



Les rituels de naissance kizzuwatniens: un exemple de rite de passage en Anatolie hittite, by Alice Mouton

Les rituels de naissance kizzuwatniens: un exemple de rite de passage en Anatolie hittite by Alice Mouton

Review by: Jared L. Miller

Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol. 71, No. 1 (April 2012), pp. 123-128

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](http://www.uchicago.edu)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/664508>

Accessed: 05/06/2012 05:31

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*.

geographical details of the case studies in chapters 3 and 4. Second, the book only includes a modern author index but would be significantly easier to use if it had included a subject index, as well as an ancient text index. Finally, although there are a number of small

typos throughout the text, a significant portion of text (with footnotes as well) is repeated on pages 14–15, and the headings of tables 24 and 25 (p. 220) should be exchanged. These minor issues, however, in no way detract from the substance of Peter Dubovský's fine work.

Les rituels de naissance kizzuwatniens: un exemple de rite de passage en Anatolie hittite. By Alice Mouton. Collections de l'Université Marc Bloch-Strasbourg. Études d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne. Paris: de Boccard, 2008. Pp. 148. €30 (paperback).¹

REVIEWED BY JARED L. MILLER, *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.*

With this concise volume, Alice Mouton, one of the most productive of the younger generation of Hittitologists, examines a series of Hittite ritual texts from the south-eastern Anatolian cultural milieu relating to pregnancy and birth from the point of view of the concept of the rite of passage, thereby offering numerous improvements to our understanding of these compositions and their interpretation.² The book begins with an introduction, in which the relevant terms are discussed and defined and the textual corpus is set out. In the first of the volume's two major sections, Mouton describes the primary characteristics of the rituals, concentrating on their actors,³ the paraphernalia utilized, their offerings and sacrifices, the rites involved, and their spatial and temporal parameters. She then turns to the question of why these compositions should be considered rites of passage, breaking

them into rites of passage pertaining to the mother on the one hand and to the newborn on the other. The second main section presents transliterations, translations, and very brief commentary on the texts themselves. The volume ends with a short summarizing and concluding chapter, a bibliography and a concise topical index.

The transliterations are impeccable, as one expects from Mouton. After failing to find any significant errors in the entire transliteration of the most extensively preserved of the texts, Papanikri's Ritual (KBo 5.1), I abandoned any further efforts on this front.⁴ Mouton also went to the trouble of collating the texts and fragments in museums when possible, against photos when not, and it can only be hoped that this level of dedication to philological basics will be understood as exemplary in the field. A few notes and thoughts are nevertheless in order.

The list of duplicates to KUB 9.22 (p. 83) can likely be reduced, as H_B (ABOT 17 = AnAr 6962) very probably belongs to the same tablet as H_E (KBo 30.1 = 464/w), since they show the same hand, clay characteristics, etc. H_F (Bo 4876) shows the NS, but a different hand than H_B(+)H_E, H_C and H_D.⁵ In KBo

¹ Abbreviations employed in this review: CHD: *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago, 1980-); KBo: *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1916-); KUB: *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi* (Berlin, 1921-1990).

² For a recent, highly informative overview and analysis of Hittite birth rituals, which appeared soon after Mouton's volume, see Gernot Wilhelm, "Ritueller Gefährdungsbewältigung bei der Geburt nach altanatolischen Quellen," in *An den Schwellen des Lebens: Zur Geschlechterdifferenz in Ritualen des Übergangs*, ed. B. Heininger, R. Lindner, E. Klinger, *Geschlecht – Symbol – Religion* 5 (Berlin, 2008), 11–25.

³ Naturally, Mouton distinguishes between human and divine "actors" (p. 27), but then states, "Il faut cependant garder à l'esprit que cette séparation est purement formelle et ne reflète en rien la réalité des rituels de naissance : ceux-ci témoignent, au contraire, d'une véritable interaction entre mortels et êtres surnaturels." Veritable interaction between mortals and the supernatural? I can only assume that the intent of this passage is something like "certainly, the participants genuinely believed they were interacting with their deities and behaved accordingly, whether such interaction was taking place entirely within their own minds or not."

⁴ A number of the conventions Mouton employed, however, could be updated to reflect more current views and/or practice, e.g.: ^dISKUR instead of ^dIM; Ī/ĥ instead of H/h; *e*-vocal in the *-ske*-morpheme, e.g. *iš-ke-ez-zī* in iv 6 instead of *iš-ki-iz-zī*; transliteration of Akkadograms with their Akkadian phonetic values, e.g. *TU-DI-IT-TU₄* in KBo 5.1 ii 26 instead of *TU-TI-IT-TUM* or *KĀ-AN-NU-UM* in ii 34 instead of *GA-AN-NU-UM*; *TA-PAL* in ii 52 instead of *TA-BAL* (in this case another word entirely); cf. correctly *šA-PAL* in ii 17 and *iš-TUR* in iv 43. Regarding the volume's format, it would have been of significant advantage for the reader if transliteration and translation had been placed on the verso and recto, respectively. Gaffes such as the orphaned *-zi* at KBo 5.1 iii 39 should also be avoided.

⁵ Thanks to Francesco Fuscagni, Akademie der Wissenschaften, Mainz, for allowing me to see a photo of this fragment.

5.1 i 5 Mouton reads ^{GIS}DUB^{HIA} and translates “les tablettes,” pointing out that the signs AB and DUB are essentially identical in most Hittite texts. She rejects (p. 102, n. 88, see also p. 40) the reading AB, “window,” stating simply that she does not find it convincing. The Sumerogram DUB, however, refers in the Hittite sources only to writing media, generally clay tablets or to a wooden writing board if determined with ^{GIS}, not to boards or planks that could function as part of the birthing apparatus. If one were to read ^{GIS}DUB^{HIA}, one would have to translate “wooden writing boards,” and if so, one might want to relate it to the frequent mention of text passages being written on “other tablets” in the Kizzuwatnean ritual corpus.⁶ This does not seem amenable to the gist of the passage, though, and there are no other references to tablets in Papanikri’s ritual. It thus seems that the oft-attested and unremarkable reading ^{GIS}AB^{HIA} is the more likely.⁷

One would like to have seen some commentary on the translation of KBo 5.1 i 41–42, especially the meaning of *appezziyaz*, “later, subsequently,” in the phrase *mān=wa AMA=KA nasma ABU=KA appezziyaz kuitki wastanuwan harkanzi*, which Mouton translates, “Si ta mère ou ton père a, par la suite, *permis la perpétration* (de) quelque faute.”⁸

The syntax of KBo 5.1 i 48–57 has been misunderstood. The list of items following *kissan* in l. 50 continues through the end of l. 55, after which the particle *-ma* indicates a change of topic.⁹ The inser-

⁶ For which see Jared L. Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 46 (Wiesbaden, 2004), pp. 511–23.

⁷ For thoughts on a contextual explanation, see Wilhelm, “Rituelle,” p. 20.

⁸ For two further recent attempts to come to terms with *appezziyaz* here, see Rita Strauß, *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna* (Berlin-New York, 2006), p. 296: “Wenn deine Mutter oder dein Vater schließlich’ irgend etwas zur Sünde gemacht haben, . . .,” and Yitzhaq Feder, “A Levantine Tradition: The Kizzuwatnean Blood Rite and the Biblical Sin Offering” in *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*, ed. Yoram Cohen, Amir Gilan and Jared L. Miller, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 51 (Wiesbaden, 2010), p. 113: “If your mother or father have left over from the past some sin, . . .”. For Mouton’s own discussion of the passage, see “Sur la différenciation entre rêve et *parā handandatar* dans les textes hittites” in *VITA: Festschrift in Honor of Belkis Dinçol and Ali Dinçol*, ed. Meltin Alparslan, Meltem Doğan-Alparslan and Hasan Peker (Istanbul, 2007), p. 523 and n. 1.

⁹ For the syntax of lists, see most recently Andrej Sidel’sev, “Syntax of Lists in Middle Hittite” in *Acts of the VIIth International*

tion in ll. 52–53 (*n=at ser BĒL SISKUR siyan hārzi*) is an explanatory clause relating to the glass objects (*zapzagai=a*) in l. 52. One must therefore understand, “The paraphernalia for the *s*. are the following: 2 *k.*, 4 *k.*, 2 *t.* of red wool, 2 *t.* of blue wool, 2 shekels of silver, 2 *z.*—they are sealed up by the ritual patron—2 bowls of fine oil . . . 2 flasks of wine (and) 2 pots of *p*. On the second day, then, they offer 2 *t.*”¹⁰

At ii 8 read “they bring the deity inside (*anda*).” At i 26 and ii 17, emend *har-na-a-ú-<i>* and *zi-in-ni-pi-aš-ma-<aš>*, respectively.

Also ii 20–22 have been misinterpreted. One should read, “Further, he places one *i*. to the right of the *z.* of the Storm-god, and one *i*. to the right of the *z.* of Hebat.”

In ii 31–33 *kuwapitta* is to be understood distributively,¹¹ thus, “Seven wickerwork tables; and on each of them one sourdough bread is placed, and on (each) sourdough bread are placed one *s*.-bread (and) one *a*.-bread.” One could also translate the terms *zurki-*, *uzzi-*, *hari-*, *ambašši-* and *itkalzi-* (and perhaps some others as well) instead of leaving them as such in italics in the translations (e.g. p. 90, ll. 18–20), since, as Mouton shows (p. 47), at least some of these are by now well defined.

Finally, the emendation *nu=šma<š>=šan* (KBo 6.34 ii 50: *nu-uš-ma-ša-an*) on p. 43, n. 43 is not necessary; while the initial consonant of the enclitic is usually doubled following a vowel, there are enough exceptions to view this writing as a variant rather than an error (see e.g. CHD Š, 129b).

Mouton’s volume also succeeds in improving our understanding of a number of elements in the rituals vis-à-vis earlier treatments. Mouton convincingly argues (p. 53f.), e.g., that the lamb of the Papanikri ritual serves as a substitute for the newborn baby, not the mother. She also persuasively confirms Börker-Klähn’s suggestion that the woman in the same ritual gives birth in her own home rather than in the *šnapši*-building (p. 57f.).

Congress of Hittitology, 25–31 August 2008, Çorum, Turkey, ed. A. Süel (Ankara, 2010), 709–24.

¹⁰ For thoughts on the crux of KBo 5.1 iv 19, see Jared L. Miller, review of *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna* by R. Strauß, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 99 (2009): 151.

¹¹ See e.g. Harry H. Hoffner, Jr. and H. Craig Melchert, *A Grammar of the Hittite Language* (Winona Lake, 2008), §§8.3, 8.9.

Upon reading this book, however, one may be left with a number of questions regarding its conception as well as some of its explanations and conclusions. First, all of the texts presented in transliteration and translation have been the subject of modern treatments by Beckman¹² and/or Strauß,¹³ especially the former, including thorough commentary. Since Mouton essentially abstains from philological commentary of these texts, it is not entirely apparent why the new editions were necessary. The occasional comments regarding improved readings and interpretations could have been worked into the appropriate places in the rest of the volume, which then would have had the length of a longer journal article.

Mouton also makes some inaccurate claims, which lead her to errant conclusions. She writes, e.g. (p. 18), “Plusieurs textes sont manifestement destinés à être conservés dans une bibliothèque, aux côtés d’autres compositions religieuses ou littéraires. C’est particulièrement clair pour le rituel de Pāpanikri KBo 5.1, dans lequel le chiffre dix a été tracé toutes les dix lignes de la tablette. Cette pratique est bien connue à Hattuša pour les tablettes destinées à être conservées en bibliothèque.” This is simply not the case, however. Not with KBo 5.1, where one finds slanted wedges at only three points (at ii 37, 57 and iv 14, only the latter two marked in Mouton’s transliteration), which do not mark every tenth line but rather the last line of a paragraph in which the last few words are placed toward the right of the column rather than at the left margin as usual; and not at Ḫattusa in general, where, even if attested at all, it is exceedingly rare.¹⁴ There is therefore no reason to suspect that it has anything to do with tablets that are destined to be conserved in the library.¹⁵ Moreover, her related claim that “Cette

pratique est également employée pour des listes lexicales Hittites” (p. 19, n. 35) is also incorrect. In these texts, too, this practice is extraordinarily rare, perhaps nonexistent.¹⁶ Mouton’s considerations based on these errant observations (pp. 18–19), then, should be reconsidered.

A further such lapse is her claim (p. 49) that the old or original deity of the Ritual for the Expansion of the Cult of the Deity of the Night “est maintenant désacralisée et ne doit par conséquent plus recevoir d’hommages.” To the contrary, the text makes it clear that the cult for the “old” deity continues while the “new” deity is split off from the original.¹⁷ The old deity is not decommissioned or desacralized.

A third (p. 77 and n. 157) is her misunderstanding of Beckman’s (see n. 12, pp. 232–235) claims concerning the Sumerogram ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI and the Hittite word *ḫasauwa-*. She writes, “Le fait qu’une nourrice puisse également être qualifiée de « Vieille Femme » . . . a été mis en évidence par Beckman.” This is, however, not what Beckman demonstrates. He shows (1) that the designations used for “midwife” are Hittite *ḫas(sa) nupalla-* and ^{MUNUS}ḫarna^{US} along with Sumerian ^{MUNUS}ŠĀ.ZU; (2) that *ḫasauwa-* is the Hittite reading of ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI; (3) and that the term *ḫasauwa-*, though etymologically derived from *ḫas-*, “give birth” (also “impregnate”, “procreate”), and its Sumerian rendering ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI do not denote “midwife,” but rather “female ritual practitioner.”

A principal objective of Mouton’s study is to show that the Kizzuwatnean gestation and/or birth rituals are indeed rites of passage. The attempt is not entirely convincing, however, as the evidence is often somewhat abused or stretched in order to force it into this mould, a theoretical construct that was not teased from the ancient Anatolian sources, but foisted upon them. This is not to say that Mouton is rigid or intractable. To the

¹² Gary M. Beckman, *Hittite Birth Rituals*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 29 (Wiesbaden, 1983).

¹³ Strauß, *Reinigungsrituale*. Since Strauß’s book appeared only two years earlier, it may be that Mouton’s was already thus structured by the time Strauß’s appeared.

¹⁴ This was kindly confirmed for me by Willemijn Waal, who recently completed her PhD dissertation at the University of Leiden on the external and formal features of the Hittite tablets. She points out that one finds rare oracle texts in which each paragraph is numbered, such as KUB 22.25.

¹⁵ For recent studies on archives and libraries at Ḫattusa, see Theo van den Hout, “Reflections on the Origins and Development of the Hittite Tablet Collections in Hattuša . . .” in *Central-North Anatolia in the Hittite Period: New Perspectives in Light of Recent Research*, ed. Franca Pecchioli Daddi, Giulia Torri and Carlo Corti, Studia Asiana 5 (Rome 2009), pp. 71–96; van den Hout, “A Classi-

fied Past: Classification of Knowledge in the Hittite Empire” in *Proceedings of the 51st Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale held at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, July 18–22, 2005*, ed. Robert D. Biggs, Jennie Myers, and Martha T. Roth, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 52 (Chicago 2008), pp. 211–19.

¹⁶ Tobias Scheucher, who has recently written his doctoral thesis on these texts (Leiden/Berlin), was kind enough to confirm this for me.

¹⁷ See Gernot Wilhelm, “‘Gleichsetzungstheologie,’ ‘Synkretismus’ und ‘Gottesspaltungen’ im Polytheismus Altanatoliens” in *Polytheismus und Monotheismus in den Religionen des Vorderen Orients*, ed. Manfred Krebernik and Jürgen van Oorschot, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 298 (Münster, 2002), p. 67f.; Miller, *Studies*, pp. 259f., 350f.

contrary, she remains nuanced and generally provides her considerations with the appropriate caveats. Still, one retains the impression that the exercise is more concerned with finding evidence to prove that the rituals in question indeed fit the pattern laid out by the concept of the rite of passage than with exploiting the concept in order to formulate questions which will potentially eke hitherto hidden secrets from the sources and thus lead to increased understanding of the cultures that created them, whether they fit the pattern or not.

This determined attempt to find each stage of the rite of passage leads to a rather forced conception of the original environment from which the infant emerges: “il est possible”, she writes, “que les Kizzuwatniens aient, eux aussi, imagine les nouveau-nés comme des créatures d’origine chthonienne. Lors de la phase préliminaire de son rite de passage, l’enfant serait alors séparé du monde souterrain pour entrer progressivement dans celui des vivants” (p. 72). It may be doubted, however, that one would reach such a conclusion if one were not searching for a phase of separation as the first step of a rite of passage. She begins (p. 70f.; see also p. 78) by referencing the passage from the (Hittite translations of the) Hurrian myth of Appu and his Sons, where one finds, “Comme les divinités de mon père n’ont pas [pris] le droit chemin pour lui et ont pris le mauvais chemin, que son (= du nouveau-né) nom soit ‘[Mauva]is;’” and of course the mirror opposite story in which the second son is named “Just.” This story she understands as indicating “que l’âme du fœtus prend pour parvenir dans le monde des vivants, chemin sur lequel le guideraient le « divinités du père ».” She finds support for this interpretation in the term *KASKAL GAL*, “grand chemin,” which “faire allusion au chemin qu’emprunte l’âme d’un défunt pour se rendre dans le monde souterrain” and in the fact that the deceased may be “placée sur le chemin” (p. 71). This, in turn, she sees as evidence for this “path” being the link between the world of the spirits and that of the living; while this may be the case as far as it goes, she then assumes that this “signifierait que le nouveau-né est considéré comme provenant de ‘l’Autre Monde,’ monde des esprits et des dieux dans lequel résident également les défunts” (p. 71). Mouton finds support for this thesis in the fact that *Akk. kūbu* can signify “l’enfant mort-né qui est considéré comme un esprit d’origine chthonienne” (p. 71).

For at least two reasons, however, this fact can hardly be taken as supporting her thesis. First, be-

cause there is no comparable evidence in the Hittite texts; and second, because even in a Mesopotamian context it is likely that it was only the stillborn child that was considered to have been a demon from the underworld, i.e., something entirely different from a surviving child.¹⁸ Granted, Mouton is aware of the tentative nature of her suggestion,¹⁹ and she conscientiously notes that there is only a single reference in the Hittite corpus to the “soul” of an infant, which she translates (p. 71, n. 137)²⁰ “Comme jadis (quand) je suis né du ventre de (ma) mère, (toi) mon dieu, redonne-moi (littéralement replace à l’intérieur de moi) cette âme! Que les bonnes âmes de mon père, de ma mère et de ma famille (var. de mes enfants) deviennent pour moi ton âme, à toi mon dieu !” Clearly, this passage cannot be said to support Mouton’s hypothesis, as the supplicant is asking that his deity, Šamaš, place the “soul” within him that he had as an infant. Still, this excerpt need not constitute a major hurdle for Mouton’s suggestion, since it is part of the Hymn and Prayer to Šamaš, which is a fascinating conglomerate of Mesopotamian and Anatolian themes and thus not necessarily part of the underlying conceptions of the ritual contexts at hand. Again, Mouton provides her discussion with the appropriate caveats, and she is not in the business of suppressing evidence. Neither is the present enumeration of its weaknesses intended to discount it entirely. It is indeed worthy of a hearing. However, the hypothesis that the Kizzuwatnean birth rituals represent rites of passage with regard to the infant depends to a significant degree on the presence of a phase of separation, and the attempt to demonstrate its existence can be seen as a bit of a stretch.²¹

¹⁸ See Daniel Schwemer, *Akkadische Rituale aus Hattuša: Die Sammeltafel KBo XXXVI 29 und verwandte Fragmente*, Texte der Hethiter 23 (Heidelberg, 1998), pp. 55f.

¹⁹ This does not prevent her from formulating at the end of her discussion some rather adventurous suggestions. She proposes, e.g., that “cette naissance royale est associée aux autres naissances ayant eu lieu au même moment dans le pays, et le nouveau prince devient ainsi symboliquement le représentant de tous les nouveaux habitants du royaume” (p. 80f.). And further, “tout au moins dans la sphère royale, la naissance d’un nouvel individu est vue comme l’écho plus ou moins lointain de la naissance d’une divinité” (p. 81). One can certainly agree with the ensuing statement, which admits that “les textes hittites décrivant les rituels de naissance kizzuwatniens n’expriment pas clairement cette conception” (p. 81).

²⁰ Here the text is KUB 31.127++, not 31.27.

²¹ To make the hypothesis credible one would also want to address the issue of the underworld being the/a place from which impurities come and to which they are banned in expiatory and

Also, regarding the final stage of a rite of passage, the integration phase, Mouton is hard pressed to find any evidence in the ritual corpus treated that hints at any such rite aimed at integrating the child into society. She states repeatedly that “Il s’agit pour l’enfant d’acquérir le statut de personne aux yeux du reste de la communauté” (p. 70) or “En effet, il semble bien qu’au Kizzuwatna, la naissance physique de l’enfant ne constitue qu’une des étapes menant à la naissance sociale de celui-ci” (p. 73; cf. also p. 72), but she fails to point out any such steps in the rituals at hand. Instead, she discusses a number of societal phenomena, such as naming the infant, as well as passages from myth that she believes suggest that a Hittite baby only slowly became accepted into society. Even if these points convinced on this question, though, they do not form any part of the rituals that she is attempting to show are rites of passage with a final phase of integration. In what way do *these* would-be rites of passage evince an integration stage?

Seeing the rituals as a rite of passage for the mother is somewhat more convincing, but even here one might want to remain skeptical to some extent. On pp. 11–12 she articulates the familiar three phases of a rite of passage as separation, transition, and integration. On p. 25 she sets out how, in her estimation, the rites in question fulfill these stages with regard to the mother-to-be, stating that she “est mise en marge de la communauté,” then she “reste isolée et doit surveiller son état de pureté rituelle, . . . l’accouchement lui-même appartient à cette phase liminaire,” and finally, “la femme est accueillie dans la communauté des mères.” So described, these rites would indeed amount to the classic rite of passage. However, it is not at all clear that the mother experiences any significant degree of separation from the community in the first stage, and Mouton’s attempts to find it in the sources seems rather forced. On p. 64f. (see also p. 121) she writes, “le texte KBo 17.65+ montre clairement que cette dernière (la parturiente kizzuwatnienne) doit rester chez elle, à l’écart du reste de la communauté. C’est probablement le sens de la phrase du Ro 14–15 où le terme *kallistarwana-* intervient. Seul son époux est autorisé à rester avec elle, à condition d’être lui aussi consacré (Ro 20).” In obv. 14–15, though, it is Mouton herself who has restored the prohibition

against attending the festival at the *kallistarwana-*building, restorations which are hardly compulsory. Beckman (see above, n. 12), p. 133, e.g., restored exactly the opposite, i.e. that the mother was indeed free to go to the festival if invited. And of course, even if she were prohibited from the festival at the *k-*building, one can hardly conclude that she was therefore separated from society, that she “n’a plus le droit de se mêler au reste de la communauté” (p. 63). The reasons for the prohibition/permission regarding the *k-*building are not made explicit, and no other social prohibitions are mentioned.²² Neither is it the case that the text indicates that only the husband is authorized to remain with her. The passage, following the purification of the mother to be (obv. 10–13), merely states that if the husband happens to be home he too should be purified: “[S]i son époux (est) avec elle, je (l’)ai, lui aussi, lavé de manière consacrée” (obv. 20). That said, Mouton does circumspectly reject the idea that the *kallistawarna-*building should be viewed as a “hutte de reclusion” (p. 63f.).

Referring to van Gennepe’s insistence that a person’s symbolic passage from one state to another be accompanied by “le passage physique de ce personnage d’un lieu à un autre” (p. 138), Mouton discusses the problem of there being no apparent physical displacement of the mother at any point in the rituals. She therefore follows a suggestion of Jean-Jacques Glassner, according to which the “symbole de la porte de la chambre à coucher que l’on scelle et descelle successivement dans KUB 9.22²³ soit à mettre en relation avec cet aspect du rite de passage de la femme.” Even apart from the misgiving that a symbolic passage needs to be accompanied by an actual displacement as opposed to a symbolic one, this suggestion must be considered quite unlikely, since there is not even any sort of symbolic displacement or separation involved in this text passage. In all likelihood the sealing of the inner chamber in which the birthing apparatus stands

²² Moreover, as Mouton states (e.g., p. 29), this text (KBo 17.65+) is not a proper ritual anyway, but a collection of proscriptions, prescriptions, and customs that are to be observed at their appropriate times. It is therefore particularly precarious to infer elements of a coherent rite of passage from this collection. I also fail to find any textual support for her assertion that “la nécessité d’isoler la femme enceinte est justifiée par le fait que sa chaise à accoucher est déjà purifiée et consacrée” (p. 63).

²³ At ii 38–39, 49, iii 4–5, 42.

purificatory rituals. It would thus be quite odd if the Hittites saw their newborns deriving from such a place.

is intended to guard its purity between the stages of the ritual (see Wilhelm, “Rituelle,” 18–19).

Moreover, Mouton defines the third stage as the integration of the woman into the community of mothers, and it is this view that guides her analyses throughout the book (e.g., pp. 62, 69f.). Only on p. 25, however, does she expressly acknowledge that “ce qui est encore plus important dans le cas d’un premier accouchement.” Indeed, this would not only be more important, it would deprive the great majority of such birth rituals of this entire phase of the rite of passage. If one assumes, conservatively, that a woman of Bronze Age Anatolia gave birth some four times in her life, then only 25 percent of such occasions would include an integration of the young woman into the community of mothers. That there are no differences, as far as I am aware,²⁴ between rites intended for first-time mothers as opposed to those for subsequent births would seem to suggest that the creators of these rituals gave no thought at all to any such integration into the community of mothers and envisioned no rites relevant to the concept.

Mouton also seems to occasionally confuse biological processes with the rites themselves. When it comes to the rite of passage in the case of the baby (p. 26), Mouton essentially abandons discussing rites found in the textual material in question and describes rather a mixture of the biological process of birth and the baby’s communal status, defining the separation phase as the baby leaving its original environment,²⁵ the transitional phase as its birth, and the integration phase as its acceptance into human society. What *rites* are enacted in these would-be rites of passage is not addressed, and indeed this remains a deficit throughout the remainder of the book, especially with regard to the baby.

Mouton, of course, notes that at least some of the compositions are designed to address impurities signaled by omens that afflict a pregnant and/or delivering mother (e.g., p. 59), the *raison d’être* of the ritual thus being impurity, not childbirth (e.g., KBo 5.1).²⁶

²⁴ Mouton does not seem to pose the question.

²⁵ Defined subsequently as the baby’s “soul” leaving the underworld, on which see above, p. 15.

²⁶ At other points she seems to forget this fact, e.g. when she writes (p. 55), “Dans le cas du rituel de naissance de Papanikri KBo 5.1, le rite de substitution qui est inséré doit plutôt être une mesure préventive censée protéger l’enfant. . . . L’emploi d’un agneau-substitut doit donc servir à neutraliser à l’avance les éventuelles attaques démoniaques que pourrait subir l’enfant.” This, however, must be considered unlikely, both because prophylactic rites to purify a person in advance would not fit well with Hittite practices, and because

Others mention no impetus for the ritual treatment apart from the fact that the woman is with child (e.g., KBo 27.67). This difference might provide a potential litmus test for Mouton’s hypothesis, but it is nowhere exploited. Are there any differences between rituals that seem to have no object but to treat a mother-to-be and those that seek to reconcile a pregnant woman with her disgruntled deities? If indeed one group functions as a rite of passage and the other as a rite of purification, one could presumably identify significant dissimilarities between them, the one in effect functioning as a control group.²⁷ Familiarity with the gestation and birth rituals treated by Beckman and Mouton seems to suggest that there are few if any such differences, which in turn might indicate that these rituals were structured and conceived not as rites of passage, but as *rituelle Gefährdungsbewältigung*, to employ Wilhelm’s recently suggested terminology. While gestation and childbirth certainly constituted transitions for the ancient Anatolians, they did not seem to accompany them with what one would properly deem rites of passage, but rather with what one could dub prophylactic and purification rites.

All told, Mouton has provided the scholarly community with a volume of solid textual treatments and a wealth of considerations concerning their function and categorization along the spectrum of theoretical possibilities. She brings to the subject a familiarity not only with the Mesopotamian but also the anthropological literature, and she shows a willingness to approach the texts from an anthropological viewpoint that, as she notes (p. 15), is all too uncommon among Hittitologists. On the downside, Mouton seems to have somewhat violently foisted an artificial construct upon textual evidence that, in my view, does not convincingly lead to the conclusion she has reached.

Papanikri’s ritual does in fact treat impurity that has already accrued to the mother and thereby her household, her family, and of course her unborn baby, as set out in the incipit.

²⁷ In complementary fashion, one might have exploited the non-Kizzuwatnean birth rituals as a control group. Wilhelm (above, n. 2), p. 23f., e.g., suggests that “In den Geburtsritualen nord- bzw. zentralanatolischer Herkunft stehen die Handlungen der Hebamme im Mittelpunkt, die bei der Geburt selbst tätig wird, und dementsprechend wird der Geburtsvorgang selbst angesprochen. Bei den . . . Ritualen aus dem südanatolisch-kizzuwatnischen Raum leiten Männer . . . , unterstützt von einer Gruppe von Frauen . . . , das rituelle Geschehen, in dessen Mittelpunkt öfter der Gebärstuhl steht, die Geburt selbst aber nicht oder nur knapp angesprochen wird.”