the author and copies taken from a variety of publications (with no indication that permissions were given to use copyrighted materials, a surprising omission for a distinguished academic publisher).

The challenge of any commentary is what to include and where to stop. To this reader, Breyer’s purpose was laudable and the undertaking courageous, but I might have wished for more attention to the interpretive problems of the readings presented, to show how difficult some of these really are, and correspondingly less to more general matters. For example, pp. 112–13, the author glosses words that can easily be looked up in an Akkadian dictionary, but offers no comment on the major problem with the meaning of īše (line 36), a decision that changes understanding of the text in a fundamental way: does it mean “with” (so Gelb, Kienast, and Sommerfeld) or “from” (so Farber and Frayne, to this reviewer less likely), and what basis do we have for deciding? This is surely a case where the student will need a teacher’s help.

Or, p. 82, could not the author do a little more with paššušum than a student could easily find (Archi, Vicino Oriente 10 [1996]: 37–71) and perhaps note, to reject it if he wishes, Hallo-van Dijk, Yale Near Eastern Researches 3 (1968): 7–8? So too the royal title dannum (pp. 108, 177, etc.) might have been glossed with reference to the interesting proposal of Hallo, Anatolian Studies 30 (1980): 189–95, which gives it a specific historical context, a goal the author strives for. Could not the ubiquitous -ma in such constructions as adī-ma (e.g., p. 82) in some cases at least be emphatic (“all the way to the sea?”). Or, p. 85, the reviewer, among others, has argued for a different interpretation of “mār Akkad” (in Studi sul Vicino Oriente Antico dedicati alla memoria di Luigi Cagni, ed. S. Graziani [Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici, 2000], 309–18); here too, the student could use guidance, even if the author does not accept the interpretation.

Likewise, p. 86, in the remarks on Kish, the student deserves more than “nicht du.” for this well-known crux, since Edzard devoted a careful essay to it and concluded the opposite (in Ah, Assyria . . . Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor, ed. M. Cogan and I. Eph’al [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1991], 258–63); the author should state why he thinks this is not a dual but Edzard did; so too the verbal root in line 35 is taken for granted, ignoring Edzard’s discussion, but, curiously, bibliography on Mesopotamian cartography is provided.

In short, this reviewer sometimes felt that the core problems of the readings were passed over too quickly, though space was found for such matters as ancient Egyptian cognates, and that a student might come away thinking that they are easier than they really are. The inquiring student will want to know if there are important differences of opinion and if so, what basis she has for preferring one to another, and here, it seems to me, the author sometimes disappoints.

Taken as a whole, this is a singularly rich learner’s text without any obvious parallel in the history of Assyriology. If the author may have tried to do too much in too small a compass, in preference to a more intense focus on specific linguistic and interpretive issues that most specialists in the source material could hardly resist discussing on, he comes across nonetheless as a committed and imaginative teacher, well read in his chosen subject, and blessed with a broad vision of his mission.

The book is nicely designed and produced, distils much disparate material, and will certainly be welcome to students who dread Old Akkadian as a forbidding, even intimidating agenda. The teacher of Old Akkadian will also be grateful for this learner-friendly resource.

Benjamin R. Foster
Yale University


The academic career of Norman Golb—l’enfant terrible of Dead Sea Scrolls studies and professor at the University of Chicago—has stretched over a half a century and spanned chronologically as well as geographically diverse people and topics. Very few, if any, living scholars can claim expertise in the literature of late Hellenistic and Roman Qumran, in Judaico-Arabic research founded on texts from the Geniza of early Islamic Cairo, as well as in the Jewish communities in the faraway regions of Normandy and Rouen in northwestern France during the period of the First Crusade. “Resembling the wide array of interests common among scholars of the nineteenth century Wissenschaft des Judentums,” Golb has maintained a strong position in and has significantly contributed to all three areas of research. But it was Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls that made his name known to everyone in the world of Judaic Studies and beyond. Starting in the late 1980s, Golb declared a one-man academic world war—no better term for it—that gradually extended well beyond the confines of the ivory tower, against the communis opinio in the study of the scrolls and the site beneath the caves in which they were found. He has adamantly argued for two central claims that, if true, would literally bring down two generations of scholarship like a tower of cards: first, that the scrolls do not belong to or reflect the world-
views of the Essenes, and second, that Qumran was not home to an ascetic sect at all.

A Festschrift could and should have been an opportunity to celebrate, discuss, and reflect on the positions of the honoree and to assess his arguments and contributions. But in the case of the Dead Sea Scrolls the debate has become too fierce and too personal and the stakes too high. Out of the twenty-five contributions in the current book only three are somewhat related, mostly in a tangential way, to Qumran.

Rachel Elior, who straddles the fields of Qumranic studies and Jewish mysticism, and in some of her conclusions has joined forces with Golb, writes about the relations between Yom Kippur and the categories of purity and impurity; Michael Wise, a former student of Golb, studies documents from the Judaean Desert, but not from Qumran, that were erroneously related to the Bar Kokhba revolt and dates them to the first Jewish revolt against the Romans in 66 C.E. This leaves a sole contribution, that of Anthony Tomasino, devoted directly to a text from Qumran, an apocalyptic fragment with close literary and conceptual ties to the Book of Daniel. The absence from this book of all central figures in the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls is glaring, and endows it and the happy occasion it was meant to celebrate with an aura of sadness.

Golb’s other fields of study are well represented in the book. Some of the biggest names from Israel, Europe, and the United States, the crème de la crème in the field of Judaeo-Arabic studies and its most treasured resource, the Cairo Geniza, have come together to salute Golb and recognize his contributions. Linguists (Joshua Blau), historians (Moshe Gil), talmudists (Mordechai Friedman), scholars of Arab and Jewish philosophy (Joel Kramer, Daniel Lasker) and mysticism (Paul Fenton), as well as those whose studies focus on the Karaites (Haggai ben-Shammai), have all contributed original, if at times short, essays, each in his own area of expertise.

Also represented are scholars of the Byzantine world (Walter Kaegi, in a beautiful memoir about the renowned archaeologist Carl Herman Kraeling), of the Crusades (Benjamin Kedar), and of Sephardic Jews (Norman Stillman), as well as a cluster of up-and-coming younger talent in all those fields. The richness of their studies makes this book a feat of scholarship and a joy to read, even as it also accentuates the absence of the missing parts.

Yaron Z. Eliav
University of Michigan