

Fremdes in Anatolien: Importgüter aus dem Ostmittelmeerraum und Mesopotamien als Indikator für spätbronzezeitliche Handels- und Kulturkontakte. By EKIN KOZAL. Schriften zur Vorderasiatischen Archäologie, vol. 11. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2017. Pp. 261, illus. €84.

The book under review aims to provide an overview of the relations between Late Bronze Age (ca. 1600–1100 BCE) Anatolia and other regions of the Eastern Mediterranean, including the Aegean, Cyprus, the Levant, and Egypt, as well as Mesopotamia. This is an important task, for we know from contemporary texts that the kingdom of the Hittites (which dominated most of Anatolia and northern Syria throughout the larger part of this era) and, during the Amarna period (ca. 1350–1330 BCE), the kingdom of Arzawa (with its core in western Anatolia), played a prominent role in international diplomacy and related trade and gift exchange.

Yet despite the apparent involvement of these Anatolian states in long-distance trade, only very few Anatolian objects have been found abroad, whereas foreign imports in Anatolia are only known from excavation reports or, at best, regional studies, thus hampering our understanding of trade routes, the nature of foreign contacts, and the means by which exchange took place. Kozal presents us, for the first time, with a catalogue of foreign imports found throughout Late Bronze Age Anatolia, and discusses how these objects could be interpreted as markers of trade, the intensity of contacts between various regions, or whether they might reflect other types of interaction, such as the payment of tribute.

Five chapters begin with an introduction, in which the main research questions are laid out and the geographical and chronological framework is explained. There are a few oddities in this chapter. This includes the chronological framework of the book, which turns out to be rather larger than the title suggests: the Late Bronze Age is normally thought to span the sixteenth to the twelfth centuries BCE, but Kozal's starting point appears to be the twentieth century—and thus includes the (Middle Bronze Age) *kārum*-period. In addition, the geographical scope is restricted to the Anatolian mainland; finds from the numerous islands off the west coast are not included.

One has to wonder whether Kozal's motivation for this exclusion—"they belong to a different 'Kulturraum'" (p. 17)—is entirely valid, seeing that various sites on the Anatolian west coast, including Troy and Miletus, are usually thought to belong to that same cultural zone (as Kozal surely must know; she cites Mountjoy's important paper on the "East Aegean –West Anatolian Interface" several times). Similarly, the Cape Gelidonya and Uluburun shipwrecks are largely omitted from this study and only briefly mentioned in the chapter (4.4) on Cypriote imports, despite the fact that their cargo reflects contact with a myriad of regions, including—if we may judge from a stone mace-head of steppe type and four bronze spearheads of an (Italo-)Balkan type—areas much further to the north.

Chapter 2, on the "Forschungsgeschichte," is divided into six parts, dealing with the history of research on Anatolian interaction with other regions (including Cyprus, the Aegean, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt), followed by a brief summary of the state of research in, presumably, 2008 (seeing that none of the publications in Kozal's bibliography are of a more recent date). This is not necessarily a major problem, in that I am not aware of significant finds in more recent years, though it should be noted that even a number of relevant studies that were already available in 2008 do not appear to have been consulted (including the work of Trevor Bryce 1998 and 1999, Houwink ten Cate 1973, and, alas, my own 2004–5 paper on Aegean-Anatolian interaction).

One reason for these omissions may be that Kozal's approach is almost exclusively archaeological. Astonishingly, textual evidence on the nature and intensity of Anatolian interactions with the outside world is hardly taken into account, even though it is precisely this type of evidence that, in recent years, has completely transformed our understanding of, e.g., the nature of Hittite relations with the Aegean world. Instead, these potentially hugely important sources merely serve in chapter 3 (on the "Historischer Hintergrund und Chronologie") to identify the various polities that dotted the Near East.

Ahhiyawa is (correctly, I think) equated with the Greek mainland, the isles in the Aegean, and bits of southwest Anatolia, but there is no reference to the various texts detailing the importance of this kingdom as a major competitor of the Hittites in western Anatolia (cf. Beckman et al. 2011). Nor is there any reference to Arzawa's rise as the preeminent power in Anatolia in the Amarna period; instead it is merely listed as one of four countries in western Anatolia, alongside Assuwa (which Kozal appears

to equate with Wilusa; to my knowledge, Wilusa was just one of several states that formed the larger “league” that comprised Assuwa). There is very little “Historischer Hintergrund” in this chapter (and, indeed, throughout the entire book), though the discussion of “Chronologie,” detailing the various relevant regional and site-specific chronologies, is most useful. The section on Egyptian chronology is outdated (there is no reference to van Dijk’s 2008 redating of Horemheb’s reign), although the errors are minor.

Chapter 4 on “Fremdgüter und Auswertung” can arguably be seen as the main part of the study. Here Kozal aims to establish the nature of Anatolian foreign contacts, by analyzing the geographical distribution and frequency of specific types of objects, the distance between the object’s (or material’s) presumed point of origin and its site of deposition, its (archaeological) context, its function (both in the object’s original cultural setting and in its eventual Hittite context), as well as possible modes of transportation by which these imports came to Anatolia. While Kozal’s discussion of the Cypriote, Levantine, Mesopotamian, Egyptian, and Aegean imports—mostly pottery, but also seals, or other objects—throughout Anatolia is useful, the results of these analyses remain relatively abstract. Kozal’s argument that the spatial distribution and frequency of imports to various regions might highlight regional differences (compare the mere hundred or so Cypriot imports found at the Cilician harbor settlement of Kinet Höyük to the whopping 2,000 Cypriote objects recovered from the inland, north Syrian city of Alalakh) is reasonable (and unsurprising) enough, it remains unclear exactly what these “regional differences” mean.

Again, one cannot help but wonder why contemporary texts were not included in Kozal’s analysis. Nowhere is it even considered that the political and military history of these various sites and their surrounding regions, as evidenced in Hittite and Egyptian texts, might have affected access to and ability to acquire Cypriote goods. The same applies to the discussion of Aegean imports in Anatolia and, to a lesser extent, of the Egyptian material. The relative abundance of Mycenaean ware on the Anatolian west coast (be it imported or locally made), set against the near absence of this group of material in the Anatolian heartland and on the south coast, is indeed remarkable, as Kozal notes (p. 120). It may well be that “der Grund dafür die geopolitischen Situation in Zentral- und Südanatolien war,” although (if we may believe contemporary Hittite texts detailing Ahhiyawan interference in the regions of Assuwa and, later, Arzawa) a more plausible explanation may be sought in the rather volatile geopolitical situation in western Anatolia.

Texts matter, especially when studying the modes of interaction between different peoples, cultures, and states, and it is a pity that Kozal chose not to use the available sources to complement her archaeological data. When finishing her book, she herself may have had second thoughts on her strictly archaeological approach, seeing that the first page of the final chapter (5), “Schlussbetrachtungen,” details how texts might identify different types of exchange that cannot be identified on the basis of archaeology alone. Kozal is surely right in stating that “Schriftliches Material kann jedoch nicht alle Fragen beantworten” (p. 127) and that “schriftliche Texten [*sic!*] nicht in allen Perioden und Regionen vorhanden [*sind*],” but that ought not to be an excuse to avoid texts altogether. As it is, Kozal explicitly chose to approach Anatolia’s foreign contacts in the Late Bronze Age through an exclusively archaeological analysis.

There is much to be commended here, for the catalogue of foreign imports at the end of the book is exhaustive and, together with Kozal’s discussions of the material and the state of research, certainly represents a major step towards a better understanding of Anatolia’s role in the long-distance trade network that covered the Near East and Eastern Mediterranean during the Middle and Late Bronze Age. What we need now is a synthesizing study that ties the archaeological data to the textual evidence.

REFERENCES

- Beckman, G., T. R. Bryce, and E. H. Cline. 2011. *The Ahhiyawa Texts*. Atlanta.
- Bryce, T. R. 1998. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford.
- . 1999. Anatolian Scribes in Mycenaean Greece. *Historia* 48: 257–64.
- Dijk, J. van. 2008. New Evidence on the Length of the Reign of Horemheb. *JARCE* 44: 193–200.

- Houwink ten Cate, P. H. J. 1973. Contact between the Aegean Region and Anatolia in the Second Millennium BC. In *Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean*, ed. R. A. Crossland and A. Birchall. Pp. 141–61. London.
- Kelder, J. M. 2004–5. Mycenaean in Western Anatolia. *Talanta* 36/37: 49–85.
- Mountjoy, P. 1998. The East Aegean-West Anatolian Interface in the Late Bronze Age: Mycenaean and the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa. *AnSt* 48: 33–67.

JORRIT M. KELDER
ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, OXFORD

Friendship in the Hebrew Bible. By SAUL M. OLYAN. The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven: YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2017. Pp. xiii + 191. \$50.

Saul Olyan's monograph argues that our Western tradition of friendship should not be thought to commence with Plato and Aristotle. Instead, he exposes a rich set of reflections throughout the Hebrew Bible's many varied texts, which can provide clues for how people conceived of friendship well before the *Lysis* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Why this should be of more than antiquarian interest for the modern friend is not always made clear in the book. But for friendship theorists and scholars, the book delivers the thrill of genuine discovery. Although we all know about Ruth and Naomi's apparent friendship from *The Book of Ruth* and David and Jonathan's close relationship from *Samuel*, it turns out there is a whole lot more to learn about friendship and non-familial interpersonal intimacy in the compendium of sources that make up the Hebrew Bible, right in plain sight.

Still, methodological questions nagged me right from the beginning. Although it is a worthy task to be able to develop a sketch of friendship from within a singular work in a dominant and important tradition, it is hard to weave coherence from a set of edited narrative works, prophetic works, and wisdom literature, components of which were likely drafted one thousand years apart by many different authors. To pick a random example, the book looks at usages from *Numbers*, *Jeremiah*, and *Proverbs* essentially in the same breath (p. 18), without any real sense that there may be a hierarchy of sources for those who view the compendium as authoritative and treat it as a guide for living.

Indeed, if someone were to write a book several thousand years from now in a post-Apocalyptic society trying to unpack "our" concept of friendship from a surviving copy of the latest *Norton Anthology of English Literature*, would it make sense to run a concordance on texts as diverse as *Beowulf* (the root word "friend" appears thirty-six times) and Zadie Smith's "The Waiter's Wife" ("friend" appears nine times)? I am not certain this would be a defensible methodology without substantial argument and framing. And Olyan does not really offer a sustained defense of his method, which treats all these books as one text.

It certainly makes sense that Olyan does not want to lead with interpretive readings of the textured and developed narratives of friendship from *The Book of Ruth* and *Samuel* because these narratives are well known and often told. Yet, Olyan has some new insights about those old stories—appreciating, for example, Ruth's too-simple devotion and Naomi's much-more-human imperfection at friendship—and he can tell these relatable stories well. And the average reader might have preferred that these materials not be delayed until the third substantive chapter (of four chapters), which also develops additional narratives that are much less familiar: one about Job's friends who comfort him in *The Book of Job*; one about Jephthah's daughter from *Judges* and the friends who accompany her as she mourns her virginity and her failure to give her father an heir; and one about Jonadab in the second book of *Samuel*, who gets his friend Amnon into some serious trouble—and ultimately abandons him.

Olyan concludes this chapter by noting: "Prose representations of friendship frequently offer the reader named characters who are more fully realized than the anonymous friends mentioned in wisdom texts such as *Proverbs* and the Job dialogues, prophetic texts, or the psalms of individual complaint,