

although valuable philological studies are presented as well. The reviewer followed the order of the articles, as published in vol. 22, but he wonders whether a grouping of contributions by main themes or study fields would not be advisable in the future, for instance by presenting all the articles dealing with Mandaean-Islamic relations in one section, text editions and linguistic studies in another one, etc. This is just a suggestion to the chief-editor of ARAM, dr. Shafiq Abouzayd, who should be congratulated for the whole work he is accomplishing.

Edward Lipiński

Yosef Garfinkel, Saar Ganor and Michael Hasel, *Footsteps of King David in the Valley of Elah. Sensational Discoveries in Biblical Archaeology* (in Hebrew), Yediouth Ahronoth, Tel Aviv 2012, 229 pp. with 48 drawings and 65 colour plates.

After the scholarly report of the excavations conducted by Y. Garfinkel and S. Ganor in 2007 and 2008 at Khirbet Qeiyafa (cf. “Rocznik Orientalistyczny” 64/2 [2011], pp. 131–133), the Israeli archaeologists of the Hebrew University published a work aiming at a larger audience and taking the results of the excavations in 2009–2011 into account. The Hebrew inscription on an ostrakon, dating from the early 10th century B.C., was the most important discovery of the earlier seasons and its presentation by H. Misgav and A. Yardeni is summarized in the present volume with photographs, a copy, and a synoptic table of characters (pp. 123–132, pls. 51–52). Instead, no reference is made to decipherments and comments by other scholars, especially by É. Puech, largely followed by the reviewer (references in “Rocznik Orientalistyczny” 64/2 [2011], pp. 131–132). Among the discoveries of the last seasons one should point in particular at the miniature sanctuaries in stone (ca. 10 x 12 cm.; 12 x 20 cm.; 20 x 35 cm.), discovered in houses (pp. 133–163, pls. 58–65). They most likely contained a figurine. The head of a figurine has in fact been found, and the Authors wonder whether this was a “Voodoo” or a household god (pp. 163–164). In a biblical context, one should rather refer to the *teraphim*, which are termed *’ēlohīm*, “gods”, in the Books Genesis 31:30,32 and Judges 18:24, and may designate ancestor figurines. The discovered miniature sanctuaries and the figurine head would then constitute an outstanding archaeological documentation on these *teraphim*.

The Authors connect the Iron Age findings of Khirbet Qeiyafa with the earlier period of David’s reign in Jerusalem (pp. 174–193), but this opinion is based on the symbolic length of forty years attributed in the Hebrew Bible to each of the reigns of David and of Solomon. Instead, more reliable data place the reigns of both kings in Jerusalem ca. 960–928/7 B.C. with 928/7 being Year 1 of Rehoboam, son of Solomon (I Kings 14:25; cf. “Rocznik Orientalistyczny” 64/2 [2011], pp. 126–127). Since Rehoboam became king at the age of 16 according to the Septuagint (III Kings 12:24a) and was most likely

the eldest Solomon's son, born two or three years after the latter's accession to the throne at the age of twelve, as stated in III Kings 2:12 and in the *Seder Olam Rabba* 14, one may date the birth of Solomon *ca.* 959/8 B.C., about two years after the conquest of Jerusalem by David, if we rely on the historical background hidden behind the account of II Samuel 11:2-12:23 (cf. E. Lipiński, *Itineraria Phoenicia*, Leuven 2004, pp. 499–500). David's reign in Jerusalem started then *ca.* 961/0 B.C. after a long career of arms in the service of King Saul and of the Philistines, and a shorter reign at Hebron. The unique Iron Age stratum at Khirbet Qeiyafa is certainly somewhat older and must go back to the time of King Saul, as indicated also by the inscription on ostrakon, at least if we follow the decipherment and the quite convincing interpretation of É. Puech.

The material culture of Khirbet Qeiyafa should then be regarded as belonging to the North-Israelite tribe of Benjamin, a member of which was precisely King Saul. His power centre was Gibe'a of Benjamin, usually identified with Tell al-Fūl, some 30 km. north-east of Khirbet Qeiyafa. Since the first king of Israel was a Benjaminite, the tribe of Benjamin must have been an important one at that time, with a larger territory than the one attributed to the Benjaminites in later written sources. Moreover, the association of Khirbet Qeiyafa with an intermediate Iron I-II North-Israelite territorial formation is acceptable also from an archaeological view point, as shown by a recent study of I. Finkelstein and A. Fantalkin, *Khirbet Qeiyafa: An Unsensational Archaeological and Historical Interpretation*, "Tel Aviv" 39 (2012), pp. 38–63, in particular pp. 52–55.

Leaving this important historical and archaeological question aside, one should stress the high quality of the presentation of the site of Khirbet Qeiyafa and of the material discovered there in the volume under review. The lavish illustrations provided by the 65 splendid colour plates and the maps, plans, drawings of objects, synoptic tables of data constitute an important source of information also for scholars not used to read books in *'ivrit*.

Edward Lipiński

Eulàlia Vernet i Pons, *Origen etimològic dels verbs làmed-he de l'hebreu masorètic. Un estudi sobre la formació de les arrels verbals en semític* (Publicacions de la Societat Catalana d'Estudis Hebraics 2), Barcelona 2011, 404 pp.

The book of Mrs. Vernet i Pons is based on her doctoral dissertation directed by Prof. Gregorio del Olmo Lete and presented at Barcelona University. It is an etymological study of the verbs having *h* as third radical in Masoretic Hebrew. As well known, the third consonant of this group of verbs can etymologically correspond to *w* or to *y*, and several verbs in question are semantically related to verbs *secundae geminatae*, i.e. with the second radical consonant duplicated. The largest and most important chapter