

and 7.32 m wide) with reinforced corners that stands on a three-stepped base. It is built of light-colored stone with false windows in dark stone. Most of the tower is solid, but in the upper half a small room with a door facing the cliff can be reached through a stone staircase. An identical monument was built at Pasargadae (Zendan-i Sulaiman). The purpose of these towers is not known, but it has been proposed that it was either a royal tomb, a depository for objects of dynastic or religious importance, or a fire sanctuary. The third can be ruled out because there is no ventilation or outlet for smoke or gases. In the Sasanian period inscriptions of Shapur I and Kerdir the high priest were cut into the tower (see below).

Sasanian Period. Apart from the Aramaic inscription on the tomb of Darius I, presumably cut in the Seleucid period, nothing is known that can be dated to the time between the Achaemenid and the beginning of the Sasanian periods.

Eight rock reliefs were carved on the cliff by Sasanian kings (numbered from west to east NRm 1-8). Although most of the reliefs are difficult to date, they are discussed here in their assumed chronological order.

The oldest relief (NRm 1) was carved at the west end, near the Elamite relief (see above). It shows the investiture of Ardashir I (224-241 CE) by the god Ahuramazda. Both the king and the god are mounted. On the ground under or beside their horses lie their slain enemies, respectively the last Parthian king, Artabanus V, in his royal dress, and Ahriman, the evil genius in the shape of a naked man whose legs end in snakes and whose head is encircled by snakes. The nearby Elamite relief, with its snake throne and perhaps with snake attributes of the gods, was still clearly visible at the time of Ardashir's carving and could have inspired the fashioning of Ahriman.

Ardashir's son and successor, Shapur I (241-272 CE), was the next to carve a relief (NRm 6). He placed his "Victory over the Romans" relief near Darius's tomb (see figure 2). It shows Shapur I on horseback grasping the wrist of a standing Roman (Valerian ?) with his extended right arm. Another Roman emperor (Philip the Arab ?) is kneeling before the Sasanian King. Later, during the reign of Bahram II, the High Priest Kerdir added his picture and a lengthy inscription.

The third relief (NRm 2) shows Bahram II (276-293 CE) with members of his family and court. In carving over an Old Elamite relief (see above) Bahram II made apparent his program to persecute all religions other than Mazdaism. Kerdir, the high priest of Bahram II, writes in his inscriptions, of which two copies are carved on Naqsh-i Rostam monuments (NRm 6 and Kabah-i Zardusht) section 11. "and idols were destroyed and the abode of the demons disrupted. . . ." Was it only the negligence of the sculptor that the portion with the snake thrones remained visible, or was it the intention of a dissident sculptor?

Narseh's (253-302 CE) investiture relief (NRm 8) was

never finished. In the main part that is shown, the king receives the ring from the hands of a goddess (Anahita?).

In the fourth century and perhaps also at the beginning of the fifth century reliefs with jousting scenes were carved below the Achaemenid tombs: Hormizd II (302-309) vanquishing his adversary (NRm 5), placed below tomb III; two jousts in two registers below the tomb of Darius I (NRm; see Figure 2), attributed to Bahram IV (388-399) by Hubertus von Gall (1990); the latest joust (NRm 3), dated by von Gall (*ibid.*) to the fifth century placed below tomb IV; and a relief of a seated king (NRm 4) that is too eroded to be dated. The area of the carvings, excluding the reliefs of Ardashir and Bahram II (NRm 1 and 2), was enclosed by a wall sometime in the Sasanian period. Outside this wall are Sasanian installations that, according to Dietrich Huff (*forthcoming*), are related to burials: the column on the Husain Kuh, and the so-called fire altars are interpreted as *astodans* (burial urns for the bones of the dead).

[See also Elamites; Parthians; Persians; and Sasanians.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Calmeyer, Peter. "The Subject of the Achaemenid Tomb Reliefs." In *Proceedings of the Third Annual Symposium on Archaeological Research in Iran*, pp. 233-242. Tehran, 1975.
- Gall, Hubertus von. *Das Reiterkampfbild in der iranischen und iranisch beeinflussten Kunst parthischer und sassanidischer Zeit*. Teheraner Forschungen, 6 Berlin, 1990. Covers Sasanian reliefs numbers 3, 5, and 7 (pp. 30-36).
- Herrmann, Georgina. *Naqsh-i Rostam 5 and 8: Sasanian Reliefs Attributed to Hormuzd II and Narseh*. Iranische Denkmäler, II 8. Berlin, 1977.
- Herrmann, Georgina. *The Sasanian Rock Reliefs at Naqsh-i Rostam: Naqsh-i Rostam 6, The Triumph of Shapur I*. Iranische Denkmäler, II 13. Berlin, 1989.
- MacKenzie, D. N. "Kerdir's Inscription." In *Iranische Denkmäler*, II 13, pp. 35-72. Berlin, 1989.
- Huff, Dietrich. "Fire Altars and Astodans." In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Parthian and Sasanian Themes in Iranian Art*. London, forthcoming.
- Schmidt, Erich F. *Persepolis*, vol. 3, *The Royal Tombs and Other Monuments*. University of Chicago, Oriental Institute Publications, 70. Chicago, 1970. The basic publication for Naqsh-i Rostam.
- Seidl, Ursula. *Die elamischen Felsreliefs von Kurangun und Naqsh-i Rostam*. Iranische Denkmäler, II 12. Berlin, 1986. See pages 14-23, pls. 11-15.
- Shahbazi, Shapur. "An Achaemenid Symbol I. A Farewell to 'Frahahr' and 'Ahuramazda.'" *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* N.F. 7 (1974): 135-144.
- Vanden Berghe, Louis. *Reliefs rupestres de l'Iran ancien*. Brussels, 1983.

URSULA SEIDL

NASBEH, TELL EN-, site located 12 km (8 mi.) north of Jerusalem (31°53' N, 35°12' E, map reference 1706 × 1436). The mound is approximately 260 m long by 130 m wide and about 7.7 acres in size. It is usually identified with biblical Mizpah of Benjamin (*Jos.* 18:21-27). The American scholar Edward Robinson traveled past the site but did not

connect it with Mizpah, which he located at Nebi Samwil, an identification some still maintain. It was A. Raboisson, in 1897, who first proposed equating Mizpah with Tell en-Naşbeh. Before the excavation of Tell en-Naşbeh, those who supported this identification were Gustaf Dalman, Albrecht Alt, Eberhard Baumann, Paul Lohmann, W. Y. Pythian-Adams, and L.-H. Vincent. William Foxwell Albright opposed this view, however, holding to Nebi Samwil instead, and proposing to place Be'erot at Tell en-Naşbeh; later he contended that Tell en-Naşbeh was 'Ataroth (Adar) because the Arab village of 'Aṭṭara was located just south of the tell. Alt twice changed his views; he first proposed to locate Gibeon at Tell en-Naşbeh, with el-Bireh for Mizpah; subsequently, he suggested that Tell en-Naşbeh was at first called 'Ataroth and after its fortification by Asa was renamed Mizpah. From the time of the excavations to the present, the major supporters of the Tell en-Naşbeh–Mizpah equation have been F.-M. Abel, William F. Badè, and James Muilenburg.

Tell en-Naşbeh was excavated in five campaigns between 1926 and 1935 by William F. Badè of the Pacific School of Religion. He uncovered approximately two-thirds of the site, even though the central part was severely eroded, and few occupational deposits, except for rock-cut installations, were recorded. The site's significance today is in the information it provides on town planning in the Iron Age, especially during the little-known Babylonian period. [*See the biography of Badè.*]

The remains uncovered at Tell en-Naşbeh correlate with what is known of Mizpah. The Mizpah traditions that have the earliest setting revolve around the prophet Samuel, battles with the Philistines, and the election of Saul as king—although not all scholars accept these as early traditions. Mizpah next appears in the reign of Asa of Judah, who fortified the site during his conflict with Baasha of Israel. Its next, and most important, role is as the capital of the Neo-Babylonian province of Judah during the period of the Exile. Inhabitants of Mizpah helped in the restoration of Jerusalem after the Exile. Finally, Judah Maccabee assembled his troops at Mizpah to face the Seleucids.

The earliest remains are from the Late Chalcolithic and Early Bronze I periods: three tombs and two caves on the tell contained ceramics and other material. Early pottery is also found in cavities in the bedrock and scattered in later debris, mainly in the northwest corner of the tell. Other caves used as dwellings and/or tombs were found in the low ridge northwest of the tell.

Tell en-Naşbeh was uninhabited from the end of EB I to the beginning of the Iron Age. Philistine bichrome pottery and local forms such as collar-rim jars attest to the site's occupation in this latter period. Architectural remains are harder to identify, but many of the rock-cut cisterns and silos were dug then, and many of the houses that were used in Iron II may have been built then as well.

Large parts of the Iron II town were uncovered. Because

Tell en-Naşbeh was not destroyed during that period, many buildings continued in use, with modifications, for more than four hundred years. The Iron II town was protected by a casemate-like wall. Later, a wall (4–6 m wide) reinforced by towers and a glacis were built and in places a fosse was erected around the casemate wall, but downslope from the original town. Entrance to the town was through an inner and outer gate complex. (These fortifications are probably the work of Asa.) There were storage bins in the intramural space on the south, and channels to drain off water crossed the northern and western sections. The dwellings usually contain two or three parallel long rooms, with a broad room across the back. The back rooms of the outermost belt of buildings are arranged to form the casemate-like wall and follow the natural oval shape of the mound. These buildings opened onto a ring-road that, with interruptions, circles the site. Facing them across a narrow street is another group. Occasional streets branch off toward the center of the town. Six olive oil presses also belong to this phase. Fragments of contemporary dwellings and agricultural installations were uncovered outside the town wall, in the suburbs of the walled settlement. The Iron Age cemetery was located on the ridge north and west of the tell.

In the Babylonian period, the inner gate and many of the earlier houses went out of use. They were replaced by more spacious houses of the same four-room type, as well as by other, even larger structures whose plans are fragmentary. One may be a palatial building with a large paved central court. The orientation of all of these buildings is completely different from that of the buildings of the previous stratum. It reflects a change in the settlement's purpose from that of a border fortress to a minor provincial capital.

Fragments of walls built over the town wall, isolated walls and rooms scattered across the tell, and two kilns built in front of the outer gate, along with finds of Attic pottery and seal impressions from the Persian period, indicate continued settlement in the Second Temple period. Coins, fragments of Roman pottery, and a possible watchtower attest to at least a minimal late occupation on the tell. The cemetery remained in use until the Byzantine period, and settlement continued in the vicinity, as affected by remains of a church near the western cemetery.

Tell en-Naşbeh was rich in epigraphic finds. These include private seal impressions and seals; noteworthy is the seal of Jaazaniah, whose title is "the servant of the king." This seal bears one of the earliest representations of a rooster found in Israel. A full range of government seals was uncovered, including *lmlk*, rosette, *msh*, and *yhd*. Seven inscribed ostraca were found, as well as an unusual bronze circlet bearing a dedicatory cuneiform inscription.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albright, William Foxwell. "Review of McCown and Wampler, *Tell en-Naşbeh I and II.*" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 7 (1948): 202–205. Best critical review of the final excavation report.

- Avigad, Nahman. "New Light on the MSH Impressions." *Israel Exploration Journal* 8 (1958): 113-119. Full treatment of this class of seals, most of which come from Tell en-Nasbeh, including a discussion of their date and function.
- Broshi, Magen. "Nasbeh, Tel En-." In *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, vol. 3, pp. 912-918. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1975-. Useful summary of the standard interpretations of the Tell en-Nasbeh material, in the main, accepting the conclusions of the final report.
- McClellan, Thomas L. "Town Planning at Tell en-Nasbeh." *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 100 (1984): 53-69. Best general treatment of the Tell en-Nasbeh material to appear after the final report and a must for those interested in ancient town planning.
- McCown, Chester C. *Tell en-Nasbeh*, vol. 1, *Archaeological and Historical Results*. Berkeley, 1947. Volume 1 of the final report. Includes a concise history of the excavation, a review of Muilenburg's discussion of the site's identification, and a report on the architecture and nonceramic small finds. Not well organized, and a number of conclusions are no longer valid.
- Muilenburg, James. "Mizpah of Benjamin." *Studia Theologica* 8 (1954): 25-42. Supplement to the author's chapters in the first volume of the final report; reviews Alt's latest identification of Tell en-Nasbeh.
- Wampler, Joseph C. "Three Cistern Groups from Tell en-Nasbeh." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 82 (1941): 25-43. Detailed treatment of the finds, especially the pottery, from three cisterns. This material is only summarized, not analyzed, in the final report.
- Wampler, Joseph C. *Tell en-Nasbeh*, vol. 2, *The Pottery*. Berkeley, 1947. Volume 2 of the final report. Includes a general discussion of the types, a list of comparanda as of about 1940, and a catalog of 1,800 types.
- Zorn, Jeffrey R. "Tell en Nasbeh: A Re-evaluation of the Architecture and Stratigraphy of the Early Bronze Age, Iron Age and Later Periods." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1993. A complete detailed restudy of the architectural remains of Tell en-Nasbeh based on research from the original records.

JEFFREY R. ZORN

NATIONALISM AND ARCHAEOLOGY. Consciously or subconsciously, archaeological interpretation and the public presentation of archaeological monuments are used to support the prestige or power of modern nation-states. Although nationalism is only one of several modern ideologies that have sometimes subtly influenced archaeological interpretation, it is often the most visible, well supported, and socially pervasive. This is the result of the dominating role played by national governmental bodies, such as departments of antiquities, universities, and ministries of tourism and education, in the funding, legal oversight, and logistical support of archaeology. Indeed, national institutions often determine which of a nation's archaeological monuments will be preserved and presented to the public (through special legal decree or inclusion in national park systems) and often approve the contents of widely distributed interpretive information about them (in the form of school textbooks, on-site signage, and promotional tourist brochures). Although scholarly literature is, in most countries, less subject to direct government control, the political context of archaeological work is often unmistakable to academics and to members of the general public. In the Near

East—as elsewhere in the world—archaeological finds, interpretations, and hypotheses are often woven into overarching narratives of progress and transformation, used to explain how the particular modern nation's peoples, lifestyles, technologies, religions, and even forms of government have roots in a distant past.

Despite bureaucratic apparatus and governmental resources, however, control of archaeology by nation-states has never been either uniform or uncontested. In the Near East, archaeological exploration was long the exclusive province of foreign archaeological expeditions, whose members' direct involvement with particular nationalist ideologies in the region varied from outspoken commitment and political activism to neutrality to open hostility. Because the expansion of archaeological activity in the Near East has long been connected with general religious attachments, resource exploration, and economic development, rather than with specific nationalism, some of the major themes of archaeological interpretation have always highlighted such universal themes as religious evolution, ecological adaptation, and technological innovation, rather than particularist histories. Also working against the power of archaeological nationalism are internal political factors. In recent years, dissident minority and political opposition groups within Near Eastern nations have inspired alternative archaeological interpretations that directly expose or challenge the validity of "official" nationalistic archaeology. Thus, the importance of an examination of the interplay of nationalism and archaeology is not simply one of direct correspondence between a particular political ideology and archaeological interpretation, but rather the illumination of archaeology's relevance to ongoing and often acrimonious philosophical and political discussions about the legitimacy of the modern state and its relationship to the wider world.

In terms of a general definition, nationalism may be described as the philosophical belief in the historical and political legitimacy of territorially circumscribed, often culturally or ethnically homogeneous polities. The conception of the nation-state as the most coherent form of large-scale political organization emerged in Europe in the eighteenth century, when earlier empires based on religious authority or dynastic connections (such as those of the Hapsburgs, the Bourbons, and the Ottomans) had begun to disintegrate. Economic change was also an important factor in the emergence of the modern nation-state in Europe: in place of hereditary aristocracies whose power was largely based on the agricultural surplus of feudal landholdings, there arose urban elites whose power was based on commerce and large-scale production. The new elites became the spokesmen for, and leaders of, territorially and ethnically defined polities of a fairly uniform type. Yet, nationalism cannot be described merely as support of an abstract political formation. Nationalism's potency lies in the concrete manifestations of the patriotism—or chauvinism—of particular nation-states. When taken to extremes in the elevation of the glory of the