Palestinian archaeology’s loss. Leonard is to be warmly thanked for bringing this material forward, and given the erudition he displays, it may be hoped that he will present some of his own views on the pre- and protohistory of the southern Levant. In the end, however, the success is bittersweet. Looking back at Mellaart’s 1962 report of his initial survey results in the Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan (which sat unpublished for seven years), one sees that all of the sites on his “danger list” have indeed suffered greatly. How many more danger lists are there, and are we paying attention to them?

ALEXANDER H. JOFFE

Pennsylvania State University

The Hittite Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard.

The text presented here (IBot I 36) is one of the most famous and most important in the entire Hittite corpus. It is also one of the most difficult to interpret due to several factors: (1) the many interpolations by the ancient scribe in a tiny and often illegible script; (2) the appearance of many common Hittite words in idiomatic or colloquial usage; (3) the contents. The text describes, in turn, the positioning and duties of guards near the entrance of a palace; the formation of a royal procession; an audience before the king on the part of the šargant(i)-attested only here. These activities involve elaborately choreographed movements of personnel in and around structures and objects whose nature and orientation were self-evident to the ancient author but quite unknown to us modern readers. The only previous complete edition, that of L. Jakob-Rost in MIO 11 (1966), may be characterized without condescension as a valiant but ultimately unsatisfactory attempt to meet the challenges of this text. The absence of any competing editions for a complete text available for nearly sixty years is eloquent silent testimony to just how formidable the task is.
The present version, by the man who made the autograph in 1934, reflects over fifty years of effort by H. G. Güterbock to publish an edition of the text. The deterioration of his sight by this time required a collaborator, and the ample and very able material assistance of T. van den Hout is acknowledged by the appearance of his name as coauthor. The results I can only characterize as masterful. I cannot adequately express my admiration for the sovereignty with which the text is rendered in idiomatic English—this is a free translation in the very best sense. As is clear from the glossary, Professor Güterbock knows the core meaning of each lexeme as well as anyone alive, but he feels no compunction about translating a word in a half-dozen different ways in order to convey the true sense in context. One may or may not accept his interpretation of a given passage, but no English reader will have any doubt as to what the author thinks it means. I offer as but one example the pellucid translation of §2 (p. 7).

I need not expati ate on the many felicities of the interpretation. Suffice it to say that this new edition advances our understanding of this central text by a high order of magnitude. It is "must" reading for anyone interested in Hittite language or civilization. Nevertheless, next to the Laws this is perhaps the richest text in the canon, and I am sure we will still be learning new things about it decades hence. I offer below a few comments on passages where I think even this splendid edition may be improved upon.

P. 19: the authors correctly interpret pēran/appan arha pāî- as "pass in front of/behind". I take awan arha pāî-in ii 42 and iv 11 (p. 33) as the unmarked third member of the set: "pass beside". In §22, the palace attendant leaves his place in line to receive the bow and quiver and must then regain his spot without disturbing the procession (ii 42 ff.): "He walks back, passes beside the guards and palace attendants, and goes and takes his place at the left wheel of the cart'.

P. 23: I am pleased that the interpretation of §27 builds upon and improves mine; see JCS 32 (1980): 52. The new idea that takšulidn refers to spectators kept away from the procession accounts for the otherwise excessive distance of 3 IKU (ca. 45 m). I would carry the theme of protection of the king over into §28, where hanteziya- and appizziya- refer to the ranks of soldiers in relationship to the king's vehicle: 'Further, if those (soldiers) who are in front (of the king) let anything in . . . , if those who are behind (the king) let anything in . . .'.

P. 23 ff.: I do not believe that the šarkant(i) are defendants but rather petitioners before the king. While I cannot prove it, I find it likely that šarkant(i)- is from the same root as šarn(u)nk- 'make restitution': the šarkant(i)- are people seeking redress. The king has made an excursion to some provincial city (thus the procession) in order to make himself available to his subjects for this purpose. I find it perfectly reasonable that even an ordinary citizen brought into the king's immediate presence would be closely guarded. Obviously, foreign troops would call for even more caution (§37).

P. 27: based on the above, I interpret §36 rather as 'but if a petitioner is standing there, and the case is against a guard or a palace attendant, then he . . . goes and takes his stand next to that (guard) who holds the outside'. That is, a guard or official involved in a complaint must abs ent himself while the king hears the matter.

P. 28: given the entire paragraph and the meaning of taruptat, I would take ḫulalttat as one more colloquialism equivalent to that in English"; 'it (the hearing of petitioners) has been wrapped up (= completed)'. Note the probable difference in "register" between ḫulalattat said by the guard to the chief-of-the-guards and taruptat said by the latter to the king (cf. p. 59 on §§56–57).

H. Craig Melchert

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill


Many a century has passed since the Babylonian conqueror sped east and west; yet his name, Nebuchadnezzar, is still one to be reckoned with by the historian, scholar of antiquity, and even the general reader.

This book about Nebuchadnezzar II is a study with more than one stated objective. Perhaps the best way to describe the multiple goals would be to cite the author's own statement of purpose in his preface: