In this archaeological report, Fantalkin and Tal have collected many surviving records, finds, and other relevant archeological data, publishing the results of two excavations at a small coastal site located at the mouth of the Yarkon River (now part of greater Tel-Aviv). Initially, P. L. O. Guy directed excavations on behalf of the Mandatory Department of Antiquities in 1936 and E. L. Sukenik, S. Yeivin, and N. Avigad of Hebrew University conducted more extensive salvage work from 1937–1938. Only brief reports with very limited information have previously appeared regarding this eighty-year-old project. Needless to say, all the principle investigators have long since passed away and Avigad’s short summary statement (“Kudadi, Tell,” NEAEHL 3:882), which appeared posthumously, remained the most authoritative treatment of the site until this volume appeared. Therefore, all interested scholars owe Fantalkin and Tal a debt of gratitude for what must have been an extraordinarily difficult task of gathering and reconstructing the stratigraphy, loci, records, and finds from this very old dig—not to mention having to sift through and interpret the suspect methodology utilized over two generations ago, with no participants left to consult.

The format of the book is unusually small for an excavation report, but fully serviceable and its compact (6.5 x 9.5 in) size is an unexpectedly welcome change from the often unwieldy, folio-sized volumes. To outline the contents of the book, five appendices provide specialist reports. Ran Zadok studies the origin of the name Qudadi, which is an incorrect rendering of the Arabic, and concludes that no pre-Islamic Semitic toponym was preserved. Ram Gophna and Yitzhak Paz present a small corpus of Chalcolithic, Early, and Middle Bronze pottery that was recovered from Qudadi, which demonstrates occupation of the site during these periods. Probable maritime activity at Qudadi during the Bronze Age is also discussed. Shahar Krispin examines flint tools. Benjamin Sass and Renate Rosenthal-Heginbottom give short reports on a late Iron Age-Persian earring and another from the Roman Period, respectively. The main body of the report is rather straightforward. Chapter one describes the site formation and history, including its role during World War I and the history of excavations. Chapter two covers stratigraphy and architecture. Chapter three describes the pottery and its analysis and Chapter four offers a summary and the conclusions of the authors. A bibliography and index complete the volume.

Fantalkin and Tal published several preliminary and related studies that preceded the final report. The two most pertinent are provisional reports in English (“Re-Discovering the Iron Age Fortress at Tell Qudadi in the Context

Two clear destruction layers are noted. Not surprisingly, considering its location just north of Joppa, the ceramics at Tell Qudadi feature northern, southern, and coastal characteristics and forms. Based on the pottery, which includes Aegean imports, the excavators date the fort to Iron Age IIB, yet follow their Tel Aviv University teacher, Israel Finkelstein, and his other disciples by shifting Iron Age IIB from the period spanning the entire eighth century BCE proper to the late eighth and into the early seventh century BCE (187–195). This theory stands in opposition to the consensus view held by most historians and archaeologists familiar with this turbulent period. The recent Ramat Rahel publications also adopt this new “low chronology” trend, which seems particularly problematic at this major Judahite site located near Jerusalem and likely based more on personal assumptions than on a reasonably viable, historical basis.

The authors attribute the fortress to Assyria, which is possible, but far from certain. Architectural similarities do exist with an Assyrian border military and commercial base at Tell Abu Salima (R. Reich, “The Identification of the ‘Sealed kāru of Egypt.’” *IEJ* 34 [1984]: 35, fig. 2), but not enough of the Tell Qudadi fortress remains to make conclusive comparisons. More significant is the complete absence of Assyrian pottery and finds, which greatly weaken Fantalkin and Tal’s interpretation. Moreover, the identity of Tell Qudadi’s destructive agent(s) remains conjectural. If Assyria erected the fort, the two destruction layers are intriguing and puzzling, but if a local polity, such as Israel, constructed the fort, several scenarios are possible. However, one should not speculate further. Nevertheless, Fantalkin and Tal seem to follow their Tel Aviv colleagues in ascribing various Iron Age II sites to imperial powers such as Assyria, Babylonia, and Egypt rather than local polities. For example, Fantalkin argues that Mezad Hashavyahu, a small fort near Yavneh Yam, was not Judahite despite the presence of Judahite pottery and its famous Hebrew ostraca.

Other scholars, including staff members from the Ashkelon excavations, have strongly contested Fantalkin’s view. Yet others, exemplified by a recent paper by Peter James, have embraced this highly questionable interpretation ("Mezad Hashavyahu Reconsidered: Saite Strategy and Archaic Greek Chronology,” in *Walls of the Prince: Egyptian Interactions with Southwest Asia in Antiquity. Essays in Honour of John S. Holladay, Jr.*, eds. T. P. Harrison, E. B. Banning, and S. Klassen. CHANE 77 [Leiden: Brill, 2015], 333–370).

Responding to a 2005 lecture given by the authors, where they announced their re-dating and reinterpretation of Tell Qudadi as a Neo-Assyrian fortress, R. Kletter and W. Zwickel ("The Assyrian Building of Ayyelet ha-Sahar,” *ZDPV* 122 [2006]: 178) seriously question whether the surviving partial plan of the fortress and the use of bricks in its construction are indicative enough to make such a claim. I concur with Kletter and Zwickel and add another observation.
While this eighth century BCE fortress located at the mouth of the Yarkon River certainly had strategic importance for local and regional kingdoms, such as Israel under Jeroboam II (2 Kgs 14:25), Judah during the reign of Uzziah (2 Chr 26:6) or a Philistine polity (198), its geo-political value and necessity for Assyria during Tiglath-pileser III’s reign seems negligible. The main north-south route, incorrectly labeled the “Via Maris,” passed through Aphek to the east, limiting Tell Qudadi’s purpose to guarding the coast north of Joppa and monitoring shipping along the Yarkon River. In the years immediately following 732 BCE, Egypt remained Assyria’s only credible foe in the region, and the impressive archaeological evidence that documents later Assyrian activity at sites, such as Ashdod and throughout the western Negeb, reinforce this supposition. While Tell Qudadi possibly served such a purpose as Assyria strengthened its hegemonic hold over the southern Levant during the seventh century BCE, other historical interpretations are at least equally plausible and, solely on the basis of current evidence, must not be dismissed.
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Chapter one surveys the unique role of Luke’s narratives, stating that Luke’s history is “the context of all of life” (1). Luke’s unique narratives acknowledge the use of sources and chronologically situate his account (Luke 1:5). Luke gives attention to the social, political, and religious contexts of events and provides a wider scope of history. González illustrates this with the birth narratives, tracing the lineage of Jesus to Adam (Luke 3:38). Luke also incorporates the element of suspense, leaving the reader to guess the fate of the older brother in the story of the prodigal son (Luke 15), as he does in the story of Paul (Acts 28).

In chapter two, González reasons that Luke presents the birth of Jesus as a fulfillment of the birth typology of Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Samson, and Samuel, who were all delivered by women in unconventional circumstances. These birth typologies culminated in the birth of Jesus by a woman in one of the most unconventional circumstances of all. Other typologies in Luke include the “link between Jesus and the Passover and the liberation from Egypt” (19), the connection of Jesus the “son of God” to Adam the “son of God” (Luke 3:22, 38), and “the genesis of the first creation and the head of humanity” paralleled with the “beginning of a new creation and the head of