

Yoram Tsafir, Leah Di Segni and Judith Green, *Tabula Imperii Romani: Iudaea-Palaestina. Maps and Gazetteer*, with contributions by Israel Roll and Tsvika Tsuk. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1994, pp. x + 263.

This is a remarkable publication which consists of two major elements: a series of maps and a Gazetteer. While the latter is a remote descendant of M. Avi-Yonah's *Gazetteer of Roman Palestine* (Jerusalem 1976), the former are part of the series of maps of Roman provinces, the *Tabula Imperii Romani*, but they are far superior to any of those published so far. The two elements, gazetteer and maps, are to be used in conjunction, for all the sites on the maps are to be found in the gazetteer. The reverse is not true, for the gazetteer also includes entries on unidentified sites or sites of uncertain identification. In this respect it represents a step forward in relation to Avi-Yonah's *Gazetteer* which supplied only one identification in every case, sometimes with a question mark, but leaving no further room for doubt or alternatives. It is important to note that the compilers have given us generous measure in every respect. The gazetteer provides full references to literary sources of the Hellenistic, Roman and (Early) Byzantine periods and the basic map (1:1,000,000) includes Sinai in addition to all of Palestine. Besides this map, laid out according to the usual model of maps in the series, there are several others: a set of two containing all of Palestine proper on a scale of 1:250,000 and two others, on a scale of 1:400,000, showing the distribution of ancient churches and synagogues respectively. The 1:250,000 maps show sites of various kinds, Roman roads and aqueducts. These maps are among the most detailed I have seen of any Roman province. For instance, the Ordnance Survey map of Roman Britain, which has been published regularly in successive editions since 1924, is on two sheets on a scale of 1:625,000, while the map of Belgium in the Roman period, published by the Service National des Fouilles (Bruxelles 1968) is on a 1:500,000 scale. Needless to say, these countries were far less densely inhabited than Palestine in the Roman period and the total number of sites included is therefore much smaller. The northern section of the map of Roman Britain indicates isolated find-spots, something no map of Palestine in antiquity could ever do. It is also worth observing that there is no satisfactory, up-to-date map of any other Near Eastern country in antiquity, with the exception, perhaps, of the archaeological map of Jordan on a 1:250,000 scale. This is a re-issue of the old British map with various additions on three sheets (1978-82).

Both the gazetteer and the maps are entirely up-to-date. This is true for the information on aqueducts (by Tsvika Tsuk) and on Roman roads (by Israel Roll) on the maps, as well as for the references to archaeological publications contained in the gazetteer. A serious problem is, of course, that the latter will not remain up-to-date for long. For instance, the numerous references to brief reports in *Excavations and Surveys in Israel*, published by the Antiquities Authority, will be out of date in a few years' time and one can hardly expect a substantial volume like this to be re-issued every few years. What we might hope for, and this could be done fairly easily, is the publication of a version in electronic form (on disk), which could be up-dated periodically at little cost. After frequent use over more than half a year I have found very few inaccuracies on the maps and almost none in the gazetteer. A few random examples: I would have added question marks to the identification of Kefar Leqitaia, Geth in Samaria, and to that of To Ennaton and To Tetarton. Qasr el Juheiniya is not Mezad

Hatrurim but Mezaḏ Tamar. On the maps Archelais is a little too far to the south, the monastery of Theodosius is on the wrong side of the wadi, that of Euthymius shifted to SW; Socho is too far from the road, Gabaon too far to the south and Monumentum Rachel is too far north of Bethlehem. There may be a few more which I have not discovered, but they are surprisingly few in number. One real shortcoming, though no fault of the compilers, is, to my mind, the method of indicating differences of elevation on the maps. This is a cartographic problem which is the responsibility of the Survey of Israel. The fuzzy method of shading differences in height without the use of any contour lines does not provide a clear or reliable impression of the terrain. For a more satisfactory method one could look at the Ordnance Survey Map of Roman Britain which, on a 1:625,000 scale, gives a much better impression through the use of four different shades. The ideal method is that employed by the Atlas of the Greek and Roman World, now under preparation under the auspices of the American Philological Association. A sample map of Byzantium and the surrounding area on a 1:500,000 scale combines eight elevation tints with contour lines. This may be too expensive for a map produced by the Survey of Israel, but a compromise could surely have been found. Again, this is not the fault of the compilers who have produced an invaluable tool to be used gratefully by all those interested in Palestine in the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine periods.

Benjamin Isaac

Tel Aviv University

Louis H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World. Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993. pp. xii + 679. ISBN 0-691-07416-x.

A book published by a major scholar with a major academic press, presenting unconventional views on a major theme in ancient history, will justifiably attract serious attention. When the theme reflects, or is perceived to reflect, urgently debated existential issues of the modern world, discussion may dissolve into passion and partisan argument. The present book has already occasioned a harsh session at an international conference, as well as several extreme reviews, both hostile and laudatory. It has become the kind of book which is more often judged than read (especially since it is so long).

The main point of the book is two-fold: 1) to demonstrate that, in the millennium from Alexander's conquests to the codification of Roman law under Justinian, Jews not only resisted assimilation into the various cultures they knew and lived in, but were widely admired by Gentiles and attracted substantial numbers of new adherents in the form of "sympathizers" or actual proselytes; and 2) to explain this phenomenon as a result of the inherent strengths of Judaism itself. The main focus throughout is on the "Gentile" of the title: how Gentiles perceived and reacted to Judaism. Developments and variations in Jewish identity and practice within the thousand-year period selected are subordinated to the main line of inquiry, and in some cases are even denied. Thus, an *external* history of the Jews, and in this respect different from most standard treatments of that sub-category of ancient history called "Jewish history".

The first order of business is, logically, to deny that Jews and Judaism were to any significant degree changed or diminished by their contacts with Gentiles and Gentile