the food supply had run out and that the situation had become so dire that people were willing to eat a donkey's head, dove's droppings, and even babies (vv. 28-29). There are no indications in this passage suggesting that donkey's head was considered an appropriate food item at that time and was only later added to the list of forbidden foods.

On the whole, What Did the Ancient Israelites Eat? is an excellent contribution to the study of the ancient Israelite diet. It provides well-substantiated conclusions, numerous references, and great bibliography for further study. It is a solid work, well edited, and enjoyable to read. It is highly recommended for both scholars and the general public who are interested in an unbiased account on the diet of ancient Israel.

Andrews University

Jan Age Sigvartsen


This impressive festschrift honors the career and scholarly contributions of Harvard University's Dorot Professor of the Archaeology of Israel and Harvard Semite Museum Director, Lawrence Stager. As the preface by J. D. Schloen elucidates, Stager has been a formidable influence upon the history and archaeology of the Eastern Mediterranean and the Levant for more than thirty years, both through his own research and indirectly through his students. Stager's varied contributions have been felt in the areas of ancient agriculture (“Farming in the Judean Desert during the Iron Age,” BASOR 221 [1976]: 145-158), the family and household unit in ancient Israel (“The Archaeology of the Family in Ancient Israel,” BASOR 260 [1985]: 1-35), the importance of sea trade to empire building, in which he coined the term “Port Power” (“Port Power in the Early and the Middle Bronze Age: The Organization of Maritime Trade and Hinterland Production,” in Studies in the Archaeology of Israel and Neighboring Lands in Memory of Douglas L. Esse, ed. S. R. Wolff, SAOC 59 [Chicago: Oriental Institute, 2001], 625-638), and the Sea Peoples and the rise of Israel (“Forging an Identity: The Emergence of Ancient Israel,” in The Oxford History of the Biblical World, ed. M. D. Coogan [New York: Oxford University Press, 1998], 123-175). His research has also touched upon the nature of David and Solomon's kingdom (“The Patrimonial Kingdom of Solomon,” in Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palæstina, ed. W. G. Dever and S. Gitin [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003], 63-74) and includes a masterful essay comparing Jerusalem and the Garden of Eden (“Jerusalem and the Garden of Eden,” Eretz-Israel 26 [1999]: 183*-194*). Stager's field work has taken him to places such as Idalion, Cyprus, the burial precinct at Carthage, and from the Buqe‘ah Valley’s fortified settlements above Qumran to Ashkelon, where he has directed the excavations since 1985. Eisenbrauns is to be commended for their superb work in producing this volume in an attractive folio-sized format. As to be expected with a festschrift, a biographical portrait and a full list of Stager's publications is included, as well
as an appreciative assessment of Stager's scholarship by Schloen in chapter 1. The book boasts a stunning array of fifty contributors, many of whom are leading figures among the various disciplines of Near Eastern studies. As one would assume, many of their essays reflect or expound upon the honoree's own research interests outlined above.

Tristan Barako’s preliminary analysis of Lapp’s excavations at Tell er-Rumeith, which he is in the process of preparing for publication, generally supports Stager’s (2003) reconstruction of the Solomonic kingdom. While provisional in nature, Barako’s article astutely utilizes historical geography and provides a brief stratigraphic overview to demonstrate continuity between the tribal allotment of Manasseh and the sixth Solomonic district.

Elizabeth Bloch-Smith’s piece, with the rather journalistically styled title of “Assyrians Abet Israelite Cultic Reforms: Sennacherib and the Centralization of the Israelite Cult” is a useful archaeological review of eighth-century B.C.E. Assyrian campaigns against Israel and Judah. Unfortunately, Bloch-Smith (36) has partially succumbed to Na’aman’s (“An Assyrian Residence at Ramat Rahel?” Tel Aviv 28 [2001]: 260-280) eloquently argued but, in this reviewer’s opinion, completely erroneous theory that Ramat Rahel served as an Assyrian administrative center. Aside from the total lack of support from Assyrian or biblical sources, there is simply not one shred of archaeological evidence to support this view, which has become popular among Tel Aviv University scholars. Moreover, her attribution of Tel Kudadi’s destruction to Tiglath Pileser III in 732 B.C., which follows that of Avigad (“Kudadi, Tell,” in The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land, ed. E. Stern [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993], 3:882), has now been challenged. A reassessment of the pottery may indicate that Tel Kudadi was initially constructed as a seaside fortress by the Assyrians themselves during the late eighth to early seventh century B.C. (Tal and Fantalkin, “Re-Discovering the Iron Age Fortress at Tell Qudadi in the Context of Neo-Assyrian Imperialistic Policies,” Palestine Exploration Quarterly 141 [2009]: 188-206; idem, “An Iron Age IIB Fortress at Tell Qudadi: A Preliminary Study, Eretz-Israel 29 [2009]: 192-205, 289*).

Other needed bibliographic updates include Barako’s (Tel Mor: The Moshe Dothan Excavations, 1959-1960, IAA Reports 32 [Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2007]) final report on Tel Mor, which reinterprets some of Dothan’s eighth-century B.C.E. conclusions, and Bunimovitz and Lederman’s (“The Iron Age Fortifications of Tel Beth Shemesh: A 1990–2000 Perspective, Israel Exploration Journal 51 [2001]: 121-147; idem, “The Final Destruction of Beth Shemesh and the Pax Assyriana in the Judean Shephelah,” Tel Aviv 30 [2003]: 3-26; idem, “The Archaeology of Border Communities: Renewed Excavations at Tel Beth-Shemesh, Part 1: The Iron Age,” Near Eastern Archaeology 72 [2009]: 114-422) studies (in English) on Beth Shemesh that review the Hebrew publications listed by Bloch-Smith. On the other hand, Bloch-Smith’s assessment of the data demonstrates that sweeping conclusions (here regarding Judahite sites attributed as destroyed by Sennacherib) are
The contribution by William Dever is the latest in a long list of studies dedicated to the Merenptah Stele. In his aggressive but engaging style, Dever makes an irrefutable case for the existence of an ethnic people named Israel in late thirteenth-century B.C.E. Canaan. At the same time, he brilliantly exposes the various minimalist (which Dever identifies as postmodernist) interpretations of this important Egyptian text for what they are: pseudo-scholarship based upon politically motivated ideologies—an evaluation with which this reviewer heartily agrees. Much of the credit for marginalizing this small, but vocal group of extremists to the fringe of scholarship goes to Dever.

Two articles provide important data from older excavations. Dan Master succeeds in publishing the important pottery plates from Stager’s (“Ancient Agriculture in the Judaean Desert: A Case Study of the Buqe’ah Valley in the Iron Age” [Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1975]) long awaited, but yet unpublished dissertation on the Buqe’ah Iron Age II agricultural sites, of which until now only a summary article has appeared (Stager 1976). Amihai Mazar’s study on the Iron Age I structures at Tell Qasile makes use of sixty-year-old material from his late uncle Benjamin Mazar’s excavations.

Aaron Brody, Larry Herr, and David Vanderhooft utilize Stager’s (1985) programmatic essay on the Israelite family for their own treatments of this subject; Brody on the use of domestic space at Tell en-Nasbeh, Herr regarding the House of the Father at ‘Umayri, and Vanderhooft for his study of kinship terminology in the priestly writings. Susan Cohen elaborates upon Stager’s (2001) “Port Power” theory for her contribution regarding theories of Canaanite development in the Middle Bronze Age, while Michael Sugerman studies this aspect in the Late Bronze Age. Avraham Faust draws upon Stager’s (1976) research on ancient Israelite agriculture for his fine contribution regarding the background of Lev 25:29-31, while Aaron Burke focuses on New Kingdom Egyptian siege tactics, a topic related to his recently published dissertation. Israel Finkelstein writes on destructions, utilizing Megiddo as a case study, while his colleague Baruch Halpern reviews the history of the same city in Iron Age I. Tim Harrison provides a report on his exciting excavations at Ta’yinat, while Tom Levy provides ethnic identifiers from burials that he excavated in the lowlands of Edom. John Holladay contributes a study analyzing wealth, tribute and trade in the Iron Age Levant. Ron Hendel elaborates on symbolic elements first accentuated in Stager’s (1999) study on Jerusalem and the Garden of Eden and Theodore Hiebert argues why he believes the ancestors of Israel were not nomadic.

The remaining studies concern various topics including Dophin jugs, chariot linchpins, incense altars, Tyrian lead weights, siege trenches, Goliath’s armor, Camels at Ur III Babylonia, the Early Bronze Age site of Giv’at Ha’esey, Middle Bronze Age Jericho, an Iron Age I enclosure in the Jordan Valley, Iron Age I textile production, the Judean Lowlands in Iron Age IIA, and the Temple Mount during the Monarchy. Three articles on Cyprus,
on viticulture and olive production, another on a Middle Bronze Age pottery from Askoi, and the third on the trophy inscription from Kition, as well as three specialized studies regarding Stager’s own excavations at Ashkelon complete this fine volume.

Berrien Springs, Michigan


“They just don’t fit very neatly; they never did.” This quotation, describing the peculiar nature of the Jewish believers in Jesus, is put as epigraph of the preface and situates the perspective of the book: a collection that brings together a series of studies focusing on the Jewish believers in the first five centuries C.E. Initiated by Torkild Mavie, director of the Caspari Center of Biblical Studies in Jerusalem, this project began with seminars in Tantur, Israel (2000) and in Cambridge, England (2001). The book evolves in six parts.

In Part 1, the Introduction, the contributors (Oskar Skarsaune and James Carleton Paget) struggle with the problems of definition; the genesis of the classic and old term “Jewish Christian” is traced in Antiquity and discussed in regard to the history of research. Definitions are indeed difficult to determine, as they depend on whether the ethnic or the religious aspect is taken as a criterion for the construction of that definition. Is the Jewish Christian a Jew who accepted Jesus as his Messiah and still kept the traditional Jewish lifestyle, as Torah observer, or is he a Jew, simply because of his birth, with or without the Torah? This definition is further complicated by the multifaceted nature of Judaism and the historical fact that the early Jewish Christian never defined himself as such.

In Part 2, the contributors (Richard Bauckham, Donald Hagner, Reidar Hvalvik, and Peter Hirschberg) examine the place and the meaning of the Jewish believer in Jesus in the NT. The Jerusalem church under the leadership of James represents the earliest manifestation of Jewish Christianity, taking a variety of names such as “the holy ones” (Acts 9:13), “the church of God” (1 Cor 15:9), and, especially, “the Nazarenes” (Acts 24:5). The community’s life and practice that revolves around the temple and in smaller groups at home, is made up of two groups: the Hellenists, generally more liberal, essentially from the Diaspora, and the Hebrews, more conservative and of Palestinian origin. A number of the Jewish members of the Jerusalem church are listed and identified (“prosopography”). The issue of Paul’s Jewish background in connection with his Christianity is analyzed. Was Paul “called,” thus remaining fundamentally a Jew, or did he “convert” to a new religion? The specific tension that characterizes Paul’s specific theology and practice is examined through Paul’s dialectic thinking between continuity and discontinuity, Law