



Review

Author(s): Konstantinos Kopanias

Review by: Konstantinos Kopanias

Source: *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 111, No. 3 (Jul., 2007), pp. 588-589

Published by: Archaeological Institute of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40027099>

Accessed: 08-11-2015 03:26 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Archaeological Institute of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Journal of Archaeology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

to Achaeon influence" (119). The enhancement, however, with gigantic monolithic ashlar blocks of the sanctuaries at Paphos and Kition should be assigned to the Late Cypriot IIC/IIIA transition; more importantly, they conform to the same monumental architectural model that does not find a parallel on the Mycenaean mainland.

Some additions are also needed to bring the references up to date. For instance, the discussion of "Cult Places at Enkomi" (213) lacks Webb's careful analysis, "The Sanctuary of the Ingot God at Enkomi" (in P. Fischer, ed., *Contributions to the Archaeology and History of the Bronze and Iron Ages in the Eastern Mediterranean, Studies in Honour of Paul Åström* [Vienna 2000] 69–82). In this study, she establishes that the sanctuary also housed (in the northeast adyton) a female deity, probably of the Astarte on the Ingot type. It is surprising that Webb's indispensable *Ritual Architecture, Iconography and Practice in the Late Cypriot Bronze Age* (SIMA-PB 75 [Jonsered 1999]) is missing from the bibliographies.

In spite of its weak structure, the book does not give false promises: it is not a work on the political history of ancient Cyprus and it should not be consulted as a history textbook. True to its subtitle, *Ancient Sources and Archaeological Evidence*, it is an encyclopedia of the Cypriot Aphrodite, a compendium indispensable to anyone trying to interpret the cultural phenomena that constituted the Cypriot goddess. It is also an outstanding product of what can be defined as a Cyprus school of archaeology. Although long in an embryonic stage, this school of thought is now beginning to flourish, which means that desperate interpretative attempts to fit the culture of the island into continental (Oriental or Occidental) models are being left in the past. In this respect, one salutes in Karageorghis' *Kypris* the effective promotion of the Great Goddess' indigenous development and her successful establishment as the "ancestor of the Greek Aphrodite" (xvi).

MARIA IACOVOU

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH UNIT
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CYPRUS
1678 NICOSIA
CYPRUS
MARIAI@UCY.AC.CY

THE GREEKS IN THE EAST, edited by A. Villing. Pp. 123, b&w figs. 109, color pls. 44, tables 4. The British Museum, London 2005. \$50. ISBN 0-86159-157-7 (paper).

This volume contains most of the papers presented at the colloquium "The Greeks in the East," organized by Schofield and held 9–10 December 1997 in the British Museum. Because of the long delay, the essays have been updated to reflect the state of research in 2002, in two cases even in 2004 (Lemos, W.-D. Niemeier). The papers were written in English, with the exception of one in French (Muller).

W.-D. Niemeier (1–36) presents a detailed essay on the results of the excavations conducted by him and B. Niemeier since 1994 in the area of the Temple of Athena in Miletus. In his richly illustrated and referenced paper, the author offers

a thorough discussion of this site's continuous stratigraphy from the Late Chalcolithic up to the end of the Mycenaean presence. Based on firm archaeological data, he addresses a series of questions of great importance, such as the character of the Minoan and Mycenaean settlement, the correlation of the Hittite textual references to Miletus/Milawanda with the actual finds, and the problem of the "Ionian migration."

Muller (37–45) offers a brief discussion of the technique and iconography of the mural paintings of the Royal Palace in Mari (21st to 18th/17th century). Although the author is ready to accept possible connections to the paintings of Çatalhöyük (eighth millennium), she rejects a Minoan influence (contra, e.g., Parrot, Crowley, W.-D. Niemeier), based on the axiomatic assumption that the destruction of the Royal Palace of Mari by Hammurabi ("1761 B.C.") predates the Minoan paintings of the second Minoan palaces ("later than 1700 B.C."). The Mesopotamian character of the paintings is indeed obvious, but the fact that some texts of the Mari palace mention Cretan artifacts is a strong indication of contacts with Minoan Crete. The author should have at least discussed the discrepancies of the various possible Mesopotamian and Aegean chronologies and also the fact that the earliest (MM II/III) so-far known Minoan fresco fragment ("Loom Weight Deposit," Knossos) could be contemporary or even predate the paintings of Mari.

Collon (47–51) presents summarily some aspects of Bronze Age trade. He discusses the mixed origin of the goods found in the Uluburun shipwreck, the longevity of several decoration motifs (e.g., the "scroll cross" and the "quadruple spiral beads"), and the appearance of similar motifs and techniques in distant places of the east Mediterranean world. She shows how frustrating the research into exchange and transfer of motifs can be.

Lemos (53–60) discusses the relationship of the Euboeans and the East in the Geometric period, based not only on the Greek pottery found in the eastern Mediterranean but also on existing historic evidence. She builds a strong case against the theory that trade was controlled solely by the Levantines (contra A. and S. Sherratt). Lemos demonstrates convincingly that changing political and social circumstances produced a complex picture: trade was sometimes dominated by the Euboeans (950–900 B.C.E.), sometimes by the Levantines (900–850 B.C.E.), and sometimes by both (850–750 B.C.E.).

Lehmann (61–92) offers a preliminary evaluation of unpublished Syrian and Phoenician pottery from Al Mina in the British Museum. The author presents an adequate sample of the material available to him (63–80) and discusses the distribution in the Levant of Syrian and Phoenician pottery types that were uncarthd in Al Mina. He concludes that in the eighth century, Al Mina was inhabited by Greeks, Phoenicians, and Syrians; it was a small harbor controlled by the kingdom of Unqi and served as its gateway to northern Syria and eventually Mesopotamia until it came under Assyrian control soon after 740 B.C.E.

Ashton and Hughes (93–103) present the results of scientific analyses (using neutron activation analysis and inductively coupled plasma-atomic emission spectrometry) on later pottery (539–301 B.C.E.) from Woolley's excavation in Al Mina. Their examination shows that many vase types that were originally believed to have been manufactured locally were in fact imported, probably from Miletus or western Asia

Minor. The high quality of locally produced copies brings the authors to the conclusion that they were produced by Greek potters or their descendants, and thus that Al Mina was, during this period, under the control of Greek merchants.

Williams (105–14) presents a small group of Late Classical jewelry in the British Museum that is said to originate from Phocaea on the west coast of Asia Minor. He also offers a helpful overview of the east Greek, Lydian, Cypriot, and Achaemenid jewelry of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E. and demonstrates that objects of mixed styles often make classification difficult.

In the last essay, Curtis (115–23) briefly surveys Greek influence on Achaemenid art and architecture in Iran and Mesopotamia, excluding, however, the so-called Graeco-Persian art in Anatolia. He concludes that some Ionian influence is indeed visible in the stoneworking and building techniques at Pasargadae and Persepolis but not in the minor arts (pottery, glass, metal vessels, coins, ivories, textiles, seals, jewelry). Interestingly, this conclusion seems to contradict some Greek literary sources (121).

This carefully edited volume covers a wide thematic spectrum and contains a collection of stimulating and informative essays. Although some of the papers are no longer up-to-date, bibliographically the volume will become an important reference for scholars working on the intriguing subject of interregional contacts in the eastern Mediterranean; it should thus be considered as a useful addition to every archaeological library.

KONSTANTINOS KOPANIAS

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF ART
UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS
157 84 ATHENS
GREECE
KONKOP@ARCH.UOA.GR

THE ROMAN FRONTIER IN CENTRAL JORDAN: FINAL REPORT ON THE LIMES ARABICUS PROJECT, 1980–1989, by *S. Thomas Parker*, with contributions by *John Wilson Bethyon, Robin M. Brown, Vincent A. Clark, Patricia Crawford, Bert de Vries, Victoria L. Godwin, Jennifer C. Groot, Janet Duncan Jones, Jennifer E. Jones, Frank L. Kouchy, Andrea Lain, Eric C. Lapp, Joann McDaniel, Robert Schick, and Michael R. Toplyn*. 2 vols. (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 60). Vol. 1, pp. xxvi + 287, figs. 128, pls. 147, tables 19; vol. 2, pp. xv + 324, figs. 189, pls. 54, tables 56. Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Washington, D.C. 2006. \$125. ISBN 0-888402-298-6 (cloth, set).

The start of the renaissance in interest in the frontier (or *limes*) in the Roman province of Arabia (in essence, modern-day Jordan) can be fixed to 1971 and Bowersock's call for a revival in research into this part of the Roman empire. Of the generation of students who rose to Bowersock's challenge, Parker's work is crucial. He made his first visit to the region in 1975, followed by a survey along the central sector of the putative frontier in 1976 (*Limes Arabicus* Survey

[LAS]). The importance of the survey was its identification of the frontier's major chronological periods. Its success led to the *Limes Arabicus* Project (LAP) and the formalizing of a number of questions. The two most important of these were: (1) what caused the dramatic military buildup ca. 300, and (2) what factors explain the abandonment of the frontier? In pursuit of answers, LAP resurveyed the "frontier" zone, along its length and in advance of it, in central Jordan and undertook excavations at the fortress of el-Lejjun, a site whose name is redolent of its Roman origins, and at four smaller, contemporary sites.

Like all good archaeological projects, LAP was a model in disseminating its results with a regular series of interim reports and statements and through conference papers that represented either work in progress or the articulation of new thinking. The downside to such productivity was the veritable blizzard of publications (a rapid count suggests no less than 35 publications from 1976 to 2002). So, while one always had a good idea about what LAP had found, it was difficult to see what had changed between reports.

Such productivity has created an additional problem. LAP was executed in two phases (in 1979, 1980, 1982, and 1985 and then in 1987 and 1989), divided by several publications, including Parker's 1979 doctoral thesis ("Romans and Saracens" [Winona Lake, Md. 1986]) and *The Roman Frontier in Central Jordan: Interim Report of the Limes Arabicus Project, 1980–1985* (Oxford 1987).

The report reviewed here (hereafter *LAP 2006*) treats the data accumulated since 1985. Its large and lavish format strongly suggests it should be regarded as LAP's definitive statement. But if this is the intention then the outcome is uneven. The 1987 report, for instance, described the excavation of one of the buildings in the so-called West *Vicus*, while *LAP 2006* describes the other buildings explored in the *vicus* but with no attempt to mesh the results into an overview. Instead, the reader is advised to read the interim statements for detailed information about earlier work.

Volume 1 of *LAP 2006* opens with an introduction and a summary of the results of the survey component of the project (pt. 2). Parts 3 and 4 give the results of excavating a number of structures in and outside Lejjun. The fifth and final part describes the excavation of other sites close by, notably at Da'janiya. Volume 2 is also divided into parts, with various chapters describing the processing of the evidence recovered by LAP, including ceramics, glass, coins, ironworking, and paleoenvironmental evidence. Again the material from Lejjun features prominently. The result of all this analysis is brought together in part 7, "History of the Roman Frontier East of the Dead Sea" [*sic*]. The bulk of the discussion concerns the third and fourth centuries, the period when Lejjun flourished. The report is copiously illustrated, although there are a couple of surprising omissions. There seems to be a problem with the scales for figures 3.3 and 3.4 (a problem evident in the 1987 report).

Before proceeding, one historical point needs to be clarified. For the first 200 years of its existence, the Roman garrison of Arabia, as elsewhere in the empire, consisted of a mix of citizen infantry (legionaries) and a variety of non-citizen infantry, cavalry, and other units (the *auxilia*). The majority of these troops was stationed in what is now called the frontier zone. Sometime in the late third century, there appeared another distinction between the types of units in