

HAZOR, SAMARIA AND LACHISH

A SYNTHESIS

By OLGA TUFNELL

The publication of *Samaria-Sebaste* 3 and *Hazor* I during 1958¹ presents a welcome opportunity to compare at one and the same time the contents of the stratified deposits from these sites with the material from contemporary tombs and from Iron Age cities at Lachish. No more favourable moment could be found to re-examine the conclusions published five years ago in *Lachish* III with regard to the destruction levels, for these three sites between them almost span the proverbial extent of the Promised Land "from Dan even unto Beersheba," and they offer the widest possible view of the culture of Israel and Judah during two centuries.

I. THIRTEENTH TO ELEVENTH CENTURIES B.C.

A. *Bronze Age destructions*

Both Lachish and Hazor were important Canaanite cities in the time of Joshua; he took two days to overcome Lachish during his campaign against the Amorite League, and though it is not expressly stated that he burnt the city (Joshua x, 32) it might be inferred that it was normally Joshua's policy to do so, since it was thought necessary in the following account of the destruction of northern tells (Heb. *tillim*) to mention that "Israel burned none of them, save Hazor only" (Joshua xi, 10-13).

At nearly all points where excavation penetrated below the Iron Age levels at Lachish, a thick layer of black earth and ash was exposed (*L.III*, p. 77, *L.IV*, pp. 36 f.), and the imported pottery found in it appeared to be closely contemporary with the Mycenaean wares dating from the last phases of the Late Bronze Age in the thirteenth century B.C., which came from the south-west corner of the rectangular enclosure at Hazor (*Hazor* I, Area C). The Canaanite cities at Hazor and Lachish are therefore sealed off from the Iron Age cities which follow by a destruction layer of similar composition, though there is nothing to prove that it was the work of Joshua. Evidence for immediate rebuilding after this disaster in the twelfth or eleventh century may come to light in future excavations, but so far there is little to indicate that an urban settlement existed at either site during this time.

¹ Reviewed in *P.E.Q.*, 1959, pp. 62-71.

B. *Relationship between the Bronze Age and Iron Age Cities*

The layout of the last burnt Canaanite city influenced the architectural plan of the earliest Iron Age city at Lachish. The brick and stone walls followed the contours of the mound, and at some points the earlier system may have been incorporated into the Iron Age fortifications. The north-west angle of the principal building (Palace A) was directly founded on the same corner of its burnt Bronze Age predecessor. At the opposite south-east corner, a trial cut through the plaster court of Palace C (attributed to Level III) established the fact that here in the heart of the mound there was a Bronze Age "Government Storehouse," the walls of which were cut through by later rubbish pits, though in this area at least there was no sign of fire (*L.III*, Fig. 4 on p. 78, cf. Pl. 16:6). Above these rooms and pits many sherds were found which could be confidently compared with sherds from Strata B₂₋₃ at Tell Beit Mirsim, and from Stratum V at Megiddo, while it will be interesting to see how far the comparisons hold for Tell el-Ful, when that pottery is published. These occupational phases may come down into the tenth century B.C.

It is therefore clear from what has already been seen that there was no general "great destruction level" between that of the Bronze Age city (Level VI) and that of Level III near the centre of the mound, neither was it apparent on the west side (*L.III*, p. 171)¹.

It is too soon in the excavation programme at Hazor to establish the relationship between the earliest Iron Age strata X-IX on the Acropolis, and the underlying buildings, though Dr. Yadin states that "Stratum XI seems to belong to the L.B. II period." He goes on to say that "there is a clear gap between the Canaanite era . . . and the restoration of the town by Solomon. Iron I pottery was scarcely found, and the little of it discovered indicates a temporary settlement only."²

II. TENTH CENTURY

A. *Building programmes under David and Solomon.*

And the king commanded, and they brought great stones, costly stones, and hewed stones to lay the foundation of the house. And Solomon's builders and Hiram's builders did hew them, and the stonesquarers:³ so they prepared timber and stones to build the house (I Kings v, 17, 18).

¹ For the hypotheses on which Miss Kenyon bases her 597 B.C. date for the destruction of Level III, see *S.S.* 3, pp. 207-208.

² *Hazor*, An Archaeological Exhibition at the British Museum, May-June, 1958, p. 20. The excavations of 1958 showed that Strata

XII-XI were still Israelite in character, but the poor remains of the earlier phase confirmed that Hazor was not reconstructed as a fortified town before the time of Solomon (*I.E.J.* 9 [1959], p. 80).

³ So A.V.; margin, "Giblites", *i.e.*, "men of Gebal" (R.S.V.).

And this is the reason of the levy which king Solomon raised; for to build the house of the Lord, and his own house, and Millo, and the wall of Jerusalem, and Hazor, and Megiddo, and Gezer (I Kings ix, 15).

The credit for the building of the Temple at Jerusalem belongs to David; it was his inspiration which set the plans in motion, and his foresight which gathered the strangers together and set the masons to work (I Chronicles, xxii, 2). He made provision of gold, silver, brass, iron, timber and stone in abundance, but feeling himself unworthy for the task, he directed his son to increase the stocks of supplies and to accomplish this holy enterprise. Though it is clear that foreign stonemasons were already famous as the best of their kind in David's reign, we have to look back possibly as much as two centuries to find examples of their work. A magnificent complex of palace buildings in dressed stone at Ras Shamra (Ugarit)¹ seems to provide the earliest parallel so far available for the style of masonry which was to be employed in Israel for government buildings, palaces and city walls from the tenth century onwards. Until 1954 no such buildings constructed in this style had been found in Judah, but Dr. Aharoni's excavations at Ramat Rahel, just south of Jerusalem, revealed masonry "almost exactly similar to the 'inner wall' of Samaria" (*I.E.J.* 6 [1956], pp. 138-144 and Pl. 23 B).²

The building programme outside Jerusalem was only begun half-way through Solomon's reign (I Kings ix, 10), which would leave some twenty years for its completion, if we assume that the conventional forty years ascribed to Solomon's reign (and also to that of his father) were approximately correct. A mention of the Egyptian king Shishak (Sheshonq I, c. 952-920 B.C.) in I Kings xi, 40, as contemporary with Solomon, and in xiv, 25, as contemporary with Rehoboam, enables us to say with some confidence that the resettlement of Hazor, Megiddo and Gezer took place in the latter half of the tenth century. These three cities dominating the plains of Huleh, Jezreel and Ajalon respectively were strategic key points in the primary defence of the newly-established kingdom.

B. *Hazor rebuilt*

A city gate at Hazor (found during the third season) proved to be identical in plan and measurements with a gate at Megiddo, attributed by

¹ *Syria*, 12 (1931), pls. xii, 1, 3; *Syria*, 13 (1932), pl. xv, 3.

² From the material so far discovered the pottery may be dated "not earlier than the eighth century B.C.," and though the excavator considers that some of the finds may belong to the ninth century, the illustrations point closely to the seventh or early sixth century. A late date for the building

of Ramat Rahel would be in keeping with the newly-published evidence from South Arabia, where "marginally drafted, pecked masonry" begins in the middle of the seventh century. For a valuable study of this style and its derivatives, see Van Beek in *Archaeological Discoveries in South Arabia*, by Richard Le Baron Bowen, Jr., Frank P. Albright, *et al.* (Baltimore 1958).

the excavators to Stratum IV B. In a recent article, Dr. Yadin compares them also to part of the "Maccabean Castle" at Gezer; he suggests that "the three gates and walls all belong to the same period, and were in fact built by Solomon's architects from identical blue-prints, with minor changes in each case made necessary by the terrain".¹ The city wall and gate attributed by the excavators of Megiddo to Stratum IV B, should "perhaps be ascribed to IV A" in the light of the Hazor evidence (*Hazor I*, p. 35). Reconstruction of the pottery from Megiddo into its original groups—irrespective of stratum attribution—should now go far towards obtaining a clear picture of developments on that site.

C. *Lachish fortified after the Schism*

And Rehoboam dwelt in Jerusalem, and built cities for defence in Judah. He built even Beth-lehem, and Etam, and Tekoa, and Beth-zur, and Shoco, and Adullam, and Gath, and Mareshah, and Ziph, and Adoraim, and Lachish, and Azekah, and Zorah, and Aijalon, and Hebron, which are in Judah and in Benjamin fenced cities (II Chronicles xi, 5-10).

On the division of the kingdom, Rehoboam had to protect Judah from Philistine attack, and a third of his fenced cities overlooked the coastal plain; others were placed in strategic positions to control the passes to the hinterland (*L. III*, Map facing p. 29). Among these fifteen cities, Beth-zur, Mareshah, Lachish, Azekah, and mounds proposed as the site of Gath, have been partially excavated. Where masonry has been exposed, walls were composed of rough boulders only crudely square. Corner stones were more carefully finished, but many small stones were used between the courses and the effect and durability of the wall above ground level was improved by one or more coats of lime plaster.

Nothing remains of the first Iron Age palace (A) at Lachish, except a stone podium 32 metres square, comparable perhaps to David's Millo (Hebrew: "filling"). It appears to encase the ruins of the Bronze Age citadel, and to form a platform for the foundation of a building, which may have been the focal point of Rehoboam's fenced city. The ceramic evidence to prove it can only be obtained when the area is more fully excavated. However, beyond the south-east corner of the later palace B-C, a trial cut through the plaster courtyard of Palace C produced pottery which appears to be of earlier origin than the majority of sherds found at or below the foundation level of the six-metre brick wall encircling the city, of which a small section was seen on the west side of the mound (*L. III*, p. 87 and Pl. 109).

¹ *I.E.J.* 8 (1958), pp. 85-86.

D. *Pottery Comparisons: Hazor X-IX, Lachish V*

Comparisons of the sherds from the south wall trial cut at Lachish (*L.III*, Pl. 105) and of the material from the small section of Strata X-IX exposed in the first season at Hazor (vol. I, Pls. XLV-XLVI) cannot be especially rewarding, though the sherds covered with reddish-brown slip burnished all over are common to both phases, like the distinctive bar handles.

III. NINTH CENTURY

A. *Defence measures in the Divided Kingdoms*

The six-metre brick city wall at Lachish may be due to extensive building works in Judah under Rehoboam's grandson, Asa (II Chronicles xiv, 6). The top surface of the same construction is to be seen in plan on Pls. 111 and 114 of *L.III*, where this wall is interrupted by projecting brick piers on either side of the gate (*L.III*, p. 94). Those were the outer piers of a complex gate system, of which the inner threshold was excavated (*L.III*, Pls. 15: 1-4); it led to a row of shops and houses designated as Level III. Both the inner gate towers and the road surface, as well as the shops facing the street which led into the city were destroyed by fire, and the event which brought this phase to an end will be discussed when the comparable phases at Hazor and Samaria have been examined. Meanwhile, it is only necessary to point out that the six-metre brick city wall must have continued in use until the destruction of Level III.

The defence programme in Judah may well have been spurred on by contemporary events in Israel; Asa had turned the threat to his own kingdom by bribing Ben-Hadad, king of Syria, to break his pact with Israel, and consequently the cities of the northern kingdom were attacked (I Kings xv, 20; II Chronicles, xvi, 4). The excavators of Hazor consider that the burning of Stratum IX can be inferred from the Biblical account. "Only the conquest of the northern frontier cities", they write, "is explicitly mentioned, but since the greater part of the land of Naphtali with all its store-cities was occupied, and Ben-Hadad's army reached the Kinnereth district, it is hardly to be supposed that Hazor remained untaken" (*Hazor I*, p. 23).

B. *Foundation and growth of Samaria*

In the thirty and first year of Asa, king of Judah, began Omri to reign over Israel, twelve years; six years reigned he in Tirzah. And he bought the hill Samaria of Shemer for two talents of silver, and built on the hill, and called the name of the city which he built, after the name of Shemer, owner of the hill, Samaria (I Kings xvi, 23, 24).

Five years after the Syrian campaign, Omri left Tirzah and founded his new capital at Samaria, though he cannot have lived to see its completion, which must date from the reign of his son, Ahab.

The architects who planned the new city were unhampered by previous buildings on the mound, and they were able to lay out the buildings with "geometrical regularity", while the masons lavished their skill on the finish and accurate fitting of the blocks which formed the walls. At Samaria, as Dr. Crowfoot remarked, "we shall be mainly concerned with the fortifications, the remains of the internal buildings being too fragmentary to make much sense" (*S.S.* 1, p. 7). The enclosure wall of Period I is partially preserved on the north side of the hill; it consisted of the stone foundations for a wall 1.60 m. thick, of which the superstructure was probably of sun-baked bricks (*S.S.* 1, p. 5). If bricks were used in the building of Samaria, it would perhaps represent a retrogression from the standards of Solomon's masons, for there is no mention of them in the detailed list of the materials needed for the building of the Temple.

In Period II a casemate wall was built outside and surrounding the original enclosure wall, which continued in use throughout the Israelite period. It is these constructions which have been repeatedly compared with the buildings of Megiddo, Stratum IV (see in particular Crowfoot in *P.E.Q.*, 1940, pp. 146 f., and more recently Kenyon in *S.S.* 3, pp. 200 f.); though the similarity of the drafting of the stones, the details of the bonding and the use of smooth-dressed stones above bossed lower courses are very striking, there are differences also which Miss Kenyon does not fail to point out. If we accept the synchronism of the Stratum IV A gate at Megiddo with that of Strata X-IX at Hazor (see p. 92 above), then we must agree that the fortifications of Periods I and II at Samaria are about sixty years later, which is not unreasonable, when it is considered that a much wider range both in time and place is now allowed for this type of masonry (see also note on p. 92). However, masonry of this type was no longer dressed on purpose for the buildings of Period III. Indeed, stones were re-used from the earlier buildings, and the foundations were from 1 m. to 1.30 m. in thickness, very roughly coursed and fitted (*S.S.* 1, p. 101).

The foundations of the important Pillared Building at Hazor (Stratum VIII) compare with them in width (1.20 m.). The plan consisted of a large hall divided lengthwise by two parallel rows of pillars, which were square and roughly dressed, and the burnt layer covering Stratum IX ran under them. The authors of *Hazor* I make it clear that this public building was not a stable, and they remark that the finds discovered on the shelves between the pillars support its identification as a store-house (p. 13). In the opinion of the excavators, the Pillared Building was erected in the reigns of Omri-Ahab, and it continued in use after repairs (Stratum VII) until the end of the ninth century, c. 815 B.C.

C. Pottery comparisons: Hazor X-VIII, Samaria I-III

In attempting a synchronism of pottery at these sites, it must be remembered that at Samaria the pottery described and figured from a particular

phase represents the sherds from beneath the floors of the structure, for the good reason that nothing was found upon them, while at Hazor, Lachish and elsewhere it is more usually that of the latest occupation on the floors (*S.S.* 3, p. 90). In a recent article on "A New Scheme for the Sub-Division of the Iron Age in Palestine",¹ Dr. Aharoni and Mrs. Amiran conclude that the pottery from beneath the floors of III buildings at Samaria belongs to the previous occupational phases, which antedate the building operations of Omri and Ahab. They consider that the bowls of Samaria III are exactly identical with those of Hazor VIII, though this comparison is not apparent from *Hazor* I, Pl. XLVII and *S.S.* 3, Fig. 4. For instance, the "characteristic" bowl of Hazor VIII (p. 14 and Pl. XLVII:10) with thickened rim is missing at Samaria III, where the earlier plain rim is common, so that personally I should prefer to allow for an interval of a decade or so between the two deposits. This is not the place to follow the intricacies of the classification of cooking pot rims, but in Samaria III, the single rim illustrated (Fig. 4:21) is of an earlier type than those attributed to Stratum VIII at Hazor (*Hazor* I, Pl. XLVIII: 1-3). However, these points will be cleared up when the evidence from later seasons at Hazor is published. Meanwhile, the important point on which all are agreed, is that there was a break in pottery technique at the end of Period III at Samaria (*S.S.* 3, p. 199) and a striking difference between the pottery types of Strata VIII and VII at Hazor (*Hazor* I, pp. 20-23). This in itself should suggest some short interval of time.

IV. EIGHTH CENTURY

A. *Alterations and Repairs*

The buildings of Hazor and Samaria were repaired sometime during the last decades of the ninth or the beginning of the eighth century B.C. New floors were laid in the Pillared Building at Hazor, and perhaps at much the same time the II casemate wall was repaired at Samaria, while a poorly-built wall was hurriedly constructed on the stump of the finer outer wall of Period I. The casemate wall continued in use during Period IV when it was the only fortification around the city. Within the enclosure, small rooms of irregular plan were built, and their roughly-made walls were only 0.60 cms. thick, while the surface was covered by a coat of plaster to hide deficiencies (*S.S.* 1, pp. 103-106).

The Pillared Building at Hazor was finally burnt (*Hazor* I, p. 13), and in Stratum VI above, domestic quarters were built over the official building, with house walls usually less than a metre thick. The tendency to produce

¹ *I.E.J.* 8 (1958), pp. 171-184.

irregular plans became more marked in Stratum V, and a number of hearths, bins and ovens figure in the plan (*Hazor* I, Pl. CLXXIV). It is interesting to compare the similar style of domestic building in Judah during the eighth century (*L.III*, Pls. 114-115).

These changes in town planning common to both Israel and Judah may reflect a change in policy, at least as far as Judah was concerned, which had favoured decentralized rule vested in the "princes of the people" who would require good government buildings during their control, a system which was interrupted by the attack on Judah and Jerusalem at the end of the reign of Joash, Amaziah's father (*II Chronicles* xxiv, 23).

The Aramaean invasion of Hazael, king of Damascus, probably also resulted in the burning of the Pillared Building at Hazor, which had been used as government premises up to that time. The same attack has also been given as one of two possible alternative causes for the phases of rebuilding at Samaria (Periods IV and IV A).

The divergent chronology of the Hebrew kings during the eighth century leaves several alternative dates open for the remaining phases of Samaria, but as far as Hazor is concerned the excavators put forward an interesting suggestion concerning the layer of debris which separates Stratum VI from V; they propose that it may have been caused by the earthquake which took place when Uzziah was king of Judah and Jeroboam II reigned in Israel (*Amos* i, 1; *Zech.* xiv, 5, and *Hazor* I, p. 22).

B. *Assyrian Campaigns*

Both Biblical and Assyrian sources combine to establish the dates of the destruction of Hazor by Tiglath-Pileser III in 732, and of Samaria by Sargon II in 722 B.C. With the destruction of the Israelite capital, Judah remained alone to withstand the advance of Assyrian troops towards Egypt. Threats to Jerusalem followed, and in 700 B.C. Lachish was besieged and captured as a necessary preliminary to the reduction of the capital. While Sennacherib was encamped at Lachish, his envoys backed by an army parleyed with king Hezekiah's officers outside the walls of Jerusalem, and the exchanges between them reveal the store set by both sides on public opinion (*II Kings* xviii-xix). Combined with the royal records written in cuneiform on baked clay cylinders, and with the bas-reliefs from the palace at Kouyinjik illustrating the Siege of Lachish¹, the Assyrian campaigns in Judah at the end of the eighth century are perhaps the best-documented events in the history of the Jewish kingdoms.

¹ See R. D. Barnett on "The Siege of Lachish" (*I.E.J.* 8 [1958], pp. 161-164).

Compare the three parallel accounts of the Siege of Lachish recorded in the Old Testament:—

II Kings XVIII, 13-17.

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. 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 the king of Assyria appointed unto Hezekiah king of Judah three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold. And Hezekiah gave him all the silver that was found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasures of the king's house. At that time did Hezekiah cut off the gold from the doors of the temple of the Lord, and from the pillars which Hezekiah king of Judah had overlaid, and gave it to the king of Assyria. And the king of Assyria sent Tartan and Rabsaris and Rab-shakeh from Lachish to king Hezekiah with a great host against Jerusalem. And they went up and came to Jerusalem. And when they were come up, they came and stood by the conduit of the upper pool, which is in the highway of the fuller's field.

II Chronicles XXXII, 9.

After this did Sennacherib king of Assyria send his servants to Jerusalem, (but he *himself laid siege* against Lachish, and all his power with him) unto Hezekiah king of Judah, and unto all Judah that were at Jerusalem, saying, thus saith Sennacherib king of Assyria, whereon do ye trust, that ye abide in the siege in Jerusalem ?

Isaiah XXXVI, 1-2.

Now it came to pass in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah that Sennacherib king of Assyria came up against all the defenced cities of Judah and took them. And the king of Assyria sent Rabshakeh from Lachish to Jerusalem unto king Hezekiah with a great army. And he stood by the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field.

C. *Pottery comparisons: Hazor VII-V, Samaria IV-VI, Lachish Level III*

Having surveyed the architectural and historical evidence for the three cities under review, we turn to the problem of the pottery. The excavators of Hazor were not able to distinguish any great differences between that of Strata VII-VI-V, and the same can be said for Periods V-VI at Samaria. The house of Period V, containing only a small amount of pottery below the floors is the last of the Israelite period on the site (*S.S.* 3, Fig 8). Whenever the floors did survive, they were overlaid by destruction debris, and no houses were subsequently built above them until the Hellenistic period (*S.S.* 1, pp. 106 f). The pottery of Period VI, deposit (1) came from a raising of level contemporary with wall 573, and was only cleared in a trench two metres wide (*S.S.* 3, p. 119 f.). Another deposit (2) came from a small "pit i" in the Period V house, used either as a rubbish dump or as a latrine; its contents were not sealed in by any floor, and the Period VII destruction debris which overlay the rest of the house did not actually overlie the pit, therefore it cannot be safely used as a closed stratified group.¹ Deposit

¹ *P.E.Q.*, 1959, pp. 65 f.

(3) pottery came from a site on the bare hillside outside the city, where a rectangular area or "high place" was nearly surrounded by a trench packed with broken pottery, which Miss Kenyon considers is "undoubtedly contemporary with Period VI" (*S.S.* 3, pp. 120, 137-139). She points out a sherd from deposit (1) as a forerunner of the bowl with the thickened triangular rim which appears in Periods VII and VIII, and states that it is "fairly but not very common" in Period VI (Fig. 9:3). A less emphatic form occurs with the pottery from the Israelite shrine, which was rare and only found in that deposit (Fig. 13:15). A larger bowl with four handles (Fig. 20:1) is exactly like the form which became so common at Lachish by the end of the century (*L.III*, Bowl Class 13, pp. 277 f.).² It is difficult to reconcile these facts with the statement on p. 206 "that not a single specimen is found in Period VI". A glance at the list which follows shows that the bowls from Period VI are paralleled at Hazor in Strata VI and V. The comparisons between the three sites show a satisfactory measure of agreement. Only the common type of store jar at Hazor, such as Pls. L: 31, 32; LII: 26, 27 and LVII: 1, 2 is unrepresented at Samaria and Lachish, which suggests that these large containers of wine or oil were either local or had closer affinities with northern types.

On the evidence of the Bible and of Assyrian records, all three sites were destroyed within thirty-five years of each other, while the excavations show that Hazor V and Samaria V were burnt, and Lachish Level III shared that fate. The parallels from Lachish with the two earlier destruction levels are too striking to be ignored, and they come from rooms in three main areas on the partially excavated mound:—

(a) Rooms south of the Citadel (*L.III*, Pl. 115), 1001, 1002, 1006, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1012, 1013, 1015, 1016; all are assigned to the building period of Group 4 (*L.III*, p. 104).

(b) Denuded rooms 1040, 1042, 1443, almost at present surface level in Grid Square J. 16/17 (Pl. 114), which, owing to their condition, could not be linked to the parallel rooms on the north side of the road, which were more deeply buried near the gate.

(c) Rooms north and south of the road leading into the city from the gate (Pl. 114), 1078-1081, 1084, 1085, 1090, 1092, 1094, 1095.

Except in the case of the cooking pot, Type 442 and of the dipper and juglet, Types 292 and 310, none of the forms listed is associated with the series of rooms east of the Citadel which were attributed to Level II. The dipper and juglet also occur in Tomb 106, which suggests that the rubbish in "pit i" may extend beyond the 722 B.C. destruction date at Samaria.

² Needless to say, Mrs. Crowfoot had not overlooked the comparison in the general list, though the bowl, Pl. 81: 120 (from

Level III rooms at Lachish), is a more exact parallel to Samaria, Fig. 20: 1, than the drawing which she cited (*S.S.* 3, p. 159).

	<i>Hazor</i> (vol. I)	<i>Samaria</i> (vol. 3)	<i>Lachish</i> (vol. III)	
Pottery	Stratum VII	Periods IV—IV A	Level III rooms	Tomb 1002
Bowl	Pl. XLIX:7	Fig. 7:1	48	48
Bowl	Pl. XLIX:14	—	83	—
Krater (Jar)	Pl. XLIX:36	—	49 ⁰	—
Krater (Jar)	—	Fig. 6:21	499	—
		Periods V—VI Israelite shrine		
Jug	Pl. L:20	Fig. 22:8		227
Jug	Pl. L:21	Fig. 22:3	280	—
Juglet	Pl. L:14	Fig. 23:5	—	—
Store jar	Pl. L:34	Fig. 21:5	—	—
Lamp	Pl. L:38	Fig. 27:1	148	148
	Stratum VI			
Bowl	Pl. LI:15	Fig. 13:15	84	—
Bowl	Pl. LI:24	—	603	—
Cooking pot	Pl. LII:9	Fig. 30:24	—	—
Cooking pot	Pl. LII:11	Fig. 30:21	—	—
Cooking pot	—	Fig. 30:22	442	—
	Stratum V			
Bowl	Pl. LIII:15	Fig. 13:16	—	
Bowl	Pl. LIV:5	Fig. 13:9a	—	
Bowl	Pl. LIV:7	Fig. 19:7	—	
Bowl or krater	Pl. LIV:21	Fig. 20:1	120	
Cooking pot	Pl. LV:4	Fig. 30:20	—	
Store jar	—	Fig. 21:10	491	
Jug	Pl. LVI:15	Fig. 22:4		
		House V—		
		pit i Fig. 10:18		
Juglet	Pl. LVI:1	pit i Fig. 10:23	292	
Juglet	Pl. LVI:5	pit i Fig. 10:24	310	
	Destroyed Tiglath-Pileser III, 732 B.C.	Destroyed Sargon II, 722 B.C.	Destroyed Sennacherib, 700 B.C.	

V. SEVENTH AND EARLY SIXTH CENTURIES

A. *Assyrian administration*

Hazor and Samaria were under Assyrian rule from the last decades of the eighth to approximately the middle of the seventh century. The Bible is silent about Hazor at this time, but the deportation of the inhabitants of Samaria, and their replacement by persons from Babylon and other cities of the Assyrian empire is recorded in II Kings xvii, 23-41. The newcomers worshipped their own gods and observed their own customs; their buildings were planned without regard for the underlying houses, and an Assyrian official was established as governor, whose pottery included, no doubt, the so-called Assyrian dinner service ware (Stratum IV at Hazor¹ and Stratum VII at Samaria).

It is known that Lachish was administered after its fall in 700 B.C. by an Assyrian governor, and that Philistine levies were assembled there in the early decades of the seventh century (*L. III*, p. 41). Much of the area around the ruined citadel was cleared, possibly for troop movements, but so little elsewhere on the mound has been excavated that other buildings besides the ramshackle rooms east of the Citadel may yet be found to represent the period. Part of a well-built city wall remains on the west slope of the tell, and in its second phase of use, the city gate was partially blocked and narrowed (*L. III*, Pls. 109, 111-113).

B. *Scythian raids and the Babylonian advance*

The Scythians, forced south from the Black Sea region by the pressure of northern nomads, dominated much of Asia for part of the seventh century. Bronze fibulae and triple-bladed arrowheads are perhaps among the few relics of their occupation, or influence at Lachish (*L. III*, p. 57). The incursion of these hordes may account for the lack of important buildings attributable to the mid-seventh century at Samaria and Lachish.

With the collapse of Assyrian power marked by the fall of Nineveh in 612 B.C., the cities of Palestine may have hoped for a respite from attack, but the swift Babylonian advance towards Egypt, and the refusal of the Jewish authorities to cooperate with them, as advised by Jeremiah, finally brought the full weight of Babylon against Judah, as a necessary preliminary to the attack on Egypt.

C. *Nebuchadrezzar's Campaigns*

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).

¹ Mrs. Amiran informs me that sherds of this ware have been found in later seasons at Hazor.

Nebuchadrezzar campaigned against Jehoiakin in 597 B.C., and after the first siege and capture of Jerusalem he still attempted to keep the royal line of Josiah on the throne. However, Zedekiah's defection and revolt made with the connivance of Egypt resulted in severe reprisals against the rebel in 588-586 B.C., culminating in the complete destruction of Jerusalem.

Conditions on the ground within the walls of Lachish seem to support the historical probability that the city was partially wrecked in the first campaign and finally ruined a few years later. At the threshold of the city gate, above the cut-down brick towers of Level III, two phases of Level II were visible, separated by a burnt layer, and after that partial destruction the gate was narrowed (*L. III*, Pl. 15: 5-6 and Pl. 113). The same road surface served both phases until it reached the top of the heap of burnt brick some ten metres from the gate, which had never been cleared after the destruction of Level III. At this point the road divided into two surfaces, each hardened by the tread of passers-by, and both upper and lower surfaces showed signs of burning.

The violence of the final onslaught is shown by the condition of the masonry on the sloping approach road to the outer city gate, where great blocks were split by thermal fracture and were reduced to a calcined mass. The methods used to assure destruction are illustrated in the piles of burnt timber on the road surfaces against the walls. Olive stones in the debris give a seasonal date for this event in the early autumn when the fruit was still on the trees, though it is not possible to say whether all the damage was done at the time of attack. In the case of Jerusalem, for instance, the chief buildings were deliberately burnt a month after the capitulation, and the walls of the city were broken down (*II Kings xxv*, 3-10; *Jeremiah lii*, 12-14).

The death of the administrators and the deportation of citizens and artisans left only the poorer classes to cultivate the land under Gedaliah and, after his murder, there was no one to take over the rehabilitation of the larger towns.

D. Pottery comparisons: Hazor IV-III, Samaria VII, Lachish Level II, Tell Beit Mirsim Stratum A.

Hazor IV and Samaria VII have no buildings of importance to detain us, and the pottery associated with these strata follows that of the underlying destruction layers, and much of it is probably contemporary with them. Lachish Level II, however, is represented on the mound by part of a well-built city wall and gate as described above, and by a row of ramshackle rooms east of the citadel, which were burnt with the pottery of the last inhabitants still on the floors. Whether they were destroyed in 597 or in 588-586 B.C. makes little difference to our problem, since the pottery they contained should belong to the beginning of the sixth century B.C., and a

gap of nearly a century exists between the destructions of Levels III and II.

This is filled as far as Lachish is concerned by the contents of Tomb 106, probably ranging in date from *c.* 671 to 580 B.C. The thickened rim bowl continued in use during the period (*e.g.*, Types 73 and 75) while in Level II Types 78 and 79 replaced them. Rare in Level III, the disk-based lamp became predominant in Tomb 106 and Level II, while the much-discussed water decanter exhibits a real development from Type 279 of Level III, through Types 275 and 280 of Tomb 106, ending with Types 276 and 281 in Level II. The widely-spaced wheel burnish on these last decanters is typical of the same forms from Stratum A at Tell Beit Mirsim, a site which lies only eight miles south-east of Lachish.

As the range of Stratum A covers all three centuries of the Jewish Kingdoms (900–600 B.C.), which the recent work at Hazor and Samaria has done so much to subdivide, we cannot use it as a basis for a fine division of Iron Age ceramics, though it retains its value as representative of the seventh and early sixth centuries as a whole. Professor Albright found that the stratigraphic divisions of loci in Stratum A were rarely possible, but he recognized up to three superimposed floors in certain areas, showing considerable differences “between the pottery of the lowest floor designated as A1—tenth to eighth centuries—and that of the upper ones” (*A.A.S.O.R.* 21–22 [1943], para. 25). It is therefore dangerous to rely on individual comparisons of pottery forms, when we cannot tell to which phase in Stratum A they belong. Miss Kenyon has relied on individual comparisons in her discussion of the destruction date of Level III at Lachish, and she makes no mention of the contents of Tomb 106 (*S.S.* 3, pp. 206–208). A glance at the Consolidated Chart on p. 330 of *Lachish III* will show that the contents of Tomb 106 lie between the rooms of Level III and II in the order of development, and if a 597 B.C. date is accepted for the destruction of Level III, then the deposits which follow must be pushed forward well into the sixth century, when historical evidence suggests that the site was deserted. Mr. Starkey’s proposal of the same date, which has been frequently quoted¹, was made in 1937 before the discovery of the Level II rooms, which were only excavated after his death. If he had had this evidence to consider, I feel sure that his conclusion would not have differed from my own, which follows the testimony of written record. It implies two main destructions at Lachish, one in 700 B.C., and another in the first (and/or second) Babylonian assault in 597 or 588–586 B.C., and all three destructions are apparent on the ground. For an acceptance of these dates, see Mrs. Ruth Amiran in *I.E.J.* 8 (1958), p. 222.

¹ *B.A.S.O.R.* 132, Dec. 1953, p. 46; (1955), pp. 188 f.; *B.A.S.O.R.*, 150, April, *A.J.A.*, 58 (1954), p. 336; *J.N.E.S.* 14 1958, p. 24.

VI. LATE SIXTH CENTURY B.C. TO FOURTH CENTURY A.D.

A. *Neo-Babylonian, Persian, Hellenistic and Roman rule*

While space and the readers' patience will not allow a discussion of the problems which arise during the final phases at Hazor and Lachish, both places were the seat of an administrative centre. In the excavators' opinion, the citadel of Stratum III at Hazor may be as early as the seventh century B.C., and the entirely new plan which it exhibits is one which has been ably discussed by Mrs. Amiran and I. Dunayevsky in an article on "The Assyrian Open-court Building and its Palestinian Derivatives" (*B.A.S.O.R.*, 149, February, 1958, pp. 25-32). The Residency at Lachish, occupied during the fifth-fourth century B.C. (Level I), belongs to a later development of the same plan, and when these buildings fell out of use there is little to suggest that either site ever recovered its former importance.

Much of the area north of the Israelite courtyard at Samaria was planted as a garden in Persian times, but its greatest glories were still to come. A Macedonian colony was settled on the site by Alexander, and for more than two centuries Samaria remained an outpost of Hellenism. In 30 B.C. Augustus gave the place to Herod, who renamed it Sebaste in honour of the emperor. The fluctuating fortunes of the city under the Romans brought prosperity and disaster to its temples and palaces, which can be traced through four separate periods lasting into the fourth century A.D.

VII. CONCLUSION

Dr. Aharoni and Mrs. Amiran have recently proposed changes in the accepted names and divisions of the Jewish kingdom period in Palestine. Their article¹ embodies the results of the work at Hazor, and it provides a most useful framework to which the results from other sites can be applied. For the benefit of readers of the *P.E.Q.* the time scale they introduce is copied in the summary below, together with the equivalent Hazor strata. The Samaria evidence is divided to emphasize the difference between the date of the construction of walls and buildings, and of the pottery embodied in the make-up of the floors. The Lachish levels are added, as far as they are known at present, with a few explanations and remarks deriving from this review of the evidence.

¹ See p. 96, n.1.

Approx. Date	Hazor	Samaria			Lachish
ISRAELITE II	Strata	Walls	Buildings	Pottery	Levels
	1000-950	—			
	950-925	X		I	
	925-875	IX Burnt	inner I	II	V
875-841	VIII	casemate II		III scarce	

Change in pottery technique and forms*

ISRAELITE III	841-815	Repairs VII Burnt	Repair casemate, inner III	III	IV	IV?
	815-765	VI earthquake		IV	IV A	
	765-732	V Burnt		IV A	V	III
	732-721	—		V Burnt	shrine VI	↓
	721-700	IV			VII	rooms Burnt
	700-650		casemate in use till Hellen. period			II
	650-587	III				Burnt
						Burnt

* Wheel—replaces hand-burnish. Cf. Lachish Bowl class B.7 with S.S., 3, Fig. 7: 1 from repair of casemate wall; see also Fig. 13:16 from IV A and later. Bowl class B.13 from VII-V at Hazor, from VI—Israelite shrine—at Samaria.