Recensioni
e Libri ricevuti


Queste sottolineature evidenziano alcuni punti deboli della dissertazione, ma non oscurano in alcun modo tutti i risultati positivi e condivisibili di una ricerca che ha messo in luce non solo la sapienza teologica e pastorale dell’“Apostolo delle genti”, ma anche la sua maestria nell’arte retorica.

Samuele Salvatori


The present volume, under the editorship and participation of Michael Eisenberg, is a continuation and completion of the first archaeological report on Hippos-Sussita, from 2000 to 2011, published in 2013.\(^1\) It features 13 chapters, written by different researchers and engaging with a variety of subjects: historical earthquakes that occurred around the Sea of Galilee, the necropoleis, the water supply system, the winery complex, human skeletal remains, pottery finds, glass vessels, stucco and wall paintings, small finds and laboratory research. Accordingly, these studies “are aimed at filling the gaps of the research presented in the first volume” (p. 11). Methodologically, this volume, like the first one, is also a tightly woven treatise. The varied chapters of the book are of great interest, revealing a multilateral approach, and this review engages with most of them.

The chapter on “The Necropoleis” (pp. 24-43), by O. Zingboym, presents a detailed description of the surveys and excavations at three main burial areas in Hippos-Sussita, where Roman mausolea, burial caves and sarcophagi have been discovered.

“The water supply system” (pp. 44-55), written by T. Tsuk, based on the survey and excavations carried out in 1993-1994, clearly presents “The 52 km water supply system to Hippos, which includes the length of the three aqueducts, …” (p. 55), dated to the 2nd or 1st century BCE and 1st century CE. This water supply system to Hippos-Sussita undoubtedly constituted an important and impressive technological/engineering feat, solving the problems of water supply to the city and its inhabitants.

R. Frankel and M. Eisenberg devote their contribution to “The Hippos Winery Complex” (pp. 56-73), located on the northern and southern sides of the

---

Northwest Church Complex and dated to the early Byzantine and early Islamic periods. The authors note that “Nine installations were uncovered, all of which are situated around and integrally connected with the North-West Church” (p. 58). The association of wine and oil presses with churches is an interesting phenomenon, reflecting ancient tradition connecting the production of wine and oil with pagan temples and sanctuaries. The authors rightly contend that “The reasons for this association are presumably a combination of ritual and economics. The use of wine and oil in religious rites and ceremonies created a demand for sanctified products which enhanced the economic power that the religious institutions already had” (p. 69).

L.-A. Kapitaikin’s long and detailed chapter, “Final Pottery Report of the 2010-2011 Excavation Seasons” (pp. 88-209), engages with the ceramics of the Hellenistic through the Umayyad periods, that is, from the 3rd century BCE to the mid-8th century CE, retrieved at Hippos-Sussita from six excavations areas. The chapter encompasses a variety of wares, such as jugs, oil lamps, jars, fish-plates, amphorae, cooking pots, cups, bowls, and many others, accompanied with many useful plates of drawings presenting detailed description, dating and parallels of the objects. While the author is aware that the picture offered by the pottery is limited, he contends that “it appears to reflect major regional and micro-regional trends in the use and trade of pottery at that site over the various periods of its existence” (p. 109). Naturally, however, the chapter is essentially technical in nature and necessarily remains with narrow limits.

The chapter “Summary of the Pottery Finds” (pp. 210-275), contributed by M. Osband and M. Eisenberg, presents selected pottery contexts from past publications, “allowing for a general diachronic view of the pottery from the Hellenistic through the Umayyad periods”, and is accompanied with plates of drawings, arranged in chronological order. The authors state that they “chose those contexts where the stratigraphy (providing an earlier or later relative chronology) and/or additional finds such as coins or glass have added independent chronological information. In general, preference was given to those contexts that had large enough quantities of pottery in the previous publications, to provide an overall picture for many of the main types from that time” (p. 211). The present chapter completes that by Kapitaikin, providing an overall picture of the pottery at Hippos-Sussita and conferring an additional dimension.

“The Glass Vessels of the Roman, Byzantine and Early Islamic Periods” (pp. 276-319), by M. Burdajewicz, offers a “summary report, sharing the glass material unearthed at Hippos-Sussita with a wider circle of researchers dealing with the history of glass in the southern Levant during the Roman, Byzantine and Early Islamic (Umayyad) periods” (p. 277). It consists in two parts: a detailed typological division of the vessels and a systematic discussion of the most interesting glass finds or glass assemblages, found in the areas excavated be-
The material, accompanied with many drawings (pp. 288-315), encompasses a variety of vessels: bottles, flasks, jugs, bowls, drinking vessels, oil lamps and kohl tubes. The chapter is characterized by a clear typological treatment, comparative study and analytical approach.

The essay “Stucco Relief Depicting Mythological Figures” (pp. 320-327), by A. Erlich, engages with the unique and interesting discovery of two figural stucco reliefs, found at the same locus (L1973), in the southern bath of Hippos-Sussita, dated to the mid-3rd century CE. One relief depicts a hairy bearded head with high forehead, marked “by two horizontal incisions indicating a ribbon, crossing the forehead just above the eyebrows” (p. 321). The other depicts a torso draped in an animal skin, tied with a knot (Hercules knot.- AO) at the centre of his chest. The author notes assertively that “The two fragments of head and torso cannot be combined and it is not certain whether they belonged to one figure or to two different figures” (p. 321); and later, repeatedly contends that “The head and torso do not fit together and it seems that they probably belonged to two different figures, each portraying either Heracles or satyr. Hence, the stucco relief from Hippos is probably part of a Dionysiac scene, of which two figures remained, those of a satyr, Silenus or perhaps Heracles” (p. 322). The author, somewhat curiously and unconvincingly, identifies the head as that of a satyr, because the head band or ribbon recalls Dionysiac imagery (p. 322). Unfortunately, this determination is clearly incorrect, since Herakles too is often depicted with a band/ribbon (tainia, stephane, diadema.- AO), on his head together with ivy leaves or fruits.2 On the one hand, she claims unequivocally that “The main attribute of the torso is the animal skin hung on the figure’s shoulders and tied with a knot in the center of his chest. This drapery arrangement is typical of Heracles who wears the skin of the Nemean lion …, tied across his chest” (p. 321). On the other hand, she writes that “Other mythological figures wearing animal skins are the male members of the Dionysos entourage, who are sometimes portrayed wearing a nebris, fawn skin, hung on their back and tied over their chest” (p. 322). Despite all this, the author is hesitant and writes the following: “Thus, the torso might belong to Heracles or to a satyr; and likewise, the head shares some features of both Heracles and a satyr. If both fragments belong to the same figure, then it is hard to associate them with any specific figure” (p. 322). It should be emphasized that: a) the head and torso were found, as noted above, at the same locus; and b) the torso with the skin of the Nemean

lion and Hercules knot are unequivocally the attributes of Herakles and not those of Dionysos or the Dionysiac entourage. The author’s discussion is regrettably inconsistent and methodologically erroneous, presenting contradictions and confusions. She has missed her goal and failed to identify the head and torso as integral parts of a single figure, namely that of Herakles, whose imagery, like that of Dionysos and his entourage, was common in bath decorations of the Roman period.

S. Rozenberg’s study “Wall Painting and Stucco Fragments” (pp. 328-369), accompanied with three detailed tables of the material from the basilica, southern bath and odeion, engages with “Many fragments of wall paintings, stuccowork, and decorated building stones, found in most of the excavated areas of Hippos” that “can be studied only from general technical and stylistic approaches” (p. 329). In this long essay, the author concentrates on the study of the pigments and plaster, stucco fragments with different profiles, and column and pilasters fragments, as well as presenting a stylistic analysis with comparative examples. She concludes that “the wall painting and stucco fragments from Hippos show eclectic iconographical models and styles. On one hand, the basic motifs of decoration are Graeco-Roman, and on the other, many of their elements show a closer connection in technique and style with the eastern provinces than with the western styles of the Roman world” (p. 352).

In light of the exhaustive work invested in the book, the addition of an analytical index would have been extremely useful in helping readers find their way around the book’s detailed text.

Aside from the above-mentioned comments, the present volume is a welcome publication and a valuable addition to scholarship on Classical and Late Antique archaeology in Israel and elsewhere in general, as well as to the study of Hippos-Sussita in particular. Finally, the two-volume publication, together, expands our knowledge and understanding of life and culture in Hippos-Sussita and offers a panoramic view from both the textual and visual aspects.

Asher Ovadiah


The present compiled work consists of two volumes and covers mainly the Hellenistic, Roman and early Byzantine periods.

“The project of compiling an Onomasticon of Palestine and Arabia in the Greek and Latin sources”, as the Authors point out, “was initiated by Prof. Mi-