
The essays in this volume treat historiographic issues within the fields of classical and biblical scholarship vis-à-vis the study of the Achaemenid Persian Empire. The contributions, including bibliographies, range from ten to fifty-four pages, with the unsurprising result of a mix in the level of detail and depth on the respective topics. In the introduction, A. Fitzpatrick-McKinley frames the volume’s purpose with an even-handed critique of scholars’ use of source material outside their fields of specialty, which often manifests “a certain lack of awareness of methodological issues on both sides” (p. 3). Taken as a whole, the volume’s contributions apply a corrective, nuanced, approach to mitigate persistent notions in both fields that, if not simply wrong-headed, are still in need of a lot of work. All the articles in the volume offer useful insights into their respective topics, but in a short review only a few of the particulars may be delineated.

T. Harrison’s contribution (“Herodotus on the Character of Persian Imperialism [7.5–11]”) focuses on the so-called Council Scene set in the Achaemenid court. He engages the ongoing question of how directly and how accurately Herodotus channels Achaemenid royal ideology, the connections between Herodotean representation and Persian reality. This is a well-covered subject, of course, but particularly trenchant here are Harrison’s assessments of the various ways Herodotus refracts Achaemenid dynastic continuity and the King’s self-representation among the subject peoples.

C. Tuplin’s learned survey (“The Justice of Darius”) seeks to contextualize the Achaemenid kings’ rule as it relates to concepts of law. One focus of his treatment involves revisiting the precise nuances of Old Persian dāta, a term usually translated as “law,” but one with wider connotations. The author shows how the term “draws us to a specifically legal or juridical environment” (p. 73). Tuplin’s survey of complementary and parallel evidence across much of the empire (organized by region), along with detailed consideration of Near Eastern antecedents, provides a strong backdrop for the empire as “a realm of law” (p. 101) even if its articulation in the royal inscriptions is not as prominent as we would like it to be.

D. Edelman’s contribution (“What is ‘Persian’ about the Book of Genesis?”) reconsiders the content, rhetorical strategies, and ideologies that point towards a crystallization of the Genesis text during the Achaemenid period. After surveying the main components of the Book of Genesis, Edelman considers how the book as a finished product—or something that approximates such, regardless of its individual components—seems to date to that period and stands also as an expression of correct behavior for the religious community of Israel.

Shorter contributions round out the volume. L. Grabbe (“The Use and Abuse of Herodotus by Biblical Scholars”) tackles the uncritical readings of Herodotus by bibliists, who often lack a solid background in Classics; as per the volume’s theme, it must be noted that the reverse applies as well. A. Fitzpatrick-McKinley (“Indigenous Elites in Yehud: The Inscriptional Evidence from Xanthus, Tayma and Dedan and the Nehemiah Memoir”) considers how the case of indigenous elites from Xanthus competing for influence under Persian rule may be applied to the political and social context of Yehud during the same period, through assessment of a number of examples.

L. Mitchell (“Admiring Others: Xenophon and the Persians”) contextualizes Xenophon’s idealistic attitude toward the Persian elites—at least those characterized in his own writings—as one of admiration as long as they maintained Greek values. Xenophon breaks down the distinctions between Greeks and “barbarians” but retains a typically conservative Greek approach which values the role of the best men uncorrupted by riches or idleness, regardless of ethnicity. M. Brosius (“From Fact to Fiction: Persian History and the Book of Esther”) approaches the Book of Esther from a Persian perspective, contextualizing numerous parts of the plots within a wider understanding of the Persian court and administration, and argues for its ultimate origins in Herodotus’ story of Xerxes’ brother Masistes (9.108ff.). P. Davies’ article (“Judaite Prophecy and the Achaemenids”) examines possible Zoroastrian influences on Yehud and prophetic literature.

The book on the whole is well edited, barring the occasional typo or missed reference in the bibliographies. It possesses a clear virtue in offering an up-to-date and convenient discussion, with attendant assessments of fundamental problems within the interdisciplinary world of Achaemenid studies. These

Northrop Frye borrowed from William Blake his title The Great Code: The Bible and Literature to emphasize the point that one of the features of “Western Civilization” is that the Bible, its images and metaphors, its rhythms, its worldview, its spirit, circulates throughout and forms the very basis of the literary culture and Gedankenwelt of Christendom. While it has always been acknowledged that the Quran functions, perhaps even more intensely, in its milieu and for its audience in precisely the same way, scholars have been slow to apply the kinds of literary methodologies—or their cognates—that Frye used to make his point. This volume goes a good distance in demonstrating the truth of the Frygian insight as applied to the Quran and in a language understood by those most needful of the lesson. (A few previous attempts are mentioned in the bibliography.) It is thus a most welcome contribution to the study, analysis, and explication of Islamicate culture, Arabic literature, the Quran, and Islam.

The volume begins, naturally enough, with the Quran, prefaced by a few salient remarks vis-à-vis the appositeness of using Aristotle’s category of ἀναγνώρισις, or recognition, for the study of such an obviously different literary culture—or is it? The first three chapters (pp. 16–186) are deeply contemplated explorations of the incomparable sūrat Yūsuf (12). Chapter one (“Cognitive Reading”—one takes this to mean “reading that focuses on occasions of recognition in the text”), based on the superb translation of Alan Jones, takes the reader through the various stages of this remarkable “tale” with an eye to locating the manner in which anagnorisis occurs and functions along its various stages. There are many instances of recognition beyond the emblematic recognition of Joseph by his dastardly brothers, “positive,” “negative,” and in between. The reader has no doubt at the end that anagnorisis, in its Quranic garb (!), was every bit as important for the author and audience of the Quran as it was for Aristotle, who in Poetics singled it out—most famously by reference to the tale of the sad but wiser Oedipus Rex—as one of the hallmarks of successful literature. It is allowed that this should come as no surprise inasmuch as the self-avowed vocation, the central preoccupation of the Quran, is, after all, revelation, one for which Islam as such sees itself the servant. The key Quranic terms—tanzīl, taʾwīl, haqq, bayān, kashf—in addition to all of the passages asking the “reader” to contemplate, to understand, to know, to perceive, help to underscore the importance of the Quran’s central concern with the epic journey from ignorance to knowledge and awareness, or as frequently, appositely, and refreshingly put here: enlightenment. (Scholars of Islam have traditionally been hesitant to use the E word when discussing Islam.) The figure of anagnorisis in the Quran, so profusely celebrated and artistically construed in Q 12, provides simultaneously the invaluable solace that things are not always what they seem and (if less consoling) that just because things happen to be very unusual at the moment does not mean they are not real.

The second chapter explores the way in which the revelations of Joseph, both of his identity to his unwitting brothers, Pharaoh, Zulaykha, Potiphar, et al., and of what came about through interpreting various dreams (his own, his fellow prisoners’, and Pharaoh’s), were a deft allusion to and figura for the prophetic, targumic, pastoral, and administrative role of Muḥammad ibn Ḥāfīz Allāh. This topic has been treated in earlier studies by Anthony Johns, John Macdonald, M. S. Stern, and others, but Philip Kennedy’s exploration adds much by centering less on the Quran than on the biographical (ṣīra) and exegetical (tafsīr) literatures. The result is much more consolidated evidence of the centrality of the Joseph story for Islam and Muslims—a case of recognition recognizing itself. On this centrality, it may