goats represent 84% of the total, cattle 9%, and chickens-birds the remaining 7%. The lack of cranial bones suggests that the butchery occurred outside the temple complex.

Chapter 12 by W. Wetterstrom provides an analysis of the plant remains taken in six "grab-bag" samples of what turned out to be primarily emmer wheat with a stray grain of barley. These charcoal bits were from the sacrificial fires fueled by local shrubs and trees for offering the wheat cakes. Chapter 13, by J. S. McKenzie, E. Reyes, and A. T. Reyes, deals with a small assortment of metals: two Seleucid coins (Antiochus III and IV, one of Aretas IV), a copper spatula, and a seal ring with a portrait head.

Chapter 14 by B. Gilmour discusses the remains of a carbon steel door hinge that was attached to the charred remains of the doors to the Inner Temenos Enclosure. Chapter 15 by M. O'Hea concerns the fifty fragments of twenty-nine glass vessels, the majority of which are beakers of the third century AD, perhaps used in ritual dining. This glass was subjected to chemical analysis by N. Schibille and P. Degryse, whose report in chapter 16 revealed that it was perhaps the earliest example from the Levantine coastal workshops.

The final essays discuss the pottery. Chapter 17 by D. G. Barrett analyzes the forty-eight lamps in intricate detail, many of which were mere fragments, and assigns them to the second-sixth centuries AD. The final essay in chapter 16 by S. G. Schmid, C. S. Alexander, and J. S. McKenzie provides a survey of the 5600 sherds, the majority dating to the second-fourth centuries AD, with a small sampling of all the types of Nabataean Painted Fine Ware. Some of the *Dekorphase* I in the late second century BC and first half of the first century BC have parallels to some Edomite prototypes and may even be earlier than the standard date assigned for this type (p. 210). The excellent extensive catalogue and drawings of the pottery will be useful for other Nabataean sites (pp. 213–16).

In sum, these volumes are a major contribution to the study of Nabataean culture and religion, and will be of fundamental importance for all scholars investigating the Nabataean heartland in the future. Appreciation must be expressed to Judith McKenzie for spearheading this effort to bring Glueck's important excavations to the larger academic world. Her re-analysis and refinement of Glueck's stratigraphy will be the basis for all future discussions of the site. The excellent Specialist Reports also are all of equal high quality.

Small criticisms include the necessity of scurrying to find the appropriate illustration on adjacent pages while reading the text, some redundancies, and lack of clarity at times. But these are minor detractions from what is an extraordinarily well presented account of the excavations. In the process, Glueck's effort also comes across in a strikingly positive fashion, especially his foresight in plucking and preserving burnt grains and charcoal from the excavation well before such remains became the subject of analysis by archaeologists. If he could read the contributions by McKenzie and her colleagues on his efforts, one might imagine that he would be proudly smiling with satisfaction over this splendid final publication of his excavation.

David F. Graf
University of Miami (Florida)

REFERENCES

Milik, J. T. 1958. Nouvelles inscriptions nabatéennes. *Syria* 35: 227–51.

Oleson, J. P. 2010. *Humayma Excavation Project, 1: Resources, History, and the Water-Supply System.* Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research.

Starcky, J. 1968. Le temple nabatéen de Khirbet Tannur: À propos d'un livre recent. *Revue biblique* 75: 206–35.

The Samaritans: A Profile. By Reinhard Pummer. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2016. Pp. xiv + 362. $30 (paper).

For many, the Samaritans exist only as a cliché, although a flattering one: that of the Good Samaritan. But there is more to this ancient people than the parable from the Gospel of Luke (or John's account of Jesus meeting a Samaritan woman at Jacob's well). For the Samaritan is not only a literary figure: on

a stroll in Holon, Israel, or in Kiryat Luza on Mt. Gerizim, one can still meet Samaritans of flesh and blood. And these Samaritans look back on more than 2000 years of history; they stick to a unique form of the Israelite religion and study a rich body of religious literature in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic. All those who are interested in getting to know the historical and the living Samaritans, the people behind the literary figures from the Gospels and their culture, should pick up a copy of Reinhard Pummer's *The Samaritans: A Profile*.

In twelve chapters, Pummer surveys thoroughly most aspects of Samaritan culture, offering a concise and very readable summary of two centuries of research (reflected in the impressive bibliography, in which even the specialist will discover new items). Pummer's book is not the first general conspectus of Samaritans and Samaritan studies, and its value depends to a large extent on how it compares with A. D. Crown's *The Samaritans* (1989) or the *Companion to Samaritan Studies* (1993) by A. D. Crown, R. Pummer, and A. Tal (which is somewhat different in scope). In this reviewer's opinion, Pummer's book exceeds its predecessors for a number of reasons. His work is up-to-date and incorporates hundreds of new studies and bibliographical items that have been published since the surge in Samaritan studies in the 1980s. The previous works were collective volumes and therefore somewhat repetitive (and the chapters notably varied in quality). Since Pummer has written a monograph, he successfully avoided these pitfalls. His excellent presentation of Samaritan literature, which includes references to unedited manuscript sources, is a showpiece in this respect, as is the chapter on Samaritans today, which incorporates the results of recent sociological research, a neglected perspective in Samaritan studies. Since space does not permit an in-depth review of all aspects of the book, I limit my remarks to a few important issues, most of which pertain to Pummer's book as well as to Samaritan studies in general. In addition, I provide a short list of minor remarks at the end.

Traditionally, the early period of Samaritan history up to Byzantine times has been a focal point of research, presumably because most Samaritanologists double as Old Testament or New Testament scholars. This situation is mirrored in the first chapters of Pummer's book, which review in detail the relatively meager and often ambiguous evidence for Samaritans in the Old and New Testaments, in post-biblical Second Temple period literature, and from Jewish and Christian Greek sources. Upon reading Pummer's succinct overviews, one cannot but notice that the situation in Samaritan studies is crooked: When compared to what can be mined from the texts, when compared to Samaritan Aramaic and Arabic literature, and when taking into account that these are texts that talk *about* Samaritans and not *Samaritan* texts, research on the early period is clearly overrepresented. It would surely be beneficial to the field if this were to change and more scholars would dedicate themselves to the study of the few published and many unpublished Samaritan texts, even if they stem from later periods.

In other words, Samaritan sources, as against source texts about Samaritans, should move more into focus. The trouble is, however, that one would have even less material to go by for the early period, even though the situation is slightly improving for the Common Era. For these "dark ages" of Samaritanism, an integrated presentation of the history of the community would be worth attempting, and it could supplement the presentation according to different sources chosen by Pummer. Such an integrated approach should also make use of linguistic material. Indeed, the lack of a chapter on Samaritan languages is the only serious drawback of Pummer's book (there are scattered remarks on pp. 208–9, 220–21). Language is important as a vehicle for cultural expression, and language history often reflects major historical events and carries remnants thereof into later times.

A few examples from different periods must suffice. Thus, the use of post-Achaemenid (fourth-third BCE) Imperial Aramaic for dedicatory inscriptions in the sacred district on Mt. Gerizim is telling: Aramaic, and not only Hebrew, was acceptable and prominent in the religious sphere. The later Samaritan Aramaic dialect that was promoted to a literary language in the first centuries CE bears no connection to this Imperial Aramaic heritage, a fact that points to discontinuity in the realms of bureaucracy and scribal training. On the other hand, non-Pentateuchal Hebrew substrate words in Samaritan Aramaic, such as *rbq* 'young man' (as in Rabbinic Hebrew *rwwq*) or *ʾyl* 'column' (as in Ezek. 40:9), testify to an unbroken continuity of the population of Samaria from Hebrew- to Aramaic-speaking times (and should give pause to those who see the Samaritan tradition exclusively as late and artificial). Subsequently, the language shift from Aramaic to Arabic is probably connected to the bands of marauding

Muslims that pillaged the Palestinian countryside in the Abbasid period and forced the rural Samaritan population to convert, die, or flee to the relative safety of Arabic-speaking Nablus (and a few other cities). Today, spoken Samaritan Arabic still betrays Damascene features, which presumably reached Nablus with the survivors of a devastating seventeenth-century pogrom.

The Hebrew substrate words mentioned above can also be used as an argument in the debate on the emergence of Samaritanism. Until well into the twentieth century, the Samaritans were often seen as "the earliest Jewish sect" (as in the subtitle of J. A. Montgomery's influential book from 1907), i.e., as secondary to Judaism. This perception is now being abandoned in favor of that of an Israelite matrix culture, from which both Judaism and Samaritanism emerged. In general, this is also the view adopted by Pummer, who uses the term "Samaritan" as a designation for a distinct religious group only for the time from about 200 BCE onward. However, some of Pummer's interpretations still betray the earlier, Judeo-centric perspective: Even elements that are nowadays known exclusively from one of these sister religions might have comprised a trait of the Israelite matrix.

Thus, non-Pentateuchal Hebrew Israelite names attested at the Mt. Gerizim cultic district need not have been taken from the Jewish biblical books (p. 24), but are common Israelite heritage. This could also be true of some of the instances booked as "Jewish influence" (p. 35) on the Samaritans. And until Byzantine times, when their numbers dwindled, the Samaritans might even have influenced their Jewish neighbors. Of particular interest in this respect (and potentially also for the assessment of the relationship of the Samaritans to the rabbis, p. 70) are occasional midrashic parallels (e.g., M. Mishor in *Ilu* 3 [2000], M. Florentin in *JQR* 96 [2006]). And, by the way, if the adjective "Samaritan" is to be avoided for the early period, "general Jewish" (p. 204) should also be replaced by "Israelite."

Some minor points might be corrected or supplemented: P. 54: The understanding of *kwty* in 4Q550^{c} as "Cuthean" is surely erroneous and can be dismissed. P. 66: Conspicuously, Rabbinic sources also use the term *šmryy* (not only *kwty*) to refer to a Samaritan (M. Sokoloff, *DJPA*, 558). P. 132: "Great Gate" is an implausible translation for the name of the Samaritan reformer Baba Rabba. *bb* 'gate' is an eastern Aramaic lexeme not otherwise attested in Samaritan Aramaic. Note, however, that in roughly contemporaneous Jewish sources from Palestine *bbh* Babba is a variant form of the common name *ʾbh* Abba (Y. Elitzur in *IEJ* 63 [2013]: 98 n. 21). P. 226 (with n. 30): A complete French translation of the Balaam-commentary has been provided by C. Bonnard and M.-C. Michau in *RHPR* 89 (2009). P. 243: The Asaṭir received its final form in the tenth-eleventh century, but clearly contains older parts that date back to Byzantine times; see C. Stadel in *JAOS* 135 (2015). Finally, the decision to use diacritics on consonants, but not vowels (p. 8 n. 12), was infelicitous: The layman is still confronted with enigmatic signs, while the reader with competence in Semitics is annoyed by seeming "mistakes" (and even this inconsistent system is not employed consistently, e.g., p. 150 *ʾAtlit*, p. 179 *Givʾat*, p. 226 *al-taniya*).

But this review must not end with carping criticism. Pummer's book is a lively testimony to the great strides made in Samaritan studies in the past thirty years. It is a highly recommended, informative, balanced, and very readable introduction to an often neglected field that is of potential importance for neighboring disciplines such as biblical studies, the historiography of Palestine, and the intellectual history of the Islamic world, to name but a few. Hopefully, this excellent book will introduce many new students to the exciting world of the Samaritans.

CHRISTIAN STADEL
BEN-GURION UNIVERSITY OF THE NEGEV

Constituent Postponement in Biblical Hebrew Verse. By JOHN SCOTT REDD. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, vol. 90. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2014. Pp. xii + 155. €68 (paper).

What makes Biblical Hebrew (BH) poetry *poetic*? This simple yet formidable question has long vexed Hebraists, and the present work enters the fray by exploring how "syntactic relaxation" can