

the region but to “enforce the ruling-forms” (p. 51); without evidence this remains hypothetical, as is his claim that the Latin of the milestones was probably clear (“klar”) to the locals although they did not know the language (p. 64). When Eck pronounces that had the emperor Caligula not died in the midst of the crisis stemming from his demand for the erection of his statue in the Jerusalem temple, “the Great Revolt would have happened 25 years earlier” (p. 52), he switches from history to prophecy.

Knowledge of the vast local literature from the High Empire, known collectively today as Rabbinic Literature, would have assisted Eck in qualifying his observations, as it would have given him access to the other side of the equation—to how the locals viewed and interacted with the very symbols he discusses. Eck’s lack of familiarity with contemporary Jewish sources from the very province he investigates resonates in other parts of the book as well. For example, he claims that “(t)o this day we have no explicit evidence for the existence of the *conventus* system in Judaea / Syria Palaestina” (p. 196). Such a sweeping statement about this touring provincial court, presided over by the governor or his representative, must be qualified, as it appears vividly in rabbinic texts, for example, in the court scene recounted by R. Yose in Tiberias, where the governor, called by the old Greek term *archontes*, pronounces the death penalty on two murderers (y. *Ber.* 2, 5c).

Essay 12 deals with the dissemination and role of Latin in the eastern, Greek- and Aramaic-speaking, areas of the empire. Through the analysis of four case studies, Eck distinguishes between regular *poleis* of the East—that is, old municipal centers that had maintained their traditional, Greek-oriented civic structure under Roman rule—and imperially established *coloniae*. Whereas the former used Latin minimally, even when it came to the epigraphic presentation of official documents or inscriptions by imperial magistrates, the latter, by definition small replicas of Rome itself, tended to embrace Latin considerably more. Not much is new in this argument—see, for example, B. Isaac in *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel*, ed. A. Kasher et al. (1990), 154—although the statistical and specific discussions of the various sites here are quite illuminating. Also, in the process of presenting his case, Eck does not shy from refuting some of the widely held assumptions of the last generation, promulgated by major scholars like Fergus Millar and Benjamin Isaac, who held that the nature of Caesarea Maritima’s colonial status was merely honorary (pp. 144–45).

This latter point regarding the Latin character of Caesarea Maritima takes center stage in another of the book’s gems, essay 13, in which Eck forcibly and for the most part convincingly argues his case that army veterans were settled in the newly established colony in Caesarea in the wake of the Great Jewish Revolt, and that Latin was the colony’s chief municipal language, at least during the first two centuries of its existence. The article is full of scholarly nuggets, marred only by a few mistakes (e.g., Capercotani is not in the north of Galilee but rather south of that region, in the so-called Jezreel Valley, p. 158, cf. p. 188) and, once again, by the neglect of the Jewish sources that offer a plethora of additional local voices and perceptions that would have amplified and complicated this piece.

This selective, and admittedly limited, discussion of some of the book’s points should suffice to highlight its great value to anyone interested in the history of Judaea / Syria Palaestina or the eastern Roman Empire in general. Werner Eck’s work is a must read, and we are all in debt to his decades of toiling on this material and for the production of such precious scholarship.

YARON Z. ELIAV  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

---

*The Archaeology of Prehistoric Arabia: Adaptation and Social Formation from the Neolithic to the Iron Age.* By PETER MAGEE. Cambridge World Archaeology. New York: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2014. Pp. xv + 309, illus. \$99.

Peter Magee here presents a synthesizing study of the archaeology of Arabia from 9000 to 800 BCE and positions it in a broader Near Eastern context (p. 2). Little of his previous work has been cast in terms of American anthropological archaeology, but this one is. It focusses more on anthropological

issues than antiquarian ones. Magee concentrates on the earlier periods, as opposed to his many Iron Age studies.

This book has an inexpensive binding but is printed in good quality. The maps are well drawn and have good contrast; some photos do not (e.g., figs. 2.17, 3.4, 3.16) or say little about the object (figs. 2.9, 8.5). The many maps relate uncomfortably to the text. Individual images do not characterize their periods as well as comparisons do. The images derive from a variety of sources. The drawings range from simple to good. Some are unattractive (e.g., figs. 6.17, 6.20, 6.25) or otherwise problematic (e.g., fig. 8.4 has no topographic data or context).

Ten chapters begin with a history of research beginning with Carsten Niebuhr and its effect on present-day archaeology. Current thought on research on “statehood” focusses on key sites such as Uruk/Warka. In chapter 1, Magee describes how the inhabitants of Arabia experienced economic and social change and contrasts the two adaptations (p. 11). Magee names two “important syntheses of the archaeology from c. 800 BC onwards” (p. 13), which he does not want to duplicate. However, one of these deals solely with the Yemen (Breton 2000) and the second (Hoyland 2003) is a fine book on Arabs and Arabia, philologically based with a thirty-page chapter on art and archaeology. These are not archaeological books on Arabia *per se* as a whole, as suggested.

Magee writes a detailed account in chapter 2 of ecological and environmental diversity in Arabia, the basis for further chapters. He divides Arabia into southeastern, western, and northeastern parts. For whatever reason, he has included Oman in the section “Western Arabia” (pp. 26–27). Although most writers understand the Nejd as a part of Saudi Arabia (maps; figs. 2.16, 3.3, 5.13), in reality it extends southward through the Yemen.

Magee’s treatment of the key parameter climate as it develops is thorough, the basis for what follows.

New and thorough is Magee’s treatment of the formation of Arabian society 7000–3000—the transition from Palaeolithic to Neolithic, which synthesizes disparate literature. The discussion also updates coverage of the Ubaid and Arabic Neolithic. Equally useful is Magee’s synthesis of the dark late fifth and fourth millennia, for which much of the research is not readily available.

Magee’s research has centered on the United Arab Emirates (UAE), which is apparent in his discussions of Eastern Arabia from 3000 to 2000 BCE (chapter 4). He details present understanding of the Hafit (3000–2500) and Umm an-Nar Periods (2500–2000), frequent subjects of discussion. Missing, however, are mention of reports on the key published tower tomb sites of al-Ayn and Shir (Yule and Weisgerber 1998), arguably important for Magee’s discussion of the transition to the Umm an-Nar Period (p. 96). Publications on the Hafit Period copper production in Oman are not mentioned (Yule and Weisgerber 1996: 141). The discussion of the voluminous Umm an-Nar trade is a perfect platform to consider aspects such as social cohesion, for the archaeology, texts, and social theory interact in an interesting way. Magee is particularly well read on this topic.

The account of the new field of Bronze Age archaeology in Western Arabia (chapter 5) has been developed from disparate field reports and provides a new overview of the sites ranging from the southern Yemen to Tayma in the northwest.

Eastern Arabia from 2000 to 1300 is known to us from disparate sources in different Arab countries. Magee reaffirms the new division between the Wadi Suq (2000–1500) and the Late Bronze Age (1500–1300), the latter based largely on the UAE site of Shimal. We know that the situation of Bahrain and Failaka differs from that of eastern Saudi Arabia, Qatar, the UAE, and Oman. Dilmun has numerous textual and archaeological links to Mesopotamia. Specialists seem to agree that the paucity of the Wadi Suq sites suggests a reversion to a nomadic lifestyle (p. 187).

Magee dates the rare and bronze-laden graves of al-Wasit W1 and Nizwa N1985 to the Late Bronze Age (p. 190). Bronze arrowheads were not introduced during the Late Bronze Age, as Magee would have us believe (cf. p. 192, fig. 6.25). They derive from contexts prior to this, e.g., Wadi Suq contexts in Ghalilah, Asimah, Shimal Sh1, and earlier (Yule 2001: I, 107–8).

Numerous serious discussions have been written regarding the human-animal symbiosis in Arabia (see chapter 7). Of great importance is the discussion of the domestication of the camel, the ship of the desert. Texts, archaeozoological data, and Magee’s own archaeological research in the UAE are

brought to bear. Dromedaries are of greatest importance in Arabia, but Bactrian camels (p. 207) and hybrids, as recently in the Yemen at Zafar, also occur (Uerpmann and Uerpmann 2013: 201). Magee gathers the evidence.

Magee explains the Early Iron Age II population boom as an adaptation to climatic conditions (p. 219). His map (fig. 8.1) shows some twenty of the known hundreds of sites. He redates the newly excavated site of Salut to his Iron I and II, which the excavators describe as Wadi Suq, Iron II and III (Avanzini and Phillips 2010: 95–102). In fact, in diverse publications (e.g., recently in press), the reviewer does not date his *falaj* settlements to “Iron Age II,” but rather to Iron III. To judge from recent publications of C. Phillips (2010) and J. Schreiber (2010), Magee’s Early Iron Age chronology is controversial, especially as regards Iron I and III outside of certain UAE sites. The largest Iron Age mountain fortification in southeastern Arabia is Lizq L1 (cf. p. 225), 175 m in width with an inner surface of more than 20,000 m<sup>2</sup>.

The reader will be grateful for Magee’s new plan of his Iron Age II excavation at Muweilah (fig. 8.10). Nowadays archaeologists accept that the earliest known occurrences of the *falaj* are found at UAE sites (pp. 215–21).

Magee’s discussion of Early Iron Age metalwork would be advanced by a mention of the largest hoard discovered in the region, that from Ibri/Selme in Oman (Yule and Weisgerber 2001). Instead, he discusses the interesting site of Saruq al-Hadid, known from a preliminary report (p. 235). Magee brings forts into the context of the Lizq fort L1. No *falaj* was necessary here. S. Kroll’s (not G. Weisgerber’s as on p. 236) recent report on Lizq (2013) appeared too late for Magee’s study.

As the reviewer differs with Magee on several points regarding the sources which he prefers, he nevertheless finds this book to be a step forward, especially in light of the vagaries of publication for the periods from 9000 to 3000.

PAUL A. YULE  
UNIVERSITÄT HEIDELBERG

#### REFERENCES

- Avanzini, A., and C. Phillips. 2010. An Outline of Recent Discoveries at Salut in the Sultanate of Oman. In *Eastern Arabia in the First Millennium BC*, ed. A. Avanzini. Pp. 93–108. Rome.
- Breton, J. F. 2000. *Arabia Felix: From the Time of the Queen of Sheba–Eighth Century B C to the First Century AD*. Notre Dame.
- Hoyland, R. 2003. *Arabia and the Arabs from the Bronze Age to the Coming of Islam*. London.
- Kroll, S. 2013. The Early Iron Age Fort at Lizq, Sultanate of Oman. *Zeitschrift für Archäologie außereuropäischer Kulturen* 5: 159–220.
- Phillips, C. 2010. Iron Age Chronology in South East Arabia and New Data from Salut, atlante of Oman. In Avanzini 2010: 71–79.
- Schreiber, J. 2010. The Iron I-Period in South-Eastern Arabia: A View from Central Oman. In Avanzini 2010: 81–90.
- Uerpmann, H.-P., and M. Uerpmann. 2013. Animal Remains from Zafār. In *Late Antique Arabia Zafār, Capital of Ḥimyar, Rehabilitation of a “Decadent” Society: Excavations of the Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg 1998–2010 in the Highlands of the Yemen*, ed. P. Yule. Pp. 195–219. Wiesbaden.
- Yule, P. 2001. *Die Gräberfelder in Samad al-Shān (Sultanat Oman): Materialien zu einer Kulturschichte*. Rahden.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. The Tower Tombs at Shir, Eastern Ḥajar, Sultanate of Oman. *Beiträge zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Archäologie* 18: 183–241.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. *The Metal Hoard from ‘Ibri/Selme, Sultanate of Oman*. Stuttgart.
- \_\_\_\_\_. In press. Valourising the Samad Late Iron Age. *AAE*.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and G. Weisgerber. 1996. Die 14. Deutsche Archäologische Oman-Expedition 1995. *MDOG* 128: 135–55.