



Articles from 2013 and after  
are now only accessible on  
the Chicago Journals website at  
**JOURNALS.UCHICAGO.EDU**

---

Review

Author(s): Paul Zimansky

Review by: Paul Zimansky

Source: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 53, No. 1 (Jan., 1994), pp. 51-53

Published by: [University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/545362>

Accessed: 20-02-2016 07:04 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

portant, why not in n. 13 cite the more generally available and comprehensible, to general readers, *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* of Averil Cameron and Judith Herrin (Leiden, 1984), which contains the full Greek text, together with commentary and translation? In n. 39, on p. 145, he should cite the George Dennis edition and translation of the sixth-century anonymous Byzantine military treatise published by Dumbarton Oaks in his *Three Byzantine Military Treatises* (Washington, D.C., 1985), and not the old obsolete one of Köchly and Rüstow. In n. 44, p. 146, one should not cite Malalas from Migne, but from the Bonn Corpus, and for the general public and scholars who know no Greek or who want a commentary, *The Chronicle of John Malalas*, translation with commentary by Elizabeth Jeffreys, Michael Jeffreys et al. (Sydney, 1986). Instead of the now obsolete French translation of Russian pilgrim accounts, one should cite the Dumbarton Oaks edition and translation and commentary by George Majeska, *Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (Washington, 1984). In other words, a little additional bibliographical updating would have produced a far superior group of footnotes to aid the general public and advanced scholars in using this book. It would even have produced a more up-to-date volume, in some cases, than the citations in *Excavations at Saraçhane*. It so happens that a number of critical editions, translations, and commentaries appeared in the years immediately preceding the production of this broader book. There was time to update the notes for this edition, instead of simply repeating now obsolete ones from the *Excavations* volume. It may have been impossible to use them for the *Excavations* volume, but it is inexcusable not to use them for *A Temple for Byzantium*. These newly available texts are often superior to the old cited ones in a scholarly sense and always more widely accessible, particularly for the intended audience of this broader volume.

One hopes that the associated palace of Anicia Juliana can be excavated some time in the future. Because of the inclusion of these color photographs, scholarly libraries may wish to purchase this volume in addition to the more comprehensive *Excavations*. In addition to those with specialized archaeological, histori-

cal, and topographical interests, a broad range of collegiate and public libraries and friends of archaeology may also wish to acquire this book.

WALTER E. KAEGI, JR.

*The University of Chicago*

*Who Were the Cimmerians, and Where Did They Come from?: Sargon II, the Cimmerians, and Rusa I.* By ANNE KATRINE GADE KRISTENSEN. Translated by JØRGEN LAESSØE. The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 57. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1988. Pp. 141. D.Kr. 220.

"I am in no way blind to the fact that the idea of connecting the Cimmerians with deported Israelites will rouse an immediate wave of contradiction, if for no other reasons, than psychologically," writes Kristensen toward the end of this intricate monograph. While more than psychological reconditioning stands in the way of general acceptance of her hypothesis, it would be wrong to dismiss her book as the work of a complete crackpot. There is a lot we do not know about the Cimmerians, and in challenging conventional assumptions, Kristensen sets out on a path that has recently been opened by scholars such as Salvini who have reinterpreted the geography of the earliest cuneiform references. By the end of her book, however, she is in much less reputable company.

Greek tradition, i.e., Herodotus, relates that the Cimmerians were driven into Anatolia from their homeland north of the Caucasus by the Scythians. Their onslaughts upon the Phrygians and the Lydians must be dated to the seventh century B.C., but Assyrian sources show that the Cimmerians were already neighbors of the Urartians and Mannaeans in the late eighth. In modern scholarship the tenet that the Cimmerians came from north of the Black Sea has generally survived in uneasy syntheses with the cuneiform evidence. Archaeological attempts to identify the Cimmerians invariably begin their search in the north Pontic areas, but this *a priori* assumption has generated little evidence of an assemblage that would corroborate the pattern of

movements expounded by Herodotus. Kristensen feels the time has come to accord priority to the contemporary cuneiform records and treat the hearsay of the classical tradition with skepticism. These ground rules give the earliest references to the Cimmerians, which appear in the context of the events surrounding the confrontation of the Urartians and Assyrians at the time of Sargon's eighth campaign (714 B.C.), crucial importance.

The thesis is presented in three chapters of unequal length. The first and briefest, entitled "Where was Gamir?" argues that the "land" of the Cimmerians (Gamir) mentioned in the Harper letters was southeast of Urartu, not north of it. The key text, *ABL* 146, states that a land called Guriana lay between Urartu and Gamir. The annals of the Urartian king Sarduri II locate a Quriani in the vicinity of lake Çıldır. Kristensen rejects the equation of these two place names, which others have taken as evidence of the Cimmerians' northern origins, on the grounds that geographical information in the other Harper letters, particularly *ABL* 112, associates the Cimmerians with Mannean territory which she believes lay to the south of Urartu.

The second chapter, "Gamir and Uishdish," makes up 60 percent of the book's text and concerns the events surrounding Sargon's eighth campaign in 714 B.C. Following the thread of argument demands considerable effort, for much depends on final detail, broken passages, and obscure texts. It has long been customary to regard the Assyrian reports of one Urartian defeat or more at the hands of the Cimmerians as having some relationship to the Sargon's campaign, but Kristensen goes well beyond anything ever presented in terms of precision. Placing the letters in a tight sequence, she would have the Urartian king, Rusa I, be defeated by the Cimmerians, return to his capital at Van to quell a rebellion, journey to his frontier fortress at Uesi, then go to Muşasir to crown Urzana—all within the late summer months that Sargon was campaigning in Urartu, before the Assyrian turned his wrath on Urzana and sacked Musasir. She concludes that Rusa's defeat by the Cimmerians and his defeat by Sargon on Mt. Uaush took place so close to each other in time, and in so much the same area, that they must in fact be

one and the same military action. If so, the land of Gamir and the land of Uishdish, where Mt. Uaush lay, are two names for the same thing, and the Cimmerians must have been troops in the service of the Assyrians.

In the final chapter, "The Cimmerians, and Where They Came from," Kristensen ventures that the Assyrians in fact brought the Cimmerians to the frontier of Urartu from Israel. She notes that this view is not at all new but, rather, has had various proponents among "students of the Ten Tribes" for more than a century, who view "Gamir" and "[Bit] ʿOmri" (i.e., Israel) as cognates. Kristensen says that she first regarded this thesis with great skepticism, but "as the premises of the commonly accepted opinions of [the Cimmerians] began to crumble, and an entirely new picture began to take shape, I had to admit that the students of the Ten Tribes must have seen the truth" [p. 121]. She gives the reader very little indication of what forced this admission. 2 Kings 17:6 is cited to confirm that some of the Israelites were placed in cities of the Medes, but otherwise the argument seems to be that the Assyrians must have brought somebody in, the people deported in the wake of the fall of Samaria were available, and the lack of references to Cimmerians between 714 and 679 B.C. would be consistent with their subordination to the Assyrians as a resettled people until the rising power of the Medes made it possible for them to act independently again.

We are left with a script of what might have happened rather than convincing reconstruction of what did. It has long been recognized that the essential difficulty of dealing with largely undated letters as historical documents is that they presume a context which is unknown to us. Kristensen is not the first scholar to attempt to confine the Assyrian letters concerning Urartu to a very narrow time frame on the basis of internal evidence in order to understand that context, but in so doing she undercuts any power an argument from negative evidence might have had. If all the surviving letters date to a few months in 714 B.C., has the possibility that the Cimmerians moved down from the north somewhat earlier really been ruled out? Proving that the first confrontation between the Urartians and Cimmerians took place in Uish-

dish makes no statement about where Cimmerians were before that, and the whole north, east and south are pretty much open given the paucity of the evidence. I am far from convinced that chronology and geography of Urartian and Assyrian interaction can be nailed down as precisely as Kristensen and others seem to believe, given the very fragmentary state of the evidence. For example, ABL 112, which *may* mention Guriana (granting a minor emendation) in some loose association with Musasir and the Urartian frontier city of Uesi, hardly gives us a precise location for Gamir since Uesi was the logical staging point for all Urartian actions to the south and east of Lake Urmia. That letter, incidentally, does not refer to Rusa but does mention Sarduri. It is quite possible that this Sarduri is not the Urartian king who was Rusa's predecessor, but to assume it is not and to take as a matter of faith that the Cimmerian entry into Mannea and Urartu which the letter also reports had to take place in 714 B.C. is to build an argument on weak foundations. Many of the assumptions about the course of events that are piled on top of this are even more dubious.

The translation is generally intelligible, but a few solecisms, such as calling a political *volte face* a "sudden revulsion," make one wish that a native speaker of English had looked at the manuscript before it went to press.

PAUL ZIMANSKY

*Boston University*

*American Expedition to Idalion, Cyprus 1973–1980.* By LAWRENCE E. STAGER and ANITA M. WALKER. Oriental Institute Communications, no. 24. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1989. Pp. xxiv + 516 + 93 figs. + 82 pls. + 64 tables.

In 1971 the American Expedition to Idalion began a project of archaeological investigation of the Dhali region, which lies about twelve miles southeast of Nicosia; work was to include excavation, field survey, ethnography, and scientific studies. The results of the first two years' work were published in 1974 (Lawrence E. Stager, Anita Walker, and G. Ernest Wright,

eds., *American Expedition to Idalion, Cyprus, First Preliminary Report: Seasons of 1971 and 1972*, BASOR Supplement, no. 18. [Cambridge, Mass., 1974]). The volume under review presents some of the results up to 1980; and a further one is planned which will publish the field survey, the remaining excavations, and the artifacts. Work at the site of Idalion resumed in 1987 under Pamela Gaber.

The main bulk of the excavations published in this volume are in the western area of the city site of Idalion. On the West Terrace are the remains of a monumental building, perhaps the royal palace, which was in use during the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., and also part of the fortification wall, which at this point reaches a massive 7.80 m high and 10.75 m wide. In the Western Lower City, another section of the fortification wall has been excavated, as well as a domestic precinct with a courtyard house, a street, and another house. A Late Cypriot IIC tomb just south of the modern village is published at length, together with a full analysis of the human remains; unfortunately, the tomb was plundered in antiquity and the surviving bones and artifacts are in poor condition.

The descriptions of the excavations and the catalogues of finds are marred by a number of errors of reference. I mention those which caused me the most confusion in the course of my own research on the city-kingdoms of Iron Age Cyprus:

On p. 47, second paragraph, for "Plate 7" read "Plate 4." The caption for pl. 1b on p. 54 should read "Phase 3A" and not "Phase 3B" (cf. p. 46). On p. 81, pl. 6, the photo on the left should be labeled "b" and that on the right, taken looking southeast, "a." On p. 82, pl. 7a, for "NE" read "E." On p. 447 and p. 449 the findspots for coins no. 5 and no. 19 should be "WNW . . ." not "ENW . . ." Under coin no. 15 on p. 449 read "Loc 038a" for "Loc 038." And coin no. 6 on p. 448 would appear to come from a square which was unexcavated at the time of the coin's discovery (cf. plan on p. 4).

Further difficulties were caused by the lack of cross-references in the catalogues of finds. Findspots are given by square and locus number alone, and so a considerable amount of searching