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 *Ventricive 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*


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 ostracon, 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’ostracon de Khirbet Qeyafa et les débuts de la Royauté en Israël”, “Revue biblique” 117 (2010), pp. 162–184. A slightly different reading and translation
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 Judaean 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’“rayim, “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-Naṣbeh, i.e. Mispah, 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). Theses 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