

historical events. It is particularly disappointing, after all of the discussions in the last two decades about archaeological theory, method, technique, and interpretation, to be presented with a volume that places archaeology in a secondary position, as an adjunct to historical/textual documentation. It seems unlikely that the author is conversant with any of the considerable literature available relating to archaeological interpretation, as there is no reference, footnote, or bibliographic entry to any of it. Whereas the author engages in interpreting the historical events of the time period he is considering, he never immerses himself in the archaeological data and, consequently, never presents the reader with an analysis. It seems unnecessary to have considered this an "archaeological study."

Second, on the one hand, the author is uninterested in unpublished archaeological data (p. 7); and, on the other, he includes sites from unpublished masters theses, for example, Qum (pp. 432–33). If sites used in masters theses, based on excavations conducted by the Department of Antiquities of Jordan, can be included in his list, then all relevant remains—for example, churches recently excavated by the Department of Antiquities at Khirbet al-Burj and Es-Saria and others documented from the 1930s on—should also have been included. Publication of archaeological data may be a valid selection criterion and may help define the author's amorphous designation of "concrete evidence" (p. 228), but I see that as a limited approach and one to which the author did not consistently adhere. As many are aware, the rapidity of infrastructural enhancement since 1980 in Jordan has resulted in the discovery of several pertinent sites and isolated structures. Access to documentation is, thankfully, unhindered in Jordan; the author might have availed himself of that documentation to provide a more exhaustive corpus of sites. Inclusion of such data would have meant, however, that the author would have been forced to assess the material culture remains and to engage in debates concerning the remains, e.g., pottery typology discussions, and construction techniques. The author's criterion seems not to have been publication, then, but rather something less clearly stated.

Third, Schick was selective about the archaeological references for the sites listed in the corpus. This methodological decision limits the value of the corpus as well as calls into question the archaeological analyses presented throughout the volume. Was it only the sources referenced on which he based his analyses? There are several examples in the corpus, where little of the published archaeological literature is cited either for on-going archaeological research projects or for those that have been completed. If the author does not agree with the excavators' interpretations, it is his obligation to present the arguments against those interpretations, not to present the reader with an archaeological *fait accompli*. Reliance on tertiary analysis of archaeological data, for example an article by Zeyadeh (1994), rather than engaging in inter-

pretive discussions based on primary data, is dangerous. Readers are cautioned about relying on the conclusions drawn in the volume.

The fourth and most significant methodological problem is that the entire area of southern "Greater Syria" is interpreted as being the same during a specific 200-year-plus period. Schick shows little regard for subregional variation either in terms of how a specific province may or may not have been affected by a specific historical/political event or in terms of the differences in the material expression of Christianity emanating from various factors, which may have been historical, political, natural environmental, or a result of who the people were who comprised the Christian community at a specific place.

The volume is helpful for research as it is an easily accessible list of where many Christian-related structures have been found. But the nine maps are poorly executed and lack details. It is unclear why certain plates were chosen, except that, as the author states, he had them for churches in Jordan! Neither the maps nor the plates are integrated into the text. Lapses in copyediting, including typographical errors (e.g., lists, pages 2, 10, and throughout the volume) and word choices, e.g., "country towns," "bedouin," "nomads," "desert fringes," indicate the author's lack of clarity as well as his unwillingness to discuss and to provide any real synthesis as much as lack of rigor on the part of the editors.

C. J. Lenzen

Homewood, IL 60430

REFERENCES

- Piccirillo, M.
1993 *The Mosaics of Jordan*. Amman: American Center of Oriental Research.
- Zeyadeh, A.
1994 Settlement Patterns, An Archaeological Perspective: Case Studies from Northern Palestine and Jordan. Pp. 117–31 in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East, Vol. 2: Land Use and Settlement Patterns*, eds. G. R. D. King and A. Cameron. Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam 1. Princeton: Darwin.

***Divine Commandment and Human Obligation: Selected Writings of David Noel Freedman*, edited by John R. Huddleston. Vol. 1: History and Religion; Vol. 2: Poetry and Orthography. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997. 2 volumes. Vol. 1: xxix + 545 pp.; Vol. 2: xx + 269 pp. Vol. 1: \$45.00, Vol. 2: \$30.00.**

The career of David Noel Freedman can only be described with superlatives. The literary output of this unique

scholar is simply extraordinary: his hundreds of articles, essays, encyclopedia entries, and book reviews cover every aspect of biblical studies; his books such as *The Unity of the Hebrew Bible* (1991) are filled with original insights; and of course his most famous work has been as editor of the Anchor Bible series and the *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (1992).

Nineteen of Freedman's essays were collected in the wonderfully titled volume *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy* (1980). Now, John Huddleston, Freedman's last doctoral student at the University of Michigan, has edited the two volumes of *Divine Commandment and Human Obligation*, which, combined, contain 62 additional Freedman essays—43 in Volume 1, 19 in Volume 2. There is no overlap between the articles published in this new work (whose title stems from a 1964 essay) and the articles published in the earlier work (named for a 1977 essay).

Unlike *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy*, all of whose essays were from the years 1968–1979, this new collection presents some of Freedman's earliest articles. The earliest among them is "The 'House of Absalom' in the Habakkuk Scroll" (1949), the fourth scholarly article penned by the young Freedman (according to the listing in his first festschrift, *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth* [1983]). The most recent article is "Editing the Editors: Translation and Elucidation of the Text of the Bible" (1993), a wide-ranging piece with reflections stemming from Freedman's aforementioned editorial labors.

In a review such as this, I cannot, of course, do justice to the breadth and depth of Freedman's research as reflected in these essays. Most of the articles in the second volume were well known to me, not only because of my own research interests, but also because most scholars identify Freedman with his work on biblical poetry and on the orthography of the Masoretic Text. I was less aware of many of the pieces in the first volume, and am happy that the appearance of this collection allows me now to become acquainted with them.

A reading of Freedman's works spanning almost four decades reveals that this scholar's views have changed over time, keeping pace with changing methods in the field. Most striking is the manner in which his approach to textual emendation has changed. I think it is fair to state that Freedman began his career as one ready to emend a biblical text that he did not understand or that simply did not look right. For example, in "Notes on Genesis" (1953), Freedman freely emends Gen 4:22 to read *tûbal hû' hâyâ 'âbî kol lôîēš* (alternatively *hôrēš*) *n'hōšet ûbarzel*, simply because MT does not match the pattern established by the preceding descriptions of Jabal and Jubal in vv 20–21. (Incidentally, Freedman proposes this emendation without reference to Targum Onqelos and to Targum Pseudo-Yonatan, even though both versions support his reconstruction in whole or in part.) Similarly, in the same article, he proposes to omit ^ʿ*āšer* in Gen 12:1 and to read instead ^ʿ*el hā'āreš 'ar'ekkā* (actually his vocalization is slightly different),

because the relative pronoun ^ʿ*āšer* "was not used in early Hebrew poetry" (Vol. 1, p. 6). And note that neither of these two examples is an emendation *metri causa* (though Freedman understands Gen 12:1–2 as poetry), an approach that Freedman utilized famously.

Twenty-six years later, in an essay called "Problems of Textual Criticism in the Book of Hosea" (1979), written in the wake of Freedman's collaboration with F. I. Andersen on the Anchor Bible *Hosea* (1980), he presents a different view. Freedman's words are so in contrast to the approach exemplified above that I feel the need to quote him extensively (Vol. 1, p. 316):

But the real problem with emendation is that it is far too easy. In a language with three-consonant words, the supply is very limited; if you change one consonant you can literally produce whatever you want. . . . Emendation is not only too easy, but too easy to justify, because there is enough manuscript evidence to show that scribes accidentally substituted not only letters that looked alike, but very often letters that didn't look alike. . . . My attack on emendation has nothing to do with any kind of religious prejudice; the notion of a surviving sacred, inerrant text is absurd. My attitude is that this is an area that is best not exploited, that emendation is not a legitimate scholarly possibility. . . . By now, we should all be thoroughly warned against emendations *metri causa*, a temptation that should be resisted vigorously, because it is the worst example of circular reasoning that I know. And since I have indulged in it along with many others, I'm an expert on the subject: you produce the meter that you think is there by emending the text. That's really a disaster.

I could not agree more with this statement, and it is warming to see a former practitioner of liberal textual emendation presenting the case against such an approach so honestly.

On the other hand, Freedman still proposes emendations in his later works, as in "Discourse on Prophetic Discourse" (1983), in which he (along with many others) prefers to read *kš'r* "like flesh" for *kš'r* "as" in Mic 3:3: "The error itself is one of the most common, as any writer or typist can attest: metathesis" (Vol. 1, p. 354).

For me, the most impressive "new" article ("new" because I had been unaware of its existence) is "Deliberate Deviation from an Established Pattern of Repetition in Hebrew Poetry as a Rhetorical Device" (1986). I have been working on the same device in prose texts (see, for example, the wording at the beginning of Num 7:19, in contrast to vv 25, 31, 37, etc.), and I plan to publish an article on this feature. So naturally I was attracted to Freedman's article on this feature in poetic texts. I was not disappointed.

Freedman presents numerous examples of this device, all convincing, especially in the book of Amos, where

a) *w^ehiṣṣattî* in 1:14 replaces *w^ešillaḥtî* in 1:4, 1:7, 1:10, 1:12, 2:2, 2:5; b) *w^eḏok^elîm* in 6:4b appears without the definite article in contrast to six other masculine plural participles in this *hōy*-poem that appear with the definite article; and c) the infinitive absolute form *w^eqattēr* in 4:5 occurs amidst a series of six other masculine plural imperatives in vv 4–5. Freedman further notes that in all three of these cases, the deviant form is in fifth position in a series of seven. He concludes that in none of these cases are we to alter the text (*contra*, for example, *BHS* at Amos 4:5), but that rather we are to recognize deliberate deviation from a set pattern as one additional weapon in the arsenal of devices available to the ancient Hebrew poets and prophets. (I checked the Anchor Bible *Amos* [1989], also by Andersen and Freedman where, curiously, this device is noted only at 1:14, on p. 282 and there only in very general terms.)

Freedman does not explain the import of the unusual form in specifically the fifth position, except to note “the alteration in midcourse, or more precisely at the fifth member of a series of seven” (Vol. 2, p. 206). Here I would call attention to Shalom Paul’s discovery that Amos not only “had a great fondness for expressing completeness in heptads” (a point that almost every commentator on Amos has noted), but that he also “had a preference for another very much overlooked numerical pattern, that of the pentad” (*Amos* [Minneapolis, 1991], p. 5). I would suggest that Amos combined these two structures by imbedding a hint at the pentad, through the placement of the deviant form in fifth position, in the midst of three of his heptads.

The world of biblical scholarship owes much to David Noel Freedman, as this array of articles so clearly demonstrates.

Gary A. Rendsburg
Cornell University
gar4@cornell.edu

***Retrieving the Past, Essays on Archaeological Research and Methodology in Honor of Gus W. Van Beek*, edited by Joe D. Seger. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns. 1996. xxxi + 312 pp., 87 figures, 33 tables. \$39.50.**

From fieldwork in the Arabian Peninsula to the southern Levant, and ethnoarchaeological research across the length of the Middle East and North Africa, few individuals in Near Eastern archaeology have led a more varied and productive career than Gus Van Beek. This festschrift proposes to highlight Van Beek’s explicit concerns with archaeological method and theory, and the connections between the two realms. Five contributions deal with Tell Halif (Borowski and Doolittle, Futato, Jacobs, Seger, and

Zeder), a site with which Van Beek has never been associated, and three with South Arabian questions (Blakely and Glanzman, Hesse, and Parr). Only one paper, by Wapnish, deals with Tell Jemmeh, while none address other areas such as Cyprus or Iron Age chronology where Van Beek made his first original contributions under the guidance of his mentor W. F. Albright. The remainder are varia. The criteria for inclusion in a festschrift are rarely explicit and that is certainly the case here. This review discusses contributions that address issues of archaeological method and theory.

Dever presents a brief discussion of the tell, echoing one of his mentor G. E. Wright’s last contributions. He creates a tentative typology of Palestinian tells using geographical and sociopolitical criteria. These include central place or “hub,” middle tier or “node,” “satellite,” and so on. The scheme is notable for taking into account contingent historical and ideological factors, such as religious and symbolic significance. Like all typologies this article is an outline, and individual sites may straddle or shift between categories, rather than fitting into a strict framework. The equally broad urban classification system of Richard Fox (1977) might be juxtaposed with Dever’s. The topic of formation processes is also usefully broached by Dever.

Two contributions on the “Gezer method,” an approach with which Van Beek has not been formally associated, show the logic of maximum separation, and some of its consequences.

Seger discusses the “point 1” concept, a technique for excavating debris layers and surfaces. Making a logical separation among different types of fills—above surfaces, directly on surfaces, the surfaces themselves, their makeup, and supporting construction material—has long been a concern of Syro-Palestinian archaeology. The solution proposed is to maximize separation between observed layers, a task which the Gezer method certainly achieves. But strict application of the method, calling for the removal of an amount up to 10 cm below the surface, simultaneously expects too much of the excavator and of the loci. The question of determining in the field whether a particular layer is a surface is rarely as clear as Seger maintains. His assertion that surfaces themselves never have material on them or in them is neither logical nor empirical. With regard to recording loci, the approach also conflates field observation and interpretation. In reality, how many surfaces, and fills above and below surfaces, are obvious as such and not reconstructed during or immediately after excavation, or on paper long after?

The point 1 approach makes *a priori* judgment about stratigraphic and behavioral relationships and fixes them in the recording system. With the proliferation of computerized databases it is, in theory, a simple matter to shift loci from one attribution to another (but not the tags and registration numbers on sherds or the position of bags on