

Book Reviews

Yossi Garfinkel, D. Ben-Shlomo, D. and N. Korn, *Sha'ar HaGolan 3: The Symbolic Dimensions of the Yarmukian Culture: Canonization in Neolithic Art.* The Institute of Archaeology and The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, in Cooperation with the Israel Exploration Society, 2010. Jerusalem. Pp. xv + 353. \$68. ISBN: 9789652210814.

This book is the third in a series of seven intended monographs describing the site and material culture of Sha'ar HaGolan, the type-site for the Yarmukian culture. Its subject is the figurines from the site, made famous by a travelling exhibition and a popular illustrated book. The first volume, *Neolithic Art in Context* was published in 2002 and the second, *The Rise of Urban Concepts in the Ancient Near East*, in 2009. Four further volumes are planned, covering pottery and lithics, among other subjects.

The subject of figurines has been given some previous attention in the first monograph, and in Garfinkel's more populist tome, *The Yarmukians*, but most of what is contained in this publication, which focuses purely on figurines, is novel material. The structure of the book is very straightforward. The introduction starts by setting out the authors' theoretical basis for their ideas about canonisation in Levantine Neolithic art in general. This revolves around population pressures and the need for planning in society, which led to standardisation of belief and artistic endeavour, as well as organised settlements. This is followed with a brief, but comprehensive description of trends in finds from Sha'ar HaGolan, from the excavations, and also from the informal finds curated by the local kibbutz. Problems with chronology and authenticity are openly acknowledged.

The main body of the volume is made up of detailed descriptions of the titular art objects, with drawings, photographs and findspot data. This section is sub-divided into categories: Clay Statues, Cowrie-Eye Clay Figurines, Pebble Figurines, Other Anthropomorphic Clay Figurines and Vessels, and Various Anthropomorphic Stone Figurines. Additional chapters on the spatial distribution of the finds, and on zoomorphic figurines, appear at the end. The figurine data is supplemented with information of a similar standard from other southern Levantine Neolithic sites for comparison, including 'Ain Ghazal, Munhata and Çatalhöyük. The conventions used to categorise each type are explained at the beginning of each chapter. The simple referencing system used to connect words to illustrations is effective.

The second part concerns comparative analysis: The two categories subjected to this investigation are the cowrie-eye figures and the pebble figurines, which are the two most numerous, and presumably common, art objects found. A large quantity of comparative data is provided for both types of object, taking the

same description-and-illustration form as the Sha'ar HaGolan data. Examples of Neolithic figurines from across the Levant, Mesopotamia, Anatolia, Greece and the Balkans are used, in order to demonstrate the ubiquity of the two forms. Typologies of the two forms are provided, with the rationale behind them. There is some discussion of function and representation, but the authors have refrained from hypothesising on what (or who) the images represent, and their ultimate purpose.

The value of this book is the large quantity of high-quality data contained within. For those studying Neolithic figurines, it is an excellent resource. Not only are the items discussed, but every one is depicted, both in drawings and photographs. Where possible, data on context is included, down to site grid references. Speaking as someone who has carried out secondary research on Near Eastern excavated material, I find this approach particularly laudable, and it has the potential to stimulate some interesting work on Yarmukian art in the future. The text is rather light on concrete interpretations, which may disappoint some readers, especially students looking for more general articles about Neolithic figurines. However, as an accessible collection of well-presented data, it succeeds.

Rachel Bichener
University of Manchester

Koert van Bekkum, *From Conquest to Coexistence: Ideology and Antiquarian Intent in the Historiography of Israel's Settlement in Canaan*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East, 45. Leiden: Brill, 2011. Pp xxii + 694. € 191.00 / US\$ 270.00. ISBN-13: 978-9-0041-9480-9; ISBN 10: 90-04-19480 0.

Koert van Bekkum's voluminous study on the conquest of the Land narrated in the Book of Joshua (9:1–13:7) originates from a doctoral dissertation submitted to Theological University, Kampen, the Netherlands, in 2010. The work claims that the narrative of conquest contained in Joshua 9: 1– 13:7 is a historiographical account composed between the late 10th and 8th century B.C.E. It was written in Jerusalem by scribes associated with the Davidic monarchy using written sources and oral traditions of memories from the Late Bronze Age, which the scribes lined up to the historical realities of Iron Age Israel. Throughout the book the author calls for and demonstrates that it is possible to maintain a fruitful dialogue between the claims of the biblical text of Joshua and the archaeology of the Levant.

The book is organised into four parts. Part 1 ('Text and Artefact', pp. 7–92) revisits the main issues in the historiography of the settlement debate, particularly where biblical accounts and archaeology meet and/or diverge. Part 2 ('Monologue of Text', 95–423) provides a translation of Joshua 9:1–13:7, with critical annotations, and submits the biblical text to a careful literary (synchronic) study. Part 3 ('Monologue of Artefact', pp. 427–572) introduces archaeological evidence of destruction, or the lack of, for (most of) the Bronze and Iron Age tells

identified from the list of vanquished kings and towns in Joshua 12. It discusses the lower and upper limits of the geography of the conquest (especially in regards to the 'remaining land' in Josh.13), the chronology of conquest as it relates to the boundaries of conquered and remaining land and also touches upon the social life of the southern Levant as it can be reconstructed from archaeological findings. Part 4 ('Dialogue of Text and Artefact', pp. 575–592) brings together the insights gleaned from the synchronic and diachronic study of Joshua's conquests – those materialised under his leadership and those remaining to be done under the leadership of YHWH (through David). An Epilogue (pp.593–597), followed by an Appendix containing a synchronic outline of the text (pp. 599–610), Bibliography (pp. 611–652) and a comprehensive Index (pp. 653–691) conclude this rich study.

As someone currently writing a book on the biblical memory of Joshua (*The Conquest of Memory: Israel's Identity and the Commemoration of the Past in Joshua 1–12*, anticipated to be forthcoming from Sheffield Phoenix Press, Sheffield, UK) there is much to praise in van Bekkum's study, in terms of both method and content. The author's focus on Joshua 9:1–13:7, for example, is a noteworthy corrective to many literary studies of Joshua's Conquest Narrative that either conclude prematurely at chapter 11 or treat chapter 12 only summarily. Van Bekkum shows that this narrative segment, which he isolates on a thematic and structural basis, weaves into its texture a host of theological sub-themes reaching the margins of the Conquest Narrative and extending throughout the Book of Joshua into Genesis and all the way to the Book of Kings. The textual relationship between Joshua and the Primary History (Genesis–2 Kings) is and will remain disputed even after this study, even if van Bekkum carefully argues his choices. His excellent command of the geography of the Land of Israel and the conventions of ancient Near Eastern historiography serve him well when drawing out the temporal and spatial features of Joshua's stories of conquest or when pinpointing the ideological spin put on this account of victory.

But am I convinced by van Bekkum's overall argument? The answer is 'only in part'. I agree that the memory of conflict between indigenous enclaves and a Yahwistic group of outsiders identified as 'Israel' led by their hero, Joshua, could have reached the scribes sometime after the reign of King David. I also find plausible that these memories contained fairly accurate, though schematic, Bronze Age information about local kings and pre-Israelite nations, as well as details about an existing treaty of non-aggression with one Hivite enclave (the Gibeonites) or even knowledge about where the Bronze Age Egyptian boundaries of the Province of Asia used to lie. However, I believe that van Bekkum's decision to link the 10th to late 9th century data – textual references to the Philistines and their five city states, the attestation of Sidon, corvee labour of non-Israelites (the Gibeonites), the parallels between the confines of David's empire (2 Sam. 8–10, 24) and the boundaries of the 'remaining land' in Joshua 13: 2–6 – to the time of the composition of this conquest's history is arbitrary. This Iron Age data, just like the Bronze Age data, could have functioned as historical memory in support of later programs. This conviction derives in part from the fact that the study leaves

ambiguous the factors that triggered the writing of the conquest history in the 10th to early 8th century. If I were to accept a composition date not too long after the death of King David, I do not see any clear reasons why a Jerusalem-based group of scribes evaded the biggest achievement of their times – Solomon’s Temple – in favour of alternative sacred locations (the altar in Gibeon)? The implications of dating a portion such as Joshua 9:1– 13:7 from a larger unified story regrettably have not been drawn out for the whole conquest narrative. Maybe this was done intentionally in order to offer van Bekkum another opportunity to display his erudition in a future study.

Ovidiu Creangă
Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington D.C.

Amnon Ben-Tor, *Back To Masada*: Israel Exploration Society, Jerusalem, 2009. Pp. 314 incl. maps, plans. \$40.00. ISBN: 9652210757; 978-9-6522-1075-3.

The story of Masada has fascinated even those who normally care little about ancient history. It has become a symbol of the modern nation of Israel standing against overwhelming odds and has led to what some call the ‘Masada myth’. Even the Jewish historian Josephus, who cared little for those he saw as insurgents and criminals, wrote admiringly of the mass suicide of the defenders before the Romans were able to engulf them. Speculation about the excavations has fuelled conspiracy theories, one of which formed the centrepiece for best-selling author Kathy Reich’s *Cross Bones*.

The site of Masada was excavated under the direction of Yigael Yadin in the years 1963–65. Few archaeological digs have excited so much interest: the nation seemed on the edge of its chair, waiting eagerly for reports from the news media who pressed Yadin for new details on almost a daily basis. Yadin wrote a popular account (1966). Yet apart from a scattering of articles and a preliminary volume reporting on the excavations, the official report was delayed for many years. Finally, between 1989 and 2007 eight volumes gave the full report on all aspects of the dig.

The author, Amnon Ben-Tor, was a protégé of Yigael Yadin (e.g., eventually taking Yadin’s Hazor excavations forward) and participated in the Masada dig as a site supervisor. He now writes up the Masada excavations, being able to go greatly beyond the earlier volume of Yadin. This volume summarises the eight professional volumes, reducing them to a single volume aimed at the educated general reader. Furthermore, he has done a good job of reducing the technical volumes into a well-illustrated and readable handbook. In producing this manual he has not skimmed on technical information or detail. A lot of information is packed into the text but in an understandable format for those who are archaeologically literate.

Even for the biblical scholar a great deal of technical detail can be found here, whether of the pottery and other artefacts, the architecture of buildings,

the stratigraphy, the written objects in a variety of languages, and even the coins. There is also a section on the history of Masada, drawing on historical accounts (especially Josephus) as well as archaeology. This includes a survey of Masada in the Byzantine period (pp. 255–68). Other aspects of interpretation are also discussed, such as the date of the Roman siege of Masada (pp. 253–54). Although taking only two pages, the essential information is given, but also the reason why scholars have not been able to pin the date down to either 73 or 74 CE is explained. Such succinct but very useful discussions are characteristic of the book.

Only occasionally is the discussion disappointing, such as why Yadin referred to the defenders of Masada as ‘Zealots’ (pp. 3–4, 282–86). Ben-Tor correctly notes that Josephus refers to them as *Sicarii*, a group that grew out of the ‘Fourth Philosophy’ according to Josephus (*Ant.* 18.1.1 §§4–10; 18.1.6 §23). The Zealots in Josephus are a group that arose after the 66–70 war began (Grabbe 2000: 207–8). Some scholars, however, have elected to use ‘Zealot’ to mean anyone who resisted Roman rule for religious reasons (e.g. Hengel 1989). This is misleading in my view, but I believe Yadin was simply following this usage. I think Ben-Tor might imply this, but he does not say this clearly that I can find.

Ben-Tor also includes (rightly, in my opinion) a chapter on the ‘Masada myth’ and those who argue that some discoveries at Masada were suppressed. Although he says he will talk about the archaeology, on which he is a specialist, he cannot restrain himself from commenting on the broader ‘Masada myth’. No doubt some issues of this chapter will remain controversial (though lack of evidence is never disproof to a conspiracy theorist; indeed, lack of evidence is seen as *proof* of the conspiracy!) but the author presents some relevant information and at least partially answers critics. Those who think archaeology is cut and dried objective fact should read this chapter (pp. 269–309).

All in all Amnon Ben-Tor has presented a very useful volume, clearly written and summarizing a lot of technical information in a convenient-and relatively inexpensive-volume. I believe Yadin would have been proud of his achievement.

Bibliography

- Grabbe, Lester L., (2000) *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London and New York: Routledge).
- Hengel, Martin, (1989) *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 AD* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark); (1976) ET of *Die Zeloten: Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr.* 2nd edition; AGAJU 1 (Leiden: Brill).
- Reichs, Kathy, (2005) *Cross Bones* (London: William Heinemann).
- Yadin, Yigal, (1966) *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand* (New York: Random House).

Lester L. Grabbe
University of Hull

Benjamin Sass and Joachim Marzahn, *Aramaic and Figural Stamp Impressions on Bricks of the Sixth Century B.C. from Babylon*. Drawings by Noga Z'evi (Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 127; Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft in Babylon 10). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010. ISBN 978-3-447-06184-1; ISSN 1860-1812.

This splendid volume provides for the first time a comprehensive catalogue and publication of the Aramaic stamp impressions on bricks found during German excavations at Babylon in 1899–1917. As so often in modern publications of items found long ago, there is in the book full attention to and considerable detail on the archival aspect of the material in Berlin, where extensive excavation-related documentation survives, including on-site photographs and squeezes.

The bricks can be dated to the period from Nebuchadnezzar II to Nabonidus (605–539 BCE). The materials are mostly in Berlin's Vorderasiatisches Museum, with smaller numbers now in Philadelphia, London and Istanbul. The main catalogue (Chapter 3) contains 131 items under the heading 'Aramaic and Figural Impressions', while the number of impressed bricks containing Aramaic letters is 87. In many cases the same impression survives in several examples (up to 22–24 examples). Naturally these are collated and listed as one entry in the catalogue, since the 131 separate impressions are the focus of the catalogue, not each brick (though information on each brick is also provided). The total number of all items bearing Aramaic and figural impressions is 330. (There are also some items which bear only cuneiform signs [2], some which have royal cuneiform inscriptions [15], and some which are unaccounted for, though mentioned in the original excavation records).

The stamping of bricks with writing was a distinctively Mesopotamian practice, going back to the third millennium BCE. The cuneiform impressions known otherwise are mostly royal inscriptions, commemorative in character. Figural impressions are rarer. Rarer still is the survival of the actual stamps, bearing the inverted writing which was to be impressed into the soft brick. Surviving stamps bearing cuneiform writing are of terracotta; there are none surviving which bear Aramaic in reverse, though there are some figural stamps of bronze.

Since Aramaic came to be widely used in Mesopotamia alongside cuneiform, it is not surprising to find Aramaic impressions, though these appear only in this sixth-century context and they are all very short. The present volume constitutes a comprehensive and definitive publication of all the Aramaic and figural material. Full documentation is provided for each impression, with photographs of all the exemplars and, perhaps most valuably, drawings (by Noga Z'evi) of each impression. The Aramaic is also transliterated. The fact that the 49 different surviving legends contain only personal names (and some acronyms), in four cases preceded by the possessive *l-*, 'for, belonging to' (or possibly 'produced by'), should not distract from the importance of this collection even on the linguistic level. Chapter 7 (p. 173) contains a linguistic commentary based on the orthography of the names (consonantal interchange, *matres lectionis*, possessive

l-), while the 42 different personal names are fully studied in the same chapter, with concluding comments on ethno-linguistic distribution in the context of the debate about the Aramatisation of Babylonia (placed in doubt by M. P. Streck): there are 15 Akkadian names, 8 or 9 Aramaic (counting only those of clear affiliation).

Another area of research which will benefit greatly from this publication is that of Aramaic epigraphy (Chapter 6). In effect a large gap in our knowledge of the monumental Aramaic script of the sixth century BCE is at least in part filled, with this body of material standing alongside an unprovenanced Aramaic inscription published by André Caquot in 1971 (dating according to Joseph Naveh). This evidence suggests the continuation of the Aramaic monumental script after the demise of the Aramaean kingdoms. There is in chapter 11 an interesting, though inevitably inconclusive, discussion of the purpose behind the stamping of bricks with these Aramaic impressions. They may have marked the destination of the bricks, perhaps with the name of the building official responsible for a particular project. There is the tantalizing possibility of linking particular names to particular parts of the site (chapter 10).

Though production quality is high, there are a few infelicities of English ('not always permits' instead of 'does not always permit' on p. 10) and printing errors (Αδαδναδιναχηζ instead of Αδαδναδιναχης on p. 11). Note may be made of one omission from the Bibliography noticed by the reviewer, Naveh 1982 (*Early History of the Alphabet*, Jerusalem), which is cited on p. 151.

This is a fine publication which clears up one of the many pieces of unfinished 20th century business in our field and provides an excellent basis for future research.

John F. Healy
University of Manchester

Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra (eds.), *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, Volume 94. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010. Pp. xii + 624, incl. illustrations. € 180.00 / US\$ 255.00. ISBN 13 978 90 04 8786 3; 10 90 04 18786 3

This volume will significantly refine our understanding of the corpus of Aramaic texts from Qumran. In addition, it is certain to extend our knowledge of eschatology, apocalypticism and messianism at Qumran, if not also our awareness of divination, astronomy, metrology, physiognomy, astrology and exorcism in the Second Temple Judean environment. Each of the twenty-two conference papers is accompanied by a précis of its contents, and is followed by an account of the respondents' subsequent discussion. The book is dedicated to the memory of the late Hanan Eshel, whose contribution to these conversations is preserved. While the collection focuses primarily upon linguistic, exegetical and textual

developments, the character of the corpus, distinctions of genre and the largely non-sectarian provenance of the texts are further examined. The reconstruction of potential historical backgrounds, if not also the cultural memory of the society (or societies) who produced and preserved these scrolls are among the most engaging, if not thought-provoking, contributions.

Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra introduce the collection by explaining that from the 900 scrolls recovered at Khirbet Qumran, 129 of these appear to have been written in Aramaic. Those 87 sufficiently well-preserved scrolls include targums, narrative compositions, apocryphal accounts, apocalyptic and other visionary texts, proverbs, a list of false prophets, an exorcism, an astrological text with a Brontologion (a Babylonian thunder omen) and accompanying horoscope, among others. Nor is the use of the Aramaic language itself particularly uniform in this diverse corpus, so that while several of the texts indicate acquaintance of Mesopotamian and Persian traditions, they are nevertheless written in a Western dialect of Aramaic.

In Part I, 'General Approaches', Devorah Dimant examines the diverse themes and genres within the corpus, highlighting its distinctive profile, which is characterised by the prevalence of pseudepigraphic works attributed to the patriarchs (or situate themselves within the Babylonian and Persian exile) and the extensive use of non-biblical elaborations. Émile Puech next presents the manuscripts originally assigned to Jean Starcky, which range from apocalyptic, pseudepigraphic, prophetic and visionary texts: other interesting finds include 4Q554, 554a and 555, labelled 'the New Jerusalem', fragments of 4Q 559 (Biblical Chronography) and 4Q561, a separate horoscope.

In Part II: 'Linguistica et Onomastica', Steven Fassberg examines the morphology of the verbal system and concludes that Qumran Aramaic is a western dialect that remains close to official Aramaic of the Persian period (i.e. Standard Literary Aramaic), yet bears witness to innovations that presage later Aramaic dialects, if not also the subsequent development of Jewish literary Aramaic. Jan Joosten examines the formula 'in front of/before (*qdm*) the king' while Ursula Schattner-Rieser discusses how linguistic archaisms may help determine dating the compositions. The next stimulating paper was given by André Lemaire, who examines the names of Gilgamesh and the monster, Humbaba, attested also in the *Book of the Giants*. In addition, he makes a separate argument regarding the *Prayer of Nabonidus* – which may be related to North-Arabic/Idumean traditions developed after Nabonidus' stay in Teiman. Both these cases are then used to demonstrate that contact existed between the late scribal cuneiform culture and the Babylonian Jewish diaspora. Equally valuable is the contribution of Michael Langlois, who lists the twenty watchers from *I Enoch* (who descended from heaven and mated with 'the daughters of men'). This is a highly informative piece in which the Aramaic names of the angels are compared with their parallels in Greek, Ethiopic and Syriac sources, while their relationship to Ugaritic deities is also considered.

In Part III: 'Exegesis and Genres' Katell Berthelot examines those texts from the subsequent canonical biblical traditions (excluding Genesis) known in this

corpus. This is followed by Armin Lange's argument in 'The False Prophets Who Arose against Our God (4Q339)'. Lange advocates that line 9 of this text should be reconstructed to read: עון [ייהנן בן שמ]עון, thus referring to John Hyrcanus I, rather than Elisha Qimron's later suggestion of : עון [בן מן גב], 'the prophet who is from Givon'. 4Q339 is a challenging bilingual Aramaic-Hebrew fragment, written and preserved only on a scrap of leather and which, if Lange's reconstruction is accepted, provides a significant indication of Hellenistic influence in the cultural memory of ancient Judaism. Next, Thierry Legrand suggests that several exegetical techniques used in *Genesis Apocryphon* are comparable with those found in the Targumin. However, as a form of 're-written bible', the *Apocryphon* is considerably more free and expansive in its development of Genesis. Three separate discussions of the Birth of Noah traditions in *Genesis Apocryphon*, 4Q Birth of Noah (4Q534–536), *I Enoch* 106–107 and 1Q19 then follow. First: Loren Stuckenbruck demonstrates that although there is clearly a genetic relationship between these three witnesses, it is too complex to reconstruct from such fragmentary remains. Second: Esther Eshel evaluates the shared terminology employed, while making particularly astute observations on the significance of the horoscope and its relationship to predicting the child's future. Third: Matthias Weigold examines the popularity of these 'wunderkind' birth traditions. He suggests (following Devorah Dimant) that Noah is a prototypical figure of a righteous survivor, but (as Michael Stone has advanced), that his role was to bridge the flood epic and to act as a repository of antediluvian secret knowledge. Weigold concludes that these developed in response to the exegetical difficulties in Genesis 5: 28–29, to explain how Lamech knew about the destiny of his son, if not also to provide a compelling ideology for the meaning of Noah's name. To complete this section Moshe Bernstein critiques the use of generic terms, such as 'midrash', 'targum', 're-written bible' and 'parabiblical' to describe the *Genesis Apocryphon*, which may be better understood as a *Mischgattung*: a composite and multi-generic collection. Jörg Frey then evaluates the criteria for examining the so-called 'literary testament', where the final speech of an important (male) biblical figure is developed as an authoritative discourse.

Part IV, 'Science and Esoterics', consists of two papers: Jonathan Ben-Dov discusses the significance of 'Translation and Concealment'. He argues that the resonances of scientific culture in Second Temple Aramaic texts presupposes their early Mesopotamian origins, whilst Greek influence is discernable only in the later material, confirming also that such traditions appear restricted to a small circle of initiates. Samuel Thomas develops the descriptions of religious esoterism, suggesting that a correspondence between the possession of secret knowledge and the *yahad's* self-understanding was evident. All discussions of the zodiac calendar (on pp.42–44, 68, 383–384, 387–388, 403, 422 and 561) and its accompanying brontologian were made without reference to the recently acclaimed research of Helen Jacobus, which did not appear in time for this conference: '4Q318: A Jewish Zodiac Calendar at Qumran', published in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Contexts*, ed. C. Hempel (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 90) Leiden: Brill, 2010: a paper that has since won the 2011 Sean Dever Memorial Prize.

In the penultimate section ‘apocalyptica et eschatologica’, Florentino García Martínez explains that the Aramaic scrolls from Qumran mainly feature a predominant interest in ‘pre-Mosaic’ protagonists, or else in a diaspora setting. He continues to explain why the categories of sectarian/non-sectarian and biblical/non-biblical are largely irrelevant, where the inspiration of the Aramaic texts in shaping the Qumran group as ‘apocalyptic community’, is of greater significance. Lorenzo DiTommaso next provides a new theory of apocalypticism, in which the temporal and spatial dimensions of the apocalypse provide the defining criteria within the ideology of the scrolls. Hugo Antonissen then evaluates ‘Architectural Representation Technique in New Jerusalem, Ezekiel and the Temple Scroll’, which he considers has drawn on earlier Mesopotamian convention. Finally, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra examines the messianic figures in 4Q541 (Apocryphon of Levi^{b?} ar), 4Q588 (4Qpap Vision^b ar), 4Q246 (Apocryphon of Daniel ar) and 4Q534 (4Q Messianic ar), with attention to the chronological development of each manuscript, comparative terminology, the actions of each protagonist and the relationship of each description to the relevant biblical sources.

In conclusion, Part VI consists of a synopsis of the implications of these insights, where John Collins observes that distinctions between scrolls that are clearly ‘sectarian’, and those that reflect ‘common Judaism’, are still valid, but might be better served by accommodating a third, in-between category: that of ‘proto-sectarian’ texts. The impression of the largely pre-Maccabean origin of the Western Aramaic texts, if not also their Persian and Mesopotamian background, is of considerable interest, while the inexplicable absence of legal traditions from this corpus is even more intriguing. Although an index of sources is provided, an index of subject areas would have been helpful for non-DSS scholars, and also students. The editors are to be commended for producing an exceptionally fine volume, which makes a substantial improvement to our understanding of the context and nature of the Aramaic scrolls from Qumran: a highly enigmatic, albeit distinct corpus.

Sandra Jacobs
King’s College, London

Albert I. Baumgarten, Hanan Eshel, Ranon Katzoff and Shani Tzoref (eds.), *Halakhah in Light of Epigraphy*. Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011. Pp. 303. €69.95. ISBN 3525550170; 978-3-5255-5017-5.

This volume contains the proceedings of a conference held in Bar Ilan University in 2008 and sponsored by their Jeselsohn Center for the Study of Ancient Jewish Epigraphy. The director of the Center at the time of the conference was Hanan Eshel, now of blessed memory. The most potentially misleading aspect of the book is addressed by the editors in their introduction: ‘epigraphy’ is defined here,

as the editors say, ‘broadly,’ by which they apparently mean that the term includes all writing, including the texts found at Qumran. The book admirably performs the purpose stated by the editors in the introduction: it demonstrates the observance of Jewish law, fundamentally the same system articulated later by the Rabbis, in the Roman period. This is accomplished effectively, since on the whole the articles do not try too hard to argue the point; instead, they all demonstrate that knowledge of *halakhah* is often a necessary pre-requisite for understanding earlier sources, just as knowledge of earlier sources enhances our understanding of halakhic sources. Taken as a whole, the volume should convince all interested parties that the study of Second Temple texts and that of rabbinic literature have to go hand in hand.

The first section contains five articles on ‘*Halakhah* and the Scrolls from Qumran’. Moshe Benovitz reconstructs an ancient stage in the laws of the Sukkot festival based on the book of Nehemiah and the Temple Scroll, combined with traditions embedded within rabbinic literature resurrected by critical tools. Vered Noam triangulates from Qumran texts and rabbinic literature, which agree that Gentiles are impure but disagree as to why, to reach the conclusion that the law itself was ancient. Shared by Qumran and the Rabbis is not just the legal tradition, but the interpretation of Numbers 31:23, taken by both sets of texts as the basis for the law. Eyal Regev provides a valuable survey of the *halakhic* positions found in Josephus and Philo which agree with the Pharisees, the Sadducees, or the Qumran texts; Regev then suggests that the two authors – and probably other Jews as well – were consciously picking and choosing whom to follow in every given case. This assumes a remarkable *halakhic* sophistication on the part of these authors, which they themselves never mention, but is a suggestion worth considering further. Lawrence Schiffman surveys the laws of forbidden foods in Qumran texts and rabbinic literature.

Finally, Aharon Shemesh uses the laws of incest at Qumran as a way to explore important issues in the early history of *halakhah*: he argues well that the Sadducees and the Qumran sect insisted on consistent application of biblical exegesis as the foundation of the legal system, whereas the Pharisees were content to follow the ‘traditions of the fathers’. The rabbinic texts show two approaches within the latter position: the school of R. Ishmael, according to Shemesh, simply acknowledge the existence of laws other than those that are Scriptural in basis, whereas the school of R. Akiva insists on deriving everything from the biblical text, even if the exegesis required takes torturous paths. These ideas are not new, but Shemesh’s use of the Qumran material throws the rabbinic positions into clearer perspective.

The second section contains four articles on ‘*Halakhah* and Quotidian Documents from the Judean Desert’. First, a very valuable article by Hanan Eshel z’l, which is not actually about *halakhah* at all, but about the texts discovered in the past 60 years in caves in the Judean Desert. Since the texts found in Wadi Murabba‘at, Nahal Hever, and elsewhere in the Judean Desert south of Qumran were published decades apart in various volumes and journals, it is very difficult to get a comprehensive picture of the various texts, their places of origin, and their contents. Eshel surveys the textual finds masterfully, providing a convenient

entry-point into the world of these texts. Steven Fraade surveys attestations of the term *parnas* in epigraphic sources, and then analyzes the same term in rabbinic literature in that light. The differences between the uses are more striking than the similarities, but bringing the two corpora into mutual dialogue allows Fraade to ask perceptive questions of each one. Shamma Friedman studies the *get* (divorce document) from Masada (actually found in Wadi Murabba'at), and shows that its formulary is essentially continued in that of the medieval *get*, as well. Friedman points out that the *get* as described in the Mishnah differs in important ways, and he sees this as an attempt at reform which did not succeed. Concluding this section, David Goodblatt reviews the methods by which legal documents, letters, and coins, were dated in late Second Temple times and the period from the destruction of the Temple until the time of the *Mishnah*. He finds that texts dates generally refer either to a regnal year or to an 'independence era' – either to the Great Revolt in 67 or Bar Koseba's revolt in 132. The early rabbinic texts entirely avoid the possibility of the latter method of dating, although the *Tannaim*, some of whom lived through Bar Koseba's revolt, would certainly have been aware of it. Goodblatt suggests that this might have been a conscious effort on the part of the Rabbis to suppress memories of the ideology of the revolt, although he is cautious in suggesting this.

The final section is entitled '*Halakhah* and Epigraphic Sources'. Here Yonatan Adler opens with a thorough discussion of the finds of *tefillin* from the Judean Desert (especially Qumran). He concludes that some of the rabbinic laws of *tefillin* are late – post-dating Bar Koseba – because those who wrote earlier *tefillin* seem to be entirely unaware of prescriptions regarding the order in which the biblical sections should appear, for example. Adler also shows that some possibilities cited and rejected in the halakhic midrashim reflect Jewish law as practiced by others, and so in these cases (and others?) the midrash is apparently polemical. Chaim Ben David insightfully analyzes the structure of the Rehov *halakhic* mosaic, arguing that the order of the paragraphs within the text, which is unmatched in rabbinic literature, reflects in particular the perspective of the Galilean populace of Rehov. Tal Ilan then argues that in ancient Israel and through rabbinic times, there was no ban on burying Jews in the cemetery as non-Jews. This argument relies on two types of evidence. The first is an argument from silence: the rabbinic authorities never proscribed such burials. The second is positive evidence, in the form of mixed cemeteries. Ilan's argument is convincing regarding the Diaspora, but falters within Israel on the cemetery at Bet She'arim, which is overwhelmingly Jewish. Ilan claims that one grave there is non-Jewish, but who is to say that the Jews were happy that he was buried there? Still, this paper is valuable for the data brought to bear on the question and the possible conclusion (although this is not the one Ilan suggests) that the 'Jewish-only' cemetery arose in third-century Palestine. The next paper is a detailed study of P. Oxyrhynchus 849 by Ze'ev Safrai and Chana Safrai z'l (Chana died prior to the conference). This fascinating text records a discussion that Jesus had with a priest, mostly surrounding *halakhic* issues, and the Safrairs provide a detailed commentary on every line. In some

cases rabbinic literature can illuminate this text, but in other cases the text helps unearth details buried within rabbinic literature and bring them out into the light of day. Finally, Guy Stiebel surveys aspects of the archaeology of Masada, which enable him to reconstruct how the massive amounts of bread needed at Masada were baked. The archaeological and epigraphic data also provide evidence for the observance of purity laws at Masada.

There is obviously no way to evaluate the significant value of the book as a whole. It should be said that the editors did little work to convert this from a collection of the papers authored by the individual authors into a book: there are no indexes at all, for example, somewhat reducing its usefulness. The papers are generally clearly written, but some of them contain passages which an editorial hand should have touched. Still, the quality of the papers makes the book worthwhile. The article by Eshel is a very important resource, since the texts from the Judean Desert have been published in such a haphazard way, and no convenient handbook has yet been published. The contributions of Regev, Shemesh, and Friedman are the most thought-provoking with regard to the development of the *halakhic* system; Goodblatt raises some very interesting questions regarding the covert politics of rabbinic literature; the Safraï's paper re-emphasises the centrality of *halakhah* in some varieties of early Christianity. The other papers, too, are worthwhile in that they illuminate specific textual and *halakhic* details. In all, this volume is an important contribution to a growing library of scholarship.

Aaron Koller
Yeshiva University, New York

R. Greenberg and A. Keinan, *Israeli Archaeological Activity in the West Bank 1967–2007: A Sourcebook*. The West Bank and East Jerusalem Archaeological Database Project. Jerusalem: Ostracon, 2009. Pp 180 + CD Rom. ISBN 978-9-6591-4680-2.

The volume under review is one of ongoing products of a project initiated and directed by R. Greenberg whose aim is to provide data on the Israeli archaeological activities in the West Bank (including East Jerusalem; aka 'Judea and Samaria'; 'Occupied Territories') since 1967. It comprises the following parts:

Forward (pp. 1–2).

Part 1 (pp. 3–10) provides the historical background of the archaeological activities in the West Bank during the period that is surveyed.

Part 2 (pp. 11–32) describes the methods used in constructing the data base of sites and examples of GIS analyses.

Part 3 (pp. 33–150) is a gazetteer of the relevant sites.

Part 4 (pp. 151–172) lists the bibliography for the gazetteer.

Part 5 (pp. 173–180) is an index of the excavated sites.

In addition, a CD-ROM with the data base files is attached to the volume.

Greenberg and Keinan are to be commended for attempting to gather as much information on all the Israeli archaeological activities in the areas under Israeli control since 1967. This is all the more stressed due to the fact that the authors were somewhat courageous in their activities, as it required a very determined, at times unpopular, and politically quite defined approach to continue on this project. Much of the information on these activities was not available to the public for many years, and according to the authors, when they requested the data it was not made readily available to them by the official government office in charge of these activities, the 'Staff Officer for Archaeology in Judea and Samaria'. Thus, the data that they provide in many cases previously unavailable and fills in lacunae as to the archaeological work in this region and the authors are to be thanked for this. In addition, it should be noted that this data base is an ongoing, continuously updated project, and online updates can be found at: <http://alt-arch.org/publications.php>.

This said, there are several comments on the volume:

1. The amount of data that is presented for each site, is, unfortunately (although clearly not the fault of the authors) rather limited. Thus, attempts, as on pages 22–28, seem rather limited in utility and one wonders whether these really have any archaeological utility, even if this information can be used to get an idea of the extent of the activity and the types and periods of site.
2. While, as stated above, the data base is being continuously updated, quite a few mistakes were seen in the gazetteer. Several examples can suffice:
3. P. 62: Entry No. 274 (site name: Khallated-Dinnabiya) is noted as an excavation of Hirschfeld. In fact, it was excavated by H. Goldfus (who is quoted in the bibliography of this item).
 - (a) P. 72: On entry No. 360, excavated by A. Eitan, reference to some of the publications relating to this site are not quoted. In addition, the name suggested for the site by the excavator ('Vered Yericho') even if baseless from an historical point of view, should at least be mentioned in the entry, to facilitate comparison with the publications about this site.
 - (b) P. 98: On entry No. 599 ('Jaffa St.') – this is a site that the present reviewer (misspelled as 'Maier') has excavated and is noted as one of the excavators. However, the various publications relating to this excavation are not provided.
 - (c) E. Eisenberg's excavations at Hebron (Tel-Rumeida) are not mentioned.
 - (d) Likewise, many of the publications by A. Ofer his excavations at Tel-Rumeida are missing as well.
 - (e) Many of Adam Zertal's publications on his excavations and surveys in northern Samaria are not included. In particular, the English versions of his volumes on his survey are not included – only the Hebrew ones. Since this publication is aimed, primarily, at non-Hebrew readers, this is regrettable.

- (f) In recent years, the office of the Staff Officer for Archaeology in Judea and Samaria (mainly authored by Y. Magen) has published a series of volumes on various archaeological activities in the region. Many of these volumes are not mentioned in the volume under review, which is a pity, since this is just the data that the entire project was aimed at obtaining!

Most of these comments are matters that can be corrected and updated on the online database, so in fact, they should be related to as minor issues. Also the quality of book (very low quality soft cover) is regrettable, since it will mean that the volume will not survive continuous use in research libraries.

Finally, as Greenberg and Keinan acknowledge in the beginning of the volume, the data collected in this project is to be seen in a clearly political context. Here the authors are to be commended for courageously stepping outside of the all-too-cosy academic ‘comfort zone,’ and wading into the perilous, and messy, political waters of the near East. At the same time, this reviewer was left wondering if such political activism was taken on by many more archaeologists in the near East, whether or not this would have a deleterious effect on the quality, and agendas, of the archaeological research conducted throughout the region.

Aren M. Maeir
Bar-Ilan University, Israel

David P. Wright, *Inventing God’s Law: How the Covenant Code of the Bible Used and Revised the Laws of Hammurabi*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Pp. xiv + 589. £43.00. ISBN 13: 978-0-1953-0475-6.

The common view regarding the birth of the Covenant Code basically maintains that it is the result of a long process of development and accretion, and its contacts with the Mesopotamian legal tradition were based on oral traditions common in Syria-Canaan early in the second millennium BCE. CC thus reflects early, if not the earliest, layers of Israelite traditions.

Wright totally changes the accepted view in three counts: date, avenues of contact and authorship. In his view, CC is ‘directly, primarily, and throughout dependent upon the Laws of Hammurabi’ (p. 3), and this is reflected both in the structure as well as the contents of the laws, both the casuistic and the apodictic. The casuistic laws of CC are dependent on the legal part of LH, mainly the second part (§§ 115–272), while the apodictic laws are derived from the prologue and epilogue of LH. CC, however, in its selective character, ‘reshapes the political and theological landscape of the Laws of Hammurabi’, being thus an ideological document with a political agenda aimed as a response to the political and cultural milieu of the NA period, between 740 to 640, the time of the height of Assyrian domination in the West. Since this period also witnessed much copying of the LH, this is the time where Wright locates the birth of CC and its heavy borrowing from

the LH. Finally, Wright sees CC as a creation of a single hand, and not an accretion of traditions along long time. Wright thus sees the type of connection between CC and LH on the literary level: both documents were literary works, and the author of CC seems thus to have been an educated person, versed in the literary works of the time.

Wright proposes to bolster this thesis of his in Part II of his book, a series of chapters which each tackles one legal theme from CC in comparison to its assumed parallel in the LH, attempting to show how the author of CC reshaped and transformed the cuneiform materials legally and ideologically. The discussion in these chapters is very detailed and quite technical, and it goes into minute details and arguments, some very intricate indeed. To make reading easy, Wright starts by presenting in a nutshell his thesis in the introduction of the book (Chapter 1: 'The Basic Thesis and Background', pp. 3–28) and follows this by Part I, in which, in two chapters, he outlines the 'Primary Evidence for Dependence: Sequential Correspondence and Date', again in summary, and then closes this part by looking, in Chapter 4, into the 'Opportunity and Date for the Use of Hammurabi's and Other Cuneiform Laws'. The book ends with a chapter of 'Conclusions', a bibliographical list and a series of indexes.

In terms of richness of materials and arguments, as well as form and outline, this book is well executed: it is well organised, with charts and tablets all over, and the discussion and style are clear and forthright. In view of the intricate argumentation in this book and the richness of materials presented and discussed, a review of it, to be fair, must take the form of a monograph, at least, especially when – I regret to say – I totally reject the author's thesis and arguments. Naturally, this is impossible in the present conditions. Therefore, I must limit myself to some details to illustrate my view of the matter.

Unlike my impression upon first being exposed to Wright's thesis in his preliminary studies, I am now far from being convinced by the main thesis of this book, and the author's arguments have not convinced me at all. Wright's discussion, especially in part 2 of his book, appears sometimes to violate Ockham's razor proposition (aka 'principle of simplicity') that assumptions should be reduced to their minimum. To put it other way, I often had the feeling that the author has shot an arrow and now he is doing his best to draw the target around it. The author makes heavy use of mainly two compositional techniques to account for similarities, which in turn would bolster his thesis: similar technical terms and the principle of cross-referencing. Applying these guiding principles, he arrives at suggestions and conclusions that, in my view, would not stand in face of a simpler interpretation.

I do agree with Wright's view regarding a genetic connection between CC and cuneiform sources. I also think that the author of CC was imbued with Mesopotamian legal traditions and definitely knew Akkadian first hand. I find Wright's discussion on pp. 99ff. of the corroboration regarding the biblical author's knowledge of Akkadian convincing, except that he focuses on first millennium evidence and ignores or plays down second millennium evidence. It is undeniable that the

biblical writers made use of many cuneiform sources, both literary and others, which they incorporated in their work, usually after ideological and theological reshaping. And this is all the more so when it comes to CC which reflects stunning resemblances in some of its laws to Mesopotamian counterparts. When it comes to CC, I agree with Wright that a straight literary dependence is preferable to the oral tradition explanation, and despite the enormous time gap between the legal sources of the 2nd millennium BC and CC, the author(s) of the latter did make use of such sources, relics of which have been unearthed in various places in Israel.

However, I find it difficult to accept the thesis of this book, that CC depends ‘directly, primarily, and throughout’ on LH, with some additions from other law collections (LE, MAL and HL). Even if the correspondences between CC and LH pointed out by the writer, especially in terms of the assumed similar sequences of the laws in both collections, are specific and clear – and they are not always convincing, to put it mildly – it seems to me quite unnecessary to pinpoint one specific legal source, LH, which happens to be the best preserved source, as the one from which the biblical author borrowed his laws and ideas. This is too much of a coincidence, and it has already been stated in Saul Lieberman’s intelligent words quoted p. 365 n.8. Wright himself, by suggesting that a few laws in CC may derive from other legal collections and sources besides LH, such as LE from the first part of the eighteenth century BCE, as well as from some ‘unknown Akkadian law’ (pp. 217f.), somehow shakes his central assumption of a primary dependence of LH. How may we fit these sources with the thesis that CC is a product of the seventh century BCE? Also, we do have copies of LH from the first millennium, but quite a few of them reflect different recensions from the one on the stele. It is again a matter of a very convenient coincidence that CC’s author picked up for his use the copy that reflects the same recension on the stele, again the one that by chance happens to be the most preserved one. When it comes to the order of the laws in both collections, the similarity of which is the main pillar of Wright’s argument, he himself admits that quite a few laws in CC do not follow the assumed order. See the summary on p. 49. But then he heavily applies the principle of cross-referencing to settle the problem.

In the limited space here I wish to demonstrate how the author applies the two compositional techniques of similar technical terms and the principle of cross-referencing. One example is the author’s attempt to deal with the intrusion of the law of negligence in Exodus 21: 33–34, which has no counterpart in LH and elsewhere, and thus in a way violates the thesis of similar order (pp. 213ff.). Defining the notion of negligence a bit differently, he suggests LH 229–230 as the parallel laws that may have influenced CC, especially since in both cases the negligence ends up in some ‘falling’: in CC an animal falls into a pit, while in LH a poorly-built house falls (and kills the owner/his son). The difference in contents does not seem to be a bother to the author, who next goes on to Gilgamesh (*sic!*) to find the coupling of opening a pit (בֹּרַר פֶּתַח/*petûm+bûrum*) with falling into it (נִפֵּל/*maqātum*). ‘Hence, the idea of ‘falling’ in LH 229–230 could have produced a new law about ‘falling’ in CC’ (p. 214). In the sequel he notices the similarity

between the phrasing of the apodosis in v. 34, with its sequence of two verbs (... ישיב...ישלם...), with the apodosis of LH 125 (*ušallamma...irīab...*), which leads him to the supposition ‘...that a connection between LH 125 and verse 34 is possible’ (p. 216). But the ‘apodosis of verse 34 is also similar to the wording of LH 267...’, although here the verb is *nadānum*, not *rābum* (השיב). Now, since ‘LH 125 (*irīab*) and 267 (*inaddin*) have no express objects’, whereas Exodus 21: 34 supplies כסף ‘silver’ to ישיב, to solve the problem created thereby let us substract the word ‘silver’ from the biblical verse, ‘leaving the ruling quite similar to LH 125 and 267’. Nevertheless that later he does find the word ‘silver’ as an objective complement in other laws in LH, his discussion seems forced and prejudged, and the sequel which presents other possible sources for the syntagm *būra(m) petû(m)* (LE 53, LH 55–56, NBL 3, p. 217f., although in the latter case ‘the purpose for and phenomenology of cistern opening in each case is different’), all outside the assumed similar order of laws, does not inspire confidence in the conclusions reached.

The technique of similar terminology, ergo direct dependence, is best demonstrated by the author’s discussion (p. 34 and fuller discussion on p. 146) of the pattern of three necessities required to be given by the husband/owner of a female slave in Ex. 21: 10, which he suggests to originate in LH 178 (and 148) (together with the verb *našûm* Gtn). But, as is well known, this threesome pattern is very common and is attested in many variegated sources in various places and periods (including a few attestations in the Bible, see Hosea 2: 7; Ezekiel 16: 18–19; Qohelet 9: 7–9). So why locate its origin in LH? The same can be said of the verb *našûm* Gtn, which is very common in legal documents of all sorts.

The methodological principle I am trying to formulate here is that if the resemblance adduced (in sequence of details, idioms and expressions, underlying ideas, etc.) is common to other sources and can be traced in other periods and places, and Wright himself adduces quite a few other sources as possible contributors to CC, the close similarity between CC and LH is then indeed a mere coincidence, and therefore there is no justification in pointing to a specific source as the main contributor. In my view, and following the principle of simplicity, many features alluded to by Wright could very well be an expression of general Mesopotamian thinking and common literary conventions. The same structure and sequence of the laws, the same expressions, idioms, and words, verbs and legal terms were all a shared lore all over the ANE along its 3000 year of history.

Although I totally reject Wright’s thesis in this book for the reasons outlined above and given that I do see matters quite differently in this issue regarding the undeniable similarities and dependence of CC upon the cuneiform literary heritage, the value of Wright’s contribution cannot be overestimated. He offers the scholar in the field a valuable tool for further work which includes all the relevant sources, thoroughly discussed and analyzed. He conveniently outlines the issues and problems involved in the study of CC, while highlighting the main discussions and solutions. Finally he also provides a thorough review of the vast literature in the field, again for the convenience of the reader. I definitely see myself leafing

and browsing often through the pages of this book and I am sure I shall continue arguing with the author's views expressed therein, thereby hopefully enriching my insights.

Meir Malul
University of Haifa, Israel

Sophie Démare-Lafont and André Lemaire (eds.), *Trois millénaires de formulaires juridiques*. Hautes Études Orientales 48, Moyen et Proche Orient 4. Paris: Librairie Droz, 2010. Pp 480, incl. 16 b/w illustrations. €91.08 . ISBN 978-2-60001-355-0.

This handsome volume is dedicated to the phraseology of legal contracts recorded in various Semitic languages used in Syro-Palestine and some neighbouring regions (Egypt, Yemen), from the second millennium BCE to the beginning of the Middle Ages, with a particular focus on changes and continuity in the standardised formularies. It publishes the proceedings of a symposium held in 2006 at the École pratique des hautes études in Paris. In fifteen chapters (with two exceptions, all in French), established experts discuss the topic on the basis of a wealth of primary sources: from Akkadian, Ugaritic and Aramaic clay tablets to Aramaic and Nabataean papyri, from South Arabian, Nabataean and Palmyrene inscriptions to Syriac parchments, from the Talmud to the Hebrew and Arabic documents of the Cairo Geniza. The book provides an important contribution to the history of law and will be of interest to anyone interested in the cultural and social history of the ancient world. The chapters feature numerous text samples, usually with a detailed commentary, and provide an excellent introduction to the primary sources. It is slightly disappointing that (with the exception of one chapter) the different materials and scripts used to record legal affairs are not illustrated by photographs.

The editors are Sophie Démare-Lafont, a legal historian best known for her work on the law traditions of the cuneiform world, and Andre Lemaire, a prominent specialist in Old Aramaic. They explain in the introduction why the geographical focus of the collection lies on Syro-Palestine rather than on the Middle East more generally (pp. 7–11): the availability of text corpora from that region allows to study legal traditions, their transmission and evolution over a period of three millennia.

The first chapter deals with cuneiform tablets from Mari, on the Euphrates near the Syrian-Iraqi border, in the early 2nd millennium BC. In his analysis of property sale contracts, Dominique Charpin pays special attention to divergences from the formulary attested in Southern Mesopotamian documents which he sees as reflections of local Amorite traditions (pp. 13–42). The next three contributions deal with clay tablets of the 14th–13th centuries BC from Syria. Sophie Démare-Lafont offers a survey of the different genres of legal documents attested in Emar on the Middle Euphrates and a detailed discussion of how debts were secured (pp.

43–84). The other two chapters deal with Ugarit, the Mediterranean harbour city. Wilfred van Soldt deals with legal texts in Akkadian language (pp. 85–124, in English) while Dennis Pardee and Robert Hawley discuss those in Ugaritic (pp. 125–140).

The following five chapters deal with documents of the Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, Persian and Seleucid empires, from the 8th to the 3rd century BC. Pierre Villard surveys the formularies of the Neo-Assyrian legal texts in cuneiform script from the 8th and 7th centuries BCE (pp. 141–161, with 41 text samples in an appendix on pp. 162–185). André Lemaire's contribution is a companion piece, as it deals with legal texts from the same period and from the same sites but inscribed on clay tablets in Aramaic alphabet script (pp. 187–224). The texts in both scripts use the same legal phrases although the documentation in Aramaic is far more restricted and mostly concerns debts. Lemaire's chapter contains an overview over recent publications of new material from Syria to which E. Lipinski's monograph *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics, Volume III: Ma'lana* (*Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 200, Leuven 2010), can now be added.

Lemaire also publishes five new tablets from illicit excavations (pp. 191–204, with photographs on pp. 220–224), two of which can be identified with certainty as originating from Dur-Katlimmu (modern Tell Sheikh Hamad on the Habur) because of the typical personal names with the divine element Salmanu (*šlmm*). As one of the excavation epigraphers, I find it regrettable that there is yet more evidence for lootings in this important city. The discussion of Aramaic legal texts continues in Hélène Nutkowitz's chapter on the papyri from the island of Elephantine at the First Cataract of the Nile during the Persian rule over Egypt. She concentrates on marriage contracts and testaments, offering editions and analyses of two examples from 449 and 404 BCE (pp. 225–260). We return to the cuneiform world with Francis Joannès' survey of the legal texts in Neo-Babylonian cuneiform script from the 7th to the 3rd centuries BCE, covering the periods of Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, Persian and Seleucid rule over Southern Mesopotamia (pp. 261–278); despite the political changes, the legal traditions prevail and the contrast with the very different formularies used in Northern Mesopotamia and also Syria (cf. Villard on p. 141) is striking. With the next chapter, we return to Aramaic documents from the Persian period. Jan Dušek's contribution deals with the papyri from a cave in Wadi Daliyeh, also known as the 'Samaria Papyri', dating to the years 375–332 BCE and probably hidden from Alexander's advancing army. Dušek offers a detailed discussion of the slave sale contracts (pp. 279–316).

The next three chapters bring the value of very different primary sources to our attention, namely monumental inscriptions which publicise legal acts. François Bron surveys the relatively meagre evidence from South Arabian inscriptions and draws attention to sources from the 2nd or 3rd century CE that have only recently come to light in clandestine excavations in Yemen: archival texts inscribed in a cursive script on wooden sticks (pp. 317–319). Mahdi Abdelaziz briefly discusses the legal information contained in Nabataean inscriptions before turning to his main topic, the Nabataean papyri from the Cave of Letters at Naḥal Ḥever on the

Dead Sea (known as the Babatha Archive after its protagonist, a Jewish woman). The texts date to the years 93–132 CE and were apparently hidden during the Bar Kochba revolt (pp. 321–336). For her overview of the legal formulary of the 3rd century CE, Eleanora Cussini combines evidence from Syriac contracts on parchment and subscriptions added to Greek contracts with citations of sale contracts in Palmyrene monumental funerary inscriptions (pp. 337–355).

In the final three contributions, we turn to rabbinical law and the Medieval Jewish world. Liliane Vana analyses the *get* (bill of divorce) as a legal and social institution and as a document type (pp. 357–389). The last two chapters deal with the rich legal documentation from the geniza of the Ben Ezra synagogue at Medieval Cairo (al-Fuṣṭāṭ).

Lastly, Judith Olszowy-Schlanger offers a survey of the different genres of legal documents attested in Hebrew (pp. 391–410) while Geoffrey Khan provides editions of two Arabic house sale contracts from 1126 CE and 796 CE (pp. 411–423).

In the conclusions, the editors give a helpful overview over the formularies discussed in the preceding chapters, bringing together the components of the legal documents in a comparative analysis (pp. 425–433). The volume concludes with a list of bibliographical abbreviations (pp. 435–441), indices of primary sources (pp. 443–453) and place names (pp. 453–456), a useful selection of legal terms (pp. 456–468) and a thematic index (pp. 469–470). All contributors are to be congratulated on this informative and well produced book.

Karen Radner
University College, London

Hershel Shanks, *Freeing the Dead Sea Scrolls, and other Adventures of an Archaeology Outsider*. Continuum International, 2010. Pp. 251. \$27.95. ISBN: 978-1-4411-5217-6.

Hershel Shanks is Mr. Biblical Archaeology – both a compliment and a criticism. He founded *Biblical Archaeology Review* forty-five years ago and has seen it grow to a circulation of 130,000: a phenomenal achievement. On the other hand, today, connecting archaeology with the Bible is unacceptable to the purist. But the Bible will not go away, and journals that have dropped the biblical connection are not reaching the public.

Whilst acknowledging the new trend, Shanks has retained the biblical association, and the great amateur public is with him, they love his journal. Not so some of the professionals, who resent the grip he holds on the subject. By publishing their works in popular form, Shanks performs them a service but he also publishes his own views on professional matters – and he can do that without peer review. His background is that of a successful lawyer and he sees archaeology through that lens. He saw the rights of publishing the Dead Sea Scrolls before the scholars had

completed their work, and he got his fingers burnt in the case of Elisha Qimron, whom he failed to acknowledge: a case which cost Shanks \$100,000 in 1994. By way of defence, Shanks explains this defeat by reiterating that the Israeli courts are different from the American. His commitment to archaeology is real. At the age of forty he came to Israel and caught the Jerusalem syndrome hard and it has remained with him ever since. He explored the water tunnel attributed to Hezekiah and still writes about it, not having yet uncovered the secret of its winding passage. He discovered the City of David, before its full significance was apparent, and wrote a fine little guide within a few months of arrival. This work, he claims, inspired the full-scale expedition by Yigael Shiloh. It was not the whole story but it helped to induce Mendel Kaplan and others to fund the dig.

Less happy have been Shanks's excursions into the murky world of forgeries. Having committed himself to defend recent suspected inscriptions, he is ingenious in exposing the weaknesses of those arguing against the authenticity of the Ivory Pomegranate (in the Israel Museum), the James, brother of Jesus, Ossuary, and the Yehoash Tablet. Expert opinion is still divided on these issues, and Shanks weighs in on the side of authenticity, using legal tricks, like derogatory thumbnail sketches ('a hitherto unknown expert', 'ever the smart aleck', 'brought no relevant expertise to the committee', etc.), of those on the other side. This approach has earned Shanks the enmity of the Israel Antiquities Authority (IAA) and other specialists, although now appears to be on the path of reconciliation and has made his peace with Shuka Dorfman, head of the IAA.

At the good age of 80, Shanks, as sprightly as ever, wants above all to be loved by the establishment, with whom he has conducted a deep love-hate relationship for many years. This autobiography is his attempt to be loved for what he has done. He did work hard to make the Scrolls available to a wider public, when scholars were hiding behind their reputations, but this was hardly an adventure. It was the dedicated lawyer exploiting loopholes in the public interest: an achievement that is well described, even though not all the experts will agree on, or approve of his self-interest(s). Unfortunately, his harping on the authenticity of dubious artefacts goes against the professional grain of archaeological endeavours: Here Shanks is the lawyer, the advocate of one (his own) point of view, which is hardly an adventure. All in all, the great adventure has been that Shanks had the good sense and drive to keep archaeology in the public eye, and has not abandoned the popular biblical connection, for which he is to be thanked. This book, which may look like a premature obituary, should be seen in the opposite light: Forty years in the law, forty years of BAR, and then what about the next forty years? We expect further ideas, further challenges and further adventures.

Stephen Gabriel Rosenberg
W.F.Albright Institute of Archaeological Research, Jerusalem

Hershel Shanks, *Jerusalem Forgery Conference, Special Report*. Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 2010. Pp. 83, incl. 17 photographs and 2 drawings, \$ 39.95.

This is the report of a three-day conference called by Hershel Shanks in January 2007. In attendance were seventeen scholars of wide repute in the field, from Israel, Germany, USA, France and England. They were called to discuss the authenticity or otherwise of five inscriptions, those of the 'James...brother of Jesus' Ossuary, the Ivory Pomegranate in the Israel Museum, the Yehoash tablet, the Moabite (octagonal) Stone and two Moussaieff ostraca (the first known as 'Three Shekels', and the other as 'The Widow's Plea'). Shanks summarises the outcome of the conference as follows (p.5), the Moabite Stone is authentic, the James Ossuary inscription is very probably authentic, the Pomegranate Inscription is very probably authentic, the Yehoash Tablet is controversial, some thought it a forgery, some did not know, and some material scientists thought it authentic, the two Moussaieff ostraca are probably forgeries. We can dismiss the Moussaieff ostraca and the Moabite Stone, which have not been the focus of the recent Forgery Trial in Jerusalem. The Conference had no problem in declaring the Moabite Stone (unfortunately named, it is a squat octagonal basalt piece later than the Mesha Stone) to be genuine and the two Moussaieff ostraca to be forgeries, without too much discussion.

The James Ossuary inscription was another matter, and Shanks' summary of it as being very probably authentic is supported by the Report, which states that Ada Yardeni, Andre Lemaire and Bezalel Porten (all present at the conference) supported it. Gabriel Barkay (also present) accepted the expert opinions of Yardeni and Lemaire. Shanks had consulted Joseph Naveh on the inscription, and as Naveh expressed no opinion, Shanks took that as agreement to authenticity. Emile Peuch (absent) had agreed authenticity but doubted that the Jesus is the one from Nazareth. Frank Cross (absent) had declared the inscription a fake. Ronny Reich (present) thought that only the fact that it was too good to be true, should not brand it a forgery, while Andrew Vaughn (also present) agreed. Also discussed was whether only the second part, referring to Jesus, was forged. That had been suggested by Kyle McCarter (absent) but rejected strongly by Yardeni and Cross. Though agreed as a possibility by Vaughn, the conference as a whole rejected this suggestion. As for the scientific evidence, regarding patina and so on, nothing conclusive was reached as the scientists from the Israel Geological Society were not present and both Wolf Krumbein and Mertin Heidi, German material scientists (both present) agreed that the cultural aspects of the palaeography were more decisive than the material ones, as the stonework had been contaminated by police inspections and later cleanings. From all this Shanks considered that the balance of opinion was that the Ossuary Inscription was probably authentic.

The Ivory Pomegranate was condemned by Aaron Demsky, who had originally declared the inscription to be a forgery, as agreed with Shmuel Ahituv (both

present at the conference). The palaeography was to be dated to Iron Age II, about 400 years after the ivory carving of Late Bronze Age. The writing shows a space between two of the words which was atypical of the earlier period when a dot would have been used. Nevertheless, Lemaire thought (as Nahman Avigad before him) the work to be of the earlier date and authentic. The argument seemed to hinge on whether one of the letters had infringed on an old break in the pomegranate, as any late forger would have stopped the letter short of the break, whereas an original inscription, made before the break, would have run onto the break. There was considerable discussion on this point and the balance was that the inscriber had deliberately stopped short of the break, so it was a later inscription, but whether this was just a later dedication, and therefore unusual and authentic, or much later, and therefore a forgery, was not resolved.

On the Yehoash Tablet, opinion was decidedly divided, as Shanks acknowledges. On the one side were Edward Greenstein, Avi Hurwitz, and Israel Ephal (all present) and Frank Cross and Kyle McCarter (absent) who thought it a forgery, while against them stood Chaim Cohen (present). Yardeni was undecided but Christopher Rollston (absent) was clear that it was a forgery, as was Andrew Vaughn. As for the material evidence, Krumbein (present) thought the stone was ancient while Yuval Goren had held the opposite view, but he was not present to be challenged. However all agreed that later cleaning and inspection will have contaminated the surface of the tablet and that the material evidence was therefore not conclusive. A clear vote of forgery was expressed by Hanan Eshel (present) who doubted the authenticity of all the factors, philology, lettering, stone, the whole thing, which was quite unlike any other known Iron Age inscription. Several other scholars, such as Barkay, Alan Millard (both present) and David Noel Freedman (absent) were more cautious and thought the Yehoash tablet was authentic or an early copy of an authentic inscription.

On the broader issues, the conference concluded that all unprovenanced material must be treated with extreme suspicion but that it should be published if at all practical, so as not to be lost to scholarship. Publication with reservations would preclude false claims and help if later information were to reveal authenticity. The conference favoured the idea of standard protocols for dealing with unprovenanced material and a three-man committee (Vaughn, Krumbein, Millard) was established, though their procedure was not reported.

The report concludes with statements by Ahituv on the Moabite (octagonal) Stone; by Barkay, citing ten points for consideration in all cases; by Cohen on the Yehoash Tablet; by Demsky on NW Semitic inscriptions and the Pomegranate in particular; by Freedman on fakes in general; by Greenstein on the Tablet; by Hurwitz on ditto; by Krumbein on patina; by Lemaire, on all the pieces; by Millard on the Tablet; by Ronny Reich on the Tablet; by Rosenfeld and Feldman (not there) on material aspects of the Tablet and the Ossuary; by Shanks on legal versus expert appraisals; by Vaughn on the conference as a whole; by Yardeni on the Tablet and the Ossuary. A final report by Gerald Richards (absent) on two photographs by Oded Golan – one of the accused on trial – completed the proceedings.

In calling this conference and publishing this report, Shanks has ensured that the trial in Jerusalem would never be the end of the matter. The law could perhaps decide if this or that person was involved in a forgery, but could not in itself conclude whether one piece or another was a forgery. That would be in the hands of the experts and this report demonstrates that their opinions were not in any way unanimous. Shanks would like to think that the balance was in favour of authenticity for the James Ossuary, the Ivory Pomegranate and the Yehoash Tablet, but that is not at all conclusive from the experts gathered at the Conference.

Stephen Gabriel Rosenberg
W.F.Albright Institute of Archaeological Research, Jerusalem

Mark J. Boda and Jamie Novotny (eds.), *From the Foundations to the Crenellations. Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 366. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2010. Pp xxxviii + 629. € 128. ISBN 978-3-86835-031-9.

Temples were the focal point of most societies in the ancient Near East, and as such deserve the attention of any scholar in the field. Collecting 21 contributions on temple building in ancient Near East texts and in the Hebrew Bible, this volume sets out to provide up-to-date information on scholarly treatments of temple building in textual sources and the texts' relationship to archaeological remains. The ten essays on the ancient Near East cover the entirety of texts from the early third millennium up to Hellenistic Babylonia, while the essays on the Hebrew Bible are more focussed on individual literary aspects of temple building reports. Richard Ellis, to whom the volume is dedicated, writes the final essay as a response to the other contributions. Since it is impossible in a short review to comment on all twenty-one contributions with equal emphasis, I will briefly summarise their main arguments and select a handful of essays for closer commentary. It is immediately obvious that the essays on ANE temple-building are more concerned with *realia* of temple building. The essays on the biblical texts provide literary analyses of texts that use temple building as a motif. This creates somewhat of an imbalance, addressed only partially by the contributions of Ambos and Schaudig.

In the first essay, R. E. Averbeck lists the available evidence for temple building in the 3rd millennium. M. Fitzgerald in contrast focuses on the various functions of temple building in a wide range of different Akkadian texts. D.S. Pitt lists the variety of terms for temple buildings in Elamite areas, where the situation is particularly difficult: inscribed bricks mention a plethora of terms that are difficult to interpret because of the lack of substantial building remains. G.A. Beckman quotes eleven Hittite texts about temple building and the installation of new cult items in temples, which show that each of these activities is itself cultic. W.T. Pitard's article on Northwest Semitic Literature focuses on the Baal Cycle and RS 94.2953, arguing that the text insists on divine permission to underscore the legitimacy of succession

of the temple in the real world. This is further supported by the fact that Pitard finds the closest structural parallel not in the story of Solomon building the temple (1 Kings 5–8), but in the narrative about the disputed succession (1 Kings 1). J. Novotny gives a very instructive overview of the reasons for temple (re-) building in Assyria from the Ur III period (21st– 20th century BCE) until Sîn-šarru-iškun (late 7th century BCE). The next essay is by H. Schaudig on the restoration of temples in the Neo-Babylonian period, focussing particularly on foundation deposits. Foundation texts are also examined in the extensive contribution by M.C. Root on Achaemenid Iranian texts from the fall of Babylon until Darius I (522–486 BCE). There are, of course, very few Achaemenid buildings that can be confidently identified as temples, but Root argues that our distinction between temples and palaces may often be false. In what is the shortest contribution to the volume, T. Boiy focuses on the Temples in Hellenistic Babylonia. The penultimate essay of the first section by C. Ambos studies first millennium building rituals, which were used in order to avert dangers of building work, while S. Dalley provides a general overview of temple building in the ancient Near East.

The biblical section commences with an essay by P. Pitkänen on the building of the tabernacle in Exodus 25–40, in which Pitkänen assumes a pre-monarchic date for the text on the basis of the necessary, but by no means sufficient, argument that the elements of the building report in Exodus follow the scheme for ancient Near Eastern temple building reports. Hurowitz himself carefully analyses the narrative about Solomon's temple as narrated in 1 Kings, arguing that the authors likely had access to original records pointing to a date of composition in the late pre-exilic period. M. Boda shows that 1 Chronicles includes much material on elements of worship because the Chronicler needs to justify temple worship as it exists at a time when the second temple has been standing for centuries. L. Fried writes on the building of the second temple in Ezra 1–6. While she agrees with Williamson that Ezra 1–6 is a Hellenistic addition to the already combined work Ezra 7 – Nehemiah 13, she nonetheless believes that it incorporates many details from the early Persian period, such as the fact that Sheshbazzar laid the foundation stone, but that he was no longer involved in the inauguration of the temple. According to Fried, this is because it took twenty-two years to build, on account of labour shortages and lack of funds. We have come to expect high quality readings by Fried and are not disappointed here, even if at times she is overly confident in the information the biblical text provides.

M.S. Odell writes on Ezekiel's great temple vision, or more precisely on the temple reform in Ezekiel 43:7–9. She considers Ezekiel's temple as a new foundation, rather than as a restoration story, because there is no search for the original foundations, an aspect that Schaudig describes as a fundamental part of Neo-Babylonian rebuilding narratives. Additionally, rather than stressing divine separation, she emphasises divine hospitality and access to sanctification as central aspects of the book. J. Kessler contributes an essay on Haggai, in which he challenges Tadmor's and Bedford's interpretation that the people and their leaders did not start rebuilding the temple because they thought the time had not yet come.

Kessler argues that the people are not described as pious in Haggai, and therefore the book constructs a reality in which the people know that they should have started, but refuse to do so. Further, Kessler sees Hag 2: 10–19 as referring not to the initiating of the rebuilding as such, but to a ritual close to the completion of the rebuilding efforts, since the event has such an impact on the people’s situation. He therefore regards it as a Judean equivalent of the placing of the ‘first’/‘former’ stone. A. Laato first focuses on five expressions in Zechariah’s temple building oracle (4:6b–10a), explaining them by reference to similar expressions in Mesopotamian temple building literature, before contextualising this within his reconstruction of religious and political events in post-exilic Judah.

The penultimate essay in the Hebrew Bible section is by R.C. Van Leeuwen, who studies how the concept of a household impacts the way that deities and temples are thought of in the ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible. B. Levine reviews the eight essays on temple building in the Hebrew Bible, adding important comments, in particular his note on the expression *lwdghrh* (‘great mountain’) for temple and its Akkadian and Sumerian cognates *šadû/KUR*, an expression found in the names of many Mesopotamian temples. The last word is given to the recipient of this *Festschrift*, Richard S. Ellis, who has had so much influence on the study of foundation deposits and temples in the ancient Near East. There are extensive appendices listing the Aramaic, Akkadian, Hittite, Phoenician, Persian, Sumerian, Ugaritic and Elamite sources and publication details, as well as giving short bibliographies on those biblical passages which mention temple building. The usual indices help the reader to navigate the volume.

Anybody working on temples in the ancient Near East, including ancient Israel, should read the essays in this volume, particularly those on ANE texts, since they provide the necessary foundation to understand the genre of temple-building texts and references to building rituals in both non-biblical and biblical texts. The essays that were most useful to this reviewer were those by Ambos, Schaudig and Hurowitz. The first two provided helpful readings of Neo-Babylonian building rituals, while Hurowitz’s article show-cased his ability to bring his vast knowledge of ANE texts to interpreting biblical texts. I can warmly recommend this book which will be the first port of call for future research on temple building in the ancient Near East.

Jonathon Stökl
University College, London

J. David Schloen (ed.), *Exploring the Longue Durée: Essays in Honor of Lawrence E. Stager*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2009. Pp. xxii + 538. \$69.50. ISBN10: 1-57506-161-9; ISBN13: 978-1-57506-161-0.

This *Festschrift*, written in honour of Lawrence E. Stager on the occasion of his 65th birthday, contains 50 relatively short articles. The majority of the contributors (archaeologist, biblical scholars, philologists, and historians) are working at North

American and Israeli institutes of higher education but European scholarship is also represented. As befitting a *Festschrift* to Stager, most of the articles belong in the realm of archaeology and feature technical and specialised discussions of archaeological artefacts. The articles appear in alphabetical order according to author's surname rather than according to topic. The volume is well presented with a wealth of maps, drawings and photographs illustrating the discussed artefacts and geographical areas. The editor, J. David Schloen, opens the volume with an overview of Stager's scholarship.

Tristan J. Barako, 'Solomon's Patrimonial Kingdom: A View from the Land of Gilead', surveys the biblical and archaeological evidence from the excavation conducted at Rumeith in the northern part of Transjordan, and argues that the findings corroborates Stager's reconstruction of the Solomonic kingdom. In particular, Barako suggests that Rumeith was one of the sixty fortified cities allotted to Ben-geber who administered Solomon's sixth district (1 Kings 4:13).

Manfred Bietak and Karin Kopetzky, 'The Dolphin Jug: A Typological and Chronological Assessment', compare the so-called 'dolphin jug, found in 1921 among the disturbed rubble in one of the chambers of the pyramid of Amenemhat I, with similar jugs unearthed in other excavations. Based on this comparison, they date the dolphin jug to the fourteenth Dynasty (1710–1650 BC).

Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, 'Assyrians Abet Israelite Cultic Reforms: Sennacherib and the Centralization of the Israelite Cult', surveys the archaeology associated with the claimed Neo-Assyrian destruction of Israel. She argues that, contrary to the Assyrian claims, they rarely left the major routes and thus left peripheral villages unharmed. Instead, they focused on destroying well-fortified strategic sites (e.g. Hazor, Lachish).

Aaron J. Brody, 'Those Who Add House to House': Household Archaeology and the Use of Domestic Space in an Iron II Residential Compound at Tell en-Nafbeh', examines one household compound at Tell en-Nafbeh to find out what light it can shed upon life in the extended family in ancient Israel. Brody explores the use of different rooms in the compound, as evidenced by the types of pottery found in them, and suggests that three nuclear families, part of one extended family, shared that compound.

Aaron A. Burke, 'More Light on Old Reliefs: New Kingdom Egyptian Siege Tactics and Asiatic Resistance', argues that a close study of the New Kingdom reliefs yields insight into both Levantine and Egyptian conduct of siege warfare during the Late Bronze Age.

Susan L. Cohen, 'Cores, Peripheries, and Ports of Power: Theories of Canaanite Development in the Early Second Millennium B.C.E.', examines the Canaanite participation in international trade across the Mediterranean in the early second millennium BC and explores the effect foreign import had on the development of social and economic relationship between city states and their rural surroundings.

Michael D. Coogan, 'The Social Worlds of the Book of Job', argues that the descriptions in the book of Job shed light upon the social realities and values of its authors. For example, Coogan maintains that careful attention to the way in

which the authors describe the fictional Job's dwelling place (permanent rather than temporary) reveals that the authors lived in agricultural towns.

Frank Moore Cross, 'Telltale Remnants of Oral Epic in the Older Sources of the Tetrateuch: Double and Triple Proper Names in Early Hebrew Sources and in Homeric and Ugaritic Epic Poetry', argues that the use of multiple names of identical persons, tribes, or places in the J and E strand of Genesis-Numbers demonstrates that J and E drew on earlier oral epic traditions.

William G. Dever, 'Merenptah's 'Israel,' the Bible's, and Ours', criticises much of recent biblical scholarship on the inscriptions by Merenptah, and argues that little prevents us from identifying the people denoted 'Israel' in the inscription with what Dever calls the 'proto-Israelites' of early Israel.

Trude Dothan and Alexandra S. Drenka, 'Linchpins Revisited' contribute with a short study on the recently excavated fragmentary bronze head of unknown provenance. They compare it with the bronze linchpin found at Ekron and the larger one from Ashkelon and argue that the fragmentary one shows Canaanite influence.

Avraham Faust, 'Cities, Villages, and Farmsteads: The Landscape of Leviticus 25:29–31', challenges the common view that Lev 25:29–31 differentiates between people living in walled cities versus those living in unwalled villages. As shown by archaeology, what is at stake is not the existence of a wall but whether a person lived in a settlement or in scattered farmhouses.

Israel Finkelstein, 'Destructions: Megiddo As a Case Study', studies the four destruction layers at Megiddo, and shows that the destroyer's aim was total desolation.

Seymour Gitin, 'The Late Iron Age II Incense Altars from Ashkelon', dates the three incense burning altars of sandstone, uncovered at Ashkelon, to the seventh century BCE. He proposes that the appearance of this type of Israelite altars in Philistia is better explained by the Neo-Assyrian policy of population transfer following the destruction of Israel in the eighth century BCE.

Ram Gophna and Shmuel Lipschitz, 'Palmachim–Giv'at Ha'esev: A Navigational Landmark for Ancient Mariners?', suggests that the tiny coastal site at Giv'at Ha'esev served as a navigational landmark.

Sophocles Hadjisavvas, 'Wine for the Elite, Oil for the Masses: Some Aspects of Early Agricultural Technology in Cyprus', looks at the Cypriot archaeological remains related to production of wine and olive oil. He suggests that the unusually high capacity of the olive press at Idalion shows that, by the fourth century BCE, the consumption of olive oil had ceased to be the privilege of the elite classes.

Baruch Halpern, 'The Dawn of an Age: Megiddo in the Iron Age I', surveys various theories relating to the transition into Iron Age I in Canaan (e.g. Alt, Mendenhall, Finkelstein) which all suggest that Israelite pastoralists overwhelmed urban Canaanite centres. Using Megiddo as a test case, Halpern argues that the changes in the Canaanite city-states in the eleventh or the twelfth centuries BCE reflect a rebellion of the local elites rather than a 'peasant revolt'.

Paul D. Hanson, 'Compositional Techniques in the Book of Haggai', analyzes Hag 1:1–15 and explores the way in which earlier temple traditions have impacted not only the message but also the structure of Haggai.

Ronald Hendel, 'Other Edens', nuances Stager's insight regarding the shared symbolic geography of the city and temple of Jerusalem and the Garden of Eden. He suggests that the myth of Eden portrays the world as it is, i.e. where human toils and are exiled from paradise, while the temple ritual presents an ideal picture of the world as it ought to be, i.e. as a 'return to paradise'.

Timothy P. Harrison, 'Lifting the Veil on a 'Dark Age': Tayinat and the North Orontes Valley during the Early Iron Age', argues, on the basis of the archaeological evidence in the North Orontes valley, that there was a large degree of continuity between the Hittite Empire of the Bronze Age and the later smaller states in the area, yet, interspersed between these small Hittite states, are other settlements that betray Aegean influence.

Larry G. Herr, 'The House of the Father at Iron I Tall al-'Umayri, Jordan', explores what the layout and content of the dwelling places from Iron I at Tall al-'Umayri can tell us about the way in which extended households lived together.

Theodore Hiebert, 'Israel's Ancestors Were Not Nomads', argues that the biblical creation traditions, primeval traditions, ancestral traditions, and Exodus traditions, together reveal that Israel understood itself as originating from an agricultural society. Stager's reconstruction of the agrarian origins of Israel based on his archaeological investigations thus receives support from Israel's own self-understanding.

John S. Holladay, 'How Much Is That in . . . ? Monetization, Money, Royal States, and Empires', looks at economical aspects of the ancient Near East. Based on lists of paid tribute, for example, Holladay concludes that states must have had significant quantities of gold and silver in 'banks'. This, in turn, suggests that pre-exilic Judah was not as poor as many scholars tend to think, and that its economy must have been more varied than 'bread, olives, and wine alone'.

Jeremy M. Hutton, 'The Levitical Diaspora (I): A Sociological Comparison with Morocco's Ahansal', detects commonality between the structure and social function of the family in the north African Ahansal tribe and the system of Levitical cities (Josh 21:10–40; 1 Chron 6:39–66). The former can therefore serve as a heuristic model for the study of the Levites. For instance, the distribution of the Levitical cities might reflect the Levites' function as intertribal arbitrator.

Vassos Karageorghis, 'A Cypriot Workshop of Middle Bronze Age Askoi', studies the form and shape of a group of zoomorphic vases (askos) from Cyprus that were probably produced in the same workshop.

Philip J. King, 'Slavery in Antiquity', provides a concise survey of the social institution of slavery as portrayed in the HB (Exod 21:1–11; Lev 25:39–55; Deut 15:12–18; Jer 34:8–22) and the NT (1 Cor 7:21–24; Phil).

Thomas E. Levy, 'Ethnic Identity in Biblical Edom, Israel, and Midian: Some Insights from Mortuary Contexts in the Lowlands of Edom', uses the material remains from the tenth-century BCE cemetery at Wadi Fidan (modern day

southern Jordan) to argue that Edom as a distinct ethnic identity came into being as the result of conflicts between neighbouring groups (e.g. the Midianites and the Israelites).

David Lipovitch, 'A Reconstruction of Achaemenid-Period Ashkelon Based on the Faunal Evidence', examines the zooarchaeological data. For instance, looking at the identifiable remains from sheep and goats (constituting 88% of the faunal evidence), Lipovitch notes that while the proportion of sheep fell, the proportion of goats rose. He suggests that this change may reflect a stress on the economy, as goats need less maintenance than sheep.

Aren M. Maeir, 'Hazael, Birhadad, and the μrf ', challenges Eph'al's suggestion that the word μrf in line 10 of the 'Zakkur Inscription' refers to the tactic of tunnelling under a city during a siege. Recent excavations of Gath suggest that the older understanding of the word as referring to a trench is preferable.

Nicolò Marchetti, 'Divination at Ebla during the Old Syrian Period: The Archaeological Evidence', argues that the clay figurines for divination activities from Ebla show that extispicy at Ebla included hepatoscopy, inspection of intestines and teratological observations.

Mario A. S. Martin, 'Egyptian Fingerprints at Late Bronze Age Ashkelon: Egyptian-Style Beer Jars', explores the Egyptian features of a specific type of beer jars unearthed at an Egyptian fort close to Ashkelon. As they all contain a whole in the bottom, it is unlikely that they contained liquid. Rather, they were utilised during the beer making process. These jars further help us to date the Egyptian withdrawal from Ashkelon.

Daniel M. Master, 'From the Buqê'ah to Ashkelon', uses the data from various excavations (the Buqê'ah Valley, the Beersheba Valley, Jerusalem, Gibeon, Ekron, and Ashkelon) to argue that Judah's economy was shocked but not radically altered after Sennacherib's attacks. Those cities along the Mediterranean coast that survived the attacks actually prospered again soon afterwards.

Amihai Mazar, 'The Iron Age Dwellings at Tell Qasile', surveys the settlement history of Tell Qasile. He looks at the ways in which the domestic architecture changes from strata to strata and explores what that tells us about the different social layers at the site. Mazar further suggests that, as the economy of the town was dominated by maritime trade, most of the houses probably belonged to merchants, ship-owners, and seaman.

Alan Millard, 'The Armor of Goliath', defends Stager's suggestion that the description of Goliath's armour in 1 Sam 17:4-7 reflects typical Mycenaean weaponry in the eleventh century BCE, up and against the dominant scholarly view that the depiction of Goliath's armour suggests a seventh century BCE date of composition.

Paul G. Mosca, 'Facts or Factoids? Some Historical Observations on the Trophy Inscription from Kition (KAI 288)', provides a new translation of the so-called Kition Trophy Inscription, unearthed at modern Larnaca, and argues that, contrary to earlier claim, it sheds little new light upon the political and military events that took place during early years of Milk-yaton's reign.

Nadav Na'aman, 'Ashkelon under the Assyrian Empire', investigates the references to Ashkelon in Neo-Assyrian sources and what light they shed on the history of Ashkelon. Na'aman concludes that despite its relatively small size, Ashkelon was an important city in the Levant in the first half of the first millennium BCE.

Lorenzo Nigro, 'The Built Tombs on the Spring Hill and the Palace of the Lords of Jericho (*'dmr rh'*) in the Middle Bronze Age', uses the remains of the tombs found at Spring Hill (Jericho) for reconstructing the history of Jericho in the Middle Bronze Age, with focus on its relationship between Egypt.

Dennis Pardee, 'A New Join of Fragments of the Baal Cycle', describes, identifies, transliterates and translates fragment RS 3.364. He argues that this fragment, hitherto assumed to be the only remains of a tablet, actually belongs to another tablet (RS 3.363 [CTA 3]).

Émile Puech, 'L'inscription phénicienne du pithos d'Amathonte et son contexte', discusses the exact reading of the six letters appearing on a pithos found in the temple of Aphrodite at Amathonte on Cyprus and how this inscription increases our understanding of the relationship between Cyprus and Phoenicia.

Itamar Singer, 'A Fragmentary Tablet from Tel Aphek with Unknown Script', analyzes the script written on a tablet from Tel Aphek and argues that it may constitute a (hitherto unknown) type of Philistine (or Sea People) script.

Piotr Steinkeller, 'Camels in Ur III Babylonia?', argues that the expression GÚ.URU.GU in an Ur III tablet from Puzriš-Dagan denotes the two-humped Bactrian camel which was brought as a gift to King Šulgi. Since we do not have any more references to this animal, Steinkeller concludes that camel breeding did not take roots in Babylonia in the Ur III period.

Ephraim Stern, 'A Persian-period Hoard of Bullae from Samaria', surveys the motifs (animals, humans, flowers) depicted on a group of bullae of unknown provenance and date. Stern compares the motifs with those on bullae and coins from fourth-century Samaria (Wadi ed-Daliyeh). As the former group share many common features with the latter group, Stern concludes that both groups stem from fourth-century Samaria.

Michael Sugerman, 'Trade and Power in Late Bronze Age Canaan', appeals to the trade networks to and from Canaan as he challenges the commonly held view that the rulers of the Canaan city states were governing on behalf of Egypt. He also criticises Finkelstein and Na'aman for depending too much on documentary sources when researching the power structure in the Canaanite city states.

Ron E. Tappy, 'East of Ashkelon: The Setting and Settling of the Judean Lowlands in the Iron Age IIA', analyzes and compares the data (settlement patterns, material remains, access routes) from Tel Zayit and Lachish. He argues that this region (the Shephelah) interacted economically with both the port cities (e.g. Ashkelon) and the towns in the hill country to their east.

Karel van der Toorn, 'The Books of the Hebrew Bible As Material Artifacts (*sic!*)', explores the material aspects of the production of written texts in the ancient Near East. For example, how long time and how much did it cost a scribe

to produce a copy of the Gilgamesh Epic? He further emphasises that the HB is a collection of scrolls (and not ‘books’), and that scrolls and books were produced and used in different ways.

David Ussishkin, ‘The Temple Mount in Jerusalem during the First Temple Period: An Archaeologist’s View’, summarises the topographical data, the archaeological evidence, and the data that can be gleaned from the Hebrew Bible, that together can help us to reconstruct the Temple Mount during the tenth century BCE. He concludes that Temple Mount was a significant cultic place already before the extensions of Jerusalem in the eighth century BCE.

David S. Vanderhooft, ‘The Israelite *mišpāhâ*, the Priestly Writings, and Changing Valences in Israel’s Kinship Terminology’, argues that the Pentateuchal P source presents a model of kinship organisation that is based on an accurate description of the social conditions of pre-exilic Israelite monarchy. As such, it sheds light upon family structure in pre-exilic times.

Samuel R. Wolff and Gerald Finkielsztein, ‘Two New Hellenistic Lead Weights of the Tanit Series’, describe and discuss two inscribed weights, one from Ashdod-Yam and one from Gezer, and argues that, given their motifs, they belong to a series of weights from Tyre from the 2nd century BCE.

Assaf Yasur-Landau, ‘Behavioral Patterns in Transition: Eleventh-Century B.C.E. Innovation in Domestic Textile Production’, surveys the changes in material culture in the coastal area in Philistia during the eleventh century BCE. For example, innovations in both cooking and textile production, with new kinds of cooking pots and new styles of loom weights, took place.

Adam Zertal and Dror Ben-Yosef, ‘Bedhat esh-Sha‘ab: An Iron Age I Enclosure in the Jordan Valley’, describe the findings from the excavation at Bedhat esh-Sha‘ab: the setting and shape of the site and its settlement, its outer walls and its pottery. Zertal and Ben-Yosef conclude that this site was used during the Iron Age as a place where people gathered for ceremonies. They compare it tentatively with the Hebrew term *gilgal* which appears to have been a camp used for religious activities (cf. Deut 11: 30; Josh 5: 9; 9: 6; 1 Sam 7: 16).

Taken together, this is a very valuable collection of articles that belong in every research library.

Lena-Sofia Tieymeyer
University of Aberdeen

Izaak J. de Hulster and Rüdiger Schmitt (eds.), *Iconography and Biblical Studies: Proceedings of the Iconography Sessions at the Joint EABS/SBL Conference, 22–26 July 2007, Vienna, Austria*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 361. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2009. € 84. Pp. xii + 239. ISBN 978-3-86835-018-0.

From huge wall reliefs down to tiny seal impressions, examples of iconography from the ancient Near East have long been known to museum visitors as well as

scholars, and their number increases steadily as archaeological work proceeds. Their testimony is mostly 'silent', however, in the sense that they are generally unaccompanied by explanatory text. The identification of humans or gods depicted and the significance of many elements in the scenes depicted thus remains a topic of continuing scholarly dispute and discussion.

In recent decades the attempt to apply some of this material to the illustration and interpretation of the biblical text has gathered pace, not exclusively but particularly under the influence of what is now commonly called the Freiburg school. Othmar Keel and his colleagues, research students and now their students in turn have published extensively in this field. Not only have they collected and categorised major groups of material that formerly were treated in isolation but they have also written many books and commentaries that apply insights from their research on an increasing body of biblical books and themes. It would be fair to say that this has now all reached the point where we may speak of a new sub-discipline of biblical research.

The volume under review reflects an inevitable by-product of this newly emergent field, namely the organisation of special sessions at international conferences with the consequent publication of their papers. On the present showing, it is less clear whether this particular development is to be welcomed. Apart from the fact that the papers are inevitably very disparate, they also vary considerably in quality, include a good deal of repetition of previously established arguments and conclusions and in some cases are trivial, being the result of pressure to produce a conference paper when there was not time for the sustained research that should undergird publication.

The first named editor has two papers, both concerned primarily with questions of method. In principle that is fine: the subject as a whole certainly needs constantly to reflect on how to proceed if on the one hand it is to treat the primary data responsibly and on the other to say something worthwhile. The sort of paper (included elsewhere in the volume) which says effectively that in a particular verse of the Bible God is depicted as smiting his enemies and here is a picture from somewhere of a smiting deity is too banal to be of value; it adds nothing to our understanding of the text. But it is regrettable to find that both of de Hulster's papers are effectively summaries or restatements of elements of his extensive monograph published in the same year as the present volume (*Iconographic Exegesis and Third Isaiah*; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), so that they take us no further forward.

Another frustrating contribution is by Meindert Dijkstra. With considerable skill and learning he offers an explanation of a seal-impression from Tall Zar'a in Jordan as probably 'a walking caprine animal carrying a symbol on or above its back, be it a sun disk or another astral symbol' (p. 41). That would look well in a report of the excavations. For the sake of the volume's title, however, he then goes on needlessly to discuss whether this is related to the reference to 'the hind of the dawn' in Psalm 22:1, only to conclude that it probably does not. He is certainly correct, but it is difficult then to understand why he should have raised the question in the first place.

The value of the application of insights from iconography to biblical interpretation will be most apparent when they open up a new avenue for exegesis or help to

arbitrate between conflicting possibilities. There are two excellent examples of this in the volume. In the only contribution to focus on the New Testament, Annette Weissenrieder discusses the significance of the crown of thorns with which Jesus was mocked during his passion. Long ago one of my main Hebrew teachers, Henry Hart, proposed on the basis of the depiction of Hellenistic kings on coins that it was intended as a lampoon on the radiating crown. (Weissenrieder mentions Hart once in a footnote without, perhaps, realising how pioneering an approach this application of iconographical exegesis was back in 1952.) To this, she adds as other possibilities that it could have been the crown worn by a victor at some contest (this is taken to be the perspective of the Freiburg school) or that it might recall the acclamation of the emperor. Her solution is that the crown was therefore multivalent in significance. This demonstrates proper scholarly caution, and in these post-modern days the possibility should be allowed, but one might have supposed that the Roman soldiers would be more likely to have had one or another idea primarily in mind.

The other fine study here (and the longest) was not prepared for the conference but invited separately by the editors. (Is there a lesson here?) Brent Strawn, who has already published a major work on leonine iconography in relation to the Bible, here turns his attention to the familiar expression that God acted in the Exodus 'with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm'. Against those who often cite depictions of Egyptian kings with arms stretched out to smite, he observes that in most (though not all) biblical passages it often has a benign meaning, and for this he compares rather depictions of the Aten and other Egyptian deities whose rays are evidently extended in blessing. By collocating both approaches, Strawn believes he can reach an 'integrative comparative approach' that allows the use of both types of depiction to be applied as appropriate to the differing biblical uses. Space precludes a summary of the other papers in the volume, though one must note with disappointment that Keel, who was also invited as a mark of esteem to contribute to the volume, writes only a short contribution in which he rather tetchily responds to some criticism of one of his own theories by F. Hartenstein.

There is thus no hiding the fact that this volume is rather a mixed bag (and it would have benefitted also by being worked over by somebody with a native command of English). The relatively new method of applying considerations based on the study of iconography to the biblical text is full of potential despite the many uncertainties and consequent hazards that attend it. But it is clear that worthwhile results can only be the consequence of prolonged research with expertise in several complementary fields. This does not necessarily make it a good topic for a conference, where contributors may be working under pressure of time to prepare a paper in the relevant field. It would be a great shame if the positive impetus coming from this fresh approach were to attract for itself a bad reputation by the over-hasty publication of half-baked proposals.

H.G.M. Williamson
The Oriental Institute, Oxford

Yonatan Mizrahi, *Archaeology in the Shadow of the Conflict: The Mound of Ancient Jerusalem (City of David) in Silwan*. Jerusalem: Emek Shaveh Publications, 2010. Pp. 47 (paperback). \$5.00. ISBN 978-3-86575-532-3.

The City of David is one of the names given in the Bible to the city of Jerusalem which king David captured. Regardless of one's views about the historical reliability of the Biblical narratives, the name has been revived in modern academic parlance for the modest-sized area which has rightly been identified as the setting for that event. It is a relatively low-lying ridge that lies to the south of the Temple Mount (hence outside the current 'Old City' of Jerusalem), and it is much more restricted than the whole area which Jerusalem became even in pre-exilic times. It is bounded on its eastern, southern and western sides by the Kidron, Hinnom and Tyropean valleys respectively. It is well known to tourists as being cut through by Hezekiah's Tunnel, the eastern entrance to which is also not far from the stepped-stone structure, which is a famous and dominant landmark.

In modern times it may also be identified as being a part of the village of Silwan. The larger part of this village is on the steep eastern slopes of the Kidron valley, but nevertheless the western part has also been well populated. This has long been a source of potential tension, therefore. The desire to explore the area archaeologically stretches back to the nineteenth century and has been frequently pursued by scholars of many nationalities. Until recent times, however, this has had to proceed with caution and to some extent in restricted areas due to respect for current habitation. Dame Kathleen Kenyon's extensive excavations in the 1960s, for instance, have often been criticised in more recent times precisely because her room for manoeuvre was more restricted in several areas than might otherwise have been desirable.

In addition to this general humanitarian concern, however, more overtly political considerations have come into play in more recent years which further exacerbate the problems. Silwan is part of the wider 'East Jerusalem' which was captured from Jordan by the Israelis in 1967 and which has since been annexed—a closer form of appropriation than the general situation in the West Bank. This in itself is controversial, of course. The particular ancient historical resonances of the area, however, have made it a target for some aggressive settler activity, behind which stands a wealthy organisation (the Elad Foundation) dedicated to the expansion of Jewish settlement in East Jerusalem. The legal rights and wrongs of their activities are not for me to comment on here, and court decisions have gone different ways over property and land disputes, but it is not surprising that such activities are viewed with deep suspicion, to put it at its mildest, by many local residents. This Elad Foundation, which has been given an element of managerial authority in this area on behalf of the Nature and Parks Authority, also supports several relatively recent archaeological projects. Some have achieved high international profile, such as the work of Eilat Mazar, who claims to have found the palace of David, but that is only one among several. A visitors' centre has been built and there are plans for extensive new car parking within the Kidron Valley and other such

tourist developments. Given that the focus (though not the sole focus, it should be said) of much of this work is on 'biblical' Jerusalem, it is difficult to dissociate the motivation for this work by those who fund it, at least, from their wider political aims.

The present booklet addresses this minefield. The difficulty for the author, who presents his aims as eirenic, is that it has now become more or less impossible to separate the archaeology from the politics. In three sections, he presents first an introduction to the history and archaeology of the site and suggests that it should be presented to the public in a social-scientific rather than events-based manner. That is to say, archaeology tells us much about the way of life of ancient peoples, so that we should concentrate on economic, popular religious and similar concerns throughout the long march of history rather than the putative association of structures with biblical narratives. In response, I can only say that this should be both/and, not either/or. I agree entirely that archaeology rarely attests specific events, and to search for such is methodologically flawed. What we learn primarily from these ancient materials is indeed the development of society which gives the context within which historical events transpired. This is illuminating and interesting, and in my experience most visitors welcome such insights. Equally, it is entirely wrong to privilege one period of history over another in an exclusive manner. On the other hand, however, it is naive to think that Jewish and Christian visitors will not have a particular interest in the periods which feature in their scriptures, just as one may hope that in due course there will be a greater cultural interest in the significant role which Jerusalem has also played in the Islamic faith. In my opinion, this element of the booklet is unrealistic, if not disingenuous. The perceived wrongs of the present situation will not be overcome by such means.

In the second section, Mizrachi deals briefly with 'the archaeological site and the local residents'. Several of the issues are not exclusive to Silwan, of course. The problems of accommodating mass tourism with all its peculiar demands and the way of life of local inhabitants raises tensions in a great many towns, cities and villages all over the world. There is no simple solution, and it is right that the voice of the local people should be heard and their inconvenience understood. But there are potential benefits (primarily economic) as well, hardly acknowledged here, so that in itself this section does not ultimately get us much further forward either.

It is the third section that brings us to the heart of the matter, therefore, namely 'archaeology and politics'. Here are some of the points that are made: whether they like it or not, archaeologists working in this area are supporting Israeli claims to sovereignty, something not accepted by the Palestinians or under international law; the funding of the excavations comes from a 'right wing foundation' (p. 23) which has a modern political agenda, and the results as well as the sites excavated are used to further that aim; as the use of the name 'City of David' makes clear, concentration is on only part of the site's history (namely that which associates it most closely with ancient Israel and Judaism); other periods, whether earlier or later, are downplayed, which is contrary to sound method, and it is used to buttress modern political claims; at least one area is being cleared of housing (on the

ground that the houses were built without permits) in order to recreate ‘the King’s Garden’ and provide parking; some of the archaeological methods used, such as tunnelling, are contrary to best practice; and receipt of funding from a politically-motivated organisation prejudices the archaeologist’s professional standing.

It is difficult to comment impartially on all this. There are several aspects which cut across universally acceptable criteria. For instance, some acts may be sanctioned by Israeli law while those who refuse to acknowledge the annexation of East Jerusalem do not accept that this is the appropriate law in question. It is not the place of a review in an archaeological journal to comment on such matters. More broadly, however, it seems to me that the very real issues at stake might have been presented in a slightly different manner in order to aid clarity and get to the heart of the matter. In such an admittedly complex situation, what are the realistic options?

(1) I have heard it stated by one prominent archaeologist that the site is of such universal historical and cultural importance that the presentation of it to the world at large should take precedence over the interest of the relatively few remaining inhabitants. With proper compensation they should be obliged to move and the whole site developed as an archaeological park or the like. My response to such a proposal is that (a) it is inhumane, (b) one wonders whether the policy would apply also to the new Jewish settlers who have moved in, and (c) it is unlikely that the presentation would avoid becoming a form of propaganda in terms of a claim that this should be part of Israel because it was so in ancient times. One meets that claim both explicitly and implicitly all too often. It fails, of course, both because it selects arbitrarily which of the several sets of ancient inhabitants it favours and because it assumes a number of questionable legal principles about ownership.

(2) The present policy might be continued, whereby the political aims are more overt on the part of the funders and the archaeologists go along with it because of the interest of the material to which they unexpectedly have access. The law is invoked as it suits the larger aim rather than on a wholly impartial and equal basis. The advantage to some local residents (e.g. those who sell and move out) is used to appease any uneasy conscience. To this, my own response is first to admit that the material being excavated is indeed of the greatest possible interest and importance. Even if some of the claims being made may turn out eventually to be exaggerated, there is a huge amount of new and sometimes quite unexpected data being provided and it will take time to assimilate this all into reconstruction of our understanding of Jerusalem’s past. Despite this, questions from a different angle impose themselves, because this booklet is certainly correct to point to the political dimensions of the work viewed as a whole. Such considerations have always been recognised with regard to the Temple Mount, and although a certain amount is being done by tunnelling, there has never been any suggestion that the site should be dug fully, even though it would obviously be of the greatest interest from a historical perspective to do so. In my opinion, given the parlous state of negotiations and sensitivities in the modern world, it would be wiser, as well as more humane, to exercise a like restraint in the similarly sensitive site of the City of David.

(3) A policy of restraint might be voluntarily adopted. This is probably unrealistic, given the political capital that is now invested in the site, but in my opinion it remains the best solution, and there are examples of its implementation elsewhere in Israel. It would empty of its force the charge of archaeology being manipulated for purposes other than the academic and it would be a concession to the need for restoration of human trust. The material underground will not go away and one day we may hope that it can be explored in a calmer and more co-operative atmosphere. In the meantime, there are some things which are of greater value than our thirst for salvageable knowledge.

In conclusion, there are elements of this booklet which I find unconvincing, and some which seem to me not to present the problem in the clearest or most helpful manner. But that it draws attention to a genuine problem which has to be addressed with a degree of humanity rather than strident claim and counter-claim is obvious, and we should be grateful for the opportunity it affords to debate these matters in a rational manner. It may be noted in addition that to aid in this process the booklet is available for free electronic downloading at www.alt-arch.org, and that Hebrew and Arabic versions are available as well as English.

H.G.M. Williamson
The Oriental Institute, Oxford

Books Received

David Amit, Orit Peleg-Barkat and Guy Stiebel (eds.), *New Studies in the Archaeology of Jerusalem and its Region: Collected Papers IV*. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority and Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2010.

Erika Fischer, *Tellel-Far'ah (Süd): Ägyptisch-levantinische Beziehungen im späten 2. Jahrtausend v.Chr.* Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, Band 247 1. Academic Press Fribourg and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011. Pp ix + 441, incl. 213 figures. €96, \$130. ISBN 978-3-7278-1691-8; 978-3-5255-4368-9.

Haim Goren, *Dead Sea Level: Science, Exploration and Imperial Interests in the Near East*. Tauris Historical Geography Series, Volume VI. London: IB Tauris, 2010. Pp 384. £59.50. ISBN: 9781848854963.

Charlotte Hempel (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*, Vol. 90. Leiden and Biggleswade: Brill, 2010. Pp xvi + 552, incl. maps. €162.00 / \$230.00. ISBN: 9004167846; 978-9-0041-6784-1.

Othmar Keel, *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit*. Von Bahan bis Tell Eton Mit Beiträgen von Daphna Ben-Tor, Baruch Brandl und Robert Wenning. OBO Series Archaeologica 29, Katalog Band II. Fribourg and Göttingen: Academic Press and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010. Pp xiv + 650, incl. plates. \$160. ISBN 978-3-7278-1655-0 (Academic Press Fribourg) ISBN 978-3-525-54362-7 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Jodi Magness, *Stone and Dung, Oil and Spit: Jewish Daily Life in the Time of Jesus*. Eerdmans. Pp 375. \$25. ISBN: 978-0-8028-6558-8.

Paolo Matthiae, Frances Pinnock, Lorenzo Nigro, Nicolò Marchetti (eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th International Congress of the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East 5 May – 10 May 2008, Sapienza, Università di Roma*.

Volume 1: Near Eastern Archaeology in the Past, Present and Future. Heritage and Identity Ethnoarchaeological and Interdisciplinary Approach, Results and Perspectives Visual Expression and Craft Production in the Definition of Social Relations and Status, with the collaboration of Licia Romano. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010. Pp xxvii + 1026, incl. figures. € 128 / \$ 179. ISBN 978-3-4470-6175-9.

Volume 2: Excavations, Surveys and Restorations: Reports on Recent Field Archaeology in the Near East, with the collaboration of Licia Romano. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010. Pp. xxv + 768, incl. figures. € 98 / \$ 139. ISBN 978-3-4470-6216-9.

Ronny Reich, *The City of David, Excavating the City of David, Where Jerusalem's History Began*. Israel Exploration Society, 2011. ISBN 978-965-221-082.

Hershel Shanks, *Ancient Israel: From Abraham to the Destruction of the Temple*. Third Edition. Biblical Archaeological Society, 2010. Pp 440, incl. 41 illustrations, 10 colour plates, 17 maps & charts. \$29.95. ISBN: 978-1-935335-41-2.