among archaeologists of his (and our) time: he saw the remainst according to his own conceptions, went on to other projects, and died before publishing a final report.

That Govaars could not excavate the HU site and check its stratigraphy or features was frustrating, as no one seems to have taken responsibility for its publication after Avi-Yonah’s death in 1974, and most of the records and finds now cannot be located. But some of the confusion is due to the odd situation of Caesarea itself. From the mid-20th century, the city has been investigated by at least 10 archaeological teams, each claiming and naming areas with (overlapping or contradictory) letters of the alphabet, often cooperating but sometimes jostling against one another in their excavations and interpretations (some only briefly reported), and storing their finds in various places, off-site and on. Also, three separate government bodies—the Nature and Parks Authority, Antiquities Authority, and Ministry of Tourism—and a private one, the Caesarea Development Corporation, now have a major say in what gets excavated and how the remains are treated. Evolving a more coherent plan for succession and publication is desirable, but difficult under these circumstances.

It is odd that one of the few flaws in a book by an architect/surveyor is in the large-scale plan of the city. The only one provided (fig. 62) shows the lettered JECM areas and a few monuments from phases of the city’s development not relevant to the “Synagogue” site. But much more is now known about Caesarea in the Byzantine period than was once the case, and far better plans, compiled by Anna Iamim and available to all Caesarea’s excavators, could have been used. Also, though the text states that mosaics were first reported on the site in 1932, Appendix E (p. 197) lists a report of 22 March 1923 of “Mosaic with inscription found ‘along north beach’”—perhaps an error for 22.3.32, the date mentioned in an addendum attached to an original Department of Antiquities document of 15 January 1923 (p. 200).

This work joins a praiseworthy number of recent reports, final and otherwise, that have come out on Caesarea, including that of Haifa University (Patrich 2008), the Combined Caesarea Expeditions (Holum, Stabler, and Reinhardt 2008), and even a posthumous monograph by Avner Raban, who, unlike the case made against Avi-Yonah here, published as early as possible (Raban 2009). His legacy and Govaars’s meticulous study provide powerful arguments for those of us who have excavated at Caesarea to get our reports out sooner rather than later.

Barbara Burrell
Brock University
bburrell@brocku.ca
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By the time this review appears, Sy Gitin, the well-deserved recipient of this festschrift, will be close to entering his fourth decade at the W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research, making him by far its longest-serving director. The present volume is a fitting tribute to Sy’s many achievements and contributions to the field of ancient Near Eastern scholarship, and, as a recipient of Sy’s generosity during various stays at the Albright, it is my pleasure to review this publication here.

The volume is prefaced by introductory and appreciative essays by Crawford and Frerichs, followed by a bibliography of Sy’s publications (sure to continue growing) up to 2006–2007. The rest of the work is divided into six sections of different lengths, reflecting both Sy’s interests and the areas of expertise of the contributors: I: Tel Miqne-Ekron and Philistia (six articles); II: The Archaeology of the Southern Levant from the Late Bronze Age through the Roman Period (twenty articles); III: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Philological Studies (eight articles); IV: Historical Geography and Demography (three articles); V: The Mediterranean Horizon (four articles); VI: Varia (two articles)—a total of forty-five contributions.
In such a lengthy and eclectic collection of essays, it is impossible to comment on all the interesting contributions in equal depth. Therefore, only some general observations and specific notes are offered here.

A fine aspect of the volume is the overlap and dialog among some of the essays. This includes the article by Garfinkel and that by Maeir and Uziel, which both explore the reasons for the rise and decline of Philistine Ekron/Miqne and Gath/es-Sâfi; the article by Borowski on burials at Halif and those by Klener and Zelinger on tomb evolution, and the Jacobs and Seger contribution on Iron I Halif; the article by Dever on the general implications of archaeology for understanding the fall of northern Israel, and that by Tappy using Samaria as a specific case study on the same topic; Biebow and Meshel both examine the ‘Arabah. The articles by Hurowitz on the role of the arms bearer and by King on Goliath nicely complement each other.

As benefits any volume celebrating Sy’s many contributions to Levantine ceramics, many of the articles deal with aspects of pottery. These include the essays by Sy’s Miqne codirector Dothan and Ben-Shlomo on ceramic pomegranates, Stager and Mountjoy on a pictorial krater from Askelon, Waldbaum on a Wild Goat oinochoe sherd, Herr on Iron I ‘Umayri ceramics, Killebrew on the Canaanite storage jar, Lapp on Persian-period ceramics from Shechem, Zuckerman on Late Bronze Age scoops (revisiting Sy’s investigations), Aubet on East Greek and Etruscan pottery, and Merrell on a non-“opium” juglet from Cyprus.

Many of the essays delve into various aspects of cult/religion. Besides some of those already mentioned, these include Kletter on Iron Age masks, Magness on the reason for Second Temple ossuaries, E. Meyers on Jewish aniconism, Stern on a Gorgon’s head and its implications for Greek temples at Dor, Wolff on stone pedestal bowls, Halpern on the rejection of religious tradition, Levine on the ban on divine images, Smith on the number of calves at Bethel, and Karageorghis on Cypriot snake charmers.

Besides several previously mentioned essays, many articles cover aspects of society and daily life. Among these are Shamir on textile production at Miqne, Etam on stone tools from el-Foqa, Fritz on the four-room house, Vargyas on gold and silver hoards, Demsky on bath oil, Spencer on texts from Hesi, Zevit on population estimates in Judah in the late Iron Age and Persian period, and C. Meyers on gender representation. A few articles contain more general essays on specific sites and topics. These include Gittlen on a nautical theme seal from Miqne; Finkelstein on methodological problems at et-Tell and Raddana; Gal, Shalem, and Hartal on the site of Karmiel; Tubb on Sa‘idiyeh in the sixth century B.C.; Na‘aman on the sources for the information used to formulate the descriptions of the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah; Iacovou on state formation in Cyprus; and Gerstenblith on the problems of war and Iraqi cultural heritage.

More specifically, the piece by C. Meyers (“Peopling the Past”) examines how archaeology handbooks and the journal Biblical Archaeologist/Near Eastern Archaeology have dealt with the ancient world, primarily through reconstructions. It is not surprising, having the predilection of many archaeologists to focus on palaces, temples, and fortifications over common houses, that most reconstructions are of such monumental constructions. Meyers also notes that where people are depicted, most are males. One wonders how Classical and New World archaeology publications would compare in a similar evaluation? I agree that more reconstructions of the domestic sphere, and related cottage industries, are much to be desired. Coming up with the people for those images is more problematic.

Take, for example, the issue of depicting Iron Age Israelite women. What is the database on which we can draw for such reconstructions? First are biblical references to items such as clothing and cosmetics, but these only tell us what was worn and not much about the appearance of the articles worn. There are depictions of females on ivories, pillar figurines, etc., but are these common women, goddesses, or nobility? Do they depict conventions of the period in which they were made, or traditional depictions of years past? There are grave goods, primarily jewelry in stone, metal, and faience, but these could also be worn by men. Finally, there are Sennacherib’s reliefs of the sack of Lachish which show women leaving the city. Even here there are limitations. Is the garb depicted what women would wear in the fields, preparing food, etc.? Is the same clothing typical of Judaean women in other periods, or of women from the northern kingdom of Israel? In other words, peopling the past can be fraught with its own perils. Even so, it would be wonderful if someone, perhaps Professor Meyers herself, spearheaded an effort to create an up-to-date and balanced body of images (perhaps online) that reconstructs the ancient world. Such a collection would be an obvious benefit both to scholars and their lay audiences.

I also appreciated the useful article by King surveying what can be said about the nature of the Goliath character in 1 Samuel 17. King stands among those who view Goliath as a Mycenaean warrior, not some latter-day hoplite. I agree with the general assessment of an early date for the appearance of Goliath and his gear, but disagree that he was a type of Mycenaean foot soldier. There are a variety of hints in the text that Goliath is actually a chariot warrior who combines traits both Canaanite and Mycenaean, not all that surprising given the trajectory of development of Philistine material culture in general. This is the subject of an article in preparation.

A bit problematic was Zevit’s article on the population of Judah/Yehud. He assumes there (based on adding all the figures in 2 Kgs 24:14–16 together), for the sake of discussion, that approximately 20,000 adult males were deported from Jerusalem after its first surrender in 598. To accommodate women, children, and the aged, he multiplies this figure by four to achieve 80,000 deportees. For no discernible reason he assumes that the number deported in 586 amounted to 40,000, with an additional 5,000 some
years later, leaving 73,600 people in Judah (out of a pre-
war population of 198,600). The problem is that the fig-
ures given in 2 Kings 24 do not specify that all the exiles
were men; in fact, royal women are specifically mentioned
as among those exiled. The figures given in Jeremiah 52
studiously avoid referring to men. These accounts are not
like those in Numbers, where the texts specify that the
numbers given were for fighting-age males. Another issue
is that the 2 Kings passages note that people carried into
exile were people specifically found in Jerusalem. No men-
tion is made of the population of Judah per se, except the
generic “all the rest of the population.” All the population
of Judah, or of the environs of Jerusalem? Nor do any
texts inform us of the number of people killed in battles or
sieges during the various Babylonian invasions; they also
say nothing about the numbers of those who died from
disease, famine, and so forth. There is no way to put even
an approximate head count on the number of people left in
Judah based on the biblical texts. Zevit’s initial assump-
tion, then, has profound repercussions for the rest of his
suggested text-based estimates for the population of Judah
at various points from the end of the Iron Age into the
Persian period. On the other hand, I am sympathetic to the
problem of the underestimation of settlement and regional
population sizes based on low area-population coefficients
(20–25 per dunam). My own work on Tell en-Nasbeh (1994)
showed that such low area estimates led to absurdly low
household sizes given the number of dwellings, and that
an estimate of 40–50 per dunam was more likely at this
site. Zevit’s cautions, based on settlement “packing,” are
worth bearing in mind.

Overall, this is a fine collection of essays which justly
honors its recipient’s many interests and contributions.

Jeffrey R. Zorn
Cornell University
jrz3@cornell.edu
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