

interaction but not conversant in the specific materials (pottery, bronze vessels, coins, swords), a few illustrations would be very helpful.

Second, the volume does not include any substantial theoretical or methodological discussion of the problems in linking archaeological and textual evidence. The text implies that archaeology and historical sources should correspond closely, and that we can interpret the archaeological evidence in light of what we know from the written documents. During the past three decades, an extensive literature has emerged on the problems of correlating archaeological and textual sources of information. The gist of much of the current discussion is that, like objects recovered archaeologically, texts are artifacts; they do not speak for themselves, but need their own interpretation. For instance, it would have been useful if the author had addressed the different Roman uses of the name "Germans" and other "tribal" names that enter into the discussion. And the author takes a traditional approach in attributing particular styles of objects to specific groups, as, for example, "Celtic" swords.

Finally, the author does not say much about how objects enter deposits that archaeologists excavate. He discusses the question of differential modern attention to different areas within his study area, but does not say much about the effects of original human behavior on the distribution of the objects. For instance, there are significant blank spots on the distribution maps—is it not possible that people used Roman objects there differently, and that is why archaeology has not recovered them?

The volume is an important contribution for specialists in Roman-native interactions. Because this part of the Roman world has been so extensively studied, specialists working in other regions of the Roman frontier could benefit from the approach developed here. The less specialized reader should also consult publications that provide illustrations of the objects, as well as discussion of the methodological and theoretical issues involved.

Like other volumes in this series, this one is extremely well produced, with plans, maps, and tables of excellent quality. And the book includes a very good seven-page summary in English.

PETER S. WELLS

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
395 HHH CENTER
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455
WELLSOO1@UMN.EDU

EL ARMAMENTO IBÉRICO: ESTUDIO TIPOLOGICO, GEOGRÁFICO, FUNCIONAL, SOCIAL Y SIMBÓLICO DE LAS ARMAS EN LA CULTURA IBÉRICA (SIGLOS VI–I A.C.), 2 vols., by *Fernando Quesada Sanz*. (Monographies *Instrumentum* 3.1 and 2.) Pp. xxii + 962, figs. 432, pls. 65. Éditions Monique Mergoïl, Montagnac 1997. ISSN 1278-3846; ISBN 2-907303-09-0 (paper).

This very substantial book, revised from the author's Ph.D. dissertation, includes an important catalogue of Iberian weapons and a detailed study of the historical

problems raised by this material. The choice of placing the catalogue in an appendix in order to reserve the main portion of the book to the analysis shows the aim of this work. Yet this does not mean that the catalogue lacks either accuracy or exhaustiveness. There are six appendices, each one with its own bibliography: (1) catalogue of the archaeological sites, (2) general table of the weapons listed by site, (3) table of the Iberian graves with weapons, (4) catalogue of the discovered pieces of weaponry (listed by inventory number and by type), and (5) and (6) catalogues of the sculptures and ceramics bearing figures of weapons. Unfortunately, for editorial reasons, the handling of this catalogue is not always easy. But, this complete database now offers the essential tool for any further research on the subject. Its extent also attests to the remarkable growing wealth of Iberian peninsular archaeology.

The main body of the text corresponds to a study of the data, divided into four parts. The first part discusses the method followed by the author, and offers a historiographical appraisal. The following parts analyze one by one the different elements that constitute the Iberian panoply: the second part thus deals with offensive weaponry (*falca-ta*, straight sword, dagger, spear and javelin, bow, and sling) and the third one focuses on defensive weaponry (shield and corporal protections: helmet, armor, greaves). The last, entitled "*la panoplia ibérica*," presents minor conclusions on each piece of military equipment and offers a renewed reflection about the evolution of this weaponry and its use during the battle. One of the main interests of this book lies in its multi-entry structure easing the reader's negotiation of an argumentation teeming with ideas. The book appears as a general survey, resulting from a huge work that is well reflected by the impressive bibliography published in the second volume.

The meticulous reexamination of the whole documentation (archaeology, iconography, texts) and the systematic use of computer databases allows the author to base his study of each weapon on improved chronologies and typologies. The regional changes are also constantly taken into account as each type of weapon is studied in its geographical and cultural context. This deliberate complexity breaks with the traditional uniform vision of Iberian weaponry inherited from the classic study by H. Sanders ("Weapons of the Iberians," *Archaeologia* 64 [1913] 205–94). Indeed, Quesada makes a point of defining precisely the Iberian area (the eastern and southern coasts) from the rest of the peninsula, of which the author also includes only the interior and especially the Meseta, thus affording the opportunity for valuable comparisons. The Atlantic coast is totally excluded. Moreover, willing to avoid any oversimplification, the author divides the Iberian area into 17 regions characterized by their geographical unity and the coherence of their archaeological features.

The intersection of all these typological, chronological, and geographical data results in Quesada's rejecting some widespread ideas about Iberian weaponry. Thus, he points out that the round shield was the main defensive weapon of the Iberians from the end of the sixth century B.C. Indeed, the *scutum*-type oval shield appears only late, at the end of the third century B.C., under the influence of the Carthaginians and the Romans, and becomes common only during the second century B.C.

In the same way, the author's typology, which is the first of its kind, demonstrates that the spear, not the javelin or the sword, was the main offensive weapon in the Iberian area from the sixth and fifth centuries to the end of the third century B.C. Otherwise, according to another of the author's studies (*Arma y símbolo: La falcata ibérica* [Alicante 1992]), he qualifies the supremacy of the falcata in Iberian weaponry: the massive diffusion of this weapon, which first appears in the fifth century, is in fact limited to the southeastern part of the peninsula (Bastetania and Contestania). Moreover, the number of examples found in graves decreases significantly from the end of the third century B.C., although the use of this weapon may have lasted until the middle of the first century B.C. Contrary to scholarly consensus, the prototype of this weapon is not Greek, but Italic: it consists of a long and curved single-edged blade. Its Iberian version, however, consists of a short and straightened double-edged blade. This typical shape did not change much between the fourth and the first century B.C. The adoption of the falcata by the Iberians must result from the transformation of a cavalryman's saber into an infantryman's slashing and thrusting sword. So, from a functional point of view, the falcata brings nothing new to the very numerous straight-bladed and double-edged short swords already in use in the Iberian Peninsula. The author better explains the success of the new weapon by other reasons connected to social prestige and funerary symbolism. On the other hand, he rightly rejects the idea, which is sometimes sustained, that this falcata would have furnished a model for the second century's *gladius hispaniensis*. According to the author, the prototype of the Roman legions' sword would instead be the Celtiberian version of the La Tène I sword, which spread through the Meseta at the end of the third century B.C. Quesada has also provided an English version of the main arguments supporting his new hypothesis in a recent study (*Journal of Roman Military Equipment Studies* 8 1997 [1999] 251–70).

The major contribution of this book is to demonstrate the vitality and the originality of the Iberian tradition of weaponry. The purpose is not to deny the importance of the various influences in such areas where contacts with Mediterranean civilizations were old and numerous. On this subject, as we have already seen in the case of the falcata, the author gives a greater place to the Italic or Latenian (for the northeastern area) influences than to eastern ones, Greek or Phoenician. The role of Hispanic mercenaries is discussed again from this point of view. According to the author, the external influences on the Iberian panoply were the strongest during the second and first centuries B.C. (e.g., the Montefortino-type helmet and the scutum). Otherwise, the author defends with convincing arguments the great adaptability of the Iberian culture. New types of weapons are fitted to Iberian tastes and needs, ending finally in true innovations, like falcata, *frontón* swords, or armor plates (*disco-corazas*).

Quesada rejects for good the widespread hypothesis that it was in the Celtiberian world that the formation and development of the Iberian panoply originated. He shows that this belief, maintained in important studies by W. Schule (*Die Meseta-Kulturen der iberischen Halbinsel* [Berlin 1969]) and by P.F. Stary (*Zur eisentlichen Bewaffnung und Kampfweise auf der iberischen Halbinsel* [Berlin

1994]), depended on the early concentration of archaeological work (1905–1955) in north Meseta, especially that of A. Schulten, J. Cabré Aguiló, and Marqués de Cerralbo. Thus, archaeological knowledge of the inland cultures and of the coastal ones was, for a long while, very uneven. Quesada now discredits the simple view that Iberian weapons were generally replications of the Meseta equipment, and discounts the ancient literary tradition of militarily inept Iberians. Rejecting these presuppositions, F. Quesada offers different findings: some of the characteristic weapons used in the Meseta came originally from the Iberian area (frontón sword and dagger, atrophied antennae dagger, *soliferreum*). Thus, from the fourth century B.C. on, Iberia was a weapon production center as dynamic as the Meseta itself.

As mentioned in the long subtitle of the book, Quesada's work does not limit itself to a typological study. Remaining faithful to the spirit of his earlier works (*Armamento, guerra y sociedad en la necrópolis ibérica de "El Cabello del Tesoro"* [Oxford 1989]), the author views weaponry as essential evidence for ancient societies marked by war and by the place occupied by the warriors. So the explicit purpose of this book is mainly to understand the relationship between weaponry, war, and society in the Iberian Peninsula during the Second Iron Age. The analysis postulates that Iberian weaponry meets a conception of war and battle, which expresses the values of a society and reflects the evolution of its organization. F. Quesada defines then four steps in the panoply of the Iberians corresponding to four transformations of their relationships to war. After a time of transition (*fase formativa*, mid seventh to late sixth century B.C.), which is still characterized by dominant features of the Final Bronze Age, comes a first period (*fase antigua*, late sixth to late fifth century B.C.) when the Iberian panoply consists of complete offensive and defensive heavy equipment (spear and javelin, short straight sword, helmet, armor, greaves, shield). It is the type of weaponry represented in the sculptures of Porcuna and Elche. Compared with what we know elsewhere in the Mediterranean or southern Europe, especially in Greece during the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., the author calls this first set *panoplia aristocrática* and interprets it as the sign of the preference for a Homeric-type close infantry battle between aristocratic champions. From the beginning of the fourth to the last third of the third century B.C., during a second and better-documented period (*fase plena*), the panoply simplifies. The author explains this phenomenon by a generalization of the weaponry beyond the little group of aristocrats (*panoplia generalizada*). The weapon types change somewhat (adaptation of the *falcata* for hand-to-hand fighting, decline of the dagger, expansion of shorter and lighter spears), but the defensive weaponry becomes cheaper and more stereotyped (the largest round shields predominate). F. Quesada understands this evolution as the sign of the development of the infantry battle in formation, similar to other Mediterranean traditions. In this period, great regional variations appear: the Meseta's panoply is now different from the Iberian one.

Punic and Roman contributions modify Iberian weaponry in an advanced phase (*fase avanzada*, last third of the third century to the beginning of the first century B.C.), corresponding to what Quesada calls a *panoplia ren-*

ovada. The tendency to simplify becomes more pronounced, reinforced by the increasing popularity of the Montefortino-type helmet and of the scutum. The author associates this evolution with the Roman auxiliary light infantry. This transformation ends with the *fase final* (first half of the first century B.C.). At this time, the *panoplia romanizada* corresponds to the disappearance of traditional Iberian weaponry.

In conclusion, as far as it is possible from the evidence, the successive panoplies do not fit with an exclusive practice of the guerrilla warfare, too often associated with Iberian war traditions. On the contrary, they imply a preference for a regular warfare (in the form of the "heroic" battle or of the battle in formation, well attested in the literary sources for later periods) that befits the aristocratic values of these societies. F. Quesada finds confirmation of his theory in the clear rejection of some throwing weapons, like bow or sling, used only for hunting, and in the evident supremacy of the infantry battle. Contrary to scholarly consensus, the use of cavalry in battles appears indeed late in the Iberian world, perhaps only in the second half of the third century B.C.

This reevaluation of the classical model of warfare in the Iberian Second Iron Age seems to me an important historical revision concerning the confrontation between these populations and Roman legions during the conquest of the Peninsula. However, the author's tendency to interpret systematically the growing use of Hispanic auxiliaries in the Roman army, from the second century B.C. onward, as a main cause for the changes in the former native tactics, mixing heavy and light infantry, seems to me less convincing. There is no evidence that Rome only asked its native allies for light infantry, nor that the supposed uselessness of native heavy infantry was the main factor for the traditional Iberian heavy equipment's eclipse. The real difficulty in distinguishing Roman from Iberian weapons in the sources at this period is not sufficient to prove such a transformation. Moreover, as the author recognizes, we must avoid confusing entirely heavy infantrymen with hoplite-type breast-plated soldiers. The complete dissolution of the Iberian panoply into the Roman military tradition, even during the first century B.C., remains for me more open than Quesada suggests.

In a short review it is impossible to give a complete account of the richness and utility of this book. It does have minor errors, of course: many inconsistencies between the bibliographical citations in the text and in the general bibliography; illustrations and figures are not always of excellent quality. But these few quibbles must not obscure the rigor of Quesada's method and the depth of his thinking. His book not only will remain essential for the classification and typology of Iberian weaponry, but is also an important and stimulating book of history.

FRANÇOIS CADIOU

UNIVERSITÉ NANCY 2
UFR SCIENCES HISTORIQUES ET GÉOGRAPHIQUES,
MUSICOLOGIE
CAMPUS LETTRES ET SCIENCES HUMAINES
3, PLACE GODEFROY DE BOUILLON—BP. 3397
54015 NANCY CEDEX
FRANCE
CADIOU.F@WANADOO.FR

THE EARLY BYZANTINE MONASTERY OF KHIRBET ED-DEIR IN THE JUDEAN DESERT: THE EXCAVATIONS IN 1981–1987, by Yizhar Hirschfeld, with contributions by R. Barkay, R. Ben-Arieh, R. Calderon, E. Cohen, L. di Segni, L. Habas, and R. Talgam. (*Qedem* 38.) Pp. xii + 180, b&w figs. 244, color pls. 4. The Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem 1999. \$44. ISSN 0333-5844 (cloth).

This monograph contains the final reports for the excavation of Khirbet ed-Deir, an early monastic settlement (late fifth–seventh century A.D.) located in the Nahal Arugot in the southern Judean Desert and excavated from 1981–1987 under the direction of Yizhar Hirschfeld and Rivka Calderon. Although preliminary reports of the site have already appeared by Hirschfeld and his colleagues ("Khirbet ed-Deir [Désert de Juda]," *RBib* 93 [1986] 276–84), this well-illustrated volume introduces the reader to the historical context of Judean monasticism, to Khirbet ed-Deir's relationship to the growing field of monastic archaeology, and how Christian monasticism fared after the Islamic conquests. Those who seek in-depth archaeological reports on the architectural components, inscriptions, numismatics, mosaic pavements, and small finds (marble, glass, and ceramics) will not be disappointed either. The reports are clearly written and accessible to those both in the field of archaeology and history, a characteristic not often found with many excavation monographs.

Hirschfeld has catalogued over 60 monastic settlements through his early survey work in the Judean Desert (*The Judean Desert Monasteries in the Byzantine Period* [New Haven] 1992). He classifies Khirbet ed-Deir as a "cliff-side *coenobium*," a description first suggested by Marcoff and Chitty ("Notes on Monastic Research in the Judean Wilderness, 1928–29," *Palestine Exploration Fund* [1929] 167–78 and plates). The monastic layout is rare since most *coenobia* were located on flat plains rather than on cliffs. The monastery is similar in form to three other cliff-side settlements: the monasteries of Theoctistus, Choziba, and Spelaion. All four communities expanded around a natural cave that was adapted and expanded to create a "cave church."

Khirbet ed-Deir is a unique single period settlement and therefore half the monograph is dedicated to documenting the variety of features of the site. Hirschfeld's thorough discussion of the monastic architecture, accompanied by line drawings, reconstructions, and photographs, records the history of the monastery and its various areas of spiritual and temporal work (e.g., cave church, burial area, refectory, stable, gatehouse, living quarters, gardens, kitchen, chapel, and water supply system). This documentation of the architectural plan of the settlement will be valuable for future comparative studies of monastic settlements found both in Judea and elsewhere in the Middle East.

The settlement broadly divides into three areas: (1) the church, burial, refectory, cistern, and garden in a small gorge; (2) the living quarters, tower, and upper cistern on a spur; and (3) the agricultural fields north of the occupied areas of the monastic complex. The location of the site is remote, being somewhat removed from

what Hirschfeld calls the "pilgrimage routes" to the larger monastic settlements, such as Mar Saba, the Great Lavra. The foundation of Khirbet ed-Deir in the late fifth century was determined by an assemblage of diagnostic evidence: comparable late fifth-century mosaic patterns (identified with those found at the Monastery of Martyrius at Ma'ale Adummim and the monastery on Masada); two coins from the reigns of Anastasius I (491–518) and Justinian I (527–565); inscriptional evidence with a date of 530 from a burial recess within the complex; and a variety of early Byzantine finds of ceramics, glass, and wall paintings. The settlement covers over 4,000 m², making Khirbet ed-Deir one of the larger Judean coenobia and Hirschfeld suggests that 50–70 monks resided there until it was abandoned in the late seventh century. This population estimate is not based upon actual excavation of the residential quarter since these remains on the spur were not well protected and were in a very poor state of preservation.

Hirschfeld's interpretation of the final years of the monastery in the seventh century deserves particular attention. Unlike previous scholarship that has often focused upon the initial decades of the first monastic communities and then has lamented its demise under the Muslims, Hirschfeld raises questions about the nature of the Judean monasteries in the seventh century and how the Muslim Conquest (630s) could have altered the life of the somewhat isolated communities. The archaeological record at Khirbet ed-Deir does not provide any evidence of violence on behalf of the Muslims (e.g., conflagration). However, Hirschfeld does assert that the monastery seems to have fallen into desperate times, likely because fewer pilgrims were traveling to monasteries in the later seventh century. The more remote waystations, such as this cliff-coenobium, could no longer benefit from

serving travelers who provided some financial stability for the monks. Despite the semi self-sufficient nature of the settlement, Hirschfeld suggests the smaller monastic communities were forced to consolidate into larger settlements (e.g., the monasteries of Euthymius, Theodosius, Sabas, and Chariton) that would flourish, not decline, in the Islamic period. This explanation of the abandonment of Khirbet ed-Deir provides an important nuance to our understanding of the settlement patterns of Judea after the Islamic Conquest. The fact that Khirbet ed-Deir yielded very few remains of personal items and complete vessels implies that the monks planned to leave the site unlike those who lived at the monastery of Martyrius at Ma'ale Adummim who fled after the monastery was damaged during the Persian invasion in 614.

The excavation report concludes with an identification of Khirbet ed-Deir as the Monastery of Severianus mentioned by Cyril of Scythopolis (*Vita Sabae* 36). Although no inscriptional evidence has been yet discovered to identify the site, Hirschfeld bases his identification both on textual references and on the typology of the site that closely resembles what would be a comparable settlement for the late fifth or early sixth century. This monograph is a welcome addition for researchers in monastic archaeology and history. It provides rich details on the site, but also demonstrates the promising new ground for investigations into the culture of monastic life in the Near East in the early and middle Byzantine periods.

DARLENE L. BROOKS HEDSTROM

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
WITTENBERG UNIVERSITY
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO 45501
DBROOKSHEDSTROM@WITTENBERG.EDU

BOOKS RECEIVED

- ABDY, RICHARD ANTHONY. *Romano-British Coin Hoards*. (Shire Archaeology 82.) Pp. 72, figs. 50. Shire Publications, Buckinghamshire 2002. £5.99. ISBN 0-7478-0532-6 (paper).
- AGNOLI, NADIA. *Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Palestrina: Le Sculture*. (Xenia Antiqua Monografie 10.) Pp. 291, figs. 251. L'ERMA di Bretschneider, Rome 2002. €155. ISBN 88-8265-181-9 (paper).
- ARCE, JAVIER, ED. *Centelles: El Monumento Tardoromano*. (Bibliotheca Italica, Monografias de la Escuela Espanola de Historia y Arqueologia en Roma 25.) Pp. xi + 122, figs. 67, map 1. L'ERMA di Bretschneider, Rome 2002. €78. ISBN 88-8265-169-X (paper).
- ASCANI, KAREN, VINCENT GABRIELSEN, KIRSTEN KVIST, and ANDERS HOLM RASMUSSEN, EDS. *Ancient History Matters: Studies Presented to Jens Erik Skydsgaard on His Seventieth Birthday*. (*AnalRom* Suppl. 30.) Pp. 333, figs. 81, table 1, maps 7. L'ERMA di Bretschneider, Rome 2002. ISBN 88-8265-190-8 (cloth).
- BEN-YEHUDA, NACHMAN. *Sacrificing Truth: Archaeology and the Myth of Masada*. Pp. 275, figs. 20. Humanity Books, Amherst, N.Y. 2002. \$35. ISBN 1-57392-953-0 (cloth).
- BERRENBURG, RUDIGER SCHNEIDER. *The Parthenon Plan of Ictinus*. Pp. 33, figs. 65, table 1. Die Berrenberg, Bonn 2002. €79.50. (paper).
- BOROWSKI, ODED. *Agriculture in Iron Age Israel*. Pp. xxii + 245, figs. 22, tables 4. American Schools of Oriental Research, Boston 2002. \$32.50. ISBN 0-89757-054-5 (paper).
- BOSCHUNG, DIETRICH. *Gens Augusta: Untersuchungen zu Aufstellung, Wirkung und Bedeutung der Statuengruppen des julisch-claudischen Kaiserhauses*. Pp. xv + 233, figs. 31, pls. 337. Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 2002. €86. ISBN 3-8053-2825-7 (cloth).
- BRADLEY, RICHARD. *The Past in Prehistoric Societies*. Pp. xiii + 171, figs. 52, tables 10. Routledge, London 2002. \$27.95. ISBN 0-415-27628-4 (paper).
- BRANDT, J. RASMUS, and OLAF STEEN, EDS. *Acta ad archaeologiam et artium historiam pertinenta*. (Institutum Romanum Norvegiae 15.) Pp. 337, figs. 183, maps 8. Bardi Editore, Rome 2001. €65. ISSN 1120-4672; ISBN 88-85699-94-4 (paper).
- BRAUN, JOACHIM. *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine: Archaeological, Written and Comparative Sources*. (The Bible in Its World.) Pp. xxxvi + 368, figs. 189, tables 2. William B.