blunders as confusing the Neo-Babylonian rulers Amel-Marduk and Labaši-Marduk (p. 56), rendering Kar-Esarhaddon as "*Festung* Esarhaddons" (p. 111), and referring to a nonexistent "Mythos über Telipinu und Illuyanka" (pp. 214–15).

In addition, the Anatolian (Luwian) hieroglyphs were not, as she says, restricted to use on royal seals (p. 156), but were often inscribed on those of (presumably higher-class) commoners, and far from being exclusive to stone display inscriptions, the script was employed on lead strips for more mundane uses such as letters, and was in all probability also incised on wooden tablets used for ordinary business.

Nonetheless, this is an interesting and thought-provoking study of an important question and will be of interest to specialists in both early Greece and in the West Semitic and late Egyptian worlds.

Gary Beckman
University of Michigan

Militarism and the Indo-Europeanizing of Europe. By Robert Drews. London: Routledge, 2017. Pp. x + 284, illus. $140.95.

Since his 1988 book *The Coming of the Greeks: Indo-European Conquests in the Aegean and the Near East*, Robert Drews has been concerned with the complex problem of the introduction of the Indo-European languages into Greece and the rest of western Europe. His latest contribution, here under review, attacks this question utilizing the tools of archaeology, hippology, and historical linguistics. His useful grand synthesis concludes that the spread of Proto Indo-European and its daughter languages was intimately connected with the domestication, training, and employment of horses for war, particularly as chariot teams.

Drews has produced an intriguing study, but the unevenness of the archaeological and textual record has made it necessary for him, as for any scholar tackling this vast subject, to fill in gaps with generalization and speculation. The reader may well not be willing to follow him in every case. Rather than attempt to summarize his intricate argumentation, I will point out here a few instances in which I found myself in that position.

For instance, in buttressing his claim that Neolithic Europe knew fighting but not warfare, and that Indo-European groups were responsible for first bringing large-scale combat to the region in the Late Middle Helladic period (pp. 177–79), Drews says, "Until we have evidence to the contrary … the 'battle axe' should despite its name be regarded as a personal weapon rather than as a weapon designed for battle" (p. 82). Just what contrary evidence could be adduced when the remnants of premodern mass combat are generally recovered only in destroyed settlements? (For a major exception, note the massacre on the Tollense River near Berlin, mentioned on p. 132, but this has been dated later, to the thirteenth century BCE.)

Furthermore, on the history of the development of the tactics of armed struggle, note Drew's opinion that prior to the second millennium BCE warfare between states in the Near East "normally meant the siege of a city, and not a battle in the open country" (p. 61; cf. p. 109). This statement is called into question, for instance, by the following excerpt from an inscription of the Sumerian monarch Enmetena of Lagash, recounting events of ca. 2500 BCE: "Ush, ruler of Umma, acted arrogantly: he smashed the (boundary) monument and marched on the plain of Lagash. (The god) Ningirsu, warrior of Enlil, at his just command, did battle with Umma. At Enlil's command he cast the great battle-net upon it, and set up burial mounds for it on the plain" (col. i, tr. J. Cooper, *Reconstructing History from Ancient Inscriptions: The Lagash-Umma Border Conflict* [Malibu: Undena, 1983], p. 49, slightly modified). This passage is not from a mythical narrative but describes a human conflict as if it had rather directly involved the patron deities of the contending polities.

Concerning the central matter of the taming of horses, Drews (ch. 2, pp. 28–55) disagrees with the conclusion of David W. Anthony (*The Horse, the Wheel, and Language* [Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2007], ch. 10, esp. pp. 221–23), that horses were ridden (in Kazakhstan) by around 3700–3500 BCE, judging instead that riding began only toward the close of the second millennium (p. 30). Much of the discussion on this point revolves around archaeological evidence for the use of bits, in particular on the wear caused by these implements on the dentition of ridden horses (Drews, pp. 41–45; Anthony, pp. 206–20). Since Anthony, along with his wife, has himself conducted experiments about this on living animals, this nonspecialist reviewer is inclined to prefer his conclusions. Drews and Anthony are in agreement, however, that the employment of chariotry in the Near East began in the early eighteenth century (Drews, pp. 115–16; Anthony, pp. 402–3), first attested textually in records describing the wars of the Hittite Old Kingdom.

More questionable are Drew's assertion that the language of the kingdom of (Assyrian) Urartu / (native) Bianili was "quite certainly" Armenian (p. 228)—a claim for which we have no evidence—and his speculation that the Greek and Armenian tongues go back to "a much earlier stage of Indo-Iranian" (p. 226), an opinion that few linguists would endorse. Remember that Greek is a centum language, while Indo-Iranian belongs to the satem group.

All in all, despite these quibbles, I would nonetheless recommend Drews's new book because it is clearly argued and will serve the neophyte as a convenient introduction to the voluminous research—recent and

classic—in the several scholarly fields whose data are adduced here. Clearly the final word has not been written on any of these fascinating questions.

Gary Beckman
University of Michigan