



Review

Author(s): John Peter Oleson

Review by: John Peter Oleson

Source: *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 102, No. 3 (Jul., 1998), pp. 641-642

Published by: Archaeological Institute of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/506426>

Accessed: 19-06-2016 13:41 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

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



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

clusion that the end of Begram II and the concealment of the cache were due to the Sasanian invasion of the 240s. Menninger supports this view by repeating Ghirshman's statement that deposits attributed to Begram II contained coins of the Kushan king Vasudeva I, whose reign, Ghirshman believed, ended with the Sasanian invasion. Vasudeva I, however, probably reigned in the second century (see below), and in any case Ghirshman seems to have included in period II all deposits that were sealed by period III, but which were not necessarily contemporary with the *occupation* of period II.

Indeed, a rather different picture emerges if we concentrate on the excavation of the cache itself. Hackin (MDAFA 9 [1939] 10; 11 [1954] 309–11) reported the discovery of three coins in room 10, and 21 coins in room 13. In room 10, the coins (one of Kanishka and two unidentified) were directly associated with the cache; but in room 13, this was not the case. We have no record of the stratigraphy in room 13, but the excavators did record the depths below the surface at which many of the objects were found. Fourteen of the coins were discovered at a depth of 2.10 m or less and seven at a depth of 2.40 m or more. Most of the objects in the cache were encountered at a depth of at least 2.50 m. Nine coins were identified: six of Vasudeva I (found at a depth of 1.80 m) and one each of Gondophares (found at 2.55 m), Kujula Kadphises (2.10 m), and Wima Kadphises (2.50 m). Thus, the only identifiable coins, found in room 13 at a depth comparable with that of the cache, were those of Gondophares and Wima Kadphises.

The dates of some of the coins are controversial. The Kushans reckoned their chronology from the beginning of the reign of Kanishka, who is documented in years 1–23 of the new era. Recent estimates of the A.D. equivalent of year 1 vary between 78 and 232. If we accept Joe Cribb's estimate (in E. Errington and J. Cribb eds., *The Crossroads of Asia: Transformation in Image and Symbol in the Art of Ancient Afghanistan and Pakistan* [Cambridge 1992] 17–18) of some time between about 90 and 110, Kanishka was on the throne for at least part of the first quarter of the second century. Vasudeva I was ruling in years 64–99 of the era of Kanishka, i.e., about A.D. 164–199. Gondophares reigned from about A.D. 20 to 46 or later, Kujula Kadphises may have been ruling in A.D. 67 and 79, and the reign of Wima Kadphises ended before the accession of Kanishka.

These observations lead to the conclusion that the only identified coins that were, or may have been, associated with the cache were those of Gondophares and Wima Kadphises, who ruled in the first century A.D., and Kanishka. The coins of Vasudeva I were not buried until some 0.7 m of deposit had accumulated above the cache; they may, therefore, be significantly later than the cache itself.

DAVID WHITEHOUSE

THE CORNING MUSEUM OF GLASS
ONE MUSEUM WAY
CORNING, NEW YORK 14830-2253
DWHITEHO@SERVTECH.COM

UPPER ZOHAR: AN EARLY BYZANTINE FORT IN PALAESTINA TERTIA. FINAL REPORT OF EXCAVATIONS IN 1985–1986, by *Richard P. Harper*, with contributions by *Gillian Clark*, *Tony Grey*, *Sheila Boardman*, *Paul Croft*, *Omri Lerna*, *David S. Reese*, and *Joe Zias*. (British Academy Monographs in Archaeology 9.) Pp. ix + 161, pls. 42, figs. 36, tables 22. Oxford University Press (for the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem), Oxford 1995. \$120. ISBN 0-19-727008-5.

Upper Zohar is a small hilltop fort, constructed in the fifth century A.D. along the upper end of a road leading from the south end of the Dead Sea through the Judean desert toward the Mediterranean coast; it went out of use early in the seventh century. There are similar fortlets at the lower end of the presumed route of the road, at Haturim (unexcavated) and En Boqeq (excavated and published by M. Gichon). The closest large, contemporary ancient settlement is Mampsis, 29 km to the southwest. Masada lies 14 km to the northeast, across very rough country. Harper selected the site for excavation by a small team from the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem on the advice of Gichon, as “the most pressing and intriguing problem that could be tackled with a limited budget” (ix). Although there is no explanation for the delay in publication of the 1985–1986 campaigns, it is likely that the principal investigator simply had a hard time collecting reports from the seven contributors. The “text” was copyrighted in 1995, the book officially published in 1997; I did not find any references to bibliography later than 1994. This thin volume is a thorough, capable presentation of the architecture and small finds at Upper Zohar, including an admirably complete catalogue of plant and animal remains. Analysis of the fort's regional and historical context, however, has been left largely to others.

The fort is a simple, square structure (ca. 26 m on a side), with an interior court (ca. 17 m on a side) and four corner towers (ca. 6 m on a side) projecting ca. 3 m from the curtain walls. The walls are aligned more or less to the compass, and a simple gate in the center of the west wall overlooks the most likely track of the ancient road. A cylindrical cistern (diam. 3.75 m; depth ca. 5 m) with vaulted roof was cut into the bedrock toward the north side of the courtyard, and three rooms, later reduced to a single room on the axis of the gate (possibly a chapel, p. 2), were built up against the inside of the east wall. A wall extending from the north-west tower southward across the axis of the gate may have been added later to shelter animals. The walls were constructed of roughly squared blocks of the local limestone. There are few right angles, and the wall thickness varies between 1.0 and 1.5 m.

Although the Upper Zohar fort appears to be an unexceptional Early Byzantine *quadrburgum*, its small scale made virtually complete excavation possible, with the consequent potential for important observations about arti-

fact and ecofact distribution. Given the essential simplicity of the architecture and its stratigraphy, it is no surprise that the bulk of the book deals with the finds. Chapter 2 includes brief descriptions of the deposits in each of the 16 grid squares, along with abbreviated lists of the finds by deposit. The cistern yielded the bulk of the finds. Chapters 3–8 catalogue and discuss briefly the coins, pottery and lamps, glass vessels, metal objects, and the stone, flint, worked bone, and jewelry. There are no particular surprises or outstanding objects.

The 42 identifiable coins range in date from the mid-fourth to the mid-sixth century, with a peak in the reign of Justinian I (15 examples); a coin of Diocletian was used as jewelry. The 565 illegible coins seem to span the same period, with a marked peak from the mid-fifth to mid-sixth century. Of the 43,692 sherds recovered, the vast majority not surprisingly were cooking ware (55.1%) and coarse ware (41.96%); 52 lamps and lamp fragments are catalogued. The drawings are crisp and legible. The vast majority of the parallels cited belong to the eastern Mediterranean world. One amphora of Benghazi LR 2 type carried a Greek dipinto on its neck, possibly referring to aromatic plants preserved in honey. The glassware includes bottles and flasks, bowls, cups, and bowl lamps, while the remaining small finds consist of fragmentary odds and ends. The assemblage is poor and lacks any marked focus; there is no obvious military character.

The remaining chapters catalogue and describe the plant and animal remains: mammalian remains (ch. 9, Clark), bird and small mammalian remains (ch. 10, Croft), shells (ch. 11, Reese), fish (ch. 12, Lernau), and fruit (ch. 13, Boardman). Clark's report is the most analytical, with careful consideration of the distribution of the faunal material around the site, as well as its inherent character. Large mammals naturally predominate (82.9% of the total faunal sample), particularly ovicaprids, but pig is well represented. Bird (almost entirely chicken) and fish each comprise approximately 8.3% of the total sample. The 16 different families of fish identified originate from both the Red Sea and the Mediterranean. The very uniform distribution of faunal remains around the fort suggests that there was no single or primary area for food preparation. The fruits were largely olive, peach, and date.

The book is attractive and well produced. The plans, balks, and drawings of small finds are crisp and very legible. The photographs are slightly dark, but provide good contrast. I noticed only one minor typographic error. The price is high for such a slim volume.

Analysis of the function of the structure at Upper Zohar is very low-key, and its meaning in the context of the region is essentially ignored. These are not defects in the presentation of the excavation, but they do represent limitations to the significance of the book. Harper simply proposes that the fortlet is not an outpost meant to resist a large military force, but "a miniature version of the fortified caravanserais such as Nessana or Oboda" (1). Upper Zohar and the nearby fortlets started out, at least, as "look-outs and police posts [meant] to protect traveling caravans and pilgrim groups" (1). The absence of completed floors suggests that the "slippage of standards began early" (115), and what may have been initiated as a military or police post soon provided "informal innkeeping by local residents,"

then "casual unsupervised camping" (115). To the author, such a process explains the absence of obviously military artifacts, and of any patterns in artifact or ecofact distribution indicating the concentration of certain activities in designated areas of the structure. Unfortunately, Harper does not explore who the local residents or the unsupervised campers might have been, and he slips badly in his definition of *limitanei* as "local people of the frontier area" (115). Nevertheless, publication of this excavation has provided useful data for analysis by others.

JOHN PETER OLESON

DEPARTMENT OF GREEK AND ROMAN STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA
VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA V8W 3P4
CANADA
JPOLESON@UVIC.CA

THE FURNITURE OF WESTERN ASIA, ANCIENT AND TRADITIONAL: PAPERS OF THE CONFERENCE HELD AT THE INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON, JUNE 28 TO 30, 1993, edited by Georgina Herrmann. Pp. xxviii + 301, col. pl. 1, pls. 92, figs. 127, maps 15, tables 5. Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 1996. DM 268. ISBN 3-8053-1838-3.

H.S. Baker's *Furniture of the Ancient World: Origins and Evolution 3100–475 B.C.* (London 1966) and G.M.A. Richter's *Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans*² (London 1966) have long constituted convenient resources for the typology, development, production, and, to some degree, uses of ancient furniture. Baker, though ostensibly universal, concentrated on the extraordinarily well preserved material from Egypt, while Richter took advantage of classical texts and detailed representations in other media, particularly those on Athenian pots, to recover objects from the classical world that, being made largely of wood, have for the most part disintegrated. The present volume by no means replaces these lavishly illustrated works or the more specialized studies that have appeared since. Rather, presenting 24 papers, all but two originally delivered in 1993, it fills an important gap, providing up-to-date accounts of furniture from numerous civilizations over a vast time span and geographical range, from the Aegean to the Indus, from the fourth millennium B.C. through the Islamic period to the present day.

Examining diverse periods and locales, this volume does not aim to present a coherent history, but rather "to lay the groundwork . . . for the widest possible assessment of the evidence for the character and role of ancient furniture" (R. Moorey, p. 258). There is a lot of evidence—though certainly patchy for most sites and periods, and always in need of judicious analysis, which the contributors to this volume provide. Badly damaged survivals, diverse ancient texts, and representations in other media are employed to trace the appearance, construction, decoration, origins, development, adaptation, and functions of seats (thrones, stools, birthing chairs; four-legged, three-legged, folding, etc.), couches, beds, tables, footstools, chests, cradles, can-