2005 NEH Summer Institute For Teachers in Boston

Gloria London, Chair,
ASOR Outreach Education Committee

The best, most stimulating professional development I’ve ever had,” the teacher said. After a month of lectures, discussions, hands-on engagement with artifacts, seed samples, bones, stones and other intriguing archaeological remains, the 25 middle and high school teachers were consistent in their praise.

In cooperation with Boston University, the Harvard Semitic Museum and the Madaba Plains Project-‘Umayri, ASOR co-sponsored a National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Teachers Institute this July in Boston. The result of several years of planning and preparation, the Institute—“Archaeology of Jordan and Its Western Neighbors”—directed by Gloria London and Donald Sharpes, made an impact on participants, who developed archaeological curricula for the hundreds and thousands of students they would teach in the future.

Through an intensive combination of lecture, discussion and hands-on lab work, the teachers from public and private schools nationwide learned about daily life in antiquity with a focus on Tall al-‘Umayri, Jordan. In the words of one participant, “It is the best educational experience I’ve had since Harvard.” Others used words such as, “Best NEH program ever—challenging, invigorating, mind-bending, exceeding expectations, enjoyable, complex, and highly intellectual, thanks to lectures and labs from people who are passionate about archaeology.” A veteran of several teachers institutes over the years decided that he could no longer continue attending them since none would measure up to this one.

Kimberley Connors astounded teachers by inviting them to sort sherds at the Semitic Museum at Harvard University,
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where we held most lectures. In Julie Hansen’s palaeoethnobotany laboratory at Boston University, the elaborate preparations of Miriam Chernoff and Tonya Largy enabled teachers to create a sample collection of fully labeled seeds to take home, along with tantalizing ideas of how to teach with it. Prior to the lab, during a walk around Walden Pond, one teacher commented that she could think of nothing more boring than counting seeds, but not after she peered into the microscope. Lawrence Kaplan’s love affair with lentils and confidence that the world would be a better place if only people ate more lentils came with his recipe for red lentil stew. Tonya Largy and Peter Burns showed us bones and teeth in Richard Meadow’s Peabody Museum zooarchaeology lab.

Fresh from the field, Larry Herr, Douglas Clark and Larry Geraty gave stimulating presentations on the latest research critical for understanding the archaeology of Israel and Jordan. Joe Greene, Assistant Director of the Semitic Museum, offered lectures and his full support to make the teachers feel at home at Harvard. Along with labs and lectures, Gloria London presented hands-on activities that teachers can replicate in their social studies, history, and science classes.

Educational specialist and Co-director, Donald Sharpes, guided the development of curriculum units. Dedicated, resourceful, creative individually and as a group, the teachers each produced a lesson plan which covered many topics. In addition, with technology specialist Elizabeth Perry, the teachers created weblogs.

Thanks to Douglas Clark, Executive Director of ASOR and the ASOR staff, our hosts at BU, we enjoyed the luxurious new BU residence hall with an unparalleled view overlooking the Charles River. It provided an excellent observation post for a July 4th display of fireworks and music, which will not soon be forgotten.

The Semitic Museum is an exhilarating and stimulating place to study. Joe Greene, Kimberley Connors, Dena Davis and veteran volunteer Kathy Mallak contributed immeasurably to the NEH Institute’s success. Our thanks to Lawrence Stager, Director of the Museum, and those involved with the current exhibit. The remarkable, fully furnished ‘four-room house’ on display helped us envision the past in many different ways.

Teachers reach hundreds of students each year, early in their lives when the enchantment with ancient civilizations crystallizes. As a springboard to teach ancient civilizations, foreign languages, literature and more, archaeology practically requires interdisciplinary teaching and cross-curricular studies that are currently in vogue.

Schoolteachers need exposure to learning opportunities that will revitalize and reinvigorate their own resource base. With the fresh perspective gained from archaeology, humanities teachers develop new techniques to present ancient history in a way that is meaningful to their pupils. If students can connect to those who came before us by focusing on daily life, they might envisage a world that is more similar to our own than it is different.

Informing and exciting our teachers about recent findings in Near Eastern archaeology strengthen and support education throughout the Humanities at all levels. Every time a teacher learns or experiences something new, the impact increases in a ripple effect that reaches thousands of young people. With a solid understanding of archaeology, teachers acquire an incentive to teach archaeology. It is their students who one day will seek out college-level archaeology classes or volunteer to join excavations and retain their enthusiasm for ancient history.

As Lawrence Kaplan, our legume expert wrote about the program, “The group was just as motivating and responsive as a speaker could possibly want…. Apart from the pleasure of meeting you all, the best thing that I am left with is the realization that some kind of funding is going to projects like yours that target in-service secondary education teachers.” Thank you, National Endowment for the Humanities.
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ASOR Executive Committee Meets in Atlanta

The Executive Committee of ASOR meets four times per year, including an autumn meeting at the beginning of October. To cut costs, all future sessions except the one tied to the Annual Meeting will be held in Boston, but hotel arrangements had already been made in Atlanta for this fall. A quick summary of discussions and actions at the October 1 meeting follows.

Finances once again occupied a good deal of our attention. In this time of transition from limited fundraising activities of the past to a full-blown development program in the present and for the future, the stress of this bold venture weighs heavily on the organization. But we feel the effort, however challenging now, will be well worth it in the long run. The staff, officers and Executive Committee members want to thank ASOR Trustees and members for their loyalty and support over the long years of ASOR’s distinguished history. They also want to encourage ongoing, stepped-up contributions especially for the next year or so as new fundraising initiatives take hold.

As part of the agenda, Scott Schultz, president of our development firm, Schultz & Williams of Philadelphia, joined us for a phone conversation. He spoke of the process in which we are currently jointly engaged to provide for current funding needs as well as a sound basis for ASOR’s fundraising for a sustainable future. David Rosenstein, Development Committee chair, and others have been working on a document—The Conceptual and Programmatic Basis for ASOR’s Case for Support—which undergirds a new Case Statement for presenting ASOR to potential donors and the wider public. This has been a massive undertaking, but promises to bring focus to our fundraising efforts across the board, particularly in the two areas of cross-border research and cultural heritage preservation.

On other business, the committee heard reports from officers, committee chairs and staff. While these tend to be routine, several important items arose:

- numerous suggestions for reducing costs and increasing revenues
- a review of current fundraising activities in Boston and Atlanta as well as elsewhere
- information on several outreach activities in Boston, including the extremely successful NEH Summer Teachers Institute and ASOR’s role in Archaeology Month in Massachusetts
- items involving the transition of the Publications Office to Boston, some of which are tied to publications and others to fulfillment/subscription services
- updates on the Annual Meeting which suggest potentially very high attendance
- a report from the Committee on Archaeological Policy on the recent CAP tour and current discussions about the role of CAP
- the appointment of a special Board committee for nominating ASOR officers whose terms have expired and who don’t wish to renew their positions

Introducing ASOR’s Development Team at Schultz & Williams

ASOR is proud to introduce the major players at Schultz & Williams (S&W) in Philadelphia who are helping ASOR toward a secure and sustainable financial future. Working together, we hope to succeed at this bold new venture which promises to position ASOR to take full advantage of a wide range of fundraising opportunities. The ASOR project team at S&W:

### L. Scott Schultz, President

While building a successful career in development, marketing and government service, Scott Schultz began to envision a non-traditional consulting firm to help nonprofit organizations meet their distinctive challenges. He believed that client companies of all sizes could best be served by a consulting group offering a full range of talents to achieve institutional objectives. The S&W philosophy is that development, marketing and management are closely linked activities that must be pursued collectively to achieve institutional goals.

Scott’s professional career began in Washington, D.C., where he served as a legislative aide. He continued his public service career as Assistant to the Mayor of Buffalo, New York, where he was responsible for the acquisition of state and federal assistance for the city to support community and economic development, parks and recreation, the arts and human services. Following his government service, Scott became Director of Development for the Buffalo Zoological Society, and then Vice President for Development at the Zoological Society of Philadelphia. In 1987 he founded the firm now serving ASOR.

### Cathy Card Sterling, Vice President

Cathy Sterling has spent 20 years in development and managing arts and education organizations. She brings to Schultz & Williams a range of skills that include strategic planning, institutional advancement, managing in transition and results-oriented communication. Her areas of focus include capital campaign planning and implementation, major gift fund-raising, planned giving, communications and Board building. She is experienced in executing a variety of giving programs including major gifts from individuals, corporations and foundations; planned giving programs; and government grants. She has served as Vice President for Development at WETA, the flagship public broadcasting station in Washington, D.C.; Director of Development for Alexandria Country Day School; Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations for The Phillips Collection; and Administrative Officer and Exhibitions Manager, The Corcoran Gallery of Art.
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Introducing Two New CAARI Officers

Over the past few months, following the death of former CAARI President, David Detrich, two new officers have emerged to help CAARI advance its cause and, as an affiliated organization, ASOR’s. Ellen Herscher, Vice President, stepped in for several months until the new officers could be chosen.

President – Gus Feissel was elected President of the Cyprus American Archeological Research Institute (CAARI) in April 2005. From 2002 to 2005 he was CAARI’s Treasurer, and since 2000, a member of the Board of Trustees.

During his thirty-five year career at the United Nations, Gus was intimately involved in diplomacy and negotiations in both political and economic issues. He retired as Assistant Secretary-General in 1998. His first twenty years with the United Nations were devoted to economic development issues. Since 1984 he was involved at the highest level of the United Nations’ preventive diplomacy, conflict resolution and peacekeeping activities.

From 1984 to 1998, his functions included responsibility for the Secretary-General’s mission of good offices on Cyprus. He was the principal author of the “Set of Ideas” which was endorsed by the Security Council in 1992 as the basis of a settlement of the Cyprus problem. As Assistant Secretary-General and Chief of Mission of the United Nations Operation in Cyprus from 1993 to 1998, he was responsible for promoting a settlement of the Cyprus problem and was in charge of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) comprising some 1250 military and 300 civilian personnel with an annual budget of some $48 million.

Treasurer – Replacing Feissel as CAARI Treasurer is Ann-Marie Knoblauch, Associate Professor and Program Director of Art History at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Ann-Marie received her education at Bryn Mawr College and New York University. She first came to Cyprus in 1991, excavating for one season at Yeronisos with Joan Connelly, and has been excavating at Idalion since 1998 with Pamela Gaber. Her research interests include sculpture and iconography, with an interest in representations of women in religious contexts.

In addition, she lectures widely and has published articles on Classical Coins of Mende and Satyrs on Greek Coins, and contributed to the Catalogue of Sculpture in the Princeton Art Museum. Ann-Marie was also a Fulbright Fellow.

ASOR’s Exchange Lecture Program in the Eastern Mediterranean Basin

The American Schools of Oriental Research is pleased to announce a new four-year Exchange Lecture Program in the Eastern Mediterranean Basin. This program includes an exchange of lectures between the W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research in Jerusalem, the American Center of Oriental Research (ACOR), the Cyprus American Archaeological Research Institute (CAARI), the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCAS) and the American Research Center in Egypt (ARCE). The lectures will be initiated in the winter semester of 2006 and extend through 2009. The Directors or Senior Fellows of the ASOR-affiliated schools will present four lectures, one each year, at the four other schools. In addition, the directors of ASCSA and ARCE will each give three lectures over the same period of time at the three ASOR-affiliated centers. The program is sponsored by ASOR and the Council of American Overseas Research Centers (CAORC).

The first exchange lectures will be between the Albright Institute and the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. The Albright Director, S. Gitin, will lecture at the American School in Athens on the subject of “Ekron of the Philistines: From Sea Peoples to Olive Oil Industrialists” on Tuesday, January 24, 2006. John Camp, the Director of the Athenian Agora Project will give a presentation at the Albright Institute in Jerusalem on “Recent Finds at the Athenian Agora Excavations” on Thursday, February 2, 2006.
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Christina M. Spoegler, Senior Associate

Christina Spoegler has 16 years experience raising institutional funds for capital needs, annual programs, and special projects, and has special expertise in raising funds for collections-based institutions, research and science-based organizations, and non-profits that serve broad constituencies through diverse programs. Christina has worked a good deal writing about scholarly, scientific and research-based topics, and in articulating such work to a lay audience. As Senior Director of Institutional Gifts at the Philadelphia Zoo, Christina directed a complex fundraising program for six years, and raised millions of dollars from foundations, corporations, and federal and state agencies. For three years, she worked exclusively with international conservation scientists, partnering with field conservationists from around the world, and raising major grants for science-based field research programs and large community development and policy initiatives.
ASOR ANNOUNCEMENTS

ASOR Publications Office Announcement

The ASOR Publications Office will soon be moving to Boston, so that all of ASOR’s operations will be housed in one location. Hopefully, relocation will be complete by some time near the beginning of 2006. In the process, the ASOR staff is working hard to ensure that there should be little or no interruption to publications or membership services. Thank you for your patience during this transition.

The W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research is pleased to announce the sixth annual (2006) Trude Dothan Lectureship in Ancient Near Eastern Studies

sponsored by the Albright Institute with the support of the Dorot Foundation

Dr. Oscar White Muscarella
Senior Research Fellow, Department of Ancient Near Eastern Art, The Metropolitan Museum of Art

will give three lectures under the auspices of three institutions

Hasanlu: An Archaeological Evaluation
Al-Quds University, Tuesday, March 7th at 5:00 p.m.
at the École Biblique, Nablus Road*

Ayanis and Urartian Archaeology
Wednesday, March 8th at 5:00 p.m. at the Hebrew University, Mt. Scopus Campus

King Midas’ Gordian and Phrygia
Thursday, March 9th at 4:00 p.m.
at the W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research, 26 Salah ed-Din Street**

Each lecture will be followed by a reception.
*secure parking is available on the grounds of the École Biblique
**because of limited space at the Albright Institute, kindly RSVP for this lecture. Tel: 02-628-8956, Fax: 02-626-4424, e-mail: director@albright.org.il

Publication Awards for ASOR Members

The Biblical Archaeology Society has announced its 2005 Publication Awards, two of which honor ASOR members:

Timothy Harrison’s *Megiddo 3* (Chicago, Oriental Institute, 2004) has been awarded the “Best Scholarly Book on Archaeology.”


November Archaeology Lectures in Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, November 15, 8 p.m.
Dr. Zvi Lederman of the Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University, will present “Recent Discoveries at Tel Beth-Shemesh – A Biblical Community at the Border with the Philistines.” Tel Beth-Shemesh is an important biblical site in the northeastern Shephelah (lowland) of Judah. The mound is located some 20 km west of Jerusalem, and overlooks the Sorek Valley. Situated at the geographical, political and cultural border, as well as the meeting point between Canaanites, Philistines and Israelites, Beth-Shemesh was the scene of great historical events and cultural changes. It is therefore an ideal site for the investigation of key historical and cultural issues relating to the vexed relations and interaction between these three peoples.

Wednesday, November 30, 8 p.m.
Orly Kenneth, Schlicah of the Jewish Agency to the Jewish Federation of Greater Washington, will present “An Archaeological Dig into the Story of Chanukah.” This slide-illustrated lecture will introduce, through documentation from the time of Judah Maccabee, the more complex reality of the Jewish society during the time of the Chanukah story. These documents, including the books of Maccabees and Josephus Flavius, reveal a fascinating look at the Hellenistic culture, its problematic influence on the Jewish society and a saga that is a bit different from the “regularly-told” Chanukah story.

The lecture series of which these two are a part is co-sponsored by the Jewish Community Center of Greater Washington (JCCGW) and ASOR. The lectures are held at the JCCGW, 6125 Montrose Road in Rockville, MD. Admission is $5 for JCC and ASOR members and Archaeology Lecture Series benefactors, and $8 for the general public for both lectures. Advanced reservations are not required. For more information call 301-348-3840.
Changes to the Annual Meeting 2005 Program as published in the Summer Newsletter

**Academic Program**

**Friday**
The Outreach Education session, “Communicating Archaeology to the Public” will be held from 1:15pm until 2:15pm, not 12:45pm–2:15pm as stated.
The World of Women II session will be chaired by Beth Alpert Nakhai, not Rebecca Martin as indicated.

**Saturday**
The session on Reports on Current Excavations, non-ASOR Affiliated will be chaired by Erin Christensen, not Susan Cohen as indicated.

**Business Meetings**

**Thursday**
The ACOR Reception will be held from 5:00–7:00pm on Thursday, November 17th, not Friday.
A new Institutional Representatives’ Meeting has been scheduled for Thursday, November 17th, from 12:45-2:00pm.

**Friday**
The AIAR Board luncheon on Friday has been cancelled.
The CAARI Executive Committee will meet from 2:00-4:00pm on Friday, November 18th.

Please see our **Annual Meeting web page** for detailed schedules, information on housing and transportation and online registration forms for the meeting and hotel:

http://www.asor.org/AM/am.htm

---

**An Evening of Mediterranean Digs & Delights**

Friday, 18 November, Upper Egypt Gallery, University of Pennsylvania Museum

7:30pm Dinner featuring Mediterranean Cuisine
8:30pm Lecture by Dr. William Dever
“Stories of Great Archaeologists and What Makes Them Tick”

Reservation deadline is November 11
I would like to reserve ____ places at $75 each. Total enclosed $_____
Menu Choice: ☐ Vegetarian ☐ Lamb

Name: _______________________________ Tel: ____________________

Please make your check payable to ASOR or use your Visa or Mastercard (circle one)
Card Number _____ _____ _____ _____ Exp. Date ____/____ Signature ____________________

or make your reservation online at https://www.bu.edu/asor/phillyevents.html

---

American Schools of Oriental Research, Located at Boston University, 656 Beacon Street, 5th Floor, Boston, MA 02215-2010
Tel 617-353-6570, Fax 617-353-6575, asor@bu.edu, www.asor.org

---

ASOR Newsletter, Fall 2005


Front Row (l–r): Editorial Consultant Edna Sachar, Senior Fellow Samuel R. Wolff, Guest Scholar Penelope Mountjoy, Ernest S. Frerichs Fellow/Program Coordinator Benjamin Saidel, Mqne Fellow Laura Mazow, Annual Professor Michael Daise and Leslie Daise, National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Fellow Jack Lundbom and Linda Lundbom, Senior Fellow Jodi Magness, Assistant to the Director Helena Flusfeder, Mqne Staff Marina Zeltser.

Row on Carpet (l–r): Gardener Faiz Khalaf, Rachel and her son Shai Klayman, Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) Fellow Seth N. Klayman, Kitchen and Housekeeping Staff Nawal Ibtisam Rsheid.

Ritual Systems in the Qumran Library

Michael A. Daise, College of William and Mary
Annual Professor

My project has been to chart and evaluate the ritual systems attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Its point of departure comes not from Qumran studies per se, but from a concern among ritual theorists—Ronald Grimes and Catharine Bell, in particular—that more attention be given to the larger frameworks in which rituals exist and operate. To be sure, this problem is less the case in the field of Formative Judaism: the work of several figures—Jacob Milgrom, Jacob Neusner, Mary Douglas, Hannah Harrington, for instance—has all been predicated on the assumption that the laws in various early Judaic corpora congeal into systems. That said, however, the point Grimes and Bell make can still be well taken, since, however forward looking these contributions (by Milgrom, Neusner, Douglas and Harrington) have been, they represent but a modicum of all that can be and is being done on a systemic analysis of ritual in early Judaism. Indeed, what Bell wrote about ritual studies in general might equally be said about early Judaic studies in particular: “How rites relate to each other within a ritual system and how such systems differ from each other may be one of the most undeveloped areas in the study of (early Judaic) ritual” (Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions [1997], p. 173).

I am using this phenomenon of ritual systems as a vantage point for broaching Qumran literature. Broadly speaking, studies proleptic of this interest were made early on, e.g., the work of Weise, Murphy O’Connor and Pouilly on connections between the covenant renewal ceremony, festal calendar and final hymn in 1QS. Since that time, the publication of liturgical and legal texts has shown the Qumran community to have put a high premium on halakhic life, of which ritual was a part. And, in the wake of those publications, a significant body of scholarship has emerged that treats of single rites or single genres of rites. Building on these contributions—and pushing the questions asked by Weise, Murphy-O’Connor and Pouilly further—I am endeavoring (1) to reconstruct more comprehensively the rituals explicitly and implicitly attested in the Qumran literature and (2) to ascertain, in a more theoretically conscious way, how those rites complemented, trumped, or competed or dovetailed with one another as parts of larger ritual networks.

Toward these ends I was able to make progress this last year along two lines. First, I was able to garner and assess basic data on the rituals attested in thirteen clusters of documents. Second, I was able to hone two methodological issues necessary for evaluating these data: distilling “ritual density” from Qumran texts and determining the specific kind of “system” for which I will be looking. Ritual density is defined by Bell as “why some societies or historical periods have more ritual than others” (Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions [1997], p. 173); it represents the ratio that exists between ritual and other aspects of life in the day-to-day operations of a community at any given period in its existence. Measuring ritual density in Qumran praxis poses a challenge, since the halakhic texts by which sectarian ritual has been transmitted often assume as much as they state, likely omitting some rites that were otherwise performed. In a paper delivered to the 10th International Orion Symposium at Hebrew University, I was able to address this problem by applying an exegetical axiom based on the assumption that rites explicitly prescribed in a halakhic text relate to one another systemically.

As for the second methodological issue—the kind of ritual systems for which I am looking—my thinking on the subject has been inestimably helped through discussions with Ithamar Gruenwald. Through correspondence and personal conversations, Professor Gruenwald afforded me invaluable insight into the issues at stake, and this has already led to continued dialogue, as I develop this project further upon my return to the United States. For such generosity of spirit, for the venue provided by the Albright Institute, and the funding from the Goldsmith Foundation as well as from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) of the US State Department, I have the deepest gratitude.

The Book of Deuteronomy

Jack R. Lundbom, Clare Hall, University of Cambridge, and Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, NEH Fellow

This year at the Albright Institute, I spent my time researching and writing up a portion of a Deuteronomy commentary that I am preparing in the Eerdmans Critical Commentary series (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans). The commentary is one volume, probably running between 900 and 1,000 pages. It will contain a major Introduction to Deuteronomy, a fresh translation of the Hebrew text, bibliography, and commentary. The translation of the entire book into English was completed before I came, as was the writing of 10+ chapters, done at the University of Cambridge the previous year.
In nine months at the Albright, I have completed the research and writing of 1) six additional chapters; 2) 90 pages of Introduction; and 3) notes containing place names and other specialized topics in the remaining 17+ chapters of Deuteronomy. All the legal material in the book is now completed. I presented a portion of the Introduction at an Albright workshop in February. I chose to complete the research on place names while I was here because of the excellent library resources available at the Albright and the neighboring École Biblique. In chapters 1–4 of Deuteronomy, and to a lesser extent elsewhere in the book, mention is made of numerous ancient sites (e.g., Kadesh Barnea, Dizahab, the Seir Mountains; Ashtaroth, Edrei, Hormah; Mount Nebo; etc.), geographical regions (e.g., Bashan, Gilead, Moab, Edom, the Arabah, the Argob, etc.), and ancient peoples who inhabited Palestine, the Sinai, Negeb, and Transjordan (e.g., Hittites, Gergashites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hitites, Jebusites, etc.), not to mention the legendary giants purported to have lived in territory later taken over by Israel (Rephaim, Anakim, Emim). On these and other subjects, the libraries of the Albright and the École contain much information in their rich collection of reference works, books, journal articles, and maps, not to be found in such quantity and all in one place in even the best libraries of Europe and the United States. To spend time working on these notes while I was at the Albright, even though they are not yet in finished form, was a good decision, for I now have virtually all the relevant discussions on geography, archaeology, ancient sites, history, and lore completed for the entire commentary.

Being physically present in Jerusalem and the surrounding area is also a major plus for anyone doing biblical research. Library work is supplemented by Albright-sponsored field trips, where the leaders are often experts in the field. My time at the Albright was also enriched by other scholars in residence, where conversations took place on subjects of mutual interest. The guest lectures as well as seminars, workshops, and reports by Albright Fellows were generally quite good—in some cases outstanding. I particularly appreciated the effort made by our Director to bring in invited guests—for seminars and workshops given by the Albright Fellows. These were enjoyable occasions giving opportunities for scholarly exchanges and personal contact with others in the field of Near Eastern studies. My wife Linda made her contribution to the Albright by doing a number of artistic renderings during the year, some of which were made into Albright postcards and others that will be used in future Albright and Tel-Miqne publications. As I discovered in previous visits to the Albright, so again I found this Institute to be a special place to live and work, and will be forever grateful for having had the opportunity to do research here.

Kershaw Lecture
Norma Kershaw, long-time honorary Trustee who has been honored in many ways for her commitment to archaeology, gave a lecture on Egypt’s Woman Pharaoh earlier this month for the American Association of University Women in Mission Viejo, CA.
in the Levant. My tentative conclusions, shaped partly by the Beth-Shean findings and in accordance with most historians of the period, is that Egyptian administration in Canaan during the 15th–14th centuries BCE was more of a “hands off” approach, while during the 13th century, there was a notable increase in Egyptian presence and control. EA 289 suggests that Beth-Shean was staffed by Canaanite mercenaries, so the dominant Canaanite assemblage is not surprising. We also know that the Egyptians used Nubians from the Medjay tribe. While a tentative conclusion, it is possible that Rowe’s discovery of an ivory inlay depicting an African with upraised hands in the “Mekal Temple” of Level IX points to a Nubian component in the garrison. Finally, vessels of Egyptian form like the enigmatic “flowerpot,” which lack any corollary in the Canaanite assemblage, might be linked to a specifically Egyptian practice. If so, this may point to a small number of Egyptian officials, or perhaps highly Egyptianized Canaanites, in the garrison at Beth-Shean.

It is my hope that this study opens the door to further interest and research into Egyptian imperial ambitions in Canaan during the Eighteenth Dynasty.

Ethnoarchaeological Investigations of Bedouin Settlements: The Hajar House Revisited

Benjamin Saidel, East Carolina University
Ernest S. Frerichs Fellow/Program Coordinator

The aim of my research as an E. S. Frerichs Fellow was to use multiple types of evidence to examine the socio-economic organization and archaeological remains of those Bedouin who lived in the western Negev during the British Mandate period in Palestine between 1920 and 1948. The goals of this long-range study were two-fold: to generate data that would enable social anthropologists and historians to better understand the processes involved in the sedentarization of pastoral nomads in the 20th century; and to provide an archaeological perspective on the material culture associated with sedentarized Bedouin.

I used this fellowship period primarily as an opportunity to conduct archival research. For example, I conducted research at the Archive of the State of Israel in Talpiot. There, I had access to correspondence between representatives of the Bedouin and British Authorities relating to a range of issues, such as land tenure. In order to gain a better understanding of those administrators during the British Mandate who dealt with the Bedouin, I also examined the personal records of specific officials. For example, I studied the personal records of Arif el Arif, the Governor of Beersheva in the early 1930s. The information contained in his dossier provided a broader context in which to evaluate his publications. One drawback with archival research is that while there are folders for specific files, in a number of cases the contents were lost and in some cases, their physical condition was poor. Based on the catalogue of the Mandate documents, there seems to be an increase in the early and mid 1940s in petitions filed by Bedouin who had legal claims to land holdings in the northern and western Negev. Obviously, this impression needs to be substantiated with more detailed documentation. I would like to thank Michal Zapt and the staff at the Archives for their assistance. I also carried out research at the Photothèque at the École Biblique with the kind permission of Jean Michel de Tarragon. One aspect of this research was to generate information on the physical conditions of specific locations in the Negev, such as Bir Hafir, during the Mandate period, in other words, to ascertain the physical conditions of the architecture at this water source and police post from the photographs. This photo archive also provided raw data which enabled me to begin a reconstruction of the settlement history for portions of the Negev from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries. In particular, I used these photographs to document the growth of settlements in the northern Negev throughout the early 20th century. By visiting these sites, I was able to determine where the photographs were taken. The photographs also provided information that enabled me to compare the conditions represented in the photographs with other images from the Mandate period. Thus, I was able to fill in some chronological gaps in my research. In order to collect additional information about the Bedouin in the Mandate period, I conducted a number of interviews with anthropologists, such as Aref Abu Rabia, and kibbutz members who have collected local histories of the northern Negev. This proved to be a useful counterbalance to the archival material, especially since these sources of information do not overlap. Finding individuals to interview is difficult as the Mandate period ended approximately forty-eight years ago.
During the award period, I submitted three articles for publication: “Reappraising Woolley and Lawrence’s archaeological survey of Khalasa in 1914” (with Dr. Gary Christopherson); “Herding Station or Pastoral Campsite;” (6th–8th centuries CE at Rekhes Natha 396); and “More Than Meets the Eye” (the occupational history of Unit A at Nabi Salah in southern Sinai).

The Socioeconomic Evolution of the Negev and Southern Jordan in the Iron Age

Juan Manuel Tebes, University of Buenos Aires
George A. Barton Fellow

The development of Iron Age overland trade in the Negev and Edom is traditionally viewed as an outcome of the beginning of Arabian incense routes in the Late Iron Age II, triggered by the demand of the Neo-Assyrian Empire. During my research at the Albright, however, I was able to work extensively with evidence that suggests that the patterns of exchange are not exclusive to the Late Iron II, but rather that they were already operating in the Iron I/Early Iron II. A case can be made for a complex, decentralized exchange of ordinary goods during this period, especially Arabian “Qurayya” painted wares and copper of the Arabah valley.

The only site that provides indications of manufacture of that decorated pottery is Qurayya (Hejaz), where the overall evidence seems to imply production of pottery beyond the household level, pointing to what some researchers have called “workshop industry.” I would suggest that the economy of Qurayya was based on the local level on irrigation farming, and on the regional level on its role as a production center (although probably not only) of local painted wares.

The major evidence of the circulation of copper is the distribution of metalworking and copper artifacts. A review of the survey and excavation reports reveal at least two large quarrying and metalworking centers in the Arabah Valley (Timna, Faynan) and four workshops for casting copper (Yotvata, Tel Masos, ‘En Sharuhen, Sheikh Zuweid, Tell Deir ‘Ala) in the Iron I/Early Iron II Negev and Jordan.

It is quite clear that Egyptians, Canaanites and Philistines cannot carry alone the burden of being the only mediators in the distribution of these goods. The circulation of Qurayya wares and Arabah copper may be attributed to a combination of Hejazi villagers and Negev pastoralists straddling the interface between the Hejaz, Edom and the Negev. If these groups exchanged their goods for agricultural products and other perishable commodities transported in biodegradable containers (leather, wood, etc.), then the latter may not appear in the archaeological record.

It is not clear from the distribution of these items if reciprocal or trade mechanisms were operating in these exchanges; the resultant archaeological records of both modes can be very similar. In fact, it can be the case that both types of exchange were present at the same time. This set of exchanges may have been operating through the territories controlled by local tribes, clans and/or chieftains, a picture not very different from the decentralized Late Iron II trade recently put forward by Bienkowski and van der Steen (2001). A significant difference, however, is that in the Iron I/Early Iron II, the exchange network consisted of relatively short local routes. The importance of it was therefore regional, restricted to the Negev, Edom and the Hejaz.

The admittedly meager evidence from local sites suggests that the context of discovery is of particular significance. Since Qurayya wares appear consistently in cultic contexts (Timna: 25% of the Mining Temple’s ceramic assemblage; Har Shani X: small sherds; Amman Airport structure: one bowl and several sherds; Tel Masos: eight sherds at House 314; ‘En Haseva [Late Iron II?], administrative buildings [Tel Far‘ah (S): seven sherds from the “Governor’s Residency”; Lachish: three sherds from Area S] and burial offerings [Tell Jedu: one bowl; Tel Far‘ah (S): one juglet from Tomb 542]), they may have been seen as “exotic” imports, probably due to their rich polychrome decorations and/or cultic significance. In addition, there is some archaeological evidence that may point to metallurgical activities associated with ritual contexts (Timna: Mining Temple and Site 2’s bamah; Tel Masos: House 314; Tell Deir ‘Ala: Phase B). The presence of Qurayya wares and copper in these contexts implies that these goods were valued for their social as well as their functional content. It would be premature to say what specific defining factor in the distribution of these unusual contexts might be, but the fact that the goods were considered to have a certain degree of significance would point to exchange mechanisms of some kind. The assumption is that in non-state societies the need for ordinary goods with symbolic significance is an incentive for the development and success of regional trade patterns, because their production was aimed at meeting both functional and social requirements. The manufacture of some of these goods for exchange provided participation in a wider social sphere, maintaining long-distance kinship networks and in doing so generating a social cohesion in the absence of a bureaucratic state apparatus.

Interaction between Near Eastern and Greek Styles in Phoenician Temples and its Significance for the Study of Acculturation in the Near East

Jessica L. Nager, University of California, Berkeley
Samuel H. Kress Fellow

My research at the Albright this year was an investigation into Greco-Near Eastern hybridity in the art and architecture of Phoenicia in the Persian and Hellenistic periods as evidence for acculturation or ‘Hellenization.’ Specifically, I undertook a reexamination of the interaction of foreign and local styles in the sculpture and architecture of sanctuaries and sarcophagi excavated at the sites of ‘Amrit, Umm el-‘Amed, and sites near Sidon, with particular attention to the question of acculturation versus cultural continu-
but lack a good archaeological context, and it is difficult to assess whether or not this evidence is indicative of greater cultural change. For everything the Phoenicians borrowed from the artistic and architectural canons of other cultures, they were at the same time rejecting something. For example, at Umm el-‘Amed, they incorporated Ionic and Doric-style colonnades, but rejected a Greek style temple. With the famous ‘Lycian’ sarcophagus, the Sidonians incorporated Attic sculptural and representational technique as represented on the Parthenon, but applied it to traditional scenes stemming from the Near Eastern canon of iconography, such as the Hunt scene, and the form of the sarcophagus itself derives from Lycian monumental tombs, but is modified to fit the needs of traditional Sidonian funerary culture. Thus, each instance of borrowing must be considered on its own, and its cultural significance analyzed; this will be the focus of my next stage of research.

Art and Text in the Vienna Genesis
Maureen O’Brien, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Samuel H. Kress Joint Athens/Jerusalem Fellow

An important phenomenon in the context of sixth-century visual culture was the production of luxurious manuscripts of the Bible that were written in silver and/or gold ink on purple-dyed parchment. Sometimes purple biblical codices were also illustrated, and it is the best preserved of the surviving Early Christian illustrated Greek codices that are the subject of my dissertation and research at the Albright Institute. Known since the nineteenth century as the Vienna Genesis because it eventually ended up in the Habsburg imperial collection in Austria, the codex is composed of the Septuagint text of the Book of Genesis on the upper half of each page accompanied without exception by a painted miniature on the lower half. Although the extant fragment comprises only twenty-four folios, the Vienna Genesis contains the largest surviving corpus of illustrations in any Late Antique manuscript and as such has an important place in the history of manuscript illumination.

During my stay at the Albright Institute (February–June 2005), I worked on two chapters of my dissertation, the first of which addresses the issue of the place of production of the Vienna Genesis. There is currently a division in scholarly opinion on the manuscript’s localization, with German-language scholarship heavily favoring Syro-Palestine (Antioch or Jerusalem) based on paleographical grounds and English-language scholarship raising instead the possibility of the imperial capital of Constantinople. There has been little engagement on either side of the divide with the other. Much of my time at the Albright was spent considering the case for Syro-Palestine, first made by Austrian scholars in the early twentieth century. By tracing the chain of scholarship on the manuscript’s paleography back to its first attribution to Syro-Palestine, I was able to prove that the paleographical research, now deemed secure, is actually originally based on unconvincing art historical research. In addition to offering a critique of previous scholarship, I compared the imagery in the Vienna Genesis miniatures to new publications and finds of illustrations in any Late Antique manuscript and as such has an important place in the history of manuscript illumination.
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few decades. My research for the past few months at the Albright suggests that the manuscript does not have any strong connection to art of the time period from the Byzantine Near East, but some similarities to art produced in the Western half of the Empire. While I don’t believe there is enough evidence to assign the manuscript firmly to Constantinople, I argue in this chapter of my dissertation that the Vienna Genesis was most likely made in a scriptorium in the West and that there is little to support and much to criticize with regard to any attempt at localization of the codex in Syro-Palestine.

Using the considerable resources of the Albright as well as other schools and libraries in Jerusalem with regard to biblical studies in general and the Septuagint in particular, I also worked on the chapter of my dissertation, first begun in Athens, that considers the unique word and image relationship between the Greek Septuagint text of the codex and its iconographically complicated miniatures. I was able to decipher and analyze several miniatures in the manuscript that were previously thought by scholars to be unexplainable as well as reconsider the potential ramifications of the unusual text of the Vienna Genesis with regard to its possible function and reception in Late Antiquity. Toward the end of the fellowship period, I was also able to work on a narratological study of the pictorial and literary narrative presented in the pages of the Vienna Genesis. Finally, I wish to express my deep gratitude to the Albright Institute, and to the Kress Foundation for its generous support of my research in Jerusalem this past academic year.

Provenanced Coins of Herod the Great

Donald T. Ariel, Tel Aviv University
Educational and Cultural Affairs Fellow

In the context of a comprehensive study of the coins of Herod (ruled in Palestine, 37–4 BCE), I conducted a geographical distribution analysis of Herod’s coins, together with an analysis of pertinent archaeological contexts and the overall coin currency of the period. All published and unpublished provenanced coin finds of Herod were noted—along with the other late Hellenistic/early Roman coins from sites with those coins. Quantitative analysis of these coins has helped identify (or confirm) the historical reports of sites founded and occupied during Herod’s reign (e.g. Aphek-Antipatris), as well as sites with Herod’s coins but which were founded only after Herod’s death (e.g. Archelais).

Provenanced coins can help identify if more than one mint was in operation in Herod’s kingdom. Because of the disproportionate appearance of Herod’s dated coins at excavations at Samaria, and because those coins’ types bear iconography uncharacteristic of other Jewish coins, the dated group is likely to have been minted there. The mint of the undated Herod coins is universally identified in Jerusalem. The distribution analysis has tended to corroborate this. Other anomalies, however, in the excavated Samaria coins suggest a complex state of affairs there, and a solution may be found in a renewed look at the history of that site in the first century BCE.

The issues of the extent of Herod’s coin distribution within his kingdom and how far from the coins’ original minting location(s) these coins circulated, were considered. The overwhelming number of provenanced, undated (Jerusalem mint) coins of Herod were found, as expected, in Judea, and particularly in the capital. No coins, or almost no coins, were reported from Transjordan: the sparsely inhabited Gaulanitis, Batanea, Trachonitis and Auranitis, but also the more central Perea. As we know of Herod’s activity in those regions, and in Nabatea itself, it is likely the coins’ absence is due to the lack of excavations—or publications of excavations—from there.

Also within the borders of Herod’s kingdom a comparison was made of the quantities of Herod’s provenanced coins vis-à-vis the distribution of coins of other rulers who operated the Jerusalem mint. Most of Herod’s coin types are actually quite rare. A few types, however, while not rare, were certainly not as common and widely diffused as a number of other Jerusalem issues, such as those of Alexander Jannaeus (104–76 BCE), Herod’s son Archelaus (4 BCE–6 CE), and grandson Agrippa I (37–44 CE), and a number of prefect/procurator coins. This stands in stark contrast to the historiographical image of Herod as a very proactive king persistently investing in the infrastructure of his kingdom.

Outside of Herod’s borders, the small proportion of Herod coin finds was also felt. Examples are the coin finds from Curium in Cyprus (Cox 1959) and Antioch in Syria (Waage 1952). In those sites, while coins of the Jerusalem mint were found from every significant issue, no coins of Herod were found. Here, too, there is a disparity between the level of Herod’s economic ties with those areas, and the coin record.

From the finds of coins in well-stratified archaeological contexts, we endeavored to understand how long the various coin issues remained in circulation. It appears that Herod’s coins, together with other first-century issues of the Jerusalem mint, were current to some small extent until the end of the Jewish War in 70 CE. A more detailed analysis of coin distribution is now underway examining the types according to their newly established internal chronology (Ariel 2000–2002). It is hoped that different spreads over the kingdom for earlier and later coin types can be determined.

Sukkot From the Bible to the Talmud

Seth Klayman, Duke University
Educational and Cultural Affairs Fellow

Spending the 2004–2005 academic year at the W.F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research in Jerusalem has enabled me to make significant progress on my doctoral dissertation and grow as an aspiring scholar of Judaic Studies. My research project is entitled “The Emergence of ‘The Festival: Sukkot during the Second Temple Period.” The study is an investigation into the nature of the development of Sukkot from the Bible to Tannaitic literature.

The research that I undertook this year has yielded results that are foundational for my project. In a number of
instances, the findings diverge from previous research on Sukkot. For example, the prevailing view is that Sukkot was the pre-eminent festival in ancient Israel from earliest times. In contrast, my research finds that there is no clear evidence for such a view; this suggestion is based entirely on hypothetical reconstruction and conjecture. Rather, the importance of Sukkot steadily increased over time and this is observable in the Sukkot texts of the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple period literature.

A number of key biblical passages, situated within a Sukkot context, contributed to this increase in importance. The pentateuchal material gives evidence of three aspects of the development of Sukkot: rural observance, ritual observance, and remembrance. The earliest strands of biblical literature emphasize the rural component of Sukkot as a celebration of the ingathering from the threshing floor and wine press (Ex 23:16b; 34:22b). The ritual material contains descriptions of gathering at a central shrine (Deut 16:15), required sacrifices (Num 29:12–38), familial observance (Deut 16:14), rejoicing (Lev 23:40; Deut 16:14–15), septennial Torah reading (Deut 31:9–13), taking up of four arboreal species (Lev 23:40), and the building of booths (Lev 23:42). The ritual of dwelling in booths synthetically invokes a remembrance of the Exodus experience: a wordplay involving the booths as structures (Sukkot; Lev 23:42) and the place in which Israel first camped after leaving Egypt (Sukkot; Ex 12:37), fueling the link between the festival and remembrance of the Exodus.

The Sukkot material within the Deuteronomic History, and during the Persian period, retains the rural, ritual, and remembrance components. For example, 1 Kings 8, which plays an important role in the development of Sukkot, makes reference to the rains expected during the ingathering season, provides implicit evidence of the connection of Sukkot to a septennial Torah reading, and recalls the Exodus no fewer than three times. A number of these elements are also present in an oracle that the prophet Haggai delivered during Sukkot (Hag 2:1–9) and in Zechariah 14, a passage filled with Sukkot imagery.

In the Hellenistic and Roman periods of Jewish history, the most conspicuous components of Sukkot observance are elements that are not present, or not explicit, in the earliest biblical material. These elements include: Sukkot’s connection with an eschatological hope, association with the nations, water, light, warfare, and kingship. The dissertation argues that in the Persian Period the rural, ritual, and remembrance components of the festival become reinterpreted in a manner that allows them to support these Sukkot themes.

The Albright Institute has served as a superb setting in which to research and write. A number of the outings to archaeological sites—such as the newly uncovered portion of the pool of Siloam in the City of David—have greatly enhanced my textual study. My project will also greatly benefit from the feedback I received from lecturing on my work in the presence of senior scholars with similar interests. The nature of the community, not only in facilitating intellectual growth, but also in terms of its personal warmth, is something that my family and I will always remember with fondness.

**Filling in the Gap: Issues in the Amram Document**

Robert R. Duke, University of California, Los Angeles Educational and Cultural Affairs Fellow

The official publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls is near completion; however, the use of this corpus for understanding Second Temple Judaism will continue. In 2001, Professor Émile Puech published volume 31 in the series, *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*. This volume included numerous Aramaic, pseudepigraphical texts. One text, currently entitled *The Vision of Amram*, is represented by at least 5 copies (4Q543–547). This document, in my current understanding, is pre-Hasmonean, a time period which still needs to be clarified. The purpose of my dissertation is to define the date and purpose of this document.

To begin with, who is Amram? In biblical literature, Amram is an extremely minor figure, described only as “a man from the house of Levi,” who happens to be Moses’ father. Besides this generic introduction of Amram, he also appears in some genealogical lists. How does this flat character spawn an entire document during the Second Temple Period? Expansion of biblical events and characters is common among the extra-canonical texts in Second Temple literature, and the lack of biblical information about Amram provided an opportunity for this type of development.

My major goal during my residency at the Albright Institute was to complete a new edition of this text and to define the major issues which concerned the author of this document. Admittedly, my new edition does not radically differ from the *editio princeps* of Professor Puech; however, some minor changes have led to a new interpretation of this work’s purpose. For example, previous work on this document has understood much of Amram’s speeches to be directed toward Aaron, not Moses. From a new reading of the initial episode in the document, I believe Moses is a major figure. This fact escaped previous scholarly notice, since Amram does not use the name Moses in the first episode. However, he does use Moses’ Hebrew birth name, *Mal’akyah*. This tradition is found in later works like Pseudo-Philo and George Syncellus (*A full discussion of this matter is forthcoming in Dead Sea Discoveries*). Chronological issues were also a major concern for this author. The 430 years of Exodus 12:40 was a major topic of discussion of many Second Temple and subsequent writers. The chronological understanding in this document is unique and differs from other presentations of history in the *Aramaic Levi Document, Jubilees* and the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Endogamous marriages of the Levitical family were also discussed, for Miriam is married to Uzziel, Amram’s brother. In later Jewish tradition (Josephus and rabbinic lit-
erature), Miriam’s husband is either Hur or Caleb, both from the tribe of Judah. These traditions may have been more ancient than the one preserved in the Amram document. If so, there must have been theological and political reasons for the discussion of endogamous marriage. This is one factor which points toward a pre-Hasmonean period when struggles over priestly authority were common.

I am still at the beginning stages of research, which will continue this summer on my return to UCLA; however, I have already found that these fragments, once properly deciphered, can fill in the gaps of our understanding of early Judaism. The Albright Institute has had a major impact on the history of Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship, and I am grateful for the opportunity provided me to further this legacy.

Approaching Nabataean Identity, Community, and State Formation

Andrew M. Smith II, Independent Researcher
Educational and Cultural Affairs Fellow

My research project at the Albright focused on “Nabataean Identity, Community, and State Formation,” and the extent to which the Nabataean experience might be used as a comparative model for similar social processes among other indigenous groups in the Near East. For this research, I drew upon a variety of sources, artistic and archaeological, epigraphic, and narrative. My primary goal was to understand the process of Nabataean sedentarization and community development in urban settings, as well as the varying social relations that accompanied this transition. In support of my research, I have begun collecting and analyzing inscriptions from Nabataean settlements in the Negev, as well as conducting an overall study of the archaeology of these settlements. This research will form an important part of the expansion, revision, and future publication of my doctoral dissertation as a book tentatively titled, “Identity, Community, and State Formation in the Roman Near East.”

Integral to my research is a reassessment of current understanding of the nature of Nabataean tribalism, which has centered so far on the feasibility of extrapolating analogou ethnographic data from nineteenth-century sources. Too often, scholars have oversimplified the complexities of tribal societies, particularly as to how they interpret processes of state formation, but also as to how they believe personal and group identities are constructed and maintained in such societies, which depends above all on context. I have discovered that a consideration of Nabataean communal development within its social, economic, political, and cultural contexts makes clear that many scholars have based their work on a flawed assumption, that is, that the tribalism of indigenous groups documented in nineteenth-century sources matches that of the Iron Age, Nabataean, or early Roman periods. I am currently writing up this analysis, and I hope to submit it for publication in the near future.

In addition to this research, I also completed an article tentatively entitled, “Pathways, Roadways, and Highways: Networks of Communication and Exchange in Wadi Araba,” which I have submitted to Near Eastern Archaeology. Writing this article has provided me with a better understanding of pastoralists and their movements in relation to classical-period sites in the region, which has enhanced my understanding of Nabataean state formation. The research for this article is also an extension of my web-based project (http://waarp.tripod.com) on Wadi Araba, developed in 1996, which provides a forum for synthesizing current knowledge of the Araba’s physical and cultural landscape. The impetus for this project remains that of integrating the cultural landscapes of the Negev and southern Jordan for all ancient periods, especially those during which the valley was more a bridge between regions than a divide. Since I began the Wadi Araba Archaeological Research Project in 1996, it has spawned various ongoing field projects in the region, including the Rujm Taba Project, directed by Benjamin Dolinka, the Bir Madhkur Project, which I direct, and the Central Araba Archaeological Survey, a component of the Bir Madhkur Project. Importantly, raw data from these field projects have informed my understanding of Nabataean cultural history.

Thus, my experience as an Educational and Cultural Affairs Fellow at the Albright has been invaluable in forming an intellectual basis for my work on “Approaching Nabataean Identity, Community, and State Formation.” I am most grateful for the opportunity to have lived and worked at the Albright, and to have been a productive part of the Institute’s long and rich history.

Fragment of a Monumental Roman Inscription at the Islamic Museum of the Haram as-Sharif (Temple Mount), Jerusalem

Tibor Grull, Saint Paul Academy, Budapest, Hungary
Andrew W. Mellon Fellow

Although in the last half century, almost every decade produced an important work on the first Jewish War, there are still many challenges left in this field of research, especially in utilizing archaeological and epigraphic material. When the supplement to the third volume of Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum was published in 1902, only 67 inscriptions out of the 15,000 came from Iudaea/Syria-Palaestina. Today, we are in possession of ca. 5,000 Greek and Latin inscriptions from this area.

The inscription, which was the focus of my research as a Mellon Fellow at the Albright Institute, is considered to be an absolute novum. This massive limestone slab (max. height 0.97 m, width 0.75 m, thickness 0.27 m) was identified, according to Khader Salameh, Director of the Islamic Museum, among a collection of architectural fragments (capitals, architraves, etc.) in the courtyard in front of the Islamic Museum, in the southwest section of the Haram al-Sharif. Mr. Salameh has no information about the provenience of the stone, but he thought it likely that it was found on the Haram itself. The fragment contains five lines of text:
The letters are equally 11.5 cm high, and the words are separated by *hederae*. The text was carved with relative negligence; nevertheless it is clearly legible, but the second line has been intentionally carved out. Although the text is fragmentary—only a small part of a much wider dedicatory inscription—it contains the key word, *arcum*, which obviously means that it can be considered as part of a Roman honorary arch.

The key to the explanation of the fragment is the second erased line, which remained legible. In all probability this line contained the name of the person who had the inscription carved, and the first word can be completed as *luissu* ("by the command of"). This was nothing other than L. Flavius Silva, the conqueror of Masada, who governed Iudaea 73/74–79/80 CE. Two milestones, found on the Ophel in 1972 and 2000 also contained an intentionally carved name of a *legatus legio[nis] X Fretensis* under Vespasian and Titus, beginning with L.- Benjamin Isaac and Mordechai Gichon had already proposed the reading L. *Flavius Silua* (1974), but this was rejected by Sir Ronald Syme (1978) and Werner Eck (1999). In my opinion, this new fragment reinforced the correctness of the original reading of the two milestones. Silva’s name was carved out intentionally—in all probability due to his “damnation of memory” (*damnatio memoriae*). Thus we already know that after his consulate (80/81 CE) he probably fell victim to Domitian’s reign of terror.

The missing one or two lines of our text must have contained Vespasian’s and Titus’ titles. The first extant line is probably a part of a longer narrative text (e.g. *ob judaicos devictos et Hierosolymam deletam*), i.e. “for having conquered the Jews and destroying Jerusalem”), just as it can be read on Titus’ Arch dedicated by the Senate in Rome (ILS 264). The second line contained Silva’s name and rank ([... *ius*su *L(ucii) Flavi A[uli?] f(ili)] Vol(ina tribu) Silvæ Noni Bassi leg(ati) leg(ionis) X Fret(ensis) et leg(ati) pr(o) pr(aelato) provinciae Iu[dæae]), in all probability in its complete form, mentioning not only the military rank (as on the Ophel milestones) or only the governorship (as his dedications at Urbs Salvia, cf. AE 1961, 140; 1969/70, 183a-b; 1961, 140; 1995, 434). The completion of the third line needs further comparative research, considering the mysterious DE F[... - - -] at the end of the line. We know practically nothing of *Athenagoras*, who appears in the fourth line, and consequently, we cannot complete this line, except for the possible conjecture of the participle *curante* (“under supervision of”). The *Maximo* in the fifth line can probably be identified with L. Laberius Maximus procurator Iudaeæ (cf. Jos. Bell. 7.216). A more accurate completion of the inscription is impossible, unless another fragment turns up. The monumental honorary arch, as well as the two milestones also erected by L. Flavius Silva, clearly prove that the Roman military and civilian establishment began the rebuilding of Jerusalem as a genuine Roman legionary fortress without delay, whose progress reached its zenith with the foundation of Aelia Capitolina half a century later.

---

Between Phoenicia and Galilee: A Study of Local and Imported Ceramics from the Hellenistic and Roman-period Site of Shaar ha–Amaqim, Israel

**Jolanta Mlynarczyk, Institute of Archaeology, Warsaw University; Research Centre for Mediterranean Archaeology, Polish Academy of Sciences**

**Andrew W. Mellon Fellow**

My project deals with a ceramic assemblage dated to the Hellenistic and Roman periods, uncovered at Shaar ha–Amaqim during 1984–1998 by the team directed by Arthur Segal, University of Haifa. The specific geographical situation of the site (the ancient name of which remains unknown) between the plain of Acco, the hills of the Lower Galilee and the Jezreel Valley, made it an ideal place for potential exchange of different ceramic traditions, inland and coastal ones.

The essential part of the research focused on typological and chronological aspects of commonware (domestic) pottery from Shaar ha-Amaqim. The ceramic typology was based on the criteria of form, and fabric. Most of the forms were dated on the basis of parallels combined with stratigraphic sequence of the Shaar ha-Amaqim deposits wherever such evidence was available. Also, Eastern Sigillata A vessels, as well as other imported ceramics provided a fairly precise chronological horizon for the associated local wares.

Comparisons made between the ceramic assemblage of Shaar ha–Amaqim and those from other sites in northern Israel (Dor, Shiqmona, Acco and Tell Keisan; Jalame, Bet She‘arim and Sepphoris; Gush Halav, Meiron and Khirbet Shema‘; Tel Anafa and Hippos) allowed for distinguishing characteristics of pottery production in the western Galilee throughout several centuries. It seems that during the Hellenistic period, the area of Shaar ha-Amaqim was supplied pottery both by western Galilean workshops and by those situated in the coastal zone; by the turn of the era, the latter were superseded by the former. Of special interest is the question of the chronological development of the store jars’ types in the western Galilee and coastal Phoenicia from the Hellenistic to the Roman periods.

A group of jars in the 1st- to 2nd-century BCE assemblage seems to be a missing link between the Phoenician hолomeh baggy jars of the late 2nd–1st centuries BCE and the Tyrian holomeh amphora of the 2nd century BCE; however, their manufacturing source remains to be located.

The Shaar ha–Amaqim pottery reflects the historical development of the site: (1) The Persian-period assemblage is rather meager and consists mainly of storage jars. In striking contrast with Tell Keisan situated nearby in the Acco plain, it contains virtually no Greek imports. Probably the site was a farm until the first half of the 3rd century BCE. (2) The assemblage of the 3rd to 2nd century BCE contains transport amphorae and fine wares imported from different areas of the Mediterranean (Cyprus, Rhodes, coastal Asia Minor, southern Italy) suggesting trade contacts and rather high material status of the inhabitants of what could be a manor house(?). (3) In the late Hellenistic period (towards the end of the 2nd century BCE?), a watchtower was built at the site, which continued to abound in
imported and local wares. (4) The 1st-century BCE ceramic assemblage is remarkable for its specific character, transitional from the Hellenistic to Roman repertoire in terms of shapes and fabrics, while the group attributed to the 1st century CE consists of “purely” Roman-period material. (5) The ceramic assemblage pertaining to the period following the First Jewish Revolt comes from unsealed loci of the upper levels and from a water cistern, which apparently was being used until the mid-4th century CE and yielded a rich deposit of commonware forms. The supply sources of pottery appear to be strictly local, or regional (such as the pottery-making village of Kfar Hananya), with very few imported vessels and virtually no fine wares at all. In all probability, the site was by then a Jewish rural settlement, possibly a satellite settlement of Bet Shearim.

The Historical Background of the Zodiac Mosaic Calendar in the Lower Synagogue at Hammath-Tiberias

Marek Titien Olszewski, University of Warsaw
Andrew W. Mellon Fellow

My research on the zodiac mosaic calendar conducted at the Albright Institute involved six synagogues and an investigation of their mosaic floor decoration including motifs borrowed from the repertoire of pagan art, namely, the twelve signs of the zodiac, the four seasons and Helios. These synagogues were in two regions of Palestine—the Galilee and Judah. The debate relating to the iconography of these floors focuses on two questions: why they were made, and who actually borrowed the motif?

The main focus of my research was on the synagogue at Hammath-Tiberias. M. Dothan dates Stratum IIa of the synagogue with zodiac mosaic floor to the early 4th century (306–320 CE; M. Dothan, Hammath-Tiberias I: Early Synagogues and the Hellenistic and Roman Remains, Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983). Johnson, who published the ceramic material from the excavations at Hammath-Tiberias, has questioned the dating of the entire stratigraphical sequence (Hammath-Tiberias II: Late Synagogue, Jerusalem 2000: Israel Exploration Society, p. 93). Dunbabin dated the founding of the synagogue in Stratum IIa to the last quarter of the 4th century (Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World, Cambridge 1999, p. 189 n.6); and Magness preferred a date in the second half of the 4th century or even at its close. (Helios and the Zodiac Cycle in Ancient Palestinian Synagogues in Symbiosis, Symbolism and the Power of the Past. Canaan, Ancient Israel, and their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palæstina, 2000 ed. W. G. Dever & S. Gitin, Eisenbrauns 2003, pp. 363–69).

In light of these new chronological findings, I studied the history of the Jews in 4th-century Tiberias, the capital of the Jews in Palestine, as well as those in the Diaspora. The Sanhedrin presided over by the patriarchs (nasi) was located there, as was the most famous rabbinic academy. In 358/9, patriarch Hillel II instituted a reform of the Jewish calendar still in use today. The reform called for a correlation of the lunar and solar calendars over a 19-year cycle, requiring a thirteenth month to be added in leap years after the regular twelve months of the lunar calendar. On the mosaic from Hammath-Tiberias, two inscriptions mention Ioullos-Hillel in Latin—cited as such in a letter written by Julian the Apostate some time between 361 and 363 CE. Thus, we have an inscription that informs us that “Ioullos the supervisor completed the whole work.” Another inscription mentions Severos, who initiated the building of the synagogue at Hammath-Tiberias, and who was a disciple of the most famous of the Patriarchs. It is likely that the Patriarchs in question were Hillel II and his father Jude II.

It remains for us to connect these facts—the creation of the mosaic in the synagogue at Hammath-Tiberias by Severos and Hillel II, and the revolutionizing of the Jewish calendar by Hillel II. Thus, the mosaic from the synagogue at Hammath-Tiberias represents the new lunar-solar calendar of Hillel II. The mosaic floor was executed some time in the 360s by a mosaic workshop of the highest class brought to Palestine from one of the great metropolises of the Roman Empire (possibly Alexandria, Nea Paphos, Antiochia, Apamea). The mosaic exudes a pagan mood only because Hillel II had nothing but pagan calendar models from which to choose. They contain a few minor modifications (introducing the motif of the moon and stars and choosing the 12 signs of the zodiac instead of the 12 months) to symbolize the new Jewish liturgical calendar. To determine the exact date of the origin of the mosaic at Hammath-Tiberias, I took advantage of Dothan’s information regarding the destruction in an earthquake of the Stratum IIb synagogue which preceded the erection of the synagogue with mosaic floor in Stratum IIa. The best known earthquake, which took place on May 19 of 363, destroyed over half of the town. We know that the mosaic from the Stratum IIa synagogue was executed in the time of Hillel II, who is said to have died around 365 CE. Thus, the mosaic was executed most likely immediately after the earthquake in 363, that is, in 364 or 365.

Discovering the meaning of the zodiac mosaic from Hammath-Tiberias in the historical and religious context of the times is of central importance also for the history of Jewish art in Antiquity, in Roman and Byzantine times. The role Hillel II played in the development of Jewish figural art in Palestine has not been taken note of to date. From now on, the Jewish art of Palestine should be discussed as pre-Hillel II—modest and representing a limited variety of figural motifs—and post-Hillel II, when thanks to the authority of the Patriarch from Tiberias it is characterized by a previously unknown richness of figural scenes.
November 15–19, 2005
The 9th Conference of the International Committee for the Conservation of Mosaics (ICCM) will be held in Tunisia. Deadline for submission of abstracts is Nov. 15, 2004. Contact: Demetrios Michaelides, Archaeological Research Unit, University of Cyprus, Kallipoleos 75, Nicosia 1678. Email: dmichael@spidernet.com.cy

November 16–19, 2005
ASOR Annual Meeting, Hyatt Regency, Penn’s Landing, Philadelphia, PA.

November 19–22, 2005

November 19–21, 2005
Arms and Armour through the Ages (from the Bronze Age to Late Antiquity). The Institute of Classical Archaeology of Trnava University and Institute of the Selcuk University at Konya http://klasarch.truni.sk or klasarch@truni.sk. The symposium will focus on political, religious and technical aspects of weapons and warfare as well as on topics concerning militaria in the cult, in the literary sources and in the arts. All papers will be published in our journal Anodos 4/2005. Modra-Harmónia (ca. 25 km from Bratislava, Slovakia). Symposium languages: English, German, French. The Symposium is jointly organised by the Institute of Classical Archaeology of Trnava University and the Institute of Archaeology of the Selcuk University at Konya (Turkey). Contact: Pavol Hnila, pavol.hnila@student.uni-tuebingen.de.

November 30–December 4, 2005
The Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association will meet at the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, DC. This year’s conference will feature a Special Invited Session by the Middle East/Archaeology Sections of the AAA: From Sumer to Southern Iraq on Friday afternoon. For information visit www.aaanet.org/mts/mtgs.htm.

January 5–8, 2006
The 107th Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America will take place in Montréal, Quebec. A preliminary version of the program is available online at http://www.archaeological.org/webinfo.php?page=10096. Any additional questions concerning submissions should be directed to 2006annualmeeting@ai.aubu.edu.

March 17–20, 2006
American Oriental Society Annual Meeting, Red Lion Hotel, Seattle, WA. Fifth Avenue, 1415 5th Avenue Seattle, WA 98101. Contact: http://www.umich.edu/~aos/.

March 26–30, 2006
A symposium entitled Archaeological Chemistry: Analytical Techniques and Archaeological Interpretation is being organized by members of the Archaeometry Lab at MURR. The symposium will be held at the American Chemical Society meeting in Atlanta, Georgia. In the past, most of these archaeological chemistry symposia have resulted in a very high quality symposium volume. We plan to produce the same. And, we hope that many of our colleagues in Archaeological Chemistry will choose to participate by describing their most up to date research in the symposium. We are currently applying to different funding sources to assist students and faculty in covering a portion of their travel costs. If you are interested in participating and would like to be added to our mailing list, please send your contact information (email address and potential research topic) to: Michael D. Glasscock (glasscockm@missouri.edu), Robert J. Speakman (speakmanr@missouri.edu) or Rachel S. Popelka (rsp89@mizzou.edu).

March 31–April 1, 2006
An international conference to be held at the British Museum on the theme of Transanatolia: Connecting East with West in the Archaeology of Ancient Anatolia seeks to bring together academics to explore the similarity and diversity of cultures across Anatolia in the Neolithic through to the Bronze Age and examine Anatolia’s position as the physical and cultural bridge between continents. Papers are invited on the following subjects: Geography and trade routes across Anatolia; Recent research and excavations in Central Anatolia; Inter-regional relationships and exchange patterns; Cultural and theoretical divides between East and West Anatolia. It is expected that the proceedings of this conference will be published. Please send proposals for papers, in the form of a 200-word abstract, to the organisers: Dr Alan M. Greaves (greaves@liv.ac.uk); Dr Alexandra Fletcher (airving@thebritishmuseum.ac.uk). Note: This conference is scheduled to complement ICAANE in Madrid (03–08.04.06).

April 3–8, 2006
The Fifth International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East (ICAANE) will be held at the Universidad Autónoma in Madrid, Spain. For information, email sicaane@uam.es.

April 20–22, 2006
The Archaeology Department of the University of Durham will host the International Conference on the Ubaid, “The Ubaid Expansion? Cultural Meaning, Identity and Integration in the Lead-up to Urbanism.” Inquire of Dr. Robert Carter at ubaid.conference@durham.ac.uk for information and to register.

April 21–23, 2006
A conference on Lawrence of Arabia as Archaeologist, Explorer, and Ethnographer will convene at Lee University in Cleveland, TN. Papers invited. Please send proposals to Wesley Burnett and Gerald L. Mattingly at gmattingly@jbc.edu. To add your name to the mailing list, please contact Richard Jones at rjones@leeuniversity.edu.

May 2–6, 2006
The 2006 International Symposium on Archaeometry will be held in Quebec City, Canada. For information, visit the ISA website http://www.isa2006.ulaval.ca. Email at info@isa2006.ulaval.ca.

July 2–6, 2006

NEW ASOR MERCHANDISE

Need a T-shirt, mug, messenger bag, or baby bib?

We would like to announce that a new line of ASOR products is now available for ordering on the Web at www.cafepress.com/asor2005.

All profits generated will go to benefit ASOR. Please tell your friends and order them for your excavations.
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The David Brown Book Co.
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825 Houston Mill Road
Atlanta, GA 30329