

more than that, and there are many other ways in which it can legitimately be studied. I am glad that this book addresses some of them.

Christ Church, Oxford

H. G. M. WILLIAMSON

MEIR BEN-DOV, *Historical Atlas of Jerusalem*. Continuum Publishing, New York / London, 2002. 400 pp. \$50.00. ISBN 082641379X.

This work is the 'first English-language edition' of the original Hebrew published in 1991 by Carta, The Israel Map and Publishing Company, under the title *Atlas Carta: Yerushalayim be-Re'i ha-Dorot*. An 'expanded and revised' Hebrew edition appeared in 2000. The translator, David Louvish, who has done an outstanding job, chose, one imagines in concert with the author and publisher, to turn the somewhat difficult Hebrew phraseology of the title into a *Historical Atlas*. The book under consideration is many things but, in the opinion of the reviewer, it is not a 'historical atlas'.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, it is questionable to what extent the Hebrew versions would rate a review in a top-notch academic journal, since Carta for the most part targets a general audience and its books clearly reflect this. The 'religion and spirituality' books of the Continuum Publishing Group, the rubric under which this volume apparently appears, seek to cover 'all levels from reference, scholarly and student to general and devotional books' in religion and spirituality.<sup>2</sup> Continuum has published serious scholarship in religious studies. The present work is a serious, popular presentation of the author's vast knowledge of all matters related to the history of Jerusalem and does indeed contain matters that will be of interest to scholars. However, it is not scholarship.

What should a historical atlas of Jerusalem contain and how should it be written? First of all there is the issue of accessibility. We shall provide one example. Should the reader of this atlas, for instance, seek information about the 'Gates' of Jerusalem, he or she would find in the index references to the 'Gate of Mercy' (with a sub-reference to the 'Golden Gate'), 'Gate of the Chain' and 'Gate of the Jews'. Glancing through the book, one of course notices that this is a 'drop in the bucket', as it were. The reader must seek individual references in the index and text to the 'Corner Gate', 'Cotton Gate', 'Damascus Gate' and so on. Clearly this is not a user-friendly reference work.

Then there is the technical nature of the work as an atlas, historical or otherwise. One looks in vain for any discussion of such technical matters as scale, scope or styles of presentation of maps. Maps have their own ideologies, as one can learn from scale, omissions, focus, labelling and even colouring. None of this is relevant for the work

<sup>1</sup> See Dan Bahat with Chaim T. Rubenstein, *Atlas Carta ha-Gadol le-Toldot Yerushalayim*, Carta, Jerusalem, 1989. A 'new format' appeared in 2000. In both cases the Hebrew was translated on the English title page as *Carta's Great Historical Atlas of Jerusalem*, making the use of the phrase by Ben-Dov, also published in Hebrew by Carta, undoubtedly somewhat awkward. (There is no English title page in the Hebrew versions of Ben-Dov's book.) However, the English version of Bahat's work, published in 1990 by Simon and Schuster, appeared as *The Illustrated Atlas of Jerusalem*. In our view, Bahat's work comes much closer to being a historical atlas than that of Ben-Dov, although a real 'historical atlas' of Jerusalem has yet to be written. Neither the Hebrew nor the English version of Bahat's atlas appears in Ben-Dov's 'Bibliography and Sources'.

<sup>2</sup> See their website at <http://www.continuumbooks.com>. The work includes a preface by Fr. Bargil Pixner O.S.B., who presents a very brief history of Christianity in Jerusalem (pp. ix–xi) and then adds his stamp of approval to the book, praising it because, for instance, Ben-Dov even 'relates to the visits of the popes, Paul VI and John Paul II'. One wonders to what extent Continuum really considers this to be scholarship.

under discussion here since the maps are overly schematic. They also ignore physical geography, which, in the view of this reviewer, is also necessary for a historical atlas.

In a historical atlas the focus should be on the maps, drawings, illustrations, pictures and the like, and the 'history' should revolve around the atlas. Such an atlas should attempt to portray, for example, the physical, cultural, political, military, religious and economic landscapes of Jerusalem within historical parameters. The texts and explanations should not outweigh the illustrative material. Ben-Dov relates his version of the history of Jerusalem; one waits in vain to see this tied in to the 300 maps and 400 illustrations.<sup>3</sup>

Then there is the issue of 'versions'. Just as there is no definitive history of anything, Jerusalem or otherwise, so there is no definitive map or atlas. Since it is acceptable for an atlas not to have footnotes, out of fairness to the reader, every attempt should be made to provide 'normative' explanations, or at least not to pass off personal, idiosyncratic views as the norm.<sup>4</sup> While Ben-Dov does occasionally provide the reader with views opposed to his own, such as in the proposals for the reconstruction of the course of Nehemiah's walls (pp. 86–87), or the possible interpretations of the description of Jerusalem's wall by Muqaddasi (p. 192), the rest of the work is 'classic' Ben-Dov. This might work in such areas as Jerusalem under the Umayyads, in which Ben-Dov's reconstructions of the Umayyad administrative centre are considered canon, but it is not fair to the reader in other pertinent areas of Jerusalem's history.<sup>5</sup> This is especially the case regarding chapter 13: 'Jerusalem at the Threshold of the Third Millennium 1989–2000' (pp. 345–67), which mostly reflects the author's personal political views and vision and very little in terms of scholarship.<sup>6</sup> His views on Moslem sensitivities to 'Jewish designations ... given to various structures of indisputably Christian or Moslem origin' and his ignoring the issue of damage caused to the Temple Mount complex by recent construction on the Temple Mount reflects Ben-Dov's stand against an almost united (Israeli) archaeological community believing otherwise. He is entitled to his views, but he should at least hint to the reader that they are far from normative.

Finally, there is the issue of the relationship of archaeology to a historical atlas. Ben-Dov is an outstanding archaeologist with a good deal of experience in Jerusalem as well as in other areas. He is certainly familiar with all archaeological developments (pp. 357–58). However, his historical descriptions read as if time had stood still. Absent are references to new issues of Jerusalem archaeology during the last decade or so, some of which require serious re-evaluations of the city's history.<sup>7</sup> This is perhaps understandable in light of the fact that his chart of 'principal excavations and surveys' takes the reader up to 1989 (pp. 327–28), which is certainly appropriate for the first

<sup>3</sup> The examples of this phenomenon are almost as numerous as the maps and illustrations. We make do with two. On pp. 200–201 there is a map of Crusader-period Jerusalem which shows the location of 52 buildings. One wonders about the connection of these buildings to the history and development of the city. The same is true for the 43 buildings of the Mamluk period (pp. 232–33). They must have had some connection to the history of the city.

<sup>4</sup> One solution to this problem is to provide volumes such as the *Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients*.

<sup>5</sup> See, for instance, p. 92: 'Different scholar's proposals for the location of the Acra and the Antiochia quarter'. The last (!) proposal, according to Ben-Dov, was that of Ben-Dov in 1973. Numerous studies have been written on this since then, but are not mentioned. Moreover, the text relates only to the view of the author himself.

<sup>6</sup> One looks in vain, for instance, for any reference to the work of Menachem Klein in the Bibliography and Sources. See, for instance, his *Doves over Jerusalem's Sky: The Peace Process and the City 1977–1999*. The Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies, Jerusalem, 1999. See also Maps 1–3 (pp. 311–15) (in Hebrew).

<sup>7</sup> A good summary may be found in *Qadmoniot* 34 (2) (122), 2001 (in Hebrew).

Hebrew edition, but not for a book published in 2002. The first half of this book should have been revised to include this material.

Meir Ben-Dov is a brilliant scholar. His views, although sometimes 'minority opinions' and sometimes somewhat radical, have often become accepted in Jerusalem scholarship. He is truly an expert on all aspects of Jerusalem and he has made important contributions to Jerusalem scholarship. His *Historical Atlas of Jerusalem* might contribute to a future real historical atlas of Jerusalem,<sup>8</sup> but the present work is a far cry from the real thing.

Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel

JOSHUA SCHWARTZ

JAMES M. SCOTT (ed.), *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 72). Brill, Leiden, 2001. xiii, 600 pp. €169.00. ISBN 90-04-11580-3.

This bulky volume is to be understood as a sequel to the 1997 volume in the same series, also edited by Scott, on *Exile*. That suggests that the focus might be on the post-exilic restoration as described principally in the biblical books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and indeed some of the seventeen contributors understand it so. There is another scholarly usage of these terms, however, which finds in them a more metaphorical sense of how the Jews saw themselves for centuries after those events, something (as Bauckham here rightly mentions, p. 436) more closely akin to subjugation. This has been an issue that has been much debated in New Testament circles in terms of how the historical Jesus may have envisaged his ministry, and this too receives detailed attention here. Finally, restoration can have a more general application to the return to some kind of golden age, the old *Urzeit/Endzeit* model, and this understanding is also represented, though less prominently.

Each of these topics is of interest and importance in its own right, and it is not surprising to find that the contributors have little difficulty in filling many pages (up to fifty in one case, and several in the region of forty) as they expound their version of restoration in the literary corpus which the editor has presumably assigned to them. What is sorely lacking, so far as I can see, is any attempt to discuss how these may be related to one another, and what the implications of such differences may be. The result is a collection of papers with less overall coherence than might have been wished. It seems that there was a lack of firm editorial rationale in conceptualising the project (or if there was, it is not explained) and/or of control in the treatment of the contributions as they were received.

The biblical (Old Testament) material is covered in three essays of very variable quality. J. G. McConville undertakes a solid survey of the relevant issues as they are raised in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic literature, and he shows good awareness of the interplay between the canonical literature and strictly historical issues. The prophetic literature is surveyed by the late O. H. Steck and one of his distinguished pupils, K. Schmid; how they divided the work is not explained, but it seems likely that the fundamental work was Steck's with Schmid preparing the whole for publication. They first survey the theme of restoration 'canonically' in the texts as we now have them, nicely basing the themes for discussion on the content of Zechariah's night visions, and then moving on to a tentative diachronic reconstruction of salvation sayings, it being well known that these were often added much later to the books in which they are now included. Finally in this section, Lester Grabbe looks at arguably

<sup>8</sup> A good historical atlas is usually a collaborative work, and perhaps some team of scholars will take up the challenge of producing such a work on Jerusalem.