

Semeiko). Others offer a more forthrightly ethnographic engagement, such as the reproductions from the Tbilisi Literature Museum exhibit and the interpretations based on fashion design by Manana Antelidze (the “Transformation” series).

It is worth highlighting the contribution of the Georgian Literature in Translation Program within the Georgian Ministry of Culture, Tbilisi, in making this work, and so many other classics of Georgian literature past and present, available in English. Would that every minimally translated literature had such a programme to support its dissemination.

Taken together in all of its many different parts, this volume makes a significant inroad into the sparsely populated field of Vazha Pshavela studies in languages other than Georgian, as well as Georgian literature generally. Readers wishing to acquaint themselves with this greatest of Georgian poets are now much more richly equipped for their journey than they were even a few years ago; they can read this book alongside my translation of Vazha’s prose, *The Death of Bagrat Zakharych and other Stories by Vazha-Pshavela* (London, 2019), for an even fuller perspective. Yet much work remains before Vazha can be considered fully integrated into the canon of world literature. His prose criticism in particular deserves fuller attention, and the study of his poetry would benefit from more comparative work.

Rebecca Ruth Gould

University of Birmingham

ROBERT DONCEEL and PAULINE DONCEEL-VOUTE:

Matériel archéologique de Khirbet Quoumrân et ‘Ain Feshkha sur la Mer Morte. Pierre, lampes, verre, matériaux divers.

xii, 501 pp. Leuven: Presses universitaires de Louvain, 2017. ISBN 978 2 87558 606 3.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X19000892

As the title suggests, this book is divided into four chapters covering categories of artifacts from Roland de Vaux’s excavations in the Qumran settlement (1951–56) and at Ein Feshkha (1956, 1958): stone; oil lamps; glass; and various materials including clay and plaster, bone, and fine local and imported pottery (local coarse wares, metal objects, and coins are not included). Each chapter is accompanied by line drawings and photographs of the artifacts, and plans showing their distribution at the site. One peculiarity is that each chapter is paginated separately, instead of having a running sequence of pages from beginning to end of the volume. Donceel (D) and Donceel-Voûte (D-V) invest much effort in reconstructing the original contexts of the artifacts, including generating distribution maps. Unfortunately, this is a futile task in most cases due to the nature of de Vaux’s excavations and records as well as cleaning and dumping activities (as in Period III), which redeposited artifacts in different parts of the site.

In 1986, Donceel was invited to assist in the publication of the material from de Vaux’s excavations by Jean-Baptiste Humbert, the current archaeologist at the École Biblique et Archéologique Française de Jerusalem. A few years later, the two authors advanced the sensational claim that Qumran was not a sectarian settlement but a *villa rustica*; see “The archaeology of Khirbet Qumran”, in Michael O. Wise et al. (eds), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site, Present Realities and Future Prospects* (Annals of the New York

Academy of Sciences, Volume 22, June 20, 1994), 1–38. Soon thereafter, Humbert revoked his invitation to assist with the publication, and D and D-V returned to Belgium, reportedly taking with them copies of the excavation notebooks and records. The current volume appears to be based on these materials.

In the meantime, Humbert has given many of these artifacts to other scholars for publication. For example, Jolanta Młynarczyk published a chapter on the oil lamps in Humbert and Alain Chambon, *Khirbet Qumrân et Aïn Feshkha, Fouilles du P. Roland de Vaux, IIIA, L'archéologie de Qumrân. Reconsidération de l'interprétation, Les installations périphériques de Khirbet Qumran* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016) (pp. 447–521), while the glass was published by H. Wouters et al. (“Antique glass from Qumran”, *Bulletin de l'Institut Royal du Patrimoine Artistique* 28 [1999/2000], 9–40). In addition, Dennis Mizzi published a synthetic study of the glass from Qumran and has been preparing the publication of the stone vessels (for the former, see “The glass from Khirbet Qumran: what does it tell us about the Qumran community?”, in C. Hempel (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Texts and Context* [Leiden: Brill, 2010], 99–198). Finally, some of the pottery and ceramic objects published here are included in the Humbert and Chambon volume cited above (e.g. Jerusalem painted bowls [“pseudo-Nabataean”]; ceramic rings).

This means that not only are there conflicting interpretations of Qumran but multiple publications of many of the same artifacts. Although this adds to the confusion surrounding Qumran, having more data is not necessarily a bad thing. The problem with this volume lies not in the documentation of the material as such, but rather the manipulation of the presentation to support their interpretation of Qumran as a *villa rustica*.

For example, D and D-V compare Judean chalkstone vessels of the late Second Temple period to Gallo-Roman/Alpine vessels of materials such as jasper, marble, alabaster, and porphyry, arguing that the former have no connection to the observance of Jewish purity laws, as indicated by the silence of “Jewish halakhic texts”. They dismiss the reference to stone jars in John 2: 1–6, ignore rabbinic literature (including numerous passages in the Mishnah); and appear to be unaware of Hanan Eshel’s article about the Qumran sect’s view on the purity of stone (“CD 12: 15–17 and the stone vessels found at Qumran”, in J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon, and A. Pinnick (eds), *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998* [Leiden: Brill, 2000], 45–52). Their bibliography lacks a number of important references including most of those cited in this review, and, in the case of stone vessels, Yonatan Adler’s PhD dissertation (“The archaeology of purity: archaeological evidence for the observance of ritual purity in Erez-Israel from the Hasmonean period until the end of the talmudic era (164 BCE–400 CE)”, The Martin (Szusz) Department of Land of Israel Studies and Archaeology; Ramat-Gan, 2011 [Hebrew with English summary]). D and D-V’s argument that small stone vessels are unattested in the Alpine region because wood was used overlooks the discovery of wooden bowls in caves along the Dead Sea including around Qumran. They attempt to situate Judean chalkstone vessels of the late Second Temple period (seemingly unaware of examples as late as the third–fourth centuries in Galilee and southern Judea) within a long-lived local tradition by lumping them together with early Islamic steatite vessels, to which they have no relationship (the latter reflect an Egyptian or Arabian tradition introduced to Palestine in the eighth century).

Similarly, D and D-V assign a dozen pieces of finely worked paving stone to an *opus sectile* floor in the *pars urbana* section of their supposed *villa rustica*.

However, as Ehud Netzer demonstrated, there is no evidence of *opus sectile* floors at Qumran or Ein Feskha: “One would expect either a large number of opus sectile tiles . . . and even more than this, evidence of the floor’s bedding (which is not an object for looting)”. Netzer concluded that the few paving stones and architectural fragments at both sites must have been brought from elsewhere (“Did any perfume industry exist at ‘Ein Feskha?’”, *Israel Exploration Journal* 55, 2005, 97–100; 98; also see Mizzi, “Qumran period I reconsidered: an evaluation of several competing theories”, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 22/1, 2015, 1–42; 30–40).

As space precludes further examples, I conclude that this volume should be used critically and with caution, and I recommend balancing D and D-V’s presentation by consulting Młynarczyk’s publication of the oil lamps and Mizzi’s study of the glass.

Jodi Magness

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

BEHNAZ A. MIRZAI:

A History of Slavery and Emancipation in Iran, 1800/1929.

xiii, 324 pp. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2017. ISBN 978 1 4773 1186 8.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X19000909

This book is an indisputably important contribution to the ongoing discourses on Qajar history and slavery in Iran. It is the first monograph on the topic and as such a study that is long overdue. It draws from a considerable number of archival sources, thus presenting new and valuable historical information. It therefore makes for interesting and thought-provoking reading.

The book takes up a challenging macro-history, covering a century-and-a-half, tracking domains from Africa, the Persian Gulf to Central Asia and the Caucasus, while reaching into micro-historical narratives of the lives of individual slaves.

A brief first chapter on “Commerce and slavery on Iran’s frontiers, 1600–1800” lays out how the non-Iranian actors, including Russians, Portuguese, British, Dutch, and “Omani Arabs”, pursuing commercial, geo-strategic advantages for the gain of wealth and power, were involved in trading slaves to Iran. The chapter emphasizes how they were particularly active in gaining “power and wealth” at the expense of Iran. In the mid-1700s Russian–British rivalry supposedly increased slave trading, exacerbated by the “Afghani incursions”, which, moreover, involved the enslavement of “indigenous Iranians” (p. 34). The latter form a defining category throughout this book, although who and what in the eighteenth and for that matter nineteenth century qualifies as “indigenous Iranian” requires further scrutiny.

Chapter 2, on “slavery and forging new Iranian frontiers, 1800–1900” continues to hold external actors accountable, chiefly the “imperialist nations” of Russia, Britain and, rather curiously, Oman. Raids by Turcomans and the Ottoman Empire, argues the author, increased the overall “insecurity”, and led to population displacement and trade in slaves (p. 35). The following pages cover the impact of the Russo-Persian wars, the conflicts over Herat, and military confrontations along the Ottoman–Persian borders and in Baluchistan. Culpability for the enslavement of prisoners of war and captured civilians – a leading theme of this chapter – lay in the above-mentioned external forces’ aggression against Iran. Pursuing this line of argument, Abbas Mirza’s decision to risk the second war with Russia in