in this volume, chiefly by Japanese and Turkish scholars, are overwhelmingly archaeological in nature.

A central concern here is Kaman-Kalehöyük, a site just within the bend of the Kızıl İrmak southeast of Ankara. S. Omura delivers a preliminary report on the eleventh season of excavations conducted there by the Middle East Culture Center in Japan in 1996 (pp. 51–91), when primarily Old Assyrian and Old Hittite levels were explored.

D. Yoshida publishes several seal impressions found at the site (pp. 183–97). Particularly intriguing is a rather large sealing inscribed with Luwian hieroglyphs within its broad circular border as well as in its central field. Three of the still-unintelligible groupings of signs from the exterior ring each appear alone as the central motif in impressions of other seals from Kaman-Kalehöyük. Since this is the position where the personal name of the seal owner is normally to be found, it appears that the bigger seal had been shared by a collegium of officials, a practice to my knowledge never before attested in Hittite glyptic.

Finally, A. Mochizuki's analysis of obsidian objects from Kaman-Kalehöyük by means of X-ray fluorescence (pp. 227–44) reveals that all came from sources within the triangle formed by the modern towns of Nevşehir, Aksaray, and Niğde (p. 233).

As in most collections of Anatolian archaeology, material from the Old Assyrian merchant settlements is well represented: Syrian flasks recovered in the ruins of *kārum* Kanesh are studied by K. Emre (pp. 39–50), while F. Kulakoğlu discusses theriomorphic decorative elements on pottery from the same site (pp. 149–65). A faunal analysis by J. Nicola and C. Glew of bones excavated in level III at Acemhöyük (pp. 93–148)[1] concludes the contributions on the *kārum* period.

The dean of Turkish archaeologists, T. Özgüç, presents a group of Old Hittite cultic ceramics from Eskiyapar (pp. 1–22), demonstrating their clear descent from forms current in the Assyrian "colonies."[2] In a second contribution (pp. 23–38) he makes known one Hittite divine image of bronze and another of gold, as well as an additional fragment of a relief vase from İnandıktepe.[3] His claim that the presence of this object indicates that the site had been a "cult city of the Weather God" (p. 30) in Hittite times seems premature.

F. Kulakoğlu publishes several pieces of Late Hittite sculpture from the vicinity of Şanlıurfa (pp. 167–81)[4]—a stele depicting a Storm-god standing upon a bull, an orthostat of a tutelary deity similarly shown upon his stag, two double bull bases for images of columns, and a corner slab also featuring a bull. The author recognizes the influence of the Carchemish school of sculptors in this new material (pp. 174f.).

Another object now available to scholars for the first time is a dirk of "Mycenaean" Type B found near Kastamonu and discussed by A. Ünal (pp. 207–21). He takes the opportunity to present a useful compendium of archaeological and textual information on swords in Hittite culture and suggests that this sub-type of weapon may have been invented in Anatolia rather than in the Aegean (p. 216).

The sole philological contribution here is an essay by S. Erkut on the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM^{SAR}-plant and the Hittite festival bearing its name (pp. 199–205). His conclusion that the Sumerogram designated a variety of tulip deserves serious consideration, despite the philological shortcomings of this piece.[5]

May the new journal of the Japanese Institute of Anatolian Archaeology be as smartly produced and interesting as its predecessor!

GARY BECKMAN

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[1] Their misapprehension that Acemhöyük-Burušḫattum was under direct Assyrian rule (pp. 93, 112) should not pass without correction.

[2] The photo in plate 6b (p. 11) has been printed backwards.

[3] The same author has already studied the fragments of this vessel recovered earlier. See *İnandıktepe: An Important Cult Center in the Old Hittite Period* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basim Evi, 1988), 117–18.

[4] The color photos of these objects are extremely fine.

[5] On p. 202, *KBo* 16.13 + *KBo* 7.17 i 3–4 should be translated, "But when sp[ring c]ame, [I departed from] Ḫat[tuša] and set out the AN.T[AḪ.ŠUM^{S}]^{AR} for the gods." On p. 203, ^{d}UTU^{ŠI} is to be rendered "My/Your/His Majesty," and not "My lord," which would usually be written *BE-LI-YA* in a Hittite text. Two sources cited here as unpublished are indeed available in hand-copy: 1252/v = *KBo* 35.260, and VAT 7683 = *VS* 28.28.

The Power and the Writing: The Early Scribes of Mesopotamia. By GIUSEPPE VISICATO. Bethesda, Md.: CDL PRESS, 2000. Pp. xvii + 298. $50.

"Although he [Dub-ḫul-tar] is mentioned as an agrig only in a dumu-dumu conscription text, he is in fact the ugula in charge of an im-ru of agrig's" (p. 40). The book under review is obviously not meant for a general public, although several sections, including particularly the conclusion (pp. 233–43), represent lucid accounts of what has evidently been a diligent examination of early cuneiform on the part of the author. Unfortunately for the non-specialist, these sections are difficult to find in this extremely dense volume, which must therefore be understood as a work by and for the Assyriologist.

Visicato presents as the object of his study the institution and person of the Mesopotamian scribe, from his first activity in the Late Uruk period ca. 3200 B.C. until the close of the Old

Akkadian period ca. 2200 B.C. As is abundantly clear to anyone who has considered the topic, we are blessed—and cursed—with a mountain of evidence from which to draw conclusions concerning this first millennium of cuneiform. Self-evidently, all clay documents are the products of scribes, and the result of scribal training. These documents number approximately six thousand exemplars from Uruk IV–III, four hundred from Early Dynastic I (ca. 2700 B.C.; Visicato, for reasons left unstated, names this period ED II), five hundred from ED IIIa ("Fara period," ca. 2600 B.C.), two thousand from ED IIIb ("pre-Sargonic Lagash period," ca. 2500–2350 B.C.), and several thousand from the Old Akkadian period (ca. 2340–2200 B.C.). One might wonder whether the existence of an unpublished but widely circulated *Habilitationsscrift* by Hartmut Waetzoldt (*Das Schreiberwesen in Mesopotamien nach Texten aus neusumerischer Zeit*, Heidelberg 1974) offers sufficient reason for the author's decision not to include the scribal evidence from the Ur III period in his work. This period witnessed far and away the greatest corpus of written evidence for the importance of accountancy in ancient Mesopotamia, and Visicato could have made this Ur III evidence available to an English-speaking public.

The book presents the Babylonian scribal tradition along chronological and geographical guidelines. Following an introduction in which the author describes earlier treatments of this subject and attempts to delineate the terminology applied in antiquity to the scribal profession, Visicato presents in a series of chapters the textual, and above all prosopographical, evidence for scribal activity in each conventionally defined period. Within each period he describes the geographical situation of the numerous archives he has mustered. This expository layout takes the form of short introductions to the various archives, followed by lists of scribes attested in the texts (usually isolated according to the qualifying phrases dub-sar(-maḫ), agrig, and um-mi-a attached to personal names, but including attestations of the same personal names without such qualification where evidence supports his arguments), and concludes with an interpretation of this evidence. In some cases, these interpretations can be substantial (for instance, for the Fara archives, pp. 46–50).

Since the book was destined to be a necessary reference work in seminars and Assyriological libraries, Visicato should have included a general index of personal names. While at times somewhat quirky (for instance, "trawling excavation records" on p. 19, n. 20; "out gone" for è on p. 135), the author's English is excellent, his expository style a pleasure to read. CDL Press has again produced a volume of high quality at a reasonable price.

A few technical comments:

p. viii: Presumably "Walter" Sommerfeld is meant.

p. 3: Visicato correctly cites the evidence for an interpretation of the sign SANGA in the archaic texts as the designation of what was later (and possibly Sumerian) dub-sar. Not only is the close relationship between writing and bookkeeping noted by Biggs and others supportive of this referent of the sign, but so its use together with signs which represent important elements of the archaic economy, including GAN_2, "field," SUḪUR, "dried fish," and GURUŠDA, "fattener" (and confer GAL SANGA, "big one of the SANGA"), also reminds us of the same semantic spread found in the case of later dub-sar. Jöran Friberg (private communication) has suggested that the original referent of the sign SANGA might have been a counting board to which a box containing early "tokens" was attached on the lower left.

pp. 4 and 16–17: Although there are several indications of Sumerian multivalency in the SIS4–8 tablets from Ur (ED I or II), the evidence for the use of dub-sar at this time is exceedingly slight, and probably nonexistent. Only the text *UET* 2, 358 i 1 contains both signs DUB and SAR in one case, with no likelihood, however, that they belong together and qualify a person. The texts cited on pp. 16–17 do not, according to my collations, contain "DUB," nor can ZU:ZU.SAR be cited as an early designation of "scribe" in the absence of any contextual evidence. It might be mentioned in passing that the entire discussion of "scribe" as a discrete profession lacks conviction. Most will simply consider dub-sar a title comparable to "graduate" or "Ph.D." (relevant literature cited here, p. 133 n. 123), and not seek recourse to the sort of argumentation found on p. 58 n. 156 (see also pp. 79 and 152) in order to make the designation more than a generic qualification. Nor is the agrig cited there incompatible with the designation dub-sar, or pre-Sargonic Lagash nu-bànda Eniggal to be considered anything other than a "scribe" with high office.

p. 47: It is difficult to know what the author means in this discussion of the internal chronology proposed by P. Mander for the Fara lexical lists. He seems to be making the argument that his groups a2–3 and b were contemporary, based on name attestations in colophons and in an administrative record described by him as exceedingly short. Group a1 was excluded, yet it appears to consist merely of one text, itself not registered in Table 2a to which Visicato refers. It is discouraging to be confronted with poorly supported speculation on the chronology of a period that neither archaeologically nor textually offers anything but strong doubts.

p. 61 n. 167: Is there any evidence for the interpretation sar-ru(-am_6) as either "wide tablet" or "tablet which gathers them" instead of conventionally as "duplicate"?

p. 85 n. 271: The interpretation of the sequence 7 - 1 - 7 is highly suspect; see *JESHO* 31: 144 n. 17.

p. 130 L 1095 obv. 12: Read "4 and 1/4 shekels [of silver]," and rev. 6"19 3/4," with consequent support for reconstructions of obv. 1 and 12 (without recourse to the text copy).

pp. 136–37 n. 137: The author explains B. Foster's interpretation of the difficult sign sequence á-ru as Akkadian *it-ru*, "were taken" (*waṭāru* mistaken for *tarû*), but does not explain his own interpretation of á-ru as a Sumerian term for "to work."

p. 165 n. 258: The reading $nigar_{\check{x}}^{gar}$ is to be credited to M. Krebernik (*ZA* 76[1986]: 199).

pp. 174–76, 178, etc.: The four-tiered system of scribal organization in the Old Akkadian period presented here seems both unclear and undocumented. In particular, one should expect an in-depth discussion of the dub-sar-maḫ, given that in the mind of the author this person assumed the leading administrative role, based both on number of text attestations and on the fact that his professional title sufficed to identify him, thus underscoring his importance.

p. 176 n. 308: M. Molina made known the existence of these Adab texts (339 in number) to the Real Academia de la Historia (Madrid), which subsequently purchased the tablets (personal communication).

p. 179 n. 323: "34 lá 1" is a highly improbable notation.

p. 179 and n. 327: The translation of A 1012 has "enigga," but the transliteration "é-níg-gur_{11}."

p. 188 n. 362: A volume of this technical nature could have been provided with an appendix presenting in as full a form as possible "some yet unpublished sealings" which have enabled the author to restore important text passages. See also p. 189 with n. 368, where we are given the readings by B. Foster of these seals from the art market, absent any reference to a future publication.

p. 237: The author seems to fall prey here to an unusual lapse in logic. He states in the text that "it is clear that this number [of the ED IIIb Girsu administrative documents] is far below that of Fara," yet follows immediately in n. 15 with the counter that "it is probable that most of the archives of the ED énsi's still lie buried under the Ur III building in the Tell de Tablettes. . . . Perhaps, then, the above analysis is inadequate after all."

ROBERT ENGLUND
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

Akhenaten and the Religion of Light. By ERIK HORNUNG. Translated by David Lorton. Ithaca: CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1999. Pp. xii + 146. $29.95.

This short and eminently readable translation of Erik Hornung's 1995 volume, *Echnaton: Die Religion des Lichtes*, focuses on the nature of Akhenaten's religion, religious beliefs, and cultic practices, bringing together concepts and discussions from a wide range of scholarly writings including his own. The author begins his discussion by presenting the historical context within which the religion is situated, both the development of modern understanding of its character through sequential discoveries and a discussion of its antecedents.

Following a brief overview of the nineteenth-century discovery of Akhenaten and his city, Horning discusses in some detail the religious context from which this belief emerged, paying particular attention to the work done by Jan Assmann on the "New Solar Theology" in which the important role of the sun was stressed. Hornung then describes the early years of the king, observing that on accession, Akhenaten immediately broke with tradition, omitting any references to Amun in his titulary, centering his building program on Karnak and dedicating his structures to the sun-god, shifting the iconography from static representations to representations of movement, and eschewing the kinds of military activities that customarily heralded the beginning of a new reign. The religion that Akhenaten developed following this beginning elaborated the role of the sun as light. It was represented by the sun disk, the Aten, whose elaborate name was enclosed in cartouches beginning early in the king's reign. The accompanying cult, particularly once the court moved to the new, planned city of Akhetaten (Tell el-Amarna), celebrated this light and occurred in open air. No dark temples with a holy of holies existed for this religion, but rather activity in an open court in the sunlight prevailed.

As Hornung develops his discussion of Akhenaten's religion, he notes its intellectual origins. There was no revelation, the god did not speak, and there was no book, no scripture. It also lacked any kind of conversion or outreach program. Akhenaten alone celebrated cult, joined by his wife Nefertiti, who served "as his personal goddess" (p. 57), thus providing the feminine principle. These points, especially when combined with the king's proscription of worship of deities other than the Aten and the loss thereby of the rich pantheon of deities associated with daily living and the afterlife, meant that the system was doomed from the start. It could not effectively outlive its founder. Nevertheless, within its formulations one finds the provocative concept of the universality of the sun disk's role in the world. This is developed in Akhenaten's "Great Hymn to the Aten," despite the king's limitation of his role to Egypt alone. The hymn's focus on nature imagery at the expense of the mythic images characteristic of earlier hymns emphasizes the active proscription of deities other than the Aten.

After discussing the basic teachings of Akhenaten, Hornung devotes a chapter to the persistent question of monotheism, suggesting that "we can speak with a certain justification of an 'original monotheism'" on the basis that in the Egyptian cosmogony/theogony, the divine was originally one which became differentiated in the process of creation (p. 91).[1] This oneness

[1] In this discussion, he builds on his earlier work, *Der Eine und die Vielen: Ägyptische Gottesvorstellungen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973), which has appeared in English as *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt*, tr. John Baines (Ithaca.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1982).