

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

as a subject of Rome, not of the Nabataean king. Nothing Nabataean features in C.002.02 (Greek, 175/76 CE) and C.003.01, whereas the authors of C.a.01 (320 CE) refer to their clans/tribes as φυλή Αὐδήνων and φυλή Χασητίνων. The 'Audenos' most probably derives from the Safaitic tribe of 'Awidh, while several Safaitic names, but none from the Nabataean corpus, can be compared to the 'Chasitenos'. Further irrelevant Greek and Nabataean inscriptions are: E.002.01; E.003.01; E.004.01; E.004.02; E.004.03; E.004.04 (Seia was not part of Nabataea, nor was 'Ubayshat necessarily a Nabataean tribe); E.004.05; E.004.06; E.009.01; E.009.02; F.007.03; F.012.01; F.020.01. F.038.02; H.008.02; H.008.05; K.006.02; K.009.01; N.060.08.01 (from the Siq at Petra, previously unpublished, 225-236: second-early fourth century, by two inhabitants of Moto — Imtan or Mu'tah?); N.060.08.02; O.006.01; P.011.01; P.011.02; Q.055.02; S.003.01; X.008.02; X.081.01; X.088.05; X.088.07; X.256.01; Z.025.01; Z.030.01; Z.037.01; Z.037.02. Not every author who left an Aramaic inscription in Nabataean script, and not every author with an Arabic name in the territory formerly under Nabataean rule, was necessarily an ethnic Nabataean.

It is gratifying to the historian of ancient Arabia to find some Safaitic inscriptions included in this collection, but their treatment betrays little knowledge of this particular script, language, culture and its modern study. D.b.01 (154f) again bears no reference to Nabataeans or their history — a Bedouin had ample opportunity to flee the Romans well before 106 CE, e.g. during Pompey's or Scaurus' campaigns. In addition, 'Hamalik' is not a possible Safaitic name; viable vocalisations are Hamlak, ham-Mâlik or ham-Malik; the same applies to D.b.02. In addition, D.b.01 is taken from Dussaud-Macler with no regard to its re-publication in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, V. The disregard of the *CIS* produces a minor catastrophe in the case of D.c.01 (156f; *CIS* V 4448), where the misreadings of Dussaud-Macler have long since been corrected (see already E. Littmann, *Thamud und Safa* [Leipzig 1940], 104). Instead of 'Hagadl' (again, not a possible Safaitic name), it was the 'Medes' who fought the Romans at Bosra in the second half of the third century CE (for the identification of these 'Medes' see this reviewer's articles in *ZDMG* 134 [1984], 219-225 and *Damaszener Mitteilungen* 3 [1988], 77-82). In O.004.01 עבד אלוהור , 'bd is surely not a verb (this assumption is syntactically and stylistically most awkward); the Nabataeans had a rich vocabulary for masonry and would have chosen a more specific word for 'making a channel'. Read instead עבד אלוהור [א] 'worshipper of (the god of) al-Hawrâ' (probably a personal name). In O.019.04, פיני cannot refer to a person from Phaino/Fênân (the *nisbah* would read פיניו or rather פיניו). The authors' insecurity in all matters Arabic/Semitic verges on the incredible in the case of P.011.01 (Ruwwâfah, 164-168 CE), when they credit the small, but persistent tribe of Thamud in the Northern Hejâz with the production of thousands of 'Thamudic' inscriptions all over the peninsula (299). The dating of X.081.01 to 'ca. 100 CE' (399) is untenable; comparable 'mixed' (Nabataean-Arabic) texts derive from the third and fourth centuries CE. For this and the other 'late' texts, R. Hoyland, *Arabia and the Arabs from the Bronze Age to the Coming of Islam* (London 2001) should have been consulted. In Z.037.01 (Sinai, 190 CE), the authors are not really qualified to question Euting's reading '(year) in which the Arabs — ע[ר]ביא (here still: Bedouin) devastated the land'.

The authors conclude from Eratosthenes' mentioning Petra as a geographical point of reference (602), and from the missions of a Priene diplomat both to Alexandria and Petra (A.005.01; second half of the second century BCE; 126f.), that in the third century BCE 'Petra als Stadt den Griechen bereits ein Begriff war'. Regardless of whether 'Stadt' is used for 'town' or 'city', this conclusion is hardly convincing. Someone returning from England might well report that he had visited London and Stonehenge: this indicates that Stonehenge was a place of interest as well as of international renown, but hardly a metropolis. That there was no major urban development in Petra (as opposed to Gaia, Wadi Musa) is well attested by the simple fact that the Petra valley provided the space for monumental architecture from the late first century BCE to the second century CE. Even after the 'Petra monumental urban architecture project' had started, it

took the Nabataeans some 100 years, well into the last quarter of the first century CE, to control the Wadi Musa flash floods and ensure that the main thoroughfare of their architectural assembly was not devastated every 10 to 20 years.

In sum: the volume is unnecessarily inflated and the treatment of the Semitic inscriptions is unreliable. The advanced Nabataean scholar will find one or other of the comments helpful, but the non-specialist is still advised to go to the original publications of the texts and to look for a historical synthesis elsewhere. As a textbook for students, especially in countries sharing in the Nabataean cultural heritage today, the volume is useless, due to the Late Germanic dialect in which it is written (and whose phonology, to the great irritation of this reader, is also presupposed in the Semitic transliterations).

Ernst Axel Knauf

Universität Bern

Martin Goodman, *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*, New York: Allen Lane, 2007. 639 pp. ISBN-13: 978-0-375-41185-4.

Goodman sets out to show that the clash of civilizations between Jews and Romans should be considered as the background against which the revolts of the Jews occurred. He asks (29): 'Was there anything intrinsic in Jewish and Roman society that made it possible for Jerusalem and Rome to coexist? Were the tensions which had so dramatic an effect in August 70 already apparent in 30 when Jesus preached in Jerusalem and died there on the order of the Roman governor?' Whereas the title is borrowed from Moses Hess' book *Rom und Jerusalem, die letzte Nationalitätsfrage* (published in 1862), the sub-title of the book 'The Clash of Ancient Civilizations' brings to mind S.P. Huntington's *The Clash of Civilizations*, a book that has aroused a great deal of debate, polemics and reactions, positive and negative. As far as I can see, Goodman does not refer to this masterful theory at all (since there is no general bibliography, and I could not find a reference to Huntington in the text, I assume that the book is not mentioned).

First and foremost, in order not to do an injustice to Martin Goodman, I would emphasize that the book appears to be meant for popular consumption and for a very wide audience, and not for specialists in the field. This would explain, I believe, the very long basic surveys of history, historiography, law, life-style and other matters that specialists would not need. Moreover, much of the modern bibliography is absent, and readers might get the (wrong) impression that most of the observations and analyses are original, and have not been tackled before Goodman's book. Goodman deals with a great many issues without even mentioning the most necessary bibliography, as if he had invented the whole field anew. Many examples can be given. For instance, his survey of the Maccabees (in particular 53-58), and later of historical writing as a medium for the forming of identity are matters that have been treated very often (in the cases of Eupolemus, Manethon, Jubilees, etc.), but the useful and important discussions of these issues over the last twenty years are altogether ignored by Goodman. An up-to-date bibliography is either missing, or else a minimal one is mentioned. The discussion of the early church and the spread of Christianity is extremely basic (for instance, [513]) '...In 300, Christians were only a small minority in the empire [does Goodman have any statistics concerning this unfounded statement?], and Constantine's conversion was a shock to them and to pagans alike. Nonetheless, there were certainly many more Christians in 300 than in 30CE. It is worth asking why...' In the following pages he again presents a survey beginning with Jesus ('finding the historical truth is not easy'. Really?). He does not refer to the hundreds of scholarly works that have been published in the last twenty years, some of which have asked these questions and given interesting answers. It would be useless to list the works one would have expected to find in such a book, even a popular one. There are also many observations, too many, that to my mind Goodman has not examined