

# The Myth of Solomon

G. J. WIGHTMAN

Department of Classical and Near Eastern Studies  
University of Melbourne  
Melbourne, Australia

*This paper deals with the chronology of Palestine during Iron Age II, i.e., the tenth and ninth centuries B.C. The author evaluates the development of the conception of Solomonic archaeology from the 1920s to the present at Lachish, Ashdod, and Tel 'Ira', and concludes that this conception is based primarily on intuitive guesses and untested assumptions. He calls for revisions in the stratigraphic sequences at sites like Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer. The author presents a lower chronology for Iron Age II, based largely on the data from Samaria.*

## BUILDING A TRADITION

When Kenyon produced the long-awaited publication of Israelite pottery from Samaria (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957) her views on Iron Age chronology met with a "knee-jerk" reaction from all sections of the Palestinian archaeological community. Her low chronology for the tenth and ninth centuries B.C. was flatly rejected (Aharoni and Amiran 1958; Albright 1958a; Wright 1959; Tufnell 1959; Yadin 1960). Kenyon maintained that the earliest Iron Age pottery from Samaria, which was associated with the first citadel walls, was attributable to the reign of king Omri, ca. 876–869 B.C. (regnal dating follows Bright 1972: chart 5), there being no identifiable Iron Age walls or deposits earlier than those of the citadel. But the same pottery was also being excavated at the site of Hazor and being attributed to the mid-tenth century B.C.; in general it was the same kind of pottery that for decades had been regarded as "Solomonic," having been found in association with monumental architecture at Megiddo and elsewhere attributed to the reign of that king. Yet rather than engage in a critical evaluation of the "received knowledge," most leading Palestinian archaeologists decided that Kenyon—one of the pioneers and leaders in Palestinian field technique—had made basic errors of stratigraphic interpretation. Essentially they argued that since the earliest Iron Age pottery from the Samaria citadel had come from fills underneath the Omride floors, it was all much

earlier than Omri's foundation. In consequence they postulated a pre-Omride occupation on the summit, which supported their own pottery chronology. That seemed a satisfactory arrangement; the storm was weathered, the status quo maintained. And so it remains today.

"Solomonic archaeology" grew from an idea. In reviewing the development of that idea a statement that Albright made many years ago comes to mind (Albright 1958b: 1; related in a slightly different context but of relevance here): "an intuition tending to become part of a fixed body of basic assumption that was eventually to be regarded as *a priori* fact." Absolute dates for the beginning and end of the Iron Age in Palestine had been founded from the beginning of scholarly investigation on pottery styles of datable contexts outside of Palestine (Petrie 1891; Bliss 1894; Welch 1900; Bliss and Macalister 1902; Thiersch 1908; Macalister 1912; 1913; Phythian-Adams 1923). The area between those two terminal peaks, the "sea of impenetrable mist" as Macalister (1925: 156) had once called it, had been brought to definition on the basis of architectural style in relation to biblical references to Israelite royal building. Prior to the first era of American excavations in the 1920s, very little was known of Israelite material culture. The German school had uncovered monumental ashlar buildings at Megiddo that fitted in between the externally datable terminal peaks of the Iron Age and provided a glimpse of Israelite public architecture (Schumacher 1908). A team from Harvard University,

excavating at Samaria-Sebaste before the First World War (Reisner, Fisher, and Lyon 1924), also uncovered important remains of Israelite royal architecture of the ninth century B.C. But the results of that excavation were not widely known outside the American school until the late 1920s.

It was the series of "big digs" by the American Schools of Oriental Research at Tell Beit Mirsim (1926–1932; Albright 1943), <sup>6</sup>Ain Shems (1928–1933; Grant and Wright 1939), and Megiddo (1925–1939; Lamon and Shipton 1939; Loud 1948) that crystallized the fundamental concepts of "Solomonic archaeology." Ever since Petrie's pioneering work at Tell el-Hesi in 1890, certain biblical passages had been uppermost in the attempts of archaeologists to bring order to Macalister's little-known "Jewish" period of Palestinian archaeology. Probably the most important of those passages was 1 Kgs 9:15—"And this is the account of the forced labor program which king Solomon raised: for the building of the house of Yahweh, his own house, the *millo*, Jerusalem's wall, and Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer" (author's translation from the MT). Gezer had been investigated extensively by Macalister (1912) but had produced very little that could be attributed to Solomon or his immediate successors. Soundings by Garstang at Hazor in the 1920s produced similarly disappointing results. Jerusalem had yielded a great deal of material, but again very little that could be associated with the Israelite kings. Megiddo seemed to be the best hope, and the German school's discovery of monumental architecture of the Israelite period there gave cause for encouragement. In the south of the country excavations were underway at Tell Beit Mirsim and <sup>6</sup>Ain Shems. Those sites seemed to have similar archaeological histories, relevant to the Solomonic era. At both, the stratum containing locally-made pottery painted in a style already attributed to the Philistines was succeeded by a stratum in which that pottery degenerated or disappeared and was replaced by red-slipped, hand-burnished pottery (Tell Beit Mirsim Stratum B<sub>3</sub> and <sup>6</sup>Ain Shems Stratum IIA). At both sites this stratum was earlier than the late Israelite stratum characterized by wheel-burnished pottery and stamped *lamelekh* storejars (Tell Beit Mirsim Stratum A<sub>2</sub> and <sup>6</sup>Ain Shems Stratum IIB, C). Moreover, the post-Philistine stratum contained a casemate city wall similar to the Omride citadel walls at Samaria. Overall pottery continuity with

the earlier Philistine stratum at each site, along with the biblical tradition that Solomon was the first great Israelite builder, encouraged the scholars to date Tell Beit Mirsim Stratum B<sub>3</sub> and <sup>6</sup>Ain Shems Stratum IIA to the tenth century B.C., although that dating left little that could be assigned to the following century. The pottery associated with the casemate walls at both sites was henceforward used as a yardstick for chronology at other sites, one of the most important of which was Megiddo.

At Megiddo the Oriental Institute of Chicago team had recognized three strata of the Israelite Monarchical period (IV, III, and II; Stratum V is now included within the tenth century B.C.). The major chronological linchpin was Stratum IV. Schumacher had uncovered building remains of that stratum and had assigned them generally to the period of the Israelite Monarchy, and possibly even to the time of Solomon, on the basis of 1 Kgs 9:15–19, since it was assumed that Solomon's building activities must have been monumental, a fitting testimony to his legendary glory and splendor. Such biblio-archaeological parallelism was already a strong conceptual pattern when excavations commenced at Megiddo in 1925. In four seasons of digging many buildings attributable to Stratum IV were uncovered, including a solid city wall (Wall 325), a governor's residence (Building 338), and a series of large, pillared compounds (Buildings 1576, 364, 407). Field director P.L.O. Guy was convinced from the outset that those buildings had been erected at the same time and that they should date to the time of Solomon:

So far, we have found nothing archaeologically inconsistent with an immediately post-Philistine date for Stratum IV. As to the buildings, we get well-planned structures, with much dressed stone well laid and bonded by evidently skilled craftsmen. . . . We get all these things occurring suddenly, in a city apparently planned and built as a whole, with its walls, gate, its streets, and a remarkable number of stables strangely similar to buildings discovered elsewhere which have been independently dated to the ninth or tenth century B.C. . . . Our buildings do not appear to develop from those of Stratum V . . . nor are the buildings of later strata evolved from those of Stratum IV . . . altogether one feels that there is something scarcely Palestinian about Stratum IV, something which suggests rather the Hittite work

of North Syria. . . . And if we ask ourselves who, at Megiddo, shortly after the defeat of the Philistines by King David, built with the help of skilled foreign masons a city with many stables? I believe that we shall find our answer in the Bible. For in 1 Kings 9:15–19 is written . . . if one reads the history of Solomon, whether in Kings or in Chronicles, one is struck by the frequency with which chariots and horses crop up. . . . It is perhaps not without significance that the other sites at which indications of stabling have been found—Gezer and Tell el-Hasi [*sic*]<sup>1</sup>—also lie close to this great trade route; and a more northerly station upon it (also built by Solomon) may well have been Hazor in the Huleh Basin. . . .” (Guy 1931: 44–48).

Four basic assumptions underlay Guy’s reasoning: that the large pillared halls were stables; that all the buildings belonged to a single building program; that chariotry and cavalry were exclusive features of Solomon’s reign; and that the architectural style of Stratum IV was non-Israelite. The first assumption involved circular reasoning, for the identification of the pillared compounds as stables rested firmly on the biblical text the excavator cited, whereas the existence of stables at Megiddo would confirm the texts and the Solomonic date of Stratum IV. To further support a Solomonic attribution for Stratum IV, Guy adduced the evidence for “stables” from Gezer and Tell el-Hesi, “independently dated to the ninth or tenth century B.C.” Yet the sites’ excavators had not identified the pillared buildings at those two sites as stables. That identification was an integral part of Guy’s circular reasoning. His term “independently dated” is misleading, since the dates had been inferred by the individual excavators directly from the biblical text of 1 Kgs 9:15–19, i.e., by the same method Guy used for dating Megiddo Stratum IV. Guy’s second assumption was later proven incorrect as new data came to light. His third assumption ignores the fact that chariotry and cavalry were equally important to Solomon’s successors down to the time of Ahab. The fourth assumption did not follow logically from Guy’s argument, since he took no account of the published material from Samaria and failed to cite comparative material from outside Palestine to support his claim.

By Guy’s era, knowledge of Iron Age archaeology and Israelite material culture had reached the point where scholars could cite “independent

evidence” in support of new claims. That allowed cumulative errors in method and interpretation to be introduced easily into chronological schemes. At that point Guy’s argument was very appealing to the majority of archaeologists and bible historians, who wanted to create any kind of order within Macalister’s “sea of impenetrable mist.” Consequently, and despite later modifications to Guy’s Stratum IV stratification and chronology, his faulty conceptual method remained unchallenged and exercised an irresistible influence over later scholarly thinking, particularly within the American and Israeli schools. In the absence of closely datable pottery from Samaria, an objective assessment of the material from Tell Beit Mirsim, <sup>6</sup>Ain Shems, and Megiddo would have allowed a chronological range for the “Solomonic” strata no narrower than the period from the early tenth century B.C. to the later ninth century B.C. (even if the excavators of those sites had interpreted their data correctly in terms of stratigraphic attribution and comparative ceramic typology). Had that essential leeway been tolerated, and had the Samaria pottery been published during the 1930s, a quite different conceptual framework for “Solomonic archaeology” would likely have emerged.

Continuing excavations at Megiddo (1932–1939) modified Guy’s stratigraphic attributions and added several important structures to the inventory, but at no time was the tenth century beginning date for Stratum IV seriously challenged.<sup>1</sup> Guy’s intuition had become part of a fixed body of basic assumption, which some circles already regarded *a priori* as fact. Wright’s and Albright’s revised synthesis of the Megiddo stratification and chronology (Wright 1950), based largely on their interpretations of Tell Beit Mirsim and <sup>6</sup>Ain Shems (which themselves were little more than guesstimates based on biblical dead reckoning), served for the next ten years until Yadin’s excavations in 1960 and thereafter. The later excavations merely added some details and modified others within the established framework. Of particular importance for future ideas concerning Solomonic archaeology was the discovery in 1935 of a gateway with six internal chambers (Locus 2156). That gateway, attributed to Stratum IV, was always held to be Solomonic, for reasons that Guy had already espoused; no new and independent evidence had come to light.

In 1950 Howie compared the dimensions and plans of the Megiddo six-chambered gateway and

the "ideal" gateway of the Temple courts at Jerusalem as envisioned by Ezekiel. Ezekiel's gateway was widely believed to be based on the one Solomon constructed when he built his royal citadel. Close similarity between Ezekiel's gateway and the Megiddo gateway therefore reinforced the belief that the latter belonged to the Solomonic period. Howie did not consider the probability that Ezekiel, in the sixth century B.C., had access to official written descriptions of the Jerusalem citadel's gateways, and that such descriptions could have served as "blueprints" for the construction of six-chambered gateways at any time during the Israelite Monarchical period. The late Judahite six-chambered gateway at Tel 'Ira<sup>3</sup> (see below) confirms that idea. Again a process of circular reinforcement helped to convert an assumption into something that was accepted as fact.

By the time Israeli archaeologists were beginning their excavations at Hazor, the prevailing conception of Solomonic archaeology had been framed primarily in terms of monumental architecture: casemate walls, chambered gateways, pillared buildings ("stables"), and multiroomed palaces or residences. When a six-chambered gateway was found during the 1950s in association with a casemate wall in Stratum X at Hazor, this conception grew still stronger, although Hazor had yielded no independent dating evidence (Yadin 1972: 136–38). The biblical passage 1 Kgs 9:15 was subtly reinterpreted: Solomon did not build a wall only around Jerusalem; he also built walls around Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer. This biblical passage was now held to refer specifically to fortifications. Yet 1 Kgs 9:15 gives no indication of the nature of Solomon's buildings at Hazor, Megiddo, or Gezer: *hōmat* refers only to Jerusalem; the other cities are direct objects to the verb *libnōt*. The argument that archaeology has proven that the text implies fortifications is clearly circular. One of Yadin's main reasons for dating Stratum X at Hazor to the time of Solomon (apart from generic architectural comparisons with other sites) was that Stratum X apparently was the first fortified town of the Iron Age at Hazor (Yadin 1972: 135). Yet too little of the Upper City has been excavated down to early Israelite levels, and not enough is known from textual sources about the nature and extent of Solomon's building program at Hazor to allow an objective judgment on this matter.

Again one is dealing with the preference for a particular ordering of the data within a range of possibilities.

The final link in the inferential chain was forged at Gezer, the fourth of the royal cities mentioned in the much-quoted biblical passage. Having dated the gateway and casemate wall at Hazor by slotting it into an existing framework, Yadin conceived the notion that a similar fortification system ought to have existed at Gezer during the reign of Solomon (note for a second time the misinterpretation of 1 Kgs 9:15–17). Searching through Macalister's site reports, Yadin found such a gateway and casemate wall within Macalister's "Maccabean Castle" (Yadin 1958); he announced that they were the expected Solomonic fortifications at Gezer, and most scholars accepted the idea.

Thus by the late 1950s all three of the provincial royal cities had produced six-chambered gateways of comparable size and plan, and two at least possessed casemate walls, which Yadin likewise considered a hallmark of the Solomonic period (rather oddly, in view of the published data from Samaria; during the 1960s Yadin tried unsuccessfully to find a casemate wall at Megiddo to go with the six-chambered gateway, but it is now known that this gateway was associated with only one city wall, i.e., offsets/insets Wall 325; see Ussishkin 1980: 5, 12; Wightman 1985a: 264). But the Megiddo dating had been based on an intuitive assumption of what Solomonic architecture ought to have looked like; the Hazor dating was merely an application of the chronology founded on that assumption; the Gezer dating was not based on stratigraphic excavation at all, but on generic similarities again coupled to an intuitive assumption. The framework had become far too rigid to allow this to be a sound basis for chronological reckoning: the desire for a particular kind of order had outweighed the need to maintain a margin for error, not within the given framework but in the basic parameters of the framework itself. When participants in the Hebrew Union College excavations validated Yadin's hypothesis at Gezer in the 1960s and 1970s (Dever, Lance, and Wright 1970; Dever *et al.* 1971; Dever *et al.* 1974), their dating of the gateway and wall was a foregone conclusion. No amount of detailed comparative ceramic analysis "proving" the tenth century B.C. date of the wall and gate could cancel

the fact that the dating was ultimately based on a handful of untested assumptions. By the early 1970s the chronological framework had become sufficiently fossilized for one leading archaeologist to state categorically that six-chambered gateways constituted a fixed chronological datum for the archaeology of Palestine in the tenth century B.C. (Aharoni 1972: 302). Indeed, according to Aharoni (1972: 302), "this is one of the rare examples in archaeology where the exact date of a building can be determined even without the discovery of any inscription." Actually, it is one of those not-so-rare examples in biblical archaeology where the exact date of a building is determined through circular reasoning. Over the last 60 years there has been no external evidence at any of those or any other sites to prove beyond reasonable doubt the attribution of the structures to the reign of Solomon.

With the widespread adoption of modern field techniques conflicting evidence about the chronology began to appear. In 1973 a team from the Tel Aviv Institute of Archaeology, under the direction of David Ussishkin renewed excavations at Lachish. Since then, two gateways of standard six-chambered format have been excavated at Lachish, one at the entrance to the city, the other at the entrance to the courtyard of the Palace-Fort. Both have been assigned to Level IV of the ninth century B.C. (Ussishkin 1978: figs. 14–16; 1983: fig. 23). The city gate was associated with a solid city wall, not a casemate wall. A smaller six-chambered gateway had been excavated earlier at Ashdod (Dothan and Porath 1982), and although its dating remains uncertain due to the localized nature of the pottery, its excavators were reluctant to date it to the tenth century B.C. Eventually they concluded that it might have been built at the end of Solomon's reign (it was, after all, axiomatic that such gateways were Solomonic). Much more recently, another six-chambered gateway has been uncovered at the site of Tel 'Ira' in the Beersheba valley (Beit-Arieh 1985: 17–25), and is dated to the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.

Despite this new evidence, the traditional chronological framework for the tenth and ninth centuries B.C. has remained unchallenged. Certain modifications have been proposed, but only within the basic framework. Ussishkin (1980), for example, argued for a downdating of the six-chambered gateway at Megiddo to the post-

Solomonic period, on the grounds of local stratigraphy rather than general historical considerations. Yet Ussishkin still accepts the tenth century B.C. date for Megiddo Strat VA–IVB, Hazor Stratum X, and Gezer Stratum VIII (Ussishkin 1980: 17). That is a telling comment on the inflexibility of the traditional chronology: at one time six-chambered gateways stood as a chronological datum for the tenth century B.C.; the Megiddo gateway in particular played a fundamental role in the emerging conception of Solomonic archaeology and cultural chronology. In Ussishkin's critique, that gateway can be plucked from its Solomonic niche while the chronological framework it did so much to create remains unchanged. The system has become self-perpetuating.

Dever attempted, discussing the 1984 excavations at Gezer, to maintain the status quo (contra Ussishkin 1980) by reattributing the Level IV city gate at Lachish to Level V, and dating Level V to the time of Solomon (Dever 1986: 32, nn. 34, 35). But Dever's arguments are groundless. Podium A of the Palace-Fort belongs to Level V, as all scholars, including Dever, seem to agree. This being so, the city can only belong to Level IV: the solid city wall forms the northern tower of the gateway; the city wall is structurally related to the enclosure wall in Area S (Ussishkin 1978: fig. 12); the enclosure wall abuts the Podium B foundation, and the latter is an extension of Podium A. The six-chambered gateway therefore postdates the Palace-Fort of Level V. Likewise, the gateway of the Palace-Fort's courtyard is structurally integral with storerooms that abut Podium B and therefore postdate Level V. Both gateways belong to Level IV, as Ussishkin has always maintained. Dever has further argued that the Level V plaster floor (Locus 4159) found in small probes beneath the Level IV city gate's foundations (Ussishkin 1978: fig. 17; 1983: 120, fig. 12), actually is the primary surface of this gateway, and that the brickly fill on top of the surface against the gate's masonry is destruction debris of Level V. Dever compares this floor-wall foundation relationship with that at Megiddo and Gezer, describing it as a "no foundation" construction (following an idea Yadin [1980: 19] espoused). But the Lachish situation is not comparable to the other two sites. At Gezer, Floor 1035 runs up to the base of casemate Wall 1001; at Megiddo, the lime Pavement 2150 near the base of the six-chambered gateway's

foundations is in secondary usage with later additions and modifications (Wightman 1985a: 215–20; 1985b: 118–19). At Lachish the Level V plaster floor runs underneath the Level IV gate's foundation; if the two were contemporary this would be an unprecedented feature of Israelite public architecture. The brickly fill between the piers of the six-chambered gateway is not *in situ* destruction debris from the gate's superstructure. Ussishkin has stated clearly that the composition of this fill is identical to that around the foundations of the Palace-Fort (and is not dissimilar to the brickly fill used under the courtyard of Building 1576 at Megiddo). In brief, Dever's attempt to force the six-chambered gateways at Lachish back into the tenth century B.C., where he thinks they should belong, has no justification. But it does show the strong influence that the scholarly tradition exerts even today. Even Kenyon eventually accepted the prevailing conception of Solomonic archaeology, while always maintaining her original idea concerning the early Israelite deposits at Samaria (see Ussishkin 1980: 2).

A basic concern of historical-archaeological synthesis is the selection of the most appropriate datable events for the particular body of archaeological data. In the present situation scholars naturally have sought out biblical references to royal building activities and destructive military campaigns, since those events are the most likely to leave a permanent impression in the archaeological record. Until the publication of the Samaria pottery, most scholars had focused attention almost exclusively on 1 Kgs 9:15–19 in their attempts to define Solomonic archaeology. If one were to accept both biblical traditions, i.e., of Solomonic and Omride building activities, one could not accept both Kenyon's and the American/Jewish biblical-archaeological syntheses: they appeared to be mutually exclusive. Yet if one must choose between the Solomonic and Omride biblical traditions on which to build a chronological framework, the latter is surely preferable. Assuming that both traditions are essentially reliable, we know that the earliest citadel walls and floors at Samaria will date to the Omri–Ahab era regardless of their architectural character; at Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer, on the other hand, we simply do not know *a priori* what to look for in relation to Solomonic architecture, either because there are several buildings from which to choose (as at Megiddo), or because there are too few structures

known through lack of excavation (as at Hazor, where soundings have been taken of only a small fraction of the Strata XI–IX town[s]), or because of lack of preservation (as at Gezer). Having severed the imaginary link between the archaeological remains and the biblical tradition concerning Solomon's building activities, there is no longer a necessity to push the earliest citadel pottery from Samaria into the tenth century B.C. Any tendency to do this must emerge from an analysis of the local stratification at Samaria. Whatever result emerges for Samaria then can be applied to the three provincial royal cities, after a reevaluation of their local stratigraphies, and thence to other sites. Such an approach may lead to a somewhat different conception of the archaeology of Israel during the tenth and ninth centuries B.C., yet one that is consistent with the historical framework of the period as presently understood.

## THE SITES

### Hazor

Hebrew University excavations during the 1950s on the western terrace of the Upper City at Hazor revealed a stratigraphic sequence spanning most of the Iron Age (Yadin *et al.* 1958; 1960; 1961; Yadin 1969; 1972). Two major architectural strata, X and VIII, were attributed to Solomon and Ahab respectively. Stratum X, uncovered mainly in Areas A and B on the western terrace, comprises the following features: a six-chambered gateway (Area A); a casemate wall attached to the gateway (Areas A, B, L, M); a garrison/residence (Area B); Building 200 (Area A); cobblestone and earth pavements between the casemate wall and Building 200 (Area A). Stratum X succeeded a phase that appeared, from the very limited exposed area, to have been an unwallled settlement; the excavators dated it to the 11th century B.C. (Stratum XI).

In Area A the Pillared Building and its Northern Annex of Stratum VIII serve as a convenient datum to analyze the structural sequence (Yadin *et al.* 1960: pl. 200, Buildings 71a and 129b). Directly beneath the earliest floors of the Pillared Building and Annex are the walls and floors of Building 200. This building is yet to be published in full, except for its pottery; and here we rely on Yadin's sketch plans and descriptions (Yadin 1972: 142, figs. 31–34). Yadin divided the history

of Building 200 into two strata, each with two phases—XB, A and IXB, A—corresponding to the four successive earthen floors found in most of the rooms. East and north of Building 200 are well preserved portions of cobblestone pavements, which together form a street east of the building and an open court or plaza near the city gate. Those pavements run up to the walls of Building 200 on the east and to the casemate wall on the west. North of the excavated casemates is a six-chambered gateway, not yet published in detail. The excavators argued that because the cobblestone pavement ran in some places up to the casemate wall, the latter (plus gateway) must have been built at the same time as Building 200, in Stratum X.

Stratum X has no independent existence. It is merely part of a long, continuous occupation on the Upper City beginning with Stratum XI and continuing until the end of Stratum IX. The architectural modifications to Building 200 are not sufficient to justify separating the two earlier phases as a separate stratum.

Yadin (1972: 137, n. 3; 142, figs. 31–34) referred to the existence of three successive cobblestone pavements between the casemate wall and Building 200, arbitrarily aligning each of the pavements with the phases of Building 200. However, the published data provide evidence for only two cobblestone pavements of Stratum X/IX. The later pavement is variously ascribed in the site reports to Strata XA, IXB, and IXA; the earlier pavement is from Stratum X (Yadin *et al.* 1960: 2, 4, 7, pls. 199–201; Yadin *et al.* 1961: pls. 19–21).

With which phases of Building 200 is the earlier pavement most likely to have been associated? The walls of Building 200 are preserved to a height of 1–2 m (Yadin 1972: 143; cf., Yadin *et al.* 1961: pls. 6:2, 22:1, 2). The Phase D floors are laid near the bases of the walls, while those of Phase C are about 30–50 cm higher (clearly visible in Yadin *et al.* 1961: pls. 21:2, 22:1, 2). The earlier pavement along the northern side of the building is more than 80 cm above the level of the Phase D floors, and is in fact at about the same level as the Phases B and A floors (for the street pavements, see Yadin *et al.* 1961: pl. 19; cf. the level of the Phase A floors as shown in Yadin *et al.* 1961: pl. 21:4; the floors are 30–50 cm below the preserved tops of the walls; the Phase B floors are about 20 cm lower). If the earlier pavement were contemporary with Phase D or C, there would

have to have been steps into the adjacent rooms. But the published reports do not indicate that such steps existed. Structural considerations favor the attribution of both pavements to Phases B and A of Building 200.

Much pottery from the street pavements has been published (Yadin *et al.* 1958: pls. 45, 46; 1960: pls. 51, 52). Although many of the illustrated sherds found on the earlier pavement have no close parallels in the Building 200 corpus, some of the bowls and storage jars have clear affinities with Phases B and A of Building 200.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, none of the illustrated sherds from the earlier pavement has strong affinities with Phases D and C, except for the cooking pots, whose forms do not change appreciably over this period. Bearing in mind the possibility of some contamination from later levels, the published sherds from the earlier pavement appear to be closer in form to those of the two later phases in Building 200.<sup>3</sup> Within the limits imposed by stratigraphic disturbance, it appears that the later pavement was in use during the last phase of Building 200.

Within each of the six excavated casemates in Area A, only one floor attributable to the Stratum X/IX occupation was found. Each casemate had a threshold providing a step up from the floor onto the pavement outside. The thresholds are at the same absolute level as the earlier pavement (+28.10 m); structural and functional integration indicates that the pavement was laid soon after construction of the casemate wall. On the Stratum X/IX floor in each casemate a small amount of pottery under destruction debris was found. Although it is unpublished, the excavators equated that pottery with Phases B and A of Building 200 (Yadin *et al.* 1960: 4).

To summarize the stratification, Stratum X/IX began as an unwallled urban settlement, probably an “upgrading” of Stratum XI, to which the construction of Building 200 belongs. At a later time, corresponding approximately to the excavators’ Stratum IX, the settlement was enclosed within a casemate wall with its six-chambered gateway.

### *Samaria*

At Samaria the British-Jewish team distinguished four building periods covering the ninth century B.C. Building Period I, which included an

inner enclosure wall (Wall 161) along the northern flank of the summit, was attributed to the closing years of Omri's reign, ca. 870 B.C. According to 1 Kgs 16:23–24 Omri purchased the hill of Samaria during his reign and began to lay out a royal citadel. Building Period II, attributed to Omri's long-lived successor, Ahab (ca. 869–850 B.C.) included remains of the palace, a casemate enclosure wall on the northern and western flanks of the summit, and possibly an ablutions pool north of the palace. Building Period III was comprised mainly of rooms within the citadel courtyard, while Building Period IV consisted of repairs and additions to those and other structures.

The pottery used to date each building period came from occupational debris in leveling fills below the floors. In theory, the construction date of each building period should be indicated approximately by the latest sherds in the subfloor fill, assuming continuity in occupation on the summit and minimal contamination between levels. The bulk of the pottery in the subfloor fills should give a reasonable indication of the main period of use for the preceding building period. Thus the bulk of the pottery from beneath the Building Period III floors should belong to the occupation of Building Period II, with the latest sherds being those in use when Building Period III was being constructed. The earliest sherds in the Building Period I fills have no underlying building period with which to be related, and can only be dated by external reference. The latest sherds in this fill should coincide roughly with the construction of Building Period I, while the bulk of the pottery should fall within the years immediately prior to the founding of the citadel.

The pottery from beneath the floor of Room C of Building Period III (Crowfoot, Kenyon, and Sukenik 1942: fig. 47, Grid Reference 455N/622E)<sup>4</sup> belongs mainly to the occupation of Building Period II; it dates no earlier than the reign of Ahab in the second quarter of the ninth century B.C., possibly from late in his reign; (see below). It is a fairly synchronistic assemblage; the bulk of the pottery is contemporary with Hazor Stratum VIII but the earliest sherds have their best parallels in Hazor Stratum IX (cf. Aharoni and Amiran 1958: 179, where that pottery is equated only with Hazor Stratum VIII). The continuously profiled or gently carinated bowls in buff or red ware (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 4:1–6) are characteristic of Hazor Stratum IX, al-

though parallels can be found in Strata X and VIII as well (cf., Yadin *et al.* 1961: pl. 171:8 [Stratum X], pls. 175:5, 6; 178:4, 9, 10 [Stratum IX]). The thin ware Samarian bowls (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 4:9, 10) appear first in Hazor Stratum IX and reach peak popularity in Stratum VIII (Yadin *et al.* 1961: pl. 178:1, 26, 28 [Stratum IXA]; Yadin *et al.* 1958: pl. 45:1 [Strata X/IX]; 1960: pl. 52:1 [Stratum IX]; Yadin *et al.* 1961: pl. 208:25, 26 [Stratum IX]; 1960: pl. 53:8–11 [Stratum VIII]; pl. 55:20 [Stratum VIII]). The shallow bowls with distinctive ring bases or conical feet are characteristic of sites in the central hill country and the Esdraelon plain, but are comparatively rare further north. The few examples from Hazor come from Strata IX and VIII. The Hazor analogues tend to have thickened rims and lower bases. The Samarian types of carinated bowl are the precursors of the common ring-burnished carinated bowls of the eighth century B.C.

The ridge-necked store jar (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 4:22) and the cup-and-saucer vessel (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 5:9) also have their best parallels in Hazor Stratum IX.<sup>5</sup> Each of these vessel types was found also in the Periods I and II fills at Samaria. The incense burner (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 5:8) has a parallel in the Stratum X/IX context at Hazor (Yadin *et al.* 1960: pl. 51:17). The globular jugs with central neck ridge and everted or offset rim (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: figs. 5:1; 22:5) have several parallels in Hazor Strata X–VII, principally with Strata IX and VIII (Yadin *et al.* 1961: pl. 179:10 [Stratum IXA]; 213:1, 2 [Stratum IX]; 1958: pl. 48:9, 10 [Stratum VIII]; 1960: pl. 58:21, 28 [Stratum VIII]).

The earliest Iron Age pottery at Samaria was recovered from constructional fills beneath the floors of Building Period I, south of inner enclosure Wall 161, and over bedrock between the latter and the northern casemate wall.<sup>6</sup> The Period I pottery is a diachronistic assemblage with parallels throughout Hazor Strata XII–VIII; yet the majority of closest parallels is with Hazor Stratum X/IX, especially Stratum IX. The following features are particularly important: the Period I assemblage does not include the carinated bowls common in Hazor Stratum VIII; the so-called “hippo” storejars (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 1:9) are common in Hazor



Strata IX–VIII; those with ridged necks typically possess a much more strongly everted and thickened rim; the everted rim crater (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 1:11) has its best parallels in Hazor Stratum X; the type diversifies in Strata IX and VIII; the simple rimmed storejars (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 1:17, 18) are common in Hazor Stratum IX, less so in Strata X and VIII.

Applying the principle that the date of deposition of a fill is no earlier than the latest pottery in it (assuming minimal disturbance), a date roughly contemporary with Hazor Stratum X/IX can be suggested for the deposition of the Building Period I fill. The typologically earliest sherds in this fill come from beneath the palace courtyard (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 1:1, 7, 6?, 8, 11, 13, 16), whereas the fills associated directly with the earliest buildings and walls on the northern side of the summit enclosure have yielded the latest sherds (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 1:3, 4, 5, 21). The presence of later sherds on the northern side may be due in part to contamination from later layers in the vicinity of Wall 161, where the earliest fills were cut into by later foundation trenches. But assuming minimal contamination, another explanation is possible. As the excavators noted, the Period I fill overlying the bedrock north of Wall 161 increased in depth towards the north, then suddenly petered out beyond the line of the casemate wall. The latter's foundation trenches were cut through the Period I fill to bedrock, so it appears likely that a terrace or defensive wall contemporary with Wall 161 had occupied the position of the later casemate wall's outer constituent, and that the area between that early "ghost wall" and Wall 161 had been infilled and leveled. The building of the early outer wall and the subsequent infilling of the slope along its south side may postdate the erection of Wall 161, the courtyard houses, etc., which would explain the later sherds in the fill. If this were so, the northern casemates would belong to a third building period intermediate between the excavators' Building Periods I and II, while the Building Period III courtyard rooms would then belong to a fourth. The southern flank of the citadel, adjacent to the palace, contains substantial evidence for such an intermediate building period, involving rebuildings of the southern casemates and defensive towers, though since those structures were cleared (by the Harvard University

team) there are no datable pottery deposits associated with the changes (see Wightman 1985a: 86–97). The question of an intermediate building period between the excavators' Periods I and II, particularly on the northern flank of the summit, can only be resolved through further excavation; but the clues are already there. The possibility that the fill underneath the floors of the so-called "Building Period III" may in fact reflect a third occupational period within the citadel, rather than a second, carries the implication that the bulk of the Period II pottery could belong within the second quarter of the ninth century B.C., with relatively less belonging to the first quarter.

All the Period II deposits are constructional fills beneath the floors of the northern casemates and beneath the surface connecting the latter with Wall 161. The floor was well preserved in the latter area but fragmentary in the former. All the illustrated pottery comes from the intermural leveling fill, except for four sherds from the casemate wall fill (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 3:13, 15, 16, 31). The pottery is diachronistic, having approximately the same range as Period I but with a somewhat later overall profile. The earliest sherds in the deposit first appear during the Early Iron Age (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 3:10, 11, 36). Many of the cooking pots have good parallels in the earlier Hazor Iron Age strata (XII–X) but are equally represented in Strata IX and VIII. The cooking pot type represented by Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon (1957: fig. 3:20, 22, 25) is characteristic of Hazor Stratum VIII, although a few examples occur in Stratum IX (Yadin *et al.* 1960: pl. 57:17–21 [Stratum VIII]; 1961: pl. 209:12 [Stratum IX]). None of the Period II cooking pots approaches the rolled- or grooved-rim types of Hazor Stratum VII.

There are few close parallels to the Samaria Period II bowls in the Hazor corpus. Bowls with carinated body and inverted rim (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 3:1) are found sporadically in Hazor Stratum X/IX, but the only close parallel is in a Stratum VIII context (Yadin *et al.* 1958: pl. 47:9). Bowls similar to those in Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 3:2 are found in Stratum IX contexts at Hazor (Yadin *et al.* 1961: pls. 212:4, 11, 12). The straight-walled shallow bowl with flat base (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 3:3) first appears in Hazor Stratum XB but remains rare until Stratum VII,

thereafter becoming one of the most common bowl types.

No parallels for the simple rimmed bowl with bar handle (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 3:5) have been found at Hazor, where bar handles were at all times uncommon and confined to bowls with thickened rims. The bowl with double ridged base (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 3:6) also has no close parallels at Hazor, although several bowls from Strata VIII and VII have a shallow ring molding at the junction of body and base ring (bowls very similar to the Samaria vessel in base form have been found in Beth Shan Lower Level V and Level IV). The bowl represented by Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 3:12 is closely related to several vessels from Hazor Stratum VIII, one of which has the concave upper rim surface of the Samaria vessel (Yadin *et al.* 1960: pl. 53:24–27). Such bowls become more common in southern Palestine during the later ninth and eighth centuries B.C. The fragment of a Cypriot black-on-red ware juglet is paralleled by two examples from Hazor Stratum X/IX; they are the earliest appearance of this class of vessel in Palestine (Yadin *et al.* 1958: pl. 46:1; Yadin *et al.* 1961: pl. 172:1).

Pottery Period II includes a few store jars with simple rims, both tall- and short-necked (also in the Period I assemblage). A related jar with molded rim is rare at Hazor, paralleled by only one sherd, from Stratum IX (Yadin *et al.* 1961: pl. 176:9). The cup-and-saucer vessel (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 3:9) is paralleled by three sherds from Stratum IX, each of which has the rounded base of the Samaria vessel (Yadin *et al.* 1961: pls. 226:16; 176:19, 20).

Even though the Period II fill was deposited later than the Period I fill, the pottery in each deposit spans approximately the same time period with respect to the Hazor sequence. In both deposits there is a concentration of types characteristic of Hazor Stratum X/IX, while the Period II deposit has a small proportion of pottery more common in Stratum VIII. Since the Period II fill was effectively sealed by a thick lime plaster floor, disturbance from later levels can be considered minimal. The Period II pottery bridges the transition between Strata IX and VIII at Hazor.

The bulk of pottery under the Building Period III floor has its best parallels in Hazor Stra-

tum VIII, but definitely spans the transition between Strata IX and VIII. This means that there is no typological distance separating Pottery Periods II and III, and the date of deposition of the Period II fill is tied to the beginning of Building Period II occupation. Building Period II began during the reign of Ahab. If, as suggested earlier, Crowfoot's Building Period II is really a third building period within the citadel, then Pottery Period III probably began more toward the mid-ninth century B.C. At any rate, the later part of the Stratum X/IX occupation at Hazor, which saw the erection of the casemate wall and the six-chambered gateway, appears to coincide with the Omri–Ahab period during the second quarter of the ninth century B.C. The expanded city of Stratum VIII would have been built either very late in the reign of Ahab or early in the reign of Jehu.

### *Megiddo*

The stratigraphy, chronology, and architecture of the Israelite period at Megiddo have been discussed elsewhere (Wightman 1984; 1985a: 202–308; 1985b), so only a brief resumé is in order here. The structural sequence in Areas A–B–E–CC on the southern side of the tell is useful for establishing a chronological framework for Periods V and IV.<sup>7</sup> Domestic houses occupied the area during Period V; at various times during Period IV they were abandoned and razed to make way for public buildings. The pottery from below and above Phase IVB Building 1723 appears reasonably well-stratified.

Ninety bowls were recovered from beneath the paved courtyard of Building 1723 (See Lamon and Shipton 1939: pls. 28:93A/B, 96–99, 101, 102, 105, 106; 29:110, 112; 30:114–22, 125–27, 129–34, 136, 139, 141; 31:142–44, 147, 149, 152). About 30 percent of the bowls are unburnished (excluding craters), 25 percent are hand burnished, 35 percent have mixed hand and wheel burnishing, and 10 percent are completely wheel burnished. Both the shapes and burnishing techniques confirm the longevity of Period V occupation and mark the assemblage as diachronistic. The Phase IVB series of buildings evidently was erected at a time when mixed burnishing was predominant in the northern hill country, and fully wheel burnished vessels were beginning to appear. The mixed technique is characteristic of Periods I and II at Samaria, spanning the first half of the ninth century B.C.

with a concentration in the second quarter. At Samaria, fully wheel burnished vessels do not appear until Period III, most of whose pottery falls within the second half of the ninth century B.C. Building 1723 and associated structures (Buildings 1567, 1482) may therefore be dated within the first half of the ninth century B.C., and most likely to the second quarter.

After Building 1723 was abandoned, its stones were reused in city Wall 325, which belonged to Phase IVAi, contemporary with the six-chambered Gateway 2156. Shortly afterwards, a fire in the courtyard of building 1723 left a thick deposit of ash and charcoal (Locus 1650). This burnt layer was soon buried under a series of clay and rubble layers. Eleven pottery types are recorded for Locus 1650 (Lamon and Shipton 1939: pls. 3:73; 25:62, 67; 28:88, 93A, 97, 99, 101, 102; 29:110; 37:14). Of those, one is probably intrusive from Period III (Lamon and Shipton 1939: pl. 3:73), while two are common throughout Periods I to IV (Lamon and Shipton 1939: pl. 25:62, 67). The remaining vessels exhibit the mixed burnishing technique and the fully wheel burnished technique. It is likely that the courtyard fire during Phase IVAi occurred soon after the abandonment of the Period V houses under the courtyard. Thus, the construction of Building 1723, its demolition, and the construction of city Wall 325 (along with Gateway 2156) must have taken place within a very short time during the second quarter of the ninth century B.C. The southern pillared Building, 1576, was built during Phase IVAii. The pottery from the fill beneath its floors is mixed with Period V types, but the latest types relate to Pottery Period III at Samaria (Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: 202) and Stratum VIII at Hazor. Building 1576 therefore can be dated to about the third quarter of the ninth century B.C., roughly contemporary with the similar compounds in the northeastern sector of the city (see Wightman 1984: 136–44).

The technique of burnishing on the pottery from Area B Period V is different from that of Area AA, Period VA, near the city gate. All the bowls from the latter area are irregularly hand burnished, and show none of the mixed burnishing technique of Period V on the southern side of the tell. The vessels illustrated for Phase VB in Area AA also are hand burnished (Loud 1948: pl. 87:14–24). It is distinctly possible that Period V occupation in Area AA ended earlier than in Area B, prior to the introduction of mixed burnishing,

although some houses may have survived longer. That phase should be dated somewhat earlier than Pottery Periods I and II at Samaria, in which the mixed burnishing technique is established.

Domestic occupation in many parts of Area AA appears to have ended in a fire. It is uncertain whether the two-chambered gateway (3165) was built before or after that fire, though it probably remained in use down to Phase IVAi, when it was succeeded by the six-chambered gateway. Construction of Gateway 3165 is dated to a period preceding the introduction of mixed burnishing and well before the construction of Building 1723. (Although both structures are assignable to Phase IVB, this is purely a stratigraphic convenience and has no real chronological value.) It may have been erected by Solomon late in his reign, as Ussishkin suggests (1980: 16). It is likely that Period V occupation began before the middle of the tenth century B.C., but how much earlier is difficult to estimate. One or more of the Period V public buildings must have been erected during the reign of Solomon, e.g., Palace 6000 and its western administrative wing, the two-chambered gateway, and possibly even the Phase VB casemate fort (Wightman 1984: 132–36, fig. 1).

### Gezer

The Hebrew Union College excavations at Gezer (Dever, Lance, and Wright 1970; Dever *et al.* 1971; 1974) resulted in the attribution of four defensive structures to the time of Solomon. These were a six-chambered gateway in Field III (construction phase); an outer gateway on the lower terrace in Field III; a casemate wall adjoining the inner gateway, traced in Fields II, III and VII; and an “ashlar towers” phase of the Outer Wall, which Macalister originally recognized and which the Hebrew Union College found in Fields I and II. Various ancillary defensive structures as well as other buildings (including “Palace 10000”) dated to the time of Solomon were found in the 1984 season (Dever 1984; 1986: 12, 25, 26). The reasons for this attribution are outlined above.

Several observations should be made in regard to the excavators’ attribution of those remains to Solomon, or even to a single chronological horizon. First, the published pottery from the first retrenching along the Outer Wall in Field I, associated with the ashlar towers phase (Dever *et al.* 1974: pl. 22:7–26), is typologically earlier than

that from Field II Stratum 6, associated with the casemate wall (Dever *et al.* 1974: pls. 31–33; Dever, Lance, and Wright 1970: pl. 34); yet both pottery groups are assigned to the mid-tenth century B.C. The filling of the primary retrenching along the Outer Wall yielded predominantly unburnished sherds, while Field II Stratum 6 is characterized by the predominance of hand-burnished pottery together with a small proportion of wheel-burnished sherds. The rebuilding of the Outer Wall should antedate the construction of the casemate wall and its associated six-chambered gateway by a considerable time, which would be the interval between the introduction of hand burnishing and the introduction of wheel burnishing.

The six-chambered gateway and the casemate wall in Field III were founded on a thick fill containing burnt debris and pottery which the excavators date no later than the tenth century B.C. Although it has not yet been published, some idea of its character can be gained through the published Phase 3 pottery of adjacent "Palace 10000" (Dever 1986: fig. 17); since this pottery was collected from above the "tenth century" floors, the latest pottery in the subfloor fill must be typologically earlier. There is no evidence that the fill is *in situ* destruction debris; if it is an imported fill, its contents are likely to be disturbed, possibly diachronistic, and useful only to provide a *terminus post quem* for construction of the gate and wall. The nature of the fill attests to some degree of burning and destruction at Gezer during the tenth century B.C. If the destruction had been widespread and caused by a military attack, a dating prior to the accession of Solomon would be preferable, but definitely earlier than the ashlar towers phase of the Outer Wall, with which there is no associated destruction level or evidence for burning. In Field II the inner constituent of the casemate wall (Wall 1001) was founded on a similar fill (Locus 1075), containing burnt material. That fill contained pottery of the Late Bronze, Iron I, and Iron IIA, an observation that underlines the composite character of the fill and its limitations for close dating.

Field II Stratum 6 was divided into an earlier (6B) and a later (6A) phase. Stratum 6B comprises the inner constituent of Wall 1001, surfaces running up to the north face of that wall (Loci 1035, 2160P), a "ghost wall" along the line of a later wall, Wall 2008, and a road on the north side

of the ghost wall running up to Wall 3235. While it is clear that Wall 1001 and its earlier surface (Locus 1035) were built at the same time, it is not so obvious that the ghost wall and its (presumed) earliest surface (Locus 3225), as well as Wall 3235, were constructed along with Wall 1001/Surface 1035. Whereas surface 3225 yielded hand-burnished sherds, the lowest five or ten centimeters of Surface 2160P yielded some wheel-burnished sherds (Dever *et al.* 1974: pl. 31:1, 9). Moreover, the field reading of sherds collected from the deep Fill 3230, beneath Surface 2160P, suggests that some might be later than the tenth century B.C. (Dever *et al.* 1974: 128). If differences in burnishing technique in this case reflect differences in date one could argue that in Field II Stratum 6B comprises a prefortification phase (ghost wall, road, and Wall 3235), in use at a time when hand burnishing was at its most popular. That would be followed by a fortification phase (casemate Wall 1001, Surfaces 1035, 2160P, 2160L, and Fill 3230), at a time when wheel burnishing was becoming more common. Hand burnishing in the Field II Stratum 6B prefortification phase postdates the ashlar towers phase of Field I, in which unburnished sherds predominated.

The 1984 excavations in Field III added significantly to our understanding of Israelite Gezer and its fortifications, but did little to change the overall chronological picture. The Phase 3 pottery from Palace 10000 (Dever 1986: fig. 17), which reflects the primary use of the building, has its best parallels in Field II Stratum 6, especially with Phase 6A; it is definitely later than the ashlar towers phase of the Outer Wall in Field I. Unfortunately no prefloor pottery was collected from Palace 10000, so a reliable *terminus post quem* for its construction cannot yet be established except by indirect reference to the fill underneath the adjacent casemate wall and gateway.

Holladay's analysis of the Iron Age Pottery from Gezer has provided a sound basis for typological comparisons with other sites (Dever *et al.* 1974: 61–69). With reference to the pottery from Field II, Holladay says: "The basic date for the bulk of the pottery from Stratum 6B and 6B/A is established by the consistency of parallelism with . . . Megiddo VA/IVB and Tell Abu Hawam III . . . 'Ein Gev V–IV, Hazor IX–VIII, Samaria Pottery Periods I–III, Shechem IXB" (Dever *et al.* 1974: 63). Those parallels "bear independent witness to the composite character of

the stratification" (Dever *et al.* 1974: 63). According to Holladay, "the latest date necessary for any item in the Str. 6B-6B/A assemblage would be roughly 840 B.C. (Samaria 'Pottery Period IV', Hazor VIII), although a slightly earlier date, ca. 860 B.C. (Ein Gev IV, Samaria Pottery Period I, Shechem IXB) would not seem out of line with the evidence as we have it at present" (Dever *et al.* 1974: 63). For Field II Stratum 6A, Holladay cites closest parallels with Samaria Pottery Period III, Hazor Stratum VIII, Beth Shan Upper Level V, Tell el-Far'ah (North) *Niveau intermédiaire*, and Ein Gev Stratum III, all dating to the second half of the ninth century B.C., with some continuing into the early eighth. Again, quoting Holladay (Dever *et al.* 1974: 63), "enough forms pointing to a somewhat lower date do exist, however, to raise the possibility that a date somewhere in between 840 and 810 B.C. might be more in keeping with the data as a whole."

In view of Holladay's conclusions it is obvious that if one abandons the *a priori* assumption that six-chambered gateways are Solomonic (or at least that those from Hazor, Megiddo and Gezer are Solomonic), there remains a wide margin for dating the associated pottery at Gezer. The ashlar towers phase of the Outer Wall is unlikely to predate the accession of Solomon, and I tentatively support the excavators in assigning the building of the Outer Wall to him (whether the older gateway belongs to this or to a later horizon will become clearer when the pottery from the underlying fills is published). At that time, irregularly hand-burnished pottery was coming into vogue. The rebuilding of the Outer Wall followed a destruction of Gezer (how much later is uncertain), reflected in the burnt debris reused later as constructional fill. The rebuilding of the Outer Wall was followed by renewal of occupation on the summit of the tell, corresponding to our prefortification phase of Stratum 6B in Field II ("prefortification" in relation to the casemate wall, not to the rebuilding of the Outer Wall). That phase is characterized by the predominance of hand-burnished pottery. Later still, the southern flank (at least) of the city was refortified with a casemate wall and six-chambered gateway, and possibly with an outer gateway as well. Hand-burnished pottery was still very common, but some wheel-burnished vessels were beginning to appear; the mixed burnishing technique is rare in the south of the country. At Samaria and Hazor,

fully wheel-burnished vessels begin to appear during the second quarter of the ninth century B.C. This observation, along with Holladay's typological comparisons (Dever *et al.* 1974: 61-69), point to a date in the first half of that century for construction of the six-chambered gateway and casemate wall. Its destruction at the end of Field III Stratum 6 is dated to the second half of the ninth century B.C., perhaps during the Philistine/Arab invasion of Judah in the reign of Jehoram, ca. 849-842 B.C. Whether it was Asa (ca. 913-873 B.C.) or Jehoshaphat (ca. 873-849 B.C.) who ordered the refortification of Gezer is difficult to determine, since both are credited with having fortified various towns in Judah (2 Chr 14:6-7; 17:12b, 19). The observation that wheel burnishing is represented by only a few sherds in the early usage of the casemate wall suggests a date more toward the mid-ninth century B.C.; so a date within Jehoshaphat's reign is slightly preferable.

#### AN ALTERNATIVE CHRONOLOGY

At Samaria, Pottery Period III belongs to the occupation of the second, or possibly third, building period within the citadel, and can hardly date earlier than the reign of Ahab; a more likely estimate would be from about 860 B.C. through the second half of the ninth century. A typological overlap between Pottery Periods II and III anchors the end of Pottery Period II at around 860 B.C. Pottery Periods I and II have similar typological ranges, though the terminal date of Period I can be no later than about 870 B.C. (or 860 B.C., if part of the fill belongs to a second building period, intermediate between Building Periods I and II). The bulk of the pottery from both periods should date to the first half of the ninth century B.C. with the earliest sherds belonging to the later tenth. There was almost certainly a pre-Omride occupation at Samaria, perhaps a small village on the eastern slopes, whose origins are in the tenth century B.C. That occupation continued into the next century until Omri purchased the hill, cleared the summit, and began to lay out his royal capital (the summit at that time may have supported olive orchards, much as it does today, with little occupational material away from the village on the slopes). The latest pottery in the Period I fill was in use at that time, whereas most of the pottery was in use during the later stages of the

"Shemer" occupation in the early ninth century B.C. The latest sherds in the Period II fill represent types that were in use during the Omri–Ahab period in the northern kingdom. It is possible that elements of the Period II fill came from a similar context as the Period I fill (extramural occupation?), in view of the similarity between their pottery types.

At Hazor, the excavators' Strata X and IX were part of a long and continuous occupational stratum on the upper city; Stratum XI may belong to this unbroken occupation as well. During Strata XI and X Hazor was a prosperous but unwallled town, though its detailed character remains largely unknown due to lack of excavation at those levels. Toward the end of that long occupation, in what the excavators called Stratum IX, the township was enclosed within a casemate wall with entry via a six-chambered gateway. The decision to fortify Hazor at that time may have been due to the growing prosperity of the town and its importance as a distribution center for produce; or to the emergence of a political rival on Israel's northern borders, which threatened the viability of Hazor and other towns in the Galilee and Huleh region. The dates of Stratum X/IX may be reckoned by ceramic correlation with Samaria. There is some typological overlap between Samaria Pottery Period III and Hazor Stratum IX, so the latter probably comes down to about the mid-ninth century B.C. Hazor VIII, which witnessed the extension of the walled city to the eastern terrace, is roughly contemporary with Samaria Pottery Period III and falls, therefore, within the second half of the ninth century B.C., although precise dates for its beginning and end remain negotiable. Stratum X/IX at Hazor has its best ceramic parallels in Samaria Pottery Periods I and II, spanning the later tenth and first half of the ninth centuries B.C. The fortification of Hazor Stratum IX might have occurred during the reign of Ahab, by whose time the Aramaean state had grown sufficiently powerful to pose a direct threat to Israel's northern frontier. But the reign of Ahab should be considered only the latest date for construction of the gateway and casemate wall; the possibility cannot be ruled out that they were erected earlier in the ninth century, perhaps by Baasha, for example, ca. 900–877 B.C.

The inexactitude of ceramic typology likewise prevents our being certain that Hazor Stratum X began during the period of the United Monarchy,

although it may have gotten underway during the later years of Solomon's reign, ca. 840–830 B.C. There is no clear evidence for an occupational gap between Strata XI and X, so again we may be dealing with a rebuilding phase during a longer occupation. Stratum XI is traditionally confined within the 11th century B.C.; yet the published pottery does not indicate that Stratum XI ended before ca. 1000 B.C., though it probably began during the later 11th century B.C.

If the monumental architecture of Hazor Stratum X/IX belongs to the post-Solomonic period, what does belong to Solomon at Hazor that will corroborate the biblical testimony of 1 Kgs 9:15? Are we prepared to "rob" Solomon of his fortifications and give back to him an apparently urban, unwallled settlement? The biblical text offers no clue as to the nature or extent of Solomon's building activities in Hazor: they may have been no more pretentious than the building (or rebuilding) of the town or one of its quarters, or the extension of the town, or the erection of some administrative building associated with the town's growing economic importance. Even though 1 Kgs 9:15 mentions several public buildings erected by Solomon at Jerusalem, it does not follow *ipso facto* that public buildings were erected at any or all the other three cities. Jerusalem, after all, possessed a special status in Solomon's kingdom. Moreover, since 1 Kgs 9:15 was probably drawn directly from annalistic sources, it is unlikely that those annals gave a list of Solomon's building activities that was biased in favor of the "monumental." A second factor worth reiterating is the very limited exposure of Strata XI and X of the upper city. Consider the situation at Megiddo: the Oriental Institute of Chicago excavators uncovered most of Period V and agreed that its character was that of an unwallled urban town. Yet within a few days in 1960 Yadin found a large public building of ashlar masonry (Palace 6000) attributable to the same period. Perhaps Hazor Strata XI and X are directly comparable to the predominantly urban character of Megiddo Period V, dating to the tenth and early ninth centuries B.C. And if Solomon had in fact erected one or more public buildings at Hazor—which is by no means certain—they remain to be excavated.

At Megiddo, where excavations have been much more extensive, we are in a better position to appreciate Solomon's "revised" building program. The large, casemated fort of Phase VB in the

northeastern sector of the town may have been built during the earlier part of his reign (ca. 960–950 B.C.). At that time Megiddo was a relatively small, open town guarded and defended by the fort, comparable to other tenth century B.C. forts and associated settlements in the Negev of Judah. Later, possibly during the closing years of Solomon's reign (ca. 940–930 B.C.), the fort was replaced by Palace 6000 and its western administrative wing, reflecting the enhanced economic importance of Megiddo. The two-chambered gateway west of the new administrative quarter may also have been built then. Yet throughout Solomon's reign most of the town was comprised of small houses whose sole means of defense was an unbroken ring of rooms around the crest of the tell. Many of the houses continued in use, albeit with rebuildings and other modifications, into the first half of the ninth century B.C.

The northeastern administrative wing may have been ceremonially destroyed by pharaoh Shishak I shortly after Solomon's death: the fragment of his victory-commemorative stele was found very near to Palace 6000. During the early part of the Divided Monarchy a new administrative quarter was established along the southern side of the town (Phase IVB: Building 1723, Gate 1567, Building 1482); but it was soon abandoned (possibly after a damaging earthquake; see Wightman 1985b: 123). Shortly thereafter Megiddo was enclosed within a solid city wall associated with a six-chambered gateway (Phase IVAii; part of Building 1482 remained in use, possibly as an administrative center). This fortification program probably took place within the second quarter of the ninth century B.C., during the reign of Ahab. The erection of the elaborate pillared compounds of Phase IVAii took place around the middle of the century and they remained in use throughout the second half.

The third of the provincial royal cities, Gezer, appears to have been destroyed in the first half of the tenth century B.C. perhaps in connection with the event related in 1 Kgs 9:16. Prior to that and probably from the Late Bronze II, the city had been defended by the stone Outer Wall. After the sack, Solomon refortified Gezer by rebuilding parts of the Outer Wall and adding ashlar-faced towers. Occupation continued on the summit, though very little of it has been excavated. It remains uncertain whether pharaoh Shishak I visited Gezer, or if he did whether he destroyed

any part of it or received its peaceful submission. There is no evidence for his campaign at the site. Sometime during the first half of the ninth century B.C. at least the southern flank of the Outer Wall system was augmented by an inner defensive system consisting of a casemate wall and a six-chambered gateway. That was done either during the reign of Asa or, perhaps more likely, under Jehoshaphat. The inner defensive system was destroyed during the second half of that century, perhaps during the reign of Jehoram (ca. 849–842 B.C.), and the inner gateway was rebuilt with four chambers.

### CONCLUSIONS

It has been widely accepted among biblical scholars that Solomon's reign was characterized primarily by massive fortifications. The first part of this article showed how that conception solidified through a series of untested assumptions. The article presented an outline for a "low chronology" of the tenth and ninth centuries B.C. in Palestine. The revised chronology views the Solomonic period as one of growing economic prosperity in a united Israel which was, if only briefly, free of serious military threat. New towns were established and older ones rebuilt or extended, as the population increased and decentralized toward the frontiers. Building on the groundwork laid by his father David, Solomon attempted to establish a provincial administration at sites like Hazor and Megiddo, and possibly Gezer. Occupation proliferated in the Negev, with the establishment of a series of agricultural settlements and forts along the main roads. At the town of Gezer there was no large scale refortification, but rather the strengthening of the earlier city wall. Some administrative buildings also may have been erected in the town.

The Solomonic period witnessed the emergence of a prosperous state with an efficient administrative system, and the succeeding period can best be described as the "era of strong fortification" in Israel and Judah. We need look no further than Damascus to find sufficient motivation for fortification programs in the northern kingdom: the Aramaean threat grew steadily from the late tenth century B.C., becoming actual in the first half of the ninth century and peaking in the later ninth century. A virtually continuous state of warfare between Israel and Judah during the early years

of the Divided Monarchy, as well as the earlier campaign by the Egyptian pharaoh, gave even further cause for building massive and widespread fortifications in Palestine from the late tenth century B.C. onward.

Downdating many of the formerly Solomonic buildings to the first half of the ninth century B.C. requires the downdating of some of the formerly Omride buildings and strata to the third quarter of that century, contemporary with the reign of Jehu. There has been a tendency to regard that period as one of stasis and decline in Israel and Judah consequent upon the rising power of Aram-Damascus. Certainly the last two decades of the century were dismal for the Israelites, but there is

no evidence in the biblical texts that most of Jehu's reign was anything but stable. The prevailing opinion that his reign was one of decline is an inevitable corollary of the chronological system that attributes the last of the major public building programs in Israel to Ahab.

The "low chronology" for Iron Age II is, at the very least, equally consistent with the recorded history of the period as is the "high chronology." However, examination and resolution of the stratigraphic problems at each of the main sites favors adoption of the low chronology. But in the current state of knowledge a good deal of leeway must still be allowed for in Israelite archaeological chronology of the tenth and ninth centuries B.C.

### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Crowfoot (1940) suggested that Stratum IV be down-dated to the Omride period, ca. 870–840 B.C., and that Stratum V belonged to the tenth century B.C. His lower chronology was not far removed from the Albright–Wright synthesis (Wright 1950), but since it was based on architectural style rather than pottery typology it could be accommodated easily within the Americans' scheme. Albright had supported Crowfoot's architectural parallels between Megiddo Stratum IV and Samaria Periods I and II, and had also dated the bulk of the Megiddo V pottery to the tenth century B.C. Crowfoot's ideas therefore had little immediate effect upon scholarly thinking.

<sup>2</sup>See Yadin *et al.* 1960: pl. 51:1, cf. 1961: pls. 175:15 [Phase B] 178:2, 32 [Phase A]; for 1960: pl. 51:4, cf. 1961: pls. 175:1 [Phase B], 178:35 [Phase A]; for 1960: pl. 51:8, cf. 1961: pls. 174:7 [Phase C], 175:15, 16 [Phase B], 178:35 [Phase A]; for 1960: pl. 51:18, cf. 1961 pls. 176:12 [Phase B], 179:14, 15 [Phase A]; for 1960: pl. 51:19, cf. 1961 pls. 176:10 [Phase B], 179:15 [Phase A].

<sup>3</sup>A similar picture emerges for the later pavement (Yadin *et al.* 1960: pl. 52:1–28). Here there is clear contamination from later levels (1960: pl. 52:1, 3, 6); but of those shapes that have good parallels in the Building 200 corpus, the closest affinities are with Phase A (for 1960: pl. 52:2, cf. 1961: pls. 171:11 [Phase D], 178:3, 17 [Phase A]; for 1960 pl. 52:4, cf. 1961: pls. 171:9

[Phase D], 178:12, 18 [Phase A]; for 1960: pl. 52:8, there are no close parallels in Building 200, but the type of vessel is well represented in Phase A, cf. 1961: pl. 178:22–31; for 1960: pl. 52:10, cf. 1961: pls. 171:13 [Phase D], 178:9, 20, 21, 36 [Phase A]; for 1960: pl. 52:22, cf. 1961: pl. 179:11 [Phase A]; for 1960: pl. 52:23, cf. 1961: pls. 176:10 [Phase B], 179:14 [Phase A]; for 1960: pl. 52:24, cf. 1961: pls. 176:12 [Phase B], 15 [Phase A]).

<sup>4</sup>For the pottery, see Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: figs. 4; 5:1, 5, 6, 8, 9; 13:11; 18:9; 22:2, 5, 8, 10; 30:8.

<sup>5</sup>For the store jar, cf. Yadin *et al.* 1961: pls. 176:10 [Stratum IXB]; 179:14, 15 [Stratum IXA]; Yadin *et al.* 1960: pl. 52:23, 24 [Stratum IX]; for the cup-and-saucer, cf. Yadin *et al.* 1961: pl. 176:16 [Stratum IXB]; 19 [Strata X and IX]).

<sup>6</sup>For the pottery north of Wall 161, see Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 1:3, 4, 15, 17, 22, 23, 24; for that between Wall 161 and the courtyard houses, see Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 1:5, 12; under the floors of the courtyard houses, Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 1:7, 8, 9, 18, 19, 21; under the courtyard floor, Crowfoot, Crowfoot, and Kenyon 1957: fig. 1:1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 20.

<sup>7</sup>On the use of the term "period" in place of "stratum," see Wightman 1958b: 118, n. 2).

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aharoni, Y.  
1972 The Stratification of Israelite Megiddo. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 31: 302–11.
- Aharoni, Y., and Amiran, R.  
1958 A New Scheme for the Sub-Division of the Iron Age in Palestine. *Israel Exploration Journal* 8: 171–84.
- Albright, W. F.  
1943 *The Excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim*. Vol. 3, *The Iron Age*. Annual of the American



- Schools of Oriental Research 21–22. New Haven, CT: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- 1958a Recent Progress in Palestinian Archaeology: *Samaria Sebaste III* and *Hazor I*. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 150: 21–25.
- 1958b Was the Age of Solomon Without Monumental Art? *Eretz Israel* 5: 1–9.
- Beit-Arieh, I.  
1985 Tel 'Ira<sup>3</sup>—A Fortified City of the Kingdom of Judah. *Qadmoniot* 18, 1–2: 17–25. (Hebrew)
- Bliss, F. J.  
1894 *A Mound of Many Cities*. London: Palestine Exploration Fund.
- Bliss, F. J., and Macalister, R. A. S.  
1902 *Excavations in Palestine during the Years 1898–1900*. London: Palestine Exploration Fund.
- Bright, J.  
1972 *A History of Israel*, revised. London: SCM.
- Crowfoot, J. W.  
1940 Megiddo—A Review. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*: 132–47.
- Crowfoot, J. W.; Crowfoot, G. M.; and Kenyon, K. M.  
1957 *Samaria-Sebaste III: The Objects from Samaria*. London: Palestine Exploration Fund.
- Crowfoot, J. W.; Kenyon, K. M.; and Sukenik, E. L.  
1942 *Samaria-Sebaste I: The Buildings at Samaria*. London: Palestine Exploration Fund.
- Dever, W. G.  
1973 The Gezer Fortifications and the “High Place”: An Illustration of Stratigraphic Methods and Problems. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 105: 61–70.  
1982 The Late Bronze Age, Iron Age and Hellenistic Defences of Gezer. *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33: 19–34.  
1984 Gezer Revisited: New Excavations of the Solomonic and Assyrian Period Defenses. *Biblical Archaeologist* 47: 206–18.  
1986 Late Bronze Age and Solomonic Defenses at Gezer: New Evidence. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 262: 9–34.
- Dever, W. G.; Lance, H. D.; and Wright, G. E.  
1970 *Gezer I. Preliminary Report of the 1966–76 Seasons*. Annual of the Hebrew Union College Biblical and Archaeological School in Jerusalem I. Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion.
- Dever, W. G.; Lance, H. D.; Bullard, R. G.; Cole, D. P.; Furshpan, A. M.; Holladay, J. S., Jr.; Seger, J. D.; and Wright, R. B.  
1971 Further Excavations at Gezer, 1967–1971. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 34: 112–20.
- Dever, W. G.; Lance, H. D.; Bullard, R. G.; Cole, D. P.; and Seger, J. D.  
1974 *Gezer II. Report of the 1967–70 Seasons in Fields I and II*. Annual of the Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology II. Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion.
- Dothan, M., and Porath, Y.  
1982 Ashdod IV. Excavation of Area M. The Fortifications of the Lower City. *Atiqot* 15. Jerusalem: Department of Antiquities and Museums.
- Grant, E., and Wright, G. E.  
1939 *Ain Shems Excavations*. Part V (Text). Biblical and Kindred Studies No. 8. Haverford, PA: Haverford College.
- Guy, P. L. O.  
1931 *New Light from Armageddon*. Oriental Institute Publications 9. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Howie, C. G.  
1950 The East Gate of Ezekiel's Temple Enclosure and the Solomonic Gateway at Megiddo. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 117: 13–19.
- Holladay, J. S., Jr.  
1966 The Pottery of Northern Palestine in the Ninth and Eighth Centuries B.C. Unpublished Th.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Kenyon, K. M.  
1964 Megiddo, Hazor, Samaria and Chronology. *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology of London University* 4: 143–56.
- Lamon, R. S., and Shipton, G. M.  
1939 *Megiddo I. Seasons of 1925–34. Strata I–V*. Oriental Institute Publications 42. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Loud, G.  
1948 *Megiddo II. Seasons of 1935–39*. Oriental Institute Publications 62. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Macalister, R. A. S.  
1912 *The Excavation of Gezer, 1902–1905 and 1907–1909*. London: Palestine Exploration Fund.  
1913 *The Philistines. Their History and Civilization*. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1911. London: Oxford.  
1925 *A Century of Excavation in Palestine*. London: Religious Tract Society.
- Petrie, W. M. F.  
1891 *Tell el Hesi (Lachish)*. London: Palestine Exploration Fund.
- Phythian-Adams, W. J.  
1923 Philistine Origins in the Light of Palestinian Archaeology. *Bulletin of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem* 3: 20–27.
- Reisner, G. A.; Fisher, C. S.; and Lyon, D. G.  
1924 *Harvard Excavations at Samaria, 1908–1910*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

- Schumacher, G.  
1908 *Tell el-Mutesellim I*. Leipzig: Deutsche Orient Gesellschaft.
- Tufnell, O.  
1959 Hazor, Samaria and Lachish—A Synthesis. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*: 90–105.
- Thiersch, H.  
1908 Die neueren Ausgrabungen in Palästina. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 23: 344–413.
- Ussishkin, D.  
1978 Excavations at Tel Lachish—1973–1977. Preliminary Report. *Tel Aviv* 5: 1–97.  
1980 Was the “Solomonic” City Gate at Megiddo Built by King Solomon? *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 239: 1–18.  
1983 Excavations at Tel Lachish 1978–1983. Second Preliminary Report. *Tel Aviv* 10: 97–184.
- Welch, F. B.  
1900 The Influence of the Aegean Civilisation on South Palestine. *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*: 342–50.
- Wightman, G. J.  
1984 Building 434 and Other Public Buildings in the Northeastern Sector of Megiddo. *Tel Aviv* 11: 132–45.  
1985a Studies in the Stratigraphy and Chronology of Iron Age II–III in Palestine. 2 vols. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Sydney, Australia.  
1985b Megiddo VIA–III: Associated Structures and Chronology. *Levant* 17: 117–29.
- Wright, G. E.  
1950 The Discoveries at Megiddo, 1935–1939. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 13: 28–46.  
1959 Israelite Samaria and Iron Age Chronology. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 155: 13–28.
- Yadin, Y.  
1958 Solomon’s City Wall and Gate at Gezer. *Israel Exploration Journal* 8: 80–86.  
1960 New Light on Solomon’s Megiddo. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 23: 62–68.  
1969 The Fifth Season of Excavations at Hazor. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 32: 50–71.  
1970 Megiddo of the Kings of Israel. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 33: 66–96.  
1972 *Hazor, The Head of all those Kingdoms*. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1970. London: Oxford University.  
1980 A Rejoinder. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 239: 19–23.
- Yadin, Y.; Aharoni, Y.; Amiran, R.; Dothan, T.; Dunayevsky, I.; and Perrot, J.  
1958 *Hazor I. An Account of the First Season of Excavations, 1955*. Jerusalem: Magnes.  
1960 *Hazor II. An Account of the Second Season of Excavations, 1956*. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Yadin, Y.; Aharoni, Y.; Amiran, R.; Dothan, T.; Dothan, M.; Dunayevsky, I.; and Perrot, J.  
1961 *Hazor III–IV. An Account of the Third and Fourth Seasons of Excavations, 1957–58*. Jerusalem: Magnes.