Benjamin Isaac

Between the Old Schürer and the New: Archaeology and Geography

In the introduction to his *History of the Jewish people in the age of Jesus Christ*, Schürer states that his aim was to write a history 'für den Christlichen Theologen', rendered in the revised version as 'the New Testament Scholar'. The justification for this undertaking, he asserts, is that the Gospels can only be understood when seen in the context of contemporary Jewish thought. Here he saw Pharisaism as the ruling trend, which he characterized disapprovingly as 'legalism'. Pharisaism had defeated the opposing hellenising tendencies in the Maccabean Wars, and as a result, 'Die Schriftgelehrten regieren nun das Volk', i.e. a branch of the religious establishment had become politically dominant. Schürer was interested in both internal Jewish religious developments and in the political situation. A secular historian working in the late twentieth century might translate this, saying that the central question to be posed for Jewish society in Judaea 'in the age of Jesus Christ' is how it changed in the process of becoming, first of all part of the Hellenistic world, and then part of the Roman Empire. Two elements which would interest present-day historians are what are now often termed 'political control' and 'acculturation'. The latter is often called 'Romanization' in the north-western provinces¹. Leaving aside the question of whether this is an appropriate concept for the north-west, it is clear that we cannot use it in the Roman East, for the peoples living there became part of an integrated Roman empire, without undergoing a process of cultural change comparable with that which occurred in Gaul and Britain. Schürer's first volume is concerned with 'politische Geschichte', a running narrative, the second with 'innere Zustände', which includes a survey of the cultural setting of political institutions, as well as the Hellenistic cities, community organization and religion. I would like to consider here to what extent archaeology and geographical studies have advanced our insights into these subjects and how far they have or have not affected the old and new versions of Schürer. It is not my intention to apply the standards and concepts of current methodology to both these monumental works in order to uncover shortcomings in them. On the contrary, this is an attempt to look at both versions of Schürer as the best

¹ See now various essays in: *David J. Mattingly* (ed.), *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism* (JRA supp. 23, Portsmouth, RI 1997).

handbooks available for the subject under discussion, in order to get a clearer impression of the contributions which have been made already by archaeology and geographical studies, and what we might expect of these disciplines in the future. Although Schürer says in his introduction that he intended to write a handbook for theologians, the shape and methods of his work were dictated by those of Classical history. The methods of Greek and Roman history, in turn, are determined to a large extent by the discipline of classical philology. This explains the choice of sources to some extent: Schürer's work is largely based on historical texts in Greek. There are, of course, good reasons for this choice, as must be obvious to anyone who has attempted to study Jewish history in the periods for which such texts do not exist.

While the old Schürer uses the term 'archaeology' in the nineteenth-century sense as referring to ancient political institutions and customs, both religious and secular, the revised version cites archaeological literature in the modern sense under this heading. This does not mean, however, that archaeology in the current sense of the term has been incorporated conceptually, for that would have meant the production of a different work, not the revision of an old one. I should add here that the sense in which the old Schürer used 'archaeology' was not in general use in his time. In the nineteenth century, classicists usually understood archaeology to mean the study of Greek and Roman art and architecture. (Some of them continue to see it as such even today.) In this paper I use the term archaeology in its common current meaning as a discipline concerned with the recovery and study of ancient artifacts². For the purpose of this paper these artifacts include objects of art, but they should clearly exclude inscriptions, which are discussed in another paper in this colloquium. While inscriptions are indeed ancient artifacts, and therefore often discovered by archaeologists during their fieldwork, they are at the same time texts and thus should be interpreted according to the methodology and discipline of philology. The old Schürer fully incorporates the epigraphic material that was available at the time, and so does the revised version. To the ancient historian it makes no real difference whether a text has survived on stone, metal, papyrus or in a codex. For similar reasons, we shall exclude the discovery of the documents from the Judaean desert from our consideration of Schürer and archaeology. They are, of course, extensively discussed in the revised Schürer, and form the subject of three other papers in this colloquium. The discovery of these documents is indeed an offshoot of the interest in material culture, for they were found through systematic exploration by archaeologists, and in an archaeological context. Once discovered, however, they were properly studied as texts and inter-

² Cf. *David L. Clarke*, *Analytical Archaeology* (London 1968), for the definition of the subjects in the terms of 'New Archaeology'. See the observation about archaeology and history in the study of the African provinces by *Brent D. Shaw*, *Archaeology and Knowledge: The History of the African Provinces of the Roman Empire*, in: *Florilegium: Carleton University Papers on Late and Antiquity and the Middle Ages 2* (Ottawa 1980) 28–60; reprinted in *Brent D. Shaw*, *Environment and Society in Roman North Africa: Studies in History and Archaeology* (Variorum, Aldershot, Hampshire 1995).

preted like other texts with the tools of Classical and Semitic philology. The documents are not part of the literary tradition because they represent the works of a marginal group. They are therefore, as it were, a coincidental by-product of the work of archaeologists, whose main concern is material culture. Thus they are not relevant to a discussion of the contribution of archaeology as a discipline to our insights into the subject discussed in this paper. This paper, then, will consider the contribution that the study of non-verbal artifacts has made, or could make, to the political and cultural history of the Jewish people in the Hellenistic and Early Roman periods.

At this point we may note briefly the contribution which archaeology can make to the study of the Roman provinces in general. Here a distinction should be made between the Mediterranean provinces like Greece and Africa which have a relative wealth of inscriptions and literary texts, and the north-western provinces, which do not. It will be obvious that, in spite of Tacitus' *Germania*, the role of archaeology in the study of the Germanic provinces is thus more important than in most of the Greek-speaking provinces. We are faced with problems of methodology, for it is not easy to determine what questions can usefully be asked and what methods properly applied. Here I should note that it would not be profitable to discuss at length the possible contribution of archaeology to the study of Diaspora Judaism, for this would involve including the excavations of all the relevant cities in the Diaspora, or, in other words, a survey of numerous cities in the Roman empire, an unprofitable exercise in scholarship³.

In the case of Judaea/Palaestina, which is relevant, it must be admitted that more than a century of intensive exploration has contributed less than we might have expected or hoped. In saying this, I do not intend to disparage the work of the many hard-working archaeologists who spend their lives producing highly professional studies on the archaeology of Judaea/Palaestina from the Persian to the Early Islamic periods. I am speaking of the contribution of archaeology to our understanding of the history of the period. In this respect, indeed, I think many would agree with me that the results are as yet fairly modest in relation to the efforts expended in exploring this part of the world. There are several reasons for this:

1) Until fairly recently, archaeologists focused heavily on Biblical archaeology. Archaeology in the Land of Israel was seen as an auxiliary science to the study of the Old Testament. This has caused problems for the archaeology of the Bronze and Iron Ages, but that is not our subject here. It is relevant, however, to note that in the past this led to a serious neglect of the study of the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine periods⁴.

³ For a review of this section of the revised edition, see *Martin Hengel*, *Der Alte und der Neue „Schürer“*, in: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 35 (1990) 19–72. Hengel discusses vol. III, the Diaspora 3–86, with a geographical survey. Obviously Schürer could not have dealt with all the geographical and archaeological issues there, for he was not writing a general handbook of the Ancient World.

⁴ This is no longer true for the present generation of archaeologists. For a full survey of the

2) Excessive emphasis was laid on the study of the Jewish revolts against Rome, both among historians and archaeologists. This tendency was reinforced by the spectacular discoveries in the Judean desert, and caused a distortion of both focus and method.

3) Another form of distortion was caused by the exclusive emphasis laid on the exploration of churches and synagogues⁵. It is easy to understand why archaeologists would prefer to excavate these structures: they are usually the dominant and most obviously interesting feature of an ancient site, and the most likely to produce objects of art and inscriptions. They identify the builders as Jews, Samaritans or Christians, and the plan, decorations and inscriptions are of use in the study of religious beliefs and practice. It cannot be denied, however, that these attractions have diverted the attention of scholars from the study of ancient communities as an integrated whole, and from the investigation of other structures⁶.

4) The excessive emphasis on the study of the Jewish revolts and of ancient prayerhouses has, in turn, often led to problems of method: inappropriate questions were often asked and inappropriate methods applied.

5) One example which illustrates both the second and the fourth point may be mentioned here. F.-M. Abel, S. Yeivin and M. Avi-Yonah gave much thought to the development of the Roman road-network in Palestine and its possible connection with the Bar Kokhba Revolt. The result of their preoccupation with this topic was a theory which held that the Roman army constructed a road-network in Judaea during the revolt, encircling the area held by the rebels⁷. The truth is that no road-construction anywhere in the province can be assigned to the years of the revolt on any factual evidence. Many roads in the province were first marked by milestones dated to the reign of Hadrian, but whenever a precise date is given, it is clear that they must have been set up well before the beginning of the revolt. This is, therefore, a vain attempt to use archaeological material for the reconstruction of specific historical events. It is true that in exceptional cases milestone inscriptions can help in illuminating specific events in history, but that is not the aim of

material culture of Palestine from the second century till the Islamic conquest: *Yoram Tsafrir*, *Eretz-Israel from the Destruction of the Second Temple to the Muslim Conquest*, vol. II (Jerusalem 1984, Heb.).

⁵ Excavated synagogues, of course, are hardly, and churches not at all relevant for the period covered by Schürer's history. For recent surveys: *Frowald Hüttenmeister* and *Gottfried Reeg*, *Die antiken Synagogen in Israel* (Wiesbaden 1977); *Marilyn Joice Segal Chiat*, *Handbook of Synagogue Architecture* (Chico, CA 1982); *Lee I. Levine*, *Ancient Synagogues Revealed* (Jerusalem 1982). For Samaritan synagogues, see the essays by *Yitzhak Magen* and by *Leah Di Segni*, in: *Frédéric Manns* and *Eugenio Alliata*, *Early Christianity in Context: Monuments and Documents* (Jerusalem 1993) 193–230 and 231–239. Churches: *Yoram Tsafrir*, *Ancient Churches Revealed* (Jerusalem 1993). For a repertoire of Palestinian churches: *Asher Ovadiab*, *Corpus of the Byzantine Churches in the Holy Land* (Bonn 1970); *Ovadiab* and *C. Gomez de Silva*, *Supplementum to the Corpus* (London 1984).

⁶ See now, for instance, the study by *Yizhar Hirschfeld*, *The Palestinian Dwelling in the Roman-Byzantine Period* (Jerusalem 1995).

⁷ See references in *Benjamin Isaac* and *Aharon Oppenheimer*, *The Revolt of Bar Kokhba: Ideology and Modern Scholarship*, in: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 26 (1985) 33–60, esp. 40f.

the systematic exploration of Roman roads and milestones. Sustained and planned exploration is not carried out for the sake of serendipitous discoveries. The purpose of this kind of research is to gain an impression of the road and transport systems under Roman rule over the centuries. The aim of archaeologists should be to uncover long-term developments.

It is generally true, and I am not the first to observe this, that uninscribed artifacts are not usually instructive in this manner. Even if they can be dated fairly precisely with the help of the archaeological context in which they are found, they must be interpreted in a wider context and will not usually give us insights into specific historical events. Masada is an excellent example. No one can deny the great importance in many respects of the excavations there, and the wide impact they made. It is hard to claim, however, that the results add much information about the Roman siege to what we already knew from Josephus, apart from confirming what he wrote. This does not detract from the value of the material: we have a unique complex of a desert palace from the first century BC and the first century AD not covered by later remains, and surrounded by Roman siege works. All this is a mine of information about many matters, but it does not bear directly on what we can learn from Josephus' text. For instance, both the date of the siege and its length are disputed because of uncertainties in Josephus' narrative, but the excavations do not help in deciding these problems. The same is true for the many excavations which have uncovered other Herodian buildings: they demonstrate that Josephus was right in reporting that these were built, but as far as the political history of the period is concerned, no more can be said. The information to be derived from the excavations enriches our insights in other fields.

It seems fair to say that our views of the political history as it is related in volume I of the old Schürer have not been drastically affected by the accumulation of archaeological material, nor would it be possible to write an essentially different history based on this material. Geographical problems are a different matter, as we shall see below.

The subject matter most likely to be illuminated by the results of archaeological research is that of volume II, on the spread of Hellenism, the cultural setting and political institutions: i.e. the sections dealing with the cities, and 'the Jewish region'. Just how I see this possibility will form the next section of this paper. Since it is not the intention of this colloquium to produce a sort of new 'mini Schürer', I will not attempt to provide extensive bibliography, but will mention only specific areas of interest that might be relevant.

The Cities

Extensive excavations have by now been undertaken in several of the cities listed in Schürer, where the survey of cities is included under the heading 'Cultural relationships: the spread of Hellenism', as is proper within the terms of its overall subject matter. Special mention may be made of the excavations at two sites: those

on Mt. Gerizim above Nablus⁸, and those at Marisa⁹, because these two sites provide remarkable new insights into settlement of these areas by different ethnic groups living side by side: Samaritans, Phoenician settlers and inhabitants of Idumaean extraction, mentioned in volume II: 'The cultural setting'. In general, however, it would be relevant to consider the following questions with regard to the cities:

1) Theatres, Herodian and later. These are all Roman rather than Greek theatres. What is the cultural context whereby Greek-speaking cities built theatres after the western model? How much is known about what went on in such theatres¹⁰?

2) Aqueducts¹¹. Were aqueducts in the region of Palestine introduced as part of a pattern of Romanization or Hellenization? More important still is the question of the water supply. How much water did the cities receive from other sources and how much through aqueducts? Did the aqueducts supply water for basic needs such as drinking and washing, or for luxuries such as bath-houses and gardens? Baths in particular are very characteristic of the Roman way of life, and it would be interesting to know how important a factor they became in the urban culture of Palestine, both before and after the Roman conquest.

3) City Walls. Many, but by no means all, of the major cities had walls at various stages of the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine periods. These walls may have been built for genuine protection or as status symbols. It is not easy to decide which was the true reason, but a systematic survey of dated walls might help in answering this question. There is very little reason to assume, for instance, that the Hellenistic cities in the coastal region and the Decapolis actually needed walls for their protection during the first two and a half centuries AD. The observations of Shereshevski about the Negev at a later period may be relevant here: the towns in the northern Negev, supposedly under threat from nomads, did not usually have any walls. Only Mampsis-Kurnub and maybe Oboda-Avdat were walled¹².

⁸ *Yitzhak Magen*, Mount Gerizim and the Samaritans, in: *Frédéric Manns* and *Eugenio Alliata* (eds.), *Early Christianity in Context* (Jerusalem 1993) 91–148.

⁹ After the publication of the revised Schürer II, p.165, n.8, two articles on Marisa appeared: *Gabriel Horowitz*, 'The Town Planning of Hellenistic Marisa', in: *PEQ* 112 (1980) 93–111; *Eliezer D. Oren* and *Uri Rappaport*, 'The Necropolis of Maresha-Beth Govrin', in: *IEJ* 34 (1984) 114–153.

¹⁰ For a repertoire of theatres in the area under discussion: *Arthur Segal*, *Theatres in Roman Palestine and Provincia Arabia* (Leiden 1995). For discussion of theatres in general: *Richard C. Beacham*, *The Roman Theatre and its Audience* (London 1991); *William J. Slater*, *Roman Theater and Society: Salmon-Conference Papers, I* (Ann Arbor 1996).

¹¹ For aqueducts in general: *David Amit*, *Yizhar Hirschfeld* and *Joseph Patrich*, *The Aqueducts of Ancient Palestine: Collected Essays* (Jerusalem 1989, Heb., English ed. forthcoming).

¹² *Joseph Shereshevski*, *Byzantine Urban Settlements in the Negev Desert* (Beer-Sheva 1991); for a positive review: *Clive Foss*, 'The Near Eastern Countryside in Late Antiquity', in: *The Roman and Byzantine Near East: Some Recent Archaeological Research* (JRA supp. 14, Ann Arbor, MI 1995) 213–234, esp. 225–231.

4) Amphitheatres and hippodromes. Several of those have now been discovered in the cities of the area, but it is not quite clear whether any of them belong to the period under discussion¹³. Some of the amphitheatres were actually converted hippodromes (Gerasa, Neapolis). In any case, they are an interesting and important cultural feature, for the amphitheatre especially is of indubitably Roman origin. This is all the more interesting because we do not have regional parallels for the inscriptions treated in Louis Robert's classic work about gladiators in the Greek Orient¹⁴. Since the *munera* organized in the provinces are known to have been connected with the imperial cult, it is clear that any study of this will have to take the existence of amphitheatres in the region into account.

5) Dwellings. The typology of houses is an important indicator of cultural origins. The general characteristics of houses and their grouping in neighbourhoods show different degrees of adaptation to the local climate, topography and economy. An interesting study of the dwellings in Early Byzantine Negev towns (which, chronologically, falls outside the scope of our Colloquium) shows that these were built after the pattern of houses in the moderate Mediterranean climate rather than according to the norms which might be expected in a desert environment¹⁵.

¹³ On hippodromes: *John H. Humphrey*, *Roman Circuses: Arenas for Chariot Racing* (London 1986), especially chapter 9. Humphrey shows that there is no evidence for the existence of Herodian hippodromes in spite of assumptions to this effect by various scholars. For the hippodrome at Caesarea: 477–91; Gerasa: 495–504; Gadara: 504f. *Amos Kloner* and *A. Hübsch*, *The Roman Amphitheater of Bet Guvrin: A Preliminary Report on the 1992, 1993, and 1994 Seasons*, in: *Atiqot* 30 (1996) 85–106. The amphitheatre may now be dated with the help of an altar discovered in the substructure of the sacellum (p.100). References to structures converted into amphitheatres in Scythopolis: *Yoram Tsafrir* and *Gideon Foerster*, in: *Qadmoniot* 1–7/8 (1995) 93–117 (Heb.); Neapolis: *Itzhak Magen*, in: *NEAEHL* iv, 1354–9. At Neapolis as at Gerasa the hippodrome was converted into an amphitheatre, a phenomenon not observed elsewhere (or at least not described by *Humphrey*, op.cit.). Note also the multi-purpose buildings encountered in various cities, including now: *Yosef Porath*, Herod's 'amphitheatre' at Caesarea: a multipurpose entertainment building, in: *The Roman and Byzantine Near East* (1995) 15–27. For amphitheatres: *Jean-Claude Golvin*, *L'amphithéâtre romain* (Paris 1988); *Jean-Claude Golvin* and *Christian Landes*, *Amphithéâtres & Gladiateurs* (Paris 1990). Golvin and Landes observe that the games normally staged in amphitheatres in the West are held in stadia and amphitheatres converted for this purpose in the East. They are unaware of the existence of actual amphitheatres in Palaestina and Arabia. Theatres in Palestine were rebuilt for use in watergames, as observed by *Segal*, op.cit., 13, with n. 38.

¹⁴ *Louis Robert*, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec* (1940, repr. Amsterdam 1971); in general: *Keith Hopkins*, *Murderous Games*, in: *Death and Renewal. Sociological Studies in Roman History*, 2 (Cambridge 1983) 1–30; also: *Erik Gunderson*, *The Ideology of the Arena*, *Classical Antiquity* 15 (1996) 113–151; *Thomas Wiedemann*, *Emperors and Gladiators* (London, New York 1992).

¹⁵ *Shereshevski*, op.cit.

The rural hinterland

1) The Negev. For the Negev it is important to note that much of the development that used to be attributed to the Nabataeans (first century BC – first century AD) has been shown to belong to the Later Roman Empire¹⁶. As far as the period covered by Schürer is concerned, this is a negative fact, but it is a fact that has important bearings on our views of the Nabataean presence in the desert south of Judaea proper. The survey and excavation of temporary sites occupied by nomads, primarily in the Later Roman Empire, is gradually uncovering the relationship between permanent settlements and pastoralists¹⁷.

2) The army. In this connection it is important to note the recent criticism of theories regarding the Roman military presence in the Negev. I. Shatzman has now produced convincing arguments that there is no evidence of any army units permanently based in the Negev before the end of the third century¹⁸. Conversely, it is important to consider whether the Roman army, from 70 till the third century, was based mainly or exclusively in the cities and in the rural parts of Judaea, and far less in the desert¹⁹.

¹⁶ The attribution of urban development to the Late Roman period rather than the Nabataean kingdom is the result of recent excavations: *Yoram Tsafrir*, Excavations at Rehovot Ba-Negev I: The Northern Church (Jerusalem 1988); *Yoram Tsafrir* and *Kenneth G. Holum*, Rehovot in the Negev Preliminary Report, 1986, in: *Israel Exploration Journal* 38 (1988) 117–27; *Shereshevski*, previous note; *Rehav Rubin*, The Negev as a Settled Land – Urbanization and Settlement in the Desert in the Byzantine Period (Jerusalem 1990, Heb.).

¹⁷ *Yehuda D. Nevo*, Pagans and Herders (IPS, Sede Boqer 1991); *Mordechai Haiman*, 'Agriculture and Nomad-State Relationship in the Negev Desert in the Byzantine and Early Islamic Periods', in: *BASOR* 97 (1995) 29–53. *Gideon Avni*, Nomads, Farmers, and Town-Dwellers: Pastoralist-Sedentist Interaction in the Negev Highlands, Sixth-Eighth Centuries CE (Israel Antiquities Authority, Jerusalem 1996). These publications refer primarily to finds from Late Antiquity. The results of surveys may be found in the publications of the Archaeological Survey of Israel, published regularly in Jerusalem.

¹⁸ *Israel Shatzman*, The Beginning of the Roman Defensive System in Judaea, in: *American Journal of Ancient History* 8 (1983) 130–60, arguing against Shimon Applebaum's Hebrew paper, re-published in English, in: *Judaea in Hellenistic and Roman Times, Historical and Archaeological Essays* (Leiden 1989) 132–42 and *Mordechai Gichon* in his unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Jerusalem 1966); *Gichon*, Idumaea and the Herodian Limes, in: *IEJ* 17 (1967) 27–42. Another critic: *Michael H. Gracey*, The Armies of the Judaean Client Kings, in: *Philip Freeman* and *David Kennedy* (eds.), *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East* (Oxford 1986) 311–22; also: *Israel Shatzman*, The Armies of the Hasmonaeans and Herod (Tübingen 1991) 239–46.

¹⁹ *Benjamin Isaac*, *The Limits of Empire* (Oxford, revised ed. 1992), Chapter III. In southern Jordan there is now one desert site which was certainly occupied by the Roman army in the second century. *Patricia M. Bikai* and *Virginia Egan*, Archaeology in Jordan, in: *AJA* 100 (1996) 528–30; 529; 101 (1997) 493–535, esp. 518–520: Humaima, excavated by John P. Oleson. The very substantial quantities of ceramics found in the barracks area in 1995 indicate without doubt that the fort was active by the first half of the second century AD, possibly early in the century. The barracks at least may have been abandoned for some time in the third century, then re-occupied in the fourth.

3) Regional surveys and the excavation of villages and isolated farmsteads provide important information about social and economic patterns in the countryside. An example of the sort of work that can be done in this connection may be found in a very interesting recent paper by Y. Hirschfeld²⁰. Hirschfeld plots the distribution of isolated farmsteads in various regions at different periods and attempts to formulate historical conclusions. I myself would tend to see regional and social patterns where he sees religious and ethnic factors at work, but this is a question of approach and matter for debate. Regional surveys uncover the interconnection between major roads, local roads, villages and farmsteads and can thus contribute much to our understanding of a society which was still largely rural in character²¹. The excavation of entire villages, as opposed to that of individual buildings in a site, is essential for an understanding of the social and economic setting.

4) The interpretation of artifacts discovered in surveys and excavations is a subject with historical implications in its own right. To what extent is Nabataean pottery Nabataean? For years it has been assumed that Nabataean pottery ceased to be produced when the Nabataean kingdom was annexed as a Roman province in AD 106. Now excavations have shown that it goes on for at least another century. In another area pottery is found that is often called 'Ituraean', because this is the region where the Ituraeans used to live (Revised Schürer, volume I, Appendix I). Pottery should be studied, not as an expression of ethnicity, but as a commodity, and as the end result of certain techniques and preferences, like art and architecture. It is an integral part of the culture of a society and the processes of acculturation, which is one of the subjects of Schürer's second volume, although he does not use this term. In the section on 'The cultural setting' several pages are devoted to terms indicating objects of commerce. Archaeology, of course, can help in tracing patterns of import and export, through the study of the distribution of imported pottery, amphora stamps, marble and valuables. The use of archaeological material for the study of the social and economic history of Palestine is a complex but attractive topic²².

²⁰ *Yizhar Hirschfeld*, Changes in settlement patterns of the Jewish rural populace before and after the rebellions against Rome, in: *Cathedra* 80 (1996) 3–18 (Heb.). Cf. *Yizhar Hirschfeld* and *R. Birger-Calderon*, 'Early Roman and Byzantine Estates near Caesarea', in: *IEJ* 41 (1991) 81–111, for the excavation of one of the estates discussed by Hirschfeld. See also: *Yizhar Hirschfeld*, The early Roman bath and fortress at Ramat Hanadiv near Caesarea, in: *The Roman and Byzantine Near East: Some Recent Archaeological Research* (JRA supp. 14, Ann Arbor, MI 1995) 28–56. There was not much evidence of estates before the most recent excavations and surveys: cf. *Hans-Peter Kuhnen*, Palästina in griechisch-römischer Zeit (Munich 1990) 241, for what little there was to be cited at the time. Note that the identification of the estate near Caesarea as Jewish is determined by the presence of a ritual bath. As observed by the excavators, Samaritans had similar baths (miqva'ot), so the identification cannot be considered entirely certain.

²¹ See for instance *Shimon Dar*, *Landscape and Pattern: An Archaeological Survey of Samaria* (Oxford 1986) 2 vols.; *Adam Zertal*, *Sefer Har Menashe* (Tel Aviv 1993).

²² For a recent effort, based on an analysis of finds from Mount Carmel in the Later Roman period: *Hans-Peter Kuhnen*, *Kirche, Landwirtschaft und Flüchtlingssilber: Zur wirtschaft-*

So far we have attempted to indicate a number of aspects of archaeology which could make a contribution at a conceptual level to developments indicated in both versions of Schürer, whose outlook reflects the historiography found in the books of Maccabees, Josephus and the Gospels. One final topic should be mentioned here, of crucial importance and hence the subject of quite a few serious studies, namely demography. It cannot be said, however, that the results of these studies are sufficiently definitive as to warrant inclusion in a handbook – and that, after all, is the present subject²³.

Geography

Neither the old Schürer nor the revised version include maps or illustrations²⁴. Yet it is obvious that the authors of both looked at maps very carefully. Schürer himself had already cited the literature and maps available in his time (Kiepert, the SWP maps), and he clearly distinguished between studies written in the library and those based on field-work. The revised version was brought up-to-date along the same lines. Neither version reflects independent study of the terrain. Schürer's interest in geography is strictly limited to two inter-connected aspects: the identification of ancient sites with modern ones, and their location on modern maps. The way the work was written, Jewish history in antiquity could have taken place anywhere: in Bavaria, Britain, or the US. There is no climate, no topography, and no ecology.

lichen Entwicklung Palästinas in der Spätantike, in: ZDPV 110 (1994) 36–50. The article discusses the impact of Christianity (donations, pilgrimage, imperial support) on the Palestinian economy.

²³ See the papers on the demography of ancient Palestine by *Magen Broshi*, *La population de l'ancienne Jérusalem*, in: *Revue Biblique* 82 (1975) 5–14; *The Population of Western Palestine in the Roman-Byzantine Period*, in: *BASOR* 236 (1979) 1–10; *The Population of Eretz Israel in the Roman-Byzantine Period* (Heb.) in: *Z. Baras et al., Eretz Israel from the Destruction of the Second Temple to the Muslim Conquest* (Jerusalem 1982) 442–7; *Agriculture and Economy in Roman Palestine: Seven Notes on the Babatha Archive*, in: *IEJ* 42 (1992) 230–240; and now: *Yoram Tsafrir, Some Notes on the Settlement and Demography of Palestine in the Byzantine Period: The Archaeological Evidence*, in: *Joe D. Seger* (ed.), *Retrieving the Past: Essays on Archaeological Research and Methodology in Honor of Gus W. Van Beek* (Winona Lake, Indiana 1996) 269–83. Fundamental literature about the demography of the Roman empire: *Tim G. Parkin, Demography and Roman Society* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press 1992); *Richard P. Saller, Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge 1994); *Walter Scheidel, Measuring Sex, Age, and Death in the Roman Empire: Explorations in Ancient Demography* (JRA supp. 21, Ann Arbor, MI 1996); *Bruce W. Frier, 'The Demography of the Early Roman Empire'*, in: *CAH* 112, forthcoming. *Roger S. Bagnall and Bruce V. Frier, The Demography of Roman Egypt* (Cambridge 1994) is essential in this field.

²⁴ Schürer, of course, wrote long before Rostovtzeff taught ancient historians what photographs with comments well integrated into the text can do to evoke ancient social and economic reality. For this point: *Arnaldo D. Momigliano, M. I. Rostovtzeff*, in: *Studies in Historiography* (London 1966) 91–104, esp. 91.

An example which shows that Schürer himself clearly looked at maps may be found on p.183 (old) = 140 (new): 'How far into the exterior these territories reached, becomes evident from the fact that Ekron and Gazara were not part of Judaea. Ekron was not united to Jewish territory and judaised until the time of Jonathan... and Gazara, not until that of Simon.' For the location of Ekron we are then referred to the section on Jonathan, p. 22, n.19 = p.181, n.19. Here we find brief references to the literary sources and modern authorities for the identification. Similarly we are referred to the section on Simon for the location of Gazara, p.345, n.12 = 191, n.8. There is some topographical information about Gazara: 'Gazara, the ancient Gezer, not far from Emmaus-Nicopolis in a westerly direction, at the foot of the mountains, ... Its possession was of importance to the Jews because it was one of the places which dominated the mountain passes and, in consequence, communications between Jerusalem and the port of Joppa annexed by the Jews.' This description, literally translated from the old Schürer, is only half correct, for Gezer does not control any mountain passes. It is sited 200 metres above sea-level and affords a splendid view across the coastal plain. To the north, the road to Jerusalem passes through a fertile valley, 2.5 kilometres broad, which links the coastal plain with the valley of Ayalon²⁵. Schürer, however, was aware that both Ekron and Gezer were relatively far inland. One final example should suffice to convey the point I want to make. Schürer devotes considerable attention to the campaign of Cestius Gallus in 66, with the disaster at Beth Horon (revised edition, volume I, 487f.). However, any understanding of what really happened requires study of the terrain, maps and photographs²⁶. With these remarks it is not my intention to accuse Schürer of shortcomings. If he had been the sort of man who travelled to the Near East, he would not have written his book and the authors of the revised edition had enough to do without walking the Beth Horon road. It may be observed, however, that there are aspects of the historical landscape not easily conveyed with the techniques available to nineteenth-century scholars.

²⁵ Clermont-Ganneau, who discovered the site in 1873, describes Gezer's three springs, an essential feature for its development; see: *Moshe Fischer, Benjamin Isaac and Israel Roll, Roman Roads in Judaea, II, the Jaffa – Jerusalem Roads* (Oxford 1996) 160.

²⁶ *Op.cit.*, 77–83, figs. 8–10; comments on pp.13f. *Schürer*, loc.cit. above, states that Cestius Gallus' retirement developed into a rout in a gorge near Beth Horon. This is an error.