of the ancient Near East and should be consulted by all scholars and students working in this area. It is thought-provoking, enlightening, and absorbing reading. This volume about ancient intellectuals and their endeavors will be especially appreciated by their contemporary successors.

VITALI BARTASH
LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT MUNICH

Near Eastern Tribal Societies during the Nineteenth Century: Economy, Society and Politics between Tent and Town. By EVELINE VAN DER STEEN. London: Equinox, 2013. Pp. xvii + 302. $110. [Distributed by ISD, Bristol, Conn.]

A book that begins by asserting "For as long as we know, Near Eastern society has been fundamentally tribal" (p. xi) had better be ready for a critical reception. I'm not sure that anyone who has ever worked on Hittite Anatolia, Elamite Iran, or Sumerian Mesopotamia wakes up every morning thinking, "My, how tribal the ancient inhabitants of those regions were." Then again, a book purporting to be about the Near East, which refers to the well-known Anglo-American historian of Islam, Bernard Lewis, as Bernhard (p. 8), does not exactly win the reader's confidence.

Rather than the "Near East," this is a book about the Holy Land, or Palestine, Israel, and Jordan (p. 45). It contends that, whereas "Anthropological studies of present-day tribal societies are of little help" in trying "to imagine what a fully tribal society looked like before the age of globalization," the "vast pool of information, drawn from a time when the great tribes controlled the region: the observations from travellers in the Near East in the nineteenth century, up to World War I" (p. xi) is. Put more directly, E. van der Steen believes that "Nineteenth-century tribal societies can tell us much about the Bronze and Iron Ages that twentieth and twenty-first century society in the region cannot" and "finds it hard not to compare nineteenth-century tribal society with the world of the Old Testament" (p. ix).

Put very simply, this is a highly questionable thesis that glosses over or ignores a vast array of changes, on many levels, that the populations inhabiting the southern Levant underwent between the Iron Age and the nineteenth century. Moreover, apart from mining, predominantly, the English-language literature on the study area, the random insertion of insights from ethnographies of Türkmen tribes (viz. the work of W. Irons) or late twentieth-century Baluchistan (the work of P. C. Salzman) is completely unsystematic. If the nineteenth century is the explicit window through which the Bronze and Iron Ages are to be best understood—as announced in the book's title—then citations of Herodotus (p. 115), Roman practices (p. 135), Saladin (p. 123), tactics used by the government of Israel (p. 133), or modern Jordanian and Saudi Arabian laws (p. 120) are simply irrelevant.

This book contains a wealth of synthesized, if not always exhaustively researched, topics, but even if one accepts the thesis that this is all somehow helpful for our understanding of the southern Levant during the Bronze and Iron Ages, the ways in which this might be the case are, more often than not, left unstated, as if they were so obvious as to need no further explication. Yet the entire undertaking is fraught with danger. From my own work on nomads in Iran, I am acutely aware how dissimilar the tribal groups of the nineteenth century were from their Safavid, Timurid, Ilkhanid, early Islamic, late Antique, Seleucid, or Achaemenid-era forerunners. The observations of nineteenth-century visitors may be important in illuminating many topics, but the notion that nineteenth-century "tribal societies" bore any resemblance to those of the Bronze and Iron Ages, and somehow escaped the vicissitudes of the intervening centuries, is simply wishful thinking.

A few specifics: An important, eyewitness account of Wahhabism in action, covering the period from its origins to 1809, which the author has overlooked, is L. A. O. de Corancez, *Histoire des Wahabis, depuis leur origine juqu'à la fin de 1809* (Paris: L'Imprimerie de Crapelet, 1810).

Map 1 (p. 42): It would be interesting to know how Kinda, a South/Central Arabian tribe in pre-Islamic Arabia, wound up in central Iraq.

The alternative spellings *asabiyyah* and *asabiyyeh* are used, in some cases, in consecutive sentences (p. 105), suggesting extreme slackness in copy-editing.

D. T. POTTS
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Entlassungsgrund: Pazifismus. Albrecht Götze, der Fall Gumbel und die Marburger Universität 1930–1946. By HARALD MAIER-METZ. Academia Marburgensis, vol. 13. Pp. 248, illus. Münster: WAXMANN, 2015. €38 (paper).

Albrecht Goetze—as his surname was spelled after his immigration to the USA in 1934—was not only a leading Assyriologist, but a member of the founding generation of Hittite scholars. Following his service in the German army in the First World War, during which he was severely wounded, he pursued his studies at the University of Heidelberg, where he became an *Extraordinarius* in 1927. In 1930, at the relatively young age of 33, he was appointed to the Chair in Assyriology at the Philipps-Universität in Marburg.

The volume under review deals with Goetze's short tenure at this institution—he was dismissed already in 1933—and the political climate in Germany and its

higher educational institutions during the later years of the Weimar Republic. Goetze, who in 1919 had briefly been a member of the Socialist Party (SPD), was out of step with the great majority of his fellow professors, who were generally right-leaning and often remained convinced monarchists. A glaring exception to this rule was the statistician and his Heidelberg colleague Emil Julius Gumbel, who enraged conservative nationalists with his book *Vier Jahre politischer Mord* (1922), demonstrating the favorable bias and lenient treatment of judicial authorities toward perpetrators of right-wing violence, and through his publication in the popular media of essays revealing the clandestine rearmament of Germany in defiance of the Treaty of Versailles.

Gumbel was the target of a campaign in the nationalist press seeking his dismissal or worse, a movement supported by numerous *Burschenschaften* (conservative student fraternities) and other political groups at the University in Heidelberg and elsewhere. Goetze became involved in the affair when he signed several petitions defending the person and rights of his friend. This, together with his association with the pacifist *Liga für Menschenrechte*, was enough to place him on the black list of the Nazis, and he lost his Chair as of November 24, 1933—less than a year after Hitler had seized power. His scholarly publications, which of course make no reference to contemporary affairs in Germany, were duly removed from circulation at the University library (p. 180). Although Goetze had of course specialized in Hittite, the description of his now-vacant position was rewritten to include explicitly the study of the "Aryan" peoples of the ancient Near East (p. 161).

But Goetze himself was fortunate: He almost immediately found temporary employment in Scandinavia and later in New Haven, where he soon received a permanent position at Yale, which he held until his retirement in 1965. Goetze also later helped Gumbel as well as fellow cuneiformist Julius Levy to come to America.

The author of this book is not an Assyriologist, but rather a pedagogue, and the work appears in a series dedicated to the history of the Philipps-Universität. Therefore most attention is naturally given to the climate among the faculty and student bodies of German *Hochschule* in the waning years of the Republic, as well as to the machinations of professors and educational bureaucrats seeking to survive in the new world imposed by the National Socialists. Maier-Metz' account of this process of *Gleichschaltung* ('coordination') makes fascinating if depressing reading, and should serve as a warning to those of us fortunate enough to occupy positions in higher education today.

There is little discussion here of the content of Goetze's scholarship, and we find a number of errors when it comes to Assyriological matters: J. J. Finkelstein was indeed greatly influenced by Goetze, but he was not his student (pp. 26, 214, 229) in the American sense, although he had held a post-doctoral appointment at Yale before being called back as his successor. Emil Forrer was never a regular employee of the Berlin Museum (p. 27). Of course, one can hardly expect an outsider to the field of cuneiform studies to avoid all such minor lapses.

A nice feature of the book is the quotation of the first-person memories (in English) of Goetze's daughter, Mrs. Marianne Pfeiffer, regarding her childhood in Marburg and America.

GARY BECKMAN
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN