Likewise, performing *herem*, a divinely sanctioned (likely genocidal) form of war recorded in certain biblical passages, may have raised the Israelite warrior out of the mortal realm; however, in the performance of this type of annihilating violence, as noted by Lemos, enemies are described as an infestation; they are pervasive and sickening. It is too easy, too simple, to use animal metaphor and simile, literary tropes, as ballasts for personhood without considering the situation of the text. Are the opponents mighty bulls that must be brought to heel or are they an infiltrating swarm of vermin to be rooted out, not humiliated, but exterminated?

Even in non-martial texts, according to Lemos, if you are neither slave nor child there is but one masculinity in the Hebrew Bible and its assigned primary performance is subjugation. At no point is a different construct (e.g., one that supports it) allowed, nor does Lemos consider that imperial action is indeed imperial; it is imposing, whether performed by a man or woman, god or goddess. Employed twice in the volume, the biblical tale of Sarah and Hagar (a story in which a wife [Sarah] offers another woman [her maidservant Hagar] as a sexual surrogate to her husband [Abraham]), which Lemos accepts as "one of the patriarchal narratives in Genesis," is never interrogated for how the socially required actions of Sarah to sexually and procreatively dominate Hagar's body legitimize a femininity that supports a system of female oppression (pp. 99–100, 123–25). Although Lemos recognizes that Hagar is ultimately evicted by Sarah because she comes to act above her position, nowhere does she discuss how the power registers between women allow certain women security within a marriage while keeping them at odds with others.

Instead, in her return to the narrative, Lemos suggests that the reader take note of the author's(?) choice in the term *gĕberet*, 'mistress'. She states that it "closely relates to the common word for man, *geber*," and that "there was a connection between masculinity and dominance in this culture even when the one in the position of dominance was a woman" (p. 124), thereby taking no linguistic account that neither *gĕberet* nor *geber* inherently "owns" the femininity or masculinity of the root *gbr* ('to be strong'). *If* she had demonstrated a rarity for the use of the feminine form in the Bible (*gĕberet* is not a wholly uncommon term for 'mistress', cf. 2 Kings 5:3; Ps. 123:2; and Prov. 30:23; also note, *gĕbirah* 'queen mother') or presented a contextualized definition of *geber*, demonstrating its association with a *masculine* strength, then, perhaps, this intriguing observation could be supported.

It is notable that, in this book's title, there is a conjunction that both distinguishes and conjoins two seemingly incompatible nouns: on the one hand an environmental state or committed action, violence, and on the other a social category of being, a person. This is significant because the latter is not so much linked to as dependent upon the former. It is too easy to say that all violence described in ancient Near Eastern texts is an oppressive masculine force that removes "personhood." The overriding purpose of violence, in any societal (or personal) arrangement, whether physical, mental, or emotional, codified or impromptu, is to oppress, quarantine, and subjugate: to remove agency. It is meant to empower the perpetrator by disabling the target, be this in war or in community and domestic situations. *Violence and Personhood in Ancient Israelite and Comparative Contexts*, which is clearly a massive and heartfelt endeavor, lays out many of the methods used to disempower and dehumanize. And it is the pure extent of the tactics discussed that emphasize the need now to interrogate the mechanisms for *how* such subjugations *confer* personhood and how they are are systematically encouraged and supported.

Ilona Zsolnay
University of Chicago

Household & Family Religion in Persian-Period Judah: An Archaeological Approach. By José E. Balcells Gallarreta. Ancient Near East Monographs, vol. 18. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017. Pp. xiv + 192. $33.95 (paper).

There is much to be said in favor of Balcells Gallarreta's new study of *Household & Family Religion in Persian-Period Judah*, an archaeologically based study that focuses on the site of Tell en-Nas-

beh (TEN), biblical Mizpah. It treats the Persian period (late sixth to fourth century BCE), a significant but less familiar era in the long history of Israel and Judah. It utilizes a corpus of material excavated nearly a century ago, which in the last quarter century has been the subject of renewed synthesis and analysis. It situates Near Eastern archaeology's most recent and singularly important development, the study of the household and the family through the examination of material culture remains, in the Persian period. Studies over the previous decade and more have already demonstrated the merit of this approach for investigating the Iron Age and earlier periods. While focusing on domestic archaeology, it also considers urban and landscape archaeology. Finally, it makes a convincing case for reconstructing ritual activities at Tell en-Nasbeh within the household setting.

The site of Tell en-Nasbeh lies 12 km northwest of Jerusalem. Five seasons of excavation between 1926 and 1935 by William F. Badè, on behalf of the Pacific School of Religion, revealed five strata ranging from the Chalcolithic to the Roman periods; the material was published posthumously (McCown 1947). During the course of the excavation, nearly two-thirds of the site was excavated, resulting in a rich archaeological record, especially for the Iron II (Str. 3) and the Babylonian-Persian (Str. 2; 586–450/400 BCE) periods. Jeffrey R. Zorn's doctoral dissertation (1993) and his ongoing publications, as well as recent work by Aaron J. Brody, Director of the Badè Museum of Biblical Archaeology (Berkeley, CA), have clarified the site's stratigraphy and advanced scholarly understanding of its architecture and material culture.

Balcells Gallarreta lays out his argument in six chapters. In chapter 1, "Methods and Definitions," he advances the case for engaging the "investigative methods" (p. 20) of the social sciences for the study of the Bible and archaeology. In particular, he highlights the relevance of sociology, anthropology, and archaeology to reconstructions of ancient religion. This concept is, of course, hardly novel (see, inter alia, Holladay 1987; Carter and Meyers 1996; Nakhai 2001: 19–37; Dever 2012; Olyan 2012; and references therein). Still, the insights of social science research have been more commonly applied to the study of society in eras that precede the Babylonian and Persian periods (Faust 2012: 253–54). In establishing definitions and typologies, Balcells Gallarreta relies on the insights of Catherine M. Bell (2009) and Colin Renfrew (1994). He concludes this chapter with a brief discussion of the archaeology of religion and ritual, and of the household and family, and he notes the potential that the latter holds for the study of gender in antiquity.

In chapter 2, "Persian Period Ritual in Ezra," Balcells Gallarreta establishes the geographic boundaries of Persian-period Yehud and its system of governance. It is unclear what he thinks would constitute archaeological evidence for Zoroastrian influence on Judaean religion and whether he accepts or denies such influence; he claims that the two are "difficult to differentiate," and that the influence of the former on the latter is both "likely" and "disputed" (p. 33). Questions of ethnicity and identity formation are viewed against the complex fabric of changing social and political identities across the southern Levant. Religion in Yehud, insofar as it can be reconstructed from the book of Ezra, occupies the final part of this chapter. Here, Balcells Gallarreta identifies a number of passages that indicate religious activities or mention religious personnel; all center on the reestablished Temple in Jerusalem. Why he limits his biblical study to Ezra and chooses not to include the books of Nehemiah and 1-2 Chronicles is not explained by his statement that "the scope of this study limits its analysis to the text of Ezra" (p. 21 n. 1). His references to additional relevant biblical passages are drawn from the work of Rainer Albertz (1994). Overall, Balcells Gallarreta claims that the rituals he identifies support the idea of the reestablishment of the people of Israel in their native homeland, in the postexilic era.

With chapter 3, "Persian Period Ritual Artifacts from Tell en-Nasbeh Households," Balcells Gallarreta turns to the archaeological data. Relying upon Zorn's reassessment of the stratigraphy, he focuses his efforts on Str. 2. In doing so, he bypasses the problems inherent in reconstructing a multi-period stratum with poorly preserved architecture and mixed ceramic assemblages, problems that Zorn and others have acknowledged (Zorn 2003; Faust 2012: 11–14). Ultimately, Balcells Gallarreta identifies several residences and larger structures as likely venues for ritual acts. Correctly disavowing attestations of stark discontinuity in religious practice between the Late Iron II and the Persian periods, he uses the Badè Museum's original excavation records to identify, quantify, and contextualize imple-

ments used in ritual acts; similar cultic objects are well known from the Iron Age. Finally, he concludes that the ritual assemblage at TEN is significant in both its quantity and its diversity.

Chapter 4, "Persian Period Architecture and Natural Landscape from Tell en-Nasbeh," considers categories of structures that might, at the appropriate times, have served religious functions; they include public buildings (e.g., palaces), city gates, and residences. Balcells Gallarreta concludes that, while it is unlikely that Persian-period TEN contained a temple, worship rituals would have taken place in the palace and at another public building, at the city gate, and in domestic settings. While Balcells Gallarreta distinguishes between public and family religion, his definition of "political rites" is not clear. His utilization of the original excavation notes to situate ritual objects in their original architectural contexts is particularly useful, Str. 2's aforementioned stratigraphic problems notwithstanding. So, too, is his use of nineteenth-century maps produced by the Palestine Exploration Fund to identify caves and water sources around TEN, which might have been venues for religious rituals.

With chapter 5, "Persian Period Ritual Material Culture from Other Yehud Sites," Balcells Gallarreta expands the scope of his investigation into the Shephelah, the lowland region separating Yehud and the coastal plain. Although the region contains a number of sites with Persian-period occupation, Balcells Gallarreta limits his discussion to Lachish, which, like TEN, served as an administrative center. Noting similarities between Lachish Building 10 and Building 106 (Aharoni's "Solar Temple" [Aharoni 1975]), he concludes that both structures served ritual functions in the Persian period. Other Shephelah sites, in his opinion, contain little by way of Persian-era ritual materials.

Balcells Gallarreta uses chapter 6, "Summary and Conclusions," to review his major arguments. He then reviews the best preserved of the buildings at TEN, considering each in terms of its architecture and ritual contents, and its residents' ethnicity and socioeconomic status. Finally, he considers those religious acts that are likely to have taken place within each building. Balcells Gallarreta concludes by stating that the inhabitants of Persian-period Mizpah were of Judaean origin, and that no evidence incontrovertibly demonstrates the presence of Zoroastrian religious rituals.

Some final comments are in order. This book's goal, the study of household and family religion in Persian-period Judah, is an important one; the newly emerging focus on household and family religion has opened new avenues for considering the engagement of non-elites with the Divine. At the beginning of the book, it seems as if Balcells Gallarreta will consider the entirety of Persian-period Yehud, but in the end his book extends little beyond Tell en-Nasbeh. Its failure to fully investigate sites in the broader region undermines his goal of studying household and family religion in Persian-period Judah. So, too, does the very limited attention paid to Zoroastrian religion.

Important resources that would have contributed to the volume have not been consulted. These include, inter alia, Carter 1999; Carter and Meyers 1996; Nakhai 2001: 19–37; Dever 2012; Olyan 2012 (for social science approaches); Knowles 2006 (for Persian-period culture and religion); and Faust 2012 (for the archaeology of the Babylonian and Persian periods). In addition, *Household & Family Religion in Persian-Period Judah* suffers from problems related to production and editing. Many of the plans and maps are insufficiently clear, making it, in some cases, difficult to follow Balcells Gallarreta's arguments. The book contains too many grammatical errors. That said, Tell en-Nasbeh is a site that offers unique opportunities, both because it was so extensively excavated and because Str. 2, dated to the Babylonian-Persian period, includes a significant number of ritual objects found in domestic settings. Balcells Gallarreta's presentation and analysis of unpublished excavation material makes an important contribution to understanding religion in this era.

REFERENCES

Aharoni, Yohanan. 1975. *Investigations at Lachish: The Sanctuary and the Residency*. Tel Aviv: Gateway.

Albertz, Rainer. 1994. *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*, vol. 2: *From the Exile to the Maccabees*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Bell, Catherine M. 2009. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Carter, Charles E. 1999. *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period: A Social and Demographic Study*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

———, and Carol Meyers, eds. 1996. *Community, Identity, and Ideology: Social Science Approaches to the Hebrew Bible*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Dever, William G. 2012. *The Lives of Ordinary People in Ancient Israel: Where Archaeology and the Bible Intersect*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Faust, Avraham. 2012. *Judah in the Neo-Babylonian Period: The Archaeology of Destruction*. Atlanta: SBL.

Holladay, John S., Jr. 1987. Religion in Israel and Judah under the Monarchy: An Explicitly Archaeological Approach. In *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*, ed. Patrick D. Miller, Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride. Pp. 249–99. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Knowles, Melody D. 2006. *Centrality Practiced: Jerusalem in the Religious Practice of Yehud & the Diaspora in the Persian Period*. Atlanta: SBL.

McCown, Chester C. 1947. *Tell en-Nasbeh Excavated under the Direction of the Late William Frederic Badè*, vol. 1: *Archaeological and Historical Results*. Berkeley: Palestine Institute of the Pacific School of Religion, and New Haven: ASOR.

Nakhai, Beth Alpert. 2001. *Archaeology and the Religions of Canaan and Israel*. Boston: ASOR.

Olyan, Saul M., ed. 2012. *Social Theory and the Study of Israelite Religion: Essays in Retrospect and Prospect*. Atlanta: SBL.

Renfrew, Colin. 1994. The Archaeology of Religion. In *The Ancient Mind: Elements of Cognitive Archaeology*, ed. Colin Renfrew and Ezra B. W. Zubrow. Pp. 47–54. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Zorn, Jeffrey R. 1993. Tell en-Nasbeh: A Re-Evaluation of the Architecture and Stratigraphy of the Early Bronze Age, Iron Age and Later Periods. Ph.D. diss., Univ. of California, Berkeley.

———. 2003. Tell en-Nasbeh and the Problem of the Sixth Century. In *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, ed. Oded Lipshcits and Joseph Blenkinsopp. Pp. 413–47. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

———, and Aaron J. Brody, eds. 2014. *The Tell en-Nasbeh Excavations after 85 Years*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press.

Beth Alpert Nakhai
Arizona Center for Judaic Studies, University of Arizona

Zauber und Magie im antiken Palästina und in seiner Umwelt. Edited by Jens Kamlah, Rolf Schäfer, and Markus Witte. Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins, vol. 46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2017. Pp. x + 565, 17 pls., CD-ROM. €78.

This collection of eighteen articles derives from a colloquium convened by the Deutscher Palästina-Verein on November 14–16, 2014 in Mainz. In addition to the individual contributions, the volume contains indices for god and demon names, places, personal names, subjects, texts, and foreign words, as well as a compact disc featuring color images for the figures described in some of the articles. I offer below a brief description of the book's contents.

Daniel Schwemer, "Quellen des Bösen, Abwehrrituale und Erfolgsrezepte: Möglichkeiten und Grenzen einer Systematik der babylonisch-assyrischen Magie" (pp. 13–40), offers a classification of Mesopotamian magic as reflected in texts, as well as amulets, figures, and seals from the third–second millennium BCE. He examines the materials from seven different angles: chronological, linguistic, text-typological, diplomatic, emic, etiological, and ritual-dynamic. This results in categorizing magic rituals into four groups: liminal magic, defensive rituals ("white magic"), aggressive rituals ("gray magic"), and harmful ("black and illegal") magic. Aggressive rituals aim to obtain success in love, court, or business, or to have slaves returned. His preliminary definition deliberately leaves unaddressed what special (ritual) techniques are used, which languages are employed, whether the activity is socially accepted or outlawed, whether deities are summoned, ignored, or avoided during the ritual, to which