

What can Krakowski's work teach us about similarities between the minority community of Egyptian Jews and their Muslim and Christian neighbors, especially regarding the experience of young women? Following other Geniza social historians of the past two generations, Krakowski reveals throughout *Coming of Age* the benefits of a comparative approach to her subject. Indeed, she cites Goitein's critical observation "that Geniza Jews 'mingled freely with their neighbors, and therefore cannot have been much different from them.'" (p. 19) The consequences of this social mingling were significant for each of the confessional communities: the Jews' Arabization, interactions with Muslims, and access to Islamic courts meant inter alia that "Geniza scribes also draw on a different repertoire of Judeo-Arabic terms and phrases, one that is neither gaonic nor even Jewish, but rather echoes the technical language of Islamic law" (p. 105). Krakowski further demonstrates the relevance of her method and findings for understanding the lives of Egyptian Muslim and Christian young women with their own bonds of kinship and nuanced observance of their respective communities' sacred law. Thereby she provides evidence for studying social relationships in medieval Islamic society as Islamicate rather than strictly Islamic.

Eve Krakowski's captivating volume is a sign of how far Geniza studies has come from its textual recovery period through Goitein's herculean synthesis. It is also a demonstration of the ways in which Geniza research lies at the intersection of Jewish social history and legal history and Islamic social and legal history. Krakowski's work, and that of her generation of Geniza scholars, defines the maturation of the field of inquiry by transcending disciplinary and areal boundaries because, above all, the documentary material requires it.

ROSS BRANN
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Kontaktzone Vorderer Orient und Ägypten: Orte, Situationen und Bedingungen für primäre griechisch-orientalische Kontakte vom 10. bis zum 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr. By IRIS VON BREDOW. *Geographica Historica*, vol. 38. Stuttgart: FRANZ STEINER, 2017. Pp. 394, maps. €44 (paper).

In the past few decades it has become increasingly apparent thanks to the works of Walter Burkert (e.g., *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* [1992]), M. L. West (*The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* [1997]), and the undisciplined Martin Bernal (*Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization* [1981–2006]) that Classical Greek civilization owed much to the first-millen-

nium cultures of Western Asia and Egypt. However, the means by which this transfer of intellectual property took place still remain unclear.

It is the aim of Iris von Bredow in the book under review to shed light on this question through the application of contemporary theories of communication. The volume opens with a useful sketch of the archaeological and textual evidence for the history of Greece, Egypt, and the Near East during the twelfth through sixth centuries BCE (part I), followed by a lucid presentation of current sociological scholarship (primarily German-language) dealing with the acquisition of cultural elements by foreigners (parts II–III). In a nutshell, this process may be divided into three stages, which succeed one another along with increasing length of contact of the outsider with the donor culture, and not all of which are necessarily achieved by any particular visitor or immigrant. These stages are borrowing, adaptation, and acculturation (pp. 204–9).

Part IV describes the varieties of situation in which a Greek of the first half of the first millennium theoretically might have undergone exposure to Egyptian or Levantine civilization, while part V considers the actual possibilities for Greek contact and borrowing from North Syria (ninth–eighth centuries), Phoenicia (ninth–sixth centuries), the Israelite kingdoms, the Philistine cities, and finally Saite Egypt.

Given the relative paucity of Near Eastern or Egyptian artifacts on the Greek mainland, and of Greek archaeological material in most of the pre-Hellenistic Levant or in Egypt before the establishment of Naukratis in the seventh century, von Bredow is largely reliant on Greek literary sources referring to the archaic period—primarily the Homeric poems (see pp. 159–62) and the *Histories* of Herodotus. In particular, she examines the experiences of Menelaus in Egypt and Sidon and of Odysseus in mythical Phaeacia, as related by Homer. From this evidence she concludes that the Greek participants in early contacts were mostly aristocrats and their followers, and that these contacts were military in nature—that is, mercenary service (pp. 227ff.) or piracy (pp. 324–31). In von Bredow's estimation, the profession of merchant did not even exist in the Greek world prior to the second half of the seventh century (p. 297), so that trade cannot have played a major role in cultural diffusion during the period she is studying.

When she is writing of archaic Greece, von Bredow's arguments seem in general plausible, but given the exiguous data, in the end they remain—as she herself admits, "suppositions" (*Vermutungen*, p. 211). In particular, her consideration of the transfer of literary genera and their contents relies on what seems to this reviewer an overestimation of the degree of literacy in both archaic Greece and the Levant (pp. 209–11).

Von Bredow herself is less at home in the east, as evidenced by her faulty and inconsistent transcriptions of personal names from cuneiform sources, and by such

blunders as confusing the Neo-Babylonian rulers Amel-Marduk and Labaši-Marduk (p. 56), rendering Kar-Esarhaddon as “*Festung* Esarhaddons” (p. 111), and referring to a nonexistent “Mythos über Telipinu und Illuyanka” (pp. 214–15).

In addition, the Anatolian (Luwian) hieroglyphs were not, as she says, restricted to use on royal seals (p. 156), but were often inscribed on those of (presumably higher-class) commoners, and far from being exclusive to stone display inscriptions, the script was employed on lead strips for more mundane uses such as letters, and was in all probability also incised on wooden tablets used for ordinary business.

Nonetheless, this is an interesting and thought-provoking study of an important question and will be of interest to specialists in both early Greece and in the West Semitic and late Egyptian worlds.

GARY BECKMAN
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Militarism and the Indo-Europeanizing of Europe. By ROBERT DREWS. London: ROUTLEDGE, 2017. Pp. x + 284, illus. \$140.95.

Since his 1988 book *The Coming of the Greeks: Indo-European Conquests in the Aegean and the Near East*, Robert Drews has been concerned with the complex problem of the introduction of the Indo-European languages into Greece and the rest of western Europe. His latest contribution, here under review, attacks this question utilizing the tools of archaeology, hippology, and historical linguistics. His useful grand synthesis concludes that the spread of Proto Indo-European and its daughter languages was intimately connected with the domestication, training, and employment of horses for war, particularly as chariot teams.

Drews has produced an intriguing study, but the unevenness of the archaeological and textual record has made it necessary for him, as for any scholar tackling this vast subject, to fill in gaps with generalization and speculation. The reader may well not be willing to follow him in every case. Rather than attempt to summarize his intricate argumentation, I will point out here a few instances in which I found myself in that position.

For instance, in buttressing his claim that Neolithic Europe knew fighting but not warfare, and that Indo-European groups were responsible for first bringing large-scale combat to the region in the Late Middle Helladic period (pp. 177–79), Drews says, “Until we have evidence to the contrary ... the ‘battle axe’ should despite its name be regarded as a personal weapon rather than as a weapon designed for battle” (p. 82). Just what contrary evidence could be adduced when the remnants of premodern mass combat are generally

recovered only in destroyed settlements? (For a major exception, note the massacre on the Tollense River near Berlin, mentioned on p. 132, but this has been dated later, to the thirteenth century BCE.)

Furthermore, on the history of the development of the tactics of armed struggle, note Drew’s opinion that prior to the second millennium BCE warfare between states in the Near East “normally meant the siege of a city, and not a battle in the open country” (p. 61; cf. p. 109). This statement is called into question, for instance, by the following excerpt from an inscription of the Sumerian monarch Enmetena of Lagash, recounting events of ca. 2500 BCE: “Ush, ruler of Umma, acted arrogantly: he smashed the (boundary) monument and marched on the plain of Lagash. (The god) Ningirsu, warrior of Enlil, at his just command, did battle with Umma. At Enlil’s command he cast the great battle-net upon it, and set up burial mounds for it on the plain” (col. i, tr. J. Cooper, *Reconstructing History from Ancient Inscriptions: The Lagash-Umma Border Conflict* [Malibu: Undena, 1983], p. 49, slightly modified). This passage is not from a mythical narrative but describes a human conflict as if it had rather directly involved the patron deities of the contending polities.

Concerning the central matter of the taming of horses, Drews (ch. 2, pp. 28–55) disagrees with the conclusion of David W. Anthony (*The Horse, the Wheel, and Language* [Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2007], ch. 10, esp. pp. 221–23), that horses were ridden (in Kazakhstan) by around 3700–3500 BCE, judging instead that riding began only toward the close of the second millennium (p. 30). Much of the discussion on this point revolves around archaeological evidence for the use of bits, in particular on the wear caused by these implements on the dentition of ridden horses (Drews, pp. 41–45; Anthony, pp. 206–20). Since Anthony, along with his wife, has himself conducted experiments about this on living animals, this nonspecialist reviewer is inclined to prefer his conclusions. Drews and Anthony are in agreement, however, that the employment of chariotry in the Near East began in the early eighteenth century (Drews, pp. 115–16; Anthony, pp. 402–3), first attested textually in records describing the wars of the Hittite Old Kingdom.

More questionable are Drew’s assertion that the language of the kingdom of (Assyrian) Urartu / (native) Bianili was “quite certainly” Armenian (p. 228)—a claim for which we have no evidence—and his speculation that the Greek and Armenian tongues go back to “a much earlier stage of Indo-Iranian” (p. 226), an opinion that few linguists would endorse. Remember that Greek is a centum language, while Indo-Iranian belongs to the satem group.

All in all, despite these quibbles, I would nonetheless recommend Drews’s new book because it is clearly argued and will serve the neophyte as a convenient introduction to the voluminous research—recent and