

cultural assumptions and much popular Christian teaching, the final goal of salvation in the Christian story is not the individual soul reaching heaven. Heaven is discussed very little in the Bible and is best regarded as a temporary abode with God in anticipation of the more glorious next act in the divine drama: The second coming of Jesus the king, which will transform heaven and earth (143). Bates reasons that at the end of the salvation story we do not find humans in heaven; rather we discover they are city-dwellers still on earth. The original garden has become a magnificent city, so the progress of life and culture has somehow been taken up into God's redemptive work (132). He concludes that final salvation is not about the individual soul going to heaven after death; it is about resurrection into new creation (163).

Can Bates's work be improved? I would say yes. One would probably wish to learn more on this topic from the point of view of the Old Testament. While the Hebrew word אֱמוּנָה is mentioned in this book, it is definitely eclipsed by the repeated references to πίστις . Where the Greek word πίστις is discussed, I expected to find the word "trust" (3). Then, the author says that there is only one true gospel and this one gospel is attested by Paul, a statement that could lead to a narrow view of the topic of faith and works in the early church (101). With all due respect to Paul, is not Jesus the true founder of Christianity? What about the other prominent New Testament writers, like Peter, John, and Jude? We need to listen more to what they had to say on this vital topic. Bates does quote verses from James, but only sporadically.

The author mentions three Pauline passages that best summarize the concept of the "gospel" (30). They are Rom 1:1–5; 16–17; and 1 Cor 15:1–5. I believe that adding Titus 2:11–15 would greatly enhance the book's thesis. Lastly, the author says that God's new creation includes the elements of the old creation (133). If this is a correct observation (and I believe that it is!) then the word "renewed" would be preferable to the word "new."

In spite of my suggestions for improvement listed above, I would recommend this book to all who study and proclaim the messages of the Bible.

Adventist University of Health Sciences
Orlando, Florida

ZDRAVKO STEFANOVIC

Bieberstein, Klaus. *A Brief History of Jerusalem: From the Earliest Settlement to the Destruction of the City in AD 70*. ADPV 47. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2017. x + 181 pp. Hardcover. EUR 48.00.

To amend Qohelet's (12:12) timeless observation: "For the making of books on Jerusalem, there is no end." Indeed, Jerusalem's exceedingly complex archaeological history aptly reflects the city's exceptionally rich religious and frequently transitory geo-political legacy. Conducting informed archaeological research in Jerusalem requires understanding the minutiae in the context of the entire city and its environs; a most formidable task. Because the data bank is immense, the archaeology of Jerusalem comprises an entire sub-discipline of historical research that nearly demands specialization. Indeed, it would come as no surprise if the number of active scholars that display mastery over all of

Jerusalem's archaeological intricacies could safely be numbered on one hand. Similarly, the published bibliographies on Jerusalem dare not claim anything approaching comprehensiveness. Moreover, semi-popular, archaeologically-based treatments of Jerusalem's history, however authoritative they appear when first published, often reveal the truth behind the oft-quoted statement that today's archaeological "facts" are, in fact, tomorrow's footnotes to earlier errors. All this is to say that the book under review, which offers a summarized 134-page history of Jerusalem until its 70 CE destruction, faces a particularly daunting challenge. In actuality, no truly detailed, comprehensive history of ancient Jerusalem has been published since the authoritative work of J. Simons and the two-volume masterpiece of L.-H. Vincent and M.-A. Steve appeared over sixty years ago. While Bieberstein's book makes no promise to fill such a large lacuna, his admirable efforts at culling many (but not all) of the frivolous claims and studies, while presenting the most important finds and the prevalent views of current scholarship regarding the city, is appreciated. The author's numerous references to German publications also provide a window into continental scholarship for English readers.

The book follows an architectural history of Jerusalem up to the early Ottoman Period (Klaus Bieberstein and Hanswulf Bloedhorn, *Jerusalem: Grundzüge der Baugeschichte vom Chalkolithikum bis zur Frühzeit der osmanischen Herrschaft*. TAVO [Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1994]). The book's seven chapters focus on Jerusalem's location, names, history of research, Jerusalem's earliest settlement, two longer chapters on Jerusalem during the Bronze Age and Iron Age, and an all-too-brief final chapter treating Jerusalem during the Persian, Hellenistic, and early Roman periods. While unsolved mysteries and vigorous debate surround nearly every era of Jerusalem's history, the earlier periods provide the most controversy and my comments will focus on them.

The two treatments of Jerusalem's geographical context and names are welcome, albeit very brief, additions to the book. Bieberstein's explanation of the term "Zion" follows G. Fohrer (and many other scholars) by connecting the word with the enigmatic ציה "to wither." A. F. Rainey repeatedly argued (e.g., A. F. Rainey, "Zion," *ISBE* 4:1198–1200) that the etymology of Zion more likely relates to the Syriac *ḥehyôn*, (fortified tower). The survey of archaeological research does recount the higher profile digs, but many of Jerusalem's greatest discoveries come from the dozens of small-scale excavations around the city. Two examples include G. Barkay's work at the Ketef Hinnom necropolis, which unearthed two amulets inscribed with the oldest biblical text yet known, as well as his Temple Mount debris-sifting project that netted important epigraphic and other discoveries. While Bieberstein treats the amulets later in the book (91–92), he fails to mention the tenth century BCE pottery discovered in Temple Mount soil (48–50), as well as its significance for supporting the veracity of 1 Kgs 6–7.

As noted above, as excavations continue at an increasing rate in and around Jerusalem, any text describing its past inevitably needs constant revision. To illustrate this fact, excavations directed by R. Reich and E. Shukron in 2004 unearthed a massive extramural tower and two parallel

walls protecting access to the Gihon Spring. The two archaeologists dated this impressive structure to the Middle Bronze Age, based upon associated pottery and apparent architectural parallels (e.g., R. Reich, *Excavating the City of David: Where Jerusalem's History Began* [Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2011], 252–261). Bieberstein rightly includes this dramatic find in his explanatory description of Jerusalem's early history and follows their interpretation (24–37). However, a recent study published by J. Regev, J. Uziel, N. Szanton, and E. Boaretto (“Absolute Dating of the Gihon Spring Fortifications, Jerusalem,” *Radiocarbon* 59.4 [2017]: 1171–1193), utilizing radiocarbon testing of soil beneath the structure, points to a much later Iron Age IIA (late ninth century BCE) dating, ostensibly contradicting the supposedly secure conclusions of Reich and Shukron and forcing authors and publishers to reluctantly revise (once again) their accounts, maps, and drawings depicting Jerusalem during the second and first millennium BCE. Finally, in Bieberstein's informed discussion of Jerusalem's royal necropolis (85–92), he cites A. Kloner's view that the mysterious Garden of Uzza (2 Kgs 21:18, 26; 2 Chr 36:8 [LXX]) should be equated with the monumental tomb complex unearthed on the grounds of the *École Biblique et Archéologique Française*. Nonetheless, Bieberstein omits a probable candidate for this royal cemetery; namely the summit of the Western Hill (modern Mount Zion), either near Herod's Palace or beneath the Cenacle. Aside from his brief treatment of the “Jesus Tomb” in Talpiyot (132), and placing the trial of Jesus at the western entrance to Herod's palace in the upper city (following, most recently, S. Gibson and J. Tabor), Bieberstein does not discuss other locations relating to the passion of Jesus Christ. He views them as a construction of a fourth-century-or-later Christian tradition (126). Hence, he circumvents any discussion over locating the two most famous events in Jerusalem's history. And so it goes. Jerusalem's topography and history are already encumbered with queries, corresponding suggested or dogmatic solutions, and sharp disputes. Whether treated here or not, these debates will continue in scholarly journals and books, as well as in public discourses.

Examining Jerusalem's fragmentary archaeological evidence is much like looking at a glass as half empty or half full. Scholars often interpret the same data in different ways. In addition, the nearly continuous occupation of the city often completely erases earlier strata, making especially tenuous arguments wholly based on silence (the absence of evidence). Bieberstein's historical assessment of the biblical account, while balanced in some instances, is often highly skeptical. The volume is nevertheless a useful reference and succeeds in presenting a well-researched and reasonably inclusive summary of the historical and archaeological sources regarding Jerusalem. Presenting at least two sides when addressing Jerusalem's many controversial issues, as well as an inclination to leave certain questions open, would enhance the book, giving the lay reader the option to adopt the author's conclusions or choose one of (usually) several others.