

locative meaning of the sentence. Directional and spatial relationships, like “in”, “out”, “under”, “behind”, were signified with the help of nouns derived from body parts and of serial verb constructions. The latter device preceded the formation of verbal extensions, two of which are dealt with in *Ventive and Centrifugal in Chadic* (pp. 179–195). Franzyngier postulates that they derived respectively from the verbs “to come” and “to go”. The next article deals with *Interrogative Sentences in Chadic: Reconstruction and Functional Explanation* (pp. 197–214). There were two devices used to form them: one was the final interrogative marker, derived from a copula, and the other consisted in tonal changes. The chapter *Logophoric Changes in Chadic* (pp. 215–231) refers to syntactic contexts most often known as “indirect speech”. Some Chadic languages have a rich correlated system, but the Author judges that no evidence supports its existence in Proto-Chadic.

The article *From Preposition to Copula* (pp. 233–250) provides evidence for the use of a verb “to be at a place” as a locative preposition, which in turn became an equational copula. The last chapter, *Theory and Method of Syntactic Reconstruction: Implications from Chadic* (pp. 251–271), discusses the implications of the reconstruction of various Proto-Chadic syntactical elements for the general theory and methodology of syntactic reconstruction. A useful bibliography (pp. 273–283), an index of subjects and geographical names (pp. 285–290), and an index of modern authors cited (pp. 291–293) close the volume, which contains a series of inspiring studies. They are of interest to scholars of Afro-Asiatic linguistics, especially to Semitists, who often regard Chadic as a quite distant language family.

Edward Lipiński

Yosef Garfinkel and Saar Ganor (eds.), *Khirbet Qeiyafa. Vol. 1. Excavation Report 2007–2008*. Israel Exploration Society & Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 2009, XIX + 304 pp.

The lavishly illustrated volume under review contains the report of the excavations conducted by the editors in 2007 and 2008 at Khirbet Qeiyafa, a site located on the northern side of the Valley of the Terebinth (Wadi as-Sanṭ, Emeq ha-Elah), some 30 km south-west of Geba of Benjamin, king Saul’s residence. This is a 2.3 hectare site surrounded by massive fortifications of megalithic stones that still stand to a height of 2–3 m. The particular importance of the archaeological site results from the quite accurate dating of its Iron Age stratum at the end of the 11th or in the first half of the 10th century B.C., and from the Hebrew inscription on an ostrakon, which “is the earliest witness of the institution of the monarchy by the people of Israel”, at the time of Saul, as rightly stressed by Émile Puech, “L’ostrakon de Khirbet Qeiyafa et les débuts de la Royauté en Israël”, “Revue biblique” 117 (2010), pp. 162–184. A slightly different reading and translation

of the inscription are proposed by E. Lipiński, “Najstarsza inskrypcja hebrajska / The Oldest Hebrew Inscription”, “*Studia Judaica*” 14 (2011), pp. 143–150.

Chapter 1 by Y. Garfinkel and S. Ganor locates *Khirbet Qeiyafa in Context* (pp. 3–18): archaeological, ethnical, chronological, as well as biblical. Since the editors believe in the forty years of the reigns of David and of Solomon, reduced nevertheless to c. 1000–930 B.C., they attribute the foundation of the city to David, thus creating a “mythological” context for archaeological and historical data, certainly anterior to David. In fact, Solomon’s and Roboam’s accession to the throne at the age, respectively, of 12 and 16 years (III Kings 2:12; 12:24a), the marriageable age in ancient Semitic societies, and David’s *curriculum vitae* suggest c. 960 B.C. for the beginning of David’s reign at Jerusalem.

A clear presentation of the *Expedition Aims and Methodology* (pp. 19–24) is followed by a chapter on the *Site Location and Setting, and History of Research* (pp. 25–46). This key chapter briefly describes the strata and provides the radiometric dating, based on carefully chosen samples of burnt olive pits. The calibrated average dates for Iron Age IIA or rather the transition period between Iron Age IB and Iron Age IIA proper is 1051–969 B.C. with 77,8% probability and 1026–975 B.C. with 59,6% probability. The calibrated date for the Late Persian and Hellenistic strata, uncovered as well, is 361–271 B.C. with 55,9% probability. This chapter also reports the results of the survey showing that no remains of a lower city are recognizable.

Chapter 4 by David L. Adams is entitled *Between Socoh and Azekah: the Role of the Elah Valley in Biblical History and the Identification of Khirbet Qeiyafa* (pp. 47–66). Since historical literary criticism and analysis of literary genres seem to be study fields alien to the authors of this volume, no firm results can be expected from this kind of discussions. The location of Khirbet Qeiyafa on the road from the Shephelah to the Judaeen Highland may nevertheless favour a name such as Sha‘rayim, “Gate” with the local suffix *-ayim*, but this place name appears only in biblical texts or phrases dating from the Late Persian or Early Hellenistic periods: Joshua 15:36; I Sam. 17:52; I Chron. 4:31. It could thus be the name of the site in the second half of the 4th century B.C., unless the visible remains of the two discovered gates among the ruins of the Iron Age town were called earlier *Ša‘arayim*, “Two Gates” (cf. also p. 10). This dual could hardly be regarded as the original name of a settlement.

Chapter 5 introduces *The 2007–2008 Excavations* (pp. 69–116), offering a well illustrated report on the work and the uncovered architectural remains. However, it is incorrect to pretend repeatedly that the two gates of Khirbet Qeiyafa are a unique feature among known biblical cities. In fact, two gates have been identified also at Tell an-Naşbeh, i.e. Mişpah, probably from the time of Saul. This does not prove that both gates were used simultaneously.

Particular finds are examined in the following chapters. Chapter 6 by Hoo-Goo Kang and Y. Garfinkel thus presents the *Early Iron Age IIA Pottery* (pp. 119–149), followed in Chapter 7 by *Ashdod Ware I: Middle Philistine Decorated Ware* (pp. 151–160). These chapters deal in fact with the pottery of the transitional period between Iron Age IB and Iron Age IIA proper. An important contribution by David Ben-Shlomo

provides the results of the *Petrographic Analysis of Iron Age Pottery* (pp. 161–173). It shows that the Ashdod Ware vessels, which seem to be a Philistine cultural indicator, were not produced on the site, but imported from Philistia. Chapter 9 by Y. Garfinkel presents the *Stone and Metal Artifacts* (pp. 175–194), adding a special chapter on *The Standing Stone near the Western City Gate* (pp. 195–200). *The Faunal Assemblage* is examined in Chapter 11 by Ron Khatzi (pp. 201–208). The complete absence of pig bones at Khirbet Qeiyafa, contrary to the neighbouring Tell aš-Šafi, is a clear ethnic and cultural indicator of Semitic inhabitants.

Finds of the Hellenistic Period (pp. 209–230) are examined by Déborah Sandhaus with particular studies of the terracotta figurine of a horse by Adi Erlich (pp. 225–227) and of metal artifacts by Ravit Nenner-Soriano (pp. 227–229). Historians will certainly pay attention to this reoccupation of an ancient site, in a key strategic location, at a particular moment in the final decades of the Persian Empire. The “seven years” of the Persian oppression recorded by Josephus Flavius (*Jewish Antiquities* XI, 7, 1, §297–301; cf. *Against Apion* I, 22, §194) come here into one’s mind. Instead, the editors of the volume do not seem to be very interested by this period of Judah history. The twenty-three coins from the Late Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman times are then studied by Yoav Farhi (pp. 231–241).

The Ostrakon is presented by Haggai Misgav, epigraphist, and by the two editors (pp. 243–257). A photo, a drawing, a palaeographic chart of the Khirbet Qeiyafa ostrakon, and a comparative chart of letters from various inscriptions of the 11th–9th centuries are provided, as well as deciphering proposals. *Further Observations on the Ostrakon* are made by Ada Yardeni (pp. 259–260) with another drawing and a decipherment. Chapter 15, *Imaging the Ostrakon*, by Greg Bearman and William A. Christens Barry offers additional good quality images (pp. 261–270) with excellent photos produced at Megavision laboratory, Santa Barbara, CA (p. 268, figs. 15.12 and 15.13). A detailed account of the field observations during the 2007 and 2008 campaigns is provided in the final part of the volume (pp. 273–304).

The editors must be praised for the excellent presentation of the architectural remains and of the finds with colour photographs and appropriate legends. The high quality archaeological work they intend pursuing in the next years will undoubtedly shed new light on the Kingdom of Saul and possibly on the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic periods.

Edward Lipiński

E. Machut Mendekka, *Na szlakach Sindbada. Koncepcje współczesnej prozy arabskiej*, Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2009, 383 pp.

Professor Ewa Machut-Mendekka (University of Warsaw) is an outstanding Polish scholar in the field of contemporary Arabic literature. In the past she dealt firstly