Graeco-Roman world is a noteworthy feature of this commentary. "Letter-writing, which was something of an 'art' in pre-typewriter, pre-computer Western culture, was likewise taken with great seriousness by the ancient Greeks and Romans. The 'friendly type,' was well known to all, and according to Cicero was the reason for the 'invention of letter writing.' In many ways this is the most 'artless' of the letters, since what are now known as 'family letters' very often belong to [this genre]" (2).

The other kind of letter mentioned in the commentary is the letter of moral exhortation, which was common in the context of friendship. While this kind of letter lacked a rigid format, it was distinguished by two main elements: (1) the writer was the recipient's friend or moral superior, and (2) the letter aimed at persuasion or dissuasion. Fee comments that "because the persuasion or dissuasion was toward or away from certain 'models' of behavior, the author frequently appealed to examples, including sometimes his own" (11). Evidence of the exhortatory character of Philippians is that a substantial part of the letter is taken up with two hortatory divisions (Phil. 1:27-2:18 and 3:1-4:3).

Regarding the so-called Christ-hymn of 2:5-11, Fee does not agree with the widely accepted view that this passage is a hymn, but does conclude that Phil 2:5-11 constitutes one of the most significant pericopae in the letter to the Philippians. He observes that "most commentaries have been compelled to offer an excursus of some kind simply to deal with the critical issues that have been raised on this passage" (39-40). Despite the widely accepted hymnic theory (by scholars such as Lohmeyer, Käsemann, Martin, and Murphy-O'Connor), Fee presents several reasons to doubt this theory: "First, if originally a hymn, it has no correspondence of any kind with Greek hymnody or poetry; second, exalted, even poetic, prose does not necessarily mean that one is dealing with a hymn; third, the hos in this case is not precisely like its alleged parallels in Col. 1:5 (18b) and 1 Tim. 3:16; fourth, as pointed out in the commentary, these sentences, exalted and rhythmic as they are, follow one another in perfectly orderly prose; and finally many of the alleged lines are especially irregular if they are intended to function as lines of Semitic poetry" (42). Not all scholars, of course, have accepted Fee's views. The secondary literature on the passage is massive.

This is a solid commentary based on the Greek text and including a thorough exposition of theological issues. An abundance of grammatical, textual, and historical information is presented in the footnotes, special notes, and appendices. Paul's Letter to the Philippians will provide a mine of information for all students of Paul and especially of the Epistle to the Philippians. It should be in the hands of every serious scholar, pastor, and student.

9104 Linson St.
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Panayotis Coutsoumpos


As professor of archaeology at the Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv
University, Israel Finkelstein is well-known for his survey work in the hill country of Ephraim (Tel Aviv 15-16 [1988-89]: 117-183), excavations at “Izbet Sartah (“Izbet Sartah: An Early Iron Age Site Near Rosh Ha ayin, Israel, BAR 299 [London: British Archaeological Reports, 1986]), Khirbet ed-Dawwara (Tel Aviv 17 [1990]: 163-208), Shiloh (Shiloh: The Archaeology of a Biblical Site [Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993]), and recently as codirector at Megiddo. He has published extensively on the settlement history of ancient Israel and on nomadism in archaeology. This volume is the culmination of years of research and combination of numerous articles on these subjects (xi).

After an introduction to the geography and demography of the southern Levant, the volume is organized in two parts. Part I deals with the problems and issues in settlement archaeology as it relates to oscillations along the fluctuating continuum of nomadism and sedentarism. The second chapter outlines the types of archaeological remains left by pastoral nomadic populations. In the southern deserts of Palestine these remains include hunting installations, cemeteries, cult places, drawings and rock inscriptions, and settlements. The author summarizes the archaeology of each of these features before dealing in the third chapter with theoretical issues of interpreting nomadic remains in the archaeological record. Here Finkelstein describes the current debate between the “no remains, no human activity” view and the view that the absence of archaeological evidence does not prove the absence of activity. Several examples of nomadic groups such as the Shasu of Egyptian XIXth Dynasty inscriptions, Arabs of Assyrian texts, and early Nabateans are cited. Finkelstein thus notes the conflicts that may arise between archaeological and textual data and states correctly that “archaeology is much more than a sherd-searching technique. It is part of broader historical research” (30).

Changes in climate, the factors influencing sedentarization and nomadization, and subsistence patterns are discussed in Chapters 4, 5, and 6. This first section incorporates all the necessary elements in laying the groundwork for Finkelstein’s reconstruction of “cyclical” history in the southern Levant.

Part II systematically charts the settlement patterns from the Early Bronze period to Iron II. On the Early Bronze Age, the author reevaluates the reasons for urbanization at Arad and the causes given for its collapse. He argues against invasion by pointing out that there were numerous other sites (Tel “Erani, Tel Hesi, Tel Yarmut, and Bab-edh-Dra’) not affected as Arad was. He likewise doubts climatic change or direct intervention of Egyptians in the copper trade as plausible causative factors. Indeed, Finkelstein doubts that Arad could ever have actually been a “Canaanite” urban center or city-state administering the copper mining in the south during the Early Bronze Age; he argues that the cultural influence was not from the north to the south, but that Arad originated from the indigenous population of the south and served as a political and commercial center on the desert fringe. This fits well with the current hermeneutical trend of viewing cultural developments as local rather than external in origin.

Chapter 8 deals with the transition between the Early and Middle Bronze Ages which the author calls the Intermediate Bronze Age. In the debate of the terminology for this period, Finkelstein maintains his earlier position that there is a distinct break in material cultural developments both from the EB into the transition and from the transition into MB, stating “there is a contradiction in
viewing the EB III/IBA transition in evolutionary terms and the IBA/MB transition in diffusionist terms." There is perhaps a logical contradiction but others have pointed out the major elements of continuity in material culture. If such a continuity exists the researcher must factor this into any reconstruction despite illogical implications.

The author renews his debate with W. G. Dever on the best interpretive model for the period, arguing strongly against the pastoral nomadic notion of transhumance between the Hebron hills and the Negev regions. It is curious that Finkelstein does not discuss in this context the disarticulated nature of burials in shaft tombs found throughout the plateau areas of southern Syria, central Palestine, and to a lesser degree in Transjordan (but see Younker et al., *AUS* 31/3 [1993]: 212-213). Literature pertaining to this important component of the pastoral nomadic model would have added considerably to the discussion (W. G. Dever, "Funerary Practices in EB IV [MB I] Palestine: A Study in Cultural Discontinuity," in *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope*, J. H. Marks and R. M. Goods, eds. [Guilford, 1987], 9-19). Some of these large cemeteries consist of hundreds of shaft tombs with multiple, disarticulated burials. By the use of ethnographic analogies, these may be linked to nomadic societies. Finkelstein is also apparently unaware that Dever recently revised his model, allowing a more central role to ruralism (W. G. Dever, "Pastoralism and the End of the Early Bronze Age in Palestine," in *Pastoralism in the Levant*, Monographs in World Archaeology, no. 10, ed. O. Bar-Yosef and A. Khazanov [Madison, WI: Prehistory Press, 1992], 83-92). Indeed, Finkelstein's alternative model of higher "rural" settlement in the Negev would not preclude elements of transhumance. This would fit well with what he (following Lemche) calls polymorphous society, allowing more flexibility and fluidity of interaction between fringe regions and the hill country. In short, Finkelstein's explanation does not account for all of the data available in other parts of the country and is in need of further explanation and clarification if these are to be included.

Chapter 9 contains another challenge to the current consensus that the explosion of sites and especially forts in the Negev during this period is the result of the settlement of the hill-country by the Israelites. Finkelstein maintains that these were not forts but courtyard settlements of nomads settling down, which supports his own "nomadic origins theory" for early Israel (see I. Finkelstein and N. Na"aman, eds. *From Nomadism to Monarchy: Archaeological and Historical Aspects of Early Israel* [Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1994]).

The basic premise of this study, that nomadization and sedentarization are cyclical events in history that occur repeatedly, has been documented elsewhere (O. S. LaBianca, *Sedentarization and Nomadization*, Hesban 1 [Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews Univ. Press, 1990]). That it occurs under the circumstances and in the way Finkelstein reconstructs is not as obvious though his views are well presented. Overall, Finkelstein provides much food for thought in this stimulating and well-written volume that will serve as an indispensable resource for anyone interested in the history of the region over *la longue durée*.
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