

1QIsa<sup>a</sup> the editors conclude that one scribe copied a parent text, while other scribes made corrections and expansions (p. 63). There is a division of this manuscript at chapter thirty-three in column XXVII; the scribe completes chapter thirty-three with at least three lines to spare at the bottom. Column XXVIII begins with the chapter thirty-four, but no sense of division between thirty-nine and forty-column XXXII. The editors maintain that there are orthographic and morphological features that occur in the second half of the text such as the more frequent use of *mater lectionis*. They attribute this feature to the possibility that this portion was originally a separate work.

The next section describes 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>. Orthographic, morphological, and paleographic analyses are described as well. The editors date this manuscript to the third quarter of the first century B.C. One of the features of this manuscript is that it dates earlier than 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, yet has more agreement with other Masoretic versions. The editors also conclude that though there are different versions of Isaiah, they all represent the final version of the book of Isaiah; however, based on the textual variants on the Greek translations, there are different families of texts.

This source will prove to be extremely useful for scholars in various fields. The editors have done a wonderful job of organizing these volumes into a useable resource. Scholars from both ends of the theological spectrum will find this source valuable for textual criticism, exegesis, and philological study. The editors maintain, as most scholars do, the possibility of a second Isaiah. They are fair with the evidence represented in these two manuscripts and will be the standard for those interested in this book.

Andrews University

CHRISTOPHER R. CHADWICK

van der Steen, Eveline, Jeannette Boertien, and Noor Mulder-Hymans, eds.  
*Exploring the Narrative: Jerusalem and Jordan in the Bronze and Iron Ages*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 583. London: Bloomsbury 2014. xxiv + 440 pp. Hardcover, \$146.00; PDF e-book, \$131.99.

This volume is a collection of essays that serves as a *Festschrift* honoring the scholarship of archaeologist and historian Margreet L. Steiner and contains twenty-one chapters written by twenty-seven of Steiner's European, North American, Israeli, and Jordanian colleagues. The title of the volume fittingly reflects Steiner's own focus of historical and archaeological research in Jordan (notably at Tell Deir 'Alla) and in Jerusalem, where she and her mentor, the late H. J. Franken, were given the responsibility of publishing part of Kathleen Kenyon's excavations on the southeast hill (the City of David). Consequently, the book is divided into two roughly equal parts, with contributors writing on topics relating to these two subjects.

Papers relating to Jordan include an essay on pottery production at Tall Hisban and Tall al 'Umayri by Gloria London and Robert Shuster, which both summarizes and expands upon their landmark study published two years earlier (*Ceramic Technology at Hisban, (597-763)* in *Ceramic Finds:*

*Typological and Technological Studies of the Pottery Remains from Tell Hesban and Vicinity (Hesban 11)*, eds. James A. Sauer and Larry G. Herr. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2012). In “A Late Iron Age I Ceramic Assemblage from Central Jordan,” Bruce Routledge and others attempt to place Khirbat al-Mudayna al-‘Aliya in a cultural and political context with other nearby sites during the Iron I period. Larry Herr publishes a useful typology of Iron Age cooking pots from Tall al ‘Umayri that covers the progression of main CP forms from the Late Bronze to the Persian period, and Piotr Bienkowski contributes an essay that surveys and discusses the paucity of evidence for Iron II Edomite Burials. Other topics relating to Jordan include studies of the Assyrian Province of Gilead, the cultural landscape of the Eastern Jordan Valley during the Late Bronze and Iron Age, regional interaction in Ammon during the Iron Age IIC, a paper on how ancients recycled pottery, two essays on Khirbet al-Mudayna (ath-Thamad) that highlight public textile production and bread ovens, an imagined conversation with the Iron IIC “Pit People” in the Jordan Valley, and the use of casemates.

Essays relating to Jerusalem include studies of the city during the transition from the Late Bronze to Iron I periods, painted figurines, and the concept of a heavenly Jerusalem in Judaism and Christianity. An important contribution by Avraham Faust reconsiders the date and process of Jerusalem’s expansion over the Western Hill during the Iron Age II period. Faust refutes the claim that much of the Western Hill was only sparsely populated during the last two centuries of the monarchy and that the expansion was a rapid process that occurred over a short duration of time. Faust cites, among other factors, the abundance of pottery, an adequate supply of water from the Gihon Spring and cisterns, the remains of an enormous city wall, as well as extensive extramural and hinterland settlements to support a “maximalist” position that the Western Hill was intensively settled by at least the early eighth century B.C. He also provides crucial ceramic evidence to demonstrate that at least limited settlement on the Western Hill occurred during the ninth century B.C. The evidence marshalled by Faust is indeed compelling. The resultant historical conclusions have powerful ramifications regarding the current debate regarding dating the establishment and rise of the monarchy in Jerusalem, which have now also been published (Hayah Katz and Avraham Faust, *The Chronology of the Iron Age IIA in Judah in the Light of Tel ‘Eton Tomb C3 and Other Assemblages*. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 371 [2014]: 103-127). Steiner’s own conclusions regarding this debate are referenced in a study by Koert van Bekkum, who cautiously accepts the historicity of Solomon’s District List (1 Kgs 4:7-19).

Norma Franklin’s study of the term *עִפְלָה* (*‘ophel*) leads her to suggest that the term, as it was utilized in ninth century B.C.E. Israelite and Moabite contexts, was synonymous with the Judahite word *millō*. Consequently, both refer to the well-known monumental step-stone structure that buttresses the upper western slope of Jerusalem’s Kidron Valley and not to the area immediately south of the Temple Mount. According to Franklin, neither term refers to a natural topographic feature, but rather only to man-made

support structures that “bulged or protruded in a distinctive fashion” (294). Nevertheless, understanding the word as a raised platform or acropolis, whether natural or artificial, remains the convincing topographical definition and is exemplified at many ancient sites in Jordan, such as Tall Hisban, which has a walled platform, and the natural acropolis at Tall Jalul, as well as at (Bronze Age) Hazor and Afula in Israel; the latter site notably preserves the Semitic root of *’ophel*, probably as a result of the prominence of this ancient tell as an elevated landmark in the expansive Jezreel Valley. Franklin’s rejection of locating the *’ophel* between the City of David and the Temple Mount is similarly problematic. The intensive occupation of this area from the Hellenistic through the Early Islamic Periods has virtually eradicated evidence of an earlier raised platform, as did the southern extension of the Temple Mount. Furthermore, the monumental tower and gateway explored by C. Warren and recently by E. Mazar (The Solomonic Wall in Jerusalem, pp. 775-785 in *I Will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Times: Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar*, eds. Pierre Miroschedji and Aren M. Maeir. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006, and *Discovering the Solomonic Wall in Jerusalem: A Remarkable Archaeological Adventure*. Jerusalem: Shoham, 2011) admirably fits the descriptions preserved in the biblical text. An essay by Ilan Sharon and Anabel Zarzecki-Peleg (Podium Structures with Lateral Access: Authority Ploys in Royal Architecture in the Iron Age Levant. pp. 145-167 in *Confronting the Past: Archaeological and Historical Essays on Ancient Israel in Honor of William G. Dever*, eds. Seymour Gitin, J. Edward Wright and J. P. Dessel. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006) argues that some raised or podium-based, multi-story monumental (royal) structures themselves served as an elevated *’ophel* to the surrounding epicenter or provincial city. Regrettably, Franklin either overlooked or chose not to consider Sharon’s and Zarzecki-Peleg’s paper. Nor does she refer to Aren M. Maeir’s (“A New Interpretation of the Term *’opelim* (עפלים) in the Light of Recent Archaeological Finds from Philistia,” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 32 [2007]: 23-40 [esp. 30-32]) novel understanding of *’ophel* (supplemented by archaeological evidence) as it was purposely employed in the Ark Narrative (1 Sam 5-6).

Eveline van der Steen contributes a fascinating chapter on the prejudicial attitudes, skepticism and corresponding observations on Jerusalem by some of its nineteenth-century Western visitors. Similarly, Shimon Gibson provides an exhaustive study on the ancient tunnels in the Kidron Valley that were explored but only briefly mentioned by Charles Warren in his publications on Jerusalem. The tunnels were hewn in antiquity, probably to divert excess water away from the area during the rainy season. Relying heavily upon nineteenth-century explorer accounts, Gibson also gives an extensive treatment on the location and history of biblical En Rogel, which he identifies with Bir Ayyub. He classifies this unique, yet largely neglected, installation as a hybrid water system, rather than strictly a well or, during antiquity, a spring. Gibson only hesitantly dates En Rogel as early as the Iron Age, which is rather surprising, given the various references to the site found in the Hebrew Bible. The Festschrift concludes with the essay “Archaeological Voices from

Jerusalem,” an interesting look inside the Israeli archaeological establishment, by Raz Kletter, who translates and comments on selected Hebrew archival documents that record the birth and growth, as well as the challenges and controversies that surrounded the fledgling Department of Antiquities, as well as its interactions with various personalities and institutions during Israel’s formative years.

Typical of the series in which it appears, the editing and production of the book generally excellent as are many of its essays, several of which comprise important contributions to the field. However, the high price of the volume places it out of the reach of many scholars and most students.

Bethel College  
Mishawaka, Indiana

JEFFREY P. HUDON