

the Roman synagogue of the Volumneses. Lampe also briefly describes three residential areas in Rome where Roman Jews resided: Trans-Tiberim, Valley of the Appian Way near the Capena Gate, and near the Viminal Gate in the northeast. As stated previously, the specialist will be aware of many of these points, yet Lampe provides a helpful description of the Jewish culture in Rome that many specialists and non-specialists may have overlooked.

There are at least two strengths of this book one notices right away: the unique focus and the wide scope. While much of early Christian scholarship gives primacy to the written sources—and with good reason—this book fills a gap by focusing on available archaeological resources. The broad scope of the work is seen in its endeavor to highlight archaeological discoveries from diverse geographic regions—indeed from the British Isles to the Far East. This work is not a theological investigation into early Christian literature, nor an attempt at a historical development of theological doctrines. The authors certainly use the literature, yet primarily as a source for reconstructing a partial history. They avoid making any arguments either for or against an early orthodoxy. Their primary concern is to highlight the various forms Christianity took during its development in a particular region. They introduce the reader to the greater cultural milieu, and then describe the material evidence in order to elucidate the earliest forms of Christianity in their respective regions. This book, therefore, functions more as an introduction to the role that the literary and non-literary archaeological evidence plays in revealing the diffusion of Christianity in the early centuries. By the end of the book many will appreciate the complexity of a world that influenced and was influenced by Christianity. Because most scholars focus their research on a narrower region, such as Palestine or Italy for example, it is easy to neglect the broader region outside their respective areas. This one-volume work is an excellent tool for students and scholars to gain knowledge of early Christianity outside their respective regions without having to do countless hours of research. And if they would like to study more, the bibliography and indices will aid them in their journey.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

CHRISTOPHER R. CHADWICK

Ussishkin, David. *Biblical Lachish: A Tale of Construction, Destruction, Excavation and Restoration*. Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 2014. 446 pp. Hardcover, \$52.00.

The great significance of the city of Lachish for biblical history, as well as its important role as the archaeological ‘type site’ for Judah during the Iron Age II period needs no apology. David Ussishkin, the author of the book under review, directed large scale excavations at Lachish from 1973-1987, with supplementary excavation and restoration work conducted at the site until 1994. Subsequently, Ussishkin edited the massive and justifiably highly acclaimed five-volume final excavation report for Lachish, which appeared in 2004. Over the past decade, while scholars and students digested the enormous amount of data and results published by Ussishkin and his team, Ussishkin has also reflected upon his own methodology and historical

conclusions about the site. This decade-long period of reflective thought is clearly evident in this book, which comprises Ussishkin's summary treatment of the history of Lachish, including his latest interpretations and conclusions regarding this great biblical site. The book will undoubtedly be welcomed by all of his colleagues in the field and also celebrated for its ability to present scholarly data and the main results from a major excavation at an important biblical site in a largely accessible semi-popular format, appealing to an informed lay audience as well as scholars in a manner arguably not seen since the death of famed Israeli archaeologist and general Yigael Yadin. Ussishkin offers a complete archaeologically based account of Lachish, from its earliest periods of settlement to the 1948 Arab-Israeli war as well as a history of each of the three expeditions that excavated the site. Lachish was a Canaanite city captured by Israel in the conquest narrative (Joshua 10:3; 12:11; 15:39) and later served as a major fortified administrative and population center for the Kingdom of Judah; second in importance only to Jerusalem (2 Chr 11:9; 2 Kgs 14:19). The majority of the book describes in detail the circumstances surrounding the two well documented destructions suffered by Lachish; the first at the hands of Assyria in 701 B.C. and later by Babylonian forces in 587/6 B.C. Utilizing a variety of evidence, Ussishkin provides captivating and sometimes graphic testimony of the desperate, but ultimately futile attempts by Lachish's brave population to resist these onslaughts as well as the horrifying atrocities committed by the Assyrians during and after their successful siege. He also includes fascinating information and photos relating to earlier archaeological work at the site, especially the British expedition led by James L. Starkey during the 1930's. A selection of photos even depicts life at the British excavation camp, which was later looted and completely obliterated after the staff departed following Starkey's murder by Arab bandits in 1938. Also recounted is the visit of Olga Tufnell to the excavations in 1983. Tufnell, one of Starkey's assistants, almost single handedly completed the task of publishing the results from Lachish and did so in exemplary fashion. Tufnell's return to Lachish provided continuity between the two expeditions that amazingly spanned 50 years. Perhaps my favorite photo in the book strikingly demonstrates this connection by showing a frail and aged Tufnell chatting with a young Orna Zimhoni, the ceramicist and recorder for Ussishkin's project. Sadly, both have since passed away.

Ussishkin does not hesitate to criticize the methodology of several of his late colleagues, notably Yohanan Aharoni (63–64, 101; who briefly excavated at Lachish in 1966 and 1968) Kathleen Kenyon (83–6, 101; who visited the site in 1977) and Rudolph Cohen (101), but he is not above self-criticism either (81, 215–7). Ussishkin takes the opportunity to endorse the "low chronology" position by arguing that the beginning of Philistine settlement occurred no earlier than 1130 B.C. (his relative dating for the beginning of the Iron Age), on the basis of negative evidence, that is, the lack of Philistine monochrome ware at Lachish. Ussishkin even mentions his attempt to persuade Aren Maier, the excavator of nearby Tell es-Safi (biblical Gath of the Philistines), to accept this view, but to no avail (198–201). Unfortunately,

Ussishkin displays an overly harsh attitude towards scholars that practice traditional Biblical Archaeology; that is, actively search for correlations between the archaeological data and the biblical accounts. For example, Ussishkin remarks that (concerning Aharoni's view): "it should be noted that the intertwining of biblical and historical thinking with the archaeological work was not unique to him, but rather was accepted by many scholars, first and foremost by disciples of the renowned American archaeologist William Foxwell Albright. *Unfortunately, this way of thinking is still accepted by many scholars, determining their worldview and distorting their fieldwork to this day*" (64, italics mine). Certain cases of these regrettable distortions indeed exist among a few conservative scholars who "force the evidence" and, for their faults, Ussishkin's point is well taken. However, there are much more serious abuses deriving from archaeologists and historians who follow an ideology of biblical minimalism that he does not address, which include some of Ussishkin's colleagues at Tel Aviv University. In one of his earlier statements on interpreting archaeological data objectively, without the influence (!) of the biblical accounts, Ussishkin confesses that, in actuality, this is usually not the case ("Archaeology of the Biblical Period: On Some Questions of Methodology and Chronology of the Iron Age," in *Understanding the History of Ancient Israel*, ed. H.G.M. Williamson. Proceedings of the British Academy 143. [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007], 131–41, esp. 131–5). Indeed, it is most certainly not the case with this book; a fact that is readily apparent by simply reading its title. Furthermore, despite his stated definitions of what an archaeologist must and must not do, Ussishkin interacts with the Bible (albeit generally in a critical vein) many times in the book and biblical citations are sprinkled throughout the volume. Not surprisingly, some of Ussishkin's interpretations are controversial, especially his conclusions about the status and makeup of Lachish during the Iron Age IIA. First, despite considerable evidence to the contrary, he continues to argue that podium A and podium B; two adjoining rectangular platforms upon which a multi-storied palace-fort (or perhaps two) stood during the ninth century B.C., were constructed at the same time. Secondly, he compresses Lachish Levels V and IV into two 50-year periods (ca. 900–850 B.C. and 850–800 B.C. respectively), dating Level V based on "general considerations" and by the chronology of other sites. Ussishkin proposes these interpretations even though he admits that Level IV has at least four distinct phases and offers little to support his date of Level V. Both interpretations appear rather arbitrary (16, 204). To compress a major occupational level with four phases into such a short time span seems problematic. The Level IV stratigraphical evidence requires a longer period of time, as does Level V, in my opinion. Perhaps Ussishkin is attempting to evade a much larger issue here, which is the further undermining of the "low chronology" position espoused by his Tel Aviv University colleague Israel Finkelstein. Ussishkin likewise interprets Lachish Level IV as a "fortress city"; a government and military center rather than a residential settlement (207) due to a lower density of domestic dwellings related to this stratum. Again, this is merely negative evidence based upon only limited excavated areas. Indeed,

he later admits that the lack of broad exposure of this level does not present a clear picture of the settlement and character of the site (209). On the other hand, Ussishkin has modified his earlier interpretation regarding the date of Level IV's collapse. Previously, he followed Moshe Kochavi's suggestion that the earthquake recorded in Amos 1:1 and Zechariah 14:5 caused serious damage to the city in ca. 760 B.C. (214–5). After extensive reconstruction and repairs were carried out, the new Level III city emerged. However, because Lachish Level IV pottery closely resembles the stratum A3 pottery from nearby Tell es-Safi, which most likely was destroyed by Hazael prior to 800 B.C., Ussishkin duly recognized the need to revise his own chronology (16, 212) while also maintaining that Lachish may have lasted a few more years before the demise of Level IV. He consequently moved its terminal date backwards approximately 40 years to 800 B.C., making a chronological adjustment that several of his colleagues had recommended for years. The lack of a Level IV burn layer should not rule out the possibility of a human agent. Consequently, the question must then be raised regarding who destroyed Level IV around 800 B.C. In my opinion, a leading suspect would be Jehoash of Israel, in conjunction with his rout of Amaziah of Judah at Beth Shemesh. Israelite soldiers dismissed from mercenary duty earlier by Amaziah also carried out random destructive acts in various cities and towns in Judah (2 Chr 25:13). While Lachish is not specifically mentioned, the date and circumstances seem to correlate with the evidence from Lachish Level IV. Moreover, the biblical accounts make no reference to Jehoash and his soldiers burning Jerusalem, only his destruction of part of the city wall and widespread plundering of the city (2 Kgs 14:14–15; 2 Chr 25:23–24). Consequently, to ascribe the end of Level IV to Jehoash is not an unreasonable assumption. A comparison of pottery from Lachish Level IV with Beth Shemesh stratum 3 may provide needed clarification when the latter is fully published.

I have great hopes that the recently initiated joint Hebrew University and Southern Adventist University excavations at Lachish, directed by Y. Garfinkel, M. Hasel, and G. Klingbeil, will provide critical information regarding the status of Lachish during the tenth and ninth, as well as the eighth century B.C. I am pleased to hear that Ussishkin serves as a scientific advisor for this new field project, providing important continuity once again. We eagerly anticipate the exciting new finds that will hopefully provide several new chapters to the saga of this ancient city so rich in biblical history.

Biblical Lachish, aside from the caveats mentioned above, is a work that deserves to be read by everyone interested in the fields of Hebrew Bible and Near Eastern Archaeology. Perhaps the deepest impression the book made on me was how archaeology vividly revealed the catastrophic plight of Lachish's beleaguered population, whose valiant efforts to resist and survive in the face of great odds tragically failed. The reader cannot help but sense the overwhelming fear and the sheer horror they faced as siege machines battered their fortifications at nearly point blank-range just before Assyrian soldiers poured through the breach, or how desperate messages regarding the encroaching Babylonian army were hastily read and transcribed in a chamber

of the city gate complex. In this way, *Biblical Lachish* admirably represents what “Biblical Archaeology” is truly all about.

Bethel College
Mishawaka, Indiana

JEFFREY P. HUDON

Wolterstorff, Nicholas. *The God We Worship: An Exploration of Liturgical Theology*. The Kantzer Lectures in Revealed Theology. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015. xi + 180 pp. Paperback, \$20.00.

Nicholas Wolterstorff is Noah Porter Professor Emeritus of Philosophical Theology at Yale University and Senior Fellow at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Culture at the University of Virginia. Before coming to Yale, he was Professor of Philosophy at Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan for thirty years. His many other books include *Justice in Love*, *Educating for Shalom*, and *Hearing the Call*.

In his most recent book, *The God We Worship*, Wolterstorff not only examines liturgical theology, but also extensively investigates the introduction of this heretofore little-explored field and its potential approach in reference to J. J. v. Allmen’s and A. Schmenmann’s works. In the afterword, the author classifies liturgical theology in what he refers to as the “three dimensions of the church’s tradition” (166), each of which constitutes a specific theology: (1) the biblical interpretation tradition (biblical theology), (2) conciliar-creedal theology, and (3) liturgy of the church (liturgical theology). While these theologies overlap in their content, he argues that each offers its own emphasis and contribution to the overall picture. The point of liturgical theology is to *explicitly* formulate that which is *implicit* (although, explicit expressions of the understanding of God are, of course, also found in liturgy). The author asserts that in communal worship, Christians everywhere adopt a form of liturgy, an unwritten “script.” Having a background himself in the Reformed tradition, he emphasizes concurrent liturgical aspects of major denominations (e.g. confession, intercession, sermon), yet stresses the fact that even newer denominations with no official liturgy per se also follow a loose liturgy of sorts.

In liturgy, one of the most obvious implicit presuppositions about God across the board is that he is worthy of worship. Wolterstorff defines “worship” as an approach to God shaped by the three attitudes of awe, reverence, and gratitude. And although worship can be part of our daily lives, what the author refers to is corporate worship in the context of church services, and this he regards as the most distinct manifestation of churches. Another implicit application of the church is that the worship of God is an obligation of the believer, a duty. Thus, if failing to worship him would mean being guilty of wrongdoing, this would imply that God is vulnerable to being wronged. Confession, a vital part of liturgy, presupposes that God has already been wronged, while intercession and supplication imply that God allows a form of resistance to the coming of his kingdom. Here, the paradox arises