and classification is the basis for a fairly strange account of the linguistic models of Vergil's description of Mt. Etna (570-87n.), in which H. adduces everyday words such as *favilla*, *fumare* and *causa* (sic!) to prove Lucretian influence. One of the underlying reasons may be H.'s way of using *TLL*. As H. explains in the preface, he simply searched the *TLL* electronically ('the work of seconds', as he writes), thus automatically missing the full picture which only emerges from the careful reading of the respective articles (cf. also e.g. *TLL* s.v. *cubile* 1269, 73-9 and 324n.; s.v. *edico* 64, 32ff. and 235n.; s.v. *excito* 1262, 47-77 and 343n.; s.v. *iam* 123, 70ff. and 270n.; s.v. *ipse* 343, 12ff. and 619n.; s.v. *iuxta* 750, 54 -751, 16 and 506n.).

Generally, H. provides very full and up-to-date bibliography, and there are only three serious gaps: M. Lippka, *Language in Vergil's Eclogues* (2001), could have provided useful material on nouns in *–men* (cf. 286n.) and various types of adjectives; the discussions of authenticity (204a-c, 230n., 340n.) would have profited from a glance at O. Zwierlein, *Die Ovid- und Vergilrevision in tiberischer Zeit* (1999), 45-6, 50 n. 2, 164, *passim*; and L. de Neubourg, *La base métrique de la localisation des mots dans l'hexamètre latin* (1986), renders H.'s frequent comments on word-order (e.g. 5-6n., 26n., 37n., 155n., 156n.) superfluous.

Throughout the commentary H. regularly assumes the role of what R.O.A.M. Lyne used to call the 'German schoolmaster', marking other scholars' work or meticulously recording what escaped their notice. These (often venomous and never illuminating) remarks would have better been omitted (e.g. 613n., 692-707n. [460]) or published as separate *Addenda* to Wölfflin's work on alliterative pairs (e.g. 91n., 242n., 459n., 709n.), Antoine's treatise on Vergilian syntax (e.g. 453n.), vel sim.. The same could be said about some *trivia* such as the references to *Treasure Island's* Ben Gunn (599n.), a performance of the bass baritone Owen Brannigan (672n.), or linguistic parallels in Highland Scots (619n.). More annoying than these (sometimes entertaining: e.g. 696n.) idiosyncrasies is the fact that on several occasions the relevant bibliographical information is missing (e.g. for 'Paschalis' [n. 79], 'Armstrong' [103-117n., 131n.], 'Laird' [181n.], 'Schmidt' [190n.]), and generally the proof-reading deserves a '*male*' on H.'s grade scale (paragraph in the middle of a sentence [50]; many obvious typos; inconsistent handling of spacing, italicization, punctuation).

Apart from the oddities in H.'s way of analyzing Vergil's style, his commentary is a work which anyone with a serious interest in Latin literature should read carefully. His daunting command of all areas of Roman culture and classical literature and his subtle analysis of compositional strategies pave the way for a much deeper understanding of the *Aeneid*.

Jan Felix Gaertner University of Leipzig

Linda-Marie Günther (ed.), *Herodes und Rom*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2007. 121 pp. ISBN-13: 978-3-515-09012-4.

Nikos Kokkinos (ed.), *The World of the Herods* (Volume 1 of the International Conference 'The World of the Herods and Nabataeans' held at the British Museum, 17-19 April 2001, *Oriens et Occidens* 14), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2007. 327 pp. ISBN-13: 978-3-515-08817-6.

These two conference volumes on Herod from the same publisher are as dissimilar as they can be. The first, in English, was published after a long delay (scrupulously accounted for by the editor) and consists of a larger number of contributions by scholars mainly from Israel and the UK, but also from the US and Germany, all of whom have worked on Herod and related subjects before (and not a few of whom recount earlier work). It also includes some papers not delivered at the conference and abstracts of some papers delivered but not submitted for publication. The second volume contains contributions of a one-day meeting by half a dozen scholars from one country,

some of whom seem to be newcomers to the field, and was published promptly in the year following on the occasion. There is much less new material in the well-edited German volume, while the London conference also provides some new archaeological discoveries and insights; some of its papers would have benefited from more careful editing and proofreading. Nor does the thirst for more collective work on Herod seem to be quenched: 2008 will (hopefully) see the publication of a (2005) conference volume on Herod and Augustus, to be edited by David Jacobson and Kokkinos.[1]

I start with the first volume, but it will be convenient to survey papers from the second with them (the provenience will be clear from their language). After a short and magisterial Introduction by Fergus Millar (17-21) there follow three sections of papers (indicated in the Table of Contents, but not in the text). The section on Literary and Documentary Evidence consists of five papers. Tessa Rajak ('The Herodian Narratives of Josephus', 23-34) confronts Josephus' more 'Roman' image of Herod in *BJ* with the more 'Jewish' one of *AJ* and once again tries to disentangle the historian's own contributions and points of view from the material available to him from Nicolaus of Damascus. This reader has not been convinced by the suggestion (25) that the arrangement of the material by topics in *BJ* may have been influenced by Nicolaus' biographical style — it is holding the stick at both ends to accept the strict generic categories of Friedrich Leo for Nicolaus' 'Alexandrian' biography and to assume that he applied a similar categorisation in his History.

Julia Wilker ('Herodes Iudaicus. Herodes als "jüdischer König"', 27-45) examines the king's Jewish identity and (self) presentation from a number of aspects: his own relations with the Hasmonaeans as well as those of his family were initially close, and only later, with the appointment of High Priests from other families, did tensions develop; the much-discussed question of Herod's descent and identity brings no unexpected revelations; the review of Herod's alleged transgressions of the Law again have the appointment of High Priests as their main subject; the Diaspora Jews accepted the king and his generosity and the Romans never doubted his Jewish identity.

'Greek and Roman Authors on the Herods' (35-44) are tackled by David Braund from the perspectives of Herodian Jewishness and of Client Kingship. 'Herod and the Herods were very much the acceptable face of Judaism, champions of Roman imperial order in a difficult area and friends of Roman emperors and their families' (43). There remained however the problem of their dynastic difficulties. Its counterpart, Daniel R. Schwartz's 'Herod in Ancient Jewish Literature' (45-53) reviews the one long passage on Herod in Talmudic literature (*bBB* 3b-4a) and the other bits and pieces (including *Ass. Mos.* 6) to show that some historical traditions common to the Sages and Josephus enhance the credibility of both, though in the main, of course, the stance of the Sages was definitely a-historical — in fact anti-historical.

According to Alla Kushnir-Stein the unresolved problems of 'The Coins of the Herodian Dynasty: the State of Research' (55-60) are the mint of Herod's first coins ('year 3'), the dating of Antipas' first and last coins, and an undated coin of Philip. She also reviews A. Burnett's analysis of Agrippa I's coinage and her own hypothesis concerning a mint other than Caesarea Philippi for some of Agrippa II's coins. 'Ossuaries of the Herodian Period' (by Tal Ilan, 61-69) provides us, by analysis of the (predominantly onomastic) inscriptions, the decorations, the ossuary contents and the relations between the ossuaries and the burial chambers, with some precious insights into the social stratification of the Jewish society of Jerusalem, as well as of Jews from elsewhere who preferred to be buried there.

The lion's share of the English volume, and about half of the German, belongs to Archaeology, Art and Architecture. The veteran excavator of many Herodian sites, Ehud Netzer, tackles

---

1 For an earlier collection of papers see K. Fittschen and G. Foerster (eds.), *Judaea and the Greco-Roman World in the Time of Herod in the Light of Archaeological Evidence*, Abh. Gött. Ak., Phil.-Hist. Kl., 3.F., 215 (1996).

'The Ideal City in the Eyes of Herod the Great' (71-91). The differences in topography and in the pre-Herodian structures of the various cities do not, in effect, permit the identification of significant common features in the planning of Samaria/Sebaste, Jerusalem, Caesarea and Antipatris. In the author's view it was Herodium, not an actual city, that most closely approximated Herod's ideal (on the assumption that such a thing did somehow exist).

The main thesis of Monika Bernett ('Herodes und die Stadt in Judäa', 47-57) concerns Herod's policy of urbanisation. According to her, the criticism of Josephus, more pronounced in *AJ* than in *BJ*, has to be viewed against the background of the critical attitude of a number of the prophetic books of the Bible on the subject; also the destruction of pagan cities by the Hasmonaeans goes hand in hand with such an attitude. While under these rulers there was only a 'village-colonisation' by Jews, Herod's policy of urbanisation encountered long-standing opposition — only to be adopted *post factum* and made a base for the claims of the Jews of Caesarea against their gentile neighbours.

It is not possible to summarise in one paragraph the rich survey of 'Herodian Caesarea: the Urban Space' by another prominent excavator, Joseph Patrich (93-129): this is a state-of-the-art review of the excavations and discoveries since the major publications of 1975 by Levine, Ringel, Foerster and Negev. On the whole, with rather minor exceptions, the finds tend to confirm Josephus's detailed descriptions, though of course new evidence, such as the Louvre Caesarea Cup, is to be added to this source. Clearly our picture of the city and its history is nearing the point of a major synthesis.

Linda-Marie Günther ('Herodes, Caesar [Augustus] und Caesarea', 79-89) questions Géza Alföldy's interpretation, though not his reconstruction, published in this journal[2] of the famous inscription of Pontius Pilatus. Her own suggestion, according to which the tower named after Drusus, and consequently the one named after Tiberius, did not get its name already under Herod, will find favour with few.[3]

Less well-known than Caesarea Maritima is 'An Herodian Capital in the North: Caesarea Philippi (Panias)' (John Francis Wilson and Vassilios Tzaferis, 131-143), the administrative centre founded by Philip the Tetrarch almost immediately on the death of his father Herod the Great and used as such until the end of the half-century rule of the last king of the dynasty, Agrippa II. The extensive excavations have not only revealed the later Roman and Late Roman city but also — in all probability — the royal palace, 'the largest and most magnificent Roman period edifice ever constructed in Palestine and one of the largest in the eastern part of the Roman Empire' (138).

David Jacobson, 'The Jerusalem Temple of Herod the Great' (145-176) is a detailed examination of the largest known sacred enclosure from classical antiquity. The enclosure 'a synthesis of Roman, Hellenistic and indigenous architectural elements' (171) and the temple itself are positioned to great advantage in the context of contemporary architectural theory and practice. This paper is particularly well served by a great number of excellent illustrations.

It seems most probable that 'A Newly Discovered Herodian Temple at Khirbet Omrit in Northern Israel' (Andrew Overman, Jack Olive and Michael Nelson, 177-195) is Herod's temple to Augustus, erected c. 20 BCE 'near the Panion' — the new temple is some 4 km SW of that site and the remains of the structure appear to correspond with the temple depicted on coins of the Tetrarch Philip. The exceptional rural location is a strong indicator of the social composition of Ituraea — or is it that the temple, one of the very first dedicated to Augustus, was still in an experimental stage?

---

2 G. Alföldy, 'Pontius Pilatus und das Tiberieum von Caesarea Maritima', *SCI* 18 (1999), 85-108. She ignores Alföldy's sequel ('Nochmals Pontius Pilatus und das Tiberieum von Caesarea Maritima', *SCI* 21 [2002], 133-148), in the main a rejection of the reconstruction and interpretation of T. Grüll.

3 See now also W. Eck, *Rom und Judaea* (Tübingen 2007), 17-18.

The two archaeological sites that are not connected with Herod in the literary sources are treated by Achim Lichtenberger ('Juden, Idumäer und "Heiden": Die herodianischen Bauten in Hebron und Mamre', 59-78). Accepting the Herodian date of the buildings leads to the question of their religious origins: does the well-known multi-religious, as it were, festivities at Mamre described by Sozomenus (*HE* 2.4) date back to Herod? The author is inclined towards the view of Mamre as aimed mainly at the Idumaean population, while the Jewish origin of the tombs of the Patriarchs at Hebron is maintained.

'Fortified Manor Houses of the Ruling Class in the Herodian Kingdom of Judaea' (197-226) by the late lamented Yizhar Hirschfeld is a lucid and exhaustive survey, with good illustrations, of sixteen such sites. The crux of the list is no. 16, Khirbet Qumran: while everyone who knew this genial man will have the fondest memories of him, it seems that few Qumran scholars have accepted his oft-repeated interpretation of that important site.

Sarah Japp's survey of 'Public and Private Decorative Art in the Time of Herod the Great' (227-246) may be regarded as a case study of one of the main questions of the reign, viz. the prevalence of Hellenistic *vs.* Roman influences, while of course there is evidence, such as Hebrew mason marks, for local Jewish workmen. This reviewer has not been entirely convinced that there is enough evidence to distinguish between an earlier stage of strong Hellenistic influence and a later stage of Roman influence.

Rachel Hachlili, 'Funerary Practices in Judaea during the Times of the Herods: The Goliath Family Tomb at Jericho' (247-278) is a richly illustrated recounting of her famous find of thirty years ago, with its important social, linguistic and anthropological implications. Last in this section, Duane W. Roller, 'New Insights into the Building Program of Herod the Great' (313-320), is in fact a call for a truly comprehensive treatment of the subject, far beyond that of the major excavated Herodian sites, and accounting for every aspect of that program.

A number of papers deal with a variety of more general questions. It is not uncharacteristic of Herodian studies that the two volumes offer one single paper on the economy, Shimon Dar's 'The Agrarian Economy in the Herodian Period' (305-311). Unfortunately this very brief survey is mostly presented in general terms.

In 'The Royal Court of the Herods' (279-303) Nikos Kokkinos projects the court of the dynasty, including its physical appearance, against its Hellenistic and contemporary Roman backgrounds, including a very elaborate and detailed list of the various categories and members at court and a prosopography of 98 attested persons. Although Herod's Hellenistic court included the institution of the φίλοι of the king, it is claimed (Jörg-Dieter Gauger, 'Herodes' hellenistische(?) Hofhaltung', 91-107) that he also remained an oriental ruler in that those mentioned as his συγγενεῖς were always literally such, rather than officials occupying the highest rank in the court hierarchy.

Finally, Benedikt Eckhardt ('Herodes und Rom 40 v. Chr. Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Königswürde für einen jüdischen Herrscher', 9-25) takes his departure from the seemingly contradictory statements of Josephus according to which Herod either asked in Rome for the title of king for himself or for the child Aristobulus. Since an analysis of the sources does not resolve the question, he takes refuge in speculation as to the possible motives of the Romans (it was Antony, it is argued, rather than the pair Antony and Octavian, who was responsible for the decision) and of Herod. The author believes that Herod may have preferred a position like his father's, pulling the strings of a Hasmonaean puppet-king — but, on the contrary, it lay in the interest of Rome and of Antony to make him king. The paper suffers from the same flaw as the disallowed argumentation of Schalit, an overconfident trust in our ability to decipher the intentions and the psychological build-up of the *dramatis personae*. Would that we could be sure about the facts.

This brings us to a short summing-up. Though there have been some shorter biographies and some monographs, no full-scale scholarly biography of Herod has appeared since Schalit. When that work was written Herodian archaeology was in its infancy (or perhaps only embryonic) — he

had to rely more on Josephus than on the spade. Moreover, the interpretative tendencies and ideological overtones of that book were not without problems even at the time of publication, and its approaches and questions are such as to be expected from a book published in the 'sixties (and probably written in part in the 'fifties). No doubt a new major synthesis is a *desideratum*, though considering both the wealth of the material, and the need to balance the textual and archaeological evidence evenly — this is a tall order indeed. Any takers?

Joseph Geiger The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Ursula Hackl, Hanna Jenni and Christoph Schneider, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Nabatäer: Textsammlung mit Übersetzung und Kommentar, Mit Beiträgen von Daniel Keller* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus/Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, vol. 51), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2003. XV + 730 pp., 14 maps, 2 plates. ISBN: 3-7278-1410-1.

The present collection of textual sources for Nabataean history was produced in cooperation with the Schweiz-Lichtenstein Petra excavations project, and was compiled by Hackl (Ancient History), Jenni (Comparative Semitics) and Schneider (Epigraphy), in cooperation with Keller (Classical Archaeology). An 'Introduction' of some 100 pages presents the authors' views of Nabataean history and society. The first section of the main part, 'Schriftquellen' sets out the epigraphical, papyrological and numismatic evidence (107-414), while the second section comprises excerpts from Greek and Latin authors in alphabetical sequence (415-620; with the oddity that St Paul is found under 'N' — 'Neues Testament', and 1-2 Maccabees under 'S' for 'Septuaginta'). Bibliography, indices and plates bring the whole volume to 730 pages or 4.6 cm of shelf-space.

One might challenge the wisdom of arranging the excerpts this way. For one interested in the history of historiography, or the making of tradition, it is fascinating to watch how Ptolemy's dealings with the Nabataeans became ever more outstanding in the course of time (and well after the general's death), but this observation has little impact on the reconstruction of Nabataean history. Such historiographical interests would have been better served if the excerpts had been arranged by event/topic. It is even more difficult to justify the inclusion of 36 pages from Diodorus and 94 pages from Josephus, including text, translation, and commentary. Is it conceivable that a reader of a volume like this does not have one or more editions of both authors at hand, in printed and/or electronic form? Was the inclusion of the Greek text really essential, in the case of well-known, well-edited and well-distributed texts like these? This entire section would look better, be more accessible, and consume less space had it been put on a CD. In addition, it must be stated that the quality of the commentaries is very uneven, especially when it comes to Arabian history. The authors state that in Plin. *HN* 6.157 'die südarabische Region gemeint ist' (571) and proceed (as does everyone else) to identify the towns of Duma and Hegra in this section, whereas in fact these towns are found in North Arabia.

The epigraphical selection is, undoubtedly, the most useful and welcome section in the book under review. From the point of view of comparative Semitics and the history of the Southern Levant, this collection of Greek inscriptions and papyri referring to matters Nabataean provides a convenient tool. Unfortunately, the treatment of the Semitic inscriptions cannot be recommended in turn to the classicist. Here too the texts are oddly arranged, according to the regions established by Wenning in his (still very useful) inventory of the Nabataean archeological heritage, instead of in chronological order. Several items do not, or do not necessarily, refer to the Nabataeans. The 'Arab' in A.008.01 (130; Rhodes, second century BCE) need not be a Nabataean, and Gerrheans figure in Greek Aegean inscriptions of that century as well. The Nabataean inscription C.002.01 (Hauran) is dated to the year Claudius 9: this implies that whatever the tribe the author (an Arab according to the proper names current in his family) might have belonged to, he regarded himself