

Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten

Herausgegeben im Auftrag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz,
von Elisabeth Rieken und Daniel Schwemer

Band 70

James M. Burgin

Studies in Hittite Economic Administration

A New Edition of the Hittite Palace-Temple Administrative
Corpus and Research on Allied Texts Found at Ḫattuša

Volume I: Background, Corpus Overview, Case Studies,
Lexical Commentary, and Glossary

2022

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

JAMES M. BURGİN
STUDIES IN HITTITE ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION
VOLUME I

Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten

Herausgegeben im Auftrag
der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz,
von Elisabeth Rieken und Daniel Schwemer
Band 70

James M. Burgin

Studies in Hittite Economic Administration

A New Edition of the Hittite Palace-Temple
Administrative Corpus and Research on Allied Texts
Found at Ḫattuša

Volume I:
Background, Corpus Overview, Case Studies,
Lexical Commentary, and Glossary

2022

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Gefördert durch die Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, im Rahmen des vom Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Bonn/Berlin, dem Ministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft, Weiterbildung und Kultur Rheinland-Pfalz, Mainz, dem Hessischen Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kunst, Wiesbaden, und dem Bayerischen Staatsministerium für Wissenschaft und Kunst, München, finanzierten Akademienprogramms.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <https://dnb.de/> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <https://dnb.de/>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our website <https://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de/>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2022
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.
Printed on permanent/durable paper.
Printing and binding: Memminger MedienCentrum AG
Printed in Germany

ISSN 0585-5853
ISBN 978-3-447-11929-0

eISSN 2702-0002
eISBN 978-3-447-39350-8

CONTENTS

List of Tables and Figures	XI
Abbreviations, Symbols, and Transliteration Conventions	XV
Preface and Acknowledgments	XIX
Introduction	1
1. History of Research (I): Past Models of the Hittite State	
1.1 Introduction	7
1.2 Early Western Consensus (Culture-Historical)	8
1.2.1 Goetze: The Ethnogenesis of the Hittite State	9
1.3 Soviet Marxist Criticism (Historic-Materialist)	13
1.3.1 Struve: The Paradox of “Oriental Stagnation”	14
1.3.2 Diakonoff: The “Two-Sector” Model	16
1.4 Western Reaction	20
1.5 The Italian School	22
1.5.1 Liverani: A Strongly Dichotomous Two-Sector Model	22
1.5.2 Zaccagnini: The Neo-“Asiatic Mode of Production” Model	24
1.6 Neo-Marxism and the “New Humanities”	27
1.7 New Western Consensus	29
1.7.1 The End of Hittite Feudalism as a Theoretical Model	29
1.7.2 Archi: The Palace Network Model	35
1.7.3 Klengel: The Palace-Temple Synthesis	37
1.8 Conclusions	39
2. History of Research (II): Current Models of the Hittite State	
2.1 Introduction	41
2.2 The Hittites and Their Environment	42
2.2.1 History of Research	42
2.2.2 Geography of the Anatolian Plateau	44
2.2.3 Climate of the Ancient Anatolian Plateau	47
2.2.4 Modes of Subsistence on the Anatolian Plateau	49
2.2.5 Strategies for Communal Self-Sufficiency	51
2.3 Political Integration on the Anatolian Plateau	55
2.3.1 Basis of the Hittite State in Communal Antecedents	55
2.3.2 Hittite State Intervention as a Necessity: The Schachner Thesis ...	55
2.3.2.1 Food Storage and Grain Silos	57
2.3.2.2 Dams and Artificial Ponds	60
2.3.2.3 Festival and Feasting	61

2.3.3 Anatolian Regionalism and Resistance: The Glatz Corollary	63
2.3.3.1 Anatolian Regionalism – Hittite Identity <i>à la carte</i>	64
2.3.3.2 Anatolian Resistance	71
2.4 The Wealth-Financed State	73
2.4.1 Wealth Finance, Staple Finance	73
2.4.2 Wealth Finance and Hittite Metal Production	77
2.4.2.1 Copper, Tin, and Bronze	78
2.4.2.2 Gold and Silver	81
2.4.2.3 Iron?	84
2.4.3 Wealth Finance and Textiles	85
2.4.4 Staple Finance (and its Near Absence in Hittite Textual Sources) ..	87
2.4.5 Wealth Finance, Staple Finance Conclusions	90
2.4.6 Patrimonialism, Bureaucracy, and the Elites	93
2.4.7 Mesopotamian Influence on the Hittite State?	95
2.5 Current Models of the Hittite State: Conclusions and Next Steps	97
2.5.1 Summary of Current Research	97
2.5.2 Future Research Questions	99
3. The Palace-Temple Administrative Corpus: Structure and Purpose	
3.1 Introduction	105
3.1.1 Format and Composition	106
3.1.2 Findspots	107
3.1.3 Dating of the Corpus	110
3.1.4 Interface of the PTAC with Other Systems of Administration	111
3.2 Division of the Corpus by CTH Number	114
3.2.1 Growth of the Corpus, and Its Division	114
3.2.2 Proposed New Categories for CTH 240–50	115
CTH 240 “Texts Concerning Sales, Purchases, and Exchange”	117
CTH 241 “Inventories of Chests”	117
CTH 242 “Texts Concerning the Crafting of Metal Objects”	117
CTH 243 “Texts Concerning Textile and Leather Production”	118
CTH 244 “Inventories of Domestic Tribute (<i>MADDATTU</i>)”	118
CTH 245 “Texts Concerning Distributions and Handouts”	118
CTH 246 “Complex Inventories”	119
CTH 247 “Inventories Concerned with Condition and Maintenance” ..	119
CTH 248 “Inventories Connected with the State Cult”	120
CTH 249 “Inventories and Inventory Fragments”	120
CTH 250 “Miscellaneous Inventories and Administrative Fragments” ..	121
3.2.3 Texts not Edited in Present Book	121
3.3 Division of the Corpus by Purpose and Function	122
3.3.1 Division of the Corpus in Siegelová’s <i>Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis</i> ..	122
3.3.2 Division of the Corpus in the Present Book	129
3.4 Conclusions on the Hittite Palace-Temple Administrative Corpus	140

4. Case Study: the KASKAL Series	
4.1 Introduction	143
4.2 Defining the KASKAL Series	144
4.3 Structure of the KASKAL Main Text	146
4.4 Editorial Relationship of the Tablets of the KASKAL Main Text: 8.1.A–K	149
4.5 Variation in the KASKAL Main Text: Systematic Differences	150
4.5.1 Columns and Dividers	150
4.5.2 Space at End of Paragraphs	151
4.5.3 KASKAL Formula	152
4.5.4 Uncorrected Erasures	153
4.5.5 Other Features	153
4.6 Variations in the KASKAL Main Text: Particular Differences	155
4.6.1 Nexus 1	155
4.6.2 Nexus 2	157
4.6.3 Nexus 3	159
4.6.4 Nexus 4	162
4.7 Editorial Layers in the KASKAL Main Text	164
4.7.1 Single-column tablet	165
4.7.2 Two-column tablet	165
4.7.3 Three-column tablet: first draft	165
4.7.4 Three-column tablet: intermediate draft?	165
4.7.5 Three-column tablet: final draft?	166
4.8 Conclusions on the Structure of the KASKAL Main Text	166
5. Quantifying the Contents of the KASKAL Main Text	
5.1 Introduction	169
5.2 Durable Goods in the KASKAL Main Text	171
5.2.1 Items in the Preserved Portions of the Durable Goods Tablet	171
5.2.2 Items in the Missing Portions of the Durable Goods Tablet	176
5.2.3 Reconstructed Total of Items in the Durable Goods Tablet	178
5.3 Textiles in the KASKAL Main Text	182
5.3.1 Items in the Preserved Portions of the Textiles Tablet	182
5.3.2 Items in the Missing Portions of the Textiles Tablet	190
5.3.3 Reconstructed Total of Items in the Textiles Tablet	193
5.4 Grand Total of Items in Reconstructed KASKAL Main Text	193
6. The Relative Value of the KASKAL Main Text	
6.1 Introduction: Finding Suitable Comparisons	195
6.2 Gifts in the Egyptian-Hittite Correspondences	195
6.2.1 Gifts in the “Eternal Treaty” Dossier	197
6.2.1.1 Commentary: The Standard Diplomatic Gift Package	199
6.2.1.2 Lacuna 1: The Gift of King Ramses to Ḫattušili	200
6.2.1.3 Lacuna 2: The Gift of Vizier Pašiyara and the Egyptian Grandees to Ḫattušili	201

6.2.1.4 Lacuna 3: Gifts to the Wives(?) of the Hittite Princes	201
6.2.1.5 Total Gifts Received by the Hittite Court in the Eternal Treaty Dossier	202
6.2.2 Gifts from the First Hittite-Egyptian Royal Marriage	202
6.3 Tribute from Hittite Vassals	204
6.3.1 Tribute from Ugarit	205
6.3.1.1 Edict of Šuppiluliuma I concerning Tribute of Ugarit (CTH 47)	208
6.3.1.2 Inventory of (Revised) Ugaritic Tribute (CTH 48)	209
6.3.1.3 Edict of Muršili II concerning Tribute of Ugarit (CTH 65)	211
6.3.1.4 Edict of Tudḫaliya IV Releasing Ammištamru II of Ugarit from Participation in War with Assyria (CTH 108)	212
6.3.2 Tribute from Amurru	212
6.3.3 Tribute from Emar	213
6.4 Comparative Magnitude of the KASKAL Main Text	215
6.5 Conclusions on the Relative Value of KASKAL Main Text	218
7. Concluding Remarks on the KASKAL Main Text	
7.1 Remaining Questions	219
7.2 Time Frame and Direction of Shipment for the KASKAL Main Text	219
7.3 Evidence for a Royal Marriage?	222
7.4 Conclusions on the KASKAL Main Text.....	226
8. The Hittite Votive Corpus as Economic Texts	
8.1 Introduction to the Hittite Votive Corpus	229
8.2 Dating Criteria of Vows in Detail	232
8.2.1 The Illness Vows	233
8.2.2 Ištar of Lawazantiya	234
8.2.3 Military Campaigns	234
8.2.4 Tudḫaliya IV	235
8.2.5 Conclusions on Dating	238
8.2.5.1 Useable Texts	238
8.2.5.2 Vows of Insufficient Context to Date	241
8.2.5.3 Texts Excluded from Consideration	241
8.3 Using the Vows as Economic Documents	242
8.4 Vows Concerning Health and Wellness (The “Illness Vows”)	244
8.4.1 Vows by Puduḫepa for Ḫattušili (Minor Gifts)	244
8.4.2 Illness Vows: Puduḫepa for Ḫattušili (Major Gifts)	249
8.4.3 Other Illness Vows by Puduḫepa	254
8.4.4 Illness Vows: Ḫattušili for Puduḫepa	256
8.4.5 Illness Vows: Conclusion	256
8.5 Vows Concerning Military Matters	256
8.5.1 The Arzawa Campaign	257
8.5.2 Northern Campaign(s)	260
8.5.3 Military Vows mentioning Tudḫaliya	263

8.5.4 Other Military Vows of Puduḫepa	264
8.5.5 Military Vows: Conclusion	264
8.6 Vows Concerning Dreams and Omens	265
8.7 Vows Concerning Calamity	268
8.8 Vows for Good Tidings	270
8.9 Vows Concerning Political Matters	272
8.10 Unconditional Vows	273
8.11 Vows with Damaged or Lost Conditions	275
8.12 Vows of Tudḫaliya IV	280
8.13 The Vow of Puduḫepa (CTH 585) and Vow Fulfillment in Practice	284
8.14 Average Value and Significance of the Vow Objects	287
8.15 Reconstructing the Vow Schedule of Ḫattušili and Puduḫepa	290
8.16 Source and Destination of the Votive Objects	292
8.17 Conclusions on the Votive Corpus	293
Summary and Conclusions on Hittite Economic Administration.....	297
Appendix I. Gifts from The Eternal Treaty Dossier	305
Appendix II. Gifts from the Hittite-Egyptian Royal Marriage	309
Lexical Commentary	313
Hittite	313
Sumerograms	365
Akkadograms	412
Divine Names	420
Geographical Names	421
Personal Names	421
Glossary	425
Hittite	425
Sumerograms	468
Akkadograms	540
Divine Names	556
Geographical Names	558
Personal Names	566
Numerals	576
Non-Lexical <i>Glossenkeile</i>	596
Broken or Illegible Forms	597
Acephalic Forms	600
Bibliography	605
List of Cited Texts	663

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Tables

Table 1: Durable Goods in Preserved Portions of 8.1.A	171
Table 2: Durable Goods in Preserved Portions of 8.1.D	176
Table 3: 8.1.A obv. i	177
Table 4: 8.1.A obv. ii	177
Table 5: 8.1.A rev. v	177
Table 6: 8.1.A rev. vi	178
Table 7: 8.1.D obv. i 4'-8'	178
Table 8: Percentage of Missing Lines in Durable Goods Tablet	179
Table 9: Total Missing Objects by Material in Durable Goods Tablet	181
Table 10: Durable Goods and Textiles in 8.1.E(A ₁)(+)E(A ₂)(+)E(A ₃)	183
Table 11: Durable Goods and Textiles in 8.1.F	186
Table 12: Textiles in 8.1.G	189
Table 13: Textiles in 8.1.H	190
Table 14: 8.1.E(A ₃) obv. i	190
Table 15: 8.1.E(A ₁) obv. ii	191
Table 16: 8.1.E(A ₁) rev. iv	191
Table 17: 8.1.E(A ₁)(+)E(A ₂) rev. v	191
Table 18: 8.1.E(A ₃) rev. vi	191
Table 19: 8.1.F obv. i	192
Table 20: 8.1.F obv. ii	192
Table 21: 8.1.F rev. v	192
Table 22: 8.1.F rev. vi	192
Table 23: 8.1.G obv. l. c.	192
Table 24: 8.1.G obv. r. c.	192
Table 25: 8.1.H rev. r. c.	193

Table 26: 8.1.H rev. l. c.	193
Table 27: Gifts in the Eternal Treaty Dossier (21 st year of Ramses II)	197
Table 28: The First Hittite-Egyptian Royal Marriage (34 th year of Ramses II)	204
Table 29: Edict of Šuppiluliuma I concerning Tribute of Ugarit (CTH 47)	208
Table 30: Inventory of (Revised) Ugaritic Tribute (CTH 48)	209
Table 31: Comparison of Gold in the KASKAL Main Text, Gifts, and Tribute	216
Table 32: Comparison of Textiles in the KASKAL Main Text, Gifts, and Tribute ..	217
Table 33: Dating of the Vow Corpus by Text and Dating Criteria	239
Table 34: Illness Vows: Minor Gifts (Puduḥepa for Ḫattušili)	244
Table 35: Illness Vows: Major Gifts (Precious Metals)	250
Table 36: Illness Vows: Major Gifts (Festivals and Rituals)	251
Table 37: Illness Vows: Major Gifts (People and Settlements)	252
Table 38: Illness Vows: Puduḥepa for Herself	254
Table 39: Illness Vows: Puduḥepa for Other Family Members	255
Table 40: Illness Vows: Ḫattušili for Puduḥepa	256
Table 41: Military Vows: Puduḥepa (Arzawa Campaign)	258
Table 42: Military Vows by Ḫattušili (Arzawa Campaign)	260
Table 43: Military Vows by Puduḥepa (Northern Campaign)	261
Table 44: Military Vows by Ḫattušili (Northern Campaign)	262
Table 45: Puduḥepa's Military Vows Mentioning Tudḫaliya	263
Table 46: Other Military Vows of Puduḥepa	264
Table 47: Vows Concerning Dreams and Omens (Puduḥepa)	265
Table 48: Vows Concerning Dreams and Omens (Ḫattušili)	267
Table 49: Vows Concerning Calamity (Puduḥepa)	268
Table 50: Vows Concerning Calamity (Ḫattušili)	270
Table 51: Vows for Good Tidings (Puduḥepa)	271
Table 52: Vows for Good Tidings (Ḫattušili)	271
Table 53: Vows for Political Matters (Ḫattušili)	273
Table 54: Unconditional Vows	274
Table 55: Vows with Damaged or Lost Conditions	275

Table 56: Personal Vows of Tudḫaliya	282
Table 57: Assyrian Campaign of Tudḫaliya	283
Table 58: Objects with Preserved Material and Weights in Minor Vows	288
Table 59: Attestations of AN.BAR in the PTAC	367
Table 60: Attestations of AN.BAR GE ₆ in the PTAC	368

Figures

Figure 1: Comparison of Gold in KASKAL Main Text, Gifts, and Tribute	216
Figure 2: Comparison of Textiles in KASKAL Main Text, Gifts, and Tribute	217

ABBREVIATIONS

The bibliographic abbreviations follow in general those of the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* (rla.badw.de/reallexikon/abkuerzungslisten/literatur-und-koerperschaften.html). Novel or especially pertinent sigla and bibliographical abbreviations are given below.

Sigla and Bibliographical Abbreviations

- ABoT 1 Balkan, Kemal (1948). *Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy tabletleri*. Istanbul: Millî Eğitim Basımevi.
- AnAr Inventory number of the Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi Ankara
- Bo Inventory numbers of Boğazköy tablets
- CAD *The Assyrian Dictionary*. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1956–2010.
- CHD *The Hittite Dictionary*. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1980–.
- CTH Laroche, Emmanuel (1971). *Catalogue des textes hittites*. Paris: Klincksieck. Supplements in *RHA* 30 (1972): 94–133 and *RHA* 33 (1975): 68–71. Maintained now as *Catalog der Texte der Hethiter* on the *Hethitologie-Portal Mainz* by Silvin Košak and Gerfried G. W. Müller (hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/CTH/).
- eDiAna eDiAna (beta 0.2): Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages, at: <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php>.
- EDHIL Kloekhorst, Alwin (2008). *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5. Leiden: Brill.
- EHS Kronasser, Heinz (1962–1966). *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- GHL Hoffner, Harry A., and H. Craig Melchert (2008). *A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part I: Reference Grammar*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- HED Puhvel, Jaan (1984–). *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Trends in Linguistics. Documentation. Berlin; New York; Amsterdam: Mouton; De Gruyter.
- HEG Tischler, Johann (1983–2016). *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 20. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen.
- HIT Košak, Silvin (1982). *Hittite Inventory Texts (CTH 241–250)*. Texte der Hethiter 10. Heidelberg: Winter.
- HVP Siegelová, Jana (1986). *Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis im Lichte der Wirtschafts- und Inventardokumente*. 3 vols. Praha: Národní muzeum v Praze.

HW ²	Friedrich, Johannes, and Annelies Kammenhuber (1975–). <i>Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte</i> . Heidelberg: Winter.
HZL	Rüster, Christel, and Erich Neu (1989). <i>Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon. Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten</i> . Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
IBoT	İstanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri(nden seçme metinler). Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1944, 1947, 1954; Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1988.
KBo	Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi.
Konkordanz	Košak, Silvin. Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, <i>Hethitologie-Portal Mainz</i> , at: http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/ .
KUB	Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi.
MesZL	Borger, Rykle (2010). <i>Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon. Zweite, revidierte und aktualisierte Auflage</i> . Alter Orient und Altes Testament 305. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
RIA	<i>Reallexikon der Assyriologie</i> . Berlin, Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1920–2018.
VBoT	Götze, Albrecht, ed. (1930). <i>Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte</i> . Marburg: Selbstverlag des Herausgebers.

General Abbreviations

abl.	ablative	MH	Middle Hittite
acc.	accusative	mid.	middle voice
adj.	adjective	fn.	footnote
adv.	adverb	n.	neuter gender
all.	allative	NH	New Hittite
C	consonant (e.g., -iC-)	nom.	nominative
CLuw.	Cuneiform Luwian	obv.	obverse
col.	column	OH	Old Hittite
coll.	collective	PTAC	Palace-Temple Administrative Corpus
com.	common (gender)	ptc.	participle
dat./loc.	dativ/locative	pl.	plural
DN	divine name	pres.	present
gen.	genitive	pret.	preterit
GN	geographical name	ptc.	participle
imp.	imperative	r. c.	right column
infin.	infinitive	rev.	reverse
inst.	instrumental	sg.	singular
iter.	iterative	V	vowel (e.g., -Vš-)
l. c.	left column	vb. subst.	verbal substantive
lo. e.	lower edge		
Luw.	Luwian		

Symbols and Transliteration Conventions

⚡*	triple <i>Glossenkeil</i>	//	duplicate text
?	reading of a sign is uncertain	*	reconstructed form
(?)	reading of reconstructed sequence of signs uncertain	**	non-existent form for the sake of argument
!	abnormal or mistaken sign; designation of column or side of tablet varies from handcopy	*...*	encloses signs over erasure
[]	encloses reconstructed text	=	separates morphological elements within words
[()]	encloses restorations according to duplicate text	[...]	indicates that some text is expected in break
⌈ ⌋	encloses damaged but legible signs	()	encloses words in translation which are understood but absent in the original language
⟨ ⟩	mistaken omission by scribe		
⟨⟨ ⟩⟩	mistaken inclusion by scribe		
⟨⟨ ⟩⟩	encloses incompletely erased signs that are still legible		
x	illegible sign (in transliteration)		
[x x]	indicates amount of space in gaps; each x = space for one sign		
+	fragments join directly; after reference to a single fragment adjoining other fragment(s) (listed elsewhere)		
(+)	fragments join indirectly		

Cursive text in translations indicates uncertain meanings of words, most of which are discussed in the respective entries of the *Lexical Commentary*.

Indentation at the beginning of a line in transliteration or translation indicates a matching indentation of arbitrary length on the original tablet.

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The present book is the fruition of two undertakings: my dissertation, “Aspects of Religious Administration in the Hittite Late New Kingdom” (PhD Diss., University of Chicago, 2016), and the project “Critical Edition, Electronic Database, and Systematic Analysis of the Hittite Palace Administrative Corpus (CTH 240-250, 503, 504, 513),” funded by an Individual Research Grant (Project Number 382183667) from the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* and conducted at the Lehrstuhl für Altorientalistik, University of Würzburg, from October 2017 to February 2021. The contribution of the dissertation is comprised by Chapters 1, 2 (in part), 4, 5, 6, and 8, with the dissertation material in every instance extensively revised, and in some cases, especially Chapter 2, greatly expanded with recent research. The remainder of the book, including the *Introduction*, Chapters 3 and 7, the *Summary and Conclusions*, and the *Lexical Commentary* and *Glossary* of Volume I, as well as the entirety of the text editions and philological commentary in Volume II, are the result of the above-named DFG project.

The book has received financial support at every stage. At the dissertation stage, I thank the Adolph Leo Oppenheim Fund for tuition assistance and the Franke Institute for the Humanities at the University of Chicago for a Dissertation Year Fellowship from 2015–2016. Beyond the stipend and tuition assistance by the fellowship, the semi-weekly workshops and research facilities at the Franke Institute provided a stimulating and productive environment in which to finish the dissertation. For the project stage, I would like to thank the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* for funding my employment as sole lead researcher on the project. I would also like to thank the University of Würzburg for the *Anschubförderung* (“Start-up Grant”) that funded research assistants and proof-reading to mitigate the time lost preparing an application for my next research project.

A number of people have contributed to the successful completion of the present book. First, I extend my warmest gratitude to my dissertation advisors Theo van den Hout, Petra Goedegebuure, and David Schloen for their readings, comments, and guidance on the original dissertation. I also thank Andreas Schachner for reading and commenting on portions of the dissertation. With equal warmth, I would like to thank the editors of the *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* series, Daniel Schwemer and Elisabeth Rieken, for their heroic efforts in guiding the book to publication. I would also like to acknowledge and express my appreciation for research assistants Marie Klein and Stefano Aprà for their help in locating and scanning secondary literature and checking the book text for consistency, as well as Helen Young for reading portions of the book for style.

I am indebted to Michele Cammarosano for the many stimulating discussions we had concerning religious administrative texts, as well as his generous provision of preliminary transliterations for those administrative texts he determined ought to be excluded from the corpus of Hittite Local Cults. For their support and accommodation at

the Hethitologie-Archiv at the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, I am grateful to Charles Steitler, who also identified and provided preliminary transliterations of some of the texts to be included in the administrative corpus, and Silvin Kořak, who sadly passed away during the completion of this book. Silvin was, in addition to his more famous role as the author and tireless maintainer of the online *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln*, one of the pioneers of the study of Hittite administrative texts. It was a pleasure to be able to discuss these with him as I worked on the expanded corpus nearly forty years after his initial edition.

I also thank Oğuz Soysal for permission to use the relevant unpublished Boğazköy administrative texts from his upcoming *Chicago Hittite Dictionary Supplements 4*, and for his generously providing a preprint version of the texts with transliteration with philological commentary. I thank here as well Şafak Bozgun (Ankara University) and Hasan Peker (Istanbul University) for their generous permissions to provide provisional transliterations of the relevant unpublished Boğazköy administrative texts from their assigned lots of Bo texts based on the original excavation materials viewed at the Hethitologie-Archiv at the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz.

Finally, I extend my sincerest thanks to the Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi in Ankara for generous permission to examine the cuneiform tablet archives while preparing my dissertation, and to the Hethitologie-Archiv at the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, for access to the card files, *Grabungsumschriften*, and tablet photographs during preparation of the book. Last, but certainly not least, I express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Schwemer for the outstanding research environment furnished by the Lehrstuhl für Altorientalistik at the University of Würzburg, where I worked on this book for four years.

James M. Burgin
Würzburg, 2022

INTRODUCTION

When I began working on the dissertation that would become this book, it was with a feeling that Hittitology had neglected the administrative texts in favor of the more accessible genres of narrative, myth, and religion. By the end of the literature review for the dissertation, however, and even more so now after digesting the flurry of research that has appeared during the preparation of the book, I realized I had been wrong, or at least not fully correct. Hittitology has in fact been interested in texts of government and administration since its very beginning, with no signs of abating. Hittite socio-economic historiography comprehends a detailed and sophisticated literature, and one which has moreover generally kept pace with the intellectual currents of the 20th and 21st centuries.

If there is a shortcoming to be found with the discipline, it is perhaps that it has not had time to consolidate. Perhaps because the field is relatively small, with no more than a handful of scholars working on questions of administration at a time, the philological situation took time to mature. The bulk of the Hittite economic-administrative corpus was not edited until the mid-1980's, which meant that much of the previous research was based on prescriptive texts such as instructions and decrees, rather than the texts of the living administration itself. Then, even when the texts became widely available, it took still longer to bring them into conversation with the theory and archaeology necessary for their contextualization. This is now being corrected, much of it by research accomplished only in the last ten to fifteen years.

Nevertheless, there is little controversy in stating that Hittitology has not featured as frequently as it could among the comparative studies on Bronze Age administration. Fundamental differences between the Hittite economic administrative corpus and the corpora of its contemporaries contribute to the problem, not least of which is the difference in size. Unlike the vast troves of economic administrative documents recovered from the archives of Bronze Age Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt, where the challenge lies in managing the enormous, if sometimes repetitive, quantities of data contained within, a researcher can only be astonished by the meagre number of the same from the Hittite world. Fewer than 300 "living" economic records have been recovered in total across every Hittite period and site. A program of apparently assiduous recycling or destruction of obsolete tablets explains part of this small size, since the vast majority of the tablets – those that contain the texts that are the focus of this book – date to what was perhaps a single generation near the end of the Hittite Kingdom. Likewise, the handful of economic records recovered from one of the few published provincial archive outside of Ḫattuša all seem to date to a short time, perhaps even a single season, before the destruction of the site. But even projecting the number of preserved texts onto previous generations reveals a written economic administration that is vanishingly small for what is expected from a Bronze Age bureaucracy.

Unusual too is the fact that the Hittite texts tend to be larger in format, more detailed in description, but at the same time less prone to numeracy and abstraction than most of the records of contemporary kingdoms. Inventories of concrete, tangible objects predominate in the Hittite corpus. Records concerning the management of foodstuffs, grain, and livestock are almost completely absent, as are all private records. In fact, the absence of entire swathes of the Hittite economy from the administrative corpus led to the expectation, persisting as late as the 1970's, that the main economic archives of the Hittite capital were still to be uncovered. Now, with excavations at Hattuša having nearly exhausted the Hittite levels, this hope has been disappointed. As a result, the preserved corpus of Hittite economic administrative records is simply not commensurate in size or comparable in contents compared to the cuneiform and hieratic bureaucracies to the south, and this fact has remained probably the main impediment to its appreciation.

The greatest challenge, then, confronting the scholar of Hittite economic administration is explaining the dearth and differences of the texts compared to what is expected based on the archives of contemporary Bronze Age kingdoms. One popular explanation is that the Hittite Kingdom recorded most of its short-term economic records on perishable materials, which are now irretrievably lost thanks to the harsh environment of the Anatolian Plateau. It is unquestionable that wooden tablets, probably covered with wax to form a reusable writing surface, were used in Hittite Anatolia. However, estimating the extent to which wooden tablets were used to record economic matters is difficult. There is little evidence within the economic records preserved on clay for an interface with the wooden tablets, and indeed there are also preserved some quite preliminary texts written on clay, precisely the kind of temporary "rough drafts" that one would expect to be the domain of the wooden tablets. This suggests that the clay tablet administration and the wooden tablet administration, to whatever extent it existed, overlapped very little.

There is also a non-literate administrative medium to consider, namely the extensive system of seals, bullae (sealed lumps of clays attached to objects by a string), and *cretulae* (sealed lumps of clay applied directly to an object). Determining the extent to which this system overlapped with or complemented literate records is similarly difficult. Very few Hittite tablets were directly sealed, and none are preserved among the economic administrative records edited in this book. There are large numbers of bullae that were retained for generations in what appear to be dedicated archives, but these seem to have unfortunately been separated from the objects to which they were attached already in Hittite times. At least some of the bullae were probably once attached by strings folded into clay tablets, as evidenced by the string hole preserved in the edges of some tablets, including at least one economic administrative record. Other hypothesized uses for the bullae include being their being tied directly to objects as tags, wrapping locking mechanisms for doors and chests, and wrapping around and tying shut the leaves of folding wooden tablets. For the less frequent *cretulae*, impressions on their interior surfaces show that they were attached directly to bags and jars, confirming a non-literate use for the system. If an extensive economic administration on wooden tablets existed, then it would account for some of the bullae. At the same

time, the fact that seals, bullae, and *cretulae* are richly attested in the archaeological record of pre-literate Anatolia is proof that they required no writing to be useful.

Given the uncertainties in the evidentiary basis of Hittite economic administration, the path of investigation chosen here is to focus on contextualizing the evidence that is actually at hand in the cuneiform texts on clay as they are preserved. For this reason, the book begins with a longitudinal historiographical study of previous and current models of the Hittite state. The intent of these chapters is to establish a framework in which the potential functions of the limited economic administration on clay tablets can be examined. The orientation of the introductory chapters is synoptic, building on the work of others, and occasionally trimming away old data and outdated assumptions, but for the most part letting the scholars speak for themselves.

Chapter 1, “History of Research (I): Past Models of the Hittite State,” traces how the initial interpretation of the Hittite Kingdom as a feudal state was supplanted by a Marxist critique portraying the palace sector as an institution in parasitic dependence on the village communal sector. Western reception of this critique was initially mixed, but especially positive in Italy, but increasingly emphasized the roles of religion, ideology, and environment in explaining the structure of the Hittite state, which strained the traditional materialism of Marxist analysis. By the 1990’s, a model was achieved whereby the combined institution of the Hittite palace and temple, with the latter fully subordinated to the former, stood at the center of a redistribution network erected in response to the environmental challenges and historical situation of the Anatolia Plateau.

Redistribution, religion, and environment loom large in Chapter 2, “History of Research (II): Current Models of the Hittite State.” Here, recent advancements in archaeology and theory provide support and vital clarifications to the palace-temple redistributive model. Archaeology has demonstrated that the Hittite state maintained its power on the Anatolia Plateau through a system of urban settlements newly founded at strategic locations. These settlements were endowed with a cultural-technological “package” in the form of walls, palace, and temples, and sustained by a system of grain silos and water features for local intensive agriculture and livestock that promoted the local, defensive accumulation of staple products. Theory suggests that states in environments such as the Anatolian Plateau, which combined an abundant mineral wealth, lack of navigable rivers, and proximity to civilizations with larger population bases, were maintained by control of trade in luxuries and exertions of ideological and military power over local elites. It is a central argument of this book that the relatively small corpus of written economic-administrative records, all of which concern the manipulation of wealth – above all religious wealth – in the form of metals, garments, and luxury objects, can be traced back to the needs of the Hittite state as it interacted with the conditions of the Anatolian environment. The economic-administrative records preserved on clay tablets concern precisely the sector of economy that the Hittite central state would have the most interest in dominating as it tied together the network of urban settlements on the Plateau. The defensive accumulation of staple resources was left to local authorities, who may or may not have employed wooden tablets in conjunction with a system of pre-literate seals and bullae to coordinate the agricultural life of their towns. These arguments are not necessarily new to this book, since, as will be seen, they build upon excellent previous research, but it is the first time they have

been combined with an extensive philological reevaluation of the Hittite economic-administrative corpus. Suggestions for future research questions testing the hypothesis of a small, religiously focused Hittite economic-administration are then offered at the end of Chapter 2.

Having suggested a background for the texts, the corpus of economic-administrative documents as a whole is introduced in Chapter 3, “The Palace-Temple Administrative Corpus: Structure and Purpose.” After reviewing its growth and revision of the criteria for inclusion, it is argued that the texts should be renamed the Palace-Temple Administrative Corpus. The renaming is necessary to reflect the redressed balance of what in previous editions of the Hittite economic texts was a decisive skew in findspots towards the palatial acropolis at Büyükkale. Now, with new finds, and the recognition that many of the temple inventories that were previously classified separately under religious administration cannot be separated from those of the palatial administration, the split between temple and palace is nearly even. A clear trend emerges, already observed based on the old editions and now further confirmed by the expanded corpus, where the documents discovered at Büyükkale involve the receiving tribute, manufacture, and distribution, while those found at temples involve storage and maintenance. The philological evidence for the limited interface of the corpus with other systems of administration, including the wooden tablets and seals and bullae, is also discussed at this point. The rest of Chapter 3 is devoted to the proposed internal divisions of the corpus. Here it must be emphasized that the contributions of previous editions have not been made obsolete. Much of the general outline of the Hittite economic administrative apparatus that can be recovered from the texts was already laid out in the previous edition of the texts by Jana Siegelová in her *Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis im Lichte der Wirtschafts- und Inventardokumente* (Prague, 1986) and expanded in subsequent studies. Every effort has been made to bring the philology up to date, but serious researchers must also consult the interpretation and arrangement of the texts by Siegelová.

The Chapters 4 through 8 of Volume I are devoted to case studies of economic-administrative documents, one within and the others without the Palace-Temple Administrative Corpus. The case studies are intended to serve as models for future research. Among other aims, it is hoped that they serve to demonstrate the benefits of quantification, however basic, when applied to the texts. Chapter 4 “Case Study: the KASKAL Series” examines the KASKAL Main Text, the largest and most complex text of the Palace-Temple Administrative Corpus. It is demonstrated that the text was constructed from a conscious editorial process of no less than four layers. In Chapter 5, “Quantifying the Contents of the KASKAL Main Text,” it is demonstrated the objects of the KASKAL Main Text comprise the single largest collection of wealth known from the Hittite world. The value of the objects is compared to other sources of wealth available to the Hittites, namely tribute from international vassals and diplomatic gifts, in Chapter 6, “The Relative Value of the KASKAL Main Text.” The destination and eventual recipient of the objects of the KASKAL Main Text cannot as of yet be determined, but a dowry for an unrecorded royal marriage is speculated in Chapter 7, “Concluding Remarks on the KASKAL Main Text.”

Chapter 8, “The Hittite Votive Corpus as Economic Texts,” provides an alternative perspective to the Palace-Temple Administrative Corpus, which can appear frustratingly timeless due to the almost complete absence of chronological markers, by examining the Hittite Votive Corpus. By correlating the expenditures recorded in the votive texts to the duration of the reign of queen Puduḥepa with which they coincide, it is shown that in the tenure of Puduḥepa at least half, if not two-thirds, of the regular gold income from foreign tribute and gift exchange were spent as votive gifts. This fact provides further, concrete support for the wealth-financed system of religious expenditure hypothesized in the introductory chapters as an explanation for the focus on religious wealth observed in the Palace-Temple Administrative Corpus. A short recapitulation of the main ideas discussed in the book is then given in “Summary and Conclusions on Hittite Economic Administration.”

The remainder comprises the philological portions of the book. The text editions of Volume II have as their aim a comprehensive update of the corpus, which has expanded by 113 texts and text fragments since the edition of Siegelová’s *Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis*. Each text is prefaced with an introductory discussion designed to contextualize it in light of the new divisions of the corpus as well as the advances in archaeology, theory, and philology. The introductory analyses to the texts have attempted to diligently, responsibly, and critically incorporate the interpretations given in the previous editions and literature, but perhaps in no other genre of the Hittite corpus is interpretation of individual texts and their organization as a group so contestable. The serious scholar is invited to consult Silvin Kořak’s *Hittite Inventory Texts (CTH 241–250)* (Heidelberg, 1982) in addition to Siegelová’s *Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis* for the interpretations of individual texts, as well as the various editions and commentaries given in the previous literature for each edition. Comments on the readings of individual lines are placed in the philological commentaries following each text. Discussion of individual words, including an impressive variety of technical terms and *realia* that are often or nearly unique to the Palace-Temple Administrative Corpus, is collected in the *Lexical Commentary* of Volume I. A *Glossary* of every word and word form appearing in the corpus is also included in Volume I. The placing of the *Lexical Commentary* and *Glossary* into a separate volume from the text editions is intended to allow for ease of simultaneous consultation.

It must be emphasized that despite its size, this book does not pretend to be a comprehensive study of Hittite economic administration. There are other text corpora, including the land grant documents, the instructions, and the few administrative texts found outside of Ḫattuša, that remain to be reinvestigated from fresh archaeological and theoretical perspectives. Then, establishing whether the focus on religious wealth in the cuneiform documentation is an artifact of preservation or evidence for a fundamentally different style of administration requires further research. This will include recourse to other genres, such as the festival texts and local cults, in order to establish the extent to which the program of religious intervention had purchase with the local populations and elites. Anthropological parallels must be consulted in conjunction with the latest archaeological research to determine whether it was possible for the Hittite state to sustain the exceptional level of urbanism on the Plateau without the use of an extensive literate administration of the staple economy. Finally, there is more

work for philologists. Having brought the Palace-Temple Administrative Corpus to a level state, studies of individual texts, text groups, and themes on the model of the case studies presented in the book are waiting to be conducted. Indeed, it must be confessed that the truism that one does not begin to understand a corpus until after having fully edited it very much applies here: there is much information left in the texts. But I am inclined to say that future studies of Hittite administration should be motivated not by how far is left to go, but how close we are to a new level of understanding. If a few habits of mind – chiefly the over-expectation of bureaucracy crept in from modernity – are questioned, and complex questions reduced to testable hypothesis; and if the results are oriented in larger theories, the pieces of a new interpretation of the economic administration of the Hittite state will fall into place.

I will consider this book to be a success if it contributes to and further stimulates the ongoing conversation on the scale and disposition of bureaucracy in the Hittite state. While it would be delightful to find definitive proof that Hittite administration was more similar to Mesopotamian administration than it currently appears, or to the opposite, that the limited bureaucracy apparent in the texts was all there truly was, I do not see resolution of the problem happening until fresh evidence is discovered, perhaps in the archives of provincial capitals; and even so, the positive evidence of the enormous importance of religious administration in Ḫattuša would not be negated by such a discovery, only contextualized. Thus, this book should be taken as the beginnings of a new project to understand Hittite administration, not the final results. There is still an enormous amount of scholarship that can be gained from these administrative texts. I encourage readers and researchers, Hittitologists and Assyriologists alike, to mine, critique, and rearrange the texts edited in the Volume II of this book. Quantification, like that attempted in the case studies of Volume I, is certainly one way forward. The application of new theoretical models, the questioning and refinement of old ones, is also vital. This book is designed to provide a firm philological foundation for these endeavors.

1. HISTORY OF RESEARCH (I): PAST MODELS OF THE HITTITE STATE

1.1 Introduction

Since the beginning of studies in the postwar period, scholars of Hittite administration have been confronted by a basic problem: that Hittite bureaucracy looks very different from its ancient Near Eastern contemporaries. Previous solutions offered that the Hittite administrative corpus is incompletely preserved, and/or that the Hittite government only partially adopted Mesopotamian administrative practices (being held back by, i.a.: cultural feudalism, non-integrated elites, the environment, or unnatural urbanism on the Anatolian Plateau). The incomplete corpus hypothesis argues that a considerable portion of Hittite administration was written on the perishable medium of wooden tablets, but the philological situation of the wooden records is inconclusive: at a minimum, there is little perceptible interface of the wooden tablet economy with the administrative texts on clay under consideration in the present book. That the preserved cuneiform administration was sufficient to maintain a state the size of the Hittite Empire stretches the imagination, but, as will be seen, modern theoretical models can help close the gap. The arguments for the second solution to the problem of Hittite administration, the partial adoption of Mesopotamian administrative practices, have varied with historiographic trends: explanations have included the “Indo-European-ness” of Hittite society, the origins of the state in a period of rapid conquest, the logistical difficulties of exploitation in a harsh environment, and the difficulties of maintaining an urban culture on the Anatolian Plateau. Factually, these arguments are not even necessarily untrue (the Hittite ruling class was indeed initially Indo-European, the state did arise from rapid conquest, etc.). But archaeological data, anthropological parallels, and philological case studies suggest that Hittite administration was not an incomplete imitation of bureaucracies to the south, but instead well-adapted to the geographical and human conditions of the Anatolian Plateau. And while the resulting bureaucracy is not as familiar to our modern eyes as those of Mesopotamia and Egypt, it is nonetheless an intelligible system when viewed through the correct historical and theoretical lens.

This chapter will review the previous literature on the Hittite state, presented in roughly chronological order from earliest to latest. For purposes of discussion, the literature should be divided into four major periods, which are labeled here the Early Western Consensus, Soviet Marxist Criticism, the Western Reaction, the New Western Consensus. These periods cover the literature from the 1950's to approximately the end of the 1990's. Scholarship from the turn of the millennium onward is saved for the next chapter, *2. History of Research (II): Current Models of the Hittite State*. As a principle the ideas discussed below can be considered additive, so that an interpretation stands

if it is not contradicted by a later proposal. Additionally, while the chapter strives to be reasonably comprehensive with the overtly theoretical articles of the period, a number of studies of Hittite government, especially those which are primarily word-studies of titles or text editions of political documents, have been necessarily left out for sake of brevity.

1.2 Early Western Consensus (Culture-Historical)

Hittitology first emerged as an academic discipline in the period between World War I and World War II. With the Hittite language deciphered by Bedřich Hrozný in 1915, scholars began the work of analyzing the over 10,000 tablet fragments discovered during the first excavations at the Hittite capital of Ḫattuša-Boğazköy. The discovery of a hitherto unknown Indo-European language at the edge of the mostly Semitic ancient Near East led to a flurry of scholarship. Initial efforts focused on the accessible texts of state and society: political, literary, and historical documents, many of which were also written in the well-understood language of Akkadian. By 1933, Albrecht Goetze's volume on Asia Minor in the *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* had synthesized a pioneering generation of Hittite scholarship into a remarkably complete outline of the Hittite state.¹

The second generation of Hittite scholarship in the 1950's and 60's advanced into legal and administrative documents with numerous publications, seeing the appearance of Einar von Schuler on the instructions to royal officials (1957),² Kaspar Riemerschneider's edition of the land-grant documents (1958),³ Heinrich Otten on the Hittite Funerary Ritual (1958),⁴ Johannes Friedrich's new edition of the Hittite Laws (1959),⁵ Vladimír Souček's work on cadastral lists (1959),⁶ and Rudolf Werner's work on Hittite court proceedings (1967).⁷ The first taxonomy of the Hittite corpus was also published at this time by Emmanuel Laroche between 1956 and 1958.⁸ There was throughout these new studies a question of whether the emerging Hittite state was better compared or contrasted to the Mesopotamian societies known from Assyriology. One strain of Hittitology emphasized the importance of Mesopotamian influences in

-
- 1 Albrecht Goetze, "Kleinasien," in *Kulturgeschichte des alten Orients, Abs. III, Lfg. 1*, eds. Albrecht Alt, Arthur Christensen, Albrecht Goetze, Adolf Grohmann, Hermann Kees, Benno Landsberger. HAW 3.1.3. (München: Beck, 1933). Revised edition: Albrecht Goetze, "Kleinasien," (2. neubearbeitete Auflage), in *Kulturgeschichte des alten Orients, Abs. III, Lfg. 1*, eds. Albrecht Alt, Arthur Christensen, Albrecht Goetze, Adolf Grohmann, Hermann Kees, Benno Landsberger. HAW 3.1.3. (München: Beck, 1957).
 - 2 Einar von Schuler, *Hethitische Dienstweisungen für höhere Hof- und Staatsbeamte. Ein Beitrag zum antiken Recht Kleinasiens*. AFO Beiheft 10 (Graz: Weidner, 1957).
 - 3 Kaspar Riemerschneider, "Die hethitischen Landschenkungsurkunden," MIO 6 (1958): 321–81.
 - 4 Heinrich Otten, *Hethitische Totenrituale* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958).
 - 5 Johannes Friedrich, *Die hethitischen Gesetze* (Leiden: Brill, 1959).
 - 6 Vladimír Souček, "Die hethitischen Feldertexte," ArOr. 27 (1959): 5–43.
 - 7 Rudolf Werner, *Hethitische Gerichtsprotokolle*. StBoT 4 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967).
 - 8 Emmanuel Laroche, "Catalogue des Textes Hittites," RHA 14 (1956): 33–38, 68–116; RHA 15 (1957): 30–89; RHA 16 (1958): 18–64.

“sophisticating” Hittite culture – the adoption of cuneiform writing and Sumero-Akkadian literary traditions being the most visible example. The Code of Hammurabi and the Hittite Laws, being separated by only two to three centuries, were especially popular comparanda for these authors, not least because of the extensive use of Akkadian terminology in Hittite Laws. At the same time, the importance of Hittite as an Indo-European language compelled many Hittitologists to search for differences between the Hittites and their non-Indo-European neighbors. The tension between the “Indo-European” and “Oriental” aspects of the Hittites can be seen in nearly every research program of the first generations of Hittitologists.

1.2.1 Goetze: The Ethnogenesis of the Hittite State

It was clear from the first historical studies that the Hittite state and society had undergone a radical shift between its “Old” and “New Kingdom” periods. The reason for this change is still one of the outstanding questions of Hittite history, and the differing answers to it will often reveal a Hittitologist’s school of thought. Most Western scholars came to a consensus by the postwar period that explained Hittite social and political changes in terms of the Indo-European/Oriental debate. For Goetze, as he argued in his revised edition of the Asia Minor volume in *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, the change in the Hittite state was an Orientalizing process. He hypothesized that Hittite government was the product of diverse ethnic influences, and wrote that the Hittites were

to an extraordinary degree ... exposed to multifarious streams of influence during their whole existence. It goes without saying, that this shifting history must have left its imprint on the people. State and society of the Hittites are likely to reflect these changes even more than the other facets of Hittite civilization.⁹

Goetze divided Hittite history into four phases based on ethnicity: in the pre-Hittite phase, the Anatolian Plateau consisted of mostly Hattian city-states, with a sedentary lifestyle of palaces with possibly matriarchal elements. The Old Hittite Kingdom phase begins with the conquest and unification of the Plateau by the Indo-European Hittites under their first king, Labarna, and the intermixture of Hittite (or “Neshite,” named after the dynasty’s home city of Kaneš) and Hattian elements. To Goetze, the implantation of the kingdom’s capital at the Hattian city of Ḫattuša suggests the intermixture was deliberate. After a poorly known “Middle Hittite Kingdom” period showing influence of the Luwians, a related Indo-European people of Anatolia, the New Hittite Kingdom (Empire) period reappears with a Hurro-Mesopotamian influenced ruling class.¹⁰

In Goetze’s model, which can be called culture-historical since it emphasizes (cultural) ethnicity as the driver of change,¹¹ the Hittites began with an inherited non-

9 This quote (p. 25) and the following are taken from an updated English summary of the “Kleinasien” volume of the HAW, published as Albrecht Goetze, “State and Society of the Hittites,” in *Neuere Hethiterforschung*, ed. Gerold Walser (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1964), 22–33.

10 Goetze, “State and Society,” 23–24.

11 The term “culture-historical” here is borrowed from a roughly contemporaneous movement in archaeology. For more, see Chapter 6: “Culture-Historical Archaeology” in Bruce Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, 2. ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

divine, *primus inter pares* style of kingship from their Indo-European roots. Elements of the arrangement were still preserved in the Old Kingdom, in which government was essentially a power-sharing agreement between the king and the Neshite aristocracy, but were already being changed by the Hattian substratum of the region. Political documents of the Old Kingdom period readily attest to the importance of the Neshite aristocrats to the functioning of the state. The Political Testament of Ḫattušili I (CTH 6), one of the most debated political document of the Old Kingdom, shows the Hittite king appealing to an assembly of nobles called the *panku-* to witness his choice of successor. Side-stepping part of the debate, Goetze noted that regardless of whether Ḫattušili actually needed to consult the *panku-* on matters of succession, it is significant that he acted and wrote as if he did. A section in the Edict of Telipinu, the other pillar of documentary evidence for Old Kingdom politics, even suggests that the king could be tried by the *panku-* for “crimes of blood,” further distancing the status of Hittite monarchy from the Mesopotamian god-kings.¹²

In the cultural-historical model, Hittite society was originally organized by clans, led by the “great clan” of the king’s family. Most of the highest officials in the Hittite Kingdom were drawn from the king’s or lesser Neshite clans, imparting an ethnic stratification to the Hittite state that probably lasted until its end. Oliver Gurney, Goetze’s contemporary and author of one of the first rigorous popular histories of the Hittites in English, described the situation as “an exclusive caste superimposed on the indigent population of the country ... [in] which a group of Indo-European immigrants became dominant over an aboriginal race of ‘Hattians’.”¹³ The Neshite officials held large estates as fiefs stemming from the initial conquest, and would later provide chariot service to the state.¹⁴ The ethnic separateness of the Neshite ruling class and the experience of conquest of the Hattian Plateau combined to give the Old Kingdom a supposed military vigor, an Indo-European *esprit de corps*, that propelled its armies to the gates of Babylon.

Non-Neshite populations in the Old Kingdom lived in the countryside and outlying towns where they were left to their own style of government, usually consisting of no more than a council of Elders. As Horst Klengel noted in his article about “Die Rolle der ‘Ältesten’,” the lack of documentary evidence produced by the Elders precludes determining whether they represented a sort of “primitive democracy” in Anatolia, or if they were a remnant of a tribal structure such as is attested in Syro-Mesopotamia.¹⁵ From the documents of the Hittite central government it can be seen that power of the Elders grew with distance from the capital. In the heartland they were reduced to a religious and juridical function, while on the periphery they had administrative authority and even a political-military function (though always in conjunction with a

12 Goetze, “State and Society,” 25–26. For a discussion by one of Goetze’s contemporaries on the theocratic but non-divine nature of Hittite kingship, see Oliver R. Gurney, “Hittite Kingship,” in *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship*, ed. Samuel H. Hooke (Oxford: University Press), 105–21.

13 Oliver R. Gurney, *The Hittites* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1961), 68–69.

14 Gurney, *The Hittites*, 69–70.

15 Horst Klengel, “Die Rolle der ‘Ältesten’ (LÚ.MEŠ ŠU.GI) im Kleinasien der Hethiterzeit,” *ZA* 57 (1965): 225–26.

Hittite supervisor). In the most peripheral areas of Anatolia, such as among the Kaška and in Kalašma, there were no kings, only Elders.

Despite the separateness of the Neshite and Hattian populations, Hattian influence on Hittite government was not limited to the periphery or local levels. Most Hittite military and state officials had titles that originated in courtly life, and many with Hattian origins. Gurney takes this as evidence that the Hittites participated in a settled courtly life in the system of Anatolian palaces in the preexpansion period.¹⁶ Furthermore, Goetze saw the political power of the Hittite *tawananna*-, a lifetime position held by the wife, mother, or even grandmother of the Hittite king, as evidence of a Hattian influenced matriarchy in Hittite government.¹⁷

The Old Kingdom ended in a period of strife that may have continued into the poorly documented “Middle Kingdom.” By the time of the New Kingdom a new Hurrian-influenced ruling dynasty had recast the Hittite government according to Mesopotamian political ideals. The most prominent change was a growing feudal arrangement between the king and elites centered around chariot-service. By Goetze’s account, the tribal relationships were replaced, as “[t]he state came more and more to depend on retainers of the king or the crown (palace) – not yet conceived of as distinct – to whom parcels of land were distributed in exchange for the obligation to serve the king as soldiers or in working the royal domains.”¹⁸ Among these retainers were the “knights,” a class of professional chariot warrior drawn from the higher strata of society, but now directly dependent on the king and supported through endowments of state-owned land.¹⁹ Below them were the LÚ G^{IS}TUKUL (‘men of the tool’), state craftsmen who manufactured goods in return for land tenure: according to Goetze, the LÚ G^{IS}TUKUL furnished the Hittite state with a limited autarky, as “[t]heir production satisfied the needs of the country, both military and civilian; a surplus may have been handed over to “Merchants” ... for export and the import of necessary materials not available in the country itself.”²⁰ Unlike in the Old Kingdom, the land tenure arrangements of both the knights and craftsmen depended on their continued service to the king. This arrangement also gave more opportunities to subaltern ethnicities, because as Goetze argued,

[t]he parcels of land fiefed out remained, at least originally, the property of the king and he saw to it that the fiefs, when falling vacant, were assigned to new men. They seem to have come from the so-called NAM.RA people ... who were *glebae adscripti* and thus not allowed to move freely from town to town but who were shifted around by the authorities presumably as the needs of the state required.²¹

The Hittite Laws show that the status of these semi-slaves was fluid, and their economic importance increased as the feudal state matured.

16 Gurney, *The Hittites*, 67–68.

17 Goetze, “State and Society,” 27.

18 Goetze, *op.cit.*, 28.

19 Goetze, *op.cit.*, 29–30.

20 Goetze, *op.cit.*, 28.

21 Goetze, *loc. cit.*

The *panku-* had disappeared as an organ of government by the start of the New Kingdom. The bodies of Elders, where they still existed, were reduced to juridical and religious responsibilities, except on the extreme periphery where they retained some administrative authority. Towns were now integrated through appointment of royal governors answering directly to the king, with larger territorial units becoming appanage kingdoms for members of the royal house. The federation of territories of the Old Kingdom was thus replaced by a “rigid structure,” where high functionaries of state were given “instructions” and required to swear oaths to the king like the soldiers.²² The use of direct personal oaths in the Hittite New Kingdom, an arrangement which only accelerated in reigns of the last kings, were reminiscent of the vassal treaties conducted between the Hittites and their client states, so that it appeared “that within the ‘Hittite Land’ the same principles were practiced that, outside, in the overall area subject to Hittite power, held the Empire together: in other words, that feudalistic ideas were all-pervasive and ruled internally as well as externally.”²³

There were no real alternatives to the culture-historical approach in Western Hittitology in the immediate postwar period. At most, scholars could limit themselves to pure descriptions: Hans Güterbock, for example, in his summarizing article of Hittite law and society, scrupulously de-emphasized the ethnic components of the Goetze–Gurney model, but in doing so forwent explanation for historical change.²⁴ The monopoly of the culture-historical approach among the scholars of the Early Western Consensus can be explained by its appeal in offering an easy equation between ethnicity and political structure. The seemingly transparent connection between ethnicity and politics was, and still is, especially seductive for philologists (that is to say almost every Hittitologist, given the many years of language training required for the field) because ethnicity is closely linked with language. The culture-historical approach tempts the researcher with the possibility that onomastics and etymologies reveal the deepest structures of politics and society; that if one could just trace the linguistic origins of government one could grasp its operation. Even more dangerously, such an approach is not completely wrong. There must certainly have been dimensions of the Hittite government in the Old Kingdom that changed with the influx of cosmopolitan ideas and people in the Empire period. But the danger is stopping at this, and being too reliant on linguistic thinking when political science and sociological theory are needed. The Soviet Marxist critique would serve as a corrective to the culture-historical approach (though possibly going too far in the other direction of over-relying on theory), but even the Marxist scholars did not entirely escape the Indo-European/Oriental tension in Hittite history. Today the question of whether the Hittites were Indo-European invaders, and to what extent this affected their society and government, remains unresolved. Most scholars, the present author included, choose to side-step the question in the absence of conclusive evidence. But the poverty of results does not mean that

22 Gurney, *The Hittites*, 72–73.

23 Goetze, “State and Society,” 32.

24 Hans G. Güterbock, “Authority and Law in the Hittite Kingdom,” *JAOS Supplement* 17 (1954): 16–24. Cf. however Güterbock’s comment (p. 20) on Hittite feudalism being a result of the “Überlagerung” of a conquering people.

the questions are wrong, and thus the positive contributions of Goetze's theory of ethnic driven change should not be discarded. His ideas on the periodization of the Hittite state, and the correlation of these changes with an increasingly multi-ethnic and connected state, are still useful today, and reappear decades later in some of the most recent models of Hittite history.

1.3 Soviet Marxist Criticism (Historic-Materialist)²⁵

Soviet scholarship of the Hittites and the ancient Near East remained largely unknown in the West until the post-Stalin period of the 1960's. In the pre- and postwar periods Marxist theoretical commitments had led most Soviet scholars to emphatically reject a feudal assessment for the Hittite New Kingdom, and indeed for any society in the ancient Near East. For them feudalism was a technical term, the name of a "mode of production," a stage of human development based on the social relationships arising from the evolving ways of manufacturing the means of life. In orthodox Soviet Marxist theory, history was divided into five modes of production, namely primitive-communal, ancient, feudal, capitalist, and socialist modes of production. In each stage there are economic contradictions that impel society to develop to the next, and ultimately towards the final mode of communism.²⁶

Given that the ancient Near East was too early to be capitalist and too complex to be primitive-communalist, the question for early 20th century Marxist scholars was whether to describe the region as participating in the ancient (based on slavery) or feudal (based on serfdom) mode of production. The crucial distinction between the two is that, despite similar levels of non-market, extra-economic coercion, slaves do not own the means of production whereas serfs do.²⁷ In the ancient Near East, and indeed

25 The discussion and basic conclusions on the Marxist scholarship of the wider Ancient Near East found in this chapter are indebted to the analysis of David Schloen, *House of the Father as Fact and Symbol* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2001), see especially pp. 187–94.

26 See the Soviet formulation in Joseph Stalin, "Dialectical and Historical Materialism," in *The Essential Stalin: Major Theoretical Writings, 1905–52*, ed. Bruce Franklin (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1972), 323.

27 As described by Igor M. Diakonoff, "Editor's Preface," in *Ancient Mesopotamia*, ed. Igor M. Diakonoff (Moscow: Nauka Publishing House, 1969), 15–16:

A *slave* is a person being property of another person or body of persons, and thus forcibly subjected to exploitation. A slave does not own means of production, but can, in certain conditions, be in the possession of means of production not his property A *slave society* is a society where the antagonism between the class owning means of production (eventually including the producers themselves), and a socio-economic class devoid of means of production and forced to labour by non-economic means is the dominating force. The term does not necessarily imply that production in such society is exclusively the result of exploiting slave labour proper, or that there does not exist a mass of free or semi-dependent producers.

In contrast,

A *serf* is a person owning means of production but personally dependent on another person (who usually belongs legally to another estate of society) or on a body, and subjected to exploitation, being coerced by non-economic means A *feudal society* is one based on the extra-

almost every economy prior to industrialization, the means of production was arable land. Though occasionally owning movable property, workers as a rule did not own the land, and were thus incapable of full economic independence in their agrarian societies: in other words, by Marxist logic they were slaves. Thus, despite superficial hierarchies of political power recalling the feudal societies of Medieval Europe, the socio-economic reality of the ancient Near East was in no way describable as feudal for Marxist scholars.

1.3.1 Struve: The Paradox of “Oriental Stagnation”

If the ancient Near East was a slave economic formation, then the next major task becomes reconciling the societies of the region, relatively alien to historians raised on Greece and Rome, with the better-known slave economies of the Classical world. In the highly influential view of Vasilii Struve, presented in his seminal article “The Problem of the Genesis, Development and Disintegration of the Slave Societies in the Ancient Orient,” the Near Eastern world was substantially similar to the Classical, in that both exhibited a similar life-cycle of rise and fall, namely

- 1.) A concentration of power in hands of elites, especially in the “hydraulic societies” of Egypt and Lower Mesopotamia, leads to despotism
- 2.) Despotic militarism leads to the growth of a slave class through conquest
- 3.) Simultaneously, free communities are eroded through usury and debt slavery
- 4.) Societal decay, especially the decline of the freeholders forming the backbone of military power, leaves state vulnerable to barbarian conquest
- 5.) The foreign conquerors, often less developed than the conquered slave state, depend on slave holding elite for collaboration
- 6.) Captives and dissidents further enlarge the slave population, until the cruelty of the foreign rulers and slave holders inflames slave revolts to the point of societal collapse²⁸

The divergent results of the Near East, which did not seem to embrace feudalism as fully as the West, were explained by the arrest of the disintegrative cycle, as slaves

economic coercion of an exploited class of producers owning means of production but personally dependent on individual members of the governing class, or on a body representing it; typical of such a society is a division into estates (the members of each estate having a different degree of legal capacity), and ownership of the producers in at least some of the means production. The term does not necessarily imply a hierarchic structure of society based on vassalage, a phenomenon which occurs also in other socio-economic formations.

What made the choice between the categories slave and serf in the Ancient Near East mandatory, besides the period of world history, is that the dependent workers of the region were “owned” in part (through labor obligation) or in full (as chattel) by others. In contrast, the proletariat in the capitalist system, while also not owning the means of production, are nominally free to sell their work to whoever they want, whereas a serf or a slave cannot.

28 Vasilii V. Struve, “The Problem of the Genesis, Development and Disintegration of the Slave Societies in the Ancient Orient,” in *Ancient Mesopotamia*, ed. Igor M. Diakonoff (Moscow: Nauka Publishing House, 1969), 17–69. This is a translation and digest (removing discussion of Egypt) of an earlier article: Vasilii V. Struve, «Проблема зарождения, развития и разложения рабовладельческих обществ древнего Востока», *Известия Государственной Академии истории материальной культуры имине Н. Я. Марра*, Вып. 77, 32–111, 157–81 (Ленинград: ИГАИМК, 1934). Citations for points 1–5 are: 22–23, 28–29, 53–54, 60, and 65–66.

were granted a more permanent attachment to the means of production.²⁹ In many parts of the Near East, both ancient and medieval, compromise situations were reached where slaves were granted limited rights (e.g., the ownership of movable property), so that the gap between the poor freeman and the slave was narrowed.³⁰ The resulting arrangement may have resembled an incipient feudalism, but paradoxically the better conditions lead to stagnation and slowed the growth of true feudalism. According to Struve, the later periods of the Near East saw the continuation of slavery as

a powerful economic substructure within a society based on the feudal mode of production even when this society had consolidated; and it still permeated the entire social and state system The existence of slavery as a substructure within the feudal economic system was the cause of Oriental feudalism assuming a somewhat more stagnant form than Western feudalism, which [conversely] arose on the ruins of a thoroughly disintegrated slave socio-economic formation.³¹

With allowances for the mechanism of “Oriental stagnation,” Struve was able to claim that the ancient Near Eastern and Classical worlds were substantially similar in their socio-economic foundations, and any differences explainable by time, culture, and the equilibrium of the East.

Struve’s work dominated a generation of Soviet scholarship on the ancient Near East, but some scholars questioned his model as research progressed in the mid-20th century. At the time of Struve’s death in 1965, coinciding with a renewed openness in the post-Stalin era, Igor M. Diakonoff was well-positioned to lead Soviet historiography in a new direction. For Diakonoff, despite the impressive Soviet achievement, which he found to have surpassed that of the West “due, to a great extent, to its theoretical base,”³² scholarship had fallen into a rut, where

studies in economic history in our country have been restricted mostly to attempts of discovering slaves in the various economic units or, at best, to establish the static class structure of society. No research has actually been carried out into the functioning of the social-economic mechanism; in particular, consumption and, especially circulation, have not been studied at all³³

With Struve’s passing, Diakonoff could advocate for more studies like the earlier works of Nikolai Nikolsky, those of contemporary scholars like Ninel Jankowska, and his own on Assyria³⁴ and southern Mesopotamia³⁵ focusing on communities outside the governing class. Diakonoff considered these studies, establishing “the extreme importance

29 Struve, “Slave Societies,” 62.

30 Struve, *op. cit.*, 63–65.

31 Struve, *op. cit.*, 66–67.

32 Diakonoff, “Editor’s Preface,” *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 10.

33 Igor M. Diakonoff, «Проблемы экономики: О структуре общества Ближнего Востока до середины 2 тыс. до н. э.» *Вестник Древней Истории*, 1968/3: 3–27, 1968/4: 3–40 [English translation: Igor M. Diakonoff, “The Structure of Near Eastern Society Before the Middle of the 2nd Millennium,” *Oikumene* 3 (1982): 7–100]: 77.

34 Igor M. Diakonoff, *Развитие земельных отношений в Ассирии* (Ленинград: Издательство Ленинградского Государственного Ордена Ленина Университета им. А. А. Жданова, 1949) [English translation: Igor M. Diakonoff, “Agrarian Conditions in Middle Assyria,” trans. G.M. Sergheyev, in *Ancient Mesopotamia*, ed. Igor M. Diakonoff (Moscow: Nauka Publishing House, 1969), 204–34].

35 Igor Diakonoff, “The Rise of the Despotism in Ancient Mesopotamia,” trans. G.M. Sergheyev, in *Ancient Mesopotamia*, ed. Igor M. Diakonoff (Moscow: Nauka Publishing House, 1969), 173–203.

of the rural and the family community in the third and second millennia B.C., as distinct from temple (or royal) land,³⁶ to be the most important achievements of the post-war era. Diakonoff and like-minded scholars now had the opportunity to promulgate their views, many of which had been opposed by Struve.

1.3.2 Diakonoff: The “Two-Sector” Model

Diakonoff’s model, published in a ground-breaking article in 1968,³⁷ postulated an irreducible tension between a state-sponsored slave mode of production in the cities and a communalist mode of production in the countryside of the ancient Near East. Every Bronze Age state was a composite, distinguished by two features, specifically:

- 1.) co-existence of state property in land and other means of production, and of private property; that is, not unlimited private property but as allowed for the members of certain communal bodies ...
- 2.) employment of the free labour of the citizens-proprietors – alongside of the exploitation of persons devoid of property in means of production and made to work by direct extra-economic coercion.³⁸

The “state sector” in Diakonoff’s model shared its etiology with the first two points of Struve’s slave model, i.e., concentration of power in the hands of elites and enslavement through foreign conquest. It is in proposing the continued existence of a “private/communal” sector, evolved from the remnants of the primitive-communal mode of production from Near Eastern prehistory, that Diakonoff diverged from Struve. For Diakonoff, the king, instead of being a supremely powerful “Oriental despot” who might occasionally extend limited property rights to his slaves, was circumscribed in his power, and there were places in his country that the state did not reach. The majority of the population in most periods of the ancient Near East may have belonged to the communal sector. But, according to Diakonoff, in times of strong central authority “this class was constantly eroded by either upwards mobility or enslavement/dependency.”³⁹ The state sector expanded at the expense of the private/communal as wealthy villagers were absorbed into royal service as “king’s men” and the poorer villagers fell victim to debt-slavery or offering to serve as royal helots. The “king’s men” entered the state sector on better terms, enticed by land grants that allowed property and status in addition to their government allotment, while the royal helot received only the inducement of security while laboring under the king’s protection.

Throughout his work on the two-sector model Diakonoff was careful not to suggest that the socio-economic formation of the ancient Near East was unique. This would be too like the “Asiatic” mode of production (abbrev. AMP), a term mentioned by Marx in his personal notebooks (only recently published at the time of Diakonoff’s writing) but deemed ideologically unacceptable in Soviet academia.⁴⁰ Rather, Diakonoff borrowed

36 Diakonoff, “Editor’s Preface,” *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 12.

37 Diakonoff, “Structure of Near Eastern Society.”

38 Diakonoff, *op. cit.*, 90.

39 Diakonoff, *op. cit.*, 96.

40 Karl Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie (Rohentwurf). 1857–1858, Anhang 1850–1859*, ed. Marx-Engels-Lenin-Institut, Moskau (Moskau: Verlag für fremdsprachige Literatur, 1939–41).

the intellectual maneuver of Struve's "stagnation" theory, though with the change that the region was stuck between the primitive-communal and slave modes instead of the slave and feudal modes of production. In Diakonoff's model all slave-holding societies had gone through this period of incomplete transition, including the Classical world, with most societies eventually differentiating along an axis of private/communal versus state-sector dominance depending on the locus of slave exploitation. Earlier societies were less differentiated and clustered in the middle of the axis, so that:

[t]he Asiatic states of the 3rd and 2nd millennia B.C., especially the city-states, just because of their 'two-sector economy', belong[ed] to an early stage of a society type which, as it were, was intermediary between Sparta and Doric Crete on the one hand [i.e., state-sector dominant], and Athens, Corinth, Republican Rome, etc., on the other [i.e., private/communal sector dominant].⁴¹

In most of the ancient Near East, especially by the Iron Age, the growth of enslavement through conquest or domestic impoverishment had benefited the state. In the Classical world, which arose after the collapse of the statist societies of the Mediterranean Bronze Age, the private/communal sector, especially the wealthy citizens of the *polis*, became the primary exploiter of slaves.

The Hittites, even among the state-sector dominant ancient Near East, were by Diakonoff many times as one of the most state-oriented and hierarchical societies of their era, and appear his discussion of the "two-sector" model as an outlier. The reason for the strong state-sector orientation of the Hittite economy was a result of the history of the Hittites as a conquering people – a story familiar from the Western culture-historical model – whose state grew rapidly from the single city of Kaneš to controlling the entire Anatolian Plateau. Because the Neshite speakers who controlled the Hittite state were an ethnic minority within the Plateau, Diakonoff considered that "the conquering community constituted nearly in its entirety the governing group of the serving aristocracy of the Hittite kingdom – [...] the so-called 'lord[s] of (the community of) Hatti'."⁴² In Diakonovian terms, this means that the entirety of the original private/communal sector of Kaneš was recruited into the state sector as "king's men," who, due to ethnic difference and economic incentive readily undermined the communal ownership of property in the conquered villages. Thus, a state-dependent governing class, whose property rights were defended solely by the king and not by family or community ties, emerged among the Hittites with artificial rapidity when compared to the strong civic societies of Mesopotamia and Syria.⁴³

41 Diakonoff, "Structure of Near Eastern Society," 93–94. Diakonoff considers the *polis* of the Classical world to be another form of communalism, albeit with an increased scope for individualism as a result of "the decline of the hierarchic agnatic structures which were so typical of all early societies ..." and a strong Mediterranean world-market which encouraged export production (*ibid.* 93).

42 Diakonoff, *op. cit.*, 95. Typos emended.

43 Diakonoff, *loc. cit.*:

The base of riches of the Hittite aristocracy were either lands allotted from the royal fund on condition of service, or royal grants which had become private property of the grantees (or of their family communes). In the synchronous Assyria and Arrapha one can observe a process developing in the opposite direction, viz., the separation of an aristocracy from among that part of the citizens of the territorial community which had grown affluent through trade and especially through usurious operations, and then got hold also of the state offices.

The great tracts of conquered land gave the Hittite king a large land fund with which to reward his kith and kin. The abundance of land and relative poverty of labor led to two distinguishing features of the Hittite system. First, because of the need for physically occupying and pacifying the land outweighed the need for taxation, the land grants were often given without service obligations and thus became unconditional property of the grantee (something that was strongly resisted by kings to the south).⁴⁴ Second, the relative shortage of labor led to the furnishing of both royal and “private” estates with royal laborers captured in battle. From these two features a category of “*muškēnūtu* (helot) of a private person” emerged unique to the Hittite cultural sphere, so that by Diakonoff’s account,

[i]f we add that in the Hittite kingdom many noblemen were local royal deputies of different ranks, or even vassal kinglets, it will be clear that the land was covered, alongside the royal domains, by manifold estates which also constituted, as it were, royal economies on a small scale.⁴⁵

From this description, it is perhaps easy to forgive a non-Marxist scholar for having mistook Hittite society as feudal.

Despite the enormity of the Hittite state sector and the power of the state land fund, Diakonoff argued in a separate article against the claim that the Hittite king was the *de jure* proprietor of all the land within his kingdom.⁴⁶ His principle objection was that the monarch lacked the power to enforce such a claim. Even in the New Kingdom, when royal power seemed strongest, the king was limited by the religious strictures of cult and ritual and dependence on the servant-aristocracy and priesthood.⁴⁷ The economic situation was also tilted against centralization, as the king often received only indirect economic benefits from the land grants. He could grant income from the royal estates to servants, artisans, and priests, in return for service and gifts from his royal officials. But, in contrast to the *latifundia* of the Classical world worked by chattel slaves, Diakonoff argued that in the Hittite state economy,

gab es kein System der Bearbeitung des Landes durch Sklaventrupps, ja auch das Einkommen floß dem König, so muß man annehmen, nicht so sehr durch das Einsammeln der Ernte von den unmittelbar königlichen Domänen als vielmehr infolge der Einnahme der verschiedenen Steuern und Abgaben zu.⁴⁸

And so, despite the greater state-sector orientation of the Hittites, the state collected its revenue in much the same way as its ancient Near Eastern contemporaries through a distributed and diversified system of service and taxation.

In other words, Hittite officials became wealthy because they were connected to the government, while Syro-Mesopotamian became government officials if and when they were already wealthy.

44 Diakonoff, “Structure of Near Eastern Society,” 87–88.

45 Diakonoff, *op. cit.*, 88.

46 Igor M. Diakonoff, “Die hethitische Gesellschaft,” MIO 13/3 (1967): 313–66. This article was nominally a book review of Eduard Menabde, *Хеттское общество: экономика собственность, семья и наследование* (Тбилиси: Издат. Мецниереба, 1965).

47 Diakonoff, “Hethitische Gesellschaft,” 316. Moreover, as Diakonoff noted in “Structure of Near Eastern Society,” 15–16, if the king were the ultimate and perpetual proprietor of the land, he would not be able to grant land to his servants, an act which is well attested in the Hittite corpus.

48 Diakonoff, *op. cit.*, 339.

While Diakonoff stuck to his Marxist credentials by rejecting the feudal description of the ancient Near East, he did offer a conciliatory note in labeling the disagreement as a miscommunication rather than a misinterpretation of the evidence. He was willing to accept that although “one can often encounter the statement that while the Soviet scholars see in the Eastern antiquity a slave-holding society, the Western scholars see in it feudalism ... [t]his, however, is not quite correct.” Rather,

the Soviet scholars usually find in the Ancient Orient an economic structure of the *society* based on slavery, and Western scholars find that the Ancient Oriental society was in certain periods of its history characterized by a feudal structure of the *state*. Western historiography mostly puts the main stress on the problem of state power, ignoring its being conditioned by socio-economic relations. But it is well known that entirely different forms of state structure can evolve on the basis of one and the same socio-economic formation.⁴⁹

The distinction between socio-economic formation and state structure served Diakonoff's own ends as well. While acknowledging that some states could look more “feudal” than others, the hierarchy of status observed among the slaves of the ancient Near East does not vitiate a description of these societies as “slave-holding.” Just as quasi-capitalist merchant republics could exist in the feudal world of the Middle Ages, so too quasi-feudal federations could exist in the slave world of the Bronze Age. Indeed, according to Diakonoff:

[C]hattel slavery ... [is] just another sub-type of the exploitation of the ancient type, to which a very numerous class of persons was subject. Characteristic of this class as a whole was the absence of property in means of production and exploitation by extra-economic (non-market) coercion. To this class belonged the ‘dependent labourers of the helot type’, the ‘dependent labourers of the patriarchal slave’ and of the ‘chattel slave type’ and, generally, all kinds of ancient ‘slave-type’ dependent labourers.⁵⁰

Ancient Near East society was thus still describable as a “slave society” if, and only if, the term is broadened to include all forms of dependent labor, and if in analogy to “feudal society,” where not everyone is a lord or serf, the term slavery is only evocative and not definitive of every member of society.⁵¹

Diakonoff's work had a profound impact on the development of ancient Near Eastern studies in the following decades. A formulation of his model, though based mostly on research from the 1980's, even appeared as late as 1991 in Gregor Giorgadze's article on “The Hittite Kingdom” in *Early Antiquity*, an English language volume of Soviet scholarship edited by Diakonoff.⁵² Perhaps because of the global intellectual currents of the mid to late 20th century, a period of intense decolonization in Europe, the focus on “subaltern” classes and ethnicities found a very receptive audience in the West. The

49 Diakonoff, “Structure of Near Eastern Society,” 91.

50 Diakonoff, *op. cit.*, 99. Typos emended.

51 Diakonoff, *op. cit.*, 100.

52 Gregor Giorgadze, “The Hittite Kingdom,” in *Early Antiquity*, ed. Igor M. Diakonoff (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 266–85. Giorgadze is mostly summarizing, providing a brief narrative and social history of Hittites, with comments about social structure. Interestingly, Diakonoff intervened with extensive commentary in editorial notes (authoring fourteen out of the twenty-two total footnotes). The editor's preface to *Early Antiquity*, pp. 6–13, provides a good history of the discussion of the Asiatic Mode of Production in the 20th century.

ready-made program of research implied by Diakonoff's model also helped the uptake, as the relationship and relative strengths of the two sectors in a given society was an attractive target for typologization.

1.4 Western Reaction

The initial response in the West to Soviet criticism of the feudal designation for the Hittites was mixed. Some Western scholars celebrated confirmation of their preexisting suspicions of Hittite feudalism. Richard Haase had critiqued Hittite feudalism from a socio-legal standpoint already around the same time of publication of Diakonoff's "Die hethitische Gesellschaft." Haase, who was a lawyer by trade, specifically the *Amtsgerichtsdirektor* for the city of Leonberg in Baden-Württemberg, made his Hittitological career publishing a number of articles on the Hittite Laws. His initial work was very much part of the proliferation of philological studies on the Hittite Laws undertaken by the Western scholars in the postwar period. But in 1968 he incorporated Soviet and Western theory in an analysis of "Herrscher und Beherrschte im Hatti-Reich."⁵³ The results, which he read against François-Louis Ganshof's work on feudalism in Medieval Europe,⁵⁴ ultimately led him to argue against a feudal designation of the Hittite state.

In "Herrscher und Beherrschte," Haase blended a Western and Soviet bibliography and often sided with the analysis of the latter. The first half of his article consisted of a schematization of Hittite society by social class. He accepted the existence of state slavery at the bottom of society in the form of the ^{LÚ}*hippara-*, but argued, contra Gurney, that slaves owning a small amount of property were not semi-free "muškênu" serfs, as their master still held the power of life and death over them.⁵⁵ The true "muškênu" were rather drawn from the middle ranks of society, in the form of the ^{LÚ}*NAM.RA* captives and possibly the ^{LÚ}*GIS**TUKUL* craftsmen, and these were the groups living most nearly to the *glebae adscripti* serfs of the Western sense. At the top of society were the members of the *panku-*, whom Haase described in the Soviet tradition as the remnants of a family originated assembly, and not the "cream of society" as Goetze calls them. While not explicitly claiming an Indo-European origin for the group,

53 Richard Haase, "Herrscher und Beherrschte im Hatti-Reich," *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin* 23 (1968): 87–100. Given the frequent citation of Eduard Menabde on Hittite slavery (but no later than 1963), the article seems to have been composed prior to Diakonoff's work.

54 François-Louis Ganshof, *Qu'est-ce que féodalité?*, 3^e ed. rev. et augm. (Bruxelles: Office de publicité, 1957). Haase cites the corresponding German edition, François-Louis Ganshof, *Was ist das Lehnwesen?* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961).

55 Haase, "Herrscher und Beherrschte," 90; contra Gurney, *The Hittites*, 72. Haase sidestepped the philological question of the *MUŠKĒNU* in the Hittite context, noting only that they are connected with the palace and mostly restricted to cadastral lists (Haase, "Herrscher und Beherrschte," 87). He deferred to Vladimír Souček, ("Randnotizen zu den hethitischen Feldertexte," *MIO* 8 [1963]: 368–82), who considered the Hittite Laws as lacking the three-fold terminological distinction between *awilum*, *muškēnum*, *wardum* (free, dependent, slave) found in Hammurabi's code. Rather, in Hittite texts, the term *MUŠKĒNU* generally means "poor" (although certain examples, such as *MUŠKĒNU* "of the Palace," and *MUŠKĒNU* appearing as providers of last resort for festivals, are enigmatic in this definition).

Haase drew parallels between the balance of power between the *panku*- and the Hittite king and the Germanic practice of elective kingship. The *tawananna*- was accepted as a vestige of Hattian matriarchy.⁵⁶

The most enduring contribution of Haase's article was to remove *šahḫan*, a service obligation translatable by the archaic English term 'socage' that applied almost universally to members of Hittite society, from the discussion of feudalism in the Hittite state. His principal objection was that *šahḫan* lacked military connotations, unlike for example the similar service arrangements of Medieval Europe and Hammurabi's Babylon. Instead, *šahḫan* was a "service-tax for land tenure," i.e., a form of rent in a non-market economy based on agriculture. If *šahḫan* was not linked to military service, then the largest piece of evidence for Hittite feudal society was removed, and with it would leave the attendant sociological and juridical structures of feudalism, such as a specialized warrior-caste, extreme fragmentation of authority, and a hierarchy of titles.⁵⁷ Haase did accept, while advocating for further research, that feudalism could be found at the apex of the Hittite state, between the Hittite king and government "dignitaries" (L^UDUGUD) and foreign vassals, but these relations were in no way the organizing principle of Hittite society.⁵⁸

Haase was for the most part vindicated by subsequent scholarship, but other Western scholars reacted to Diakonoff's work by doubling down on the feudalism label. Friedrich Cornelius in 1972 wrote a short article entitled "Das Hethiterreich als Feudalstaat," probably aimed as a rebuttal to Haase (though without citing him or any other anti-feudal authors!), which argued that the parallels between the Hittite state and Medieval Europe were too numerous to warrant any other designation ("das Hethiterreich gleicht in allen Zügen, die wir feststellen können, dem mittelalterlichen Feudalstaat.").⁵⁹ Crucially, Cornelius considered feudalism to rest not on "economic matters," but rather the institution of equestrian military service common to both

56 Haase, "Herrscher und Beherrschte," 98–99.

57 Haase, *op. cit.*, 94–95, citing François-Louis Ganshof, *Was ist das Lehnwesen?*, 13–14. The exact citation is as follows:

'Lehen' bedeutet im Mittelalter: (a) soziologisch 'stark ausgeprägte Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse zwischen den einzelnen, eine *spezialisierte Kriegerkaste*, äußerste Zerstückelung der Eigentumsrechte, eine aus dieser Zerstückelung hervorgegangene Hierarchie der Grundbesitzrechte, die der ebengenannten Hierarchie der persönlichen Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse entspricht; dann eine Aufspaltung der öffentlichen Gewalt, aus der in jedem Lande eine Hierarchie autonomer Instanzen hervorgeht, die in eigenem Interesse jene Gewalten ausübt, die normalerweise dem Staat zugeordnet sind und oft aus dem Machtbereich des Staates einer vorangegangenen Zeit stammen', (b) juristisch 'eine Gesamtheit von Institutionen ..., die zwischen einem Freien, genannt 'Vasall' (*vassal*), und einem anderen Freien, genannt 'Herr' (*seigneur*), Verbindlichkeiten zweifacher Art schaffen und regeln: der 'Vassal' ist dem 'Herrn' gegenüber zu Gehorsam und Dienst – *vor allem zum Waffendienst* – verpflichtet und der 'Herr' dem 'Vassal' gegenüber zur Gewährung von Schutz und Unterhalt.

58 Haase, *op. cit.*, 95.

59 Friedrich Cornelius, "Das Hethiterreich als Feudalstaat," in *Gesellschaftsklassen im Alten Zweistromland und in den angrenzenden Gebieten; XVIII. Rencontre assyriologique internationale, München, 29. Juni bis 3. Juli 1970*, ed. Dietz O. Edzard (München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1972), 33.

periods of history. The lords of Ḫatti were defined as those who had the means to own and train a warhorse, and were lords because they were professional soldiers, and not vice versa. The reliance on skilled horsemen, and the resulting social status of “knights,” explained the similarities of the Hittites and Medieval European states. In fact, Cornelius considered that the only major difference was the absence, and even prohibition, of subinfeudation, i.e., the unsupervised creation of lower-ranked vassals, in the Hittite state.⁶⁰ However, most later Western scholars, if they accepted feudalism at all, gravitated towards Haase’s thesis of a “shallow feudalism” affecting only the highest reaches of Hittite society.

1.5 The Italian School

Diakonoff’s challenge to the Western culture-historical model was taken up most fully in Italy, where in the 1970’s and 80’s a number of scholars undertook an immensely productive project of explaining ancient Near East society in neo-Marxist terms. The Italian scholars, perhaps because they were free to work outside the Stalinist orthodoxy, took Diakonoff’s work to its logical conclusion and embraced the Asiatic Mode of Production as a description for the societies of the ancient Near East.

The Italian School began with the two-sector premise of co-existing palatial and communal modes of production. Unconstrained by rigid historical materialism, the Italians mooted the question of slavery that wracked Soviet literature and simply accepted the gradations of dependency as a sociological fact of the region. They shifted the research questions instead to the interaction of the two sectors, how they were integrated, and the specialization of production between them, on which there was a spectrum of results. One side, led by Mario Liverani, a specialist on Syria and pioneering literary critic of ancient Near Eastern sources, emphasized the strong political and productive divide between the palace and communal sectors. The other side, led by Nuzi specialist and historian Carlo Zaccagnini, focused on the parasitic dependency of the palace sector on the communal sector.⁶¹ The work of Liverani, Zaccagnini, and their many collaborators framed the discussion of ancient Near Eastern and Hittite history well into the 1990’s and even today.

1.5.1 Liverani: A Strongly Dichotomous Two-Sector Model

Mario Liverani wrote for the first time on the “Two-Sector” model in 1975, using it to describe the relationship between village and palace in Late Bronze Age Syria.⁶²

60 Cornelius, “Das Hethiterreich als Feudalstaat,” 34.

61 Prior to his work on the Asiatic Mode of Production, Zaccagnini was probably best known for his study of gift exchange, one of the primary drivers of the palatial economy in the Ancient Near East: see Carlo Zaccagnini, *Lo scambio dei doni nel Vicino Oriente durante i secoli XV–XIII*. *OrAntColl.* 11 (Rome: Centro per le antichità e la storia dell’arte del Vicino Oriente, 1973).

62 Mario Liverani, “Communautés de village et palais royal dans la Syrie du II^e millénaire,” *JESHO* 18 (1975): 146–64. For a succinct English summary of his model, see Mario Liverani, “Economic and Socio-

Lieverani's interest in Soviet historical materialism can be traced back to at least 1969, when he edited a volume on Syria with a contribution from Michael Heltzer, and to a review of an edited volume of Diakonoff's on Mesopotamian history.⁶³ In his own first article on the topic, Liverani used Diakonoff's model to explain the erosion of the communal sector in Syria, but with a refined description of the role of land grants in the process.

According to Liverani, it was the innovation of heritable land grants – and not just the skimming off of the talented or ambitious villagers and enslavement of the poor – that undermined village communalism by creating social stratification.⁶⁴ In essence, the introduction of non-communal private property corrupted a system of inheritance ill-equipped to handle it. The transformation was for the most part unintentional: land grants were initially not heritable, but social pressure and human nature pushed the recipients to make them so, often against the wishes of the palace. The traditional Syrian practice was for divided inheritance, where each child received more or less equitable shares and the property stayed within the village community. However, the conditions of land grants were often indivisible, linked to a specific service or profession required by the palace. Parents now had to pick and choose among their children who would inherit the grant, oftentimes based on ability. Sometimes the eldest son was not the best suited to his father's profession, and other times a son-in-law was adopted if the grantee only had daughters. In extreme cases, the grantee could attempt to sell his office through an adoption of convenience. Over time, the effect of undivided inheritance and notions of private property was to sort the communal sector into “winners” and “losers,” transforming the village, as Liverani argued, “d'une communauté organique de travail à un endroit où chacun poursuit sa propre politique d'affirmation personnelle.”⁶⁵ The palace benefited from the changing social structure in that it sapped the independence of the villages and colonized the communities with loyal servants. The outcome of communal erosion was the same Struvean rebellion, leading to the final collapse of the two-sector structure into the single mode of production of generalized slavery.⁶⁶ Though Liverani did not explicitly explore the topic, it can be deduced that the same general process should have occurred in the other societies of the ancient Near East.

In the same article Liverani also argued for a strongly dichotomous Two-Sector Model, when he parsed the division of production between the palace and communal sectors in terms of an urban revolution, writing that

Au point de vue de la réparation du travail, il est bien connu que dans les villages la population 'libre' se consacre presque exclusivement à la production primaire de nourriture (agriculture et

Political Developments,” in *History of Humanity, Volume II, From the Third Millennium to the Seventh Century B.C.*, eds. Ahmed H. Dani, Jean-Pierre Mohen (New York: Routledge, 1996), 130–36.

63 Michael Heltzer, “Problems of Social History,” in *Syria nel tardo bronzo*, ed. Mario Liverani (Roma: Ipocan, 1969), 31–46. Mario Liverani, “Review of Igor Diakonoff, *Ancient Mesopotamia: Socio-Economic History (Moscow, 1969)*,” *OrAnt.* 11 (1972): 226–29.

64 Liverani, “Communautés de village,” 157–59.

65 Liverani, *op. cit.*, 158.

66 Liverani, *op. cit.*, 162–63

élevage); tandis que le travail de transformation (artisanat) et d'échange (commerce) est concentré dans le secteur palatin, avec les "services" de nature culturelle, militaire, d'administration et d'organisation de la production. On peut dire – pour simplifier – que les communautés de village n'ont pas participé à la 'révolution urbaine' en ce qui concerne leur structure interne (réparation spécialiste du travail), mais qu'elles l'ont seulement subie, car le palais prélève le surplus des villages pour entretenir ses spécialistes.⁶⁷

Liverani's language is striking, even if he does qualify the description as a simplification ("pour simplifier"), and later acknowledged in an article from 1978 that, despite the human and spatial continuities between Neolithic and Bronze Age villages, the socio-economic trajectory of a community is not always linear and village life not necessarily fossilized. Nevertheless, he argued in the same article that villages in the Bronze Age Near East were marked by undiversified economies, dependence, and technological stagnation, and completely subjected to the palatine cities, compelling him to use a biological metaphor to describe the villages as "cellule produttive subalterne del sistema socio-economico complesso centrato sul palazzo."⁶⁸

1.5.2 Zaccagnini: The Neo-"Asiatic Mode of Production" Model

In 1981, Carlo Zaccagnini penned a large article which attempted to synthesize the Western Marxist discussion of the Asiatic Mode of Production.⁶⁹ The article was aimed at two different audiences. To non-theoretical orientalists, or those who might be less informed about Marxist and socio-economic methodologies in general, Zaccagnini offered an intellectual history of the Asiatic Mode of Production that is still an extremely useful discussion for anyone wishing to know more about the historiography of the period. For this audience Zaccagnini also provided analysis of land grant use in the major Bronze Age states in the second half of the article. For the Marxist historian,

67 Liverani, "Communautés de village," 148.

68 Mario Liverani, "Sulle tracce delle comunità rurali. In margine ai lavori della Société J. Bodin," *OrAnt.* 17 (1978): 71.

Ed essendo la città palatina dell'antico Oriente la sede del potere politico, il rapporto di contrapposizione è un rapporto di subordinazione della comunità rurale e di inserimento di essa quale cellula di un organismo più vasto, unificato dalla città palatina. Il primo tratto strutturale della comunità rurale è dunque il suo carattere subalterno. Il secondo tratto strutturale è il persistere nelle comunità rurali di un modo di produzione non basato sulla differenziazione specialistica delle attività lavorative, che invece caratterizza le unità produttive proprie del palazzo anche quando si dedichino alla stessa produzione di cibo cui si dedicano le comunità rurali. Le comunità rurali sono cioè unità produttive internamente indifferenziate che si situano però quali unità costitutive di un processo produttivo differenziato, controllato dal palazzo. Al tratto dell'indifferenziazione produttiva se ne connettono strettamente altri: il ristagno tecnologico, l'ideale della sussistenza (e non dell'accumulo come a palazzo), l'autosufficienza (con un livello di scambi estremamente ridotto), e così via. Tutto può confluire nella definizione delle comunità rurali come cellule produttive subalterne del sistema socio-economico complesso centrato sul palazzo.

69 Carlo Zaccagnini, "Asiatic Mode of Production and Ancient Near East, Notes Towards a Discussion," in *Production and Consumption in the Ancient Near East*, ed. Carlo Zaccagnini (Budapest: Chaire d'Égyptologie de l'Université Eötvös Loránd de Budapest, 1989), 1–126 (translation of Carlo Zaccagnini, "Modo di produzione asiatico e Vicino Oriente antico. Appunti per una discussione," *Dialoghi di archeologia*, NS 3/3 (1981): 3–65).

who reflexively rejected the Asiatic Mode of Production because of the after-effects of Stalinist orthodoxy, he attempted to fashion a new version of the model that was consistent with the theoretical framework, if not the exact contents, of the canonical Marxist texts. For convenience, Zaccagnini's model will be designated here as the "neo-AMP" to distinguish it from Marx's aborted "(paleo-)AMP."⁷⁰

Zaccagnini found much inspiration in Liverani's work: after a thorough evaluation of recent Marxist literature, he chose Liverani's interpretation of the Two-Sector Model as the basis for his own reformulation of the Asiatic Mode of Production (Zaccagnini's choice to extensively study the land grants is direct evidence of his debt to the former). But unlike Liverani's "strong" version, the key feature of the model for Zaccagnini was the *relationship*, not the division, between the sectors. He argued that

the functional nexus that binds the village m.o.p. to the palatial m.o.p. in such a way that the 'combination' of the two m.o.p.s figures forth one mode of production, the asiatic mode [I]t is just this 'dominance' (in Liverani's meaning) of the palatial m.o.p. – which represents an evolution of the village m.o.p. – and the functionality of the relation that binds it to the 'subaltern' m.o.p. (the village one), that brings out the structural features of an asiatic form.⁷¹

The "superordinate" relationship of a palace sector directly over a village sector ("village+palace" in Zaccagnini's notation), with no intervening levels, was the *sine qua non* of the Asiatic economic formation. Formations not based on this dominance, the recognition of which Zaccagnini credits to Liverani, are not "Asiatic"; so too, economic formations lacking a communal/village element (thus "slave latifundia+palace" or "feudal estates+palace" would not qualify).⁷² Turning to Marx's original texts, Zaccagnini recovers the following features of the Asiatic Mode of Production:

- 1.) Common ownership of the land, based on the villages. The individual, as member of the community, is only a possessor (1st level of mediation).
- 2.) In its turn, the presupposition for (communal) ownership of the land is the superior authority (the "despot," the State), which claims to be the unique and higher owner of all the land (2nd level of mediation).
- 3.) The superior unit demands and receives a surplus quota of the product and of the work of the community in the form of tribute and *corvée*.⁷³

Thus far Liverani and Zaccagnini agreed. But in the next two points, on the economic disposition of the villages, their models diverged to an extent that has not been sufficiently recognized:

- 4.) The individual productive units (= the village system). This characteristic seems, for Marx, to apply not only to individual village communities ... but to the Asiatic system as a whole, that is to say, to the combination: city + country: ... [in which] 'the unification of manufacture and agriculture, of city (village) and country' is emphasized. This statement probably refers to a higher level of historiographic abstraction, [because] in reality it is only the second term in the equation that has the decisive role in the process of production and transformation (manufacturing) of the primary product, and the superior unit defines itself – apart from its 'fiscal'

⁷⁰ Zaccagnini, "Asiatic Mode of Production," 6–14.

⁷¹ Zaccagnini, *op. cit.*, 22.

⁷² Zaccagnini, *loc. cit.*

⁷³ Zaccagnini, *op. cit.*, 26. Formatting changed.

activity – by its responsibility for the celebratory and the ostentatious (pyramids, etc.) achievements.

- 5.) Undifferentiated unity of the city and the country: the city does not exist (or exists as a superfetation),⁷⁴ or it identifies itself with the villages.⁷⁵

The last two points minimize the economic impact of the urban/rural dichotomy by locating all productive power within the village. The results of the “urban revolution” – economic specialization, industry, social hierarchy – that Liverani ascribed to the palatine cities are in Zaccagnini’s model diffused into the countryside, reducing the palatine city to a locus of expenditure in the form of royal monuments and propaganda.

The main implication of Zaccagnini’s “neo-AMP” model is to make the control of villages by the palatial sector even more important. Instead of being benighted, agricultural backwaters serving only to power the urban sector, they become the fundamental units of production for ancient states. Thus, when Zaccagnini finished his article with a thirty-page excursus on land grants and the transfer of villages in the ancient Near East, it was more than just homage to Liverani; it was in fact the axis of his own project aimed at showing how the palace sector managed economic units that were in many ways greater than themselves. The results of the project were ambiguous in the Hittite case. On the one hand, Zaccagnini concluded from the *Landschenkungsurkunde* of Kuwatalla and the Šahurunuwa grant discussed in the article that the Hittite king could transfer full ownership of villages and households, even those not already belonging to the palace, to individuals or institutions. In comparative terms this is a remarkable level of power for any monarch to wield in the ancient Near East. It also speaks to the relative weakness of the Hittite nobility, further undermining the feudal thesis of Hittite society. On the other hand, because the king would sometimes compensate the land-stripped third party with grants of palace land, the king’s justification for transferring property lay, according to Zaccagnini, not “in some supposed ‘eminent right’ of the sovereign over all landed-property, but rather in a *de facto* power of widespread intervention even where the property is that of third parties ...”⁷⁶ Of course, *de facto* power changes with the facts. The king’s power was naturally limited by the

74 The unusual term “superfetation” (*Superfötation*), meaning here a useless outgrowth or artifice, comes from a passage at the very end of Notebook IV of Marx’s *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie (Rohentwurf)*, where Marx refers to the indifferent unity of town and country in Asiatic cities, which tend to have the function of “royal camps.”

75 Zaccagnini, “Asiatic Mode of Production,” 26–27. Formatting changed.

76 Zaccagnini, *op. cit.*, 86. See further Gregor Giorgadze, “Zum Kauf und Verkauf von Grund und Boden in der hethitischen Gesellschaft,” *AoF* 25 (1998): 57:

In der hethitischen Gesellschaft bestand kein umfassendes und ausschließliches Eigentum des Staates am gesamten Land, weil in einem Staat, der seiner Bevölkerung als Gegenleistung für den Besitz von Land bestimmte Pflichten auferlegte, Bedingungen für die Entstehung eines nichtstaatlichen, privaten Eigentums geschaffen wurden. Die Quellen für die Entstehung von Privateigentum an Land waren folgende: königliche Landschenkungen, besonders solche mit Immunität; Aufteilung von Wirtschaften, wenn sich ein Teil des nicht mit Verpflichtungen verbundenen staatlichen Landes bei einer Privatperson mit Verfügungsrecht befand; Kauf und Verkauf des Landes unter der Bedingung, dass die Erfüllung der staatlichen Verpflichtungen auf den Käufer übergeht. In diesen Fällen gab der Staat sein Recht auf das Eigentum am Land auf, das nach dem Verkauf in das Eigentum einer Privatperson übergehen mußte.

opportunity for later kings to overturn the arrangements of their predecessors; though, as seen in the Šaḫurunuwa donation, the king could try to prevent this by writing clauses explicitly prohibiting revocation by future kings. It also is worth recalling here Ḫattušili III’s perhaps hyperbolic claim to have accepted being stripped of every title but his last. It is remarkable that this supposedly happened even under a very weak king dealing with an exceptionally strong vassal, but in this case the king, Urḫi-Teššub, overestimated his strength and lost his throne to rebellion.

1.6 Neo-Marxism and the “New Humanities”

The other implication of the Zaccagnini’s neo-AMP Model is to cause the historian to take more seriously the monuments and propaganda, which far from being secondary products of government become the prime industry of the palatial sector. Zaccagnini did not explore the production of monuments in the scope of his article, perhaps out of a Marxist habit of mind to consider these “superfetations” of the city as less important than the material products of the village. However, the intellectual trends of the period were against Zaccagnini as more emphasis came to be placed on the “New Humanities,” a set of intellectual approaches which arose out of the neo-Marxist embrace of culture.

In an introduction to a collection of essays on the ancient economy (including one on the ancient Near East by Liverani), the Classicists Ian Morris and Joseph Manning explained the concept of “New Humanities” as arising from the struggles of Marxist intellectuals in the 1950’s to 1970’s to escape the purely economic determinism of orthodox Marxism, which lead them to embrace diverse philosophies such as “existentialism, psychoanalysis, structuralism, poststructuralism, and feminism”; as a result,

Rather than seeing culture as an epiphenomenon, legitimating the economic infrastructure and institutional structure, some Marxist humanists argued that these structures were culturally constituted ... [These] new humanists pay great attention to economics but generally argue that economic categories are culturally constructed as merely one dimension of the creation of a new set of subjectivities, narratives, and gender relations.⁷⁷

While no Hittitologist advanced so bold an argument for the economy (though Mario Liverani came closest in certain literary analyses of ancient sources),⁷⁸ the field could not help but be influenced by emerging new humanistic studies.⁷⁹ A year after the

77 Ian Morris and Joseph G. Manning, “Introduction,” in *The Ancient Economy: Evidence and Models*, eds. Joseph G. Manning, Ian Morris (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005), 28.

78 The most important in the Hittite context are Mario Liverani, “Storiografia politica hittita – I. Šunaššura, ovvero: della reciprocità,” *OrAnt.* 12 (1973): 267–97, and Liverani, “Storiografia politica hittita – II. Telipinu, ovvero: della solidarietà,” *OrAnt.* 16 (1977): 105–31. Liverani outlined his methodology in Mario Liverani, “Memorandum on the approach to historiographic texts,” *Or.* 42 (1973): 178–94.

79 To the great lament of Itamar Singer, who railed against the corrupting influence of Liverani’s approach (variously described as “pessimistic,” “hyper-critical,” and, most damningly, “postmodern”). Against the proponents of Liverani’s “semiological revolution,” who claimed it had not received the attention it deserved, Singer argued its outsized impact on the field:

appearance of Zaccagnini's neo-AMP model, Fiorella Imparati wrote an article pleading for the expansion of historical research to consider also the cultural products of the Hittite state. In it she gave a description of the erosion of the communal sector and village life in Hittite Anatolia that is in practice almost identical to Liverani's account for Syria, but with the caveat that the loss of village autonomy was not uniform but disproportionately greater in the political and economic spheres.⁸⁰ Because a purely economic typology of Hittite society would fail to capture the continued independence of law and religion in the communities, she argued for increased attention to the cultural side of Hittite history, or as she phrased it: "des ainsi-dites 'super-structures' (religieuses, juridiques, idéologiques, linguistiques, etc.), qui exerçaient une fonction très considérable dans les sociétés à économie pré-capitaliste."⁸¹ This decidedly new humanistic approach risks stretching the definition of Marxism so as to become unrecognizable (indeed, a page later she went so far as to suggest that different periods of

My own impression is that Liverani's influence on ancient Near Eastern studies has been far more decisive than it may appear on the face of it. As noted by the renowned French historian Marc Bloch, co-founder of the Annales School, 'for a philosophy to impregnate an entire age, it is not necessary that it should act precisely in accordance with a prescribed formula nor that the majority of minds should come under its influence except by a sort of osmosis of which they are often only half aware.'

(Itamar Singer, "Between Scepticism and Credulity: In Defence of Hittite Historiography," in *Diversity and Standardization: Perspectives on Social and Political Norms in the Ancient Near East*, eds. Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum, Jörg Klinger, Gerfrid G.W. Müller [Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2013], 178).

As of 1973, Liverani was not poststructuralist. His focus was: "the text as source of knowledge of its author, and not {or previously to being} source of knowledge of narrated events" (p. 198). The post-structuralist criticism would be that the text is not even a source of knowledge of its author, but can only be interpreted as an object in and of itself; that the difficulties experienced in recovering narrated events from the text are the same as recovering knowledge of the author – i.e., both impossible. The tendency of structuralism to lead to poststructuralism, and from there to "a conspicuous transformation in scholarly focus, namely a decreasing interest in political history and a rush towards other historical sub-disciplines, such as socio-economic, cultural and intellectual histories," (Singer, "Between Scepticism and Credulity," 179) was the thrust of Singer's criticism of Liverani. Others, such as Gary Beckman ("The Limits of Credulity," *JAOS* 125 (2005): 343–52), riposted that traditional scholars (cf. William Hallo, "The Limits of Skepticism," *JAOS* 110 (1990): 187–99) ignore the internal structure of the text.

- 80 Fiorella Imparati, "Aspects de l'organisation de l'État Hittite dans les documents juridiques et administratifs," *JESHO* 25 (1982): 260–61:

Il me semble donc qu'on puisse conclure en remarquant que, avec le temps, le secteur communautaire tendait de plus en plus à être subordonné au pouvoir central. Et même si certaines compétences continuaient à être attribuées à ce secteur et à ses représentants, les Anciens et l'inspecteur de ville ou de village, cela semble avoir eu lieu surtout pour les institutions liées à certaines traditions, comme les institutions juridiques et religieuses. Mais tout ce qui concernait le secteur politique et économique était contrôlé par la vaste organisation bureaucratique du Palais.

Compare also Imparati, "Die Organisation des hethitischen Staates," in *Geschichte des Hethitischen Reiches*, by Horst Klengel, contribs. Fiorella Imparati, Volkert Haas, Theo van den Hout. HdO 1/34 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 320–87, which contains the most mature version of Imparati's AMP-influenced model of the Hittite state.

- 81 Imparati, "Aspects de l'organisation," 263.

Hittite society could have different Modes of Production, a proposition that is categorically impossible in orthodox Marxism),⁸² but looking ahead to Hittitological research in the 1990's and 2000's, the renewed appreciation for culture was useful in explaining the monumental yet under-inhabited urban plan of Ḫattuša, or the recognition of the importance of religious institutions to the state economy.

In retrospect, the main contribution of Italian Neo-Marxism to the discussion of Hittite and Near Eastern history was to create testable hypotheses for the archaeological and textual data of the different cultures and periods of the region (cf. the second half of Zaccagnini, "Asiatic Mode of Production," 56–58, on the transfer of villages in the ancient Near East). The political subordination of village to city, for example, while unremarkable given the natural tendency to centralize power in human government, becomes a productive statement when it makes specific claims of where certain economic activities took place, i.e., agrarian villages and industrial cities for Liverani, versus diversified villages and monumental cities for Zaccagnini. Comparing such claims to the much less testable hypothesis of Orientalization in the culture-historical model demonstrates the welcome scientific rigor brought to the study of Hittite history by the neo-Marxists. The results of their approach can and should be contested, but the questions and method are still useful to modern attempts to model the Hittite state.

1.7 New Western Consensus

The new Western consensus on the Hittite state emerged as an adaptation to the Marxist critiques of the 1970's. Its earliest stages were prefigured by Richard Haase's article on feudalism; that is to say, scholars were willing to entertain (neo-)Marxist ideas without adopting the theoretical apparatus itself. However, the rapprochement between East and West quickly faded as the study of religion, a topic famously ill-suited to historical materialist explanation, grew in importance for modeling the Hittite state. A slew of articles published in the 1980's began the immense and still ongoing task of untangling the Hittite religious-administrative corpus. By the mid-1980's Western scholars achieved the framework of a consensus that remains stable into the 21st century: a paradigm firmly rooted in a centralized temple and palatial infrastructure, but with a growing awareness of regional difference and impact of the Anatolian environment on the Hittite government (the implications of which will be discussed in Sections 2.2 *The Hittites and Their Environment* and 2.3 *Political Integration on the Anatolian Plateau*).

1.7.1 The End of Hittite Feudalism as a Theoretical Model

At the same time as Liverani and Zaccagnini were drawing attention to the differences between palaces and villages in the ancient Near East, the Italian Hittitologist Alfonso Archi was attempting to put Hittite society back together amidst the disintegration of feudalism as a useful model. His major insight was to focus research on the palatial

82 Imparati, "Aspects de l'organisation," 264.

(and later temple) infrastructure as the premier site of integration for the Hittite state. When he began modeling the Hittite state in a pair of articles from 1973, two years before the publication of Liverani's study on two-sector Syria, the question of Hittite feudalism was still alive and well. Haase's debunking (1968) and Cornelius' defense (1972) were still recent, and it remained to be seen which direction the new generation of Hittitologists would go with the controversy. Archi for his part rejected the feudal label from the standpoint of Diakonoff's Two-Sector Model, but used the intellectual space created by feudalism's demise to craft his own alternative interpretation of the Hittite state.

Archi was perhaps the first Western Hittitologist to positively cite Diakonoff's Two-Sector Model, when he used it to side with the anti-feudalists in his 1973 article on "Bureaucratie et communautés d'hommes libres dans le système économique hittite."⁸³ At this time Archi was in general agreement with Diakonoff's assessment of the nature of power in the Hittite state; that is, observing a two-sector division in Hittite society while acknowledging a much more limited economic role for the Hittite state sector than its Mesopotamian contemporaries. In practical terms this meant that while the Hittite palace had the usual responsibilities for defense, religion, justice, and basic infrastructure, it lacked the decisive control over the means of production needed to create the grand public works observed to the south. Anatolian villages, like their counterparts everywhere in the ancient Near East, were essentially economically self-sufficient; however Archi argued that in contrast to other societies they had a relatively open membership, being composed of essentially anyone who could afford land. The Hittite Laws recorded that landowners, state tenants, and even deportee "serfs" could freely buy and sell land so long as the general service-tax on land was paid, and there was thus very little evidence for the persistence of communal ownership in Hittite Anatolia.⁸⁴ Though the Hittite palace lacked decisive economic control, it paradoxically may have had a broader base of interaction with the village sector than its Mesopotamian and Syrian counterparts. Land grants, often with attendant serfs, were the primary currency of the Hittite state, and were used for everything from the maintenance of temples, the salary of state officials large and small, and even purchasing services from craftsmen. Archi agreed with Haase's earlier argument that the land grants were no evidence for a feudal relationship, because the beneficiaries enjoyed the use of the land only as result of their continuing participation in the state bureaucracy. But he improved the argument with respect to Diakonoff's Two-Sector Model by claiming that the serf-like condition of the deportees was an anomaly in Hittite society, and arose only in the specific moment in Hittite history when the kingdom was consolidating its conquests into empire. For Archi, Hittite serfdom was only a phenomenon that "vint s'insérer dans une situation essentiellement 'asiatique', puisque, à la base du système, il y a contraste entre les communautés et la bureaucratie."⁸⁵ This sentence marks the high point of Archi's commitment to (neo-)Marxist theory, which he seems

83 Alfonso Archi, "Bureaucratie et communautés d'hommes libres dans le système économique hittite," in *Festschrift Heinrich Otten*, eds. Erich Neu, Christel Rüster (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1973), 17–24.

84 Archi, "Bureaucratie et communautés," 18–22.

85 Archi, *op. cit.*, 21–22.

to tacitly abandon after the late 1970's, but the general conclusion of a Hittite society defined by a broad, direct interface between palace and community remains remarkably durable.

Archi returned to the topic of feudalism in 1977 with the publication of "Il 'feudalismo' ittita," an article which more than any other can be credited with permanently ending the debate on the term in Hittite society. Living up to the categorical promise of its title, the work began with a deep Soviet and Western bibliography of the use (and misuse) of the feudal designation in studies of the Hittite and ancient world.⁸⁶ Archi's method of attacking the label was the same as Haase's ten years earlier, namely stripping the "benefices" normally cited as evidence of their feudal characteristics ("La concessione di tali benefici è un tratto comune a molti stati antichi e dell'Oriente medievale, e non costituisce di per sé un elemento feudale ...").⁸⁷ Archi expanded the philological foundations for rejection by showing that the service obligations of the LÚ^{MES} G^{IS}TUKUL and LÚ^{MES} ILKI, and not just *šahhan*, must be disqualified from feudal evidence.⁸⁸ Previously, the LÚ^{MES} G^{IS}TUKUL (lit. 'men of the weapon/tool'⁸⁹) were mostly thought of as "free men," i.e., those entitled to bear arms, and the LÚ^{MES} ILKI (lit. 'men of the soke') as the palace dependents. A sharp distinction between these two groups had been assumed by both the feudal and two-sector models of the Hittite state: the former because it postulated a class of armigerous freemen in voluntary service to the state, and the latter because it needed contrasting groups of autonomous villagers and palace dependents. Archi showed that in practice the distinction between TUKUL-men and ILKU-men was not exact: rather, both groups held land tenure agreements that could be freely bought and sold, with the distinction being that TUKUL-tenure was on land that belonged to a village, and ILKU-tenure on land belonging to the palace. Holders of TUKUL obligations were taxed indirectly under the system of *luzzi* 'corvée', which was the

86 Alfonso Archi, "Il 'feudalismo' ittita," *SMEA* 18 (1977): 7–18.

87 Archi, "Feudalismo," 16. Archi seems to have reached this conclusion through the works of Paul Garelli, "Le problème de la 'féodalité' assyrienne du XV^e au XII^e siècle av. J.-C.," *Semitica* 17 (1967): 5–21; and Richard Haase, "Einführung in das Studium keilschriftlicher Rechtsquellen. Rezension von G. Cardascia," *IVRA* 17 (1966): 325–28. However, Haase's "Herrscher und Beherrschte" was overlooked.

88 It is not the intention to present here a comprehensive discussion of the LÚ G^{IS}TUKUL and LÚ ILKI. The nebulous socio-economic status of these persons has tended to evolve with the theoretical models imposed on them. For recent discussion, see Taifun Bilgin, *Officials and Administration in the Hittite World*. SANER 21 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018), 444, and especially Lorenzo d'Alfonso, "'Servant of the King, Son of Ugarit, and Servant of the Servant of the King'. RS 17.238 and the Hittites," in *Pax Hethitica. Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*, eds. Yoram Cohen, Amir Gilan, Jared L. Miller. StBoT 51 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 71–80, with previous literature.

89 On the ambiguous etymology of G^{IS}TUKUL, Richard Beal ("The G^{IS}TUKUL-institution in Second Millennium Hatti," *AoF* 15 [1988]: 304) concluded that the military implications were negligible by the historical period of the Hittite Kingdom:

In summary G^{IS}TUKUL-men appear to have been men who worked for the government or others and received their pay in the form of land who produce supported them. This type of pay seems to have originally been introduced to pay for army troops, hence the title 'weapon-man' for those paid in this way. However, already in the Old Hittite Period, it had been extended so as to provide pay for a vast number of different types of civilian employees, who, since they were paid in the same way as their military counterparts, were also called 'weapon-men.'

collective responsibility of the village, while *ILKU*-holders paid taxes directly to the palace as *šahhan* ‘socage’. Individuals, even “*muškēnu*” who were bound to their *ILKU*-land, could simultaneously hold *TUKUL* and *ILKU* land, provided they could meet the tax obligations.⁹⁰ Archi thus did for the *LÚMEŠ GIŠTUKUL* and *luzzi*- what Haase did for *šahhan*, that is, showed the terms to be another variety of land-tax, and not permanent social categories, meaning neither term could be used as evidence for feudalism in the Hittite state. This interpretation, with some refinement, still has currency to the present day.⁹¹ But by demonstrating the free mixing of palace and village service obligations, Archi also undermined the validity of the Two-Sector Model for the Hittites – a trend that would continue in his later articles.

Archi concluded his dismantling of Hittite feudalism with what was perhaps his most innovative contribution to Hittite political theory. He began with the premise, going back to Goetze, that external Hittite political relationships should homologize internal political relationships. While Goetze used the link to argue that the seemingly feudal vassal treaties reflected the feudalism of Hittite society, Archi turned the conclusion on its head: he argued that the internal political documents, especially the instruction and loyalty oath genre that regulated the relationship of the king and palace dependents, had a non-feudal, contractual arrangement that is also observed in the vassal treaties.⁹² The language shared by the instructions and treaties revolves around clearly defined obligations (*išhiul-*) that bind (*lengai-*) the two parties before the gods.⁹³ While mutual protection (*paḥš-*) and homage⁹⁴ can be part of the treaty/instructions, they are only two stipulations among the many which can appear. The instruction genre prescribed the responsibilities, schedules, and even hygiene of palace officials, and treaties could include stipulations ranging from the exact number of troops to be contributed by a village (CTH 133 “Treaty between Arnuwanda I and the Men of

90 Archi, “Feudalismo,” 13–15.

91 See Massimiliano Marazzi, “Messa a coltura e procedure di gestione e controllo dei campi nell’Anatolia hittita: caratteristiche della documentazione e stato della ricerca,” in *The Management of Agricultural Land and the Production of Textiles in the Mycenaean and Near Eastern Economies*, eds. Massimo Perna, Francesco Pomponio. *Studi egei e vicinorientali* 4 (Paris: De Boccard, 2008), 63–65; Jürgen Lorenz, “Sahhan und luzzi,” in *Private and State in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 58th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Leiden 16–20 July 2012*, eds. Riens de Boer, Jan G. Dercksen (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2017), 193–202; Lorenzo d’Alfonso and Alvis Matessi, “Extracting Cohesion: Fiscal Strategies in the Hittite Staple Economy,” in *Ancient Taxation. Mechanics of Extraction in Comparative Perspective*, eds. Jonathan Valk, Irene Soto Marín. Institute for the Study of the Ancient World Monographs (New York: New York University Press, 2021): 132–34.

92 Archi, *op. cit.*, 16–18.

93 Here Archi built on the work of Einar von Schuler, “Staatsverträge und Dokumente hethitischen Rechts,” in *Neuere Hethiterforschung*, ed. Gerold Walser (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1964), 34–53; von Schuler, “Sonderformen hethitischen Staatsverträge,” in *Anadolu Arastirmaları. Helmuth Bossert’in Hatırasına Armağan* (Fs. H. Th. Bossert) (Istanbul: Istanbul University, 1965), 445–64; and von Schuler, *Hethitische Dienstanweisungen für höhere Hof- und Staatsbeamte. Ein Beitrag zum antiken Recht Kleinasiens*. AfO Beiheft 10 (Graz: Weidner, 1957).

94 There is no direct Hittite translation for the concept of homage, but a number of vassal treaties, including all of the Syrian treaties beginning with Šuppiluliuma I and Aziru of Amurru (CTH 49), require the appearance of the vassal in person at the Hittite court at least once a year.

Išmerikka”) to the sexual behavior of the vassal when he visits the Hittite court (CTH 42 “Treaty between Šuppiluliuma I and Ḫuqqana of Ḫayaša”). Despite the loyalty and mutual protection undergirding the stipulations (such as the responsibility of vassals and officials to report malicious gossip and curses to the king), Archi argued that the treaties and instructions cannot be considered in feudal terms. The missing feature of both the vassal treaties and the instructions was the element of subordination – political, financial, cultural, or otherwise.⁹⁵ Referring to Hittite vassals as protectorates or even confederates, as the Egyptians did in the propaganda surrounding the battle of Qadeš, is entirely inappropriate, as even the smallest cities and village groups were generally free from Hittite interference in their internal matters. While Archi conceded that “vassalage” may be the least worst term to describe the network of treaties binding the Hittite Kingdom with its allied states, care must be taken not to confuse the situation with Medieval Europe.⁹⁶

Archi came very close to banishing feudalism completely from the Hittite state. He still considered the “loyalty oaths,” decrees requiring an unlimited and personal allegiance from all senior officials and vassals to the Hittite king, to be evidence of a growing feudal tendency at the very end of the Hittite New Kingdom.⁹⁷ But as Fiorella Imparati pointed out in her article from 1982, these oaths are better read as symptoms of the difficulties of the last days of the Hittite New Kingdom.⁹⁸ While Imparati attributed the troubles of the Hittite state to the Kaška and Assyrians, her view was confirmed by the discovery of the Bronze Tablet and rereading of the Ulmi-Teššub treaty, which laid bare the extent of the political fractures resulting from Ḫattušili III’s usurpation. With the discarding of the loyalty oaths as evidence, there is very little reason today to find feudalism anywhere in Hittite society.⁹⁹

The disposal of feudalism as a valid model left the question of the identity and historical origin of the Hittite state apparatus open. The earlier idea (presented in, e.g., Goetze, “State and Society,” 25–26, as discussed in 1.2.1 Goetze: *The Ethnogenesis of the*

95 Archi did not explicitly define a sociologically typical feudal society, but he could have referenced here the analysis of Marc Bloch on the personal locus of feudalism as a relationship of subordination. Bloch found the feudal relationship in Medieval Europe to be illustrated best not by oaths of fealty or law codes, but the act of homage between two free men: where one man places his clasped hands between the hands of another as a gesture of submission, and declares himself to be the “man” of the person facing him, and they kiss each other on the mouth in a gesture of friendship (Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society*, trans. L.A. Manyon (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 145–46). From everything we know as Hittitologists, such a scene would be entirely alien to Hittite culture and completely insufficient as a contract between the king and his vassal, which had to be defined and then sworn before the assembled gods.

96 Archi, “Feudalismo,” 17.

97 Archi, *op. cit.*, 18.

98 Imparati, “Aspects de l’organisation de l’État Hittite,” 257.

99 As Fiorella Imparati (“Lebenswesen s. a. Feudalismus, *ilku*. A. Bei den Hethitern,” RIA 6 [1980–83]: 547) concluded after a review of arguments in favor and against the feudal interpretation of the Hittite state:

We can conclude, therefore, that the divergences in the structure of Hittite society and that of feudal societies seem to prevail over certain similarities which can be observed. It ensues that the adoption of a typically feudal terminology to designate certain institutions of the Hittite state may misrepresent the features proper to this society.

Hittite State) that there existed a deliberative body called the *panku-* drawn from the free-men of the realm survived in some permutation until the early 1980's. Clelia Mora approached the topic from a philological perspective to demonstrate that *panku-* indicated only a generic term for "the community, the entire population," a group that could informally called to assembly (*tuliya-*) when needed to witness or reinforce the ruling monarch's decisions.¹⁰⁰ Gary Beckman, in his article on the "The Hittite Assembly,"¹⁰¹ demonstrated that the *panku-* was composed of the court officials and high-level servants resident at the palace, and "[n]ot a gathering of a class, but rather primarily a judicial body, subject even in this area to the will of the monarch" (p. 435). Fiorella Imparati agreed with Beckman's interpretation of the *panku-* as palace officials, and considers this an attempt by the kings of the Hittite Old Kingdom to create a centralized power base to counterbalance the power of local potentates.¹⁰²

From later periods, it is clear that royal family members received many positions of power, including most of the internal governorships in Hittite Anatolia and many of the high-level positions in the palace bureaucracy.¹⁰³ While there was a terminological distinction between the *panku-* and the royal family (*šalli haššatar*) (Beckman, "The Hittite Assembly," 442), prosopography shows there was at least a partial overlap between the two groups. However, as Beckman noted at the time, "the extent to which the higher bureaucracy was coterminous with what indeed might be called the Hittite 'ruling class' is a question which awaits further study" (p. 442, fn. 91), which, as will be discussed next chapter in *2.5 Current Models of the Hittite State: Conclusions and Next Steps*, the book of Taifun Bilgin, one of his students, would accomplish.¹⁰⁴

100 Clelia Mora, "Il ruolo politico-sociale di *pankus* e *tulijas*: revision di un problema," in *Studi orientalistici in ricordo di Franco Pintore*, eds. Onofrio Carruba, Mario Liverani, Carlo Zaccagnini. StMed. 4 (Pavia: GJES, 1983), 159–84. See especially review of previous literature pp. 161–65, and conclusions 179–80.

101 Gary Beckman, "The Hittite Assembly," *JAOS* 102 (1982): 435–42.

102 Fiorella Imparati, "Autorità centrale e istituzioni collegiali nel regno ittita," in *Esercizio del potere e prassi della consultazione. Atti dell'VIII Colloquio internazionale romanistico-canonistico (10–12 maggio 1990)*, eds. Americo Ciani, Giovanni Diurni. *Utrumque ius* 21 (Rome: Libreria editrice vaticana, 1991), 161–81; also Imparati, "Die Organisation des hethitischen Staates," 345–48. See also Franca Pecchioli Daddi, "The System of Government at the Time of Tuthaliya IV," in *The Life and Times of Hattušili III and Tuthaliya IV. Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Honour of J. de Roos, 12–13 December 2003, Leiden*, ed. Theo van den Hout. *PIHANS* 103 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2006), 121–25.

103 Archi, "Feudalismo," 18.

104 Bilgin, *Officials and Administration*. Ironically, in discussing the socio-economic structure of the Hittite state in terms of Weberian ideals, Bilgin also took a step towards resurrecting feudalism as an analytic category when he suggested (pp. 445–46) that the benefices and land-grants which seemed to have constituted the primary means compensation of Hittite high officials were in essence fiefs. Bilgin was cautious due to the lack of information concerning the rights and services attached to these parcels, but it will be interesting to see if future discoveries from provincial towns and the periphery confirm Bilgin's statement (p. 446) that "as we move away from the center of the empire towards its edges, the territorial organization of the administration starts to appear more feudal."

1.7.2 Archi: The Palace Network Model

Archi's second article from 1973, "L'organizzazione amministrativa ittita e il regime delle offerte cultuali,"¹⁰⁵ was a philological study of the administrative units of the Hittite Kingdom. The article formed the foundation of what can be called the "Palace Network" model of the Hittite state, and would have a profound impact on future studies of the Hittite state by emphasizing the importance of redistribution, not just extraction as did the Italian neo-Marxists, in the palatial-communal interface. Archi's argument was that the Hittite state functioned as a redistributive apparatus, physically manifested in the palatial infrastructure, and operating through the "regimen of cultic offerings." The very first sentence of the article offered a powerful reappraisal of the Hittite state, described as

organizzato su una rete di cosiddetti palazzi, É.GAL, dislocati in numerose città, anche di non primaria importanza, che non solo servivano al re come residenze durante i suoi spostamenti, ma costituivano i centro da dove i funzionari controllavano i possedimenti statali, detti appunto del palazzo.¹⁰⁶

The "palaces" were full-service administrative centers implanted in the local communities, accompanied by storehouses and seal houses, and governed by superintendents who distributed taxes and labor to state and especially temple institutions. Finished goods and foodstuffs were supplied to government workers through the system of cults, and members of local communities received ration supplements at festivals. Archi argued that there was neither a distinction between state and royal property, nor a functional difference between the palace and temple: all were aspects of the same redistributive system of the Hittite state.¹⁰⁷

Archi returned to his Palace Network model in 1984 to provide a historical account of its development out of the pre-Hittite political infrastructure.¹⁰⁸ The article can in many ways be read as a counterpart and corrective to Goetze's culture-historical description of Hittite government, sharing the basic details and periodization as the earlier model, but explained from a resolutely economic and administrative perspective. Epigraphic and archeological evidence agree that pre-Hittite Anatolia was composed of multiple principalities, based around cities mentioned in the Old Assyrian trade documents such as Purušhanda, Ankuwa, Kaneš, and Ḫattuša, each with dependent towns and hinterland. Besides the Assyrian trade network, the Anatolian principalities had independent contacts with the kingdoms of Syria, as evidenced by ivories, lapis lazuli, and seals with the name of Mari kings at Acem Höyük.¹⁰⁹ The conquest of the Anatolian Plateau by the Hittites changed this by cutting off the lateral contacts of the former

105 Alfonso Archi, "L'organizzazione amministrativa ittita e il regime delle offerte cultuali," *OrAnt.* 12 (1973): 209–26.

106 Archi, "L'organizzazione amministrativa," 209.

107 Archi, *op. cit.*, 218–20.

108 Alfonso Archi, "Anatolia in the Second Millennium B.C.," in *Circulation of Goods in Non-Palatial Context in Ancient Near East*, ed. Alfonso Archi (Roma: edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1984), 195–206.

109 Archi cited Kurt Bittel, *Die Hethiter* (München: Beck'sche Verlag, 1979), 64–66 for a general overview of trade relations, and Machteld Mellink, "Archaeology in Asia Minor," *AJA* 81 (1977): 295 for Acem Höyük specifically.

principalities and routing all trade through Ḫattuša. The newly centralized taxation system provided, perhaps by political design, an insufficient economic stimulus to maintain the population base of the large cities. The diminishing of the principalities meant local government could flourish: while the large urban centers were systematically disadvantaged compared to Ḫattuša, Archi argues that the villages, “favoured by the morphology of the largely mountainous and hilly territory,” were privileged with new autonomy.¹¹⁰ A tangible result of the autonomy was the system of local Elders in unmediated contact with the central government observed in the Old Kingdom period.¹¹¹

While echoes of the pre-Hittite “urban+hinterland” organization persisted into the time of Ḫattušili I and Muršili I, by the reign of Telepinu central Anatolia was reorganized into 100 or so administrative centers centered on the É^{NA}KIŠIB ‘seal-house’. The seal-houses were outposts of central authority in the now largely rural Plateau, and were staffed by the LÚ^{MES} AGRIG, local authorities who acted as liaisons between the villages and Ḫattuša. In later times the É^{NA}KIŠIB network was supplemented by strategically placed É.GAL ‘palaces’ that served as extensions of the palace in Ḫattuša.¹¹² The palaces collected metals and wool as taxes (compared to the agrarian responsibilities of the É^{NA}KIŠIB and LÚ AGRIG), with some evidence for the existence of dependent craftsmen such as weavers.¹¹³ Temples were planted along with the palaces as extensive land-owners and self-sufficient centers of production.¹¹⁴ In the absence of local dynasties and urban conglomerations, Hittite state officials, who were often members of the royal family, accumulated scattered estates and governorships; but Archi, ever watchful for misconstruings of feudalism, emphasized that their individual power never supplanted or constituted the state.¹¹⁵

Taken together, Archi’s two articles from 1973, and their descendants of 1977 and 1984, erased the feudal interpretation of the Hittite state and in its place offered a new evaluation focused on the role of palace infrastructure in uniting the Anatolian Plateau in a redistributive scheme. Much of the philological detail is shared with the consensus

110 Archi, “Anatolia,” 198.

111 It should be noted here that the prohibition of the Elders speaking to the king in the Political Testament of Ḫattušili I (CTH 6) (LÚ^{MES} ŠU.GI *uddār lē memieškanzi* ... ‘let the Elders not speak words ...’ KUB 1.16 obv. ii 59), interpreted by Güterbock, “Authority and Law,” 19 as evidence for the Elders’ impotence, actually signifies its opposite: Ḫattušili is advising his successor *not* to be swayed by the Elders seeking favors (see CHD M s.v. **mi(ya)ḫu(wa)nt-* 3. 4’ [pp. 225–26]). It is in fact a classic example of an “exception proving (the existence of) a rule,” where Ḫattušili’s warning shows that the Elders normally had a potentially dangerous amount of influence.

112 Archi, *op. cit.*, 199.

113 Archi, *op. cit.*, 201–2.

114 Archi, *op. cit.*, 204–5.

115 Archi, *op. cit.*, 205–6. Emmanuel Laroche came to the same assessment in “Pouvoir central et pouvoir local en Anatolie hittite,” in *Les Pouvoirs locaux en Mésopotamie et dans les régions adjacents: colloque organisé par l’Institut des Hautes Études de Belgique 28 et 29 janvier 1980*. ed. André Finet (Bruxelles: Institut des hautes études de Belgique, 1982), 138–43. He noted (p. 139) that the recently discovered Mašat letters show that local officials behaved as executors of the king’s will, not independent rulers, though this might be a special case only applying to the northern frontier.

of Goetze and Gurney, but presented with a finer appreciation of socio-economic power thanks to the Marxist literature published in the intervening decades. It should be stressed, though, that Archi was not a theoretician. He was comfortable with using theory to contextualize his source material, but did not feel compelled to develop theory for its own sake. Thus, his articles from 1973 were perhaps the high point of his engagement with neo-Marxist interpretations of Hittite history. From this point on, Archi abstained from engaging directly with the neo-Marxists, even after the work of Liverani and Zaccagnini in the late 1970's and early 1980's. Nevertheless, his model evolved to be tacitly incompatible with the strong divisions of Liverani's Two-Sector Model. There is evidence that Archi was aware of this, as his later work includes commentary that contradicts two of the main pillars of Liverani's model, namely the internal colonization of the communal sector by the palatial and the impoverishment of the village at the expense of the city. To wit, Archi found in his study of the LÚMES TUKUL and LÚMES ILKI a muddling of the two social categories, and noted that "Tra i due gruppi, gli uomini dipendenti dal Palazzo e i membri delle comunità, non esisteva una separazione netta e definitiva."¹¹⁶ And in his assessment of the historical development of the palace administrative system, Archi argued that the decline of Anatolian regional centers actually favored the growth of the villages, so that the region was on the whole not impoverished by Ḫattuša's new preeminence as capital city.¹¹⁷ At the same time Archi did not embrace Zaccagnini's neo-AMP. Perhaps at the time of its publication in 1981 Archi was already contemplating the "religious turn," incompatible with Marxist analysis, that would define his work and others' into the 1980's and 1990's. Indeed, it was only when the Palace Network Model shifted its focus to emphasize the temple and performative religious experience in the Hittite state that it truly escaped co-option by the neo-AMP.

1.7.3 Klengel: The Palace-Temple Synthesis

By the 1970's the Hittite Laws had been well-studied, and it became clear that advances in understanding the Hittite state would have to come from elsewhere. Investigating the administrative corpus led Hittitologists to realize that the living bureaucracy of the Hittite state was confined almost exclusively to the religious sphere, though it was not yet known if this was an accident of preservation or a fundamental feature of Hittite society.¹¹⁸ In 1975, Horst Klengel provided the first investigation of the economic role of the Hittite temple, a topic which, as he noted in his introductory footnotes, had previously received attention only in passing.¹¹⁹ His article was not concerned with

116 Archi, "Feudalismo," 14. An antagonism to a strong two-sector division can also be read in Haase's remarks on the thematic unity of the Hittite Laws: "Hier wie überall findet man ein einheitliches Recht für Stadt und Land. Das zeigt sich auch daran, daß gewisse Vorschriften für die Hauptstadt Ḫattuša in die Rechtssammlung übernommen und damit verallgemeinert worden sind." (Richard Haase, "Die ländliche Gemeinschaft im Hethiterreich," in *Les Communautés rurales, Deuxième partie: Antiquité = Rural Communities, Second Part: Antiquity*, ed. Société Jean Bodin pour l'histoire comparative des institutions [Paris: Desain et Tolra, 1983], 201).

117 Archi, "Anatolia," 204.

118 Archi, "Bureaucratie et communautés," 23.

119 Horst Klengel, "Zur ökonomischen Funktion der hethitischen Tempel," *SMEA* 16 (1975): 181–200.

theory, but on the inapplicability of models of the Mesopotamian temple to the Hittite situation. For Klengel, the differences between the Hittite and Mesopotamian systems was most revealed by the absence of independent “temple cities” in Anatolia. All temples in Hittite lands functioned as part of the palace system outlined by Archi: physically, the temples were built proximate to palaces and in the same “government style” of architecture, and administratively no distinction can be found in the Hittite state archives between temple and state property.¹²⁰ Unlike in Mesopotamia, Hittite temples did not seem to conduct activities to accumulate wealth, using their benefices only to serve their cult obligations.¹²¹ As such they played no role as workshops or engines of economic innovation. Klengel suspected that Hittite temples failed to innovate because there was no money economy in which to exchange their products; similarly Gregor Giorgadze traced the dearth of hired labor – a key driver of a monetized economy – to the prevalence of *corvée* in the Hittite economy.¹²² Combining these two points suggests a vicious equilibrium where the Hittite economy was too dependent on compulsory labor to innovate. Land transferred to temples remained state land. It was worked to provide offerings for the gods, but any surplus production was sent back to the state palace/temple complex. Thus, unlike the situation in Mesopotamia, there was a complete identification between the interests of the temple and state in Anatolia, unified in the person of the king.¹²³

For Klengel, the unity of palace and temple in Anatolia resulted from its pre-Hittite history. The geography of the Anatolian Plateau encouraged scattered local com-

-
- 120 Klengel, “Zur ökonomischen Funktion,” 181–83. On the architecture of Hittite temples, see recently Dirk P. Mielke, “Hittite Cities: Looking for a Concept,” in *Insights into Hittite History and Archaeology*, eds. Hermann Genz, Dirk P. Mielke (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 167–70, where he notes that later Hittite temples look like compact, stylized palaces. Both structures tended to be built in prominent, artificially elevated areas of landscape within a city and are difficult to distinguish because of their similar economic functions.
- 121 Klengel, *op. cit.*, 191.
- 122 Gregor Giorgadze, “Two Forms of Non-Slave Labour in Hittite Society,” in *Labor in the Ancient Near East*, ed. Marvin A. Powell (New Haven, American Oriental Society: 1987), 251–55.
- 123 Klengel, *op. cit.*, 199. In 1979, Vladimír Souček examined KBo 19.28, a list of temple personnel probably belonging the Temple 1 in Hattuša, in which 205 administrative personnel (singer, priests, seers, musicians, and nineteen scribes and thirty-three “scribes on wood”) are mentioned. Emphasizing the role of the state in managing the temple, Souček notes that at least some of the temple personnel were NAM.RA “deportees” assigned to the temple by the king. (Vladimír Souček, “Soziale Klassen und Schichten in der hethitischen Tempelwirtschaft,” *ArOr.* 47 [1979]: 78–82.) Alfonso Archi in 1989 penned a short article confirming in philological detail Klengel’s assessment of the temple as an arm of the Hittite government. Archi’s main argument is that the temples, while possessing economic-administrative structures of their own, were fully integrated and subordinate to the king, and act as centers of redistribution and royal ideology (Alfonso Archi, “Funzioni economiche del tempio ittita,” *Sc. Ant.* 3–4 [1989–90]: 119–25). It should be noted that the English abstract of the article is somewhat misleading when it says “The Hittite temple has ‘Oriental’ features, in the sense that the important economic-administrative structures were autonomous of the Palace.” The structures, i.e., the economic apparatus that allowed the temple to provision its cultic activities, while separate from the Palace were subordinate to it in every way. Finally, Klengel’s model was adopted (pp. 327–39) in the overview of the Hittite state in Fiorella Imparati, “Die Organisation des hethitischen Staates,” 320–87.

munities and did not permit large collective institutions like the Mesopotamian temples (see discussion of the impact of geography in 2.2.2 *Geography of the Anatolian Plateau*). On the positive side, this meant that when the Hittites united Anatolia, they did not have to contend with powerful and independent urban institutions (which would have necessitated a different response, as seen with their later conquests in Syria).¹²⁴ The negative side was there was no preexisting system for coordinating the economic surplus of the Anatolian region, and the temple system was an attempt to create one *ex novo*.¹²⁵ This description of the Hittite temple as an extractive/redistributive unit resulting from the environmental and political history of the Anatolian Plateau can be called the Klengel hypothesis. It remains the foundation for the current understanding of the role of temples and religion in the Hittite state.

1.8 Conclusions

Klengel refined his model over the next two decades and along with Archi lead a theoretical shift away from the old feudal/two-sector binary to a new discussion based on redistribution, patrimonialism, and bureaucracy.¹²⁶ At the same time, Hittite administrative philology enjoyed its second great flourishing with the publication of the Hittite

124 Cf. Gary Beckman, "Hittite Administration in Syria in Light of the Texts from Ḫattuša, Ugarit, and Emar," in *New Horizons in the Study of Ancient Syria*, eds. Marc W. Chavalas, John L. Hayes (Malibu: Undena, 1992), 41–49.

125 Klengel, "Zur ökonomischen Funktion," 200:

Dem Herrscher der zugewanderten Hethiter, der die politische Gewalt an sich zu bringen vermochte, standen diese Einzelwirtschaften der Leute von GN gegenüber sowie wohl Grosswirtschaften lokaler Dynasten, jedoch, soweit man sehen kann, keine Tempelwirtschaften mesopotamischen Typs. Auf der Grundlage eines Unterwerfungsverhältnisses entstand ein Herrschaftssystem, das im Wesentlichen auf der Nutzung intakter Wirtschaftseinheiten beruhte, deren Leistungsfähigkeit im Interesse des Staates lag und daher von ihm kontrolliert wurde. Die Veränderungen lagen vor allem im Bereich der Distribution; die Existenz der Tempel wurde dabei umso mehr von dem Herrscher abhängig, desto umfangreicher ihre kultischen Aufgaben und damit die kultische Konsumtion wurden. Die Tempel wurden als vorgefundene oder neu gegründete lokale Zentren in dieses Herrschaftssystem voll einbezogen und erfüllten darin eine Funktion.

While Klengel's description is difficult to confirm in the absence of historical sources, the Hittite king's self-promotion as priest of the land very much recalls Max Weber's definition of a "Caeseropapist" society, where the religious structure is fully subordinated to the ruler.

126 See Horst Klengel, "Naturbedingungen und Produktivkraftentwicklung im alten Vorderasien," *Ethnographisch-Archäologische Zeitschrift* 23 (1982): 33–44, in which Klengel grounds his focus on the environment in Marxist materialism; Klengel, "Aspetti dello sviluppo dello stato ittita," in *Stato Economia Lavoro nel Vicino Oriente antico: Atti del convegno promosso dal Seminario di orientalistica dell'Ist. Gramsci Toscano* (Milan: Franco Angeli, 1988), 183–94, where he extends his hypothesis to include an imported, Mesopotamian influenced bureaucracy in the later Hittite state. Finally, Klengel, "Einige Bemerkungen zur Struktur des hethitischen Staates," *AoF* 30 (2003): 281–89, and Klengel, "Studien zur hethitischen Wirtschaftsgeschichte: Einleitende Bemerkungen," *AoF* 32 (2005): 3–23, represent the final recapitulations of his thesis, with the latter intended as the introduction to a monograph on Hittite economy that unfortunately was never to appear.

inventory texts¹²⁷ and the ration lists of the KILLAM-festival,¹²⁸ among others, as well as the discovery and publication of the Maşat Höyük texts, the first major collection of Hittite texts found outside the capital, which contained a number of local administrative documents.¹²⁹ Finally, new archaeological evidence from around the Anatolian Plateau, including many smaller sites, expanded understanding of the conditions of Bronze Age life outside of Hattuša. The three trends – theoretical, philological, and archaeological – combined to usher in the current, redistribution-centered era of study of the Hittite state that forms the subject of the next chapter.

127 Silvin Kořak, *Hittite Inventory Texts (CTH 241–250)* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1982); Jana Siegelová, *Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis im Lichte der Wirtschafts- und Inventardokumente* (Praha: Národní muzeum v Praze, 1986).

128 Itamar Singer, *The Hittite KILLAM Festival (Part Two)*. StBoT 28 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1984), 139–70.

129 For the letters, which contain interesting evidence of royal intervention in local affairs, see Sedat Alp, *Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat Höyük* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991). For the local administrative texts, see Giuseppe del Monte, “I testi amministrativi da Maşat Höyük/Tapika,” *OrAntMisc.* 2 (1995): 89–138.

2. HISTORY OF RESEARCH (II): CURRENT MODELS OF THE HITTITE STATE

2.1 Introduction

Just as “feudalism” was the theme of postwar scholarship on the Hittite state, “redistribution” can be considered the theme of studies today. The terms feudalism and redistribution both serve as convenient labels to explain the system of Hittite government, but on closer analysis both are found to have limitations. Feudalism neglects the importance of slavery to the Hittite economy and assumes sociological features of personal dependence that were not there; redistribution neglects communal self-sufficiency and assumes a level of state economic intervention that is unattested outside of the core regions. But whereas the critique of feudalism ended with a complete rejection of the model no later than the 1980’s, perhaps because the Marxist wing of Hittitology that existed at the time would have brooked no less, the concept of redistribution, arising as it does from the more ecumenical fields of anthropology and archaeology, seems to be undergoing a progressive refinement rather than outright rejection (though as will be discussed, the explanatory capacities of redistribution might also be reaching their limits). So, although Hittitologists today no longer speak of feudalism, redistribution is still regarded as a perfectly acceptable function of the Hittite state, if care is taken to specify the *kind* of redistribution, and to what end.

Because the gradual awakening to the limits of an intellectual trend (redistribution) is unfortunately not nearly as compelling a narrative as a clash between political philosophies of East and West (feudalism), the present chapter must eschew the chronological and character-driven structure of the previous chapter. Instead, discussion will proceed topically. Since the influence of the Anatolian environment looms large over modern research on the Hittite state, the sections are organized following the propositions of the Klengel Hypothesis. To recap from the last chapter, these were that the environment of the Anatolian Plateau conditioned a system of weak political integration in the Hittite state based on a redistributive network of palaces and temples. Accordingly, the chapter will be divided into discussions of the current understanding of the interaction of the Hittites with their environment (2.2 *The Hittites and Their Environment*), the resulting impact on political integration (2.3 *Political Integration on the Anatolian Plateau*), and the kinds of redistribution used in the Hittite heartland (2.4 *The Wealth-Financed State*). Finally, a brief overview of the current trends in understanding of the Hittite state and possible future questions will be presented in 2.5 *Current Models of the Hittite State: Conclusions and Next Steps*.

The ultimate goal of the chapter is to navigate from the environment and geography of Anatolia to the limited Hittite economic administration reflected in the textual evidence. It will be suggested that the limited scale of direct economic intervention

attested can be interpreted as an appropriate response to the geographical conditions in which the Hittite state developed, and not a deficiency in economic-administrative sophistication or evidence for an extensive hidden bureaucracy conducted on a perishable medium.¹³⁰ Since a single book chapter is insufficient to discuss a topic as complex and evolving as the impact of environment and geography on the Hittite state, and since so much of the information on the early state in Anatolia is archaeological, and hence beyond the philological scope of the present book, an effort is made instead to direct the reader to the recent literature on the topic. The present chapter cannot of course aspire to contribute to the developing archaeological understanding of the Hittite state, only to serve as a preface to encountering the administrative texts that are the focus of the remainder of the book.

2.2 The Hittites and Their Environment¹³¹

2.2.1 History of Research

For most of the history of Hittite studies, whenever Hittitologists acknowledged the influence of the Anatolian environment (if they did at all), it was in the negative sense: usually how the unfavorable geographical conditions retarded the growth of a centralized state that could compete with those found in the rest of the ancient Near East. Anatolia is generally lacking in navigable rivers and deep alluvial soils. As has been noted, this puts the Hittites at odds with other “first-wave Old World civilizations” that developed in major river valleys in climatic zones dependent on irrigation.¹³² Whereas conditions in Mesopotamia and Egypt promoted centralized, interconnected city-states sustained by irrigation and bureaucracy, “second-wave civilizations” such as Hittite Anatolia were relegated to a precarious existence as dispersed, territorial states

130 That some administration was conducted on perishable (waxed) wooden tablets is not contested, only the assumption that it must have matched the bureaucracy known from Mesopotamia and Egypt.

131 The reader is encouraged to reference Andreas Schachner, “Geographical Prerequisites versus Human Behavior: Settlement Geography, Rural Economy, and Ideological Aspects of Anthropogenic Relations with the Natural Environment during the Second Millennium BC in Central Anatolia,” in *Handbook of the Hittite Empire. Power Structures*, ed. Stefano de Martino. Empires through the Ages in Global Perspective 1 (Oldenbourg: De Gruyter, 2022), 159–202, for the most recent comprehensive overview of the topics discussed in the present section.

132 Neil Roberts, “The Land of the Hittites: Airs, Waters and Places,” in *Hittite Landscape and Geography*, eds. Mark Weeden, Lee Z. Ullmann, HdO 1/121 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 17, referencing the earlier “hydraulic civilization” hypothesis of Karl Wittfogel. Although the explanatory power of Wittfogel’s theory was challenged (see, among many others, Robert McCormick Adams, “Historic Patterns of Mesopotamian Irrigation Agriculture,” in *Irrigation’s Impact on Society*, eds. Theodore E. Downing, McGuire Gibson. Anthropological Papers of the University of Arizona 25 [Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1974], 1–6, who argued that the rigidly bureaucratic state dependent on control of the Mesopotamian alluvium for its existence is not evident in the earliest polities of the ancient Near East), the impact of irrigation on human and state organization in the region is undeniable (see Chapter 5 “Landscapes of Irrigation” in Tony J. Wilkinson, *Archaeological Landscapes of the Ancient Near East* [Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2003], 71–99, for an impressive guide to the daunting literature on the subject in 20th century archaeology).

dependent on trade with their more established neighbors. Advantages to low centralization can sometimes be acknowledged. For example, Viktor Korošec attributed the comparatively better legal situation of the Hittite slave at least partially to the impossibility of extreme economic concentration and exploitation on the Anatolian Plateau.¹³³ But, in general, the Hittite Empire's geographic location was seen in past research as perhaps its greatest misfortune.

For decades, from the 1970's to the 90's and early 2000's, Horst Klengel was one of the few Hittitologists to examine the potentially positive impact of the Anatolian environment on the Hittite state, even if his valiant attempt to connect Marxist materialism and environmental studies failed to elicit further work on the environment from other Marxist Hittitologists.¹³⁴ Nonetheless, Klengel's earliest work on the topic still emphasized the negative effects of low-density settlement patterns. In his 1975 study on the economics of Hittite temples, for example, Klengel posited that the great difference between the Mesopotamian and Hittite religious systems was the comparative absence of independent "temple-cities" in Anatolia. Whereas Mesopotamia possessed the advantages of economically active religious institutions throughout its history, Hittite temples were mere extensions of the central government. As such, they played no independent role in economic accumulation or innovation, which limited the formation of non-governmental capital and credit. Klengel attributed the absence of temple-cities to the dispersed population of the Plateau, which inhibited the formation of large collective institutions.¹³⁵ Klengel's view of an economically inert system of local temples fully subordinate to the central government might be challenged today (temples were in fact vital economic organs of the state),¹³⁶ but it must be admitted that the Hittite temple was by no means as independent, as influential, or simply as large as the massive temples of the Mesopotamian world.¹³⁷

The first hint of a positive role for the Anatolian environment came in 1988 in a short article by Klengel on the development of the Hittite state. He argued that the

133 Viktor Korošec, "Einige Beiträge zur gesellschaftlichen Struktur nach hethitischen Rechtsquellen," in *Gesellschaftsklassen im Alten Zweistromland und in den angrenzenden Gebieten; XVIII. Rencontre assyriologique internationale, München, 29. Juni bis 3. Juli 1970*, ed. Dietz O. Edzard (Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1972), 111.

134 Horst Klengel, "Naturbedingungen und Produktivkraftentwicklung," 33–44.

135 Horst Klengel, "Zur ökonomischen Funktion der hethitischen Tempel," *SMEA* 16 (1975): 199–200. See 1.7.3 Klengel: *The Palace-Temple Synthesis* in previous chapter for main discussion of this article.

136 Cf. Chapter 6, *Economics of the Local Cults: Offerings and Participants*, in Michele Cammarosano, *Hittite Local Cults*. WAW 40 (Atlanta: Society for Biblical Literature, 2018). For an archaeological perspective, see Suzanne Herbordt, "Die Tempelinventare aus der Oberstadt von Boğazköy/Hattusa: hethitische Tempelanlagen als Kultstätten und Wirtschaftseinheiten," in *Ancient Near Eastern Temple Inventories in the Third and Second Millennia BCE: Integrating Archaeological, Textual, and Visual Sources*, eds. Jean M. Evans, Elisa Roßberger. Münchener Abhandlungen zum Alten Orient 4 (Gladbeck: PeWe-Verlag, 2019), 175–87.

137 On the subordination of the Hittite temple to the Hittite state, see Amir Gilan, "Formen der Transaktion im hethitischen 'Staatskult' - Idee und Wirklichkeit," In *Geschenke und Steuern, Zölle und Tribut*, eds. Hilmar Klinkott, Sabine Kubisch, Renate Müller-Wollermann. CHANE 29 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 314–18.

short growing season and rich mineral wealth of the Plateau encouraged a focus on metallurgy, and that the scattered communities were conducive to the establishment of local aristocracies specialized in the exchange of accumulated wealth.¹³⁸ The influence of metallurgy on Anatolian history had been recognized since the beginnings of Hittitology, at which time metal was identified mostly as a source of trading wealth and military technology.¹³⁹ Klengel, however, was the first to argue for a direct link between the environment, metallurgy, and political structure of Anatolia (an argument that would later be developed by K. Aslihan Yener in expanded and greatly amplified form into her “highland production model”).¹⁴⁰ Thus, instead of being a simple brake on the growth of complex states, the environment was depicted as a positive factor insofar as it promoted an alternate, indigenous form of political hierarchy. Klengel still acknowledged an important role for Mesopotamian influence on Anatolian history, in that the Old Assyrian trade colony network accelerated the formation of native competing principalities on the Plateau. Mesopotamia also offered a model for the Hittites on how to break the power of the Anatolian local nobility, most notably when Ḫattušili I’s conquests of Syria allowed to him acquire the booty, the alternative religious cults, and a new bureaucracy staffed by Syrian scribes necessary to centralize the state.¹⁴¹

Since the 1990’s much of the progress in understanding the Hittite state can be attributed to archaeologists. Studies such as Andreas Schachner’s systematic investigation of the interaction of the Hittites with their environment, Jürgen Seeher’s work on the grain silos of Ḫattuša, Claudia Glatz’s work on the archaeological markers of empire, Ulf-Dietrich Schoop and Dirk Paul Mielke and others on Hittite pottery, and Marcella Frangipane on the finance of the Hittite state (all of which, along with others, will be discussed below), have made the 21st century an “archaeologist’s century” thus far in the field of Hittitology. The basis of much of the archaeological insight in Anatolia has been the anthropological consequences imposed by the environment: a sort of “history from below” beginning with the land itself. This section will follow the archaeologists’ lead, and now begin with a description of the Anatolian Plateau and its anthropological impact.

2.2.2 Geography of the Anatolian Plateau

The landscape of the Anatolian Plateau offers a mosaic-like habitat ranging from semi-arid steppe with hills and scrubby forest, to open parklands, to dense coniferous and

138 Horst Klengel, “Aspetti dello sviluppo dello stato ittita,” in *Stato Economia Lavoro nel Vicino Oriente antico: Atti del convegno promosso dal Seminario di orientalistica dell’Ist. Gramsci Toscano* (Milan: Franco Angeli, 1988), 184–85.

139 The study of Anatolian metal production goes back at least to Stefan Przeworski, *Die Metallindustrie Anatoliens in der Zeit von 1500–700 v.Chr.: Rohstoffe, Technik, Produktion* (Leiden: Brill, 1939); for a history of the importance of iron in Hittitology, see the introductory chapter of Silvin Košak, *Hittite Inventory Texts (CTH 241–250)*. THeth. 10 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1982); for Hittite metallurgy in general, see Andreas Müller-Karpe, *Altanatolisches Metallhandwerk*. Offa-Bücher 75 (Neumünster: Wachholz, 1994).

140 K. Aslihan Yener, *The Domestication of Metals: The Rise of Complex Metal Industries in Anatolia* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

141 Klengel, “Aspetti dello sviluppo,” 186–87.

broadleaf forests in the surrounding mountain ranges.¹⁴² Archaeologist Jak Yakar, in his overview of the growth of ancient Anatolian society, divided the area into three zones based on agricultural potential (cf. the illustration *Abb. 44: Karte und Profile der potenziellen natürlichen Vegetation* in Hütteroth and Höhfeld, *Türkei*, 96). To the north, the Plateau contains “a narrow discontinuous belt” along the inner arc of the Pontus Mountains that contains soils and precipitation levels favorable to agriculture.¹⁴³ In Hittite times, this fertile zone lay just north of Ḫattuša and seems to have been one of the few regions directly managed by the Hittite state. This fertile area was often contested between the Hittites and Kaška tribesmen because of its agricultural potential and proximity to the refuge of the Pontus Mountains. To the south of the farming belt lay a region, including Ḫattuša itself, defined by moderate rainfall in the fall and spring allowing for the dry farming of various cereals.¹⁴⁴ In Hittite times most of what was designated the “Upper Land” belonged to this region. Archaeological excavations have shown that small-scale irrigation was used in this region to supplement rain-fed agriculture in areas of artificially high population, above all the capital city.¹⁴⁵ Then, beginning with the Kızıl Irmak valley and continuing south and west to the center of the Plateau, the climate becomes arid and the land steppe-like. Agriculture within this zone is precarious, with the land having saline soils that are suitable for wheat and barley if there is sufficient rain for the year, but prone to exhaustion from over-cultivation or over-grazing.¹⁴⁶ The pastures of the region, especially in the colder but wetter higher elevations to the east, support seasonal semi-nomadism.¹⁴⁷ The Hittite “Lower Land” encompassed most of this region. In total, about one-third of the Anatolian Plateau was

142 Perhaps the best general overview of the (modern) Anatolian landscape remains the chapter “Klima und Vegetation” (pp. 73–114) in Wolf-Dieter Hütteroth and Volker Höhfeld, *Türkei* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2002). Description of the geographic conditions on the Anatolian Plateau forms something of a genre within Hittitology. In addition to the work of Jak Yakar discussed in this section, the reader can compare Neil Roberts, “The Land of the Hittites: Airs, Waters and Places,” in *Hittite Landscape and Geography*, eds. Mark Weeden, Lee Z. Ullmann. HdO 1/121 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 17–27 for an overview of the central Anatolian environment and its impact on the state during the Hittite period, as well as the relevant portions of Schachner, “Geographical Prerequisites versus Human Behavior.” For the economic considerations imposed by central Anatolian environment, cf. also Klengel, “Studien zur hethitischen Wirtschaft,” 7–14.

143 Jak Yakar, *Reflections of Ancient Anatolian Society in Archaeology: From Neolithic Village Communities to EBA Towns and Politics* (Istanbul: Homer Kitabevi, 2011), 345. This region corresponds to the (*eu*)*mediterrane Trockenwälder* (dark blue) and *submediterrane Trockenwälder* (medium blue) patches immediately south of the Pontus range in the map of Hütteroth and Höhfeld, *Türkei*, 96, *Abb. 44*.

144 Yakar, *Reflections*, 345, corresponding to the *supramediterrane Trockenwälder – Waldkiefer, Schwarzkiefer, Flaumeiche* (medium green) region that dominates the map of inland Anatolia in Hütteroth and Höhfeld, *Türkei*, 96, *Abb. 44*.

145 Andreas Schachner, “Ḫattusa and its Environs: Archaeology,” in *Hittite Landscape and Geography*, eds. Mark Weeden, Lee Z. Ullmann. HdO 1/121 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 40.

146 See Hütteroth and Höhfeld, *Türkei*, 110–11 for description of the mechanism of over-grazing in this region.

147 Roberts, “The Land of the Hittites,” 19.

suitable for agriculture and horticulture in ancient times – enough to sustain a good-sized, but dispersed population.¹⁴⁸

In prehistoric times most of the Plateau was covered by pine forests (*Pinus brutia*, *P. nigra*, *P. halepensis*) with interspersed deciduous oaks (mostly *Quercus pubescens*) and junipers (*Juniperus oxycedrus*, *J. excelsa*, *J. feotidissima*). Pollen samples found in sedimentary layers of ponds demonstrate that central Anatolia was, on the whole, wetter and more wooded and ecologically diverse than it is today.¹⁴⁹ The forests helped store precipitation and supported a diverse range of wildlife, including game animals such as roe (*Capreolus capreolus*), fallow (*Damus damus*), and red (*Cervus elaphas*) deer (the latter, thanks to its size and impressive antlers, being a popular subject in Anatolian art). Although studies of faunal remains have shown that wild game did not form a significant part of the diet of urban ancient Anatolia,¹⁵⁰ remains of game animals are found at Hittite sites, where they were perhaps regularly delivered to temples to be sacrificed,¹⁵¹ and one can imagine that Hittite city dwellers would not have rejected wild game as a potential food source during periods of famine.

In terms of settlement patterns, prior to the urbanization and then territorialization of the region during the late 3rd/early 2nd millennium BC as a result of the intensification of trade contacts with Mesopotamia, the Plateau was covered with small settlements. Yakar described these towns as

hardly more than villages with small residential areas The spacing of villages, usually no closer than ca. 4–5 km from each other, would have allowed each small community to develop separate tracts of land for cultivation and pasturage According to a rough estimate of 4–5 ha of cultivatable land per household and judging from the spacing of most small EBA sites, it is reasonable to suggest that an average-sized farming village consisted of less than 50 or 40 households.¹⁵²

148 Yakar, *Reflections*, 345, corresponding to the *Steppen – winterkühl bis kalt* (dark brown) region in Hütteroth and Höhfeld, *Türkei*, 96, *Abb. 44*.

149 Walter Dörfler, Reinder Neef, and Rainer Pasternak, “Untersuchungen zur Umweltgeschichte und Agrarökonomie im Einzugsbereich hethitischer Städte,” *MDOG* 132 (2000): 367–80.

150 According to Walter Dörfler, Christa Herking, Reinder Neef, Reiner Pasternak, and Angela von den Driesch, “Environment and Economy in Hittite Anatolia,” in *Insights into Hittite History and Archaeology*, eds. Hermann Genz, Dirk Paul Mielke (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 117:

Hunting contributed insignificantly to the diet of the inhabitants of the different Hittite sites. It can be assumed that hunting was primarily an amusement of the kings and their courtiers, as shown in Hittite and post-Hittite iconography This general observation does not rule out the existence of professional hunters who, from time to time, sold game to households, to the court or to the temples (where such meat was part of the offering ceremonies to the gods).

151 For overview of the consumption of wild game in the Hittite world, see Horst Klengel, “Studien zur hethitischen Wirtschaft, 3: Tierwirtschaft und Jagd,” *AoF* 34 (2007), 168–70. For the archaeological presence of wild game in the Lower City of Ḫattuša, including large numbers of red deer (*C. elaphas*), but also lions, leopards, and bears, see Angela von den Driesch and Joachim Boessneck, *Reste von Haus- und Jagdtieren aus der Unterstadt von Boğazköy-Ḫattuša. Grabungen 1958–1977*. BoḪa. 11 (Berlin: Mann, 1981).

152 Yakar, *op. cit.*, 436.

The overall effect of the numerous hills, hollows, and original forests of the landscape was to create a dispersed and isolated human geography across the ancient Anatolian Plateau.¹⁵³

2.2.3 Climate of the Ancient Anatolian Plateau

With much of the region under conditions of marginally sufficient rainfall, year-to-year survival on the Anatolian Plateau was sensitive to short- and long-term variations in climate. In modern time, the region has experienced a pattern of drought that leads to poor or catastrophically poor harvests almost every ten years.¹⁵⁴ Although this specific pattern of decadal drought in Turkey dates back probably only to the 18th century AD,¹⁵⁵ there is evidence that ancient Anatolia experienced similar climatic conditions, especially during the Hittite period. Based on sedimentary cores recovered from lake beds at various sites on the Anatolian Plateau, environmental archaeologist Catherine Kuzucuoğlu was able to conclude that:

the climate in central Anatolia during the whole period of Hittite rise and expansion remains dry, with only three short humid phases between 1650–1550 BC, 1450–1400 BC and 1350–1300 BC. Thus, the central Anatolian regions lived under dry conditions during most the IPnd mill. BC, with a few decades-long additional droughts *ca* 1680–1650 BC, 1530–1490 BC, 1380–1350 BC. The longest dry phase is bracketed *ca* 1250 and 1050 BC.¹⁵⁶

Recognition of the cyclical nature of drought and crop failure in ancient Anatolia is a recent phenomenon. As late as 2005, even Klengel, perhaps the Hittitologist most sensitive to the effects of the environment on the Hittite state, wrote that “Trockenjahre, Dürrekatastrophen oder Schädlingsbefall konnten *zuweilen* [emphasis added] die Ernteerträge beträchtlich mindern und zu Notzeiten führen.”¹⁵⁷ Now, however, it is apparent that drought was a *regular* occurrence on the Anatolian Plateau in Hittite times, especially in the latter phases of the kingdom.

-
- 153 On the tendency of the Anatolian Plateau to produce a diversity and regionalization of political and economic entities, see Ulf-Dietrich Schoop, *Das anatolische Chalkolithikum. Eine chronologische Untersuchung zur vorbronzezeitlichen Kultursequenz im nördlichen Zentralanatolien und den angrenzenden Gebieten* (Remshalden: B. A. Greiner, 2005); also Bleda S. Düring, *The Prehistory of Asia Minor: From Complex Hunter-Gatherers to Early Urban Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- 154 Hütteroth and Höhfeld, *Türkei*, 86–90 (esp. Tab. 1 showing the frequency of crop failure in Turkey from 1928–1961, and Abb. 36 showing the geographical extent of drought and near-drought conditions in Turkey from 1930–1947).
- 155 Hütteroth and Höhfeld, *op. cit.*, 93–94.
- 156 Catherine Kuzucuoğlu “The Rise and Fall of the Hittite State in Central Anatolia: How, When, Where, did climate intervene?” in *La Cappadoce méridionale de la Préhistoire à l’époque byzantine: 3^e Rencontres d’archéologie de IFEA, Istanbul 8–9 novembre 2012*, eds. Dominique Beyer, Olivier Henry, Aksel Tibet (Istanbul: Institut français d’études anatoliennes, 2015), 27.
- 157 Klengel, “Studien zur hethitischen Wirtschaftsgeschichte,” 13. Earlier, Klengel (“‘Hungerjahre’ in Hatti,” *AoF* 1 [1974]: 165–74) had already argued that “hunger years” were a regular occurrence in Hittite Anatolia, such that mention of crop failure in a Hittite text could not date it to a particular year. Crucially, however, he did not tie the phenomenon to the underlying climatological conditions of Anatolia.

Against the backdrop of drying and drought-prone climatic conditions, an anthropogenic phenomenon known as the Beyşehir Occupation Phase (BOP) spread across Anatolia beginning around 1500 BC.¹⁵⁸ Beginning on the inner slopes of the Taurus mountains in central and southern Anatolia, the BOP is the archaeological signal of an economic system in which forest was cleared from most of Anatolia to make way for cereal, livestock, and tree crop production,¹⁵⁹ and was subsequently kept clear by the intensive grazing of sheep and goats.¹⁶⁰ The overall effect of widespread deforestation was to make the region more susceptible to the long-term patterns of cyclical drought, though the impact varied according to local climatic conditions and agricultural practices. It is tempting to draw a connection between the introduction of the BOP economic system, subsequent environmental degradation, and the eventual collapse of the Hittite state at the end of the Bronze Age (ca. 12th century BC). However, caution is warranted, since other regions of Anatolia continued to employ and even expand upon the BOP well into the Iron and Classical Ages. As Kuzucuoğlu emphasized:

This 1500 yr-long continuity [of the BOP] demonstrates the capacity of this production system to resist to climatic change. It also shows that the impacts of climate changes on a production system depend on the organization and technics of the rural management. It also evidences the importance of the maintenance of resources diversity. When dependent on a large centralized political authority (in a “capital” such as Hattusa for example), the centralization would have reverse impacts on this sustainability in case climate change modifies the availability vs. types of resources.¹⁶¹

Kuzucuoğlu instead argued that it was what she perceived as the rigidity of the Hittite centralized management of food resources and its failure to adapt to changing climatic conditions by taking advantage of new or diversified agricultural resources that resulted in the collapse of the Hittite state. However, there may also have been some bad luck involved, in that the Hittite imperial heartland lay in the north of the Plateau, where the drought was not only the most intense and longest, but also the environment

-
- 158 For the Beyşehir Occupation Phase in Anatolia in general, see Willem van Zeist, Henk Woldring, and Dick Stapert, “Late Quaternary Vegetation and Climate of Southwestern Turkey,” *Paleohistoria* 17 (1975): 55–143; Sytze Bottema and Henk Woldring, “Late Quaternary Vegetation and Climate of Southwest Turkey II,” *Paleohistoria* 26 (1984): 123–49; Sytze Bottema, Henk Woldring, and Burhan Aytuğ, “Palynological Investigations on the Relations Between Prehistoric Man and Vegetation in Turkey: The Beyşehir Occupation Phase,” *Proceedings of the 5th Optima Congress, Sept. 1986* (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, Fen Fakültesi, 1993), 315–28; Sytze Bottema and Henk Woldring, “Anthropogenic Indicators in the Pollen Record of the Eastern Mediterranean,” in *Man’s role in the shaping of the Eastern Mediterranean Landscape*, eds. Sytze Bottema, Gertie Entjes-Nieborg, Willem van Zeist (Rotterdam: Balkema, 1990), 231–64; Warren J. Eastwood, Neil Roberts, and Henry Lamb, “Paleoecological and Archaeological Evidence for Human Occupation in Southwest Turkey: The Beyşehir Occupation Phase,” *AnSt.* 48 (1998): 69–86.
- 159 Ünal Akkemik, Hülya Caner, Grace A. Conyers, Matthew J. Dillon, Nurgül Karlıoğlu, Nicholas K. Rauh, and Lawrence O. Theller, “The Archaeology of Deforestation in South Coastal Turkey,” *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 19/5 (2012): 1–11. For deforestation during the Hittite period see Nathan J. Wright, Andrew S. Fairbairn, J. Tyler Faith and Kimiyoshi Matsumura, “Woodland Modification in Bronze and Iron Age Central Anatolia: An Anthracological Signature for the Hittite State?,” *JArS* 55 (2015): 219–30.
- 160 von den Driesch and Pöllath, *Vor- und frühgeschichtliche Nutztierhaltung*, 37.
- 161 Kuzucuoğlu, “The Rise and Fall of the Hittite State,” 35.