

STRATA

Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society

Volume 31

2013

The Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society
2nd floor, Supreme House
300 Regents Park Road
London N3 2JX

The full texts of articles within Strata are available online through Academic Search Premier (EBSCO). This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database®, published by the American Theological Library Association, 300 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 2100, Chicago IL 60606, Email: atla@atla.com; website: www.atla.com

Cover: Beth Alpha synagogue mosaic, NASA image

© 2013 The Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society, 2nd floor, Supreme House
300 Regents Park Road
London N3 2JX

ISSN Series 2042-7867 (Print)

Typeset by 3DWM, Switzerland
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
4word Page & Print Production Ltd.

Strata: Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society

Editor: David Milson

Reviews Editor: Sandra Jacobs

Editorial Assistant: Rupert Chapman III

Editorial Advisory Board: Rupert Chapman, Shimon Dar, Yossi Garfinkel, Shimon Gibson, Martin Goodman, Sean Kingsley, Amos Kloner, David Milson, Rachael Sparks, Fanny Vitto

Please send correspondence and books for review to:

The Executive Secretary
The Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society
2nd floor, Supreme House
300 Regents Park Road
London N3 2JX
UK

Please format material according to the 'Notes for Contributors' found at the back of this volume and submit articles to the editor electronically at: editor@aias.org.uk. Book reviews should be sent to the book reviews editor at strata.reviews@aias.org.uk

Strata is published annually. To subscribe, please consult the Society's website at www.aias.org.uk or use the form at the back of this volume.

The Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society

HONORARY OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Honorary President

Rt Hon. The Viscount Allenby of Megiddo

Chairman

Prof. Martin Goodman, DLitt, FBA

Vice-Chairman

Prof. H. G. M. Williamson, DD, FBA

Mr Mike Sommer

Vice-Chairman (Israel)

Prof. Amihai Mazar

Hon. Secretary

Dr Nick Slope

Hon. Treasurer

Dr Paul Newham

Committee

Mrs Barbara Barnett

Prof. George Brooke

Dr Simcha Shalom Brooks

Dr Rupert Chapman III

Dr Irving Finkel

Prof. Shimon Gibson

Mrs Roberta Harris

Dr Sandra Jacobs

Dr Sean Kingsley

Dr David Milson

Dr Stephen Rosenberg

Dr Joan Taylor

Executive Secretary

Sheila Ford

Contents

EDITORIAL	5
GERSHON GALIL	
‘ <i>yyn ḥlq</i> ’ <i>The Oldest Hebrew Inscription from Jerusalem</i>	11
NAVA PANITZ-COHEN, ROBERT A. MULLINS AND RUHAMA BONFIL	
<i>Northern Exposure: Launching Excavations at Tell Abil el-Qameh (Abel Beth Maacah)</i>	27
DAVID M. JACOBSON	
<i>Military Symbols on the Coins of John Hyrcanus I</i>	43
YEHUDAH RAPUANO	
<i>The Pottery of Judea Between the First and Second Jewish Revolts</i>	57
MICHAEL J. DECKER	
<i>The End of the Holy Land Wine Trade</i>	103
OREN TAL, ITAMAR TAXEL AND RUTH E. JACKSON-TAL WITH AN APPENDIX BY LIDAR SAPIR-HEN	
<i>Khirbet al-Ḥadra: More on Refuse Disposal Practices in Early Islamic Palestine and Their Socio-Economic Implications</i>	117
<i>Appendix: The Faunal Remains</i>	145
STEPHEN GABRIEL ROSENBERG	
<i>Charles Warren at Airaq Al-Amir in 1867</i>	149
AYALA ZILBERSTEIN AND ARIEL SHATIL	
<i>New Finds Dating from the British Mandate from the Tyropoeon Valley: the Givati Parking Lot Excavations near the Dung Gate</i>	153
<i>Book reviews</i>	163
<i>Summaries of Lectures</i>	240
<i>Reports from Jerusalem by Stephen Rosenberg</i>	245
<i>Grant Report</i>	264
<i>Notes for Contributors</i>	267

Reviews

- Yohanan Aharoni, Michael Avi-Yonah, Anson Rainey, Ze'ev Safrai and R. Steven Notley (eds.),** *The Carta Bible Atlas. Fifth Edition Expanded and Revised* (Adrian Curtis) 163
- Avraham Faust,** *Judah in the Neo-Babylonian Period: The Archaeology of Desolation* (Graham Davies) 165
- Yardenna Alexandre, with contributions by Guy Bar-Oz, Ariel Berman and Noa Raban-Gerstel,** *Mary's Well, Nazareth: The Late Hellenistic to the Ottoman Periods* (Richard Freund) 166
- Mayer Gruber, Shmuel Ahituv, Gunnar Lehmann, and Zipora Talshir (eds.),** *All the Wisdom of the East: Studies in Near Eastern Archaeology and History in Honor of Eliezer D. Oren* (Lester L. Grabbe) 169
- Meir and Edith Lubetski (eds.),** *New Inscriptions and Seals Relating to the Biblical World* (John F. Healey) 176
- Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers and Manfred Oeming (eds.),** *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context* (Sandra Jacobs) 178
- Eilat Mazar with Y. Shalev, P. Reuven, J. Steinberg and B. Balogh,** *The Walls of the Temple Mount (2 vols.)* (David M. Jacobson) 182
- Jack Green, Emily Teeter, and John A. Larson (eds.),** *Picturing the Past: Imaging and Imagining the Ancient Middle East* (Janice Kamrin) 186
- Chad S. Spigel,** *Ancient Synagogue Seating Capacities. Methodology, Analysis and Limits* (Lee I. Levine) 188
- Mordechai Cogan (ed.),** *Hayim Tadmor: "With My Many Chariots I have Gone Up the Heights of Mountains:" Historical and Literary Studies on Ancient Mesopotamia and Israel* (Peter Machinist) 192
- Cynthia Shafer-Elliott,** *Food in Ancient Judah: Domestic Cooking in the Time of the Hebrew Bible* (Carol Meyers) 197
- Jens Kamlah (ed.), with the assistance of Henrike Michelau,** *Temple Building and Temple Cult Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.-1. Mill. B.C.E.) Proceedings of a Conference on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Institute of Biblical Archaeology at the University of Tübingen (28th-30th of May 2010)* (William Mierse) 199
- Mordechai Cogan,** *Bound for Exile. Israelites and Judeans under Imperial Yoke: Documents from Assyria and Babylonia* (Alan Millard) 204

Martin Worthington , <i>Principles of Akkadian Textual Criticism</i> (Alan Millard)	205
Pau Figueras , <i>The Pagan Image of Greco-Roman Palestine and Surrounding Lands</i> , (Orit Peleg-Barkat)	207
Hannah M. Cotton, Leah Di Segni, Werner Eck, Benjamin Isaac, Alla Kushnir-Stein, Haggai Misgav, Jonathan Price, Israel Roll and Ada Yardeni (eds.) , <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae: Volume 1, Jerusalem, Part 1: 1–704. Part 1 The Hellenistic Period up to the Destruction of the Temple in 70; Part 2: The Roman Period from 70 to the Reign of Constantine; Late Antiquity from Constantine to the Arab Conquest</i> (Tessa Rajak)	209
Hannah M. Cotton et al., with contributions by Robert Daniel and assistance of Marfa Heimbach, Dirk Kossmann and Naomi Schneider , <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae Vol. II Caesarea and the Middle Coast, 1121–1260</i> (Tessa Rajak)	209
Avraham Faust , <i>The Archaeology of Israelite Society in Iron Age II</i> (Gary A. Rendsburg)	215
Katerina Galor and Gideon Avni (eds.) , <i>Unearthing Jerusalem, 150 years of Archaeological Research in the Holy City</i> (Stephen Gabriel Rosenberg)	219
Gershon Galil, Ayelet Gilboa, Aren M. Maeir, Dan’el Kahn (eds.) , <i>The Ancient Near East in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE. Culture and History. Proceedings of the International Conference held at the University of Haifa, 2–5 May, 2010</i> (Jack M. Sasson)	222
Joan E. Taylor , <i>The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea</i> (David Stacey)	225
Anthony Frendo , <i>Pre-Exilic Israel, the Hebrew Bible, and Archaeology: Integrating Text and Artefact</i> (Joan Taylor)	230
Jodi Magness , <i>The Archaeology of the Holy Land from the Destruction of Solomon’s Temple to the Muslim Conquest</i> (Joan Taylor)	233
Lester L. Grabbe and Oded Lipschits (eds.) , <i>Judah Between East and West: The Transition from Persian to Greek Rule (ca. 400–200 BCE)</i> (H.G.M. Williamson)	235

Book Reviews

Yohanan Aharoni, Michael Avi-Yonah, Anson Rainey, Ze'ev Safrai and R. Steven Notley (eds.), *The Carta Bible Atlas*. Fifth Edition Expanded and Revised, 2011. Carta: Jerusalem. Pp. 232 pages + 40 new maps. \$50. ISBN: 978-965-220-814-9.

What began life as *The Macmillan Bible Atlas*, edited by Yohanan Aharoni and Michael Avi-Yonah in 1968, has now reached this fifth revised and expanded edition, undertaken by Anson F. Rainey and R. Steven Notley. The change of name to *The Carta Bible Atlas* came with the fourth edition. (2002). Those who believe that an atlas should be primarily a collection of maps will welcome the addition of 40 new ones in this edition. In particular, maps reflecting extra-biblical episodes have been added with the aim of 'placing the biblical events in a solid framework of Near Eastern culture' (Preface to the fifth edition). Its chronological range has been extended by the addition of what the Preface rather grandly calls a 'chapter' (actually a single page) on the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius.

The latest edition continues the approach of its predecessors in concentrating heavily on the provision of maps, the majority of which aim to illustrate quite specific events although some are more general, with information about such things as geographical regions, mountains and rivers, and economy. There is a view that the provision of maps, particularly those which mark routes, battles, campaigns etc. can convey an unwarranted sense of confidence in the historicity of what is being mapped. This is, if course, not a necessary conclusion: works of fiction can be set in 'real' places or maps can be drawn of fictional settings. But there can be a cumulative effect and the reader of a volume such as this can be left with the overriding impression that most events happened as recorded in the biblical or other sources and that they can be mapped. The dust jacket speaks of a 'sweeping cartographic portrayal of biblical history' and the emphasis does indeed appear to be on history.

The Preface does add an important note of caution, pointing out that some sites are uncertain, and that boundaries, and particularly the routes of campaigns and journeys, are often conjectural. But it may be necessary to go further than this. On the map of 'The Exodus and Wandering in the Wilderness' (p.50) the traditional southern route is indicated, whereas in

the 1968 atlas a northerly route was shown, demonstrating that there has been uncertainty as to *where* it happened. However the more fundamental question ‘Did it happen at all?’ is not asked, implying that any uncertainty is geographical rather than historical. The juxtaposing in a single map of ‘The Birth of Jesus and the Flight into Egypt’ (p.173) could imply that the two events are equally likely to be historical; but in the case of the Flight to Egypt it is not just a question of the possible route but of *whether* it happened or (some would say more importantly) *why* the story was told. This is not to deny that the biblical writers had a keen geographical interest and placed their stories in geographical settings. Many of the maps are accompanied by references to biblical passage or other sources, underlining the links between text and geographical situation.

In addition to maps and accompanying text, many atlases include pictures, often now in colour. By contrast, *The Carta Bible Atlas* is not quite monochrome but is black, white and green throughout, apart from the impressive photograph of some of the Qumran Caves on the dust jacket! Opinions differ as to whether or not atlases should include photographs of ‘biblical’ lands and locations. On the one hand things may have changed significantly with the passage of two or three millennia, but on the other hand it may be possible to convey something of the lie of the land, and of such things as flora and fauna, to those who have never visited the region. *The Carta Bible Atlas* does not, on the whole, include pictures of places. It does however include numerous illustrations, predominantly line drawings but with occasional photographs, particularly of artefacts or inscriptions, many of which were present in the first edition. It has to be said that the quality of some of these is not good, some of the captions are rather minimal, and occasionally the positioning of a picture is strange. The object depicted on p.77 may well be a ‘Philistine sword’, but without an indication of its size or its provenance it is difficult to tell! The picture of an Execration Text from Sakkara is now next to a map whose source is given as Texts from the Mari Archives (p.27) and the relief of a fortified city from the palace of Assurnasirpal II at Calah accompanies a map of the Campaign of Pharaoh Shishak (p.96).

There is undoubtedly a great wealth of material in the volume for the reader seeking to understand the Bible in the context of the ancient world, as is to be expected from the expertise of the contributors. But the atlas needs to be used bearing in mind some of these cautionary points about the importance of not confusing history and geography, and remembering that the Bible is above all theology.

Adrian Curtis
University of Manchester

Avraham Faust, *Judah in the Neo-Babylonian Period: The Archaeology of Desolation*. Archaeology and Biblical Studies, 18. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012. Pp. xiv + 302. \$35.95. ISBN 978-1-58983-640-2.

Avraham Faust, Professor of Archaeology at Bar-Ilan University, here puts into book form his assessment of the debate about ‘the myth of the empty land’, which was initiated in the 1990s by biblical scholars such as Hans Barstad. Faust has been contributing to the debate in articles for several years and his title already makes clear that, over against Barstad and the archaeologist Oded Lipschits, he maintains that the archaeological evidence relating to the 6th century BCE indicates that the territory of Judah was, if not empty (which no leading scholar has actually asserted), then certainly ‘desolate’: there can be no question of life in Judah having continued as it had been before the Babylonian invasions.

After introducing the debate Faust develops his argument in a well planned series of chapters. The first re-examines the evidence from urban sites and confirms the generally accepted view that they were destroyed or abandoned in the late 7th or early 6th century, with some exceptions in the Benjaminite tribal area to which he returns later. The situation in the rural settlements (Ch. 2) is more controversial because of the difficulty in distinguishing 6th-century pottery from that of earlier periods and much of the evidence comes from surveys rather than excavations. To get round this problem Faust has proposed a method which infers that rural sites that were occupied both at the end of Iron Age II and in the Persian period were most probably also occupied in the period of Babylonian rule. Although the method is if anything biased in favour of continuity of occupation, the results are meagre, suggesting 6th-century occupation at only about 15% of sites occupied earlier and later. Another valuable indicator of occupation would be the presence of contemporary imported Greek pottery (Ch. 3), but this is almost completely absent. The next two chapters, on social and cultural change and demography, broaden the discussion to include a wider period and draw attention to major changes which Faust attributes to the effects of the Babylonian invasions. Traditional Judahite tombs and ‘four-room’ houses quickly disappear, the structure of kinship groups changes and (probably less relevant) there are new linguistic and cosmological developments. Even in the Persian period the number of settlements and the size of the population remained well below those of the Iron Age and this was probably a period of slow recovery after a much worse decline earlier, perhaps by as much as 90%. This need not be due entirely to deportation into exile, for other results of war would also have contributed. In Ch. 6 Faust argues that the effects of Nebuchadnezzar’s invasions were far greater than those of Sennacherib’s a century earlier, which were bad enough. Further comparisons are made in Ch. 7 with examples of ‘post-collapse’ societies elsewhere, to answer claims that such

massive devastation of the land is intrinsically improbable and would have been against the interests of the Babylonian rulers.

In turning his attention more directly to the presentation of the opposite 'continuity' view (Ch. 8) Faust points out that its proponents created a 'straw man' which it was easy for them to overturn. None of the previous generation of scholars (including W.F. Albright), as quotations show, had believed that the land became 'empty' after 586 or that exile was the only cause of depopulation. In addition the claim that the Babylonians simply continued the old system of provincial administration lacks evidence, except for the short-lived episode of Gedaliah. The land of Benjamin (Ch. 9) is often cited as a special case where urban life continued but Faust points out that even the evidence for this is shakier than many suppose and needs fresh examination. In Ch. 10 he sets out his own view of what life was like in 6th-century Judah, on the basis of excavated remains at sites such as Tel Batash and Khirbet Abu et-Twein. It is a bleak picture, with a population only in the thousands scattered across the land, with perhaps 15% of older villages still occupied. Others lived among the ruins, practising subsistence agriculture and without any evidence of continuation of the specialised production of wine or oil. In such circumstances changes like those described in Ch. 4 were entirely likely. A final chapter summarises the argument and points to some wider implications.

As a whole the book, which is very up-to-date and furnished with countless references and many footnotes which pursue the debate into detail, is a much better defence of the 'traditional' view of the period than those which have appeared before. Uncertainties of course remain and it is always possible that future discoveries could change the picture. But it seems unlikely that this will happen: the marshalling of several different kinds of argument greatly strengthens the case that is being made.

Graham Davies
University of Cambridge

Yardenna Alexandre, with contributions by Guy Bar-Oz, Ariel Berman and Noa Raban-Gerstel, *Mary's Well, Nazareth: The Late Hellenistic to the Ottoman Periods*. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2012. Pp vii + 169 incl. illustrations, maps and plans. \$30. ISBN: 9654062836; 9789654062831.

The idea of excavating a site which is associated with a well-known religious traditional relic site is a daunting undertaking especially when the public report may be scrutinized by the general public as well as by the academic community.

Yardenna Alexandre (YA, for short in this article) of the Israel Antiquities Authority was assigned in 1997–1998 to excavate the Mary’s Well complex in Nazareth, Israel as part of the Nazareth municipality’s plan to demolish the 1960s modern concrete well-house and to rebuild the 1860s stone well-house. Her long-awaited report appeared in April, 2012. It is a masterful multi-specialty archaeological report which answers many of the questions that have emerged in the past ten years about Nazareth in general and Mary’s Well in particular. The ‘Mary’ of Mary’s Well is, of course, the mother of Jesus of Nazareth and one of the central figures of Christianity and of Christian veneration, and the well became associated with one of the non-canonical Christian accounts associated with the announcement of the birth of Jesus by the well.

The whole issue of Nazareth’s existence in the pre-Byzantine period is the subject of much interest in the past decade with controversies between archaeologists and literary text scholars (and denominational religious scholars) aligning themselves on two sides (and sometimes extremes) of the argument. One extreme view contends that there was ‘no Nazareth’ in the period of Jesus and another claims that there was a Nazareth in the period of Jesus; but this was based upon scant systematic archaeological evidence until Alexandre’s publication. While Alexandre’s publication includes extensive information about Nazareth in the Crusader, Mamluk and Ottoman periods the publication is also an important corrective to many of the speculative pieces that have been written about Byzantine, Roman and the Hellenistic periods in Nazareth and Galilee in general.

Based upon the extensive Hellenistic and Roman remains exposed at nearby Sepphoris and on the absence of literary accounts of Nazareth from before the first century CE (and even in first century CE writers such as Josephus Flavius, for example) some scholars began to conjecture that Nazareth was not a town or even a village in the Roman period. Based upon other excavations in the area, however, most scholars have continued to hold that there was sufficient evidence to hold that Nazareth was a settlement in the first century CE. The question has been: “What type of settlement?” There are no references to Nazareth in any literature or inscriptions prior to the NT, but there is a fourth century CE inscription that mentions Nazareth as a Jewish town in Galilee where priests settled, possibly in the late first century CE after the destruction of the Temple (M. Avi-Yonah 1962). Among many other Byzantine-era writings there is also a rabbinic source that holds that Nazareth was a priestly city. (Midrash Ecclesiastes 2.8) The fact that the NT genealogies give Jesus a priestly family background creates a new area for research by both textual and archaeological investigators in the Nazareth story: Nazareth as a small separate Jewish (priestly) settlement (perhaps of expats from Judea) which is set at a distance from the Romanized city of Sepphoris on purpose. A small priestly

settlement centered around the Mary's Well might have inevitably wanted to distance itself from the more "Roman" city of Sepphoris to allow for more regular water purification rituals (even though there are *mikvaot* at Sepphoris as well) at the same time that they are employed.

YA has clear pottery and coin evidence (Chapter 5, "The Numismatic Evidence" Ariel Berman) that points to a settlement in her Stratum V – the Late Hellenistic and Roman periods. There is sufficient pottery (a healthy representation of kraters, bowls, cooking pots and storage jars from Late Hellenistic-Roman periods) and coins (18 from the Late Hellenistic and Roman period) to make the statement that there was a settlement based upon this array of material culture in the Well. The evidence of Kefar Hananyah and Shikhin ware pottery forms and the Herodian knife-pared lamp indicate that "the population of Nazareth was Jewish and had Judean connections" (YA, p. 153) and that "it seems probable that a church was erected above the spring at some time in the Byzantine period" (YA, p. 154).

What is wonderful about this well-produced publication is that it included literary and early illustrations and photographs in her work (YA, Chapter 8) and alludes to the implications of the controversy in her conclusions with a new 'middle path'. Concerning the existence of Roman Nazareth YA writes: "The archaeological evidence at the fountain reflects continuous activity and occupation in the Roman period." (YA, p. 153). Regarding the Byzantine period, YA writes: "It seems probable that a church was erected above the spring at some time in the Byzantine period" (YA, p. 154).

If there is one suggestion that might be made about this work it is to add a petrographic study to the pottery finds. Up until the present time, neutron activation and simple petrographic and petrological analysis of the pottery were available to establish the original provenance of the pottery. The vessels could also simply be thin-sectioned for petrographic analysis which would add to our knowledge of the provenance of the pottery. This type of study, for example, would test the pottery source of the Kefar Hananya ware to see if it is indeed from Kefar Hananya, and the Herodian lamp to see whether it came from the Jerusalem area, and would compare the data with the results of other excavations where these examinations have been carried out. This would help settle ongoing arguments about provenance, possibly having repercussions on ethnic identifications. The newest form of analysis 'Inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectroscopy' (for short: ICP-AES), a chemical characterization of pottery, could be also be used to identify the specific chemical provenancing of the pottery and to tell whether indeed the pottery is from a Judean source or from a source associated with Jewish settlements.

The volume moves seamlessly from the architectural evidence to the pottery, glass and faunal evidence of the Crusader, Mamluk and Ottoman periods, the work

thus adding immeasurably to the body of knowledge on the Crusader and Mamluk periods. YA writes: “The Nazareth Crusader fountain house would thus be one of the earliest Crusader edifices in the Holy Land” (YA, p. 155).

The most important corroborative evidence for our own excavations at the Nazareth bathhouse and in the bathhouse cisterns near the Mary’s Well complex are the Mamluk period bathhouse glass windowpane finds (Stratum II of YA) that parallel Mamluk bathhouse windows well-known elsewhere (YA, p. 100). For the past decade we have been working on the bathhouse some 15 meters from the public well-house (and some areas of the bathhouse may have been even closer in the Mamluk period). To date our conclusion has been that the Ottoman period hammam that was re-built (rather than originally built) by the Kawar family in the 19th century was built upon an earlier bathhouse dating at least from the Mamluk period, based (among other items) on C-14 retrieved from just below the present bathhouse floor. Based on our extensive geophysics work there, our hypothesis, however, is that the Mamluk period bathhouse may have been built upon an even earlier bathhouse; just as the Ottoman period bathhouse was built on the Mamluk period bathhouse.

The YA publication of Mary’s Well joins the increasing body of publications on the Roman and Byzantine periods in the area of Nazareth by K. Dark, B. Bagatti, S. Pfann, alongside the work produced by those working on burial caves nearby Mary’s Well. How big the settlement was in the Late Hellenistic and Roman period, how Jewish, and what the fate of this settlement was in the Byzantine period and Islamic periods remains to be seen. The existence of Mary’s Well as the major water source of Nazareth may have assured that this settlement would be occupied during many periods, whilst geological and political forces may have played a role in determining periods of greater and lesser population in and near the village.

The information in this report will give future excavators another piece of the puzzle for understanding ancient Nazareth. The report was worth waiting for.

Richard Freund
University of Hartford, USA

Mayer Gruber, Shmuel Ahituv, Gunnar Lehmann, and Zipora Talshir (eds), *All the Wisdom of the East: Studies in Near Eastern Archaeology and History in Honor of Eliezer D. Oren.* OBO 255. Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012. Pp. xxvii + 475 (Eng.) + 85 (Heb.). ISBN 978-3-7278-1719-9 (Academic); 978-3-7278-1719-9 (Vandenhoeck).

This is essentially a study on archaeology in honour of an archaeologist known for his survey of northern Sinai, his excavations at Tel Sera’ and Tel Haror, and his

archaeological work in the Gaza Strip, among other work. Even those contributions that bring in textual material mostly still have an archaeological perspective. It has 22 contributions in English, 1 in German, and 5 in Hebrew (with English abstracts), along with an appreciation of the honoree in both English and Hebrew and a list of his publications. The English essays are the following:

Michael Artzy and Svetlana Zagorski, "Cypriot 'Mycenaean' IIIB Imported to the Levant" show that some ceramics from Tel Akko designated as "Mycenaean" have been shown by Neutron Activation Analysis and other techniques to have originated in Cyprus. Cyprus production of Mycenaean-type pottery began in the 13th century.

David A. Aston, "Cypriot Pottery and its Imitations from Hebwa IV" gives a survey of the Cypriot (and imitation) ceramics found in the tombs of the rescue excavations in the mid-1990s. (Tell Hebwa was one of the way stations in the "Ways of Horus" established in the reign of Tuthmosis III). Twenty-seven pieces are described, along with a presentation of the other pottery found in the tombs for context.

Rachel Ben-Dov "The Mycenaean Pottery from the Occupation Levels at Tel Dan" describes an assemblage of Late Bronze ceramic fragments (from a variety of vessel types) of Aegean origin from stratum VII occupation levels. The Mycenaean pottery is from Argolid Greece, while the few Mycenaean-style fragments come from the Lebanese coast north of Tyre. Tel Dan was at the junction of major trade routes, and Argolid Greece exported Mycenaean pottery to Cyprus and the Near East as luxury items at this time.

Daphna Ben-Tor and Othmar Keel "The Beth-Shean Level IX-Group: A Local Scarab Workshop of the Late Bronze Age I" return to a group of seals already noted by Keel. These appear to be imitations of individual Egyptian scarabs (thus differing from Middle Bronze Canaanite scarabs), and probably from a single workshop operating after Tuthmosis III had conquered Beth-Shean. These seals were found in a temple context, perhaps of a combined Egyptian-Canaanite cult; in any case, they argue for Egyptian-Canaanite technological cooperation.

Manfred Bietak and Karin Kopetzky "The Egyptian Pottery of the Second Intermediate Period from Northern Sinai and its Chronological Significance" comment on pottery from the Middle Kingdom and the New Kingdom in Oren's north Sinai survey, with regard to its implications for the land route across the northern Sinai to Palestine. The Middle Bronze pottery indicates that the trade between Egypt and southern Palestine was not conducted by Egyptians. After a gap, the trade along this land route was resumed at the end of Hyksos rule or the beginning of the 18th Dynasty, despite the fact that the Hyksos preferred trade by sea.

Ruhama Bonfil "Did Thutmose III's Troops Encounter Megiddo X?" discusses the archaeology of Megiddo, arguing that the structures of stratum IX are completely new, built according to new town planning. This is matched

by a change in pottery. Thus Tuthmosis III destroyed Megiddo X (not IX), with the aim of maintaining the local inhabitants' loyalty to their Canaanite rulers (who were clients of the Egyptians): he divided Canaan into several administrative centres with a minimum of military supervision. The beginning of Late Bronze I material culture is to be associated with Tuthmosis' conquest, not the start of the 18th Dynasty.

Annie Caubet "A Matter of Strategy, Taste or Choice? Glazed Clay versus Siliceous Faience" notes how the technology of glazing clay vessels and bricks developed at the end of the Late Bronze, though not used in Egypt which excelled in siliceous faience. However, glazed tableware was found mainly east of the Euphrates, while Greek style vernis ware and "Egyptianizing" faience figurines and amulets prevailed west of the River. It seems that local tradition, habit, and taste were the determining factors rather than economics or technological knowledge.

Lilly Gershuny "Zoomorphic Protomes in the Middle Bronze Age: An Innovation of the Period?" reports on a group of five vessels (related to those fashioned as complete animals or animal heads) that first appear in Canaan in the Middle Bronze. They are locally produced, showing that local potters had learned the new techniques. They all function as rhytons, with the liquid always poured out from the perforated animal's snout. She argues that these were used in drinking or libation ceremonies rather than daily life.

Victor Avigdor Hurowitz "The Return of the Ark [1 Samuel 6] and Impetrated Ox Omens [STT 73:100–140]" looks at the account of the return of the ark by the Philistines, with special concern for the actions of the cows who carried the ark to the Israelites (even though their calves were kept behind). The incantation text from Sultantepe also talks about divination by observing the behaviour of cattle. The parallel is impressive in that the two examples seem to be unique.

Kenneth. A. Kitchen "‘Roy of the Rovers’: An Egyptian Warrior in 2nd-Millennium Phoenicia?" discusses a hieroglyphic inscription on a bronze spear point from the Middle or Late Bronze, which he reads as RYNRHR and suggests means "Roy of Ro-Har" (Ro-Har being interpreted as a place name). The author discusses the possible place of origin and profession of "Roy", but considering that the object seems to be unprovenanced, the location of its owner in the Levant and his date in the period 1550–1400 BCE is all very speculative. As Kitchen admits, we do not even know whether the point or its inscription are genuine (interestingly, he does not seem to have seen the object itself, only photographs).

Maria Kostoula and Joseph Maran "A Group of Animal-Headed Faience Vessels from Tiryns" interpret faience fragments found in recent excavations at Tiryns in the Pelopponesus as parts of one or more head-shaped vessels, the first of a rare group of ceramics dating to the 14th and 13th centuries BCE. At least one vessel shows the head of a monkey or perhaps the demon Humbaba/Huwawa. Near

Eastern head-shaped cups are known but not previously in the Aegean. The vessel is a rhyton, interpreted as being used for ritual purposes, and probably produced locally (perhaps by foreign specialists) rather than imported.

Jodi Magness “Archaeologically Invisible Burials in Late Second Temple Period Judea” discusses burial practices at the end of the Second Temple period. Rock-cut tombs are easy to find and have been extensively studied, but they were evidently used only by the wealthy. Other types of burial (in the ground) seem to have been common for ordinary people, but although leaving less in the way of visible remains, they are attested in literature and have been found archaeologically in a few cases (e.g., at Qumran).

Aren M. Maeir, Itzik Shai, Joe Uziel, Yuval Gadot, and Jeffrey R. Chadwick “A Late Bronze Biconical Jug with a Depiction of a Scorpion from Tell es-Safi/Gath, Israel” focus on just one of the rich assortment of finds from the large Building 66323, destroyed in the late 13th century. The jug fragment contains a striking image of a scorpion depicted in some detail, though the decoration is done in a somewhat careless manner and probably produced locally. The scorpion is relatively well-known in Late Bronze Levant, and is here probably a fertility motif.

Pierre de Miroschedji “Egypt and Southern Canaan in the Third millennium BCE: Uni’s Asiatic Campaigns Revisited” has a long article interpreting the autobiographical narrative of Uni, governor of Upper Egypt at the beginning of the 6th Dynasty (c. 2300 BCE), for historical purposes. He argues that Uni campaigned against the Canaanite inhabitants of what later came to be the Philistine coast, probably because they were interrupting the Egyptian sea trade with Byblos. The Egyptians were only trying to control piracy against their vessels, since they did not attempt to dominate this region until much later (under the 18th Dynasty).

Lorenzo Nigro “The Temple of the Kothon at Motya, Sicily: Phoenician Religious Architecture from the Levant to the West” interprets the history of the temple (C1-C2) by the basin considered a “kothon” (inner harbour). The temple (C5) was founded in the 8th century and destroyed in the middle of the 6th. Temple C1 was constructed according to the “Four Room Building” (or “tripartite”) schema and lasted to the beginning decades of the 5th century. It was then rebuilt as C2 with some changes and lasted until its destruction by Dionysius of Syracuse in 397 BCE. At that point, the cultic ruins were dismantled and collected into an open sanctuary (C3).

Bezalel Porten and Ada Yardeni “Dating by Grouping in the Idumean Ostraca--The Intersection of Dossiers: Commodities and Persons” publish the second of two articles that need to be read together (the first in *Eretz Israel* 29 [2009] 144*-83*). They concern the data from commodity chits, some of which fall into dossiers. The authors are able to gather data not only on prices and dates but also on the relations

between individuals named in the chits who interact with one another on a regular basis over a number of years. This information is recounted in a narrative (though technically detailed) section in the first part of the article but then given in tables in the last part. The authors are preparing a three-volume collection of these texts, less than half of which have yet been published.

Kay Prag “Footbaths: Secular, Ritual and Symbolic” gives a survey of 26 fragments of the so-called “footbaths.” Some think they are braziers or hearths. They are often associated with gateways, which could suggest a ritual function, but they could also be for washing the feet of officials or messengers: “None of the evidence is conclusive” (p. 369).

Anthony J. Spalinger “Divisions in Monumental Texts and their Images: The Issue of Kadesh and Megiddo” seeks to interpret the inscriptions of Ramesses II’s battle at Kadesh. Drawing on Tuthmosis III’s capture of Megiddo, he argues that the poem gives a connected “official” account of the campaign, based on military daybooks kept during the attack. The bulletin is a type of *Königsnovelle* that dramatically highlights one episode only, Ramesses’ conference with his military staff. In some cases there are pictorial representations but these reveal the common pharaoh as hero in battle and the Poem and Bulletin were often copied without the pictorial reliefs.

Varda Sussman “Oil Lamps of the Early Roman Period Decorated with Patterns Copied from Funerary Art, Phoenician Wall Paintings and Sculptured Sarcophagi” describes four mould-made lamps of Phoenician origin. Two of the lamps are identical and the two others differ from them and each other typologically. One has two human figures of uncertain identity on either side of the lamp’s shoulder. All the lamps represent scenes inspired by tomb wall paintings and sarcophagi (alternatively, all were copied from a Roman source decorated with Erotes/Cupids). The lamps date from the mid-2nd century CE and were intended to be placed in burials.

Herbert Verreth “The Ethnic Diversity of the Northern Sinai from the 7th Century BCE until the 7th Century CE” sketches the broad picture of ethnic distribution. An article on the internet gives archaeological and written sources (www.trismegistos.org/sinai/). The Egyptian influence over the whole area was firmly established in the Ptolemaic period. Yet only a few toponyms and personal names show an Egyptian background, and there are only a few Egyptian inscriptions. This is because fortresses of the region were often manned by foreign mercenaries: Greeks, Phoenicians, and others. Most of the toponyms are Greek. We know from Jeremiah there were Jews in Magdolos. The Arabs roamed over the whole area, and the Nabataeans bordered Egypt. Some temples and shrines have been identified but not necessarily the gods associated with them. The Christians had a definite presence in the later part of the period.

Samuel R. Wolff and Celia J. Bergoffen “Cypriot Pottery from MB IIA Loci at Tel Megadim” catalogue the Cypriot pottery found in the salvage excavation. This establishes the presence of Cypriot pottery in Canaan already in the MB IIA (previously well attested only for MB IIB-C), suggesting a more significant coastal distribution for this period than previously thought. None has been found in the earliest layers of MB IIA, but these sherds are from the later MB IIA. In the so-called “Byblos run”, Cypriot cargo was landed at a Levantine port (e.g. Ugarit), and was then carried by Levantine coasting vessels to ports further south on their way to Egypt. This would suggest that Tel Megadim was founded as a part of this international network.

Jak Yakar “The Nature of Symbolism in the Prehistoric Art of Anatolia” argues that the cosmic world order envisaged by prehistoric farmers was not essentially different from that of hunter-gatherers. He bases it on iconographic assemblages from Göbekli Tepe and other sites. The megalithic sanctuary near Göbekli Tepe seems to symbolize communication with mythical ancestors or forces of nature. Interestingly, the figures seem to be mostly male. Snake and bird motifs also seem to be links with the supernatural world. Animism appears to be at the core of their religious beliefs.

The German essay by Wolfgang Zwickel concerns famines in the southern Levant from the 14th century BCE to the 1st CE “Hungersnöte in der südlichen Levante vom 14. Jh. v. Chr. bis zum 1. Jh. n. Chr.” He argues for four major periods of famine, based on the height of the Dead Sea, as well as literary accounts: beginning of the last third of the 14th century; conclusion of the 13th century, with a high point c. 1208/1205 BCE; second quarter of the 9th century (between 870 and 852 BCE), and between 445 and 433 (at the time of Nehemiah). Those in the second millennium BCE were the most severe. Other famines known in literature were of short duration and limited effect, while some are unsupported by scientific or other data and thus unlikely (e.g., Acts 11:28).

The essays in Hebrew are the following:

Einat Ambar-Armon and Amos Kloner “Hellenistic Oil Lamps from Maresha Decorated with Figures” describe a group of oil lamps that are shaped either as heads or complete figures (Plastic Lamps) or have decorations in specific areas. Because found in a stratigraphic context, they help to establish oil lamp chronology and typology as well as their distribution and the workshops producing them. The influence of the Hellenistic tradition on their creation is quite evident.

David Gal “The Process of Urbanization in the Northwestern Negev during the MBIII Period: Social and Economic Aspects” notes that the region would probably

support no more than 800 families which means that the volume of earthworks would have required help from elsewhere, such as the Delta. The “Malthusian model” can be used to explain the collapse of the settlement system in the mountain region, but providing a population for the Negev settlements. The “shifting frontier” model helps explain the creation of urban settlements in the frontier region of the Delta. The economy was founded on winter crops and herding. The circumstantial evidence points to the Delta Kingdom’s contribution to the urbanization of the Northwestern Negev.

Itamar Singer “The First Treaty Between Hatti and Egypt” writes about the very first treaty (a treaty violated by Šuppiluliuma I). People from the Anatolian city of Kuruštama were transferred to Egypt, perhaps as professional soldiers. This treaty was probably made between Tuthaliya I and Amenophis II about 1417 BCE.

Ephraim Stern “Decorated Phoenician Finds from Israel” discusses four ivories decorated with Phoenician motifs: a rectangular spoon from the Assyrian period, an ivory plaque (from the time of the monarchies of Israel and Judah) with a praying figure in an Egyptian garment, a plaque showing a bearded king from the Persian period, and a stone chalice with the Phoenician motif of the Tree of Life with two sphinxes from the late Iron Age.

Oded Tammuz “The ‘Shipyard Journal’ and the ‘Customs Account’: An Investigation of the Nature of the Documents, of their Journey and its Circumstances and of the Benefits of Forgotten Lines of Inquiry” examines the preserved remains of two documents from ancient Egypt, the “Memphis Shipyard Journal” from Saqara and the “Custom’s Account” from Elephantine. The former originated in a storage depot for small boats and harpoons established by the local Persian rulers, perhaps to hunt hippopotamus. The latter was an annual report by Egyptians who worked in a customs house. Both documents were kept in Memphis archives that were pillaged in a revolt against Persian rule in 463/462 BCE. One or both were salvaged as reusable for writing material; hence, the “Customs Account” became a palimpsest for the *Wisdom of Ahiqar* far away in Elephantine.

This is a wide-ranging collection, with many insights from archaeology but also from documents and literature. It is excellently illustrated. For biblical scholars, the many contributions on the Middle Bronze Age and earlier may be of less interest but there is much from the “biblical period”, especially the Late Bronze but also later. A worthy tribute to Professor Oren.

Lester L. Grabbe
University of Hull

Meir and Edith Lubetski (eds.), *New Inscriptions and Seals Relating to the Biblical World.* Society of Biblical Literature Archaeology and Biblical Studies 19. SBL: Atlanta, 2012. Pp. 313. \$39.95. ISBN: 1589835565.

This volume is devoted to the study of items in the well-known antiquities collection of Dr Shlomo Moussaieff. It is a follow-up to an earlier volume, *New Seals and Inscriptions, Hebrew, Idumean and Cuneiform* edited by Meir Lubetski (Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007).

The Foreword to the present volume by Lubetski tackles head-on the subject of artefacts obtained on the antiquities market. His discussion of the issues involved gives a fair and cautious hearing to both sides of the argument, though it principally concerns itself with the problem of collections being taken in by unprovenanced fakes. Such items should not be excluded from our field of vision unless there is clear evidence of forgery but I would have limited sympathy with a purchaser who *was* taken in since much of the trade in such pieces rests on dubious foundations.

And Lubetski sets aside some other aspects of the problem, such as the fact that the market in unprovenanced artifacts encourages wanton damage to archaeological sites as is happening extensively in present-day Syria. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries antiquities laws were extremely weak where they even existed; they are today much stronger, if not always enforced. But setting aside the legal question, there are also academic, ethical and moral issues.

The academic problem with this kind of artifact is that it has no clear archaeological or sometimes even topographical context (sometimes the place of origin is obscured by dealers who do not want the item to fall under the scrutiny of relevant authorities). The item is, as a result, diminished in its potential for throwing light upon the past. This diminution varies considerably from piece to piece. Common artifacts collected on the surface, such as fragments of pottery, may not be much diminished because they were of little intrinsic archaeological value even when they were picked up. By contrast a unique and very impressive object might be of little use as a guide to anything about the past if it has no archaeological context. The exceptionally fine statue, if it is unprovenanced and undated, is unlikely to tell us anything, even if it looks impressive in the front garden.

Of course the presence of inscriptions often changes the situation dramatically, though, like statues, they are frequently mute unless they contain a date or some other unique information. There are many examples of formulaic inscriptions which hardly vary from one instance to the other, so that an individual instance adds little or nothing to the sum total of understanding unless we know exactly where it came from.

The moral issue is much clearer: archaeological artifacts belong to the people of the states in which they were found. They are part of their heritage. Whether their precise provenance is known or not, they should be returned to the jurisdiction of the relevant antiquities department.

I do not pretend that my own epigraphic work has been able to treat these issues as black and white, so I am throwing stones from within my own glass house! Many of the pieces I have studied have slightly embarrassing histories: they have ended up in museums in the UK, France and the US by devious routes. One, the Orpheus Mosaic (with a Syriac inscription) which was on display in the Dallas Museum of Art for many years (having been bought at an antiquities auction in the US), has recently been repatriated to Turkey, since there is now evidence that it was removed illicitly from the city of Urfa. The Museum is to be congratulated in taking a responsible line in this instance.

In the case of artifacts held in museums since before antiquities laws were enacted, there is also the complex problem of the relationship between modern states and their nineteenth-century antecedents. The Palmyrene Tariff inscription (the provenance of which is known quite precisely) is in Russia; it was given as a gift by the Ottoman Sultan to the Russian Imperial Court. Should it now be returned to modern Syria (which did not exist as a separate state until 1946) and which at the time of writing has no effective government? Should the various artifacts in the Ottoman collections, now in Istanbul in the Turkish Republic, such as the Gezer Calendar and the Siloam Tunnel Inscription and the Greek inscription from Herod's Temple (all collected when these were in Ottoman domains) be sent to Israel? Or does it depend on which side of the 1967 armistice line they originally came from?

Several of the articles in the present volume touch on the question of authenticity and the reader is drawn into such questions. Alan Millard's contribution, on "Hebrew Seals, Stamps, and Statistics: How Can Fakes Be Found?" is specifically concerned with the role of statistics in the estimation of genuineness, discussing earlier theories on this, while Martin Heide discusses "The Moabite and Their Aftermath: How to Handle a Forgery Affair with an International Impact", giving an excellent brief account of the key palaeographic and grammatical arguments which undermined confidence in the forgeries produced in the Shapira scandal of the 1870s and 1880s (touching also on the Yeho'ash Inscription). Chaim Cohen is non-committal on the authenticity of the Yeho'ash Inscription in his "Biblical Hebrew Philology in Light of the Last Three Lines of the Yeho'ash Royal Building Inscription (YI: lines 14–16)."

The material is so varied that this reviewer cannot comment usefully on all contributions. Three are by André Lemaire: "From the Origin of the Alphabet to the Tenth Century B.C.E.: New Documents and New Directions", "New Perspectives

on the Trade between Judah and South Arabia” and “A New Inscribed Stone Bowl from the Moussaieff Collection.” The first of these surveys recent evidence on the emergence of the linear alphabet and includes the publication of several new inscriptions on arrow and axe heads. The second discusses new evidence on the “towns of Judah” in a Sabaic inscription published by Lemaire and F. Bron in 2009. The third (well beyond the “Biblical World”) deals with an inscribed Palmyrene crater dated 154/5 CE and similar to one published earlier by F. Briquel-Chatonnet (1995) and from the same workshop.

Also dealing with post-biblical material is the important article by Matthew Morgenstern on the Mandaic magic bowls in the very significant Moussaieff collection of magic bowls. Morgenstern surveys existing published bowls and lists the Moussaieff bowls which he is about to publish in full, commenting on new lexica and parallels in formulae found elsewhere.

There is also a small group of cuneiform contributions, two by Kathleen Abraham: “A Unique Bilingual and Biliteral Artifact from the Time of Nebuchadnezzar II in the Moussaieff Private Collection” (“biliteral” here means “using two different scripts”, cuneiform and Aramaic), and the artefact appears to be a jar lid and “Bricks and Brick Stamps in the Moussaieff Private Collection.” A third is by the late W. G. Lambert: “A Babylonian Boundary Stone in the Moussaieff Collection.” One of the editors, Meir Lubetski (who also contributes two other articles to the volume, as well as the Foreword already alluded to) contributes a brief appreciation of Lambert, “A Teacher, A Colleague, A Friend: Wilfred G. Lambert, 1926–2011.” The death of Lambert, one of the greatest Assyriologists in the history of cuneiform studies, was well worthy of note in this volume.

With scholarly contributions from such as those named above, as well as the remaining contributions by Peter van der Veen, Lawrence J. Mykytiuk, Robert Deutsch, Claire Gottlieb and Richard S. Hess, this is an important collection of papers.

John F. Healey
University of Manchester

Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers and Manfred Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context.* Winona Lake: Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2011. \$64.60. Pp. xvi + 600, incl. 10 illustrations and one map. ISBN: 9781575061979.

This volume explores the profile of early Second Temple Judaism as it emerged from the diverse ethnicities of the Southern Levant in the Persian period. The papers, initially presented at a University of Heidelberg colloquium (06–08

April, 2008), trace the shift from the determination of “Judean” identity purely in geographical terms to its subsequent ethnic construction. The collection is divided into two parts: *Diversity Within the Biblical Evidence* and *Cultural, Social and Environmental Factors*, where the relationships between geo-political and ethnic groups, including Babylonians, Samaritans, Idoumeans, Egyptians, Moabites, Ammonites, Pheonicians are examined.

In the first contribution, “Judean Identity and Ecumenicity: The Political Theology of the Priestly Document,” Konrad Schmid evaluates the covenantal blessings in Genesis 17 with reference to the perceived exclusion of Ishmael. Schmid maintains that the divine promises of progeny and land included Edomites and Arabs, together with Judeans and Israelites, since “the exclusive Judean privilege is not political but cultic.” (p.26). This is followed by “Torah and Identity in the Persian Period,” where Joachim Schaper looks at how legal formulations, such as כְּכָתוּב, “as it is written,” or to the authority of the written law, as כְּכָתוּב בְּתוֹרָה were understood in Deuteronomy 23:2–9, Ezekiel 44:4–9 and Isaiah 56:1–6. In “The Absent Presence: Cultural Responses to Persian Presence in the Eastern Mediterranean,” Anselm Hagedorn compares the literary features in Genesis 20 and the Book of Esther, clarifying how both texts reconfigure their remembered past. Christophe Nihan then suggests that conflicting views of communal inclusion (and exclusion) originated in diverse views of the role of the Temple as it became a centralized institution, in “Ethnicity and Identity in Isaiah 56–66.”

Next, in “Trito-Isaiah’s Intra-and Internationalization: Identity Markers in the Second Temple Period,” Jill Middlemas documents how trito-Isaiah expands the understanding of ethnic identity, initially based on geographical and national criteria, to one that is characterized by religious and political concerns. Dalit Rom-Shiloni then provides a sophisticated analysis of the reception of Babylonian exilic theology in Second Temple sources, including Zechariah 1–8 and Deutero-Isaiah. In her paper, “From Ezekiel to Ezra–Nehemiah: Shifts of Group Identities within Babylonian Exilic Ideology,” she pinpoints how the repatriate-exilic community successfully formulated their take-over strategy which both displaced and delegitimized the indigenous Judeans. Jakob Wöhrle then discusses “Israel’s Identity and the Threat of the Nations in the Persian Period: Reflections from a Redactional Layer of the Book of the Twelve,” in which he dates the redaction of the “Foreign-Nations Corpus I,” to the late fifth or early fourth century.

The complex question of intermarriage is here investigated by Yonina Dor, in “The Rite of Separation of the Foreign Wives in Ezra–Nehemiah.” This analysis of the separatist ideology is based on the accounts of “membership registers” listed in Ezra 2:2–61 and Nehemiah 7:6–63, in which attendance at public and cultic events was restricted to the returned exiles. It is suggested that the first returnees

were able to perform a symbolic separation ceremony in which they denounced their sin and became thereby ritually absolved from expelling their foreign wives. While this is not entirely convincing - and I would also question the extent that this demonstrates “the elevation of pluralism over zealotry,” (p. 186) – it does offer a fresh interpretation of this challenging issue. From a social anthropological perspective Katherine Southwood focuses on Ezra’s purging and purifying “the Holy seed,” זרע הקדוש by means of enforced endogamy. In her discussion of “The Holy Seed: The Significance of Endogamous Boundaries and Their Transgression in Ezra 9–10,” she maintains that the construction of impermeable boundaries “also create(s) the representation of an extremely particularistic, perhaps somewhat insecure group who perceive that their identity is being threatened,” (p. 208). This section concludes with Deirdre Fulton’s contribution, “What Do Priests and Kings Have in Common? Priestly and Royal Succession Narratives in the Achaemenid Era.” Fulton investigates the use of Achaemenid and Priestly genealogies (as in Ezra 7:1–5, 1 Chronicles 3:1–24, 5:27–41, 6:18–33, 8:33–40), in light of Ionian, Egyptian and Mesopotamian non-royal lineages where creating links with the classical past served to legitimize and privilege institutional authority.

The second section commences with Paul-Alain Beaulieu’s fascinating study of “Yahwistic Names in Light of Late Babylonian Onomastics.” Beaulieu examines Israel’s “monotheizing onomasticon,” in relation to its contemporaneous “hegemonic theophoric” equivalent in the late Babylonian city of Uruk. Here the preference of these urban elites for the god Anu indicates that “at most, we can talk about is henotheism, with a strong monolatric tendency in personal names,” (p.257) and where it appears that the cult of Yahweh did not constitute the main referent of identity for Judeans living in the Aramaic cultural *koine*. Alongside this essay Laurie Pearce provides a brief comparison of the Judeans identified in the Murašu archive (454–405 BCE, Nippur) with those in the *āl-Yāhūdu* corpus (c. 572 BCE, which she locates now in the Nippur-Keš-Kakara triangle). In her paper “‘Judean:’ A Special Status in Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Babylonia?” she maintains that the Judeans were “a group of ‘ethnically’ homogenous state dependents,” (p.271) who were well-integrated into Babylonian society and whose status was no different to that of any other deported group.

Donald Redford then provides an extensive analysis of the Egyptian motifs in Genesis 37 - Exodus 15, dating the Joseph and Moses narratives to the fifth or fourth centuries BCE, in “Some Observations on the Traditions Surrounding ‘Israel in Egypt’,” This study is complemented by Joachim Friedrich Quack, with “The Interaction of Egyptian and Aramaic Literature,” who confirms that intense contact between vernacular demotic and Aramaic existed as demonstrated by the fragmentary versions of Ahiqar in Syriac, Egyptian demotic and Greek. Staying in Achaemenid Egypt, André Lemaire’s piece, “Judean Identity in Elephantine:

Everyday Life according to the Ostraca,” suggests that ethnicity in these records was determined by religion and ritual. This is particularly notable given that Judean Hebrew was neither spoken nor written by the scribes from this vicinity. More broadly, Bob Becking explores “Yehudite Identity in Elephantine,” providing one of the most useful pieces (especially for teaching at undergraduate and post-graduate levels), where he outlines the elements which constitute this community’s “prebiblical form of Yahwism,” (p.415). Admittedly the identification of Pia, son of Pahi, as the second husband of Mibtahiah, daughter of Mahseiah, is no longer tenable as Joseph Modrzejewski (1996:26–36) has argued, but this is a relatively minor point. Reinhard G. Kratz then compares the representation of Hananiah (from two Aramaic letters from Elephantine), with that of Ezra and Nehemiah, in “Judean Ambassadors and the Making of Jewish Identity: The Case of Hananiah, Ezra, and Nehemiah.” He clarifies how Persian authority was delegated locally, providing a basis upon which the biblical scribes could develop their accounts of the activities of Ezra and Nehemiah.

Moving away from text-based sources, Oren Tal presents, “Negotiating Identity in an International Context under Achaemenid Rule: The Indigenous Coinages of Persian-Period Palestine as an Allegory.” As coins were the communicative medium of municipal, ritual and dynastic authority, the role of currency beyond its purely economic value is informatively described. Next, Joseph Blenkinsopp considers representations of the patriarch Abraham in “Judeans, Jews, Children of Abraham.” He concludes that “usage seems to point to the first century of Persian rule for the emergence of the ethnic-religious connotation of יהודים, justifying the appellative “Jew” rather than “Judean,” (p. 467) *au contraire* Bob Becking (in this volume) and Shaye Cohen (1999). In “The Controversy about Judean versus Israelite Identity and the Persian Government: A New Interpretation of the Bagoses Story (*Jewish Antiquities* XI.297–301),” Rainer Albertz reconstructs aspects of regional ethnicity, inclusion and exclusion in the context of events described in c.445–401BCE. Jacob Wright then examines the tensions for Judeans serving in foreign armies, paying attention to the relationship between royal courts and their respective troops, in “Surviving in an Imperial Context: Foreign Military Service and Judean Identity.”

In “*el-medînâ ûmedînâ kiktabah:* Scribes and Scripts in Yehud and in Achaemenid Transeuphratene,” David S. Vanderhooft discusses the re-emergence of the archaic paleo-Hebrew script in Judea and Samaria during the Persian period, which is presumed to be primarily motivated by issues of identity. Manfred Oeming then provides a well-supported paper, “Jewish Identity in the Eastern Diaspora in Light of the Book of Tobit,” in which he identifies the religious practices and ethno-centric elements presumed in this drama. His dating of this book to 250–170 BCE is extremely compelling.

Finally in “The Identity of the Idumeans Based on the Archaeological Evidence from Maresha,” Amos Kloner outlines the epigraphic sources, purification installations, carved circumcised phalli and various burial complexes, which confirm that the Idumeans were the major *ethnos* at Maresha in the Persian and early Hellenistic period. Readers may wish to note also that photographs of all nine of the circumcised phalli have since been published by Ian Stern in the previous issue of this journal.

A collection of this significance warrants a comprehensive introduction summarizing each paper and also an index of subjects, enabling readers to conveniently locate elements of Second Temple religious practice, such as circumcision, shabbat, festivals, etc. While only one or two formatting errors were noticed (where the Hebrew letters appear reversed, as in footnote 33, on page 46 and also footnote 42, on page 48), these minor issues do not detract from this wealth of scholarship which collectively provides an eloquent affirmative to Sara Japhet’s important question: “Can the Persian Period Bear the Burden?”

- Cohen, S.J.D. (1999) *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).
- Japhet, S. (2006) “Can the Persian Period Bear the Burden? Reflections on the Origins of Biblical History.” Pp. 342–352 in *From the Rivers of Babylon to the Highlands of Judah: Collected Studies on the Restoration Period* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns).
- Modrzejewski, J. M. (1996) “Mibtahiah and Her Husbands: A Family of Note During the Reign of Artaxerxes I.” Pp. 26–36 in *The Jews of Egypt from Rameses II to the Emperor Hadrian* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark).
- Stern, I. (2012) “Ethnic Identities and Circumcised Phalli at Hellenistic Maresha,” in *Strata: The Bulletin of the ALAS* 30: 57–87.

Sandra Jacobs
King’s College, London

Eilat Mazar with Y. Shalev, P. Reuven, J. Steinberg and B. Balogh, *The Walls of the Temple Mount* (2 vols.). Jerusalem: Shoham Academic Research and Publication, 2011. Pp. 320 + 6 fold-out maps and numerous illustrations. \$270 (\$249 from BAS). ISBN 978–965–90299–7–6.

This impressive-looking publication by Eilat Mazar as principal author, provides a detailed description of the walls that enclose the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. It is comprised of two parts that are packaged in a box. Besides the main volume is a folder in the same sized format with pouches containing fold-out elevations of the four perimeter walls, for the most part only above present ground level,

represented by composite modern photographs and corresponding drawings placed side-by-side. On each sheet there is also a version of the drawing which includes subterranean portions, colour-coded according to the ascribed date of the different types of masonry. There are six sheets in all, with two each devoted to the longer western and eastern walls. In addition, there are copious illustrations in the text volume. The project to record the walls was a team effort, also involving Peretz Reuven, Balage Balogh, Yiftah Shalev and Jonathan Steinberg, who are given due credit in this monograph.

Because so much of the information in Mazar's publication builds on the work of earlier investigators, so as to place it in context I shall lead into it with some of this background. In 1864–65, with the financial backing of Baroness Angela Burdett-Coutts (perhaps the wealthiest woman in Victorian England and celebrated philanthropist), a team of British Royal Engineers led by Captain Charles Wilson carried out a topographical survey of Jerusalem to the standards of an Ordnance Survey. The main result of the survey was a 1:10,000 map of Jerusalem and its environs and a 1:2,500 plan of the walled city, which was so accurate that when a new one came to be made in 1937 only a revision of Wilson's map of the city was necessary. As part of their expedition, but using separate funding provided by James Fergusson, a pioneering architectural historian, Wilson and his team surveyed the walled enclosure of the Temple Mount, and they produced the first reliable map of this compound to a scale of 1:500. They also produced accurate plans of the Dome of the Rock and the Aqsa Mosque. The Jerusalem survey, which was accomplished and published within a year (in Southampton and not London, as stated in the bibliography), uncovered much new information about the shrines and related structures and also on the cisterns and underground passages of the Temple Mount. A great arch springing from the western wall beneath a Mameluk madrasa, first described by the Swiss explorer, Titus Tobler, was re-examined by Wilson and is named after him ("Wilson's Arch"). Charles Wilson was the first to pay proper scholarly attention to the stonework of the enclosure walls of the Temple Mount, examining the ancient masonry that was visible on the exterior. Wilson also had an excellent photographer with him, a Scotsman named James MacDonald who took the photographs that are included in Wilson's Survey publication, some of which are of the walls.

Encouraged by the results of Wilson's expedition, the newly-formed Palestine Exploration Fund (PEF) dispatched another small team of Royal Engineers, under Charles Warren, to investigate the ancient remains of Jerusalem with a particular brief to carry out excavations at the Temple Mount. Not being allowed to dig within the precincts, he concentrated on sinking subterranean shafts to the wall foundations, recording the different types of stonework encountered at different levels and other features, such as Robinson's Arch on the western side and the Herodian street below it. Warren continued digging in Jerusalem until 1870. His detailed drawings of the Temple Mount walls were fully published by the PEF in

1884 as part of a large portfolio entitled *Plans, Elevations, Sections, etc., Shewing the Results of the Excavations at Jerusalem, 1867–70* and an account of his labours was published the same year in the Jerusalem volume of the *Survey of Western Palestine*. His co-author of the latter, Captain Claude Conder, who was responsible for conducting most of the *Survey of Western Palestine* from the Litani River in the north to Wadi Beer-Sheva in the south at the behest of the PEF between 1872 and 1875, discovered a fragment of the enclosure wall of the Herodian Temple surviving on the western side above the level of the present esplanade, comprising an intact fragment of a pilaster course. All-too-brief biographical sketches of these and other key figures make up the second chapter of Mazar's publication and it is a pity that she does not, at the very least, refer to the fuller biographies of these colourful personalities in her bibliography for readers to follow up. It was only a century later, in the wake of the Six-Day War, that significant new exploratory work could be undertaken around the walls of the Temple Mount. This task was taken up by the grandfather of Eilat, Professor Benjamin Mazar, who focused his archaeological endeavours in the vicinity of the south western corner of the Temple Mount from 1968 to 1978. As part of these labours large quantities of fill were removed during which masonry that had been dislodged from the walls in earlier times was recovered and recorded, as was freshly revealed detail on the actual walls. Concurrently, elevation drawings were made of the sections of exposed wall abutting those excavations. Eilat Mazar, who is working on the final publication of her grandfather's archaeological findings, was clearly inspired by his work at this site and decided to take it further by documenting the visible construction in all four walls of the Temple Mount.

In this project the walls were recorded by modern techniques which are described in Chapter 1, devoted to the methodology that was employed. As Mazar points out (p. 21), the use of digital photography and image processing was indispensable and facilitated the removal of distortions produced by camera lenses and geometrical perspective, cross-checked against numerous on-the-spot measurements, to produce faithful panoramic elevations of long stretches of wall (a process known as orthophotography). In parallel, architectural drawings were made of all accessible areas based on the photographs and measurements. This operation clearly represented an enormous task: the complete circuit of walls measures no less than 1,550 m, of which roughly two-thirds was accessible to the team above ground, and the elevations studied varied from between about 10 to 30 m in height. To make matters worse, there were serious logistic issues and other problems that needed to be addressed, as pointed out by Mazar. Therefore, the successful completion of this project represents a sterling achievement.

The main body of the monograph, Chapters 3 to 6 (pp. 37–253), deals with each of the four walls in turn. The author summarises the findings of her predecessors, from

the 19th century onwards, for each portion of the wall and associated features and reproduces illustrations from their publications that she considers relevant to her own findings. She complements that information with her wealth of fresh observations and illustrations, occasionally photographs of details which were previously only available in drawings by earlier investigators. This makes for a lively and insightful account even if one does not accept some of her judgements. Virtually every facet is covered, including inscriptions in various languages and from different periods, carved into the masonry (or painted on it, in at least one case).

Chapter 7 (by Mazar, Shalev and Reuven) provides an exposition of the chronological mapping, mentioned above, which is essentially based on masonry styles and dressing techniques. There are no startling revelations here; but quite appropriately a caution is voiced about the masonry that is widely dated to the Umayyad period with the suggestion that some of it might be Byzantine. This reminds us that the dating of some segments of the masonry should be regarded as tentative. The general consensus is that all the masonry in the walls postdates the First Temple period and that verdict is essentially accepted by these authors; the earliest segment in their view is to be found on either side of the Golden Gate in the eastern wall. This they categorise as ‘The First Temple period to Pre-Herodian’, showing willingness to lend an ear to Leen Ritmeyer’s view that it dates to the Persian period (annoyingly, his name is misspelt throughout the monograph). Following mainstream scholarly opinion, the ashlar courses arranged alternatively in headers and stretchers north of the seam in the eastern wall near the southeast corner is classed as ‘Hellenistic/Hasmonaean’, as argued by Yoram Tsafrir nearly 40 years ago (five years earlier than implied by the reference cited in this monograph; see Tsafrir 1975). In total, 22 phases of masonry construction are identified, although allowance is made for the possibility that some of these may overlap in their chronology.

The very brief Chapter 8 (‘The Origins of the Herodian Drafting Style of the Temple Mount Wall’) and Chapter 9 (‘A Comparison of the Temple Mount Compound with Other Sacred Precincts from the Classical Period’), both by Reuven, are somewhat superficial and might have been better omitted altogether. On the subject of the Herodian drafting style and its origins, the authors show ignorance of two major studies published in *Levant*, Jacobson 2000 and Kropp and Lohmann 2011. With regard to the placing of Herod’s Temple complex in the context of classical temple schemes, it is surprising that the authors did not consult the treatment of this subject in Jacobson 2007. Reuven is clearly better versed with the material close at hand and his last two short chapters, Chapter 10 (‘The Pilasters in the Temple Mount Walls’ – written with Shalev) and Chapter 11 (‘Angular Cutting in the Early Islamic Gates of the Temple Mount Compound’) contain important new information. There is a slight howler in the caption of

Fig. 10.25: for ‘medallion cornice’, read ‘modillion cornice’. Fortunately, this is rendered correctly in the body of the text (p. 301).

If I have one disappointment with this monograph, it is that the value of the foldout elevations is compromised somewhat by the small scale of their reproduction. With the authors having gone to so much trouble to achieve accurate drawings and photographs of the walls, it is a pity that the user of these foldouts is unable to clearly resolve and study the courses of the masonry, let alone individual ashlar, in the published resolution of 1:400. Thus, for example, a course height of 1 m is reduced to a mere 2.5 mm in the printed versions! Since the photographic and drawn mapping of the walls was achieved using digital technology, it would have been an easy matter to have bundled in a CD-ROM (or Blu-ray disk) containing the wall elevations, capable of convenient magnification for study purposes, without loss of resolution; the high price of this publication certainly warranted it and could have absorbed the small extra cost involved. This caveat aside, there is no denying that Eilat Mazar’s publication is a substantial addition to the literature of the Temple Mount and will, no doubt, serve as an important sourcebook for future study.

Jacobson, D. M., (2000). ‘Decorated Drafted-Margin Masonry in Jerusalem and Hebron and Its Relations’, *Levant* 32: 135–54.

Jacobson, D. M., (2007). ‘The Jerusalem Temple of Herod the Great.’ Pp. 145–76 in N. Kokkinos (ed.), *The World of the Herods* (Stuttgart).

Kropp, A. J. M., and Lohmann, D., (2011). ‘Master, Look at the Size of Those Stones! Look at the Size of Those Buildings! Analogies in Construction Techniques Between the Temples at Heliopolis (Baalbek) and Jerusalem, *Levant* 43: 38–50.

Tsafir, Y., (1975). ‘The Location of the Seleucid Akra in Jerusalem,’ *RB* 82: 501–21.

David M. Jacobson
University College, London

Jack Green, Emily Teeter, and John A. Larson (eds.), *Picturing the Past: Imaging and Imagining the Ancient Middle East*. Oriental Institute Museum Publications 34. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 2012. Pp. 184 incl. 168 illustrations. \$29.95. ISBN 978–1–885923–89–9.

Created to accompany the special exhibition *Picturing the Past: Imaging and Imagining the Ancient Middle East*, on view from February 7 through September 2, 2012 at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, this volume explores various types of visual documentation and interpretation carried out since the mid-19th century for archaeological sites, buildings, and artifacts. The

book is structured as a series of essays followed by a catalogue of exhibition objects organized by theme.

The catalogue is introduced by items from the dawn of modern epigraphy at the Oriental Institute (including several objects related to the early work of James Henry Breasted). Next, a section on “The Epigraphic Process” uses a scene from Karnak to elucidate the classic “Chicago Method” (created by Breasted and brought into the digital age under W. Raymond Johnson). The accompanying entries, by Emily Teeter, Johnson, and John Larson, illuminate the process and underscore its trademark attention to detail. More information is provided by Teeter (“The Oriental Institute and Early Documentation in the Nile Valley”) and Johnson (“The Epigraphic Survey and the ‘Chicago Method’”). Relevant here is also the introductory essay by Jack Green, who notes Breasted’s focus on comprehensive and accurate records rather than a more artistic approach that might have had a broader appeal but would have blurred the lines between what was clearly observed and what was inferred.

Several Facsimiles from Egyptian tombs and temples by luminaries such as Nina de Garis Davies, Amice Calverley and Myrtle Broome, and Prentice Duell illustrate their differing techniques and styles. Supplementing these and highlighting the crucial importance of facsimiles in bringing ancient Egypt to the fascinated attention of the general public are “The Sakkarah Expedition,” by Ann Macy Roth, and “Facsimiles of Ancient Egyptian Paintings,” by Nigel Strudwick.

Architectural Renderings and Reconstructions of sites, buildings, and scenes provide glimpses into the willingness of 19th and early 20th century artist-scholars, such as David Roberts and Joseph Lindon Smith (also discussed in an essay by Dennis O’Connor) to venture into the realm of imagination, taking what was and superimposing on it their best guess as to what might have been, and provoke discussion of the pros and cons of these methods. Teeter notes: “Reconstructions that are based on good evidence...are a very effective means of presenting the past. However, such images may have a seductive quality that has the potential to impact the objectivity of archaeologists and architectural historians...” On the other hand, Charles B. Altman’s version of a New-Assyrian wall scene in which the recovered fragments are not distinguished from the reconstructed parts prompts Green to wonder: “...if Altman had been more cautious in his restoration would this painting be as well known today?” Current trends in site reconstruction are elucidated by Jean-Claude Golvin with an aerial reconstruction of Medinet Habu and an essay, “Drawing Reconstruction Images of Ancient Sites.”

“Reconstructing the Past from Fragments” furnishes examples of other types of pictorial reconstruction, including 3D computer images of architecture from Choga Mish by Farzi Rezeian and Abbas Alizadeh, accompanied by specific information on the archaeological evidence used in their creation.

The use of photography both to document and popularize archaeology is illustrated by entries ranging from a turn-of-the-century stereoscope to a declassified image from a spy satellite. Essays on this powerful tool include “Photography and Documentation of the Middle East,” by Teeter; “The Oriental Institute Photographic Archives,” by John A. Larson; and “Aerial Photographs and Satellite Images,” by Scott Branting, et al. The discussions of three-dimensional “Models and Copies” note their usefulness but also underscores the care that must be taken to distinguish between a cast made from a mold of an original work and a model, which can be an excellent way of communicating the original appearance of an object or structure, but is more subjective and open to error. The final exhibition topic, the “Future of Documentation,” explores the role of new technologies in our quest to picture the past. Related here are Joshua Harker’s “Three-Dimensional Digital Forensic Facial Reconstruction,” which discusses the techniques used for the mummy of Meresamun at the Oriental Institute; and “A Brief History of Virtual Heritage,” by Donald H. Sanders.

The organization of the book results in some duplication of information, and several of the essays could have benefitted from additional copy editing. Expansion of certain topics, such as the potential challenges and drawbacks of the various techniques discussed, the need to balance broad popular appeal with accuracy, and how best to integrate “hard” data with artistic expertise and imagination would have been welcome. However, “Picturing the Past” provides an excellent overview of the history and methods of archaeological illustration and reconstruction, and emphasizes its essential goals of preserving information through documentation, providing increased access to information to scholars, and both engaging and educating the general public.

Janice Kamrin

The Metropolitan Museum of Art

Chad S. Spigel, *Ancient Synagogue Seating Capacities. Methodology, Analysis and Limits*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 149. Tübingen: Möhr Siebeck. 2012. Pp. 406. €129.00. ISBN 978-3-16-151879-9.

This volume is a revised and expanded version of the author’s doctoral dissertation submitted to Duke University in 2008. While the monograph is rather focused and specific, the topic itself relates to a number of intriguing issues regarding synagogue and communal life generally, to which Spigel relates in his concluding chapter.

Chapter 1 provides an overall introduction touching on a number of subjects: recent scholarship on synagogue seating capacities, the goals of this particular study, recent studies on ancient synagogues, and a discussion of ancient demography. Chapter 2 addresses synagogue worship and furnishings, especially those connected to the question of seating. Chapter 3 details the coefficients relating to seating calculations, e.g., how much space should be assigned per person when sitting on a bench, sitting on floor mats, or standing. Chapters 4–6 form the core of the book and focus on specific case studies. Special attention is given to the Second Temple Gamla synagogue (Chapter 4) and to the cluster of four synagogues from the Late Roman Meiron region (referred to as Tetracomia)—Nabratein, Khirbet Shema', Meiron and Gush Halav (Chapter 5). A catalogue of the seating capacities of 57 ancient Palestinian synagogues extending over some 200 pages then follows (Chapter 6). Chapter 7, entitled “Conclusions,” summarizes the findings from additional perspectives and also discusses several ramifications of the previous presentation and analysis. A bibliography as well as three indices (of sources, authors, and subjects) is appended at the end of the volume.

Spigel adopts a cautious approach in his analysis, emphasizing time and again that seating arrangements in various synagogues might differ markedly, even among contemporaneous buildings in the same region. In analyzing seating space, the author addresses each site individually, taking into consideration a variety of possible seating patterns—fixed stone benches, the addition of portable benches, sitting on floor mats, or the use of balconies and other elevated areas (as at Khirbet Shema'); standing is regularly added as a further option. The author addresses the very basic question as to how much space an individual (man or woman) living in Late Antique Palestine would occupy, but a more or less concrete conclusion is never fully or satisfactorily reached (Spigel, pp. 52–57). Spigel suggests a series of possible scenarios for each of the synagogues he discusses. Beginning with the rule-of-thumb capacity (i.e., an oft-invoked coefficient reflecting how many people could be seated in a given space), he then proceeds with the following agenda: (1) what was the seating capacity of the permanent benches at a particular site? (2) what would have been the capacity of the main hall if the floor were used either for seating, standing, or both? and (3) what was the seating capacity under special circumstances, e.g., if the nave had a highly ornate mosaic floor, if the liturgy was conducted in the center of the nave rather than on a *bima* located against the wall, or if a balcony was to be included in the seating estimate? Based on all these variables, the estimates for the seating capacity in a given building might vary considerably (e.g., Gamla – 407, 444–454, or 509–536; Nabratein – 83–87, 99–103, or 90–107; Khirbet Shema – 199–227, 181–211, or 202–230; Gush Halav – 168–205, 154–188, or 143–173). In the case of Gush Halav, the question arises as to whether a balcony (or mezzanine) existed along with stairs leading to it and, if

so, how that would affect seating capacity; the balcony, of course, would add seats whereas stairs would reduce space. According to Spigel, the numbers would then be 170–226, 158–209, and 157–204. Moreover, seating capacity might change significantly depending on radically different theories regarding the suggested reconstruction of a given building. With regard to Ma‘on (Nirim), estimates differ as to the number of worshippers that could have been accommodated—between 100–130 (Hiram) and 340–390 (Dunayevsky); (*cf.* Spigel, p. 342).

A second issue, the relationship between a synagogue’s seating capacity and the population of an entire village or town (assuming it was largely Jewish), is likewise problematic. The geographic limits of such small settlements is usually unknown (was Meiron 105 or 300 dunams? – Spigel, p. 118), as was its population density. Regarding the latter, Spigel chooses a minimalist figure of 10–15 persons per dunam as a coefficient (e.g., pp. 112, 118, 129). Thus, the range of possibilities for each determination is large, and certitude elusive, as the author himself fully admits. To his credit, Spigel has worked hard at calculating the various options and has put figures on the table for future students and scholars to consider. Moreover, he has been forthright in admitting the uncertainties as well as in explaining why he chose a certain option.

Several additional aspects of this study deserve comment. Spigel admits on several occasions that his estimates regarding synagogue seating capacity are maximal, i.e., they reflect how many people could fit into a synagogue’s space when fully packed. He readily concedes that this was often not the case, rendering it hard to surmise what percentage of the total population might have been accommodated in the synagogue hall (p. 132). Very often the author concludes that only a minority of the local population filled the hall—indeed a fascinating and rather surprising conclusion in and of itself.

On occasion, Spigel takes note of the question of separate seating for women in the synagogue, a subject he has also addressed in a recent article (2012). Therein he concluded that this practice differed from site to site; in this book, the topic is invoked *en passant*, mostly to justify further seating options. For example, if the women of Meiron were relegated to a gallery, then the adult male population might have been able to fit into the main synagogue hall. While this marginality of women cannot be proven, such speculation, as the author often says, “forces us to consider the possibility” (pp. 112–13). This same line of reasoning may also hold true for Khirbet Shema’ (p. 131), where, if the author is correct, only some 30 women could have been accommodated as against 230 males in the main hall.

In addition to issues involving calculation of synagogue seating capacity and how this relates to the larger communal picture, several other questions should be raised. Besides the extensive catalogue, which is perforce brief and limited, in-depth discussions are devoted to the five above-noted synagogues,

Gamla and four from the Upper Galilee. It is never explained why this particular selection was made, nor is it clear why the author did not include synagogues from other parts of the country, such as the fourth–fifth-century Susiya synagogue, the well-preserved and famous fifth-century synagogue at Capernaum, the fifth-century Sepphoris synagogue, or sixth-century Bet Alpha synagogue? Why were only four synagogues from the same region given extensive treatment? Two would have sufficed to demonstrate diversity even in a situation of geographical and chronological propinquity. It certainly would have been valuable to include at least one building with a mosaic floor, wherein seating capacities would have been markedly different, given the presumed need to leave the decorated mosaic floor exposed.

Some issues of a historical or archaeological nature were omitted to the detriment of the analysis. For example, the discussion of Nabratein I should have taken into account Jodi Magness's forceful critique, in which she suggests that such a stage never existed (2010), while the discussion of the Bet She'arim synagogue assumed the destructive fall-out of the so-called Gallus revolt, an interpretation that has been rejected by most historians and archaeologists of late.

The volume concludes with a brief chapter that raises many of the above-noted issues: how to determine seating patterns from the range of options, what to do with differing assessments in reconstructing a building or dating it, and how to assess the broader demographic picture. Spigel takes note of the differences in synagogue settings resulting not only from various seating patterns, but from different internal furnishings and the use of mosaic floors as well. On a broader social level, Spigel tried to assess the percentage of Jews who probably attended the synagogue and why so many did not. What may have prevented or dissuaded them from doing so? Was there a difference between rural and urban synagogues in this regard? The author also relates to outlying areas of towns and villages and the degree to which people living there took advantage of a nearby synagogue. Assuming house synagogues were probably not that common, what role, if any, did they play in the overall worship setting of the contemporary Jewish community?

In all, this well-written and systematically organized volume contributes significantly to the ongoing discussion of the ancient synagogue, owing to its specific agenda of seating capacity but no less to the important issues that were raised as an outcome of Spigel's investigation. For this the author deserves our gratitude.

J. Magness, "The Ancient Synagogue at Nabratein," *BASOR* 358 [2010], 61–68

S. Spigel, "Reconsidering the Question of Separate Seating in Ancient Synagogues," *JJS* 53 (2012), 62–83.

Lee I. Levine
The Hebrew University, Jerusalem

Mordechai Cogan (ed.), *Hayim Tadmor: "With My Many Chariots I have Gone Up the Heights of Mountains:" Historical and Literary Studies on Ancient Mesopotamia and Israel.* Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2011. Pp. 972. \$120. ISBN 978-965-221-083.

Hayim Tadmor (1923–2005) was one of the best known and most important historians of the ancient Near East of the last half century, and the present volume makes clear why. Carefully and lovingly edited by his former student and colleague, Mordechai Cogan, it is an imposing collection of 971 pages gathering 45 of Tadmor's published essays, several of which contain small revisions, by Tadmor or Cogan, of their original publication and several are translated here into English from their original Hebrew for the first time. The volume builds on an earlier collection of Tadmor's previously published essays, also edited by Cogan, which was in Hebrew (*Assyria, Babylonia and Judah. Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East* [Mosad Bialik and the Israel Exploration Society, 2006]). But the present volume is more than double the size of the Hebrew collection, representing arguably the bulk of the major essays that Tadmor published in his career. Tadmor published in his career. Since Tadmor was pre-eminently an essayist - the two major exceptions being his Anchor Bible commentary, with Mordechai Cogan, on the book of II Kings (1988) and his magisterial edition of *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III, King of Assyria* (1994 reprinted with corrections and additions 2008, See the new edition, in 2011, edited posthumously by another former student, Shigeo Yamada, *The Royal Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III [744-727 BC] and Shalmaneser III [726-722 BC]*) - it is this new volume that offers the best picture of the kind of history Tadmor wrote and the contributions he made with it.

The essays in the volume at hand focus on the two primary areas of Tadmor's scholarship: his first priority, Mesopotamia, especially of the first millennium BC and the Neo-Assyrian empire in that millennium, and a second priority on ancient Israel - these two areas were studied by Tadmor separately, but especially in connection with each other. Editor Cogan has divided the essays into seven parts. First is Historiography and Royal Ideology in Assyria. Its six essays offer a broad picture of how the Neo-Assyrian ruling elites saw the world around and above them and Assyria's governance of that world (Nos. 1,6). Tadmor paid attention to the territorial expansion of the Assyrian state in the Middle and Neo-Assyrian periods and the changes in world view that accompanied this (No. 6), the nature of Assyrian royal governance (No. 4,6), and the articulation and promulgation of this complex of ideas - this ideology - in the official written documents, viz., the so-called royal inscriptions (Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5).

The second part, *Society and Institutions in Ancient Mesopotamia*, gathers five papers on administrative, social, and cultural phenomena pre-eminently in first millennium Assyria and Babylonia: temple and royal cities and their structures, functions, and inter-relationships (No. 7); the question of whether and how kings and their courts could be held accountable, even criticized, for their actions (No. 8); the role of eunuchs in the governance of the Neo-Assyrian empire (No. 9); the influence of the West, particularly the Aramaeans, on this empire in culture, administration, and politics (No. 10); and a wide-ranging essay on the traditions of treaty and oath across the ancient Near East in the second and first millennia BC (No. 11).

This last article has a particular interest in the ancient Near Eastern background of treaty- and oath-making in biblical usage. Tadmor was an early proponent of this background, especially the first millennium connection with Assyria, and since then studies have multiplied almost exponentially, along with new evidence, especially the recent discovery at Tell Tayinat in southeastern Turkey of a western version of the Esarhaddon succession treaty, hitherto known only for the eastern vassals of Iran (Jacob Lauinger, “Esarhaddon’s Succession Treaty at Tell Tayinat: Text and Commentary,” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 64 (2012), 87–123). In this treaty and oath essay Tadmor offers an illuminating perspective on the use of the term *ade* - “loyalty oath” in his translation - in Neo-Assyrian praxis for the treaties between the Assyrian emperor and his vassal states (pp. 224–236). Emerging, as Tadmor argues, in Assyrian rule in the eighth century, the *ade* is, for Tadmor, to be contrasted with another relationship between emperor and subjects called *ardutu* “servitude”, which pre-dated the *ade* but continued alongside it. For Tadmor, a key difference between the two was the emphasis in the *ade* on an oath of loyalty to the emperor, but as Tadmor describes the two terminologies and what he takes as their different conceptual ranges, it seems difficult to distinguish them in many instances. Much rests, as Tadmor recognizes, on what is explicit and what may be implicit: does an absence of mention of “loyalty” or an oath of loyalty in the *ardutu* mean, in fact, that none was given? Or if none was, in fact, given, what did that mean, particularly in view of the fact that any relationship to Assyria must have involved loyalty? The matter becomes important for Tadmor in regard to the relationship between Neo-Assyria - also its successor, Neo-Babylonia - and their subject states of Israel and Judah: were the latter bound to Assyria and Babylonia by *ade* or simply by *ardutu*? As Tadmor points out, an oath of loyalty is explicitly mentioned only for Zedekiah of Judah with the Babylonian emperor Nebuchadnezzar II.

Part III offers fourteen studies of specific Akkadian texts. Three of them edit - one of the essays with Tadmor’s teacher, Benno Landsberger - important tablets from Hazor in second millennium BC Palestine, which exhibit characteristic Mesopotamian traditions in liver divination, lawsuit, and

scholastic lexicography (Nos. 21, 22, 23). The other essays focus on Assyrian and Babylonian historical texts of the first millennium including such fundamental studies as those on the inscriptions of the military campaigns of Sargon II (No. 12); on the compositional history of the inscriptional narrative relating to Ashurbanipal and the Lydian king, Gyges (written with Mordechai Cogan) (No. 17); and on the order and interpretation of the inscriptions of the last Babylonian king, Nabonidus (No. 19).

These textual studies in Part III are complemented by essays in Part V, Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East, which treat particular historical periods and episodes. Three are on periods from the second and first millennia BC: the age of Hammurabi, the end of the Late Bronze Age empires and “the club of powers” - Tadmor’s felicitous, and widely adopted, phrase - that they formed, and that of the Philistines under the Neo-Assyrian empire (Nos. 28,29,30). A second group of three are on episodes of the first millennium: Sennacherib’s campaign against Judah, the text and historical circumstances concerning the sin of Sargon II and its repercussions under his successors, and the complicated events behind the accession of Darius I as Achaemenid king (Nos. 31,32,33, the last with E.J. Bickerman).

Between Parts III, on texts, and Part V, on periods and episodes, is Part IV, which presents two comprehensive essays, distinguished by their bibliographical range and analytical detail, on the backbone of any historical reconstruction, chronology. In complementary fashion, they cover, first, the chronology of the ancient Near East as a whole in the second millennium BC (No. 26), and second, the chronology of ancient Israel and Judah of the first millennium BC (No. 27). The two essays grow out of Tadmor’s doctoral dissertation at the Hebrew University, *Problems in the Chronology of the Ancient Near East in the Biblical Period* (1955, in Hebrew), and several subsequent essays.

Part VI turns to ancient Israel and Judah themselves, and its nine essays discuss problems of political, social, and cultural history, with emphasis on where Israel and Judah intersect with first millennium Assyria, Babylonia, and Achaemenid Persia. The subjects include the historical background of two biblical prophets, Hosea and Haggai (Nos. 35,40), the historical context of Cyrus’s declaration of release from Babylonian exile (No. 39), the ways in which Judaeans of the Exilic and Post-Exilic periods viewed Israel’s origins (No. 41), the relations of Ahaz of Judah with Tiglath-pileser III as depicted in the biblical II Kings (written again with Mordechai Cogan) (No. 37), popular groups vis-a-vis the monarchy in Israel and Judah until the Babylonian Exile (No. 34), the history of Samaria from its ninth century beginnings through the Achaemenid Persian period (No. 38), the apparently Arabian community of the Meunites from the biblical Chronicles and a hitherto unexplored inscription of

Tiglath-pileser III (No. 36), and the concept of longevity and the terms for it in Akkadian and Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew (No. 42).

Part VII, the final section of the volume, has Tadmor reflecting, in three essays, on the profession of Assyriology, especially in its relationship with biblical studies, in its nineteenth century origins and its subsequent history (Nos. 43–44), and in the development of a program and then department of Assyriology at Tadmor's home institution of the Hebrew University (No. 45). Here can be found illuminating observations on George Smith, that passionate British genius of early Assyriology, and his views on how chronology was treated by the biblical authors and those responsible for the Assyrian royal inscriptions. Equally arresting is Tadmor's use of the Hebrew University archives to reconstruct the long and often difficult effort to establish Assyriology at the university, confronted as it was by an inability to attract several foreign scholars of eminence to join its permanent staff.

The preceding summary of this volume has had necessarily to be brief and selective. Yet we cannot conclude without a few general comments on the themes and approaches evident in the book. The first is the number of essays that are co-authored: so with Mordechai Cogan (Nos. 17,37), Elnathan Weissert (No. 15), Israel Eph'al (No. 16), Benno Landsberger and Simo Parpola (No. 32), Benno Landsberger and Yigael Yadin (No. 21), William W. Hallo (No. 22), E.J. Bickerman (No. 33), Miriam Tadmor (No. 25), and the present reviewer (No. 20). This association underscores the fact that Tadmor was not only a consummate scholar; he was an exceptionally lively and challenging colleague and teacher, whose students came to Jerusalem from around the world, and who encouraged collaboration with students, colleagues, and teachers in all his work.

A second point about the essays in this volume: they are the work of an historian: one, to be sure, who is perfectly competent in philological, literary, religious, and archaeological matters, but for whom these other fields are in the service of writing history. Or as Tadmor himself expressed it: "I must stress, however, that I am a historian: my tools are philological, and my *modus operandi*, diachronic." (p. 138).

In this regard, it is important to note that Tadmor did not begin his education in ancient Near Eastern philology nor biblical studies but in general history at the Hebrew University, particularly under Richard Koebner, known for his work on comparative nationalism and imperialism. Tadmor then moved into the history of the Second Temple period, under the challenging direction of Gedalyahu Alon, whose lectures Tadmor (under his original family name, Frumstein) helped to collect and edit for publication after Alon's untimely death. Already before Alon's death, however, Tadmor had decided that his strengths and finally interests lay in another direction, namely, the ancient Near East, largely before Hellenism. He was drawn there in particular by another magnetic teacher, Binyamin Mazar (originally Maisler), who emphasized the historical challenges of integrating the

study of ancient Israel within this broader ancient Near Eastern realm. It was also Mazar, I believe, who encouraged Tadmor to focus on Mesopotamia and cuneiform civilization as his specific anchor point in ancient Near Eastern history, as Mazar himself had done in his training in Germany in Berlin and Giessen. And Mazar had a hand as well in pointing Tadmor's path to advanced work in Assyriology at the London School of Oriental and African Studies, under Sidney Smith, and then at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago under its several cuneiform masters, foremost of whom was Benno Landsberger.

Historical studies for Tadmor, as the present volume demonstrates, are primarily those of politics and what might be called political culture and administration - thus, the nature, development, and function of polities. Although problems, say, in economic and social history do emerge in Tadmor's work (e.g., No. 34 on popular groups versus the monarchy in Israel and Judah), these are largely treated under the rubric of politics. We can go further and note that Tadmor's emphasis is on the political history and culture of the elites: how they operated in war and peace, and their *Weltanschauungen*. Tadmor, though well-read in the historiography of other cultures besides those of the ancient Near East (see in Part I), does not make as much explicit use of these studies and theoretical statements and models from the social sciences more generally as, for example, another great historian of the ancient Near East, Mario Liverani.

And since the most obvious and arguably basic evidence for this political culture of the elites was the official texts, the royal inscriptions, it is these that captured a significant part of Tadmor's research and writing. The point is repeatedly demonstrated that the line between the inscriptions as historical testimonies and as literary compositions, with their ideological visions often in epic-like formulations, is a very narrow one; indeed, the two cannot really be separated and must be examined as an interwoven complex. Tadmor works out this interconnection in such broader studies as Nos. 2 ("History and Ideology in the Assyrian Royal Inscriptions") and 3 ("Observations on Assyrian Historiography"), which have become standard treatments of the rhetorical features of the Assyrian inscriptions - e.g., the tendency to assign the major achievements of the Assyrian king to his first year, and the various terms for "reign" and "accession year" - and of the origins of one characteristic form of these inscriptions, the annals, in traditions that can be traced back to the Assyrian rulers of the second millennium BC, beginning with Shamshi-Adad I. There is also the important study of "Autobiographical Apology in the Royal Assyrian Literature" (No. 5), which remains the basic analysis of those Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions that offer a public justification for a king who acceded to the throne in an unexpected, if not irregular fashion. And one should not forget the examination of "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study" (No. 12), which, first

published in 1958 as the fruit of Tadmor's work with Benno Landsberger, has not lost any of its importance despite an abundance of later publication, particularly on Sargon's campaign against Samaria.

It should be plain that this volume of Hayim Tadmor's essays contains an embarrassment of riches - a well of wisdom on the history of the ancient Near East and its documentary sources that future scholarship cannot ignore.

Peter Machinist
Harvard University

Cynthia Shafer-Elliott, *Food in Ancient Judah: Domestic Cooking in the Time of the Hebrew Bible*. Bible World Series. Sheffield: Equinox, 2013. Pp. xiv + 239. £60.00. ISBN-13 978010908049-73-5; ISBN-10 1908049731.

The book's title, suggesting a comprehensive study of cooking in Iron Age Judah, belies its more narrow focus—it addresses the question of how cooked foods are prepared in two kinds of settlements: fortified urban sites and rural farmsteads of the Iron IIB–C periods. This aspect of daily life toward the end of the Judean monarchy is examined by analyzing household cooking vessels and installations; biblical texts, other ancient Near Eastern materials, and ethnographic reports are also considered.

Following an introduction, the first chapter reviews the resources used in this project, the two major ones being archaeological reports and “Jack Goody's food-preparation paradigms” (p. 22). As background to the two kinds of settlements being considered, the second chapter provides information about settlement types. The heart of the book is the long third chapter, which examines the pottery, other artefacts, and cooking installations found in domestic structures at four Judean sites: two dwellings each at two walled settlements (Tel Lachish and Tel Halif), and one dwelling each at two farmsteads (Khirbet er-Ras and Pisgat Zeev). Iconographic and literary sources from the ancient Near East—although of limited value because they reveal mainly elite meals—and ethnography related to cooking technologies are discussed in the fourth chapter. The fifth chapter considers what, why, how, for whom, and by whom food is prepared in four biblical passages (Gen. 18:1–8; Gen. 25:29–34; Judg. 6:19–21; 4 Sam. 13:5–10). Using the archaeological data presented in chapter 3, supplemented by biblical and other sources, the sixth chapter presents Shafer-Elliott's conclusions, including: food in the smaller dwellings of the two urban sites was prepared in larger vessels than food in the larger farmstead dwellings; clay ovens were probably the main installation for

cooking soups and stews as well as baking bread; food prepared in larger vessels likely included more meat than food prepared in smaller ones.

This book contains much material that, to this reviewer, seems extraneous. For example, detailed lists of the contents of every room of the dwellings are provided and analyzed, but only the cooking vessels and installations involve cooking techniques. Similarly, the author's extensive comments about household space seem irrelevant to the focus on food preparation, especially because most rooms were probably multi-use spaces used for different purposes depending on the season and time of day. Also, the apparent engagement with the "Goody paradigm," four phases of food production, seems unnecessary. Jack Goody's *Cooking, Cuisine and Class: A Study in Comparative Sociology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982) examines these phases—which he insists must be considered together—in order to understand why *haute cuisine* develops in some cultures but not others. But Shafer-Elliott has different goals and is looking at only one (food preparation) of Goody's four phases. Appealing to Goody's paradigm has guided her inquiry into the various aspects of food preparation, but it is of questionable interpretative value for her enterprise.

More serious are methodological problems in the author's use of archaeological materials. For one thing, her conclusions about the presence of food-preparation vessels in a room do not properly consider the fact that many of the reported types are vessel fragments, not whole pots, and thus are probably not indicative of the presence of a complete vessel of its type. Also, the volume of the vessels is not calculated; that would be necessary given that open and closed forms are much closer to each other in capacity by the end of the Iron II period than earlier. Another problem is that conjectures about what cooking installations were used do not take into account certain features (thickness and ware) of cooking vessels that relate to cooking techniques. Perhaps most serious is the small sample size of cooking vessels recovered from the incompletely excavated or poorly preserved rooms at the two farmsteads, in contrast to the rather complete repertoires recovered from the suddenly destroyed dwellings at Lachish and Halif; the conclusion that rural households used smaller cooking vessels is thus tenuous at best.

Unfortunately, the book also suffers from the lack of copy-editing. Grammatical mistakes, incorrect punctuation, flawed syntax, redundancies, curious lexical choices, and imprecise language too often interfere with the reader's ability to follow the discussion.

Despite these difficulties, the author is to be commended for analyzing cooking techniques in relation to the repertoire of ceramic cooking vessels and installations of late Iron II Judah. Distinguishing between the open and closed forms of cooking vessels is indeed important for determining the kinds of foods prepared. Her work

suggests promising avenues of research that can be pursued in relation to the corpus of data emerging from the growing attention to households in the archaeology of Syria-Palestine.

Carol Meyers
Duke University

Jens Kamlah (ed.), with the assistance of Henrike Michelau, *Temple Building and Temple Cult Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.-1. Mill. B.C.E.) Proceedings of a Conference on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Institute of Biblical Archaeology at the University of Tübingen (28th-30th of May 2010)*. Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 41. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012. Pp. xxiv + 586, incl. 73 plates. €68 / \$102 / £60. ISBN 978-3-447-06784-3.

Most of these articles were first presented as papers at a conference to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Institute of Biblical Archaeology at the University of Tübingen in 2010. Those asked to present at the conference or just to contribute articles for the volume include some of the major excavators currently working in the Levantine region. The initiator of the conference and the editor of this volume, Jens Kamlah, has written thoughtful articles on Iron Age temples in Israel and the Phoenician region including the lost Temple of Solomon. This background certainly permitted him to bring together a group of presenters who represent the most current thinking on the development and use of temples in the Levant from the Middle Bronze Age to the period of the Second Temple in Jerusalem.

Though the title states that these are the proceedings of the conference, in reality they are not. The arrangement of the book does not follow the format of the conference. The contributions by S. Mazzoni (Temples at Tell 'Āfiš in Iron Age I-III), F. Sakal (Der spätbronzezeitliche Tempelkomplex von Emar im Lichte der neuen Ausgrabungen), Chang-Ho (The Early Iron Age Temple at Ḥirbet 'Aṭārūs and Its Architecture and Selected Cultic Objects), E. Blum (Der Tempelbaubericht in 1 Könige 6,1-22. Exegetische und historische Überlegungen), and E. van den Brink, O. Segal, and U. Ad (A Late Bronze Age II Repository of Cultic Paraphernalia from the Environs of Tēl Qašīš in the Jezreel Valley) were not originally included in the conference, and Kamlah's own addition to the volume (Temples of the Levant – Comparative Aspects) is different from his conference presentation (Die Tempel der Levante und der Tempel von Jerusalem). Novák's presentation was delivered in German but appears here in an English version. Though the conference included discussions for each section, these are not part of the published proceedings.

Temples, along with palaces and gates, were among the most impressive manifestations of architectural investment made by Levantine communities of the Middle and Late Bronze Ages and the Early Iron Age. Though several categories of temple types can be distinguished in the archaeological record for this 1000 year span, the articles here consider only the temples which formed part of an urban matrix, city temples. Ten of the contributions are about structures and physical remains. These articles divide into those by the site and written by the excavators themselves and those best classified as new analyses by scholars not engaged in the initial excavations. The contributions by T. Harrison (West Syrian *megaron* or Neo-Assyrian *Langraum*? The Shifting Form and Function of the Tell Ta'yīnāt [Kunulua] Temples), S. Mazzon, S. Bourke (The Six Canaanite Temples of *Ṭabaqāt Faḥil*. Excavating Pella's 'Fortress' Temple [1994–2009]), and Chang-Ho Ji provide the first detailed published analyses of these temple remains which have been found over the last fifteen years. As such, these are significant studies since they now allow for these temples to be really incorporated into the larger corpus of temple remains that has been formed over more than a century of excavations in the Levant. K. Kohlmeyer (Der Temple des Wettergottes von Aleppo. Baugeschichte und Bautyp räumliche Bezüge, Inventar und bildliche Ausstattung) has already provided several studies of the Weather god's temple from the citadel at Aleppo which he excavated, but this article is the most complete consideration of the changing architectural forms of the temple. S. Gitin (Temple Complex 650 at Ekron. The Impact of Multi-Cultural Influences on Philistine Cult in the Late Iron Age) and P. M. M. Daviau (Diversity in the Cultic Setting. Temples and Shrines in Central Jordan and the Negev) provide thoughtful reconsiderations of the structures already well published from sites that they have excavated as well as from comparative sites.

The temples at 'Ain Dara, Emar, Hazor, and Beth Shean were revealed in excavations during the last century and have been well published and analyzed. They already are structures that must be included in any survey of Levantine temple building. M. Novák (The Temple of 'Ain Dāra in the Context of Imperial and Neo-Hittite Architecture and Art) and F. Sakal offer new perspectives on these temples. Novák argues that the 'Ain Dāra temple along with its sculptural decoration is best understood as among the first manifestations of a Neo-Hittite identity which would come to influence other developments in the Levant during the Iron Age. Based on the new excavations at Emar, Skalar offers a revision of the two-temple terrace complex as initially proposed by the French excavators which stresses the longevity of hallowedness for the Temple of Baal and a more complicated double processional route for the two-temple grouping. S. Zuckerman (The Temples of Canaanite Hazor) provides a complete review of the sacred structures identified at the site and dating from the Middle through

Late Bronze Ages, and R. Mullen (The Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Temples at Beth-Shean) reconsiders, once more, the changing sacred landscape at Beth Shean as the site moved from the Egyptian sphere to a renewal of Canaanite identity in the 12th century B.C.E. J. Zangenberg (The Sanctuary on Mount Gerizim), working with the results of the excavations of Y. Magen, provides a picture of the earliest sanctuary on the site and its development from Iron Age II through the Early Hellenistic period. B. Morstad (Phönizische Heiligtümer im Mittelmeerraum und ihre Kulteinrichtungen) supplies the first review of Levantine influenced designs in the western Mediterranean to include the new architectural discoveries of cult centers at Carthage and Kerkouan.

Three articles address the lost temples of Jerusalem using the textual evidence from biblical sources. E. Blum (Der Tempelbaubericht im 1 Könige 6,1–22. Exegetische und historische Überlegungen) takes up the challenge of yet again reconstructing the Temple of Solomon using the problematic text from 1 Kings and relating it to the ʿAin Dara. B. Janoski (Der Ort des Lebens. Zur Kultsymbolik des Jerusalemer Tempels) mines the text slightly differently looking for the connections between the descriptions of the building and the furnishings and the notion of the Temple as the “Place of Life.” While the Temple of Solomon has generated an extensive bibliography of textual studies, far less interest has been shown in the lost Second temple. D. Edelman (What Can We Know about the Persian-Era Temple at Jerusalem?) navigates the textual material to provide both some notion of the physical appearance of the temple and the possible ways in which it functioned.

Most of the remaining articles treat issues of cultic objects, evidence for deities, and ideas about ritual practice. S. Ackerman (Women and the Religious Culture of the State Temples of the Ancient Levant, Or: Priestesses, Purity, and Parturition) attempts to isolate the roles that woman could have played in the more public rituals associated with the state temples in Levantine cities. O. Keel (Paraphernalia of Jerusalem Sanctuaries and Their Relation to Deities Worshipped Therein during the Iron Age IIA-C) works with the seal evidence from the Gihon Spring in Jerusalem and shows that Egyptian religious influences remained a feature of the city and of Judah until the Assyrian period, and that solar symbolism was particularly prominent. D. Vieweger (Die Kulturausstattung “philistäischer” Heiligtümer in Palästina) reviews the architecture and the findings from *Nahal Patṭiṣ*, *Tell el-Qasīle*, and the Favissa at *Yavnē*; all have been identified as Philistine and he points out that these are technically outside of the Philistine pentapolis and exhibit a heterogeneous mixture of architectural forms and finds. Rather than demonstrating a coherent Philistine religious culture, they suggest a mixing of several traditions and probably ritual practices that came together on the south coastal plain of Palestine in the Early Iron Age.

Jens Kamlah (*Temples of the Levant – Comparative Aspects*) provides a final article which attempts to bring together some of the ideas developed in the individual presentations by concentrating on features of the architectural designs. He reviews the categories of temple types that have now emerged in the study of Levantine temples, the nature of the morphological changes that occur in temple designs from the Early to the Late Bronze Ages, the nature of continuity at some sites (Aleppo and Pella), the ways in which the architectural forms conveyed the concept of the temple as the house of the god, and the roles of sculptural decoration in sanctuary settings and of sculpted cultic paraphernalia.

This is an impressive compilation of current views on Levantine temples, cultic items, and ritual practices. All the articles offer important contributions to the study, but there is too much here to go through systematically and offer criticism or commentary for each article. I will limit myself to a few observations on some of the articles. To categorize and classify building forms is standard practice in the study of architecture since it makes for greater ease of analysis. However, it can become an end in itself, and to some extent some of these articles reveal the problem. The temple *in antis*, so far as I can determine, first appears in Vitruvius (III.2.1), and though he credits his Greek sources with the category (ναὸς ἐν παραστάσι), there is no evidence that such a classification existed for builders in the ancient Levant. Therefore, our attempts to pigeonhole structures in this manner and then to refine the label even more by arguing whether a building is better considered *in antis* or *Langraum* strikes me as meaningless in the long run, since the builders of these structures would not have comprehended the rationale for such labels. I find the debates over the *migdal* classification even more troubling since this is a completely modern category invented by 20th century archaeologists. When dealing with ancient art, we should never let our need to classify by our systems take precedence over the objects themselves.

There seems to be a growing consensus that the temple at 'Ain Dāra probably represents the closest representation to the Temple of Solomon that has so far been found in the archaeological record. The concordance of many of the features in the temple with the descriptive section from 1 Kings cannot be denied, but this should not blind us to a couple of important distinctions. The evidence for a temple structure at 'Ain Dāra predates the earliest possible date for the Temple of Solomon, and if anything, the Temple of Solomon looks like the 'Ain Dāra temple because the Syrian structure was a prototype. However, the biblical text makes clear that the Temple of Solomon was part of a larger complex that included a palace. This is an old model, certainly going back to the Late Bronze Age at Tell Atchana, but the 'Ain Dāra temple stands alone. So far no evidence for a palace sharing the high place has been unearthed. So while

there are structural similarities to the two temples themselves, the larger setting for each is quite different. How important is the difference? I would suggest quite important. Temples that served as *de facto* court chapels (Guzana (Tel Halaf), the temple of the Storm god at Carchemish, the double temples at Tell Tayinat, and the Temple of Solomon) operated in a context quite different from those that stood alone. Our emphasis on design over context may be misguided. It suggests that the format of the temple had greater significance than the setting in which the building operated. A part of the problem may well lie with the source for our information on the Temple of Solomon, a highly problematic text, the origin for which is neither clear nor agreed upon.

One of the most important findings of the last two decades must be the Aleppo citadel temple of the weather god. Not only does this temple reveal that certain topographical spots could retain their sanctity for many centuries and through several changes in rulership and even populations, but that the sculptural decorations within the temple could be used to convey not just cultic information but political changes. None of the other Late Bronze Age or Iron Age temples has yet yielded such a rich display of interior sculpture. 'Ain Dara does have interior as well as exterior sculpture, and the description in 1 Kings would indicate a sculptural embellishment of the interior of Solomon's Temple, but neither comes close to what Kohlmeyer and his team found at Aleppo. Only at the Iron Age Neo-Hittite and Aramean cities of Carchemish, Sam'al (Zincirli), and Guzana can we find equally rich sculptural displays, but these are all exterior programs visible to a much larger public than the interior decoration at Aleppo. It may have been that some of the functions of the interior sculpture at the Aleppo citadel temple were performed by the sculpted paraphernalia that have been found in association with the southern Levantine temples, the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age sculpted ceramic fenestrated cult stands (Tabaqāt Faḥil, Beth Shean) and Iron Age model shrines (Pella), though these much more modest and portable objects clearly could not have been the focus of attention and ritual in a manner similar to that of the interior decoration at Aleppo.

The volute capital which appears for the first time in the Iron Age Levant has produced its own specific bibliography over the decades. There is general agreement that the find spot for this architectural member is never in purely religious contexts, and so it has come to be treated as an item associated with secular rather than with religious constructions, and this is the interpretation that Zangenberg has given to the fragments of volute capitals found at Mount Gerizim in the Persian level. However, Keel has offered a rather intriguing suggestion in regards to the seals from Jerusalem decorated with volute capitals (proto-aeolic). He argues that the capitals were indeed a reference to kingship, and one perhaps specific to Israelite kingship, but not one that denied a religious association. As

he points out, the main temple in Jerusalem was part of the palace complex, and as such a reference to the king's residence through the presence of the volute capital used for the seal could also be an indirect reference to the temple itself.

This is an important collection of writings. The volume is well edited, generously illustrated with good drawings, and lavishly supplied with excellent black and white photographs. We must thank Jens Kamlah for arranging the symposium and for producing the published proceeding in such a timely manner and Harrassowitz for publishing such a handsome book.

William Mierse
University of Vermont

Mordechai Cogan, *Bound for Exile. Israelites and Judeans under Imperial Yoke: Documents from Assyria and Babylonia*. A Carta Handbook Carta, Jerusalem. 2013. Pp. xiii + 177 incl. 5 maps and 37 Figs. \$64.00. ISBN: 978-965-220-843-9.

Assyrian and Babylonian kings followed a long-established and widespread policy of deporting inhabitants of rebellious kingdoms, often replacing them with people from other regions a practice illustrated most extensively by documents and inscriptions from the Assyrian empire. Mordechai Cogan, who has previously translated Assyrian and Babylonian texts concerning Israel and Judah (*The Raging Torrent*, 2008) gathers cuneiform records that disclose the circumstances of exiles from the two kingdoms. After an Introduction (pp. 1–9) and a few documents about the provinces of Megiddo and Samaria (pp. 10–33), Ch. 2 identifies 'Israelites in Assyrian Exile' (pp. 34–53) through individuals' origins ('Samaritan') or names. Cuneiform tablets supply a number of personal names commencing or ending with forms of YHWH, so clearly Hebrew (e.g. Hilqiyau = Hilqiah). Some men were incorporated into the army, one was a chariot driver, others were workmen or slaves. One sculpture showing Judeans working on Sennacherib's palace supplements the written sources (Fig. 28). The reason for exile is set out in Ch. 3, the longest (pp. 54–103), breach of 'Treaties and Oaths in the Assyrian Empire'. Cogan translates 'Esarhaddon's Treaty for the Succession of Ashurbanipal' (first translated by D. J. Wiseman in 1958 as 'The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon'), 'Esarhaddon's Treaty with Baal of Tyre' and 'Ashurbanipal's Treaty with the Tribe of Kedar'. For the first he has been able to include a few improved readings from the copy found at Tell Tayinat in 2009. If Israelite and Judean kings were forced to accept treaties like these, Cogan and others suggest, some of the curses they list, such as 'May the gods make your ground like iron, so that nothing can sprout from it' (p. 83, §63), may have given rise to similar curses in Deuteronomy (Deut.

28: 23). However, the Assyrian scribes drew on a long tradition of curses and there seem to be western influences in the Assyrian treaties, so their authors may have adopted those curses from the west; the argument for Assyrian models for Deuteronomy is far from certain (see K. A. Kitchen and P. J. N. Lawrence, *Treaty, Law and Covenant in the Ancient Near East* [2012], part 3, pp. 222–33). Cogan also points to many of the curses which occur in other biblical books and ancient near eastern texts.

While some exiles experienced forced labour or slavery, others enjoyed freedom. ‘Judeans in Assyrian Exile’ and ‘Judeans in Babylonian Exile’ (Chs 5, 6, pp. 119–57) list about fifty people with names clearly or likely to be Hebrew - another forty can be counted. Most are names known from the Bible, with the Divine Name appearing as *yau* for *yahu* in Assyrian and *yama* for *yaw* in Babylonian, which also has, rarely, *yahu* (Abda-yahu, p. 147, Shahid-yahu, p. 153). Legal deeds include one regulating the shares of an estate between a man’s five sons, all with Hebrew names (6.05) and one reducing a man named Isaiah’s daughter to slavery if she consorts with a Babylonian man or he abducts her without her resisting (6.06). A few years ago, Iraqi treasure hunters uncovered a new source for the Babylonian period, releasing on to the antiquities market scores of tablets from a place called ‘Judah-ville’ in the region of Nippur. Two are included here (nos. 6.04, 6.05) but the publication of many more will add numerous Hebrew names and expand knowledge of the exiles’ activities to be set beside the long known Murashu archive from Nippur.

A few texts from other eras and kingdoms - Egypt, the Hittites - record deportations or list exiles, but the cuneiform documentation is the most informative outside the Bible. While the Hebrew reports are the only extensive sources from subjugated populations, Mordechai Cogan’s book supplies a valuable complement to them.

Alan Millard
University of Liverpool

Martin Worthington, *Principles of Akkadian Textual Criticism*. Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records 1. De Gruyter, Boston/Berlin, 2012. Pp. xxiii + 352. € 99.95. ISBN: 978–1–61451–051–2, e-ISBN: 978–1–61451–056–7; ISSN: 2161–4155.

Ancient scribes did not always attain the accuracy expected when they copied existing texts, nor did they aim for the consistency in spelling assumed nowadays. Their mistakes and variations can be revealing and instructive, as studies of

manuscripts from many ages and areas have shown. Now Martin Worthington's close scrutiny of Babylonian and Assyrian cuneiform texts, 'the examination of minutiae' (p. 38), presents for the first time a comprehensive analysis of textual changes found in them. (In 1920, Friedrich Delitzsch offered an initial collection of such scribal errors.) Most types of scribal error known in other cultures are evident, from simple haplography, lipography, dittography and metathesis to miscomprehensions and more complex confusions. The nature of the cuneiform script enabled the easy misreading of polyvalent signs to produce a new sense, or a nonsense. Thus in Gilgamesh XI 149, two manuscripts have the dove Ut-napishtim released after the Flood returning to him, but two have the preferable reading 'soaring upwards' (p. 119).

However, Worthington has done much more than collect and catalogue scribal differences and errors. He sets out four 'Potential rewards deriving from the study of textual change': elucidating obscurities, tracing patterns of transmission, revealing the attitudes and practices of scribes and suggesting approaches for future work. His first four chapters, with many sub-divisions, cover, in Ch. 1, methods of transmission and ancient attitudes to texts (notions of fidelity, apprentice or pupil copies), in Ch. 2, problems in dealing with errors (oddities, orthography, stemmata), in Ch. 3, 'mechanisms of textual change' (all types of error, misunderstandings, deliberate changes and redactions), in Ch. 4, variations in orthography and grammar. In Ch. 5 he uses his findings to consider the ease of reading cuneiform texts in the first millennium. Colophons reveal there was considerable circulation of tablets within Babylonia and Assyria so that scribes would have to read unfamiliar scripts, some, of course, being more accustomed to legal and administrative than 'scientific', ritual, or literary works. (Here surveying the contents of some 'private libraries' could expand the point.) A relevant aspect is spacing, for, Worthington states, without punctuation it was hard to identify clause or sentence boundaries, although the layout might sometimes help (p. 258, and n. 847). While words were not divided, scribes avoided splitting words between lines and might space signs so that a short word filled a line, or crowd them in, in order to include a whole clause in one line, in 'scholarly' texts and also in letters and legal deeds. Here comparison could be made with Jewish scribal habits of completing a word at the end of a line or of 'stretching' letters to fill a line. In the Old Hebrew script, by contrast, because a point commonly separated one word from the next, a word could be split at the end of a line. Native readers of either script would intuitively discard many possible readings however the words were divided. Scribes of cuneiform had additional aids to correct reading: particular signs would rarely be used in certain positions and signs for single vowels could mark precisely the value of an adjacent vowel which Worthington terms 'disambiguated *plene* spellings' (pp. 266–69). *Plene* spellings were optional and appear erratically in some manuscripts, for

example, varying between two copies of Sennacherib's 'Rassam cylinder' which share oddities and seem to have been copied by the same scribe (pp. 128–32). A similar variety appears in ancient West Semitic manuscripts (see Millard 1991). Many Assyrian royal inscriptions survive in multiple copies, so where the same odd reading occurs in several, but not all, it points to an erroneous exemplar (e.g. a short inscription of Shalmaneser III, pp. 122–23, 133–34). From these comments it should be plain that textual criticism of Akkadian offers instructive analogies for studying Hebrew manuscripts. In Ch. 6 Worthington discusses choice between variants and, with compelling cases, suggests there should be greater readiness to adopt conjectural emendations.

The book's real importance is its demonstration of the value of textual criticism in improving the interpretation of Akkadian compositions of all sorts, notably several passages in the Epic of Gilgamesh, including one which Worthington demonstrates does not portray a homosexual relationship between Gilgamesh and Enkidu as has been widely supposed (pp. 204–09). Persevering readers, undiscouraged by Akkadian phrases and technical discussions, will appreciate the work of ancient scribes much better. Despite concentration on errors and vagaries, Worthington's work should inculcate greater respect for competent scribes whose legacy we enjoy! (Ironically, errors exist in his book!)

Delitzsch, F., (1920). *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament* (Berlin and Leipzig).
 Millard, A., (1991). 'Variable Spelling in Hebrew and Other Ancient Texts', *Journal of Theological Studies* 42: 106–15.

Alan Millard
University of Liverpool

Pau Figueras, *The Pagan Image of Greco-Roman Palestine and Surrounding Lands*. BAR S2495. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013. Pp. ii + 252 incl. illustrations, gazetteer and glossary. £39.00. ISBN 9781407311098.

During the Hellenistic and Roman periods the majority of people who inhabited Palestine were pagan. Nevertheless, most scholarly research on the history and archaeology of Palestine in these periods has been devoted to the Jewish and Christian communities and their archaeological remains. Therefore, the increase in recent years in the number of studies dealing with the various gods worshipped in Palestine (e.g., Ovadiah and Mucznik 2009) and the temples and shrines erected in this region (e.g. Ovadiah and Turnheim 2011) is much welcomed. Pau Figueras' new book is another addition to this growing body of research.

The aim of the book is to collect all appearances of pagan motifs in Palestine and surrounding countries (modern Israel, parts of Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and north Sinai) during the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine periods. The items presented in this study include: temples and shrines, open-air cult sites, altars, inscriptions and sacred writings, statues and figurines, stelae, betyls and obelisks, carvings and reliefs, cult objects, coins, finger rings and bracelets, amulets, gems and cameos, tombs, coffins and sarcophagi, mosaics and paintings. The collection refers not only to the representations of pagan motifs whose origin lies in the Greek and Roman religions, but also to motifs that are related to the cults of the Edomites, Nabataeans, Itureans, as well as those used by Jews and Christians to adorn their synagogues, churches and tombs. The book professes to deal only with the archaeological evidence for the pagan legacy in this region and does not include references in ancient texts from which much information concerning pagan practices in Palestine could have been drawn.

The book is divided into two main sections. The first, entitled 'Archaeological Gazetteer,' follows a geographical sequence in alphabetic order as its format, and includes a short summary of the information collected by the author about each site, together with relatively small, black and white illustrations of the relevant archaeological remains, and a few bibliographical references. The second section, entitled 'Explanatory Index,' offers short explanations (also in alphabetical order) on the names of gods, goddesses, beliefs and superstitions, and syncretism, as well as a record of cultic objects and structures, with appropriate references to the places and illustrations recorded in the first section.

Figueras' extensive collection is an impressive and meticulous work. Students of archaeology, as well as interested layman, will surely find it useful as a search tool for the appearance of certain motifs in this region in various visual media and throughout a vast time span. Yet the author in his introduction claims that his work does not pretend to be an exhaustive one and indeed one should admit that the entries are indeed rather short, in many cases incomplete and also not up to date. Thus, for example, the entry on Paneas refers to the Augusteum erected at the site by Herod according to Flavius Josephus and mentions only the identification made by Zvi Ma'oz of that building, without referring to other suggestions to identify it elsewhere. The site of Omrit, where the same Augusteum is identified by the site's excavators, does not appear at all in the book, though most impressive remains of three successive temples were unearthed at the site. Other entries, such as the one on Jerusalem, Khurvat 'Aleq (should be 'Eleq), are incomplete and lack reference to recent publications of intaglio gemstones, decorated furniture, statues and figurines. As a whole the entries are too short, the bibliography in many cases insufficient and the illustrations are too small and not always clear.

Most of all, however, an analysis and overall discussion of the pagan image of Palestine is lacking. Figueras mentions at the start of his introduction that his late venerated teacher, Prof. Michael Avi-Yonah, expressed his intention some forty years ago to conduct a comprehensive research on the historical and archaeological legacy of paganism in Hellenistic and Roman Palestine. Unfortunately, Avi-Yonah did not fulfil this intention. While this work is a start, the archaeology world still awaits the publication of such a research.

Ovadia, A. and Mucznik, S., (2009) *Worshipping the Gods: Art and Cult in Roman Eretz Israel* (Leiden).

Ovadia, A. and Turnheim, J., (2011) *Roman Temples, Shrines and Temene in Israel* (Rome).

Orit Peleg-Barkat

Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Hannah M. Cotton, Leah Di Segni, Werner Eck, Benjamin Isaac, Alla Kushnir-Stein, Haggai Misgav, Jonathan Price, Israel Roll and Ada Yardeni (eds.), *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae: Volume 1, Jerusalem, Part 1: 1–704. Part 1 The Hellenistic Period up to the Destruction of the Temple in 70; Part 2: The Roman Period from 70 to the Reign of Constantine; Late Antiquity from Constantine to the Arab Conquest.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010. Pp. xxvi + 694. \$195. ISBN: 978–3–11–022219–7.

Hannah M. Cotton et al., with contributions by Robert Daniel and assistance of Marfa Heimbach, Dirk Kossmann and Naomi Schneider, *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae Vol. II Caesarea and the Middle Coast, 1121–1260.* Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2011. Pp xxii + 918 incl. illustrations, maps and plans. \$252.00. ISBN: 9783110222173.

The Corpus of which these magnificent volumes are the first instalments is an important milestone in epigraphic publication for the ancient world as a whole, as well as a watershed in the study of the highly diverse, mutable, complex – and famous – region that they cover. They are the first two to appear, out of a projected nine. The plan excels firstly in its breadth of conception and wide geographical scope (the project extends beyond the borders of Israel and stops sensibly where the writ of other Middle Eastern corpora begins to run). Particularly striking is the linguistic range: the editors write that ‘traditional linguistic divisions and exclusions previously adopted for epigraphic corpora [were]...abandoned’. Combining Greek and Latin with Semitic texts, and others too, such as Armenian and Georgian (in Volume 2), makes good historical sense in dealing with multi-lingual societies;

and the result is coverage of no less than eight languages, not to mention, within these, six different types of Aramaic and two forms of proto-Arabic. A consistently high level of scholarship is guaranteed by the expertise of an unusually large core team (eight active participants), plus (so far) eight more authors responsible for particular contributions, three dedicated assistants, and then an enlisted range of support and guidance, both institutional and individual. The result is exemplary in thoroughness of research (with fresh inspection of even the smallest fragments wherever humanly possible); in the determined hunting down of data; in the clarity and thoughtfulness of the overarching structure, with a sensible degree of flexibility in the organization of individual volumes; in the precision, starting from the precise location of each find-spot in terms of the geography of today's Jerusalem, and generally offering a good photograph, transliterations and, where appropriate, translations, and an intelligently edited and marked up text; in the meticulous attention to detail; in the sound judgment, control and economy of the commentaries (with initials indicating the particular editor responsible), even when it comes to matters that have been highly controversial, such as the supposed ossuary of James brother of Jesus, or the Talpiot burial cave that contained ten 'unexceptional' ossuaries, partly damaged by a demolition blast, belonging to the family of Yeshu'a; in the judiciousness of the select bibliographies for texts of significance and the completeness of the general bibliographies; and, last but not least, in the learning, concision and immediate usefulness of the two general introductions, both by Benjamin Isaac.

The production has been a remarkable two-centre operation, based in Jerusalem, but with a counterpart labouring in Cologne. The painstaking teamwork, co-ordination and sheer determination of the overall directors, Hannah Cotton and Werner Eck, is particularly to be applauded. The very substantial support of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft should be singled out, alongside that of the Hebrew University.

These two volumes take the total so far to an almost unbelievable 2160 entries. Formulaic, 'mass-produced' inscriptions, i.e. stamps and marks of various kinds have been excluded. But milestones will appear in due course in their own volume. As a research tool, as a reference work, and indeed also as absorbing reading, the corpus will only achieve its full potential with a full roster of indexes; so far we do at least have indexes of personal names to each volume, with that for Volume 1 appearing at the end of Part 2. The provisional indexing whose appearance on the internet has been promised is eagerly awaited.

The volumes here under review offer dramatically contrasting bodies of material, drawing upon the diverse skills of several editors. Volume 1, Part 1, which is, as we shall see, the record of a very largely and very distinctively Jewish Jerusalem that was none the less by no means a parochial place, is

dominated by personal burials in the shape of 590 funerary inscriptions, mostly from the ossuaries characteristic of the immediate area, in which bones were deposited by way of secondary burial in tombs cut into the rock, once the flesh of the laid out body had disintegrated. The practice is well explained in Isaac's introduction. Over half of the known containers bore only schematic patterning and were without inscriptions altogether, but attention has been paid to virtually every possibly intelligible trace of would-be writing, however rudimentary the scratches and squiggles – and many are just that. As for the funerary inscriptions themselves, most are nothing more than a name or names, but choices of name alone are eloquent when viewed in quantity and carefully interpreted. Other types of text are far less numerous in the volume, but they include a few that are very familiar, and all have been authoritatively re-presented. Much of the editorial work in 1.1 has been most ably carried out by Jonathan Price.

In Volume 1 Part 2 Jerusalem has become an intensely Christian city. Ecclesiastical material dominates from the start, for the surviving public epigraphy of the post 70 CE Roman colony of Aelia Capitolina that was in time established over the ruins of the former city is sadly limited. It is the religious world that mainly fills the post-Constantinian section, and that is inseparable even from the small number of imperial or official documents. As it happens, an imperial rescript of the mid-sixth century was found in re-use in the church of the Holy Sepulchre (785). The construction of dozens of churches, including some monumental edifices, is graphically documented by Isaac in his introduction (appearing in Volume 1.1), a particularly helpful accompaniment to the numerous building inscriptions and dedications of 1.2. The celebrated Christian Holy Places burgeoned during this period; inscribing on walls, mosaic floors or objects, was the order of the day, so those famous places are amply represented here. At the same time, less well-known sites, whether churches, chapels, monastic buildings, caves or simple pilgrims' graffiti, proliferated around the city and in its outskirts and the surrounding hills. The arrangement of this volume is, as before, geographic for cases where provenances are known, which for the later period is in quite a high proportion of them; but this time geography sits under the customary generic headings commonly employed. Maps serving both 1.1 and 1.2 appear at the end of this second part, and they serve well the purpose of displaying the sacred geography of Christian Jerusalem and of locating find-spots.

Volume Two is in its content the most varied volume to date. Caesarea has been extensively excavated over the past decades, and indeed the preparation of a corpus of Latin and Greek inscriptions by Holum and Lehmann, published in 2000, is duly registered as having provided much of the spadework. This was a truly mixed

city already in the first century CE, when it was the capital of the Roman prefect/procurators and the source of ethnic violence that helped trigger the Great Revolt. After 70 CE, the Roman military presence was much increased, and the city's status elevated to that of a *colonia*. In addition, Caesarea became a very significant Christian centre in late antiquity. But it is also to late antiquity that belong long known vestiges of what was apparently a synagogue to the north of the city, and it is good to see its texts set out in full even if the crop is rather disappointing. These too have been edited by Jonathan Price. In Caesarea Latin was a significant component in the linguistic mix, above all in public texts associated with imperial officials and in those of the *colonia*, including dedications to emperors. The unrivalled mastery of Werner Eck (who had already dealt with such texts in 1.1) is brought to bear on this material, and another find from a German university. Walter Ameling, having joined the editorial board, handles the small but significant collection of 'pagan' Greek inscriptions, which are associated with a revealing range of Graeco-Roman cults. Isaac's introduction gives readers in under eighteen pages just what they most need in order to contextualize the evidence. I hope to discuss this volume in detail on a future occasion.

In the rest of this review I offer some notes on Part 1 of Volume 1, whose riches, offer countless rewards to the attentive historian. Even though most of the inscriptions were known before, some had slipped out of view, and their representation here makes an impact that deepens immeasurably our understanding of their period as well as raising new questions. It is not an unreasonable proposition that the study of Second Temple Jerusalem is best begun right here – before even taking note of the city's archaeological sites or its indispensable historian, Flavius Josephus, or the priceless Dead Sea scrolls that were produced and collected in the Judaeian wilderness by a community in opposition to Jerusalem. For in this humbler material we catch the highly distinctive atmosphere of the city, and even the voice of pre-70 CE Jerusalem's ordinary inhabitants (and sometimes their masters) residing still in their own usually simple artefacts.

The absence of public inscriptions emanating from the majority Jewish population, and the remarkably restricted number of donor inscriptions associated with Herod's Temple, raises anew the question of Jewish attitudes to the epigraphic habit of the Romans. The collection of miscellaneous significant texts in the very small first section, 'Inscriptions of religious and public character', includes just seventeen items, some more Roman than Jewish, such as the long-known warning inscription from the Temple enclosure (2) found in two copies and complementing Josephus's account; the *titulus* from the cross (15), taken of course from its literary source, the four Gospels (differing slightly in the four versions); and the brief inscriptions, taken from Philo's *Embassy to Gaius*, that were allegedly on the gilded shields set up within Jerusalem by Pontius Pilate in the reign of Tiberius,

to the fury of pious Jews. Other texts of substance have Diaspora associations, such as the record of a donation from a Rhodian to Herod's Temple in 18–17 BCE (3), and the almost certainly pre-70 synagogue inscription of Theodotus (9) written on a limestone slab found in a cistern in the Ophel. It may be that the sheer thoroughness of the Roman destruction in the summer of 70 CE of the Temple Mount and its surrounds, and their subsequent treatment in and after the reign of Hadrian (still a matter of uncertainty) have resulted in the loss of epigraphic data from Herod's Temple itself; but equally, and following Solomon's precedent, there may have been none.

In a different sphere, the quality of the writing and carving on the ossuaries raises similar questions in relation to Jewish reservations concerning public recording or memorializing. The observation made by Price in discussing the authenticity of the James ossuary should be noted: 'ossuary inscriptions were essentially labels identifying the deceased for the benefit of the family in their private sealed caves; there was no wider "audience"'. Thus, even a designation such as 'brother of', found in the James inscription, was only a marker and as such not common. Display would have been immodest, as Josephus tells us in his *Against Apion* (2.205). A minority of the texts are nicely carved (eg 33). But the crudity of much of the lettering is striking. One incision was apparently done with a nail (eg 408). Another is described as 'inexperienced scratches' (485). Many are 'insecurely written' (for an example, see 46). In bilingual texts, the Greek is likely to be better written than the Hebrew or Aramaic; thus the ossuary of Selampsin daughter of Ariston is described as having 'Greek letters shallowly but precisely incised; formal Jewish script less expert, some letters gone over more than once' (and for another example see 28). This disparity may be culturally significant, or it may simply reflect the disparity in skills of those who did the writing, whether commissioned masons or private individuals. It is also telling that the lettering may well be inferior to the carving of the designs on the ossuaries (387), the latter obviously a job for professional craftsmen working with simple pattern books.

A contrast with these small chests is provided by the 'elegant' limestone sarcophagus of Queen Sadan from the so-called Tomb of the Kings in Wadi Joz 123, likely that of Queen Helena of Adiabene, inside which the discoverer, de Saulcy, reported in 1864 having found a richly robed female skeleton whose bones instantly crumbled to dust on exposure to the air. And yet even here the Aramaic incision is fairly crude, an indication perhaps of a chosen style rather than lack of the wherewithal to employ skilled craftsmen.

It is presumed that burial in rock-hewn tombs around the city ceased after 70, and we must suppose that the habit of ossuary burial of bones in family tombs was disrupted and that the tradition sooner rather than later came to an end (though a few such arrangements have been found in the later necropolis of Beth She'arim, outside

Judaea). Nor would Jerusalem any longer have been a possible burial place for Jews from other regions, or indeed from the near Diaspora, as seems to have been the case before the destruction. Among instances of outsiders are the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek inscriptions of several deceased individuals from Beth She'an/Scythopolis in one burial cave (410–2). The Palmyrene script also makes its appearance.

Yet in the main the burials must be local, and perhaps the single most striking feature, highly visible when surveying the material en masse, is the amount of Greek, at whatever level, present among the Jews of Judaea, along with the not negligible presence of Latin. The repertoire of names is astonishing. An assessment could in theory already have been made from Tal Ilan's indispensable *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Antiquity* (2002–8). But now the concentration, organization and specific boundaries of the surviving corpus, so effectively presented, are truly telling. We encounter Ptolema, and also Cleopatra (558), Demarchia (202), Tryphon (220), Verutarion (a woman) together with Nikandros (222), Chares (290; a name recorded also by Josephus, *Jewish War* 4.18, in connection with Gamla in the Golan), Erotas (292), Kyria (302; written in Greek), Maria (312; written in Hebrew/Aramaic), Rufus (385), Aristoboulos son of Iasion (387), Africanus Furius (?) (412), Julia, figuring beside Iouda (554), Furinus (582), Psyche (584), and a good number of others.

On the other hand, there are multiple examples of the Hebrew/Aramaic names common in the period, and alongside them we have not a few appearances of other biblical names such as Sha'ul and Ishmael, while we also meet a Hillel, a David, and, again, Mattya, Hezkya, Elazar, Shapira, Bar Giora, and Shalom (a woman). It does not take a prolonged search to discover a mixture of languages and scripts within one cave. A full analysis of the groupings of different kinds of names in particular tombs or zones would undoubtedly be fruitful.

Alongside the naming patterns come contrasts in custom and behaviour. What might be deemed imported practices, such as the cursing of those who disturb a grave, are not unattested (see 385; in Greek, and 507, protecting the burial of Tertia, bilingual in Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic). But they are easily outweighed by evidence of Judaism in action: a Nazirite (Hananiya the son of Yehonatan, 70), a member of the priestly course of Yakim (Menahem, 183), the granddaughter of the High Priest Theophilus (Yehohana of the Caiaphate family, 534), proselytes (Ioudas son of Laganion, 551; the non-local Ioudan the proselyte of Tyre, 174); Megiste the priestess (297; written in Greek) is more mysterious. Even the curse mentioned above appears twice in a Judaized version that employs a vow formula, either in Greek (287) or in Aramaic (*qorban*, 466). The noteworthy re-interment of the bones of King Uzziah recorded in the first person by an unknown agent on a (probably genuine) limestone plaque in quite nicely written Aramaic also carries the injunction 'not to open' (602).

The edited inscriptions exhibit what might be called the Jewish cosmopolitanism that characterized Jerusalem, and Isaac's introduction points us to Acts 2.5–11 – 'now there were dwelling in Jerusalem devout men from every nation under heaven...', while reminding us that one major source of this remarkable diversity was the practice of thrice-yearly Temple pilgrimage. The collected inscriptions of the Jerusalem volume of CIIP draw us right into this multi-faceted world; and the chasm between the contents of the two parts of this first volume reveal with horrifying clarity that when the Temple and the city fell, and its population was destroyed or dispersed, along with the countless casualties, a rich and unique way of life was lost that could never be replaced.

Tessa Rajak
Universities of Reading and Oxford

Avraham Faust, *The Archaeology of Israelite Society in Iron Age II*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2012. Pp xviii + 338. \$49.50. ISBN: 9781575061795.

Avraham Faust's latest book is a fully revised and updated English version of his Hebrew monograph, *מבט אכיאלוגי: המלוכה והחברה בתקופת הישראלית* (2005), which in turn was based on his Bar-Ilan University doctoral dissertation (1999). The author's work, accordingly, has been known to specialists for at least a decade now, but since this English version will reach a much wider audience, I will approach this review as if this were a totally new volume – which to some extent it is, given the ever-increasing amount of evidence applicable to Faust's ongoing project, notwithstanding its roots stretching back to the late 1990's.

The key word in the title is 'society', for while many works by archaeologists report their findings and attempt to place their excavation within the larger picture of ancient (economic, political, military, etc.) history, insufficient attention has been paid to how archaeology can inform social history. To some extent, the springboard for Faust's monograph (and its earlier versions) is a comment by William Dever (1995) regarding a 'serious deficiency' in the field of archaeology, which as a whole fails to utilize the revealed material culture in order to reconstruct the social structure of ancient Israel and surrounding peoples. Faust has answered that challenge in strong fashion, and his book no doubt will serve as the basis for all future discussion on the topic.

The bulk of the monograph is to be found in Chapters 3 (pp. 39–127) and 4 (pp. 128–177), which present and analyze the data for the urban and rural societies, respectively. As one can see from the disproportionate length of these two chapters, not surprisingly there is considerably more material available concerning the urban

setting than there is regarding the rural landscape. In addition, for the former chapter, Faust is careful to distinguish between Israel and Judah, and for Judah, between the 8th century and the 7th century. One important data set will serve here to illustrate Faust's attempt to reveal the social aspects of ancient Israel.

Through a series of lists and graphs, Faust pays close attention to the sizes and locations of the residential houses in the different cities, especially in those cases, such as Hazor, Tirzah, Tell en-Nasbeh (Mizpah), Tell Beit Mirsim, and Beersheba, where such data are forthcoming in critical mass. These houses range in size from 50–160 sq.m. (experts will recognize Building 2a from Hazor as an exquisite 160-sq.m. house, for example), with an occasional outlier (such as the huge 250-sq.m. Governor's House at Beersheba), and are found in such places as 'residential neighborhood', 'near the city citadel', 'near the city gate', etc.

When the numbers are crunched, we learn that in Israel "there was a relative socioeconomic continuum [with] clear differences between the different strata but not a polarized reality of a few rich and many poor; between these two groups there appears to have been a middle class" (p. 68). The situation in 8th-century Judah was different, with "clear socioeconomic differences": "A narrow stratum of society was the wealthy elite, while the rest of the population was in a much worse economic condition" (p. 95). For 7th-century Judah the vast majority of the evidence comes from Jerusalem only, where "these gaps are wider" still. Towards the end of the chapter, the contrast between the two kingdoms is spelled out explicitly: "An analysis of the settlements shows that at the end of the eighth century B.C.E. there were usually only two classes in Judahite cities (except in Jerusalem, particularly in the seventh century B.C.E.): a lower class including the vast majority of the population . . . and a very limited upper class of the very rich. In contrast, in Israelite cities there was more of a spectrum between the richest and the poorest. The socioeconomic gap in Israel was no smaller, but there were also middle classes" (pp. 116–117). While specialists in the field may have been familiar with this picture before, Faust's analysis (to repeat) is certain to reach a broader array of readers now. For statements on this matter from the biblical prophets, one will wish to consult Amos and Isaiah for the northern and southern kingdoms, respectively.

Chapter 3 also includes a wide-ranging discussion on the role of the city gate, as the place of justice, as a commercial center, and as an area where the poor would gather. Faust garners a variety of biblical verses (e.g., Amos 5:12, Prov 22:22) in support of this last aspect, which has not received sufficient attention in the literature. As indicated above, by necessity Chapter 4 on the rural landscape constitutes a shorter treatment. The chapter divides the discussion between villages and farmsteads (the biblical *הַצְּרִיּוֹת* [see Lev 25:31 etc.] most likely). The villages have a wall; most of the houses are of the four-

room type; the residences are quite large, c. 120–130 sq.m.; and these villages typically specialized in oil and wine production. The farmsteads are essentially a single large house, also c. 130 sq.m. or even larger, once more of the four-room type, with a pen for animals.

Faust makes the important point that the rural four-room houses are larger than their urban counterparts, a feature which translates into different social aspects: the former most likely housed extended families, “including parents, married sons and their children, unmarried daughters, unmarried aunts, and other relatives who remained living there for various reasons, slaves (?), agricultural workers, and others”; while the latter typically “were inhabited by nuclear families” (p. 160).

As one indication of how widely Faust reads the social-historical and social-scientific literature, I present here an instance of how he builds on the findings delivered in an article whose subject matter is far removed from the world of ancient Israel. Faust cites M. J. Kolb and J. E. Snead, “It’s a Small World after All: Comparative Analysis of Community Organization,” *American Antiquity* 62 (1997), pp. 609–628, to the effect that villages are characterized by three important components: a) social reproduction; b) subsistence economy; and c) self-identification. Faust finds all three of these elements present in the ancient Israelite villages, as revealed through the archaeological data: “they were large enough to entail social reproduction through the interactions of their components; the community enabled a subsistence economy; and the existence of boundary walls shows that the communities maintained a large degree of self-identity and differentiated themselves from the outside world” (p. 171).

The remaining chapters examine specific issues in the study of ancient Israelite society in more in-depth fashion: fortified structures attached to the military (Ch. 5); political organization in both Israel and Judah (Ch. 6); the four-room house (Ch. 7); and ‘pots and peoples’, to use the author’s felicitous phrase (Ch. 8), though this chapter discusses other topics as well, such as faunal remains. Space does not allow a detailed summation of Faust’s views on each of these subjects, though naturally many will want to read especially chs. 7–8 carefully, given the deep interest in and ongoing discussion of the four-room house, the collared-rim jar, and the presence or absence of pig bones. To be sure, much of the treatment appears in slightly different form in the author’s *Israel’s Ethnogenesis* (London: Equinox, 2006), so that his opinions on these subjects are by now well known. In short, while the 2006 book dealt mainly with the emergence of Israel in the historical and archaeological record, and the 2012 book under review concerns the period of the monarchy, a consistent picture emerges in the two different epochs. A prime example is the lack of painted pottery both in early Israel and in the later kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

On the question of whether or not one can tell an Israelite from a Canaanite, and vice versa, in the archaeological record, Faust directs the reader's attention to the rural villages, where the essential differences may be seen. In the northern urban centers (for example, Megiddo), "there are indications of Israelites and Canaanites-Phoenicians living side by side" (p. 249). Not so in the rural sector, however. The residents of the valley villages (e.g., Tel Qiri) were Canaanites-Phoenicians; especially noteworthy is "the great similarity between the villages discussed here and the Bronze Age villages" (p. 252). In the hill-country villages, by contrast, one finds evidence of a different population, with their four-room houses and so on – and these people, of course, are the Israelites.

If I had to select one sentence that serves as an overarching statement regarding this crucial issue, and which speaks to the essence of Israelite society, it would be the following: "in complete contrast to the heterogeneity typical of the Bronze Age population, Israel was far more homogeneous. Even though there were undoubtedly differences in wealth, property and status, the archaeological findings reflect an unprecedented architectural uniformity in all strata of society and in both kingdoms (evidence for a degree of shared ethnic identity). This uniformity is also reflected in the Bible" (p. 229), to which Faust add the following footnote, "Although minimalists see the picture arising from the Bible as a deliberate forgery of course" (p. 229, n. 25).

I do not mean to imply that the issue to which I have just devoted two paragraphs dominates the monograph – it does not – but given the intense interest in the subject, I thought it pertinent to say more than a passing word. Indeed, as the bulk of this review hopefully has demonstrated, the main points of discussion relate to kinship structure, community organization, socio-economic stratification, and the like.

To round out this review, note that Chapters 1 and 2 introduce the subject with the history of the field and the *status quaestionis*; a concluding Chapter 9 provides historical, diachronic analysis, as per its title "From Hamlets to Monarchy"; and an Epilogue provide some ideas about future directions. In sum, Faust has sifted (pun intended?) through an enormous amount of archaeological data buried (ditto?) in excavation reports, and then has distilled this data through the sociological and anthropological lens (as we have come to expect from his pen), in order to weave a coherent narrative depicting Israelite society during the Iron II period. The result is an elegant statement, from which historians, archaeologists, and biblical scholars alike will benefit.

Gary A. Rendsburg
Rutgers University

Katerina Galor and Gideon Avni (eds.), *Unearthing Jerusalem, 150 years of Archaeological Research in the Holy City*. Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, Indiana, 2011, Pp. xix + 490 incl. figs. 204. \$79.50. ISBN 978-1-57506-223-5.

This is a substantial volume on the history of Jerusalem as mainly revealed by archaeology. It is the result of a conference held in 2006 at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, USA and it encompasses the 26 papers delivered to the conference by distinguished scholars from several countries. The collection is divided into five parts, The History of Research, From Early Humans to the Iron Age, The Roman Period, The Byzantine Period, and The Early Islamic and Medieval Periods. Each period is covered by at least three papers which are all separate presentations but eventually add up to a comprehensive history. Each paper has its own bibliography and illustrations which leads to some duplication, but makes it easier to read it section by section, as the specialist is likely to do. On the other hand there is no index but, as the papers are concentrated each on one period, it is not difficult to locate the required subject.

The History of Research comprises seven papers, one each on the work done by the British (Shimon Gibson) the German Protestants (Ulrich Huebner), the Americans (Joan Branham), the Ecole Biblique (Dominique Trimbur), the Franciscans (Michele Piccirillo[†]), the Israel Exploration Society (Ronny Reich) and the Department of Antiquities and the Israel Antiquities Authority (Jon Seligman). All are useful summaries and give a fair background to the research efforts of the different nationalities.

The Early Humans section (Ofer Bar-Yosef) is a detailed analysis of the Paleolithic, Natufian and Neolithic cultures, very interesting in fact but rather remote from Jerusalem sites, except for some evidence of the PPNB in the early farming areas of Motza and Abu-Ghosh to the west of the city. The scant archaeological remains of the four thousand years from the late Neolithic to the Late Bronze Age are described by Aren Maeir, mainly as tombs inside and outside the city, and the later building remains of the LBA, when Jerusalem and its ruler Abdi-Hepa come into focus in the El Amarna letters. The importance of Jerusalem in the Iron Age is doubted by Israel Finkelstein who sees it as a reflection of the more successful Northern Kingdom as a vassal at times to Assyria, and which suffered greatly when it went on its own under Hezekiah. Yet he acknowledges that Judah achieved statehood in the eighth century BCE with a population influx from the north, after the fall of Samaria.

Part Three, the Roman period, opens with the proposal of Joseph Patrich that the Temple on the Temple Mount was situated alongside the large cistern no.5, where the bronze “sea” and laver could be fed with a water wheel, much water

being needed to flush the areas of animal slaughter, and thus he places the Temple diagonally across the Mount. The idea is shown on sketches by Leen Ritmeyer and it just looks out of place to see this grand edifice so to speak sliding awkwardly into the eastern wall, but the proposal has practical logic to support it.

Doron Ben-Ami and Yana Tchekhanovets describe the extensive work that is still in progress on the huge Givati parking lot, and which they identify as the “Palace” of the Royal Adiabene family who came to Jerusalem in the first century CE. It is a large rich site and, as described by Josephus, it was the major building in the Lower City, and the finds bear this out. The site exhibits strong evidence of the Roman destruction of 70 CE. when it appears that the inhabitants fled via the basement to the area of the Shiloam pool and beyond. The Pool and its surroundings are described by Ronny Reich and Eli Shukron who uncovered the shallow steps that surrounded it. It is assumed that this was a large public *miqveh*, or ritual pool, used by pilgrims before ascending to the Temple Mount and it is suggested that there were screens to provide privacy and modesty within this large pool. Also described is the long stepped passage that leads from the pool to the Mount which was built over a large drain that was found to contain domestic remnants, indicating that it was used by refugees fleeing from the wrath of the Roman army.

The paper by Zvi Greenhut shows details of a rare domestic unit on the hillside opposite the pool. It is a three-storey house set into the hillside and the majority of the sherds date from the late Hellenistic-early Roman period. These were the apartments of perhaps three families of high status, indicated by the fine panel decoration. Numerous coins from the excavation are listed by Donald Ariel, they were all bronze and included one rare sheqel of the Jewish War. Hillel Geva describes what he calls the “New City” of the Second Temple period, after it expanded to the north in the third and second centuries BCE and the area changed from agricultural to urban usage. It was later only lightly populated and not fully inhabited again until Byzantine and later periods. Judy Magness discusses Aelia Capitolina and states that by numismatic evidence we now know it was established by Hadrian before 132 CE. and therefore a possible cause for the Bar-Kochba war. She claims that, compared to the present Old City, it only occupied the northern half, the southern was occupied by the Tenth Legion where evidence is based on a Roman bath-house and an army bakery.

The Byzantine urban layout is carefully delineated by Oren Gutfeld by tracing the many different early pavings of the City which he uses to describe the location of its streets and buildings. He makes a careful analysis of the three types of street that vary in width, type of paving slab and types of under-road drainage. Leah Di Signi reveals unknown epigraphic evidence to the history of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, some of it reflecting on a rebuild after the Persian invasion

of 614 CE. The hinterland of Jerusalem in the Byzantine Period is the subject of Jon Seligman's paper and he records the numerous monasteries that dotted the area around the city. He describes several of them in detail and expands on their agricultural surroundings, which included large vineyards producing over two million litres of wine annually.

The last part starts with the transition from the Byzantine to Islamic period by Gideon Avni. Although the Temple Mount was completely transformed by the building of the Dome of the Rock and El-Aqsa Mosque, there was little fundamental change elsewhere, although the Moslems were careful to eradicate as many Christian symbols as possible. The Kathisma Church, started in the 5th century, became a mosque and lasted until the eleventh. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre did not suffer but was renovated, though later partly demolished in 1009. Donald Whitcomb points out the importance of the Madeba Map to pilgrims who wished to visit the City, and the accuracy of the work by Al-Muqadassi (985 CE) in describing the layout of the Islamic city. The addition of six palaces, a diwan, a bathhouse and a mosque at the south-west corner of the Temple Mount represents the typical administrative compound of a Moslem town and incorporates all its essential elements. The City was divided into sectors, with the Moslems to the east, the Christians to the west and the Jews apparently in the south.

The ancient walls of Jerusalem are meticulously surveyed by Shlomit Weksler-Bdolah, who has conducted several digs along their line and describes the whole length in detail, beginning with the Romano-Byzantine works and all the various ins and outs of the Ottoman walls caused by bedrock moats, earthquakes, sundry destructions and later rebuildings. She tells how the walls were destroyed in 1219 to deny the city to any later Crusades and eventually rebuilt by Suleiman the Magnificent in the sixteenth century.

The wonderful Ayyubid monuments are described by Mahmoud Hawari in full architectural detail, showing how the austere style of the Ayyubids was able to incorporate many Crusader elements in secondary use, thereby enriching their plainness without too much effort. Finally Robert Schick details the Mamluk and Ottoman period with the lament that so much of it has been carelessly destroyed as being of little consequence, it should have all been recorded, and he makes a plea for what remains to be properly documented while it is still standing.

With its detailed accounts and descriptions of so many periods in the history of Jerusalem, it is fair to say that this is a very valuable volume that highlights the many fascinating aspects that make up the history of the Holy City in all its variety, eccentricity and beauty.

Stephen Gabriel Rosenberg
W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research, Jerusalem

Gershon Galil, Ayelet Gilboa, Aren M. Maeir, Dan’el Kahn (eds.), *The Ancient Near East in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE. Culture and History. Proceedings of the International Conference held at the University of Haifa, 2–5 May, 2010* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 392). Münster Ugarit-Verlag, 2012. Pp. xviii + 647. €116. ISBN 97838683506611.

Cleanly edited, handsomely produced, and nicely packaged, this large volume publishes over 30 studies by specialists in diverse disciplines, some of whom had not physically attended the conference. What brings the papers together is a focus on the shift from the second into the first millennium BCE, so a backdrop to the formation of Israel as a nation and as a culture. There is hardly any minimalist intrusion here, as much because few of the contributing Biblicists share that persuasion, as because a good number of papers deal with archaeology (so wielding criteria for dating) or with records from beyond Israel.

The articles are sequenced alphabetically by author, a pity in that such a large harvest can be unwieldy and few will read the book from first to last (600 page) to access its riches. Luckily, the Preface does compile them under several headings: Mesopotamia and Anatolia (5 papers), Egyptian empire (4), history of Israel (a dozen), The Philistines (8), and culture (5). The indexes (of authors, biblical sources, and subjects), rather rare in such collections, are helpful.

It would take *chutzpah* to evaluate contributions on so many subjects and points of view and I beg forgiveness for slighting many of them. Very useful are papers that give comprehensive (with limits) review of a subject, such as André Lemaire’s “West Semitic Epigraphy and the History of the Levant during the 12th–10th Centuries BCE.” The paper breaks out of its title limitations to cover inscriptions into the 8th c. More narrow in its goal, but no less appreciated is Alan Millard’s brief overview “Scripts and their uses in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE.” Here belongs also several reviews/overviews of archaeological excavations, among them Yosef Garfinkel, Saar Ganor and Michael G. Hasel’s “The Iron Age City of Khirbet Qeiyafa after four Seasons of Excavations,” Moti Haiman’s “Geopolitical Aspects of the Southern Levant Desert in the 11th–10th Centuries BCE,” and Larry G. Herr’s “Jordan in the Iron I and IIB Periods.”

A set of papers researches moments in Mesopotamian and Egyptian history, some less relevant than others to the volume’s subject. Yigal Bloch’s “Assyro-Babylonian Conflicts in the Reign of Aššur-rēša-iši I” nicely illustrates its subtitle, “The Contribution of Administrative Documents to History-Writing.” It sharpens the disadvantage facing historians of pre-monarchic Israel (precisely the period studied in this volume) in lacking equivalent documentation. Dan’el Kahn goes beyond his title “A Geo-Political and Historical Perspective of Merneptah’s Policy in Canaan” in reviewing Egyptian military involvement in the Western Mediterranean through

Dynasty 20. His first paragraphs are filled with bibliographical information on the famous mention of “Israel” in the pharaoh’s stela. He hardly does anything with it, however. Troy Leiland Sagrillo evaluates “Šiṣaq’s Army: 2 Chronicles 12:2–3 from an Egyptological Perspective.” He is impressed by the Chronicler’s sound, albeit occasionally anachronistic, control of military details that were not extant in 1 Kings.

John P. Nielsen tells us a about success on “Nebuchadnezzar I’s Eastern Front.” Frederick Mario Fales offers a “A Retrospective View” on “Ḫanigalbat in the Early Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions.” Rather than being moribund after the failure of Mitanni, Hanigalbat remained an entity around the Ṭur Abdin plateau well into the ninth century. Mario Liverani reports on recent excavations at Arslan Tepe in offering a review of “Melid in the Early and Middle Iron Age: Archaeology and History.” Several papers survey our knowledge of the evidence but not without a specific point to make; among them are Ran Zadok’s “The Aramean Infiltration and Diffusion in the Upper Jazira, 1150–930 BCE,” an update of his Tadmor Volume study (1991), Christoffer Theis and Peter van der Veen’s “Some ‘Provenanced’ Egyptian Inscriptions from Jerusalem: A Preliminary Study of Old and New Evidence,” and Ephraim Stern’s compact collection of evidence for the culture of northern Sea People (the Sikils among others) as inspired by his Tel Dor excavations, “Archaeological Remains of the Northern Sea People along the Sharon and Carmel Coasts and the Acco and Jezrael Valleys BCE.”

For obvious reasons, the Sea People are nicely featured in this volume, with interest on their encounter with the Egyptians then in control of Palestine (Wolfgang Zwickel, “The Change from Egyptian to Philistine Hegemony in South-Western Palestine during the Time of Ramesses III or IV”; Assaf Yasur-Landau, “Chariots, Spears and Wagons: Anatolian and Aegean Elements in the Medinet Habu Land Battle Relief”) to their settlement in the Pentapolis in the southern Levant (Avraham Faust, “Between Israel and Philistia: Ethnic Negotiations in the South during the Iron Age I”; Aren M. Maeir, “Insights on the Philistine Culture and Related Issues: An Overview of 15 Years of Work at Tell eṣ-Šafi/Gath”). Although titled as a question, Michal Artzy does find evidence for “Continuation and Change in the 13th–10th Centuries BCE: Bronze-Working Koiné?” Walter Dietrich’s “David and the Philistines: Literature and History” can be read in conjunction with some of these papers as well as the report on Tel Qaiyafa (above), as he reassesses, with due caveats and caution, the biblical testimony on the matter.

Most interesting within this group, is the late Itamar Singer’s “The Philistines in the North and the Kingdom of Taita,” a paper that goes beyond exploitation of newly recovered evidence for Philistine settlement in the Amuq region of North Syria. By opening on a pungent review of Susan Sherratt’s thesis about the indigenous, socio-economic rather than migratory context for

Philistine culture and by linking exploration of the past with what he calls the “interpretive *Zeitgeist*” in our days, Singer gives us good reason why we will deeply miss his searching intellect. He writes with much excitement (as well as heroic evocation of his own past suggestions) about the kingdom of Palastin, elsewhere known also as Walistin, warning us all against a too hasty association with the familiar Philistines. Amen to that.

Several studies are hard-core contributions to ideas generated in the Bible, some to collate details drawn from archaeology, comparative religion, and biblical testimony, for example Wolfgang Zwickel’s “Cult in the Iron Age I–IIA in the Land of Israel.” Reinhard Achenbach offers his own take on “Divine Warfare and Yhwh’s Wars: Religious Ideologies of War in the Ancient Near East and in the Old Testament” by carrying the analysis deep into the first millennium. Two papers reflect on the construction of Solomon’s temple. The late Victor Avigdor Hurowitz updates his fundamental study with “Yhwh’s Exalted House Revisited: New Comparative Light on the Biblical Image of Solomon’s Temple,” by referring to newly recovered temples in neo-Hittite Cilicia. He confirms the Bible’s vivid knowledge of temple construction, symbolism, and ceremonials in the ancient world. Gershon Galil goes one better and strives to make biblical testimony contemporaneous with the temple’s construction (“Solomon’s Temple: Fiction or Reality?”). Since no ruler in the ancient world leaves testimony of a building inscription to honor a predecessor, Solomon (or his circles) should be credited with the Bible’s testimony. Whatever the truth of his insight, it remains dubious to compare biblical descriptions on the temple embedded in narratives and manipulated over the centuries with the punctual testimony of royal building inscriptions. On this basis, we might attribute to Moses (or his scribes) all those cultic constructions reported in the Pentateuch. Yet historiographic narratives that we find in Greece are full of reports on the construction of shrines that are attributed to venerable ancestors. This is not to say that we must date what is said about Solomon’s temple to a corresponding age but that it is always best to draw comparisons from material in the same genre.

A number of papers have slight linkage with the conference’s theme; they are welcome nonetheless. Yigal Levin reflects on “Ideology and Reality in the Book of Judges,” distinguishing between stories about individual judges that are realistic to life in Iron Age I and a Deuteronomistic framework that artificially massages them into an ideology of a covenantal based kingship. The thesis is similar to other proposals (see my *Anchor Yale Bible* commentary, now in print), but Levin rehearses the issues cleanly. Koert van Bekkum (“Coexistence as Guilt: Iron I Memories in Judges 1”) too finds memory of Iron I culture in the opening chapter of Judges 1 despite the manipulation of the text over time. Moshe Garsiel revisits comprehensively his scarcely verifiable hypothesis that the Books of Samuel were

the products of two authors living at opposite ends of Solomon's reign. His final pages summarize it once more. Michael Avioz asks, "The Davidic Covenant in 2 Samuel 7: Conditional or Unconditional?" before opting for the former.

Aaron Koller offers a title that covers it all, "The Kos in the Levant: Thoughts on its Distribution, Function, and Spread from the Late Bronze to the Iron Age II" to which is attached an appendix on excavated examples. For him, the *kōs* is a bowl, an identification that gives him leave to discuss banqueting, feasting, and artistic depiction about such occasions. Yet there are enough references for the *kōs* as held with one hand to suggest that it also was a goblet or a cup, however large it might be. (In a Mari metaphor, a *kāsum* had a mouth large enough to catch excrement.) I imagine that the term applied to a variety of drinking vessels and it might not be useful to insist on just one form. Richard S. Hess offers a rather parochial look at "The Distinctive Value of Human Life in Israel's Earliest Legal Traditions." For him Israel's law of slavery and of homicide shows it espousing the "fundamental equality of all people and the unique worth of each person." Hard to accept are analyses that cut across literary categories and are unconfirmed by living documentation.

By no means least because here it is last, is editor Sandra Jacobs's "נפש תחת נפש" 'A Life for a Life' and *napšāte umalla*," an appealing, detailed study that perhaps is too categorical in deciding that a living substitute is intended when the phrase occurs in the Covenant Code. תחת cannot mean "a substitute" in the famous talion formulations ("an eye for eye...") and it takes special pleading to claim them irrelevant to the thesis. All in all, this is a stimulating volume, providing a good inkling on research in these early decades of the new millennium.

Jack M. Sasson
Vanderbilt University

Joan E. Taylor, *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea*. Oxford: OUP, 2012. Pp. 448 pages, incl. 56 figures and col. plates. £30.00. ISBN 978-0-19-955448-5.

This is a book of two halves. The first is a prodigious work of scholarship by the Professor of Christian Origins and Second Temple Judaism at Kings College, London, delving into the Essenes in Ancient Literature. This is not my field of expertise; moreover, as this review is for an archaeological journal, I will make only one minor comment on this essentially textual study. Taylor successfully brings the Essenes from the outer margins of Judaism where they have often languished, into a more mainstream position in Judaic philosophy. But in doing so she does, perhaps, over emphasize the influence they might have had in day-to-day practical

life. They ‘were not a small group’ (p. 196) she writes, quoting classical authors who variously used words such as ‘throng’ or ‘multitude’ or ‘huge numbers’ in reference to Essenes. Yet if those same authors’ figure of 4,000 is correct that is a very small proportion of the total population in the Second Temple period, which historians have estimated as about 4,000,000 of whom half were Jews, 1,250,000 were Samaritans, and the rest ‘foreigners’. Thus the Essenes were only 0.2% of the total Jewish population. The second half of the book, which attempts to place the Essenes near the Dead Sea, and, in particular, at Qumran, is less convincing. The meticulous scholarship of Part I is less evident, particularly in the coverage of the archaeology.

Although certain classical authors place the Essenes vaguely in an area northwest of the Dead Sea, the site of Qumran is never specifically mentioned. Taylor wants us to believe that the Essenes received Qumran as a gift from Herod on the basis of a possibly apocryphal story in Josephus. At the end of a passage concerning Herod’s attempts to recover the goodwill of the people at a time of unpopularity during his reign, in part by releasing them of a third part of their taxes, his current problems are dropped and a story of his childhood is tacked on in which one Menahem the Essene predicted that he, Herod, would become King of the Jews. As a result, we are told, Herod honoured the Essenes, though it does not indicate any particular manner in which they were so honoured. Taylor, whilst being initially cautious - ‘If it is historically correct that the Essenes ... received honours and gifts from Herod ...’ (p. 128) – nonetheless goes on to take the leap that the ‘surmise that the gifts given by Herod to Essenes included a tract of land between En Gedi and Jericho’ (p. 247). Even if the story is true and not merely an indication of Josephus’ own interest in divination, and if a youthful Herod was indeed impressed by one soothsayer’s predictions it seems entirely out of character that the adult Herod would relinquish control over a small part of his important Jordan Valley holdings that stretched as far south as En Bokek. He does not come across as an altruist who might carelessly give something away without clear gain for himself. The work of another scholar is invoked as supporting the supposition; ‘as Samuel Rocca noted ... Herod also gave gifts of parts of his royal estates.’ (p. 270). However Rocca indicates that the Jordan valley estate was exploited directly by the crown and that most of ‘Herod’s gift lands and colonies were situated outside the Jewish areas.’ (Rocca 2008: 215).

Taylor says that ‘Josephus’ description creates many gaps it is all too easy to fill with assumptions,’ (p. 103) and to me the gift of Qumran to the Essenes by Herod is one of them. To consider whether it is likely that Herod would give away Qumran to the Essenes, or to anyone else, it is necessary to look more closely at the archaeology of the Royal Estate in Jericho, a site with which, having excavated there for ten years, I have some familiarity. Too much reliance is put on the

descriptions of Jericho given by Josephus and Strabo. Taylor writes that the Jericho area was ‘watered from the highly esteemed spring at Ain es-Sultan’ (p. 311 and see p. 226) based on Josephus, who accounted for the large area under irrigation to the erroneous belief that the spring ‘waters a larger space of ground than other waters do,’ but was unlikely to have traipsed all over the Royal Estate. Somewhat misleadingly Taylor mentions briefly that Strabo refers to the Hasmonean palace ‘which he’ (i.e. Strabo) ‘notes had gardens stretching northwards and eastwards, involving complex irrigation systems.’ (p. 217). Strabo merely refers to a large garden ‘watered with streams’ and the more precise details come from the published archaeological record although it is to be noted that the volume dealing specifically with the irrigation systems (Netzer, 2004) does not appear in the bibliography and Taylor does not question whether Josephus’ claim may be too simplistic.

Ain es-Sultan had, of course, supported a settlement in Jericho since Neolithic times but when the Hasmonean dynasty, in need of a steady source of income, saw the possibility of harvesting large quantities of two high value cash crops, dates and balsam, if only they could irrigate previously uncultivated land, they had to go to considerable lengths to bring water by aqueduct from Ain Qelt, c 8 km to the west in Wadi Qelt, as the Sultan spring had no spare capacity. This water did allow for the successful development of irrigated agriculture on the flat land to the north of where the Wadi Qelt emerges from the scarp cliffs. Land to the south of the wadi, however, was irrigated, by a huge pool, Birkat Musa, ‘the largest man-made water tank ... in the country’ (Netzer and Garbrecht 2002, 377), which must have been fed by diverting some of the permanent, and occasional flood, water that ran in the wadi. Only as agriculture flourished did palaces begin to be built on the north bank utilising the same water supply. To expand irrigated agriculture on new fields to the east of the first plantations, and to allow for larger palaces to be built, the Hasmoneans had to bring water from Ain Na’aran, to the north of Ain es-Sultan, by an aqueduct that had to run for some 5 km along ‘tortuous contours’ (ibid 373) on the scarp face. As it would have required frequent repairs following winter floods its water would have been ‘expensive’.

When Herod wanted to further increase the water supply for the estate he brought water to the head of the Na’aran aqueduct from Ain el Auja a further 8 km to the north. The total course to the fields would have been at least 14 km. He also exploited the two upper springs in Wadi Qelt by building a 20 km long aqueduct, which ‘incorporated ten bridges and five tunnels in order to overcome the many small ravines descending into the wadi’ (Garbrecht and Peleg 1994, 167). The Qelt water was used to develop fields south of those irrigated by Birkat Musa, fields which may have reached to within 8 km of Qumran. Thus ultimately all the water required for the success of the Royal Estate had to be brought to the site either by a 14 km long aqueduct from the north; by two from the west, one 8 km long, the other over 20 km; or was gathered in

the largest open pool in Palestine. With the difficulty that was encountered bringing water to the Royal Estate it seems certain that both the Hasmoneans and Herod would have exploited, and kept under their control, the locally falling rain water that could be gathered with comparative ease at Qumran only 14 km to the south, not for agricultural purposes, because the land there was not suitable, but for various water intensive industries producing low return, but necessary, goods without using the 'expensive' water of Jericho itself. It is unlikely that either the Hasmoneans or Herod would have tolerated a group of people exploiting this water for their own purposes, which would have been seen as a major sign of political weakness, particularly as Qumran was at the foot of a track leading up into the Buqe'ah.

An unusual feature of the water system at Qumran is a water raising dam (as against a baffle dam that diverts water into a side channel or directly into a cistern). It is not mentioned by the classical authors nor by Taylor. Its construction would have required specialised and expensive technological knowledge, probably from Roman engineers, something only likely to be available to Herod. He probably received assistance from Marcus Agrippa, and the dam, whilst prestigious in itself, was primarily designed to expedite the construction and supply of two of Herod's most impressive constructions, Hyrcania and Herodium. Herod was a keen builder, an enthusiasm he shared with Agrippa. When visited by Agrippa in 15 BCE Herod proudly escorted him around his prestigious building projects. It seems inconceivable that Herod would relinquish control over a site that played a part, however minor, in his building programme.

Based on the pragmatic realities of the water systems of the Royal Estate in Jericho – very much glossed over in this book - and of the dam in Qumran, which is not mentioned at all (rather than on a possibly apocryphal story, and a supposed act of uncharacteristic generosity on the part of Herod), equally valid alternatives to some of the archaeological interpretations of Qumran, accepted here by Taylor, will be advanced in my forthcoming volume *Qumran Revisited*, whose publication is scheduled with Archaeopress of Oxford. Taylor emphasises that the area widely surrounding Qumran was exploited in the Hasmonean period for 'both military and economic reasons' (pp. 221, 223, 239, 247) although little thought is given to what the economic exploitation would be in Qumran itself where the growing of crops would be extremely limited. In an article published in an earlier manifestation of *Strata* (Stacey 2008) I pointed out that the Dead Sea littoral had been used since time immemorial for winter grazing of sheep brought down from the Buqe'ah in the brief period of verdancy following winter rains. During our long winter seasons excavating in Jericho in the 1970s and '80s we were aware that such transhumance still continued. Following rain we would see flocks being brought down to the plains under the control of Bedouin shepherds, although our Bedouin workers explained that the sheep belonged to fellahin in the hills, and that the mutually

beneficial relationship between the families of the owners and of the shepherds went back many generations, the sort of relationship that Essene shepherds may well have had with clients two thousand years ago. I suggested that a sizeable part of the economic activity in Qumran was to do with the seasonal presence of those sheep, generating the production of wool, hides, glue etc. Although my article is referred to (p.268 where the quote reads: ‘As David Stacey has noted, Qumran must have been a locus of seasonal activity, manned only by guards during the hottest months of the year, when life here would have been almost intolerable.’ This is not strictly true as I envisaged the site totally abandoned in the summer months and did not suggest any ‘guards’), the presence of sheep is ignored and not discussed. Indeed it is unclear what economic activity is envisaged for Qumran during the Hasmonean period.

Too much uncritical reliance is placed on the work of others e.g. Humbert (p. 252–3) and Mizzi (p. 260). Mizzi’s claim that the number of stone vessels found at Qumran is greater ‘than is usual at comparable sites’ (p. 260), and thus reveals an unusual concern with ritual purity, may be undermined by the publication, hopefully early in 2013, of *Hasmonean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho Vol V*, edited by Rachel Bar-Nathan. Taylor states that from the time of Herod there was a ‘radical change to the Hasmonean square structure ... consistent with new occupants creating industries not original to the site’ (p. 342 my italics). Whether an isolated ‘Hasmonean square structure’ ever existed either as ‘a property of the Hasmonean aristocracy’ (thus Humbert), or as ‘a fortified farmstead’ (thus, apparently, Mizzi, p. 260) seem unlikely as there was neither sufficient water for farming or for year round occupancy, nor any signs of architectural luxury. And are we to believe that the industrial unit in the west is only a Herodian addition - unlikely as, at least in L 101, Hasmonean jars and mudbrick presumably fallen at the time of the earthquake of 31 BCE were found; or that the pottery kilns beneath L 48/9 are not Hasmonean (have they, perhaps, been relegated to the Iron age along with the inconvenient pools L 117 and L 118 in an as yet unpublished article noted on p. 253. f.n.28)? The archaeological details are discussed fully in my forthcoming book in which I conclude that the industrial exploitation of Qumran began under the Hasmoneans and that its products were of equal importance in the Herodian period. What changed was the expansion and ambition of the royal building program.

In the final chapter the Essenes are assigned a particularly important, possibly exaggerated, role in the gathering and processing of herbal remedies near the Dead Sea. In an age when everyone had to rely on herbal remedies the Essenes certainly did not have a monopoly over them. The Dead Sea region did have some unique flora, useful for both dyes and medicine, which the transhumant shepherd would have been in an ideal situation to gather. Other plants, said by classical sources to be of importance in the Dead Sea pharmacology, are scarcely to be

found there and could be found far easier elsewhere. In the Hebrew University's online 'Flora of Israel' (<http://flora.huji.ac.il>) neither Mandrake nor Madder are considered as having a distribution near the Dead Sea, and Rue is far more common in the uplands. Whilst the classical scholarship makes the first half of this book such a success, an over reliance on those same sources, as opposed to delving into the pragmatic realities of the 'facts on the ground,' reduces the efficacy of the second.

Garbrecht, G. and Peleg, Y., (1994). "The Water Supply of the Desert Fortresses in the Jordan Valley," *BA* 57/3: 161–170.

Rocca, S., (2008). *Herod's Judaea*. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Netzer, E., (2004). "Hasmonean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho." Vol. II. IES Jerusalem

Netzer, E. and Garbrecht, G., (2002). "Water Channels and a Royal estate of the late Hellenistic period in Jericho's Western Plains." Pp 367–379 in Amit, Patrich and Hirschfeld (eds). *The Aqueducts of Israel* (JRA Supplementary Series 46, Portsmouth R.I.).

Stacey, D., (2008). Seasonal Industries at Qumran. *BALAS* 26, 7–29.

David Stacey

Field Archaeologist, Jericho Excavations (1975-1987)

Anthony Frendo, *Pre-Exilic Israel, the Hebrew Bible, and Archaeology: Integrating Text and Artefact* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 549; London: T&T Clark, 2011). Pp. xii +120. \$120.00. ISBN 9780567415639.

The author of this excellent examination of method in the study of the archaeology of ancient Israel states at the start of his work that the book is long overdue partly because of 'new administrative tasks assigned to me at the University of Malta, as well as the pressure of deadlines linked with the publication of academic papers' (p. xi). Unfortunately, the present reviewer has been in much the same situation, so that this review in *Strata* is long overdue, and I do thank Sandra Jacobs and the editor David Milsom for their patience.

Having now read and digested Anthony Frendo's work in full, I can sum it up by the short recommendation of 'essential reading' for all those working in the field of the history and archaeology of Israel. It is not a long book, but every chapter homes in on key issues that have – dare I say – stymied academic discussion of evidence. Frendo identifies that the key problems in regard to maximalist and minimalist positions (and he does not like these terms) are epistemological and methodological, and therefore tries to explore an elementary grammar on 'joining, without confusing, written and non-written evidence' (p.7).

Both archaeological and literary evidence provide gateways to the actual past, but both can be preserved randomly, in a fragmentary and selective state. While postmodern theorists have championed the subjective, seeing history as invariably a text of the present and the search for the actual past a futile one (p.52), Frendo notes the inherent confusion here between history and historiography. History is knowledge of the actual past, but historiography is a reconstructed presentation of the past (p.14). How do we find out what was actual? The study of texts and the analysis of archaeological material must go hand in hand in a methodology of critical realism.

In proposing this, Frendo stands firmly in a camp opposed to ‘postmodern’ notions that would accept textual evidence as useful only if it is subjected to tests that are impossible to do, without allowing any tests on its own claims. The view that texts are too subjective to be valuable for understanding the actual past is countered by careful, informed and coherent analysis. He notes that the maximalist and minimalist argument is largely about whether we endorse the relativism and scepticism found within the ‘postmodern’ position on texts. He does not. However, he takes the subjective as an essential beginning point, in that every researcher begins with unproven assumptions that need to be carefully examined (p.101).

The historiography of the classical world is brought to bear on the question to show how such authors as Herodotus, Thucydides, Quintilian and Polybius knew their fables from their fact: a *fabula* was not a *historia*, though an *argumentum* could be a more complex entity. The question then is one of genre, in regard to the biblical narratives, or multiple genres, and what the authors thought they were doing in the 6th century when they collected together both oral and written material in the final forms of the texts that became in due course canonical. Frendo insists time and again on just how many components of these texts have to be pre-exilic for the various redactional and interpretive elements to come into play.

Frendo rejects a literal and simplistic face-value reading of texts, and insists on the undertaking a kind of archaeological examination of literary material, with careful analysis of their composition and redaction history, context and so on. This must be done independently of archaeological examination, so that the historical material and the archaeological data can then be compared.

In Frendo’s view, archaeology cannot really prove texts or *vice versa*; what one ultimately hopes for is a convergence or compatibility of data, the ‘converging probabilities’ long ago proposed by Newman (p.100). Absence of evidence does not prove a negative. You cannot claim that a city like Byblos did not exist in the Late Bronze and Iron Age when it is otherwise attested in the Tell el-Amarna tablets, among other evidence, even though there are no strata of this time (pp.30–31). However, positive archaeological evidence that is contrary to a historical

thesis can disprove it. This is the principle of falsification rather than verification (p.5); logically two contradictory statements cannot both be true at the same time. The main point is that if something did take place historically then existing archaeological and historical evidence should point in the same direction (p.105).

In Chapter 7 Frendo provides some discussions that demonstrate how his method can be used, in particular he looks at how archaeology can illuminate Rahab's house, particularly the word *gir* (probably 'edge'), in Josh. 2: 15. He explores how the text itself is composed of layers of a core piece of narrative and then a later editorial explanation (15a and 15b), as evidenced by the Greek Septuagint (LXX) version. He likewise explores developments of walls from the Middle Bronze to the Iron Age. The point is that an Late Bronze house built into the ruins of a Middle Bronze wall with its back wall forming the city wall is 'explained' to later readers familiar with a casemate wall in which the back broad room formed a compartment, where presumably a window would not be expected. Frendo also notes how the LXX rejects the addition of 'with a rope' so that the original text should simply read: 'she let them down through the window' (p.78); this piece of the story originated at a time when people still understood the kind of house being described.

The macro-archaeological question of pre-exilic Israel as an entity is tackled in Chapter 8 not so much by archaeology but by textual study of numerous relics: these are already evidenced in the 8th and 7th century prophets, and were traditions that were used then in post-exilic Israel, with a certain spin. The notion that if a text is rhetorical, or even propagandistic, it cannot preserve truth and must be classified as fiction is given short shrift (pp.102–3). Frendo quotes James Barr to support the notion that 'ideology is a set of ideas – it can affect historical narrative and bias it, but it does not originate it' (p. 102). The story has to begin somewhere else.

Frendo completed his book ahead of important studies, which he acknowledges, by Philip Davies, Hugh Williamson and Lester Grabbe, all of which appeared in 2007, and it would be interesting to know how he would now present the debate about the discoveries at Khirbet Qeiyafa. There is undoubtedly more he could say, and he will, time permitting. He is careful to respectfully endorse points made by scholars with whom he engages critically, and he writes clearly and concisely, with quite important points made in the notes as well as the main text. He has read and processed intelligently a vast number of important scholarly works and writes with great erudition. Most significantly, he is convincing. His approach is clearly one that is essential to apply if progress is to be made in understanding pre-exilic Israel and this book is extremely important reading for students and scholars in the field.

Joan Taylor
King's College, London

Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of the Holy Land from the Destruction of Solomon's Temple to the Muslim Conquest*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. 385 incl. illustrations. \$32.99. ISBN: 9780521124133.

In this beautifully-produced volume, Jodi Magness provides a superb introduction to the archaeology of the region of ancient Palestine, and creates a focus that is somewhat different from the usual presentations of 'biblical archaeology.' Magness puts the issue of pre-exilic Israel largely to one side (though it is profitably discussed in relation to Jerusalem on pp. 24–46), and concentrates on a time period that has been somewhat neglected, at least in terms of a holistic appraisal, from the Second Temple to Byzantine periods. This book is an invaluable overview and full of Magness's characteristically sound and insightful judgements. It will be much used by students and scholars alike, even without footnotes.

Magness is concerned to introduce the material, and thus in each era she begins with looking at the general historical situation of the eastern Mediterranean and Middle East, and then the specific historical situation of Palestine, with maps to orientate the reader, thereafter introducing some key archaeological sites and artefacts. In the Introduction she looks at the region and its peoples, and notes her use of 'Palestine' as referring to the modern state of Israel, Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and Palestinian Territories. She provides a review of chronology, and the subject of archaeology, including its basic principles, including methods of dating.

Magness then turns to Jerusalem, in Chapter 2, considering here the topography (with reference to biblical texts) and pre-exilic background, including water systems. The Babylonian and Persian periods are discussed in Chapter 3. Here there is a careful appreciation of the division of the land between the Sanballat dynasty (in Samaria), the Tobiads (in Rabboth-Ammon) and Nehemiah and his successors in Jerusalem, with comments on Persian remains in Jerusalem, Mt. Gerizim, Tell Jemmeh, Kedesh, Dor, Ashkelon and the Wadi ed-Daliyeh cave, which takes us into the Hellenistic era (post 331 BCE). The amount of Greek pottery and coinage in Persian-period coastal sites is presented, and serves to show how already before Alexander the cultural influence of the West was felt on the Palestinian seaboard, with the local imitations minted by the fourth century BCE, even before Alexander's conquest.

The Early Hellenistic Period (332–167 BCE) is discussed in Chapter 4. The archaeological sites presented are Samaria and Shechem, Straton's Tower, Jerusalem, Iraq el-Amir (Tyros) and Marisa, with Magness rightly noting the influence of Alexandria here. Sidebars describe the Zenon papyri and Greek architecture. The better known era relating to the Maccabean revolt and the Hasmoneans is covered in Chapter 5, with a presentation of Jason's tomb and Petra, though not the Hasmonean palaces now so well-known from Ehud Netzer's work,

probably because these are looked at in terms of their Herodian developments (in Chapter 8 and 10), and in fact the index entry of 'Hasmoneans' is worth following to find a wider corpus of Hasmonean material.

Chapter 6 contains a summary of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran, which is justified given that the Scrolls have loomed so large in terms of the archaeological discoveries of the region. Magness's understanding of Qumran as being occupied by Essenes is clearly argued, with a focus on animal bone deposits as representing the remains of communal meals, ritual baths for the careful maintenance of ritual purity, a majority of adult males in the cemetery representing a largely male group, and special toileting arrangements reflecting Essene practice as described by Josephus. Magness appears to cite the chronology given by de Vaux (p.112), but actually it is her own, viz. 'in the second half of the first century B.C.E., the settlement suffered two destructions: by earthquake (31 B.C.E.) and by fire (ca. 9/8 B.C.E). After the earthquake, the inhabitants cleaned up the site and repaired the buildings. After the fire, which seems to have been the result of an enemy attack, the inhabitants abandoned the settlement briefly before reoccupying it.' De Vaux's conclusion, in his influential synthesis *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1973), was that the fire probably arose as the result of the earthquake (pp.22–23), after which the buildings were not immediately repaired and the site abandoned, with the repairs leading to the beginning of Period II done in the reign of Archelaus (4–1 BCE). Magness has (in my view correctly) countered de Vaux's theory of post-earthquake abandonment, and also argued persuasively elsewhere for Period Ib continuing through to a fire caused by human agents sometime *after* 9/8 BCE, see *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2002), p. 66–69. At any rate, the difference between her chronology and that of de Vaux needs to be clarified in the next edition or printing.

Chapter 7 begins a series of chapters on the archaeology of the Herodian period, with special attention here given to Jerusalem. This chapter is very useful for those interested in the city at the time of Jesus and the First Revolt. Chapter 8 turns to Caesarea Maritima, Samaria-Sebaste, Herodian Jericho and Herodium, and Chapter 9 to the region of Galilee, with the context of Jesus explored in Sepphoris, Capernaum, Chorazin, Gamla, Nazareth and the Sea of Galilee. Chapter 10 is a very good summary of the archaeology of Masada, while Chapter 11 provides a clear presentation of types of tombs from Iron Age II through to 70 CE, with a section here on the historical evidence for the death and burial of Jesus and his brother James, with a sidebar countering the claims made about the Talpiyot tomb and James ossuary (pp. 245–54).

Chapter 12, on the period from 70 CE to 135/136 CE concentrates on the Nahal Hever and Nahal David discoveries by the Dead Sea, while Chapter 13 turns to Hadrianic Jerusalem (actually 135–300 CE), while using the 6th Madaba mosaic

map, which may be misleading for some readers, though this is to show the core design of the decumanus and the Hadrianic northern gate. In Chapter 14 Magness provides a succinct summary of her argument concerning the dating of synagogues, in which she presents the traditional typology but questions in particular the early dating of some of these types, preferring a dating in the fourth to sixth centuries, and she provides also a succinct and useful discussion of the Helios and Zodiac cycle on synagogue mosaic floors. The final Chapters 15–17 take readers through Byzantine Palestine (313–640 CE) and on to the early Islamic period. Chapter 15 concerns Jerusalem, with a review of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, Nea church and the Cardo, while Chapter 16 looks at Beth Shean, Gerasa, the Negev, desert monasteries and Chapter 17 the Dome of the Rock and al-Aqsa.

Throughout, the book is very nicely illustrated, with numerous fine photographs, many of which were taken by Magness's photographer husband Jim Haberman. My only significant criticism is that there is no extensive bibliography, and only a few selected books and articles appear at the end of each chapter. While it might be justified that footnotes should not be included, for such an introductory work, the lack of a more significant bibliography means that many of Magness's own important scholarly articles are not provided for further reading, even when they form the basis for certain chapters. Nevertheless, this is a very good book that does exactly what it intends to do, in introducing the archaeology of Palestine to beginners in the field. It will be much used in classes for years to come.

Joan Taylor
King's College, London

Lester L. Grabbe and Oded Lipschits (eds.), *Judah Between East and West: The Transition from Persian to Greek Rule (ca. 400–200 BCE)*. London: T & T Clark, 2011. xviii + 317 pp. \$140.00. ISBN 978-0-567-04684-0.

This volume includes many of the papers that were given at a conference in Tel Aviv that was planned for 2001 but in the event was not held until 2007. Judging from the conference programme, which is also included in the volume, it would appear that some of the papers were subject to considerable further revision in the meantime. It is noteworthy here as well that the conference was partly sponsored by the (British) Academic Study Group for Israel and the Middle East, hence explaining why most of the participants were from either British or Israeli universities.

The thirteen papers that are published are summarized at length in an introduction by Grabbe (in fact, at 30 pages the introduction is nearly the longest

‘article’ of all), and although he valiantly tries to bring some of the material together in his final section on ‘themes and topics’, nothing can hide the great diversity of contributions. The 200 years in question are historically among the least well known in the entire history of Judah from the beginning of the first millennium BCE to the present. The written sources that address it directly are few (as Grabbe shows in his own contribution), the attribution of others (such as biblical texts) to this period is highly controversial (as illustrated here by the survey and discussion by Lena Sofia-Tiemeyer), the nature of the relevant archaeological evidence is a matter of dispute, as I will discuss below, and even the question of the self-identity of the inhabitants of Judah is less clear than one might have supposed (see James Aitken).

One valuable source is, or ought to be, the later historian Josephus. It is generally agreed, however, that he was not as clear as we might have hoped about the closing decades of Persian rule; he seems to have thought, for instance, that there were only two kings Artaxerxes and Darius, whereas in fact there were three. The result is that in our terms he shortened the period by at least as much as two generations. This not only adds to our problem in dating some items that he records (to which Artaxerxes is he referring, for instance), but it also suggests that he himself might have had some difficulties in knowing what happened when. A few decades ago some elements in his narrative which had been previously dismissed as unreliable appeared to be vindicated by the discovery of the Wadi ed-Daliyeh papyri, but more recent research, not least by Grabbe himself, has reignited the debate. Since this relates in particular to the development of religious life in the northern part of the country, and further to the question of the dealings that Alexander the Great may or may not have had with Jerusalem and the nascent Samaritan community in either Samaria or Shechem, it is also relevant to note that recent archaeological work on Mount Gerizim has suggested that the Samaritan Temple may have been built as early as the middle of the Persian period and not in the early Hellenistic period (say around 300 BCE), as had previously been thought, not least because of Josephus. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand Grabbe’s expressions of frustration in his introduction, when he deals in particular with the chapters by Menachem Mor and Aryeh Kasher. Mor seeks to defend Josephus’s account of the building of the Samaritan temple, which obliges him to dismiss the evidence of current archaeological research which was undertaken since he originally formed his views on this subject quite a long time ago, and Kasher seeks to defend Josephus’s account of a meeting between Alexander and the Jerusalem High Priest, for which, of course, there is no other evidence and which Grabbe regards as unlikely in the extreme. These disagreements are interesting in themselves, but they also serve to illustrate well how many uncertainties we face as we try to understand this elusive period which was nevertheless so crucial for the emergence of Judaism and Samaritanism in their recognizable later formats.

Without being able here to discuss every paper, it will be appropriate in Strata to note especially the contribution from archaeology to these debates. Some details are relatively straightforward: Amos Kloner, for instance, notes the evidence from inscriptions and coins about the language situation in Idumaea while numismatic and other evidence in relation primarily to the coastal cities is discussed by Oren Tal. The real problems arise when archaeology and biblical texts are compared in relation to Jerusalem through these centuries.

On the one hand, Oded Lipschits offers a relatively conventional outline in which he allows some written materials to contribute when archaeology is silent. Thus, although no Persian period wall in Jerusalem has been certainly identified, he allows the account of its building in Nehemiah 3 to be taken more or less at face value and he uses the related finds of some other materials to support the conclusion that there was a Persian period settlement there, albeit reduced considerably in size and number from its previous state under the monarchy (he estimates a population of 1,000–1,250 in the pre-Hellenistic period). He tries to offer rational explanations for the lack of fuller material evidence as well. On the other hand, Israel Finkelstein argues that if we have not found a wall, then there was no wall. He reads the same material remains as Lipschits with a more critical eye, so arriving at an estimated population of 400–500 people (and hence only about 100 adult men). The real growth in Jerusalem is only late Hellenistic (the Hasmonean period) and the outline account of the building of the wall in Nehemiah 3 (on which he follows David Ussishkin in seeing it as encompassing both southern hills of the city, not just the eastern spur, as Lipschits and others prefer) should be dated to that later period. If this means we must completely revise our understanding of Nehemiah 3, making it reflect a second rather than a fifth century date, then so be it. Similar conclusions, he also argues, should be drawn about the purported list of those who returned from exile in Ezra 2/Nehemiah 7.

The difference of opinion could hardly be sharper, though the two scholars do not really interact closely with each other. And this is disappointing, as in fact both of them have already published closely comparable articles or chapters elsewhere. (This detracts somewhat from the value of the volume, of course.) Equally, Finkelstein was presumably not in a position at the time of the conference to mention such careful analyses of his opinions as may be found, for instance, in Z. Zevit, 'Is There an Archaeological Case for Phantom Settlements in the Persian Period?', *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 141 (2009), 124–37, though note might have been taken in revising his text for this publication. While Zevit deals with the question of the list of returning exiles, the main problem for Finkelstein, of which he indicates awareness but which he does not seriously address, is that in the book of Nehemiah wall building is not confined to the list of builders in chapter 3. This list certainly seems to derive from an independent source and so it could

theoretically be late Hellenistic. It needs here to be stressed, however, that not only this list but more or less the whole of the first-person account by Nehemiah in Neh. 1–6 is based on wall-building. Thus, if Finkelstein were correct, we should have to presume that this whole narrative was a late fiction. Of course, that can be raised as a question, but almost all scholars of whatever persuasion will quickly retort that this hardly seems plausible in view of all the other evidence which has (in my opinion correctly) been taken as indicative of a contemporary first-person account, however propagandistically biased. In fact, there are ways in which these divergent opinions might at least be brought closer to one another than at first appears, but the conference publication format, where each position is stated without apparent discussion or rejoinder, does not allow these to be explored.

The conference and this volume certainly tackle an intractably difficult and important subject, and some of the chapters shed elements of helpful light here and there. No reader can close the volume, however, without appreciating the degree to which further research remains a pressing requirement.

H.G.M. Williamson
The Oriental Institute, Oxford