Çelik elegantly frames her inquiries with cross-cultural literary analyses to illustrate the impact of the growing field of archaeology on different aspects of Ottoman culture and society. Çelik’s cross-cultural methodology stands as a contribution not only to the Ottoman and Republican history of Turkey but also to the historiography of archaeology and heritage studies in general, while providing insight into the subtle but powerful role antiquities have played in the construction of national identities.
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This volume provides a summary of an ambitious long-term project organized and directed by MacDonald involving almost four decades of an intensive archaeological survey of the Transjordan region between the Wadi al-Hasa and Ras en-Naqb that comprised the territory of the Iron Age Edomite Kingdom. The focus greatly expands that time frame to include the evidence for human occupation from 3800 BCE to 1917 CE, so the volume has broader appeal than just to biblical scholars.

The region is divided into three topographical areas: 1) the Southern Ghor and Wadi Arabah, better known as the Dead Sea Rift Valley; 2) the highlands of the Transjordan Plateau; and 3) the eastern desert steppe. The territory is quite sizeable, comprising 6,900 sq. km, and very rugged. The elevations range from 400 m below sea level to 1700 m above, with annual rainfall varying from 350 to 25 cm. MacDonald’s extraordinary energy and dedication are exuded throughout this description of the rugged landscape of this massive project, in which 2,350 sites were recorded, many for the first time.

Each of the six chronological chapters of the volume has a similar structure: an introduction, followed by discussions of the climate and the primary literary and epigraphic evidence, before a summary of the archaeological evidence from MacDonald’s surveys, including highlights from other major archaeological explorations of the landscape. But the main objective is to draw attention to the results emerging from MacDonald’s previously published surveys: Wadi al-Hasa (WHS), Tafila-Buseirah (TBAS), Shamkak-Ayl (SAAS), and Ayl-Ras en-Naqb (ARNAS). There are twenty-four maps scattered throughout the text, and forty-nine excellent illustrations at the end of the volume, many in color.

Beyond Petra, the excavations in this region are few and widely scattered: Buseirah, Tawilan, Khirbat edh-Dharih, Gharandahl, Bir Madhkur, Khirbat en-Nahas, and the Feinan are the major sites. MacDonald’s survey focused on the interstices, excluding some of the steep ridges that descend into the Dead Sea Rift and the Petra Archaeological Park.

The main objective of the surveys was “to discover, record and interpret the sites” encountered in the pedestrian surface-sherding survey of this terrain by MacDonald’s team. The percentage of sherds for the various periods is provided. For large sites, the method was to select random squares that comprised less than five percent of the settlement. The driving questions were the chronology of the site, establishing the beginning and end of occupation, and the reasons for each, emphasizing the environmental resources available, with a proposed delineation of the settlement pattern for each period, including the transportation lattice revealed in the region.

The various chronological periods are characterizing as a “filling up” or “emptying out,” which are attributed mainly to immigration of newcomers and forced migration of settlers to other areas, with attempts to coordinate the fluctuations with climatic changes (“moist” and “arid”). But there are contradictions. No urban centers are recorded for Bronze Age I–III on the Edomite Plateau, in spite of the period between 3000 and 2300 being defined as a “moist period.” The period of Middle and Late Bronze also has minimal occupation and is characterized as an arid period of “nomadic pastoralists.” The same absence of sites occurs for Iron Age I (1200–1000 BCE), but Iron II (1000–539 BCE) represents the first “filling up” period of Edom, although it is assumed to be a drier or arid period.
MacDonald posits that this may be a result of an influx of Canaanites from Palestine to the west or of the region attracting traders and miners. The possibility of a “population explosion” is minimized, ignoring the studies that allege that eighth-century BCE Greece experienced just such a rapid and dramatic population increase at the same time. The Edomite settlements in Iron II are mainly impregnable mountain strongholds, such as at Umm al-Biyara, Ba‘aja, Khirbat al-Mu‘allaq, and Sela, viewed as places of refuge against marauding Arabs, ignoring the tradition that Edomites were themselves Arabs.

In contrast, the survey recorded abundant agricultural villages and farmsteads on the plateau in the period, which marked a transition from the pastoralism of previous periods, supplanted by a newly arriving population. For the animosity between Edom and Judah associated with the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 BCE (mentioned by MacDonald on pp. 27 and 96), see now Tebes 2011.

The Persian and Hellenistic periods represent another arid phase for MacDonald, when the population presumably lived in tents and rock-cut caves, in marked distinction to the “wet” Roman period from Augustus to Constantine, which represents another “filling up” stage, marking the transition of the Nabataeans from commerce to agriculture that purportedly transpired after Augustus seized the trade routes.

This traditional depiction of the Nabataean economy persists in spite of the mid-first-century CE shipping manual known as the Periplus Maris Erythraei (ch. 19) attesting Nabataean trade flourishing at this time. Another caveat. In describing the route of the Via Nova Traiana south of Petra, MacDonald tracks it through Sadaqa (Kastron Zadacathon) west to Khirbat al-Munay‘a (p. 64 with fig. 5.3), connecting it to the Darb ar-Rasif, ignoring the evidence of one of its best-preserved sections with six milestones between Sadaqa and Dor that leads south to Humayma (Graf 1995: 250–51 = 1998: 14–19). This mistake was already made by Nelson Glueck and Sir Aurel Stein in the 1930s, both of whom ignored Alois Musil’s accurate observations decades earlier.

But MacDonald alertly notes the evidence for Nabataean wine production in the Baidha area, just north of Petra, and the Nabataean presence in the Faynan, areas not covered in his surveys. It should be noted that a botanical study of various sites in the region of southern Jordan suggests a much greener landscape in antiquity that implies that the growth of the civic population was the real stimulus for increased agricultural production (Ramsay 2017).

The real surge in settlements was in the Byzantine era (324–640 CE), but again in a period assumed to be arid. The surveys of MacDonald consistently revealed half or more of the sites recorded as Byzantine. The impact of the earthquake in 363 is emphasized as a hiatus, but a revival is signaled by the Petra Papyri that indicate extensive land-holding in the sixth century. This is followed by very few early Islamic settlements in the region. It is not until the “medieval” Ayyubid-Mamluk period that there is again a revival, with villages and farmsteads dotting the landscape, particularly in the Petra region. During the late Islamic period, there also is the emergence of a large number of agricultural settlements.

The final chapter summarizes the results of MacDonald’s important surveys. With the extensive development of the Jordanian countryside that has taken place in recent decades, his exploration was both timely and productive. The volume provides a valuable contribution for all future archaeological studies of the region. The pattern of settlements also provides a historical basis for questioning the impact of the presumed hypothetical climate changes in antiquity proposed by scientists, since the juxtaposition of the periods of “moist” and “dry” are often in conflict with the realities on the ground. As MacDonald observes, multiple factors must be considered in taking into the account the reasons for the rise and fall of the population in the region.
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Our Western culture is the outcome of a very fruitful symbiosis of a Levantine religion and Greek thought, and this intercultural, Near Eastern-Hellenistic encounter dates back more than two millennia and has over the years and to some degree affected almost every sphere of human activity. Thus, inter alia, constant engagement with religious literature in Greek had left easily recognizable traces in the local vernaculars of Middle Eastern Christians in the form of hundreds of Greek loanwords. The phenomenon is well known to every student of Syriac, for example, but—surprisingly—only very few (and somewhat eclectic) studies have been dedicated to the study of Greek-Syriac language contact. Aaron Butts’s new book *Language Change in the Wake of Empire: Syriac in Its Greco-Roman Context* aims to remedy this situation.

The book is divided into three sections dedicated to the methodological and historical background, loanwords, and grammatical replication, respectively. After a short introduction, Butts surveys in chapter two (pp. 11–24) various contact linguistic frameworks and opts for Van Coetsem’s typology of language contact, which categorizes the changes and expectable outcomes according to the linguistic dominance of the agents of change. Based on the scant “anecdotal evidence” (p. 38) that survives in historical sources, Butts establishes in chapter three (pp. 25–40) that the sociohistorical setting of Greek-Syriac language contact is best described as one of recipient language agentivity: The agents of change were in all likelihood Syriac-speakers who borrowed from Greek, in which they were less proficient. (Note that p. 26 n. 9, Brown 1989 is not listed in the bibliography. Read Brown 1971?)

The following one hundred pages are dedicated to the analysis of 800+ Greek loanwords from a corpus of pre-eighth-century Syriac texts (note that if the corpus indeed contained the NT [p. 47 n. 15], it is not restricted to “texts that were not translated from Greek”). Apropos, the issue of Greek-Syriac contact becomes even more complicated when one takes later periods into account, in which original Greek compositions were occasionally translated back into Greek from the Syriac, as happened, e.g., with the Syntipas tradition of the Aesopic fables.

While Butts’s analyses contain scores of examples, he does not include in the volume under review a full list of all the loanwords on which his work is based. Chapter four (pp. 43–63) introduces relevant theoretical concepts: Butts views the level of integration of a foreign word (often associated with the somewhat fuzzy terms *Lehnwort* and *Fremdwort*) as a continuum. Lack of morpho-syntactic integration or relative frequency may be used to distinguish loanwords from (single-word) code-switching. Greek also served as a channel through which words of other foreign origin, for example Latin, reached Syriac. On the other hand, some ultimately Greek words were loaned into predecessors of Syriac and are thus inherited in that language (and therefore do not attest to language contact in the period under discussion); these are assembled in appendix 1 (pp. 212–22). Note that A. Schall, “Zur griechischen Nebenüberlieferung im Syrischen,” in *FsKrotkoff* (1977): 237–46, has remarks on Greek in the early Syriac inscriptions.

Chapter five (pp. 64–96) surveys the representation of the Greek consonants and vowels in the Syriac alphabet. Correspondences are remarkably stable throughout the corpus, with seeming exceptions often harking back to Koiné Greek input forms. In some cases, the time-depth of the corpus enables