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In the following pages an analogy will be made between Homeric traditions relating to the Greek conquest of Troy and Hebrew traditions pertaining to the Israelite conquest of Jericho. These events are said to have taken place in about 1200 BC.

Troy

Three major literary works dating from Classical antiquity revolve around the Trojan War. The first two are Greek and tell the story of the victors: the *Iliad* describes several weeks during the tenth and last year of the siege of Troy; and the *Odyssey* recounts ten years of the adventures of Odysseus culminating in his return home. The third book, the *Aeneid*, tells how the vanquished Trojan refugees founded the city of Rome at the end of their wanderings.

The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are attributed to Homer, who wrote in the 8th century BC, some 500 years after the events he described, doubtless on the basis of orally transmitted traditions. Modern scholars are of the opinion that ‘Homer’ was two different poets – the author of the *Iliad* living in the 8th century BC and that of the *Odyssey* at the beginning of the 7th century BC. The *Iliad* was composed by the Roman poet Virgil in the years preceding his death in 19 BC.

So famous was Troy that it was obvious for it to be the first ‘prehistoric’ (or ‘pre-Greek-alphabet’) site to be excavated in the Greek world. It has since become one of the most famous of all sites not only in its own right, but also due to its extraordinary excavator, Heinrich Schliemann (1822–90), the subject of various biographies. From poor beginnings he amassed fabulous riches, that he channelled in the last twenty years of his life into excavations. As a small boy he had taken a vow to discover Troy and to prove the veracity of its story. What he mainly achieved – and he was fortunate to unearth almost unparalleled finds – was not exactly what he intended. Indeed, Homer’s Troy itself could never be discovered, since it is now known to be nothing but a figment of the poetic imagination.

Schliemann identified Troy with the mound called in Turkish *Hissarlik*, that lies some 3 miles both from the Aegean and the Dardanelles. He observed nine strata, and at first thought that the Homeric city was represented by Stratum II, in which he found a now legendary treasure of gold and silver objects and other valuables. He left a detailed but archaeologically useless inventory of the finds: No. 22, for instance, is
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‘56 gold earrings’, and No. 23 ‘8700 gold rings’. He named the treasure after Priam, the last king of Troy.

Later excavators, mainly the American C. Blegen who excavated the site almost exhaustively in 1932–8, dated Stratum II to the 23rd century BC, about 1000 years before the city of Homer. Homeric Troy, destroyed, according to Greek tradition, in about 1200 BC, should be identified with Stratum VIIa of the 13th century BC. The city that preceded it, Stratum VI, was destroyed in about 1300 BC by an earthquake, but its description does not suit the city that was destroyed in battle. The identification of Homeric Troy with Troy VI, quite popular at the beginning of the 20th century, was put forward again recently, and gained some popularity through a BBC TV series. It is, however, untenable for various reasons that cannot be enumerated here.

The excavation apparently proves nothing in the Homeric epics except that the city was destroyed by fire. It cannot show whether the fire was due to war or to the carelessness of a citizen who perhaps lit a stove inefficiently on a windy day. Troy VIIa came to an end at a time when the palaces of Mycenaean Greece were gone. The coalition which was supposed to have conquered Troy was Achaean Greek, headed by Agamemnon, the king of Mycenaes, which means that the city was destroyed when Mycenaean Greece was already much diminished. Moreover, the city is little more than a settlement, which does not suit the description of Homeric Troy. It is a mere 5 acres, and contains small, poor houses and no public buildings, to say nothing of a palace. The community could not have numbered more than 400 or 500 inhabitants.

Can this have been the city for which the face of fair Helen launched 1186 ships, or which it took a coalition of all the Achaean tribes ten years to conquer? The answer must be that the Trojan epics are non-historical. They may be among the greatest works of literature, but the more we know of their period the more we find that the epics do not accurately represent it.

One does, indeed, find in Homeric poetry some echoes of Mycenaean institutions and culture: the bard remembers, for instance, that in the Mycenaean period war chariots were in use, something that did not exist in his time. But he misunderstands their use; for he sees them as a means of transportation – the warriors arrive at the battle in them, tether the horses and go into combat on foot. Again, in the Mycenaean period the dead were interred, but in the Homeric epics they are cremated; and one can cite many such examples. Even if the epics do not correctly describe the Bronze Age, however, they are an important source of information on the beginning of the Bronze Age and the Greek world, a period which differs sharply in its economic, technological and political institutions, and style of warfare from the society described in the epics.

Yet, as examples of heroic epics, the Homeric books are the first and the best. The tales were put to writing after many generations of oral transmission, and they weave a very intricate and detailed plot, rich in anachronistic details, around a tiny factual kernel. Studies have been made comparing later heroic epics with surviving historical records. The Song of Roland describes an event from the reign of Charlemagne: a battle between the emperor and a Muslim prince that took place in Roncesvaux in the
Pyrenees. The historical data reflects a small skirmish following an ambush laid in AD 778 by Basques to the rear of the emperor's army. In the *Song of Roland* one sees a mighty battle with 400,000 participants, the enemy being Muslim Saracens, not Christian Basques. Even the historical background is the 11th and 12th centuries, some three centuries after the event took place. Other heroic epics are also substantially fictional, such as the *Niebelungenlied* and the Serbian epic describing the battle of Kosovo.

Although Schliemann clearly misunderstood his sources, it should not be deduced that his work was futile. He not only aroused the interest of the world in archaeology and charmed the public with fascinating archaeological discoveries (perhaps to be compared only with the unearthing of the tomb of Tut-ankh-amon), but he was the first prehistoric archaeologist of Greece and western Anatolia. He was the first person scientifically to dig a *tell* and — to a great extent due to the assistance of the professional archaeologist W. Dörpfeld — he was the first to divide an archaeological site into its various strata. He was also one of the first who accurately registered apparently banal finds and who understood their importance in establishing chronology. Such achievements make him undoubtedly one of the most important pioneers in archaeology.

**Jericho**

Palestinian archaeology developed from its very beginnings as a technique for studying biblical sites; and it was due to the Bible that Palestine, in spite of the relative poverty of its archaeological finds, became the most excavated country in the world. Among all the historical events mentioned in the Bible, perhaps the most significant are the Exodus from Egypt and the Conquest of the Land.

The Exodus, even if its participants were numerous (and they were not), was not an event of a kind that could leave archaeological traces, so Palestinian archaeologists concentrated instead on digging sites that might help solve the problem of the Conquest of the Land. In this cycle of Conquest tales, Jericho holds a special place: not only was it the first city captured by Joshua west of the Jordan, but its conquest is described in great detail. Jericho became the first *tell* to be excavated in Palestine, and the most excavated site outside Jerusalem.

The first excavator was Charles Warren in 1868, two years before Schliemann began work at Troy. Warren, who made outstanding discoveries in Jerusalem (such as the walls of the Temple Mount and 'Warren's Shaft'), felt unable to investigate a *tell* and left Jericho after a short time. Palestinian archaeologists later learned how to understand the structure of a *tell* from W. M. F. Petrie, who established his method in only six weeks during the spring of 1890 while excavating Tell el-Hesi.

The second excavation here was Austro-German, headed by E. Sellin and C. Watzinger, that lasted from 1907 to 1909; the third was headed by the British archaeologist G. Garstang in 1930–6; and the fourth, British-Canadian, was led by Kathleen Kenyon in 1952–8.

These four expeditions, which removed most of the upper layers of the mound, did
not find the city which Joshua was supposed to have conquered. There is now practically a consensus among historians that Joshua's Conquest of the Land (whatever form that might exactly have taken) occurred in the 13th century BC, at a time when Jericho did not exist, for the city was deserted from the beginning of the 15th century until the 11th century BC, and even in the 14th century Jericho was no more than a poor unwalled settlement. As at Troy, however, the excavators of Jericho did not work in vain, for Garstang and Kenyon discovered the pre-pottery Neolithic city, one of the largest and most interesting settlements of that time in the world. But their efforts failed to solve the riddle of the Conquest of the Land.

Jericho was not the only biblical site that disappointed its excavators. After the fall of Jericho the Bible describes the conquest of Ai, yet here also the excavators learned that the site was deserted at the time of Joshua, for it was unoccupied from the early Bronze Age for more than 1000 years, and was settled by the Israelites only in the 12th century BC, when other settlements like Bethel, Mizpah (Tell en-Nasbeh) and Gibeah (Tell el-Ful) were established or resettled by the Children of Israel. Still another biblical description that proved unfounded is the story of the conquest of Arad, also unoccupied at that time.

No one need doubt the identities of the aforementioned sites, for even Heshbon (the capital of Sihon, the Amorite king in Trans-Jordan) which, like Jericho and Arad preserved its name – in the form of Hesban – until our own times, was not settled either. Yet the Israelite victory over Sihon is mentioned in the Bible more than a dozen times, between Numbers (21, 24) and Nehemiah (9, 22).

Other sites mentioned in the Conquest Cycle, like Gibeon (which surrendered without a battle) and Jarmuth (which was supposedly captured by force) yielded hardly any remains from this period. Only one site out of four stated explicitly to have been burned – Hazor – was found to have been destroyed by fire some time in the 13th century BC. The other three are Jericho and Ai, mentioned above, and Zephat, also called Hormah, whose precise location (in the vicinity of Arad) is not exactly known, yet cannot have existed then, as there was no settlement in the plains of Beersheba and Arad in the Late Bronze Age, when the Conquest must have occurred. These negative results make even the case of Hazor suspect, and there are scholars who believe that it was not necessarily destroyed by Israelites.

It should be noted, although we will not dwell on this here at length, that the Conquest Cycle in the books of Joshua and Judges is replete with contradictory data. To mention only one salient case, we mentioned above that the Bible lists four cities burned and destroyed at the time of Joshua. But there also exists an explicit statement claiming that Hazor was the only city burned by fire: ‘But as for the cities that stood on their mounds, Israel burned none of them, save Hazor only – that did Joshua burn’ (Joshua 11, 13).

Archaeology merely underlines the fact that the biblical account of the Conquest of the Land does not accurately represent historical reality. The archaeological data indicates that the transformation of Canaanite into Israelite lands was not due to a concerted, short, military campaign, but was rather a long process of infiltration by Israelite settlers, and was completed, by and large, in a peaceful manner.
This line of argument does not indicate that all biblical data is historically unreliable, but merely that the stories on the periods of the Conquest, the Settlement and the Judges reached us after long oral transmission, which tends to distort such traditions: facts are forgotten, exaggerated and invented to such an extent that the historical picture is at least partially lost. Only with the establishment of the monarchy in Israel did the royal, and perhaps also the Temple, scribes start to put in writing the chronicles of their times. Their account of the four centuries from the beginning of the monarchy to the destruction of the First Temple is not only the first attempt to write history; it is, as literature, one of the best.

The analogy between the stories of the conquest of Troy and of the conquest of the cities of Canaan is of course not complete, but one observes common traits. The events described in the cycles must have taken place at about the same time: 1200 BC. Both were handed down by oral tradition, to the highest literary standards and in a most credible manner; yet they are mostly figments of the imagination. One can, of course, find small kernels of historical fact, yet the texts should be the subject of literary rather than of historical study.

It is a sign of maturity both in Palestinian and Greek archaeology that, after a century of intensive research, it can not only reveal a wealth of new facts and draw detailed pictures of worlds about which we know nothing, but can refute deeply entrenched and generally accepted historical traditions.
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A Roman-period Samaritan Burial from Talluze

RACHEL BARKAY

In the framework of a study on local sarcophagi of the Roman period in Eretz Israel, we collected over 140 sarcophagi that all belong to one specific group. These sarcophagi are made of local limestone and have definite distinguishing characteristics. They are long and narrow, and are decorated with a typical geometric-shaped panel in low relief. In many cases these panels have carved geometric and floral designs (e.g. Vincent 1920, 131; Crowfoot, Kenyon, Sukenik 1942, 89 fig. 44; Avi-Yonah 1946 pl. A:1; Eitan 1967 pl. 18:1,4; Smith 1973, 72 pls I–II; Porath 1985, 140–1).

The lids of these sarcophagi are gabled with distinctive acroteria. On their narrow sides, two trapezoidal ledge handles are placed to facilitate the lifting of the lid (Plate 1). Such handles are unique to this type of sarcophagus, as are the legs hewn along the entire length of each of the narrow sides (e.g. Vincent 1920, 131; Eitan 1967, 114; Eitan 1969 pl. XII; Damati 1973, 119; Smith 1973, 72; Zias 1980, 61 fig. 2, 62 fig. 3; Damati 1985–6, 87–106).2

Almost without exception, when sarcophagi of this type are supported by legs, they stand on just such short strips, an average of c. 3cm long and c. 6cm wide (see the example from ‘Askar, Damati 1985–6, 90–5 Ills 5–17).

Sarcophagi of this type, identified by the characteristic handles and strip-legs mentioned above, could be associated with the burial customs of the Jewish population during the Second Temple period – all members of the family were buried in rock-cut caves; the dead were placed in stone sarcophagi decorated with floral and geometric designs; and secondary burial was also practised. All of these would indicate that the Samaritan population had customs and traditions similar to those of the Jews at the time.

The Burial Cave at Talluze

Talluze is situated in the Hills of Samaria some 15km southeast of Samaria-Sebaste, near ‘Ein Faru’a (map reference 1779.1864). In the Jerusalem Talmud the site is referred to as Tur Lusa, that is ‘Mount of Almonds’ (Jerusalem Talmud, Ta’anit iv, 8–68; 73). Talluze, now an Arab village, has many ancient remains: buildings, cisterns and tombs (Press 1948, 376, ‘Tur Lusa’). From the written sources and the finds of the archaeological survey we learn that the site was inhabited during the Iron Age II, Byzantine, Medieval and Ottoman periods (Kochavi 1972, 222).
In 1941, a rock-cut burial cave was uncovered at the village, and was examined by S. A. S. Husseini of the Department of Antiquities of the British Mandatory Government. The cave was discovered accidentally by a local farmer while cultivating a field. When Husseini arrived, he found that the cave had already been disturbed, and that the finds had been removed and partially lost. Our knowledge of the cave's contents is therefore incomplete, and mainly based on the report of the farmer who discovered it. Husseini notes that this cave was originally a natural one that had been enlarged in order to be used for burial (Fig. 1). Five crudely cut steps lead to the opening of the burial cave, which is oriented north-south. The entrance is from the north and the opening is irregular.

The burial chamber is roughly square. In the northern wall on either side of the entrance are two elongated, crudely hewn burial niches (kokim). In the southern end of the eastern wall is another niche similar to the other two, while in the southern wall close to the eastern end we find a small cavity, which is apparently an unfinished burial niche.

The measurements of the burial chamber were not included in Husseini's preliminary report, but on the basis of the scale in the plan they can be calculated as follows: The chamber is c. 2.70m long, c. 2.90m wide and on average c. 1.10m high. The kokim are carved at a distance of c. 0.20–0.30m above floor level. The height of
Fig. 1. Plan and section of the burial cave at Talluze.
the *kok* located in the eastern wall is c. 0.50m; its width is c. 0.60m and its depth c. 1.60m. The depth of the eastern *kok* in the northern wall is c. 1.30m and its average width c. 0.50m. The depth of the western *kok* in the northern wall is c. 1.55m and its average width c. 0.40m. (The height of the fourth *kok* is unknown since we have no section of it.) The opening of the cave is c. 0.50m high and c. 0.70m wide. Husseini notes that in general the cave is crudely cut and the walls not smoothed.

### The Sarcophagi

Two stone sarcophagi were found with their lids in the cave. One of them, Sarcophagus A, was found intact in the northeastern corner of the cave, while the fragments of Sarcophagus B were found near the southern wall of the tomb (see Fig. 1). Both sarcophagi are rectangular and narrow with thin, delicately worked walls.

*Sarcophagus A:* This sarcophagus has the following measurements (calculated on the basis of the scale in the photograph, see Fig. 2 and Pl. 2): length c. 0.68m; width c. 0.32m, height c. 0.34m. The walls are c. 5cm thick, and the upper part of the front surface is decorated with two plain square panels in low relief. The average size of the panels is 17.5 x 17.5cm.

On the four corners of the lid are acroteria carved in the shape of quarter-spheres. Each of the narrow sides of the lid has a typical ledge handle (Pl. 1). The sarcophagus stands on two strips of the characteristic type mentioned above. The strips are c. 3cm wide and c. 2cm high.

This sarcophagus is small compared to other sarcophagi of the same type known to us, and its dimensions could well fit those of an ossuary. However, if ossuaries of this type had been used for burial as they were among the Jews in the Second Temple period (Rahmani 1977 *passim*), we would have come across other such items at the Samaritan burial sites. The practice of collecting the bones of the deceased is

![Fig. 2. Sarcophagus A – front and side.](image-url)
encountered in the mausoleum at ‘Askar where bones are found inside a special niche used for that purpose. (Damati 1973, 119–20; Damati 1985–6, 105.) From over 140 such sarcophagi found so far, we know of only four that are less than 1m long, and it is very likely that they were intended for children.⁵

**Sarcophagus B:** Both this sarcophagus and its lid were found broken (Fig. 3, P. 1). It is decorated with two plain round panels carved in low relief on the two ends of the front surface. The diameter of each panel is c. 21cm. According to the farmer who discovered the tomb, an inscribed fragment from the cave belongs to the front of the sarcophagus. In fact, on both edges of the inscribed fragment there are signs of breakage which fit well with those on other parts of the front surface (see our reconstruction of the fragments in Fig. 3). According to Husseini’s report, the sarcophagus is c. 1.5m long, c. 0.40m wide and c. 0.50m high. Based on the pictures of his report, we made a reconstruction of the fragments belonging to the sarcophagus. According to the scale in the pictures, verified by measuring the fragment of the inscription, the sarcophagus would be at least 1.95m long.⁶

On the fragment that was originally in the centre of the front side of the sarcophagus, there is a Greek inscription bearing the name of the deceased. The maximum height of the fragment is 0.50m, and the width 0.63m. The inscription is
shallowly engraved on a rectangular panel 32.5cm wide and 19.5cm high. The panel projects several millimetres only from the surface of the sarcophagus. Such panels are commonly found among sarcophagi of this type (see for example the square panels on Sarcophagus A from Talluze as well as an inscribed square panel from 'Askar [Damati 1985–6, 99, Ill. 25]). In the panel, the inscription is enclosed within an incised rectangular frame. Between the frame and edge of the panel are narrow margins – the width of the horizontal margin is 1cm and that of the vertical margin 3cm.7

The Inscription (Fig. 3, Pl. 3)

The Greek inscription was found engraved on a fragment which is attributed to Sarcophagus B. It was first published by M. Schwabe as a Jewish inscription of the Second Temple period (Schwabe 1942, 245–8; Lifshitz 1969, 92:1), although he did not attribute the inscription to the sarcophagus with the round panels. The three-line inscription is written in letters 2.5–3cm high. It reads as follows:

IWCHIIOC
IAKKWBOU
ZXAPIA

‘Joseph (son of) Jacob Zechariah’.

Joseph, the name of the deceased, is in the nominative case; the name of his father, Jacob, is in the genitive case; and the third name, Zechariah, is probably the name of

Fig. 3. Sarcophagus B – the Greek inscription and reconstruction of the fragments.
the dead man’s grandfather, although it may be his father’s second name. Since all three are well-known biblical names, the two last names were probably used for definitive identification. Inscriptions on sarcophagi of this type have been published from only one site, the mausoleum at ‘Askar near Shechem.8

In the mausoleum of ‘Askar the two inscriptions were found engraved on two of the sarcophagi. As in Talluze, they are written in Greek and are intended to identify the buried. Most of the names on the sarcophagi from ‘Askar can be regarded also as Jewish, since they are either of biblical origin or are Greek translations of biblical names (Damati 1985–6, 98–9).

Thus, out of a total of three inscriptions known on this type of sarcophagi, we have nine names: the Hebrew or biblical names are Joseph, Jacob, Zechariah, Shabtai and Simon; the two Hebrew names in Greek translation are Justus (Zadok) and Theophilos (Jedidiah). Only two names are not of biblical or Hebrew origin: Archaeais and Alexander. The names appearing on the sarcophagi, then, are typical of Jewish or Samaritan populations, and were not likely to be used among pagans. Schwabe, who did not know of any other sarcophagi of this type, or their distribution, attributed the fragment with the inscription to a Jewish population, although he notes that such biblical names could also have been Christian. However, he rules out the latter possibility because of the dating (Schwabe 1942, 249). Damati attributed the
mausoleum of Askar to the Samaritan population of the end of the second century CE (Damati 1985–6, 99, 105). All three inscriptions were engraved on the front sides, after the sarcophagi had already been finished and decorated. The burial inscriptions were written in Greek since that was the common language among the local population during the Roman period. So far, no inscriptions in Samaritan script have been found from this period. The earliest known Samaritan inscriptions belong to the Byzantine period. Even then, Samaritan scripts were not used in everyday situations, but only for sacred purposes (Naveh 1982, 123–4).

The Finds

The farmer who discovered the cave reported that he had found a number of pottery vessels there, but when Husseini examined the tomb it was already empty. Husseini reported having been shown an oil lamp which originated in the cave, although according to the farmer there were originally four others. Based on the information from the farmer, Husseini reported that there were candlestick-shaped glass bottles as well, which were also lost. No drawings or photographs of these finds were included in the report. It should be mentioned that the candlestick-shaped bottles and the round Roman-period oil lamps are typical funerary offerings accompanying sarcophagi of this type (Eitan 1969, 61 fig. 21, 63–4 figs 13–14; Zias 1980, 63–4 figs 4–5). The limited information on the funerary offerings in the burial cave at Talluze prevents us from dating the tomb independently (see below).

Identification of the Deceased and Date of Burial

It is difficult to determine the ethnic group identified with the sarcophagi through the inscriptions alone, especially since the majority of sarcophagi do not bear any inscriptions at all. According to the biblical names appearing in the Talluze cave inscription, Husseini identified this burial complex as Jewish. There is no literary or archaeological evidence of Jewish settlement in Talluze or its vicinity during the late-Roman period. We do know, however, that Samaritan settlement in the area increased during that time and continued during the Byzantine period (Press 1948, 376). Hence it can reasonably be assumed that the names appearing in the inscription are of Samaritans.

In discussing the ethnic attribution of these sarcophagi, a few more factors should be born in mind: (a) The geographical areas in which other sarcophagi of this type were found, and information from historical and archaeological sources about the population of those areas during the Roman period. (b) The character of the sarcophagi themselves and the type of burial customs associated with them. These might provide an indication of the population that made and used them.

The data are reflected in the shape of the sarcophagi, decorations and type of stone; burial offerings accompanying the sarcophagi and funerary customs associated with them; and the absence of pagan elements (with the exception of certain groups). In a comprehensive survey, we found that the diffusion of the sarcophagi under
discussion is concentrated primarily in two geographical regions (Fig. 4): the Samaria Hills, whose centre was the city of Flavia-Neapolis (Nablus) where approximately 75 per cent of the sarcophagi have been found; and the Coastal Plain, especially towards the north, in and around Netanya. A few sarcophagi have also been found on the periphery of these areas at Rosh Ha’Ayin, Pella in Transjordan, Ammuriyah on the slopes of the Samaria Hills and ‘Ar’ara in the western approaches of Wadi ‘Ara. All these sarcophagi are locally made and differ completely from those imported into Palestine during the Roman period.

The sarcophagi, which were made by the resident population for their own use, reveal stylistic affinities with Jewish ossuaries and sarcophagi of the Second Temple period, thereby indicating links with the world of Jewish beliefs. As mentioned, the names appearing on these sarcophagi would discount any possibility of their belonging to a pagan population. The funerary offerings are also devoid of pagan elements. The oil lamps characteristically associated with the type of sarcophagi under discussion are usually moulded and circular, dating to the second and third centuries CE (Vincent 1920, 133 fig. 6; Eitan 1969, 61–4 figs 12–14; Zias 1980, 63 figs 6–11; Barkay 1987, 15–17). Wherever such lamps were found, they were decorated only with geometric and floral motifs, whereas during the same period, oil lamps of this type were commonly decorated with a variety of human figures. Other pottery vessels, such as cooking pots, jugs and bowls, and personal objects, such as jewellery, were found with the sarcophagi. The dating of the sarcophagi to the second-third centuries was confirmed by the material found in the mausoleum of ‘Askar (Damati 1985–6, 87–106). A dating which was also accepted by Magen (1987, 88). (However, Magen suggests continuation of the use of some of the sarcophagi up to the fourth century, which is not based on any archaeological data.)

An unusual object was found in a burial cave at ‘Ar’ara – a clay toy shaped like a rooster, originally with wheels. Altogether, none of these finds have characteristic signs that can be attributed to any specific ethnic group. So far, the earliest cultural material we know of that can be attributed to the Samaritans dates from the Byzantine period: the Samaritan-type oil lamps with inscriptions in Samaritan script. The types of finds accompanying the sarcophagi, lacking any specific ethnic elements, fit in well with the Samaritan tradition.

The tombs where the sarcophagi were found are of different shapes, most commonly rock-cut caves. In each of the sites, the type of tomb fits the natural and local circumstances and the family’s economic means. The types of tombs ranged from very simple pits dug into the ground to luxurious mausoleum buildings. The burial customs and shape of the tombs are quite close to those of the Jews.

After suppressing the Jewish Revolt in 70 CE, the Romans founded Flavia-Neapolis near ancient Shechem, where the Samaritans were involved in the city council. From the founding of Flavia-Neapolis to the Bar-Kokhba Revolt, there were friendly relations between the Samaritans of Neapolis and the Romans. It is not totally clear whether the Samaritans collaborated with the Jews during the Revolt, but when it was suppressed they pursued a policy of neutrality and even collaborated with the Romans (Büchler 1980, 115–21).
A ROMAN-PERIOD SAMARITAN BURIAL FROM TALLUZE

Fig. 4. Distribution map of Samaritan sarcophagi.
Following the Revolt, the Jewish population dispersed mainly to the southern region of the Judean Hills (Daroma) and to the Galilee, while the Samaritan population expanded and became a significant element in the rural areas of the Samaria Hills, the northern Judean Hills, the northern Coastal Plain (the Sharon) and the Beth-Shean Valley. The Samaritan religious and cultural centre remained in the Samaria Hills. It seems that this prosperity came to an end in the third century CE when the Samaritans were victimized during the Roman persecution of the Christians. Since their religion was not recognized by the Roman Empire as Judaism had been, the Samaritans were forced to prove their loyalty to the pagan cult. During the second-third centuries CE, pagan and Samaritan populations were interspersed throughout the distribution areas of the sarcophagi in question, and we do not know of any Jewish settlement there during that period (with the exception of Caesarea, where the Jewish population is well known, and a synagogue has been excavated). The rock-cut tomb of Talluze is one of a large group of tombs in which the same type of sarcophagi were found. Their shape and character, the burial customs associated with them, the offerings and names on the inscriptions, as well as their geographical distribution, all enable us to attribute sarcophagi of this type to the Samaritans.

Summary

The Roman-period burial cave from Talluze, which has been attributed to the Samaritans, adds a new chapter to the history of settlement at the site. Also, the fact that Talluze was populated by Samaritans prior to the Byzantine period, adds the site to the distribution of Samaritan settlements in Palestine during the Roman period. I. Press mentions that among the ancient remains of Talluze there were some rock-cut tombs which he refers to as Jewish or Samaritan (Press 1948, 376). It is possible that he is discussing Samaritan tombs of the Byzantine period, but he may have been referring to the kind of tombs represented here.

As we have concluded, the sarcophagi of Talluze belong to a large, well-defined family of coffins that were made and used by the Samaritans, and are found mainly in Samaritan settlement areas of the late-Roman period – second-third centuries CE.

The sarcophagi from Talluze, and the rest of the large group to which they belong, unquestionably reflect a large, densely concentrated and prosperous population. In our opinion it would be very difficult not to attribute these sarcophagi to the Samaritan population of the second and third centuries CE which was concentrated in the Samaria Hills and the Coastal Plain. On the basis of the data at our disposal, we would propose that the manufacturing and use of these sarcophagi be dated to the period between the Bar-Kokhba Revolt and the time when the Romans persecuted the Samaritan population – that is approximately from the second quarter of the second century CE to the middle of the third century CE. The slightly later sarcophagi, which are the primary indications of Roman influence, were discovered in 'Askar, in the west mausoleum of Shechem and at the village of Beith-Iba. They were most likely made at a time of growing Roman cultural and political influence, towards the last stage of sarcophagi production. Hence, we surmise that when they were oppressed by
the Romans, deprived of their cultural and religious autonomy and finally persecuted outright, the Samaritans ceased to produce sarcophagi of the type discovered at Talluze.

Notes

1 These sarcophagi were collected and examined in the course of research for an MA thesis under the guidance of Professor A. Negev.
2 In Zias 1980 fig. 2, the legs of the sarcophagus should have been drawn like those of Sarcophagus A from Talluze.
3 There is a preliminary report on the cave by S. A. S. Husseini of the Department of Antiquities of the Mandatory Government. The information cited in our article, and the related illustrations, are published with the kind permission of the Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums.
4 The plan presented here was drawn by Tatiana Kofian and is based on a preliminary plan made by Husseini. The placement of the sarcophagi on the plan is approximate, based on an oral description by the farmer who discovered the cave.
5 One of these is our Sarcophagus A from Talluze; one is from Samaria (Crowfoot, Kenyon, Sukenik 1942, 98 fig. 44 'the lower sarcophagus'), this sarcophagus is 85cm long; the other two are from Shechem (Clermont-Ganneau 1896, 324). This one is represented only by the lid; the sarcophagus itself was not found, but the lid undoubtedly belongs to the type of sarcophagus from Talluze. The measurements of the lid are not provided, but on the basis of its proportions it must have been less than 1m long. Information about another small sarcophagus from Shechem appears in Magen's article, which reached us after the present article was completed. This fourth small sarcophagus was found in the Western Mausoleum of Shechem. It is the shortest of all, only 25cm long, and decorated with two square panels in low relief, similar to Sarcophagus A from Talluze (Magen 1987, 78 no. 7).
6 The length of this sarcophagus is a little above average for its type. The average measure for sarcophagi belonging to this group is 1.93m length, 0.53m width, and 0.58 height (without the stripped legs). Only the measurements of sixty-four sarcophagi were available (either indicated by excavators or measured by us). These were used as the basis for the above-mentioned measurements. The source of Husseini's mistake in calculating the length of the sarcophagus lies apparently in his calculating only the length of the fragments with the round panels, even though he himself indicates that the fragment with the inscription belongs to the front of the sarcophagus.
7 The inscribed fragment was purchased by Husseini and has since been kept in storage at the Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums at the Rockefeller Museum, Jerusalem. The fragment was neatly sawn, most probably by antiquities robbers who intended to use it for commercial purposes.
8 (Damati 1972, 174; Avi-Yonah 1973; 34; Negev 1973, 64; Yeivin 1973, 147–63; Damati 1985–6, 98–9.) Two more inscriptions from Talluze are mentioned by Magen (1987, 89, n.5), but have not yet been published. These two inscriptions are also Greek and bear the name of the deceased 'Josephus son of Ptholemeus'.
9 The tombs from Samaria which contained this type of sarcophagi are exceptional: they have pagan elements such as a clay figurine of Dionysus, cremation burials and sculptured busts. However, we should not be surprised by the appearance of such elements, since the Samaritan population in the city of Samaria had assimilated and adopted pagan cultural elements (Crowfoot, Kenyon, Sukenik 1942, 89). For the later group of sarcophagi made under Roman influence, see Damati 1985–6, 91–3 sarcophagi nos 4, 5, 6, Ills 9, 11 and 13.
sarcophagus from the village of Beit-Iba, and others from the Western Mausoleum in Shechem, belong to the same group: Magen 1987, 78–90.
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Garden Excavations at the Herodian Winter Palace in Jericho, 1985–7

KATHRYN L. GLEASON

When Herod took control of the Jericho valley from Matthias Antigonus in 37 BC, he came into possession of the Hasmonean palace on Wadi Qelt outside Jericho, in an area known today as Tulul Abu el Alayiq. Over the next thirty years of his reign, Herod altered and embellished the complex to serve as an unfortified winter residence.1 This article reports on the recent excavations of a series of gardens in the area of the palace expanded by Herod sometime after 15 BC.2 The architecturally unified complex featured dining rooms, baths, gardens, porticoes and other entertainment facilities ranging from the intimate in scale to the monumental.3

The palace, located in the basin of the great Jordan rift just north of the Dead Sea (1300 feet BSL), was situated at the foot of the Judean Hills in order to take advantage of transportation routes, irrigation works and scenery (see Fig. 1). Taking the nearby road, one could reach Jerusalem, 20kms to the west, in a day. Located at the edge of the valley outside the oasis, the site is naturally desert, but the Hasmoneans constructed aqueducts from a variety of springs in the Judean Hills: Ein es-Sultan, Ein Duq, Ein Nueima, Ein Auja and the three springs of Wadi Qelt.4 When these were abandoned after the destruction of the Second Temple in AD 70, the site returned to desert conditions.5 The vegetation is similar to that found in the deserts of Africa and Arabia, while the oasis of Jericho and its irrigated areas support tropical and Mediterranean vegetation in richly fertile soils.6 Thus, when the palace was well irrigated, it provided a lush winter refuge from Jerusalem, where the winter weather is more severe, but the summer climate milder.7

Systematic excavations of the Herodian complex were begun by James L. Kelso and Dimitri C. Baramki in 1950. They regarded the assemblage of buildings, with its different types of construction, as the civic centre of New Testament Jericho, built in phases.8 This view was maintained by James Pritchard, who excavated the area in 1953.9 Ehud Netzer, in excavations conducted between 1973 and 1987, identified the site as a palace complex and recognized the architectural unity of the features on both sides of Wadi Qelt, despite the variety of Herod’s construction methods.10 In all these campaigns, the area north of the grand façade (B6), as well as peristyles B55 and B64, were recognized as gardens (see Fig. 2). Several flower pots found in these areas were published.11 I was contacted in 1985 to consult on the excavation of peristyle B64, and to make small soundings in peristyle B55 and the ‘sunken garden’ (B6), during three-to four-week visits in April 1985, December 1985 and February 1987.

Peristyle B64 (19.1 x 18.7m) is located north of Wadi Qelt (see Fig. 3). Along the north side of the peristyle lie a series of small rooms leading to baths of mixed Roman
and Judean design. To the west is a large banqueting hall (29 × 19m) and, to the east, more small rooms of undetermined function. The south end of the courtyard has eroded into the wadi, onto which it does not appear to have had a view, although the portico wall may have had windows. Access to the courtyard is from the baths through a large apse (9m wide) at the north end and from small rooms (B90 and B51) on the west side. Although the courtyard appears to have an internal focus, no doorways open directly onto it and no windows have been preserved. The walls are constructed either of *opus reticulatum* or mudbrick, then decorated with stucco imitating marble panels and a moulded stucco trim. The columns, forming a colonnade that surrounds the courtyards on three sides, are composed of carved triangular stones, stuccoed in the Ionic Order with plaster base profiles, and shafts of smooth red to 1.4m high, continuing in fluted white plaster and topped with white plaster capitals. The portico itself was paved in *opus signinum*, while a second paved walk ran outside the line of the colonnade on four sides of the garden and into the...
apse. The roofs of the peristyle and of the surrounding rooms were probably flat, as no roof tiles were found and there is no gutter. In short, the courtyard was decorated in a curious combination of late Hellenistic and Augustan styles, using building techniques that indicate the involvement of both Roman and local craftsmen. The garden, as will be seen, may reflect a similar mix of traditions.

During a three-week excavation in April 1985, we reopened Netzer's 1978 trench (2.5 × 11.74m) through the centre of the courtyard (see Fig. 4). In this area only 0.5m of modern topsoil covered the ancient surface, which had not been well sealed with the debris of the fallen building; thus the stratigraphy was poorly preserved. In excavating this sounding, Netzer arrived at a surface into which three flower pots had been set. Although he had removed the pots, their settings were still clear, and in 1985 we found additional pots, indicating the presence of rows.

For the purposes of this new excavation, four trenches were laid out east-west across the width of the courtyard (labelled I–IV), allowing 1.0m-wide baulks along the east and west sides and between the sectors. Excavations in 1985 continued to focus on the central area of the garden with its flower pots and on the thick destruction level encountered at the edges of the garden, where the removal of stucco fragments occupied the better part of the season. We distinguished five main levels:
Fig. 3. Plan of Herodian entertainment complex showing areas of excavation: B64, B55, B6.
Fig. 4. B64, West Peristyle. Plan showing 1985 and 1987 excavations. Fully hatched area indicates unexcavated baulks; heavy diagonal hatching represents areas remaining above garden level; light diagonal hatching indicates areas excavated to garden surface. Soundings for pots are not shown.
modern topsoil (with no artifacts of any period); building collapse; garden soil (these
second two being difficult to distinguish in the centre but clear at the sides);
compacted surface; and gravel/cobble subsoil. Sectors I and II were taken down to the
compacted plaster surface and limited soundings were made to locate flower pots. All
levels and soundings were sampled for environmental remains, retrieved by bucket
flotation. At the end of the season the basic layout of the garden was evident: seven
rows of as many as eleven pots each (see Pl. 1).

The opportunity for further work at Jericho did not arise until February 1987.
During the three-week visit, Baulk I/II was excavated, using a more strictly observed
context system than had been employed in April 1985.\textsuperscript{15} The excavation was
facilitated by damper winter conditions, which revealed details of the deposits not
apparent in the drier April climate.\textsuperscript{16}

In this way the construction of the garden became clear (see Fig. 5). The subsoil,
probably fill, is composed of coarse, poorly cemented alluvial pebbles and cobbles.
Above this, a thin layer of soil, in most places plastered over, formed a rough surface
over the courtyard, except at the north end, where the plaster tapers off onto a packed
earth surface.\textsuperscript{17} The crude quality of the plaster and varying types of mortar suggest a
working surface for the construction of the peristyle.\textsuperscript{18} When the garden was installed,
Fig. 5. Section of garden B64 (see fig. 4): (a) gravel subsoil; (b) working surface; (c) flower pot; (d) planting pits – E11 not yet excavated; (e) ridges; (f) ridged and furrowed garden soil; (g) alluvial deposit; (h) sidewalk; (i) fallen building debris; (j) modern surface.
trenches extending down into the subsoil levels were cut out of the plaster surface for the pots and planting pits. The plantings were aligned in rows, roughly 1.5m apart. Between the rows, ridges were formed of small cobbles crudely plastered over, apparently to direct the flow of irrigation water. At the north end the situation appears to be somewhat different. The ridges characteristic of the plastered surface end approximately 2m from the walk in front of the apse. In this area only one pot was found, but late in the excavation, after light rainfall, three planting pits became evident. These were filled with a light sandy loam, and two were free of flower-pot sherds. The fertilized garden soil was then laid over the whole area, 8–10cm deep and surrounding the pots, but only on the surface of the planting pits.

This garden soil was well fertilized with domestic rubbish, as evidenced by the finds recovered during flotation. Although poorly preserved and much abraded, they included fish and bird bones, as yet unidentified, except for a distyle tibia, proximal astragalus and several fragments of an unidentified species of wild artiodactyl, possibly a large, male *Ibex*, as well as the right mandible of a young domesticated pig. The charcoal, also badly abraded and of small size, consists primarily of native oasis species: *Ziziphus* sp., *Tamarix* sp., *Ficus sycomorus*, *Olea europaea*, *Pistacia* sp. and *Quercus* sp. Most of the genera are indigenous scrub plants of a sort unlikely to be present in a royal pleasure garden of this date. They may have been used as fuel for hearths and cooking ovens. The only non-native specimen was a poorly preserved fragment of *Juglans* sp. It may be significant that all the taxa, with the exception of *Tamarix*, produce edible fruit. Analysis of the carbonized seeds and grains, however, produced no specimens in common with the charcoal species: *Triticum* sp., *Lens* sp., *Moraceae* sp., *Geranium* sp., *Plantago indica*, and *Trifolium* sp. Overall, it appears that these botanical remains originated entirely from domestic rubbish used as fertilizer, rather than as charred clippings of garden plants mixed back into the soil, or plants destroyed in situ. The pottery fragments also appear to be from the mulch, as they are small and abraded. Miscellaneous fragments of metal, and two coins as yet unidentified, may have entered the garden soil with the fertilizer or accidentally at another time. All the finds mentioned were in a matrix that was highly disturbed, indicating both the random mix of mulch and the tilling of the garden. Considering the composition of this soil and its proximity to the banqueting hall, one is reminded of the passage from Pliny the Elder in which he praises refuse from banquets as one of the best fertilizers (*NH* 17.50).

The flower pots vary slightly in size but are all of similar construction: 11cm in diameter at the rim, the body rounding out gently at the middle and tapering to a small foot 3.5cm in diameter (see Fig. 6). This foot is rather more like a neck, in that it is open and has a rim of its own, like an inverted bottle. Three holes made in the clay before firing puncture the lower part of the body. The pots are clearly function-specific and are fairly elegant for their type, though they are not decorated, and bore no stamps or graffiti.

Of the 33 pots located, most were found intact, three in perfect condition. Many of the pots remain in situ, so it is not possible to judge their condition. In one of the three pits identified, potsherds were found dispersed, as at three other locations not yet
identified as pits. In the other two pits there were no potsherds. The pots with ancient breaks show no sign of having been broken deliberately and, pending excavation of the rest of the garden, it seems safe to conclude that the pots broke under the pressure of the roots, rather than having been broken by a gardener at the time of planting, as Cato the Elder recommends (Agr. 52.133). This may have important implications regarding the layout of the garden and the survival of the plants. The evidence seems to suggest that few of the plants survived to break their pots and root firmly in the soil. Alternatively, larger plants were put in the pits, some in pots, others perhaps in baskets, while yet other plants were capable of surviving in the limited space of the small pots.

Pliny the Elder (NH 17.64) refers to these pots as *ollae perforatae*. Pliny as well as Cato indicate that they are used both for the propagation and transport of a variety of types of small trees and shrubs (NH 17.97; Agr. 52.133). In the technique of aerial layering, a perforated pot is slipped over a young branch or shoot of the tree, packed with soil, and left to root for approximately two years. The pot is then cut off the parent tree, ready for transport. After planting, the pot may help to conserve moisture and possibly filter salts present in irrigated conditions. Although a complete archaeometrical study has yet to be made of Roman flower pots, the evidence suggests that *ollae perforatae* were generally made in the region of their use. This is true of the pots from Jericho, which we have tested using neutron activation analysis with
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conclusive results. Overall, *ollae perforatae* had a wider variety of uses than modern pots and were commonly used in the propagation, trade, transport and cultivation of plants at the local and regional levels.

The use of the Herodian pots for aerial layering is tentatively confirmed by a silicon rubber cast taken of the cavity in a pot brought back to England in April 1985. The pot (D5) was entire, with only a chip in its rim. During excavation a slight depression appeared in the centre of the pot. This was investigated in the laboratory at the Institute of Archaeology, Oxford, to ascertain if the depression was, in fact, a cavity. Two cm below the rim, a clear channel through the centre appeared. A cast of this channel was taken in December 1985, by which time the surrounding soil had dried completely. The cast, 2.5cm in diameter, runs from the top of the vessel to the opening at the bottom, though soil had settled there, thus disfiguring the cast. Perhaps this was due to the partial deterioration of the ancient branch at its base. Two smaller roots clearly break off from the main, and a large mass of rubber to one side of the main root may represent other root cavities. The silicon rubber was sufficiently viscous to enter the myriad of insect channels that lace the soil, obscuring any finer root cavities. After this technique is applied to the remaining pots, we may be able to determine if all the pots were used for the same purpose.

The pots, in conjunction with the stratigraphic remains, provide the main evidence for the layout of the garden, which can now be described as an area 9.1 by 12.3m, bordered on all sides by the walk of *opus signinum*. There is no curb or finished edge between the walk and the garden surface, which are flush. The garden is laid out in rows spaced 1.5m apart, oriented north-south, with pots and planting pits within each row spaced about 1m apart. The alignments are regularly but carelessly laid out. The plants are set into the furrows, rather than into the ridges as at Pompeii, where this type of layout invariably indicates a market garden, orchard or vineyard. Ridges with a spacing of 1.5m are found in vineyards, and vegetable and flower gardens; orchards, on the other hand, have ridges 2 or 3m apart. If the evidence for the spacing of ridges and plants at Pompeii can be applied to Jericho, then garden B64 should contain either herbaceous plants or small shrubs, which is, in fact, commensurate with its small size and the data obtained from the flower pots.

The Augustan-style form and decoration of the peristyle suggest that the garden might resemble those familiar to us from Pompeii with their box hedges, roses, oleander, fountains and statuary, or some other manifestation of *ars topiaria*. Thus far, however, the garden appears to have been planted in straight rows, in a style more in keeping with that of the Hellenistic period. This design would be appropriate for a grove of a single species of shrub or small tree, such as Josephus describes in the courtyards of Herod's palace gardens in Jerusalem, and perhaps all the more impressive if composed of exotic, rare, or symbolic plants. The flower pots of local manufacture suggest a species grown in the vicinity rather than a foreign import, and in fact Judea was renowned in antiquity for three plants, all attractive enough to be displayed in a royal garden: the citron, the balsam and the palm.

In Pompeii, Professor Jashemski suggests that the flower pots of the Villa Oplontis at Torre Annunziata and two pots in the Garden of Hercules at Pompeii contained
citron, a small citrus tree.\(^3^5\) Pliny the Elder confirms that this plant was ‘transported in pots with breathing holes for the roots’ (NH 12.5; cf. Theophr. Hist. Pl. 4.4.2–4). In Judea, the citron had a particular significance in Jewish ritual.\(^3^6\) It is tempting to hypothesize that a small grove of citron trees planted in a public area of the palace, one frequented by the high priests and other prominent Jewish citizens, would have been a significant gesture. Visually such a planting would have been pleasing as well.\(^3^7\) If, however, this was the main plant of the garden, it is difficult to imagine that many of the specimens survived, as few of the small pots were shattered.\(^3^8\)

The ancient sources also emphasize the importance of the palm tree at Jericho, one species of which was unique to the place, \textit{Palma caryota}, and thus prized for its walnut-like fruit (Strabo 16.241; Pliny NH 13.26). Palms were propagated in pots or baskets (Pliny NH 13.36; Theophr. Hist. Pl. 4.4.2–4). Carbonized date pits appear in various contexts around the palace complex, but none where they indicate a palm tree in a garden.\(^3^9\) While it is unlikely that palms stood in the closely spaced rows of pots, one or two may have been present in the planting pits, giving a higher canopy and some shade to the peristyle.

The most intriguing possibility is that the famous Judean balsam was grown or displayed in the garden. Its actual genus is uncertain, but it is believed to be \textit{Opobalsamum gileadensis}, a small, stiff-branched evergreen, rarely growing as high as 3m.\(^4^0\) The branches are angular and straggling, with small trifoliate leaves spaced widely over the paper-like, peeling bark of the stems (see Fig. 7). Today, gum is obtained by making incisions in the stems and branches, and the collected nodules are shipped to Bombay to make perfume. The fruit also contains gum. The plant now grows only in North Yemen, where, in its native habitat, it requires no irrigation.\(^4^1\) The plant is traditionally believed to have been brought to Judea from Arabia as a gift from the Queen of Sheba to King Solomon, and certainly there is no evidence that it ever grew natively or became naturalized in Jericho.\(^4^2\) Theophrastus describes the balsam as a small tree, requiring constant irrigation, that in his day grew only in two parks of Judea. The fragrant gum which exuded from the trunk and branches was so limited in quantity and of such exceptional quality that, in Theophrastus’ time, it was worth twice its weight in silver and grew only under royal authority (Theophr. Hist. Pl. 9.6.1). Pliny the Elder repeats the tradition that balsam grew only in the royal gardens of Jericho, adding that Pompey the Great, as well as Vespasian and Titus, brought back the trees to Rome to be displayed in their triumphal processions (NH 14.128). He goes on to describe the vine, shrub and tree forms of the plant, any of which could be suitably planted in a courtyard garden (NH 13.67).

The physical attributes of \textit{Opobalsamum gileadensis} fit the profile of the archaeological remains. It is a small shrub, likely to have been propagated in Judea, yet is hardy enough to survive the Jericho summers and, perhaps, the narrow confines of the flower pots. Cuttings may have been obtained from the larger commercial balsam groves for which Jericho was famed. Considering the great value of the balsam and its renowned fragrance, a balsam grove would have been a luxurious, finely scented and appropriately ostentatious addition to the palace, in spite of its unattractive appearance.
Fig. 7. Sketch of *Opobalsamum gileadensis* from specimens in the herbarium of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew.
Many other types and combinations of fruit trees or vines would have been pleasant and archaeologically plausible in peristyle B64. Until more direct evidence of the plant can be obtained, such as carbonized remains or pollen, no certain conclusions as to the exact type of plantings can be drawn.

Peristyle B55, with porticoes on three sides and measuring 20.5 by 14.5m, is decorated with columns in the Corinthian Order (see Fig. 3). The lower portions of these smooth stucco shafts alternate between red and black; above them the columns are of fluted white stucco while the Corinthian capitals are of stone. Thus far, no entablature or roof tiles have been discovered. A low stone pluteus ran between the columns. Water entered the garden at the north end, under the pluteus from the aqueduct channel serving the adjacent baths. As with garden B64, an opus signinum walk runs along the exterior perimeter of the porticoes.

When this sector was excavated in 1977, Netzer found a ridged surface immediately below the destruction debris (see Fig. 8). Superficially, this peristyle appeared similar to that of B64. In February 1987 we laid out a 1.5-by-3m sounding along the southeast edge of the courtyard which helped clarify a number of important differences between the two peristyles.

Unlike garden B64, the ridged surface of the garden lies 12cm below the surrounding walk, which is neatly finished with a curb. The ridges are of packed earth, 3 or 4cm in depth, with no trace of plaster or mortar; and whereas in garden B64 there is a covering layer of fertilized soil, in B55 the ridges are exposed. Beneath the packed surface, lies coarse gravel, perhaps equivalent to the subsoil or fill in B64. No perforated pots were found. The only evidence of ornamentation within the garden is a large boulder, apparently part of the garden scheme rather than fallen debris.

Along the curb, layers of mineral deposit were excavated from very fine silty sand. In some respects, this courtyard has the appearance of a pool, although its surfaces are not sealed with the grey hydraulic plaster usually employed in water features elsewhere in the palace complex. The nature of this courtyard remains uncertain pending further excavation.

The monumental 'sunken garden' (B6), which measures $37.27 \times 113.67$m, lies largely unexcavated on the south side of Wadi Qelt, in alignment with the buildings and gardens described above (see Fig. 3). Explored in the 1950s and again by Ehud Netzer in 1979, its perimeter is known, although the northern side has eroded into the wadi. The south side is defined by a retaining wall set into the slope of the hill and presents a spectacular façade of semicircular and squared niches separated by columns in antis. The façade is interrupted in the middle by a great hemicycle, which formed a small stepped theatre. The 'seats' are planting beds containing perforated pots of the same general size and description as those found in garden B64 and elsewhere in the palace. Porticoes around the top of the retaining walls, preserved on the east and west sides, allowed visitors to promenade around the garden and to look into it; what they observed remains buried beneath a deep landslide. In 1978 Ehud Netzer cut a
Fig. 8. B55, East Peristyle. Plan partially reconstructing ridging of courtyard surface: (a) water channel from aqueduct; (b) sidewalk; (c) puteus; (d) ridge, elevation: 7912; (e) furrow elevation: 7911; (f) decorative rock; (g) area of 1987 excavations, indicated by boundary line; (h) mineral deposits along curb; (i) graffito; (j) drain from earlier phase; (k) baulk edge; (m) Wadi Qelt.
trial trench along the foot of the east retaining wall and discovered a perforated pot at this lower level.\(^50\)

In February 1987 we made an adjacent sounding to sample the soil and clarify some stratigraphical questions to determine the exact setting of the perforated pot (see Figs 3 and 9). No further pots came to light, but two layers of garden soil were found beneath the destruction debris, the upper one perhaps a more tilled and fertilized version of the original topsoil represented in the lower layer around the pot. This upper layer was very similar in composition to the garden soil in garden B64, while the lower layer was lighter in colour and contained less domestic debris.\(^51\) These trenches confirm the presence of garden features without indicating anything of the overall layout of the area. This very large, ornate Augustan-period garden promises rewarding results for future excavation.

**B6 Sunken Garden**

**SECTION**

![Diagram of B6 Sunken Garden](image)

Fig. 9. B6, Sunken Garden. Section of 1987 sounding along west retaining wall: (a) modern surface, after construction of nearby irrigation channel; (b) 1951 surface beneath fill from irrigation; channel; (c) fallen building debris; (d) garden surface; (e) upper level of garden soil; (f) lower level of garden soil; (g) estimated location of 1975 pot in the stratigraphical sequence; (h) natural alluvial gravels; (i) lower part of *opus reticulatum* wall.
In many respects, the conditions at Jericho are typical of those an archaeologist might find while excavating gardens elsewhere in the Mediterranean. Our results suggest that, even on sites lacking the special preservation conditions of Pompeii or Masada, garden remains can be substantial. Although the discovery of flower pots has been essential for gaining an understanding of the gardens at Jericho, such pots may be more common in Roman gardens than formerly suspected.

Ancient gardens are not as ephemeral as they may seem. The soil stratigraphy is of the greatest importance: without built features and floor levels as guides, it can be quite difficult to recognize garden elements which our research has shown can be clearly present. Using an especially adapted approach to excavation, that rigorously stresses recorded stratigraphy and the study of environmental as well as artifactual data, it may be possible greatly to increase our present knowledge of Roman and other ancient gardens.

Notes

1 Shortly after Herod’s victory, according to Josephus, Antony gave Cleopatra ‘the palm grove of Jericho where the balsam grows’ (BJ 4.362). By this he meant the entire oasis of Jericho, with its luxurious dwellings for kings and high priests, groves of rare palms and royal gardens of balsam, grown only in Judea and highly prized for its resin (BJ 4.468; Strabo 16.241). Herod rented the land until he regained full control following the Battle of Actium in 31 be (BJ 1.362.; 1.18.5).

2 These garden studies have been carried out under the auspices of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, under the direction of Dr Ehud Netzer, who has kindly offered hospitality, volunteers, workmen and equipment, and patiently entertained my slow and sometimes unsuccessful experiments with new techniques of garden excavation. I am also grateful to Dvorah Netzer and Rivka Berger. Funding for these studies has been provided by generous grants from the Craven Fund (Oxford University), the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society, the Meyerstein Fund (through the Committee for Archaeology, Oxford University) and the graduate fund of Lincoln College. At the time of these excavations I was supported by a Fulbright Scholarship (1985) and a Samuel H. Kress Fellowship in Classical Art and Archaeology at the American Academy in Rome, where I first presented the results of these excavations in March 1987. My advisor, Mr Nicholas Purcell, St John’s College, introduced me to Dr Netzer and I am grateful for his support, as I am to Professor Barry Cunliffe for his advice on garden excavation. I would particularly like to thank the volunteers and workmen who have spent long hours looking for the bleak remains of an ancient garden when they could have been enjoying the verdure of their own. This article reports on the excavations; however, a full interpretation of the gardens and finds, and their place in the context of Roman garden archaeology, is presented in my forthcoming Oxford D.Phil. thesis, ‘Towards an Archaeology of Landscape Architecture in the Roman World’.


4 Netzer, BASOR, 2.

5 Netzer, BASOR, 12.

6 Efraim Orni and Elisha Efrat, Geography of Israel (Jerusalem: Israel Program for
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Scientific Translations, 1964) 125–6. Ibid., 116, 181: the mean winter and summer temperatures at Jericho are 57.7 F (14.3 C) and 93 F (34 C) degrees, respectively; and 49.5 F (9.7 C) and 77 F (25 C) degrees in Jerusalem.

7 In terms of archaeological preservation, the microclimate of the site is slightly wetter than the desert areas just to the south along the Dead Sea. Winter rains at Jericho do not penetrate the soil deeply, but as the site is shallow, the moisture, in combination with insect activity, has prevented preservation by dessication as at Masada and desert sites in Egypt.


10 Netzer, BASOR, 6.


12 On the interpretation of these rooms see Netzer, BASOR 8–11; Netzer, IEJ, 92–9.

13 Kelso and Baramki, 45–9, pls 19, 20; Netzer, IEJ, 93.

14 Kelso and Baramki, 5; Netzer IEJ, 93.

15 This involved peeling off each distinct layer of soil, assigning it a number, describing it, quantifying it, and graphically presenting its relationship to other layers. Between 10 and 100 per cent of each layer was set aside for flotation, depending on the quantity of soil in the context.

16 I have found that allowing the exposed soil to weather and to view it under many different conditions of moisture and light is not only helpful but essential in recognizing garden features.

17 The section provided in the illustration is adjusted slightly to illustrate the various contexts clearly. It is taken along row 11 and presented as though the features were laid out horizontally rather than slightly askew.

18 Pockets of pigment, particularly yellow, were found on the surface, as well as crushed terracotta, mixed stuccoes — opus signinum, white plaster, hydraulic plaster — and possibly some sources of pigment: murex shells, for example were found in several locations.

19 I am grateful to Dr Gil J. Stein of MASCA, The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, for this preliminary report.

20 This report was prepared by Rowena Gale, formerly of the Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew, and now an independent consultant on wood anatomy. Many of the observations in her report are included here.

21 The carbonized seeds, grains and nuts were studied by Ms Jane Fitt, an archaeobotanist then at the British School in Rome. I am additionally grateful to her for general assistance in locating other specialists and reference facilities.

22 The pottery from the garden excavations has not yet been studied. Rivka Berger observed the pottery as it was brought to the museum and noted no anomalies in regard to the dating.


24 Jashemski observes that some of the pots at Pompeii were shattered before planting (Jashemski, 240, 293), Dorothy Burr Thompson, in ‘The Garden of Hephaistos’, Hesperia 6 (1937), 417, notes this as well. At both sites unbroken pots are also preserved. The Jericho pots that I have seen do not show any indication of a particular breakage point.

25 Dr Nigel Hepper of Kew Gardens has suggested this function, and it is noteworthy that all pots found thus far would have been planted in irrigated gardens, with the possible exception of the pots found in England, if they are indeed ollae perforatae used for plants. The one Jericho pot to have been thoroughly cleaned was encrusted on the exterior with mineral and salts that resisted detergent and required a 5–10 per cent solution of hydrochloric acid. The inside of the pot was relatively free of accretions.
26 Yellin and Gunneweg (see above) note 24.
28 My particular thanks to Esther Cameron, conservator at the Institute of Archaeology, Oxford, for working out the best approach to making this cast and providing guidance and expertise throughout the process.
29 A silicon rubber mixture was poured into the cavity and left overnight to set. The soil was then flushed out of the pot with water and the cast was removed.
30 Cf. pots from Pompeii used either for growing plants from seed or small cuttings (Jashemski, 295).
31 This is unlike the peristyles at Pompeii, where the garden soil meets the gutter of the tiled peristyle roof, rather than an exterior sidewalk.
32 With the exception of the Garden of Hercules, watered by hand and thought to be a commercial flower garden. See Jashemski, 283-4.
33 For examples, see Jashemski, 148, 190, 200-14, 236, 288.
34 Josephus BJ 5.4.4: ‘All around [the palace] there were many circular cloisters, leading one into another, the columns in each being different, and their courts all of greensward; there were groves of various trees intersected by long walks, which were bordered by deep canals, and ponds everywhere studded with bronze figures, through which water was discharged, and around the streams were numerous cots for tame pigeons’ (Loeb translation).
35 Jashemski, 295.
36 Jashemski, 239-40, notes that ollae perforate were also found in the excavations of the House of Hebrew at Pompeii (I. ix. 14), thought to be a gathering place of the Jewish community.
37 I have visited a garden near the site planted in a remarkably similar way, just outside a house. The canopy is uncomfortably low for walking, but the effect of the citrus trees from without is very like a Roman garden painting.
38 Two pots in the Garden of Hercules at Pompeii were found at the end of a tree cast, thought to be citron or lemon. One of the pots had failed to start and the other was the successful replacement. Jashemski, 285.
39 Carbonized date pits appear frequently in the ashly hydraulic mortar used around the entire palace site.
40 Formerly called or thought to be: Commiphora opobalsamum, Amyris gileadensis, Amyris opobalsamum, Balsamodendron gileadensis, or Balsamodendron opobalsamum. Others regard it as Balanites aegyptiaca: see J. A. Duke, Medicinal Plants of the Bible (New York: Trado-Medic Books, 1983), 28. I am grateful to Dr Nigel Hepper of the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew for this information and for providing me with herbarium specimens to sketch and describe.
43 Pollen samples are currently under analysis by palynologist Dr Robert Scaife and, separately, the palynology laboratory at the Hebrew University. The soil conditions are not promising for pollen studies, as modern insects and animals have thoroughly worked through all levels.
44 Netzer BASOR, 8-9; IEJ, 93-6; Kelso and Baramki, 45, pls 20, 21.
45 In the fallen remains we found a fragment from the lower shaft of a column bearing the graffito (see Illustration 10): ΦΡΑΤΙΤΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΕΥΚΛ... 
46 This layer of packed soil contained some carbonized remains and potsherds. The identifiable botanical remains were meagre: three fig seeds, Ficus carica, one Trifolium sp. and one Triticum sp. fragment, identified by Jane Fitt; and small, unidentifiable fragments of bark examined by Rowena Gale.
47 Kelso and Baramki, 15-17; Netzer IEJ, 99.
48 Kelso and Baramki, pls 38, 39.
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49 Ibid. 17.
50 Netzer, IEJ, 99. Pritchard, 52, pl. 47, found a flower pot ‘in front of the façade’.
51 Carbonized remains of wheat, Triticum sp. were retrieved from the upper level, while other seed fragments, as yet unidentified, were retrieved in the lower level. Again, all remains were in poor condition.
The Biblical Samaritans in the Present Day
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In his Schweich lectures for 1923, which later became his book, The Samaritans, Moses Gaster made it clear that he felt that the Samaritan nation had run its course. This once powerful nation that had been a rival of rabbinic Jewry had been steadily diminishing in number, and by Gaster’s day had been reduced from a large Diaspora to one community in their principal city of Nablus. When Gaster wrote that “The sun of the Samaritans is setting fast and I consider myself fortunate that it has been granted to me to catch a few of the rays which still light up the holy mountain, Garizim”, he was aware that centuries of endogamous marriages had taken a physical toll of the community. Their numbers were reduced to about 160 souls; there was an imbalance of males to females and congenital defects were occurring in, and wiping out, whole families. Fortunately, Gaster, who was so often instinctively correct in his assessments, was wrong in this.

Today the position has changed markedly to the better of the Samaritans. In the sixty-five years since Gaster wrote, the community has multiplied at a rate that is extraordinary, by some 400 per cent to some 530 souls. This increase in size is consistent, and is the most important increase in the period for which statistics have been available. What we are seeing is the regeneration of a people, especially since 1948. Before that year there were less than 2 Samaritan marriages per year, and since that year there have been more than 5 per year. Of especial significance is that 20 per cent of the Samaritan community is under the age of 10 years and the same percentage is in the age group between 11 and 20. This makes this ancient people the youngest community in the world in statistical terms.

However, 58 per cent of the marriages have taken place within the same clan, because the four remaining Samaritan clans, the Marhiv, Danfi, Kohen and Tsedaqa families, try to keep their females within the clan. One result is that there is still an imbalance, in the ratio of 5 to 3, between females and males born, and a large number of couples proposing to marry is given genetic marriage guidance counselling to try and avoid the birth of physically handicapped children. A significant factor in the move to correct the genetic imbalances is the marriage of Samaritan males to Jewesses, which has now reached 5 per cent of all marriages.

Of equal importance to the spiritual renewal of the Samaritan community has been its spiritual refreshment, which might yet prove to be an intellectual rejuvenation. The community has developed a self-awareness, born of the feeling that it has an on-going and burgeoning future rather than a fate of numerical diminution and communal...
extinction. If one may judge from the volume of literature in the journals, both scholarly and semi-popular, and in the form of books, the Samaritans are undergoing a revival in popularity, as an object of scholarly curiosity, that is not dissimilar in proportion to that which they underwent in the seventeenth century, under the influence, now as then, of renewed European orientalism.

Some of the self-awareness of the Samaritans may well be attributed to the fact that they live in two communities – in Israeli Holon and Arab Nablus. Under the influence of these two disparate cultures they have begun a healthy self-examination.

One thing has become abundantly clear from studying the contemporary Samaritans: it is no longer possible to maintain the viewpoint, with any degree of certainty, that Samaritanism represents a fossilized form of pre-Rabbinic Judaism. Not long ago this popular view was put in these terms. ‘The Samaritans’ beliefs represent an extreme in religious isolationism and their personal and religious life is patterned by tradition to an extraordinary degree. [They are] An offshoot of Biblical Judaism that seems to have remained in a state of arrested development for some 2,000 years...’

In the first place it cannot be disputed that Samaritanism is the daughter of Judaism and has never lived in religious isolation from Judaism from the Hasmonean period onwards. Just as Christianity and Islam betray calques of Samaritanism, showing at least some degree of dependence on Samaritan rituals and beliefs, so we find that the Samaritans betray calques of Jewish-Rabbinic and Karaites practices and theology. Some of these can be seen to be relatively recent, showing the continued association and dialogue. Much of the Samaritan halachic writing is not an explanation of the halachah for the sake of clarification, and expansion for the ritual purposes of the Samaritans, but is designed to meet and explain Samaritan objections to Karaites and Rabbinic practices and interpretation of the Torah. Throughout the last millennium, and into the twentieth century, this combative or polemic literature has continued to be written, testifying to the fact that the Samaritans have never lived in complete isolation from other varieties of Judaism or in ignorance of them.

The matter has become much clearer since 1948. We are now able to study the Samaritans in Holon and Nablus, where their environments are quite different, respectively Jewish-Israeli and Arab, and can put these two centres in a synchronic time scale and make comparisons between them. At the same time there are sufficient records to make modest judgements about changes in Samaritanism at Nablus in the longer perspective of time, the diachronic scale. From these comparisons we are able to see changes, and the workings of the Samaritan eclecticism which is one of the special features of Samaritanism and makes their halachic processes so different from the Jewish halachic processes. It is true that change has been slow to show itself and, because the core of Samaritanism around which the current religion is built has traces of Judaism of a pre-Rabbinic variety – including the sacrifice of the lamb on Mount Gerizim at Passover – the Samaritan religion presents the impression of remarkable stability and, as noted, even of fossilization. Yet one must argue that change does take place, for Samaritanism, like Rabbinic Judaism, is a practical religion rather than a theoretical one.

The simplest demonstration of this flexibility inside Samaritanism is that while the
liturgy in Rabbinic Judaism is still principally couched in Hebrew, with only a small
corpus of the prayers in Aramaic, the liturgy of the Samaritans is framed in Hebrew,
Aramaic and Arabic, the three principal vernacular languages which the Samaritans
have spoken. Both Rabbinic Jews and Samaritans have shared this multilingual
environment, but even in places where Aramaic and Arabic were Rabbinic Jewish
vernaculars, liturgical compositions for the daily prayer book and festival liturgy
were written in Hebrew. One easy key to the age of any part of the Samaritan liturgy
is the language of the prayers.

The apparent stability of Samaritan life, and its reputed petrifaction and preserva-
tion of forms of pre-Rabbinic Judaism, cannot be taken for granted in the face of
contemporary evidence. The assumed cryogenic state of Samaritan rituals and
practices is an illusion based on the fact that the priesthood is the medium of halachic
authority, and that the priesthood is centred in Nablus where its long isolation from a
Diaspora of its own has also kept it from too close a contact with other varieties of
Judaism. A proof can be found in the eleventh century, when the Samaritan
settlement in Palestine still encompassed a number of towns. A Samaritan writer
acknowledged that not all Samaritans came to the sacred mountain to appear before
God at the pilgrimages, but only selected groups from each town. The Samaritan
Diaspora, in Egypt and in Damascus, was still in existence in the fifteenth century.
The letters of Obadiah of Bertinoro confirm the data we have from the scholia in
Samaritan manuscripts, that there was a substantial, if diminishing Samaritan
settlement in Cairo. The overseas Samaritans came home for at least one of the
Haggim, the pilgrim festivals – Passover – across the short stretch of the Mediterra-
nean. We must assume from the scholia in the manuscripts that the same annual
pilgrimage to Mount Gerizim held true for the Samaritans in Damascus, for the same
manuscripts are found in the hands of families in Damascus, Nablus, Gaza and
Egypt, often being traded within a relatively short time, indicating that there was
constant contact. Yet we may not assume that rites and rituals were the same in all
parts of the Samaritan Diaspora. Even if there were sacrifices in Egypt – and we have
no clear evidence for that – there would be essential differences between what was
done in Cairo and what on the sacred mountain; for the Gerizim ritual, as we shall see
very shortly, related to the holy places on Mount Gerizim as well as to the sacrifice of
a sheep. Moreover, we have clear evidence that the liturgy varied in different parts of
the Samaritan Diaspora. In one of the British Library’s Harleian manuscripts, a
calendar, a scribe has copied on the reverse side of the calendar pages parts of the
liturgy which are noted as being specifically for the Damascus Kinsah, or Samaritan
synagogue, and not for use elsewhere.

It is worthwhile examining the Samaritan Passover in greater detail before we
attempt to assess other elements of the life and rituals of the contemporary
Samaritans. The Passover is the most important of the Samaritan feasts, at least so far
as participation is, and has historically been, concerned. It begins the Samaritan
religious year, and is the first of the pilgrim festivals at which Samaritans are
supposed to take part in ceremonials atop their holy mountain, Mount Gerizim.
Because it is the best known of their festivals, and the one which scholars and tourists
have most frequently described, we are able to see from their descriptions over about 150 years that the festival with its sacrificial ritual has not remained as unchanging as it is often said to be. We must therefore be sceptical when we are told that the sacrificial rites of the Samaritan Passover preserve in a fossil form the old Israelite Passover sacrifice.

The Passover is celebrated on the fourteenth day of the first month. The fifteenth day is the first of the seven days of Maṣṣot. On the twenty-first day of the month is the pilgrim feast of Maṣṣot, on which the first pilgrimage of the liturgical year takes place. On the first Sunday following the Passover sacrifice the Omer is counted, and Shavuot, the second pilgrim feast of the year, is celebrated on the Sunday of the eighth week after Passover.

The Passover is celebrated on the sacred mountain, with stopping stages for the processional at the sacred places on the mountain. There were times when access to the mountain was forbidden by Roman, Byzantine or Moslem overlords, but we do not know what took the place of the Passover at these times, although we are informed in the matter of the feast of Succot and of the Succah. We do, however, know that there is a special form of the services for Passover for use in the medinah, that is, at times when they are not allowed to ascend the mountain. Moreover, the identification of the sacred places on the mountain seems to have changed from time to time, so the precise location on the mountain of the site of the sacrifice may well have changed. The most important part of the ritual is the slaughter, roasting and eating of lambs, as prescribed in Exodus 12.

The fourteen days preceding Passover are called ‘Days of Watching’, referring to the watching of the sheep that are selected for the sacrifice. The Samaritans move up to the mountain for part of this time, and stay until the twenty-first day of the month. Here they live in special houses. If the fourteenth day of the month is the eve of the Sabbath, the sheep are slaughtered shortly after noon. If the fourteenth is the Sabbath the sheep are slaughtered after Shabbat is concluded, but the roasting fire cannot be lit until after sunset.

The act of slaughter is normally carried out at twilight. The High Priest recites Exodus 12 and the lambs are carried to a hollow in the ground known as the ‘altar of earth’. Here they are slaughtered, and blood is smeared on the foreheads of the children, but not on the doorposts of the houses. The number of sheep slaughtered relates to the number of families and clans present, but is about one for every twenty-five or thirty people.

After the sheep have been slaughtered they are scalded with boiling water and then fleeced. They are hung up by their hind legs and inspected: a defective sheep is burned and another slaughtered in its place. The innards are taken out, washed and salted, and some parts, such as the kidneys, the intestine and gall bladder, are burned, while others, such as the liver, are put back to be roasted with the sheep. These are put on long wooden spits and salted. The sheep are then put into ovens – pits which are about two metres deep, and stone lined. Each oven can accommodate a number of sheep. The spits stand upright and are held apart by a wooden grill over the pit. These are sealed with branches and moist earth, and it takes some four hours to roast the
sheep. At about midnight the roasted sheep are taken out, brought to the nearby houses and are eaten. The leftovers are burned.

The Samaritans separate the feast of Ma\textsuperscript{\textregistered}j\textsuperscript{\textregistered}ot from Passover, keeping the feast of Ma\textsuperscript{\textregistered}j\textsuperscript{\textregistered}ot from the fifteenth day of the month for seven days, during which period no leaven is eaten. The pilgrimage of the period takes place on the seventh day of Ma\textsuperscript{\textregistered}j\textsuperscript{\textregistered}ot. Each of the stopping points along the length of the pilgrimage represents one of the sacred sites of Biblical events, for the Samaritans connect the name Bethel, where so much happened in Patriarchal times, with their sacred mountain. In the literature it is known as Har Gerizim-Bethel.

It is clear from the liturgy, and from descriptions of the pilgrimages, that the stopping places have varied from era to era. Nowadays the pilgrimage starts from the synagogue near the top of the mountain, whereas it once started on the lower slopes. In all probability there is some aetiological connection between the ladder in Jacob's dream at Bethel and the natural steps in the mountain slope, which are to be noted as an architectonic feature on the coins of Romano-Byzantine times depicting Mt Gerizim and its sacred places. The pilgrimage commences shortly after midnight, when the congregation leaves the synagogue to climb to the peak. Before they start their climb up the hill they read the scriptural verses beginning 'And Jacob came safely to Shechem' (Genesis 33:8-20). The officiating priest carries a Torah scroll and a stand for it, and they take with them drink, food and prayer carpets.

The procession moves to the sacred sites associated with the mountain, while reciting Deuteronomy from chapter 4 onwards. The first stop today is at the so-called twelve stones of Joshua (Deuteronomy 27:4 SP; the MT puts them on Ebal; Joshua 4:19-24 puts them at Gilgal), a row of stones just below and parallel with the western wall of the fortress built by Justinian. There, the participants stand and recite liturgical texts, the so-called Hymn of the Angels and two other prayers; the priest blesses them and waves the Torah scroll above their heads. Some observers report that the Samaritans used to stop first at a single pillar of stone on the lower ridges of the mountain, which they identify as the single pillar of stone which Joshua set up when the covenant was made (Joshua 24:26). A similar pattern of activities is carried out at each of the following six staging points on the way up the mountain: the Altar of Adam and Seth, which the Samaritans say is near the 'Seven Steps of Adam' which Adam used when leaving the Garden of Eden which in their view is on Mt Gerizim. They stop also at the Eternal Hill (Give'at Olam, 'The Height of the World'), the summit of Mount Gerizim, which is the large walled-in rock platform on the summit of Mount Gerizim, stretching southwards on the higher ridge. From there they progress to the place known as 'God will Provide', near the Altar of Isaac and the Altar of Noah, again at the Eternal Hill. At the Altar of Isaac, a trough-like formation in the rock on the southeast side of the peak, all the participants kiss the surface of the rock. At their second time of stopping at the Eternal Hill, towards the end of the pilgrimage, the qataf of the Blessing is recited and the congregation traverses the rock seven times. This site, the so called Sakhrah, mentioned by Conder and Kitchener, may well have been the Holy of Holies of the Samaritans. (The seven traverses, displaying the Torah, is redolent of the ceremonial in the Jewish synagogue.
at Simchat Torah and may be related to it.) Finally, the participants embrace each other and wish each other peace.

As the foregoing description of the Passover rituals show, the possession of a single holy site has buffered the Samaritan tradition from the pressures of cultural diffusion. Today, we see that renewed regular and close contact with a peer system, in which religion is part of the all-embracing culture, has brought renewed pressure for change inside Samaritanism.

So far in this discussion a distinction has been made between Rabbinic Jews and the Samaritans as Jews. Scholars do not take this for granted, however, although contemporary Samaritans do not wish to be regarded as a legitimate variety of Judaism. Despite the biblical account (2 Kings 17) which indicates the Judean view of Samaritan origins, the Samaritans claim to be the Bnai Yisrael, descendants of the northern tribes of Israel and, as such, they regard themselves as full brothers of the Jews, as did many ancient observers. However, they claim not to be Jews, but Israelites, a distinction which underlines a number of areas for scrutiny in the matter of the relationship of normative Judaism to the biblical religion. The Samaritan claim to be Shomrim, guardians of the true Pentateuch and of the true Israelite tradition, is an ancient one, known to the fathers of the Church as well as to the Jews. Josephus points out the dilemma posed for both Romans and Samaritans in the matter of circumcision by their self-identification as Bnai Yisrael and not as Jews. He wrote: ‘But someone may say that the Samaritans are also persecuted for their religion. Our answer to him will be as follows. They are put to death on account of circumcision as Sicarii on the grounds that they are doing what is allowed to Jews alone.’ (Contra celsum xi:13.).

It is not at all germane to the present situation of the Samaritans to argue the accuracy of their claim about their origins. Time has passed in the shadow of their claim and in the practice of a gradually changing religious culture which, even if not native, is a naturalized form of the Israelite parent. It cannot be claimed that it is identical to the Israelite parent, but it is clearly a derived form. Despite the Samaritan claim not to be Jewish, we can see in their eclecticism and in the very nature of their polemics with Karaite and Rabbinite Judaism that their tradition, however they acquired it, belongs firmly to the family tree of Judaism and must be identified as a variety of Judaism. Having argued this we must recognize that it is a variety of Judaism in which such ‘Jewish’ festivals as Chanukah and Purim, and the four minor fasts, are not observed, whereas festivals of Pentateuchal provenance are in their religious calendar. Yet there comes a point at which heterodox views are so removed from the views held to be normative that one is looking at a different tradition. Just as normative Judaism differs from mainstream Christian traditions, there are those who would argue that the Samaritan tradition can no longer be described as Jewish. Contemporary orthodox Jewry has exhibited an ambivalence to the Samaritans that is reminiscent of the attitudes expressed in Tannaitic sources. On the one hand, in 1842, when the Samaritans of Nablus were threatened with violence from Moslem mobs, an appeal for protection to the Rabbinate in Jerusalem elicited the tactful response that the Samaritans are a ‘Branch of the Children of Israel who acknowledge
the truth of the Torah'. They were therefore deemed to be entitled to the same protection as the Jews. On the other hand, when the Samaritans sought burial rights in the Tel Aviv Cemetery, the Tel Aviv Chevra Kadisha refused them on the grounds that they were not Jews.

In order to clarify the argument further, it is useful to look at some more of the Samaritan rites.

Ablution

Jews are strict about ritual washing of the hands before meals, prayer and on rising in the morning, just as Samaritans are about ablution and rites of purity including Niddah (menstrual impurity) and the use of the Mikveh. Nowadays, before they go to the synagogue, they wash at home while reciting passages from the Pentateuch. The order of the washing may be derived from the ritual prescribed for priests in the Torah. The parts of the body to be washed are the hands, mouth, nose, face, ears and feet. When the Samaritan prays in the synagogue he wears a traditional Samaritan Tallit (prayer-shawl) in the form of a long white garment.

Mezuzzah

A number of observers report that the Samaritans do not use Mezuzot. Indeed this statement is true if one defines the Mezuzzah as a container for parchment on which parts of the Torah are presented. In Nablus, the Samaritans are just as likely to have the blue hand of Fatimah on their door, either to ward off evil spirits or to ward off the attentions of those spirits personified as their Arab neighbours. Inside the house most, but not all, families do indeed use a Mezuzzah in the form of a hanging or fixture on which some portion of sacred Scripture is inscribed. It might be the Decalogue, the priestly blessing (Numbers 6:22), or Deuteronomy 6:4–19 (a passage which includes the Shema). There is nothing on the Mezuzzah in any of the limited Samaritan halachic literature, but there are enough stone inscriptions of the Decalogue preserved in the remains of ancient Samaritan synagogues to advise us that this was their oldest form of the Mezuzzah, and it was indeed placed outside the building rather than inside as now. As with other aspects of Samaritan life, survival and security seem to have governed the placing of the Mezuzzah. Incidentally, the Decalogue is reported to have been used at Qumran as a Mezuzzah.

Circumcision

The Samaritans circumcise their children, and have such reverence for this practice that they never postpone it from the eighth day, whatever the dangers either for the individual or the community. The Samaritan version of Genesis 17:14 adds the words 'on the eighth day', so the passage says: 'Any uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin on the eighth day shall be cut off from his
people'. There are references in the Samaritan chronicles, the Church Fathers and Josephus to the strictness with which this rite was always performed.

Circumcision used to take place in the parental home. Today in Holon, it takes place at the community hall. Whereas in the past a priest was called in, today a Jewish mohel performs the circumcision. The act of Periah, uncovering the corona, is not performed by the Samaritans. Instead of a male sandek, who becomes the godfather by holding the child during circumcision, a woman holds the baby. Prayers are recited, the foreskin is cut and the boy is then named. At the end of the ceremony the father gives the guests sweets, and they give him money.

There are some indications that Samaritans practised second circumcision, so that when Jews were converted to Samaritanism they were circumcised a second time. There are no records of how this was done. Samaritan circumcision is probably rather similar to early Jewish circumcision, which may not have included Periah.

Bar Mitzvah

The ceremony of Bar Mitzvah as the Jews know it appears to be relatively late. This may account for the differences with the Samaritan tradition. Samaritan children, boys and girls, begin instruction in their traditions, and especially in the reading of the law, at the age of four or five years. They may be taught by their father, a scholar or a priest. When they have read the complete Torah the ceremony of the ‘Completion of the Reading of the Law’ takes place, which can be at any age up to about ten years old. The child recites the blessing of Moses (Deuteronomy 33) by heart, but does this in the family home rather than in public. It may be for this reason that the Samaritan Torah often carries its Tashqil down through the end of Deuteronomy, whereas those written by priests have their Tashqils in Leviticus or Numbers.

Burial and Funeral Rites

The Samaritans of Holon today have their own burial plot in the military cemetery at Kiryat Shaul near Tel Aviv, and those of Nablus have their cemetery on Mt Gerizim. There is some debate as to whether the Samaritans have always had a cemetery on Mt Gerizim. Their priests have the same need to avoid cemeteries as do the Jewish Qohanim. Since Gerizim is the sacred mountain on which the Festival takes place some observers have claimed that the Samaritan cemetery was never there. So far as we are aware this is indeed the case, for in early times, they buried their dead on Mt Ebal, the mountain of the curse, and later their cemetery was close to Nablus until land was confiscated by the Moslems.

Before burial the body is washed, dressed in white garments and then extracts from the Torah are read, relating to the death of patriarchs and matriarchs, and of Moses and Aaron. Deuteronomy 32 is read when the coffin is put in the grave. The coffin is a simple, undecorated wooden coffin, transported to the grave on a small truck. It is lowered into the grave, which is lined with stone or cement slabs, and covered with freshly mixed cement and earth. A meal is served after the funeral. Mourning
continues for seven days, in which relatives visit the grave and recite prayers. On the thirtieth day after the funeral, relatives invite members of the community to a memorial meal. Since the detailed description of the Samaritan funeral rites by Gaster in 1931, many of the restrictions imposed on the Samaritan community during the mourning period have lapsed.

**Succot**

The Samaritans build their *Sukkah* inside the house, using the four species described in *Leviticus* 23:40. They use any citrus fruits, palm branches, branches from trees with dense foliage, and myrtle or red peppers. The building of the *Sukkah* inside the house developed in the Byzantine period because of persecution, and has been the custom since those days. Naturally, the Samaritans eat their meals inside the *Sukkah*.

It is clear that Samaritan religion is derived from the same roots as contemporary Rabbinic Judaism, but shows a propensity for change. Those changes may accelerate under the weight of identity problems posed for the Samaritans today. Some arise from their relationship with the State of Israel, others from their relationship with the Halachic authorities in Israel, and still others from their separation into two communities, which enjoyed restricted contact between 1948 and 1967. In Nablus, until 1988, some Samaritan officials received Jordanian salaries. In Holon, Samaritans have been eligible to serve in the Israel defence forces since 1948, and have been obliged to do so since 1954. The Samaritans of Nablus are much troubled about the possibility of autonomous Arab rule in the territories, and dare not speak their minds about the political situation. On the one hand, they risk offending their brethren in Holon who are Israelis in the fullest sense, and on the other hand, are afraid to offend the Jordanian authorities or the Israel military government.

In Nablus priestly rule is pre-eminent. In Holon, until the past few years, there were no priests, and a lay council governed and made regulations about the conduct of affairs. To some extent the communities have gone their own ways, though centripetal forces mask the differences. Young children in Holon became Israeli in every way except the rituals in the home. In Holon the Samaritans live close together near the synagogue, not in a ghetto, but for the preservation of their communal identity in a situation where everything is open to them. In Nablus they preserved their Arab lifestyle and live in a ghetto-like atmosphere for the preservation of their bodies. They seek seclusion to avoid the pressures placed upon them by a hostile population. As a result the two communities have begun a separation in lifestyle. The decision to move a few priests from Nablus to Holon was an attempt to restore priestly authority in Holon, but there are clear tensions between priests and lay leaders.

The tensions with the Halachic authorities arise because in Nablus the religious affairs of the community are also subject to the oversight of the military administration, whereas the Samaritans of Holon enjoy full religious rights. Moreover, there is no clear-cut solution as to who grants divorces between Samaritan males and Jewish women. Those which have taken place are not recognized by either authority.
Finally, the Samaritans are facing problems caused by modernity. Though the Sabbath is observed as meticulously as ever, the traditional Sabbath dress has undergone subtle changes under the pressures of changing lifestyles. While the Samaritans do not use the *Erub* or the *shabbat goy* to alleviate the rigours of the Sabbath, they do now leave an electric light on all night, and, so long as the power is not turned on, food may be kept in the refrigerator to keep it cool.

It is clear, then, that within the general picture of religious stability there is a pragmatism and an acceptance of slow change which underscores the same emphasis on the practical and systems of ritual, rather than on credos and systems of belief, among Samaritans and Jews.

Notes

1 The reader is referred to my longer study, 'The Samaritans in 1984', in *Yod, (Revue des études hébraïques et Juives modernes et contemporaines)* 20 (1985) 9–32, for a full citation of many of the points raised here. Descriptions of the rituals of the Samaritans which are rather fuller here are drawn from Reinhard Pummler, 'Samaritan Rituals and Customs', in A. D. Crown (ed.) *The Samaritans* (Tübingen 1988).


3 Some discussion of this point is to be found in various entries relating to the Samaritans in the yearbooks of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. The actual numbers for January 1987 were 529 souls comprising 238 females and 291 males. There were 292 singles, 27 widowed and divorced. (See *Aleph Bet Samaritan News* no. 4471/11/1987 p.3). The death of the Samaritan High Priest reduced the number to 528, but towards the end of the year the number of 530 was cited by the Samaritans indicating two births.

4 Towards the middle of 1987 the relative ages of the community in Shechem (270 strong) were cited as follows: 100 souls above 45 years, 50 between 25 and 45 years, 60 between 13 and 25 years and the remainder, 60, below 13. See *The Jerusalem Post*, 26 June 1987.

5 It is reported that the new Samaritan High Priest, who took office in 1987, summoned the Samaritan notables in the first week of his priesthood to speak up on the subject of the marriage of the large number of unwed Samaritans. See *Aleph Bet Samaritan News* no. 451.

6 See my *Bibliography of the Samaritans* (New Jersey and London 1984) for some impression of the volume of publication. Since the bibliography was printed, a two-year supplement lists nearly 1000 items.

7 On this point see my 'Manuscript and Cast Type', forthcoming in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*.

8 See S. Talmon, 'The Samaritans', in the *Scientific American* no. 236 (June 1977) 100–8.
Book Reviews


This book by Claudine Dauphin and Gershon Edelstein is an account of their excavation of a Byzantine church at Nahariya. Such archaeological reports are extremely rare and valuable, for even though many churches have been excavated in Israel, very few have been properly published. One of the most recent excavation reports on a church concerned that excavated at Shavei Zion, near Nahariya, and was published some twenty years ago.1 For this reason alone the authors are to be complimented for the prompt publication of their excavations.

The report has been well organized in four chapters. The first describes the structure of the church and its additions, and also deals with various liturgical objects (such as chancel screens and offering tables) found during the excavations. The second chapter describes the mosaic floors found within the church, and includes a historic and artistic appreciation of their designs. The inscriptions found during the excavation are discussed in the third chapter, and the small finds are dealt with in the fourth chapter and in the appendices.

The report has a pleasing format; the plans and drawings – many of them on fold-outs – are large and clear, and the copious plates are gathered at the end of the volume. Special note should be taken of Figure 3, which is an isometric reconstruction of the church from an unusual perspective.

That said, one notices an imbalance between the first two chapters of the book. The first chapter (by G. Edelstein) is flawed by omission. Firstly, the text dealing with the structure of the church is too short. The circumstances of the excavation are given in only cursory fashion and very little attempt has been made to interpret the finds. Among the questions left untackled are the possible location of the church entrance and the shape of the additional rooms.

The second major omission is a historical-geographical discussion. A detailed map should have been provided, showing the names of the sites mentioned in the report; the map on p. 14 is too general to be of use. This would have helped in understanding what the author has to say about a number of interesting facts. For example, the remains of a Jewish settlement from the Byzantine period, known as Aiyataim, are said to have been found in the vicinity of the church. However, at the same time the church itself was part of a Christian village known as the ‘new village’ (Nea Come)
referred to in an inscription found at Nahariya. Reference to such facts only emphasizes the need for a proper historical-geographical discussion in the report.

In addition, the standard of recording used during the excavation is flawed. A photograph showing the final appearance of the site at the end of the excavation is missing. The only general photograph published - Pl. VII - shows the church before the side rooms were excavated. Moreover, section drawings are missing and are especially necessary for the earth-fills ('terra-plein') found beneath the floor of the church. According to the author (p. 25), the finds from these fills included material from the Roman period. The discussion in this chapter relates to the fourth chapter of the report, which has short but succinct descriptions of the finds with excellent illustrations.

In comparison with this, however, the second chapter of the report (by Claudine Dauphin) is an excellent example of how mosaic floors should be described and interpreted. The chapter constitutes the bulk of the report, with 35 pages of text, compared with the 21 pages of all the rest. A methodical description of the motifs represented in the mosaics appears at the beginning of the chapter; the geometric motifs are dealt with first and then the figurative ones. Following this are a number of technical descriptions, including discussion of the materials used for the mosaics and their manner of execution. Finally, the author gives her conclusions relating to the artistic significance of the mosaics from the church at Nahariya. This systematic approach allows the author to reach some very interesting conclusions. The mosaics from the Nahariya church belong to a genre typical of the Byzantine period: representations which give a feeling of movement as distinct from the static representations typical of mosaics from the Roman period. This quality is clearly visible in the features of the border surrounding the central mosaic floor, which has acanthus scrolls inhabited by figures following one upon the other. The figures are organized into groups with a different rhythm. Dynamic hunting scenes alternate with calm scenes including figures such as the flute player or the boy removing a thorn from his foot. This transition from one group to another provides a continuous rising and falling narrative, a kind of musical flow.

At the same time one can discern in the mosaic a resurrection of classical motifs, such as the rosette in the centre of the floor and the pair of peacocks decorating the chancel area. The rosette, which has a diameter of close to 2 metres, is distinguished by its colours and its interplay of perspective. This type of design is known from mosaics at Antioch dating from the Hellenistic period. The rosette is depicted against a flat and neutral decorative background, which highlights the design and focuses the attention of the observer on the most significant part of the church: the chancel. A good parallel for this design was discovered during the present writer’s excavations in the church of the monastery at Khirbet ed-Deir in the southern Judean Desert (Pl. I).² This church, like that at Nahariya, is dated to the first half of the 6th century AD. The resurrection of classical motifs in the mosaic floors of the church at Nahariya, lends support to the suggestion made by Renan in 1864, that there was a ‘Justinianic renaissance’ in the art of mosaics at that time.

The chapter on the inscriptions (also by Claudine Dauphin) deals with the reading
of a complete dedicatory inscription and of a number of fragmentary inscriptions. An important feature of this chapter is the suggestion relating to the date of the construction of the church. Four identical monograms were found on marble colonnettes which belonged to an offering table. The excavator suggests (pp. 92–3) that the monograms are the capitalized initials of John Bishop of Ptolemais (Acre). John’s name appears among the names of bishop signatories of a letter sent to John Archbishop of Constantinople in the year 536. The fact that the Nahariya church was located within the diocese of Ptolemais, since it lies south of Nahal Zip (Kesiv), lends support to this suggestion. If it is accepted, then the date of the construction of the church can be placed around the year AD 536.

On the basis of the finds from the excavation, it has been suggested that the church was destroyed by fire at the time of the Persian invasion of the country (AD 612–614.) Signs of this destruction have also been found at churches excavated nearby, at Evron and Shavei Zion. However, it has recently been proposed to attribute the razing of these churches to the destructive activities extended to the Christian communities by the Jewish population of western Galilee. This would have occurred during the years immediately following the Persian conquest (AD 614–617).

To sum up, this report on the excavation of the church at Nahariya is a publication
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of great scientific value, and serves as an important contribution to the study of the material culture in Israel during the Byzantine period.

Notes

2 Y. Hirschfeld and R. Birger, 'Khirbet ed-Deir (désert de Juda) 1981–1984', RB 93 (1986) 279, Fig. 25.

Yizhar Hirschfeld
(Hebrew University, Jerusalem)


The Western rediscovery of Palestine in the 19th century is a fascinating story, full of interesting characters – many of them delightfully eccentric – international intrigue, and plenty of incident. Naomi Shepherd is to be congratulated for having realized that such a story does not need to be spiced up in order to be exciting; all it needs is to be well told, and this is what she has done. I have only two criticisms of her book, the first being relatively minor. It seems a pity that no cross-reference was made between the text and the illustrations, and that the many well-chosen quotes have not been connected to the references and sources given at the end of the book. My second criticism concerns one of those references. It is most unfortunate that in her account of the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund she has relied at several points on the highly inaccurate account given by Neil Asher Silberman in his book *Digging for God and Country*. Specifically, on p. 209 she states that Warren handed over the fragments of the Moabite Stone which he had salvaged to Clermont-Ganneau before leaving Jerusalem in 1870. In fact, Warren protested most vociferously, in his book *Underground Jerusalem* (pp. 544–6) at the act of the PEF in handing over, against his expressed wishes, the fragments, which Warren had brought back to London and presented to the Fund, to Clermont-Ganneau. This was done in January 1874. On p. 205 she states that at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the PEF in April 1868, Warren brought about the reform of the Fund. In fact, Warren did not leave Jerusalem until 15 May, and the meeting in question took place on 9 June 1868. On
p. 205 she states that George Grove was persuaded to step down as Honorary Secretary of the PEF in favour of Walter Besant; and on p. 208, in connection with the letter Grove sent to *The Times* about the affair of the Moabite Stone, she repeats that he was no longer the Secretary of the Fund. In fact, George Grove was Honorary Secretary to the PEF from 1865 until 1881, without interruption. On 25 February 1868 George Grove proposed the creation of the post of Acting Secretary (today’s Executive Secretary) to take the burden of day-to-day administration off the Secretary, and Walter Besant was appointed to the post after its creation was approved on 3 July 1868. All of these errors are due to Silberman. Fortunately Shepherd does not appear to have relied on him at any other point. All things considered, this book is not only a (generally) reliable and accurate account of a fascinating period in the history of a part of the world of interest to a multitude of people, but a good read.

Rupert Chapman
(Palestine Exploration Fund)


P. R. S. Moorey’s revised edition of K. Kenyon’s *The Bible and Recent Archaeology* is an expanded, updated and radically reworked treatment of the subject. Citing the demands of sound scholarship, Moorey has undertaken the revision of an outdated volume of limited value, written by a respected colleague who was his one-time teacher. He has succeeded in producing an up-to-date version which broadly and skilfully discusses recent archaeological discoveries pertinent to an understanding of the Bible. The result is a good primer on the subject, that must be regarded as recommended reading.

In his introduction, Moorey promises to offer: ‘a constant stream of fresh information on antiquity from which to reconstruct the societies of the lands of the Bible …’. The book goes on to do this in a series of chapters arranged chronologically, according to Moorey’s understanding of the history of the Old and New Testament periods and the span of time between them.

Chapter 1 deals, in a general way, with the Old Testament and its milieu, the literary and material cultural traditions of Israel and its neighbours. Here Moorey states his understanding of biblical texts as altered versions of earlier traditions which underwent two major periods of reshaping. The historicity of the narratives is therefore of dubious value, and they are not to be expected to correspond closely with archaeological information. In this vein Moorey rather colourfully introduces Chapter 2: ‘It is with the theatre of Israel’s earliest history that we may best begin rather than with the leading players, since they, as will become readily apparent, remain invisible to the eye of the archaeologist.’

In the following chapters Moorey’s scholarship is brought into full play. First he
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sketches in the background of each period, reviewing the historical, textual and archaeological evidence, and including brief explanatory paragraphs and pertinent illustrations. In the early periods this includes information on such far-flung sites as Mari, Ebla and Ugarit, and their relevance to the study of the Bible and to the cultural milieu of Ancient Israel. For later periods the discussion centres virtually uniquely on local finds.

The results of earlier research are often included, together with the views developed by major schools of thought, then followed by a clear statement of the author's own view. The latter is often not definitive, and leaves the reader without precise archaeological contexts for biblical events. Some will feel that Moorey's views, compared to earlier approaches to the subject, including that of Kenyon in the first edition of this work, convey a sense of the inadequacy of biblical archaeology as practised by him and other researchers. It is precisely this inquisitive, open minded, and above all scholarly approach to the subject which is so appealing to this reader.

Moorey's treatment of the period of the settlement of the Tribes of Israel is a case in point. The Bible may see this process as of central importance; Moorey views it as 'only one aspect in a complex process of social and military action of a period of two hundred years...'. He then devotes half of the chapter aptly titled 'The Eclipse of Canaan' to his interpretation of the events peripheral to this process, the weakening of Egyptian authority, the arrival of the Philistines and the assimilation of the Canaanites.

When reviewing the archaeological record he takes to task some traditional theories, including that which claims the presence of a specific type of pottery at a certain site as proof of the accuracy of a specific biblical account. Thus the existence of Philistine or Israelite occupations cannot be proven by the presence of 'Philistine' pottery and 'collared-rim' storage jars; and, indeed, as Moorey points out, the whole determination of ethnicity from the evidence of artifacts is, at best, a dubious one. An interesting note offered by Moorey on the 'four-room' house of the Iron I period, thought to be an indication of Israelite presence, is that its distribution is wider than was formerly believed.

The chapters on the monarchical periods of Israel's history emphasize architectural finds, especially temples and fortifications and our understanding of the societies which produced them. Jerusalem, from the excavations of Kenyon, and most recently of Shiloh, is extensively treated, but considerable space is devoted to other sites. Especially in this chapter, the accompanying illustrations are most helpful.

The discussion of the divided monarchy is broken down into distinct regions. This is something of a departure from earlier and later chapters and reflects Moorey's adherence to political history as much as to an awareness of regional differences in material culture.

The chapter on the inter-Testamental period deals with Persian rule at some length and in some detail; the remainder of the period, from the Hellenistic phase until the reign of Herod, which in archaeological terms may be deemed particularly rich, is treated with brevity. One could fault Moorey with this approach were not the book confined to archaeology and the Bible.
The discussion relevant to the New Testament provides a good overall view of the Herodian period, especially the extensive descriptions of the not-so-recent excavations of Mazar and Avigad. A final discussion, concerning the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, deals with the authenticity of the tradition of its location, clearly setting out the main pros and cons of the question.

Moorey has undertaken to produce a popular, brief, synthetic introduction to biblical archaeology. He has done so in a narrative which is entirely comprehensible to the layman, writing clearly and concisely, while maintaining high standards of scholarship. His familiarity with recent research is felt on virtually every page. What he has produced is a thought-provoking, eminently readable volume which is well illustrated with many excellent-quality black-and-white photographs, plans and drawings.

_Eliot Braun_

(Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums)


The present volume is the latest of a number of publications covering the results of archaeological surveys undertaken in different parts of Israel on behalf of the Archaeological Survey of Israel (cf. _BAIAs_, 5, 1985–6, pp. 10–12). Hirschfeld’s book deals with his 1981–2 survey of 123 archaeological sites, many of them previously unknown, from the area covered by the Herodium map in the Judean Desert. Unlike previous publications of the Archaeological Survey of Israel, this book has commentaries and a full description of sites in both Hebrew and English, making the material available to a much wider scholarly public. This fact should not pass unmentioned and I would like to suggest that previous volumes published in Hebrew be translated as well, so that eventually all of this primary source material will be made available to scholars in one common international language.

A wide variety of archaeological sites was found or re-investigated by Hirschfeld and his survey team, and these date from Prehistoric to Ottoman times. The Prehistoric (Palaeolithic to Chalcolithic) remains are dealt with in a commentary by A. Gopher. There appears to have been very little human activity in this part of the Judean Desert during the Early and Middle Bronze Ages. A total of twenty-eight tumuli were discovered, dating from the MB I (or EB IV) period. However, the fact that not one settlement site from this period was found indicates that the area was probably populated only on a seasonal basis, by a semi-nomadic people living in campsites that have left behind very few traces for the archaeologist to identify. It
remained largely unpopulated, except by nomads, until the late Iron Age (7th century BC) which fits in very well with Stager’s findings (BASOR 221 (1976) 145–58) from the Buqe’ah region of the Judean Desert. The first substantial settlement of the area took place only during the late Roman and Byzantine periods. The sites include fortresses, farmhouses and monasteries and churches, including six which were not previously known. Church historians and Byzantine scholars interested in monasticism in the Judean Desert will find Hirschfeld’s book an invaluable source of information. During the Arab conquest of the country in AD 636–8, the settlements in the area appear to have been abandoned, whereupon the area reverted to its former use as a roaming ground for nomads. In the plains of the Negev Desert, on the other hand, there is evidence for the continuity of settlement throughout the Ummayyad period.

The book is well arranged, and is marred only by a very few errors and misprints. It is worth noting that the maps and plans by E. Cohen, and the reconstruction drawings of Byzantine monasteries by L. Ritmeyer, are exceptionally good. However, in one place (p. 81) a scale is missing from the plan of the enclosure found at Site No. 61, and Illustration No. 80 (p. 102) clearly represents a detail of a wall painting and not an ornamental voussoir. It should also be pointed out that some of the examples of pottery from Khirbet Badd Faluh (Site No. 2) illustrated on p. 31 (e.g. Nos 9–10), appear to be of Byzantine and not of Hellenistic/Roman date as is stated in the text below the drawing. Since Early Arab pottery was apparently not found at Sites Nos 39 and 45, it is puzzling to see these listed on p. 23* as sites dating from the Early Arab period.

This book contains primary archaeological information of great value, and Hirschfeld is to be congratulated for having published his finds so soon after the completion of his survey.

Shimon Gibson
(Institute of Archaeology, University College, London)


The Times Atlas of the Bible, published in Canada and the USA as Harper’s Atlas of the Bible, is a splendid volume packed with information and including up to 600 colour maps and illustrations. Measuring 362 x 265mm, it is inexpensive for what it is; this kind of book excites the ‘pride of possession’ which motivates all true bibliophiles. The atlas is divided into three principal sections, each consisting of a series of articles and maps, devoted respectively to Old Testament, inter-Testamental and New Testament times. Apart from the general index, there is a very detailed chronological table, and a useful index listing the ‘People of the Bible’. A reading list, however, is notably absent.

The publisher’s pre-launch advertising claims it to be ‘the complete history and
archaeology of the lands, events and people of the Bible'. This, of course, is in the
tradition of advertising hyperbole, but it indicates the aims of its General Editor, the
distinguished Professor James B. Pritchard, and of its over fifty contributors. It has
taken eight years to bring *The Times Atlas of the Bible* to print, and, by any standard,
the time has been justified. The atlas will appeal to a wide range of people who share
an interest in the Scriptures of the Jews and the Christians.

Not the least of the pleasures derived from this atlas is the wealth of knowledge and
experience brought to it by Israeli contributors, and we must include L. Ritmeyer, the
archaeological illustrator who is responsible for many of the fine drawings and
reconstructions in the book.

There are, however, several aspects of the publication which must be called into
question. In the modern meaning of the word an atlas is a book of maps. By that
definition our book is not truly an atlas. Even a cursory examination demonstrates it
to be history illustrated by maps, drawings and photographs, with the text predom­
ninating. We are asked to take note of the contributions of the authoritative scholars,
rather than of the work of learned and skilful cartographers; and, indeed, many of the
maps so lack detail as to indicate that they do not stand as maps in their own right but
serve to illustrate the text. This is a legitimate use of maps, but not in a book which
purports to be an atlas. One cannot escape the suspicion that in some cases the
quantity of detail in the maps was reduced not principally in order to make them
better illustrate the text, but to enhance the aesthetic appeal of the page. In spite of
sustaining a warm recommendation to buy the book, this reviewer is still looking
forward to the publication of an up-to-date atlas of Bible lands.

*The Times Atlas of the Bible* is said to have 'unique authority' by virtue of the
contributions of an international team of fifty highly qualified archaeologists,
linguists, historians and theologians. But the reader of the book is denied knowledge
of which of these scholars has written any given section, so is unable to attribute any
statement to a given scholar. This reviewer finds such an editorial policy misleading,
for it appears to suggest that we should believe a statement simply because it appears
in the atlas. The standard of scholarly contributions is probably higher than in any
previous publication of this type, but each scholar has a bias or predilection, and it is
essential for the reader to assess any statement against known works of the
contributor involved. It could be argued that the atlas is directed to a fairly general
reader, and that its function is to encourage a fuller study. But precisely for this
reason, the reader should know with whom he is dealing, so that he may buy the
books or follow the lectures of the scholar concerned. The reviewer is puzzled that
eminent contributors should have accepted this unpleasant restriction.

It should rather have been freely admitted that its archaeological and historical
scope is so broad as to prevent any uniform approach to the Bible to be adopted.

The atlas contains vast amounts of information, and one could go through it page
by page listing details which provoke criticism. This reviewer will confine himself to
one or two representative points. In the section dealing with the Second Revolt
against the Romans (p. 180), the author claims that in Jerusalem 'Hadrian erected his
new city on the site of the ruins of the Temple'. This is a serious inaccuracy,
contradicted later on in the text: ‘A temple of Jupiter Capitolinus stood on the emplacement of the Jewish sanctuary’. The total picture remains unclear. Omissions are bound to occur in a volume as comprehensive as this, but one cannot help being surprised by the very sparse mention of the siege and destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple in AD 70, especially since the fall of Jerusalem had a significant effect on the subsequent development of both Judaism and Christianity. A map illustrating Titus’ capture of Jerusalem should have been included, as well as short discussions concerning the topography of the city, the line of its walls, the structure of Antonia and its water supply. The subject is disposed of in the atlas with the following words: ‘by which time the Temple had been reduced to ashes and much of the population had starved to death or been massacred. Others were captured and sent to the mines or were paraded in Titus’ triumph in Rome.’ The failure to describe the fall of Jerusalem and to provide plans and illustrations seems unfortunate.

The atlas is richly illustrated, yet could have been still larger, perhaps appearing in two or more volumes. The designers, however, are to be congratulated on having been able to fit in all the material they have. They did this by using a now standard technique of graphic design known as ‘overlaying’. So many publishers now employ this that it calls for notice. It does not enhance the book (unless one is thrilled by travel brochures), and most readers will be irritated, for example, by two splendid reconstruction drawings (on pages 158–9) being ruined by overlaying. Why is one not allowed to see what is under the superimposed pictures? Other examples abound: pages 143 and 181, for instance. But, on the other hand we do receive all the material in one volume, and the cost is limited.

On balance, this book is to be greatly welcomed, proudly possessed, and deeply studied. It will give the financially minded the satisfaction of having made a good deal.

Robert F. Pitt
(Archaeological Photographer)
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Collon, D., *First Impressions: Cylinder Seals in the Ancient Near East*, 1987, British Museum Publications. £25.00


The Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society

Chairman’s Message

This year Israel celebrates her fortieth birthday. Her friends throughout the world take pleasure in paying tribute to her achievements during this short space of time.

In the realm of archaeology Israel’s achievements have been truly remarkable. The passionate interest of ordinary people in the study of the past is perhaps unequalled elsewhere – not surprising in a young nation eager to acquaint itself with its links with the ancient land. Yediat haaretz – the study of the land – and the study of the Bible are major subjects in the school curriculum in Israel, and hiking through the countryside is a favourite pastime.

Archaeology, then, has been pursued during the last forty years with vigour and popular enthusiasm. The list of the sites excavated would have done credit to a much larger country. Surveys and digging have been carried out throughout the length and breadth of Israel, both in the heartland and on the periphery, in step with developments on the rapidly changing political scene – in Sinai before its return to Egypt, in the Negev and in the Golan. Most celebrated are the names of Hazor, Masada and Qumran, where discoveries have led to a fundamental reappraisal of history and theology. But the jewel in the crown is, of course, Jerusalem. There excavation and restoration have taken place on a grand scale – notably in the City of David, in the area beside the Temple, and in the Jewish Quarter. The results are displayed to the public with splendid expertise.

Within this context the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society seeks to play a helpful role. Britain has a fine record in the archaeology of the Holy Land. Among its giants were Warren, Conder, Wilson, Petrie and Kenyon. It is natural that Israeli archaeologists should look for an audience in Britain. Among our founder members we numbered Yigael Yadin. Through the dedication and leadership of Richard Barnett, the roll-call of distinguished lecturers to our Society reflects the broad progress of archaeology in Israel. As she moves into her fifth decade we look forward to a quickening of our activities in lectures, publication and student awards.

The contents of this Bulletin present a faithful picture of those activities during the past year. We are deeply grateful to Mr John Day of Auto-Wrappers Sales Ltd for the munificent generosity with which once again he has made its publication possible. To Judith Littman the Society is greatly indebted for her skill and her unfailing solicitude for its wellbeing, and to the Editors for assembling and issuing this seventh volume of the society’s Bulletin.

Professor J. B. Segal, MC, DPhil, FBA
The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years On

Geza Vermes

The Society is grateful to Dr Vermes for having replaced, at very short notice, a lecturer who was unable to attend owing to sudden illness.

In the spring of 1947 a Bedouin shepherd boy accidentally stumbled on a cache of ancient Hebrew texts hidden in a cave in the Judean Desert. From that time onwards, the Dead Sea Scrolls have been a household name and the subject of much academic attention. How, with the hindsight of four decades of intense research, do they appear today?

The ancient library of Jewish literature is made up, with the possible exception of the Copper Scroll, of religious texts written in Hebrew or Aramaic, but among them are also a few Greek fragments. A substantial section of the documents represent the Hebrew Scriptures: one of them complete (Isaiah) and the rest in fragments. The second group of documents corresponds to the Apocrypha, i.e. religious books reckoned as Holy Scripture by the Jews of the Diaspora and included in the Greek (Septuagint) translation of the Bible, but banned from the canon by the Palestinian authorities. Prior to Qumran only the book of Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira, was known in Hebrew. A third division of Jewish religious books, the Pseudepigraphia, failed to attain canonical status either in Palestine or in the Dispersion. To these three categories of writings, previously known in one form or another, must be added the many Hebrew and Aramaic
manuscripts the existence of which, with the single exception of the Damascus Rule yielded by the Cairo Genizah, was not even suspected before Qumran. These are the so-called Sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls. Five rules or Codes present the laws and customs of the Qumran community. One of them, the Temple Scroll, takes the form of a divine law substituted for the Torah of Moses. Next, we have a rich collection of documents in which the Bible is systematically expounded. Sectarian religious poetry and liturgical texts are also represented. The fourth category includes fragmentary remains of sapiential writings. Finally, we have a few oddments: calendric fragments seeking to combine the lunar and solar months; the Copper Scroll, which describes in cryptic style sixty-four hiding-places containing gold, silver and scrolls, including another copy of the same inventory in plain language, and horoscopes.

Publication of the scrolls has proceeded very slowly since they were handed over to an editorial team by Father Roland de Vaux in 1953. The bulk of the material is still unpublished. Of the twenty volumes originally contemplated – in today’s revised estimate the figure appears to have risen to twenty-five – only seven have appeared so far. This situation I once described as ‘the academic scandal par excellence of the twentieth century’. Be this as it may, after a few years of research, converging views began to emerge in regard to the dating of the finds. Apart from a few odd dissenting voices, the Dead Sea Scrolls are assigned today to a period between 200 BC and AD 70 by most experts. The roughly contemporaneous manuscripts found at Masada, and in caves in other areas of the Judean desert, now supply external confirmation for the correctness of the proposed Qumran chronology. Again, within a few years of the first publications, the overwhelming majority of scholars came to identify the community of the Scrolls as the sect of the Essenes described by Philo, Josephus and Pliny the Elder. This identification, too, seems still valid, provided that we do not expect an absolute correspondence between the classical accounts and the Scrolls.

What are the most important contributions of the Scrolls to Jewish studies and to the history of the late Second Temple era? The scrolls have created a new discipline, ancient (i.e. pre-Medieval) Hebrew codicology, the technical study of manuscripts, and have enriched beyond measure Hebrew palaeography of the inter-Testamental age. They have enabled scholars to transfer Esseneism from the a-historical setting provided by the classical authors into the concrete reality of Jewish history of the Graeco-Roman era. The discovery of their original writings and of the remains of one of their settlements at Qumran affords a hitherto unparalleled grasp of the life, customs and beliefs of a Jewish minority party. This detailed portrait of a Jewish minority group or sect provides an invaluable yardstick for the study of the parallel phenomenon of the nascent Palestinian Christian Church. As the manuscript evidence offered by the scrolls is considerably earlier than anything previously available, they have also opened a totally new chapter in our search for an understanding of the genesis and transmission of ancient Jewish texts, biblical, apocryphal and Essene sectarian alike.

Plants and the Bible: Literary and Archaeological Evidence

F. Nigel Hepper

The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew

With an increasingly urbanized society, today’s Bible readers have largely lost touch with the rural type of society of biblical times. In those days even the cities were little more than country towns, since the inhabitants depended on their surrounding gardens and farms. It is no wonder, therefore, that the whole biblical setting is pervaded with references to agriculture, trees, fruits and plant-life in its many forms, and that the Israelite festivals were founded on the agricultural seasons. Archaeological evidence confirms the written record and expands our knowledge of the plant material used in each age. Enigmatically, the
drier or wetter the ancient site, the better preserved is that material, since decay soon disposes of the evidence in the presence of a combination of moisture and atmospheric oxygen.

Oral tradition eventually crystallized into the written word on stone, potsherds, skins or papyrus sheets to form the Bible. The papyrus, being of plant material, introduces us to the great swamps of the Egyptian Delta region in which flourished the tall papyrus sedge (*Cyperus papyrus*). Pliny explained the preparation of the writing material from the pith and how the waters of the Nile at times of flood caused the adhesion of the strips. However, Hepper & Reynolds found that tapwater sufficed, although in the humid English atmosphere no water was necessary, and analysis of the saps showed natural gums to be present. Subsequently, Ragab held that physical interlocking of the cells provided the adhesion.

It was in Egypt that God saved the infant Moses in a papyrus basket (*Exodus* 2:3) and later spoke to him through the burning bush (*Exodus* 3:2). Also in Egypt the People of Israel endured captivity, and to this day at Passover (Pesah) Jews eat bitter herbs (*Exodus* 12:8), such as Cretan eryngo (*Eryngium creticum*), in remembrance of their burden of making bricks without straw (*Exodus* 5:7). Moses led the Israelites across the Sea of Reeds - the reeds being *Phragmites*, *Typha* and *Scirpus* - to the oasis of Elim where there were seventy date palms (*Exodus* 15:27). But the people murmured against Moses for food, and God gave them manna (*Exodus* 16:31), which was like coriander seed (*Coriandrum sativum*), but otherwise cannot be satisfactorily identified with any plant, in spite of numerous suggestions (4, 5). The Israelites soon tired of it and longed for cucumbers (*Cucumis melo*), melons (*Citrus lanatus*), leeks (*Allium porrum*), onions (*A. cepa*) and garlic (*A. sativum*), all of which are well represented in Egyptian tombs in engravings or as dried garlands and offerings.

At Mt Horeb Moses received the pattern for the Tabernacle to be constructed of ‘shittim wood’, from the *Acacia* trees that grow in the wadis of Sinai. A lampstand was also made with branches like those of a sage plant (*Salvia judaica*), and cups like almond flowers (*Exodus* 25). Almond twigs (*Prunus dulcis*), also featured in the dispute over Aaron’s authority: his rod flowered and fruited overnight (*Numbers* 17).

The forty years of nomadic existence in the Desert of Negev must have included sedentary periods of which nothing is known. However, the later Nabatean settlements included elaborate rainfall catchment for local agriculture in the depressions. Recent experimental reconstruction pioneered by Evenari at Avdat demonstrates the effectiveness of such run-off agriculture, which must have supported some 6000 people in the city.

The bleak rocky Sinai and sandy Negev gave way to the hot rift valley of the Araba and the King’s Highway on the eastern side, before the Jordan was crossed. God had promised a land of ‘milk and honey’ (*Exodus* 3:8, *Deuteronomy* 26:15), which seems to indicate an abandoned agricultural land where the flocks yield milk and the profuse wild flowers honey. At the same time it was to be a land with rain, unlike Egypt which was irrigated by channels that could be stopped by one’s foot (*Deuteronomy* 11:10). The hills and valleys of the Promised Land would yield cereals (wheat and barley), vines, figs, pomegranates, olive trees and date-honey (*Deuteronomy* 8:7–10). These are the famous seven varieties, and they include the great trio of corn, wine and oil (cereals, vine and olive) of the Mediterranean area (*Deuteronomy* 11:14; *Hosea* 2:22).

Barley (*Hordeum vulgare*) was the cereal of poorer people (*Ruth* 2) while wheat (*Triticum dicoccum*) was grown on better ground and yielded fine flour for bread and offerings (*Leviticus* 2:1). Most excavated sites yield carbonized grains, and at Nimrud weed seeds were identified among them which gave an interesting ecological setting to the cornfields. In fact the wild ancestors of these cereals occur in this Fertile Crescent.

The vine (*Vitis vinifera*) is the second of the seven varieties and of the trio, providing fresh fruit, raisins and wine. The first biblical reference is the unfortunate occurrence
when Noah became drunk with wine (Genesis 9:20). But wine also gladdens the heart (Psalm 104:15). The vine plant is symbolic of Israel, and the terraced hill-sides are characteristic of the Land (Isaiah 5:1–10; Ezekiel 17:5–10) and is well demonstrated at the Neot Kedumim Reserve. In excavations seeds and wine jars are often found.\(^{11,14}\)

Figs (Ficus carica) were important fruit trees grown near homes or in orchard terraces, especially on the hills.\(^{14}\) Warm areas favour another fig, the sycomore (F. sycomorus), which has long been grown for fruit and timber – in Egypt it was the usual wood for sarcophagi.\(^{11}\) Study of its pollination by Galil\(^ {12}\) has explained why notching of the young fruit (Amos 7:14) is necessary to obtain insect-free fruits.

Fruits of the pomegranate (Punica granatum) were excavated at Canaanite Jericho by Kathleen Kenyon,\(^ {13}\) engraved on Tutmos III's temple at Karnak and as ornaments on the hem of the priestly robe of the ephod (Exodus 28:33).\(^ {14}\)

The third species of the trio is olive (Olea europaea), about which the Torah says the harvester should leave some fruit for the widow (Deuteronomy 24:20). Olive-oil lamps are well known from digs, and place-names such as the Mount of Olives attest to the frequency of cultivation in the past as much as at present. The olive has a firm place in the history of the Holy Land.\(^ {14}\)

There is no doubt that the honey mentioned as the seventh variety was derived from the date palm (Phoenix dactylifera) and was not that from bees referred to earlier. Male and female trees occur and it is necessary to ensure pollination in order to set fruit – an ancient practice known to the Babylonians.\(^ {14,15}\)

At the time of the conquest the hill country seems to have been forested (Joshua 17:14–18), although ‘wooded’ is probably a better word since the low rainfall is unable to support natural high forest such as occurs in Lebanon. Access to the timber supply of Lebanon accounted for territorial struggles between Egypt, Assyria and Babylon; and even Israel used its resources of cedar for Solomon’s Temple (1 Kings 5; 2 Chronicles 2). Old timber can be identified from its microscopic cell structure, and even charcoal retains its anatomical characteristics, which may be examined along fracture lines.\(^ {16}\) Excessive felling, fuel-gathering and uncontrolled fires soon decimate woodland, which fails to regenerate in the presence of sheep and goats grazing the seedlings and sprouting rootstocks. Although a tree of life is mentioned (Genesis 2:9; Proverbs 3:18) and has important symbolism, trees were not worshipped as in other religions.\(^ {8}\) Certain trees were revered or honoured, such as Abraham’s oak (Genesis 18:8), Deborah’s palm (Judges 4:5) and Saul’s tamarisk (1 Samuel 22:6), while others were burial sites (Genesis 35:8, 1 Samuel 31:31); Abraham planted a tamarisk at Beersheva (Genesis 22:33), and Jotham told a story of the trees (Judges 9:7–20). Palms were symbolic of uprightness, and cedars of great size (Psalm 92:12), hence they are planted at Neot Kedumim, the Biblical Landscape Reserve in Israel, within sight of each other.\(^ {9}\)

The rocky-thicket vegetation is fragrant with rockroses (Cistus), from which ladanum balm was obtained (Genesis 37:25), together with rue, myrtle, sage, mint and wild flowers. They may also be cultivated as such plants make attractive subjects for a Bible garden.\(^ {17}\) More exotic incense plants were obtained from afar and carried along ancient trade routes (1 Kings 9:26).\(^ {18}\) They were used in the holy anointing oil (Exodus 30) which included galbanum (Ferula galbaniflua) from Iran, and frankincense (Boswellia sacra) from south Arabia. Myrrh (Commiphora myrrha) was also imported from Arabia and the Horn of Africa. It was these and other spieces that the Queen of Sheba brought to Solomon at Jerusalem, and of which she said that (like this account of the plants of the Bible) the half had not been told (1 Kings 10:7), while Solomon ‘spoke of trees, from the cedar that is in Lebanon to the hyssop that grows out of the wall’ (1 Kings 4:33).

Notes

1 Pliny the Elder, Natural History, Book 13 para. 77.

3 Hassan Ragab, *Le papyrus* (Cairo 1980).


14 A. Goor and M. Nurock, *The fruits of the Holy Land* (Jerusalem 1968); including vine, olive, date, pomegranate, almond and many other fruits, especially from a Jewish perspective.


17 F. Nigel Hepper, *Planting a Bible Garden* (London: HMSO, 1987), deals with all biblical plants from which those suitable for one’s climate may be selected for cultivation; also *Bible plants at Kew* (London: HMSO, 1985).


**Sataf: Landscape Archaeology Near Jerusalem**

Shimon Gibson

The archaeological study of ancient rural landscapes is a relatively new area of research in the Near East. A survey and two seasons of excavations were recently carried out at Sataf, in the Judean Hills west of Jerusalem. The site, located on a steep slope overlooking the Soreq Valley, has two springs (En Sataf and En Bikura) and a system of agricultural terraces extending over approximately 16 acres. The springs include rock-cut caves, flow tunnels and large plastered pools. On average they provide about 3–4 cubic metres of water per hour, which was channelled from the springs to the terraces, on which fruit trees and vegetables were cultivated.

During work at Sataf, the remains of ancient rural settlements were discovered under several later agricultural terraces. The earliest settlement dates from the Chalcolithic period (4th millennium BC). The remains of a rectangular structure were unearthed in an area above the En Bikura spring, comprising at least two rooms, with
rock-cut and stone-built walls, grey earthen floors and storage pits. A lower grinding stone was found embedded in the floor of one of the rooms. Pottery from within the structure included typical V-shaped bowls, churns and cornets, with many examples decorated with bands of red paint. Flint tools were also discovered, including fan scrapers and chisels with polished edges. The small finds included a carnelian bead, a stone weight and seashells. Animal bones and plant remains were also collected. Near the structure a small rock-cut cave was excavated, which also contained material from the Chalcolithic period.

The site was resettled during the Early Bronze I period (late-4th millennium BC), and remains were found in three separate areas of the excavation. The structures belong to two architectural traditions, characterized by either rectilinear or curvilinear walls. In one excavation area the remains of an agricultural terrace was unearthed which probably dates from the EB I. It has a wall built of large boulders retaining a fill of light-brown soil.

Sataf was apparently occupied during the Middle Bronze II B and the Late Iron Age, judging by the discovery there of pottery from these two periods. But architectural remains or stratified deposits have not yet been found.

The site was resettled during the Early Roman period (1st century BC–1st century AD). It was apparently quite small, and was located immediately east of the En Bikura spring. Structures were found in two excavation areas, and the major components of the water systems at Sataf were probably first built then.

Sataf was reoccupied in the Byzantine period, probably during the 4th century AD. A plastered water installation, with a pipe outlet made of lead, was unearthed in one of the excavation areas. In the lower parts of the spring of En Bikura, two rows of ceramic jars were found set into the walls; similarly installed jars, identified as fish ponds, are known from a number of Byzantine sites in Israel, including Kh. Sabiya and Caesarea. Many of the agricultural terraces at Sataf were first built during this period. A farm building and wine presses dating from the Byzantine period were surveyed to the south of Sataf, at Esh Sheikh Ubeid.

During the Ottoman period, a village was founded to the south of the En Sataf spring, and the water systems substantially restored. Many of the ancient agricultural terraces at Sataf were rebuilt and continued to be used for cultivation until 1948.

Important results have been achieved during two seasons of work at Sataf. The test-pitting of agricultural terraces at the site has proven extremely successful. Remains of ancient rural settlements have been found in different parts of the landscape, dating from Chalcolithic, Early Bronze I, Early Roman and Byzantine periods. This is the first time that a detailed study of the forms and patterns of an ancient landscape has been undertaken in Israel. The work carried out at Sataf will serve as a test case for the application of landscape archaeology to the study of ancient agricultural systems in other parts of Israel.

Select bibliography


The Biblical Samaritans in the Present Day

Alan D. Crown

(This paper is printed in full on pp 40–9.)

The Iron Age at Tell Halif

Oded Borowski

Lahav Research Project, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

Since 1976, the Lahav Research Project (LRP) has been working at Tell Halif and
the region surrounding Kibbutz Lahav. In seven field seasons, the project recovered seventeen strata and several sub-strata and phases, showing that occupation of the site started in the late Chalcolithic-EB I period and continued with a few gaps through the EB II (first fortification), EB III, LB I, LB II, Iron I, Iron II, Persian, Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, Early Arab and Modern Arab periods.

The transition from the Late Bronze to Iron I seems to have been peaceful, although more work should be done on this question. During the Iron I period the site was not fortified; however, remains recovered in Field III during the last two seasons show that the occupation during this period was much more intensive than had been previously uncovered. At that time, several storage pits were built as part of a large and massive stone structure, the nature of which cannot be determined. It seems that the site suffered destruction during the Iron I, but more work is needed to verify the point.

The site was fortified in the 9th century BC during the time of the kings of Judah, and the fortifications were altered before their destruction at the end of the 8th century. The fortifications included a casemate wall, an offset tower (in the early phase), and a steep, stone-covered glacis. Adjacent to the wall were houses with domestic structures and installations.

The city suffered destruction at the end of the 8th century (probably in 701 BCE) possibly by the Assyrians under Sennacherib on their way from Gaza to Lachish and Jerusalem. It was immediately resettled by squatters who neither occupied the whole site nor repaired the fortifications. The city was abandoned some time in the mid-7th century. In addition to the remains recovered at the site, a cemetery dated to the same period has been excavated across the valley, south of the tell. By now, close to fifteen tombs have been cleared and many more are visible and await recovery. The tombs are typically Judahite, with a narrow entrance and blocking stone, and a burial chamber with benches and repositories.

The site has been previously identified as Ziklag, the city given to David by the Philistines, however, presently its identification with Rimmon is gaining more support among scholars.

Recent Anthropological Discoveries in the Holy Land

Joe Zias

Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums

The anthropological community has contributed greatly during the past three decades to understanding man's place in the history of the ancient Near East. Earlier archaeological reports dealt mainly with lithics, ceramic typology and architecture, while the reports emanating today from the field comprise a joint effort with allied sciences.

It is difficult in a short article to review the contribution of anthropology to archaeology, particularly biblical archaeology, therefore we have chosen several recent discoveries that show the relationship between the two disciplines.

The first of these is the presence of head lice. The earliest hair combs discovered in Israel were found by British archaeologists in 1931 while excavating Mugharet el-Kebarah cave along the Mediterranean coast.1 These combs, dated to 10,000 BCE, are unique, for later combs are almost invariably two sided, one side being coarse with 5–7 teeth per cm, while the opposing side will have up to 15 teeth per cm. We recently decided to investigate the organic debris embedded between the teeth of several Ist-century CE hair combs by placing them in a solution of alcohol and then examining the organic debris under a microscope. Our initial investigations showed that head lice (Pediculus capitas) and their eggs were found in 12 of 24 hair combs discovered in the Judean and Negev deserts of Israel. The combs were dated from the 1st century BCE to the 8th century CE, thus making these parasites the earliest reported discovery of head lice from personal combs (see Plate 1).2 The high percentage of combs containing lice and eggs found in the Judean Desert (8/
Enlarged photograph of a 2000-year-old head louse (Photo Tsila Sagiv, Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums).

11) may be a reflection of the wars and adverse historical conditions of the period, in which many Jews were forced to flee urban environments and settle in Judean desert caves. The overcrowding and poor hygienic conditions presumably would encourage parasitic infections.

A second area of special interest is ancient dentistry. While the art of dentistry was known to the ancient Egyptians as early as 3000 BCE, it is rare to find any direct archaeological evidence of the profession. Egyptian dentists, who were known as 'toothers', had a variety of remedies for curing and alleviating dental pain. Yet until the spring of 1985 no archaeological evidence of the profession had been discovered in Israel, despite the early literary evidence for the profession.

Excavation of a Middle Bronze Age settlement in the biblical Wilderness of Zin, uncovered a mass grave which was found to be intrusive, as it was dated by grave goods to approximately 200 BCE. The mass burial contained the skeletal remains probably of the inhabitants of a nearby Hellenistic fortress, which guarded the Nabatean trade route traversing the Negev Desert. One adult male found in the burial was of considerable interest in that the right lateral incisor had turned green, indicating the presence of metal in the maxillary area. Subsequent radiographic examination showed that a 2.5mm bronze wire had been implanted in the root canal. This is the first case of operative dentistry in ancient Israel, as well as the earliest date for this specific treatment in the world.

The third area of interest to us concerns an even more radical form of surgery. Trephination, the surgical removal of a portion of the skull, is undoubtedly the oldest surgical technique known to man. Rare in the Middle East, the operation was common in the European Neolithic period and widespread in certain areas of South America. Most scholars today are in agreement that the operation was mainly performed for medical reasons, generally resulting from traumatic injuries to the skull in which internal haemorrhaging created pressure on the brain. The drilling of a hole in the skull thus relieves intracranial pressure which would eventually prove fatal to the individual.

Recent excavation of a series of caves north of Jericho produced four crania which showed evidence of trephination. Unfortunately the cave deposits were severely disturbed by local inhabitants of the region searching for ancient scrolls and other saleable archaeological artifacts. Associated finds were limited, so C-14 dating was necessary to date the skeletal remains. New techniques for dating ancient bone on the basis of bone collagen provided a C-14 date of 5540 ± 140 yrs BP, thus placing the material in the Chalcolithic period.

One skull in the series was of particular interest in that the individual showed evidence of three successive trephinations performed over a period of several months. Furthermore, there is clear osteological evidence that the operation was performed for medical reasons rather than for religious-magical purposes. The frontal sinus of the individual was infected, which resulted in a perforation of the posterior wall of the sinus.
into the intercranial space. Clear signs of infection can be seen in the frontal sinus cavity extending posteriorly into the inferior surface of the frontal and along the sagittal suture. Thus the trephination was carried out to relieve pain and drain the infection resulting from acute sinusitis. Lack of bone remodelling in the area of the bregma, or infectious response, indicate that the individual died following the operation.

Notes


Plans for the Settlement of Palestine during the Nineteenth Century

Ruth Kark

Department of Geography, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

During the nineteenth century, Palestine became the focus of numerous settlement plans, some extremely ambitious. They stemmed from the growing interest and increased involvement of the Western nations in the Holy Land, both as the land of the Bible, and as a potential terrain for contemporary religious, economic and political activity.

The background for the development of the plans included:
- Political changes, both in Europe and the Middle East;
- Political concepts – the Eastern question, imperialism – military or economic domination;
- Altered attitudes of the Egyptian (Mohammed Ali) and Ottoman governments to settlement of foreigners;
- Religious motivations – millenarism, evangelism, missionary activities, Anglican and Lutheran joint Bishopric in 1841;
- Research of the Holy Land – familiarization, mapping, identification of various areas, fertile, barren and uninhabited.

The initiators of the projects were statesmen (such as François P. Guizot of France), army officers (Helmut von Moltke of Germany), religious figures (Orson Hyde of America), community leaders (Moses Montefiore of England), and other individuals (Laurence Oliphant also of England). They included Protestants, Catholics, Mormons and Jews, who influenced one another and maintained a network of international contacts. The initiators popularized and publicized their plans through lectures, sermons, pamphlets, official correspondence and reports in the world press.

The main characteristics and contents of the plans that emerge when comparing them seem to be:
- Acquiring the whole or part of Palestine by a grant from the Sultan, its purchase or lease;
- Mainly Jews and/or Christians as possible settlers;
- Governed by a Western Power/s;
- Beginning of settlement in selected areas (the coastal plains and the valleys, Trans-Jordan), weighing of site and situation factors, such as soil, port cities, railway, seat of nearest consul;
- Preliminary preparations included visits, surveys, study and selection of settlers;
- Detailed preplanning of many aspects of the settlement/s, such as their number, population size, type of settlement, farms sizes and the agricultural economy.

Although most of the plans did not materialize, they had a considerable impact on contemporary and future events. They stimulated subsequent settlement of Jews, German Templars and Americans in the Holy Land, and played a role in the Balfour Declaration and the building of a Jewish national home in Palestine.
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Kathryn Gleason received a grant to carry out research on the Herodian Gardens Project. Her research paper appears on pp. 21–39.

**Fanny Vitto**

Fanny Vitto received a grant to attend an international symposium on ancient synagogues. Her report appears on pp. 71–4.

**Sariel Shalev**

In the summer of 1987 I worked in Oxford on a programme of interdisciplinary research with Dr J. P. Northover, concerning a puzzling find from recent excavations conducted by Professor D. Ussishkin (Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University) at Lachish in the southern Shephela of Israel.

At the entrance to the city in stratum IV, some bronze pieces were found, and archaeological investigation showed their connection to the wooden door at the inner gate, destroyed violently at the end of the 8th century BCE.

The destruction can be attributed to the conquest of Lachish by the Assyrian king Sennacherib, in his campaign against Judea and King Hezekiah in 701 BCE.

The archaeometallurgical investigation proved that the pieces are from a single object cast in bronze, and enabled us to reconstruct it as a bronze gate pivot, destroyed probably at the end of Sennacherib’s siege.

This project was undertaken as part of a wide-scale investigation concerning ancient metallurgy in Israel. It continues the pioneering work of Professor B. Rothenberg in establishing archaeometallurgical data concerning copper-ore and copper smelting at the mining site of Timna.

The success of this metal-source-area investigation suggested a wider analysis of copper items and copper industrial remains from archaeological sites in Israel.

A survey was conducted of archaeological material available in museums, collections and excavations throughout Israel. A group of items was then chosen to be sampled. A chip of less than 1 sq mm was removed from each with a jewel-piercing saw.

In the summer of 1988 I will take these to the Metallurgical Department at Oxford University, where the tiny metal pieces will be hot-mounted in an acrylic compound. They will then go through various stages of grinding and polishing, until they look like shining dots on the surface of an acrylic capsule.

At this stage the grain’s structure is examined, revealing its composition and technique of manufacture, such as whether it was cast, how fast it was cooled inside the mould, and whether it was hardened by cold-hammering (forging), or annealed in order to maintain its workable condition.

After determining the mechanical properties of the metal finds, through investigating their microstructure in an optical microscope, the polished mounted samples will be subjected to chemical analysis by an electron-probe micro analyser. Qualitative and quantitative analysis will determine whether these metal items were made of pure copper, what alloys were used, what impurities are present, and as what percentage of the total metal volume. These questions can also be answered through electronic microscopic analyses.

The grant of £150 which I received from the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society helped to establish this programme of restoration and to work on some intact parallels at the British Museum and the Ashmolean Museum. The results are due to be presented for publication by the end of 1988.
GRANTS GIVEN BY THE SOCIETY

Norman Jackson

Norman Jackson received a grant in order to take part in the Shiqmim excavations, which are sponsored by the Society. Tom Levy, the co-director, informs us that: 'We had a very successful season and all of our research goals were met. In a series of deep probes, we discovered a network of Chalco-lithic underground structures which have never been found west of the city of Beer-sheva. We also found a number of copper prestige items, such as a sceptre and mace head, identical to those found in the famous “Cave of the Treasure” in Nahal Mishmar. New work in Shiqmim brought to light burial forms which had never been found before in western Palestine.'

Reports

NEW RESEARCH ON ANCIENT SYNAGOGUES

Fanny Vitto

The International Symposium on Ancient Synagogues held at the University of Haifa on 25-28 May 1987, included, in addition to important lectures outlining the best of recent research, a one-day tour of recently excavated synagogues in Galilee and the Golan Heights. It was sponsored by the Reuben and Edith Hecht Museum, and the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Haifa, in cooperation with the Centre for the Study of Eretz-Israel and its Yishuv, and the Golan Research Institute.

The first session was devoted to ‘New Discoveries in Synagogue Excavations and Research’. Dr S. Dar and Y. Mintzker described the synagogue of Khirbet Summaqa, on Mount Carmel. Built in the 3rd century CE, the building underwent significant alterations during the second and third phases. A small coin-hoard was found, containing examples dating from between Justin II (565–78) and Heraclius (618/19), that seems to have been contemporary with the third phase. The synagogue was then abandoned, to be reused for dwelling in the 11th–15th centuries.

Dr Z. Ilan and E. Damati then spoke on the synagogue of Khirbet Marus – ancient Meroth – in Upper Galilee. Built at the beginning of the 5th century CE, it underwent several structural changes, including, by the mid-5th century, the laying of a mosaic floor, the preserved portion of which represents a Roman soldier, perhaps an ‘assimilated’ version of the biblical scene of David and Goliath. To the south of the building were two rooms with benches, possibly a study-room and a Beth Midrash. The mosaic floor of the latter depicts a lamb and a wolf, accompanied by Isaiah 65:25 in Hebrew script. The contents of the community’s coffer suggest that the building continued to be used as a synagogue until the end of the 12th century.

On the first evening a session was held at the Reuben and Edith Hecht Museum. Professor S. Safrai delivered a lecture on ‘The Synagogue on Saturdays and on Weekdays’. He argued that all written evidence attests that until the destruction of the Second Temple, the synagogue was used only on Sabbath and holidays, and that it was...
intended for the reading of the Torah and not for prayer. After the lecture, the opening took place of the exhibition 'Jewish Art in the Golan', prepared by Dr R. Hachlili and Ms R. Zommer. The exhibition, which was accompanied by a richly illustrated catalogue, was divided into five sections: lintels and capitals and architectural fragments carved with menoroth, animals and inscriptions.

The topic of the second day was 'Synagogue Art and Architecture'. The morning session began with a lecture by Dr Z. Yeivin on the Khirbet Susiyah synagogue, focusing especially on the two be mot adjacent to the northern wall. Their aspect in the third stage can be reconstructed with reasonable certainty thanks to the hundreds of marble fragments that once adorned them. Written sources suggest that one bema served as a place for the Torah scrolls and the other for the reading of the Torah. The decoration of the mosaic floor includes a Torah shrine, menoroth, a lulav, an ethrog and perhaps a mahta (incense shovel), motifs that Dr Yeivin believes were not symbolic but which represented structures and objects actually present in synagogues.

Professor Z. Safrai read a paper on 'Duchan, Aron and Teva', in which he drew information from literary sources on the furniture associated with worship in ancient synagogues, and compared this data with the archaeological evidence. The duchan (platform), on which the priests stood while blessing the worshippers, seems to have been restricted to Babylon. The teva and the aron are synonyms for Holy Ark, and the change in usage is associated with its altered function: the Tannaitic teva corresponds to a semi-portable ark with no fixed location in the synagogue, such as continued to be used in Babylon, while the Amoraic aron in Eretz Israel replaced the Temple Ark of Jerusalem, and was a fixed item of furnishing. The bema (platform), found only in large synagogues such as Sardis, became a permanent feature during the Gaonic period. The khursaya, frequent in Eretz Israel, was the chair (kathedra) on which the Rabbi sat during the derasha. The ezrat nashim (women's section), for which there is no literary evidence in the Talmudic period, probably began in the 7th–8th century as a curtain behind which women were hidden, and became a separate area in the Gaonic period, under the influence not of mosques but perhaps of churches. No table was used for reading the Torah, and the scrolls were held in the reader's hands. The congregation sat on benches.

The last lecture of the morning was given by Professor M. Dothan who spoke of the late (Ib and Ia) synagogues of Hammat Tiberias. The Ib synagogue, in use from the 5th to the 7th century, covered a much larger area than its predecessor (Ia). An aisle, paved with flagstones, and ending in a small apse, had been added to the west. The Ia synagogue, built in the early Ummayad period, seems to have continued to be in use in the Abbasid period. Its floor was covered with a mosaic portraying, near the main entrance, a stylized menorah. Both literary and archaeological evidence attest to the existence of a Jewish community at Tiberias still in the Fatimid period.

The afternoon session opened with a paper by Professor A. Seager, the architect of the Sardis synagogue expedition: 'The Recent Historiography of Ancient Synagogue Architecture'. He explained how the last decade's discoveries have shown that the dating of synagogues can no longer be based on typology. Study has also revealed the importance of regionalism. The synagogue of Sardis differs from Eretz Israel synagogues in several features, including its exceptionally large dimensions and the discovery of a table in the prayer hall.

The next lecture, delivered by the present writer, examined the problem of whether there was a relationship between wall and floor decoration in ancient synagogues; the synagogue of Rehov was taken as a test case, as it has yielded a relatively large number of fragments of painted plaster fallen from the walls and columns of the building, and these seem to indicate that elements usually found on mosaic floors of synagogues also appeared painted on walls and columns, either figuratively or, perhaps more frequently, in a written version.

The last lecture of the afternoon was given by Dr R. Hachlili, who drew our attention to a feature peculiar to Jewish art
from the 3rd–4th centuries onwards: ‘unidentical symmetrical composition’ (such as unidentical menoroth depicted on either side of the Holy Ark). She would tend to consider this feature intentional since, even for an unskilled artist, it would have been easier to repeat an identical design instead of creating two different ones. A visit was then paid to the Mane Katz Museum, which had especially extended until the symposium an exhibition of models of 17th- and 18th-century wooden synagogues of Poland, made with great skill, to a scale of 1:100, over the last twenty-six years by Moshe Verbin, a native of Poland and now a member of Kibbutz Yakum, using straw, balsa, veneer and pine.

The morning of the third day was devoted to ‘Inscriptions and Coins in Synagogues’. Professor Y. Naveh recalled the fact that all dedicatory inscriptions found in synagogues were in fact prayers, and that the amulets found in a few synagogues - Kh. Marus and Maon - were inscribed with prayers intended to expel demons. He then spoke of Samaritan inscriptions laid in mosaic floors, and concluded that they were mainly dedicatory. Samaritan inscriptions other than those found in Shaalabim, Beth Shean and Tel Qasile, engraved on stone and containing quotations from the Samaritan Pentateuch, probably mostly belonged to private houses.

In the following paper, Dr A. Kindler considered what can be learned about the economic and social status of the Jewish population of Eretz Israel from synagogue inscriptions referring to donations, and from the hoards uncovered in synagogues. He took as an example the considerable funds found in the synagogue of Kh. Marus, and compared the standard of living and the income of a villager at that time - a semissis for eleven days of work - with the contents of the chest. After suggesting several possible reasons for the presence of such hoards in synagogues, he concluded that despite the general poverty of the Jewish population and the heavy taxes, people perhaps made donations to the synagogue in order to allow it to maintain the various social and welfare institutions of the community.

The final lecture of this session was given by Y. Meshorer, who suggested that the use of the vine motif in Jewish art, particularly on the lintels of synagogues, recalls the gold vine motif that adorned the lintel of the Temple of Jerusalem.

The afternoon session was devoted to problems of synagogue chronology. Dr H. Bloedhorn stressed the need to re-examine the much debated dating of the synagogue of Capernaum, and to base this on a study of its capitals. He explained how most of the capitals of this synagogue date to the second half of the 3rd century CE, and were reused in the synagogue reconstructed after the former building had been destroyed by the earthquake of 363 CE. Some of the capitals of the courtyard were added in the 5th century.

Dr A. Kloner spoke of the synagogue of Horvat Rimmon in the Darom, where three phases have been identified. Coin evidence dates its construction to the mid-3rd century CE, and it remained in use until the end of the 7th century CE, when it was abandoned. In a ‘storage area’, various objects were found, including bronze candelabra fragments, jewellery, two pottery jars containing gold coins and a hoard of hundreds of coins dating to between the 4th and the beginning of the 6th centuries. Z. Maoz concluded the session by tackling the question of the multiplicity of architectural styles and the chronology of Galilean synagogues. He suggested that when synagogues were destroyed and deserted, their stones were robbed to be used in other buildings. An example can be seen at Kh. Shema, where one can see reused architectural fragments from the Meiron synagogue.

On the last day, participants visited a number of recently excavated synagogues with their excavators. At Kh. Marus a lively discussion arose on the issue of the apparent transfer, at the third stage of the building, of the façade from the southern wall (facing Jerusalem) to the northern wall. At Capernaum, Father Corbo summed up the findings of the last years’ excavations in the synagogue. They explained how, unlike our previous view, the synagogue did not have a second storey, and the stairs should be
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explained as leading to some upper store­room. Beneath the ‘limestone synagogue’, visible today, and dated from coins found beneath its floor to the end of the 4th or the early 5th century (but reusing 3rd-century capitals), a synagogue made of basalt was found, which must be the one built by the Roman centurion and recorded in Luke 7:5. In Katzrin, Z. Maoz explained the structure of the synagogue while A. Killebrew took the participants to the houses found nearby, several of which have been reconstructed to be included in an open museum (in preparation), which will show daily life in Talmudic times on the Golan. After a visit paid to the Archaeological Museum of the Golan, where various finds – in particular, carved basalt architectural elements from various Jewish, Christian and Pagan sites of the Golan Heights – are displayed, the symposium was concluded.

The symposium was conceived by its Academic Programme Committee: Dr R. Hach­lili (chair), Professor J. Naveh, Professor S. Safrai and Dr Z. Yeivin, and organized by Ms R. Zommer, B. Tokatly, N. Karmon, B. Adler and N. Merhav.

A leaflet containing summaries of the lectures was distributed at the beginning of the symposium. The proceedings are to be published in the near future.
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THE BARNETT COLLECTION

Eliot Braun

On 6 December 1987 the Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums held a dedication ceremony for the Richard D. Barnett collection in the Department’s library. Those in attendance included members of Jerusalem’s academic community, from a broad range of disciplines concerned with the Ancient Near East. They came to honour the memory of Dr Barnett, and the very diversity of their fields of specialization attested to the wide range of his interests and his scholarly prowess.

The ceremony was held in the presence of Dr Barnett’s widow, Barbara, who generously endowed the major portion of her husband’s library to the Department’s library in the Rockefeller Museum building. Mr A. Eitan, director of the Department of Antiquities and Museums, opened the ceremony with an expression of thanks to Mrs Barnett and her family, and Professors B. Mazar (emeritus) and H. Tadmor of the Hebrew University offered tributes in memory of Dr Barnett. In reply, Mrs Barnett offered the gathering a fascinating account of something of her husband’s family history, his career and his scholarly interests, which extended far beyond the Ancient Near East.

The gift includes some 400 volumes on subjects dealing with Anatolian, Persian and Mesopotamian art and archaeology. It is fully catalogued, and occupies a complete unit in the main reading room of the Department’s library. Any qualified person wishing to use it, and the 60,000 additional volumes held by this library, may make application to the Department’s librarian, Ms Giovanna Baruch.
Letter to the Editors

The editors have received the following communication from Dr David Jacobson.

I have noted a criticism by Dr Ehud Netzer (BAIAS [1986-7] 59) of a definition used in my article published in the previous issue of this journal (BAIAS [1985-6] 55-68). Netzer objects to my use of the term 'chateau' to describe Upper Herodium.

Netzer gives as the reason for his objection that the term chateau 'is taken from the totally distinct context of the French Renaissance'. He is evidently unaware that, for some years past, eminent scholars of Roman and early Islamic architecture have been using this term to describe Diocletian's Palace at Split, near the Roman town of Salona, and the early Arab country mansions referred to in my article. The word 'chateau' has accordingly been admitted into the vocabulary of architectural historians to denote a certain type of building complex from any period.

In his influential study on Diocletian's Palace at Split, Noël Duval (Urbs 4, 1961-2 [1965] 67-95) finds the term 'chateau' the most adequate one to use for the imperial residence on the Dalmatian coast.¹ Thus: 'En définitive, si on doit choisir un term précis, Split serait plutôt un "château". Ce

Note

¹ The term that was consistently used for Diocletian's residence at Split in late Roman times was villa. See J. J. Wilkes, Diocletian's Palace, Split (Sheffield 1986) 56.
Notes for Contributors

Original manuscripts should be submitted in two copies to the Editors of BAIS, typewritten in English, on one side of A4 paper only, double-spaced, and with ample margins on each side of the sheet. Endnotes typed on separate sheets should be kept to a minimum. The ‘Harvard’ reference system will be employed in future issues. Works should be cited in the text by author’s name and date of publication, i.e. ‘(Albright, 1949, 71)’. An alphabetical bibliography should be appended at the end of the text, i.e. ‘Albright, W. F., 1949. The Archaeology of Palestine (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books)’. Original photographs and line drawings (in black and white only), suitable for 1:1 reproduction, may accompany the text. Authors are responsible for obtaining permission to reproduce copyright material. A scale should be added to all drawings and photographs where necessary. The authors of all published articles will receive a copy of the Bulletin and offprints.
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