

Doubleday is to be congratulated for publishing this commentary, which will further add to the reputation of the Anchor Bible series as one in which innovative and exciting commentaries may be found.

Avondale College  
Cooranbong, Australia

ROBERT K. McIVER

Mazar, Amihai. *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible: 10,000-586 B.C.E.* New York: Doubleday, 1990. xxx + 572 pp. \$30.00.

Until the publication of this volume by Amihai Mazar, currently one of Israel's leading archaeologists, the most prominent books available as introductions to Syro-Palestinian archaeology were W. F. Albright's *Archaeology of Palestine* (rev. ed., Gloucester, MA, 1971), K. M. Kenyon's *Archaeology in the Holy Land* (4th ed., London/New York, 1979), and Y. Aharoni's *Archaeology of the Land of Israel* (Philadelphia, 1982).

While each of these earlier books was written by a leading scholar of the time and remains a classic in its own right, these works tended to interpret the archaeology of Palestine largely from the perspective of the authors' own excavations without always making the reader aware of alternate interpretations. For beginning students this could be confusing and frustrating. While Mazar is inevitably influenced by his own field work (what field archaeologist is not?), his book does a better job of alerting the reader to key issues and alternate interpretations than previous treatments, both within the text and in notes at the end of each chapter.

Chronologically the book spans the archaeology of Palestine from the Neolithic to the Iron II period (ending with the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.). Each chapter focuses on a specific archaeological period and is organized into various sections discussing such items as pottery, architecture, fortifications, technology, burial practices, weapons, art, and so on, although the same sections do not appear in each chapter, nor are they covered in the same order.

Space does not permit a comprehensive review of Mazar's stimulating and sometimes provocative viewpoints, but some of his opinions on current topics of debate and interest to biblical scholars include the relationship of the archaeology of the Early Bronze Age (ca. 3100-2000 B.C.) to the biblical traditions. As a specific example, Mazar notes the attempts by some scholars (such as van Hatten and Rast) to relate the archaeological remains at sites such as Bab edh-Dhra<sup>c</sup> and Numeira, southeast of the Dead Sea, to the biblical "cities of the plain." Although Mazar does not endorse any specific theory of integrating the archaeological data with the biblical material, he does allow for two possible models: first, the possibility that a "severe catastrophe," which destroyed these five cities, was "remembered and trans-

mitted orally in legendary form" down to the first millennium B.C., when it was "adapted to its final form by the author of the Book of Genesis" (p. 144); second, that later peoples, such as the Israelites, simply observed these ancient ruins and "invented etiological legends" about them (*ibid.*). Although other models could be suggested, Mazar correctly implies that the currently available archaeological data cannot conclusively decide the issue. At the same time, however, he cautions that "attempts to relate Genesis narratives to Early Bronze Age features cannot be completely excluded" (p. 143).

Of related interest is Mazar's view on the patriarchal narratives and the Middle Bronze Age (ca. 2000-1550 B.C.). After noting the recent trend of several scholars, such as T. L. Thompson and J. Van-Seters, who have attempted to place these traditions as late as the Iron Age (ca. 1200-550 B.C.), Mazar argues that he finds "the similarities between the MB II culture and that illustrated in the Genesis stories too close to be ignored" (p. 225). While Mazar would allow that the narratives may have been written down for the first time during the period of the United Kingdom of David and Solomon, he cautions that "we should note the many details which do not correspond to the period of the Israelite settlement and monarchy" (p. 226). Thus, these views on the archaeological background for the patriarchal period would seem to place Mazar more within the "Albright school," which has traditionally taken the historicity of these narratives more seriously than have some other interpretative perspectives.

As for the emergence of Israel in Canaan, Mazar believes that, even though the lack of archaeological evidence at certain key sites mentioned in the conquest narratives raises questions about their historical value, that difficulty "does not exclude the possibility that the stories echo individual historical events which may have occurred during the process of the Israelite settlement" (p. 331). With regard to the actual nature of Israel's acquisition of the land, Mazar maintains that "even if the Israelites were the invaders of certain cities, the devastation was not carried out in one sweep during the same military campaign; rather, such destruction was a result of a drawn-out process of regional wars" (p. 334). Although Mazar's discussion leaves a lot of questions unanswered, and the data from some of the sites he discusses can easily be interpreted in other ways, he does appear carefully to avoid an exclusive and simplistic endorsement of any of the current models on Israel's emergence—such as Albright's military conquest, Alt's peaceful infiltration, and Gottwald's sociological models. The actual taking of the land was undoubtedly a complex process that involved elements of all of the above theories—elements which can also be seen as clearly reflected in the various relevant biblical texts when properly understood.

While Mazar's discussions on the topics noted above will be of interest to the specialist, there is much also for the beginning student. Particularly useful in this regard are Mazar's introductory chapter on archaeology in

Palestine, his final chapter on Israelite material culture, and, scattered throughout the book, his discussions of terminology. The latter item is especially helpful for beginning students, since archaeological terms have different meanings, depending on the scholars who are using them (e.g., Middle Bronze I equals Early Bronze IV for some scholars but is the same as Middle Bronze IIA for others). The historical background given for each archaeological period is also useful. Sources used are authoritative and up-to-date. Citations are as recent as 1988—not bad for a book published in 1990.

The illustrations are generally of good quality, numerous, and conveniently located throughout, rather than grouped together in plates in the center or at the end of the book. The tables correlating contemporary strata from different sites will also be helpful to the beginner. The only negative reaction this reviewer had was to the distracting, pasted-on look of the map labels. Overall, this book is probably the best general work on the archaeology of Palestine currently produced and will provide a first-rate introduction for the beginner and serve as an excellent reference for the scholar.

Andrews University

RANDALL W. YOUNKER

Mazzaferri, Frederick David. *The Genre of the Book of Revelation from a Source-Critical Perspective*. BZNW, vol. 54. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1989. xix + 486 pp. \$102.00.

Frederick Mazzaferri's contribution to the discussion regarding the genre of the Apocalypse is based on a dissertation produced under the guidance of Ruth Edwards at the University of Aberdeen. After a survey of introductory issues (chaps. 1 and 2), he reviews the literature on the subject of genre within biblical criticism (chap. 3). He then defines the genres of classical prophecy and "apocalyptic," Christian prophecy and "neo-apocalyptic" (chaps. 4-8). The last half of the book evaluates Revelation on the basis of his definitions of prophetic and apocalyptic genre. Mazzaferri argues that Revelation is not an apocalyptic book but is a "proximate classical prophecy" that is modeled on the classical prophets of the OT, particularly Ezekiel.

The book's most critical assumption is that the author of Revelation at times employs sources with "generic intent" (pp. v, 58, 379, *passim*)—in other words, as a pointer to his self-understanding of the kind of book being written. If one can define the genre of documents used in such "generic" fashion, one can determine the genre intended by the author. Mazzaferri believes that John never uses apocalyptic sources "with generic intent" but often does so when quoting prophetic sources, Ezekiel in particular. John thus identifies himself with the classical prophets rather than with the apocalyptic writers.