

invasion in 2 Kings 18:13–19:37. The chronological calculations for the founding date of the temple in relation to the founding of Carthage come from Josephus, who lived in the first century C.E. and who used the Bible as a reliable source for ancient Judahite chronology, taking its statements at face value. Barnes has concluded elsewhere in his book that the accounts in the books of Kings have been shaped by ideological concerns that have highlighted small portions of reigns in ways that have undermined chronology. Was the Hiram who built a fleet at Eziongeber with a king of Judah Hiram I or Hiram II? How much about events from the early monarchy did the biblical writer derive from sources and how much of the present account is comprised of chronologically displaced stories that accrued over time as the idea of the reigns of David and Solomon as a “golden era” developed? With two disputed ancient dates for the founding of Carthage itself and an old Tyrian king-list that itself inevitably would have developed copyists’ errors through transmission over time, how much weight can we really put on Josephus’s calculations as a reliable “fixed point” for the reconstruction of biblical chronology?

A presentation of the established Mesopotamian-biblical synchronisms would have been helpful to the reader who is not steeped in the wider discussion of chronological intricacies. In this way, the double-scoring of regnal dates in his final proposed chronology that he considers to be “reasonably secure” (p. 151) because most are fixed by external synchronisms would have been made more understandable.

The volume provides a good presentation and critique of the biblical chronologies of Thiele and Albright, which can serve as a helpful introduction to the problems of biblical chronology for the novice. Its subsequent chapters are less useful in this regard because of their shortcomings, some of which were outlined above.

DIANA EDELMAN

James Madison University
Harrisonburg, Virginia

The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities.

By GREGORY McMAHON. Assyriological Studies, no. 25. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1991. Pp. xiii + 302.

This monograph, a revision of the author’s Ph.D. dissertation, has two principal aims: (1) to analyze the Hittites’ conception of “tutelary” deities (PLAMMA) and their role in the state cult; (2) to present a comprehensive and up-to-date philological treatment of the major festival texts involving these deities. The conceptual discussion seems to me generally judicious and well founded, but I will leave it to specialists in Hittite religion to make a final pronouncement on how well the author has achieved the first goal. The following remarks focus on the philological aspects.

McMahon has made a significant contribution to our understanding of the organization of the ritual texts concerning the tutelary deities. Everyone should take note of and adopt the revisions to Laroche, *CTH* 681–85 (pp. 6 ff.). Particularly noteworthy is McMahon’s division of the “Festival for All the Tutelary Deities” into two parts, group offerings and individual offerings (chap. 3).

The establishment of the texts is highly reliable and painstakingly detailed. The chronology of the texts and manuscripts is also mostly well founded, and the basis for it gratifyingly explicit (including an appendix with tables of characteristic sign shapes for several MSS). I express thanks for the citation of crucial signs by line number which I have elsewhere requested. I do find it surprising that McMahon offers no table of sign shapes nor any detailed discussion for the one tablet which he claims to be an OH manuscript, *KUB* 53.11 (p. 236).

This is particularly problematic because in the published autograph the heads of vertical strokes do not show the “slant” characteristic of OH manuscripts, and the sign Uḫ of *šu-uh-ḫa-a-i* (ii 18.21) is not in the OH form. Note also the unusual RA of *ta-ra-u-ur* (ii 14) with only two horizontals. Several linguistic features (such as the ablative *ērḫuyaz* in instrumental function, ii 16) also argue against an OH manuscript. I must therefore seriously doubt McMahon’s claim.

The grammatical and lexical interpretation of the texts themselves is dramatically and disap-

pointingly uneven. Chap. 4, which presents the “Festivals for Renewing the *KUSkursā-s*,” treats material never fully edited elsewhere. It cannot be accidental that this chapter has by far the most detailed line-by-line commentary and is the only one in which I found no errors in interpretation. One receives the distinct impression that McMahon concentrated his efforts on this set of texts, while his degree of attention varied widely in the case of previously edited texts and the fragmentary ones.

While some of the errors cited below involve subtle distinctions, others (such as the mistranslations of *kinu-* and *QATAM dāi*) are very basic and would lead to serious misunderstandings on the part of readers who do not control the Hittite. It is also disturbing that McMahon does not seem to have read and understood some of the sources he cites (e.g., de Martino and Dressler). Therefore, despite its quite genuine contributions, I can only recommend chaps. 1 and 4 of this work without qualification. Readers should use other chapters with caution.

Space limitations require that the following notes be limited to only the most serious errors and omissions affecting understanding of the texts and to the most important positive lexical contributions.

P. 41 etc.: Hitt. *tuzzi-* = KARAS means “camp,” not “army,” the word for which is hidden behind the logogram ERIN.MEŠ-*t*.

Pp. 50 and 59 with n. 26: *wašḫazza* is dative singular of a Cuneiform Luvian adjective meaning “sacred, sacralized” (see my article in *HS* 103 [1990]: 202).

P. 57: de Martino, *Hethitica* 5 (1983): 75 ff. (in the bibliography!), has shown convincingly that *taršan-zi-pa-* means “movable partition, screen.”

P. 67, n. 58: the use of the *-ške-* form here and elsewhere is not iterative but distributive, as per Dressler, *Plur.* (1968), pp. 176 f.

Pp. 71 ff.: *waršuli ekuzi* is “drinks to the lees,” as persuasively analyzed by C. Zinko, *Betrachtungen zum AN.TAḫ.ŠUM-Fest* (1987), pp. 39 f.

Pp. 91 ff.: as the particle *-ššan* and the Akkadian accusative *QATAM* clearly show, *-ššan QATAM dāi* means “puts his hand on.” This important and frequent ritual act symbolizes the king’s approval of and active participation in an action performed by some functionary.

Pp. 93 ff.: *kinu-* means merely “(break) open, unseal” pithoi, not “break,” which would be *duwarni-*

Pp. 95 ff.: *menaiḫanda* is “opposite, facing.” The consistent mistranslation “in front (of)” is sometimes harmless but, in some cases, seriously misleading.

P. 109, n. 119 and p. 115, n. 160: the frequent lapsing into the nominative case in long lists is not due to scribal error but reflects the natural use of the nominative as the “zero” or unmarked case.

P. 117: the translation “stripped” (of a carcass) for *-pittalwant-* seems promising, but what is the basis for it?

P. 133: *piran tianti* is not an error for *tianzi*. The phrase is a nominalized participle in apposition to *ḫahpunai* (like *aššiyanti* in the preceding paragraph): “for Z, who stands before King Tuthaliya” (lit. “the in-front-standing one of King T.”). Thus LUGAL-*waš* is not a genitive governed by the postposition *peran* and this criterion for an OH composition falls (cf. p. 140). An OH text remains likely.

P. 144, with n. 3: I did not, of course, say in my dissertation (p. 92, n. 98) that the manuscript was MH (I had no access to it) but merely that the composition was at least as old as MH.

P. 153 and pp. 255 ff.: pace Bédalí et al., the only plausible meaning for *palwāi-* is “clap.” As McMahon himself notes, the alleged meaning “recite” does not fit all passages. The fact that the “clapper” is holding something in his hand in a few instances is not a valid counterargument, as anyone who has attended a modern ceremony with refreshments can attest.

P. 209: the context of obv. 11 (*dāi*, “puts” + dative-locative) argues overwhelmingly for interpreting *namma=an=zan* as *=z(a)+ššan*, not as *-(z(a))+an* with McMahon. Again then, this criterion for an OH text fails.

P. 241: since the breaking of a moist bread results in two *taraur* (ii 13–15), and the breaking of a *taraur* results in two “morsels” (*paršulli*) (ii 11–13), *taraur* manifestly cannot mean “measuring vessel.” The basic meaning is “handful.” If one breaks a loaf of bread with two hands, one is left with half the loaf in each hand—clearly the meaning here.

Pp. 250 ff.: the meaning “hunting bag” for *KUSkursā-* adopted from Güterbock is convincing and important.

P. 258: likewise the new suggested meaning “be prescribed” for *rukka-*.

Pp. 263–64: LÜ.MEŠ UR.GI₇ EGIR GISAB.ḪLA is merely a complete nominal sentence with the verb “to be” regularly omitted in the present tense: “the dogmen (are) behind the windows.”

CRAIG MELCHERT

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill