

what their exact relation really was. Any aprioric assumption that biconsonantal roots must be older and that triconsonantal ones must be younger is not really scientific. Even this „biconsonantal and triconsonantal” Cushitic root hypothesis may be well used in support of the thesis that Proto-Semitic possessed a much bigger number of biconsonantal roots so that the triconsonantal roots did not constitute such an overwhelming majority.

As the author is writing about things he does not know, it is not surprising that he has not found the list of the reconstructed roots I have found:

353. biconsonantal roots of which a fair number has been hypothetically reconstructed as roots with generated second consonants
357. other biconsonantal roots
359. triconsonantal roots
362. quadriconsonantal roots
363. complicated roots

Given the state of the reconstructions are questioned by some scholars and even if, perhaps, some of them have no really Proto-Cushitic status being only Proto-Araw or Proto-Berber (Cushitic etc.) we still have to change the current opinion about the predominance of the biconsonantal roots in Cushitic. Even if there is such a predominance (what we know about it in the present stage is only estimative), it was not so great in the past. Since the overall number of the reconstructed roots is quite small from a statistical point of view (though, obviously, quite well significant for comparative-historical purposes), I do not think that we may be sure that the relation 353:339 or 461:339 (if we include all the generated roots) is really significant in absolute terms in favor of the biconsonantal roots. What we may rather safely assume is that Proto-Cushitic had both triconsonantal and biconsonantal roots and that it is impossible to say now (i.e. further research is needed)

Classic than to other Afro-Asiatic subdivisions. Certainly a verification of the hypothesis is one of the most important tasks within Afro-Asiatic studies.

* Op. cit., pp. 378—388.
* Many of them are names of animals and words denoting parts of human body.

EDWARD LIPIŃSKI

ARCHAEOLOGY OF PALESTINE *

A monumental *Archaeology of Palestine* has been realized in Polish by a team of twenty-two authors. They have presented this volume to a great Polish scholar and archaeologist, Prof. Kazimierz Michałowski, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. Thus, after W. F. Albright's preface and L. Stefaniak's words of introduction, Barbara Gąsowska has outlined Prof. Michałowski's scholarly activity and achievements (pp. 11—19). His photograph adorns the first page of the book.

The bulk of the volume constitutes a kind of academic textbook of Palestinology. It is divided in four main parts: an introduction, a description of the Palestinian civilizations from palaeolithic times to the Mamluk domination, an outline of Palestinian technics and arts up to Vespasian's reign, a view of the religious institutions of ancient Palestine. It is rather surprising for the two last parts of the volume not to cover the same period as the second part.

I. INTRODUCTION

L. Stefaniak has written the introductory chapter of part one (pp. 23—46). This author largely follows chap. II of Albright's *Archaeology of Palestine*. The chapter's aim was to give a historical

* Review article of *Archeologia Palestyny*, edited by L. W. Stefaniak, Poznań, Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1973. In-8°, 1076 pages, out of which pp. 883—1055 with illustrations and maps. 190 fig. in the text. Price: zł 390.

outline of man's interest in the ancient remains of Palestinian civilizations. Unfortunately, it is on the whole very eclectic and one of the weakest of the volume. Judging by the uncorrect accentuation of the Greek words (p. 23), the location of Palmyra in Asia Minor (p. 27), and the assumption that the oldest records of travellers concerned with the remains of man's past in the Holy Land date from the fifteenth century, the reader gets the impression that the author is writing about things he does not know very well. The last point just referred to deserves to be somewhat illustrated, as the bibliography collected by V. Fritz, Z. Kapera, and L. Stefaniak (pp. 145—195) does not mention some important Mediaeval sources where that concern clearly appears. These sources are also neglected in the historical outline of the Palestinian civilization given in the second part of the book.

Perhaps the best Mediaeval document that offers an objective and accurate travel description of the Holy Land before the collapse of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem is the *Sepher ha-Massa'ot* or *Book of Travels* of Benjamin of Tudela, from Spain. The beginning of his journeys has been dated either c. 1159 or c. 1167; he returned to Spain in 1172/73. His book, largely impersonal, was based on the observations which he wrote down in the course of his travels. This itinerary is a document of primary importance for the Palestinian history of that period and it is by far more objective than the descriptions of Christian pilgrims of that time. Benjamin shows himself to peculiar advantage in his account of Jerusalem and its monuments. He also travelled throughout the country. He indicated the distances between the various towns he visited, gave a detailed description of the Holy Places, and noted economic and social conditions. His *Book of Travels* was first published in Constantinople, in 1543, and, according to a very different manuscript, in Ferrara, in 1556. It was translated from Hebrew into Latin by Arias Montanus in 1575. The standard editions are those by A. Asher, with valuable notes and additional material (London, 1840—41; reprinted New York, 1927), and by M. N. Adler, *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, London, 1907, with critical Hebrew text and English translation (reprinted 1964).

The most interesting figure among the Mediaeval travellers to Palestine was Estori (Isaac ben Moses) ha-Parhi (1280—1355?), from Florenza in Spain. By no means an occasional tourist, he delved deep into the study of the Holy Land. He studied in Jerusalem and thereafter settled in Beisan. From Beisan he travelled throughout the land investigating ancient sites: „Thus I was about two years in Galilee — he wrote — inquiring and investigating, and another five years on the rest of the land of the (Twelve) tribes; I did not restrain myself one hour spying out the land”. In Beisan he wrote *Sepher Kaphtor wa-Pherah*, which was completed in 1322. In this book he describes Jerusalem and the various regions of the country and gives a list of the biblical, talmudic and Arabic names of the sites. Most of the 180 identifications of ancient sites made by him have been confirmed by subsequent investigation, even if some of them were „discovered” anew by modern scholars who did not know his work. His assumption that the biblical and talmudic names of villages and rivers are preserved, with only slight changes, in the Arabic names is accepted in modern scholarship. A great importance is to be attached to his study of ancient coins, weights, and measures, which he compared with the ones of his time. Estori studied plants, noting their Arabic names and attempting to determine their Hebrew equivalent according to the Mishna and the Talmud. He also described the aspect of dresses. He discovered the ruins of an ancient synagogue in Beisan and described the remnants of another one in Hukok. Besides, he provided valuable information about the different religions: Muslims, Christians, Jews, Karaites, and Samaritans, whom he calls „Sadducees”. He mentions eight Jewish communities in Cisjordan and three in Transjordan. *Sepher Kaphtor wa-Pherah* appeared for the first time in Venice, in 1549. A critical edition was published by A. M. Luncz (Jerusalem, 1897).

L. Stefaniak mentions the itinerary of prince Radziwiłł, who visited the Middle East in 1583. However, the author is unaware of the numerous travel descriptions of Jewish settlers and travellers who went from Poland to the Holy Land. Probably the oldest of these itineraries is the *Sha'alu Shelom Yerushalayim*, written by Gedaliah of Siemiatycze. He left Poland early in 1699 together

with a group of thirty-one families and arrived in Jerusalem on the 14th of October 1700. In his book, Gedaliah of Siemiatycze describes the adventures of the travellers, as well as life in Jerusalem.

Several chapters by H. J. Franken have been translated from English into Polish. This author explains the dating of archaeological finds by means of pottery (pp. 47—62), soil stratigraphy and its interpretation, as well as the modern methods of digging and surveying (pp. 72—91). Franken further discusses the evolution of the archaeological method from the end of the last century (pp. 92—102), presents the various elements and aspects of human settlements (pp. 463—476), and examines the importance of the archaeology of Palestine for Old Testament studies (pp. 799—808). The outstanding merit of these chapters, written by an expert archaeologist, is that they clearly show the reader the methods and the function of archaeology, as well as the limits of an archaeological approach to the Bible. Useful and illuminating as they are, these chapters slightly suffer through their failure to relate Palestine to the larger context of the Near East and of the East Mediterranean world, of which Palestine was but a province. Besides, the discussion of practical problems is often limited to the biblical period. Franken's chapters are complemented by R. Bauer's useful exposition of the radiocarbon dating system (pp. 63—71).

H. Haag's chapter on the physical geography of Palestine (pp. 103—120) and E. Sitarz's on its historical geography (pp. 121—144) are rather on an elementary level. Judging by the contents of his contribution, E. Sitarz does not even seem to know very well what historical geography actually is. He conceives it as a history of tribal and political boundaries from the time of „the strong Egyptian influence” in the 20th century B. C. until the „Israeli aggression in June 1967”. E. Sitarz makes no attempt in recognizing the roads and highways, he does not study the toponymy and neglects to give a serious characterization of the places: cities, villages, khans or stations on roads, fortresses, harbours of various importance. Some statements are even simply inexact, as, for instance, the identification of Palestine with the *māt Amurri* of Akkadian texts (p. 121).

II. HISTORY OF PALESTINIAN CIVILIZATIONS

The weakness of the two aforesaid chapters vividly contrasts with the quality of some chapters in the second part of the volume. In this part of the book J. K. Kozłowski gives an excellent description of the palaeolithic and neolithic civilizations of Palestine (pp. 199—260), while J. Śliwa describes the civilization of the Chalcolithic (pp. 261—273) and of the Bronze Age (pp. 274—310). Unfortunately, Kozłowski's article was already completed in 1967 and, therefore, it does not integrate the results of the most recent researches. Most likely, this is the case of Śliwa's contributions also, since he does not yet refer to the admirable synthesis of J. Perrot, *Préhistoire palestinienne*, in *Dict. Bible. Suppl.*, 43, Paris, 1968, col. 286—446. Śliwa also relies much more on the authority of various excavators, who have not always got the same conception about the situation as a whole. His exposition is less synthetic and not so well integrated.

W. F. Albright's study of the Iron Age (pp. 311—338) is translated from chap. VI of his *Archaeology of Palestine*. This book is now twenty years old and the description it gives of the Iron Age is outdated and superseded by the results of the many Israeli and foreign excavations in the Holy Land. Some of Albright's statements even proved to be definitively wrong, as, for instance, in the matter of ancient Israelite sanctuaries or of the allegedly Solomonic stables of Megiddo, whose foundations only might be Solomonic. The chapter on the Iron Age should have been entirely re-written. It is highly surprising therefore to find it edited without change in spite of the tremendous progresses made by Palestinian archaeology in the last years, especially with regard to the Iron Age.

J. Wolski's chapters on the Persian period (pp. 339—349) and on Hellenistic and Roman times (pp. 350—375) are mainly based on literary sources and not on archaeological, epigraphic, and numismatic evidence. According to the reviewer, therefore, they cannot be considered as an appropriate introduction to the civilization of these important periods in an archaeological handbook. Unfortunately, the bibliographical references given in the footnotes are of little help for the reader interested in these periods

during which close relations existed between the oriental and the classic world. However, one may find a useful historical geography of that time's Palestine, an outline of the economic geography of the country and a brief study of the composition of the Palestinian population, as reflected in literary and epigraphic sources, in M. Avi-Yonah, *The Holy Land from the Persian to Arab Conquests*, Grand Rapids, 1966. The new work edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern, *The Jewish People in the First Century*, vol. I, Assen, 1973, deals with a more limited historical period. The first part treats of the historical geography, the political history, and the legal institutions of the Jewish people in Judaea and in the Diaspora. Volume II will describe social, cultural, and religious life and the institutions of the Jews in the first century A.D.

The study of the Hellenistic influence on Judaism has developed into a special branch of research represented, among others, by such brilliant scholars as S. Lieberman (*Greek in Jewish Palestine*, New York, 1942; *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, 2nd ed., New York, 1962), V. Tcherikover (*Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, 2nd ed., Philadelphia, 1970), and M. Hengel (*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 2nd ed., Tübingen, 1973). Research has been greatly helped by archaeological discoveries, new inscriptions and papyri. An invaluable mine of information for the history of fine arts in that period is of course the monumental work of E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, New York, 1953—1968, in thirteen volumes.

The traditional or Pharisaic Judaism of the same period has been examined on a scholarly and historical basis by J. Neusner, *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70 A.D.*, Leiden, 1971. The sectarians of Qumrān and their literature are the object of a new branch of research. The pertaining bibliography has been collected by Ch. Burchard, *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer*, Berlin, 1957—1965, W. S. Lasor, *Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1948—1957*, Pasadena, 1958, M. Yizhar, *Bibliography of Hebrew Publications on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1948—1964*, Cambridge (Mass.)—London, 1967, and B. Jongeling, *Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah, 1958—1969*, Leiden, 1971.

However, the Jews were not the only inhabitants of Palestine at that time. The relatively important Samaritan community and

its traditions have been studied by H. G. Kippenberg, *Garizim und Synagoge. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode*, Berlin, 1971. One must also take into account the importance of the Nabataean civilization in southern Palestine, which is attested, for instance, in Avdat and in Shivtah. A good synthesis of Nabataean history and civilization is given by J. Starcky, *Pétra et la Nabatène*, in *Dict. Bible. Suppl.*, VII, Paris, 1966, col. 886—1017.

The Byzantine period (395—640) is examined by Helena Małkiewiczówna (pp. 377—417). This article is excellent. It is well documented and equilibrated, though the author seems to be mostly interested in sacral buildings. The large-scale Israeli excavations at Avdat, in 1958—60, have given very important results which are not integrated in this chapter. After the destruction of the Nabataean city, Avdat was resettled in the Byzantine period. A large citadel, two churches, and a monastery were built on the acropolis, whereas the settlement itself moved down to the western slopes of the mountain ridge. The Byzantine dwellings consisted of houses erected over rock-hewn caves, that were used for storing and processing agricultural produce. A small bath-house which drew its water from a nearby well was built in the valley west of the city. Extensive remains of dams, irrigation canals, and other water-storage installations were found, as well as wine-presses and fruit-drying apparatus. These finds reflect Avdat's economy in the Byzantine period and demonstrate that it was mainly based on agriculture and wine production. This kind of evidence should not be missing in a description of the Palestinian civilization in the Byzantine period.

Shivtah or Sobatah, in the Negev, is another characteristic Byzantine centre of which no mention is found in the article of Miss Małkiewiczówna. However, this city is mentioned in the story of Saint Nilus and in the Nessana papyri. It covers a superficies of c. 29 acres and 1200—1300 rooms have been counted in its total area. Its population could hardly have outnumbered 5000 inhabitants. The dwellings were made out of local limestone and they have been built without any particular planning. The outer walls of the houses at the city's limits formed a defensive line, as no walls or fortifications existed. The southern and older

part of Shvtaḥ was built around two large pools. The church of this quarter was erected after the other buildings. The northern part of Shvtaḥ covers 10 acres, where 340 rooms have been counted. It included, at its southern extremity, a church with a tower and perhaps a public building. On the northern outskirts of the town, there are important remains of a large church which was dedicated to Saint George. It consisted of an open court, a narthex, a mosaic-paved side chapel, a baptistery, and the main building measuring 21×12 m. It has three apses, a nave and two aisles separated by six columns. The walls of the main church were once covered with white marble. Near the church there was a large square surrounded by thirty-six shops and workshops for potters, dyers, and other craftsmen.

The inhabitants of Shvtaḥ cultivated an area of more than 1270 acres in the Laban valley. Rainwater from a drainage area of almost 200 sq. km. was brought through a series of complicated channels to the fields. Water was indeed scanty, also in the city itself where only 4 liters a head were available per day. Every citizen had the duty of cleaning the reservoirs and each house was also provided with one or two cisterns. The reviewer would have expected to find even this kind of information in an outline of the Palestinian civilization during the Byzantine period.

A. Zaborski's chapter on the Arab domination of Palestine before the crusades is extremely short (pp. 419—424), but well documented. Some additional precisions would have been welcomed, as the Muslim conquest had far-reaching consequences for the religious life, as well as for the economic and social structures in Palestine. For instance, the Muslim's victory was seen by many Jews as a divine retribution for the evil and perfidy of Christian Byzantium. Jerusalem was taken by the Arabs in 638 and the Christian prohibitions on the entry of Jews into the Holy City were soon lifted. The sudden change in the political order revived hopes for even greater changes and it was not by accident that several militant Jewish messianic movements followed shortly on Islamic successes.

On the other hand, the first generation of Arab rulers knew little about agriculture, nor did they care about it. A heavy burden was imposed on infidel farmers and the rulers were not concerned

with the disastrous results of this policy. Instead, they respected trade and regarded the city as a favourable social and moral environment for a truly Muslim life. All these circumstances contributed in drawing people, especially Jews, away from agriculture and the villages toward the towns, that were then developing, and toward the appreciated occupations in trade and handicrafts. This clearly appears in Ramleh, the only city in Palestine established by Arabs. The city was founded in 716 by the Umayyad caliph Suleiman ibn 'Abd al-Malik. From the beginning it had a large population of Samaritans and Jews, who called it Gath or Gath-Rimmon or Ramathaim-Zophim, after the biblical towns with which it was identified. In the tenth century, the Jerusalem academy was even transferred to Ramleh which became a flourishing Jewish centre. During the domination of the Crusaders, the Jewish and Samaritan communities were dispersed. When Benjamin of Tudela visited Ramleh, he recorded a Jewish population of only three dyers, living in the midst of wide cemeteries.

The chapters on the Crusaders (pp. 425—453) and on the Mamluk period (pp. 455—460) are written by J. Ostrowski, who largely relies upon the monumental work of S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, London, 1951—54 (new ed., 1965).

III. TECHNICS AND ARTS

The third part of the work opens with H. J. Franken's chapter on the settlements (pp. 463—476). Thereafter H. Brandys studies the grinding of corn and bread baking (pp. 477—491), while Z. Kapera describes animal breeding, hunting, and fishing (pp. 493—502), agriculture (pp. 503—515), gardening, oil and wine producing (pp. 516—527), mining (pp. 528—540) and metallurgy (pp. 541—552), pottery (pp. 553—563), weaving and dying (pp. 564—573), tanning (pp. 574—579), and glass making (pp. 581—592). These chapters are in general sufficiently documented and they give quite an objective idea of the situation until the first century A.D. within the limits of our present

knowledge. However, the exposition could often be more integrative. For prehistoric times, one should now refer to J. Perrot's excellent synthesis, already mentioned above.

In regard to mining and metallurgy, one should take into account the results of the excavations carried out between 1959 and 1969 by the Arabah Expedition headed by B. Rothenberg. It actually appears that the copper mines in the Timna area are not to be attributed to the time of Solomon. Rothenberg was able to distinguish three periods in that site:

1° During the Chalcolithic period, in the fourth millennium B.C., tribes of shepherds and hunters with a good knowledge of copper metallurgy settled around Timna. They collected copper ore nodules and smelted them in well-built bowl furnaces. The Chalcolithic copper smelting furnace excavated on the fringes of the Arabah, east of the modern Timna copper mines, is the earliest smelting installation found so far.

2° The next metallurgic installations date from the Late Bronze and Early Iron I periods. They include workshops, store-houses, cisterns, furnaces, and slag heaps. The date of this large complex, called „King Solomon's Mines” by Nelson Glueck, was for some time controversial, and Z. Kapera dates these copper mines from the time of David and Solomon. The numerous hieroglyphic inscriptions recently discovered in Timna and dating back to the 14th—12th centuries B.C. now indicate that the copper industry of Timna, and probably of most of the other copper-producing sites in the Arabah, was developed by Egyptian mining expeditions during the 19th and 20th Dynasties.

The inscriptions were found inside an Egyptian temple dedicated to the goddess Hathor and located at the foot of „Solomon's Pillars” in the centre of the mining and smelting area. This temple was built in the reign of Sethi I at the end of the 14th century B.C. Gifts were also sent to it by Ramses II, Merneptah, and Sethi II. It was destroyed in 1216—1210 B.C. and restored only during the reign of Ramses IV (1198—1166 B.C.). This second temple existed just for a short period. It came to an end with Ramses V (1160—1156 B.C.).

According to B. Rothenberg, Timna, and perhaps also the other copper plants in the eastern Arabah, not yet explored, should be

identified with „Atika, the great copper mines”, described in the Papyrus Harris I which dates from the time of Ramses III. This source reports that Egyptian copper mining expeditions travelled to Atika from Egypt by sea and by overland caravans. Rothenberg identifies the bay of Ġazirat Far'un, the only natural anchorage in the Gulf of Eilat, as the Egyptian mining port before it became the shipyard of king Solomon. In fact, extensive casemate walls and a well-built harbour testify to its maritime use in the Iron I age. These discoveries have suggested reconsidering the date and the character of Tell el-Halayfa, and consequently Ezion-Geber's location. It became clear that Tell el-Halayfa was a fortified place, perhaps serving as a caravanserai, and not a copper smelting plant. This favours the identification of the site with the ancient city of Eilat. In this case, the port of Ezion-Geber should be located on the island of Ġazirat Far'un, 12 km. south of modern Eilat.

3° The mines of Timna were not operating after the 12th century B.C., if one excepts the period going from the second to the fourth centuries A.D., when they were reused, apparently by soldiers of the third Roman legion of Cyrenaica. At this time copper ore was transported from Timna to the large copper furnace at Be'er Orah or Bir Hindis, south of Timna. This site was excavated in 1969.

For more details, one should report oneself to the numerous publications of B. Rothenberg and his collaborators. We may mention in particular the series of articles which appeared in the *Bulletin of the Museum Haaretz*, starting from volume 8 (1966), as well as the synthesis published in *Archaeologia Austriaca*, 47 (1970), pp. 91—130, and in *Timna*, London, 1972.

The article on painting, by Janina Czarnecka (p. 593—613), constitutes a good synthesis and is well documented. Unfortunately, it is based on the wrong assumption that Palestinian art was in principle not figurative. This certainly does not apply to the Palestinian art anterior to the coming of the Hebrews. Nor does this even correspond to the real situation of Hebrew art in the Monarchic period. The best indication is given by a painting on a pottery sherd from Ramat Raḥel, Jerusalem. This painting is supposed to represent the seated figure of a king of Judah c. 600 B.C.

J. Czarniecka, however, does not mention this characteristic painting, which has been studied by P. Matthiae, *L'ostrakon dipinto di Ramat Rāḥēl*, in *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Rendiconti*, Ser. VIII, 17 (1962), pp. 265—277 and pl. I. Nevertheless, it is not easy, as yet, to discern the development of what may be termed as native Hebrew art in the period of the Monarchy. In fact, the available sources explicitly say that the expert craftsmen employed in the construction of the Temple were Phoenicians from Tyre. The relatively few relics of this period that have been preserved in Israel, such as the Astarte figurines, have mainly a Canaanite character. On the other hand, the ivory plaques from Samaria are under the influence of Phoenician art and were possibly executed by Phoenician craftsmen. Similarly, the admirably executed Israelite seals of the Monarchic period are either of Egyptian, or of Phoenician, or of Assyrian character and execution.

J. Czarniecka's chapter on seals (pp. 614—620), though good, does not give entire satisfaction. The author assumes in fact that seals with Hebrew or Phoenician inscriptions completely disappear in the fifth century B.C. (p. 619). This statement is not correct, as inscriptions are found on seals from Wādi Daliyah and from Makmish. They date from the fourth century B.C. A seal-impression from the late Second Temple period bears the name of a type of wine, *tamad*, and the name of the vintner, *Hōšē'ā*. This seal is written in the square Hebrew script; it was used to seal wine jars. The Jewish seal in red sardonyx with the legend *h̄tm yhwdh br 'bh*, „Seal of Yahuda, son of Abba”, is more important, as it was most likely used to seal documents. This seal (VA. 1531) probably dates from the first century A.D. and was edited by P. Horn and G. Steindorf (*Sassanidische Siegelsteine*, Berlin, 1891, p. 18 and pl. V). P. Horn considered the inscription as Pehlevi, but naturally did not manage to read it. In Palestine, seals were also used in the post-biblical period. This appears not only from rabbinical literature, but also from discovered Jewish seals. The Albertinum Museum in Dresden possessed before World War II two seals dating from the second or third century A.D. One seal was an amethyst with a *menora* emblem and the other a carnelian with a seven-branched *menora* between two pillars. A seal in the

Israel Museum bearing the inscription *knšt dprg* probably comes from Babylonia and dates back to the fifth or sixth century A.D. It was edited by I. Schachar, *Oseph Feuchtwanger, Masoret be-Ommanut Yehudit*, Jerusalem, 1971, No. 615. As for what concerns the bibliography, the mention of a single work, namely of A. Reifenberg's *Ancient Hebrew Seals* (London 1950), is certainly not satisfactory and can even be misleading.

Elżbieta Rodziewicz presents ivory carving (pp. 621—641). This chapter is well documented, but not up to date. In fact, ivory objects have been found in a Chalcolithic cave of Wadi Hēver, in the Judean desert. Small statuettes dating back to the same period have been discovered in the northern part of the Negev. They are described by J. Perrot, *Statuettes en ivoire et autres objets en ivoire et en os provenant des gisements préhistoriques de la région de Béershéba*, „Syria”, 36 (1959), pp. 8—19. Ivory incrustations from the Middle Bronze IIB period (1750—1550 B.C.) have been found at Tell Nagilah, also in the northern Negev. These most ancient attestations of ivory carving in Palestine are not taken into account by the author.

Music and musical instruments are examined by Zofia Skulimowska (pp. 643—650). This chapter is mainly based on literary sources, especially on the Bible, while archaeological finds are practically ignored in the exposition. Now, bronze cymbals and a bronze drum from the 14th or 13th century B.C. have been found in Hazor (Y. Yadin, *Hazor I*, Jerusalem, 1958). A bronze bell from the 10th or 9th century has been discovered at Megiddo (R. S. Lamon and G. M. Shipton, *Megiddo I*, Chicago, 1939, pl. 77). The two shoulder-like protuberances hold an iron pin, from which an iron clapper was suspended; it is now missing. Pottery rattles from the second millennium and the first half of the first millennium B.C. have been found in Gezer and in Beth Shemesh. Four musicians are moulded on a cultic pottery incense stand from Ashdod, dating back to the 11th or 10th century B.C. These musicians are playing, respectively, cymbals, a double pipe, a frame drum, and a lyre. A dancer accompanied by a man playing the double pipe are represented on an engraved panel from a small ivory casket; they are entertaining a dignitary at a banquet. The object was found at Tell Far'eh, the ancient

Sharuken, in the Negev (W. M. Petrie, *Bet Pelet I*, London, 1930, pl. LV), and dates back to the 13th or 12th century B.C. An alabaster relief from the palace of Sennacherib in Nineveh shows three captive lyre players, probably from Lachish, in charge of an Assyrian soldier (see p. 988, No. 215). The Annals of Sennacherib mention „male and female musicians” given him as a tribute by Hezekiah, king of Judah. Instead, in cuneiform texts there is no allusion to the Hebrew musical repertory, as wrongly stated by Z. Skulimowska (p. 647). One should still mention the highly interesting rock engraving of the Wadi Kudeirat, in north-eastern Sinai. It shows a row of dancers accompanied by a drummer. The leading dancer is swinging a rope or kerchief, and the scene might be compared to the traditional Arab *debkâ* dance. Unfortunately, the date of this engraving is disputed. E. Anati (*Una danza nel Negev centrale*, in *Rivista di scienze preistoriche*, 10, 1955, pp. 70—75) thinks it dates back to the second millennium B.C., while Bayer places it in the Hellenistic period. The chapter on music lacks a good bibliography. See A. Sendrey, *Music in Ancient Israel* (1969).

J. Ostrowski examines trade and metrology (pp. 651—673). The author outlines a history of Palestinian trade and commerce up to the end of the biblical period and describes the main trade routes. According to the reviewer, J. Ostrowski does not pay a sufficient attention to the considerable contribution the nomads gave to the development of economic relations in Palestine. For the last centuries B.C., the Nabataeans, at least, should have been mentioned. Personally, the reviewer is not as pessimistic as the article's author about the possibility of determining the approximate capacity of the Old Hebrew measures of volume. This is not the place, however, to discuss this problem at length.

Aleksandra Krzyżanowska has written the chapter on money (pp. 675—684). This author assumes that the Lydian coins from the seventh century B.C. were known in Palestine. The trouble is that no coins from that period have as yet been discovered there. The earliest coins found on Palestinian soil are from the second half of the sixth century and the first half of the fifth century B.C. They are Greek coins from Athens, Thasos, and Macedon, apparently brought to the country by Greek merchants.

Referring to biblical texts, the author assumes, besides, that Persian coins were used in Palestine in the fifth century B.C., when the country was under the Persian rule. So far, however, no Achaemenian imperial coins seem to have been discovered in Palestine, at least to the reviewer's knowledge.

The author is decidedly mistaken when writing that Judaea „constituted” the fifth satrapy of the Persian empire (p. 677) or when speaking about a „satrap” of Judaea (p. 678). In fact, Judaea was only one of the provinces that constituted the fifth satrapy, whose satraps struck their own coinage. Nevertheless, in the late fifth and first half of the fourth century, Phoenician coins, in particular those issued in Sidon and Tyre, circulated in the northern part of Palestine and in the coastal strip down to the south of Jaffa. And various small coins of the obol and hemi-obol denomination, struck in the Gaza area, were used at the same time in the south-eastern part of the country. During that period, it was not the Persian coinage, but the Athenian, bearing the head of Pallas Athene and the owl sacred to her, that was used as international currency in the eastern Mediterranean. This Athenian coinage was widely imitated on a local level, and this also in Judaea.

From the reviewer's point of view, the author's description of this first Judaeian coinage is not sufficiently precise. Though silver coins with the inscription *Yhd*, „Judaea”, are rather rare, five coin types at least, all issued in Judaea in the fourth century B.C., are so far known. One follows the „head/owl” type, with the only difference that it bears a male head, in oriental style, instead of the head of Pallas Athene; the owl is standing and facing a small lily. Another shows a falcon on the obverse and a fleur-de-lis on the reverse. A unique piece has a Janus head on the obverse and shows on the reverse a god seated on a winged chariot and holding a falcon in his left hand. As a consequence of the erroneous decipherment of the legend — read *Yhw* instead of *Yhd* — some authors have suggested to identify the sitting god with Yahweh. A. Krzyżanowska seems not to be aware of the origin of this interpretation. Another type of coinage with the legend *Yhd* is blank on the obverse and bears on the reverse an unidentified bird, probably an owl. A piece from the Beth Šur excavations is

blank on the obverse and bears on the reverse an owl placed between two inscriptions: *Yhd* on the left and *Yhzyqy[w]* on the right. The largest denomination of these silver coins with the legend *Yhd* is so far the drachm, but the bulk consists of oboloi and hemi-oboloi.

The paragraph dedicated to Hasmonaeen coinage (p. 680) contains several imprecisions and inexactitudes. All Hasmonaeen coins bear Hebrew and not Aramaic legends, as wrongly stated by the author. Moreover, the legend was written in the Old Hebrew script, different from the Aramaic. There is only one coin type of Alexander Yannai (103—76 B.C.) which bears an Aramaic legend written in square Hebrew letters. Some coins of Alexander Yannai and of Mattathias Antigonus bear bilingual Greco-Hebrew legends. In spite of the author's opinion expressed on p. 680, not all the Hasmonaeen princes have struck coins. Simon, the first independent Hasmonaeen ruler (142—135 B.C.), never issued any coins. Even Simeon's son, John Hyrcanus I (135—104 B.C.), did not start issuing coins immediately on succeeding his father, but only considerably later, probably c. 110 B.C. For some incomprehensible reason, the author takes this fact into account in another chapter of the book (pp. 825—833), where she gives a much better description of the Hasmonaeen coinage and characterizes the various series of coins. However, she does not specify in a clear way the Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic legends. In this second chapter on numismatics, she also examines the coinage of the Herodian dynasty (37 B.C.—95 A.D.), as well as the coins issued by the Roman procurators or prefects in 6—37 and 44—66 A.D. The coinages of the Jewish War (66—70 A.D.) and of the Bar Kokhba Revolt (132—135 A.D.) are also characterized there, but not the coinage of the Palestinian cities.

IV. RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS

The fourth part of the volume is dedicated to religious institutions. The first chapter, written by G. R. H. Wright (pp. 689—709), appeared also in English: *Pre-Israelite Temples in the Land*

of *Canaan*, in PEQ, 103 (1971), pp. 17—32. It contains a good synthesis of what we actually know about the question. S. Mędala examines the sacral buildings of the Iron Age and of the Greco-Roman period (pp. 711—731). The article is well documented, but it does not give a real synthesis of the actually available data. The author knows about the sanctuary of Arad (pp. 720—722), but does not really integrate the results of the Arad excavations in a broader synthesis. The location of the Arad sanctuary in the royal citadel makes it clear that the temple was a royal institution, which existed until Josiah's time, in the late seventh century B.C. Without going into details, the plan of the temple corresponds to the divisions of the Solomonic temple in Jerusalem, and even more to the biblical description of the Tabernacle. The altar is built of earth and unhewn stones and it measures 5 cubits by 5, which are precisely the measures of the Tabernacle's altar according to Ex. 27.1 and 38.1. These and other finds are important for the interpretation of the biblical description of the Tabernacle, which seems to be an ideal prototype of the royal Yahwistic sanctuaries of the Monarchic period. In fact, the plan of the so-called „Solar Shrine” at Lachish is virtually identical with the one of Arad, though it is to be dated in postexilic times. This is explained by the pre-exilic antecedents of this sanctuary. Excavations recently carried out by Y. Aharoni beneath some of the rooms of the „Solar Shrine” and in its immediate vicinity have shown that a Yahwistic temple existed also at Lachish, in the tenth century B.C. It appears therefore that, during the Monarchic period, royal Yahwistic sanctuaries existed not only in the capital, but also in provincial centres, in Judah as well as in the Kingdom of Israel. These shrines were of course „legitimate”.

L. Stefaniak has written a few pages about the synagogues in ancient Palestine (pp. 733—736). The author has decidedly chaotic ideas about the subject and does not even distinguish between literary and epigraphic sources, between speculations and personal testimonies of ancient writers. At the beginning, he refers to inscriptions found in Egypt and revealing the remains of synagogues in the third century B.C. (p. 733). Subsequently, this same author states that the earliest synagogue, so far discovered outside Palestine, is the one of Delos, which would date back to the second

century B.C. (p. 734). L. Stefaniak enumerates the synagogues mentioned in the New Testament, but seems to ignore the existence of other sources. With regard to Palestine, Josephus mentions synagogues in Tiberias (*Life* 280), Dora (*Jew. Ant.* 19, 305), and Caesarea (*Wars* 2, 285—289). To these synagogues the Talmud adds, for Jerusalem, the synagogue of the Alexandrians (Tosephta, *Meg.* 3 (2), 16; Talm. Jer., *Meg.* 3,1, 73d) and of the „Tarsians” (Talm. Bab., *Meg.* 26a), i.e. filigree workers weaving tapestries and upholsterers. However, the context seems to indicate that these two synagogues were in reality only one. One could explain its double name by the fact that the so called „Tarsian” carpet industry flourished at that time in Egypt, whose main centre was precisely Alexandria. Saint Paul may have belonged to this synagogue (Act. 18,3; cf. I Cor. 4,12; 9,13—15; I Thess. 2,9) and thus received the by-name „Tarsian”, which was later misunderstood (Act. 21,39; 22,3).

A passage of the Talmud of Jerusalem (*Meg.* 3,1) records the number of synagogues existing in Jerusalem at the time of the Temple's destruction as 480, while another (Talm. Bab., *Ket.* 105a) gives what looks like an exact figure of 394. The author dismisses the first figure (he does not mention the second) as „undoubtedly exaggerated” (p. 734). Nevertheless one must bear in mind that archaeological investigations have proved beyond question that ancient synagogues were generally small. Most of them were simple prayer rooms and therefore cannot even be distinguished as such by the excavators. More surprising is the existence of a synagogue on the Temple Mount itself, as seems to result from the Mishnah (*Sot.* 7,7—8; *Yōmā* 7,1). Archaeological evidence of synagogues in Judaea, in the first century A.D., has been discovered so far in the two Herodian fortresses of Masada and Herodium. Both synagogues are similar in plan and already pre-announce the early type of Galilee synagogues of the third and fourth centuries A.D. The author dedicates only a few lines to the architectural evolution of Palestinian synagogues, and this is inadmissible in a handbook of archaeology. A comparison with the contemporaneous synagogues in the Diaspora is completely missing. Most of the Greek words given in the foot-notes are misspelt.

St. Mędala examines the cultic objects and other sacral remains (pp. 737—765), as well as the burial traditions (pp. 767—797). Both articles are well documented, but the author fails in giving everywhere a mature and coherent synthesis. In the first mentioned chapter, one gets the impression of being confronted with a series of files reflecting opinions which are not always perfectly concordant and ripe. The chapter concerns too many different subjects to be discussed here in detail. The second chapter is much better articulated.

However, in the reviewer's opinion, the burial practices of the pre-exilic period are in reality better known than the article's author seems to think. St. Mędala refers in particular to the tombs discovered at Beth Shemesh and at Lachish (pp. 781—782). Additional tombs of the same kind have been discovered near the road leading to Mevaseret Yerushalayim, at Tell en-Naşbeh, on the eastern slope of the hill of Hirbet Bêt Lei, 8 km. east of Lachish, and in some other places. They are all burial caves, hewn in limestone, with an ante-chamber and one or more burial chambers. There are burial benches in each chamber; the exceptions are extremely rare. Therefore, these benches appear to be characteristic of the Israelite pre-exilic burial practice. The author does not in the least mention the series of graves of the First Temple period cut in the rock east and west of the Ophel, above all in the Kidron valley and in the Siloam village. D. Ussishkin made in 1968 a new survey of all the rock-tombs in Siloam, while B. Mazar discovered a whole series of tombs cut in the rock south of the Temple Mount. These tombs date back to the ninth and eighth centuries B.C. A Phoenician influence is noticeable in the planning of the graves cut in the rock, as well as in the general conception of the cemetery area. The richest graves of this type, as the ones found, for instance, at Achzib, have a vaulted ceiling, cut as deep as 10 m. in the rock. At the bottom of the cave there is a catafalque hewn out of rock; the corpse was placed upon it. A stone or a pillow-shaped projection of the catafalque were used to lift the dead person's head.

Many tombs of the Hellenistic period have been unearthed and excavated in recent years. On the north-eastern outskirts of Jerusalem, at Giv'at Mivtar, several Jewish cave-tombs have been

discovered. The chronological range can be placed with certainty between the end of the second century B.C. and the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D. All the tombs are hewn in the soft limestone and include several burial chambers with loculi and forecourts (*Israel Exploration Journal*, 20, 1970, pp. 18—59 and pl. 9—24). A tomb of a design similar to the one of Marissa has been found in Nazareth. The author does not extend his outline up to the Roman-Byzantine period. Therefore, he does not describe the necropolis of Beth She'arim, which became from the beginning of the third century A.D. a central burial place for the Jews of Palestine and of the Diaspora.

H. J. Franken discusses the importance of the archaeology of Palestine for Old Testament studies (pp. 799—808), while L. Stefaniak does the same for the New Testament (pp. 809—823). If Franken's chapter gives an objective idea of the role of archaeology, Stefaniak's contribution is extremely eclectic and for a great part not pertinent. One is surprised at not finding parallel chapters on the importance of the archaeology of Palestine for Middle Eastern and Classic studies, as well as for the archaeology of the East Mediterranean area.

The last chapter contains A. Zaborski's outline of Palestinian epigraphy in the second and first millennia B.C. (pp. 835—871). The author's distinction between epigraphy and palaeography (p. 835) does not seem, in the reviewer's opinion, to be quite adequate, as palaeography is the science of ancient writing, while the object of epigraphy is actually larger and parallels the one of papyrology. In fact, epigraphy is the science concerned with the classification and explanation of inscriptions. The study of the types of writing used in inscriptions is only one aspect of epigraphy and authors rightly characterize this kind of study as palaeography. Apart from this terminological question, Zaborski's outline of the function and history of Palestinian epigraphy is clear and objective. The review of the main inscriptions gives an excellent idea of the situation and is well documented. Since the author mentions also the Ammonite and Moabite inscriptions (pp. 848—852), it would have been advisable to characterize the language of these inscriptions in the pertinent passage in p. 841. One can only regret the absence of a parallel chapter on the Greek epigraphy of ancient

Palestine and on the parchments and papyri discovered in the Holy Land.

To conclude, this work on Palestinian archaeology contains several good and even some excellent contributions. Unfortunately, this book is burdened by some immature or quite inadequate chapters. As a whole, it can hardly fulfil its role, also because it often fails to relate Palestine to the larger context of the East Mediterranean world and of the Near East, of which Palestine was just a province. However, some parts of the book should certainly be recommended. The photographs are in general sufficiently clear and well chosen. A superior quality paper would naturally have given better results, but, undoubtedly, this would have had a considerable influence on the price of the book.