ASOR's 2009 Annual Meeting took place from November 18–21, 2009 at the Astor Crowne Plaza Hotel in New Orleans. The Annual Meeting marked ASOR's first return to 'The Big Easy' in over a decade. With attendance over 600 people, the rooms at the hotel were filled with a palpable energy that lasted from the plenary session on Wednesday night through the final session on Saturday evening. Feedback from the attendee evaluations included phrases such as “interesting papers”, “great location,” and “best meeting so far!” There were 55 academic sessions, 40 business meetings and receptions, and exhibitors to visit, so there was little time for rest while in New Orleans. Attendees found time to explore New Orleans and the French Quarter.

Prior to the official start of the Annual Meeting on Wednesday night, ASOR volunteers helped document the current condition of Holt Cemetery. With the guidance of the non-profit organization Save Our Cemeteries, the ASOR volunteers surveyed individual graves and took photos to create an archive of the state of the cemetery as a baseline, to compare to pre-Katrina photos and also to serve as a database for future stabilization and restoration efforts. This project will be the groundwork for a future archaeological survey of the cemetery.

The Annual Meeting kicked off on Wednesday night with a welcome from Michael Homan and Morag Kersel, co-Vice Presidents for Programs. Michael, a resident of New Orleans, provided the group with a warm “N’Awlins” greeting. Following the opening remarks, Sarah Parcak gave a presentation entitled “Recognizing Space-based Methods for Archaeological Investigations: The Future of Archaeology.” After the presentation, ASOR President Tim Harrison introduced the plenary speaker, Karel van der Toorn, President of the Board of the University of Amsterdam and the Hogeschool van Amsterdam. The title of his talk “The Wisdom of Magic” was fitting for the start of the Annual Meeting in New Orleans. The ASOR Welcome Reception followed the plenary talk and provided a place for attendees to relax and enjoy some New Orleans cuisine.

Thursday was a full day of sessions and business meetings. With 20 academic sessions, there were many topics to choose from and among the highest attended sessions were both Khirbet

continued on page 3
I am pleased to report that at its spring meetings in Ann Arbor, MI, the ASOR Board voted unanimously to adopt the Strategic Plan put forward by the Strategic Planning Task Force. The task force worked hard to incorporate the feedback it received, evaluating assessments from a variety of recent consultations, information provided by our standing committees, and feedback received from our membership, particularly regarding early drafts of the Strategic Plan itself. I am confident this consultation process has resulted in a planning document that reflects the values and priorities of our membership and its diverse constituencies, and will serve as a sound guide for the organization as we work to build and strengthen our programs and operations in the years ahead. The Strategic Plan is available via the ASOR website (www.asor.org). We owe a debt of gratitude to Susan Ackerman, Jimmy Hardin, Morag Kersel, Sten LaBianca, P. E. MacAllister, and Carol Meyers for their excellent work, and I wish to thank each member for volunteering their time and service to ASOR in this way.

The Strategic Plan sets forth a blueprint for ASOR, identifying a series of strategic priorities for the organization, but it intentionally does not address the specifics of how to implement each priority. Although the task force carefully considered the implications of the recommendations it made, it resisted, I think wisely, the temptation to encumber the Strategic Plan with details of how specific priorities are to be implemented. This was viewed as a distinctly separate, albeit critically important, second step in the planning process. Towards this end, I will be announcing shortly the appointment of an Implementation Task Force, which will work in close consultation with ASOR’s standing committees and professional staff, to develop a detailed ‘action plan’ designed to implement the strategic priorities set forth in the Strategic Plan. Updates on the progress of this committee will be posted online and in forthcoming ASOR Newsletters.

Developing a strategic plan has also been a necessary first step toward embarking on a coordinated fundraising campaign to raise support for ASOR’s programs. We are now at the point of launching such an effort. Accordingly, I will shortly be naming the Chair and members of a Development Committee. This committee will be charged with developing a fundraising strategy designed to identify potential funding sources, and raise the funds needed to underwrite the programs and priorities articulated in the Strategic Plan.

Concurrent with this planning process, we have continued to work to manage ASOR’s operating expenses responsibly, while meeting our Annual Fund goals and raising support for the Archives Initiative. Our Executive Director Andy Vaughn and Treasurer Sheldon Fox have done yeoman service in this regard and deserve special thanks. I am especially pleased to report that the Archives Initiative Challenge was successful, and I wish to thank the generous donors who made the challenge possible. The challenge exceeded its target goal, thanks also to more than 40 matched contributions, many from first time contributors. In all, more than 190 individuals contributed to ASOR this fiscal year, representing more than a 20% increase in the number of donors, and a 50% increase in the amount given over last year. Most encouragingly, this has put us within reach of our budgeted goals for the Annual Fund and Archives Initiative as we approach the end of the fiscal year, this in economically difficult times, and we are poised to end the fiscal year in the black. This simply would not have been possible without the continued generous support of our membership. These are exciting times for ASOR, and I wish to express my heartfelt thanks and appreciation to each and everyone who gave so generously this past year.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Qeiyafa sessions, as well as “Archaeology of Jordan I.” In addition to the academic sessions, the Junior Scholars Luncheon was held and included a panel discussing the research opportunities at ASOR institutes. Representatives from ACOR, AIAR, and CAARI were available to talk about resources at their institutes and about strategies for applying for fellowships.

On Friday, the academic program offered 16 sessions for attendees. The best attended sessions included “Hebrew Bible, History, and Archaeology” and “Philistia and the Philistines I and II.” Over the lunch break, the Order and Conflict: Roundtables on the Agency Role of Empires in the Levant provided yet another learning opportunity. ASOR’s Members Meeting took place on Friday afternoon. The ASOR Honors and Awards were presented at the meeting and ballots were cast for new members of the ASOR Board. After this last meeting of the day, attendees enjoyed a reception sponsored by CAARI.

Saturday was the final day of the Annual Meeting and 18 interesting sessions were offered. Some of the sessions with the highest attendance were “Teaching Archaeology to Undergraduates: Success Stories and Cautionary Tales” and “Artifacts: The Inside Story.” A highlight of Saturday included ASOR’s Brown Bag Roundtables that took place over the lunch break. Scholars gathered to take part in compelling conversations about archaeological issues including data sharing, approaches to integrating plant and animal data, public archaeology, and meeting ASOR’s President. Also during the lunch break, the Projects on Parade Poster Session occurred with representatives from the various projects standing with their posters to answer questions. To close out the Annual Meeting in New Orleans, a special outreach session entitled “Voodoo Dolls of the Ancient Near East” had over 70 attendees.

On behalf of ASOR, we would like to thank the Program Committee, led by co-chairs Elise A. Friedland and Andrew M. Smith II, for organizing a tremendous academic program. Additional thanks to Michael Homan and Morag Kersel, co-Vice Presidents for Programs, for their tireless work on the Annual Meeting. There is an incredible amount of work that goes into the Annual Meeting and it would not be possible without our wonderful volunteers. We look forward to ASOR’s Annual Meeting in Atlanta from November 17-20, 2010. We hope you can join us! 🌟
Call for Nominations for ASOR Awards

To nominate someone for an award, please submit the following information: Contact information of proposer, name of nominee, award name, and why nominee is suitable for award. Please send your nomination information to Kelley Bazydlo at asorad@bu.edu and call 617-353-6576 with any questions.

For a list of past recipients, please visit www.asor.org/am/nominations.shtml

Descriptions of the Honors and Awards

The Richard J. Scheuer Medal.
This is the most prestigious award which honors an individual who has provided truly outstanding, long term support and service contributions to ASOR. (given only as appropriate)

The Charles U. Harris Service Award.
This award is given in recognition of long term and/or special service as an ASOR officer or Trustee. (one annual award)

The P. E. MacAllister Field Archaeology Award.
This award honors an archaeologist who, during his/her career, has made outstanding contributions to ancient Near Eastern and Eastern Mediterranean archaeology. (one annual award)

The G. Ernest Wright Award.
This award is given to the editor/author of the most substantial volume(s) dealing with archaeological material, excavation reports and material culture from the ancient Near East and eastern Mediterranean. This work must be the result of original research published within the past two years. (one annual award)

The Frank Moore Cross Award.
This award is presented to the editor/author of the most substantial volume(s) related to ancient Near Eastern and eastern Mediterranean epigraphy, text and/or tradition. This work must be the result of original research published during the past two years. (one annual award)

The W. F. Albright Award.
This award honors an individual who has shown special support or made outstanding service contributions to one of the overseas centers ACOR, AIAR, CAARI, or to one of the overseas committees - the Baghdad committee and the Damascus committee. (given as appropriate)

ASOR Membership Service Award.
This award recognizes individuals who have made special contributions on behalf of the ASOR membership, through committee, editorial, or office services. (maximum three annual awards)
In addition to the below Fellows, 2009-10 Associate Fellows comprise 23 Senior, 10 Post Doctoral and 12 Research Fellows for a total of 66 Fellows.

Annual Professor:
Aaron Burke, UCLA

National Endowment for the Humanities Fellows:
Katherine S. Burke,
Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, UCLA
Philippa L. Townsend, Ursinus College, Pennsylvania
Edward Maher, The Field Museum, Chicago
John I. Kampen, Methodist Theological School in Ohio

Ernest S. Frerichs Fellow/Program Coordinator:
Joe Uziel, Bar-Ilan University

Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) Fellows:
Peter J. Stone, University of Cincinnati
Dana D. DePietro, UC Berkeley
William G. Zimmerle, University of Pennsylvania
Alice Hunt, University College London

Noble Group Fellows:
Cao Jian, Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Hui Liang, Zhejiang University, China
Reuben Yat Tin Lee, York University, Canada

Glassman Holland Research Fellow:
Mariusz Burdajewicz, National Museum, Warsaw

Andrew W. Mellon Fellows:
Petr Balcarek, Presov University, Slovakia
Marcin A. Czarnowicz,
Jagiellonian University, Krakow
Maria Rangelova Gurova,
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

George A. Barton Fellow:
Paul Lesperance, University of Minnesota

Carol and Eric Meyers
Doctoral Dissertation Fellow:
Rosa Maria Motta, University of Virginia

Getty Research Exchange Fellow:
Hamdan Taha, Palestinian Department of Antiquities

Kathleen S. Brooks Fellow:
Ghassan Nagagreh, Yarmouk University

For fellowship and application information, go to www.aiar.org

Check out the new ASOR website at www.asor.org
Winners of the third ASOR Open Archaeology Prize competition were announced on November 20, 2009 at the annual ASOR meeting in New Orleans. The ASOR Open Archaeology Prize, sponsored by the Alexandria Archive Institute, rewards open access, digital contributions to Near Eastern archaeology. A panel of judges from the ASOR community selected winners based on the project’s scholarly merit, its potential for reuse in research or teaching and its availability on the web in a free and reusable format. This is the final year of the three-year, sponsored competition. Past winners of the ASOR Open Archaeology Prize can be found here: [http://www.alexandriaarchive.org/openup.php](http://www.alexandriaarchive.org/openup.php)

**First Prize**

First prize ($500) was awarded to the West Bank and East Jerusalem Archaeological Database Project (http://digitallibrary.usc.edu/wbarc/). The data was a result of a research project authored by Prof. Rafi Greenberg (Tel Aviv University) and Adi Keinan (University College London) with logistical and financial support from the Israeli Palestinian Archaeology Working Group (IPAWG; http://crrc.usc.edu/initiatives/shi/ipawg.html), which was organized by Ran Boytner (UCLA/USC) and Lynn Swartz Dodd (USC). The purpose of the research portion of the IPAWG project was to develop a database of surveyed and excavated archaeological data from work done in the West Bank and East Jerusalem since 1967. Much of this is being made available for the first time in English and many data records are being released into the public domain for the first time at all. These data, available to the public through the University of Southern California Digital Library, constitute a scholarly and public resource that is widely available and widely searchable. The entire database file itself will become downloadable for scholars, developers, the military or anyone who needs to plan around ancient sites and wants to use their own GIS tools. In support of open access publication of such content, Lynn Swartz Dodd told the Chronicle of Higher Education: “This type of open access is where archaeology has to go in order to survive. The days of ivory-tower archaeology, where academics sit on all this data while only publishing tiny fractions of their work and leaving the rest to languish in inaccessible depots, is over.” This is a step toward putting material out there to be used to answer big questions.” The project’s receipt of the Open Archaeology Prize was announced in the LA Times, the Chronicle of Higher Education and a variety of blogs, including Science Magazine’s ScienceInsider.

**Second Prize**

Second prize ($200 in books, co-sponsored by the David Brown Book Company) was awarded to the online publication of digital content from Brown University excavations at Petra’s Great Temple from 1993 – 2006 (http://opencontext.org/projects/). This extensive corpus of over 123,000 linked items includes over 3000 images. All of this has been viewed over 200,000 times since its online publication in the Open Context system (www.opencontext.org). The online publication includes descriptions of excavated contexts, related architectural features and remains, a small finds catalogue, zooarchaeological analyses, and associated digitized maps, plans, drawings and photographs. Over the past year, the digital publication expanded to include analyses of glass and coin artifacts. Additional datasets related to this corpus are forthcoming, including analysis of figurines recovered and analyzed during the Brown University work at the site. The Petra Great Temple Excavation is one of a number of projects available in Open Context, a system that offers a highly generalized approach to data sharing and data publication. The Petra Great Temple Excavation corpus serves as an exemplar for more comprehensive publication of excavation results than possible through print publication alone. Its primary intended purpose is to complement the printed publication series on the Great Temple by providing researchers with the full corpus of materials analyzed in the project, organized by context, and browseable through sophisticated search tools.
Publication in Open Context also makes the results of the Petra Great Temple project easier to reuse in subsequent analyses because a Creative Commons Attribution license waives most copyright restrictions and because all data and media can be retrieved in machine-readable formats.

These two prizes reflect very different yet complementary approaches to data publication and sharing. The Petra Great Temple corpus represents a rich and in-depth resource for individuals interested in this one site, the Nabatean culture, and the Classical Mediterranean world. In contrast, the West Bank and East Jerusalem Archaeological Database Project provides invaluable information required for heritage stewardship, but also relevant to a greater breadth of chronological interests. The two projects, thus, represent exemplars of data sharing in breadth and depth. The complementary nature of these approaches is best illustrated by the interoperability enabled by releasing machine-readable data on the Web, such that these two datasets can be readily aggregated together and even combined with other data sources. By sharing machine-readable archaeological data on the Web, these prizewinners help to lay the foundations for a powerful information infrastructure that future researchers can build upon.

The ASOR Open Archaeology Prize competition is sponsored by the Alexandria Archive Institute (www.alexandriaarchive.org), promoting the development and use of open educational resources in archaeology and related disciplines. The competition, which aims to enhance community recognition of open scholarly communication, receives generous support from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation (www.hewlett.org) and the David Brown Book Company (www.oxbowbooks.com).
ASOR’s 2010 Annual Meeting Plenary Speaker

PROFESSOR EMERITUS EDGAR PELTENBURG, University of Edinburgh

“Fashioning Identity: Workshops and Cemeteries at Prehistoric Souskiou, Cyprus”

Edgar Peltenburg graduated with a degree in Ancient History and Archaeology from the University of Birmingham. He was Lecturer in Archaeology and Adult Education in Argyll and the Isles before joining the University of Edinburgh. Research interests include small-scale society dynamics, archaic states and early technology, especially vitreous materials. Peltenburg had carried out fieldwork in Canada, several parts of the Middle East and Cyprus where he is director of the Lemba Archaeological Research Centre. He is Corresponding Member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and among his publications are Early Society in Cyprus (ed. 1989), The Burrell Collection: Western Asiatic Antiquities (1991) and The Colonisation and Settlement of Cyprus. Investigations at Kissonerga-Mylouthkia, 1976-1996 (ed. 2003).

Professor Emeritus Edgar Peltenburg, University of Edinburgh

“Fashioning Identity: Workshops and Cemeteries at Prehistoric Souskiou, Cyprus”

Projects on Parade Poster Session

At this year’s annual meeting, CAP, CAMP and the Junior Scholars Committee will again sponsor the “Projects on Parade Poster Session” and we would like to invite you to participate. Posters will be prominently displayed during the entire conference and a formal poster session will be scheduled.

The poster session is an ideal opportunity to involve student and junior members in the ASOR meeting, as well as getting the word out about your research. We are looking for posters that highlight: projects in general; a technical aspect of your project; a spectacular find from the field season; or use the session as a great advertisement for students looking for a summer field school.

If you are interested or have questions, please send a message of your intent to submit by August 15th to Morag Kersel (morag.kersel@utoronto.ca)
## 2010 ASOR Annual Meeting Registration

**NOVEMBER 17-20 • ATLANTA, GEORGIA**

Register online starting in January at [www.asor.org/AM/index.html](http://www.asor.org/AM/index.html)

### Membership Information

**Member Institution Name**

☐ Check box if you have applied for membership in the past 10 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institution (for name badge)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mailing Address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City | State | Postal Code | Country**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Tel.</th>
<th>Work Tel.</th>
<th>Fax No.</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Registration Fee

[Circle appropriate fee]:

**SUPERSAVER [Apr. 5 – Sept. 30]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Non-Member</th>
<th>Student Prof. Member</th>
<th>Student at ASOR Member School</th>
<th>First-time Student Member**</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADVANCE [Oct. 1 – Nov. 8]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Non-Member</th>
<th>Student Prof. Member</th>
<th>Student at ASOR Member School</th>
<th>First-time Student Member**</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ONSITE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Non-Member</th>
<th>Student Prof. Member</th>
<th>Student at ASOR Member School</th>
<th>First-time Student Member**</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Paper presenters must be registered as a professional or student member.

Note: If you are retired and would like to apply for a partial scholarship, please email Kelley Bazydlo at asorad@bu.edu.

* Non-Member rate includes an ASOR associate membership.

** Students at ASOR member schools who are first-time attendees also qualify for this special rate.

*** Spouse/Partner rate applicable only if member and spouse/partner register on the same form.

**S/P name:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/P name:</th>
<th>S/P institution:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Payment Information

**PAYMENT:**

Please bill my ☐ Mastercard ☐ Visa for $ ____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card Number</th>
<th>Expiration Date</th>
<th>Zip Code of Billing Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Card Holder</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>My check is enclosed in the amount of $ ____________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tax Deductible Contributions

☐ $500 ☐ $250 ☐ $100 ☐ Other $ _________

**Refund Policy:**

All refunds must be requested in writing by November 10, 2010. A $35 administrative fee will be assessed per registration. No refunds will be given on the student or spouse/partner fees. Refunds may be processed after the meeting and will be issued by February 10, 2011.

**MAIL FORM TO:**

ASOR at Boston University
656 Beacon St., 5th floor
Boston, MA 02215-2010

**FAX FORM TO:** 1-617-353-6575

**QUESTIONS:**

Phone: 1-617-353-6570
Email: asormtg@bu.edu
REGISTER NOW!

November 17-20, 2010,

2010 ANNUAL MEETING
SHERATON ATLANTA HOTEL
165 COURTLAND STREET NE, ATLANTA GA 30303
$159 Single/double and $179 triple/quad

CALL 1.404.659.6500
Ask for the “ASOR Annual Meeting”
The room block is open—make your reservation now by visiting
www.asor.org/am/hotel-city.html

PLEASE VISIT
www.asor.org/am/index.html for details
AVIRAM PRIZE ANNOUNCEMENT FOR ASOR’S 2010 ANNUAL MEETING

The Dorot Foundation announces its sponsorship of a Prize, administered by ASOR, to honor Joseph Aviram, Director of the Israel Exploration Society (IES) for seventy years and President of the IES as of January 1, 2010.

The $2,500 Prize will be awarded for the paper selected by a Committee of Judges from single-authored papers offered at the 2010 Annual Meeting. The primary criterion of the Prize paper will be that it most advances the scholarship of its given field. The paper can be by a scholar of any national origin who received her/his Ph.D. within the last five years. The paper can be on any topic that is consonant with ASOR’s mission statement. The author must be or become a registered participant in the Annual ASOR Meeting.

The submission deadline is October 1, 2010. While the paper that is submitted to the prize committee may be up to 25 pages in length, the winner of the prize will need to read an abbreviated version of the paper in an existing time slot (typically no more than 20 minutes). The paper must be submitted by email to ASOR at asormtgs@bu.edu along with the candidate’s name and email address, the date of the receipt of the Ph.D., and the name, email address, and phone number of the dissertation adviser. Eligible Meeting participants who have already registered for the Annual Meeting will be given an opportunity to register their desire for inclusion in the competition.

Join fellow scholars in compelling conversations about archaeological issues at ASOR’s Meeting:

HOST A ROUNDTABLE!

What are Roundtables? Roundtables bring together 10-12 people at a table to talk about a subject of interest. This event will take place over the lunch period at the Annual Meeting in Atlanta. Members might grab a sandwich, gather at a table of interest and discuss issues of interest.

Why Have a Roundtable? Roundtables focus attention on and give voice to the concerns of the membership of ASOR. Roundtables are intended to afford an opportunity for members to discuss ideas and concerns, to gain information on specific topics, and to expand their professional networks. Topics could include any or all of the following: craft production and social complexity; public outreach and education; writing grants; taking digital photographs; foodways/ethnobotany; academic careers; careers in government; and publishing. Roundtables are an excellent way to include new, junior and lay members of the organization – who can all come together to discuss areas of interest. Please note that hosting a roundtable does not count in the ASOR two appearance rule.

Please consider hosting (facilitating) a roundtable at the Annual Meeting in Atlanta. If interested please contact Morag Kersel (morag.kersel@utoronto.ca) by August 15.
Congratulations to the recipients of the ASOR Honors and Awards 2009

The following awards were presented at ASOR’s 2009 Annual Meeting in New Orleans.

**ASOR Membership Service Award**

This award recognizes individuals who have made special contributions on behalf of the ASOR membership, through committee, editorial, or office services. Maximum three annual awards.

**Tammi Schneider**

Professor Tammi Schneider has been a faithful member of ASOR for several decades, dating back to her graduate days at the University of Pennsylvania. She has worked on numerous archaeological excavations including Miqne/Ekron, Tell es-Safi, and Tel Herasim, and currently co-directs excavations at Tell el-Far’ah (South) in Israel. Most recently Schneider has served as ASOR vice president for membership and has worked tirelessly to recruit institutional members and improve the benefits for our current members. Schneider was one of the people who championed the need for more student scholarships for the annual meeting, and she helped to start the travel grant program for students at institutional member schools.

**Ann Killebrew**

Professor Ann E. Killebrew is honored for her work as editor of Near Eastern Archaeology. Through the solicitation of articles for NEA and overseeing the production of the journal, Ann has fostered good relations through the archaeological community among archaeologists working in all periods and all middle-eastern countries. She has restored the luster to the journal through interesting issues with well-written, informative articles.

**The Charles U. Harris Service Award**

This award is given in recognition of long-term and/or special service as an ASOR officer and trustee. One annual award.

**Orlyn Nelson**

Mr. Orlyn Nelson’s involvement in archaeology dates back to the 1970’s as a student volunteer from Andrews University on excavations in Jordan. He joined the board of trustees 5 years ago, and he has quickly become one of ASOR’s most active and supportive trustees. As a lay trustee, Orly Nelson has provided valuable service to ASOR above and beyond what one would expect from a trustee. He has provided valuable advice and counsel to ASOR officers in the area of publications and printing. He prefers to work in the background and not seek recognition, yet, he is constantly trying to find ways through which he can help ASOR with his expertise and business contacts. He has provided a wide variety of advice about the printing industry that has allowed the organization to save much money. Over the last 4 years, he has served as an integral member of the ASOR executive committee, and has been a key leader in development projects and efforts to recruit and retain lay supporters for ASOR. For all of these types of service, there is not a more fitting person to receive this year’s Harris Service Award for service as an ASOR trustee.

**The G. Ernest Wright Award**

This award is given to the editor/author of the most substantial volume(s) dealing with archaeological material, excavation reports and material culture from the ancient Near East and eastern Mediterranean. This work must be the result of original research published within the past two years. One annual award.

**Alan Simmons**

Professor Simmons has been a central figure in Near Eastern archaeology for several decades, having participated in and directed research at sites in Israel, Lebanon, Jordan, and Cyprus. Shortly after the turn of the millennium, he decided to undertake a synthesis of current knowledge about agropastoral origins and immediately subsequent developments in the eastern Mediterranean. In 2007 he published The Neolithic Revolution in the Near East: Transforming the Human Landscape. Simmons is the first scholar in many years to present an up-to-date summary of knowledge concerning the environmental context and the primary evidence for agricultural origins in western Asia. The information essential to such a synthesis is embedded in a body of publications, interim reports, and gray literature now so vast that only someone as experienced, knowledgeable, and dedicated as Simmons would contemplate taking on the task. He did do so, however, and in addition he discusses—succinctly and clearly—alternative theories and explanations for the creation of primary village-farming economies in the Near East. Happily for non-specialists who have a strong interest in the topic and want to keep up with new data and current interpretations of those data, he succeeds brilliantly on both fronts.

Those of who teach Near East prehistory have been waiting far too long for a text as important as Simmons’s book. His even-handed treatment of the information as well as the competing explanations that inevitably arise make this a invaluable resource for students who want to understand one of the most interesting and most consequential periods of human cultural development. The book richly deserves this year’s G. Ernest Wright Award.
Gus Feissel

Gus Feissel was elected to the CAARI Board of Trustees in 2000. He had much to contribute to the Board due of his longstanding involvement with and political understanding of Cyprus which culminated with his appointment as Chief of Mission of the United Nations Operation in Cyprus. From 2002 to 2005, Gus was Treasurer of CAARI and after the sudden death of CAARI President David Detrich, was appointed as his replacement. Since shouldering these responsibilities, he has guided CAARI with a steady hand and worked tirelessly to promote and develop the Institute. This has involved, amongst other things, overseeing the planning for the underground library extension for which most of the funds are now in hand. Gus is very well known and respected in business circles and the highest echelons of the Cypriot government and as a result has been able to establish in 2009 a CAARI Advisory Group composed of prominent Cypriots who have pledged to seek material support for the institute. In the present economic climate, it is extremely difficult to raise funds for an organization like CAARI, yet Gus is working on this onerous obligation with the determination and experience of someone who has directed major international programs.

The W.F. Albright Service Award
This award honors an individual who has shown special support or made outstanding service contributions to one of the overseas centers—ACOR, AIAR, CAARI, or to one of the overseas committees—the Bagdad committee and the Damascus committee. Given as appropriate.

Seymour Gitin

Professor Gitin is perhaps best known for his nearly three decades of stewardship of the W. F. Albright Institute in Jerusalem. Indeed, during those decades the Institute has flourished, superbly promoting archaeological fieldwork, research and publication. It provides the perfect venue for archaeologists and other scholars from the region and, indeed, from around the world, to come together to pursue common goals. The list of Sy’s accomplishments as Director of the Albright is extensive, and those accomplishments alone would make Sy a noteworthy recipient of the P. E. MacAllister Award for outstanding contributions to ancient Near Eastern and Eastern Mediterranean archaeology. Sy’s extensive contributions to field archaeology similarly merit this honor. His early fieldwork was done at Tel Gezer, Jebel Qa’aqir and Tel Dor. He led the Tel Miqne-Ekron Ex-

The P.E. MacAllister Field Archaeology Award
This award honors an archaeologist who, during his/her career, has made outstanding contributions to ancient Near Eastern and Eastern Mediterranean archaeology. One annual award.

Ron E. Tappy and P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., Editors

Literate Culture and Tenth-Century Canaan, The Tel Zayit Abecedary in Context, Eisenbrauns (Winona Lake, IN) 2008.

Professor Ron E. Tappy, the director of Tel Zeitah Excavations, has demonstrated a long-standing and evolving interest in multiple issues, epigraphy among them. A few years ago, when an incised abecedary was found in his excavations, he joined forces with Professor P. Kyle McCarter of Johns Hopkins University to decipher, analyze, and publish this important find. They presented their work to the scholarly community eloquently and quickly, and their interpretation of the provenance and palæography of the inscription came with impressive clarity and detail. This editio princeps has been followed by the book Literate Culture and Tenth-Century Canaan: The Tel Zayit Abecedary in Context.

This work not only expands in new ways the interpretation of this important epigraphic find from Tel Zayit, but it lays the groundwork for the proper interpretation of future discoveries. The attention to detail demonstrated in this book holds a high standard for epigraphic analysis in general. This book is now pivotal and crucial for future discussions of the history, epigraphy and literacy of ancient Israel, especially during the debated tenth century BCE. 

The Frank Moore Cross Award
This award is presented to the editor/author of the most substantial volume(s) related to ancient Near Eastern and eastern Mediterranean epigraphy, text and/or tradition. This work must be the result of original research published during the past two years. One annual award.
BECOME AN AMERICAN SCHOOLS OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

CONTRIBUTING MEMBER

Founded in 1900, ASOR is the premier learned society that supports and fosters historical and archaeological research in the eastern Mediterranean. Together with its affiliated research centers in Amman, Jerusalem, and Nicosia, ASOR supports more archaeological excavations in the eastern Mediterranean than any other American society.

Like most educational, religious, artistic, and cultural institutions, ASOR relies on financial support from lay colleagues and interested professionals to continue its work. Please consider a Contributing Membership—the $125 fee allows you to support the work of ASOR with a tax-deductible gift of $100 and to receive a discounted subscription to *Near Eastern Archaeology* for $25.

**ASOR CONTRIBUTING MEMBERSHIP DETAILS**

- Annual contribution is $125
- $100 of the fee is tax-deductible
- $25 is used for a subscription to NEA
- Knowledge that you are a part of the continuing search for new insights into Near Eastern history and culture

If you are interested in becoming a Contributing Member, call 617-353-6570 or check out information online at [www.asor.org/membership/index.html](http://www.asor.org/membership/index.html).
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Cypriote Bronze Age Pottery Found in Jerusalem

Robert Merrillees, Independent Researcher
Annual Professor

Having the good fortune to be appointed Annual Professor at the Albright Institute for the first half of 2008/2009 gave me the opportunity to complete archaeological business left unfinished since my diplomatic assignment in Tel Aviv over twenty years ago. Though I made no special study at that time of the Cypriote connection with the southern Levant in the Bronze Age, I vowed that if ever I returned for any extended period, I would take up research on the Cypriote Bronze Age pottery found in Jerusalem. I am grateful to the Albright for awarding me a five month fellowship for this purpose.

I was already familiar with the Archaeological Museum of the Monastery of the Flagellation in the Old City with the small display of Cypriote pottery from the Franciscan excavations in 1954 at Dominus Flevit on the Mount of Olives, but had never seen the rest of the imports, not all of which had been published. I was able to catalogue the six vases on show but unfortunately the missing pottery was nowhere to be found in the storerooms of the Monastery or in Dominus Flevit itself, and had still not been relocated by the time I came to the end of my fellowship in January 2009.

Tracking down the contents of the tomb group accidentally discovered in 1933 at Nahalat Ahim in the northwestern quarter of the new city and initially housed in the Bezalel Museum proved equally challenging as the entire deposit had been transferred to the repository of the Israel Antiquities Authority (IAA) in Beth Shemesh and then re-distributed in large part to different locations in Ashkelon, Haifa, Jerusalem and Tel Aviv. In the end I was successful in seeing most of the pieces and recording those features which had been overlooked in earlier publications.

The small collection of objects belonging to the Late Bronze Age from a cistern in the grounds of Government House in Talpiot turned out to have held two Base-ring II jugs instead of only one, and I was also able to record but not catalogue a substantial number of Late Cypriote sherds from the Ophel hill, south of the Temple Mount, and some fragmentary Base-ring II jugs from rescue excavations at Ras el-Amud, at the southern end of the Mount of Olives. New finds are continuously adding to the overall picture of the Cypriote pottery imports in Jerusalem.

For comparative purposes I chose three sites: Bethany, near Jerusalem, Gezer, between the coast and Jerusalem, and Ashkelon, by the sea. From these data it was possible to determine that all of the Cypriote Bronze Age Wares and types recovered from Jerusalem were attested from Gezer at least, but that the repertory of fabrics and shapes encountered at Gezer was greater than the range recorded in Jerusalem. The most notable absences from Jerusalem were the Wares which typify the 17th and 16th centuries B.C.

My project is far from completed. I am in fact almost back where I started. Despite the accumulation of much more information, there are still many gaps in our knowledge of the Middle and Late Bronze Ages in Jerusalem. Being based in the city itself was, for obvious reasons, ideally suited to my work, and the Albright afforded Helen and me facilities, including fellowship in every respect, that allowed us to enjoy as well as benefit from an extended stay. However, to do justice to the Cypriote Bronze Age pottery found in Jerusalem, I would need to be not just Annual but Perennial Professor at the Albright!

Jews, Christians, and Jerusalem’s Sacred Places in Antiquity

Susan L. Graham, Saint Peter’s College
Annual Professor

This project concerns the sacred sites of Jews and Christians in Jerusalem as perceived during the (post-Temple) late Roman and Byzantine periods. It combines material and literary evidence to argue for the role of such Jerusalem places in the growth of Jewish-Christian polemic in the Late Roman and Byzantine periods in Jerusalem. The argument requires assessment of literary sources, with all their social, political, historical and theological biases, for the traditions concerning the several sites in question. It also requires interpretation of material remains at the sites themselves, taking account of all the challenges inherent in Jerusalem archaeology. To all this material is applied theoretical frameworks concerning sacred space and place, legendary topography, and collective memory. The ultimate result of the work during my Annual Professorship was to complete a book that is being drafted under the working title of Jerusalem: Jews, Christians, and Sacred Places.

The project contributes to the investigation of early Jewish-Christian relations in two ways. First, theory of sacred place and space, and the formation of traditions concerning them, offer additional data to explain competition for the sacred sites, and possibly contribute to our understanding of the later development of Christian anti-Semitism. Second, it uses this theoretical framework and current results...
from archaeological campaigns to interpret the literary evidence from both Christian and Jewish sources from these centuries. A growing segment of scholars working on early Christian texts in general and anti-Jewish texts in particular are recognizing the necessity of more sophisticated analysis of the texts at rhetorical and political levels. A good deal of this work is taking place in Israel’s universities.

The primary objective for the Annual Professorship was photography, examination and discussion of Jerusalem’s Late Roman and Byzantine-period sites. The task expanded beyond expectations, owing to a high level of current activity in excavations, discovery and publication of Late Roman and Byzantine remains in Jerusalem. I was able to profit by activity at Siloam, the Tomb of the Kings, and recent publications on the Probaticum (St. Anne’s) and Peter in Gallicantu, among others. Particular attention went to the southwest (Dormition) Hill, which is the location of two very promising excavations, and especially to the problems involved in determining the footprint of the late fourth-century Hagia Sion basilica. The tradition that David’s Palace and seven synagogues were once there (reported in 333 C.E.) and shifting Byzantine Christian traditions associated with the area – beginning with Christian acceptance of Josephus’ assignment of the name Sion to this hill rather than the Temple Mount – make the site a particularly good example of the potential of examining these places for elements of early Jewish-Christian polemic.

Preliminary results of this year’s work took the form of several invited papers. In the short term, they will be honed for publication, along with other manuscripts on specific Jerusalem sites that are in varying stages of completion. The first-fruits of this effort is the appearance of my article on Justinian’s Nea Maria Church in a volume which was published in late 2008. These articles represent initial studies of particularly important sites for this study, and provide the foundation for the book draft and for continuation of the critical work necessary to it, as the material is reshaped into final form.

---

**Publication of Ashkelon III: The Seventh Century B.C.**

Daniel Master, Wheaton College  
**National Endowment for the Humanities Fellow**

Through the generosity of the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Albright Institute, I have been able to spend this year in Jerusalem working on material uncovered in the excavations at Ashkelon. This opportunity for research was also graciously sponsored by a sabbatical grant from Wheaton College and by the Leon Levy Foundation.

During this year, I have had the privilege to refine an important contribution to the field which was made by Lawrence Stager, the Director of the Leon Levy Expedition to Ashkelon. In 1995, he announced the discovery of an Iron Age royal winery and an Iron Age bazaar with warehouses and shops surrounding a retail market.

This year’s task has been to prepare this well-known material for publication. In the process, I have relied not only on the synthetic conclusions of Stager, but also on the excellent field notes of the grid supervisors, Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, and Egon Lass. Further, I have used a ceramic typology which was first outlined by Stager and J. David Schloen. Most recently, Egon Lass has been involved once again in the stratigraphic fine tuning. Building on the work of these scholars, my work this year has been about the details and the gaps, the nuts and bolts of turning an interesting slice of history into a technical archaeological volume.

Reexamination of the stratigraphy in light of the extensive excavation of earlier phases in later seasons showed the importance of deep stratigraphic context for understanding any given period. The winery plan was enhanced by our growing understanding of the eighth century which allowed us to see new wall stubs that were missed in earlier plans. In the marketplace, our review of a subsiding quarry fill immediately below the seventh century market helped explain why one half of the seventh century market was more than a meter lower than the other half.

Study of the pottery, including extensive consultations with many scholars in Israel who generously shared unpublished results, showed that, in addition to being a robust international market with connections across the Eastern Mediterranean, Ashkelon was also part of two seventh century ceramic sub-regions with distinct local styles: an Ashkelon/Ashdod region, and a Greater Gaza region.

Review of the artifacts within their context has brought to light clusters of Egyptian objects in close proximity to the key corner of the marketplace, perhaps an indication of Egyptian oversight at Ashkelon in the late seventh century. Further, clusters of clay spheres appeared in patterns which provide insight into the debates of the function of these enigmatic objects: some objects were clearly part of vertical looms; others were used for stopping jars. And more than one hundred thousand typed and measured pottery fragments allowed us to link the activities in the rooms at Ashkelon to similar contexts at Tel Batash, Tel Miqne/Ekron and beyond.

While these studies add new depth to the story of Ashkelon, the synthetic narrative remains the same. A well-built winery functioned in the midst of a crowded urban space; a newly renewed section of the city was the locale of a bustling marketplace. Ashkelon was deeply connected to the Mediterranean world of the seventh century until, in Kislev 604 BCE, Nebuchadrezzar complete razed the site. That big picture, so elegantly articulated a decade ago, should not be lost amid the torrent of details assembled in preparation for the publication of the *Leon Levy Expedition to Ashkelon, Volume 3.*
The Use of Domestic Space in Middle Bronze Age Canaan: The Case of Tel Nagila

Joe Uziel, Bar-Ilan University
Ernest S. Frerichs Fellow/Program Coordinator

During my fellowship at the Albright Institute, I conducted research on the Middle Bronze Age domestic quarters excavated at Tel Nagila. Tel Nagila lies approximately 32 km north of Beersheba and 28 km east of Gaza in the border area between the southern Coastal Plain and the Shephelah of Judea.

The site was excavated in 1962-63 by Ruth Amiran and Avraham Eitan. While the excavation methodology and documentation were of a very high standard, the excavations were never fully published. The excavations revealed remains dating from the Early Bronze Age to the Mamluk period, including a fortified city of the Middle Bronze Age, enclosed by a rampart and city wall. David Ilan, Aren Maeir and I are preparing the final excavation report for publication with funding from the Shelby White - Leon Levy Program for Archaeological Publications.

As part of the analysis of the Middle Bronze Age remains at the site, I established the find-spots of the MB artifacts and made an attempt (along with Rona S. Avissar) to reconstruct the use of domestic space at the site during the Middle Bronze Age. Ovens and cooking vessels were used to define cooking areas, grinding stones and installations were used to define food preparation, serving vessels were used to define dining, and storage jars were used to define areas for storage. Special emphasis was placed on searching for children in the home, as they are often not included in the archaeological record, despite being a significant portion of the population.
Several important aspects of the domestic use of space were found through our study. Household activities including food consumption, food preparation, storage, and dining, as well as various other activities such as weaving and herding were found to have occurred within the MB homes. Herding was identified through faunal analysis (by Lidar Sapir-Hen), which showed that a specific room yielded a large number of bones of animals, which had not been slaughtered and had reached adulthood. Further study showed that these bones may in fact have been several complete skeletons, which had not been identified in the excavations due to the destruction that they were buried under. It was interesting to see that while certain areas were multi-functional, some areas seem to have been designated for a specific task. For example, while many archaeological contexts (including some at Tel Nagila) are defined for food consumption and storage, it was discovered that there were also areas with evidence of only a single activity in a given space.

In searching for children, we tried to identify artifacts that could be related to their presence. The discovery of a large amount of miniature vessels dating to the Middle Bronze Age at the site provided us with a tool to spot the children. While many times thought to be votive, the discovery of these vessels in a clear domestic context, and scattered throughout the home, seemed to indicate that they should not be interpreted as “votive.” Furthermore, initial studies of the fingerprints on these vessels indicate that they were made by children. If in fact these vessels indicate the presence of children in the home, then an interesting picture arises. While on the one hand, the vessels are found scattered throughout the home, indicating the interaction of children with the adults throughout the home, one area seems to have been defined for children, with the recovery of numerous miniature vessels.

In searching for children, we tried to identify artifacts that could be related to their presence. The discovery of a large amount of miniature vessels dating to the Middle Bronze Age at the site provided us with a tool to spot the children. While many times thought to be votive, the discovery of these vessels in a clear domestic context, and scattered throughout the home, seemed to indicate that they should not be interpreted as “votive.” Furthermore, initial studies of the fingerprints on these vessels indicate that they were made by children. If in fact these vessels indicate the presence of children in the home, then an interesting picture arises. While on the one hand, the vessels are found scattered throughout the home, indicating the interaction of children with the adults throughout the home, one area seems to have been defined for children, with the recovery of numerous miniature vessels.

“Major Gods on a Minor Scale: Gender, Iconography and Small-scale Art in the Hellenistic Near East”

Lisa Cakmak, University of Michigan George A. Barton Fellow

In the 2nd c. BCE, a small, regional administrative archive was destroyed by fire at the site of Tel Kedesh in the Upper Galilee. This fire, which destroyed both the archive room and its contents, hardened the clay fragments used to seal the documents. These clay fragments, called sealings or bullae, preserve the impressions of individual seals or signet rings. The images on the sealings range from aniconic symbols to ruler portraits of Hellenistic kings to Greek deities. My dissertation examines a selection of these images, specifically the naked male and female images, many of which are identifiable as the Greek deities, Apollo and Aphrodite by comparison to larger scale, well-known representations of these deities.

Kedesh was located along a critical but fluctuating border between two Hellenistic Kingdoms: the Seleucids to the east and the Ptolemies to the south. The Kedesh sealings reflect a variety of iconographic traditions that had different visual conventions for representing male and female bodies. This fact raises the question of how naked images of Aphrodite and Apollo would have been understood by the local population.

In order to address the way in which diverse cultural traditions interacted, I employ post-colonial theories of acculturation and cultural hybridity. I contend that both the physical features of the Hellenistic Administration building and the iconography of the bullae draw upon Greek and Phoenician elements, which, in the case of the bullae, can lead to unique iconographic motifs.

Much of my time at the Albright was spent compiling comparative material in other small-scale media, in the hope of identifying trends in Hellenistic art. In the case of the Aphrodite poses, there is an overwhelming amount of terracotta evidence. Though she is popular at Kedesh, there are decidedly fewer glyptic examples from other Hellenistic archives and almost no numismatic comparisons. What implications does this have regarding the popularity of Aphrodite images on the sealings from Kedesh?

I have suggested that this is, in part, due to the prior worship of indigenous female goddesses such as Phoenician Tanit and Semitic Astarte in the Phoenician hinterland. The absence of Aphrodite images from Hellenistic coinage suggests that while Aphrodite may have been an appropriate and desirable motif for a personal talisman, such as a seal or a religious dedication, like a statue or figurine, Hellenistic rulers did not consider her image to be an effective political symbol.

The opposite is true for Apollo: as patron of the Seleucid dynasty, his image is extremely popular on Hellenistic glyptic, both at Kedesh and elsewhere, and on coinage, but terracotta representations are few. Given the role of Apollo as a symbol of Seleucid power, his popularity as a motif at the Kedesh archive is not surprising as it may be indicative of a local administrative seal. This theory is reinforced by the number of sealings to seals; Apollo impressions outnumber Aphrodite by almost double, but there are almost the same number of discrete seals: 66 Apollo seals versus 62 Aphrodite seals. This suggests that there are just as many people with Apollo seals as Aphrodite seals, but those with Apollo seals are doing a large portion of stamping. This indicates that individuals with Apollo seals were called upon more often than holders of Aphrodite seals to seal documents that required security and safekeeping, but is does not suggest that Apollo was necessarily a more popular seal type for individuals in general.
The Darom Synagogues: Art, Architecture, and Religion in Southern Palestine

Steven Werlin, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Samuel H. Kress Fellow

During my tenure as a Samuel H. Kress Fellow at the Albright Institute in 2008-09, I continued my dissertation work on the synagogues of southern Palestine in late antiquity. The ten extant synagogues—at Na’aran, Jericho, En-Gedi, Eshtemoa, Susiya, Ma’on (of Judaea), ‘Anim, Rimmon, Ma’on-Nirim, and Gaza—are sometimes referred to as the “Darom synagogues.” The “Darom,” literally the “south,” is a designation used in rabbinic and Christian sources to refer to a rather nebulous geographic region in Judaea proper and along the southern coastal plain.

The vast majority of ancient synagogue research has focused on the Galilee and the Golan. There are, to my mind, three reasons for this scholarly bias. First, the Galilee in particular is identified in the rabbinic sources as the home of the most influential rabbinic sages of Palestine and their schools. Most late ancient Jewish Palestinian literature was generally written about, by, and in the context of the Galilean rabbis. Second, because the rabbinic sources tend to focus on the Galilee, the consensus view has held that the majority of Palestine’s Jewish population migrated northward following the Bar-Kokhba revolt. The general focus of research has therefore reflected this view. Third, and perhaps most importantly, the synagogues in the Galilee and the Golan are far more numerous, as well as more geographically dense, than those in southern Palestine, a fact that reinforces the first two points.

Despite the ancient rabbinic and modern scholarly emphases on the northern Jewish communities and their synagogues, the literary sources attest to a significant number of Jewish communities in southern Palestine in late antiquity. A comprehensive study of the archaeological evidence, in particular the monumental synagogues, has not yet been attempted.

My project considers the synagogues, their art and architecture, their features, and material culture within the context of the region’s Christian majority, on the one hand, and their relation to the contemporary synagogues of the Galilee and the Golan, on the other. The synagogues and their attributes are examined in this study as sacred space, constructed by the associated communities as more than places of meeting and worship. As monumental edifices, they are endowed with meaning by those who built, employed, and in some cases destroyed them; consequently they can provide us with important information regarding the religion and cultural identity of the communities.

One area to which I devoted some time during my fellowship at the Albright was the issue of iconoclasm. There are at least two or three synagogues in southern Palestine that demonstrate evidence of this phenomenon. In the synagogue at Na’aran, northwest of Jericho, the animal and human images depicted in the mosaic floor were haphazardly, though systematically, removed, leaving large holes in the pavement. At Susiya, in the southern Hebron Hills, the figurative imagery in the mosaics was removed and replaced with either scrambled tesserae or geometric designs, apparently rendering the images innocuous in the minds of the iconoclasts themselves.

The identities of the iconoclasts of these two buildings are unknown to us. We can speculate on who destroyed these images—disaffected Jews, rival Christians, newly-arrived Muslims?—but a more fruitful discussion emerges when we consider this phenomenon alongside the iconoclastic damages in churches. The method and patterns of iconoclasm in churches is conspicuously similar to the pious destruction in these two synagogues. Such parallel developments among the Jewish and Christian communities of southern Palestine and Transjordan highlight the close relations and interaction among the various groups of late antique Palestine.

Having benefited greatly from my time in Jerusalem, I will continue my research on the Darom synagogues in the coming year as I carry on with my doctoral studies.

Constructions of Queenship: Royal Women in Syria-Palestine

Stephanie Pryor, University of Missouri-Columbia
Joint Samuel H. Kress Fellow

My research agenda at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCSA) from September, 2008 – January, 2009 and at the Albright Institute (AIAR) from February – May, 2009 focused on the evidence for royal and imperial women from the Ptolemaic through Early Byzantine periods in Syro-Palestine. This material constitutes one chapter of my dissertation, which is a regional study of the material evidence for royal women from the Hellenistic to Early Byzantine periods in the Eastern Mediterranean. There are five research goals of my dissertation: 1) to understand how a broad range of royal women were depicted in various regions of the eastern Mediterranean; 2) to explore what the material evidence tells us about how gender, gender roles, ideology, and hierarchy intersect with status at the highest level of society; 3) to define what types of cultural, social, and political circumstances affected the ways in which queens and empresses were gendered; 4) to explore how the visibility of royal and imperial women were affected by certain cultural and political conditions and 5) to examine if the iconography of more powerful queens influence those of lesser power.
The evidence for royal and imperial women in Syro-Palestine clusters around several time periods. While there is interesting evidence from the Ptolemaic and Seleucid periods, the majority of the material evidence comes from the Augustan to Flavian periods. There is a proliferation of evidence of royal women during these periods because of the prominence of the Herodian dynasty, which produced a number of important women. This dynastic family was close to the imperial household with some of its members living in Rome and returning later to rule in Palestine. While the second century shows little in the way of material evidence for royal women, in the third century there was a spike in the numismatic evidence associated with the Severan women. Although there were a considerable number of coins minted with the portraits of Erennia Etruscilla (249 – 253 CE) and Salonina (254 – 268 CE), the proliferation of these types was due to the upswing in the minting of provincial coinage before the mints were officially closed and not due to any local prominence of these empresses. In the fourth and fifth centuries we again find renewed interest in the region in the imperial family because of its connection with the Christian faith. Emperors such as Helena and Eudoxia both came to the region and were involved in the constructions of monuments here. While the office of the king/emperor was public and official with specific tasks that kept kingdom and empire running, the office of the queen/empress was not an official office, and as such it was flexible. Sometimes they could be sovereign as in the case of Seleucid queen Cleopatra Thea, commanding an army and minting coins, breaking stereotypical gender roles; other times they could be patronesses and benefactors (e.g. Salome, Herod the Great’s sister, Livia, Helene of Adiabene, etc.), showing that like the king/emperor, queens/empresses had vast amounts of wealth at their disposal; like kings/emperors, they could also play a role in judicial matters (e.g. Berenike II – 267 or 266 – 221 BCE) or they could be represented as the consummate wife and the progenitor of the royal line, fulfilling their typical gender role and dynastic duty.

My research has shown that there is no typical queen. The roles and representations of royal women were fluid and flexible and the prominence of a queen and how she was depicted were affected by the political, social, and cultural conditions. Their roles and depictions were always changing and being adapted to suit the queen’s own needs and those of her husband. 

The Early Bronze Cultic Complex at Megiddo, 2004–2008 Seasons

Matthew J. Adams, Pennsylvania State University Educational and Cultural Affairs Junior Research Fellow

In the 1930’s, the University of Chicago excavated an enormous sectional trench into the eastern portion of Tell Megiddo, revealing a sequence of temples extending from the Early Bronze to the Late Bronze Age. Since the renewed excavations began in 1992 under the direction of Israel Finkelstein and David Ussishkin (Tel Aviv University), the Megiddo Expedition has reassessed the stratigraphic sequence of the Early Bronze Age cultic complex (Area J). The early seasons focused on the earliest of the temples and from 1996 to 2000, portions of a massive EB Ib temple came to light. From 2004 to 2008, I supervised excavations in Area J with two primary goals: 1. to complete the reassessment of the EB strata and 2. to continue to expose the unprecedented EB I temple.

The results of this latest work provide a wealth of new data for understanding the Early Bronze Age at Megiddo. The massive EB Ib broad-room “Great Temple” (J-4) has now been exposed to the fullest extent possible, revealing a building at least 50 meters wide and more than 30 meters long with a central row of limestone pillar bases, 12 massive basalt ‘tables’, and stone walls almost 3 meters thick. This colossal temple has proven to be the most monumental single edifice so far uncovered in the Bronze Age Levant. The recent excavation has also extracted a new coherent stratigraphic picture of the period from the first EB I settlement (J-2) to the construction of the three well-known ‘megaron’-style temples of the late EB III (J-7) and beyond into the Late Bronze Age (J-18).

During my tenure at the Albright Institute, I prepared the final publication of the 2004–2008 seasons, comprising a number of articles to appear in Megiddo V and elsewhere. The stratigraphic report detailed the new, revised stratigraphy of the EB through LB in Area J and included a reconsideration of the University of Chicago strata on the basis of this new data. In conjunction, my publication of the pottery from this new sequence will bolster our current understanding of the Megiddo ceramic repertoire of the EB I – III. Because of Megiddo’s frequent use as a type-site, it was crucial that the ceramic typology reflect the new stratified sequence.

I also reconsidered the cache of Egyptianized vessels discovered in 1996. Much debate has centered on these vessels as, stratigraphically, their find spot may be interpreted as either EB I or EB III, and, typologically, they might fit into the Egyptian Naqada III or Old Kingdom corpus. In this study, I re-investigated the primary data and field notes from the 1996 and 1998 seasons and produced a detailed stratigraphic argument that the cache was actually a foundation deposit belonging to the ‘megaron’-style Temple 4040. A typological reassessment of this Egyptianizing pottery is still in progress at the time of this writing, but preliminary data supports a late Old Kingdom or early First Intermediate Period ceramic affinity.

In addition, I am preparing a synthetic treatment of the “Great Temple” coauthored with Finkelstein and Ussishkin that delves into issues such as construction, foundation ceremonies, cult, crisis archaeology, and urbanism. This and a number of other spin-off articles from this archaeological work will be submitted to academic journals in the coming months. In a continuation of my work at the Albright I will...
The Elusive Palestinian Synagogue: Archaeology, Texts, and Culture in the 2nd–3rd Centuries CE

Justin Winger, University of Michigan Educational and Cultural Affairs Fellow

A more than 2,200 year-long continuity in the archaeological evidence for the synagogue is broken only by a 150 year gap between 135 CE and the end of the 3rd century. Synagogues reappear in the early 4th century CE, when buildings decorated with mosaic floors, standardized architecture, and mostly Jerusalem-centric orientations can be found in Jewish towns. The search for the “lost” synagogues is hampered by a similar void in the historical record. If the synagogue of the 2nd century CE can be identified, then an archaeological problem is solved and it will be possible to better explain the social, cultural, and historical transition from “Second Temple Judaism” to “Rabbinic Judaism.”

There has been little more than superficial attention paid in the Tannaitic literature to the topic of physical buildings used for synagogues after the Bar Kokhba revolt, with the focus having been more on aspects of liturgy and ritual. This is in part due to the relatively small number of Mishnaot that mention the synagogue in the Mishnah and Tosefta (45), and in part due to problems of interpretation that come as part and parcel with this corpus of literature. Not only is there the question of intended meaning, but also that of the influence and perspective of the authors/compilers of these legal texts. For example, when t. Meg. 4.23 says that synagogues were built at the highest point of the town, citing Prov. 1:21 as the reason (“on the top of the walls [wisdom] cries out”), is this a rabbinic observation of where synagogues were usually built, a rabbinic prescription of where synagogues should be built (and were the rabbis’ in a position to make prescriptions that were heeded by Jewish society at this time?), or a theological interpretation of the Tanakh that had no bearing on reality?

The Tannaitic literature can be historically helpful if an attempt is made to find not the overt statements and prescriptions about the synagogue, but the (often unstated) underlying conceptual framework that the rabbinic literature assumes was the state of affairs in antiquity and on which the rabbis based their opinions. The resulting picture is one that reinforces many scholarly assumptions about the synagogue building in the archaeological void: it is clear that synagogue buildings existed, that they were a place where prayer and the reading of the law occurred, and that they were a place that the community gathered for religio-cultural holidays. It is also one that reveals that the synagogue was a stand-in example of public domain in discussions of public and private space. Nearly every occurrence of the synagogue in the Mishnah and Tosefta is in the context of such a discussion. To give just one example, in m. Neg. 13.11-12 and t. Neg. 7.11, passages that are ostensibly a series of laws about leprosy signs, a partition is required to separate a leper from the rest of the congregation. However, it is clear from details of the rules and the unstated assumptions that are required to make logical sense of the argument that the rabbis are using the synagogue to mean “public space” (cf., m. Toh. 3.6; m. Toh. 6.1; m. Óhol. 8.1; m. Eruv. 10.5). The partition required is of a size that allows the leper to participate in a public event while residing in a karmelit domain.

This reanalysis of the Tannaitic literature, when coupled with an archaeological study of Jewish and non-Jewish villages in antiquity, promises to shed new light on Jewish society, culture, and religion in the 2nd–3rd centuries CE.

Maintaining the Empire: Archaeological Analysis of the Roman Military Presence in Judaea/Palaestina in the 1st–6th centuries CE.

Alexandra Ratzlaff, Boston University Educational and Cultural Affairs Fellow

The function and deployment of the Roman military varied greatly in individual provinces. Judaea/Palaestina presented a unique case of a highly civilized culture with long standing socio-political constraints for the Romans to contest as they established their administration of the province. The goal of this project is to explore the nature of the Roman military presence and development in Roman Judaea/Palaestina in the 1st – 6th centuries CE. My hypothesis is that the location of military sites strongly correlates with socio-economic and administrative mechanisms put in place to maintain the province. Consideration will also be given to the placement of units in Palaestina as an “interior province” – aligning its organization more closely to other interior provinces in the western empire such as Gallia Belgica. In conjunction with ideas of military deployment, this project addresses concepts of internal security as a focal point of military strategy in maintaining provincial control. An analysis will be made of the military response to issues of internal and eventually external unrest, giving consideration to how processes of administration developed over time given these factors.

Roman studies have traditionally focused on individual sites or phenomena such as the military occupation of the frontiers. In contrast my project is a diachronic study of the military presence over several centuries permitting the analysis of internal development which may correlate to socio-
economic and political situations unique to Judaea/Palaestina. My dissertation adheres to the central philosophy that the military’s general policy was to stay alert, closely observing activities in the surrounding region, including the monitoring of potentially volatile populations as well as controlling political and economic factors so that conflicts would not arise in which soldiers would be attacked within their own fortified locales. In essence, the majority of military constructions should be viewed as “base camps” of military administration, not mechanisms of defense and warfare.

During my tenure at the Albright I have focused on conducting a targeted survey of approximately forty Roman military sites throughout the country. My survey was aimed at collecting the geographical position of each site to be incorporated into ArcGIS for the production of a range of detailed maps. Evaluation of each site included an analysis of its architectural characteristics, position in the natural and cultural landscape, and relationship to other military sites in the region. Upon returning to Boston University, I will analyze my survey data and add to it information on Roman economic centers, roads, and communication networks in order to recognize the relationships between these two mechanisms.

The preliminary data from my survey and research suggests that Judaea/Palaestina’s military presence presents correlations with socio-political and economic factors. While historical and epigraphic research has supported this hypothesis, the archaeological evidence seems to also confirm this perspective. My survey research has also revealed distribution patterns of military deployments that offer new insight into the chronological development of the Roman administration of the province. Several distinct architectural forms were also identified during my survey, prominent among them distinct “fortlet” types. Further analysis of Judaea/Palaestina’s military architecture will be conducted to find sources of comparanda in which the function of individual fortifications has been established.

While at the Albright I was able to work with colleagues from the Israel Antiquities Authority and Rockefeller Museum who helped me gather vital information on unpublished military sites in Israel. The time I spent both in the field and at the Albright with experts on Roman Judaea/Palaestina highly influenced my research questions and methodology. I am extremely grateful to those individuals who took time to assist me with my project.

The case of the “round temple” is revealing. Its naos (cella) was destroyed not later than 404 CE when an aqueduct was built in order to service the nymphaeum. While the temple’s naos, which was connected with pagan cult, was dismantled to its foundations, the monumental façade, together with a dedicatory inscription honoring the emperor Marcus Aurelius (161-180 CE), were preserved until the earthquake of 759 CE.

The preservation of the altar in the Roman basilica in the middle of the 4th century CE in a city with an important Christian population might demonstrate that the inhabitants were still willing to honor their legendary founder, Dionysos, and also that there must have been those in Scythopolis who still practiced pagan rites. After the sacrificial table was removed, the altar lost its ritual function, but could still have been tolerated for its artistic and decorative value. So the presence of this altar inside the basilica in the middle of the 4th century indicates that the transition from the classical Hellenistic tradition to the new Christian culture was a gradual one.

In Scythopolis, like in the other parts of the Byzantine Empire from the 4th century CE, the building of churches, or other private buildings on sites which were previously occupied by pagan temples (the Roman temenos/ Caesareum, the Temple of Zeus Akraios on Tel Beth Shean), did not occur immediately after the desertion and destruction of the temples, but only after a long period of abandonment. This long period of abandonment might have been an expression of the Christians’ fear of settling in these sites, which until the 6th century CE were considered to be haunted by demons; but there are no precise dates for the re-occupation of these cultic places after their abandonment.

The fact that the transition from the Greco-Roman culture to the Christian culture at Scythopolis was not a dramat-
ic one, and even these two cultures reached a modus Vivendi that could be seen in the fact that some of the mythological themes on mosaics were re-used although with different symbolic meanings.

At the same time, sculptures depicting gods were preserved for a while because of their aesthetic values, although mutilated, until the Church became more radical during the 6th century CE.

Demonology and Apotropaic Practice in Qumran

Ida Fröhlich, Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest, Hungary
Andrew W. Mellon Fellow

During my tenure at the Albright Institute (March – May, 2009), my research focused on the study of demonology and magical practice in Qumran, a theme previously not thoroughly investigated. The Qumran manuscripts provide a unique set of documents from the ancient world for such a study. They represent the spiritual and literary tradition of an Essene community between the 3rd c. B.C.E.- 1st c. CE. Although fragmentary, the documents clearly reflect the world view, intellectual traditions, and spiritual tendencies of the community. The works present fully developed ideas from the demons’ world. Part of the texts related to demons are of a “theoretical” or “theological” character dealing with the demons’ origin and nature, and their role in the world, while other texts were written for practical, apotropaic purpose against demons.

The earliest tradition of demons is known from a pseudepigraphical work, the Ethiopic book of Enoch (1Enoch). Fragments of several copies of the original Aramaic text were found at Qumran. The part containing the story of the Watchers (1Enoch 6-11) is represented in the earliest Qumran manuscript tradition (end of 3rd c. B.C.E.). The story is usually considered in scholarship as a commentary to Gen 6:1-4. Based on my previous research, I have come to the conclusion that it is a carefully composed and independent story on the origin of evil, an important document for mytho-poetic thinking, composed presumably in a Jewish community, in the post-exilic era. The authors (like those of several other parts of the Enochic collection) seem to be well acquainted with Mesopotamian astrological, demonological, and magical lore. Recent scholarship has a renewed interest in research on the cultural impact of Mesopotamian science and literature on exilic and post-exilic Jewish culture.

An important point in my research is the obvious relationship between demonology and the idea of impurities (physical and ethical impurities). The rationale of the impurities known from the world’s impurity systems is the danger of the demonic. It can be supposed that the inhabitants of Qumran’s obsession with purity, their claim of a ban of all kinds of impurities from their place of residence, their requirement of bodily and ethical purity of the members, and their use of sacred texts in the forms of prayers and apotropaic texts were all intended to keep away any harmful (demonic) effect from the community.

In light of the results of my previous analyses, I examined some of the Qumran texts used for apotropaic practice, namely 1Q11 including four songs “for the stricken,” and the text of 4Q560 bearing an exorcism. I examined various forms of exorcism in 1Q11, and in view of the calendrical background of the text, I was able to reconstruct its possible ritual use. I also examined the cosmological aspects of the figure of the Watchers in 1Enoch in light of Babylonian and Qumran Aramaic astronomical lore, as well as in the Enochic tradition subsequent to 1Enoch. During my fellowship, I wrote three articles on the above topics:

‘Blessing’ III. Judaism. A. Second Temple and Hellenistic Judaism’ (EBR); The Watchers in the Enochic Tradition (1-3 Enoch); Healing the Sick with Songs in Qumran. I also completed two articles of my earlier work: Qumran Biblical Interpretation in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Historiography; and Embryology and healing in Genesis Apocryphon), and made considerable progress in writing a comprehensive work on Apocryphal literature in light of Qumran tradition.

My thanks to the Albright’s Mellon Fellowship Committee for providing me with the opportunity to work in the Albright Institute, and to the Director and staff of the Albright for their warm welcome and support of my work.

Mycenaean IIIC Pottery in Cyprus and the Levant

Penelope Mountjoy, British School at Athens
Glassman Holland Research Fellow

My project is the study of IIIC pottery on Cyprus. This equates chronologically to Late Cypriot IIIA and covers the 12th century and the early 11th century. I am also looking at pottery from the preceding Late Cypriot IIC phase in order to see how the IIIC pottery on Cyprus developed. My project concentrates particularly on the “missing” IIIC Early phase on Cyprus, known as IIIC:1a. The phase is difficult to identify in Cyprus with the result that most scholars implicitly regard the following IIIC:ib phase in Cyprus and in the Levant as belonging to the earliest phase of IIIC. The problem is compounded by the fact that the Greek Mainland parallels to much of the pottery (especially the Philistine pottery) date to LH IIIC Middle, not to LH IIIC Early (see E.French and others in Mediterranean Peoples in Transition. Festschrift T.Dothan eds. S.Gitin, A.Mazar and E.Stern, 1998). The definition of this missing phase and thus of the origins of the earliest IIIC pottery in Cyprus is of particular importance because of its relationship to the movement of peoples after the collapse of the palace economies on the Greek Mainland; it is also important to the development of IIIC pottery in the Levant, particularly that of the Philistines, as there are many
phase in Cyprus throws light on the movement of peoples which has not been recognised. The definition of this pottery identified IIIC1a phase, which comprises the earliest IIIC pottery from Cyprus, is presented by material from different sites, which has not been recognised. The definition of this pottery phase in Cyprus throws light on the movement of peoples after the collapse of the palace economies on the Greek Mainland. This phase is also particularly significant for settlement in Philistia, as reflected through the Philistine pottery. It, thus, seemed a good idea to look at pottery from Philistia in conjunction with the Cypriot IIIC pottery.

The earliest Philistine pottery appears at Ekron in Stratum VIIb, at Ashdod in Stratum XIIIb and at Ashkelon in Phase 20b. It equates to Sinda II and Enkomi Level IIIA on Cyprus and to LH IIIC Early Phase 2 on the Greek Mainland. My methodology has been to examine and draw pottery from the relevant contexts in Cyprus and Israel to see how exactly it is linked to LHIIIC Early pottery, not only in terms of the Greek Mainland but also in relation to the Dodecanese, Crete and Turkey. To this end I have studied the pottery in Cyprus from fourteen sites; in Israel I have been very fortunate in having access to pottery from the excavated Philistine sites of Ekron, Ashdod and Ashkelon. Three months work at the Albright has enabled me to complete the Philistine part of my project.

The research I have done so far suggests that the unidentified IIIC1a phase, which comprises the earliest IIIC pottery in Cyprus, is represented by material from different sites, which has not been recognised. The definition of this pottery phase in Cyprus throws light on the movement of peoples parallels between Philistine Monochrome pottery and IIIC Early pottery.

Recent work at Mycenae and Tiryns now aids the study of IIIC pottery on Cyprus. The current work on the LH IIIC stratigraphy at Mycenae has divided LH IIIC Early into two phases, Phase 1 and Phase 2 (see E.French in M.Bietak and E.Czerny (eds.), The Synchronisation of Civilisations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Second Millenium BC, Vienna, 2008). This more precise division allows the early IIIC pottery from Cyprus to be more finely defined in its turn and the missing phase to be isolated. The pottery from the recent excavations at Tiryns follows on stratigraphically from that of Mycenae. There is good stratigraphy for the end of LH III Early Phase 2 and LH IIIC Middle Phase 1, which in turn is very important for defining Cypriot stratigraphy.

The research I have done so far suggests that the unidentified IIIC1a phase, which comprises the earliest IIIC pottery in Cyprus, is represented by material from different sites, which has not been recognised. The definition of this pottery phase in Cyprus throws light on the movement of peoples parallels between Philistine Monochrome pottery and IIIC Early pottery.

My methodology has been to examine and draw pottery from the relevant contexts in Cyprus and Israel to see how exactly it is linked to LHIIIC Early pottery, not only in terms of the Greek Mainland but also in relation to the Dodecanese, Crete and Turkey. To this end I have studied the pottery in Cyprus from fourteen sites; in Israel I have been very fortunate in having access to pottery from the excavated Philistine sites of Ekron, Ashdod and Ashkelon. Three months work at the Albright has enabled me to complete the Philistine part of my project.

The ancient Chinese did not have an equivalent to Deuteronomy. But they had similar moral maxims. Hebrew rituals were comparable to lì, which were sacred rituals at first, but were later transformed into the rules of civilized behavior, a kind of decorum. They had fully respected xiao (filial piety), regarded as the foundation of all virtues, which was the equivalent of the Fifth Commandment. Deuteronomic righteousness was similar to the Chinese yi, loyalty to zhong, faithfulness to xin. The concept of wisdom and its substrata in Deuteronomy and the deuteronomistic works were similar to that expressed by early Chinese philosophers and it is possible to find it in The Commentary of Mr. Zuo, too.

If we agree with Th.C. Römer and characterize Former Prophets as a “narrative history,” The Commentary of Mr. Zuo is just this kind of work. It is similar to the deuteronomistic histories with their narrative methods, repetitions, use of parallels and paratactic language.

I am sure that more research on the Chinese side (I am the first to have initiated such a study) will show that early Chinese historiography (4th cent. B.C.E.) is most similar among the ancient historiographies to the Hebrew Deuteronomistic historiography (6th cent. B.C.E.), and that it chronologically follows after it, and after the early History by Herodotus (5th cent. B.C.E.).

---

Hebrew Deuteronomistic and Early Chinese Confucian Historiography: A Comparative Approach

Marián Gálik, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava
Andrew W. Mellon Fellow

My project focused on the material mostly concerned with King David (ca. 1037-ca. 967 B.C.E.) from 1.2 Samuel and 1 Kings (6th cent. B.C.E.) and the Duke Wen of Jin (ca. 698-629 B.C.E) from the Chinese historical work Zuo zhuan (The Commentary of Mr. Zuo) (4th cent. B.C.E.). During my stay at the Albright Institute as an Andrew W. Mellon Fellow (March-May, 2009) and after reading more works on Hebrew Deuteronomistic history beginning with Martin Noth’s Deuteronomistic History, I started to ponder the possibility of conducting more detailed comparative research into the biblical Former Prophets and The Commentary of Mr. Zuo. I was looking at them as typologically similar historical writings without any contact between them but nevertheless nearer to each other as examples of some of the oldest “narrative histories” in Asia and in the history of mankind.

From the historical materials connected with the history of the Near East (Mesopotamia, Levant), Egypt and early Greece, the one in 1.2 Samuel and 1.2 Kings is most similar to The Commentary of Mr. Zuo. The latter is an historical treatment and detailed elaboration of the book Chun qiu (Spring and Autumn Annals) of the state of Lu, where Confucius (571-479 B.C.E.) was born and which is traditionally attributed to him. The book comprises the records of events that occurred in various Chinese states and their historical elaboration from 772-481 B.C.E.

Theocrazia was the ruling form in Israel and Judah and fully respected by the biblical Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic historian(s). The kings were annotated representa-
The Junior Scholars committee invites Annual Meeting attendees to this exciting panel on Thursday, November 18 from 12:45-2:00pm. If you are interested in attending, please register as part of the Annual Meeting registration process. Boxed lunches will be provided for a $15.00 fee and you must register and pay for the Junior Scholars Luncheon while registering for the annual meeting.

The current economic environment and the means by which institutions have negotiated budgetary crises have intensified the erosion of junior tenure track positions. For young scholars lacking an extensive publication record and teaching experience, prospective employment can be daunting. Lacking the time or means to correct these deficiencies during doctoral education, doctoral students and recent graduates may consider alternatives to the job market that support further research and teaching development, as they prepare to compete for full-time employment in the academy.

The 2010 Junior Scholar’s luncheon will focus on post-doctoral fellowships as transitions toward permanent academic positions. Speakers will include faculty administrators, current post-doctoral fellows, and the recently employed. Presentations will focus on the characteristics of successful applications, the pros and cons of these fellowships, and ways postdoctoral fellowships can be best used to further academic careers. Please contact Kelley Bazydlo at asorad@bu.edu with any questions.

Gary “Termite” Lindstrom passed peacefully in New Orleans, while attending ASOR’s 2009 Annual Meeting. He was 67. Mr. Lindstrom was the owner of Gary K. Lindstrom’s Termite Company, located in San Leandro, California for over 40 years. Aside from his termite business, he had many varied interests, but foremost and dear to his heart was the Lindstrom Foundation for Archaeological Research and Development, which helps professors and college students to make it possible to travel to the Middle East every year to experience and partake in the archaeological digs; and temporarily live in an entirely different culture. Mr. Lindstrom also donated generously to ASOR and established the “Lindstrom Foundation Student Service Scholarships” which are granted to undergraduates or graduate students to help with the costs of attending ASOR’s Annual Meeting. A complete tribute will follow in an upcoming newsletter.

In the session Art and Artifacts of the Ancient Near East I: Context, Content, Contacts, Eudora J. Struble should have been listed as co-author of the following paper. The correct listing is Virginia Herrmann (University of Chicago) and Eudora J. Struble (University of Chicago), “An Eternal Feast at Sam’al: The New Iron Age Mortuary Stele from Zincirli in Context”.

The following paper should have been listed in the Individual Submissions I: Lynn Swartz Dodd (University of Southern California), “Monuments of Resistance: Gurgum and the Assyrian Conquest”.
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Wednesday, November 17

7:00-8:30pm

A1 Welcome and Introductions

Plenary Address
Edgar Peltenburg (University of Edinburgh), “Fashioning Identity: Workshops and Cemeteries at Prehistoric Souskiou, Cyprus”

Thursday, November 18

8:20-10:25am

A2 Archaeology of Islamic Society
Bethany J. Walker (Missouri State University), Presiding

A3 Archaeology of Anatolia I: Current Work
Sharon R. Steadman (SUNY Cortland), Presiding

A4 Art Historical Approaches to the Near East
Marian H. Feldman (University of California, Berkeley) and Elise A. Friedland (The George Washington University), Presiding

A5 Archaeology of Syria
Michael Danti (Boston University), Presiding

A6 Archaeology and the New Testament: Contexts and Texts I
Tom McCollough (Centre College), Presiding

10:40am-12:45pm

A7 Archaeology of the Near East: The Classical Periods
Jennifer Gates-Foster (University of Texas at Austin), Presiding

A8 City and Sanctuary: A Session in Honor of Robert J. Bull’s 90th Birthday
Jane DeRose Evans (Temple University), Presiding

A9 The History of Archaeology
Rachel Hallote (Purchase College, SUNY), Presiding

A10 Archaeology and the New Testament: Contexts and Texts II
James Riley Strange (Samford University), Presiding

A11 Archaeology of Lebanon
Claude Doumet-Serhal (British Museum), Presiding

A12 Philistia and the Philistines During the Iron Age
Aren M. Maeir (Bar-Ilan University) and Jeffrey R. Chadwick (Brigham Young University), Presiding

12:45-2:00pm

Junior Scholars Luncheon

2:00-4:05pm

A13 Archaeology of Cyprus
Erin Walcek Averett (Creighton University) and Elisabetta Cova (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee), Presiding

A14 Archaeology of Egypt
James K. Hoffmeier (Trinity International University), Presiding

A15 Archaeology and Biblical Studies
Stephen Von Wyrick (University of Mary-Hardin Baylor), Presiding

A16 Nabataean and Roman Arabia
S. Thomas Parker (North Carolina State University), Presiding

A17 Prehistoric Archaeology
April Nowell (University of Victoria), Presiding

A18 Publishing Archaeological Data from the Field to the Web (Workshop)
Eric C. Kansa (University of California, Berkeley), Presiding
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4:20-6:25 pm

A19
Archaeology of Jordan I: Bronze and Iron Ages
Suzanne Richard (Gannon University), Presiding

A20
Archaeology of Mesopotamia
Constance E. Gane (Andrews University), Presiding

A21
Christianity and Judaism in Late Antiquity:
Cultures, Connections, and Contrasts
Steven H. Werlin (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) and Carrie Duncan (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), Presiding

A22
Archaeology of Gender
Beth Alpert Nakhai (The University of Arizona), Presiding

A23
Teaching Archaeology to Undergraduates:
Success Stories and Cautionary Tales
Ellen Bedell (The Ellis School) and Eric H. Cline (The George Washington University), Presiding

A24
Khirbet Qeiyafa: A Fortified City in Judah from the Time of King David
Yosef Garfinkel (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem) and Michael G. Hasel (Southern Adventist University), Presiding

7:00-9:20 pm

A25
Reconstructing Ancient (Biblical) Israel: The Exact and Life Science Perspective. An Atlanta 2010 Update
Israel Finkelstein (Tel Aviv University) and Steve Weiner (Weizmann Institute of Science), Presiding

Friday, November 19

8:20-10:25 am

A26
Archaeology of Islamic Society II
Bert DeVries (Calvin College), Presiding

A27
Theoretical and Anthropological Approaches to the Near East I
Louise Hitchcock (University of Melbourne), Presiding

A28
“Figuring Out” the Figurines of the Ancient Near East
Stephanie M. Langin-Hooper (University of California, Berkeley), Presiding

A29
Reports on Current Excavations and Surveys, ASOR-Affiliated
M. L. Pruitt (University of California, Berkeley and The Graduate Theological Union), Presiding

A30
Technology in Archaeology
Stephen H. Savage (Arizona State University), Presiding

10:40 am-12:45 pm

A31
Settlement and Society in the Ancient Near East I
Jason A. Ur (Harvard University), Presiding

A32
Sepphoris in Recent Research
Eric Meyers (Duke University), Carol Meyers (Duke University), and James E. Strange (University of South Florida), Presiding

A33
Hebrew Bible, History, and Archaeology
Daniel C. Browning, Jr. (William Carey University), Presiding

A34
Death and Burial
Helen Dixon (University of Michigan), Presiding
ASOR Annual Meeting
Academic Program — Friday & Saturday

A35
Community-Based Practice
Jane Peterson (Marquette University), Presiding

12:45-2:00 pm
Projects on Parade Poster Session

2:00-4:05 pm

A36
Settlement and Society in the Ancient Near East II
Jesse Casana (University of Arkansas), Presiding

A37
Caesarea Maritima: The Byzantine-Islamic Transition
Kenneth G. Holm (University of Maryland), Presiding

A38
Myth, History, and Archaeology
Eric Smith (Nebraska Christian College), Presiding

A39
Communication and Power in Mesopotamian Civilizations
Seth Richardson (University of Chicago) and Steven Garfinkle (Western Washington University), Presiding

A40
Archaeology of the Near East: Bronze and Iron Ages, I
Britt Hartenberger (Western Michigan University), Presiding

4:20-6:25 pm
ASOR Members Meeting

Saturday, November 20

8:20-10:25 am

A41
Theoretical and Anthropological Approaches to the Near East II
Andrew McCarthy (University of Edinburgh), Presiding

A42
Archaeology of Jordan II: Roman Period
Leigh-Ann Bedal (Penn State Erie, The Behrend College), Presiding

12:45 pm-2:00 pm
ASOR Brown Bag Roundtables

2:00-4:05 pm

A43
Archaeology of Anatolia II: Material Culture in the Anatolian Landscape
Jennifer C. Ross (Hood College), Presiding

A44
Bioarchaeology of the Near East
Megan A. Perry (East Carolina University), Presiding

A45
Maritime Archaeology
Justin Leidwanger (University of Pennsylvania), Presiding

10:40 am-12:45 pm

A46
Warfare, Empire, and Society in the Ancient Near East I
Aaron Burke (University of California), Presiding

A47
Archaeology of the Natural Environment: Archaeobotany and Zooarchaeology in the Near East
Jennifer Ramsay (The College at Brockport, SUNY) and Alexia Smith (University of Connecticut), Presiding

A48
Archaeology of the Near East: Bronze and Iron Ages, II
Rudolph H. Dornemann (ASOR), Presiding

A49
Archaeology of Lebanon II
Jessica L. Nitschke (Georgetown University), Presiding

A50
Ancient Inscriptions: Recent Discoveries, New Editions, New Readings
Christopher A. Rollston (Emmanuel School of Religion) and Annalisa Azzoni (Vanderbilt University), Presiding

A51
Warfare, Empire, and Society in the Ancient Near East II
William Zimmerle (University of Pennsylvania), Presiding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Chairpersons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A52</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Protection and Management: Protecting Heritage in War-Zones and the Role of the Media (Workshop)</td>
<td>Friedrich T. Schipper (University of Vienna), Presiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A53</td>
<td>Tayinat Archaeological Project: Recent Investigations in the ‘Land of Palistin’</td>
<td>Timothy Harrison (University of Toronto), Presiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A54</td>
<td>Individual Submissions I</td>
<td>Jennie Ebeling (University of Evansville), Presiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A55</td>
<td>Archaeology of Israel</td>
<td>Zvi Greenhut (Israel Antiquities Authority), Presiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A56</td>
<td>Archaeologies of the Body in the Ancient Near East</td>
<td>Jean Evans (University of Chicago) and Aubrey Baadsgaard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A57</td>
<td>Individual Submissions II</td>
<td>Annlee Dolan (San Joaquin Delta College), Presiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A58</td>
<td>Reports on Current Excavations and Surveys, Non-ASOR Affiliated</td>
<td>Yorke M. Rowan (University of Chicago), Presiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A59</td>
<td>Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls</td>
<td>C. D. Elledge (Gustavus Adolphus College), Presiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A60</td>
<td>Current Issues in Biblical Archaeology</td>
<td>Jane Cahill-West (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem) and Robert A. Mullins (Azusa Pacific University), Presiding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DIRECTOR, CYPRUS AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE (CAARI), NICOSIA, CYPRUS – JULY 2011**

Founded in 1978, the Cyprus American Archaeological Research Institute (CAARI) is an American not-for-profit organization located in Nicosia, Cyprus. The mission of CAARI is to promote the study and knowledge of Cypriot archaeology and related disciplines. CAARI is one of the most important centers for the study of archaeology and related history and culture in the eastern Mediterranean. Affiliated with the American Schools of Oriental Research (ASOR) and the Council of American Overseas Research Centers (CAORC), CAARI offers international and Cypriot scholars comprehensive research facilities through its world-class library and technical support facilities. CAARI also conducts lectures, seminars, and symposia for professional and lay audiences; offers fellowships for international students and established scholars; and maintains a residence for overseas students and scholars.

Please visit www.caari.org for further information and a full job description. Applications comprising a cover letter, curriculum vitae, a statement of not more than two pages setting out the candidate’s vision of CAARI as an American overseas research center, as well as names and contact information for three references must be received by September 1, 2010. Email application to CAARI at caari@bu.edu.
**ASOR Annual Meeting**

**Business Meetings, Receptions, and Events Schedule**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2010**

1:00-4:00pm  Madaba Plains Project Workshop, Larry Herr and Randall Younker, Presiding
1:00-2:30pm  Administrative Oversight Committee, Timothy P. Harrison, Presiding
2:45-5:00pm  Chairs Coordinating Council, Timothy P. Harrison, Presiding
7:00-8:30pm  Welcome to the Annual Meeting and Plenary Address
8:30-10:30pm ASOR Welcome Reception

**Thursday, November 18, 2010**

7:00-8:15am  Bulletin of ASOR (BASOR) Editorial Board, James Weinstein, Presiding
7:00-8:15am  Near Eastern Archaeology (NEA) Editorial Board, Ann E. Killebrew, Presiding
7:00-8:15am  Regional Affiliations Committee, Suzanne Richard, Presiding
12:45-2:00pm Madaba Plains Project Staff Consultation, Douglas R. Clark, Presiding
12:45-2:00pm Junior Scholars Luncheon, Robert Darby and Erin Darby, Presiding
9:00-11:00pm ASOR Committee on Archaeological Policy (CAP), Oystein S. LaBianca, Presiding

**Friday, November 19, 2010**

7:00-8:15am Consultation of Dig Directors in Jordan, Bethany Walker, Presiding
7:00-10:00am ASOR Committee on Publications (COP), Jeffrey A. Blakely, Presiding
8:00-10:30am AIAR Fellowship Committee, Joan Branham, Presiding
8:30-9:00am ASOR Membership Committee – Combined, Tammi Schneider, Presiding
9:00-9:45am ASOR Membership Committee – Individual, Britt Hartenberger and Randall Younker, Presiding
9:00-9:45am ASOR Membership Committee – Institutional, Tammi Schneider, Presiding
10:30-12:30pm AIAR Executive Committee, Edward Wright, Presiding

**Saturday, November 20, 2010**

7:00-8:15am ASOR Program Committee, Elise A. Friedland and Andrew M. Smith II, Presiding
7:30-9:00am ASOR Finance Committee, Sheldon Fox, Presiding
9:00-5:00pm CAARI Board of Trustee Meeting, Raymond Ewing, Presiding
9:00-11:30am ASOR Executive Committee Meeting, P.E. MacAllister, Presiding
10:15-1:45pm ACOR Board of Trustees Meeting, Artemis Joukowsky, Presiding
12:45-2:00pm ASOR Roundtables, Morag M. Kersel, Presiding
3:00-5:00pm Tell el Hesi Board & Publications Committee, Jeffrey A. Blakely, Presiding

**Sunday, November 21, 2010**

8:00am-12:00pm ASOR Board of Trustees Meeting, P.E. MacAllister, Presiding
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Web: www.asor.org

To purchase ASOR monographs, contact:

The David Brown Book Co.
P.O. Box 511
Oakville, CT 06779
Tel.: (800) 791-9354
Fax: (860) 945-9468
E-mail: david.brown.bk.co@snet.net
Web: www.oxbowbooks.com