be a reflection of court protocol and does not necessarily inform us about *administrative* hierarchy and the chain of command (p. 422).

Turning to the question of kinship among the highest levels of the administration (pp. 423–36), Bilgin intriguingly demonstrates that there were several individuals in high-level offices who may not have been related to the royal family. In fact, of the 140 high-level officials (excluding appanage kings) identified through the prosopographic analysis, only thirty-two have been attested with the title “Prince,” which amounts to ~23% of these officials (p. 427). The titles GAL SAGI, LÚ *urijanni*, UGULA NIMGIR.ÉRIN.MEŠ, and LÚ/EN^{URU} Hurma/Nerik, and most importantly, LÚ SAG, who rose to prominence in the Empire Period, are never held by persons bearing the title “Prince.”

Bilgin turns finally to the overall evaluation and (Weberian) typological classification of Hittite administrative organization (pp. 437–51). Bilgin suggests that Hittite administration was a *primarily* patrimonial organization at the upper levels and that there may have been “more rationally-organized lower layers with better functional divisions, handling routine administrative operations” (p. 450). The only significant issue with Bilgin’s assessment of Hittite administration, which can be said of most of its predecessors in Hittitological scholarship, is that the picture it engenders is a very partial one — something he readily admits and reminds the reader (pp. 437, 450–51)—since his assessment concerns only the upper rungs of the central administration. This leaves a significant gap in our understanding of Hittite state and society and potentially invalidates his remarks on the absolute authority wielded by Hittite rulers (pp. 2, 15–16, 439), or the political agency (or lack thereof) of the “lower ranks of the administration or the people” who “must have been to a large degree unaware and uninterested in any power struggle within the royal family” (p. 438).

In its conclusion, the book provides a very brief summary of its main findings (Chapter 6, “Summary Conclusions,” pp. 452–54). The five appendices (pp. 455–63) synthesize information from the witness and tribute lists and list the frequently mentioned titles.

The monograph under review is undoubtedly an indispensable resource for specialists and novices alike and will long serve as a starting point for further studies on the structure and organization of the Hittite state. Its greatest strength lies in its collection and presentation of an immense amount of data harvested from a diverse range of sources. Bilgin’s careful collection and analysis of the evidence, which he condenses into user-friendly tables and appendices, his impartial presentation of long-standing debates on specific titles or issues, and his acknowledgement of counter-arguments and alternatives to his own suggestions actively foster further analysis and cross-cultural comparison. At the same time, Bilgin’s narrow focus on the highest levels of the central administration reveals the necessity to counterbalance in future studies the almost exclusive focus of Hittitological scholarship on the central state and its upper echelons with more consideration of local and/or non-central agents, groups, and structures.