

EXCAVATIONS AT TELL ED-DUWEIR, PALESTINE,
DIRECTED BY THE LATE J. L. STARKEY, 1932-1938

Some Results and Reflections

An address delivered at a meeting of the P.E.F. on
January 25, 1950

BY OLGA TUFNELL

As a Danish friend once complained—"the trouble about you English is that you're always apologising about something"—so I shall not excuse the long delay in presenting some results of the excavations at Tell ed-Duweir: world events and the expedition's tragic loss have conspired to put such peaceful pre-occupations far beyond individual control.

Twelve years have elapsed since the late James Leslie Starkey last addressed members of the Palestine Exploration Fund in June, 1937, but less than five of them have been spent on the publications of the Wellcome-Marston Expedition. The first volume in the series was Professor Torczyner's account of the Lachish Letters, published early in 1938. It was followed two years after the Director's death by volume II on "The Fosse Temple" prepared by his successor in the field, C. H. Inge, Lankester Harding and myself, and issued by the Oxford University Press at a time when general attention was otherwise engaged. War and its aftermath completely engrossed us all until 1945, when Miss M. V. Seton-Williams and I made a beginning on volume III, which I am thankful to say is now approaching completion.

Fortunately, Dr. David Diringer, now University Lecturer in Semitic Epigraphy at Cambridge, was then able to examine all the early Hebrew inscriptions, and his detailed report forms a special chapter. We had the benefit of Dr. M. A. Murray's profound knowledge of Egyptian hieroglyphs in the elucidation of scarabs and amulets.

Miss D. M. A. Bate provided a report on the animal bones and numerous other members of the British Museum (Natural History) staff have identified those unconsidered trifles, such as stones and shells which sometimes contribute information out of all proportion to their size. Most of the admirable photographs in the book are the work of R. Richmond Brown, while the plans of the site, its buildings and tombs were made in successive years by W. B. K. Shaw, G. I. Goulden and H. V. Bonney.

All this and much more practical help and encouragement has come my way, but above all I have had the unfailing support of the Wellcome Trustees, headed by their Chairman, Sir H. H. Dale, and they have never faltered in their determination to overcome the many obstacles in the way of publication.

The fourth and final volume in the publications will deal with our knowledge of the site from the earliest times to the end of the Bronze Age, but as a preliminary account, Mr. B. S. J. Isserlin and I have prepared an outline and interpretation of the occupational levels present in the trial trenches, which is to be published in the next number of the Quarterly.

The present intention is, therefore, to summarise for your benefit some of the conclusions contained in volume III, in so far as they emerge from the incomplete excavations.

The period to be discussed ranges from about 1200 to 600 B.C. and covers the first and second Iron Ages, though most of the material belongs to the end of the period. A close attribution of specific groups or objects to a definite date is dependent on the discovery of inscriptions mentioning historic events or personages, and it is a lamentable fact that despite a century of excavations in Palestine nothing of the kind has yet been found in an undisturbed city level or a closed tomb deposit of the Iron Age.

To illustrate the importance of a fixed point in a sequence of archaeological material, may I refer to the contents of a tomb found in Amman, which is to be published as a monograph of this Fund by Lankester Harding. With good

quality pottery, seals and rings, there was a signet inscribed with the name of "Adoni Nur servant of Ammi Nadab." Now Ammi Nadab was styled ruler of Ammon in the Assyrian lists of Ashur-bani-pal (668-625 B.C.). It is memorable that the remote kingdom of Ammon—now seen to be under Assyrian suzerainty in the 7th century B.C.—should produce the first group which can be associated with a known personage, and the Department of Antiquities of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan is to be heartily congratulated.

Though there are local specialities in the group and a close affinity with Assyrian ceramics, the general trend of the pottery in this and other contemporary deposits conforms to Palestinian development, and is particularly noticeable in the case of the lamps.

Taking lamps as an example of a trend which can also be followed in the case of bowls, jugs and jars, the sequence of lamps at Tell ed-Duweir establishes that the practical improvement of a disk base did not become popular before the occupation of Tomb 106. On the analogy of the Amman group where lamps with flat disk bases are predominant, the tomb was occupied in the latter part of the 7th century and possibly after, for there were double the number of heavy disk-based lamps, which are a late development.

To show what is meant by a pottery sequence—and there are many who still cannot accept that it is a true mirror of chronology—I must digress to introduce to you a very familiar object presented in the terms of archaeological drawing convention: it is the tea-cup.

Mr. W. B. Honey, of the Victoria and Albert Museum, very kindly selected for me the most typical forms illustrating the development of cups between the 17th and 19th centuries of our era. Derived from the heavy bowl without saucer used in the Chinese tea ceremony, the delicate cup and saucer at the top of the drawing¹ was specially made in China for the export market. As the tea-drinking habit spread in

¹ Plate XVII.

Europe, the cup became larger and acquired a handle, attached well below the rim. In the next phase, the form was more angular, and the handle was put on nearer the rim. In the third phase, the handle is higher than the rim of the cup. It is interesting to speculate on the mental processes resulting in the upward tendency of the handle on the cup, for the same trend is a marked characteristic of Palestinian jugs and juglets. We are not sufficiently removed in time from the cups of the late 19th and 20th centuries, to recognise the typical and commonest forms, but no one will contest the predominance of the "utility" cup of 1950, nor can they fail to agree that it is far removed from the elegant vessels of the last two centuries. It is also instructive to see how many distinct phases are apparent in just over a century.

Given a sufficient amount and variety of material from an ancient site, it is comprehensible that any group of associated objects can be placed in its correct sequence according to the proportionate increase or decrease of various forms. If we look at our own china cupboards, for instance, they contain pieces used by our parents and our grandparents, but most of the tea-cups—and this is the important point—in the shops and on our shelves came from the potteries in the last decade.

If careful statistics had been kept recording the incidence of the main classes of lamps or any other common form in all stratified deposits throughout Palestine, it would now be an easy matter to correlate the material and reach a proved synthesis. Assuming that we can place in order the ceramic contents of associated groups from tombs or city levels, then the whole series can be related with the help of a few fixed points to the history of Judah, which is of all histories one of the most familiar to us through the detailed records of the Old Testament.

Starkey's work at Tell ed-Duweir between 1932-1938 provided the first, but not the second of these requirements. Less than a dozen multiple tomb chambers contained between them many hundreds of burials, each provided with pottery and personal ornaments. Bowls, lamps, jugs and

juglets are the commonest forms and they can be placed in order according to their shape and frequency. This is a step forward because it is the first time that enough tombs groups have been found of Iron Age date to make such a close division possible. It now remains to fix the whole series in a chronological setting based on historical events. In order to do so, geography and topography must also be considered.

Tell ed-Duweir lies close to the southern extremity of the kingdom, some twenty-five miles south-west of Jerusalem. From the summit of the mound on a western spur of the Judaeen foothills, the whole expanse of the Philistine plain is visible, though the site is completely hidden from afar. In the words of Jeremiah applied to an unnamed place it is "Inhabited of the valley, Rock of the plain" (Jeremiah xxi, 13).

There is no doubt that it was the most considerable fortified city in the southern kingdom, possibly even larger than Jerusalem itself, estimated at $11\frac{1}{2}$ acres (C.A.H., vol. III p. 344.). The area within the walls was 18 acres, double the size of any other site in Judah. The commanding site of Tell es-Safi, which may represent the town of Libnah, covers 9 acres; Tells Beit Mirsim, er-Rumeileh ('Ain Shems) and en-Nasbeh are each between 7 and 8 acres, while Tell ej-Judeideh is $6\frac{1}{2}$ acres and Tell Sandahannah and Tell Zakariyeh are less than 5 acres.

Sites of comparable size are hard to find in Israel. Tell el-Mutesellim (Megiddo), holding the vital pass for Syria, covered 15 acres within its walls, while Sebastiyeh (Samaria), capital of the northern kingdom, was about the same size.

Tell Jezer alone covers the same area, and it is securely identified as the site of Gezer by the presence of boundary stones inscribed in Hebrew and Greek. This great independent city state was conquered by an Egyptian Pharaoh who presented it to Solomon as part of his daughter's dowry. The equality in size to Tell ed-Duweir suggests that we should look for the name of an ancient city as prominent in history as Gezer, in order to identify the site. The place which presents itself most forcibly in this connection is *L-k-š* or

Lakišu, so frequently mentioned in Assyrian and Biblical record, and already prominent in the 15th-14th century correspondence of Tell el-Amarna as *Lakiša*.

Firstly, what references are there to the city and what position does it hold in the political history of Judah?

At the close of the Bronze Age, about 1200 B.C., five kings of the Amorites formed a league against Joshua:—

“ . . . the king of Jerusalem, the king of Hebron, the king of Jarmuth, the king of Lachish, the king of Eglon, gathered themselves together, and went up, they and all their hosts, and encamped before Gibeon and made war against it.” (Joshua x, 5).

After the defeat of this coalition, Japhia, king of Lachish, with the other kings, was hanged at Makkedah, and Joshua advanced southwards:—

“ And the Lord delivered Lachish into the hand of Israel, which took it on the second day, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and all the souls that were therein.” (Joshua x, 32.)

“ Then Horam king of Gezer came up to help Lachish; and Joshua smote him and his people, until he had left him none remaining.” (v. 33.)

“ And from Lachish Joshua passed unto Eglon . . . and they took it on that day and smote it with the edge of the sword . . . according to all that he had done to Lachish.” (v. 34-5.)

About 925 B.C. Lachish was included among fifteen cities fortified by Rehoboam:—

“ And he fortified the strongholds, and put captains in them, and store of victual and of oil and wine.”

“ And in every several city he put shields and spears and made them exceeding strong . . . ” (II Chronicles xi, 11-12.)

A century later:—

“ Now after the time that Amaziah did turn away from following the Lord, they made a conspiracy against him in Jerusalem; and he fled to Lachish: but they sent to Lachish

after him and slew him there." (II Chronicles xxv, 27 and II Kings xiv, 19.)

From the Assyrian annals, Sennacherib's campaign is very closely dated to 700 B.C. and it is also described in II Kings, II Chronicles and Isaiah :—

"Now in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah did Sennacherib king of Assyria come up against all the fenced cities of Judah, and took them." (II Kings xviii, 13.)

(The account in Chronicles does not admit that the cities were taken—the phrase is "thought to win them for himself.")

"And Hezekiah king of Judah sent to the king of Assyria to Lachish saying, I have offended ; return from me : that which thou puttest on me will I bear . . .

And Hezekiah gave him all the silver that was found in the house of the Lord . . .

And the king of Assyria sent Tartan and Rabsaris and Rabshakeh from Lachish to King Hezekiah with a great host against Jerusalem." (II Kings xviii, 14-17.)

The account in Chronicles adds a note in brackets " (but he *himself* laid siege against Lachish and all his power with him)."

The Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire (vol. I, Letter 218, J. Waterman), includes a letter from one Nergalballit to the king :—

"As for the Philistines, from whom the king my lord has organized a contingent of five troops (and) given them to me, now they are before me. They are *stationed* in the city of Lachish . . ."

The passage may have been written after the capture of the city by Sennacherib in 700 B.C. or some 25 years later when Esarhaddon campaigned against Egypt. Anyhow it shows that Lachish, like Megiddo and Ammon, and probably other chief cities, was under Assyrian control in the 7th century B.C.—an unpleasant fact which would not be emphasised in Biblical record.

The collapse of Assyrian power in 612 B.C. gave the cities of Palestine a short respite, but the Babylonians lost little time in regaining control. Nebuchadnezzar led two campaigns, one in 598 and a second between 589—587 B.C. It is probably to the second of these that the following passage refers :—

“ When the king of Babylon’s army fought against Jerusalem, and against all the cities of Judah that were left, against Lachish, and against Azekah : for these defenced cities remained of the cities of Judah.” (Jeremiah xxxiv, 7.)

Lines 10–13 on the reverse of Lachish Letter IV are relevant in this connection :—

“ and will know that for the signals of Lachish we are watching, according to all the indications which my lord hath given, because we do not see (the signals of) Azekah.”

Let me state at once that I am in full agreement with those scholars who do not see any proof in this passage that Tell ed-Duweir can be identified with Lachish (QS 1940, p. 148). I support the identification for different reasons :—

In my opinion the case for the identity of Tell ed-Duweir with Lachish is strong because Tell ed-Duweir is the largest site in Judah and Lachish was the most important stronghold during the last centuries of the kingdom.¹

Lest you should be dazzled by the grandeur and magnificence of ancient cities, may I remind you that the smaller towns are comparable in area to that covered by the Houses of Parliament (8 acres) while Tell ed-Duweir is 6 acres larger than the Tower of London (12 acres).

¹ Strong evidence is afforded by the statement of Eusebius in *Onomasticon* that Lakeis stood at the seventh milestone on the way from Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin) to Daromā, a distance which brings the traveller within sight of the Roman settlement at Khirbet Duweir (*see* Garstang, *Joshua Judges*, p. 173). The line of a road, marked by stones, was visible in the valley north of the ancient mound. About 50 cms. below the present ground surface, sections of a well-built road were exposed, bordered by a footpath and drainage channels. The presence of a “ crossbow ” fibula and numerous coins of the IVth cent. A.D. make it extremely probable that the road is that to which Eusebius referred.

Having discussed the historical and geographical setting, let us consider the historical facts. In common with most sites so far examined in south Palestine, excavation has proved that Tell ed-Duweir suffered wholesale destruction at the end of the Bronze Age, of which the last phase had been distinguished by great prosperity and a close connection with the Egyptian empire.

Marked by a heavy layer of burning, this destruction occurred in the early decades of the 12th century B.C. and was followed as at most sites by a period of stagnation.

Tell Beit Mirsim is a useful exception to the general rule. There Professor Albright has revealed stratified deposits and pits above the burnt city (C) containing wares which retain many characteristics of the Late Bronze Age pottery forms with simplified painted decoration. He divides city (B) into three phases; and the Philistine wares with birds and spirals painted in black and red are confined to the middle phase, which dates between 1150-1000 B.C.

It is clear that the Philistines had no lasting hold on our city. The distinctive pottery so generally attributed to these people is also found at Tell Jemmeh and Tell el-Fara to the south, Ascalon on the sea coast, and Tells Sandahannah, es-Safi, er-Rumeileh and en-Nasbeh to the north, yet only three sherds were recovered from the central site of Tell ed-Duweir after six seasons' work.

On the western edge of the mound, where a trial cut was made through the Iron Age deposits, very few sherds of any kind came from the ground above the burnt Bronze Age city, and none were found to match the beautiful red burnished wares—chiefly deep bowls with thick inturned rims—which were recovered from one brick building partly exposed at the south-east corner of the palace-fort.

Level VI

There are actually two brick buildings at the south-east corner, partly superimposed, and neither of them was apparently affected by fire. The lower building, of which three long narrow rooms were visible, continued under the

stone wall of palace C and contained pottery which is comparable to Structure III of the Fosse Temple, the burnt surface levels of the cutting on the north-east side, and the burnt levels 10 ft. below the surface in the trial trench on the west side. This central building at least escaped the general conflagration which destroyed the rest of the city.

Level V

Cut through the brick walls of the lower building were several pits and they contained sherds which are comparable to those from Tell Beit Mirsim C and B¹, but the majority are typical of B³ and of Tell el-Ful periods I and II. The contents of the pits are similar to the sherds in the filling of the second brick building extending south of the massive wall which runs parallel to and under the south wall of palace B—C. This wall, 2 m. wide, reappears west of the palace, and was rebuilt in stone in Level IV—III.

It is perhaps to Level V that the single square block of Palace A should belong near the northern extremity of the Bronze Age structure. These ruins were encased in stone, massive roughly-hewn boulders, rising over 7 m. above their foundations. The central part was filled in with clay and hard earth kept in place by interior walls or casemates, the whole forming an impressive platform on which the superstructure of the first Iron Age building was presumably built. The podium is, in my opinion, a fine example of a "millo" such as David built at Jerusalem. The root meaning of the Hebrew word is "filling" or "that which is filled in", and there is a similar word in Assyrian.

Level IV

The next phase of occupation is visible in the west trench. There were some fragments of burnished wares but they were not numerous or early in the development of the technique. Recognisable pottery fragments belong to the middle tombs (224, 1004, 1002, 120), and shapes common in the earlier large groups are hardly represented.

The brick city wall founded on one course of stone was set into this occupational level at 257·88 m., and Late Bronze Age sherds were fairly common up to about a metre above the foundations. As the wall conformed to the edge of the scarp, a foundation trench was unnecessary, and it is likely that some city rubbish was cleared away to provide a flat surface for the construction. Along the inner side there is apparently a lining of rectangular stone slabs, somewhat reminiscent of the slabs embellished by reliefs in Assyrian buildings. The stone seen in section on the plan (Plate XIV) is over 2 metres high, but there is unfortunately no sign that it is decorated or inscribed.

The scarcity of pottery forms and burnished sherds characteristic of the earlier tombs and of Level V in this marginal area does suggest that the city was confined within smaller limits, and that the massive wall, parallel to the south wall of Palace B—C, was the outer enclosure of the 12th—11th century city.

If we adhere to the literary evidence that the brick wall on the western scarp was part of the fortifications initiated by Rehoboam in 925 B.C., we should have to admit that it continued in use until Sennacherib's destruction in 700 B.C., for the brick wall is associated with the brick gate tower leading into the city of Level III.

On the whole this date is satisfactory, as it can be controlled by the appearance of wheel-burnished pottery at Tell ed-Duweir and elsewhere.

Introduction of Wheel Burnish

Tell Beit Mirsim (AASOR XII, pl. 31, 1-33, par. 89).

Silo 40 end of period B left open or partially dug again in period A.

“Majority of sherds belong probably to A¹, 900-800, since they are wheel burnished for the most part.”

'*Ain Shems* (AS V p. 136 f.) City II b, 950-825.

Burnish characteristic—"by hand in spiral or chordal fashion or else on a wheel . . . burnishing over exterior from the rim down to about the middle of the side."

Megiddo (M.I p. 164).

Stra. V. Wheel burnish "restricted to a few bowls."

Date:—Lamon and Shipton, 1050-1000; Albright, 1050-975; Crowfoot, 960-870; Kenyon, 1000-850.

Stra. IV. Burnish becomes common.

Samaria (verbal information, Miss Kenyon).

No wheel burnish in period I, 880-850. Sparsely represented in period II, III. 850-800. In general use, period IV.

Tell ed-Duweir.

West trench at 258.34-04 m. "a few sherds," c. 900. Tomb 224, 3 examples.

Tomb 1002 and Level III, burnish becomes common.

The use of the wheel to burnish the surface, as well as to turn the vessel was introduced after 900 B.C., it was not in common use for another half century or more and the technique did not completely displace hand burnishing until about 700 B.C.

Level III

We are best informed about the city of Level III, of which a part was cleared to the south of the palace-fort. Some of the walls close to the south wall may have been incorporated from houses built during the occupation of Level IV, but the huddle of poorly-constructed rooms, built over the underlying ramp rising up to the palace wall had been abandoned with all the domestic equipment, owing to destruction by fire. A similar group of stores and shops on either side of the road into the city shared the same fate. In almost every room there were broken handles and

fragments of large storage jars made of a metallic ware. In two cases the jars could be repaired : on one vessel there was the stamped impression of a private name, and on the other there was a winged emblem with two words in Hebrew script.

The significance of the stamps has been discussed by Dr. Diringier in the pages of the *Quarterly Statement* (1941 : pp. 38-56, 91-101) ; on palaeographic grounds he would prefer to date all three classes in the 8th rather than the 7th century, which would accord with the suggested destruction by Sennacherib in 700 B.C.

Nothing but a few burnt patches of plastered floor remained of the palace B—C, which stood on the greatly enlarged podium south of the square block of Palace A. A quantity of stamped jar handles came from the floor levels and from the open space on the podium not covered by the later residency. However, east of the palace much burnt debris and fallen brick covered the plastered court, which was intact along a large part of the east wall, and a flight of steps was preserved up to half the remaining height of the podium.

On the earlier underlying steps, I was lucky enough to discover on the last day of the last season, five faintly scratched signs, which proved to be the first five letters of the early Hebrew alphabet. Professor Albright and Dr. Diringier are agreed that these schoolboy scribblings should be dated to the late 9th or early 8th century B.C. Though made of very soft stone, neither the earliest nor latest set of three superimposed flights were worn, so the later flight contemporary with the plastered court could have been in use about 700 B.C.

With regard to the fortifications of the city at that time, there is the valuable evidence of the Assyrian field artist's impression of Lachish, depicted with instructive detail on the bas-reliefs from the Palace of Nineveh, discovered by A. H. Layard in 1850 and now preserved in the Assyrian gallery of the British Museum. An upper and a lower wall are shown crowning a steep escarpment or stone glacis. Both circuits have towers and battlements and are recessed at regular intervals.

In the lower half of the composition to the left, is an isolated tower with projecting parapet manned by bowmen and slingers, and six non-combatant men and women are to be seen emerging from a door or gate. Is it by any chance the representation of the square stone bastion of which the plan is visible at the south-west corner of the mound?

Unfortunately, the relationship of the tower to the walls is obscured on the picture by foreground detail. If the tower were actually detached from the lower revetment in 700 B.C., it would confirm that it was only incorporated into that line in the following century. A deviation in the line of the west wall not far from the bastion, does, indeed, suggest some alteration in plan, and there are at least two periods of repair along the west side.

The archaeological evidence for the constructional date of these magnificent walls will not be conclusive until further cross sections are made, but both lines were certainly standing when the Assyrians attacked. Hebrew builders were capable of constructions on a grand scale, as attested by the entirely Iron Age walls of Tell en-Nasbeh, where a similar method of construction was employed. (T.N., vol I, pp. 189-205.)

The fortifications at Tell ed-Duweir consisted of three superimposed blocks or units. Section A contained twelve or more rows of enormous boulders, founded on bedrock and resting at an angle against Early Middle Bronze Age town rubbish.

Above section A was a vertical stone wall (B) of smaller stones decreasing in size. Over B was a free-standing brick wall (C) about 6 metres wide, recessed in panels along the outer face. Whenever there was a rise in the level of the underlying rock, the order of these sections became deranged, and it is quite possible to find the vertical stone wall above the brick section.

The brick section was heavily coated with a white lime plaster, which would have shone and glittered in the sun. As we found in building the camphouse, the plaster facing was a practical necessity to preserve the mud walls from

driving rain. A passage in Ezekiel is undoubtedly based on bitter experience :—

“ . . . one built up a wall, and, lo, others daubed it with untempered mortar : Say unto them . . . that it shall fall : there shall be an overflowing shower . . . So will I break down the wall . . . and bring it to the ground, so that the foundation thereof shall be discovered.”

Level II

As a result of the destruction of Level III, the brick wall which had stood for two centuries was cut down to within 3 metres of its base, and upon the flat upper surface another wall was built of stone blocks, filled in with smaller stones. Only a small section remained in the low lying level of the gate, but it included the stone threshold, covered by a burnt deposit, also visible on the contemporary road surface inside the city. The area formerly occupied by shops and houses in Level III was an open space in the next period, very suitable for the troop formations conscripted by the Assyrians. The only houses of the period were some lean-to shacks against the ruined east wall of the palace-fort. Perhaps the most significant discovery was a wine or water jar, crushed in many pieces. On the shoulder was a half obliterated early Hebrew inscription beginning with these words : “ In the ninth . . . ” Though tantalizingly incomplete, it reminds us that Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon advanced for the second time against Jerusalem in the ninth year of King Zedekiah’s reign (II Kings xxv, 1), and it is generally agreed that Lachish was finally destroyed in 588 B.C. though an earlier burnt roadway within the city may suggest that it suffered some damage in the earlier attack.

The devastation was thorough and complete, and there is no indication at present that any rebuilding took place for more than a century. Meanwhile the south Arabian tribes were pushing in from Edom, leaving traces of their presence at Tell ed-Duweir in the deposits of crude chalk altars, one of which is inscribed in Aramaean. Lachish no

longer formed part of Judah but it was chosen to be the capital of the southern province of Idumaea. The new rulers cleared the fallen burnt brick from the palace platform and built a well-planned residence on the site, with a spacious court, steps and columns. A bathroom and water closet—infrequent in Palestinian buildings—were also included.

The architectural affinities of the residency lead us to Syria. The closest parallel is undoubtedly the central block of the topmost building at Arslan Tash (*Arslan Tash*, by F. Thureau-Dangin, A. Barrois, G. Dossin and Maurice Dunand. Paris, 1931), which is itself similar to the earlier "House of Ivories" on the same site. The excavators were not able to provide close dates or parallels for either building, and these two with the residency at Tell ed-Duweir certainly bear no comparison to the Persian palaces at Persepolis and Pasargadae.

Other less imposing isolated buildings were cleared at Tell ed-Duweir, but I can only mention one which has been frequently referred to as the "solar shrine" owing to its east to west orientation and the presence of an overturned altar. I cannot say when it was built, but it was certainly in use as late as the 2nd century B.C. Among the pottery and other objects in the filling were coins of Antiochus III and IV.

Antiochus the Great became master of Palestine in 198 B.C. after defeating Ptolemy IV of Egypt, and it is a close reflection of historic events that only coins of the first four Ptolemies (*circa* 223–203 B.C.) were recovered from the surface of the mound, while coins of the Seleucid kings of Antioch replaced them after that date. Moreover no coins of the early Maccabaeen kings were found (166–103 B.C.), though Alexander Jannaeus—who greatly extended the kingdom—was represented. Throughout Roman and Byzantine rule the state of local security is apparently mirrored by the presence or lack of coins—the sure tokens of economic prosperity.

A few milliemes and piastres dropped by our men, some deposits of tin cans and the razed charred walls of the Expedition's camphouse now add their insignificant quota to the long history of the site.