amulet workshops north of the Carmel Range. He dates the objects to LB I or IIA and one of the imports to the Middle Kingdom, which he notes might be an heirloom.

Chapter 6 presents a preliminary report and observations on a computed tomography analysis of five ceramic vessels. The research was conducted by Nachum Applbaum and Yaakov H. Applbaum. Following a discussion of the methodology of using medical X-ray computed tomography (CT) and a brief overview of this technology for archaeological investigation, the authors provide useful references for previous experiments using this technique. The five vessels used in this analysis—two bowls, a composite pyxis, a Mycenaean piriform jar, and a Cypriot white-painted juglet—were chosen on account of their known ceramic technology (e.g., coil vs. fast-wheel, wheel vs. hand-built, insertion of juglet handles vs. pasting them to the body). The authors demonstrate that CT technology can be an efficient tool for nondestructive inquiry into ceramic technology. However, this experiment is only in its preliminary stages and any information is tentative. Indeed, because there are no comparative studies of the artifacts, the authors had to commission a potter to create a series of control vessels which were then scanned to create a “digital standard” for future CT studies.

Maier concludes the monograph with a summary chapter. The data from the nine tombs represent a rich collection of finds from the Middle and Late Bronze Ages through Iron IIB–IIC. While these tombs lack the important osteological data, inferences can be made from other Late Bronze Age burial practices (Gonen 1992) and from the LB tomb excavated during Seger’s project (Seger 1988). Maier’s conclusions offer a sober analysis of the tomb data with the occupational history of Gezer presented by the American excavations and recent studies on Aegean pottery and Egyptian administrative activity during the Late Bronze Age. The monograph contains several plates of line drawings and photographs. In addition, there are two plates of the CT sections.

Maier and his contributors are to be commended for their enterprise. While this monograph shows the debilitating effects of lost data, unprovenienced artifacts, and lack of timely excavation reports, it also illustrates that persistence and exhaustive research can pay off in published results that make a contribution to scholarship. Ironically, Tomb I, with its chronological link between the Late Bronze and Iron I, provides evidence for the occupational history of Gezer and the Ajalon Valley during the transitional period between the Bronze and Iron Ages. Although this inference is based on only one tomb, it suggests that in the social upheavals and destructions associated with the collapse of the Late Bronze Age, there was continuity, and historians cannot make sweeping generalizations concerning occupation and settlement history. Maier thus has provided another chapter to the history of Gezer. In addition, the monograph contributes important chapters to the history of the archaeology of the Levant and specifically to the archaeology of the modern state of Israel.

Steven M. Ortiz
New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary
sortiz@nobts.edu
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The work reviewed here is a collection of papers gathered together by the editors from those who participated in a series of symposia held at SBL meetings between 1998 and 2001. Twenty essays are presented under three general sections: Jerusalem during the Reigns of David and Solomon; The Rise and Fall of Jerusalem at the End of the Judahite Kingdom; and Biblical Jerusalem: Toward a Consensus. This work is not intended as a complete archaeological-historical survey of Bronze and Iron Age Jerusalem (a work much to be desired) but instead focuses on issues of relevance to the contributors.

The first section contains articles by J. Cahill, I. Finkelstein, D. Ussishkin, G. Lehmann, J. J. M. Roberts, and R. E. Friedman. Probably the response article by M. Steiner would also have fit better here than in the third section. The first four essays focus on the contentious archaeological record of Jerusalem during this period and what this bodes for the reconstruction of the Davidic/Solomonic capital; the latter two focus on literary traditions. Roberts and Friedman (and Schniedewind and Amit in the third section) agree that traditions regarding David and Solomon are very old, easily preexilic, with some at least going back to that very era, with much of it crystallizing around the time of Hezekiah.

The archaeological battle lines on Davidic Jerusalem have been drawn by the other authors in various publications. All agree that the stepped-stone structure and its underlying terrace system once supported a now lost expansion of the usable flat building area at the north end of
the City of David. Cahill argues that these are a single unit and date to the end of the 13th–beginning of the 12th century B.C.E. and that, on the basis of material from the house of Ahiel, it was partially dismantled in places already in the 10th century. Finkelstein, Ussishkin, and Steiner generally accept that the terraces are earlier, at least Iron Age I, but assert that the stepped mantle is tenth or ninth century (depending on one’s chronology). Cahill’s article is especially welcome because it surveys the material from Jerusalem from the Late Bronze Age through the Iron II and provides a series of plates showing the ceramics recovered from both the terraces and the stone mantle which seem to well support her dating scheme. That being said, it should not really surprise anyone if tenth-century pottery was recovered from some parts of the stone mantle. The biblical record asserts that both David (2 Sam 5:9) and Solomon (1 Kgs 9:15; 24; 11:27) “built” the Millo, which is often identified with this massive retaining structure.

However, Finkelstein, Ussishkin, Steiner, and Kilbrew are probably right in asserting that our traditional image of Jerusalem as a glorious urban center at the time especially of Solomon (as described in 1 Kings) is probably overblown and that we are dealing with a relatively small highland stronghold and cult center. This is especially well illustrated in Lehmann’s contribution on the Jerusalem countryside, the most innovative in the volume. Much hinges on finding Iron Age floor surfaces directly associated with the old Middle Bronze II wall system. Without such a secure connection, we have no certain archaeological evidence for a fortified city at the time of Solomon. I confess, though, to being troubled by 2 Kgs 14:13, an almost parenthetical comment which describes how Jehoash of Israel broke down 400 cubits of the (northern?) wall of Jerusalem in the early eighth century. While the glory of Solomon may need to be toned down, what are we to do with a statement meant to denigrate the reign of one of his successors which mentions walls?

The second section contains welcome summaries of the post-1967 work undertaken by N. Avigad in the Jewish quarter written by H. Geva, and of Reich and Shukron’s recent excavations around the Gihon spring. Both well highlight the expansion of Jerusalem in the late eighth century and later. Articles by J. K Hoffmeier, K. L. Younger, Jr., and J. J. M. Roberts focus not so much on Jerusalem as a whole is a welcome addition to the ever expanding corpus of works on this important city.

Jeffrey R. Zorn
Cornell University
jrz3@cornell.edu


This final report on important Iron Age burials at Akhziv is a welcome addition to studies on material culture from the Phoenician homeland. Dayagi-Mendels is to be commended for her exemplary research and presentation of dormant archaeological materials excavated over six decades ago. The volume consists of a brief introductory chapter, six body chapters, and a conclusion by Dayagi-Mendels. Specialized appendices follow on the epigraphy of the grave stelae by Frank Moore Cross and the scarabs and amulets by Othmar Keel. It is thoroughly illustrated, with detailed technical drawings of tomb plans, pottery, and other material culture, as well as object photographs.

Given the circumstances leading up to the publication of this tomb material, detailed by Dayagi-Mendels in the preface and chapter 1, we owe a debt of gratitude to the author for presenting these finds to the scholarly community. The cemeteries were first dug in 1921 by an unknown individual who claimed to have excavated close to 100 burials, recording the work in a note to the authorities. The cemeteries came to Ben-Dor’s attention in 1941 when visiting Nahariya, where looted objects were for sale, Ben-Dor traveled to Akhziv to assess the situation and found recently plundered tombs. Rescue excavations were mounted to further hinder looting and to better understand the cemeteries. Four one-month excavation seasons were conducted between 1941 and 1944, the materials from which were transited and housed in the Rockefeller Museum. In 1947 war broke out; when fighting ended, the