

who find their identity and mission in restoration of the “everlasting gospel,” thereby preparing the way for the return of Christ, and whose history includes refusal to participate in military combat in the name of loyalty to that gospel.

Washington Adventist University  
Takoma Park, Maryland

DOUGLAS MORGAN

Beit-Arieh, Itzhaq. *Horvat ‘Uza and Horvat Radum: Two Fortresses in the Biblical Negev*. Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology, 2007. vi + 349 pp. Cloth, \$60.00.

This volume comprises the final report of the excavations conducted, with some interruptions, from 1982 to 1996 at Horvat ‘Uza and Horvat Radum, two Iron Age II sites in the eastern Negev that were reoccupied as paramilitary posts during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. It must be noted that Horvat ‘Uza should not be confused with a site that shares the same name located east of Akko in the Galilee, which was also recently excavated and published (N. Getzov, R. Liebermann-Wander, H. Smithline, and D. Syon, *Horbat ‘Uza: The 1991 Excavations, Vol. I: The Early Periods*, Israel Antiquities Authority Reports 41 [Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2009]; N. Getzov, D. Avshalom-Gorni, Y. Gorin-Rosen, E. J. Stern, D. Syon, and A. Tatcher, *Horbat ‘Uza: The 1991 Excavations, Vol. II: The Late Periods*, Israel Antiquities Authority Reports 42 [Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2009]).

The author, I. Beit-Arieh, served as director of this joint Tel Aviv University and Baylor University excavation project. Beit-Arieh was also a student of the late Yohanan Aharoni and, following in his master’s footsteps, has spent much of his career excavating and surveying sites in the biblical Negev and the Sinai. One of the reasons Aharoni and his disciples were drawn to this arid region was their recognition of its well-preserved remains, coupled with the strategic importance of the Negev in antiquity. The book under review is the third in a series of final reports of Negev sites excavated by the author and follows volumes on the Edomite Shrine at Horvat Qitmit (I. Beit-Arieh, *Horvat Qitmit: An Edomite Shrine in the Biblical Negev* [Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology, 1995]) and the fortified town at Tel ‘Ira (I. Beit-Arieh, *Horvat Qitmit: An Edomite Shrine in the Biblical Negev* [Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology, 1999]).

Chronologically, the excavators have dated both ‘Uza and Radum firmly to the seventh and early sixth centuries B.C. They present their case on the basis of datable pottery forms (120) and the lack of multiple phasing, indicating a relatively brief occupational history. Interestingly, Aharoni (*Arad Inscriptions*, trans. J. Ben-Or from Hebrew, ed. cccs rev. A. F. Rainey [Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981], 147) claims to have recovered sherds from the tenth to the seventh centuries B.C. during his earlier survey work at ‘Uza. Freud’s comparative study of the Iron Age pottery includes clear photos of whole forms and the usual diagnostic profiles (77-121, 318-322). She draws parallels from a wide selection of Judahite and Edomite sites with seventh-

century B.C. occupational levels. Earlier forms are rare. Interestingly enough, at least one “Rosette”-style storage jar was recovered from both ‘Uza and Radum. However, no rosette- or *mlk*-stamped handles were found. A more extensive ceramic comparison with the Lachish material (e.g., O. Zimhoni, *Studies in the Iron Age Pottery of Israel: Typological, Archaeological and Chronological Aspects* [Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1997]), and the reports from the British expedition) and other Judahite sites such as Beit Mirsim, Kadesh Barnea and Halif may still be a worthwhile endeavor.

About forty inscriptions were recovered from the two sites and are published here in full by Beit-Arieh, with the assistance of Frank Moore Cross. Such a large number of ostraca, like the rich epigraphic finds from Arad, testify to the inherent preservation qualities of the dry eastern Negeb climate. While a useful table comparing the various letter forms is found on p. 182, this reviewer failed to discover any attempt to date the corpus based solely upon paleographic evidence. Perhaps a comparative paleographic study utilizing the ‘Uza, Radum and Arad material may someday help to answer the stratigraphic questions that still plague the latter site. Nevertheless, we are in Beit-Arieh’s debt for presenting this important epigraphic collection to scholarship.

The biblical toponym (place name) for ‘Uza is disputed (Beit-Arieh, 1999, 15; idem, 2007, 1-4). However, this reviewer agrees with the excavators (e.g., I. Beit-Arieh and B. C. Cresson, “Horvat ‘Uza: A Fortified Outpost on the Eastern Negev Border,” *Biblical Archaeologist* 54 [1991]: 128) that ‘Uza should be identified with Qinah (Josh 15:22), since the Wadi al-Qeini, which runs below the site, preserves the biblical name. Y. Aharoni (“The Negeb of Judah,” *Israel Exploration Journal* 8 [1958]: 30, 35, n. 18) originally suggested equating ‘Uza with Qinah and also posited a possible connection between Qinah and the biblical Kenites (Jdgs 1:16 [LXX], 1 Sam 15:6), who settled in the general vicinity. Later, based upon his interpretation of an ostrakon found at Arad (Inscription 24), Y. Aharoni (“The Negeb and the Southern Borders, in *The World History of the Jewish People: The Age of the Monarchies: Political History*, 4-I, ed. A. Malamat and I. Eph’al [Jerusalem: Massada, 1979], 297; idem, *Arad Inscriptions*, trans. J. Ben-Or, ed. and rev. A. F. Rainey [Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981], 146-147) identified ‘Uza with Ramat Negeb (Josh 19:8; 1 Sam 30:27). To be sure, ‘Uza occupies a commanding topographical position that guards the entrance to the road descending from the Negeb (Judah) across the Arava into Edomite territory. This is the easiest, most convenient route between the two kingdoms and should be identified as the biblical “Way of Edom” (2 Kgs 3: 8, 20). However, forts and border posts are, by nature, characteristically located at strategically prominent, easy-to-defend sites, and scholars such as Lemaire, Rainey, and Na’aman have demonstrated that Tel ‘Ira’s more centralized location and its more imposing topographical position make it a superior candidate for Ramat Negeb (Beit-Arieh 1999, 15; idem, 2007, 4).

What do the excavations at ‘Uza and Radum tell us about the geopolitical status of the eastern Negeb during the final century of the Davidic monarchy? Aharoni (1979, 296) believed that the administrative and demographic center of southern Judah moved to the eastern Negeb in the wake of Sennacherib’s

campaign and the destruction of Beer Sheba. The author, followed to some extent by Tatum and Finkelstein, suggests that the Negeb of Judah reached its *floruit* during the seventh century B.C. in the Negeb (e.g., Beit-Arieh, 1999, 1). L. Tatum (“King Manasseh and the Royal Fortress at Horvat ‘Uza,” *Biblical Archaeologist* 54 [1991]: 136-145) interprets the archaeological data to indicate that an economic and construction boom occurred during the seventh century B.C., not only in the eastern Negeb, but throughout Judah. I. Finkelstein (“The Archaeology of the Days of Manasseh,” in *Scripture and Other Artifacts: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King*, ed. J. C. Exum, M. D. Coogan, and L. E. Stager [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994], 176-178) equates this development, at least initially, as reflecting the harsh political realities Judah faced in the wake of Sennacherib and the necessity to utilize every bit of arable land for agricultural production and settlement. A. G. Vaughn’s (*Theology, History, and Archaeology in the Chronicler’s Account of Hezekiah* [Atlanta: Scholars, 1999], 45-58) reassessment of the evidence points toward a different interpretation and conclusion. He argues that while Negeb settlements expanded during the seventh century B.C., this growth was by no means dramatic. Judah during the eighth century B.C. was much more populous and economically prosperous.

The growth of Judah’s Negeb settlements and the (re)garrisoning of its fortresses during the seventh century B.C. does not imply a strong resurgent nation rebuilding its defenses, as Beit-Arieh concludes (332). Rather, in the opinion of this reviewer, it reveals the *permanent* military and economic realities that underlie the loss of much of the Shephelah as well as Elath, Tamar, the Arabah, and possibly all of the Negeb Highlands and, with them, the crucial loss of control over the lucrative Arabian trade routes that traverse these areas. Judah never recovered these regions (e.g., 2 Kgs 16:6). Consequently, she was faced with the refortification and garrisoning of a new southern border, now dangerously close to her population centers in the hill country.

Indeed, one of the contributions this report offers to biblical scholars is the data it provides regarding the role that ‘Uza and Radum played in the ebb and flow of Judah’s hegemony in the south and the changing lines of her borders during the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. In the opinion of this reviewer, the comparison of ‘Uza with ‘En Haseva (biblical Tamar), a huge fortress that guarded the Aravah and the road to Elath, is of paramount importance when attempting to reconstruct and understand this important issue. Comparing the history of these two sites is a fascinating study in contrasts. R. Cohen (“The Fortresses at ‘En Haseva during the Roman Period and in the Days of the Kingdom of Judah,” in *Eilat: Studies in the Archaeology, History and Geography of Eilat and the Aravah*, ed. J. Aviram, H. Geva, R. Cohen, Z. Meshel, and E. Stern [Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Israel Antiquities Authority, 1995], 164-165, Hebrew) published two illustrations with side-by-side scale plans comparing the various Judahite Negeb fortresses. ‘Uza’s relatively thin walls and small size become dramatically apparent, especially in comparison with the massive casemates and huge size of Haseva. From preliminary reports, Haseva apparently served as a Judahite fortress until the late eighth-early seventh

century B.C., when it probably slipped into Edomite control, as evidenced by the Edomite shrines uncovered at Haseva and at Horvat Qitmit and Malhata (R. Cohen and Y. Yisrael, "The Iron Age Fortresses at 'En Haseva," *Biblical Archaeologist* 58 [1995]: 224-228; see also Beit-Arieh 1995; idem, 1999, 3-4, 176-177). Shortly after Haseva was lost, 'Uza and Radum were apparently built. The Negev Highland settlements, apart from the fortresses at Tell el-Qudeirat, Har Boqer, and Har Raviv, were apparently not occupied during this time either, suggesting that this region lost its geopolitical significance to Judah during the last two centuries of Judah's existence (M. Haiman, "The Iron Age II Sites of the Western Negev Highlands," *Israel Exploration* 44 [1994]: 61). While the data from 'Uza provides clues, but no conclusive evidence for the roles of Judah and Edom *vis-à-vis* the eastern Negev during the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., there is virtually no doubt that this was a contested region. In fact, Vaughn (1999, 53) enlists an Edomite ostrakon from 'Uza to question whether the site functioned as a Judahite or Edomite border post during the late seventh-early sixth centuries B.C. However, while the two Edomite inscriptions and pottery recovered at 'Uza demonstrate a certain degree of Edomite cultural influence at the site, they most likely do not reflect Edomite control of 'Uza during this time. Moreover, the location of both 'Uza and Radum reflects strategic planning for a garrisoned border that protects against threats approaching from the east (and south), not from the west. L. M. Zucconi ("From the Wilderness of Zin alongside Edom: Edomite Territory in the Eastern Negev during the Eighth-Sixth Centuries B.C.E.," in *Milk and Honey: Essays on Ancient Israel and the Bible in Appreciation of the Judaic Studies Program at the University of California, San Diego*, ed. S. Malena and D. Miano [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007], 249) has recently proposed that "Edomite domination (of the eastern Negev) occurred through slowly developing cultural assimilation." While this "peaceful infiltration" theory is possible, at least during its initial stages, the well-known cache of ritually destroyed Edomite cultic figurines at Haseva seems to demonstrate that a more complex and violent geopolitical history of this region existed during the seventh-sixth centuries B.C. than is currently understood.

At Radum, the remains of a tower were exposed in the center of the courtyard (314-317). This building served to facilitate long-range observation as well as communication purposes. It also functioned as an inner fort or "keep" in the event of a sudden attack. While the author points to parallels at Kheleifeh (accepting Glueck's reconstruction), as well as other sites in Transjordan, he overlooks several Iron Age forts with central towers that have either been surveyed or excavated in the Judean desert and along the Dead Sea (e.g., Z. Meshel and A. Ofer, "A Judahite Fortress and a First-Century Building Near the Top of the 'En-Gedi Ascent," *Israel Exploration Journal* 58 [2008]: 51-59; esp. 57-58). Despite the dating of most of these "tower" fortresses to the end of the monarchy or even later, it is difficult to overlook the biblical passages that attribute identical structures in the same region to eighth-century kings Uzziah and Jotham (2 Chron 26:10; 27:4). In the opinion of this reviewer, it is plausible that these strategic outposts were

the heirs to ninth-eighth-century B.C. towers. Perhaps some of these towers were also constructed earlier than their excavators suggest. As observation towers, these posts were garrisoned only occasionally, when the geopolitical situation demanded it. This supposition, in turn, would also account for the paucity of small finds apart from those associated with and datable to the final abandonment of these sites (314, 318).

The production of the book is well thought out and attractive. Moreover, the price is reasonable for a technical report of this nature. One complaint concerns the detailed plan that spreads over two pages (18-19), diminishing its usefulness for scanning purposes; for instance, in preparing a series of site plans for a comparative study. A folded plan on a single sheet would have been much more helpful.

A few editorial errors were noted. Spot checking revealed several mistakes on p. 331, where misspelled words such as “fulfil” were noted. The word “event” should be “events” on p. 334. A cited reference found on p. 338 to an article by Biran and Cohen (*Eretz Israel*, vol. 15) is dated 1985, when its publication date is actually 1981. For some reason, works cited as forthcoming in the text, including the author’s name, are not listed in the references. It would seem more appropriate to designate these sources as “unpublished,” “personal communication,” or simply not reference them at all if they comprise the author’s own work. As with most English-language publications originating from Israel, sources in Hebrew are occasionally cited when English translations of these works already exist.

With the appearance of this monograph, Beit-Arieh deserves to be heartily congratulated for fulfilling nearly all of his publication obligations—an extraordinary achievement among active archaeologists working in Israel and Jordan. We eagerly await his report on Tel Malhata.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

JEFF HUDON

Colón, May-Ellen. *From Sundown to Sundown: How to the Keep the Sabbath . . . and Enjoy It!* Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2008. 222 pp. Paper, \$15.99.

In her first book, May-Ellen Colón attempts to create order in the cross-cultural chaos and confusion of Seventh-day Adventist Sabbath-keeping etiquette. In doing so, she does not focus on technical matters of the day or time-setting, but rather tries to paint a picture of the Person behind the Sabbath. Thus the book is not concerned with the *why* of the Sabbath, but with the *how*. *How to Keep the Sabbath* is the result of Colón’s dissertation research (2003) on Sabbath-keeping practices in fifty-one countries, which she rewrites in a practical and descriptive manner. The objective of the book is, in her own words, “How to ‘do’ Sabbath in real life” (44).

Colón focuses on the Person behind the Sabbath, Jesus, asserting that by our having a relationship with him, the Sabbath will become a delight (Isaiah 58). She proposes that “When we have a profound relationship with Jesus and understand the meaning of the Sabbath, we can more easily find guiding principles to keep the Sabbath well” (49). To this end, she suggests fifteen