



A New Scheme for the Sub-Division of the Iron Age in Palestine

Author(s): Y. AHARONI and RUTH AMIRAN

Source: *Israel Exploration Journal*, 1958, Vol. 8, No. 3 (1958), pp. 171-184

Published by: Israel Exploration Society

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27924742>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Israel Exploration Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Israel Exploration Journal*

JSTOR

A New Scheme for the Sub-Division of the Iron Age in Palestine

Y. AHARONI AND RUTH AMIRAN

Hebrew University, Jerusalem

THE Iron Age constitutes, to all intents and purposes, one cultural entity, whose main features remain traceable through all its phases. The changes recorded below are mainly the result of inner and local developments, with a certain amount of stimulus from without.

The generally accepted scheme sub-divides the Palestinian Iron Age into two periods, Iron I (1200-925 B.C.) and Iron II (925-587 B.C.),¹ on the grounds that the division of the Solomonic Kingdom and the creation of the two monarchies formed the major turning-point in the history of the country at that period. It was indeed the beginning of individual development in each of the kingdoms. From that date onwards a gradual differentiation can be felt between the cultures, both material and spiritual, of Israel in the north and

¹ The following table contains the other terminologies used in literature:

Iron I	=	Early Iron	=	Early Iron I
Iron II	=	Middle Iron	=	Early Iron II
Persian	=	Late Iron	=	Early Iron III.

In the present paper the following abbreviations have been used:

- AS V* = E. Grant & G. E. Wright: *Ain Shems Excavations (Palestine)*, Part V. Haverford, 1939.
Hazor I = Y. Yadin, Y. Aharoni, Ruth Amiran, Trude Dothan, I. Dunayevsky, J. Perrot: *Hazor I*. Jerusalem, 1958.
Lachish III = Olga Tufnell: *Lachish III: The Iron Age*. Oxford, 1953.
Megiddo I = R. S. Lamon & G. M. Shipton: *Megiddo I: Strata I-V*. Chicago, 1939.
Megiddo II = G. Loud: *Megiddo II: Seasons of 1935-39*. Chicago, 1948.
SS III = J. W. Crowfoot, Grace M. Crowfoot, Kathleen M. Kenyon: *Samaria-Sebaste III: The Objects*. London, 1957.
TAH = R. W. Hamilton: Excavations at Tell Abu Hawam, *QDAP*, 4, 1935, pp. 1-69.
TBM I = W. F. Albright: The Excavations of Tell Beit Mirsim I, *AASOR*, 12, 1932.
TBM III = W. F. Albright: The Excavations of Tell Beit Mirsim III, *AASOR*, 21-22, 1943.
TF(N.) = R. de Vaux: Les fouilles de Tell el-Far'ah, près Naplouse, Cinquième Campagne, *RB*, 62, 1955, pp. 513-589.
TQ = B. Maisler (Mazar): The Excavations at Tell Qasile, Preliminary Report, *IEJ*, 1, 1950-51, pp. 61-76, 125-140, 194-218.

Judah in the south. It seems to us, however, after re-examining the archaeological data, that 925 B.C. is not such a sharp turning-point as has hitherto been assumed. A much sharper point of demarcation can be observed in the middle of the 9th century, at the end of the Omrid dynasty in Israel. From the historical point of view too there is no real justification for separating the Omrid period from the one that preceded it. The two kingdoms continued to flourish and extended over approximately the same territory as in the later days of Solomon. Relations with the Phoenician coast were even strengthened during the Omrid dynasty, and Israel held its place as one of the main factors in Palestine-Syria.

In our opinion two dates in the history of the period are essential for its sub-division: the first, about 1000 B.C., marks the establishment of the United Monarchy of Israel and the decline of Philistine influence. The second date, some time in the middle of the ninth century, corresponds to the revolts of Jehu in Israel and Athaliah in Judah. At this date the first real decline in the history of the kingdoms began. All the conquered territories in Trans-Jordan were lost, and the northern state of Israel shrunk at least temporarily to its smallest dimensions. The permanent Aramean pressure endangered the existence of the kingdom, and in particular the Assyrian domination and influence began to be felt at this period. The two dates then suggest the following tripartite sub-division of the Iron Age:

Israelite ² I	1200-1000 B.C.
Israelite II	1000- 840 B.C.
Israelite III	840- 587 B.C.

We need not dwell on the first turning-point, which is generally regarded as marking a phase within Iron Age I, on account of the great difference in pottery between the 11th and 10th centuries B.C. This difference has been well demonstrated by Albright in his levels B2 and B3 at Tell Beit Mirsim, and by Mazar (Maisler) in levels X and IX2 at Tell Qasile, but it has not been sufficiently emphasized and expressly marked in the different schemes of division of the Iron Age used hitherto.³ We shall not repeat in detail the

² We suggest that the term 'Israelite Period' should be used instead of 'Iron Age', in order to avoid confusion with the terms used hitherto. It seems to us that this term is historically justified, for throughout that period (including its early part) Israel played the chief role in the country.

³ It has, however, to be pointed out that in *Megiddo II* (p. 5) the Iron Age is divided into Early, Middle, and Late, the dividing line between Early and Middle being 1000 B. C.

well-known differences between the pottery of the first two suggested sub-periods.

On the other hand we propose to devote this study to a proof of the validity of the second turning-point suggested, for this has not been indicated in any of the current systems of sub-division.

New evidence, especially the data produced by the excavations of areas A and B at Hazor, excavated under the supervision of the present writers, permits us to cast doubt upon the usual system of taking the ninth century B.C. as one unit — as part of the first half of Israelite history. Hazor, being close to the border, was destroyed every 40-50 years on the average; every invasion of Israel is reflected in its history. The comparatively large number of historical documents mentioning Hazor makes it possible to connect some of these destructions with historical events. Thus, when we uncovered a great number of strata covering a relatively short period, we were in the fortunate position of being able to suggest accurate dates for every stratum. The strata are as follows:⁴

X	}	950-875 B. C.
IX		
VIII		875-841
VII		841-815
VI		815-765
V		765-732
IV		end of 8th - beginning of 7th century B.C.

This chronology has now been proved by the four-piered Solomonic gate in the casemate wall of stratum X. The dates of the six strata can hardly be more than a few years out.

The six strata from Solomon to the destruction by Tiglath Pileser III fall convincingly into two well-separated groups,⁵ with the crucial turning-point in the middle of the ninth century. The difference between the pottery of the two groups of strata is marked not only by the new single types which make their appearance in stratum VII, or by others which disappear with the end of stratum VIII, as will be shown immediately; the totally different character of

⁴ We here take into consideration the material from the 2nd and 3rd campaigns at Hazor as well.

⁵ *Hazor I*, pp. 22-23.

each group of strata is proved by considering all the elements which compose each single context. It was quite easy during the excavation to assign baskets of sherds to one or the other of the groups of strata to which they belonged. But it was difficult and sometimes impossible to distinguish the baskets belonging to various strata within each group. In the following demonstration we shall use those types which either end their existence in stratum VIII, or those which make their appearance in strata VII or VI.

We have already remarked that when we speak of a turning-point or break, we do not mean a complete revolution, and we have to keep in mind that the process dealt with here is a process of gradual, inner development. And even in the case of new types, their line of ancestry can be detected in the preceding phase, where single specimens already herald the fully-developed types to come. The quantity of specimens of any one type is also important in helping to define the character of a certain period or stratum or culture. The picture of the material from the floors of stratum VII is already preponderantly new and different from VIII.

Let us first set out the main points of difference between the pottery of our two groups of strata at Hazor.

Cooking-pots. Albright has distinguished two main types of cooking-pots, the 'shallow' and the 'deep'; he designated as a 'transitional' type the shallow type with handles and a grooved rim.⁶ At Hazor, and throughout the Northern Kingdom, the deep type does not occur at all, and the type called by Albright 'transitional' is the shallow type which continues in use till the end of the Israelite period in the North. Hence it now seems justified and desirable to suggest a common terminology for both the North and the South—for Israel and for Judah. We would propose the following terms:

Early Shallow Type⁷

Late Shallow Type⁸

Deep Type.⁹

This suggestion disregards the possibility that the Late Shallow Type may typologically represent a transition between the Early Shallow Type and the

⁶ *TBM I*, § 88; III, § 155.

⁷ *TBM I*, Pl. 47 : 11; *Hazor I*, Pl. XLV : 18, 19, 22; XLVIII : 1-3.

⁸ *TBM I*, Pl. 55 : 2, 4, 9; Pl. 56 : 1, 2; *Hazor I*, Pl. LV.

⁹ *TBM I*, Pl. 55 : 3, 6, 10-12, etc.

Deep Type, for chronologically the Late Shallow Type continues to be used in the South too till the end of the Israelite period there.¹⁰ Furthermore, there is general agreement that no sharp transition can be noticed between the two types of shallow cooking-pots; that is to say, both of them were for some time in use together.¹¹ At Hazor, however, the situation is quite different: the transition between the Early Shallow and the Late Shallow Type is clearly marked; it falls between strata VIII and VII. In VIII the Early Shallow is exclusively in vogue in its various forms. From stratum VII onwards the Late Shallow family only appears in all its rich variety. It does not seem possible to differentiate between the Late Shallow shapes characteristic of strata VII to IV.

Bowls. Of the various classes of bowl-types, we shall restrict ourselves to the differences found in two of them: *The carinated bowl:* in stratum VIII the ruling type is the one with a short wall from the keel upwards;¹² the type with a long wall from the keel upwards also appears, but in such cases the wall is flaring.¹³ In stratum VII the short wall disappears, and the type with a long wall from the keel upwards becomes straighter and simpler.¹⁴ This type continues in use till stratum IV. *The straight-sided flat-based bowl,* sometimes called a 'dish', makes its appearance in stratum VII,¹⁵ and turns out to be the reigning type of bowl in strata VI and V.

Water decanter. This is one of the most characteristic types of Late Iron Age strata in this country.¹⁶ It makes its first appearance at Hazor in stratum VII,¹⁷ and continues throughout VI and V with no real changes. Here again we may stress the similarity, or rather the kinship, between the strata of each of the groups X-VIII and VII-IV.

Store-jars. The shouldered type, called at Megiddo 'sausage jar',¹⁸ does not occur in Hazor VIII, but is most common in VI. Its absence in stratum VII may be a mere accident, especially if we take into consideration its abundance

¹⁰ *AS V*, p. 138; *TBM III*, § 155.

¹² *Megiddo I*, Pl. 30 : 122.

¹⁴ *Hazor I*, Pl. XLIX : 1.

¹⁶ Cf. the forthcoming paper by Ruth Amiran on the water decanter.

¹⁷ *Hazor I*, Pl. L : 23.

¹¹ *Megiddo I*, p. 172, § 76; *AS V*, p. 138.

¹³ *Hazor I*, Pl. XLVII : 1.

¹⁵ *Hazor I*, Pl. XLIX : 10.

¹⁸ *Megiddo I*, p. 167, § 43.

in Megiddo stratum IV,¹⁹ the termination of which coincides with the termination of our stratum VII (cf. also p. 177 below).

These can be reckoned the main types illustrating the differences between the two groups of strata at Hazor. Various other types do continue throughout both periods, but show minor developments in certain details, e. g. the ovoid store-jar (called 'hippo' at Megiddo).²⁰ In this type the transition from the first group of strata to the second is expressed in the neck and in the rim.

Two other classes of pottery, essential to the repertoire of the Iron Age, remain to be discussed, though indeed without definite results. These are Samaritan Ware and Cypro-Phoenician Ware, and in each case much more investigation and stratified excavation is required.

Samaritan Ware is still a field with no definite boundaries. It is not yet clear which of the thick-ware types and which of the thin-ware types are to be included under this heading. It may, however, already be stated that the thin-ware bowls with alternating buff and red burnished bands appear to be common in both groups of strata. Differences in shape seem to exist, but the subject needs further study.

Cypro-Phoenician Ware. This ware does not provide a definitive answer either. It is clear that the ware was imported in both groups of strata. But the question arises whether the transition from Cypro-Geometric III to Cypro-Archaic I does not happen to coincide with the transition from our Israelite II to Israelite III, i. e. in the middle of the ninth century. The most prominent type of this class in Palestine is the Black-on-Red. It is certain that Black-on-Red I (III) appears in Palestine at least as early as the tenth century, and that it continues well into the ninth.²¹ On the other hand Black-on-Red II (IV) occurs on various sites in the strata of the ninth and eighth centuries B. C. Its occurrences in Megiddo VA-IVB and in Tell Abu Hawam III,²² may indeed be considered exceptional; although they led to the assumption that Black-on-Red II (IV) had also started as early as the middle of the tenth century. As

¹⁹ *Megiddo I*, Pls. 14 : 72; 15 : 78; 16 : 81.

²⁰ *Megiddo I*, pp. 167-168, § 42.

²¹ *TBM III*, p. 6, n. 2; G. W. Van Beek: Cypriote Chronology and the Dating of Iron I Sites in Palestine, *BASOR*, 124, 1951, p. 28; id.: The Date of Tell Abu Hawam, Stratum III, *BASOR*, 138, 1955, p. 37; *Hazor I*, p. 11.

²² Van Beek, *BASOR*, 124, 1951, p. 28; id., *BASOR*, 138, 1955, p. 37.

for Tell Abu Hawam III — its date is still controversial and we shall suggest later on that it ends in the middle of the ninth century. Thus Tell Abu Hawam III should not be taken as evidence for the earlier appearance of this ware. On the other hand, if its single occurrence in Solomonic Megiddo (VA-IVB) is not intrusive, we shall have to admit that the two classes (B-o-R I and B-o-R II) overlap, and no light is thrown by this phenomenon on our problem. At Hazor we have so far found among the identifiable specimens B-o-R I in strata IX-VIII and B-o-R II in strata VI and V (eighth century B. C.). Consequently it seems to us that it is not impossible to assume that the transition between these two classes of pottery falls in the middle of the ninth century B. C.

We cannot, of course, expect that on every site, especially on those in the South, the same series of destructions will be found as at Hazor. We shall also see that in some excavations the ninth century B. C. is represented by one stratum, which naturally contains mixed material. It seems to us that this fact is the root of the assumption, held by many scholars, that there is no distinctive division between the two groups of types discussed above. — Let us now re-examine the main excavations with respect to this question.

Megiddo IVA is the best example of a stratum which spanned the whole length of the ninth century B. C. and ended only at its close. The attribution of its destruction to Hazael (c. 815 B. C.) seems most probable.²³ As *Megiddo* IVA covers both strata VIII and VII of Hazor, it is no wonder that it contains pottery types of both VIII and VII: cooking-pots of the Late Shallow Type are assigned in *Megiddo* to strata IV-I.²⁴ On the other hand, specimens belonging to the Early Shallow Type have been assigned to strata V-IV.²⁵ It thus becomes clear that the dividing line at *Megiddo* is within stratum IVA, which is in full accordance with the finds at Hazor. We have already discussed the 'sausage-like store-jar' of *Megiddo* IV, which clearly belongs to the end of that stratum. The water decanter also first appears at *Megiddo* in IV,²⁶ certainly to be equated with the latter part of IVA. The straight-sided flat bowl appears at *Megiddo* in strata IV-II,²⁷ and not in the range V-IV. This means that it has the same range as at Hazor — from VII onwards.

²³ *TBM III*, p. 2, n. 1; G. E. Wright: The Discoveries at *Megiddo*, *BA*, 13, 1950, p. 45; B. Maisler (Mazar): The Stratification of Tell Abu Huwam on the Bay of Acre, *BASOR*, 124, 1951, p. 24.

²⁴ *Megiddo I*, Pl. 39.

²⁵ *Megiddo I*, Pl. 40: 13, 16, 19.

²⁶ *Megiddo I*, Pl. 4: 97, 99, 100, 107.

²⁷ *Megiddo I*, Pl. 24: 40, 41.

Tell Abu Hawam. The crucial stratum for our present problem at Tell Abu Hawam is stratum III. Hamilton suggested, with some reserve, the date 925 B.C. as the end of that stratum.²⁸ Mazar proposed to lower it to 815 B.C.²⁹ Van Beek tried to prove that most of the types belong to Megiddo VA-IVB, thus reverting to Hamilton's date.³⁰ If we compare Tell Abu Hawam III with Hazor it seems that the Tell Abu Hawam material corresponds to that from Hazor X-VIII.

The bulk of the material belongs indeed to the tenth century, but there are some types which seem rather to belong to the first half of the ninth. We shall enumerate some of the latter: No. 66 (Pl. XIII) is a high-foot bowl, common at Samaria in period III (p. 147). No. 69 is a thin-ware Samarian bowl, also indicating a date not before Hazor IX, i.e. end of tenth or beginning of ninth century B. C. The cooking-pot on the left in Fig. 10 is a late variety of the Early Shallow Type, occurring in Hazor IX-VIII. Bowl No. 72 is characteristic of Hazor VIII. Painted jar No. 97 is exactly duplicated in the jars of Hazor VIII. Jug No. 80 resembles Megiddo I Jug Type 118, which has the range of strata III-II there. On the other hand, there is in Tell Abu Hawam III no material clearly comparable to Hazor VII. Consequently the date of destruction of Tell Abu Hawam III cannot be later than 840 B. C. (=end of stratum VIII at Hazor). This date makes it easy to explain the appearance of the juglet of the Black-on-Red II (IV) ware (No. 87) and the fragments of Protogeometric vases³¹ in this stratum. We would therefore suggest that the end of Tell Abu Hawam III should be assigned to the middle of the ninth century B. C., and that this stratum should be considered a good representative of our sub-period Israelite II.

Samaria. When we come to examine the material from Samaria, as recently published in the new *Samaria-Sebaste III* volume, it is obvious that the main break lies between strata III and IV, which fits perfectly with the evidence from Hazor. Stratum III of Samaria is identical with Hazor VIII, and in fact Samaria III, IV, V, and VI equal Hazor VIII, VII, VI and V. The material of Samaria I and II is too scanty to be definite, but it can hardly be dated later

²⁸ *TAH*, pp. 67-68.

²⁹ *Op. cit.* (above, n. 23), pp. 21-25.

³⁰ *BASOR*, 138, 1955, pp. 34-38.

³¹ *TAH*, p. 24, Pl. XII: 96; p. 181, Pl. LXXXVIII; V. R. d'A. Desborough: *Protogeometric Pottery*. Oxford, 1952, pp. 182 and 294.

than the 10th century B.C., or the beginning of the 9th.³² According to Dr. Kenyon there are no examples of completely wheel-burnished vessels in these two strata.³³ Dr. Kenyon emphasizes the special burnishing technique which distinguishes her period III. It is so continuously burnished 'that in some cases it is impossible to see burnishing lines or to establish the technique' (p. 95). At Hazor this feature characterizes the bowls of stratum VIII. In the pottery the same differences demonstrated between Hazor VIII and the latter group of strata can be found between Samaria III and IV. The cooking-pot occurs in III only in the Early Shallow Type, and in IV in the Late Shallow Type (stray fragments have to be reckoned as intrusive).³⁴ The bowls of Samaria III are exactly identical with those of Hazor VIII. Furthermore, the use of the straight-sided flat bowl begins in Samaria IV, which again fits very well with Hazor VII. The other types discussed above in connection with Hazor (pp. 175-177) are not represented at Samaria in sufficient quantities. For instance it is not clear from the plates showing the stratified pottery, when the water decanter made its first appearance. We may, however, assume on typological grounds that this occurred in Samaria IV.

The common assumption that there is no pre-Omid stratum at Samaria seems therefore to be untenable. On the contrary, strata I and II are to be attributed to the 10th or early 9th century B.C. They prove that a small settlement existed there at that time, but was completely razed by the great building operations of Omri and Ahab. This fact does not necessarily contradict the biblical statement in 1 Kings xvi, 24. The latter does not exclude the possibility that a small settlement existing there was bought by Omri.³⁵ The inner wall has most probably been correctly attributed to Omri by the excavators, but there seems to be no proof of their assumption that the pottery

³² I express again my gratitude to Dr. Kenyon for her kindness in showing me the material from Samaria in the collections of the Institute of Archaeology, London. (Y. A.)

³³ *SS III*, p. 94.

³⁴ A general methodical statement might be propounded here, i.e. that small fragments of vessels may be considered as evidence for the beginning of the appearance of that very type only, not for the termination of its occurrence, since intrusion of earlier sherds into later strata is most natural. In floors and walls earlier material is always to be expected.

³⁵ We owe to Prof. Mazar the suggestion that this was perhaps a family estate, owned by Shemer. 1 Chr. vii, 1 mentions Shomron (Septuagint-Lucianic version; the Masoretic text has Shimron) as one of the four main families of Issachar, together with other families, which are clearly connected with Mount Ephraim. We may suppose, therefore, that at this place existed a country estate of the Shemer-Shomron family of Issachar, which was bought by Omri.

of strata I and II is connected with the inner wall. The method used by Dr. Kenyon of correlating the pottery with the architectural remains seems to us open to objection. She explains her method *in extenso* on p. 90: 'It is therefore only the pottery of the period of construction that can safely be associated with a building, and not that of the succeeding period of occupation. All the stratified pottery comes from beneath the floors associated with the various walls.' According to Dr. Kenyon, therefore, the pottery of every stratum comes exclusively from beneath the beaten earth floors. At the same time she admits 'that the deposits making up the floor may contain objects somewhat earlier than the buildings'. It is difficult to understand why a sealed floor should contain pottery of the period of construction of that very stratum. On the contrary, it seems to us obvious that the bulk of the pottery 'from beneath the floors' belongs as a rule to the preceding stratum, and may contain some still earlier sherds; it is also obvious to us that only single sherds 'of the period of construction' should be expected. That is the reason why we maintain that pottery found *on* the floor is the most reliable indicator, belonging, of course, mainly to the end of the period of occupation of a certain stratum. Consequently it seems to us that Dr. Kenyon's correlation of the pottery and the buildings is not correct: the pottery attributed by her to a certain stratum belongs in reality to the preceding one. This is especially true in the case of her periods I-II, for most of their material comes from the filling between the walls and the courtyard. To sum up our opinion: periods I-II antedate the great building operations of Omri and Ahab, whereas the pottery of period III belongs to these buildings.

Tell el-Far'ah (N.). A comparison between the stratification of de Vaux at Tell el-Far'ah (N.) and the stratification of Hazor shows further parallels. De Vaux's 'intermédiaire', dated to the 9th century B.C., contains cooking-pots of the two classes,³⁶ in accordance with the finds in the 'mixed' stratum IVA of Megiddo.

Tell Qasile. Stratum VIII, which touches our problem, is dated by the excavator to the 9th century B.C.³⁷ As has been recognized by Mazar, the typical Iron II material (called by him 'Middle Iron Age I'), begins in this stratum. Accord-

³⁶ *TF(N.)*, p. 585, Fig. 19.

³⁷ *TQ*, pp. 67, 195-207.

ing to our scheme this material would be Israelite III. It may, therefore, be asked whether Qasile VIII should not correspond to Hazor VII. Furthermore, Mazar assigns IX2 and IX1 to David and Solomon respectively. In case our assumption is correct we should perhaps date IX2 to both David and Solomon, whereas IX1 would cover the period from Shishak to the middle of the 9th century B.C. If this chronology proves correct we have again a transition in the middle of the 9th century B.C.

When we come to discuss sites in the south of the country, the difficulty of finding out the crucial dates of the 9th century B.C. becomes obvious.

Albright and Wright have worked out with exemplary thoroughness the differences between Iron I and Iron II (to use the common nomenclature). These differences are represented in part by the same pottery types that have been described above with reference to Hazor: (a) the appearance of the Late Shallow cooking-pot, called by Albright 'transitional' type, which continues till the end of the Israelite period alongside the Deep Type; (b) the appearance of the water decanter.

On the other hand, these differences are expressed in pottery types not found in the north of the country. The most prominent of these are: (a) an abundance of ring-burnished bowls; (b) hole-mouth jars; (c) ribbed-handled store-jars; (d) the late type of the black juglet.³⁸ The question therefore arises, when does the transition to these types occur? Albright has fixed this turning-point at 920 B.C. on the basis of an historical analysis. Practically all other excavations in this country followed his system. However, apart from historical considerations connected with the Shishak invasion (it is very doubtful whether he destroyed Tell Beit Mirsim), we cannot see at the moment any local evidence to determine an absolute date for TBM B3 and A1. It seems quite clear, however, that the whole material of TBM A contains only types corresponding to our Israelite III; the types noted above as ending with Hazor VIII do not appear in TBM A. This fact is especially clear in the cooking-pot series. We have discussed above (pp. 174 f.) the complications of naming the three main types of cooking-pots. In TBM A Albright found two types: the Late Shallow and the Deep Type. Now, in comparing this situation with Hazor, where the Early Shallow Type goes on till the middle of the 9th century, we are

³⁸ Mention should also be made of the high disc-based lamp, which appears somewhat later than the rest of the types.

virtually forced to assume that stratum A of TBM cannot be dated before the middle of the 9th century B.C.³⁹ The same date is indicated by the appearance of the water decanter in stratum A, though it is not clear whether it makes its appearance with the beginning of A1.⁴⁰ Furthermore, Albright emphasizes the abundance of ring-burnished bowls in A, which already begin to appear in B3.⁴¹ As we have pointed out above, completely ring-burnished bowls do not occur before Hazor VIII and Samaria III. Again we are forced to believe that the end of TBM B3 is contemporary with these strata and cannot be earlier than the middle of the 9th century B.C.

The only other site in the south whose stratification has some bearing on our problem is Beth Shemesh.⁴² The stratum of interest there is IIB, which was originally dated by Grant and Wright to 950-825 B.C.⁴³ Their analysis of the pottery shows that this stratum, like Megiddo IVA, contains earlier and later types together. Hand- as well as wheel-burnishing is common.⁴⁴ Water decanters already make their first appearance in this stratum.⁴⁵ The 'mixed' context of stratum IIB is most obvious from the discussion of the early and late types of the cooking-pot: 'In the late 10th or early 9th century this form (=our Early Shallow Type) is gradually displaced by one which has a grooved rim (=our Late Shallow Type)' (p. 138). This statement shows an accurate observation of the development of the type, but the date, if compared with Hazor, is some 50 years too high, and the transition between the two types is not gradual but rather sudden. Thus we have in Beth Shemesh IIB the same phenomenon as in Megiddo IVA, and Tell el-Far'ah (N.) 'intermédiaire',

³⁹ We have to keep in mind that almost all the published material belongs to A2, and that Albright himself had difficulty in indicating the types which belong to A1, and their differences from those of B3 (*TBM I*, pp. 78-79). If, therefore, it is concluded that part of the material of A1 does continue the types of B3, it may perhaps be necessary to put the beginning of stratum A somewhat higher than the dates we propose here, on the basis of the published material. If such is the case, the turning-point falls between A1 and A2. This, however, will not affect our conclusion that the main shift in the pottery types falls in the middle of the ninth century B. C.

⁴⁰ *TBM I*, § 111; *TBM III*, § 152.

⁴¹ *TBM I*, § 117; *TBM III*, § 160.

⁴² We need only mention the situation in the other important sites: Lachish: stratum IV has not yet been excavated; hence it is not yet possible to tell when IV terminated and III began. However, it seems quite probable that III ended with Sennacherib's siege in 701 B. C. Tell en Naşbeh: no stratification. Gezer was destroyed, as generally assumed, by Shishak; therefore no material of our Israelite III is found there. As for Tell Jemmeh—the sequence of pottery types is the same as in *TBM* and *AS*, but no chronological conclusions can be deduced.

⁴³ *AS V*, p. 15.

⁴⁴ *AS V*, p. 136.

⁴⁵ *AS V*, p. 140.

Appr. Date	Hazor	Megiddo	Tell Abu Hawam	Samarra	Tell el-Far'ah (N.)	Tell Qasile	Beth-Shemesh	Tell Beit Mirsim	Lachish	
1000-950 ISRAELITE II	—	VB	III	I-II	III	IX ₂	IIa	B ₃		
	X-IX	VA-IVB								
	950-925	VIII		IVA	III	interm.	IX ₁	IIb		
										875-841
841-815 815-765 765-732 732-721 721-700 700-650 650-587 ISRAELITE III	VII		—	IV		VIII			V2-III	
	VI		—	V		VII ₂	c. 795 —			
	V	III	—	VI	II	VII ₁		A ₁		
	—		—			—				
	IV	II	—	VII	I	—	IIc			
	III		—			—		A ₂		II

—a stratum covering the whole of the ninth century B. C. and therefore containing a mixture of our Israelite II and Israelite III.⁴⁶

To summarize the above discussion the comparative chart (p. 183) will be helpful.

Historically, the new scheme for the division of the Israelite period (Iron Age) corresponds well to the development of the period:

(a) Israelite I, 1200-1000 B. C., is the period before the establishment of the Monarchy. Its material culture is an entity amalgamating the beginnings of the Israelite pottery developed out of Canaanite traditions and Philistine elements intruding from without.

(b) Israelite II, 1000-840 B. C. This sub-period marks a high point in cultural and material activities. We may discern in this period clear Phoenician influences in pottery as well as in architecture. Its achievements do not seem to end immediately with the division of the Monarchy after the death of King Solomon, but to continue in the same line for another two or three generations, until after the reigns of Omri and Ahab in Israel and of Asa and Jehoshaphat in Judah.

We have tried to prove the extent of this sub-period in time and its cohesion from the ceramic point of view. We may reach parallel conclusions by examining its architecture and methods of building: ashlar building and elaborate capitals are found at Megiddo and Gezer⁴⁷ in the time of Solomon, and at Samaria and Hazor in the time of Ahab, without any difference. This fact lies at the root of Crowfoot's suggestion that Megiddo IVB should be assigned to Ahab instead of to Solomon.⁴⁸

(c) Israelite III, 840-587 B. C. The last sub-period manifests in a very interesting way the increasing differentiation between the cultures of Judah and Israel, together with the increasing Assyrian influence. It is a period of standardization of material culture in both kingdoms. During this relatively long sub-period (especially in Judah) only slight changes are to be noted. It may be defined as a period of stabilization, followed by decline.

⁴⁶ The new date given by F. M. Cross & G. E. Wright (*JBL*, 75, 1956, p. 216) in the tenth century B. C. is quite improbable. Since IIb contains material of Hazor VII, it cannot end before the second half of the ninth century B. C.

⁴⁷ See Y. Yadin: Solomon's City Wall and Gate at Gezer, *IEJ*, 8, 1958, pp. 80-86.

⁴⁸ J. W. Crowfoot Megiddo—A Review, *PEQ*, 1940, pp. 132-147.