

ARCHEOLOGIE

YENER, K.A. (éd.) — The 2003-2004 Excavations Seasons (Tell Atchana, Ancient Alalakh, Volume 1). Koç University Press, Istanbul 2010. (30 cm, XLI, 283). ISBN 978-605-5607-13-5. € 100,-.

Comme on le sait, Tell Atchana – Alalakh a été fouillé entre 1937 et 1949 par Sir Leonard Woolley et le rapport définitif fut rapidement publié ¹⁾. Les fouilles viennent d'y être reprises par une mission de l'Institut Oriental de l'Université de Chicago, sous la direction de Kutlu Aslıhan YENER, avec la contribution institutionnelle de *Koç Üniversitesi* à Istanbul et la collaboration de *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi* à Antakya. Cette énumération des universités qui participent à l'opération montre déjà l'importance du projet en cours. Par ailleurs, la visite du site web de la mission www.alalakh.org permet de se rendre compte du soin et des moyens substantiels avec lesquels la fouille actuelle est menée.

Le rapport de fouilles présenté ici concerne les deux premières campagnes et une opération de «sondage» qui a eu lieu en 2001 et 2006. Je commencerai ce compte rendu par une énumération des différents chapitres de la publication.

On trouve dans les premières pages, notamment, une table des matières bien détaillée, la liste des membres de la mission et la bibliographie. Le chapitre initial (*Introduction*, p. 1-9) est de la main de la directrice de la mission, K.A. Yener, qui y présente le projet global intitulé *Amuq Valley Regional Projects* inauguré en 1995 (cf. *OIP* 131). C'est dans ce cadre que se placent les nouvelles fouilles d'Alalakh. Après trois campagnes de préparation entre 2000 et 2002, la fouille à proprement parler a débuté en 2003.

Chapitre 2. K.A. Yener & G.B. Yazıcıoğlu, *Excavation Results* (p. 11-49): on y lira les résultats obtenus dans les différents chantiers de fouille (*Area 1, Area 2, Area 3*).

Chapitres 3-4-5. R.A. Mullins, *A Comparative Analysis of the Alalakh 2003-2004 Season Pottery with Woolley's Levels* (p. 51-66); E. Kozal, *Cypriot Pottery* (p. 67-80); A.B. Koehl, *Mycenian Pottery* (p. 81-84): ces chapitres contiennent l'étude préliminaire de la poterie mise au jour.

Chapitre 6. J. Lauinger, *Epigraphic Report* (p. 85-88): on y trouvera une présentation succincte des documents épigraphiques dont les copies (avec l'édition d'une des tablettes) ont été déjà publiées dans *JNES* 64 (2005), p. 53-58.

Chapitre 7. D. Collon, *Report on the Seals and Sealings found at Tell Atchana (Alalakh) during the 2003 Season of Excavation* (p. 89-97): il s'agit de l'étude circonstanciée des sceaux et des scellements.

Chapitre 8. K.A. Yener, *The Small Finds* (p. 99-109): c'est une description très synthétique des objets avec un tableau qui présente l'analyse d'une série d'objets en métal.

Chapitre 9. A.T. Boutin, *The Burials* (p. 111-121): le titre du chapitre est trompeur, car il ne s'agit pas de la publication des tombes (à paraître plus tard) mais de l'étude des ossements provenant des tombes.

Chapitre 10. S. Riehl, *Flourishing Agriculture in Times of Political Instability. The Archaeobotanical and Isotopic Evidence from Tell Atchana* (p. 123-136): l'étude principale porte sur les prélèvements botaniques, mais le chapitre

¹⁾ C.L. Woolley, *Alalakh. An Account of the Excavations at Tell Atchana in the Hatay, 1937-1949*, Londres 1955.

début par une synthèse sur les résultats déjà obtenus ailleurs et sur les méthodes utilisées.

Chapitre 11. K. Deckers, *Anthracological Research on Charcoal Samples from Atchana* (p. 137-139): c'est une brève présentation synthétique des résultats d'analyse des charbons de bois.

Chapitre 12. C. Çakırlar & S. Rossel, *Faunal Remains from the 2003-2004 Excavations at Tell Atchana* (p. 141-146).

Chapitre 13. S. Selover, *Metallurgical -Analysis of Clothing Pins from the 2004 Season* (p. 147-159): dans ce chapitre, sont présentés les résultats de l'analyse métallurgique et l'examen des techniques de fabrication de 15 épingles.

Chapitre 14. S. Batiuk & M. Horowitz, *Temple Deep Sounding Investigations 2001-2006* (p. 161-175): c'est le seul chapitre qui décrit une opération menée en dehors des limites chronologiques du rapport; les auteurs y décrivent les observations faites sur un profil nettoyé en 2001 en bordure des chantiers ouverts par C.L. Woolley et les résultats d'un forage effectué avec une sonde en 2006.

Appendix A. G.B. Yazıcıoğlu, *Excavated Loci and Archaeological Contexts* (177-213): cette partie contient aussi les plans détaillés de la fouille.

Appendix B. K.A. Yener & G.B. Yazıcıoğlu, *Small Finds Catalogue* (p. 215-283): en plus des informations relatives aux poteries et aux objets, chaque élément est aussi accompagné d'un dessin ou d'une photographie.

Cette énumération du contenu du volume montre clairement la richesse des informations livrées dans cette publication même si les résultats ne sont que provisoires. La directrice du projet considère la publication des fouilles qu'elle dirige comme «une responsabilité importante et une obligation morale» (*Preface*, p. XV) et ce rapport de fouille est une illustration parfaite de cette attitude indiscutablement exemplaire. Dans ces conditions, la plupart des remarques qui suivent doivent être considérées comme des suggestions pour une conception encore meilleure des rapports à venir. Je commencerai par des observations de détail avant d'en terminer par certaines considérations générales.

– La bibliographie est très riche. Mais on y trouve une série de thèses de doctorat non publiées; c'est une situation un peu embarrassante pour un lecteur moyen (dont je suis) car ces thèses ne sont pas directement accessibles. Par ailleurs, une de ces thèses (citée Pruss, 1996) vient d'être publiée en 2010 (Subartu 26).

– On aurait souhaité trouver dans le chapitre 1 une explication sur le nouveau carroyage mis en place, sur le système utilisé pour la numérotation des entités mises au jour et pour celle de la poterie et des objets.

– Les dates citées au début du chapitre 1 (p. 1) pour le Bronze moyen et le Bronze récent me paraissent incorrectes (ca 2200-1300 BC). Je suppose qu'il faut les corriger en «ca 2000-1200 BC».

– La Figure 1.3 (p. 9) est un curieux «plan topographique». On aurait souhaité disposer d'un vrai plan topographique, si possible mis en relation avec le plan topographique publié par C.L. Woolley en 1955. Par ailleurs, il y a, me semble-t-il, une incohérence entre les carrés de fouille repris sur ce «plan» et ceux qui figurent à la Figure 1.4.

– La lecture du chapitre 2 est rendue difficile par la citation de nombreux numéros d'inventaire qui encombrant le texte. On aurait pu présenter ces numéros soit sous forme de tableaux, soit dans des notes de bas de page, ce qui aurait allégé considérablement le texte.

– Le terme «locus» est utilisé, comme dans bien d'autres rapports de fouilles, pour désigner indistinctement toute construction ou installation, voire tout dépôt archéologique, en s'inspirant de l'usage mis en place dans la grande mission de l'Institut Oriental de Chicago dans la Diyala dans les années 1930 (cf. *OIC* 13, p. 7). Mais l'emploi du mot «locus» dans un sens si élargi ne me paraît pas justifiable sur le plan étymologique. Car le mot latin n'a qu'une connotation spatiale (de même qu'en anglais); il serait donc préférable de l'appliquer plutôt à un espace bi-dimensionnel.

– Il y a un problème manifeste avec les échelles utilisées pour les illustrations, surtout pour celles qui sont citées à partir du chapitre 2. En premier lieu, les échelles des relevés ne sont pas proportionnelles. Par exemple celle du relevé général à la Figure 2.2 (p. 35) est de 1/298,50! Celle du relevé de terrain détaillé d'une partie du même secteur à la Figure A.2 (p. 194) est de 1/58,82! En deuxième lieu, les échelles des relevés de la même catégorie ne sont pas les mêmes (voir notamment les Figures A.1 et ss, p. 193 ss). Enfin, en dernier lieu, les chiffres curieux que je viens de citer témoignent d'un certain manque de rigueur. Il en va de même pour les illustrations du catalogue (p. 215 ss). Il est possible que ces bizarreries soient le résultat de l'inefficacité (ou de l'ignorance?) de l'imprimeur mais on aurait dû mieux surveiller les opérations menées à l'impression.

– L'exposé des résultats de la fouille dans le chapitre 2 est accompagné de plans schématiques (p. 34 ss, qui donnent des aperçus d'ensemble) et les auteurs renvoient aussi aux relevés de terrain qui se trouvent à la fin de l'Appendix A (p. 193 ss). Quelques petites divergences (vraisemblablement accidentelles) existent entre les deux séries (voir par exemple Figure 2.2, p. 35, et les Figures A.12-13, p. 204-205, pour les fondations en pierres de la Sub-phase 1a, Area 2).

– L'utilisation du terme «installation pyrotechnique» pour les fours me paraît déplacée, puisque les fours de potiers ou domestiques que nous connaissons n'ont jamais contenu de produits explosifs (du moins à ma connaissance).

– Il aurait été souhaitable de disposer de relevés détaillés avec plans et coupes des fours de potiers décrits dans le chapitre 2 (p. 16 ss). Le relevé sommaire Figure 2.11 (p. 40) me paraît confus et n'aide pas à la compréhension de ces installations très intéressantes.

– Les tombes mises au jour en 2003-2004 feront l'objet d'une publication archéologique détaillée plus tard (cf. p. 24). Donc, on ne dispose pas encore de plans détaillés ni des illustrations de la totalité du mobilier funéraire (voir aussi plus bas la remarque à propos du Catalogue). Néanmoins, d'après les descriptions et les relevés de chantier publiés, je me suis posé deux questions:

1° Pourquoi les fosses des tombes n'ont pas pu être délimitées avec précision (cf. Figures A.9, 12, 18-19, 21)?

2° Peut-on admettre la présence d'un cimetière à la Phase 1 de l'Area 3 parce qu'on y a découvert 3 tombes (p. 27 ss et Figure A.21)? On a trouvé, en effet, des restes d'habitat au dessus de ces tombes et la tombe 03-3017 est une tombe à inhumation multiple. Ces tombes ne seraient-elles pas plutôt des inhumations dans des maisons ayant existé dans ce secteur?

– Quatre fragments de tablettes sont présentés dans le chapitre 6. Le fragment A03-R 1002 est l'angle supérieur droit d'une tablette de nature indéterminable (p. 86) et non «right corner of an envelope for a contract tablet» comme annoncé dans le chapitre 2 (p. 24). Il y a par ailleurs une

inversion dans les photographies: la Figure 6.3 est la photographie du fragment A03-R 1600 et la Figure 6.4 celle du fragment A03-R 1112.

– Parmi les sceaux et les empreintes étudiés par D. Collon se trouve la bulla A03-R 1115 portant l’empreinte d’un cachet avec un motif intéressant (p. 91) mais il ne s’agit pas d’une «bulla with Luwian hieroglyphic inscription» comme mentionné dans le chapitre 2 (p. 20). Pour un commentaire pertinent sur le motif, voir *sub* A03-R 1207 (le numéro A03-R 1209 cité *sub* A03-R 1115 est à corriger en A03-R 1207).

– Dans le catalogue, parmi d’autres appellations à mieux définir, se trouve celle de la perle A03-R 1012 qualifiée de «flower shaped bead». Il est plutôt d’usage d’appeler ce type de perles «melon bead» (G.A. Eisen, *AJA* 34, 1930, p. 20-43).

– Le catalogue final ne contient pas tous les objets retrouvés mais je ne suis pas arrivé à déterminer le critère qui a guidé le choix des pièces reprises dans la liste.

– En règle générale, dans la totalité du volume et dans le catalogue, les dessins des poteries et des objets sont remarquablement bien faits. Mais je me demande pourquoi certains objets qui auraient pu être dessinés ne l’ont pas été et seules des photographies en sont publiées?

Je voudrais terminer ce compte rendu par quelques considérations d’ordre général. Il est de nos jours à la mode (et parfois de bonne guerre pour obtenir des crédits de recherche) de présenter les objectifs et les résultats des recherches dans un langage emphatique. C’est aussi de cette manière que sont annoncés les objectifs des fouilles engagées à Alalakh en quatre points (*Research Design at Alalakh*, p. 4-6). On a ainsi l’impression que les nouvelles fouilles d’Alalakh vont révolutionner nos connaissances de l’âge du Bronze moyen et récent dans la région, voire dans toute la partie occidentale du Proche Orient.

Il est certainement justifié de ne pas se lancer aveuglement dans une recherche sans fil conducteur et sans méthodes. Mais, comme tous les fouilleurs le savent certainement, la fouille est imprévisible et il en va de même des résultats. Dans le cas présent, la superficie fouillée en deux saisons atteint quelque 1350 m², les vestiges dégagés sont plus qu’épars et pratiquement aucun objet n’a été retrouvé *in situ*. Il faut cependant souligner que le travail effectué est plus qu’honorable, surtout compte tenu du soin apporté à la fouille. Néanmoins, à ce stade des travaux, il n’est certainement pas possible de dégager des réponses aux questions ambitieuses formulées au début du rapport avec ce qu’on a trouvé pendant ces deux campagnes.

À cet égard, le premier exemple est le problème chronologique. Certes, plusieurs datations C14 sont citées (d’ailleurs sans source et sans mention de laboratoire). Mais on a souvent tendance à oublier qu’une date C14 n’est qu’une date C14 même si elle est calibrée. Elle ne fait que donner des tendances mais certainement pas une date absolue pour les périodes historiques où nous sommes et dont la fourchette d’incertitude est très étroite en comparaison, par exemple, avec les dates géologiques.

Dans le même ordre d’idées et comme un autre exemple, le titre du chapitre 10 (S. Riehl, *Flourishing Agriculture in Times of Political Instability...*) et l’introduction qui le suit promet un apport décisif sur la problématique annoncée. La conclusion de l’étude (p. 131), aussi intéressante qu’elle soit dans l’attente de l’examen d’autres échantillons, me paraît

être le résultat d’un raisonnement circulaire. Elle revient à dire, notamment, que la variété des espèces attestées dans l’échantillonnage retenu (et il faut bien souligner le mot «échantillonnage») ne révèle pas de modifications dans la production agricole aux temps d’instabilité politique en cette fin du Bronze récent. À mon sens, il aurait fallu d’abord démontrer la représentativité indiscutable de l’échantillonnage (tous proviennent de contextes remaniés), ensuite démontrer comment et dans quel sens une instabilité politique pouvait modifier la production agricole et, enfin, démontrer comment une modification, surtout en terme de quantité de la production agricole, pourrait se refléter dans un échantillonnage obtenu sur un site archéologique.

En d’autres mots, je me demande pourquoi nous ne devons pas nous contenter des résultats déjà importants obtenus avant de nous lancer dans des constructions théoriques presque indémonstrables de l’histoire?

En conclusion, il est évident toutes ces remarques ne diminuent en rien la valeur de la publication. Les fouilles engagées et qui sont dirigées avec compétence et efficacité par K.A. Yener sont certainement prometteuses et on attendra avec impatience la publication des rapports portant sur les campagnes suivantes.

Université de Liège, août 2012

Önhan TUNCA

*
* *

WERNER, P. — Die Glyptik. (Ausgrabungen in Tall Munbaqa-Ekalte, Band III). Saarländische Druckerei & Verlag GmbH, Saarwellingen, 2004. (35 cm, XVI, 62 + 52 pl.). ISBN 3-930843-83-8. ISSN 0342-4464.

This is the fourth volume in the series of final publications of the excavations at the site of Tall Munbaqa (ancient Ekalte) that took place from 1969 to 1994. The archaeological project began as part of the Tabqa Dam rescue efforts in the Middle Euphrates region of Syria and by 1975 Lake Assad had filled the valley. The site lies on the east bank of the river in close proximity to a number of other excavated sites, such as Tell es-Sweyhat, Tell Hadidi (ancient Azû), Habuba Kabira, Jebel Aruda, Tell Kannas, and Tell Selenkahiye, all of which have informed our knowledge of the region.

The long-running Munbaqa excavations were led by many different German scholars — first Ernst Heinrich (1969-71) and then Winfried Orthmann (1973/74), Alfred Maurer (1977), and Dittmar Machule as of 1978. Preliminary reports were consistently presented in the *Mitteilungen der Deutschen-Orient Gesellschaft (MDOG)* nos. 101-128) from the initial 1969 short visit described by Ursula Seidl to their final season in 1994. Later work undertaken as a new project by Dittmar Machule and Felix Blocher from 1999 to 2004 is separate from the first series of excavations and is not included in this series of excavation monographs.

Final publications have appeared steadily and are to date Vol. I — for Bronze Age objects (Rainer M. Czichon and Peter Werner as WVDOG 97 in 1998); Vol. II — the texts on Late Bronze Age tablets (Walter Mayer as WVDOG 102 in 2001); Vol. III — this volume under review on the glyptic evidence (2004); and Vol. IV on the Bronze Age ceramic material (R. Czichon and P. Werner as WVDOG 118 in

2008). The other final (I, II, IV) publications have not been consulted by me as they are not available in the academic libraries in Amman. They are clearly important for gaining a more complete picture of the project as a whole. One publication that presents an overview is the catalogue of the 1998 exhibition in Hamburg entitled *Tall Munbāqa: Bronzezeit in Syrien* by Peter Werner (Wachholtz Verlag Neumünster) which commemorated the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft in 1908. Some of the glyptic evidence is included in that catalogue as well as in the numerous preliminary reports but it is this volume *Ekalte III* that allows one to assess the glyptic range from those excavation years.

This volume presents primarily material from the Early Bronze Age to the Late Bronze Age (third to late second millennium B.C.) and it is during the latter period that the site was at its peak. There are two prehistoric stamp seals (nos. 4557-4558), one of which is of obsidian with an uncarved surface. The catalogue numbering system follows from the previous final publication volume on the Bronze Age small finds and thus the first catalogued sealing device, an Akkadian style cylinder seal, is catalogued as no. 4492 and the last item, no. 4634, is an incomplete seal impression on a Late Bronze Age tablet. In total 133 different items are presented. Twenty-one pieces are examples of Early Bronze ceramic vessels decorated with continuous patterns that are pressed into the upper body and necks of jars and bowls with flat rims. This material is discussed by R. M. Czichon as *Rollstempelkeramik* (pp. 5-8, nos. 4502-4522, pls. 4-7) and he included a small, unpierced ceramic device (H. 2.1 cm) that could have created such decorative bands (p. 5, no. 4523). The catalogued examples are primarily sherds but there is one almost complete jar with three different horizontal patterned bands arranged near the top of the vessel as preserved (H. 17 cm; no. 4506, pl. 5). Czichon notes that he uses the term “Rollstempel” to convey that the original device that created the design was carved in the positive (versus the cylinder seal negative) (p. 5). This Munbaqa evidence adds to the growing corpus of such material known from such Syrian sites as Tell es-Sweyhat and Tell Mardikh/Ebla and many other places in the Near East ranging from Iran to the southern Levant.

The remaining glyptic evidence is presented by Peter Werner and there is a summary by Ruth Mayer-Opificus at the end (see below). The cylinder seals and seal impressions dated to the third millennium include two Akkadian style cylinders (nos. 4492-4493), both carved out of the shell of a sea snail (pp. 1, 4; pl. 1) and shown to be Mesopotamian imports. The glyptic material in this volume is presented in sections based on period and within each section first by a general discussion and then a catalogue with the essential information: excavation number, museum number — if known and mostly in Raqqa, findspot, dimension, materials, design description, and principle prior publication in their preliminary studies. For the comparanda, one must follow the introductory discussion. The drawings of the seal images in *Punkeltechnik* are at a scale of 1:1 in the main plates. On the final page of text (p. 62) the draftsmen and photographers are acknowledged and their efforts are indeed to be appreciated. It is noted (p. x) that the photos are not to scale but they are enlarged and thus more readable. The drawings in the catalogue are primarily rendered at a scale of 2:1.

Under the Early Bronze period glyptic, one other actual seal is catalogued (no. 4494), a crude serpentine example carved with a scene of a stick figure surrounded by grate-like patterns. This seal was found in a vase along with the Akkadian style seal, no. 4493, mentioned above and included in the original preliminary report for the 1986 season (*MDOG* 120, p. 45). It represents the only actual example in the catalogue of a local Early Bronze cylinder seal (albeit previously dated to the Late Bronze age, see p. 1, n. 1) as the remaining third millennium examples are six cylinder seal images known from impressions found on fragments of large ceramic storage jars (nos. 4496-4501).

My own interest in the Munbaqa glyptic material stemmed from the one example of a Middle Bronze period cylinder seal (no. 4524), discovered in the 1971 season and now in Aleppo. I included this seal in my dissertation (“Old Syrian Popular Style Cylinder Seals,” Columbia University 2001, no. 255) and I was very grateful at the time for the photograph of the seal (H. 3.2 m) and the modern impression kindly supplied by D. Machule. I expended considerable effort reviewing the original and subsequent reports to determine if the find spot was helpful in any way for dating this seal and came to the same conclusion expressed by Werner that the context is disturbed so this piece can only be dated based on comparanda (p. 8). The design includes a wavy band that creates four arched areas filled with standing male human figures inverted in relation to each other, a caprid with head turned, and a *Mischwesen*. For my dissertation, I tracked the references concerned with this seal and thus note that the catalogue entry here only provides the original preliminary report and the catalogue entry in Hamido Hammade, *Cylinder Seals from the Collections of the Aleppo Museum, Syrian Arab Republic. 2. Seals of known provenance* (BAR International Series 597 [1994], 85, no. 401), duly noting Hammade’s ascribing it to the Late Bronze Age. A publication omission from the original excavation notices is the report by D. Machule and M. Wäfler in the *Annales Archéologiques Arabes Syriennes* (Vol. 33 [1983], fig. 1, pp. 124, 127, 129) which was in turn cited by Donald Matthews for a discussion of “Wave patterns with figures” in *The Early Glyptic of Tell Brak* (*Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 15, 1997, p. 11). This cylinder was also noted for the undulating line and the figures placed tête-bêche by Dominique Collon in *First Impressions* (1987, p. 44, n. 7, p. 57). Having more complete citations of each individual image included in the catalogue entries would have been helpful. One virtually unreadable cylinder impression on a thick sherd is ascribed to the Middle Bronze Age based on the pottery type and context (no. 4525, p. 9, pl. 7), thus providing a second piece from this period which is poorly represented at the site.

On the other hand, the Late Bronze Age is the main period preserved and reflected its greatest physical extent (ca. 20 ha). This corpus includes 31 Late Bronze seals and seal impressions (nos. 4526-4556) which encompass 18 actual cylinders, 1 frit stamp in the shape of a right hand (no. 4533), 12 cylinder seals known from impressions on clay devices like jar stoppers (pls. 8-14). Handled separately are 76 different cylinder seals (nos. 4559-4634) used on 85 inscribed cuneiform clay tablets (pls. 15-47), mostly found in houses that were burned and part of the occupation level referred to as Munbaqa II-Mbq-4. Given that *Ekalte II* by Walter Mayer provided the comprehensive study of the cuneiform tablets and has not been consulted by me, all my comments rely on observations from this glyptic volume.

Of the 12 sealed clay pieces most were identified as jar stoppers, but a door sealing (no. 4527), a bag sealing (no. 4542), and a complete oval bulla with the same seal impressed on each of its two flattened sides (no. 4544) were also catalogued. Given the small sample little can be discussed in terms of the administrative usage of these seals as it certainly takes a larger sample for that to be feasible as shown by Adelheid Otto in *Tall Bi'a/Tuttul — IV: Siegel und Siegelabrollungen*. WVDOG 104 (Saarbrücken 2004, pp. 100-116).

In presenting the Late Bronze Age glyptic, Werner divides it into the phases in which the material was found, from earliest Phase II-Mbq-4, then II-Mbq-3 and II-Mbq-2 and younger (pp. 10-12) as explained in the preamble for the catalogue itself (pp. 13-16). A wide variety of styles is displayed and he provides parallels for many from the main studies concerned with Late Bronze Age glyptic by such scholars as Edith Porada, Diana Stein, Beate Salje, and Dominique Collon amongst others. One seal that interested me is no. 4552 (pp. 12, 16, pl. 13) which shows a male figure seated on a simple stool and facing right toward an offering table and pot with a drinking tube as well as a ball staff. Behind is a door-like rectangular device filled with horizontal and vertical lines. This seal is made of frit thus confirming its Late Bronze Age date but all the elements harken back to Middle Bronze examples included in the corpus of my dissertation on Old Syrian popular style cylinder seals and one might speculate that it imitated older seals.

The final part of this study is concerned with the cylinder seals that are known from their impressions on the Late Bronze Age cuneiform tablets. The drawings of all the seal images are included in composite plates (pp. 25-27) which allow one to see the range of seal imagery at a quick glance. The catalogue (pp. 28-42) provides the drawings at a larger scale (mostly 2:1 but for no. 4559 at 1:5:1 given its larger size) and a full description of the image as well as the tablet number and the *Beischrift* if one exists. The plates are assembled based on the tablet numbers (Tontafel Nr. 1-84 and Mbq T13a) and for each tablet there are drawings showing where the impressions are located on the tablet and drawings of the seal impressions accompanied by easily readable photographs of the impression. What would have been helpful is a concordance of the seal impression (nos. 4559-4634) indicating on which tablets they were impressed. Such a list would readily indicate that seal no. 4559 was used by far the most (on 16 tablets, i.e. nos. T1, 3-11, 47-48, 61, 73, 74, 79) but this information is of course included in the individual catalogue entry. All other seals are mostly used just once although several are used on two tablets. The other example of a frequently used seal is no. 4581 (on 13 tablets).

Surely the most interesting use of a seal from this corpus is no. 4559 (original H. 3 cm) which is an Akkadian period cylinder seal depicting two seated figures facing each other — male (left) and likely female (right) and both deities — with two standing figures completing the scene, one of which has sun like rays emanating from the shoulders. The tablet evidence has shown that this seal belonged to the City God Ba 'laka and in one case was also used by the city elders (pp. 21, 28). It is an example of an heirloom being used many hundreds of years later. Werner points to other categories of seals as those belonging to fathers and others to brothers and provides the references to Mayer's 2001 discussion (pp. 20-21). Werner also discusses seal no. 4560 which when

used on Tablet Nr. T70 has the *Beischrift* naming it as the seal of Jahsi-Ba'la, the King, but that designation is not given when it was rolled on Tablet Nr. T62 (pp. 21-22).

Furthermore Werner presents the evidence that on Munbaqa Tablet T25 is the impression of a seal (Nr. 4585) that served as a dynastic seal at Emar, an important royal capital to the east (pp. 22-23). Dominique Beyer published a comprehensive study of the Emar glyptic and noted that this seal (E2a) was used frequently at Emar over three generations (with different metal mounts) (*Emar IV. Les sceaux, Mission archéologique de Meskéne-Emar*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 20, Freiburg, 2001, pp. 208, 432-435). This evidence is brought to bear on the final discussion which concerns the dating of the cuneiform tablets from Munbaqa. Three scenarios are presented (pp. 23-24) and Werner expresses his own preference that the tablets come from a level that was destroyed around 1325 B.C.E. due to a Hittite attack and thus the tablets would span the period of ca.1400-1325 B.C.E. after which there was a hiatus and then the site was resettled. It is noted that Mayer has put forth the dates 1530 to 1446 B.C.E. and tied the destruction of the level with the tablets to the Egyptian king Tuthmosis III (pp. 24, 44).

The final section was written by Ruth Mayer-Opificus who presented brief remarks on the seals used on the tablets (pp. 43-44). She conjures up the relatively short period when the inhabitants of Ekalte started writing on tablets and sealing most of them and thus needed scribes and seal cutters (whom she notes are not likely one and the same). She commented that the study of seal impressions (versus the ancient seal) is now a significant discipline in its own right; she also made reference to plans to work on a volume dealing with the Munbaqa seal images that will sadly not be realized given that she died in 2006. Her interest and involvement in the Munbaqa glyptic is manifest in her three articles cited within the bibliography (pp. xi-xv).

The last part of this volume lays out the iconographical details of the seal images and divides them into deities, human figures, animals, plants and standards, antiquarian, and inscriptions (pp. 45-61). Opificus had noted that two of the cylinders that sealed tablets had cuneiform legends which were illegible (p. 44) and this section on iconographical details helped identify those examples (nos. 4609, 4610, pp. 39, 61). Those interested in specific details can turn to this section and check the original photos thereafter.

Finally Opificus makes clear that the seals were valuable items and Werner also stated that no actual seals were found in the houses that contained sealed tablets and this can very likely be ascribed to the fact that the owners had enough warning before the destruction to remove their valued seals (p. 10). This volume is very fairly priced and belongs in any collection concerned with the study of cylinder seals in the ancient Near East. The chance to study the seals and seal impressions uncovered from one site remains valuable and in this case sheds light on the seal choices of this community in northern Syria for more than a millennium.

August, 2012

Barbara A. PORTER
American Center of Oriental Research,
Amman, Jordan

*
* *

HAUSER, R. — Reading Figurines. Animal Representations in Terra Cotta from Royal Building AK. (Bibliotheca Mesopotamica, Vol. 28; Urkesh/Mozan Studies 5). Undena Publications, Malibu, 2007. (27,5 cm, XXVIII, 623). ISBN 978-0-9798937-0-4. \$ 60.00.

Die Arbeit, die hier rezensiert wird, erschien 2007 in der Reihe Bibliotheca Mesopotamica als fünfter Band der Unterreihe Urkesh/Mozan Studies, die den Ergebnissen der amerikanischen¹⁾ Ausgrabungen in Tell Mozan gewidmet ist. Der Autor des Buches ist Rick Hauser, ein studierter Regisseur und Produzent aus der Filmbranche,²⁾ der seit Beginn der Grabungen 1984 zum amerikanischen Team gehört. Fast alle Zeichnungen stammen aus der Hand von Claudia Wettstein.

Die Arbeit widmet sich den theriomorphen³⁾ Terrakotten aus dem Gebäude AK in Tell Mozan (Urkesh), welches in die zweite Hälfte des 3. Jts. v. Chr. datiert. Die Siedlung befindet sich heute in Nordostsyrien an der Grenze zur Türkei. Das Gebäude AK stellt einen Magazintrakt des sog. „Königspalastes“ dar, ist also Teil eines öffentlichen Gebäudes.

In der Studie wurden 281 stratifizierte, meist fragmentarische theriomorphe Terrakotten untersucht, die nur aus dem Gebäude AK stammen.⁴⁾ Ergänzt wurden diese aber noch durch weitere 92 stratifizierte sowie unstratifizierte Terrakotten aus anderen Teilen der Siedlung, so dass insgesamt 373⁵⁾ Exemplare in der Studie untersucht und beschrieben werden. Dieses sehr beachtliche Corpus von theriomorphen Terrakotten gehört so zu den größten in dieser Region.⁶⁾ Allein die 281 Exemplare aus dem Gebäude AK repräsentieren das größte stratifizierte Inventar an theriomorphen Terrakotten aus einem Gebäudekomplex für die Zeit und Region.

Das „Foreword“ (xvii-xxiii) hat Giorgio Buccellati, der Kodirektor der Ausgrabung in Tell Mozan, geschrieben: er betont nicht nur den wissenschaftlichen Wert der Studie sondern weist auch bereits auf mögliche Interpretationen hin, die durch Hausers Studie unterstützt werden.

In einem „Guide for the reader“ (xxv-xxvi) beschreibt Hauser den Aufbau der vorliegenden Arbeit. Auffallend ist seine Entscheidung, die identifizierten Tierarten mit Begriffen aus der Taxonomie zu benennen. Diese Praxis ist gänzlich anders als die der bisherigen Veröffentlichungen über theriomorphe Terrakotten im Vorderen Orient, da die meisten Autoren zurecht nicht mit Sicherheit sagen können, um welche real existierenden Tiere es sich bei den dargestellten handelt, die meistens auch noch fragmentarisch sind. Hauser behauptet aber, dass er anhand der von ihm entwickelten

Merkmalsanalyse in der Lage sei, die einzelnen Tierarten zu identifizieren, gar diese zu „lesen“.⁷⁾ Dieser Umstand veranlasst G. Buccellati im „Foreword“ zu folgender Erklärung „Hence, his use of the Latin terminology for the specific types of animal should be seen not as pretentious, but as the expression of a carefully thought out categorization“ (xviii).

Die in „A Guide for the reader“ erklärten Punkte sind sehr wichtig für das Verständnis der Arbeit, v.a. aber des Kataloges. Die Leser, die einen Gesamtkatalog der Objekte erwarten, werden leider enttäuscht. Stattdessen wurde der Katalog nach einzelnen Gattungen⁸⁾ unterteilt, sodass von mehreren Katalogen gesprochen werden kann. Eine weitere ungewöhnliche Methodik wurde bei der Nummerierung der Objekte innerhalb der jeweiligen Kataloge verwendet: es gibt keine einfache durchgehende Nummerierung. Vielmehr werden unterschiedliche durchgehende Nummerierungen verwendet, um den stratigraphischen Wert, die unterschiedlichen Identifikationstendenzen und die Informationen über die Herkunft der Objekte zu verdeutlichen. So ergibt sich leider eine komplizierte Vergabe der Katalognummern, die je Gattung wie folgt gestaltet wurde: Nummern 1 bis 99 (stratified finds); 100-199 (stratified finds tentative identification); 200-299 (related stratified finds); 300-399 (related unstratified finds) und 400-499 (other genera). Wie kompliziert diese Katalogführung ist, zeigt sich an den Tabellen des Autors selbst (48-49, Table 2A-2B), die auch handwerkliche Fehler aufweisen, wodurch falsche Angaben über die Anzahl der untersuchten Objekte produziert werden. Daher wurden hier Hausers Kataloge in einer Tabelle zusammengestellt, um die Gesamtanzahl der untersuchten Objekte zu dokumentieren (vgl. hier Tab. 1).

Die Arbeit umfasst insgesamt acht Kapitel, die nicht hierarchisch aufgebaut oder gar durchnummeriert sind. Jedes Kapitel fängt mit einem Deckblatt an, auf dem der Titel der Arbeit wiederholt wird, was aber auch nicht konsequent durchgehalten wurde.

Im Kapitel „Introduction“ (1-53) erklärt Hauser, wie seine Typologie aufgebaut ist und wie das „Lesen“ der Terrakotten funktioniert. Hauser gibt vor in der Lage zu sein, anhand der Körperform der Objekte, Proportionen der Glieder sowie deren Verhältnis untereinander die dargestellten Tiere eindeutig identifizieren zu können. Unterschiedliche Domestikationsstadien sollen dann die Typen innerhalb der Gattungen bilden. Die Argumentation mit den Körperformen kann nicht immer nachvollzogen werden. So ist beispielsweise nicht zu verstehen, warum *Capra* 1 und *Equus* 36 unterschiedliche Körperformen belegen sollen (13, Figure 3B). Gleiches gilt für *Ovis* 7 und *Canis* 7, deren Körperformen eigentlich sehr ähnlich sind, wobei durch dicke Striche wiedergegebene Konturen unterschiedliche Körperformen dokumentieren sollen (12, Fig. 3A). In „Cranial and caudal views“ (21-35) werden typendefinierende Maße und

¹⁾ Von 1998 bis 2003 arbeitete zusätzlich ein Team der Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen unter der Leitung von P. Pfälzner in Tell Mozan.

²⁾ Über die akademische Qualifikation des Autors in der Archäologie wird leider nichts berichtet. Er selbst bezeichnet sich in seinem Academia-Profil als „Research Associate, International Institute for Mesopotamian Area Studies Senior Staff, Archaeological Expedition to Urkesh“, vgl. <http://urkesh.academia.edu/RickHauser> (zuletzt besucht am 01.07.2012).

³⁾ Vogelterrakotten wurden nicht in die Arbeit eingegliedert und werden nach Aussage des Autors in einem getrennten Artikel veröffentlicht.

⁴⁾ Eine Studie zu anthropomorphen Terrakotten aus Gebäude AK soll getrennt folgen.

⁵⁾ Die ursprüngliche Angabe von 335 Exemplaren durch Hauser wurde zwar in „errata corrigée“ auf 397 korrigiert, dennoch wurden nach der Zählung des Rezensenten nur 373 katalogisiert, vgl. hier Tab. 1.

⁶⁾ Laut Hauser wurden doppelt so viele theriomorphe Terrakotten in Mozan gefunden, die aus anderen Schichten stammen. Wann diese veröffentlicht werden sollen, ist nicht erwähnt.

⁷⁾ Obgleich Hauser betont, dass die Methode durch Diskussionen mit dem Archäozoologen Sándor Bökönyi entstanden und weiterentwickelt sei, wäre eine Rezension der Arbeit durch einen Archäozoologen sehr wünschenswert, um Hausers „Lesen“ vom archäozoologischen Blickwinkel zu beleuchten. Hierzu fehlen dem Rezensenten die Kompetenzen.

⁸⁾ Hauser bleibt hier nicht konsequent und verwendet auch Ordnungsnamen, wie *Carnivora*, unter denen er mehrere Gattungen wie *Felis* und *Ursus* und sogar Familien wie *Mellivora* und *Erinaceinae* zusammenfasst. Obwohl diese dann in einem Katalog der *Carnivora* vorgestellt werden, erscheinen die Katalognummern mit Gattungsnamen, wie *Felis* 10; *Ursus* 403.

	stratified finds	stratified finds tentative identification	related stratified finds	related unstratified finds	other genera	Gesamt
<i>Bos</i>	13 (<i>Bos</i> 1 – <i>Bos</i> 13)	4 (<i>Bos</i> 100 – <i>Bos</i> 103)	7 (<i>Bos</i> 200 – <i>Bos</i> 206)	1 (<i>Bos</i> 300)	–	25
<i>Bos</i> (horns)	6 (<i>Bos</i> 14 – <i>Bos</i> 19)	7 (<i>Bos</i> 104 – <i>Bos</i> 110)	–	–	–	13
<i>Ovis</i> I	21 (<i>Ovis</i> 1 – <i>Ovis</i> 21)	1 (<i>Ovis</i> 100)	3 (<i>Ovis</i> 200 – <i>Ovis</i> 202)	1 (<i>Ovis</i> 300)	–	26
<i>Ovis</i> II	9 (<i>Ovis</i> 22 – <i>Ovis</i> 30)	3 (<i>Ovis</i> 101 – <i>Ovis</i> 103)	1 (<i>Ovis</i> 203)	2 (<i>Ovis</i> 301 – <i>Ovis</i> 302)	–	15
<i>Ovis</i>	27 (<i>Ovis</i> 31 – <i>Ovis</i> 57)	6 (<i>Ovis</i> 104 – <i>Ovis</i> 109)	6 (<i>Ovis</i> 204 – <i>Ovis</i> 209)	2 (<i>Ovis</i> 303 – <i>Ovis</i> 304)	–	41
<i>Canis</i>	18 (<i>Canis</i> 1 – <i>Canis</i> 18)	8 (<i>Canis</i> 100 – <i>Canis</i> 107)	8 (<i>Canis</i> 200 – <i>Canis</i> 207)	1 (<i>Canis</i> 300)	–	35
<i>Felis</i> I	31 (<i>Felis</i> 1 – <i>Felis</i> 31)	14 (<i>Felis</i> 100 – <i>Felis</i> 113)	8 (<i>Felis</i> 200 – <i>Felis</i> 207)	–	–	53
<i>Felis</i> II	7 (<i>Felis</i> 32 – <i>Felis</i> 38)	2 (<i>Felis</i> 114 – <i>Felis</i> 115)	4 (<i>Felis</i> 208 – <i>Felis</i> 211)	3 (<i>Felis</i> 300 – <i>Felis</i> 302)	–	16
<i>Hystricidae</i> <i>Erinaceinae</i> <i>Mustelidae</i>	–	–	–	–	3 (<i>Hystricidae</i> 400 <i>Erinaceinae</i> 401 <i>Mustelidae</i> 402)	3
<i>Ursus</i>	–	2 (<i>Ursus</i> 116 – <i>Ursus</i> 117)	1 (<i>Ursus</i> 212)	–	4 (<i>Ursus</i> 403 – <i>Ursus</i> 406)	7
<i>Capra</i>	17 (<i>Capra</i> 1 – <i>Capra</i> 17)	4 (<i>Capra</i> 100 – <i>Capra</i> 103)	7 (<i>Capra</i> 200 – <i>Capra</i> 206)	–	–	28
<i>Capra</i> app.	17 (<i>Capra</i> 18 – <i>Capra</i> 34)	4 (<i>Capra</i> 104 – <i>Capra</i> 107)	8 (<i>Capra</i> 207 – <i>Capra</i> 214)	1 (<i>Capra</i> 300)	–	30
<i>Equus</i> I	11 (<i>Equus</i> 1 – <i>Equus</i> 11)	7 (<i>Equus</i> 100 – <i>Equus</i> 106)	–	–	–	18
<i>Equus</i> I-II	6 (<i>Equus</i> 12 – <i>Equus</i> 17)	–	–	–	–	6
<i>Equus</i> II	17 (<i>Equus</i> 18 – <i>Equus</i> 34)	8 (<i>Equus</i> 107 – <i>Equus</i> 114)	–	–	–	25
<i>Equus</i> III	4 (<i>Equus</i> 35 – <i>Equus</i> 38)	2 (<i>Equus</i> 115 – <i>Equus</i> 116)	–	–	–	6
<i>Equus</i>	–	5 (<i>Equus</i> 117 – <i>Equus</i> 121)	17 (<i>Equus</i> 200 – <i>Equus</i> 216)	4 (<i>Equus</i> 300 – <i>Equus</i> 303)	–	26
Gesamt	204	77	70	15	7	373

Tabelle 1: Dokumentation der Kataloge

Proportionen anhand von Zeichnungen belegt und weiter erklärt. Ein interessanter Aspekt ist dabei der Winkel zwischen den Beinen, der laut Hauser je nach Gattung Unterschiede dokumentieren kann.

Weiterhin werden in der „Introduction“ die Methodik der Dokumentation (Vermessung der Objekte), die Eigenschaften der Ware (Qualität des Tons, Magerung und Farbe) und der Herstellungsprozess (Oberflächenbehandlung) vorgestellt. Zwei Tabellen, in denen die Materialbasis in Zahlen dokumentiert wird (48-49, vgl. hier Tab. 1), und eine Legende zur zeichnerischen Dokumentation (50) sowie eine Diskussion über Domestikation und Zählung runden das Kapitel ab.

Im nächsten Kapitel „Comparanda: Representative Sites“ (55-79) geht Hauser nicht nur auf die Siedlungen mit vergleichbarem Material ein, sondern diskutiert auch die Herangehensweise der jeweiligen Bearbeiter kritisch. Als Vergleichsorte dienen Tell Al’Abd Zrejehey, Assur, Ebla,⁹⁾

⁹⁾ Anders als von Hauser behauptet, behandelt die dort zitierte Arbeit von Nicolò Marchetti nicht die Terrakotten aus dem 3. Jts. v. Chr. sondern die aus dem 2. Jts. v. Chr.

Ekalte, Tepe Gawra, Halawa A, Hama, Hammam et-Turkman, Mari und Nippur.

In den darauffolgenden sechs Kapiteln werden die Gattungen vorgestellt: „Genus *Bos*“ (81-119),¹⁰⁾ „Genus *Ovis*“ (123-192), „Genus *Canis*“ (193-232), „Genus *Felis/Ursus/Mellivora*“ oder „*Carnivora*“ (233-306), „Genus *Capra*“ (307-352), „Genus *Equus*“ (353-444), deren Aufbau immer gleich ist. Die Kapitel fangen mit einer „Discussion“ an, in der die Merkmale der einzelnen Gattungen noch einmal vorgestellt und diskutiert werden, gefolgt von einem „Catalog“, in dem die einzelnen Objekte beschrieben sind. Die Kurzbeschreibung der Einzelobjekte beinhaltet sowohl grabungstechnische als auch herstellungstechnische Informationen, welche in Textboxen untergebracht

¹⁰⁾ Ergänzend zur Diskussion über Zebuterrakotten (90) sollte noch die folgende Veröffentlichung genannt werden: Matthews, R. 2002. Zebu: Harbingers of Doom in Bronze Age Western Asia? *Antiquity* 76, 438-446, welche den großen Wert der in Tell Mozan aus dem 3. Jts. v. Chr. stammenden Zebufigurine (*Bos* 202, 109) besser verdeutlicht, als das durch den Vergleich mit den spätbronzezeitlichen Zebuterrakotten aus Munbaqa möglich ist.

sind. Weitere Informationen — Kommentare, Diskussionen, Vergleichsfunde aus anderen Orten sowie Kommentare über die Vergleichsfunde — die eigentlich in die Fußnoten gehören, tauchen auch in Textboxen auf, was als störend empfunden wird. Die Kataloge sind mit SW-Fotos und Strichzeichnungen ergänzt, wobei auf Querverweise zu den Tafeln gänzlich verzichtet ist. So ist es sehr umständlich, Zeichnungen oder Fotos der Objekte zu finden. Auch eine Liste der Abbildungen, Fotos, Zeichnungen fehlt. So bleibt dem Leser nichts anderes übrig, als die Zeichnung an unterschiedlichen Orten zu suchen. Als Beispiel soll hier *Bos* 201 erwähnt werden, zu dem es keine detaillierte Beschreibung gibt und dessen Zeichnung sich in der „Comparative Table 2A“ (457) befindet.

Mit diesen Kapiteln über die Gattungen endet die Arbeit. Hausers komplizierte Darstellungsweise, die von der üblichen wissenschaftlichen Darstellungsweise stark abweicht, lässt die Ergebnisse der Arbeit nicht deutlich sichtbar werden. So werden solche Leser enttäuscht, die ein Kapitel Zusammenfassung, Ergebnisse oder Ausblick erwarten.

Abgeschlossen wird die Arbeit stattdessen mit einem „Comparative table commentary“ (445-451) und den dazugehörigen „Comparative tables“ (453-469), in denen verschiedene Eigenschaften der Gattungen miteinander verglichen werden. Es folgen die „Plates“ (471-548), in denen die meisten Objekte aus mehreren Ansichten zeichnerisch dokumentiert wurden. Bibliographische Angaben erscheinen unter „Works cited“ (549-557); in den „Descriptive tables“ (599-625) werden die einzelnen typenspezifischen Maße der Objekte aufgelistet.

Schließlich müssen noch einige Bemerkungen zur graphischen Gestaltung gemacht werden. Obgleich einige Zeichnungen qualitativ sehr gut sind, sind die meisten grob und nicht sehr informativ. Vor allem die unterschiedlichen Strichstärken bzw. sehr dicke Konturstriche sind störend und beeinträchtigen die zeichnerische Dokumentation. Erfreulich ist aber, dass die Zeichnungen mehrere Ansichten der Objekte dokumentieren, was nicht oft praktiziert wird. Aber die Ordnung der dargestellten Ansichten ist leider nicht immer konsequent, sodass der Leser nicht immer auf einen Blick erkennen kann, welche Ansicht welche Seite des Objekts darstellt. Entsprechend ist der Zustand der abgebildeten Fotos, die sehr voneinander abweichende Qualitätsstufen aufweisen.

Es ist ein großes Verdienst des Autors, dass dieses umfangreiche Repertoire an theriomorphen Terrakotten detailliert beschrieben und veröffentlicht wurde. Die Arbeit fällt durch ihre ungewöhnliche Gestaltung auf, der aber wissenschaftliche Darstellungsweise und Handwerk fehlt. Hausers Idee und Methodik ist erfrischend und in der Diskussion dieser Objekte auch sehr willkommen. Seine Begeisterung für diese Objekte ist sehr deutlich zu erkennen, und das macht Mut, dass die häufig durch die anthropomorphen Terrakotten dominierten und deshalb nicht immer mit der gebührenden Intensität behandelten theriomorphen Terrakotten jetzt das Interesse des wissenschaftlichen Publikums stärker auf sich ziehen und weitere Arbeiten auf diesem Gebiet fördern.

Da die „Lesung“ Hausers anhand von Körperformen und Proportionen der Glieder, die auf mehreren unterschiedlichen Messungen basiert, sehr kompliziert ist, hat die Methode bisher wenig Anklang gefunden, sodass er in den wichtigen

Veröffentlichungen nur kurz erwähnt oder gar nicht beachtet wurde.¹¹⁾

Das 2009 publizierte Werk zu den Kleinfunden aus den deutschen Ausgrabungen in Tell Mozan,¹²⁾ die ebenfalls ein sehr reiches Corpus von theriomorphen Terrakotten aufweisen, erwähnt Hausers Arbeit überhaupt nicht. Dadurch stehen die beiden Werke über die theriomorphen Terrakotten aus Tell Mozan leider nebeneinander, als ob sie aus zwei verschiedenen Siedlungen stammten, da sie sowohl methodisch als auch typologisch unterschiedlich aufgebaut sind. Wünschenswert wäre jedoch, dass alle Terrakotten aus Tell Mozan in einer Arbeit behandelt und interpretiert wären, sodass deren Entwicklung, Funktion und Deutung besser verdeutlicht werden kann. Die Dokumentation der Verteilung und Vergesellschaftung der theriomorphen Terrakotten innerhalb des Gebäudes AK, die dieser Arbeit sehr fehlt, wird vermutlich mehr Licht auf die Funktion der Objekte innerhalb des Palastes werfen. Das Repertoire aus Gebäude AK ist für die Interpretation der Objekte enorm wichtig, da bisher sowohl theriomorphe als auch anthropomorphe Terrakotten aus dem 3. Jts. v. Chr. fast immer mit Wohnbebauung in Verbindung gebracht wurden und ihre Deutung im Bereich der häuslichen Magie gesucht wurde. Neuere Arbeiten zeigen aber, dass auch in öffentlichen Bauten wie Palästen und Tempeln diese Objekte durchaus in großer Anzahl vorkommen.¹³⁾

Die Funktion dieser Objekte innerhalb von Gebäude AK wurde neben Hauser (46-47) auch von Buccellati (xvii-xx) versuchsweise angerissen, jedoch nur auf bestimmte Tierarten begrenzt ausgeführt. Es wird sehr spannend sein, fundiertere Argumentationen zu diesem Interpretationsversuch zu lesen, die hoffentlich auf Verbreitungs- und Vergesellschaftungsanalysen der Objekte aus dem Gebäude AK basieren, wie sie von Buccellati in Aussicht gestellt wurden. Daher kann Hausers Arbeit nur als Vorbereitung zur weiteren Auswertung der Objekte gelten.

Tübingen, July 2012

Ferhan SAKAL
Institute for Ancient Near
Eastern Studies (IANES)
Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen

*
* *

DÜRING, B.S. — *The Prehistory of Asia Minor. From Complex Hunter-Gatherers to Early Urban Societies*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010. (26 cm, XIV, 360). ISBN 9780521763134. £ 19.99.

This relatively new addition to the growing literature on Anatolian prehistory and Early Bronze Age consists of seven chapters. The first of these is devoted to the geography of the

¹¹⁾ Pruß, A. 2011. *Small Finds & Figurines*, Lebeau, M. (ed.) *Associated Regional Chronologies for the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean 1: Jezirah*, Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 239-254.

¹²⁾ Bianchi, A. – Wissing, A. 2009. *Studien zur Urbanisierung Nordmesopotamiens / Serie A, Ausgrabungen 1998-2001 in der Zentralen Oberstadt von Tall Mozan / Urkeš, Band II: Die Kleinfunde*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

¹³⁾ Peyronel, L. 2008. Making images of humans and animals. The clay figurines from the Royal Palace G at Tell Mardikh-Ebla, Syria (EB IVA, c. 2400-2300 BC), Cordoba, J.M.; Molist, M.; Perez, M. C.; Rubio, I.; Martinez, S. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East*, Volume 2, 787-805.

land, and the second to the history and status of prehistoric research. The following four chapters investigate the successive stages of development stretching from the cultural ancestry of the Neolithic farmers (chapter 3) to the Chalcolithic period (chapter 6). The last chapter of this book describes the various aspects of the Early Bronze Age society.

In his brief Introduction, Düring explains the reason for “conceiving this book” was to help “those who wanted to study the Prehistoric Asia Minor” have access to a synthetic study. Earlier publications on this topic were in his view either out of date by now and/or lacked a synthetic overview. Although I agree that with advances made in the field of archaeology most books and monographs eventually become outdated and irrelevant within a few years, his assertion that until now none contained a “synthetic overview” is not accurate. For example, Yakar 1985, 1991 and 1994 referred to on page 2, footnote 5 contain chapters that discuss the economic, social and religious aspects of prehistoric Anatolian society based on regionally evaluated “site-by-site” archaeological data!

Düring states his three specific purposes for writing this book as: a) To provide a thorough and up-to-date synthetic overview of the Prehistory of Asia Minor; b) “To address issues of general anthropological significance in relation to the unique trajectories of development and phenomena that constitute the Prehistory of Asia Minor and how these bear on wider debates in the discipline of archaeology”; c) To contextualize “the Prehistory of Asia Minor within the wider Prehistory of adjacent regions and to assess the nature and importance of contact between regions” (1-3). Or in other words, the reevaluation and reinterpretation of the published data include the revision of some past and current theories relating to a variety of social and cultural aspects in order to present the reader a different and clearer picture of the prehistoric society of Asia Minor.

The first chapter “The Land of Asia Minor” describes the physical characteristics of the geography with emphasis on the geomorphology, natural resources, current ecology, paleoecology and coastal changes on record. No one can dispute Düring’s assessment that the distinct cultures that emerged in this landmass over the millennia, which obviously did not develop in complete isolation from their broader geographical surroundings, owed their characteristics to their own geographical settings.

The second chapter, which could have been part of the introduction, dedicated to the history of research presented under the heading of “Archaeology in Asia Minor” starts with the initial activities that mainly involved the investigation of biblical and classical civilizations including the archaeology of Homer, and ends with a brief report on the current status of prehistoric research (21-30). He then continues the journey through the ‘time capsule’ describing the archaeological research under the Ottomans, and then in the Turkish Republic which opened the way to more comprehensive prehistoric investigations by a few Turkish and western archaeologists. By the 1950’s these efforts finally resulted in the discovery of a long and relatively well documented Neolithic period.

The third chapter: “Hunter-Gatherers of the Epipalaeolithic and Mesolithic (20,000-6500 BC)” starts with a short overview of the Upper Palaeolithic sequence (31-46). He elaborates on the suspicion among some archaeologists of the existence of a hiatus in the “Late Upper Palaeolithic-26,000-20,000” of Turkey based mainly on the absence

of Gravettian-type assemblages in Palaeolithic sites. Expressing his reservations on this point Düring dismisses the ecological arguments supporting such a hiatus as unfounded. In his opinion sites from this period most likely exist but have not been recognized so far (31). Describing the Epipalaeolithic and Mesolithic continuum, he remarks that the distinction between them is based on chronology since both represent a rather similar type of hunter-gatherer society. He argues that despite the fact that the regional Epipalaeolithic records of hunter-gatherers are rarely complete or well preserved the existence of such groups in the Marmara basin and south-central plateau could be inferred due to the preservation of their lithic characteristics in later Mesolithic assemblages (44-45). Therefore, he disagrees with those who believe that the Epipalaeolithic way of life ended at the beginning of the Holocene. The survival of “microlith traditions” in some regional lithic assemblages as late as 6000 BC (e.g. Marmara) indicates indeed that Epipalaeolithic hunter-gatherers “had a pivotal role to play in the transition to Neolithic way of life in Asia Minor” (45-46).

In chapter four: “Early Farmers of the Southern Plateau,” Düring analyses the problems with most past and current views on Neolithic origins and that of Central Anatolia in particular “entrenched in much of the synthetic literature” (47-121). He defines Neolithic “as a sedentary way of life in which agriculture provided the staple subsistence resource” (48). He believes that the wild cereals widely consumed by PPNA hunter-gatherer groups did not become scarce in the Younger Dryas, and therefore, “there was no climatically induced need for experiments in cereal cultivation” in that period. And maintains the first appearance of domesticated crops in the early PPNB sites in Turkey rather than in the Levant confirms the eastern Taurus and Zagros foothills as the principal centers for the domestication of plants and animals, and their ‘polycentric’ origins and dispersal. Düring regards the southern Levant, Central Anatolia, and Upper Mesopotamia as interacting core regions in his ‘polycentric’ model, and despite certain commonalities among them each created its particular regional culture and history. Referring to the “roots of Central Anatolian Neolithic,” the author disagrees with the hypothesis of colonization from the Fertile Crescent. Instead, he sees an autochthonous development having Epipalaeolithic roots rather than the influence or superimposition of culturally distinct elements originating from the Fertile Crescent. His observations concerning the Neolithic continue with an assessment on the nature of obsidian exchange from Asia Minor with emphasis on Cappadocian mining workshops. He then presents in some detail the Neolithic data from Aşıklı Höyük and Çatalhöyük, the two major Central Anatolian sites, while briefly describing the initial archaeological findings from the promising site of Boncuklu Höyük in the Konya Plain. His assessments on the nature and continuity of Neolithic building traditions, and social dimensions which derive from architecture and burials are mostly known to us from his earlier and well researched comprehensive publications (see the Bibliography), and in particular his relatively recent monograph: B.S. Düring, *Constructing Communities: Clustered Neighbourhood Settlements of the Central Anatolian Neolithic, ca. 8500-5500 Cal. BC*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten. I am inclined to agree with Düring that the reason for the emergence of large and densely populated sites such as Aşıklı Höyük and Çatalhöyük in the south-central plateau

was not because of presumed demographic or economic pressure but rather social and ideological factors (121).

Chapter five: “Neolithic Dispersals (6500-5500 BC),” presents a well-detailed cultural, economic and social analysis of the millennium-long developments, including the Early Chalcolithic period (6000-5500 BC) (122-199). This millennium long period which followed the gradual emergence of the Neolithic way of life in the south-central plateau during ca. 8500-7000 BC, witnessed the spread of farming and animal husbandry to Western Anatolia, Greece and the Southern Balkans. Düring is also in the opinion that the so-called ‘second Neolithic revolution’ was a direct consequence of the colonization of these territories by some Central Anatolian farmers. Although there is a general agreement on this point, additional factors such as continued economic interaction crossing geographical boundaries between hunter-gatherers including the settled ones and farming communities or their more mobile elements (e.g. herders, transhumant groups, traders) could have also resulted in the spread of food production techniques and cultivation practices from the steppe environment of the south-central plateau towards the Aegean and Marmara basins and beyond. Düring proposes that changes in agriculture by the mid-seventh millennium BC could have made farming an attractive subsistence option outside the steppe zone in the Late Ceramic Neolithic period (124). Long spells of drought that may have occurred in parts of the Near East between ca. 6400-6200, the so-called ‘8.2 KA event’, could have contributed in the acceleration of the Neolithic expansion which presumably started a century earlier. In this respect he does not rule out social dynamics as a contributing factor to this expansion at this time (125). Düring’s account of the Late Ceramic Neolithic period is based on the published, evaluated and reevaluated archaeological data from key sites such as Çatalhöyük(130-136), Erbaba(136-138), Can Hasan I(139-148), Köşk Höyük and Tepecik-Çiftlik(148-155). Presumably social changes and socio-economic restructuring in the south-central plateau during this millennium could have been the principal reasons for the appearance of numerous small villages and the gradual disappearance of large and densely populated villages with clustered neighborhoods. The author suggests that “settlement hierarchies may have developed during this period” (156). This chapter provides a good overview of additional regions of Asia Minor which were populated by Late Neolithic communities and their descendants. Referring to Cilicia, he remarks that the Yumuktepe material inventories indicate this region “developed along trajectories distinct from those of Central Anatolia, and in some periods it appear to be more in synchrony with the Fertile Crescent”(160). As for the Lake District (160-174), he agrees the data recovered from the principal sites of Hacılar, Kuruçay, Höyücek and Bademağacı demonstrate that this fertile region developed independently creating its own cultural trajectory that extended well beyond the Late Neolithic period. Referring to “the Neolithic of the Aegean Anatolia” (174-179), the author concludes based on the general impression of architectural remains and various material inventories assembled from sites such as Ulucak, Ege Gübre, Yeşilova Höyük, Dedecik-Heybelitepe, Hoca Çeşme(in Thrace), as well as survey material Köprüova, Coşkuntepe and Kaynarca that the cultural development and the settlement in this region did not follow a strictly homogenous

regional pattern. This because of the presence of a significant degree of variability of settlement forms among the excavated Late Neolithic sites, especially referring to Ulucak and Ege Gübre (179). The synopsis of the Neolithic Marmara region starts with reference to the Epipalaeolithic/Mesolithic (e.g. Ağaçlı groups) as its likely genesis (179-195). Evaluating the excavated data published in the site reports of İlipınar, Fikirtepe, Pendik, Menteşe, Barcın, Fikirtepe and others, the author remarks that the differentiated settlement types/patterns, including regional variations in building material(e.g. inland versus coastal), probably represent two different but co-existing subsistence economies otherwise sharing similarities in their material culture inventories and technologies. Despite its particular cultural affinities the village communities in this region seem to have interacted in this period with their Central Anatolian counterparts in the economic and perhaps social spheres. The “dispersing diversity” discussion is the final section of this chapter (195-199). Düring’s criticism of deeply entrenched views such as the transmission of “the Neolithic way of life from the Near East to Europe” without reference to Anatolia’s distinctive Neolithic cultures or to perceive Anatolia as a homogenous entity with little consideration to its local diversities is justified. Equally justified is his remark that for a long time “the spread of the Neolithic way of life has often been regarded as a self-evident feature, rather than a development that has to be explained as a result of either interaction between local and non-local groups or colonization.” Obviously the Neolithic way of life gradually expanded from Central Anatolia during the second half of the seventh millennium, perhaps starting in ca.6500 BC, but not as a massive movement or disruptive chain of events. Some of the unconnected or interconnected factors that prompted the expansion could have included a dramatic change in the climate, innovations in food production modes based on farming, social changes or demography-related causes, and more. However, in Düring’s view there is very little evidence to support these kinds of “push factors.” Instead, he proposes “a model in which small groups of entrepreneurial farmers moved into new regions, where in some cases they may have chosen to adopt local hunter-gatherer practices as much as the hunter-gatherers did the reverse, created a kaleidoscope of unique cultural traditions” (99). This proposed scenario explaining the spread of the Neolithic way of life from Central Anatolia, no matter how convincing, does not cancel other hypothetical proposals as additional factors that were also responsible for the start of the ‘Neolithisation’ process in the more arid parts of the central plateau.

Chapter six: “Millennia in the Middle (5500-3000)” presents the available archaeological data and evaluates the cultural, social and economic developments in the Middle and Late Chalcolithic periods (200-256). The author’s disappointment with the rather few and slow pace of investigations of this relatively neglected period in Anatolian archaeology is certainly shared by many others. Indeed by all accounts, the Middle and Late Chalcolithic periods have not been investigated in detail and in equal intensity in every region. Although this period would have been one of cultural, social and economic interactions varying in form and intensity with the flourishing neighboring regions such as the Balkans, northern Syria and Iraq, in Central Anatolia it has often been regarded as an obscure transitional and

culturally regressive period between the Early Chalcolithic period and the EBA. Düring argues that one should refrain from viewing Asia Minor and the Balkans as a single archaeological complex between 5500-3000 BC because there are clear typological and decorative distinctions between their respective ceramic repertoires and other material assemblages (204). The chapter provides a comprehensive and well-detailed introduction to “The Chalcolithic of the Greater Marmara Region” and its key sites Aşağı Pınar, Tilkiburnu, Orman Fidanlığı, Kumtepe, Ilıpınar, Barcın Höyük, Demircihöyük (206-219). The author attempts to define the Middle Chalcolithic period of the Lake District and the Southern Aegean both culturally and chronologically. In doing this he relies mainly on the typological similarities between the monochrome ceramic inventories of Bağbaşı, Kızılbilbel, Kulaksızlar, Araptepe, Kumtepe IA, Beşik-Sivritepe, Çine-Tepecik, and a few other sites. Despite the laborious and methodical efforts he admits that “it is clear we know very little, especially about the Middle Chalcolithic” (228). As for the Northern Asia Minor, which in addition to the Pontus region it includes “the interior plateau north of the Tuz Gölü,” again Düring’s meticulous reevaluation of the published material from Büyük Güllücek, Çadır Höyük, İkiztepe II, and other sites produced hardly more than a sketchy picture of the Middle Chalcolithic. This, he claims, because the excavations and publication records Büyük Güllücek and İkiztepe “leave much to be desired,” and Çadır Höyük was investigated only in a small 4m² trench (240). On the other hand, the Late Chalcolithic settlements such as Yarikkaya, Çamlıbel Tarlası with their simpler plan and architecture seem to differ, according to him, from the walled settlement at Çadır Höyük. He cautiously suggests this architectural contrast could perhaps be indicative of a differentiation of settlement types in the fourth millennium BC. Referring to “the Chalcolithic of Southern Central Anatolia,” he reaffirms the uncontested view that unlike the Late Chalcolithic, the Middle Chalcolithic is better documented in this region, especially in the south-central plateau (e.g. Güvercinkayası; Köşk Höyük level 1) (240-247). The “Chalcolithic of Cilicia,” which is still represented by Mersin-Yumuktepe, more so than Tarsus-Gözlükule, requires more thorough investigations especially the excavation of new sites long recorded in field surveys. According to the author, the stratified ceramic evidence from key sites fail to demonstrate the consecutive presence of Halaf, Ubaid or Uruk groups in Cilicia from the mid-sixth to fourth millennia BC. Nevertheless, the same inventories suggest at least some recognizable influence from those cultural horizons in the development of a local Cilician culture in the Middle and Late Chalcolithic period. I certainly agree with the assessment that “it is a mistake to conceive of a period such as the Chalcolithic of Asia Minor, which lasted no less than two and a half millennia, as an eventless period,” and most of his cultural reassessment (253). The proposed internal division of this long period is not entirely clear. This period in Anatolian prehistory could be defined as one of socioeconomic and sociopolitical continuity while undergoing slow changes, ca. 5000-3000 BC (Yakar 2011:281). In other words, the Anatolian society of the Middle and Late Chalcolithic period was slowly acquiring a more complex social structure. This development perhaps was the consequence of settlement hierarchies appearing in clan or tribe controlled territories.

In the broader geography of Anatolia one can notice geocultural variations in acculturation and management of agro-pastoral and industrial production (e.g. centralization) at a time when interregional trade became more organized. Art forms peculiar to this stage of cultural development seem to be characterized by abstract artistic expressions in iconography. The dominance of handmade dark burnished monochrome wares in the central plateau and bordering regions is quite striking and could suggest a long lasting tradition with sub-regionally variable repertoires and technologies sharing general similarities in pottery production (Yakar 2011: 281-343).

Chapter seven: “Elites and Commoners (3000-2000 BC)” is a sort of treatise explaining the social dimensions of the EBA in Asia Minor seen from the author’s perspective (257-299). Touching briefly on misconstrued terminologies and internal divisions of EBA published prior to the publication of this book, Düring proposes his own version of chronological order (258-261). As for the presumed destruction layers, migrations and paleo-linguistics at this time, he is of the opinion that there is no convincing evidence at present, archaeological or otherwise, for supporting the theory of migrations by Indo-European-speaking groups into Asia Minor (261-263). Among the principal EBA I sites (e.g. Beycesultan, Beşik-Yassitepe, Demircihöyük, Tarsus, and Troy Ia-e), the author regards Demircihöyük as the best representative settlement of the early third millennium BC (263-270). The analysis of the EBA II period is based on the evaluation of archaeological data from regional representative sites such as Alişar, Bademağacı, Beycesultan, Demircihöyük-Sariket, Karataş, Kültepe, Küllüoba, Tarsus, Troy If-II (270-287). His agreement with the estimated size of the Karataş inhabitants (740 people) based on the assessment of “no fewer than 128 houses are reconstructed for this settlement” does not take into consideration the possibility that they were probably constructed over time measured in generations. Such houses were most likely rebuilt after a generation or two of occupation, and that some of them could have been seasonally occupied and other turned into barns following disuse (Yakar 2011:381- 383, 387-388, 441, 462). Therefore, using the Karataş example in estimating the population of Troy II lower town could be rather misleading! The EBA III segment of the third millennium culture, which he dates to the 2300-2000 BC is represented by material inventories from the relatively well-stratified sites of Troy, Beycesultan, Alişar and Tarsus. Additional sites more briefly described include Alaca Höyük, Horoztepe, Kalınkaya, Kültepe, Ahlatlıbel, Kaman Kalehöyük, and a few others. Following his brief summary of the principal material culture inventories from settlements and burials, Düring maintains that “we are relatively uninformed about the nature of settlements in western Asia Minor,” mainly due to the shortcomings of the archaeological research and publication practices. As for “the rise of hierarchical societies,” he finds the argument of the possible Syro-Mesopotamian influence due to intensifying trade relations an inadequate one, and believes that purely local conditions were responsible for the development of hierarchical urban societies (297-299). In his opinion “contact with more complex societies does not result in emulation.” And that “the normative idea that urban life and social hierarchy are great achievements, and that people not living in this manner are culturally backward, is a modern teleological way of perceiving human societies.” Düring does not mention the archaeologically documented contact between

the middle Euphrates basin settlements in eastern Anatolia with the economically and socio-politically more organized societies of southeastern Turkey, which were culturally affiliated to some degree with the state-level Syro-Mesopotamian society. One may argue with some confidence that interaction with the latter could have accelerated through the intermediary of southeastern towns the pace of social changes in the more east-central and eastern regions of Anatolia. The emergence of towns in eastern Anatolia (Norşuntepe, Korucutepe) or southeastern Turkey (e.g. Tıtrış Höyük and many others in this region) reflects a good measure of Syro-Mesopotamian influence in the new architectural concepts and administrative structure and centralized economic organization. The fact that fully developed towns appeared in some regions earlier than in others indeed supports to some extent Düring's view that the so-called urban development in Asia Minor could have been initiated according to local developments, especially in the Aegean littoral and west-central plateau. However, considering the positioning of these towns controlling some stretches of major land and sea routes, the prospect of becoming a partner in market oriented regional and interregional trade network and perhaps also a player in regional politics could have played a part in the emergence of economically and politically significant towns in Asia Minor. In this hypothetical scenario aspects of non-Anatolian economic management models perhaps redesigned to meet the local needs and political traditions could have been introduced to serve the affluent political elite better manage its interests. This would have resulted in the adaptation of the town model in enlarging and reorganizing the settlements for a more stratified society, with the class divided inhabitants occupying their designed neighborhoods. One could perhaps define a city-state in this period as a politically organized territorial entity whose hierarchic center of power would have been located in the largest settlement. Such a hierarchic polity with a tribute system would have organized or controlled the economic activities of villages situated in its political territory. Competition between neighboring towns and the desire of each of them to protect its economic and political interests could, at least in some cases, have resulted in the formation of territorial city-states with flexible boundaries (Yakar 2011: 436-437). Some scholars have even proposed that state-level socio-political organizations might have developed more rapidly in areas of greater economic risk, as a means of buffering those risks (Raish 1992:76).

Despite the self-imposed geographical scope which excluded the incorporation of the highlands or southeast in his synthesis, I agree with Düring's final assessment of his book. It is indeed a significant contribution to a much broader effort in the pursuit of a better understood prehistory of Asia Minor (303). I have no doubt that this book regardless of the more recent publications which cover broader geographic and thematic expanses (e.g. Yakar 2011; Steadman and McMahon 2012) will be inspirational to new research into the prehistoric and preliterate periods of Anatolia in the years to come.

References

- Raish, C. 1992. *Domestic Animals and Stability in Pre-State Farming Societies*. BAR International Series 579, Oxford.
 Steadman, S.R. and G. McMahon, Eds. 2012. *Ancient Anatolia 10,000–323 BCE*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Yakar, J. 2011. *Reflections of Ancient Anatolian Society in Archaeology: From Neolithic Village Communities to EBA Towns and Politics*. Homer Kitabevi, Istanbul.

August 2012

Jak YAKAR
 Sonia & Marco Nadler
 Institute of Archaeology
 Tel Aviv University

*
 * *

HAUPTMANN, H., and E. PERNICKA (Hrsg.) — *Die Metallindustrie Mesopotamiens von den Anfängen bis zum 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. Katalog, Tafeln*. (Orient-Archäologie, Band 3). Verlag Marie Leidorf, Rahden, 2004. (29,5 cm, XIV, 149, 161 Pls.). ISBN 3-89646-633-X. ISSN 1434-162X.

Archaeometallurgy has come a long way since its early roots in the 19th and early 20th century, and is in many respects now a mature discipline in its own right (Rehren and Pernicka 2008). There are regular and well-attended national and international meetings, dedicated journals (either purely for archaeometallurgy, or as part of archaeological science more generally), and — at least in the Anglosaxon world — established university positions to maintain and define standards in the field and to develop genuinely new research questions and approaches. At the same time, there is still a common cross-disciplinary co-existence of mainstream archaeologists and philologists on the one hand, and hardcore scientists on the other, where the latter analyse archaeological finds provided by the former, but with limited academic interaction between the two, and a routine relegation of the resulting reports to the appendices of the main publication, alongside the other specialist reports, and often without noticeable impact on the actual text. Where between these two extremes do we see this volume here? First, one should set out that both editors are well established leaders in their field, with impeccable track records of high-quality research and a genuine devotion to the study of archaeological finds made of metal. Also, the production is of a standard one has come to expect of a German archaeological publication, well bound and with high-quality paper so that the drawings and photographs in the plates lose hardly anything of their original quality during reproduction in print. Thus, this is not just any volume, but a lovingly produced one, edited by well respected colleagues.

Nominally, the book is in German throughout; only the two-page foreword has been translated into English and printed alongside the German original. This, however, ought not to discourage any potential reader from buying the book, even if they feel less secure in this only historically important language. As can be seen from the details above, slightly over half of the total pages are plates anyway — as mentioned, these are all high quality, mostly simple scale drawings lovingly inked up, but also numerous almost photo-realistic stippled drawings, and some b/w photographs mounted in the plates alongside the traditional drawings. This leaves just under half of the book for text, and the operative word here is the very first word after the foreword: *Katalog*. This is easily recognized as the German word for *catalogue*, and from here on the book does what it says on

the tin. Very brief, almost staccato descriptions of the individual sites from which the artefacts originate, followed by the individual entries for each artefact analysed — altogether 2,623 numbers, running over 103 pages. One needs very little actual German and just a bit of practice on the first few pages to get the hang of it. Soon, one will be able to distinguish between a Nadel (needle) and a Schale (bowl); and if in doubt, one can simply check with the drawing in the plates to see what the object in question looks like; almost a picture book to learn German — at least nouns relevant for metal artefact typologies. The remaining 45 pages are easily read even for the linguistically challenged; they are entirely numerical. After four pages of neutron activation analyses we get a further 40 pages of x-ray fluorescence analyses, again numerically sorted, in line with the catalogue and the plates. That's it — all of it.

How to review such a volume? The foreword gives a bit of the background to this opus. The volume is the outcome of the five-year *Early Metals in Mesopotamia* project, conducted from 1991 to 1995 and aimed at rectifying a perceived imbalance between the large number of analysed prehistoric metal artefacts from Europe, Anatolia and the Levant and the less well studied cultures of Mesopotamia, from where only a thousand analyses were previously known, spanning nearly six millennia. With this project now the number of published analyses of Mesopotamian metal artefacts more than trebled; a total of 2777 new XRF analyses and a further 145 NAA analyses are presented here, covering 2623 artefacts. The foreword also mentions a second volume for which this catalogue is meant to provide the basis; in combination with cuneiform texts and the insights gained from the analyses, this second volume should provide a holistic image of the Mesopotamian metal industry. Should — unfortunately, even now, eight years after the publication of the first volume and 17 years after completion of the original project, it has not been published.

Thus, this volume stands in the long (though not proud) tradition of the work of the *Sumerian Copper Committee* of the interwar era and the *Mesopotamian Metals Project* of the 1980s; both projects were initiated and directed by pre-eminent scholars of their days, and both failed to reach the stage where the amassed data could have been coherently and meaningfully interpreted. Unfortunately, this scenario seems to be repeating itself here again.

On the up-side though, at least for this project we have all the data publicly available. Unfortunately though, it will be difficult to make actual use of the data, given that the 45 pages of tables, with data for eleven elements for each of the 2,623 artefacts, are not presented as a searchable data base but as printed paper, and all the metadata are in a separate catalogue sorted by archaeological site, with only the most basic description of dimensions for each artefact, but crucially no stratigraphic or other dating information. Thus, it is impossible to glean from this volume whether even the most pressing concern of the editors, expressed in the first paragraph of their foreword, has been successfully addressed, or not. Here, they give as a key motivation the following intriguing statement: 'In contrast, from Europe, Anatolia, and even Palestine there are many more analyses available of metal objects dating from the beginning of metal working until the end of the Bronze Age. This created the impression that the early copper metallurgy of southeastern Europe had taken an autochthonous course of development. The traditional idea of a transfer

of knowledge ... to which the European bronze metallurgy had owed the decisive stimuli from Mesopotamia via Anatolia and the Aegean, seemed to have been invalidated.' Apparently, Mesopotamian supremacy in early metallurgy is under threat, and has to be maintained and defended! Unfortunately for the cause, since these words were written evidence has come to light demonstrating copper smelting in the Balkans as early as 5,000 BC, contemporary with, if not predating, the earliest known such evidence from western Asia (Radivojević et al. 2010). I remain curious to learn whether the shotgun approach of this project, 'to analyze as many dated metal finds as possible', changes the increasingly persuasive picture of an independent emergence of metallurgy in the Balkans — but I don't hold my breath. This volume may hold the answer, but it reminds me of my past as an economic geologist: it is a significant deposit waiting to be mined — but until someone does the actual (data) mining and unlocks the wealth of information undoubtedly hidden in there, it has more potential than value.

Going back to the somewhat crude description of the state of the art in archaeometallurgy at the beginning of this review, how does this book fit? Unfortunately, it pretty much sits at the very extreme of the second (traditional) scenario. It is a huge appendix, but with no main text to which it is appended or which it could have informed — a tail without a dog if you like, and hence not even wagging.

Doha, Qatar, August 2012

Thilo REHREN
Hamad bin Khalifa University,
UCL Qatar

References

- Radivojević, M., Rehren, Th., Pernicka, E., Sljivar, D., Brauns, M. and Boric, D., 2010, On the origins of extractive metallurgy: new evidence from Europe. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 37, 2775-2787.
- Rehren, Th. and Pernicka, E. (2008): Coins, artefacts and isotopes: archaeometallurgy and Archaeometry. *Archaeometry* 50, 232-248.

*
* *

STEADMAN, S.R., and J.C. ROSS (eds.) — *Agency and Identity in the Ancient Near East. New Paths Forward. (Approaches to Anthropological Archaeology)*. Equinox Publishing Limited, London, 2010. (25,5 cm, VII, 207). ISBN 978-1-84553-443-1. £ 70.00, \$ 125.00.

Agency and Identity in the Ancient Near East is an ambitious volume, aiming to demonstrate the relevance and importance of agency and identity theories through a large number of case studies ranging from small-scale societies to various large empires, and from the Neolithic to the Early Islamic period. Chapters in the volume address a wide range of topics, including megalithic monuments, building practices, movement in urban landscapes, subsistence practices, writing, pottery production, cooking and cuisine, and written and iconographic forms of state propaganda. What ties all these contributions together is a shared interest in applying agency and identity theories to the archaeology, art, and texts of pre-modern Western Asia.

Among the contributing authors there is a shared perception that: "For scholars working in the Near East, concepts

of agency and identity have penetrated little into our practices and ideas.” (Ross and Steadman, 2), and it is this perceived deficiency that the books seeks to overcome. Many chapters therefore start with a reflection why agency and identity theory has not been explicit in the work of the contributing author before. To my mind the view of the contributors is too bleak, given that are significant publications dealing with agency and identity in Near Eastern archaeology (Verhoeven 1999; Pollock and Bernbeck 2005; Yoffee 2005; Hodder 2006; Knapp 2008; Finlayson and Warren 2010), although I can agree with the view that these studies are far from mainstream.

The introduction to the volume integrates and links the various contributions in the volume. Those with some knowledge of agency studies may wish to skip this altogether, but it will provide students with an understanding of the key issues.

The first set of chapters deals with the agency in place. Three chapters deal with how the built environment and landscapes can be studied from an agency perspective. Jennifer Jones considers economic and ritual activities people undertake in the Early Bronze Age landscape near el-Lejjun, Jordan. Sharon Steadman considers choices made in design of buildings in Neolithic and Chalcolithic Anatolia and how these might reflect social strategies of people. Finally, Scott Branting considers how the urban fabric of Iron Age Kerkenes Dağ in central Anatolia might have impacted people’s movement and activities in the city, drawing on time-geography models developed by Pred (1986) and others. Each of these chapters demonstrates the potential of approaches to landscapes, buildings, and settlements that focus on how people would have interacted with them. Through such studies the study of these societies, rather than their material remains, comes to the fore.

The second set of chapters in the volume deals with the agency of daily practice. Nerissa Russell and Amy Bogaard discuss the various activities people at Neolithic Çatalhöyük in Turkey would have been engaged in to meet their subsistence needs. Drawing on the *chaine opératoire* concept they provide a rich and innovative understanding of subsistence practices at this important site. Jennifer Ross describes the emergence of writing practices in Uruk period Mesopotamia, and shows the emergence of systems of written classification that betray a lack of interaction with people engaged in metallurgical and pottery production, and in doing so provides new insight into the nature of society in the Uruk period. Gabriela Castro Gessner reconstructs painting sequences and techniques of Halaf pottery, showing how remarkably diverse techniques were used to produce visually similar and standardized painted motifs on Halaf pottery. This study has important implications on our understanding of how crafts were transmitted in the Halaf horizon and how people were socialized. Finally, Jodi Magness discusses a series of linked changes in agriculture, cuisine, and cooking technologies in the Early Islamic period and how these changes were rooted in routine daily practices and social emulation strategies of the period.

The third set of papers in the volume deals with the agency of power. More specifically the focus is on how complex states try to achieve hegemony and how these states depend on people in various ways. Timothy Matney reconstructs the Iron Age cultural landscape of the Upper Tigris region and how the Assyrian State achieved partial domination of an

ethnically complex region through the use of various strategies. Marian Feldman describes how a new use of perspective on the Hammurabi stele and other objects in the Old Babylonian period served to create new types of subjects. Anne Porter considers the crucial role crafts people had in the construction and maintenance of elite identities in third millennium BC Mesopotamia. Finally, Gregory McMahon considers the agency of Anitta, an early Hittite king, and how he crafted the Hittite state from heterogeneous components in second millennium BC Anatolia.

Agency and Identity in the Ancient Near East then provides a very rich and interesting amalgamation of studies that should be of great interest to many scholars in the field. Nonetheless, one has the feeling that the studies do not match the theme of the volume completely. The problem is not in the quality of the contributions but in a specific use of the agency concept. There is something particular about the use of ‘agency theory’ in archaeology. Whereas the key thinkers on ‘agency’ (Bourdieu 1977; Giddens 1984; Sewell 2005) all envision agency in relation to structures that both enable and limit agency — hence these theories are usually labeled *structuration theory*, archaeologists generally tend to privilege agency and do not like to discuss the associated structures. This point is in fact made by various contributors to *Agency and Identity in the Ancient Near East* (Castro Gessner, 103; Knapp, 197; Porter, 169-70), and should have been given more prominence in the volume because many of the contributions to the volume deal at least as much with structure as they do with agency.

Nonetheless, the focus on agency in the book under consideration does allow the contributors to foreground motivations, mentalities, and choices made in the past, bringing people back into focus. In this way we the human scale is given the centre of the stage in the study of ancient Western Asia — which is probably why the Vitruvian Man by Leonardo da Vinci was put on the cover — and in this endeavour the volume provides excellent ways forward. My one regret about this volume is that it was published with Equinox at a hefty price of £70/\$125, a price that puts the book outside the reach of most scholars in the west and most libraries in Western Asia. This will undoubtedly limit access to this important book for many colleagues. For those who can afford it this important book it is hereby recommended.

References

- Bourdieu, P., 1977, *Outline of a Theory of Praxis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Giddens, A., 1984, *The Constitution of Society, Outline of a Theory of Structuration*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Hodder, I., 2006, *The Leopard’s Tale, Revealing the Mysteries of Çatalhöyük*. Thames and Hudson, London.
- Finlayson, B., and G. Warren, (ed.), 2010. *Landscapes in Transition*. Oxbow, Oxford.
- Knapp, A.B. 2008, *Prehistoric and Protohistoric Cyprus: Identity, Insularity and Connectivity*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Pollock, S., and R. Bernbeck, (eds.), 2005, *Archaeologies of the Middle East, Critical Perspectives*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Pred, A. 1986. *Place, Practice and Structure: Social and Spatial Transformations of Southern Sweden*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Sewell, W.H., 2005, *Logics of History, Social Theory and Social Transformation*. Chicago University Press, Chicago.

- Verhoeven, M., 1999, *An Archaeological Ethnography of a Neolithic Community. Space, Place and Social Relations in the Burnt Village at Tell Sabi Abyad, Syria*. NHAI, Istanbul.
- Yoffee, N., 2005, *Myths of the Archaic State. Evolution of the Earliest Cities, States and Civilizations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

August 2012

Bleda S. DÜRING
Faculty of Archaeology,
Leiden University

*
* *

MILWRIGHT, M. — An introduction to Islamic archaeology. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2010. (23,5 cm, X, 260). ISBN 978-0-7486-2311-2. £ 22.99.

Since the early 1970s, archaeologists working with Islamic period strata (e.g. James Sauer and Robert Smith) have been trying to build an independent profile for its archaeology. Within the last decade, most archaeologists (some hesitantly) seem to have reached a consensus that with the current amount of targeted work and data, a level has been reached that allows Islamic archaeology to be legitimately defined as an autonomous field of scientific inquiry. This tendency is seen in a growing number of scholarly attempts to outline and define what Islamic archaeology constitutes, and how it relates to traditional archaeology, Islamic history and Islamic art history.¹⁾ One of the most recent, encompassing, and in many ways successful contributions to this corpus of literature is Marcus Milwright's *An Introduction to Islamic Archaeology*.

Let it be said from the beginning; Milwright's book is neither a complete nor satisfactory account of the scope and purposes of Islamic archaeology. However, as the title indicates, this is not its goal. It is an introduction to a dynamic area of research that continues to expand geographically, chronologically and conceptually. Likely users are newcomers to the field: primarily undergraduate archaeology students or early post-graduates in associated fields. The occasional Islamic historian or art historian may also find the book useful as an overview of the possibilities that contemporary archaeology has to offer. That this is the intended audience is evident from the relatively basic level of the information conveyed. The book has little to offer someone seriously engaged in the field already. This is, however, not a critique. Milwright has identified a niche in the plethora of available literature, and for the uninitiated, his book constitutes a sound and considered introduction.

Due to this work's apparent usefulness for students of Islamic archaeology, this review will primarily consider it in this perspective. The book has an unusual structure in that

starts along a chronological trajectory, then shifts to more thematic issues, before returning to a chronological structure at the end (explained by the author on pp. 10-11). Framing the eight main chapters of the book, we find a comprehensive introduction to the field, including an outline of its history and the problems related to it; and a short conclusion that tries to bring the many threads of the book together. In many ways, it is these framing chapters that are the most interesting, as they position Islamic archaeology both in relation to the more traditional archaeologies, but also within a broader field of science. In doing so, Milwright explains where our field stands and how it came to stand there. These considerations allow one to appreciate how varied a field Islamic archaeology is, but also how multifaceted the author's approach is.

In spite of this, the chapter does have notable shortcomings. Milwright outlines the formative history of Islamic archaeology, but refrains from assessing its scientific or ideological validity. Similarly, he makes no attempt to define a methodology or to identify paradigms of thought within the discipline, nor does he highlight the idea and approaches that caused Islamic archaeology to progress as an independent discipline. In that sense, his work is rather uncontroversial. Nevertheless, the introduction emphasises the archaeological approach and the data it generates. This is crucial, in that newcomers to the field much too rarely are made to understand how archaeological data is distinct from other categories of data (textual sources, ethnographic observations, object d'art etc.), and how the latter should serve to contextualise the primary data. By means of exemplification, Milwright elegantly departs from historical narratives and spectacular finds, guiding students on to paths of archaeological inquiry instead.

The eight thematic chapters are organised into a conceptual introductory discussion followed by case-studies that exemplify the theme. Chapter 2 is on Early Islam and its relationship to the Late Antique cultures of the Near East. Even though this is a well established area of study within Islamic archaeology, it does not seem to be Milwright's field of expertise, and one might argue that his discussion is not really up-to-date. Thus, he considers aspects of cultural and socio-economic continuity and change, but does not consider the ways in which the archaeology of pre-Islamic societies addresses questions on the formative history of Islam. Similarly, he discusses the resilience of pottery production and styles, but not the archaeological implications of this phenomenon. Perhaps most detrimental to this chapter's purpose, is the lack of any consideration of discursive or paradigmatic developments within Islamic archaeology. Milwright uses loaded discursive concepts such as 'the Islamic conquests' and 'squatters' (p. 90), and does not discuss the central role archaeology has played in revising how we understand and explain the expansion of Islam.

Chapter 2's case-study of the *qusur* suffers from a similar problem, in that it does not question the taxonomic categories that predominantly western male scholarship has applied to the Islamic repertoire. Nor does it depart from the somewhat outdated approach of looking for the origins of an architectural form. That said, it should be noted that the *qusur* are a difficult subject, and that Milwright considers aspects from function and ecology, to the control of land, resources and trade routes in his assessment of these buildings. The chapter also introduces some of the earliest archaeological evidence

¹⁾ Stephen Vernoit (1997). "The Rise of Islamic Archaeology." *Muqarnas Annual* 14: 1-10; Timothy Insoll (1999). *The Archaeology of Islam*. Oxford: Blackwell; Alastair Northedge (1999). "Archaeology and Islam". In *Companion Encyclopedia of Archaeology Vol. 1 & 2*, ed. G. Barker, pp. 1077-106. London: Routledge; Sheila Canby (2000). "Islamic Archaeology: By Accident or Design?" In *Discovering Islamic Art. Scholars, Collectors and Collections, 1850-1950*, ed. S. Vernoit, pp. 128-37. London & New York: IB Tauris; Alan Walmsley (2004). "Archaeology and Islamic Studies. The Development of a Relationship". In *From Handaxe to Khan. Essays Presented to Peder Mortensen on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, eds. K. von Folsach, H. Thrane and I. Thuesen, pp. 317-30. Århus: Århus University Press; (2007). *Early Islamic Syria. An Archaeological Assessment*. London: Duckworth.

of Islamic culture, but there is not enough space to contextualise or evaluate it critically. He mentions the fundamental problems in assessing this period historically, reveals the promising potential of Arabic papyrology, but does not specify how archaeology can and has remedied the situation.

Chapter 3 (*New directions in the early Islamic period*) discusses the formative centuries of Islamic civilization. Examples are offered to substantiate developments, but here Milwright's technique of general discussion followed by case-studies does not really work. The cases deal with two distinct phenomena: the expansion of mercantile networks and the establishment of a Muslim administration (exemplified by the *Dar al-Imara*). In the first case, emphasis is on the Gulf as a transit corridor and on the discovery of Islamic coin hoards in Scandinavia and Russia. Clearly, these themes illuminate import and export practices, but also neglect other powerful dynamics. Omissions are unavoidable in synthetic works such as this, but the case-studies limit the extent of Islam's impact, undermining the point the chapter tries to make. Moreover, there is a degree of laxness: specific quantities of Islamic coins found in Scandinavia are mentioned twice, yet the numbers do not match and the references are a little dated.

With Chapter 4 (*The countryside*), the thematic chapters of the book really begin. A consideration of rural life is central to the type of understanding that most archaeologists today are aiming for, which highlights human life in all its multitudinous manifestations, and departs from dynastic approaches that define history as lists of reigns and battles. Milwright is clearly on home turf here, and he reviews the methods and practices applied in rural Islamic archaeology with authority and precision. Similarly, the case-studies are used as opportunities for the author to delve deeper than is otherwise permissible. His first case deals with complex water management and collection systems. Even though this is an old trope of Near Eastern archaeology, it remains highly relevant to understanding everything from economy, over technology, to ecology, infrastructure and landscapes. Pages 60-64 provide a sound introduction to the water management technologies found in Islamic contexts and an array of archaeological approaches to such installations are exemplified by the author's work on the Kerak Plateau. The efficient transport of water is next and also exemplified by installation types (e.g. *qanat*, *norias*, *aflaj* etc.) and the sites where these have been identified.

Chapter 4 also deals briefly with the practice of transposing irrigation technologies from one part of the empire to another (e.g. from Iran to Spain), and how this allowed the introduction of new crops. This changed the agrarian face of many regions in the Islamic world, but Milwright does not elaborate on the consequences. Instead, he focuses on sugar production. Sugar is indubitably an interesting crop from an archaeological perspective, because it is associated with specific material culture and has a substantial historical narrative related to it. Milwright concludes this section with a speculative correlation of jar size with molasses quality. This is problematic because most undergraduates will not yet have acquired the skills to critically assess the scientific validity of such an approach.

Chapter 5 (*Towns, cities and palaces*) deals with urbanism in a broad sense, and questions whether it is possible to define characteristics of an 'Islamic' urban environment. While the subtle answer is no, the chapter seeks to outline a model by

which Early Islamic urban centres grew. This includes a discussion of antiquated ideas such as Sauvaget's famous model from Lattakia, and discusses continuities from Late Antiquity. Even so, Milwright returns to the mosque-palace unit as the centre of most Islamic cities and towns. The discussion includes surprising new information such as an extra muros mosque at Aylah (p. 77), but without any referencing. Concluding the section on urbanism with an appropriate discussion of Samarra, Milwright compares developments here with trends identified at Madinat al-Zahra (Spain) and Kilwa (Tanzania), suggesting that they partly reflect ideas conceived for Samarra. While comparative analogies such as this are not without merit, the discussion is only on potential parallels, not the many differences. Again this should be seen in light of the target audience, who might take away that comparisons such as this are methodologically sound.

Middle Islamic urbanism is also discussed, and exemplified by Fustat and Nishapur. Here too there is a problem: Fustat is presented as progressing from shabby in the 7th-10th centuries to impressive in the 11th-12th centuries. Milwright draws upon some archaeological evidence to substantiate this, but does not acknowledge the paucity of available evidence on the early period. He nevertheless provides a solid discussion of the material culture associated with these two sites. This approach is very good, as it teaches students that they must first master the synthesis of different categories of archaeological evidence, before moving on to interdisciplinary considerations such as juxtaposing archaeological and historical evidence. In this reviewer's opinion, the book would have been better if it had employed the evaluation of context specific artefacts more consistently.

Chapter 6 (*Religious practice*) is subdivided into three themes: mosques as the locus of religious praxis; burials and the associated practices; and the communities of non-Muslim groups in the Islamic world. In dealing with mosques, Milwright emphasises how these buildings can be elaborated and enhanced over time, and how this can change the building's symbolic significance and function. To exemplify this, Figure 6.2 shows the development of the mosque at Shanga. This is the first visualisation of stratigraphy in the book. Stratigraphy generally ought to play a much more decisive role in archaeological overviews, so I was pleased to see it in this work. The failure to incorporate stratigraphic evidence and considerations in introductory works is creating a growing number of archaeology students that may be familiar with a given area or period's material culture, but who have little grasp of provenance or context, or how to use stratigraphic data in a relevant and coherent fashion.

The chapter goes on to discuss Muslim burials, and especially the section on the Tall al-Hasi cemetery reveals the wealth of information retrievable from such contexts. The last section on non-Muslim communities is also a good idea, as it demonstrates the cultural complexities encapsulated by the concept of Islamic archaeology (e.g. the iconoclastic movement, pp. 138-40). That said, I found it peculiar that so much space was used to describe the tapestry of religious identities that characterised the regions into which Islam expanded. Core issues in Islamic archaeology are not afforded the same space, and the prioritization seems at odds with the book's purpose.

Chapter 7 (*Crafts and industry*) begins with an undue emphasis on the lack of identity marks left by Muslim craftsmen on their products. Presumably, this is to distinguish the

Islamic arts and craft traditions from western traditions (and, one is tempted to suggest, the traditions of the intended audience). Milwright soon returns to that which he knows, and the chapter sets the diachronic production of pottery at Raqqa-Rafiqā within a broader socio-economic framework. Even though the discussion presupposes a degree of technical knowledge that the rest of the book does not, readers can easily consult the glossary for most terms. In general, the discussion gives the reader a good overview of techniques and materials, but also of the importance of these materials in archaeological interpretations.

Chapter 8 (*Travel and trade*) takes up another central theme in Islamic archaeology. It begins with a discussion of pottery circulation in the eastern Mediterranean that revisits some of the technical jargon of Chapter 7, but soon moves on to consider other archaeological aspects of trade. The chapter is generally sound, but inconsistencies occur. When discussing Chinese wares, Milwright states that these were among the most expensive commodities of Mediterranean trade, but also refers to them as an 'ubiquitous' feature of urban life (p.167). The topic of trade in the Islamic world is so encompassing that one can hardly address it without being highly selective. Similarly, the Indian Ocean is an entire world, and the mercantile dynamics associated with it reach far beyond the scope of Islamic archaeology. Consequently, the author should not be criticised for his choice of focal points (*i.e.* Quseir and Siraf).

To this reviewer, Chapter 9 (*The 'post-medieval' Islamic world*) was definitely the most stimulating. This may partly be due to my familiarity with the Early Islamic themes discussed in this book, but it is also because the later periods of Islamic history only have emerged as a legitimate field of archaeological study within the last twenty years or so. Consequently, it has a freshness to it that the more established areas have lost. Even though this chapter returns to the chronological structure of the first chapters, the focus on tobacco and coffee, and their associated practices and material culture, brings many of the thematic threads of the previous chapters together in an elegant and innovative way that the conclusion does not. Regrettably, Milwright cannot refrain from making exaggerated comparisons, and the chapter loses something by suggesting that Turkish *ciftliks*, Umayyad *qusur* and Andalusian *munyas* might be fruitfully compared. In doing so, he fails to caution against the generalisations that typically arise from such sweeping comparisons, and offers no indication of appropriate methodology.

An Introduction to Islamic Archaeology is an ambitious and considered account that tries to cover too much material on too little space. In a sense, the book falls between chairs. There is no attempt to define new approaches to Islamic archaeology as for example Insoll (1999) tried to do. Nor does it have the geographic focus of Walmsley's introduction to the field (2007). Another problem is that it has too many small shortcomings. A few can be overlooked in a work such as this, but relying on unsubstantiated statements is weakness of argumentation. Thus, when the conclusion mentions historians questioning the usefulness of Islamic archaeology, Milwright should provide concrete references and respond directly to that criticism based on issues taken up in the book. Instead, he states that Islamic archaeology cannot rival history in scope and level of detail; failing completely to relay that archaeology is not meant to answer the same questions as history, but addresses different and more long term

processes (*e.g.* social and economic evolution). He acknowledges that archaeology can address '*...lacunae in the primary written sources, by complementing conclusions formulated by historians, and by elaborating new interpretive models*' (p.193), and provides examples of long term dynamics such as ecology in rural environments or the morphology of urban environments. In general, Milwright's book identifies a range of issues and questions which archaeology is better suited to address than history. Yet it is as if he himself underestimates the potential of our discipline and considers the nature of archaeology as complimentary to historical research. I cannot agree with this.

Milwright suggests that archaeology's true potential has yet to be realised. While this is no doubt true, it appears that even when archaeology's potential has been exploited, this is not really recognised by the author. Thus, when he on page 195 states that '*archaeology does not overturn the historical account of the seventh century, but it does add significant perspectives*', it is as if he unaware of the fundamental and broadly recognised impact that archaeological research has had on the popular (both in the West and in the Islamic world) perception of the rise and expansion of Islam as a violent phenomenon. The paucity of destruction strata in the archaeological record of *Bilad al-Sham*, has in a few decades vanquished the notion of Islam as being a religion spread by the sword.

A final criticism should be launched against the publishers. *The New Edinburgh Islamic Surveys* constitute an important contribution to the study of Islam in general, but in this case, the editors do not seem to appreciate the importance of images as a means of relaying complex ideas and concepts — especially in an introductory work on material culture. The image-sections of the book are annoying to use, and the quality of the black and white imagery is mediocre at best. In this reviewer's opinion, the book's impact would have been stronger if a combination of monochrome and colour images had been incorporated in the text.

July 2012

Kristoffer DAMGAARD
University of Copenhagen