

settlement. The chronology of these processes is examined in a separate paper by Vogt, Sedov, and Buffa, who present over thirty C-14 dates from Ma'layba and Sabr. This leaves no doubt that together the two sites span the entire second millennium with a possible continuation into the early first millennium B.C. The complete publication of these dates is a crucial step in permitting other scholars to assess the chronological basis of these new discoveries.

Together with the work of Chicago's Oriental Institute in the Yemen highlands and the Italian Archaeological Mission at ad-Durayb, the results obtained at Ma'layba and Sabr will completely revolutionize our understanding of the emergence of the Sabeian Kingdom sometime around the first quarter of the first millennium B.C. For a long time, theories that emphasized foreign origins for this polity have held sway, since it was commonly assumed that complex economic and political systems were the result of contact with the Mediterranean basin or great river systems of Egypt and Mesopotamia. It is now clear that processes of adaptation to the arid Arabian environment led to the emergence of complex Bronze Age settlements in the millennium before the emergence of the Sabeian Kingdom. Ma'layba and Sabr are part of this process, even if there is still much debate about the nature of the transition to the Sabeian Kingdom and the implications of the early onomastic evidence for ad-Durayb and other sites. Nevertheless, the first three papers of this volume will be much referred to in future years as they present a great amount of primary archaeological data that is described and illustrated in an exemplary fashion.

The largest single number of chapters in this volume are dedicated to the excavations of the cemetery adjoining the Awam Temple in Marib. Unfortunately we do not have the space to present anything more than a brief description of these. Since the first large-scale excavations in the 1950s, this Temple has provided archaeologists with the most visible aspects of the south Arabian past in terms of statuary and monumental architecture. Gerlach's excavations, as reported in this volume, have revealed an extensive necropolis consisting of monumental stone-constructed tombs to the south and southwest of Awam Temple. The tombs are presented with

fold-out plans and crisp black-and-white photographs. The finds, including numerous alabaster statues, ceramic figurines, and stone and ceramic vessels, are presented by Gerlach and Röring. These are complemented by chapters on the miniature ceramic vessels by Japp and tomb construction technique by Bessac and Breton.

In summary, with its clear text and well-presented data this volume will go a long way to highlight what is, to my mind, the unique trajectory and economic configuration of ancient Arabia. The many authors are to be congratulated; this work will be appreciated by a wide range of scholars for many years to come.

PETER MAGEE

*Bryn Mawr College*

---

*Taboos and Prohibitions in Hittite Society: A Study of the Hittite Expression natta arā ('Not Permitted').* By YORAM COHEN. Texte der Hethiter, Heft 24. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 2002. Pp. xv + 198. € 49.

The Hittites were a conservative society. We do not know, however, whether their character should primarily be attributed to the Indo-European invaders or to the former indigenous inhabitants of ancient Anatolia, the Hattians. We possess numerous documents that reveal meticulous customs, strict regulations, prohibitions, and punishments in the social, religious, and political life in the Hittite Empire. These appear not only in the legal (laws, depositions) and administrative texts (instructions, protocols), but also in the historical inscriptions (in the form of proclamations), treaties, rituals, legends, and especially in the oracular records.

The Hittite writing tradition used the following lexemes for the general concepts of "crime" and "sin" in their cultic, juridical, and ethical meanings: *ḫaratar* and *ḫaratnant-* (= Hurr. *par(i)li, paliri*) "offense, crime"; *waštai-*, *waštant-*, *waštul* (= Hurr. *arni*), and *wašdumar* all mean "crime, sin"; *šalli waštul* "a major crime"; SAG.DU-*aš waštul* "capital crime"; *gullakuwan* "shame, scandal"; Akkadian *ḪĪTU* and *ḪIṬĪTU* "sin"; *ANZILLU* "abomination." The particular undesirable, immoral situations and forbidden,

punishable acts among the Hittites include *ešhar* “bloodshed,” *kunatar* “murder,” *tayazzilatar* (*tayazzil, tayawar*) “theft,” *pupuwa(la)tar* “adultery,” *hurkel* “sexual abomination (including bestiality and incest),” *maršaštarri-* “sacrilege,” *papratar* “impurity,” *aštayaratar, alwanzeššar, and alwanzatar* “sorcery,” *hu(wa)rzakiwar* “curse,” *daliyauwar* “(cultic) omission,” *wašku(i)-* “(cultic) negligence,” *lingai-* “perjury,” *kušduwa(n)ta(uwa)r* “slander,” *maršatar* “deception,” *kukupalatar* “deceit,” *kupiyati-* “plot,” *kurur(atar)* “enmity,” *šullatar* and *halluwai-* “quarrel,” *halluwatar* “quarrelsome behavior,” *huiipayatt-* “ruthlessness,” *šallakarta(tar)* “presumptuousness,” and *dampupatar* “barbarism.”

Concerning crime, failure to do something, and improper behavior, the common prohibitive expression used in Hittite is *natta (UL) āra*, which is the main subject dealt with in the book under review. It is translated by the author in most of the cases discussed here as “(it is) not permitted/allowed” but also occasionally as “not acceptable” (p. 2), “not legal” (pp. 15, 139, 141), “unjust, legally rejected” (p. 137), “illegal” (p. 140, n. 606), “not right” (pp. 2, 75, 133), and “not correct” (p. 172). The last two definitions seem to reflect the basic meaning of this expression, which can be broadly interpreted depending on its context, in ethical, cultic (religious), and administrative (juridical, political) examples.

The present book is the revised version of Y. Cohen’s 1997 M.A. thesis. Since then, he has published a number of studies on the same or closely related subjects. See, for example, G. Wilhelm, ed., *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie: Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Heft 45 (Wiesbaden, 2001), pp. 73–82, and the *Proceedings of the XLV<sup>e</sup> Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, part 1 (Bethesda, Maryland, 2001), pp. 113–29. In the lines that follow I will review the structure of the book and offer some remarks on selected topics.

Chap. 1, “Introduction” (pp. 1–7), presents the subject of the work, lexicographic definitions of *natta āra*, the aim of the study, and some general considerations on regulations and prohibitions in the ancient Near East.

Chap. 2, “Grammar, Etymology, and Cognates” (pp. 8–33), pp. 26 f.: the vocabulary en-

tries (Sum.) NÍG.GIG = (Akk.) [IK-KI-B]U = (Hitt.) *Ú-UL a-a-ra* in KBo 1.42 iv 7’ may not themselves allow a specific meaning such as “abomination” or “taboo”; see also chap. 7, “Conclusions,” on pp. 161–63. Whatever the controversial Sumerian and Akkadian lexemes really mean, the Hittite translation is a simple interpretation of them, since the two-word formula in the negative sense “not right” cannot be semantically considered as a real term; rather, it could reflect a euphemism. Another possible “taboo” word, Akkadian ANZILLU, was known to the Hittites: KBo 13.109 ii 10’, iii 9, KUB 18.9 ii 20’, KUB 57.70 obv. 6’, KUB 57.122 r. col. 6’.

Chap. 3, “Religions and Cultic Prohibitions” (pp. 34–73): P. 35 (n. 151); see a full text edition of KUB 29.1 by M. F. Carini, *Athenaeum*, n.s., 60 (1982): 483–520, and G. Kellerman, “Recherche sur les rituels de fondation hittites” (Ph.D. diss., Université de Paris, 1980), pp. 7–123.

Pp. 41 ff.: one may strongly doubt that <sup>d</sup>Āra (spelled <sup>d</sup>A-a-ra(-aš)) is a Hittite deity and can therefore be linked to the lexeme *āra* “correct, right (thing).” Most of the occurrences of <sup>d</sup>Āra refer to a Hurrian (Kizzuwatnan) milieu, since <sup>d</sup>Āra is associated there with other Hurrian deities such as <sup>d</sup>Kelti, <sup>d</sup>Ḫinkallu, and <sup>d</sup>Allani.

P. 58: there is no clear evidence that the enigmatic *dampupi*-people (see below) consumed puppy flesh for cultic or magical purposes, as A. Ünal, *Orientalia*, n.s., 54 (1985): 438 (Korrekturzusatz), once suspected. The incomplete context of KUB 9.7 obv. 3–4 allows no direct connection between the butchered puppy and the *dampupi*-people who are eating something in the next line; cf. also further, but contradictory, statements by B. J. Collins, in the *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42 (1990): 213; in M. Meyer and P. Mirecki, eds., *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power* (Leiden, 1995), p. 88, and in B. J. Collins, ed., *A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East* (Leiden, 2002), p. 249.

P. 69 (with n. 308): following N. Oettinger, *Die militärischen Eide der Hethiter*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 22 (Wiesbaden, 1976), p. 48, we know that *za-aḫ-ḫé-li* in KBo 6.34 iii 45, which for a long time was thought to be the phonetic reading (or the Hittitized form) of ZÀ.AḪ.LI<sup>(SAR)</sup> “cress, weed,” should be a ghost-word. The form *za<sup>(1)</sup>-aḫ-ḫé-li* is a scribal error

for *ḫa-aḫ-ḫal-l[i]* of the duplicate 1087/z III 6' (ibid., p 138). Fortunately, the vocabulary text Or. 95/3 from Ortaköy has revealed the hitherto unattested noun *marasḫanḫa-* as the ancient Anatolian equivalent of ZĀ.AḪ.LI<sup>(SAR)</sup>; see A. Süel and O. Soysal, in G. Beckman, R. Beal, and G. McMahon, eds., *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Winona Lake, Indiana, 2003), pp. 353, 359 f.

P. 70 f.: for the passage KUB 28.4 iii 10'–16' (// KUB 28.5 iii 10'–14') containing the expression *UL āra* “not permitted,” see most recently H.-S. Schuster, *Hattisch-Hethitischen Bilinguen. II. Textbearbeitungen Teil 2 u. 3* (Leiden, 2002), pp. 397–98 and 645 (commentary).

Chap. 4, “Sexual Prohibitions” (pp. 74–96). Pp. 74 ff.: the Old Hittite “Zalpa Tale” is a unique composition that opens with a legend about the pre-Hittite Queen of Kaniš and her thirty children and then continues with the narrative of historical events concerning the political relations between the Hittites and the important city Zalpa/Zalpuwa during the reigns of three Old Hittite Kings: Labarna I, Ḫattušili I, and Muršili I. The last, but not well-preserved, scene of the tale narrates that the thirty sons of the queen unknowingly were about to have incestuous affairs with their own sisters. The youngest brother became aware of the dilemma and warned the others of the danger using the prohibition expression “[*natta*] āra.” Then the text breaks off. The question arises of whether this situation in fact reflects a moral custom prevalent in Hittite Anatolia, as Y. Cohen suggests on p. 79, or a later Anatolian practice among the Hittites. A. Ünal, in K. Hecker and W. Sommerfeld, eds., *Keilschriftliche Literaturen: Ausgewählte Vorträge der XXXII. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Münster, 8.–12.7.1985* (Berlin, 1986), p. 131, assumes that this sexual crime would have indeed occurred; thus the origin of the royal dynasty of the city Zalpa, the place where the thirty boys grew up, may go back to a shameful past, at least in Hittite imagination. If one follows this hypothesis, it is quite feasible that the “Zalpa Tale” was invented by the Hittites for an ideological purpose, since this apparently hateful past of the city would be, in addition to the political-military motivations, another justifica-

tion for the Hittites to punish Zalpa (also on behalf of the gods?), which was one of their most powerful enemies in the Old Hittite kingdom. Indeed, the punishment of Zalpa at the hand of the Hittites took place as described in the final lines of the historical narrative of the same text in which the Hittite king is said to have destroyed the city (KBo 22.2 rev. 15').

Pp. 79 ff.: with regard to moral and sexual behavior, the written sources reveal the Hittites' concern and caution in their relationships with foreign countries and less-civilized ethnic groups. We can trace an extremely skeptical approach in Šuppiluliuma I's treaty with Ḫukkana of Ḫayaša. Here the Hittite king often addresses his treaty partner in a humiliating manner not present in treaties with other vassals. One of the reasons for this discrimination appears to be the existence of a number of bizarre customs in the land of Ḫayaša, including sexual acts within the immediate royal family that the Hittites found to be intolerable. As additional evidence of Hittite fear of sexual crimes that may possibly have been committed also with individuals of other cultures, we know of an Old Hittite document containing a treaty or a protocol with the SA.GAZ (*ḫabiru*) people in KBo 9.73 (+) KUB 36.106 (E. Laroche, *Catalogue des textes hittites* [Paris, 1971], no. 27; henceforth *CTH*). Despite its unclear context, we encounter a prohibitive clause including a case of <sup>LÚ</sup>*pupuwātar* “adultery” between members of both treaty partners, the Hittites and the “mercenary troops” (KBo 9.73 obv. 5–6).

P. 82: The word *dampupi-*, which is understood by the author as “ignorant, uninitiated” (pp. 58, 81) has been discussed exhaustively since the publication of J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, part 2 (Leipzig, 1930), p. 153. It is generally translated in an adjectival sense as “untrained, unskilled; uncivilized, barbaric; foreign(?)”. Further discussions about *dampupi-* that should be added here are: J. Puhvel, in *Revue hittite et asianique* 33 (1975): 60 f.; A. Ünal, in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 44 (1987): 477; J. Tischler, *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar III/8* (Innsbruck, 1991), pp. 88 f.; and H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition* (Leiden, 1997), pp. 208, 221. The less-accepted meaning “foreign”

is now more conceivable in the light of a small, but relevant, fragment, KUB 58.92, probably an instruction or a protocol. It reads in i 3'–9':

*našma* DAM BĒLI [. . .] / *našma* <sup>LÚ</sup>*parš[u . . .]* / *našma dampūp[in<sup>?</sup> . . .]* / *našma tuel x[. . .]* / *našma kuin i[mma kuin . . .<sup>?</sup>]* / *naššu antūr[iyan . . .]* / *idal<sup>1</sup>auwann<sup>1</sup>[i lē šanḫiškiš(?)]*

Either a wife of a lord [. . .], or *parš[u . . . -man]*, or a *dampūp[i . . .]*, or your [. . .], or whoever[*r* it may be], or a nati[*ve . . .* Do not afflict them(?)] with evil intentio[n].

On the semantic level, *anturiya*- “native, domestic” and its possible antonym *dampūpi*- “stranger, foreign, alien(?)” (thus, somehow a synonym of *arahza*- / *arahziya*-, *arahzena*- and *tameuma*- ?) would be an attractive alternative within the context above. In support of this, note also the cooccurrence of Sumerian <sup>LÚ</sup>GAD.TAR and Akkadian <sup>LÚ.MEŠ</sup>UBĀ<RU> “nonresident, stranger” in a cultic scene described in KUB 46.17 iv 8. Surprisingly, <sup>LÚ</sup>GAD.TAR appears in the proto-<sup>LÚ</sup> vocabulary KBo 1.30 obv. 9' as one of the counterparts of Hittite *dampūpi*-.

Pp. 88 ff.: for *hurkel*, see also J. Puhvel, in A. Etter, ed., *o-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1986), pp. 151–55.

Chap. 5, “International Affairs” (pp. 97–130). Pp. 103 f.: in his treaty with Targašnalli of Ḫapalla, the Hittite king Muṣili II says that he will not return a runaway coming from Ḫapalla in the land of Ḫatti. Then he states: “From the land of Ḫatti it is ‘not *āra*’ to give back a fugitive” (KBo 5.4 obv. 38). Since the main agent of the acts of “not giving back” (ibid.) and later “giving back” a fugitive (ibid., 40) is the Hittite king himself, the translation of the expression *UL āra* with “not allowed” does not fit well here. This sentence indicates a situation that the vassal Arzawan, treaty partner of the Hittite king, may not expect or hope for, and it is repeated the same way in Hittite treaties with other West Anatolian cities as a common regulation regarding fugitives (pp. 106 ff.). Thus the translation “not custom(ary)” is preferable for those phrases. An analogous regulation concerning fugitives in the Akkadian treaty of Šuppiluliuma I with Šattiwaza of Mitanni contains the expression *ul paršu* as a replacement for the Hittite *natta āra*. Although Cohen sometimes translates Akkadian *paršu* in his book with the meaning “customary (behavior),

customs, normative” (pp. 27 ff., 162), he interprets *ul paršu* in his translation of the passage KBo 1.1 rev. 11 in a misleading way again, and we read: “the king of Ḫatti will not seize him (and) will not return him. *It is not permitted*” (p. 100).

Chap. 6, “Administration and Justice in Hatti” (pp. 131–60). P. 131: it is true that the earliest customary instruction texts are Middle Hittite, and on the basis of surviving written sources one may agree with the claim that this genre was formulated during the insecure political atmosphere of the Middle Hittite kingdom. The same political instability, however, also prevailed during the Old Hittite kingdom, and we have several royal edicts or proclamations dating to this period that include various instructional regulations: “Anecdotes” KUB 36.104 in its reverse (CTH, no. 8), the “Royal Edict” KBo 3.28 etc. (CTH, no. 9), the “Pimpira Edict” (CTH, no. 24), the “Telipinu Proclamation” (CTH, no. 19), and the “Alluwamna Edict” KUB 31.74 (CTH, no. 3). It was perhaps during Middle Hittite times that the sporadically issued instruction tradition became an independent literary genre.

P. 140: a more accurate dating of the Middle Hittite instruction KBo 16.25 (+) KBo 16.24 can be provided using the royal individuals and their successors mentioned in the text narration: Ḫuzziya II (first generation), Muwattalli I (second generation), *ABI* <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI (third generation = Tuḫaliya I/II). Thus, the composer of this document is the recent king (fourth generation), Arnuwanda I, who refers to himself here as <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI “My Majesty.”

P. 145: for the latest complete edition of the Royal Funerary Ritual, see now A. Kassian, A. Korolëv, and A. Sidel'tsev, *Hittite Funerary Ritual* šalliš waštaiš, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament*, Band 288 (Münster, 2002).

P. 148: for the prayer of Ḫattušili III to the Sun-goddess of Arinna, see most recently I. Singer, *Hittite Prayers* (Atlanta, 2002), pp. 97–101 (English translation only).

P. 154 (n. 662): the Old Hittite composition KBo 3.28 may no longer be classified as the “Palace Chronicle” because it evidently differs from CTH, no. 8 in its context. The definition “royal edict with anecdotes” seems to be more plausible. On this text and related fragments, see my “Muṣili I.—Eine historische Studie” (Ph.D.

diss., University of Würzburg, 1989), pp. 31 ff., 90 ff., 135 ff.

Chap. 7, "Conclusions" (pp. 161–69). P. 164: the Old Hittite text KBo 3.60 is mentioned here as the "Cannibal Story"; its focus is the short, but striking, report about a cannibal tribe living somewhere in Northern Syria during the early sixteenth century B.C. Although many scholars tend to ignore this document as a historical source of actual events due to its narration of certain cannibalistic acts (see G. Wilhelm, in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, vol. 8 [1993–97], p. 60), Cohen correctly decided to refer to KBo 3.60 in his book, since cannibalism is mankind's most ancient known taboo, and this text remains one of the rarest documents on cannibalism in all of ancient Near Eastern history in which an ethnic group that practices both endo- and exocannibalism appears. These enigmatic people, living in the wild, possibly nomads of the steppe, are considered (see M. C. Astour, in G. D. Young, ed., *Mari in Retrospect: Fifty Years of Mari and Mari Studies* [Winona Lake, Indiana, 1992], p. 4 [with n. 10], and my article in *Hethitica* 14 [1999]: 143 [n. 83]) to be the allies of the Hittites who served them as mercenary troops in their military operations against Ḫalap/Yamḥad, the powerful kingdom in Northern Syria. The existence of a "mercenary troops" tradition in Hittite political and military history is indeed revealed by the aforementioned Old Hittite SA.GAZ treaty that also partially reflects the Hittite carefulness with behavior *contra bonos mores* regarding their allies (see above remarks on pp. 79 ff.).

P. 164 (n. 688): see additional bibliography for KBo 3.60: L. Bayun, *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 10 (1995): 21–32; S. de Martino, in P. Taracha, ed., *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Warsaw, 2002), pp. 77–85; and my article in *Hethitica* 14, pp. 134–45.

Chap. 8 "Appendix: Fragments and Unpublished Texts" (pp. 170–75) presents ten fragments, partly unedited, and a number of text citations with the expression *natta* / *UL āra*. The unpublished fragments are mostly very tiny pieces and therefore not very useful. Only 1131/v (p. 175, text 53) merits attention; it is a new copy of an instruction or a protocol with archaic features in its language (cf. the spellings *e-eš-tu* [ii 4'], *nu-uz-za* [ii 5'], *i-iš-ša-i* [ii 9'], *ku-e-da-ni-ik-ka*

[ii 11']). The usage *āppali kapuwai*- "to take a trap into account > be aware of a trap" in ii 10' pleads for a neuter *i*-stem noun *appali*- instead of a commune *a*-stem *appala*- as H. G. Güterbock, in H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *Alimenta Hethaeorum: Food Production in Hittite Asia Minor*, AOS 55 (New Haven, 1974), p. 125 (n. 192), suggested.

The "Concordance" (pp. 176–80) lists the text passages that include the Hittite and Akkadian terms (*natta*) *āra* and (*ul*) *paršu*.

The "Bibliography" (pp. 181–98). Pp. 181 ff.: since the present book does not provide an adequate abbreviation list, it is sometimes difficult to figure out the full title of a journal; see, for example, "JSSEA" for the entry Schulman, A. R. (1978) on p. 194.

P. 183: As in the case cited above, the bibliographic entry "TA" for the journal "Tel Aviv" is not well known among Hittitologists, and it thus causes the reader difficulties in locating T. R. Bryce's article "The Boundaries of Hatti and Hittite Border Policy." It is in fact the double volume of *Tel Aviv* 13–14 for the years 1986–87.

P. 190: correct the page numbers to 199–212 for the entry Korošec, V. (1980).

P. 192: M. Marazzi's article 'Costruiamo la reggia, "fondiamo" la regalità': note intorno ad un rituale antico-ittita (CTH 414)" is published not in *O(riens) A(ntiquus)* 5 but in *V(icino) O(riente)* 5 (1982).

P. 193: entry for Neu, E. (1979b) and p. 196. Entry for Tischler, J. (1972): at the time both articles were published, the journal was called (*K*)*uhns* (*Z*)*eitschrift*, or alternatively (*Z*)*eitschrift für* (*V*)*ergleichende* (*S*)*prachforschung*, but not (*H*)*istorische* (*S*)*prachforschung*.

P. 195: correct the volume number to *V(icino) O(riente)* 7 for the entry Soysal, O. (1988).

In my opinion, Cohen delivers a well-organized and convincing study that masterfully utilizes the original sources and secondary literature and that introduces a complex subject in an easy-to-follow manner. Both the general conclusions and detailed observations are generally reliable. Moreover, the choice of subject and scholarly level of Cohen's study exceeds what one sees in the usual master's thesis; for this he deserves our respect and congratulations. One small criticism, however, addresses two points: first, the reader will miss a subject index, which is a necessity in a work dealing with a topic of

great cultic and cultural importance such as the one before us. Second, the book does not meet the expectations raised by the term “taboo” in its title. Neither the quoted Hittite documents nor the presentation of the topic that mainly discusses the expression *natta āra* (not particularly a “taboo”; see my remarks above under “Pp. 26 f.”) justifies this. The “taboo” concept among the Hittites will require further studies covering broader aspects based on more numerous sources that carefully examine the enormous numbers of legal documents, administrative texts, rituals, and oracular reports of religious offenses. It must be kept in mind that there are many other written sources of different kinds that are also relevant for understanding the Hittite concept of “taboo” that do not use the expression *natta / UL āra*, one meaning of which therefore may require more attention from scholars drawing general conclusions. For example, one of the strongest Hittite taboos apparently was the sacrilege of purity of the Hittite king caused by undesirable materials coming in contact with his sacred body as a result of human failure. This is narrated in some archaic instructional documents in an anecdotal and somewhat enigmatic manner, as can be seen in KBo 3.34 i 1–2, where a pebble is found in the king’s *tunink(a)*-bread (see my dissertation “Muršili I.—Eine historische Studie,” p. 117), and in KUB 13.3 iii 24–25, where a hair appears in the king’s washbasin (see J. Friedrich, *Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft* 4 [1928–29]: 46 ff., with the discussion on this “taboo” on pp. 56 ff.). Not surprisingly, the persons responsible for these mishaps were later punished by death.

OĞUZ SOYSAL

*The University of Chicago*

*Das syro-hethitische Grabdenkmal: Untersuchungen zur Entstehung einer neuen Bildgattung in der Eisenzeit im nordsyrisch-südostanatolischen Raum.* By DOMINIK BONATZ. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2000. Pp. vi + 232 + 43 figs. + 23 pls.

Iron Age bas-reliefs, statues, and steles from southern Anatolia and northern Syria form a major corpus of Near Eastern art that spurred on

early excavations at Zinjirli, Carchemish, Tell Halaf, and other sites and that has also led to numerous art-historical studies. Bonatz’s volume on the *Grabdenkmäler* of Syria and Anatolia from that period is an important contribution not only to such works, but also to a topic that is at last assuming a proper prominence in ancient Near Eastern studies. Long of interest because of the wealth of objects often associated with burials, death is now understood as a complex social phenomenon imbued with political implications. Bonatz enters this discussion of death by analyzing the meaning of the Iron Age occurrence of *Grabdenkmäler*, decorated and/or inscribed grave-markers,<sup>1</sup> and firmly places the art-historical analysis of individual decorative elements (and inscriptions) in a broader socio-symbolic context. He undertakes an impressive survey of both the relevant theoretical and physical material in developing his proposal that *Grabdenkmäler* are complex expressions of identity and as such serve certain social, cultural, and political functions.

We would summarize Bonatz’s argument as follows: the widespread use of *Grabdenkmäler* in the Iron Age, their nature, and their location are all indicative of key aspects of social and political identity in this period. Unlike the previous period, where iconography was structured around ideas of deities and representations of religious beliefs, these steles are marked by designs and inscriptions that Bonatz understands as portraits of the deceased and of their survivors, who record their pious acts in erecting the *Grabdenkmäler*. In the dining scenes that are so prominent on these markers, funerary meals do not portray gods of destiny with the deceased as some have argued, nor are they merely records of a completed act; rather, they are a locus of communication between the living and dead in which, and at which, the dead are simultaneously invoked and provided for and where their power is present (pp. 156–57, 181). The *Grabdenkmal* is the liminal point between the world of the living and the world of the dead—a separation that is spatial rather than temporal, for the dead and the living exist side by side in the latter terms—re-

<sup>1</sup> To be distinguished from *Grabmal*, the undecorated and uninscribed grave-marker (p. 120).