the Emperor of Germany who dealt with Sultan Abdul Hamid was Wilhelm II, not I (p. 86), and at the battle of Kadesh studied by Breasted in his 1903 book Ramses II of Egypt faced the Hittites, not Mittanni (p. 106).

GARY BECKMAN
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Studies in West-Semitic Epigraphy: Selected Papers. By JOSEPH NAVEH. Jerusalem: THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY, MAGNES PRESS (www.magnespress.co), 2009. Pp. xviii + 544.

Gathered here are fifty-four of Naveh's *opera minora* originally published in various journals and collections. Some of the entries are reproduced photographically (e.g., those from *Israel Exploration Journal*), others have been re-set (e.g., those from *ʿAtiqot*). There is a consecutive pagination at the bottom of the page, with these numbers placed in square brackets; if an article is reproduced photographically and the page numbers of the original were at the top of the page, they are visible here. Any illustrations in the original are here placed on a numbered page; in those cases where illustrations were presented in figures or plates outside the original article, the number of pages per entry and their arrangement will, of course, vary here, even in the cases of articles that are photographically reproduced, as compared with the original.

The collection is preceded by a brief preface from the hand of the author and a list of "Acknowledgments" in which the origin of each entry is indicated. At the end are a comprehensive list of the author's publications, a general index, an index of (ancient) names, an index of references (to ancient texts), and a glossary which is divided into two parts, ancient terms in transliteration and ancient terms in Hebrew script (here the mixing of Hebrew and Roman scripts has led to some awkward and even garbled entries).

The author's methodological stance as a "typologist" in the mold of his mentor Frank Moore Cross led him to one of his more controversial conclusions, on the one hand that the script of the Aramaic text of the Akkado-Aramaic stele from Tell Fakhariyah must date to earlier than the ninth-century *limmu*-dating of one of the protagonists (among other indications), on the other that this script is of no relevance for the question of the borrowing of the Semitic alphabet by the Greeks, which, according to Naveh, must for palaeographic reasons have occurred some two and a half centuries earlier than the late ninth–early eighth-century date adopted by most scholars on the basis of the presently available archaeological and epigraphic data from the Mediterranean. In one of relatively few specific topics addressed in his preface, the author here declares himself willing "to withdraw my theory on the transmission of the alphabet to Greece in the mid-eleventh century" (p. x) in the event that B. Sass's recent proposal to down-date the early Byblian series of Phoenician inscriptions by some two centuries should be confirmed (Benjamin Sass, *The Alphabet at the Turn of the Millennium. The West Semitic Alphabet ca. 1150–850 BCE. The Antiquity of the Arabian, Greek, and Phrygian Alphabets* [Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, Institute of Archaeology, 2005]).

This statement prompts two observations: (1) true confirmation would require new archaeological data of a very specific nature, but in the meantime Sass's interpretation of the currently available data has not been met with acclaim by all epigraphers (see C. Rollston, "The Dating of the Early Royal Byblian Phoenician Inscriptions: A Response to Benjamin Sass," *Maarav* 15 [2008]: 57–93); (2) though the Biblian texts are of undoubted importance, the basic problem is that their dating is not fixed archaeologically—but down-dating these texts would seem to entail, on the part of a typologist, a parallel down-dating of the entire early Northwest Semitic corpus of inscriptions in scripts that are supposed to have been borrowed from the Phoenician (Aramaic, Hebrew, Moabite . . .) and of which at least some may be dated archaeologically or historically. Is it plausible, for example, that the very different scripts of the Phoenician inscription of Kulamuwa from Zincirli and the Moabite inscription of Mesha from Transjordan, which should both date to roughly the mid-ninth century, could have evolved from a common Phoenician ancestor in but a few decades? In the light of currently available data, it appears preferable either to adopt some form of a "dark-age" theory in line with Naveh's views published over the years (the Greeks would have adopted the alphabet in the eleventh century but no trace of their writings would be attested before ca. 800 B.C.) or to drop the classic hypothesis of Greek borrowing from Phoenician seafarers in favor of one allowing for an overland passage through Anatolia of a script-type closer to what was not known to have been still in use in the ninth century until the discovery of the Tell Fakhariya inscription (cf. P. Bordreuil, "Migraines d'épigraphiste," in *Writing and Ancient Near Eastern Society: Papers in Honour of Alan R. Millard*, ed. P. Bienkowski et al. [New York: T & T Clark, 2005], 15–28, esp. 22–23).

DENNIS PARDEE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A Guide to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. By JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J. Revised ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: WILLIAM B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING COMPANY, 2008. Pp. xvii + 302. $24.

Some might be confused regarding the title and edition of Fitzmyer's book: Though it is, in fact, a revised and expanded edition of an earlier work, that earlier