the most difficult. This is because the constituent texts or sources found within Samuel are very long (contrast, e.g., Kings, treated very successfully by Burke Long in the FOTL series), the text of Samuel has gone through a long and complicated history, and there are few internal clues to the Sitz im Leben of individual texts. Given the difficulties inherent in writing this volume, Campbell has produced a very interesting and worthwhile book. Campbell’s expertise on Samuel and good judgment are well known from earlier projects on Samuel and the Deuteronomistic History, especially the recent Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History, a source-critical work co-authored with Mark O’Brien. Thus, to the extent that the works in the FOTL series typically serve as a mini-commentary, this is a very useful one, showing sober judgment. The manner in which Campbell often admits that he is uncertain, but speaks of a “reasonable” judgment (e.g., p. 3) or “probability” because “certainty [is] out of reach” (e.g., p. 299) is especially welcome. He is properly tentative when exploring the Sitz im Leben of various texts, noting how different Samuel is from typical ancient Near Eastern texts dealing with kings, whose Sitz im Leben we may surmise. On the one hand, this tentativeness is disappointing—I was looking for a more full and certain exploration of this issue, but Campbell is honest, and I do not believe that this issue may be answered in a definitive fashion. The final sections of the book are also very strong—the last chapter, “Diachronic Dimension: From Past Texts to Present Text” (pp. 295–339), complements the earlier parts of the book, by examining different historical stages of the books form-critically. The glossary (pp. 340–50) is shorter, more clear, and less jargon-filled than those of most volumes in this series.

The book is not perfect—I have quibbles here and there with how Campbell reads or structures various texts, and with his insistence that theology and history-writing are mutually exclusive ventures. (See esp. p. 17: “This is a theological endeavor; it is not history-writing.”) Also, unlike the most other FOTL volumes, the bibliography is very selective, so the volume may not be used to determine all the latest literature on any unit in Samuel. Yet, the strengths of the book, especially its recognition of the limits of the form-critical approach in relation to Samuel, far outweigh its limitations, and I strongly recommend it to anyone interested in understanding the book of 1 Samuel. I look forward to the publication of 2 Samuel by the same author.

Marc Z. Brettlé
Brandeis University


One wants to be kind to the short treatment of textile production in the Late Uruk period ca. 3300–3000 B.C. reviewed here. In this as in other research tasks, K. Sarzynska has evidently spent many hours gathering and considering a substantial number of proto-cuneiform records that ostensibly document the management of wool-producing sheep, and the distribution of the raw wool and the textiles that derive from these herds. Those who have worked on the early administrative record of Babylonia will immediately recognize the important social and economic role in laborrationing, and in domestic and foreign exchange that the concentrated-value textiles of southern Mesopotamia played in early history (see, e.g., OBO 160/1, 150–53, with its many unanswered questions).

Research into early textile production is, however, in no way served by this book. Woe to the reader who decides to make the effort to work through English that is in part incomprehensible (for instance, p. 26, “As instrument used to scratch the raw fleece (or wool) was a card presented by the sign UR₄,”) who studies the book’s graphics that in print are either so pixilated as to be gray smears (most sign representations), or in the case of text copies are feeble ersatz, apparently created to avoid making a reproduction request of the editors of the series ATU and MSVO (that would have been freely granted). This dutiful reader is presented with idle speculation covering four millennia of tokens and tablets, speculation either repeating fantastical interpretations of others, or analyzing proto-cuneiform accounts with a disregard for the publications of Nissen, Dame-row, Englund and Friberg that would, had the author had access to better libraries, be characterized as wanton.

Despite explicit warnings from the reviewer, Szarzynska has (p. 13 n. 18) repeated her nonsensical interpretations of archaic time metrology that should never have appeared in 1997, and has made some effort to make of the gallows LA₂ a bouncing skirt, in so doing resurrecting a frivolous earlier interpretation of the related sign ZATU644 as “TIL/sumun” (pp. 20–22). She has excluded from the candidates for the early form of the sign KID the very sign that is in fact this precursor (p. 40 n. 57; see OBÖ 160/1, 74–76 with n. 151). She has analyzed texts as recording units of wool based on a misinterpretation of the signs under SIG₂ in ATU 2 (pp. 27–30, etc.); her sign T38 in reality represents a grain product.

Editors who cannot judge the quality of such submissions must look to others.

R. K. Englund
University of California, Los Angeles